

R. C. Majumdar, "Les rois Śailendra de Suvarṇadvīpa," *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient* 33 (1933): 121-141.

[121]

The Śailendra Kings of Suvarṇadvīpa

by R. C. Majumdar, Professor at the University of Dacca (Bengal)

The Nālandā copper-plate inscription (¹), dated to the 39th year of Devapāla, has revealed to us a line of kings belonging to the Śailendra dynasty who ruled over Yavabhūmi and Suvarṇadvīpa. Hindu historians know very little about these two kingdoms and the dynasties that ruled over them, and the few pieces of information that we possess are satisfactorily summarized by the editor of the inscription, Pandit Hirāvanda Śāstri, in his introductory remarks. The Śailendra kings nevertheless occupy a position of the first importance in the annals of Indonesia, and their history is at present the subject of lively controversy among Dutch scholars. Since the Śailendras' relations with India are, in my opinion, much closer than has hitherto been believed, I propose to review the whole subject briefly here, reserving a fuller treatment for a book that I am currently preparing on the history of the ancient Indian colonies in Malaysia (the Malay Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago). For the reader's convenience, I shall begin with a brief summary of the evidence relating to the Śailendra dynasty.

¹ EI, vol. XVII, p. 310. The inscription was also published separately by M. N. G. Majumdar in a memoir of the Varendra Research Society.

§ 1

I. The Ligor inscription dated 775 A.D. (²)

A stele found at Ligor in the Malay Peninsula, south of the Bay of Bandon, contains two inscriptions (A–B) engraved on its two faces.

Inscription A begins with a eulogy of Śrīvijayendrarāja and then mentions the construction of three brick temples dedicated to Buddhist divinities by Śrīvijayeśvarabhūpati. Jayanta, the royal chaplain (*rāja-sthavira*), built three *stūpas* by order of the king. After Jayanta's death, his disciple and successor Adhimukti built two brick *caityas* beside the three *caityas* (built by the king). Finally, we learn that Śrīvijayanṛpati, who resembled Devendra, built stupas in this place in the Śaka year 697 (*muni-nava-rasa*).

[122]

Inscription B, engraved on the reverse of the stele, contains only a single stanza, together with a few letters of the one that followed it. It begins with a eulogy of an emperor

² BEFEO, vol. XVIII, vi, App. I, pp. 29 ff.

(*rājādhirāja*) whose name was Viṣṇu (*Viṣṇvākhyo*). The last line is difficult to interpret. ⁽³⁾ It seems to refer to a lord of the Śailendra dynasty called Śrī Mahārāja, and it is probable, though not absolutely certain, that this person is the same as the *rājādhirāja* named Viṣṇu.

II. The Kalasan inscription dated 778 A.D. ⁽⁴⁾

This inscription was found in the village of Kalasan, in the district of Jogjakarta in Java. Its contents may be summarized as follows:

Adoration of the goddess Ārya Tārā. The preceptor (guru) of the Śailendra kings had caused a temple of Tārā to be built with the assistance (or consent) of “Mahārāja Dyah Pañcapana Panamkarana.” At the order of the guru, certain officers of the king constructed a temple with an image of the goddess Tārā, as well as a residence for monks professing the Vinaya-Mahāyāna.

In the prosperous kingdom of “the ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (*Śailendravaṃśatilaka*), the temple of Tārā was built by the preceptor of the Śailendra kings. In the Śaka year 700, Mahārāja Panamkarana caused a temple to Tārā to be built for the worship of the Guru (*gurupūjārtham*) and granted the village of Kalasan to the Saṅgha. This gift was to be protected by the kings of the Śailendra dynasty. Śrīrān Kariyāna Panamkarana makes this request to future kings.

³ M. Cœdès reads the second word of the second line as *Śailendravaṃśaprabhu-nigadataḥ*, which does not yield a satisfactory sense. I would propose reading *nigaditaḥ*, but M. Cœdès informs me that there is no trace of the vowel *i* above the *d*. M. Mus, in *BEFEO*, XXIX, p. 448, proposes correcting it to *prabha[va]nigadataḥ*.

⁴ This inscription was first published by Brandes in *Tijdschrift*, vol. 31, pp. 240–260. It was re-edited by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar in *J. Bo. B. R. A. S.*, XVII. The latest edition is by Dr. Bosch, *Tijdschrift*, vol. 68, pp. 57 ff.

According to Vogel, *Bijdragen*, 75, p. 634, the inscription refers to two Śailendra kings: the Śailendra king of Sumatra, whose Guru played an important role in the foundation of the temple dedicated to Tārā, and Kariyāna Panamkarana, a descendant of the Śailendra dynasty reigning in Java.

III. The Kělurak inscription dated 782 A.D. ⁽⁵⁾

This inscription was originally located at Kělurak, to the north of the temple of Loro Jonggrang at Prambanan, in the district of Jogjakarta (Java). It is partly illegible, and the extract that follows reproduces the passages most important from the historical point of view.

— Adoration of the Three Jewels (*ratnatraya*).

— Praises of the Buddhist divinities.

[123]

— This land is protected by the king called Indra, who is an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty (*Śailendravaṃśatilaka*), who has conquered kings in all directions, and who has crushed the mightiest of enemy heroes (*vairivara-vīravimardana*).

⁵ Edited by Bosch in *Tijdschrift*, vol. 68 (1928), pp. 1 ff.

— By him whose body was purified by the dust of the feet of the Guru who came from Gauḍa (*Gauḍadvīpaguru*), ... this image of Mañjuśrī was erected for the welfare of the world by the royal preceptor (*rājaguru*).

— In the Śaka year 704, Kumāraghoṣa (that is, the preceptor from Gauḍa mentioned above) erected this Mañjughoṣa.

— This pillar of glory, an excellent boundary-marker of the religion (*dharmasetu*) having the form of an image of Mañjuśrī, has been erected for the protection of all creatures.

— In this enemy-destroyer of Māra (*Smarārātinisūdana*) dwell the Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha.

— This wielder of the thunderbolt, glorified as Svāmī Mañjuvāk, contains all the gods: Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Maheśvara.

— I ask future kings to preserve this boundary-marker of the religion (*dharmasetu*).

— The preceptor who received the deferential hospitality (*satkāra*) of King Śrī Saṅgrāmadhananjaya.

IV. The Nālandā copper-plate inscription dated to the 39th year of King Devapāla (⁶)

This inscription commemorates the gift of five villages by Devapāla, at the request of the illustrious Bālaputradeva, king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Suvarṇadvīpādhipa Mahārāja Śrī Bālaputradeva).

⁶ See note 1, p. 121.

The inscription ends with a brief genealogy of Bālaputradeva, which may be summarized as follows:

There was a great king of Yavabhūmi (*Yavabhūmipāla*) whose name meant “tormentor of brave enemies” (*vīravairimathanānugatābhīdhānaḥ*), and who was an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty (*Śailendravaṃśatilaka*).

He had a valiant son (called) Samarāgravīra (or “he who is foremost in battle”).

His wife Tārā, daughter of King Śrī Varmasetu (⁷) of the lunar race, resembled the goddess Tārā.

By this wife he had a son, Śrī Bālaputra, who caused a monastery to be built at Nālandā.

V. In addition to these texts, several Chola inscriptions refer to kings of the Śailendra dynasty ruling either over Kaṭāha, Kadāra, Kidāra, or else

[124]

over Kaṭāha and Śrīvijaya, and they mention their relations with the Chola kings as sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile.

⁷ Pandit H. Śāstri reads this name as Dharmasetu, but M. N. G. Majumdar’s reading, Varmasetu, seems to me beyond doubt.

1° The text known as the Great Leyden Charter (⁸), written partly in Sanskrit (1044 A.D.) and partly in Tamil (1045 A.D.), informs us that in 1005 A.D. Śrī Māravijayottuṅgavarman, king of Kaṭāha and king of Śrīvijaya, descended from the Śailendra dynasty, granted a village to a Buddhist monastery at Nāgipaṭṭana, built by his father Cūḍāmaṇivarman and bearing his name. In the Tamil part of the text, these kings are mentioned once as kings of Kadāra and another time as kings of Kidāra.

2° The Tiruvalangadu plates (⁹), dated to the 6th year of Rājendra Chola (1017–1018 A.D.), refer to that king's conquest of Kaṭāha, with the help of his valiant armies which had crossed the ocean.

3° An inscription of Rājendra Chola dated 1029–1030 A.D. (¹⁰) mentions him as ruling over Kadāram (¹¹).

4° Three inscriptions dated 1043, 1050, and 1068 A.D. concern the conquest of Kadāram by Rājendra Chola.

5° Several inscriptions of Rājendra Chola, dated between 1034 and 1039 A.D., set out in detail the territories of Saṅgrānavijayottuṅgavarman, king of Kadāram. Among the names of

⁸ Edited by Burgess in *Arch. Surv. S. India*, vol. IV, p. 206.

⁹ *South Ind. Ins.*, vol. III, part III, pp. 383 ff. The Sanskrit portion of this inscription, although expressly dated to the 6th year of the reign of Rājendra Chola, is ordinarily considered to have been engraved later. I have discussed this question at length in my book and will not return to it here.

¹⁰ *Ep. Carnatica*, vol. IX, p. 29.

¹¹ *Ep. Carnatica*, vol. IX, pp. 107, 33; *EI*, vol. XVIII, pp. 45–46, 54.

the conquered localities mentioned in this text appears the name of Śrīvijaya (¹²), whose ruler is expressly called king of Kadāra.

6° The Perumber inscription (¹³) of the 7th year of Vīra Rājendra (1068–1069 A.D.) tells us that: “Having conquered Kadāram, he graciously restored that country to its king, who had worshipped his feet.”

7° The Little Leyden Charter (¹⁴), dated 1089–1090 A.D., says: “At the request of the king of Kadāra, communicated by his envoys Rājavidyādhara-Sāmanta and Abhimanottuṅga-Sāmanta, (the Chola king) Kulottuṅga declared tax-exempt the village that had been granted to the Buddhist monastery called the Śailendra-Cūḍāmaṇivarma-vihāra” (that is, the very same one referred to in the Great Leyden Charter).

[125]

§ 2

We shall now see how the present views on the power of the Śailendras gradually developed.

¹² *Ep. Carnatica*, vol. IX, pp. 148–150, 161, 30, 35; *South Ind. Ins.*, vol. II, part V, pp. 105 ff. (with corrections in EI, vol. IX, pp. 231–232).

¹³ *South Ind. Ins.*, vol. III, part II, p. 202.

¹⁴ *Arch. Surv. of S. India*, vol. IV, pp. 226 ff.

It was M. Cœdès who first set the movement in motion. In an article that has become almost classic, he tried to prove that Śrīvijaya is the original form of the name corresponding to the Chinese Fo-che [Foshi], Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi], Fo-ts'i [Foqi], and San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], and to the Arabic Sribuza. Since all these places are situated at Palembang, Śrīvijaya must be identified with that country. ⁽¹⁵⁾

M. Cœdès quite naturally deduced from the Ligor inscription that the authority of Śrīvijaya had, by the end of the eighth century A.D., extended as far as the northern part of the Malay Peninsula. He further advanced the hypothesis that the king of the Śailendra dynasty mentioned on face B of the Ligor inscription was identical with the king of Śrīvijaya referred to on face A of the same stele.

M. Cœdès therefore logically concluded that there existed a Śailendra empire having Palembang as its capital and comprising Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula. He also regarded as probable the hypothesis of Chavannes and Gerini, namely that this empire was identical with the one known to us from the Arabs under the name Zābag. Ferrand ⁽¹⁶⁾ went a step further and declared that this identity was beyond doubt by identifying Zābag with San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]. Thus, in the eyes of scholars, the Śailendra dynasty of Palembang became the ruling house of a powerful Pacific empire, whose eloquent descriptions have been left to us by so many Arab authors.

¹⁵ *BEFEO*, XVIII, vi.

¹⁶ G. Ferrand, "L'empire sumatranais de Śrīvijaya," *JA*, 11th series, vol. XX (1922), pp. 1–104, 161–244; especially pp. 163 ff.

Further light on the power of the Śailendras was provided by M. Krom ⁽¹⁷⁾ and M. Vogel ⁽¹⁸⁾. These two scholars, working independently of one another and almost simultaneously, brought out the important role played by the Śailendras in Java. The Kalasan and Kělorak inscriptions clearly attest Śailendra supremacy in Java in 778 and 782 A.D. On the basis of this fact, M. Krom showed the great influence that the Buddhist Śailendras must have exercised on the art and religion of Java. In short, he expressed the view that it was to the Śailendras that Java owed the introduction of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the construction of such famous monuments as Borobudur, Candi Mendut, and Candi Kalasan. Thus was born the hypothesis of a “Sumatran period” in the history of Java, with its far-reaching consequences for the political and cultural history of Java.

[126]

This theory, however, received a fatal blow when Stutterheim ⁽¹⁹⁾ astonished the scholarly world by advancing the bold hypothesis that the Śailendra dynasty was of Javanese origin and subsequently conquered Śrīvijaya. Thus, instead of a Sumatran period in the history

¹⁷ Krom, *De Soematraansche periode in de Javaansche geschiedenis*, Leiden, 1919. A French summary of this article appeared in BEFEO, XIX, v, p. 127.

¹⁸ P. Vogel, *Het Koninkrijk Śrīvijaya* (Bijdr., 1919, pp. 626–637).

¹⁹ W. F. Stutterheim, *A Javanese Period in Sumatran History*, Surakarta, 1929.

of Java, we should, according to this author, envisage a Javanese period in the history of Sumatra.

§ 3

In view of these radical divergences of opinion among scholars, we shall take up the whole question again from its origins, in the light of the positive evidence, and without relying on any theory or preconceived idea.

First of all, let us examine M. Cœdès's view that the Śailendras were originally kings of Śrīvijaya (Palembang).

The evidence to which he refers is that of the Ligor inscription. Face A of this inscription refers to Śrīvijayendrarāja, Śrīvijayeśvarabhūpati, and Śrīvijayanṛpati. M. Cœdès assumes that these three designations may be translated as "king of Śrīvijaya," whereas M. Stutterheim proposes translating the first two as "king of the lords of Śrīvijaya." As for the third, it certainly cannot mean anything other than "king of Śrīvijaya." In defending his view concerning the existence of a sovereign placed above the king of Śrīvijaya, M. Stutterheim expresses himself as follows: "When the king was mentioned for the third time, this indication was omitted and replaced by the shorter expression 'king of Śrīvijaya,' the title which he in fact bore in the eyes of the inhabitants of that country." ⁽²⁰⁾ Now, without disregarding the force of this argument, it must be observed that probability lies on the side of the opinion expressed by M. Cœdès. ⁽²¹⁾

²⁰ Op. cit., p. 14.

²¹ Mus showed in *BEFEO*, XXVIII, p. 520, the soundness of Cœdès's theory.

Although we cannot regard the matter as absolutely certain, we may accept it as highly probable that these designations refer to the king of Śrīvijaya.

However, when this king of Śrīvijaya is identified with the king of the Śailendravaṃsa mentioned on face B of this inscription, we are obliged to express serious doubt.

The word *svasti* placed at the beginning of the second inscription proves that it is an independent text and not the continuation of the first inscription. By comparing the script of the two texts, one becomes certain that, although they are contemporary or nearly so, they were not written either by the same hand or at the same time. Next, in the long panegyric of the king of Śrī—

[127]

...vijaya, which forms part of the first inscription, the latter is nowhere said to belong to the Śailendra dynasty. On the other hand, Śrīvijaya is not mentioned in the second inscription, which not only refers to a *Rājādhirāja* and *Prabhu* (Lord) of the Śailendra dynasty, but also gives two of his appellations: Viṣṇu and Mahārāja. It is therefore legitimate to maintain, until proof to the contrary is produced, that the two inscriptions should be regarded as emanating from different persons, face B being manifestly later than face A.

Thus, the only reasonable conclusions that we can draw from the Ligor inscriptions are:
1° that the locality in question formed part of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya in 775 A.D.; 2° that it was

under the suzerainty of the kings of the Śailendra dynasty at a subsequent period. Nothing proves that the king of Śrīvijaya belonged to the Śailendra dynasty.

M. Cœdès has expressed the view that the kings Cūḍāmaṇivarman and Māravijayottuṅgavarman, who belonged to the Śailendra dynasty, are mentioned in the Chola inscriptions as rulers of Śrīvijaya, and that consequently the Śailendra king named on face B of the Ligor inscription may likewise be regarded as king of Śrīvijaya.

On examining the Chola texts, it appears that the two kings in question were regarded rather as kings of Kadāra (or Kaṭāha-Kedah in the Malay Peninsula), whose authority extended over Śrīvijaya, and not as kings of Śrīvijaya. With a single exception, all these texts refer simply to rulers of Kaṭāha, Kadāra, or Kidāra. Even in the exceptional text, namely the Great Leyden Charter, the Tamil part mentions these kings as kings of Kadāra, whereas the Sanskrit version designates them by the title of kings of Kaṭāha and kings of Śrīvijaya.

Whereas inscriptions of the Śailendra dynasty have been found in Java and in the Malay Peninsula, none has yet been found in Sumatra, and nothing proves that the center of the authority of the Śailendra kings was at Śrīvijaya, at least before the end of the tenth century A.D. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Śailendra dynasty is mentioned in none of the four Śrīvijaya inscriptions belonging to the end of the seventh century A.D. (²²), a time when that kingdom had already entered the period of expansion which, according to M. Krom, was to culminate in the establishment of its suzerainty over Java.

²² These inscriptions were edited by Cœdès, *BEFEO*, XXX, p. 29.

We thus have certain proof that the Śailendras ruled over the Malay Peninsula and Java toward the end of the eighth century A.D. Now, the history of the powerful empire of Zābag, comprising the islands of Indonesia and the Malay Peninsula, appears for the first time in the Arab authors about the middle of the eighth century A.D. (²³)

[128]

The first to speak of it, Ibn Khordādhbeh (844–848 A.D.), tells us that the king of Zābag was called Maharaja. This immediately recalls the fact that in the Ligor inscription, face B, the Śailendra emperor is referred to as *Mahārājanāma*, that is, “bearing the name Maharaja.” However interesting this piece of evidence may be, it cannot be regarded as a decisive argument in favor of the view that the empire of Zābag was identical with the Śailendra empire.

Nevertheless, for general reasons, it is reasonable to admit that in the ninth century, and in the century following, there was in the Pacific only one great empire corresponding to the description given by the Arab authors, rather than two. Since the Śailendras undoubtedly ruled over a vast empire in Malaysia during that period, it may be considered extremely probable that the Śailendra empire was the same as the empire mentioned by the Arabs as that of the Maharaja of Zābag. But before discussing this question, it is necessary to identify Zābag.

²³ The Arabic texts were translated by G. Ferrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 ff.

§ 4

As we have seen above, it is now generally accepted that the name Zābag, and the other forms of this name used by the Arab authors, designate the country called by the Chinese Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi], Fo-che [Foshi] , or San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], that is, Śrīvijaya. However, the question is not without certain difficulties. M. Ferrand, who was the most recent scholar to deal with this subject, gave the following reasons in favor of this identification: ⁽²⁴⁾

1° According to the Ligor inscription, the king of Śrīvijaya is called Maharaja (Śrī-*Mahārājanāma*). All the Arab authors mention Zābag as being the kingdom of the Maharaja.

2° Abūlfidā, relying on the authority of earlier authors, says that “the island of the Maharaja is the island of Sribuza,” which means that the two names designate the same island. It is certain that Sribuza represents Śrīvijaya. The island of the Maharaja, according to the testimony of Dimashqī, is “the mother of the islands belonging to the Maharaja,” or in other words the capital of the islands forming the domain of the Maharaja. This island, therefore, can only be Zābag. We may therefore set up the following equation:

$$\text{Island of the Maharaja} = \text{Zābag} = \text{Śrīvijaya}.$$

Now, the first of these arguments loses its force after what has been said above. As for the second, we may accept without difficulty the identification of the island of the Maharaja with Zābag. This identification is confirmed by the fact that various Arab authors, when

²⁴ Ferrand, op. cit., pp. 163 ff.

describing certain characteristics of this kingdom, sometimes attribute them to Zābag, sometimes to—

[129]

...the island of the Maharaja. Thus Abū Zayd Ḥasan says that Zābag has a very dense population and contains an unbroken line of villages, so that when a cock crows at daybreak, its call is repeated by the cock of the neighboring village, and the sound thus travels a distance of nearly 100 parasangs. The same author tells us the story of the lake situated in front of the palace, where the king of Zābag each day threw a brick of gold. Let us recall in this connection that Ibrāhīm bin Wāṣif-Shāh tells the first of these stories about the island of the Maharaja, and that Ibn Saʿīd repeats the second about the same island.

However, although “the island of the Maharaja” is equivalent to Zābag, its identification with Śrīvijaya seems impossible. For Abūlfidā, quoted by Ferrand, clearly distinguishes Zābag from Sribuza (Śrīvijaya) by assigning different longitudes to the two kingdoms.

This view is confirmed by the testimony of other Arab authors whom Ferrand passes over in silence. Thus Ibn Saʿīd clearly distinguishes Sribuza from Zābag. He places Sribuza at 3° 40' latitude and 88° 30' longitude, whereas the latitude and longitude of Zābag are respectively 12° 30' and 151°. This agrees entirely with that author's statement that to the southeast of Sribuza there is a large number of islands constituting the archipelago of Zābag.

Abū Zayd Ḥasan likewise makes a clear distinction between Zābag and Śrīvijaya. After describing the kingdom of the Maharaja, of which Zābag was the capital, he says: “Among the kingdoms over which he rules are the islands called Sribuza and Rāmī.” Likewise Mas‘ūdī says that the island of Sribuza is situated within the limits of the empire of Zābag, thereby distinguishing the two. Harakī lists Sribuza and Zābag as distinct islands in the Indian Ocean. Yāqūt is even clearer. Not only does he mention the two islands separately in his list, but he further notes that whereas Zābag is an island situated at the boundary between India and China, Sribuza is an island in India itself.

It is therefore perfectly clear that, against the statement of Abūlfidā that the island of the Maharaja is identical with Śrīvijaya, there is decisive testimony from a large number of Arab authors tending to prove that Zābag and Śrīvijaya are two different islands.

The Arab authors do not enable us to locate Zābag definitively, but they do provide some general information about its position. The information they give may be summarized as follows: ⁽²⁵⁾

1° India is bounded on the south by the kingdom of Zābag (62, 54), which lies midway between China and the kingdom of Balharā (62). Zābag lies at the eastern extremity of India beyond the Sea of Harkand (the Bay of Bengal), and to the west of China (66).

²⁵ The numbers in parentheses in the quotations that follow refer to the pages of Ferrand’s article, “L’empire sumatranais de Çrīvijaya,” *JA*, 1922.

[130]

2° Zābag separates China from India (62), and from its capital to China the voyage takes about one month.

3° The Khmer country is situated on the same longitude as Zābag. The distance between the two countries is equivalent to a voyage of 10 to 20 days by sea in the north-south direction, or vice versa (59). The relative position of the Khmer country and Zābag is the same as that of Madura and Ceylon (62).

4° There exists a “Gulf of Zābag,” and the China Sea forms numerous inlets along the coast of Zābag (61). The islands of Zābag form a vast archipelago (63).

5° The equator crosses the sea to the south of China, passing by the island of Zābag (which contains gold), between the islands of Kalah and Sribuza (65–73).

6° The latitude and longitude of Zābag, as given by the Arab authors, vary considerably, and since their method of calculation differs greatly from ours, the only useful indication we can derive from their data is a notion of the relative position of these various localities.

Thus Ibn Saʿīd gives us the following data:

	Latitude	Longitude
Zābag	12°30'	151°

[131]

...point. He says that to the south of Zābag lies the island of Jāwa. Since the towns of Lāmūrī and Faṣūr are placed in Jāwa, this latter country must be identified with the northern part of Sumatra. Therefore, the island of the Maharaja must be located in the Malay Peninsula. This is confirmed by the fact that the author places Kalah to the southeast either of the island of the Maharaja or of Jāwa. In any case, since Kalah denotes the well-known locality of Kedah, the island of the Maharaja must be placed to its north. The longitudes for Jāwa (western extremity), Zābag, and Kalah are respectively 145°, 151°, and 154°. Jāwa lies between latitudes 1° and 5°, whereas the island of the Maharaja is situated at latitude 12°30'. Moreover, Ibn Sa'īd places the islands of the Maharaja not far from the Andamans in a southeasterly direction. All this seems to correspond quite well with the northern part of the Malay Peninsula.

The earliest of the Arab authors, Ibn Khordādhbeh (844–848 A.D.), mentions the insular kingdom of Djāba, and although he sometimes uses the form Djāwaga, the following considerations show that the two localities are identical: ⁽²⁶⁾

1° He mentions the island of Kilah (i.e. Kalah) as belonging to the kingdom of Djāba (p. 27), whereas his contemporary Sulaymān (851 A.D.) and other Arab authors speak of Kalah-bār, identical with Kilah, as dependent on Djāwaga.

²⁶ Ferrand, *Textes*. The numbers in parentheses refer to the pages of that work.

2° He mentions the volcano of Djāba (p. 28), which Sulaymān (p. 41) and other Arab authors (p. 60) place in the vicinity of Djāwaga (p. 41, note 7).

3° He mentions Djāba, Salāhīt, and Harladj as situated in immediate proximity to one another (pp. 27–28), whereas Ibn Rustah (903 A.D.) regards Djāba, Salāhat, and Harladj as neighboring islands.

Now, al-Idrīsī (1154 A.D.) not only mentions Kilah, Djāba, Salāhat, and Harīdj (a variant of Harladj, p. 27, note 9) as lying extremely close to one another, the distance between them being only 2 parasangs, but he adds that all these localities constituted the territory of a single king who resided at Kilah and was called Djāba (pp. 184–185). In other words, the sovereign of all these states took his title from Djāba, but his headquarters were at Kilah. This observation leaves no room for doubt that Djāba, and therefore also Djāwaga, was situated in the Malay Peninsula, and that in the twelfth century the supreme ruler of this country and the neighboring islands resided at Kalah. This agrees well with the testimony of the Chola inscriptions, which mention the king as being the ruler of Kaṭāha (Kalah).

We arrive at the same conclusion by studying the geographical conceptions of the Arabs. The earliest Arab authors speak of a country called Rahmā, and from the details they give us about it, there can be no doubt—

...that this term does indeed designate Pegu, as M. Ferrand in fact accepts. ⁽²⁷⁾ Now Ibn al-Faqīh says: “There is in India a country called Rahmā which lies on the coast. Next to this kingdom is the land of Djāwaga, whose king is called Maharaja. There is no one beyond him, for the island over which he rules is the last.” ⁽²⁸⁾

Now, if Rahmā designates Pegu, we are obviously obliged to look for Djāwaga in the Malay Peninsula; and for an Arab author who perhaps knew nothing of Borneo and regarded China, Cambodia, and the Malay Peninsula as a series of lands extending from north to south, the expression “there is nothing behind (that is, east of) Djāwaga” is not far from the truth.

Of course, we must not forget that the term Djāwaga is employed by almost all the Arab authors in the broader sense of Malaysia, which readily explains the statements of Ibn al-Faqīh. Certain other statements may be explained in the same way.

Thus Ibn al-Faqīh mentions the volcano situated in the neighborhood of Zābag ⁽²⁹⁾ and also describes Fanṣūr as a province or country forming part of Zābag. ⁽³⁰⁾ Since Sumatra, or at least a part of that island, was included under the more general designation of Zābag, that author’s statements are easily understood and do not appear incompatible with the view that Zābag properly so called means the Malay Peninsula. With regard to Fanṣūr, we may note, for

²⁷ Ferrand, *Textes*, pp. 29, 36, 43.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

example, that Ko-kou-lo, placed by Jia Dan to the west of Kala, and which for that reason must be located in the Malay Peninsula, ⁽³¹⁾ is mentioned as being a country of Djāwaga. ⁽³²⁾

The Arab statement that Zābag was the frontier country between India and China confirms its location in the Malay Peninsula. For the port of Kalah is mentioned by the Arab authors as being the first Indian country situated in the neighborhood of China, at a distance of 300 parasangs. ⁽³³⁾ If one recalls that Rahmā (Pegu) and Khmer ⁽³⁴⁾ are both regarded as parts of India, and that Djāwaga is described as separating China from India, or again as situated at the eastern extremity of India, beyond the Sea of Harkand and west of China, ⁽³⁵⁾ we—

[133]

...may quite naturally admit that Djāwaga represents the northern part of the Malay Peninsula together with the regions situated immediately to the north of that country.

³¹ *BEFEO*, IV, p. 353.

³² Ferrand, *Textes*, p. 308.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 313.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 92, 205. From these two examples, we may conclude that Zābag, while being on the frontier between India and China, was considered part of India. But an earlier author, Ibn Rustah (ca. 903 A.D.), expressly says that “beyond Multān there are kings until one reaches the country of Djāwaga.”

The Arab testimony that Zābag was the frontier country between India and China leads us to include within it Laos and the vaguely defined mountainous country lying to the north of that region, which was known by the name Java or Sava. ⁽³⁶⁾ In this broad sense, the term Davāka, used in the inscription of Samudragupta, may be regarded as the origin of the variant Jāvaka or of the Arabic form Zābag. ⁽³⁷⁾ The theory that Zābag should be located in the Malay Peninsula is strikingly confirmed by evidence independent of that which we have just invoked. South Indian literature mentions a country called Sāvaka or Jāvaka. We find a reference to it in the famous epic poem Maṇimēkhalai. ⁽³⁸⁾ As M. Ferrand observes, the names Jāvaka and Zābag are the only terms in Indonesian geography whose equivalence can be established with certainty. ⁽³⁹⁾

The Sinhalese chronicle Cūḷavaṃsa has preserved for us a detailed account of two invasions of Ceylon by Candrabhānu, king of Jāvaka. ⁽⁴⁰⁾ Now an inscription of King Candrabhānu, king of Tāmbraliṅga, has been found at Chaiya, near Ligor. M. Coedès has shown, by comparing the dates, that the king Candrabhānu who caused this inscription to be drawn up in 1230 A.D. must be the king mentioned by the Sinhalese chronicle. ⁽⁴¹⁾ It is thus definitively established that the Cūḷavaṃsa used the term Jāvaka to designate part of the Malay Peninsula.

³⁶ Gerini, *Researches*, p. 131.

³⁷ The comparison of Zābag with Java, Sava, or Davāka is only a suggestion which cannot be pressed very far in the present state of our knowledge.

³⁸ V. R. R. Dikshitar, *Studies in Tamil Literature and History*, p. 83.

³⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁴⁰ *Cūllavaṃsa*, ch. 83, st. 36–48; ch. 88, st. 62, 75.

⁴¹ *Bijd.*, 1931, p. 463 ff.

Candrabhānu was aided in his second expedition by the Pāṇḍyas. A little later, however, the Pāṇḍya king boasts in his inscriptions that he defeated both the king of Jāvaka and the king of Ceylon. Now, in an inscription of Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya dated 1264 A.D., he claims to have defeated and killed the Sāvakas, and in an inscription of the following year we find in the list of defeated kings the king of Kadāra (and not the king of Sāvaka).⁽⁴²⁾ One is inevitably led to conclude that Sāvaka or Jāvaka and Kadāra both designate the kingdom of Candrabhānu. Thus the Sinhalese chronicles agree with the Arab authors in locating Jāvaka in the—

[134]

...the Malay Peninsula. Let us add that the Arab author Sulaymān, writing in 851 A.D., had noted that “Kalāh-bār and Zābag were governed by the same king.” Since Kalāh-bār is without doubt identical with Kedah, it follows that Kedah and Zābag formed a single kingdom.

The Arab authors of the tenth century A.D. attest the extension of Zābag’s authority over the various islands of the Pacific. However, Abū Zayd Ḥasan (around 916 A.D.), our earliest authority on this matter, clearly distinguishes the kingdom of Zābag proper, with its capital called Zābag, from the island named Sribuza⁽⁴³⁾, representing a dependent state of that

⁴² These inscriptions are mentioned in *Govt. Epigraphist’s Report*, Madras (No. 588 of 1917, and No. 356 of 1906). Their contents were summarized by Ferrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–49.

⁴³ Ferrand, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

kingdom. In Sribuza we cannot fail to recognize Śrīvijaya. Thus it clearly appears that Zābag was formerly a distinct kingdom, and that its authority had extended over Śrīvijaya by the tenth century A.D. It was no doubt this extension of Zābag's political authority over the various islands that led the Arab authors to give the name Zābag to the whole of Malaysia. But the island of Zābag proper was still considered distinct from the empire of Zābag, which comprised the archipelago. Given the agreement between the testimony of the Arab authors and that of the Cūḷavaṃsa, we are justified in locating the kingdom of Zābag proper in the Malay Peninsula, probably in the neighborhood of Ligor.

Before concluding this discussion of the identification of Zābag, something must be said about the Chinese data. At present, it is generally taken as established that the kingdom called San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] in Chinese works from the tenth to the fourteenth century A.D. is identical with Zābag or Zābaj. But this theory implies hypotheses that, in my view, have been accepted without sufficient proof. These hypotheses are as follows: 1° San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi], Zābag, and Sribuza would all be equivalents of Śrīvijaya; and 2° all these states would be identifiable with present-day Palembang.

As regards the first hypothesis, we have seen above that Zābag is distinct from Sribuza, and that alone would suffice to demonstrate the weakness of the theory in question. Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi] and Sribuza are both obvious equivalents of Śrīvijaya, but the same cannot be said of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] or Zābag. M. Arousseau does indeed identify San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] with Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi], ⁽⁴⁴⁾ but M. Ferrand thinks it impossible to see in San-fo-ts'i

⁴⁴ *BEFEO*, XXIII, p. 476.

[Sanfoqi] an equivalent of Śrīvijaya, for philological reasons. ⁽⁴⁵⁾ Moreover, the Chinese themselves never suggested that Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi] was the equivalent of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]. The History of the Ming ⁽⁴⁶⁾ informs us that San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] was formerly called Kan-da-li (or Kan-t'o-li [Gantuoli]). According to Chao—

[135]

Chao Ju-kua [Zhao Rukuo] ⁽⁴⁷⁾, San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] entered into relations with China in 904–907 A.D. These two testimonies definitively oppose the proposed identification. It is true that Cūḍāmaṇivarman and Śrī-Māravijayottuṅavarman are both mentioned as kings of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], but that in no way proves that San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] was Śrīvijaya. For, as we have said above, we are in no way authorized to conclude from the Chola evidence that these two kings ruled at Śrīvijaya. We should rather regard them as kings of Kadāra, and suppose that their authority extended over Śrīvijaya. Thus the fact remains that sufficient evidence has not yet been produced to prove that San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] was the equivalent of Śrīvijaya. It is noteworthy that Che-li-fo-che [Shilifoshi] is not mentioned in Chinese writings after 742 A.D., whereas San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] makes its appearance at the beginning of the tenth century A.D., shortly after the first mention of Zābag by the Arab authors. Naturally, if one were able to prove

⁴⁵ Ferrand, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

⁴⁶ Groeneveldt, *Notes*, p. 68; Ferrand, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁴⁷ Edited by Hirth and Rockhill, p. 62; Ferrand, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

that San-fo-ts'i is [Sanfoqi] identical with Śrīvijaya, we would then have to dissociate San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] from Zābag.

The identification of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] with Palembang likewise does not seem beyond doubt. It rests, obviously, on the following statement by Ma Huan (1416 A.D.): "Kieou-kiang [Jiugang] is the same country which formerly was called San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]; it is also called Palembang and lies under the supremacy of Java." The History of the Ming dynasty also informs us that around 1397 A.D., "Java had completely conquered San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] and had changed its name to Kieou-kiang [Jiugang]." ⁽⁴⁸⁾

These testimonies appear decisive in favor of identifying San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] with Palembang. But this favorable impression disappears as soon as we read the passage that follows the citation taken from the History of the Ming. ⁽⁴⁹⁾ There we learn, in fact, that after the Javanese had conquered San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi], they were unable to keep the whole country, and troubles broke out there. We are then told how two Chinese adventurers proclaimed themselves kings of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] and of Kieou-kiang [Jiugang]. Groeneveldt drew from this the obvious conclusion that Kieou-kiang [Jiugang] and San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] were different localities. ⁽⁵⁰⁾ It is clear that Kieou-kiang [Jiugang] was the name given to that part of the vast kingdom of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] which was under Javanese domination, and naturally the name of the old kingdom of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] came in time to be applied to the kingdom of Kieou-

⁴⁸ Groeneveldt, *Notes*, p. 73. I have substituted San-fo-ts'i for Groeneveldt's San-bo-tsai.

⁴⁹ Groeneveldt, *Notes*, p. 71.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, n. 4; cf. p. 76.

kiang [Jiugang], which had originally formed part of it. The fact that San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] and Palembang were different localities is likewise attested by Chao Ju-kua [Zho Rukuo], who places Pa-lin-fong [Balinfeng], or Palembang, among the dependencies of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]. ⁽⁵¹⁾ It follows from all—

[136]

... this that Palembang was a kingdom under the suzerainty of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] and was therefore distinct from it. Wang Ta-yuan [Wang Dayuan] (1349 A.D.), in his geographical work entitled *Tao yi chih lio* [Dao yi zhilue], likewise mentions Kieou-kiang [Jiugang] and San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] as two separate states. ⁽⁵²⁾

Thus, nothing proves the validity of the identifications: 1° of Śrīvijaya with San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi]; 2° of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] with Palembang. Needless to add, the definitive identification of Śrīvijaya with Palembang at present rests on no solid foundation. That this kingdom occupied the southeastern part of Sumatra is a fact attested by Jia Dan ⁽⁵³⁾, but it is difficult to identify it more precisely.

§ 5

⁵¹ p. 62.

⁵² Ferrand, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

⁵³ *BEFEO*, IV, p. 373.

We must now return to the Nālandā plate, which refers to the Śailendra king as sovereign of Yavabhūmi and Suvarṇadvīpa. Pandit H. Śāstri repeats the generally accepted opinion when he writes that: “Yavabhūmi and Suvarṇadvīpa are identical with the islands of Yavadvīpa and Suvarṇadvīpa mentioned in Sanskrit works such as the Rāmāyaṇa and the Kathāsaritsāgara, and that these two countries are none other than Java and Sumatra.”⁽⁵⁴⁾

Unfortunately, neither of these identifications can be regarded as certain. Ferrand rejects the identification of the Yavadvīpa mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa with Java. Whether one accepts his view or not, it is difficult to ignore the substantial arguments advanced by him in favor of the thesis that Yavadvīpa means Sumatra and not Java.⁽⁵⁵⁾ But we shall soon see that there is reason to give Yavabhūmi a meaning quite different from that hitherto assumed.

As for Suvarṇadvīpa, the assertion that this term indisputably designates Sumatra is no better founded than the further claim that “Suvarṇadvīpa is distinct from Suvarṇabhūmi.” In the work cited above, I have brought together a large number of passages drawn from Indian, Greek, Chinese, and Arab sources, and these passages clearly prove that the names Suvarṇabhūmi and Suvarṇadvīpa were used interchangeably to designate a vast region comprising Burma, the Malay Peninsula, and the islands of the Indian archipelago. For example, Sumatra, mentioned by Yijing under the name Suvarṇadvīpa, is also called Suvarṇabhūmi in an inscription from that island.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Likewise, al-Bīrūnī states that the islands of the—

⁵⁴ *EI*, vol. XVII, p. 312.

⁵⁵ Ferrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 173 ff.

⁵⁶ Ferrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 179–180.

[137]

...the islands of Zābag are called by the Hindus Suvarṇadvīpa, although elsewhere he uses the term “Land of Gold,” or Suvarṇabhūmi, for the same country. ⁽⁵⁷⁾ The testimony of al-Bīrūnī is sufficient to show that Suvarṇadvīpa was the designation applied to all the islands of the archipelago known to the Arabs under the name of Zābag or Zābaj. This conclusion is confirmed by the Kathāsaritsāgara cited by Pandit H. Śāstri. That work contains the adventurous story of the great merchant Samudrasūra, who had sailed for Suvarṇadvīpa and had reached its principal city, Kalaśapura. Now, as M. Pelliot has shown, ⁽⁵⁸⁾ Kalaśapura is mentioned by the Chinese authors and located by them to the north of P’an-p’an [Panpan], which corresponds to Bandon or Ligor in the Malay Peninsula. Thus the Malay Peninsula, or at least a part of it, would have borne the name Suvarṇadvīpa, a supposition strikingly confirmed by the fact that Ptolemy also calls it Chryse Chersonesos (or Golden Peninsula). It is well known that dvīpa means both “island” and “peninsula,” and that therefore Chryse Chersonesos turns out to be a very exact equivalent of Suvarṇadvīpa.

According to the Arab writers, the archipelago of Zābag includes both the Malay Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago, and would therefore correspond to Suvarṇadvīpa, as al-

⁵⁷ Sachau-Alberuni, vol. I, p. 210; vol. II, p. 106.

⁵⁸ *BEFEO*, vol. IV, p. 360.

Bīrūnī says. The fact that even in modern times more than one island of the eastern sea was known by the name Suvarṇadvīpa is proved by the itinerary of Buddhagupta, a Buddhist monk of the sixteenth century. ⁽⁵⁹⁾

I am inclined to agree with Pandit H. Śāstri in the view that the author of the Nālandā plate regarded Yavabhūmi and Suvarṇadvīpa as designating the same country. If this view is correct, we may easily identify Yavabhūmi with the Zābag of the Arabs and its variants, and consequently establish the following equation: Yavabhūmi = Zābag = Suvarṇadvīpa = San-fo-ts'i.

§ 6

The foregoing discussions allow us to establish the following facts:

1° The Malay Peninsula, or at least Ligor, formed part of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya around 775 A.D.

2° Shortly after this date, a powerful king of the Śailendra dynasty, called Maharaja and Viṣṇu, was ruling in the same locality of the Malay Peninsula.

3° In 778 and 782 A.D., we find the authority of the Śailendra kings established in Java.

[138]

⁵⁹ *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. VII, p. 698.

4° A powerful kingdom whose capital was at Zābag (Ligor or the neighborhood of Ligor) is mentioned by the Arab authors as early as 844–848 A.D. Its ruler is always designated by the Arab authors as the Maharaja.

5° The Nālandā charter dated 850 A.D. acquaints us with three generations of kings belonging to the Śailendra dynasty, the first of these kings being designated by the title king of Yavabhūmi and the third by that of king of Suvarṇadvīpa.

6° Although Zābag proper at first designated only the territory situated around Ligor, this empire of Zābag eventually came to include the Malay Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago, and we have reason to believe that this enlarged empire was known by the names Zābag, Yavabhūmi, Suvarṇadvīpa, and San-fo-ts'i. Before 916 A.D. this empire included Śrīvijaya.

7° In the eleventh century, the Śailendra kings ruled over Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula. Indian texts generally mention them as kings of Kadāra or Kaṭāha in the Malay Peninsula, although in one case they call them kings of Kadāra and Śrīvijaya.

It is easy to draw from the facts we have set forth certain general conclusions. It is evident that the Śailendras attained great power toward the end of the eighth century A.D. and established a vast empire in Malaysia. This empire is called Zābaj or Zābag by the Arabs, San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] by the Chinese, and Yavabhūmi, Suvarṇadvīpa, Sāvaka, and Kaṭāha by the Indians. All these sources provide very interesting and detailed accounts of this powerful state. The Arabs speak of the authority it exercised over all Indonesia and praise in emphatic terms the glory and splendor of its king. The Chola texts, on the other hand, acquaint us with the various

states of the Malay Peninsula, Java, and Sumatra that were under its suzerainty in the eleventh century A.D. We have some reason to believe that the authority of this empire extended even for a time over Cambodia and Annam. ⁽⁶⁰⁾

In the thirteenth century A.D., this empire still comprised fifteen vassal states in Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, a fact attested by Chao Ju-kua [Zhao Rukuo]. ⁽⁶¹⁾ He even mentions Ceylon among these vassal states, and we have seen above that this assertion is to some extent justified by the conquest of Ceylon by Candrabhānu, the Śāvaka king of the Malay Peninsula. Of course, nothing proves that the Śailendra dynasty continued to rule over this empire in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries A.D., but the continuity of the empire under the names Śāvaka, Zābag, and San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] seems to be attested by all our sources.

[139]

It is not my intention here to retrace in detail the history of the Śailendras; I propose only to establish its general framework. For that purpose, it is enough to discuss briefly the relations of the Śailendras with Java and Sumatra.

⁶⁰ The Cham inscriptions mention successful seaborne incursions by the armies of Java, which may be identified with the Zābag of the Arabs (cf. R. C. Majumdar, *Champa*, Book III, pp. 43, 50, 70). For Cambodia, cf. the story told by Sulaymān in Ferrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 58 ff. and 219 ff.; *BEFEO*, XV, II, p. 87.

⁶¹ Chao Ju-kua, ed. Hirth and Rockhill, p. 62.

It is well known that, with the exception of M. Stutterheim, all scholars agree in placing the center of Śailendra authority in Sumatra. It follows from what has just been said that this supposition rests on no solid basis. Given the inadequacy of the evidence, it would be imprudent to be too dogmatic either one way or the other, but I hope it will readily be granted that, apart from the identification of San-fo-ts'i [Sanfoqi] with Palembang—which, to say the least, is highly doubtful—we possess no argument in favor of the Sumatran origin of the Śailendras. It is only in the Chola inscriptions of the eleventh century A.D. that these kings are mentioned as rulers of Kaṭāha and Śrīvijaya; similarly, the Arab authors of the tenth century and the centuries that follow regarded Sribuza as a dependent state of Zābag.

The ever-growing commercial importance of that country, and perhaps also its historical prestige, assured it a leading role and made it the center of gravity of the Śailendra empire. The evidence at our disposal does not allow us to say more. By contrast, the position of Java appears to us much stronger.

There we find two texts that unquestionably refer to Śailendra kings and belong to the earliest period of their history known to us. At least one of their kings, Rakai Panankarana, appears in the Kědu inscriptions, where he figures among the Javanese kings of Matarām. It is also possible to identify Samarottuṅga, mentioned in a Kědu text dated to the year 847 A.D., with the Samarāgravīra of the Nālandā inscription. ⁽⁶²⁾ All these facts, together with the

⁶² Krom, *Geschiedenis*, 2nd ed., p. 156.

existence of Borobudur and other famous temples, lead us to regard Java as the cradle of the Śailendras.

The temptation is all the greater when one considers how easy and natural it is to derive Zābag from Java, and how some of the Arab testimonies fit Java. Thus, for example, we may emphasize three characteristic features of Djāwaga that constantly appear in the Arab accounts:

1° There is a volcano in the neighborhood of Djāwaga.

2° There is no land beyond Djāwaga, and that island is the last.

3° The whole country is fertile and the villages follow one another without interruption, so that the cries of cocks in the morning are propagated continuously over a distance of 100 parasangs.

[140]

Now, all these characteristics apply better to Java than to the Malay Peninsula. The statement that Djāwaga lay on the frontier between India and China should not be regarded as a decisive argument against Java, if one considers that in this matter the Arab authors possessed only vague information. However, it is clear that some of their statements, especially concerning the latitude and longitude of Djāwaga, when compared with those of Sribuza and other well-known places, cannot apply to Java. It is therefore legitimate to maintain that Djāwaga may at first have designated Java, but that later the Arab authors located the country designated by

that name in the Malay Peninsula. This confusion is easily explained by the fact that the seat of Śailendra authority had been transferred in the ninth or tenth century A.D. from Java to the Malay Peninsula. Perhaps the Arab authors applied the name borne by the Śailendra kingdom in its beginnings to the new seat of its power.

The only other hypothesis that can be justified by the evidence at our disposal is to place Djāwaga, and therefore the seat of Śailendra authority, in the Malay Peninsula from the very beginning.

Compared with Java, the Malay Peninsula may seem poor in antiquities, but it is no poorer than Sumatra, the island where Zābag is usually located. M. Wilkinson goes even further. Speaking of the antiquities and certain other characteristic features of the northern part of the Peninsula, he says: "All these facts attest the existence in the past of powerful states and of a high degree of wealth and luxury in the north of the Malay Peninsula." ⁽⁶³⁾

In fact, it is only in the Malay Peninsula that we find traces of Śailendra power from its beginning to its end.

The Ligor inscription; the series of South Indian inscriptions mentioning the hostile or friendly relations between the Cholas on the one hand and the Śailendras of Kaṭāha or Kadāra on the other; the continuity of similar relations between the kings of Kadāra and Sāvaka and the kings of the Pāṇḍyas and of Ceylon; the localization of Zābag or Sāvaka in the Malay Peninsula— all this constitutes a chain of very strong arguments in favor of the view that the Malay

⁶³ R. G. Wilkinson, *History of the Peninsular Malays*, 3rd ed., p. 15.

Peninsula was the original homeland of the Śailendras and the seat of the vast empire over which they ruled.

In concluding, we must insist on the fact that there are good reasons for believing that the Śailendras were newcomers from India. This fact alone could explain for us the introduction of Nāgarī in the inscriptions and the use of the new name Kaliṅga for Malaysia, as attested by the Chinese authors. The stretch of the eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal which in earlier times was called Kaliṅga included the famous port of Palūra, which from the earliest times had been the port of embarkation for the Far East. The same region was, in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D., under—

[141]

...the authority of the Ganga dynasties ⁽⁶⁴⁾ and the Śailodbhavas, ⁽⁶⁵⁾ and beyond that, farther inland in the Vindhya region, we find a dynasty called Śaila. In the preamble to one inscription, this dynasty is said to descend from Gaṅgā, daughter of the Himalaya (Śailendra), but the first of these kings bears the title Śailavaṃśatilaka, “ornament of the Śaila family.” ⁽⁶⁶⁾ Thus, the names

⁶⁴ Cf. Urlam plates, *EI*, vol. XVIII, pp. 330 ff.

⁶⁵ Cf. Buguda Plates, *EI*, vol. III, p. 41.

⁶⁶ *EI*, vol. IX, p. 41.

of the Ganga, Śailodbhava, and Śaila dynasties may be regarded as standing at the origin of a name such as Śailendra.

The Gangas formed a widely scattered tribe, distributed almost entirely along the eastern coast of India, the most important of these dynasties being those of the Gangas of Kaliṅga and of Mysore. According to a tradition preserved among the Gangas of Kaliṅga, Kamārṇava, after handing over his paternal kingdom (in Mysore) to his uncle, departed with his four brothers to conquer the earth and took possession of the Three Kaliṅgas. The title “sovereign of the Three Kaliṅgas” was borne by his successors down to a relatively recent period. The accession of Kamārṇava would fall in the second half of the eighth century A.D., according to the regnal years supplied by the texts. ⁽⁶⁷⁾

Now, the expression Tri-Kaliṅga is very ancient, and it is still preserved today in the name of the Telinga or Talaing of Lower Burma. If there is any truth in the tradition cited, we find in this fact evidence relating to the conquest of Lower Burma by the Gangas in the eighth century A.D. Taking Lower Burma as their base, they must then have spread rapidly throughout the whole of the Far East.

It is interesting to note that the names of these Ganga kings end in Mahārāja or Mahādhirāja, for example Viṣṇugopa-Mahādhirāja and Śrī-Puruṣa-Pṛthvī-Koṅgaṇi-Mahārāja. In the first of these names we find a form almost equivalent to Viṣṇvākhyo-Mahārājanāma, that is, “having the name Viṣṇu Mahārāja,” an appellation that we also find in the Ligor inscription. Of

⁶⁷ Cf. *Ep. Carnatica*, vol. IX, introduction, p. 9; English translation of the inscriptions, pp. 39 ff.; *EI*, vol. VIII, App. I, p. 17 and the references there. For this date, cf. also *JBORS*, vol. XVIII, pp. 286 ff.

course, this does not indicate the identity of the two kings, but one is struck by the resemblance between these two names, each of which unusually includes the word Mahārāja.

Although, in the present state of our knowledge, we cannot formulate any definitive conclusion, we do not lack indications allowing us to suppose that the Śailendras were originally from Kalinga, and that they extended their power over the Far East by way of Lower Burma and the Malay Peninsula.

Translated from the English by Mlle G. Naudin.