

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The use of the Sanskrit words *rājasin̄ha* and *dharmasetu* in the Kalasan charter and their potential significance with respect to the single-dynasty thesis for Central Javanese history

In a recently published *Pacific World* article, my esteemed colleague Jeffrey Sundberg expressed his irritation with my analysis of the designation *rājasin̄ha* based on its use in v.10 of the Kalasan inscription from Central Java. As the reader shall see, this issue is crucially pertinent to the ongoing debate as to whether the Kalasan charter actually refers to a single sovereign or to two different kings, with the Śailendra head of state being most clearly designated through the use of the designation *rājasin̄ha* and the other ruler by means of the title *mahārājā*.¹

Sundberg claimed that my gloss of *rājasin̄ha* as the “lion among kings” had been made “without comment or justification” and concluded that no royal personage known by this designation could have

1. The two-kings theory for the Kalasan charter initially was explicated by Frits Herman van Naerssen (“The Śailendra Interregnum,” in *India Antiqua, a Volume of Oriental Studies Presented by His Friends and Pupils to Jean Phillippe Vogel on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of His Doctorate*, ed. J. Phillippe Vogel, F.D.K. Bosch, Instituut Kern [Leiden: Brill, 1947]: 249–253) and subsequently revised and refined by F.D.K. Bosch (“Śrīvijaya, de Śailendra- en de Sañjaya-vaṁśa,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 108, no. 2 [1952]: 113–14). For wider discussions of the so-called two dynasties theory as it pertains to eighth and early-ninth century Java, see R. Jordaan, “The Śailendras, the Status of the Kṣatriya Theory, and the Development of Hindu-Javanese Temple Architecture,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 155, no. 2 (1999): 210–243; and Roy E. Jordaan, “Why the Śailendras Were Not a Javanese Dynasty,” *Indonesia and the Malay World* 34, no. 98 (March 2006): 3–22.

been the titular superior of Mahārājā Panangkaran.² In doing so, however, he neglected to even mention the extensive discussion³ that I also had provided concerning the contextual use of *rājasīṅha* as an integral part of a formulaic verse that is also found in more than a dozen other charters hailing from India, Campā, and Nepal as well as in the *Skanda Purāṇa*. The Kalasan strophe in question is reproduced below, together with two of the many other comparable examples.

Kalasan Charter, v.10 (778 CE):

*Sarvān evāgāmināḥ pāṛthivendrān bhūyo bhūyo yācate rājasīṅhaḥ /
sāmānyo 'ya-m> dharmasetur narāṇām kāle kāle pālaniyo
bhavadbhiḥ //*⁴

Sīsavai Grant of Govinda III (807 CE):

*Sāmānyo 'yam dharmasetur nṛpānām kāle kāle pālaniyo bhavadbhiḥ /
sarvān etān bhāvinaḥ pāṛthivendrān bhūyo bhūyo yācate
rāmacandraḥ //*⁵

Skanda Purāṇa, v.40:

*Dattvā bhūmim bhāvinaḥ pāṛthiveśan=bhūyo bhūyo yācate
rāmacandraḥ /
sāmānyo='yam dharma-set r=nṛpāṇām sve sve kāle pālaniyo
bhavadbhiḥ //*⁶

After accounting for the parallel use of certain synonyms, one may conclude that the key difference displayed by the Sanskrit text of the Kalasan charter is the substitution of *rājasīṅha* for *rāmacandra*, this last

2. Jeffrey Sundberg, “The Abhayagirivihāra’s Pāṃśukūlika Monks in Second Lambakaṇṇa Śrī Lanṅkā and Śailendra Java: The Flowering and Fall of a Cardinal Center of Influence in Early Esoteric Buddhism,” *Pacific World*, 3rd ser., no. 16 (2014): 164, continuation of n177.

3. Mark E. Long, *Voices from the Mountain: The Śailendra Inscriptions Discovered in Central Java and on the Malay Peninsula* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2014), 75–77.

4. Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java* (Calcutta: Firma KLM, 1971/2), I:59.

5. Sheldon Pollock, “Rāmāyana and Public Discourse in Medieval India,” in *Studies in Jaina Art and Iconography and Allied Subjects in Honour of Dr. U. P. Shah*, ed. Ramakrishna T. Vyas and U. P. Shah (New Delhi: Abhinav, 1995), 155n.33.

6. Dineschandra Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy* (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965), 193n1.

of which evokes the hero Rāma as the classical example of a superordinate king (e.g., one who is superior in rank or status to others), as Sheldon Pollock points out.⁷ Kamaleswar Bhattacharya also had noted previously that these references to *rāmacandra* (alternatively given as *rāmabhadra* or *rāma* in other known examples of this formulaic verse) properly pertain to the royal donor himself, who symbolically speaks in his role as the “Rāma” of the era in which the specific charter was issued.⁸ Given that *rājasīnha* in all probability signifies the Buddhist counterpart for designating a superordinate king in the Kalasan charter, I had elected to gloss this expression as the “lion among kings” based on the specific context of its use as opposed to the alternative translation possibilities of “lion-king,” “lion of kings,” or “mighty king” cited by Sundberg. Hence, the specific application of this designation in the Kalasan charter potentially can be viewed as a diplomatic method for referring to the superior standing of the Śailendra sovereign in a charter promulgated within the dominion of the Mahārājā Panangkaran, who would then be a contemporary ruler with a somewhat less exalted status. We shall examine the views of F.D.K. Bosch that pertain to this hypothesis somewhat later.

Sundberg also believes that the references to *dharmasetu* (= *dharmasetu*) and the goddess Tārā that appear in the Kalasan charter are allusions to the maternal ancestors of Bālaputradeva, the mid-ninth century Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvīpa. Mentioned in the Nālandā charter discovered within the ruins of the Buddhist monastery founded by Bālaputradeva at Nālandā in Bengal, India, Śrī Dharmasetu⁹ and his daughter Tārā also were identified as descendants of the “lunar dynasty” (*somavamśa*). Additionally, the Nālandā copperplate¹⁰ refers to the paternal grandfather of Bālaputradeva through the use of the epithet “tormentor of brave foes” (*viravairimathana*, which Sundberg glosses as the “killer of arrogant enemies”)¹¹ and otherwise identifies

7. Pollock, “Rāmāyana and Public Discourse in Medieval India,” 146.

8. Kamaleswar Bhattacharya, “Recherches sur le vocabulaire des inscriptions sanskrites du Cambodge,” *Bulletin de l’Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient* 52, no. 1 (1972): 48.

9. Read as “Varmasetu” by R.C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa: Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East* (Calcutta: Modern Pub. Syndicate, 1927), 13.

10. See Hiranda Shastri, *Nalanda and Its Epigraphic Material* (New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1942), 101–2.

11. Jeffrey Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*, King Warak, and

him as the king of Java (*yavabhūmipāla*) who was “an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (*śailendravamśatilaka*).

As nearly as can be told, the Kalasan inscription seems to be a *praśasti* which flattered the Somavaṃśa by artfully incorporating the names of the father Dharmasetu and the daughter Tārā into the text. Of the tens of thousands of terms which might be selected out of an extensive Sanskrit vocabulary to include in the short dedication of a temple to the Buddhist goddess Tārā, after whom his daughter-in-law and a future queen of the family was named, the Śailendra king managed in prophetic anticipation to select the term *dharmasetu* (‘Bridge of Religion’), the exact name of the Somavaṃśa king who was the maternal grandfather of the Killer’s grandson Bālaputradeva.¹²

In his more recent *Pacific World* article, Sundberg once again refers to this presumed coding of names, which supposedly had been accomplished “in a manner that could hardly be happenstance, and furthermore suggests that the Kalasan inscription must commemorate the marriage that brought Bālaputradeva to the Sumatran throne.”¹³ As F.D.K. Bosch pointed out in his paper on the Nālandā copperplate, this inscription specifically refers to Tārā, not only as the mother of Bālaputradeva but also as one who resembled the goddess herself.¹⁴ In this respect, suggesting that the Kalasan charter’s references to the goddess Tārā might also be allusions to a Śailendra queen consort does seem plausible. On the other hand, Bosch later downplayed the possible allusive significance of the word *dharmasetu* found in the Kalasan and Kelurak inscriptions as well as in the edict of Nālandā by noting that the idea of a “closer connection was not entertained because in the first [two] documents the word is used as an appellative in contrast to the last document wherein it is used as a proper name.”¹⁵ This last distinction is worthy of further comment.

the Fracturing of the Javanese Polity, ca. 803 A.D.,” in *From beyond the Eastern Horizon: Essays in Honour of Professor Lokesh Chandra*, ed. Manjushree Gupta (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2011), 144.

12. *Ibid.*, 145n4.

13. Sundberg, “The Abhayagirivihāra’s Pāṃśukūlika Monks,” 96 & 160n169.

14. F.D.K. Bosch, “De oorkonde van het groote klooster te Nālandā,” *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 65 (1935): 521.

15. F.D.K. Bosch, “Boekbespreking: Dr. W.F. Stutterheim, a Javanese Period in Sumatran History, Surakarta 1929,” *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 69 (1930): 141–42. I referred to this previously in Long, *Voices from*

In his explication of the various aspects of royal land charters as they had formerly existed in early medieval India, R.S. Sharma¹⁶ observed that the word *dharmasetu* specifically applied to royal grants and went on to delineate the types of court officials and other notables who were to be addressed in such examples of *rājasāsana* (lit. “the decree of the ruler”). This potentially helps to explain why the Kalasan charter (778) devotes so much attention to addressing royal functionaries in several Sanskrit verses.

It is noteworthy that *dharmasetu* only emerges in the Kalasan charter as an essential component of an entire formulaic verse that also appears to heavily color a major portion of the remainder of the same inscription (i.e., vv.4, 7, 9, and also 12, with this last strophe echoing a significant part of the contents of v.10 as shall be demonstrated in due course). Obviously, if an important objective really had been to “artfully” incorporate the name of King Dharmasetu, then the inscription’s composer certainly could have achieved this in a far less cumbersome manner. Just four years later the composer of the Kelurak (Śrī Saṅgrāmadhanañjaya, 782) inscription had incorporated *śrīdharmasetu* without specifically mentioning or otherwise alluding to the goddess Tārā,¹⁷ thus evidently having used this particular designation solely as a referent for a royal religious foundation.

The postulated allusions to a Śailendra marriage debated above are directly relevant to a single-dynasty thesis for Central Javanese history that Sundberg initially had characterized as his “unproven working assumption.” According to his hypothesis, the Śailendra monarchs residing on Java were Javanese kings descended from King Sañjaya, with the Javanese ruler Rakai Panaraban not only having been the son of the renowned Śailendra “Killer of Arrogant Enemies” but also the father of Bālaputradeva as well as the husband of Tārā of the Somavamśa.¹⁸ This premise is based in major part on Sundberg’s analysis of the content pertaining to Rakai Panaraban and Rakai Warak that appears in an Old Sundanese text called the *Carita Parahyangan*. Therefore, the issues which collectively have led me to question the historical accuracy of

the Mountain, 74.

16. Ram Sharan Sharma, *Early Medieval Indian Society* (Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2001), 167.

17. See Sarkar, *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, 1:42–9.

18. Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*,” 153n24.

this particular document in general, as well as Sundberg's single-dynasty thesis in particular,¹⁹ shall now be outlined in brief.

In his discussion of the *Carita Parahyangan*, Sundberg only alludes in passing to the sixteenth-century provenance of this Old Sundanese text. In other words, his principal source document not only postdates the personages and events in question by seven centuries but also was written from the Sundanese viewpoint. Roy Jordaan has expressed as his opinion that the *Carita Parahyangan* should be regarded as "a late and unreliable source of historical information."²⁰ Moreover, N.J. Krom had found this mythic-colored work to be "a murky source of information," especially with respect to its claim that Sañjaya's conquests had extended as far as mainland Southeast Asia and even China, whilst he was more open to the possibility that this text might contain some useful information with respect to the substantially later Majapahit phase of Javanese history for which there are other available sources of information.²¹ Though W. J. van der Meulen did refer to the text's juxtaposition of freely romanticized and mythologized portrayals with "a number of remarkably sober passages derived, it seems, from older genealogical material,"²² whether the latter is applicable to the content specifically cited by Sundberg is open to discussion as the reader shall see momentarily.

19. Sundberg (*ibid.*, 144n2; and "The Abhayagirivihāra's Pāṃśukūlika Monks," 163, continuation of n177) has attempted to support his view that the Śailendra kings had continuously ruled on Java until King Erlangga founded a new dynasty in the eleventh century by citing an analysis of medieval Javanese chronicles written by C.C. Berg ("The Javanese Picture of the Past," in *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, ed. Kahin, Resink, and Soejatmako [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965], 106–7, 111). In doing so, however, he neglected to contradict or otherwise note the existence of two critical reviews that have already examined Berg's hasty methodologies and disputable Śailendra claims, respectively. See F.D.K. Bosch, "C.C. Berg and Ancient Javanese History," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 112, no. 1 (1956): 1–24; and S. Supomo, "Lord of the Mountains in the Fourteenth Century Kakawin," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 128 (1972): 281–297.

20. Jordaan, "Why the Śailendras Were Not a Javanese Dynasty," 18.

21. N.J. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis* ('s-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 1931), 126, 407.

22. W. J. van der Meulen, "King Sañjaya and His Successors," *Indonesia* 28 (Oct., 1979): 19n7.

As noticed by Sundberg himself,²³ the *Carita Parahyangan* makes no mention whatsoever of Rakai Panangkaran (reign 746–784). Instead, his successor Rakai Panaraban becomes represented as the son whose father King Sañjaya had advised him to change his religion, an event that more plausibly could be attributed to the life of his immediate predecessor. Furthermore, the overseas military expeditions that this particular document attributes to King Sañjaya are more reasonably ascribed to the reigns of Panangkaran and Panaraban, respectively, based on the content of other historical source materials.²⁴ So it would appear that the compiler of this document was entirely ignorant about the existence of a key Javanese royal personage and as a result seems to have incorrectly assigned some historical facts and mythic events to the reigns of the wrong kings. This naturally makes us be curious about whether any content ascribed to Rakai Panaraban or Rakai Warak dyah Manāra had similarly become conflated with materials otherwise attributable to dissimilar periods and rulers—especially in light of certain statements found within the text that scarcely can be construed as “remarkably sober.”

At the border with Sunda there was a powerful pandit, namely Bagawat Sajalajala, murdered without having any sin. He was reincarnated as Sang Manarah [= Rakai Warak], the son of Rahyang Tampėran [= Rakai Panaraban] and the brother of Rahyang Banga. Sang Manarah took revenge: Rahyang Tampėran was jailed by his son. Rahyang Tampėran was imprisoned behind iron bars by Sang Manarah. Rahyang Banga came weeping, bringing rice to those iron bars, and was seen by Sang Manarah. Then he fought with Rahyang Banga. The face of Rahyang Banga was hit by Sang Manarah. From that moment, Sang Manarah became king of Jawa Pawwatan, according to the Javanese way of speaking. Rahyang Tampėran was a king for seven years, due to his behavior. He liked to destroy ascetics. Therefore he was not long in being a king. Sang Manarah was a king for eighty years, because of his perfection in religion.²⁵

Here the actual reign of Rakai Panaraban (784–803) has been misrepresented as having endured for a mere seven years, perhaps to make the compiler’s mythologized account conform with Javanese metaphysical notions pertaining to reincarnation and karmic retribution.

23. Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*,” 153n23.

24. *Ibid.*, 146–7.

25. *Ibid.*, 151.

By contrast, the authentic duration of Rakai Warak's reign (803–827) has been misreported as a highly romanticized eighty-year incumbency, and thus would seem to conflate this particular king's sovereignty with that of the next four Javanese rulers (reigning 827–885) mentioned in epigraphic records.²⁶ So either the compiler of this Old Sundanese account had willfully altered the respective lengths of two reigns to suit his storytelling objectives or simply was unacquainted with the historical reality.

Now nothing presented above precludes the possibility that the *Carita Parahyangan* may contain at least some valid historical details with respect to Panaraban and Warak. But just as Krom did, we can see that the principal difficulty is deciding how much, if any, weight one should give to the text's freely romanticized and mythologized content without the aid of support from additional source materials.²⁷ And this task is only further complicated by Sundberg's hypothesis that Panangkaran should be equated with the Śailendra king known by the epithet "Killer of Arrogant Enemies" in the Ligor (Isthmus of Kra, ca. 775), Kelurak, and Nālandā inscriptions as well as identified as "Śrī Mahārāja by name" on the Ligor stele. If we follow Sundberg's single-dynasty thesis, then the failure of this Old Sundanese text to even mention this famed "Killer" is rather astonishing. What's more, the composer of the Kalasan charter did not apply the "Killer" designation to the Kariyāna Paṇamkaraṇa (= Panangkaran) also identified

26. Sundberg has argued that the text's subsequent shift to an otherwise unknown line of Sudanese kings should be interpreted as an indication of a significant historical divergence in the opening decade of the ninth century, based on his view that the applicable dividing line should be the conflict between Sang Manarah and Rahyang Banga (*ibid.*, 144, 152). However, the references to the Sunda line of kings do not appear until after the compiler refers to the romanticized eighty-year reign of Sang Manarah, so it cannot be excluded that the text's compiler had believed instead that this shift had taken place in the latter part of the ninth century.

27. To support his views, Sundberg ("The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*," 143, 150) did cite the Wanua Tengah III inscription's reference to Rakai Warak as the *rāgin*, which Lokesh Chandra had glossed as "one who is angry" but with the closest Sanskrit dictionary definition being "impassioned, full of passion or feeling." Whether *rāgin* should be viewed as a reference to this king's distant past or to his more recent decision to void previously awarded *simā* rights remains unclear.

as the Mahārāja dyaḥ Pañcapaṇa or specifically refer to him as Śrī Mahārāja,²⁸ whereas the Kelurak inscription produced just four years later does indeed incorporate an iteration of the “Killer” epithet but does not provide any indigenous honorifics or Javanese names for the Śailendra ruler.

By contrast, as distinguished a scholar as F.D.K. Bosch has postulated the following: “[I]f we continuously distinguish between the *mahārāja* (or *kariyāna*) named Paṇaṃkaraṇa and the Śailendra king referred to as *rāja* or *rājasimha* ... [t]hen the strophes 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are all related to the Śailendra whilst Paṇaṃkaraṇa only figures in strophes 2, 6 and 12.”²⁹ Here it is significant that the previously cited formulaic verse of the “lion among kings” is closely comparable to a statement subsequently attributed to Panangkaran in strophe 12 of the Kalasan charter:

kariyānapaṇaṃkaraṇaḥ śrīmānabhiyācate tra bhāvi<n>ṛpān /
*bhūyo bhūyo vidhivad<i>hāra paripālanārthamiti //*³⁰

In v.10, the lion among kings (*rajasimha*) entertreats (*yācate*) all future kings again and again (*bhūyo bhūyo*) just so: This *dharmasetu* (used in the sense of a pious foundation),³¹ which is the common property of men, should be maintained/protected (*pālaniya*) by you always at the right time. In v.12, the illustrious Kariyāna Paṇaṃkaraṇa solicits (*abhiyācate*) future kings again and again (*bhūyo bhūyo*) for the sake of the care/protection (*paripālana*) of this *vihāra* (used in the sense of the entire

28. Louis-Charles Damais (“Bibliographie indonésienne: XI. Les publications épigraphiques du service archéologique de l’Indonésie,” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 54 [1968]: 357) had left his readers with the mistaken impression that the title awarded to the Kariyāna Paṇaṃkaraṇa in the Kalasan inscription had been Śrī Mahārāja: “Donc, dans l’inscription de Kalasan, Kariyāna Paṇaṃkaraṇa est le nom d’apanage propre au souverain et Śrī Mahārāja son titre.”

29. Bosch, “Śrīvijaya, de Śailendra- en de Sañjaya-vaṃśa,” 113n4.

30. See Bosch (“De inscriptie van Kēloerak,” *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 68 [1929]: 59); and Sarkar (*Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, I:39n33).

31. Citing the Mungen (Monghyr) copperplate of King Devapāla of Bengal, Lokesh Chandra (“The Śailendras of Java,” in *Cultural Horizons of India*, vol. 4 [New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1995], 216) made the following observation: “The word *dharmasetu* is used in the sense of a pious foundation in the inscriptions of the Pālas and of other dynasties.”

foundation, thus the temple and monastery together as per Krom)³² according to rule. The overriding justification for the inclusion of this last strophe, which echoes the contents of v.10 in major part, becomes clarified when we view these two stanzas as signifying the respective solicitations of two different kings, just as Bosch did.

Next, Sundberg discusses the *Carita Parahyangan* episode in which Sang Manarah is said to have imprisoned his own father and fought with his brother Rahyang Banga. Here Sundberg wonders whether Rahyang Banga might be equated with Bālaputradeva,³³ the Śailendra monarch who had ruled in Suvarṇadvīpa during the mid-ninth century—despite the dissimilar names and the paucity of evidence indicating that Bālaputradeva had ever resided on Java.³⁴ Additionally, he

32. See Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis*, 133. On the other hand, Bosch (“De inscriptie van Kēloerak,” 61–62n4) did not exclude the possibility that the word *vihāra* in this particular case might be applicable solely to the Tārā temple, which the Kalasan inscription mentions with greater frequency than the monastery.

33. Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*,” 154.

34. There is a singular instance in which an epigraphic record of Central Java perhaps pertains to Bālaputradeva. The Śivagr̥ha inscription (856) refers to a “killer as fast as the wind” who had battled with Rakai Pikatan (847–855) toward the end of this Javanese king’s reign. J.G. de Casparis (*Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D.* [Bandung: Masa Baru, 1956], 293–96, 316–21) conjectured that the name he read for this particular personage, Wālaputra, should be equated with Bālaputradeva, who must have assumed the throne of Suvarṇadvīpa prior to the promulgation of the Nālandā charter (ca. 843–850; see Roy Jordaan and Brian Colless, *The Mahārājas of the Isles: The Śailendras and the Problem of Śrīvijaya* [Leiden: Leiden University, 2009], 34).

If we should elect to simultaneously entertain the respective notions of de Casparis (Wālaputra = Bālaputradeva) and Sundberg (Rahyang Banga = Bālaputradeva), then “Wālaputra” would have to have been quite elderly by 855, given that the *Carita Parahyangan* represents Banga as having been old enough to fight with his brother at the beginning of Rakai Warak’s reign. However, Sundberg apparently decided not to discuss the potential relevance of the Śivagr̥ha inscription because he has not been able to personally confirm de Casparis’s reading of “Wālaputra” on the stone (see Sundberg, “The Abhayagirivihāra’s Pāṃśukūlika Monks,” 172). On the other hand, “in most of the relevant cases his [de Casparis’s] readings cannot be positively rejected either” (Andrea Acri, “On Birds, Ascetics, and Kings in Central Java, Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, 24.95–126 and 25,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 166, no. 4 [2010]: 501n62).

sidesteps any mention of the name of the specific Śailendra king who plausibly could be equated with Panaraban as the presumed father of Bālaputradeva³⁵ and as a result his entire thesis presently rests on tenuous grounds.

I also have found Sundberg's single-dynasty premise to be unconvincing to date because he has not yet discussed several pertinent points previously raised by his own research. Instead he simply stated that, "Now is not the time or venue to debate whether King Warak and others in the line of kings stemming from Śrī Sañjaya are to be identified as the Śailendra kings (the single-dynasty thesis of Central Javanese history),"³⁶ which seems odd given what he had communicated further on about the unproven working assumption of his *Carita Parahyangan* paper. Elsewhere, however, Sundberg has identified some of the principal questions that he still needs to confront with respect to the origin and untimely demise of the use of the *śailendravaṃśa* designation on Java:

35. The reason for this lack of clarity was subsequently made evident in Sundberg's more recent *Pacific World* paper ("The Abhayagirivihāra's Pāṃśukūlika Monks," 96–7), in which he notes his continuing uncertainty as to whether the Abhayagirivihāra charter (792) presents the ruling Śailendra king's name as Dharmattuṅgadeva (as initially proposed by J.G. de Casparis, *Inscripties-uit de Śailendra-tijd* [Bandung: A.C. Nix, 1950], 22), or as Samaratuṅga, a revised reading by the same translator provided without further comment (J.G. de Casparis, "New Evidence on Cultural Relations between Java and Ceylon in Ancient Times," *Artibus Asiae* 26 [1961]: 245).

It hardly needs to be said that the selection of either name would only further complicate the explication of Sundberg's single-dynasty hypothesis. If Rakai Panabaran is identified with the name Dharmattuṅgadeva, then Samaratuṅga potentially would emerge as the name of an additional Śailendra ruler on Java. Moreover, the equating of Panaraban with Dharmattuṅgadeva would obviate any potential benefits coming from the presumed connection (see W.F. Stutterheim, *A Javanese Period in Sumatran History* [Surakarta: "De Bliksem," 1929], 13) between the name Samaratuṅga and the expression *samarāgravīra* ("foremost warrior in battle-fields") used to characterize the father of Bālaputradeva in the Nālandā charter (see Shastri, *Nalanda and Its Epigraphic Material*, 99, 102). Conversely, the identification of the name Samaratuṅga with Panaraban would demand an explanation as to why the Kayumwuhan charter had lauded this particular king during the reign of his usurper Sang Manarah, according to the *Carita Parahyangan*.

36. Sundberg, "The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*," 144n2.

It is an enormously difficult question to address how the luster of the name of this extraordinarily radiant family could have died out so quickly and so thoroughly after the issuance of the last known Javanese Śailendra inscription by Samaratuṅga's daughter in 824. How could the kings of the 830's and afterwards have failed to claim participation in the name of this dynasty, even when they built their younger, smaller, simpler temples in the shadow of the great temples of the Śailendra? If the 'Sañjaya' were truly Śailendra all along, where did their family name originate and why did the Javanese throne holders abandon it even while it persisted in Sumatra for at least two centuries?³⁷

Another outstanding issue raised by Sundberg's own research pertains to the *om takī hūṃ jaḥ svāhā* mantra recovered from Caṇḍi Ratu Boko's western complex. This features an exaggerated bubble comprising the vowel "ī" and containing the Old Javanese words *panarabvan* and *khanipas*. Sundberg³⁸ deduced that this gold-foil mantra must be a variant of the *hūṃ takijjaḥ* formula uttered by the wrathful Trailokyavijaya (a.k.a. Vajrapāṇi) in the *Sarvatathāgatattva Saṅgraha* (STTS) for the purpose of subjugating Śiva, Umā, and other Hindu deities. The application of phonetic and orthographic arguments enabled Sundberg to deduce that the Old Javanese word *panarabvan* can be viewed as a variant of the proper name Panaraban. To Roy Jordaan and Brian Colless,³⁹ the placement of this designation within an exaggerated bubble suggested an attempt to mantrically subjugate Rakai Panaraban as well as convert him to Buddhism. Moreover, Andrea Acri has suggested that the "vaguely vajra-shaped double quadrangle" of the gold foil recovered from Ratu Boko had been fashioned specifically to serve as a *yantra* of coercive magic that would be comparable to other examples delineated in a sixteenth-century Tantric compendium called the *Mantramahodadhi* as well as in other Tantric sources.⁴⁰

37. Jeffrey Sundberg, "The State of Matarām: A Review of Recent Efforts to Clarify Its History," in *Caṇḍi Mendut: Womb of the Tathāgata*, ed. Mark E. Long (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2009), 340.

38. Jeffrey Sundberg, "A Buddhist Mantra Recovered from the Ratu Boko Plateau: A Preliminary Study of Its Implications for Śailendra-era Java," *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 159, no. 1 (2003): 163–88.

39. Roy Jordaan and Brian Colless, "The Ratu Boko Mantra and the Śailendras," *Berkala Arkeologi* 24, no. 1 (2004): 56–65.

40. Andrea Acri, "Once More on the 'Ratu Baka Mantra': Magic, Realpolitik,

Given that the principal functions ascribed to Trailokyavijaya in the STTS pertain to the summoning, taming and conversion of Hindu divinities, it seems indeed more plausible to view this gold-foil artifact as a coercive magical *yantra* for subjugating and converting a Hindu ruler. By contrast, the *Carita Parahyangan* represents Panaraban as the son of the Hindu ruler Sañjaya who already had been advised by his father to change his religion, presumably to Buddhism.

—Mark E. Long

A reply to Mark Long's letter

In the past thirty years two new epigraphic sources have surfaced which greatly alter the discussion of eighth-century Central Java, to the extent that they should be considered game-changers: the 908 CE inscription of Wanua Tengah III and the 869 Pananngaran inscription recovered from the lahar-buried Kedularan temple a few kilometers north of Kalasan. Furthermore, the personal and *raka* names revealed in the Wanua Tengah III inscription allowed me to make further identifications in the “Sañjaya Saga” of the Old Sundanese *Chronicle of the Deified Ancestors*, the *Carita Parahyangan*, a source compiled in the sixteenth century which is the only extant narrative to treat events in the Central Java of the eighth century.⁴¹

The Wanua Tengah III inscription establishes that an apotheosized figure called the Deified One (*rahyangta*) at Hara founded a Keḍu-area *vihāra* at Pikatan. This Deified One at Hara is associated by the intimate kinship term “*awi*” with the Deified One at Mēḍaṃ, whose identity as the dynast Sañjaya seems certain. The Wanua Tengah inscription then provided unprecedented insight into the successive kings

and Bauddha-Śaiva Dynamics in Ancient Nusantara,” in *Esoteric Buddhism in Mediaeval Maritime Asia: Networks of Masters, Texts, and Icons*, ed. Andrea Acri (Singapore: ISEAS Press, forthcoming).

41. Jeffrey Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*, King Warak, and the Fracturing of the Javanese Polity, ca. 803 A.D.,” in *From beyond the Eastern Horizon: Essays in Honour of Professor Lokesh Chandra*, ed. Manjushree Gupta (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 2011).

of the kingdom and their varying stance toward the disposition of the Wanua Tengah crown lands first dedicated to Sañjaya's sibling's Pikatan *vihāra*, from the *sīma* originator King Panangkaran (r. 746–784) through King Balitung, by which time the Deified One's Pikatan *vihāra* had existed for 150 years. These epigraphically-attested mid-eighth century Buddhist predilections confirmed among the immediate relatives of the Śaiva Sañjaya tend to affirm the *Carita Parahyangan*'s recollection that Sañjaya ordered his son to “change” religions.

As part of its citation of the CE 829 Sanskrit edict concerning the Pikatan *sīma* by King Garung (r. 829–847), the Wanua Tengah III inscription mentioned the name of one of the *raka* lords who accompanied Garung, allowing Kusen,⁴² amplified by Sundberg,⁴³ to make the pioneering identification of Garung as the anonymous “*śrī mahārāja*” who, with his *raka* lords and court officaries, so richly embellished the Plaosan complex with each and every one of its *stūpa*-shrines. In the archaeological and epigraphical recoveries from the Plaosan site, where the dedication graffiti was enduringly carved rather than painted, there is no more evidence of a putative second dynasty than that found in the *Carita Parahyangan*, which is utterly oblivious of such a “dual-dynasty” scenario.

As first pointed out by Wisseman-Christie, the Wanua Tengah III inscription assigns a consecration name, Śrī Īśvarakeśavsamarottuṅga Rudramūrti, to King Balitung which differed from that differed from the Śrī Dharmmodāya Mahāśambu used in his Mantyāsiḥ inscription from only the year before. Wisseman-Christie therefore properly pointed out that “this complexity and mutability of royal names, and the fact that different portions of these names might be used in different inscriptions, inevitably creates confusion and adds to the difficulties involved in establishing a workable list of rulers and their dates.”⁴⁴

42. Kusen, “Raja-raja Mataram Kuna dari Sanjaya sampai Balitung: Sebuah Rekonstruksi Berdasarkan Prasasti Wanua Tengah III,” *Berkala Arkeologi*, Tahun XIV, Edisi Khusus (1993): 87.

43. Jeffrey Sundberg, “Considerations on the Dating of the Barabudur Stūpa,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 162, no. 1 (2006): 117n39; Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*.”

44. Jan Wisseman-Christie, “Revisiting Early Mataram,” in *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J. G. de Casparis*, ed. Marijke Klokke and Karol van Kooij (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2001), 28.

It should be reiterated, as Louis-Charles Damais pointed out, that the epigraphic record is quite muddled by the unfortunate state of affairs left by the epigrapher and “dual dynasty” promoter J.G. de Casparis, whose own published transcriptions contradict themselves without explanation or acknowledgment. Furthermore, Damais has called upon at least one of De Casparis’ published (and thesis-favorable) readings as “*fausse sans aucun doute*.”⁴⁵ What is more, it is now evident to me upon direct inspection of high-quality photographs of the “Śivagr̥ha” funereal stele of King Pikatan that appreciable amounts of De Casparis’ published transliteration are flatly wrong, leading one to natural questions about the fidelity of others of his transcriptions. The entirety of his work needs to be subjected to both scrutiny and, more importantly, quality documentation.

To add to the circumstantial evidence surrounding the “dual-dynasty” debate, which certainly places King Garung alone at Candi Plaosan and circumstantially places Candi Borobudur within the *watak* of Warak during the regency of King Warak *dyaḥ* Mānara (r. 803–827),⁴⁶ newly unearthed epigraphical data from the Panangaran inscription⁴⁷ found at the deeply-buried Kedularan temple, located a scant few kilometers to the north of the inscription commemorating the erection of a Tārā temple and monastery by the *Raka* of Panangkaran on the instruction of the Sailendra *rājaguru*, and a scant few kilometers to the Buddhist edifices like the Candi Sewu complex and the Candi Plaosan complex. If a modern toponym associated with the *watak* of Panangkaran cannot be found, at least the reason is known: the entire area running on an east-west axis to the north of Kalasan was obliterated with lahar. It should be noted, however, that this entire area was important to Sañjaya: per the inscription thought to originate at Taji

45. Louis-Charles Damais, “Bibliographie indonésienne : XI. Les publications épigraphiques du service archéologique de l’Indonésie,” *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 54, no. 1 (1968): 467.

46. Sundberg, “Considerations on the Dating of the Barabudur Stūpa,” and Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*.”

47. Balai Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala Yogyakarta, *Pusaka Aksara Yogyakarta: Alih Aksara dan Alih Bahasa Prasasti Koleksi Balai Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala Yogyakarta* (Yogyakarta: Balai Pelestarian Peninggalan Purbakala Yogyakarta, 2007), 31.

Gunung at the base of the Ratu Boko, this locale hosted the site of his “camp.”⁴⁸

In short, solid epigraphical and toponymic data seems to place Sañjaya and his family everywhere across the Buddhist ruins of Central Java, which run from Klaten to Wonosobo. Any confusion engendered by, especially, the published transcriptions in the corpus of De Casparis may either be dispelled by careful reexamination of his undoubtedly questionable work or may be attributed to the epigraphically attested practice of these Central Javanese kings to employ multiple coronation names. Should fickle Nature have allowed the survival of a pattern of archaeological facts which so strongly favors an understanding that the Buddhist descendants of Sañjaya were the Śailendra kings who fashioned the majestic Buddhist temples of Central Java, fickle Nature did so in a way which seems to entirely affirm and validate the perspectives offered by the narrative of the *Carita Parahyangan*, in which the putative second dynasty is perfectly transparent.

Regarding the validity and utility of the *Carita Parahyangan*: Exploiting the newly-discovered appanage names and personal name of the *Raka* of Panaraban (r. 784–803) and the *Raka* of Warak *dyah* Manāra (r. 803–827) as enumerated in the Wanua Tengah III listing of Central Javanese kings, my essay on King Warak⁴⁹ used that new epigraphic data to extend the historical comprehensibility of the *Carita Parahyangan* for a century beyond that permitted to previous students of the manuscript, who lacked the information necessary to decode the text’s references to the two kings it named “*Rakeyan* Panaraban” and his son “*Sang* Manarah.” In my essay, I invoked an observation made by the pioneering Universitas Sanata Dharma academic Father W. J. van der Meulen, another student of the *Carita Parahyangan*, to whose memory I had dedicated my 2006 essay exploring the dating of the Borobudur *stūpa* and the existence of the Warak- and Menarah-related toponyms which lay around it.⁵⁰ Van der Meulen’s quotation was picked up on by Mark Long in his letter above, but I think that both

48. Jeffrey Sundberg, “A Buddhist Mantra Recovered from the Ratu Baka Plateau; A Preliminary Study of Its Implications for Śailendra-era Java,” *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 159, no. 1 (2003): 179n32.

49. Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*.”

50. Sundberg, “Considerations on the Dating of the Barabudur Stūpa.”

the complete quotation as well as my commentarial wrapper are usefully reproduced here. I wrote:

So central a focus does Sañjaya occupy in this Sundanese history that Van der Meulen⁵¹ was lead to surmise the existence of a “King Sañjaya Saga” which was used as the basis for the material in the *Carita Parahyangan*. Van der Meulen noted that “the life of Sañjaya, who is portrayed there as a Sundanese folk-hero from Galuh, is freely romanticized and mythicized. There are, however, a number of remarkably sober passages derived, it seems, from older genealogical material.” The entire *Carita Parahyangan* is well-worth examining and explicating, especially the information about Sañjaya and his Sundanese origins which is largely ignored in this essay- by no means has the text been wrung dry.⁵²

The brevity of the Panaraban-Warak excerpt of the *Carita Parahyangan* quoted by Long might deprive the reader of the perspective offered by a more extended acquaintance with its contents and narrative style, and lead one to conclude that the *Parahyangan* is nothing more than crackpot history. I pointed out that this Panaraban-Warak episode, although presented in a form fit for a *wayang* performance, could scarcely be construed as anything other than a coup by Warak against his royal father Panaraban. I further pointed out that although there is epigraphic confirmation of the kings Senna, Sañjaya, Panaraban and Warak named in the *Carita Parahyangan*,⁵³ no name on its list of Warak’s successors as king of Sundanese Galuh could be matched with the well-documented kings who reigned as Warak’s successors in Central Java. I therefore concluded that this divergence assuredly signaled that a previously unitary kingdom had fragmented after the reign of Warak, splitting along the ethnic lines of Sundanese and Javanese.

51. W. J. van der Meulen, “King Sañjaya and His Successors,” *Indonesia* 28 (1979): 17–54.

52. Sundberg, “The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*,” 144.

53. I believe that I performed historiographical due diligence on the obvious omission of King Panangkaran from the *Carita Parahyangan* narrative, noting that either a leaf was missing from the author’s source or else that he mistook a reference to the Panangkaran for the *raka* name associated with Sañjaya. This confusion would have paralleled his mistaking Śrī Vijaya for the Sumatran king rather than the kingdom, an error also made by early European researchers.

As an adjunct to my 2016 essay on the sudden ca. A.D. 857 Śaiva presence at the decades-old site of the Abhayagirivāsins on the Ratu Boko plateau,⁵⁴ I further scrutinized the Panaraban-Warak episode as a plausible historical rationale for the gold-foil Ratu Boko mantra which apparently implicates King Panaraban by name,⁵⁵ noting that noting that if Panaraban were indeed the victim rather than the beneficiary of the goldfoil's mantric intention, that his son Warak was the only human recorded to be hostile to him. I further observed that the strategy of narrative mythologization positing Panaraban's malicious murder of Warak in his blameless prior incarnation, far from being some pointless, madcap metempsychotic addendum similar to the supernatural events recorded in the lives of the Shingon patriarchs or intermittently in the Sri Lanka *Cūlavamsa*, constituted a legitimization of Warak in what would otherwise be the deeply odious act of rebellion against his royal father. This narrative construction, of representing the betrayed royal father as bad and the traitorous son good, could only be pertinent if Warak's rebellion were incomplete, with another son of Panaraban continuing to reign elsewhere in Panaraban's domains with a legitimacy and reputation unburdened by disloyalty to his father. This, I believe, is the heart of the *Parahyangan's* erection of a dodgy supernatural narrative around the Panaraban-Warak episode, a mythicization equaled in degree only in the text's invocation of the Indic *Pañcakuśika* or *Pañcaṣi* in the royal foundation myth of Sañjaya's Sundanese family.

If a modern historian will rightfully reject the unbelievable supernatural fiction which justified the moral reversal of the offence that Warak directed to Panaraban, the modern historiographer must also appreciate the appearance of this fictional karmic explanation as a valid and acceptable device to exonerate a royal usurper in medieval Java in the eyes of the *Parahyangan's* audience. Indeed, it is not inconceivable that the rationalizing myth was first devised in the circles around the traitorous Warak himself.

54. Jeffrey Sundberg, "Mid-9th-Century Adversity for Sinhalese Esoteric Buddhist Exemplars in Java: Lord Kumbhayoni and the 'Rag-Wearer' *Paṃsukūlika* Monks of the Abhayagirivihāra," in *Esoteric Buddhism in Maritime Asia: Networks of Masters, Texts, Icons*, ed. Andrea Aciri (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing, 2016), 375–379.

55. Sundberg, "A Buddhist Mantra Recovered from Ratu Baka Plateau."

The *Carita Parahyangan*, therefore, offers unique insight into otherwise baffling issues fundamental to understanding Java, Sumatra, Śailendra, Sañjaya, and the belt of grand Central Javanese Buddhist edifices. It presents a narrative history which is sufficiently rich and sufficiently grounded to be taken as the *grosso modo* narrative of Sañjaya's kingdom, perfectly willing to acknowledge that kingdom's own internal melodramas but sensitive to its reputation, and utterly uncomprehensive of the dual-dynasty ontology discerned by De Casparis and Long.

While I continue, even despite the mythologizations surround the family's foundation myth and the karmic metempsychosis of the Panaraban-Warak episode, to support van der Meulen's assessment that a remarkably sober genealogical structure underlay the *Carita Parahyangan*, I wish to recast into a complementary form my observation that the *Carita Parahyangan* is oblivious to the dual-dynasty envisioning: how and why could the compiler of the *Carita Parahyangan* so successfully airbrush the Śailendra out of the picture, going so far as to attribute to Sañjaya the dominance over Sumatra and the Malay lands that we, and the author's contemporary readers, know to have been firmly in the hands of kings identifying themselves as Śailendra? Should further investigation conclusively demonstrate that there were indeed two Buddhist dynasties functioning simultaneously in the Keḍu and Prambanan plains in the century spanning the year A.D. 800, and that my multiple writings have therefore been misfounded by an unwarranted reliance upon deceptive archaeological givings and their serendipitous corroboration by a deceitful *Carita Parahyangan* narrative, then my final essay in Javanology will be devoted to sixteenth-century Sundanese Orwellian historical erasure.

—Jeffrey Sundberg

