INTRODUCTION

The three articles by Hermann Kulke, Jan Wisseman Christie, and Pierre-Yves Manguin published in this volume are revised versions of papers presented at a panel on early Indonesian state formation during the Association for Asian Studies Meeting at Washington, DC, in 1989. Using different kinds of evidence and different methodologies, these authors share a common interest in how new structures of authority were conceptualized and formalized in early Java and Sumatra and how these structures may have responded to pre-existing patterns of hierarchy. These papers reveal possibilities for analyzing early state formation that suggest diversity both in the Indonesian past and in the epistemological and methodological potentialities of various kinds of evidence. They are published here not out of an antiquarian interest in the distant past but more with the conviction that efforts to analyze the past into coherent narratives or models reveal important aspects of contemporary academic and political culture.

K. W. Taylor.

EPIGRAPHICAL REFERENCES TO THE "CITY" AND THE "STATE" IN EARLY INDONESIA

Hermann Kulke

I.

As explained elsewhere in a more theoretical context, state formation in Southeast Asia took place in three consecutive phases, which correspond with chiefdom (or local principality), the early kingdom, and finally the imperial kingdom.[1] The present article organizes and analyzes the epigraphical references to the "city" and the "state" according to these three developmental phases. Part I deals with Indonesia's earliest inscriptions of Mūlavarman and Pūrṇavarman of the fifth century C.E., which depict the transformation of a chiefdom into an early kingdom. Parts II to IV analyze various developmental stages and structural problems of early kingdoms as exemplified by the inscriptions of early Śrīvijaya and of Central and Eastern Java from the late seventh to twelfth centuries. The final part deals with the growth of the imperial kingdom under Singasari and Majapahit. The emphasis of the paper is the descriptive analysis of the epigraphical evidence rather than an evaluation of its theoretical implications.[2]

[1] H. Kulke, "The Early and the Imperial Kingdom in Southeast Asian History," in: *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, ed. D.G. Marr and A.C. Milne (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1986), pp. 1–22; also "Indian Colonies, Indianization or Cultural Convergence? Reflections on the Changing Image of India's Role in South-East Asia," in: *Onderzoek in Zuidoost-Azië. Agenda's voor de Jaren Negentig*, ed. H. Schulte Nordholt (= *Semaian*, 3), Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden 1990, pp. 8–32.

[2] For further theoretical discussions, see D. Lombard, "Le concept d'empire en Asie du Sud-Est," in: *Le Concept d'Empire*, ed. M. Duverger (Paris, 1980), pp. 433–41; see O.W. Wolters, *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1982); L. Gessick, ed., *Centers, Symbols and Hierarchies: Essays on the Classical States of Southeast Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies

The first step towards state formation that is discernible in inscriptions is the transition from chieftaincy to early kingdom. In Indonesia this transition is illustrated very instructively by the famous Kutei inscriptions of Mūlavarman who ruled about 400 C.E. in East Kalimantan.[3] These earliest inscriptions of Indonesia, incised on seven yupa or sacrificial stone posts that bear a strong resemblance to menhirs, contain the unique story of the rise of a local chieftaincy and its transformation into an early kingdom within three generations.[4] The story begins with a local leader, perhaps a lineage elder, with the name Kundunga. His Sanskrit title "Lord of Men" (*narendra*) may have been conferred upon him only posthumously by his son or grandson. Under his son something important apparently took place, as one of the inscriptions reports that he became the founder of a lineage or "dynasty" (*vaṃśa-karta*) and assumed the Sanskrit name Asvavarman. Whatever that may have meant in detail, it appears that Asvavarman was able to raise considerably the status of his lineage (*vaṃśa*) within his own clan.

The decisive steps towards the establishment of an early kingdom took place in the third generation under Mūlavarman. He assumed the royal title *rājā*, defeated neighboring chiefs (*pārthiva*), and made them his tributaries (*karadā*). Furthermore, he invited Brahmins "who came hither" (*ihāgata*) and celebrated grand rituals at a "most sacred place" (*puṇyatama kṣetra*) called Vaprakeśvara, and had a series of impressive inscriptions incised.[5] The meaning of the unusual name of "Lord (Śiva) of the Vapra(ka)" is unclear. But the fact that the place is explicitily described as "most sacred" allows us to infer that it had something to do with Mūlavarman's rise to power. Sanskrit *vapra* has the meaning of either "rampart" and "earth raised as the foundation of a building" or "mound" and "hillock." Thus this "Lord of the Vapra(ka)" may have been associated either with the foundation of Mūlavarman's own "town" (*pura*), which is mentioned in one of the inscriptions, or with a ritual on a hillock. Although the first meaning cannot be ruled out, the latter is more likely in view of other examples known from Southeast Asia where liṅgas of Śiva (*isvara*) were consecrated on a hillock (*vapra*) in connection with the foundation ritual of a polity. The most famous example is, of course, the establishment of a Śivaliṅga as Devarāja on the Mahendra mountain in 802 C.E. by Jayavarman II, the founder of the kingdom of Angkor.[6] More important in the context of early Javanese history, however, is the consecration of a Śivaliṅga by Sañjaya on a hillock in Central Java in 732 C.E.[7] In regard to Mūlavarman's Vaprakeśvara, we may even go a step further and infer that the deity Vaprakeśvara may have also been associated with the cult of a deified ancestor, the very "root" of the "dynasty" established by Mūlavarman's father. At least Mūlavarman's name, "protegé (*varman*) of the root (*mūla*)," makes such an

Monographs, 1983); P. Wheatley, *Nagara and Commandery: Origins of Southeast Asian Urban Traditions* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Department of Geography Research Paper Nos. 207–208, 1983); K. R. Hall, *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985); Marr and Milner, eds., *Southeast Asia*; S. Subrahmanyam, "Aspects of State Formation in South India and Southeast Asia, 1550–1650, in: *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 23 (1986): 358ff; for Mainland Southeast Asia see C. Higham, *The Archaeology of Mainland Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989; R. Hagensteijn, *Circles of Kings. Political Dynamics in Early Continental Southeast Asia* (Dordrecht, 1989).

[3] B. Ch. Chhabra, *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture During Pallava Rule* (New Delhi, 1965) pp. 85–92.

[4] See also F. H. van Naerssen, *The Economic and Administrative History of Early Indonesia* (Leiden/Köln, 1977), pp. 18–23.

[5] See also J. G. de Casparis, "Some Notes on the Oldest Inscriptions of Indonesia," in: *A Man of Indonesian Letters. Essays in Honour of Professor A. Teeuw*, ed. C.M.S. Hellwig and S. O. Robson (Leiden, 1986), pp. 242–55 (= VKI, 121).

[6] H. Kulke, *The Devaraja Cult* (Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program Data Paper 108, 1979).

[7] H. B. Sarkar, *Corpus of Inscriptions of Java*, vol. I (Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay, 1971), pp. 15–24.

inference quite likely. Finally, it should be emphasized that the making and establishment of the monumental *yūpa* stone inscription by the Brahmins (their authorship is mentioned twice in the inscriptions) in a tribal surrounding must have been particularly impressive and successful in raising the status of Mūlavarman. The Brahmins "who had come hither" were generously rewarded by Mūlavarman with land (*bhūmi*) and thousands of cows.

The analysis of the epigraphical evidence of these earliest inscriptions of Indonesia allows us to draw the following tentative picture of Mūlavarman's new polity. At its center was the *pura*, which, however, certainly did not yet represent a truly urban settlement. The statement that it was "his own (*svaka*) pura" makes it more likely that, as in later cases, here, too, *pura* meant the "residence" or kraton of Mūlavarman. Not very far away from the *pura* was the "most sacred place" (perhaps on the "sacred mountain") of Mūlavarman's polity, which might have been associated with a Hinduized ancestor cult. The *pura* may have been surrounded by the dwelling places and lands of the Brahmins "who came here" and by the places of other members of Mūlavarman's lineage (*vaṃśa*). Beyond this nuclear area and its adjoining jungle, similar, though most likely smaller, places of other "landlords" (*pārthiva*) and lineage elders and their family members were situated. Some of these little chiefs had been defeated by Mūlavarman and thus become his tributaries. This is all we know about Mūlavarman's polity from his inscription. Apart from the *pura*, the holy *kṣetra*, the land (*bhūmi*) donated to the Brahmins, and the surrounding "landlords" (*pārthiva*) donated to the Brahmins, no other evidence is known that allows us to define the polity spatially. Further-more, it is significant that no "officers" of any political function are mentioned in these in-scriptions. In Weberian terminology, Mūlavarman's authority was thus a purely patriarchal rule based, most likely, on his patriarchal household and its *oikos* economy. But there was one significant difference. Mūlavarman's court was able to attract Brahmins who certainly acted not only as ritual specialists but also as advisers, thus fulfilling a role that comes al-ready near to Weber's extra-patrimonial staff. The fact that Mūlavarman managed to invite (and feed!) Brahmins and to have them perform grand rituals and to compose and incise seven impressive yūpa inscriptions distinguishes Mūlavarman's polity from the many little chieftaincies that surrounded him. However, although he claimed to have defeated them, he still remained one of them, though as primus inter pares; whereas these chiefs were called "Landlord" (*pārthiva*) Rājā Mūlavarman was praised in his inscriptions as the "Lord of the Landlords" (*pārthiva-indra*).

In this connection a small hint from the earliest inscription of mainland Southeast Asia, the famous Vo-Canh inscription from Central Vietnam, is very instructive.[8] It reports an announcement "beneficial to the people" (*prajā*) by King Śrī Māra that he was willing to share all his property with those dear to him. Among these were his sons, brothers, and relatives explicitly mentioned as having been satisfied by Śrī Māra while he sat on the throne in the midst of his kinsmen (*svajana*). Much has been written about this inscription. On palaeographical grounds, its date is usually given as the second or third centuries C.E. G. Coedès and others assumed an identity of Śrī Māra with Fan Shih-man, the great king of Funan in the third century C.E.[9] But to my understanding it is absolutely impossible to interpret this inscription as a document of a great Funanese king who, in this case, would have been ruling over a large kingdom that spread from Funan's center in the Mekong Delta up the Annamite coast where the Vo-Canh inscription was found. Instead, the Vo-Canh inscription appears to represent a "state" that has to be equated evolutionarily with Mūlavarman's polity. In the Vo-Canh inscription we meet only the king, his relatives, and

---

[8] R. C. Majumdar, *The Inscriptions of Champa* (Lahore, 1927), pp. 1–3.

[9] G. Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968), p. 40.

the people. He sat amidst his own kinsmen and promised to share his property with them. As in the case of Mūlavarman's inscription, there were no officers of any kind present during the ceremony. Some Brahmins must have been around to compose and to incise the inscription, but they seem to have been even less influential than under Mūlavarman as they are not referred to at all. Śrī Māra's "state affairs" were therefore clearly the affairs of the "royal family" (*rājakula*) which is mentioned in the inscription.

There is yet another fact that brings the Vo-Canh inscription typologically even nearer to the Kutei inscriptions. In its (otherwise very mutilated) introduction, the Vo-Canh inscription, too, mentions a "first conquest" (*prathama vijaya*). As in the case of Mūlavarman in Kalimantan, Śrī Māra's family (*kula*) or clan obviously had just undertaken some successful raids against neighboring chiefs. In order to ascertain the loyalty of his (envious?) relatives (in this regard the explicit mention of his brothers is noteworthy), Śrī Māra felt obliged to assure them of his willingness to share the spoils, and he appealed to future kings to do the same. From a structural point of view, we have thus the same situation as we came across in Eastern Kalimantan after Mūlavarman had undertaken his first conquests. In this regard it is important that D. C. Sircar, the renowned Indian epigraphist, stated that "the date (of the Vo-Canh inscription) is not much earlier than the 5th century AD."[10] Śrī Māra thus would have been a contemporary of Mūlavarman, facing obviously quite similar problems while extending his authority beyond his own family or clan territory.

Pūrṇavarman's nearly contemporary inscriptions of mid-fifth century West Java depict a picture of a slightly more developed early statehood.[11] Pūrṇavarman is praised as the "Lord (*īśvara*) of the city (*nagara*) of Tārumā" whose predecessor Pīnabāhu already bore the truly royal title "Foremost King of Kings" (*rājādhirājā*). Whereas Pīnabāhu had dug a canal passing beside the "famous city" (*purī*), Pūrṇavarman dug another canal that cut across the "cantonment" (*śibira*) of his grandfather, who might have been identical with Pīnabāhu. In any case, here, too, three generations are mentioned, although in this case already the grandfather seems to have been able to impose his authority upon other chiefs. Pūrṇa-varman continued this policy as he is explicitly praised as conquerer of the "towns of his enemies" (*arinagara*). In this connection, too, it is interesting to note that Pūrṇavarman, in spite of his conquest, remained a primus inter pares, ruling over his own *nagara* as did his enemies (*ari*) in their own *nagara*. As in the case of Mūlavarman's (and Śrī Māra's) inscriptions, we find no mention of officers or any references pertaining to the spatial aspect of his authority. Therefore we have no idea about the character of Pūrṇavarman's relations with the "cities" (*nagara*) of the enemies that he claims to have conquered. There was, however, a remarkable difference between these early kings. Pūrṇavarman's association with the Hindu deities Viṣṇu and Indra[12] clearly indicates that his court has already come under much stronger Indian influence, perhaps over several generations, than those of Mūlavarman and Śrī Māra. But in Java, too, this influence had not yet fundamentally changed the nature of the state of Tārumānagara.

However, one aspect of the epigraphical evidence of Pūrṇavarman's inscription deserves our attention. Whereas Mūlavarman's inscription mentions only once a *pura* (there is no

---

[10] D. C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, vol. I (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965), p. 54, note 1.

[11] Chhabra, *Expansion*, pp. 93–97.

[12] In his Ci-arutan Rock Inscription, a pair of human footprints "which belongs to the illustrious Pūrṇavarman, the Lord of Tārumānagara" are compared with Viṣṇu's footprints, whereas in the Kebon-Kopi Rock Inscription the footprints of his royal elephant are compared with those of Indra's elephant Airavata. (Chhabra, *Expansion*, pp. 93 and 95.)

such mention at all in Śrī Māra's inscription), Pūrṇavarman's four inscriptions refer to *nagara, purī,* and *śibira.* The so-called Ci-Arutan inscription clearly praises Pūrṇavarman as the "Lord of Tārumānagara"; the Jambu Rock inscription mentions Tārumā and the defeated *arinagara;* the Kebon-Kopi Rock inscription praises the "Lord of Tārumā" (without mentioning *nagara);* and the Tugu Stone inscription describes the two canals in connection with the "famous *purī"* and the *śibira..* The meager epigraphical evidence does not allow a clear distinction between these three terms. But we may infer that *śibira.* meant a fortified place, perhaps the kraton of Pūrṇavarman or his grandfather, which was situated within the *purī.* This expression then would refer to Tārumā as a semi-urban or urban-like settlement.

Already at this early time, the third term, *nagara,* might have had a wider connotation, referring to the city and the hinterland controlled by it. The question as to whether the epigraphical evidence allows such a terminological distinction between the kraton, the town, and its politically controlled hinterland will remain a crucial problem throughout this article. One point, however, is worth mentioning in connection with the *nagara* of Pūrṇavarman's inscription. The fact that only the term *nagara* occurs in connection with Tārumā and the polities of its defeated enemies may be understood as an indication that the spatial concept of the "state" in fifth-century Java was primarily "city"-centered. The earliest epigraphical evidence of Indonesia from the fifth century thus confirms Wheatley's definition of early political units on the Malay peninsula which he derived mainly from Chinese sources: "a polity in which a focally situated settlement exercised direct control over a restricted peripheral territory and exacted whatever tribute it could from an indefinite region beyond."[13]

II.

The next evidence of early urbanism and state formation in Indonesia comes from the most interesting corpus of inscriptions of the early Malay world, i.e. the inscriptions of early Śrīvijaya which can be dated around 682 to 686 C.E. The spatial distribution of the seven major inscriptions indicates an interesting pattern. Three have been found at Śrīvijaya's center around Palembang[14] and four were discovered in outer regions (*maṇḍala*)[15] that encircled the center at a distance of several hundered kilometers. Furthermore, some fragmentary inscriptions have come to light in the center.[16] This distribution pattern foreshadows a major problem of Śrīvijaya's statehood, the control of its outer regions. The most important inscription is the Telaga Batu or Sabokingking (Skk) inscription of Eastern Palembang, which contains dreadful curses against disloyal members of the royal family and local chiefs. The author of all these inscriptions seems to have been king Jaynāśa under whom

---

[13] Wheatley, *Nagara and Commandery,* p. 233.

[14] P.-Y. Manguin, "Palembang et Sriwijaya: anciennes hypotheses, recherches nouvelles," *BEFEO* 76 (1987): 337–402.

[15] From Palembang, the Kedukan Bukit and Talang Tuwo inscriptions were published by G. Coedès, "Les inscriptions malaises de Çrivijaya," *BEFEO* 30 (1930): 29–80; for the Telaga Batu [Sabokingking] inscription see J.G. de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia,* vol. II, (Bandung: Masa Baru, 1956), pp. 15–46; The more or less identical "*maṇḍala* inscriptions" are known from Karang Brahi (Jambi) and Kota Kapur (Bangka), see Coedès, "Les inscriptions," and from Palas Pasemah (South Lampung), see Boechari, "An Old Malay Inscription of Srivijaya at Palas Pasemah," *Pra Seminar Penelitian Sriwijaya* (Jakarta, 1979), pp. 19–40; another badly weathered version of the *maṇḍala* inscription was also found in the Lampung district and has been dealt with by Boechari in his article "New Investigations on the Kedukan Bukit Inscription"*Untuk Bapak Guru (Bernet Kempers Festschrift)* (Jakarta, 1986), pp. 33–56.

[16] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia,* vol II, pp. 1–15.

Śrīvijaya experienced a period of breath-taking expansionism, conquering Malayu-Jambi and Kedah and attacking Java with a naval expedition.[17]

The Skk inscription begins with "an almost entirely unintelligible oath formula,"[18] which is followed by a peculiar list of officers and occupational groups.[19] It includes princes (*rājaputra*), landlords (*bhūpati*), army leaders (*senāpati*), local magnates (*nāyaka*), confidants (*pratyaya*), royal confidants (*hāji pratyaya*),[20] judges (*daṇḍanāyaka*), surveyors of groups of workmen (*tuhā an vatak = vuruḥ*), surveyors of low castes (*addhyākṣi nījavarṇa*), cutlers (*vāṣīkaraṇa*), ministers of princely status (*kumārāmātya*), regular and irregular troops (*cāṭabhaṭa*), administrators (*adhikaraṇa*), clerks (*kāyastha*), architects (?, *sthāpaka*), naval captains (*puhāvaṃ*), merchants (*vaṇiyāga*), royal washermen (*marsī hāji*), and royal slaves (*hulun hāji*). De Casparis is certainly right to assume that this heterogeneous list contains those "categories of people that might constitute a possible danger"[21] to the security of the king and his court and who had therefore to swear the oath. The inscription furthermore refers to three categories of princes: the crown prince (*yuvarāja*), second crown prince (*prātiyuvarāja*), and other princes (*rājakumāra*).

These lists seemingly depict a well-organized hierarchy of princes, court officers, and servants at Śrīvijaya. As no identical lists are known from contemporary India or Southeast Asia it is likely that they reflect a fairly true picture of an already quite advanced society at the court of Śrīvijaya. However, it may have been differentiated more horizontally than hierarchically structured. This assumption is based on the fact that the many Sanskrit titles of court officers are known only from the introductory list of the Skk inscription, which, later on, also thrice mentions the three categories of princes. Otherwise two other Malay terms were apparently considered much more important than these "foreign" names. These were *dātu* and *huluntuhān*. *Dātu* appears to be the traditional Malay title of a chief and occurs frequently in all Malay inscriptions of early Śrīvijaya. In the maṇḍala inscriptions even the "King" of Śrīvijaya is referred to by this traditional title.[22] *Huluntuhān*, the "slaves [*hulun*] and lords [*tuhan*]," occur seven times in the Skk inscription. This term obviously denotes the members of the traditional patriarchal household of the *dātu* of Śrīvijaya and therefore would have included all sorts of family members and retainers who acted on behalf of the *dātu* of Śrīvijaya. These *huluntuhān* most likely were identical with those officers mentioned in the introductory list.

As regards the spatial dimension of Śrīvijaya's political authority these Malay inscriptions contain several new pieces of important information that can be derived from several key-words in these inscriptions, in particular *kadātuan, vanua, samaryyāda, maṇḍala,* and

---

[17] Coedès, "Les inscriptions," note 7 pp. 81–85; O. W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian Commerce. A Study of the Origins of Śrivijaya* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), pp. 15–29.

[18] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia,* vol.II, p. 36, note 1.

[19] The translation follows, in most cases, ibid., pp. 36ff.

[20] J. G. de Casparis (ibid., p.37, n.7) calls his translation of *hāji pratyaya* as "confidents of the king" as conjectural ("but we do not see another alternative"). Perhaps one could also think of the group of officers who are so frequently mentioned in later Javanese inscriptions as *mangilala drawya haji* ("persons who collect the lord's property"); *pratyaya* has the meaning of "revenue, income or tax"; D. C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* (Delhi, 1966), p. 262.

[21] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia,* vol II, p. 21.

[22] In the Talang Tuwo inscription of 684 C.E. king Jayanāśa is also addressed with the priestly (?) title *(da)punta hiyam.*

bhūmi. In a recent paper[23] I have tried to show that these terms allow us to draw some con-
clusions on the early process of concentric state formation in seventh-century Sumatra. The
center of this process was the kadātuan Śrīvijaya, "the place of the dātu" of Śrīvijaya, which
had thus the same meaning as Javanese *kěraton*, "the place of the ratu."[24] According to the
Skk inscription the *kadātuan* contained the inner apartments of the residence (*tnah rumah*) of
the dātu where his women folk (*bini hāji*) lived and where gold (*mas*) and tribute (*drawya*)
were kept. Most likely the kadātuan also housed the dewata, or tutelary deity (a deified
ancestor?), which, according to the *mandala* inscriptions, protected the *kadātuan* of
Śrīvijaya.

The *kadātuan* was surrounded by the *vanua Śrīvijaya*, the semi-urban area of Śrīvijaya.[25]
Fragments of inscriptions refer to citizens (*paura*) and to a "*vihara* in this *vanua*."[26] This
monastery may have housed some of the one thousand Buddhist monks whom the Chinese
monk I-ching mentioned as being in Śrīvijaya during these years. Furthermore, the Buddhist
park Śrīkṣetra established by King Jayanāśa and Bukit Senguntang, Śrīvijaya's "sacred
center"[27] where a number of Buddhist remains have been unearthed, may have been situ-
ated within this *vanua Śrīvijaya*. Morever, we may assume that it contained several truly
agricultural villages, and, in particular, the markets frequented by the foreign merchants
(*vaṇiyāga*) and sailors (*puhāvam*) who are mentioned in the Skk inscription. The *kadātuan* and
the *vanua* formed the nucleus of Śrīvijaya. Only these two terms occur in connection with
the name Śrīvijaya[28] and, what is perhaps equally revealing, only these two central spheres
are known by their Malay terms. The other more distant surrounding "circles" of this nucle-
ar area are referred to in the inscriptions only by the Sanskrit names *samaryyāda, maṇḍala*,
and *bhūmi*.

The term *samaryyāda* is very unusual; in fact, it is unknown in Indian[29] or Southeast
Asian epigraphy. De Casparis translates the term as "frontier province" whereas I prefer its
literal meaning "having the same boundaries" (*maryyāda*). The *samaryyāda* thus would have
referred to the neighboring region beyond the *vanua* Śrīvijaya. According to the Skk inscrip-
tion the *samaryyāda* was connected with the central *vanua* by special roads (*samaryyāda-
patha*). This hinterland was populated by an obviously large number of *dātu* who resided—
according to the Skk inscription—in their own places (*sthāna*) on their own land (*deśa*). But
these local *dātu* have come under the control of the *dātu* of Śrīvijaya and his *huluntuhān* who
appear to have been particularly active in the *samaryyāda* hinterland. The endeavor of these
dātu to again become "independent" (*swasthā*) must have posed one of the greatest dangers
to the security of the *dātu* of Śrīvijaya and the *kadātuan* as these *dātu* are threatened several
times by the imprecations of the Skk inscription.

---

[23] H. Kulke, "*Kadātuan Śrīvijaya*—Empire or Kraton of Srivijaya? A Reassessment of the Epigraphical Evidence,"
in: *The Ancient Southeast Asian City and State*, ed. J. Stargardt (in press).

[24] J. G. de Casparis and Coedès translate *kadatuan* as "Empire" and "province" respectively. Boechari prefers
"kingdom," although he admits that, strictly speaking, *kadātuan* is the equivalent of *kěraton*, "Old Malay Inscrip-
tion," p. 23.

[25] J. G. de Casparis (*Prasasti Indonesia, Vol II*, p. 14) and Boechari ("Old Malay Inscription, p. 22) translate *vanua* as
"country" and Coedès as "le pays" ("Les Inscriptions," p. 35, n. 12).

[26] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia*, Vol. II, p. 14.

[27] O. W. Wolters, "Restudying Some Chinese Writings on Sriwijaya," *Indonesia* 42 (1986): 1–41.

[28] *dātu Śrīvijaya* is mentioned in all *maṇḍala* inscriptions, whereas *vanua Śrīvijaya* is known from the Kedukan
Bukit inscription.

[29] Thus *samaryyāda* is not mentioned in D. C. Sircar's *Glossary*.

The fourth important term for our consideration about the spatial dimension of Śrīvijaya's statehood is *maṇḍala*. It occurs only once in the Skk inscription in the famous passage *maṃrakṣāña sakalamaṇḍala kadātuanku*, which de Casparis translates "you who protect all the provinces of my empire."[30] I have tried to show that, in the context of early Śrīvijaya, the term *maṇḍala* most likely did not refer to centrally administered provinces in the extended core area of an empire, as such provinces did not yet exist in early kingdoms; they became a typical feature only of the later imperial kingdoms.[31] In the context of early kingdoms, the term *maṇḍala* usually referred to autonomous or semi-autonomous principalities and chiefdoms at their periphery. Several such *maṇḍala* are known from contemporary Southern and Eastern India.[32] In the case of late seventh-century Śrīvijaya "all the maṇḍalas" therefore appears to have meant those outlying regions where the above-mentioned "*maṇḍala* inscriptions" have been found. The exact nature of Śrīvijaya's control over its *maṇḍala* is unknown. They had certainly been conquered by Śrīvijaya's army (*bala*), which is mentioned several times in Śrīvijaya's inscriptions. However we have no evidence at all that they had come under the direct political control of Śrīvijaya as no *huluntuhān* or royal princes of Śrīvijaya are mentioned in these *maṇḍala* inscriptions. They were obviously still ruled by the local *dātu* who lived in their own *vanua*, as is known from these inscriptions. They had been recognized (*sanyāsa*) in their position by Śrīvijaya. But their precarious loyalty obviously had to be improved by the *maṇḍala* inscriptions and their peculiar mixture of imprecations and taking of the oath of allegiance. However, military coercion and imprecations alone would not have sufficed to establish an enduring relation. Of equal importance must have been the incentive to participate in Śrīvijaya's international trade.

Apart from providing us with a conceivable model of an early concentric state, Śrīvijaya also provides us with the first generic term of such a state. As mentioned above, Coedès, de Casparis, and Boechari regarded *vanua*, *kadātuan*, and *huluntuhān* as just such a comprehensive term and translated them accordingly as "le pays," "empire," or "kingdom." But, according to my interpretation, none of these expressions had such a comprehensive spatial connotation in the context of early Śrīvijaya. The word *bhūmi*, however, appears to have been such a generic term for Śrīvijaya's statehood. In Sanskrit, *bhūmi* means primarily "earth" or "soil" but also "realm" and "country." It occurs twice in Śrīvijaya's inscription. One instance is in a more or less identical passage found in all the *maṇḍala* inscriptions, which threatened the disloyal "people inside the land [that is] under the order of *kadātuan*" (*uraṅ di dalaṅña bhūmi ājñāña kadātuanku*).[33] As this passage occurs only in the *maṇḍala* inscriptions it has to be inferred that the places where they have been found either constituted a *bhūmi* or formed part of a larger polity which was called *bhūmi*. Although the first meaning cannot be excluded, two other references make the latter connotation of *bhūmi* more likely in the context of early Indonesian history. The first of these references comes from the important passage of the Kota Kapur inscription of the year 686 which announces the departure of an army expedition against *bhūmi jāwa*, which had not yet become submissive to Śrīvijaya. Obviously, Java was not regarded just as one of the many *vanua* or *maṇḍala* surrounding Śrīvijaya but as an equally matched opponent of Śrīvijaya. The other evidence of a *bhūmi* polity comes from several inscriptions of late ninth and early tenth-century Java that

---

[30] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia*, Vol II, p. 43.

[31] Kulke, "The Early and the Imperial Kingdom."

[32] Thus, in the early Middle Ages, Tosali, the center of coastal Orissa in Eastern India, was surrounded by more than half a dozen such semi-autonomous *maṇḍala*-principalities; see S.N. Rajaguru, *Inscriptions of Orissa*, vol. I, 2. [300–700 A.D.] (Bhubaneswar, 1958); and B. Misra, *Dynasties of Medieval Orissa* (Calcutta, 1933).

[33] Boechari, "Old Malay Inscription," p. 38 and Coedès, "Les inscriptions," p. 47.

refer to *bhūmi* Matarām (infra). As in the case of *bhūmi* Java and *bhūmi* Matarām, the Śrīvi-jayan concept of "the *bhūmi* under the control of my *kadātuan*" apparently referred to the whole sphere that had come under the control of Śrīvijaya.

Comparing Mūlavarman's and Pūrṇavarman's fifth-century polities with Śrīvijaya in the late seventh century we are able to recognize several important structural changes. The "first victories" (*prathama vijiya*) of these earliest kings certainly had led to the defeat of neighboring "landlords" (*pārthiva*) and "hostile towns" (*arinagara*). And in some cases a vic-torious "lord of the landlords" (*pārthiva-indra*) may have been able to collect (most likely irregular!) tribute (*kara*). But none of their earliest inscriptions allow us to infer that this pristine political development presupposed or led to far-reaching structural changes. The courts of these early rulers still remained patriarchal households. Their rule was the affair of the chief's family (*kula*) or lineage/"dynasty" (*vaṃśa*). It is this background that explains the frequent mention of these two kinship terms in these early inscriptions, that is, *kula* and, particularly, *vaṃśa*. However, it is worth mentioning that these Sanskrit terms only occur whenever the foundation of a "dynasty" is reported in inscriptions. As no equivalent Malay or Javanese word ever occurs in inscriptions written in these languages, it is likely that these Sanskrit terms were required for the definition of an apparently new social institution, that is, a "ruling lineage" in a hitherto rather unstratified tribal society.

This situation had already changed considerably in late seventh-century Sumatra around present-day Palembang. Whether international trade by the "sailors and traders" (*puhavaṃ vaṇiyaga*) mentioned in the Skk inscription was the main cause of this change is still an open question. But it is evident that the inscriptions of Śrīvijaya which have been discovered around Palembang depict an already fairly well-developed society. But in this regard, too, we have to distinguish between different spatial zones of social change. Social differentiation and stratification was strongest in the *vanua*, center from where its influence spread into its *samaryyāda* hinterland. But we have no evidence of such a development in the outer *maṇḍala*, even though we may conjecture that the *dātu* of these regions had their own *huluntuhān*. But particularly in these cases they would have been patriarchal "servants and lords" rather than administrative officers.

Apart from new social stratification in *vanua* Śrīvijaya, the other decisive difference be-tween the epigraphical evidence of fifth-century Kalimantan and Java on the one side and late seventh century Śrīvijaya on the other side is an incipient change in the center-periph-ery relations. Śrīvijaya seems to have been the first Indonesian state that succeeded in extending its direct political authority beyond its own *vanua* into the *samaryyāda* hinterland and to conquer even far-off powerful chieftaincies and trade emporia (e.g. Malayu and Kedah) and to establish some sort of hegemony over these outer *maṇḍala*. Śrīvijaya's rapid expansion was due to two new factors which had different spatial significances. First, Śrīvijaya's direct rule in the *samaryyāda* hinterland was based primarily on its disposal of a fairly well-developed staff of "administrators," the *huluntuhān* of the Skk inscription. How-ever, these "officers" still had to face various types of difficulties at the center and in its hin-terland that are vividly accursed in the Skk inscription. As shown by J.G. de Casparis in his analysis of the fragmentary inscriptions, *vanua* Śrīvijaya was still afflicted by dangerous rebellions of internal insurgents.[34] Second, Śrīvijaya's control over the far-off *maṇḍala* pre-supposed the existence or at least the temporary availability of a strong army (*vala*). Its inscriptions show that the main cause of Śrīvijaya's hold over the outer *maṇḍala* was the ability to muster an army of apparently uncontested strength. Nevertheless, Śrīvijaya's

---

[34] de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia*, Vol. II, pp. 4ff (particularly inscriptions *a* and *b*).

authority still remained very precarious in these *maṇḍala*. Śrīvijaya's major problem at this point appears to have been its "failure" either to integrate at least some of the more powerful *dātu* chiefs of the *maṇḍala* into its own central court or to obliterate and replace them with loyal members of its own court. In fact, the solution of these center-periphery relations remained the crucial problem of all pre-modern states. As we will see, the Mataram-Śailendra dynasties chose the first and Majapahit the second method to solve this problem.

In regard to the main concern of this article, the epigraphical evidence for the "city" and the "state" in early Indonesia, Śrīvijaya provides for the first time a rather clear picture of an already well-developed concentric state in early Indonesia. Mūlavarman's polity had comprised only two such spatial spheres. These were a still rather undifferentiated center consisting of a *pura* (= kraton?), a "most holy place" (*kṣetra*), and the living places of the "royal" *vaṃsa* and the Brahmins. Beyond this center a group of unspecified defeated chiefs (*pārthiva*) existed whom Mūlavarman claims to have made his "tribute-givers" (*karadā*). Pūrṇavarman's inscriptions from West Java offer a slightly more-developed stage of an early polity. As all three epigraphical terms that occur in these inscriptions and that are relevant for our study, that is, *śibira, purī*, and *nagara*, have a clear urban connotation, Tārumānagara appears to have been a typical early "city state." But we have to keep in mind that in the context of early Indonesia these Sanskrit terms may have referred to kratons of strong chiefdoms and Hinduized "little kings" rather than to an urban "city."

The major contribution of Śrīvijaya's inscriptions to our study is the fact that they indicate several spatial spheres of its political authority. And moreover, for the first time in early Indonesia, a generic term, *bhūmi* , for the "state" is given. This *bhūmi* realm was divided into three zones, that is, the *vanua* center, its *samaryyāda* hinterland, and the outer *maṇḍala*. The center, too, consisted of two distinct zones, the *kadātuan* (or kraton) of the ruling *dātu* and its surrounding *vanua*. *Vanua* Śrīvijaya seems to have comprised a densely populated area at present-day Palembang with urbanized "pockets." However, it is astonishing that we only once hear of Śrīvijaya's "citizens" (*paura*) whereas the terms *pura* or *nagara* never occur in Śrīvijaya's inscriptions. Whether this evidence is sufficient to infer that no "city" outside the *kadātuan Śrīvijaya* existed in the late seventh century is difficult to decide. But the epigraphical evidence makes such an inference quite likely.[35] A possible reason why we may search in vain for the epigraphical terms *pura* and *nagara* in the context of early Śrīvijaya may be the fact that much of its urban life took place in the many houseboats on the Musi river.

III.

The two earliest dated inscriptions of the middle period of early Indonesia, the Canggal inscription of Sañjaya of the year 732 C.E.[36] and the Dinaya inscription of 760 C.E.,[37] belong to Central and Eastern Java, respectively. Their date is only about two generations later than Śrīvijaya's early inscriptions. But in regard to Java itself, there is a wide gap of three centuries between Pūrṇavarman and Sañjaya. Both inscriptions of the eighth century provide some new evidence of a conceptual and structural development of the "city" and the "state" in early Indonesia. Sañjaya's inscription reports the consecration of "a liṅga on a mountain" (*prātiṣṭhipat parvate liṅgaṃ*) in a place or "country" (*deśa*) called Kuñjarakuñja in the island (*dvīpa*) of Java. Sañjaya is praised for protecting the "royal highways" (*rājapathi*), defeating

---

[35] In this connection further excavations at the newly discovered sites at Karanganyar in western Palembang will be most important. See P.-Y. Manguin, "Palembang et Sriwijaya."

[36] Sarkar, *Corpus*, pp. 15–24.

[37] Ibid., pp. 25–33.

"numerous circles of neighboring chiefs" *(aneka-sāmanta-cakra-rāja)*, and for ruling justly his kingdom *(rājya)*. From later inscriptions we know that the Matarām dynasty praised him as "king" *(ratu)* and founder of their dynasty.[38] Furthermore it is worth mentioning that Sañjaya's Canggal inscription provides the first epigraphical evidence for agrarian extension when it mentions that Java was "rich in rice and other seeds."

The evidence of Sañjaya's inscriptions as well as that of later inscriptions leaves no doubt that Sañjaya established a genuine early kingdom, in fact the first known in Javanese history. It is of particular interest for our study that the concept of his state and the *praśasti* eulogy of the inscription were much nearer to contemporary Indian models than the earlier cases that so far have been discussed. For the first time, the "state" is called *rājya*. It comprised, most likely, several *deśa* which were linked by "royal highways." It was surrounded by a *sāmantacakra*, the common term of Indian and future Javanese inscriptions referring to the "circle of (originally independent) neighboring rulers *(sāmanta)*."[39] According to the Indian concept they had to be subjugated to the central king. Another indicator of Indian influence is the consecration of a purely Hindu temple, dedicated to Śiva.

But despite this evidently strong Indian influence, Sañjaya's inscription lacks several important indicators of contemporary Indian statehood and kingship. This is most evident in regard to the complete absence of officers usually mentioned in connection with such a grand ceremony as the establishment of Sañjaya's "royal" Śivaliṅgaṃ. Whether this evidence allows the *argumentum ex silentio* that Sañjaya's court still consisted only of his extended family *(kula)*, which in fact is mentioned twice in the inscription, is a matter of conjecture. But in this regard it has to be remembered that Sañjaya's "dynasty" was not yet an old-established one. He traced his genealogy back only to his father Sanna, and he himself is praised in a later inscription by the Malay title *ratu* whereas his successors are glorified as *mahārāja*.[40] In this regard it is significant that his father is reported to have ruled his people by the traditional method of "conciliation and gifts" *(sāma-dāna)*. Another interesting point is the fact that Sañjaya's inscription does not contain any term that can be associated with an urbanized settlement. This again does not automatically mean that no such settlement existed in his *rājya* in Central Java. But at least this evidence shows that he did not regard it necessary (or important enough) to mention such a settlement in his inscription.

A rather different picture of an early kingdom is depicted in the Dinaya inscription of the year 760 C.E., the earliest one known from East Java. Much has been written about it because of several uncertainties about its contents, which, however, need not bother us here.[41] It reports the consecration of a temple and a stone image of the divine seer Agastya by king *(rāja)* Gajayāna who protected a *pura*, called Kañjuruha. King Gajayāna urged his relatives *(bāndhava)*, sons *(nṛpasuta)*, and his principal ministers *(mantri mukhya)* not to act against this gift. He appealed to the members of the "royal dynasty" *(vaṃśa nṛpa)* to follow his example and to perform meritorious acts and thus to protect the kingdom *(rājya)*.

---

[38] Ibid., vol. II, p. 68 (Mantyasih I copper-plates, B, 8).

[39] L. L. Gopal, "Samanta—Its Varying Significance in Ancient India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1963): 21–37.

[40] See above note 38.

[41] F.D.K. Bosch, "Het Lingga-Heiligdom van Dinaja," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde* 64 (1924): 225–91; J.G. de Casparis, "Nogmals de Sanskrit-inscriptie op den steen van Dinojo," *Ibid.* 81 (1941) 499–513; W.J. van der Meulen, "The Purī Pūtikeśvarapāvita and the Pura Kañjuruhan," in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* 132 (1976): 445–62.

The interesting evidence in regard to the "city" of Kañjuruha is the fact that the first verse mentions that the *purī* was protected by Gajayāna's deceased father Devasiṃha, whereas the next verse reports that Gajayāna protected the *pura* Kañjuruha after his father had died. Furthermore we are told about "citizens" *(paura)* who, together with the "groups of leaders" *(nāyaka-gaṇa)*, constructed the temple. The juxtaposition of *purī* and *pura* in the first two verses, which were protected by the deceased father and his ruling son respectively, allows us to infer that in this case *purī* may have referred to the *kraton* and *pura* to the "city" of Kañjuruhan. The *purī* thus appears to have been protected by the (deified) ancestor (as was *kadātuan* Śrīvijaya by its *devatā)*, whereas King Gajayāna protected the *pura* "capital" of his *rājya*. It was inhabited by *paura*, groups of *nāyaka*, ministers *(mantri)*, and Brahmins who, too, are mentioned in the inscription.

In contrast to Sañjaya's inscription from Central Java, the Dinaya inscription from East Java thus reveals an urban center comprising the *purī* -kraton and the *pura*. The latter was inhabited by members of the royal family, by "citizens," officers, and priests. However, although Gajayāna's "state" is called a "kingdom" *(rājya)*, the inscription does not contain a single piece of evidence that would allow us to assume the existence of administrative units. This fact reminds us of Sañjaya's nearly contemporary *rājya* where we came to know about the existence of at least one *deśa*. Despite the mention of "principal ministers" and "groups of leaders," and "citizens," the strong emphasis of the responsibility of "royal relatives," princes, and members of the "royal dynasty" for the welfare of the *rājya* makes it likely that Gajayāna's "state," too, consisted mainly of an urbanized center that may have had strong relations with, but only little or even no political control over, its surrounding hinterland. The major difference between Mūlavarman's polity in the fifth century and Gajayāna's eighth-century "kingdom" thus appears to pertain to the degree of urbanization of its center rather than to the development of its territorial dimension.

IV

The late eighth century bears witness to the rise of the Buddhist Śailendras, one of Southeast Asia's most important dynasties to which the world owes one of its greatest religious monuments, the Borobudur. But despite its importance in early Indonesian history and its historically established links with Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula, Śrī Lanka, Bengal, and South India till the eleventh century, its genealogical history and, even more, the structure and extent of its kingdom, particularly during its most important period in Central Java in the eighth and ninth centuries, is only partly known.[42]

The major reason for our lack of knowledge is, no doubt, the relatively small number of inscriptions. But in the same way as the international relations of the Śailendras and their masterpieces of art and architecture indicate a new stage of cultural, societal, and political development, the dynasty's few inscriptions, too, reflect a new type of full-fledged kingdom. Already the earliest-dated Sanskrit inscriptions of the eighth century speak of a *rājya* state, ruled by a *mahārāja* who had defeated the neighboring *sāmanta-rāja*. Ministers *(mantri)*, (local?) lords *(pati)*, and superintendents of *deśa* areas *(deśādhyakṣa)* were in charge of the administration.

In this connection it is of particular importance that the Kalasan Sanskrit inscription of the year 778 C.E. mentions for the first time the local *deśa* officers *paṅgkura*, *tavān*, and *tīrip* which belong to the large number of different Javanese titles of officers that occur frequently

---

[42] Coedès, "Les inscriptions," pp. 87–93, 107–9; J. G. de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia* II, pp. 288ff.

in Javanese inscriptions of the ninth century and later. The obviously well-established hierarchy of officers, linking the central court with intermediary, territorially defined, administrative units and villages, is certainly the most important new epigraphical evidence of the classical age of central Javanese history under the Śailendra and Mataräm dynasties. This is not the place to discuss in detail this complicated administrative set-up of Central Javanese kingdoms.[43] Suffice it to say that it appears to have been the outcome of a double process that must have been operating for a much longer time than evidenced in the inscriptions. On the local level of the *vanua*, agrarian expansion, translocal trade, and social differentiation had created a vast number of village elders and authorities. The early history of this process is unknown to us as we come across its result only when these *vanua* authorities were already fully existing in Central Javanese inscriptions in the early ninth century. The other aspect of this process is of equal relevance for our study as it pertains to the political expansion of supra-local authority. Mūlavarman's and Śrī Māra's inscriptions illustrated the incipient stage of this process. The inscriptions of Pūrṇavarman, Sañjaya, and Gajayāna depicted further stages of this development. But in their cases, too, no political authority appears to have as yet been established permanently beyond the chiefly "Stammland" and its immediate hinterland. This decisive step of early state formation was made by Śrīvijaya which extended its political control into distant *maṇḍala*. However, Śrīvijaya's authority in these *maṇḍala* continued to be precarious, as their local *dātu* leaders remained a threat to Śrīvijaya's *dātu* rather than being integrated into the political structure of the *bhūmi* state.

According to our epigraphical evidence, political expansion through integration occurred only with the rise of the Śailendra dynasty and reached its first culmination towards the end of the central Javanese period in the late ninth century.[44] It is worth noticing that in contrast to the Sanskrit inscriptions of the early period of Java, this ninth-century process of intensive state formation in Central and, from the tenth century onwards, East Java is documented nearly exclusively by Javanese-language inscriptions with but little Sanskrit terminology. The basis of this expansion of royal authority was the stepwise integration of neighboring areas. Even though they remained "under the jurisdiction" *(watěk)* of local chiefs *(raka)*, some of these chiefs slowly rose to high administrative or even "ministerial" positions in the patriarchal central court. In the same way as these chiefs retained their "Stammland" as their own *watěk*, the king *(mahārāja, ratu)* kept his own *watěk* land under his direct control. Although having thus, at least theoretically, the same territorial basis of authority, the "Stammland" of the future *ratu* may have been larger, perhaps more fertile, and linked to translocal trade routes. Certain "material" factors must have given the family/lineage of the future *ratu* an advantage over his neighboring chiefs *(raka)* during this process of early state formation in Central Java.

As already mentioned, the early history of this process of territorial and political integration of the *raka* into a central court of a *ratu* is largely unknown, as these *raka* are usually referred to only in the inscriptions of a central *ratu* when a certain degree of their integration had already occurred. However, among the early inscriptions of classical Central Java several inscriptions are known to have been edited by local chiefs without referring to a *ratu* or

---

[43] See for instance de Casparis' detailed epigraphical study of the Tjaṇḍi Perot inscriptions of 850 C.E. in ibid., pp. 211–43 or W. F. Stutterheim's study of the Cunggrang II inscription of the year 929 C.E. in *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde* 65 (1925): 208–81.

[44] van Naerssen, *Economic and Administrative History*, pp. 46ff; Boechari, "Some Considerations of the Problem of the Shift of Mataram's Centre of Government from Central to East Java in the 10th Century A.D.," *Bulletin of Research Centre of Archaeology of Indonesia* 10 (Jakarta, 1976); J. Wisseman-Christie, "Raja and Rama: The Classical

rājā. A rare case even allows some conclusions about the process of political integration when the Central Javanese court was just moving to the east. In 891 C.E. the *rakryan* of Kanuruhan (a locality most likely identical with Kañjuruhan of the Dinaya inscription of 760 C.E.) established a freehold by his own "favor" *(anugraha)*.[45] But only twenty-four years later, in 915 C.E., it was the central "Great King" *(mahārāja)* Dakṣa who did the favor *(anugraha)* to allow the *rakai* of Kanuruhan to establish another freehold in his own *watĕk* Kanuruhan.[46] Between 891 and 915, under circumstances still unknown, the Lord of Kanuruhan thus had come under the authority of the Mahārāja Dakṣa.[47] During the next century the *rakryan* of Kanuruhan rose to the highest administrative position at the central court, a position which they held for several centuries.

The stepwise integration of local magnates into the central court and the encroachment of the royal "persons who collect the lord's property" *(mangilala drawya hāji)* upon the *watĕk* and *vanua* is perhaps the least known aspect of state formation in early classical Javanese history. But it seems to have been an extremely protracted process that finally worked in favor of the central dynasty only temporarily in the fourteenth century, when Majapahit was able to exchange the local *raka* in the extended core area of its kingdom with members of its own dynasty.

The structure of the Javanese kingdoms of the ninth through early thirteenth centuries is fairly well reflected in the epigraphical evidence and may be summarized as follows. The unique feature of the Javanese kingdom during this period is the highly elaborated and strictly fixed hierarchy of state officers and local authorities as listed in these inscriptions. The establishment and continuous maintainance of this hierarchy appears to have been one of the main means of authority for the center. This hierarchy of patrimonial officers, however, should not be automatically equated with a hierarchy of administrative officers and administrative territorial units. Apart from "personal" *watĕk* and from *vanua* with their village authorities, which are frequently mentioned in inscriptions, we still find nearly no terms that hint at a more sophisticated spatial structure of the kingdom. Very rarely does the term *deśa* occur, which refers to a territorial unit of a larger size than *vanua*. An inscription of the year 824 C.E. appears to indicate that the *rājya* constituted of many *deśa*.[48] The Sanskrit term *deśa* may thus have to be equated with *watĕk*.[49] This inference perhaps may be corroborated by another early Central Javanese inscription of the year 782 C.E. It reports the consecration of a Mañjuśrī image by a Śailendra king and his *guru* who had come from Bengal *(gauḍidvīpa)*. The image was installed by the king in order to protect "his *deśa*" *(deśasya tasya)*.[50] Here *deśa* apparently refers to the land of the king, that is, his *Stammland* or *watĕk*.

Important information about the structural concept of the Javanese state during this period can be derived from a passage which is repeated more or less identically in a few inscriptions of the late ninth and early tenth centuries. It occurs for the first time in an inscription of King Lokāpala of the year 880 C.E.[51] At the end of an extremely long list of

---

State in Early Java," in: *Symbols and Hierarchies*, ed. Gessick; J.G. Casparis, "Some Notes on Relations between Central and Local Government in Ancient Java," in: *Southeast Asia*, ed. Marr and Milner, pp. 49–63.

[45] Inscription of Belingavan (Singasari), Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. I, pp. 295–303.

[46] Inscription of Sugih Manek (Singasari), Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. II, pp. 145–60.

[47] van Naerssen, *Economic and Administrative History*, pp. 53ff.

[48] Inscription of Gandasuli, line 8D; de Casparis, *Prasasti Indonesia*, vol. I, p. 61.

[49] J. G. de Casparis suggests "landstreek" (ibid., p. 68).

[50] Inscription of Kelurak, Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. II, pp. 41–48.

[51] Copper-plates of Vuatan Tija (Manggung), Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. I, pp. 250–61.

Hindu deities who are called upon for protection of a newly established freehold, the tutelary deities are invoked: "Also all you deities who are known to protect the kraton of the illustrious Great King in the country of Matarām" *(devatā prasiddha mangrakṣa kadātuan śrī mahārāja i bhūmi i matarām)*. Nearly exactly the same text is repeated in the same epigraphical context in the stone inscription of Sugih Manek near Singasari of the year 915 C.E.[52] Thirteen years later this invocation occurs again in the so-called Minto Stone from the region of Malang, however with an important addition.[53] The tutelary deities are invoked "who are known to protect the kraton of the Great King **in Medang** in the country of Matarām." For the first time, Medang, the capital of the central Javanese kingdom of Matarām, is explicitly mentioned in this context. This latter version of the invocation is then again repeated twice in inscriptions of the years 942 and 944 C.E.[54]

In the context of our study, the most relevant aspect of these inscriptions is the fact that they reveal, at least partly, a repetition of the Śrīvijaya model. As in Śrīvijaya, the center was the kraton *(or kadātuan)* of the Mahārāja, which was protected by ancestor deities. It was situated in (the "capital") Madang which may have been identical with *vanua Matarām*, a resident of which is mentioned in an inscription of the year 919 C.E. *(anak vanua i matarām)*.[55] This center was surrounded, as we know from other contemporary inscriptions, by the *deśa* or *watĕk* of other *raka* or *rakryan*. The state that comprised these "segments" was called *bhūmi*, a term we came to know for the first time in Śrīvijaya's inscriptions. The most important and, in contrast to early Śrīvijaya, new political element of state formation in pre-Majapahit Java is the obviously very successful integration of allodial chiefs and "lords" into the patrimonial hierarchy of the central court without, however, uprooting them in their own *Stammland*.[56] No such attempts to integrate the *dātu* into the court hierarchy are known from the inscriptions of Śrīvijaya. In contrast to *bhūmi Śrīvijaya*, however, *bhūmi Matarām* appears not to have included outlying *maṇḍala*.

Furthermore, the territorial administration of *bhūmi* Matarām in Central Java and its successor kingdoms in East Java may have been structured even less than Śrīvijaya in the late seventh century. At least, we have no inscriptional evidence, for instance, of the kingdom *(bhūmi)* of Keḍiri from the late eleventh to early thirteenth centuries which would allow us to come to a different estimation of its statehood. There seem to have been only two exceptions to this "rule," that is, king Siṇḍok in the early tenth century and Airlangga in the early eleventh century. They obviously had tried to extend their political control even beyond those *watĕk* or *deśa* that had already come under their hegemony. But their personal, most likely military, success did not survive their demise. Airlangga's inability to perpetuate his temporary success was later on transformed into the famous myth of the division of the "empire" by the king himself. However, Airlangga's striving for "imperial" hegemony (he was the first Javanese king who assumed the imperial title *ratu cakravartin*[57]) became a major prop of the imperial ideology of later Singasari and Majapahit rulers.

[52] Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. II, pp. 144–60.

[53] Ibid., pp. 227–48.

[54] OJO, XLVIII and LI; see also W. J. van der Meulen, "King Sanjaya and his Successors," in: *Indonesia* 28 (1979): 17–54 (esp. pp. 24ff).

[55] Sarkar, *Corpus*, vol. II, p. 165.

[56] Boechari, "Rakryan Mahamantri i Hino. A Study on the Highest Court Dignitary of Ancient Java up to the 13th Century A.D.," *Beberapa Karya Dalam Ilmu-Ilmu Sastra* (Publikasi Ilmiah, No. 2), Universitas Indonesia 1975/76, pp. 61–114.

[57] OJO, LXI.

During the Mataräm and Keḍiri period, the *"bhūmi* state" of East Java thus remained the classical concentric "Early Kingdom."[58] It comprised the central nuclear area, consisting of the kraton and the *Stammland* or *watĕk* of the central dynasty, and the surrounding *watĕk* whose *rakryan* and *rakai* had been integrated into the patrimonial staff of the central court. The local administration in the royal and allodial *watĕk* remained in the hands of the traditional village authorities.

Finally it should be pointed out that throughout the period of the Śailendra dynasty and the kingdom of Mataräm and Keḍiri, no epigraphical evidence exists about the existence of "cities" except those of the "capitals" of these kingdoms, e.g. Madang and Keḍiri. But neither are they called *pura* or *nagara* nor are urban settlements known in the *watĕk* of the *rakryan*. According to the epigraphical evidence, state formation in Java in the eighth to early thirteenth centuries appears to have operated largely without urbanization.

V.

The most dramatic changes in the process of state formation and urbanization in pre-Islamic Indonesia took place in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries under Singasari and Majapahit. For nearly two centuries after Airlangga, the history of Java had retreated to the middle Brantas valley. However, the small but obviously prospering kingdom of Keḍiri preserved faithfully the structural concept of the administrative set-up of the Mataräm kingdom and the imperial ideology of Airlangga's short-lived East Javanese kingdom. This ideology was based on the (under Airlangga only partly achieved[59]) unification of the two East Javanese nuclear areas Janggala and Pañjalu and the (never-realized) hegemony over the whole of Javadvīpa. The myth of a unified kingdom of Janggala and Pañjalu (and its alleged partition by Airlangga) and East Java's imperial claim over the whole of Java served as legitimation of the imperial expansionism of late Singasari which Coedès summarized as follows:

> The reign of Kṛtanagara [the last king of Singasari] was marked by a considerable expansion of Javanese power in all directions. In 1275, taking advantage of the decline of Śrīvijaya, he sent a military expedition to the west which established Javanese suzerainty over Malayu and probably also over Sunda, Madura and part of the Malay peninsula. After establishing his authority in Sumatra, Kṛtanagara turned toward Bali, whose king he brought back as a prisoner in 1284.[60]

In East Java itself, the most important change was the subjugation of Keḍiri under Singasari's hegemony, which had already been finally established under Viṣṇuvardhana, Kṛtanagara's father. However, Keḍiri still retained an autonomous status as a *sāmantarājya*.[61] King Jayakatwang of Keḍiri still felt strong enough to attack and defeat Singasari in 1292 C.E. During the occupation of the royal residence of Singasari, King Kṛtanagara died. Keḍiri's new hegemony over the whole of eastern Java however came to an abrupt end when Kṛtanagara's son-in-law, Raden Vijaya, with the help of a Chinese expeditionary army, defeated Jayakatwang's army and established himself as the first ruler in the newly founded city of Majapahit.

---

[58] Kulke, "The Early and the Imperial Kingdom."

[59] See Boechari, "Sri Maharaja Mapanji Garasakan," *Madjalah Ilmu-Ilmu Sastra Indonesia* 4, 1/2 (1968): 1–26.

[60] Coedès, *Indianized States*, p. 198.

[61] Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, 44,1; in Th. G. Pigeaud, *Java in the 14th Century. A Study in Cultural History. The Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.*, 5 vols. (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1960).

The kingdom of Majapahit was truly a successor state of Singasari, both in its "internal" policy in eastern Java and in its expansionistic "external" policy in the outer regions. But in both aspects the state of Majapahit represents the culmination of state formation in pre-modern Indonesia. As regards the "internal" policy in eastern Java, the most decisive new development under Majapahit was the systematic replacement of the allodial local *raka* and *rakryan* in East Java by members of the royal family and, in a few cases, by deserving members of the court. It was more than a mere symbolic act that, already in 1295, Raden Vijaya crowned the eldest son of one of his wives (he was married to four daughters of Kṛtanagara) as Prince of Keḍiri. His new policy of systematic annexation or "provincialization" of all neighboring *watĕk* or *deśa* and their many "little kings" led to a series of revolts, which, however, appear to have been successfully supressed by Majapahit. According to our epigraphical evidence, Majapahit succeeded for the first time (after Śrīvijaya's similar attempts) to extend its political control considerably beyond its own *Stammland*, this time, however, by a ruthless policy of annexation and "dynastification" of its hinterland.

In this regard it is significant that the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, the famous court chronicle of Majapahit composed by Prapañca in the year 1365 C.E., begins with a descriptive list of the various towns *(nagara)* held by members of the royal family as demesne in the hinterland of Majapahit. Summarizing this chapter, the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama concludes "All Illustrious Javanese Kings and Queens, the honoured ones who equally are distinguished by their towns *(nagara)*, each having one for his or her own, in one place *(eka sthāna)*, in Wilwa Tikta (= Majaphit) they hold in their lap the honoured Prince-Overlord." [62]

As is known from other Southeast and South Asian kingdoms of this age, too, (e.g. Angkor and the Cōḷas), the establishment of an "Imperial Kingdom" required a considerable enlargement of the original **nuclear area** or *Stammland* of the ruling dynasty.[63] In this extended **core region** the ruling dynasty had to strive for uncontested access to the agrarian surplus and, wherever possible, for some sort of control over, and sharing of, the long-distance trade. However, even in these "Imperial Kingdoms" of pre-modern South and Southeast Asia, the central dynasties still had to share the revenue from these sources with their own local representatives, whether they were princely members of the dynasty or members of the patrimonial staff. The transfer of resources from the local and intermediate levels to the imperial center thus remained a crucial problem even within the core region of these large imperial kingdoms. Although the imperial kings had succeeded in extending their un-contested political authority by eliminating all sorts of potential putschists in their extended core region, actual political control remained fragmented. The "segments" still existed even though they had come under members of the central dynasty.[64] But in contrast to the earlier cases (e.g. in 760 C.E. in Kañjuruhan in East Java) where a "family dynasty" *(kula-vaṃśa)* depended mainly on its own *Stammland*, the imperial dynasty of Majaphit was able to extend its patrimonial control far beyond these pristine boundaries. It systematically distributed its hinterland to members of the dynasty who thus became "share holders" of the state. The central core region of Majapahit had come under a "family regime."

The very center of this family enterprise was the royal compound *(pura)* or kraton. Accordingly the second chapter of the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama contains a detailed description of this compound and the surrounding *nagara*, that is, the capital of Majapahit. The Nāgara-

[62] Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, 6,4.

[63] Kulke, "The Early and the Imperial Kingdom," p. 8ff.

Kĕrtāgama again pays special attention to the residences of all the principal ministers and the princely family members whom we have already met in their own *nagara*. According to their status, their residences were distributed in a clear hierarchical order around the royal *pura* or kraton, adjacent to temples, monasteries, markets, and places of the commoners. The Nawanatya, a most-likely much later text, contains a nice definition of the *nagara*. "What is called nagara? All where one can go out (of his house) without passing through paddy fields."[65] Archaeological surveys at present-day Trowulan and literary evidence confirm that Majapahit was a truly urban settlement, in fact the earliest in Java so far known both from archaeological and literary sources.

In regard to the spatial concept of statehood the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama and an inscription of 1323 C.E. from Tuhañaru contains an interesting piece of information.[66] In this inscription the kingdom (*rājya*) of Majapahit is compared with a temple (*prasāda*) in which the king is worshipped as an incarnation (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu. The *maṇḍala* of the island (*dvīpa*) of Jawa is equated with the temple land (*punpunan*) whereas the islands (*nūṣa*) of Madhura, Tañjunpura, etc. are compared with *aṃśa* land or dependencies which were only partly (*aṃśa*) under the control of Majapahit. The interesting point is the fact that this inscription clearly distinguishes between the *rājya* Majapahit and the (surrounding) *maṇḍala* of Jawadvīpa. It therefore appears that only the core region, comprising the kraton, the capital, and the *nagara* of the princes, constituted the *rājya* of Majapahit. We are used to translating this term as "kingship" or "kingdom" as in the literal sense it means "belonging to the king." Therefore it should be no surprise that in the context of South and Southeast Asian concentric states, *rājya* actually referred only to the inner core region under the direct authority of the *rāja*.

Beyond this *rājya* of Majapahit in eastern Java was *bhūmi* (or *dvīpa*) *jawā*, which, for the first time in its history, has come under the hegemony of a single dynasty. No sources, however, are available that would allow us to infer that here in *Jawadvīpa-Maṇḍala*, too, members of the central dynasty or court have been imposed "from above" as local rulers. Outside the *rājya* of Majapahit, *bhūmi jawā* apparently was still under the *watĕk* of its autonomous local *raka*. Moreover we have no idea as to whether Majapahit was able to establish any sort of provincial administration in these autonomous *watĕk* of *bhūmi jawā* outside the *rājya* of Majapahit and to collect regular taxes in these regions. But militarily, Java was certainly fully under the control of Majapahit. Furthermore, we may assume that military expeditions and visiting officers of the central court had to be supplied by local authorities.

Beyond *bhūmi jawā* were the "other islands" *(nusāntara* or *dvīpāntara)*. The Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, 13-16, contains a long list of these islands, which include most of present-day Indonesia's islands as well as parts of the Malay peninsula. Most important among these islands was Sumatra with Malayu, the successor state of Palembang/Śrīvijaya. It was the only polity on these outer islands to which the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama concedes the important term *bhūmi*. This reminds us of the fact that in Śrīvijaya's early inscriptions, too, the term *bhūmi* was reserved for Śrīvijaya and Java. The outer islands were regarded as tributary states of Majapahit. The Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama claims that "already the other islands *(dvīpāntara)* are getting ready to show obedience to the Illustrious Prince, without exception

---

[64] For the concept of the segmentary state see B. Stein, "The Segmentary State in South Indian History," in *Realm and Region in Traditional India*, ed. R. G. Fox (New Delhi, 1977), pp. 3–51; see also Subrahmanyam, "Aspects of State Formation."

[65] *Nawanatya*, 9a, in Pigeaud, *Java in the 14th Century.*, vol. III, p. 121.

they bring in order all kinds of products every ordained season. As an instance of the honoured Prabhu's [King's] exertion for all the good that is in his care, ecclesiastical officers *(bhujaṅga)* and mandarins *(mantri)* are sent to fetch the produce regularly."[67]

The last concentric circle of Majapahit's statehood was constituted by the "other countries" *(desāntara)*. According to the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, Siam, Ayuthaya, Ligor, Martaban, Rajburi, Singhanagarī (=Satingpra), Campā, and Kamboja belonged to this category; Yavana (= Vietnam) "is different, it is a friend *(mitra)*."[68] The *desāntara* countries most likely were identical with "all the *maṇḍalita rāṣṭra* (which are) looking for support, numerous, entering into the Presence."[69] This description obviously refers to mere diplomatic relations between these countries and Majapahit.

The imperial kingdom of Majapahit thus represents the final stage of a continuous process of state formation in pre-modern Indonesia. The state consisted of a series of concentric circles of authority. Its political control was strongest in its center, that is, the *rājya* of Majapahit. It decreased stepwise in *bhūmi jawā* and the *nusāntara* and ended up in mere diplomatic relations with the *maṇḍalita rāṣṭra* or the "other countries" *(desāntara)* on Mainland Southeast Asia.

Despite the structural weakness of all pre-modern states of South and Southeast Asia, viz., the lack of actual political control outside the royal core region *(rājya)*, under Majapahit two decisive structural changes had taken place. First, it was able to annex completely the neighboring kingdoms and little chieftaincies which usually still had surrounded the *Stammland* of the "Early Kingdoms" as autonomous *watĕk* or *sāmantacakra*. Majapahit thus created a considerably extended core region *(rājya)*. Second, Majapahit succeeded in extending its uncontested hegemony over Java, to enforce tributary relations with a large number of outer islands and to establish diplomatic relations with kingdoms in Mainland Southeast Asia. Majapahit thus became Indonesia's first truly "Imperial Kingdom."

The concentric structure of the "empire" of Majapahit has indeed a strong resemblance to the conceptual model of the *maṇḍala* state as described by O. W. Wolters and more recently by C. Higham in the context of Mainland Southeast Asia.[70] Derived from the ancient Indian Arthaśāstra, this concept is very suggestive and thus may be applied even more frequently to the pre-modern state in Southeast Asia. But while employing it in this context, one has to keep in mind that we have very little evidence that the term *maṇḍala* was ever used in contemporary Southeast Asian sources in such a comprehensive way. As we have observed in the early Malay inscriptions of Śrīvijaya and in the Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, the political connotation of *maṇḍala* always referred to a portion rather than to state as a whole. Particularly in the context of early kingdoms it denoted autonomous or semi-autonomous chieftaincies and principalities at the periphery of these states. As they were slowly integrated some of the *maṇḍala* became provinces of the imperial kingdoms. In this later context, particularly in some of the great regional or imperial kingdoms of India (e.g. the Cōḷas in South India and the Gaṅgas in eastern India),[71] the term *maṇḍala* was also used for provinces

---

[66] Boechari, "Epigraphic Evidence on Kingship in Ancient Java," *Madjalah Ilmu-Ilmu Sastra Indonesia*, 5,1 (1973): 119–26.

[67] Nāgara-Kĕrtāgama, 15,3.

[68] Ibid., 15,1.

[69] Ibid., 12,6.

[70] See above note 2.

[71] R. Subbarayalu, "The Cōḷa State," *Studies in History* (New Delhi) 4 (1982): 265–306; S.K. Panda, *Herrschaft und Verwaltung im östlichen Indien unter den späten Gangas (ca. 1030–1434)* (Wiesbaden, 1986).

in the extended central core region. In order to avoid terminological misunderstandings, we have, therefore, to distinguish clearly between the ancient Indian concept of a *maṇḍala* state system and the—rather different—medieval epigraphical meaning of the term *maṇḍala*, denoting peripheral principalities or provinces. Moreover, as shown elsewhere, "the *maṇḍala* concept does not give sufficient scope to structural changes which constitute the difference between the Early and the Imperial Kingdoms."[72]

---

[72] Kulke, "The Early and the Imperial Kingdom," p. 13.