



Menuruni tangga Candi Wisnu (Prambanan) yang curam perlu sedikit bantuan

NEW INVESTIGATIONS ON THE KEDUKAN BUKIT INSCRIPTION

By

Boechari

Faculty of Letters, University of Indonesia, Jakarta

I. On the 25th of March 1985 it was reported that at the hamlet of Karanganyar, village of Bungkuk, subdistrict of Jabung, regency of Central Lampung, was found a new stone inscription. Through the intermediary of Mr. Uka Tjandrasasmita, Director of the Directorate for Protection and Development of Historical and Archaeological Heritage, we got a photograph of the stone. It shows a weathered and damaged stone inscription, of which the right and left upper corners are abraded, maybe because it has been used to sharpen hoes, sickles, knives and the like for a long time. Also the right and left lower corners are abraded, though to a lesser degree. With a flash magnifier we are able to establish that the stone bears the same imprecation formula as the inscription from Palas (South Lampung) and Karang Brahi (Upper Jambi) and part of the inscription of Kota Kapur on the island of Bangka, dated 686 A.D.

Now we have thus four more of less identical imprecation inscriptions of Śrīwijaya.¹⁾ Palaeographically this recently discovered inscription may be considered contemporaneous with the inscription from Palas Pasemah (Boechari, 1979). The stone is inscribed with 12 or 13 lines of script,²⁾ of which the first three and the last three lines are too weathered to allow us a reasonable

reading from the photograph. Anyhow we present here our reading, as far as the flash magnifier can help us.

1. [.....] -- -- -- -- [.....]3)
2. [.....] -- -- -- -- [.....]4)
3. [.....] -- -- -- -- [.....]5)
4. [..... ha]raki unai tunai -- -- -- -- [.....]6)
5. [..... ki]ta tuwi tandrun luah wañakta dewata mūla
yan parsumpahan parā [wis]
6. [.....] kadatuanku ini parāwis drohaka wānun
samawud dhi lawan drohaka mañujāri [dro
7. [haka ni]ujāri drohaka tāhu din drohaka tida marppadah
tida ya bhakti tatwa ārijawa diy=āku dnan di yan niga
[lar kku]
8. [.....] niwunuh ya sumpah nisuruh tāpik ya mulan par
wwāndan dātu śrīwijaya tālu muah ya dnan gotra santāna
9. [ña wa] ñakña yan wuatña jāhat maka lahit uran
maka sākit maka gila [.....] wiša pra
10. [yoga] sarāmwat kasihan waśikarana [.....]
11. [.....]tña [.....]7)
12. [.....]7)
13. [.....]8)

For a translation of the complete text we refer the readers to our edition of the inscription from Palas Pasemah (Boechari, 1979).

II. This new piece of epigraphic material does not give us other perspectives than that it forms evidence of another conquered territory by Śrīwijaya along the Way Sekampung

river, in its southward quest for prosperous dependencies. That is why we do not go into more details about this inscription. Instead, on this occasion we will take a new look into the Kedukan Bukit inscription, mainly because we are stirred by an article of Dr. H.B. Sarkar in the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land- en Volkenkunde* on the origin of the Śailendra dynasty of Indonesia, in which as an appendix he put forward his own ideas on this controversial piece of historical evidence, with some of which we cannot agree (Sarkar, 1985).

We give here a new transcription of the Kedukan Bukit inscription by filling in the existing gaps based on our own study of the paper prints and the original stone and on the reading of a fragment found at Telaga Batu which seemingly bears nearly the same text as this inscription (de Casparis, 1956, p. 14 f.):

1. swasti śrī śakawarṣātīta 604 9) ekādaśī su
2. klapakṣa wulan waiśākha dapunta hiyan nāyik di
3. sāmwaḥ mañalap siddhayātra di saptamī śuklapakṣa
4. wulan jyeṣṭha dapunta hiyan marlapas dari mināña
5. tāmwan mamāwa yan wala dua lakṣa dañan kośa
6. dua rāṭus cāra di sāmwaḥ dañan jālan sariwu
7. tlu rāṭus sapuluh 10) dua wañakña dātaṇ di mukha --p-
11)
8. sukhacitta di pañcamī śuklapakṣa wula [n āsādha] 12)
9. laghu mudita dātaṇ marwuāt wanua [ini]13)
10. sriwijaya jaya siddhayātra subhikṣa ni[t]y[akāla] 14)

Translation:

1. May there be well-being and prosperity. In the elapsed

Saka year 604, on the eleventh

2. of the bright part of the month of Waiśākha Dapunta Hiyan boarded (15)
3. a boat to "mañalap siddhayātra" 16). On the seventh of the bright part
4. of the month of Jyestha Dapunta Hiyan embarked from Mināṇa 17)
5. while taking with him an army of 20.000 men 18) and
6. 200 boxes [of supplies] going by boats and on foot thousand
7. three hundred and twelve men and arrived at Mukha --p--
8. joyously. On the fifth of the bright part of the month of Āsādha
9. easily 19) and delightedly [he] came and made [this] settlement. [and so]
10. Śrīwijaya was victorious, the journey successful and became prosperous ever since.

Thanks to Dr. J.G. de Casparis who had found the name of the third month on a fragment from Telaga Batu (de Casparis, 1956, p. 11 ff.) we now have three definite dates, viz.

- a. the eleventh day of the bright part of the month of Waiśākha of the Śaka year 604, or the 23rd of April 682 A.D., on which Dapunta Hiyan boarded a boat to "mañalap siddhayātra, which we interpreted as "going to a Buddhist shrine to celebrate the Waiśāk festivals and at the same time praying for the success of his intended expedition";
- b. the seventh day of the bright part of the month of Jyestha of the same year, or the 19th of May 682 A.D., on which Dapunta Hiyan embarked from Mināṇa, taking with

him a huge army and came joyously at Mukha --p--, [after which]

- c. on the fifth day of the bright part of the month of Asadha of the same year, or the 16th of June 682 A.D. Dapunta Hiyan easily and delightedly came and built a settlement [at the site where the inscription was found]. And so Śrīwijaya was victorious, the journey (= expedition) successful, and became prosperous ever since.

The first question to be raised is how many stages of Dapunta Hiyan's journey were recorded in this inscription? We propose three alternatives, i.e.

A. there were two stages, viz.

1. On the 23rd of April 682 A.D. Dapunta Hiyan boarded a boat in his capital town which lies on the bank of a river to go to a buddhist temple to celebrate the Waisak festivals and at the same time to pray for the success of his intended military expedition. After receiving the blessings from the Buddha, perhaps in the form of good omens, he went back to the capital. His return journey was not explicitly recorded in the inscription, because it is self-evident.

2. After gathering his army, comprising troops of his "governors" who ruled over the different regions of the kingdom of Śrīwijaya, he embarked from Mināṇa on the 19th of May 682 A.D. and came at Mukha --p-- which he conquered and where he built a new settlement on the 16th of June.

B. there were three stages, viz.

1. The same as point 1 above
2. Dapunta Hiyan embarked from Mināṇa on the 19th of May

682 A.D. with his huge army and came at and conquered Mukha --p- on a not specified ddate.

3. From Mukha --p- he proceeded to a certain place where he made a new settlement (marwuāt wanua [ini] on the 16th of June 682 A.D. This place was most likely the present Palembang where the inscription of Kedukan Bukit was found. His departure from Mukha --p- was not specified.

C. There were four stages, i.e.

1. The same as no. 1 above
2. Dapunta Hiyan went [from his capital] to Minanga to meet his victorious army. This trip was not explicitly recorded in this inscription, including the date of his departure from the capital and his arrival at Minanga.
3. On the 19th of May 682 A.D. he proceeded from Minanga with his army to Mukha --p-, at which he arrived at a not specified date. This place he conquered.
4. From Mukha --p- he proceeded on a not specified date to another place at which he arrived and built a new settlement (marwuāt wanua [ini]) on the 16th of June 682 A.D. But where to locate this site?

The third alternative, especially point 2, was proposed by G. Coedès and the late Dr. R.B. Slametmuljana. Coedès identified Mināṇa Tāmwan with an area on the Mekhong Delta, where a native tribe called Tmon had lived (Coedès, 1964). He concluded that the inscription of Kedukan Bukit was engraved to commemorate a victorious expedition against Camboja. This was convincingly refuted by Sarkar in his above mentioned article (Sarkar, 1985, p. 334-335). Slamet-

muljana also refuted this idea (Slametmuljana, 1981, p. 72-73). We can add here that Coedès apparently overlooked the Śrīwijayan infantry of 1312 men. How did he imagine this military unit taking the overland route back to Śrīwijaya?

Slametmuljana adopted our reading of the toponym from which Dapunta Hiyan started the second stage of his journey as Mināṇa, and not as Mināṇa Tāmwan as other scholars did up to now, taking the word tāmwan as a conjunction introducing the next subsentence (Boechari, 1979). He identified this Mināṇa with the present town of Binangan on the Barumun river in North Sumatra (Slametmuljana, 1981, p. 73-74). He said in one of his latest books that Dapunta Hiyan's first stage of his journey on the 11th of Waiśākha 682 A.D. did not have an ultimate object, and that was why he he proposed Mināṇa to be the final goal (idem., p.64). His purpose was to meet his victorious army which had defeated North Sumatra and made Binanga one of his harbours here.

Here lies one of Slametmuljana's weaknesses. He did not realize the meaning why Dapunta Hiyan went on the 11th of the bright part of the month of Waiśākha. For a buddhist leader this is certainly to go to a buddhist temple to celebrate the Waiśākha festivals, and at the same time praying for the success of his coming military expedition (maṇalap siddhayātra). And so he did not see the difference of the first and the second stage of Dapunta Hiyan's journeys. And since he adhered to the generally accepted opinion that the center of Śrīwijaya was always at Palembang, he did not see that the 26 days (minus] 20) between the first and the second stage was not sufficient for Dapunta Hiyan and his retinue to celebrate the Waiśākha festivals, i.e. between the 11th and at least to

the 3rd of the next Kṛṣṇapakṣa of the month of Waiśākha, and the trip from Palembang to Binangan, the distance of which is approximately 3,5 times the distance from Palembang to Jambi in a straight line, for which he only had at the most 19 days left.

Another weak point of Slametmuljana's theories was about the proposal of the Kedukan Bukit inscription. He said that after returning from Binanga and coming back to the capital, i.e. Palembang, on the 16th of June 682 A.D. Dapunta Hyang built a wihāra, mentioned in a fragment from Telaga Batu (idem., p. 63-64; de Casparis, 1956, p. 11-15). Bukit this fragment was younger than the Kedukan Bukit inscription. According to J.G. de Casparis this fragment was written at least eight months after the third date of the Kedukan Bukit inscription (de Casparis, 1956, p. 14). If Palembang was the age-old capital of Śrīwijaya, why should Dapunta Hyang built a new wihāra? Were the older wihāras in which more than 1000 buddhist priests lived becoming too small, or had Dapunta Hyang brought new followers of buddhist priests from North Sumatra?

A new center or a new capital would be more plausible, because the geographical position of Palembang was more advantageous than Mināna. After transferring its new capital to this place, Śrīwijaya could force all ships coming from China, Mainland Southeast Asia and the eastern parts of Indonesia going to India and vice versa to pay tribute at Palembang.

Consequently the first or second alternative was to us more appealing, with the note that the center of Śrīwijaya, at the date of Dapunta Hyang's departure of his first stage was at Mināna, and that the end purpose of the inscription

of Kedukan Bukit was provisionally to record Dapunta Hyang's military expedition on this ordinary river boulder, to be replaced later on by a more appropriately shaped stone. Palaeographically the inscription of Kedukan Bukit was written by someone who was literate enough. The stone thus to be found at the site in which Dapunta Hyang made the new center, i.e. Palembang.

In the first alternative Mukha --p-- was Palembang. In our previous paper we proposed the reading of Mukha Upan, based on the fact that on a photograph published by Dr. N.J. Krom in his "Heiligdommen van Palembang" (Krom 1938, facing p. 26) a small round dot could be seen above the pa, which G. Coedes interpreted as a virāma, hence his reading of matajap. Prof. Dr. O.W. Wolters hailed our reading of Mukha Upan as an exciting advance in Śrīwijayan studies, because now we have another fixed point. Upan is the name of a small "island" surrounded by the rivers Musi and Upang, situated some 40 miles downstream of Palembang (Wolters, 19..., p. ...). So Mukha Upang, which means "the mouth of Upang" or "in front of Upang" might well mean the present Palembang. But as we have shown earlier the reading of Upang cannot be maintained. Closer examination of the paper prints and the original stone revealed that the anuswāras at other loci are much bigger, whereas the virāma has the form of a small crescent.

Another drawback of the first alternative is that although we have the advantage of not having to add anything to the existing text except for the return journey of Dapunta Hyang from his pilgrimage to the capital, it does not give place to the conquest of Malayu by Śrīwijaya. This conquest was mentioned in I-tsing's Record, stating

that when I-tsing came for the first time in Fo-she in 671 A.D. he stayed there for six months; then he proceeded to Mo-lo-you "which is now called Fo-she", where he stayed for two months. On his way back from India in 685 A.D. he again came to Mo-lo-you which "has now become Fo-she". But in Takakusu's edition it was said that the first statement was in the form of I-tsing's note.

We are no Sinologist and we never have seen the Chinese text, so that we do not know exactly what Takakusu's statement means. But if it means that the phrase "which is now called Fo-she" was added by I-tsing himself to his own writing, then it might be interpreted indicating that Mo-lo-yu was still an independent state when I-tsing came there in 672 A.D., but that in 685 A.D. when he came for the second time it was conquered by Śrīwijaya. According to Takakusu I-tsing wrote his Record and Memoire between 691-692 A.D. (Takakusu, 1966, p. LX), that is to say some 20 years after his first arrival in Mo-lo-yu. The length of the journey from Mināṇa to Palembang, i.e. 28 days, was enough to make a fight at Mo-lo-yu, since Kedah could be reached from Śrīwijaya within 2 x 15 days.

The second alternative is thus more preferable. In this case Mukha --p- had to be identified with the center of the kingdom of Mo-lo-yu or its harbour, and had to be located near the mouth of the Batanghari river, or somewhere near the present town of Jambi. The end journey was again the site in which the inscription of Kedukan Bukit was found, i.e. Palembang, where Dapunta Hyang made a new capital or a new center which made the kingdom of Śrīwijaya more prosperous.

A rather puzzling fact is that the imprecation

inscription indicating that the area around it had been subjugated by Śrīwijaya was found at Karangbrahi on the Merangin river in Upper Jambi, near the town of Bangko, and not on the lower reaches of the Batanghari river near the coast. And now we have to turn our attention to the infantry unit of 1312 men, the role of which, as far as we can remember, was never discussed in particular by previous scholars. In our opinion, if the now existing road system was based on an ancient existing system since Śrīwijayan times - as was the case with many road systems in Java - the infantry unit did not go to the east along the river, but went southwards to Bangko. This area was the "hinterland" area of Mo-lo-yu and was thus conquered by the infantry unit of Śrīwijaya, while its fleet was striking Mukha --p- on the coast.

After setting up its imprecation inscription at Karang Brahi 21) the army went to Palembang by a shorter road via Surulangun - Sekayu, or by a longer road via Lubuklinggau - Lahat. We do not know whether this unit had to come at the same time as the naval unit coming by fleet at Palembang, or a few days/weeks later. The approximate distance from Minana to Bangko, and from Bangko to Palembang via the shorter road is 720 - 750 km, and via the longer road 880 - 900 km. If the infantry could walk 30 to 40 km a day, i.e. 10 hours a day walking, the distance could be covered within 28 days and a few days more. Even the longer road could be covered within the appointed time.

But where was Mināṇa? As we have shown above the late Dr. Slametmuljana identified this Mināṇa with the present Binanga on the Barumun river, which we considered too far to the north. In our previous paper we have located it

somewhere on the Batang Kuantan, based merely on the identification of mināṇa with kuala, meaning "estuary", of which the krama form is kuantan, and on one of I-tsing's statements, viz. that the kingdom of Fo-she included areas around the equator. Actually we have a vague clue provided by the Kedukan Bukit inscription, i.e. 28 days sailing from Palembang, either to the north, to the south or to the west, upstream the Musi river which is the least likely. It could not be located to the south of Palembang, because as we have shown above Lampung was conquered territory. So we have to look for Mināṇa to the north of Palembang.

In one of our visits to Muara Takus we got the information that there is a village called Minanga on the Kampar Kanan river, to the east of Bangkinang. As is well known the Muara Takus temples are located upstream the Kampar Kanan from Bangkinang. 22) If we have to choose between Minanga on the Kampar Kanan and Binanga on the Barumun for the location of Mināṇa in the Kedukan Bukit inscription we will prefer the former, because it is more in accordance with the sailing distance from Palembang. This proposition, however, has to be substantiated by a more intensive archaeological survey and digging around the present Minanga. 23)

Our location of Minana, the former center of Śrīwijaya before 682 A.D., in our present province of Riouw might well agree with what was said in the Ming-shih that the forerunner of San-fo-ch'i or Śrīwijaya was Kan-t'o-li (Groeneveldt, 1960, p. 68). We are of the opinion that this Kan-t'o-li is to be identified with [A]khaṇḍala[pura] mentioned in a Sanskrit inscription from the Ratu Baka hills south of Prambanan (the inscription of Haralīṅga),

probably dating from 856 A.D., in which its promulgator, Rakai Walaiṅ pu Kumbhayoni, claimed descent from a deified person coming from Akhaṇḍalapura (de Casparis, 1956, p. 277-279). 24) Dr. de Casparis conjectured that Ākhaṇḍalapura in this inscription is a misspelling for Ākhaṇḍalapura, and since Ākhaṇḍalapura is another name of Indra, Ākhaṇḍalapura is a synonym of Indrapura. Although Indrapura is a very common name for a royal residence which can be located anywhere in Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula or even in Mainland Southeast Asia, de Casparis was more inclined to locate it in Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula (de Casparis, 1956, p. 262). But in this case we will leave the Malay Peninsula out of consideration, since up to now no Old Malay inscriptions had been found there. We limit the location of Ākhaṇḍalapura in Sumatra, i.e. in the neighborhood of Minanga, or more generally in the present province of Riouw, with the Siak river, on which we now still have the small town of Siak Sri Indrapura as the northern boundary, and the Indragiri river or the Batang Kuantan as the southern boundary.

III. Concluding our renewed studies of the Kedukan Bukit inscription we will point here once again that the apparently picnic like journey of Dapunta Hiyaṅ was in fact a big military expedition to create another center of the kingdom from Minanga in the present Riouw province to Palembang in 682 A.D. And this is, as many scholars agreed, in contradiction with I-tsing's Record and Mémoire which gave the impression that, at least during I-tsing's time, the center of Śrīwijaya was never shifted from one place to another and was always at Palembang.

As is well known I-tsing first came to Śrīwijaya in 671 A.D. where he stayed for 6 months. Then he proceeded to Mo-lo-yu on his way to India, which means that at that time Śrīwijaya was already south of Jambi. But as we have said earlier the phrase that Mo-lo-yu "was now called Fo-she" was put by I-tsing in a note. On his return from India he passed Kedah and Mo-lo-yu which were now parts of Śrīwijaya. Then he stayed in Śrīwijaya from 685 to 695 A.D., with an interval of several months when he incidentally went back to China in 689 A.D. to fetch an assistant and writing materials to finish his translations of the more than 500.000 ślokaś which he took with him from India. According to Takakusu I-tsing wrote his Record and Mémoire in 691-692 A.D.

We have to consider the possibility that I-tsing wrote his Record according to the conditions in 691/2 A.D., in which the center of Śrīwijaya was already at Palembang. That was why he put the note on the new status of Mo-lo-yu when he notified his first visit there in 672 A.D. Or as a buddhist monk he was oblivious to changes in political and other worldly conditions, so that even the return of Śrīwijaya's army from an expedition to Bhūmi Jawa in 686 A.D.,²⁵ of which he certainly had heard, if not seen with his own eyes, was not notified in his two works although he was fully aware of the changed status of Mo-lo-yu and Kedah.²⁶)

That Palembang was a new center built or created in 682 A.D. was shown by the inscription of Kedukan Bukit which was found at the village of Kedukan Bukit on the Tatang river, a tributary of the Musi. This inscription was most likely to be found at the area which had been subjugated by Dapunta Hiyang, and not at his age-old capital

town; hence it was carved on a small and unobvious river boulder. If Palembang was the old capital town the stone commemorating Dapunta Hiyang's big victory would be written on a bigger and more neatly shaped stone like the inscription of Telaga Batu, for instance. And there was another more appropriately shaped stone with nearly the same text as the Kedukan Bukit inscription, with the additional information of the building of a new wihāra, written at least eight months after the third date of the Kedukan Bukit inscription (de Casparis, 1956, p. 14).

Another argument in favour of this assumption was the occurrence of the inscription of Telaga Batu, containing a more menacing imprecation directed against the crown-prince and other royal princes, high state functionaries, "governors" and royal servants (de Casparis, 1956, p. 32-46). This inscription is more likely to be found in a newly established center, unless it can be shown that palaeographically the Telaga Batu inscription was much older than the inscription of Kedukan Bukit. But according to Dr. J.G. de Casparis the script of the Telaga Batu inscription "appears to agree in every possible detail with the variety used on the stone of Kota Kapur, dated, as is well known, 686 A.D. It seems quite possible that both inscriptions were engraved by the same scribe" (de Casparis, 1956, p. 16). A statement of such an authority like Dr. J.G. de Casparis is hardly to be doubted.

A more convincing argument would be if our assumption that the missing word after *marwat wanua* in the Kedukan Bukit inscription is indeed *ini*, as we try to make it plausible in note 13, which will clearly indicate that the settlement made by Dapunta Hiyang after he defeated Mukha —

p- was the locality at which the inscription was found, i.e. the present Palembang.

After settling at Palembang, building a new *wihāra* for the buddhist priests from Minanga a few months later, and building a new park (the Śrīkṣetra park) in 684 A.D., Dapunta Hiyang went to Bhūmi Jāwa in the present Lampung districts in 686 A.D., because this area was not loyal to Śrīwijaya. We still could not find reasonable grounds for supposing that with Bhūmi Jāwa in the inscription of Kota Kapur was meant West Java or the kingdom of Tārumanāgara (Moens, 1937, p. 363; Slametmuljana, 1981, p. 105), or Central Java (Poerbatjaraka, 1952). West Java in general was called Supḍa in an Old Malay inscription from the regency of Bogor, supposedly dated 854 Śaka or 932 A.D. (Bosch, 1941). The kingdom of Tārumanāgara was called in Chinese Chronicles as T'o-lo-mo, or according to its center as Ho-lo-tan (= [Ci]aruteun) or Mo-ho-sin (= Bekasi) (Slametmuljana, 1981, p. 25, 108). Chau-ju-kua called West Java Sin-t'o or Sun-t'a (Hirth and Rockhill, 1966). The occurrence of the imprecation inscriptions at jabung and Palas Pasemah were evidences of Śrīwijaya's attack to Bhumi Jawa, mentioned in the inscription of Kota Kapur. It is also possible that on his way to Bhūmi Jāwa or backwards to Palembang Dapunta Hiyang also subjugated areas on the Air Mesuji, the Way Tulangbawang and the Way Seputih, but up to now no imprecation inscriptions like that found at Jabung or Palas Pasemah had been found on those rivers.

Notes:

- 1) We have asked Mr. Uka Tjandrasasmita to write to his Branch Offices in Jambi, South Sumatra and Lampung to

make a more intensive archaeological research along the rivers flowing to the east in their provinces for other epigraphic materials. But after more than one year no positive answer have been received.

- 2) We still can see traces of *aksaras* on line 12, but of line 13 we only can see very vaguely traces of some *aksaras* here and there. An examination on the original stone will help us to find out the exact number of lines.
- 3) Only traces of 7 *aksaras* are visible, but we are unable to give a transcription of this part, because it is too weathered. Considering the nearly complete line 7, on which can be read 41 *aksaras*, a considerable portion on the left and on the right part of the stone are abraded.
- 4) On line 2 can be discerned traces of 10 *aksaras*.
- 5) Traces of 13 *aksaras* are discernible here, but too vague to be read.
- 6) After *raki unai tuṇai* traces of 7 *aksaras* are visible.
- 7) From the photographs it is very difficult to make out how many *aksaras* are written on these two lines.
- 8) See note 2 above.
- 9) G. Coedès read the date as 605 Śaka (Coedès, 1930, p. 34) but we follow here the reading of L.C. Damais (Damais, 1952; 1955, p. 235).
- 10) Coedès read *sapulu* but we can clearly see a *wisarga* after *lu*; so we read *sapuluh*.
- 11) We have to withdraw our reading of *mukha ūpan*, proposed at the first SPAFA Workshop on Archaeological and Environmental Studies on Śrīwijaya held in Jakarta (Boechari, 1981). The round dot which we can see on the photograph of part of a paper print published by Dr.

N.J. Krom is not found on the stone. On a paper print at our disposal we can see that this round dot is much smaller than the *anuswāras* in this inscription. And we cannot yet decide what *aksara* is written before the remnants of the *pa*. The reading of *mukha*, however, is to be maintained.

- 12) The name of this month is provided by a fragment found at Telaga Batu, published by J.G. de Casparis (de Casparis, 1956, p. 14-15). It is most probable that the inscription of which only a fragment was found bore nearly the same text as the inscription of Kedukan Bukit.
- 13) On the above mentioned fragment can be read *wihāra ini di wanua ini*. Based on this reading we propose to add *ini* after *wanua*. It is also possible that there are still one or two *aksaras* after *ini* missing, since the broken part is sufficient for there or at the most four *aksaras*. If so then these *aksaras* had to be seen as a conjunction. As we have proposed in our previous paper the inscription of which the fragment was found at Telaga Batu was written some time (according to Dr. J.G. de Casparis it was written at least eight months after the inscription of Kedukan Bukit) after the inscription of Kedukan Bukit, after the conditions in the newly established center at Palembang was more orderly and peaceful, and Dapunta Hyang could have a new *wihāra* built at this place to accommodate the monks who also had to move from Minanga to this new settlement.
- 14) On the paper print at our disposal can be seen traces a thin *aksara* with most of the left part of an *ulu* above it; we identify this as *ni*. Under this letter can be

seen the left part of the *pasangan ya*. So we propose to add *nityakāla* which makes good sense.

- 15) In the inscription the word is *nāyik*, the Old Malay form of the Indonesian word *naik* = to embark. 'There is thus no *nāyaka* or *nāyika* in the inscription of Kedukan Bukit (Sarkar, 1985, p. 334).
- 16) As we have said in our previous paper we adopt Dr. W.F. Stutterheim's interpretation of this term, viz. "pilgrimage of victory" (Boechari, 1979, p. 32).
- 17) As we have said earlier the place from which Dapunta Hyang went for his second stage of his journey with his army was Mināna, and not Mināna Tāmwan as other scholars supposed. We consider the word *tāmwan* as a conjunction having as its synonym the Old Javanese word *tāmwayan*, meaning "while", or as Slametmuljana would have it to be equalized with the Indonesian word *tambahan*, meaning "moreover". So there is no corrupt from Sanskrit *minānka stambhān* in this name (Sarkar, idem., p. 336).
- 18) In the Old Malay and Modern Indonesian language the word *laksa* means 10.000, while 100.000 is *keti*. So Dr. Sarkar is wrong when saying that in this case one has to translate "an army of twice one hundred thousand" (Sarkar, idem., p. 334).
- 19) *Laghu* literally means "light", but we give it here, the derived meaning of "easy".
- 20) He had to stay one full day at Binanga to continue his "procession of victory" the next one.
- 21) If the stone was found on its original place, and not transformed from somewhere else.
- 22) Unfortunately the date of the Muara takus temples is still unknown. There were definite indications that

there were several phases of building activities. It is to be regretted that restoration activities in the past accompanied by excavations of the site were not always carried out according to the fundamentals of archaeological research, so that a lot of historical data were "lost". Some palaeographic evidence recovered up to now points to a date between the IXth and XIIth centuries A.D. So it is not justified to say that Dapunta Hiyang went to Muara takus to "*mañalap siddhayātra*". But aerial photographs recently made of this area revealed that the Mahligai *stūpa* compound known to us is not the only archaeological site. Other ruins are still buried in the ground, scattered within an area of 94,5 HA., surrounded by an earthen wall. It is thus not impossible that one day remnants of a temple dating from the VIIth century come to light here.

- 23) It is possible that the present Minanga is not at the same locality as the ancient Mināṇa of the VIIth century. It is customary to give the name of an abandoned settlement to a new one. So an intensive archaeological survey along the Kampar river is highly recommended.
- 24) We do not have B. Karlgren's *Grammata Serica Recensa* at our disposal. So we rely on the authority of Prof. Dr. T. Yamamoto who personally gave us the confirmation of the identity of Kan-t'o-li with Khaṇḍala, hence [A] *khaṇḍala*[pura]. We express here with our sincerest gratitude to Prof. Yamamoto.
- 25) H. Kern translated *kliwat manāpik* with "heeft getuchtigd" = had chastised (Kern, 1917 p. 214), while G. Coedes translated it with "venait de partir en

expédition" = had just left for an expedition (Coedès 1930, p. 49). Poerbatjaraka gave another translation, viz. "sangat berusaha menaklukkan" = has done the utmost to submit (Poerbatjaraka 1952, p. 41). It is apparent that Poerbatjaraka was influenced by the Javanese word *keliwat* in his translation, but the Indonesian word *kelewat* contains the meaning of "to pass" or "something in the past". So we are more inclined to translate *kaliwat manāpik* with "had chastised" or "had just returned from a military expedition". De Casparis, however, has drawn our attention to the Minangkabau word *manape* which has the meaning of "to defend oneself against, to resist" (de Casparis, 1956, p. 352). But this meaning is incompatible with the context of the whole phrase. If we adopt de Casparis' suggestion we would rather expect the phrase reading "*kaliwat manāpik-yan bhūmi jāwa mar Śrīwijaya*", looking for a word meaning "to attack" instead of "*tīda bhakti*".

- 26) That Kedah was a dependency of Śrīwijaya was mentioned on his return journey from India in 685 A.D. On his way to India in 672 A.D., when he stayed at Kedah, he said nothing about the relation of Kedah and Śrīwijaya. But about Malayu he already noted on his way to India that "it was now called Fo-she", although in a note (Takakusu 1966, p. XXX, XXXIV).

Jakarta, September 19, 1985;
September 6, 1986.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boechari,

- 1979 An Old Malay Inscription of Śrīwijaya at Palas Pasemah (South Lampung). *Pra Seminar Penelitian Śrīwijaya*. Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional. Jakarta, p. 18-40.
- 1981 Report on Research on Śrīwijaya. *Studies on Śrīvijaya*. Proyek Penelitian Purbakala. Jakarta, p. 79-84.

Bosch, F.D.K.,

- 1941 Een Maleische inscriptie in het Buitenzorgsche. *B.K.I.*, C, p. 49-53.

de Casparis, J.G.,

- 1956 Selected inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th century A.D. *Prasasti Indonesia II*. Masa Baru, Bandung.

Chavannes, Edouard,

- 1984 *Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande Dynastie T'ang sur les religieux éminents qui allèrent chercher la loi dans les pays d'Occident*. Paris. Ernst Leroux.

Coedes, G.,

- 1930 Les Inscriptions Malaises de Śrīvijaya. *BEFEO.*, tome XXX, p. 29-80.
- 1964 A Possible Interpretation of the Inscription of Kedukan Bukit (Palembang). *Malayan and Indonesian Studies*. J. Bastin and R. Roolvink,

eds. London, p. 24-32

Damais, L.C.,

- 1952 *Études d'Épigraphie Indonésienne*. III. Liste des Principales Inscriptions Datées de l'Indonésie. *BEFEO.*, tome XLVI, p. 1-105.
- 1955 *Études d'Épigraphie Indonésienne*. IV. Discussion de la date des Inscriptions. *BEFEO* tome XLVII, p. 7-290.

Groeneveldt, W.P.,

- 1960 *Historical notes on Indonesia and Malaya*. Compiled from Chinese sources. Penerbit Bhratara. Djakarta.

Hirth, F. and W.W. Rockhill,

- 1966 *Chau Ju-kua: His work on the Chinese and Arab trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chi*. Oriental Press. Amsterdam.

Kern, H.,

- 1917 Inscriptie van Kota Kapur (Eiland Bangka; 608 Caka). *VG.*, VII, p. 205-214.

Krom, N.J.,

- 1938 De heiligdommen van Palembang. *MKAW*. afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel I no. 7, p. 397-423.

Moens, J.L.,

- 1937 *Śrīwijaya, Yawa en Katāha*. *TBG.*, deel LXXVII, p.

MEMAHAMI ARTI SIMBOLIK DAN MISTIK BANGUNAN MONUMEN "YOGYA KEMBALI" YANG AKAN DIBANGUN

Poerbatjaraka, R.Ng.,

1952 *Riwayat Indonesia*, Djilid I. Penerbit
Pembangunan. Djakarta.

Sarkar, H.B.,

1985 *The Kings of Śrī Śailam and the Foundation of
the Sailendra Dynasty of Indonesia*. BKI., deel
141, p. 323-338.

Slametmuljana, R.B.,

1981 *Kuntala, Śrīwijaya dan Suwarnabhumi*. Yayasan
Idayu. Jakarta.

Takakusu, J.,

1966 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised
in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671--
695)*. Munshiram Manoharlal. Delhi.

Wolters, O.W.,

19 *"Studying Śrīwijaya"*. JMBRAS.,

Oleh

Djoko Soekiman

Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta

I

Sebagai mahasiswa baru Universitas Gadjah Mada dengan
pengajar tidak sebangsa pada sekitar tahun 1953 merupakan
kebanggaan tersendiri, lebih-lebih dengan matakuliahnya
yang masih asing. Di samping gurubesar yang sudah fasih
berbahasa Indonesia seperti Prof. Dr. Zoetmulder, Prof. Dr.
A.A. Fokker, ada pula yang belum fasih benar, seperti Prof.
Dr. A.J. Bernet Kempers (yang kita rayakan ulang tahunnya
yang ke-80 dengan tulisan ini), Ny. Dr. Baudish (?), Dr.
Fischer, Prof. Dr. D.C. Mulder (kemudian juga fasih berba-
hasa Indonesia). Di dalam kuliah-kuliahnya sering mengguna-
kan kata-kata Indonesia yang membingungkan para mahasiswa.
Lebih sulit lagi bagi para mahasiswa yang baru datang dari
pelosok-pelosok, ditambah baru turun dari gunung untuk
menyesuaikan diri dengan kehidupan kota. Banyak mahasiswa
Prof. Kempers pada tahun-tahun tersebut adalah bekas geril-
yawan atau istilah dahulu extremist yang langsung ikut
menghayati pertempuran di berbagai tempat. Mereka berasal
dari berbagai kesatuan kelasykaran yang waktu belajar di
Sekolah Menengah tidak teratur.

Penampilan Prof. Kempers yang tinggi, besar dengan
kuliah-kuliahnya yang mantab, yang kami anggap sebagai
serba baru, menambah kebanggaan, sehingga sangat sayang