An Investigation Into why Buddhism Mixed With Hinduism in Southeast Asia: Indonesia as an Example

Pochi Huang[1,2*]

Abstract

This paper deals with problems of Buddhism mixed with Hinduism in pre-modern Indonesia. It starts with an overview of early phase of Indian religious culture in Indonesian archipelago. Then, it explores coexistent situation of Hinduism and Buddhism in Southeast Asia. Subsequently, it goes back to India exploring the earlier phase of religious development there. It argues that the genesis of the Mahayana and Vajrayana in Buddhism cannot be separated from the rejuvenation of Brahmanical orthodoxy as Buddhism has to come to terms with growing sway of Hinduism. Tantric Buddhism has to appropriate Hindu Tantra for a following in India. With this historical background as the premise, this paper also discusses the co-ordination of Vajrayana and Śaiva for royal patronage during the Singhasari and Majapahit periods.

Keywords: coexistence, Īśvara, Tantric Buddhism, Śaivism, royal patronage

[1] Graduate Institute of Religious Studies, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
[2] Research Center for Chinese Cultural Subjectivity in Taiwan, National Chengchi University, Taiwan.
[*] Corresponding author, E-mail: huang9@nccu.edu.tw

1. Introduction: Indian Religions in Southeast Asia

Why Buddhism and Hinduism are blended in pre-modern Southeast Asia is intriguing in terms of cultural dissemination. In East Asia, the arrival of Mahayana Buddhism was not accompanied with Hinduism. Hinduism never came to East Asia. One may term Buddhinization in East Asia in a strict sense, but Indianization as we see in Southeast Asia did not happen there. The impact of Indian religious culture in East Asia is mainly through Buddhism and East Asian Buddhism tries to defend its orthodoxy by denouncing heterodox doctrines—mainly Hinduism. In contrast, Mahayana Buddhism and Hinduism are not opposed to each other in Southeast Asia from the very beginning. The situation of orthodoxy vs. heterodoxy did not take place in this area and the most remarkable example is Indonesia where Buddhism and Hinduism are often mingling together. Using Indonesia as reference point, this paper offers some reflections on this matter.

2. Buddhism in Indonesia

To be sure, in the process of Indianization in Southeast Asia, the active role played by the locals cannot be neglected. Mabbett argued:

> *One of the remarkable things about South-East Asian cultural history is that countries in the area constantly responded to Indian styles in thought, art and architecture (with whatever local adaptations) with promptitude and sensitivity. (Mabbett, 1986, p. 293)*

In terms of Indianization in Indonesia, Java was the first island influenced by Indian culture. In general, Java was already a fertile land of Hinduism in the beginning of the fifth century and Buddhism came to the Indonesian archipelago later. Chinese monk 法顯 (Fa-hsien) incidentally landed in Java in 414 AD because the merchantman he took from Sri Lanka encountered tempest in the sea. In his 佛國記 (*Records of Buddhist Kingdoms*), Fa-hsien said: "Eventually we came to a kingdom named Yavadvīpa [Java], where heretic Brahmanism was flourishing, and Buddhism was nothing worthy of mention."[1]

---

[1] "乃到一國，名耶婆提，其國婆羅門興盛，佛法不足言" (Takakusu & Kaikyoku,1924–1932, vol. 51, p. 865). From what is depicting by Fa-hsien who knows the difference between Buddhism and

Shortly before 425 AD, monk Guṇavarma from Kashmir came to Java and converted a Javanese king and his mother to Buddhism and this laid the foundation of Buddhism in the Indonesian archipelago (Coedès, 1968, p. 54; Pachow, 1958, p. 9). However, following 義淨 (I-ching), Coedès pointed out at in 8th century's Śrīvijaya (near modern-day Palembang, Sumatra) "the Mūlasarvāstivāda, one of the great sects of the Theravada Buddhism that used the Sanskrit language, was almost universally adopted there" (Coedès, 1968, p. 84). As Sanskrit, not Pāli, was used, the Theravada Buddhist lineage in maritime Southeast Asia most likely was from Indian Subcontinent. However, as noticed by I-ching, that there were also followers of Mahayana Buddhism near Śrīvijaya at the end of the 7th century (Coedès, 1968, p. 84). This could also mark the beginning of Mahayana Buddhism in the Indonesian archipelago.

It is very likely that Tantric Buddhism (Vajrayana) in Sumatra also started in late 7th century as some Indian monks visited Śrīvijaya before travelling on to China in the beginning of the 8th century. Both Vajrabodhi and his pupil Amoghavajra are thought to have stayed in Śrīvijaya in early 8th century.[2] Interestingly, Mahayana and Tantric Buddhism came to Śrīvijaya nearly at the same time. This indicates a close relationship between the Mahayana and Vajrayana in terms of developments in Buddhism.

It has to be noted that Theravāda Mulāsarvāsivādin sect which was predominant in Malāyu (probably near the current province of Jambi) at the time of I-ching probably had no connection with contemporary Theravāda in Sri Lanka. In Indonesian archipelago we do not find Theravāda Buddhism as it was practiced in medieval Sri Lanka transmitted by the Mahāvihāra. Modern Theravāda Buddhism from Sri Lanka would be introduced to mainland Southeast Asia after the 11th century.[3]

However, it seems that the arrival of the Mahayana and Vajrayana also marks the decline of sectarian Buddhism in the Indonesian archipelago. In fact, both

---

Hinduism, there were brāhmaṇas staying in Java. Apparently, Java had become a stronghold of Hinduism in the 5th century.

[2] "But if Tantrism had not reached Śrīvijaya in 684, it must have reached Śrīvijaya about thirty years later, for the Indian Vajrabodhi, the introducer of the doctrine in China, stopped at Śrīvijaya in 717" (Coedès, 1968, p. 297, n. 33).

[3] "By the end of the fourteenth century the Buddhist practices which modern scholars have subsumed under the term Theravada ("the Doctrine of the Elders") had essentially displaced Hinduism and Mahayana Buddhism in much of the region covered by present-day Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and southern Vietnam" (Andaya & Andaya, 2015, p. 57).

the Mahayana and Vajrayana, together with Hinduism, were to become dominant religious culture in Java after the 8th century.

3. Coexistence of Buddhism and Hinduism From Champa to Java

A conspicuous feature in the religious history of medieval Indonesian archipelago was a spontaneous fusion of Hindu Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism as religious practices into one belief system and East Java is the very exemplification. In the Singhasari and Majapahit periods (c. 1200–1500). This mixture of two religions is most remarkable. Scholars of medieval Indonesia often used "syncretism," "coalition," or "parallelism" to depict this religious blending.[4] Reflecting on the amalgamation of Hinduism and Buddhism in these two periods, Ann Kinney said:

> One of the most important developments was the merging of Hinduism and Buddhism into one religious system, not as a syncretistic belief combing elements of both religions but as two separate paths within one overall system. The equality of the two paths is stressed in many texts from this period, including statements that they form different but equal ways to attain highest reality. In the words of the Old Javanese text, Sutasoma, "bhinneka tunggal ika," which translates as unity in diversity and became the motto of the Indonesian Republic, Siva and Buddha described as different but essentially one. (Kinney, Klokke, Kieven, & Helmi, 2003, p. 24)

Clearly, Buddhism and Hinduism here are not treated as two separate religious traditions in Indonesia. Rather, they are considered mutually complementary without contradiction in belief and practice. Ultimately, either Buddhism or Hinduism can provide the way (*marga*) for the eventual spiritual realization. Hinduism and Buddhism are not conflicting at all for followers because they teach different means or expedient to reach the same goal. They are only different in their names but the same in essence.[5]

---

[4]   For a discussion of above views on religious fusion in east Java at this period, see Reiche (2007, pp. 37–39) and de Casparis and Mabbett (1993, pp. 328–329).

[5]   "Broadly speaking, the two strands of thought are often intertwined in the secondary literature:

What mentioned above is a very late development of Indian religions in Indonesian archipelago. Indeed, from the reign of Kṛtanagara (1268–1292) in Indonesia Śaivism and Buddhism started to merge into one and this fusion of Hinduism and Buddhism is most distinguishable among Southeast Asian kingdoms (de Casparis & Mabbett, 1993, pp. 328–329). However, this period is also the last stage of Indian culture in Southeast Asia. The decline of Javanese Majapahit Empire (1293 to c. 1500) and the rise of Islamic kingdom in the 16th century in Java furthered the wide propagation of Islam. Islam was about to replace Indian religions soon.[6]

In fact, from early period of Indianization in Southeast Asia, Hinduism and Buddhism are not opposed to each other. In both Champa and Angkor, while Hinduism was the official religion most of the time, disseminations of Buddhism are not proscribed. Consequently, as a Buddhist religious tradition, either the Mahayana or Vajrayana, coexists along with Hinduism in Southeast Asia. Śiva and Viṣṇu are often worshiped together with the Buddha and Bodhisattvas.[7] An either-or situation between Hinduism and Buddhism in medieval India is more or less absent here. De Casparis and Mabbett said:

> *On the mainland of Southeast Asia, it was ultimately [Theravada]*

---

on the one hand, such reflexes of tantrism as were found to exist in the [Indonesian] Archipelago are presumed to be profoundly syncretic in nature, containing both Buddhist and Hindu elements whose separate identity was further attenuated by local Javanese or Balinese genius" (Nihom, 1994, p. 73).

[6] "By 1500, the Hindu-Buddhist power of East Java was in an advanced state of decay, beset by internal disputes and subject to attacks by newly risen Muslim trading ports on the north coast. About 1527, the most powerful of these north coast city-states, Demak, captured both Kediri and the [Majapahit] kingdom's chief post, Tuban. Thus ended the charter/classical era of Javanese history-even though, as befit a charter polity, Majapahit inspired the rulers of Demak and later Muslim states to reserve its high culture and to depict themselves as Majapahit's legitimate heirs" (Lieberman, 2009, p. 796).

[7] In general, the presence of Hinduism is much stronger than that of Buddhism in Southeast Asia. Take Champa as an example: "Except for a short while around the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth centuries, Buddhism in Champa never really rivaled Hinduism. Epigraphic statics give some idea of the relative importance of the two faiths, at least in royal and courtly circles: of 130 inscriptions published, 21 are not sectarian, 92 refer to worship of Śiva, 3 are directed to Viṣṇu, 5 to Brahmā, 7 to Buddhism, and 2 to Śiva and Viṣṇu jointly" (Mabbett, 1986, p. 294). For an account of Buddhism in Campa, cf. also Schweyer (2009).

Buddhism that came to dominate, but it is important to recognize that, from early times, Brahmanism and Buddhism were mingled in the cultural legacy bequeathed to all the "Indianized" states. Just as ancient Southeast Asian traditions mingled freely with the observances of imported religion, so did the lore of different imported religions mingle with each other: the orthodoxy of a state would favour one, each king being free to patronize his own favoured cults and divinities, but others persisted, their representatives dotted about the countryside in temples and monasteries. (de Casparis & Mabbett, 1993, p. 286)

Not only indigenous culture interacts dynamically with Indian religious traditions, but Indian religious traditions cooperate in harmony. This fluid and inclusive situation in Southeast Asia is very striking in comparison with South and East Asia and contributes greatly to the peace process of Indianization. Depicting religious landscape in medieval central Java, Reichle also said:

During the Central Javanese period [8th to early 9th century], Hindu and Buddhist temples were built side by side, reflecting what must have been an atmosphere of both cooperation and competition. It is possible that successive rulers sponsored different religions or that a single ruler could have supported the construction of both Buddhist and Hindu monuments. (Reichle, 2007, p. 21)

If Buddhist and Hindu temples were built next to each other, then Śaivism and Buddhism can surely coexist without denying each other. This situation of coexistence can be seen in many kingdoms of Southeast Asia from Java to Angkor (cf. Coedès, 1968, *passim*). Intellectual rivalry between the orthodox and heterodoxy forms a major theme in India religious history. However, in Southeast Asia, Śiva the Maheśvara and Avalokiteśvara as Lokeśvara are both suitable for the deification of kingship.[8] In fact, the historical development of Buddhism in Southeast Asia cannot

---

[8]   This can also be seen in Khmer Empire from the 9th to the 14th century. Although Hinduism was the "official religion" for most of the time and most kings were devotees of Śiva at least during reigns of Jayavarman VII (reigned 1181–1219) and Dharanindravarman II (reigned 1150–1160 AD), Lokeśvara was worshipped as king was Avalokiteśvara incarnate. Coedès (1968, p.173) noticed: "Although we can scarcely doubt that Jayavarman VII was personally a Buddhist, we nevertheless observe that Brahman continued to play a more than negligible role at court."

be separated from that of Hinduism. The last phase of Buddhism, the Vajrayana, is closely interwoven with Saivism in Indonesia. For this, Stutterheim said:

> *The designation "Buddhism" is very misleading for Java. It would be better to call it: Tantrism with a Buddhist base. But Tantrism is as much as Śivaite as Buddhistic, and hence the differentiation has to be looked into very carefully. They are very similar in character and were so on Indian soil. Whether the mantras got their power through Śiva or Buddha it was not so material. The main point was always the matters themselves, in short the magical practices, Śivaite or Buddhistic are here no more than [a] difference of system of magic. (Stutterheim, 1989, p. 242, quoted in Reiche, 2007, pp. 38–39)*[9]

As will be shown in this paper, this may not be a historical coincidence. The Mahayana and Vajrayana as new developments of Buddhism are very closely related to the expansion of Hinduism. We have to go back to India to investigate the shifting relationship between Hinduism and Buddhism. In fact, the rise of Mahayana and Tantric Buddhism as a radical transformation of Buddhism has much to do with the rejuvenation of Brahmanical orthodoxy expressed in the Bhakti and Tantra. This also changes the original relationship between the orthodoxy and heterodoxy of the early religious history in India.

4. Rivalry and Emulation Between Buddhism and Hinduism in India

As rival religious traditions in India, Buddhism and Brahmanical orthodoxy had an adversarial relationship as they fought hard for a following and royal patronage since the early times. In the beginning when Buddhism and other Śramanical traditions aggressively challenged Brahmanical hegemony in the age of the Buddha.

---

[9]   On the other hand, Rassers argued the unique Javanese character of this fusion. He also argued that Buddhism and Hinduism were considered two brothers from indigenous viewpoint. He said, "in the East Javanese relationship between Buddhism and Śivaism, we have before us the singular instance of two powers which blends with each other as thoroughly as possible, which can be said to form one unit, and which besides this manage to preserve completely, in a very singular way, their independence" (Rassers, 1959, p. 70, quoted in Reiche, 2007, p. 227, n. 67).

Śramanism, particularly Buddhism, Jainism, and Ājīvika prevailed over the old establishment. Together with other Śramanical religions, Buddhism triumphantly walked in the religious arena of India. On the other hand, in this head-on competition, Brāhmaṇas had to strive strenuously against Śramaṇas for the survival of the orthodoxy and orthopraxy. Apparently, they lost this battle and Śramanical culture prevailed through much of the Indian Subcontinent for about five centuries to come (cf. Bronkhorst, 2007). However, after centuries of profound religious modification, Brahmanism rejuvenated itself and eventually reemerged as Hinduism at the turn of the Common Era. Hinduism, with a new synthesis of otherworldly and this-worldly elements, as presented in Bhakti and Tantra, emerged as powerful religious movements. Together with Sanskrit, this renewed religious tradition became the emblem of new Brahmanical orthodoxy.[10]

It is also at that time that Hinduism started to spread in Southeast Asia. Champa was the first land in the Southeast Asia to embrace Hinduism and Sanskrit. Champa in the name of 林邑 (Lin-yi) began to appear in Chinese historical record from 192 AD. This also suggests that Hinduism could have arrived at Southeast Asia as early as the late 2nd or the beginning of the third century.[11] Evidently, Mahayana Buddhism came to Southeast Asia later as Buddhism was still in the process of transformation after the impact of Hinduism in India. Sectarian Buddhism probably arrived earlier than Mahayana Buddhism in the Southeast Asia as evidenced from I-ching (Coedés, 1968, p. 84).

This new point of departure of Hinduism in India surely owes greatly to the redaction of the two epics-the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa and Dharmaśāstras

---

[10] "The period between 200 BCE and 200 CE marks the transition from the Vedic period to the post-Vedic period in which a new Brahmanical synthesis—that 'federation of cultures popularly known as Hinduism'—emerged, which attempted to bring together and reconcile diverse strands of Indian thought and practice. . . . It is only in the period between 200 BCE and 200 CE that we see the emergence of popular *bhakti* movements. The bhakti stream . . . suddenly bursts forth in certain areas of the Indian subcontinent in the last centuries before the Common Era, finding expression in the rise of sectarian devotional movements centering on the deities Viṣṇu and Śiva" (Holdrege, 2015, p. 21).

[11] "By the beginning of the Christian era some parts of the region [Southeast Asia] has already reached a high level of civilization which enabled local élites to choose, albeit mostly unconsciously, those forms of Indian religion which were consistent with, or could be adapted to, their own beliefs and practices" (de Casparis & Mabbett, 1993, pp. 281–282; cf. also Coedés, 1968, pp. 36–45).

as they reaffirm core values of the Hindu society. The immense influence of these two epics and Dharmaśāstra on Southeast Asian culture is a well-known fact (cf. Coedés, 1968, pp. 253–254). However, new ideals of Īśvara-god as the creator and supreme existence, provides Brahmanical orthodoxy a powerful momentum. Among others, Śiva as the Maheśvara is worthy of special mention. Beyond dualistic opposition, he is the completely independent Īśvara full of paradoxes beyond conventional inference. As almighty god, he is the combination of omnipotence, omnipresence and surely omniscience as well. He is also the supreme deity to be meditated, absorbed and worshipped. Panikkar said:

> *Īśvara (including also the names īśa and īśāna) is the Lord, the all-powerful God and point of convergence of the theistic tendencies of the Upanishads, supplanting and at the same time resurrecting the "henotheism" of the Vedas. . . . In the later Upanishads like the Śvetāśvatara, the personal aspect becomes more prominent and the Lord is called the One God (eka deva). But even there, where Īśvara has risen to the heights of supreme Lord, creators, ruler, protector, refuge, he remains closely linked with other concepts like ātman, Brahman. . . . He is Lord of time, he is both today and tomorrow. From fear of him the wind blows, from fear of him the sun rises, and he is Lord over death. (Panikkar, 1981, pp. 148–149)*

Indeed, ideals of the supreme god are depicted most powerfully in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. Salomon called the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad "a Śaiva Upaniṣad" (Salomon, 1986). Theism advocated in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad also marks the beginning of Bhakti and Tantra.[12]

Theistic development of Hinduism not only fashions the idea of the supreme deity, but also creates new religious movements in India. Īśvara is a deity with divine

---

[12] Zaehner sums up the importance of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad in the development of Hinduism: "The achievement of the *Śvetāśvatara Upanishad* is that it welds together the teachings of *the earlier Upanishads . . . as well as the insights of the creation hymns of the Rig-Veda, into a theistic framework. Its God, Rudra-Śiva is no longer one god among many, but the First Cause who emanates, sustains, and reabsorbs the universe into his own substance.* Though himself inactive and impassible, he is ceaselessly active through his 'power,' his *śakti*, through which the world comes into being and is again destroyed. He, the Great Lord (*maheśvara*), does not disdain to dwell in the human heart, and 'whoso knows him with heart and mind as dwelling in the heart, becomes immortal'" (Zaehner, 1962, p. 82; italics mine).

power to be contemplated, visualized and united by the yogins. On the other hand, he is also the universal savior who goes to his devotee's rescue. Thus, he is not only a Tantric deity for the practitioners to experience divine union, but also a redeemer for his worshippers (*bhaktas*) to pay their unswerving devotion. With the compilation of numerous Pūraṇas, Bhakti becomes a popular and powerful religious movement. The savior as a cosmic rescuer of human suffering comes to the fore. Moreover, Tantric movement becomes a widespread practice for *religieux* with the codification of Tantras. The empowering of the body is the chief concern for a tāntrika—follower of the Tantras. Hence, Hinduism has begun a new phase which must have made a strong impact on Buddhism as it was still beset with sectarian strife. Buddhism had to come to terms with this new religious development in India. The genesis of the Mahayana and Vajrayana cannot be separated from the rejuvenation of Brahmanical orthodoxy.

As reiterated, the creation of the universal savior has set off Bhakti and Tantric movements in Hinduism. This new development must have presented a daunting challenge to Buddhist since Buddhism originally is a tradition for the pursuit of individual liberation from saṃsāra than salvation for all. In the Bhakti, devotees worship the Lord for deliverance. There is no distinction between religious professional and lay people. This cult surely can attract many ardent devotees because the Lord is readily accessible. On the other hand, tāntrikas aspire to be empowered by the Īśvara visualized through ritual practices (*vidhi*). To attain *siddhi* (worldly accomplishment) and become a *siddha* is the chief goal of a tāntrika.

Buddhism as an otherworldly tradition in its early phase has to fight with its formidable rival for the adherents in this new era. Eventually, Buddhism has incorporated Hindu deities and rituals into practices. Hindu ideals of Īśvara and Maheśvara as the most powerful gods are certainly to be absorbed into new Buddhist pantheon and religious universe.[13]

---

[13] Avalokiteśvara first appears as a wish-fulfilling Bodhisattva, one finds that he is actually Buddhist īśvara (Studholme, 2002, p. 44) rather than merely a mahāsattva, as it is said in the *Samantamukha Parivarta* of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarṇḍarīkasutra*: "*bhagavān . . . etadavocat-santi . . . lokadhātavaḥ yeṣvavalokiteśvaro bodhisattvo mahāsattvo buddharūpeṇa sattvānāṁ dharmaṁ deśayati/ santi lokadhātavaḥ, yeṣvavalokiteśvaro bodhisattvo mahāsattvo bodhisattvarūpeṇa sattvānāṁ dharmaṁ deśayati/ . . . keṣāṁcid brahmarūpeṇāvalokiteśvaro bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ sattvānāṁ dharmaṁ deśayati/keṣāṁcicchakrarūpeṇāvalokiteśvaro bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ dharmaṁ deśayati/ . . . īśvaravaineyānāṁ sattvānāmīśvararūpeṇa, maheśvaravaineyānāṁ sattvānāṁ maheśvararūpeṇa dharmaṁ deśayati*" [The Buddha said thus: "In some worlds . . .

Indeed, the assimilation of Īśvara and Maheśvara into Buddhism is noteworthy as it announced a new departure in the Mahayana. Obviously, Buddhism at this moment has to deal with Hinduism very seriously. The Buddhist universe no longer left without a redemptive meaning. The cult of Bodhisattva represents this new type of belief in Buddhism. He is a rescuer on call anytime. A popular religious movement in Buddhism begins. The original emphasis on the relationship between the Saṃgha and its worldly followers in early Buddhism undergoes a drastic change. The prominent position of the Saṃgha recedes into the background as the devout worship of the Bodhisattva spread far and wide. As a result, relationship between Bodhisattva and his devotee predominates the Mahayana discourse. The cult of the Bodhisattva, especially Avaloketeśvara, gives a momentous expression to this new religious movement—the Mahayana—which stands for a religious venture inseparable from contemporary religious climate.[14]

Buddhism, with distinctive otherworldly religious orientations had to come to terms with Hindu popular and powerful movements and truly made a very decided turn. Consequently, theistic ideals were assimilated into Buddhism and became embodied in the Bodhisattva. Eventually, the Buddha was also deified like Śiva. In medieval India, we find that Hinduism was the forerunner and Buddhism was the emulator in the religious field. In the long run, Sanskrit also became the scriptural language of Buddhism and the Mahayana movement has much to do with Hindu

---

the Bodhisattva Mahāsattva Avalokiteśvara teaches dharma to sentient beings with the form of a buddha. In other worlds, he teaches dharma with the form of a bodhisattva. . . . To those (who are fit to be taught by the form of Brahma), he teaches the dharma with the form of Brahma. To those (who are fit to be taught by the form of Śakra), he teaches the dharma with the form of Śakra. . . . (*To those who are to fit to be taught by the form of Īśvara, he teaches the dharma with the form of Īśvara. To those who are to fit to be taught by the form Maheśvara, he teaches the dharma with the form of Maheśvara.*)] (in *Saddharmapuṇḍarṇḍarīkasutram*; Kern & Nanjio, 1908, pp. 444–445; italics mine).

[14] Mahayana as a new point of departure in Buddhism cannot be properly understood without the impetus of Hinduism. In contrast, we do not find Mahayana movement in Jainism. Jainism remains more or less faithful to early Śramanic ideals in the medieval period. Williams said: "The changelessness of Jainism is no more than a myth. Admittedly, there have been no spectacular changes in basic assumptions such as there were, for example, in Mahāyāna Buddhism. At most there have been variations in emphasis. Had Jainism, as at one time must have seemed possible, become a majority religion in southern India akin to a Digambara Mahāyāna might, with continuing favourable circumstances, have emerged. But all that can be detected today are traces of aborted developments" (Williams, 1963, p. xix).

Bhakti.[15] Likewise, Vajrayana developed in the shadow of Hindu Tantra (Sanderson 1995). Sanderson argued that Tantric Buddhism is the adoption and adaption of Śaivism:

> [T]his co-existence of Buddhism and Śaivism under royal patronage was surely facilitated by the fact that the form of Buddhism adopted and developed was one that had equipped itself not only with a pantheon of ordered sets of deities that permitted such subsumptive equations but also with a repertoire of Tantric ceremonies that paralleled that of the Śaivas and indeed had modeled itself upon it, offering initiation by introduction before a Maṇḍala in which the central deity of the cult and its retinue of divine emanations have been installed, and a system of regular worship animated by the principle of identification with the deity of initiation . . . through the use of Mantras, Mudrās, visualization, and fire sacrifice . . . and this was presented not only as a new and more powerful means of attaining Buddha-hood but also, as in the Śaiva case, as enabling the production of supernatural effects (siddhiḥ) such as the averting of danger (śāntiḥ), the harming of enemies (abhicāraḥ), and the control of rain . . . through symbolically appropriate inflections of the constituents of these procedures. (Sanderson, 2009, p. 124; cf. also Sanderson, 1995)

Sanderson (2009) emphasized that Buddhism in the medieval India has to accommodate itself for layman support and royal patronage. Both the Mahayana and Vajrayana could be seen as efforts to revitalize Buddhism. After all, the Saṃgha has to maintain its momentum so that dharma could be safeguarded. However, in this process of transformation, Buddhism, in contrast to Jainism, takes a bold step to march closely

---

15   It is argued by Warder: "In some of the Mahāyāna *sūtras* . . . we find the Buddha becoming the supreme overlord of the universe, just as in the same period the theistic religions were with great success exalting Śiva or Viṣṇu as creator and ruler of the universe. . . . In Mahāyāna Buddhism, the central ideal of the compassionate *bodhisattvas*, beginning with Avalokiteśvara . . . the 'Observing Lord (*īśvara*)' or 'Watching Lord' (where the prefix *ava* adds a suggestion that this lord is looking downwards, with compassion, on unhappy humanity), may not be entirely unrelated to a social ideal of a protecting lord who gives security to helpless individuals in times of difficulty. In either case the chief advantage of the new system would appear to be the ease with which help and protection can be obtained by the humble supplicant" (Warder, 1980, pp. 374–375). Warder's observations are very pertinent as the Mahayana movement is unprecedented in Buddhist history. Hindu *Bhakti* should be crucial for this new formation in Buddhism.

with Hinduism. Thus, Buddhism begins a new era deviating its original path in terms of the path to *mokṣa*. This deviation from traditional path is most visible in the later phase of Buddhist Tantra as interest of mundane benefits override life of celibacy and purity. Sanderson emphasized that the coordination between Buddhism and Hinduism can be seen most clearly in Southeast Asia where the kingdoms, staring from Champa, would embrace both faiths from the fourth century to the fifteenth centuries (Sanderson, 2009, p. 117).

5. Kingship and Teamwork: Co-ordination of the Two Faiths

In the greater Indian society of Southeast Asia like the Indonesian archipelago, the situation is different from Indian Subcontinent. Unlike Buddhism in India where Śramaṇism has to compete with the orthodoxy for the adherents and patronage, the development of medieval Buddhism like the Mahayana or Vajrayana in Southeast Asia had to render itself appeal first to the kings for sponsorship. The problem of a following is also very different from that of India as Buddhism here is more to do with royalty than common folks.[16] Consequently, when Indian religions came to Sumatra or Java, kings would decide which tradition to follow for the immediate and far-reaching benefits of the kingdoms.[17] It is a not a choice between orthodoxy and heterodoxy since the issue did not arise. To follow an exclusive religious tradition and practice is not a requisite. Thus, the demarcation between Buddhist and Hindu kingdoms is also blurred as a shift in religious affiliation is not unusual in Southeast Asia even for a single dynasty. Reichle said:

> *The early history of Central Java has often been discussed in terms of two competing dynasties; inscriptions mention a line of Hindu kings called*

---

[16] "To the extent that they were at all influenced by Indic religions, it is probable that, for the vast majority of Indonesians, Hinduism or Buddhism was deeply intertwined with older indigenous practices. Literary references to royal visits to sacred geographical sites indicate that even the elite continued to worship local cults" (Reichle, 2007, p. 22).

[17] "[T]he Javanese Prapañca tells us that the purpose of king Kṛtanagara's adherence to Tantric Buddhism was to increase his people's prosperity and the stability of his realm, and that its reward was the undiminished and undivided sovereignty (*ekacchattra*) of his descendants" (Sanderson, 2009, pp. 124–125).

the Sanjaya in the north and a line of Buddhist rulers, the Śailendra, in the south. Discoveries of remnants of Buddha and Bodhisattva images from Selomerto in northern Java have made archeologists reexamine this geographical dichotomy. The question remains whether the Sanjaya and Śailendra represent two separate lines of sovereigns who ruled distinct kingdoms at the same time or whether they were different branches of a single dynastic line. The two-dynasty theory is buttressed by the fact that different royal names are mentioned in the inscriptions of Candi Kalasan. But recently, several scholars have convincingly argued that different regnal names for a single king, sometimes in Sanskriticized form, sometimes in Old Javanese, were used for different occasions and do not necessarily designate different rulers. (Reichle, 2007, p. 21)

If a king can use various regnal names for different occasions, then it is also possible that kings in Indonesia might support Hinduism or Buddhism for different religious and practical purposes. Here, to make a rigid distinction between Hindu and Buddhist dynasty is not applicable. For Indonesian kings what matters is not purely a religious issue, social and political concerns are also included. Material and spiritual interests should be taking into account as well. Consequently, conciliatory attitude is adopted and this surely would create "the reciprocal tolerance between Buddhism and Hinduism, and in some cases the syncretism of the two . . . as marked in Java and Cambodia" (Coedès, 1968, p. 126). Sanderson mentioned that in the kingdoms of the Khmers, Chams and Javanese, the joint patronage of Buddhism and Śaivism is evident (Sanderson, 2009, pp. 117–123). He discussed the situation of teamwork between Buddhist and Śaiva in Indonesia:

This co-ordination of the two faiths is . . . evident in eastern Java. The "Calcutta" stone inscription of Airlangga (c. 1010–1050), founder of the kingdom of Kahuripan, reports in its Old Javanese section that he was consecrated as the king in 1019/20 by Buddhist (Saugata), Śaiva (Māheśvara), and Mahābrāhmaṇa dignitaries, and much evidence of simultaneous royal support of both Śaivism and Buddhism during the Singhasari and Majapahit periods (1222–1292; 1293–c. 1500) is present in the old Javanese poem Nāgarakṛtāgama, also called Deśawarṇana, completed in 1365 by Mpu Prapañca during the reign of Hayām Wuruk of Majapahit, consecrated as Rājasanagara (1350–1389). We learn from this work that both Śaiva and Buddhist participated in periodic ceremonies for the benefit of the realm within

*the great courtyard inside the royal gate of palace compound, that the
administrative heads . . . of these two communities had official quarters
in the east and west to the south of the royal compound, and that his
sovereign was dedicated to the support of both religions. (Sanderson,
2009, pp. 118–120)*

If official attitude is lenient and tolerant, then Buddhism and Hinduism surely
could be coordinative without enmity in the Singhasari and Majapahit periods.
In fact, this flexible attitude toward religion shows the official policy of the court
concerning religious affairs. Additionally, the Vajrayana or Mantrayana, as it was
deeply interweaved with Śaivism, became more and more indistinguishable in their
ritual practices from the Śaiva for patronage.[18] Therefore, the last phase of Buddhism
in the Indonesian archipelago is an age in emulation of Hindu Śaiva example.
Eventually, like what happened in Indian Subcontinent before, Buddhism vanished
completely from the Indonesian archipelago. In contrast, Hinduism survives as the
major religion in Bali and Javanese Hindu minorities can also be found in Java. In
spite of all vicissitudes, it is Hinduism, not Buddhism that remains an unbroken
living religious tradition in Indonesia.[19]

6. Conclusions

Indian religious culture in Southeast Asia has a glorious history. Either
Buddhism or Hinduism has left an indelible mark on local cultures. Contribution of

---

[18] "The Mantrayana also followed the example of the Śaivas by devising Tantric ceremonies
for patrons in the public domain: for the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*) of temple images (*pratimā*),
paintings of deities on cloth (*paṭaḥ*), manuscripts of sacred texts (*pustakam*), monasteries
(*vihāraḥ*), shrines (*gandhakuṭī*), Caityas, reservoirs (*puṣkariṇyādi*), gardens and the like
(*ārāmādi*). It also adapted the Śaiva procedures for funerary initiation to produce a Tantric
Buddhist funeral rite (*antyeṣṭiḥ*) for initiates, in which, as in the Śaiva case (*antyeṣṭidīkṣā*), the
officiant draws the consciousness (*jñānam*) of the deceased back into the corpse from the other
world, takes it again through the initiatory process of consecration and the rest (*abhiṣekādi*)
before a Maṇḍala, and then sends it out through the top of the head to ascend to liberation or a
pure Buddha-field such as Sukhāvatī" (Sanderson, 2009, pp. 126–127).

[19] "Indian culture [Hinduism] took refuge in certain districts of the east [Java], and especially
on Bali. Thus, this island became, and to the present has remained, an intellectual center
preserving the essentials of Indo-Javanese literature and religion which Islam rapidly caused
to disappear in Java. Bali played the same role of preserver for Java as Tibet did for Buddhist
India" (Coedès, 1968, p. 242).

Indian religions to the development of indigenous culture in pre-modern Southeast Asia is immense. However, the fusion of Buddhism and Hinduism makes religious culture in Southeast Asia, and Indonesia in particular, diversified yet unified. Indonesia, as the last stronghold of Indian religions, gives us a glimpse of what the final stage of Indian Buddhism and Hinduism in Southeast Asia was. Amicable political milieu makes Buddhism and Hinduism in the late medieval period of Indonesia work together well. Like the development of Buddhism in medieval India follows the example of Hinduism, the mix of Buddhism and Hinduism in Indonesia intimates that Buddhism, especially the Vajrayana, was in emulation of the Śaiva. On the other hand, the political situation in Southeast Asia and Indonesia in particular encourages incorporation of Indian religious traditions. In the end, Śaivism and Buddhism became mixed for about three hundred years in Indonesia.

References

Andaya, B. W., & Andaya, L. Y. (2015). *A history of early modern Southeast Asia. 1400–1830*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139051323.001

Bronkhorst, J. (2007). *Greater Magadha. Studies in the culture of early India*. Boston, MA: Brill.

Coedès, G. (1968). *The Indianized states of Southeast Asia*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

de Casparis, J. G., & Mabbett, I. W. (1993). Religion and popular beliefs of Southeast Asia before c. 1500. In N. Tarling (Ed.), *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia* (Vol. 1, pp. 276–340), Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CHOL9780521355056.007

Holdrege, B. A. (2015). *Bhakti and embodiment. Fashioning divine bodies and devotional in Kṛṣṇa Bhakti*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kern, H., & Nanjio, B. (Eds.). (1908). *Saddharmapuṇḍarṇḍarīkasutram*. St. Péterbourg, Russia: Académic Impériale des Science.

Kinney, A. R., Klokke, M. J., Kieven, L., & Helmi, R. (2003). *Worshipping Siva and Buddha: The temple art of East Java*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Lieberman, V. (2009). *Strange parallels. Southeast Asia in global contexts, c. 800–1830. Vol. 2: Mainland mirrors: Europe, Japan, China, South Asia, and the Islands*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Mabbett, I. (1986). Buddhism in Champa. In D. G. Marr & A. C. Milner (Eds.), *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th centuries* (pp. 289–313). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Nihom, M. (1994). *Studies in Indian and Indo-Indonesian Tantrism: The Kuñjarakarṇadharmakathana and the Yogatantra*. Vienna, Austria: De Nobili.

Pachow, W. (1958). The voyage of Buddhist missions to Southeast Asia and Far East. *Journal of the Greater India Society*, *17*, 9–12.

Panikkar, R. (1981). *The unknown Christ of Hinduism. Towards an ecumenical Christophany*. New York, NY: Orbis.

Rassers, W. H. (1959). *Pañji, the culture hero: A study of religion in Java*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Reichle, N. (2007). *Violence and serenity. Late Buddhist sculpture from Indonesia*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Salomon, R. (1986).The Śvatāśvatara and the Nāsadīya: Vedic citations in a Śaiva Upaniṣad. *Adyar Library Bulletin*, *50*, 165–178.

Sanderson, A. (1995). Vajrayāna: Origin and function. In *Proceedings of Buddhism into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings* (pp. 89–102). Los Angeles, CA : Dhammakāya Foundation.

Sanderson, A. (2009). The Śaiva age: The rise and dominance of Śaivism during the early medieval period. In S. Einoo (Ed.), *Genesis and development of Tantrism* (pp. 41–350). Tokyo, Japan: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.

Schweyer, A.-V. (2009). Buddhism in Campā. *Moussons*, *13–14*, 309–337.

Studholme, A. (2002). *The origins of Oṃ Maṇipadme Hūṃ—A study of the Kāraṇḍavyūha Sūtra*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stutterheim, W. F. (1989). *Rama-legends and Rama-reliefs in Indonesia*. New Delhi, India: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.

Takakusu, J., & Kaikyoku, W. (Eds.). (1924–1932). *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō/ 大正新脩大藏經* . Tokyo, Japan: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.

Warder, A. K. (1980). *Indian Buddhism* (2nd ed.). New Delhi, India: Motilal Banarsidass.

Williams, R. T. (1963). *Jaina yoga. A survey of the medieval Śrāvakācāras*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zaehner, R. C. (1962). *Hinduism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.