THE PRE-ISLAMIC ENDOWMENT IN NUSANTARA AND ITS RECEPTION IN THE POST-ISLAMISED WAQF INSTITUTIONS

Syamsul Idul Adha[1*]
Hafas Furqani[2]
Muhammad Arifin[3]
[1] Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh
[2] Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh
[3] Faculty of Islamic Economics and Business, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh

[*1]*Corresponding email: syamsul.iduladha@ar-raniry.ac.id*

ABSTRACT - The discourse on the history of Islamic philanthropy in Indonesia often suffers from a historical vacuum, assuming that waqf (Islamic endowment) emerged as a completely foreign concept during the Islamisation period. This study aims to deconstruct this paradigm by contextualizing the pre-Islamic roots of endowments in Nusantara during the Hindu-Buddhist era and analyzing their structural reception into post-Islamic waqf practices. Utilizing a historical-epigraphical approach, this research examines various ancient inscriptions, including the Talang Tuwo, Ligor A, Tugu, Canggal, Kalasan, *Muñcaṅan*, Mentyasih B, Sukawana A1, and Turun Hyaṅ A inscriptions. The study reveals that the classic tradition of *Sima* or *Perdikan* (tax-free lands granted by rulers for sacred or public purposes) shared striking structural and functional similarities with Islamic waqf such the Waqf of *Blang Padang* and the Waqf of Masjid Agung Cirĕbon. Both systems emphasised asset perpetuity, public or religious utility, and non-alienable ownership. Furthermore, this paper highlights that modern concepts like infrastructure waqf, green waqf (ecological management), and social entrepreneurship were already implemented through these pre-Islamic patrimonial and fiscal decentralization models. The transition into the Islamic era did not uproot these established traditions, rather, Islamisation provided a new theological paradigm and legalist framework (*'urf*) to an already mature indigenous practice. The resilience of these public assets across generations was secured not merely by managerial efficiency, but by a sentiment of sanctity (*Sāsatkāla* in the Hindu-Buddhist worldview or *muabbad* in Islamic jurisprudence). Ultimately, this study contributes to rewriting Islamic history by demonstrating that the reception of waqf in Nusantara lies in its capacity for cultural continuity and smart economic accommodation of local institutions.
Keywords: Sima, Perdikan, Pre-Islamic Endowment, Waqf Practices, Cultural Continuity, Nusantara.

ABSTRAK – *Wacana mengenai sejarah filantropi Islam di Indonesia sering kali mengalami kekosongan historis, dengan asumsi bahwa wakaf muncul sebagai konsep yang sepenuhnya asing selama periode Islamisasi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendekonstruksi paradigma tersebut dengan mengontekstualisasikan akar pra-Islam dari lembaga anuitas atau dana abadi (endowment) di Nusantara pada masa Hindu-Buddha dan menganalisis resepsi strukturalnya ke dalam praktik wakaf pasca-Islamisasi. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan historis-epigrafis, penelitian ini mengkaji berbagai prasasti kuno, termasuk Prasasti Talang Tuwo, Ligor A, Tugu, Canggal, Kalasan, Muñcaṅan, Mentyasih B, Sukawana A1, dan Turun Hyaṅ A. Penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa tradisi klasik Sima atau Perdikan (tanah bebas pajak yang diberikan oleh penguasa untuk tujuan suci atau publik) memiliki kesamaan struktural dan fungsional yang mencolok dengan wakaf Islam seperti Wakaf Blang Padang dan Wakaf Masjid Agung Cirĕbon. Kedua sistem tersebut menekankan keabadian aset, kemaslahatan publik atau keagamaan, dan kepemilikan yang tidak dapat dialihkan. Lebih jauh lagi, artikel ini menyoroti bahwa konsep modern seperti wakaf infrastruktur, wakaf hijau (pengelolaan ekologis), dan kewirausahaan sosial*

sebenarnya telah diimplementasikan melalui model patrimonial dan desentralisasi fiskal pra-Islam ini. Transisi menuju era Islam tidak mencabut tradisi yang telah mapan tersebut, melainkan, Islamisasi menyediakan sebuah paradigma teologis dan kerangka hukum ('urf) baru terhadap praktik pribumi yang sudah matang. Ketahanan aset-aset publik ini lintas generasi dipastikan bukan sekadar oleh efisiensi manajerial, melainkan oleh sentimen kesucian (Sāsatkāla dalam pandangan dunia Hindu-Buddha atau muabbad dalam fikih Islam). Pada akhirnya, penelitian ini berkontribusi dalam menulis ulang sejarah Islam dengan menunjukkan bahwa keberhasilan wakaf di Nusantara terletak pada kapasitasnya untuk kesinambungan budaya dan akomodasi ekonomi yang cerdas terhadap institusi lokal..
Kata Kunci: *Sima, Perdikan, Dana Abadi Pra-Islam, Praktik Wakaf, Kesinambungan Budaya.*

INTRODUCTION

The pre-Islamic civilization of the Archipelago was forged through a centuries-long infiltration of Hindu-Buddhist culture into its political, social, religious, and economic structures starting from the 5th century CE, a phenomenon historically conceptualised as Indianization (Bosch, 2013, Kulke, 1991). This process of Indianization did not manifest as a total receptive transposition (*receptio in complexu*), rather it occurred adaptively through the strategic alignment and elaboration of Hindu-Buddhist religious values and traditions with the pre-existing cultures of the indigenous Austronesian societies (Wolters, 2018). The impact of Indianization was characterised by the adoption and institutionalization of political and religious structures derived from the *Devaraja* (God-King) theocratic system, the adaptation of *Dharmaśāstra* legal frameworks into localised texts such as the *Kutara Māṇawa Dharmaśāstra*, *Śiwaśāsana*, and *Nītisārasamuccaya*, the adaptation of epics (*Itihāsa*) and mythology (*Purāṇa*), the absorption of the Sanskrit language alongside Pre-Nagari and Post-Pallava scripts as the foundational systems of language and literacy, and the structural implementation of Indian architecture in monumental constructions (Cœdès, 1975).

Among the Austronesian societies inhabiting the islands of the archipelago, the prevailing political framework was patrimonial, dominated by tribal chieftains (*Datu*) who held primordial dominion over land and ecological landscapes, which they distributed for usage or stewardship based on socio-political considerations (Munoz, 2016, Pauker, 1956). Through the performance of the *Vrātyastoma* ritual, these local rulers underwent an ontological transition, elevating their status from mere tribal leaders (*narendra*) to supreme sovereigns (*Maharāja* or *Rajendra*) legitimised within the *Devarāja* theocracy (Djoened & Poesponegoro, 2008, Vogel, 1918). The codification of *Dharmaśāstra* law adapted by these rulers did not dismantle the pre-existing socio-economic

structure or indigenous land tenure systems. Instead, through institutional formalization, it granted sovereigns the explicit function and authority over property rights and land distribution driven by political, religious, or social imperatives (Hooker, 1978, van Naerssen, 2022).

Archaeological epigraphical evidence reveals that rulers of these Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms frequently alienated or bestowed land properties within their realms as *Sima*[1] or *Perdikan*[2]. Lands designated with *Sima* or *Perdikan* status operated as autonomous enclaves, completely liberated from royal property claims (*Drabya Haji*)[3] and entirely insulated from fiscal extraction or taxation (*Upêti*)[4]. Sovereigns generally instituted *Sima* or *Perdikan* status either by granting an autonomous tract of land or by decreeing a protective, sacralised status over an existing territory (Jones, 1984). The endowment or declaration of land as *Sima* or *Perdikan* was predominantly executed for the founding and maintenance of sacred monuments (*Caitya*)[5], as a royal reward for exceptional merits rendered by specific dignitaries or communities, or for the establishment of educational sanctuaries (*Āśrama*)[6] and monastic cells (*Kuṭi*)[7] inhabited by scholars and ascetics (Christie, 2004).

The widespread impact of Islamisation in the Indonesian Archipelago (*Nusantara*) since the 13th century CE did not instantly obliterate the pre-existing political and socio-economic institutions of the Hindu-Buddhist era (Adha, 2018; Alatas, 1985). Operationalised as an adaptive and selectively receptive phenomenon (*receptio contrario*), Islamisation advanced through legal pluralism frameworks specifically leveraging customary traditions (*'urf*) and prevalent public practices (*ta'āmmul*), thereby preserving established socio-economic institutions including the sovereign bestowal of *Sima* and *Perdikan* by aristocratic rulers for the advancement of the public interest

[1] Derived from the Sanskrit word *sīman* meaning a bounded or special territory.
[2] Derived from the Old Javanese/Kawi word *ardika* meaning exempt or free.
[3] This is a compound Old Javanese phrase widely found in stone and copperplate inscriptions, combining *Drabya* (Sanskrit for property/wealth) and *Haji* (Old Javanese/Austronesian for king).
[4] The word originates from the Sanskrit *utpatti* meaning production, yield, or revenue.
[5] A Sanskrit term commonly used in Old Javanese literature and charters to denote a sacred building, ancestral temple, or a small Buddhist/Hindu shrine erected on special lands (including *Sima* regions).
[6] This word refers to a religious sanctuary, hermitage, or a center for learning and spiritual retreat located in a *Sima* or mountainous area.
[7] It originally referred to a monk's dwelling or cell, but in ancient Java it expanded to mean a localized Buddhist monastic complex or temple sanctuary built on sacred land.



(*maṣāliḥ al-'āmmah*). Muslim aristocrats in one hand maintained the practice of *Sima* and *Perdikan* as a core mechanism of triparty socio-political and economic relations (Syarifuddin & Sakti, 2021).[8] On the other hand, these Muslim sovereigns utilised a dual paradigm while the practice of *waqf* strictly conformed to the principles and mandates of Islamic Sharia, the parallel practices of *Sima* and *Perdikan* having long been institutionalised within the socio-economic fabric of this patrimonial society were continuously deployed to sustain structural dynamics and political-theocratic legitimacy with the reciprocal backing of religious and customary authorities (Furqani & Adha, 2021, Hurgronje, 1893).

The structural preservation of *Sima* and *Perdikan* land grants within the framework of Islamisation was not merely cultural, but deeply institutional. The structural foundations underpinning the designation of *Sima* and *Perdikan* along with their accompanying esoteric and metaphysical rituals were continuously adapted and aligned with the Islamic worldview (*Weltanschauung*) and jurisprudence. Although this surface-level phenomenon resembles an acculturative adaptation, the actual execution of *waqf* (pious endowment) was not entirely identical *an sich* to the classical institution of *waqf* found in orthodox Islamic law, precisely because indigenous customary law

[8] Within the patrimonial systems of the Indonesian Archipelago (*Nusantara*), a tripartic division of power was recognized, deeply anchored in primordial Austronesian cosmology. This cosmic tripartition is epigrapically documented in the Grahi Buddha Inscription and the Padang Roco Inscription as *Triloka* or *Tribhuwana*, and is textually articulated in the *Nītisārasamuccaya* as *Trilokastutim* (de Casparis, 1967; Kozok & Mahdi, 2015). In the Old Sundanese (*Sunda Buhun*) political framework detailed in the *Sanghyang Siksakandang Keresian*, this tripartic governance manifested through the symbiotic division of authority among the sovereign (*Ratu*), the religious ascetic (*Rsi*), and the customary patriarch (*Romo*) (Noorduyn & Teeuw, 2021). This theocratic cosmological structure is equally evident in the traditional Acehnese system of *lhèe sagoe* (the Three *Sagi*), which maintained a strict separation of jurisdictions between the reigning Sultans and Sultanahs of Aceh in the capital city (*Kutaraja*), the Islamic scholars (*'ulamā'*) who governed the realm of Sharia (*hukôm*), and the military chieftains (*ulèebalang*) who presided over the domain of customary law (*adat*) (Hadi, 1999; Lombard, 1986). Similarly, within the *Rajo Tigo Selo* (the Three Kings) apparatus of Minangkabau cosmology, authority was divided functionally among the *Rajo Alam* (King of the Realm) as the supreme political-aristocratic leader stationed at *Istano Gadang* or *Istano Silinduang Bulan*, the *Rajo 'Ibadat* (King of Religious Duties) who served as the institutional continuation of the pre-Islamic *Rajo Pandito* based in Sumpur Kudus, and the *Rajo Adat* (King of Customary Law), who presided over the traditional clan councils (*kaum*) across the various sovereign territories (*nagari*) (Kahn, 2020; von Benda-Beckmann, 1979).

(*adat*) remained the definitive domain where these practices were operationalised.

This systemic alignment is evident in the foundational institutional architecture shared between the *Sima-Perdikan* framework and *waqf* mechanics. For instance, the absolute perpetuity of the endowed asset conceptualised as *Sāsatkāla* (eternal time) in the *Dharmaśāstra* and *mu'abbad* (perpetual) in Islamic jurisprudence was consistently directed toward public welfare or sacred religious functions, rendering its ownership status fundamentally inalienable. Conversely, in stark contrast to the standard structural execution of *waqf* across the broader Islamic world, the practice maintained by these Muslim aristocrats resolutely preserved the traditional imprecation element (*Śapatha*) found in the original Hindu-Buddhist *Sima* and *Perdikan* charter inscriptions (Ardika et al., 2018, Istari, 2007, Kartakusuma, 1993). Serving as a persistent form of Tantric-oriented metaphysical and cosmic threat, this element underwent Islamisation by replacing the traditional esoteric guardian deities (*yidam*) with the severe wrath, threat, and curses of Allah SWT. Nonetheless, it continued to function as a deeply feared and highly potent instrument of psychological coercion among the publics (Ricklefs, 1998; Woodward, 1989).[9]

Historiographical studies on the practice of *waqf* generally overlook the pre-Islamic antecedents of land *waqf* in the Indonesian Archipelago (*Nusantara*), which substantially shaped the subsequent evolution of *waqf* as executed by the Muslim community. This systemic neglect of the continuity of pre-Islamic foundations implies that *waqf* practices among Muslims are often erroneously viewed as entirely dependent upon classical *fiqh* compendiums. Fahmi et al.

[9] The transition of the patron (*yidam*) utilized as the guardian or protector of *Sima* and Perdikan lands from the Hindu-Buddhist era into the Islamic era did not diminish the sense of sacrality and the dread of the engineered Tantric curses (*śapatha*)**.** Early Srivijayan inscriptions, such as the Kota Kapur Inscription (608 Śaka), for instance, employ the phrase, *"...kita tuwi tandrun luaḥ wañakita dewata mūlāña yaŋ parsumpahan parāwis kadāci yaṃ uram di dalaṃña bhūmi (ājñāñā kadatuan inī)..."* which signifies, *"...and you Tandrun luah and all the deities who initiate every curse mantra."* On the Terengganu Inscription (702 AH / 1303 CE), the curse formula (*parsumpahan*) of the protective patron (*yidam*) was replaced by Dewata Mulya Raya: *"... tamrā inī segāla isī tamrī ini bārang siāpā tidā menūrut tamrā ini laanat Dewata Muliā Rāya……..dijadikan Dewatā Muliā Rāya bāgī yang langgar acāra tamrā inī."* The mention of *Dewatā Muliā Rāya* which in Old Malay literature serves as an honorific for Allah SWT, demonstrates a shift in the concept of patronage. Conversely, the attribution of the curse toward lawbreakers and the sacrality of the space or territory (*vanua*) was strictly maintained (Cœdès, 1918; Fang, 2013; Paterson, 1924).



(2024) acknowledge strong indications regarding the existence of a pre-Islamic *waqf* archetype in *Nusantara* which established the structural foundation for customary law (*'urf*) to serve as both a legal guide and an operational blueprint for Islamic *waqf* practices (Chambert-Loir, 2017, Hassan, 2014). The institutional nexus connecting the pre-Islamic endowments enacted by Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms manifested through the royal granting of *Sima* and *Perdikan* with the waqf traditions of Muslims during the Islamic sultanate period is perfectly illuminated by the jurisprudential concept of '*urf* (Schrieke, 2021). This adaptation allowed Muslim jurists to absorb existing socio-legal frameworks into Islamic property law via the maxim *al-ʿāddah al-muḥakkamah* (Ricklefs, 2006). Pre-Islamic traditions specifically the land endowment mechanics of *Sima* and *Perdikan* were consciously absorbed and preserved as customary practices deemed both virtuous (*'ārif*) and systematically consistent (*mundābiṭ*) within the social fabric.

The societal acceptance of customary practices (*'urf*) governing *waqf* is uniquely demonstrated in the 18th-century treatise *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām fī Takhlīṣ al-Khaṣṣām* by the jurist *Al-Faqīh* Jalāl al-Dīn b. Kamāl al-Dīn al-Turasānī, alongside the 16th-century code *Kitab Salokantara* from the Demak Sultanate era. While contemporary Nusantara legal texts such as *Mir'āt at-Ṭullāb* and *Sabīlal Muhtadīn* remained strictly fiqh-centric and textually bound to universal Shafi'ite doctrines, *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* and *Salokantara* operated as highly localised state statutes. These texts fundamentally engaged with political-agrarian realities deploying '*urf* and *maṣlaḥah* as legal mechanisms to systematically institutionalise preexisting, pre-Islamic communal property structures into the administrative matrix of the sultanates.

The *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* stands as primary evidence of how prevalent societal customs (*'urf*) were validated as an integral component of operative Islamic law (Azzuhri, 2026). This text was engineered as a formal Islamic civil law instrument designed to protect and preserve the perpetual nature of *waqf* assets, utilizing legal frameworks of formal testimony (*shahādah*) and judicial oaths (*yamīn*) to resolve property disputes within Islamic tribunals (Hasjmy, 1990; Jamhuri, 2012). Furthermore, the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* established that the legal status of *waqf* land remains irrevocable, persisting seamlessly despite institutional shifts or transitions in sovereign political power.

Kitab Salokantara is a masterpiece Islamic legal-ethical in Sultanate Demak that maintained the conceptual framework governing the transition of

aristocratic property assets (*Drabya Haji*), explicitly validating the *Sima* and *Perdikan* land grants of the Majapahit era as protected assets administered by the *Wali Songo* for educational and proselytizing infrastructure (Romdhoni, 2021). The governance of these *Sima* and *Perdikan* tracts originally designated during the Majapahit period for the maintenance of sacred temples (*prasādha*) and monastic sanctuaries (*mandala*) was structurally reallocated to finance the Demak Grand Masjid, religious boarding schools (*pesantren*), and sacred funerary complexes (De Graaf, 2012). Moreover, the systematic abolition of social stratification (*varna*) within the *Salokantara* code effectively catalysed a structural transformation, land utility that was once strictly restricted to elite dynastic privilege was democratised into communal-social property, thereby ensuring that its overarching economic value could be accessed by the publics (*kawula*) (Hoadley, 2025).

The reception of pre-Islamic land endowment practices is further substantiated by formal *waqf* charters issued directly by early sovereigns. Prominent examples include the *Blang Padang waqf* land charter promulgated by Sultan Iskandar Muda, also known as Teguh Dharmawangsa (1593–1636), and the imperial *waqf* charters for the *Astana Gunung Jati* complex and the *Sang Cipta Rasa* Grand Masjid issued by Sunan Gunung Jati (Syarif Hidayatullah). The *Blang Padang* charter was enacted by Sultan Iskandar Muda specifically to provide ironclad legal certainty for the *Blang Padang waqf* tract, permanently dedicating its yields to fund the *Baiturrahman* Grand Masjid (van Langen, 1888). The Sultans of Cirebon issued royal decrees that systematically alienated rural village lands from royal property claims (*Drabya Haji*). These charters dictated that the agrarian revenue from these villages must be exclusively allocated to maintain the Astana Gunung Jati funerary complex and to continuously finance the Cirebon Grand Masjid (Hoadley, 2025).

This study examines the continuity of pre-Islamic endowments in the Indonesian Archipelago (*Nusantara*) and their institutional reception into post-Islamised *waqf* frameworks. The systemic neglect of this pre-Islamic continuity within existing literature inevitably results in legal-historical misinterpretations. It erroneously limits the scope of *waqf* practices to the confines of classical Islamic *fiqh*, while completely overlooking the fact that the actors executing these endowments were customary (*adat*) authorities belonging to the aristocracy (Hurgronje, 1893, Lombard, 1986). These aristocratic actors were far more structurally bound to customary law than to



classical Islamic *fiqh*, and they possessed vested political interests in preserving their power by leveraging socio-economic instruments to secure reciprocal validation from both customary and religious authorities (Azzuhri, 2026, Hassan, 2014). To execute this analysis, this study employs a structural analogy approach, scrutinizing historical inscriptions containing *Sima* and *Perdikan* charter decrees from the Hindu-Buddhist period and systematically comparing the institutional architecture of those pre-Islamic endowments against post-Islamic legal texts and imperial *waqf* charters promulgated by the Islamic sultanates.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pre-Islamic Endowment

The primary source of civil law within the Hindu-Buddhist tradition is the *Dharmaśāstra*, a corpus of legal texts (*Dharma*) that predominantly regulates governance, religious affairs, social structures, and economic systems (Muljana, 1967). During the era of the Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms, *Dharmaśāstra* texts were adapted into localised legal codes such as the *Kunṭara Māṇawa Dharmaśāstra*, *Śiwaśāsana*, and *Nītisārasamuccaya* through contextualization within the prevailing patrimonial political, social, and economic frameworks. The alignment of the *Dharmaśāstra* with localised realities demonstrates an adaptive reception and cultural synthesis of Hindu-Buddhist legal structures with indigenous Nusantara traditions, thereby enabling court rulers to secure social and cultural legitimacy for enforcing policies (Muljana, 1967; Panji, 2015).

One of the primary functions of these adapted *Dharmaśāstra* texts was to serve as *Agamas*, or authoritative legal manuals. In this context, a legal manual refers to the prescriptive guidelines governing law, ethics, and morality, which guided the populace in both their daily social interactions and their political relationships with the court rulers (Muljana, 1967). Conversely, the *Dharmaśāstra* also functioned as a procedural guide for judicial administration. Law enforcement officers (*Dhyakṣa*) coordinated with field investigating judges (*Prāḍvivāka*) and the Chief Justice (*Dharmmādhyakṣa*), who was supported by member judges (*Upapatti*). Their duty was to analyse the specific

statutory clauses within the *Dharmaśāstra* to formulate jurisprudential considerations for judicial verdicts (Panji, 2015).

Among the legal provisions codified within the *Dharmaśāstra* are those pertaining to the law of land endowments. An endowment is conceptualised as the voluntary alienation of private property for beneficial purposes, viewed from both religious and socio-communal perspectives. The *Dharmaśāstra* classifies land endowments into several distinct typologies, delineated as follows (Muljana, 1967):

1. *Pūrta* (*Pūrta-dharma*): The *Dharmaśāstra* prescribes two distinct categories of religious obligations (Dharma) including *Iṣṭa*, which encompasses ritualistic worship such as veneration (*pūjā*) and sacrificial rites (*yajña*), and *Pūrta*, which denotes philanthropic activities dedicated to public welfare and long-term utility, including the construction of water wells, reservoirs, and the cultivation of public flora.
2. *Dāna* (*Bhū-dāna*): This refers to the alienation of assets for religious and educational purposes. Endowments rendered under *Bhū-dāna* are legally irrevocable. A foundational principle governing Dāna is *Akṣaya-nīvī*, derived from *akṣaya* (indestructible) and *nīvī* (principal capital). The doctrine of *Akṣaya-nīvī* stipulates that the corpus or principal property of the endowment must remain inviolate, while only its generated yields or revenues may be expended to finance monasteries (*vihāras*) and student hostels.
3. *Devadāna* and *Brahmadeya*: These function as state-sponsored endowments within the framework of state-religious institutional relations, categorised as follows:
    a. *Devadāna*: The dedication of land plots or entire villages exclusively for the maintenance and upkeep of temples.
    b. *Brahmadeya*: Land grants bestowed upon the Brahmin class to facilitate education and the transmission of knowledge.
4. *Sima*: Sovereign territories officially exempted from state fiscal obligations or taxation, wherein the generated revenues are strictly earmarked for the preservation and upkeep of sacred structures, including sanctuaries (*prāsāda*), monasteries (*vihāras*), and temples (*caṇḍi*).



Islamised Waqf and Its Institutional Structure

The Arabic term *waqf* originates from the etymological root *waqafa*, which denotatively signifies "to retain," "to halt," "to remain stationary," or "to persist in an upright posture." The linguistic progression *waqafa-yaqifu-waqfan* corresponds symmetrically to *ḥabasa-yaḥbisu-taḥbīsan*. Within *Lisān al-ʿArab*, Ibn Mandẓūr (1301) elucidates that *ḥabasa* connotes *amsakahū* (to restrain or hold back), exemplified in the expression *al-ḥubusu mā wuqifa* (the retention of that which has been dedicated as an endowment). Conversely, al-Fairūzzābādī (2005) in *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* delineates *al-ḥabsu* through the concepts of *al-manʿu* (prohibition or prevention) and *al-imsāk* (retention), as manifested in the phrase *ḥabsu al-shayʾ* (the confinement of a thing). Corroborating this semantic framework, al-Zubaidī (1966) in *Tāj al-ʿArūs* similarly affirms that *al-ḥabsu* implies both *al-manʿu* (prevention) and *al-imsāk* (retention).

The Shāfiʿī jurists, notably al-Nawawī (n.d.) and al-Qalyūbī (n.d.), define *waqf* as the retention of property (*ḥabsu mālin*) that yields usufruct while preserving the integrity of its principal asset (*baqāʾi ʿaynihī*), effectively sequestered from the intervention of the dedicator (*wāqif*), with its revenues allocated toward benevolent avenues and the attainment of divine proximity (*taqarrub*) to Allah the Almighty. Conversely, although the Ḥanafī school concurs with the premise of asset retention (*ḥabsu mālin*), al-Zuhaylī (1985) notes that, within their paradigm, the ownership of the endowed property resides perpetually with the *wāqif*, and merely its usufruct is enjoyed by the designated beneficiaries (*mawqūf ʿalayhi*). For this reason, the Shafi's scholars completely disagree to some Hanafi's Scholars that legalise the practice of current assets *waqf* as a clear boundary.

Another point of divergence pertains to the subject matter of the endowment. The Shāfiʿī school posits that the object of *waqf* is strictly confined to immovable assets (*muʿāqar*) to guarantee long-term perpetuity (*muʿabbad*), wherein the corporeal entity (*ʿayn*) of the fixed property can be continuously utilised (Abbasi, 2012; Ar-Rūyānī, 2009). Contrarily, the Ḥanafī jurists most notably Mullā Khusrū and Ebussuʿūd permit movable property (*manqūl*) to serve as the object of *waqf*, expressly validating capital or cash endowments (*akçe*), provided that the principal value of the asset is successfully sustained (Al-Ḥanafī, 2019; Çizakça, 2000).

METHODOLOGY

This study constitutes an interdisciplinary inquiry synthesizing archaeological methodology specifically epigraphic analysis with philological investigation to scrutinise the continuum of normative institutions and practices of pre-Islamic endowments alongside the post-Islamised institution of *waqf* (Boechari, 2012; Tjandrasasmita, 2009). The corpus of primary sources comprises ten published inscriptions from the Hindu-Buddhist era pertaining to endowment policies, two distinct Islamic jurisprudence textual sources, and two extant endowment assets from Islamic sultanates. The corpus of sources is detailed in Table 1 as here:

Table 1. The Inscriptions, Legal Texts and *Waqf* Assets

No.	Inscriptions	Legal Texts	*Waqf* Assets
1.	*Pūrta* (*Pūrta-dharma*): • Tugu • Talang Tuwo	• *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām fī Takhlīṣ al-Khaṣṣām* • Salokantara	• *Blang Padang* • *Kawedrahan*
2.	*Dāna* (*Bhu- Dāna*) • Yūpa Mulawarman.		
3.	*Devadāna* • Canggal • Kalasan • Ligor A		
4.	*Brahmadeya* • Muñcaṅan		
5.	Sīma • Mentyasih B • Sukawana A1 • Turun Hyang A		

The interpretation of the primary sources is operationalised through the method of structural analogy, which juxtaposes two disparate entities based on the congruence of their relational patterns, structural configurations, or internal systems, rather than their physical appearance or superficial commonalities. The application of this methodology necessitates a strict analytical focus on how internal components within a system interact and exhibit structural alignment (Jagn, 1936). Consequently, the process of establishing structural correspondence among the sources facilitates a rigorous comparative analysis



across the corpus, even when direct, explicit comparisons are epistemologically challenging to execute (Markman & Moreau, 2001).

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Institutional Structure of Pre-Islamic Endowment

A number of pre-Islamic endowment practices in the Nusantara archipelago during the Hindu-Buddhist kingdom era were subject to the ordinances of the *Dharmaśāstra* through adapted local legal texts. Consequently, these pre-Islamic endowment practices adhered to the institutional nomenclature regulated within the *Dharmaśāstra* compendia, albeit the classification of the various pre-Islamic endowment practices analysed in this study is not rigidly stringent. This flexibility stems from the fact that these pre-Islamic endowment practices were anchored in the concept of *Sīma* a land distribution framework predicated upon the political, economic, and spiritual interests of Hindu-Buddhist rulers aimed at securing political legitimacy.

In principle, all typologies of endowments codified within the *Dharmaśāstra* were actively practiced during the Hindu-Buddhist period in the Indonesian archipelago. However, they underwent a process of indigenization, characterised by the adaptation of these legal terms to align with local cultural idioms. The institutional classification of these endowments is substantiated by several epigraphical records, detailed as follows:

Table 2. The Classification of Pre-Islamic Endowment

No.	Type of Endowment	Inscription	Information
1.	*Pūrta* (*Pūrta-dharma*)	• Tugu • Talang Tuwo	• Development of the Chandrabhaga and Gomati rivers for flood prevention and the irrigation of residents' rice fields. • Construction of *Śrīkṣetra* Park as a green endowment for the well-being of all beings.
2.	*Dāna* (*Bhu- Dāna*)	• Yūpa Mulawarman.	• The granting of vast tracts of land and 20,000 head of cattle and *Bahuranyah* which is the donations of precious gold.
3.	*Devadāna*	• Canggal • Kalasan • Ligor A	• Installation of a Shiva Linga.

No.	Type of Endowment	Inscription	Information
			• Granting of a village to monks for the maintenance of an Arya Tara temple (*Caitya*). • Construction of a place of worship (*Caitya*).
4.	*Brahmadeya*	• Muñcaṅan	• The construction of a temple (*prāsāda kabhaktyan*) dedicated to *Siddhayoga*. • The maintenance of the temple was fully funded by agricultural proceeds.
5.	Sima	• Mentyasih B • Sukawana A1 • Turun Hyang A	• Designation of land in Mentyasih as *sīma* (tax-exempt land) to be held on a rotational basis by the *patih* (officials) of Mentyasih and their families. • Designation of land on Kintamani Hill, Bali, for the establishment of an ascetic complex (*kuṭi*) and a rest house (*satra*), accompanied by the endowment of rice fields and open areas, the yields of which were to fund religious and public activities. • Granting of a royal favor (*waranugraha*) to an agrarian village (*thāni*), with its agricultural produce allocated for the maintenance of a monastery established as *Śrīvijayāśrama*.

The above table represents structural institutionalization of pre-Islamic endowments in the Nusantara archipelago, as identified through epigraphic records, as here:

Pūrta (*Pūrta-dharma*)

The *Pūrta* (*Pūrta-dharma*) category of endowments conceptualised as the dedication of assets for public welfare and utility encompasses the endowment practices documented in the Tugu Inscription (mid-5th century CE) and the Talang Tuwo Inscription (606 Śaka/684 CE). The Tugu Inscription records the excavation of the Gomati and Chandrabhaga channels, a hydraulic engineering project executed to mitigate the recurring floods afflicting the Tarumanegara kingdom (Muljana, 1980). Conversely, the Talang Tuwo Inscription chronicles the establishment of a park designated as *Śrīksetra*, which functioned as a botanical sanctuary and an ecological ecosystem. This reserve was cultivated



with flora such as coconut, areca nut, sugar palm, and sago palm, alongside a diverse array of other trees and fauna including specific bamboo species such as *aur*, *buluh*, and *betung* complemented by dams and artificial ponds. The entirety of these public facilities was explicitly consecrated for the welfare of all sentient beings (Cœdès, 1918).

The Tugu Inscription records that the excavation of the Gomati and Chandrabhaga channels was initiated by King Purnawarman as the supreme ruler of Tarumanegara. This hydraulic project was completed within twenty-one days, spanning a length of 6,122 bows (*dhanus*), and intersected the residential domain of King Purnawarman's grandfather, who held the status of a *Rajarshi* (Sage-King) (Muljana, 1980, 2006). Conversely, the Talang Tuwo Inscription attributes the establishment of the Śrīksetra park to Śrī Jayanāśa who can be identified as the Dapunta Hyang mentioned in the Kedudukan Bukit Inscription (605 Śaka/683 CE). The utilization of this estate was dedicated to public exigencies, serving as a sanctuary for procuring sustenance and water during transit, a horticultural plantation, and a pastoral ground for livestock husbandry (Cœdès, 1918, 1975).

Beyond the excavation of the Gomati and Chandrabhaga channels, King Purnawarman also consecrated a propitiatory ritual performed by the *Brahmins*, offering a *dakṣiṇā* (sacrificial gift) of one thousand cows (Muljana, 2006). Conversely, Śrī Jayanāśa incorporated an expression of aspiration, spiritual commitment, and solemn vow (*praṇidhāna*) concerning the establishment of the park within the Talang Tuwo Inscription. A comparative analysis of the concluding sections (*escatocols*) of both epigraphic records reveals a distinct divergence that the final portion of the Tugu Inscription features an *Āśīrvāda* (benediction) in the form of a chronicle detailing the consecration ritual for the infrastructure project, whereas the Talang Tuwo Inscription articulates a *Praṇidhānanda* (vow of aspiration) dedicated to the welfare and spiritual benefit of all sentient beings (Cœdès, 1918; Muljana, 1980).

Dāna (Bhu- Dāna)

The concept of Dāna (*Bhū-dāna*) constitutes an endowment materialised in the form of land assets serving as a perpetual principal foundation (*Akṣayanīvī*), designed to be managed for religious and educational utilities. A manifest example of this *Dāna* (*Bhū-dāna*) practice is documented in the Yūpa Inscriptions promulgated by King Mūlavarman circa the fifth century CE.

These inscriptions elucidate that Mūlavarman performed the *vrātyastoma* ritual, wherein he offered twenty thousand cows to the Brahmins, alongside the *bahu-suvarṇaka* ritual, during which he donated a vast quantity of gold. It is this *bahu-suvarṇaka* ritual that is construed as a form of *Dāna* (*Bhū-dāna*), executed by dedicating or endowing (*yaṣṭvā*) these assets (Djoened & Poesponegoro, 2008). These Yūpa Inscriptions were erected by Mūlavarman as commemorative pillars to memorialise his acts of sacrifice upon a sacred ground designated as *Vaprakeśvara*, a rite officiated by *Brahmins* possessing mastery in the *vrātyastoma* and *bahu-suvarṇaka* liturgical traditions (Vogel, 1918). Albeit these rituals appear to have been initiated by Mūlavarman as an apparatus for securing theocratic political legitimacy, the sacrificial acts manifested through the donation of twenty thousand cows and immense treasures of gold undeniably demonstrate that these endowments were consecrated for religious requisites (Cœdès, 1975).

In the concluding sections (*escatocols*) of the Yūpa Inscriptions, it is explicitly stated that their erection was exclusively intended to commemorate the magnanimity of Mūlavarman, who graciously undertook the sacrificial rituals and offerings for the *Brahmins* (Vogel, 1918). This narrative pattern strongly indicates that the final portion of the inscriptions encapsulates an *Āśīrvāda* which is a benediction and ritual blessing bestowed by the *Brahmins* upon the completion of the rites, thereby consecrating and consolidating Mūlavarman's sovereign authority (Cœdès, 1975; Wirawan et al., 2025).

Devadāna

The concept of *Devadāna* conceptualised as an endowment comprising the grant of land or entire villages for the maintenance of temple complexes is evidenced in the Canggal Inscription (654 Śaka/732 CE), the Kalasan Inscription (700 Śaka/778 CE), and the Ligor A Inscription (697 Śaka/775 CE). The Canggal Inscription was promulgated to commemorate the consecration of a *Linga* upon a hill by King Sañjaya to secure the tranquillity of his populace. Acting in his capacity as a landed magnate (*rakryān*) within the Mataram Kingdom, King Sañjaya effectively dedicated his private estate to a temple consecrated to Śiva, accompanied by the erection of the *Lingga* (Boechari, 2012; Zakharov, 2012). The inscription indicates that the *Lingga* was installed within a pre-existing temple complex founded by a dynastic lineage originating from Kuñjarakuñja, which may refer to a region either in Southern India or within the Sunda Kingdom. The Canggal Inscription further elucidates



Sañjaya's lineage as the son of Sanna a monarch presumably from the Sunda-Galuh region through Sannāhā, the latter's sister. This suggests that Sañjaya in his capacity as a *rakryān* utilised the Canggal Inscription to reaffirm his institutional role as the primary custodian responsible for the preservation and maintenance of the Śiva temple (Cœdès, 1975).

The Kalasan Inscription was issued by Dyāh Pañcamapaṇa (Dyah Panangkaran), the successor of Sañjaya to memorialise the construction of a sacred monument (*caitya*) dedicated to the Bodhisattva Ārya Tārā executed under the royal decree (*ājñā*) of the Śailendra preceptors (Cœdès, 1975). Dyāh Panangkaran functioned in this context as the executor of the decree (*ājñāpti*) issued by the Śailendra gurus (R. Jordaan, 1999; R. E. Jordaan, 2007). Paralleling this development, the Ligor A Inscription was promulgated by a Śrīvijayan ruler known as *Çrīvijayendrarāja* and *Çrīvijayanṛpati* which assigned *Śrīvijayavarabhūpati* (*yuvarāja*) to commemorate the establishment of the *Trisamaya Caitya* by which was dedicated to Padmapāṇi, Śākyamuni, and Vajrapāṇī (Cœdès, 1918, 1975).

In its concluding section (*escatocol*), the Canggal Inscription incorporates a *praṇidhāna* manifested as a supplicatory formula for public welfare, security, and societal tranquility, ensuring that the populace remained shielded from civil unrest. An analogous pattern is observable in the Kalasan Inscription, wherein Panangkaran implores future monarchs to safeguard the structural preservation of the religious edifice. Conversely, the Ligor A Inscription encapsulates an *Āśīrvāda* pertaining to the consecration ritual of the triple stupas (*stūpatrayam*) in accordance with the sovereign mandate of the Śrīvijayan king

Brahmadeya

The concept of *Brahmadeya* conceptualised as a land endowment granted to the Brahmin class for the explicit purposes of religious and spiritual instruction is evidenced *inter alia*, in the *Muñcaṅan* Inscription (866 Śaka/944 CE). The *Muñcaṅan* Inscription records that Mpu Sindok commanded the *rakryān i halu Pu Sahasra* and the *rakai Kanuruhan Pu Da* to emancipate a parcel of land situated south of the marketplace in *Muñcaṅ*. This decree excised the territory from the administrative jurisdiction of the *hujung* region and transferred it to *Samgat Daṅ Ācāryya Hitam*. Under this arrangement, the estate was declared tax-exempt (*sīma*), under the strict legal proviso that a sacred sanctuary (*prāsāda kabhaktyan*) designated as *Siddhayoga* be erected upon it. The maintenance of this edifice was to be funded entirely by the land's agricultural

yields, serving as a consecrated space where the *paṇḍita(s)* could present ritual offerings to the deity (*bhaṭāra*) (Admin, 2015).

Sima

The concept of *Sīma* conceptualised as an endowment consisting of land granted by the sovereign and formally emancipated from royal ownership (*Drabya haji*) and fiscal extractions encompasses, *inter alia*, the Mentyasih B Inscription (829 Śaka/907 CE), the Sukawana A1 Inscription (804 Śaka/882 CE), and the Turun Hyaṅ A Inscription (958 Śaka/1036 CE). The Mentyasih Inscription was promulgated by *Mahārāja Rakai Watukura* to commemorate the emancipation of several parcels of land in Mentyasih as a *sīma*, designed to be utilised by the *patih* (ministers) of Mentyasih and their respective families on a triennial rotational basis (Wurjanto, 2018). Conversely, the Sukawana A1 Inscription encapsulates an official decree issued by an anonymous Balinese monarch on *Patih* Dadang Kumpi and the Śaiva-Buddha priests for mandating the construction of a monastic hermitage complex (*kuṭi*), equipped with a communal hospice or resthouse (*satra*) within the mountainous terrain of Kintamani. Furthermore, this charter records the endowment of wet-rice paddies (*sawah*) and open lands, the agricultural yields of which were earmarked to fund the operational expenditures of these religious and public utilities (Goris, 1954). Paralleling these charters, the Turun Hyaṅ A Inscription was issued by Prabhu Airlangga to memorialise the conferral of exclusive privileges in the form of a royal grace (*waranugraha*) upon the wet-rice paddies (*sawah*) and open lands, stipulating that the totality of its agricultural produce be allocated toward the development of a monastic sanctuary designated as *Śrīvijayāśrama* (Wurjanto, 2018).

Characteristically, the Mentyasih B Inscription lacks a formal concluding section (*escatocol*), aligning structurally with the pattern observed in the *Muñcaṅan* Inscription. Similarly, the Sukawana A1 and Turun Hyaṅ A Inscriptions do not incorporate any specialised closing formulas. The complete absence of an *escatocol* strongly suggests that these *sīma* charters functioned purely as instruments of administrative record-keeping, executed within a stable and established socio-political environment free from civil unrest or threats to security. The mapping of pre-Islamic endowment is presented within the table 2 as here:



Table 3. The Structure of Endowment

No.	Type of Endowment	The Structure of Endowment
1.	*Pūrta* (*Pūrta-dharma*)	**Endower:** • Purnawarman (Tugu). • Śrī Jayanāśa (Talang Tuwo). **Endowment Objects:** • The Chandrabhaga and Gomati rivers (Tugu). • A green park or *Śrīksetra* (Talang Tuwo). **Purpose of Endowment:** • Construction of river canal infrastructure for flood prevention and as a source of irrigation for rice fields (Tugu). • Preservation of a green environment for the benefit of all beings (Talang Tuwo). **Beneficiaries**: • *Āśīrvāda*: The public (Tugu). • *Praṇidhāna*: All beings (Talang Tuwo). **Endowment Administrators:** • Not mentioned • Not mentioned.
2.	*Dāna* (*Bhu- Dāna*) – Yupa Mulawarman	**Endower:** • Mūlavarman. **Endowment Objects:** • Gold (*bahu-suvarṇa*). • Ten thousand cows. **Purpose of Endowment:** • As a gift for the performance of the *vrātyastoma*. ritual. **Beneficiary:** • *Āśīrvāda*: Brahmins. **Endowment Administrator:** • Not mentioned.
3.	*Devadāna*	**Endower:** • Sanjaya (Canggal). • Praṇidhāna: Panangkaran (Kalasan). • Çrīvijayendrarāja and Çrīvijayanṛpati (Ligor A). **Endowment Object:** • Establishment of a Shiva temple and a Linga (Canggal). • A sacred structure (*caitya*) dedicated to the Bodhisattva Ārya Tārā (Kalasan). • A sacred structure (*Trisamaya Caitya*) for Padmapāṇi, Śākyamuni, and Vajrapāṇī (Ligor A).

No.	Type of Endowment	The Structure of Endowment
		Purpose of Endowment: • Not specified, but likely for the worship of Shiva (Canggal). • As an act of homage to the Sailendra teachers (*Śailendrarajaguru*) (Kalasan). • As an offering to the Jina or Buddha (Ligor A). **Beneficiary:** • Not specified (Canggal). • The Sailendra teachers (*Śailendrarajaguru*) (Kalasan). • Not specified (Ligor A). **Endowment Administrator:** • Not clearly specified, but likely the Galuh Dynasty (Canggal). • Not clearly specified, but likely the *Pangkur* and *Tirip* officials (Kalasan). • Çrivijayavarabhupati (*yuvarāja*) (Ligor A).
4.	*Brahmadeya - Muñcaṅan*	**Endower:** • Mpu Sindok **Endowment Object:** • The administrative territory of Hujung. **Purpose of the Endowment:** • Establishment of a sacred structure (*prāsāda kabhaktyan*) designed as a Siddhayoga. • Funding the operations of the sacred structure (*prāsāda kabhaktyan*) using proceeds from agricultural land. **Beneficiaries:** • The *Pandita* (priests/scholars). **Endowment Administrator:** • *Samgat Daṅ Ācāryya Hitam.*
5.	Sima	**Endower:** • Mahārāja Rakai Watukura (Mentyasih B) • Unidentified (Sukawana A1) • Airlangga (Turun Hyaṅ A) **Endowment Object:** • Land of Mentyasih (Mentyasih B) • Monastic hermitage complex (*kuṭi*), resthouse (*satra*), wet-rice paddies (*sawah*), and open lands (Sukawana A1) • Wet-rice paddies (*sawah*) and open lands (Turun Hyaṅ A) **Purpose of Endowment:** • Utilization by the *patih* (ministers) of Mentyasih and their respective families (Mentyasih B) • Provision of educational facilities and operational funding (Sukawana A1)



No.	Type of Endowment	The Structure of Endowment
		• Development of a monastic sanctuary (Turun Hyaṅ A) **Beneficiaries:** • The *patih* (ministers) of Mentyasih and their respective families (Mentyasih B) • Not clearly identified; possibly Brahmana(s) and their students (Sukawana A1) • Not clearly identified; possibly Brahmana(s) and their students **Endowment Administrator:** • Unidentified (Mentyasih B) • Dadang Kumpi, Śaiva-Buddhist priests (Sukawana A1) • Unidentified; possibly the Brahmana(s)

The aforementioned inscriptions demonstrate that the issuers of the endowments were Hindu-Buddhist monarchs who exercised absolute control over royal assets, particularly agrarian land and spatial domains (Hall, 2010; Wolters, 2018). In the context of ancient Mataram kings, such as Sanjaya and Panangkaran, it is evident that they functioned as landlords (*rakriyan*) presiding over defined agrarian territories (*watak*). Although this political structure is not explicitly delineated for other monarchs, it can be posited that they fundamentally operated as patrimonial rulers possessing proprietary rights over agrarian and spatial assets (Boechari, 2012; Hall, 2010). Local rulers in Sriwijaya, for instance, were designated as *datu*, signifying traditional aristocratic legitimacy over a specific tribe or clan and its corresponding agrarian assets, while remaining obligated to submit and pay tribute (*upêti*) to the sovereign of the Sriwijaya Kingdom (Muljana, 2006; Wolters, 1962).

Driven by socio-political imperatives, these rulers exercised the right of land distribution (*Hausgewalt*) to both religious authorities (*pinandiṭā*) and customary authorities (*ramā*) to safeguard their legitimacy and maintain the *status quo* (Colless, 2009; Poerbatjaraka, 1958; van Leur, 1967). In endowing royal agrarian assets, the rulers entirely relinquished royal proprietary and usufructuary rights to the beneficiaries, further exempting the assets from tribute (*upêti*) and other state obligations. Within this framework, the endowment constitutes not merely the granting of public usufructuary rights, but a definitive divestment of royal ownership over agrarian and spatial assets. In the specific case of the Mulawarman Yupa inscriptions, the sacrificial offering of numerous cattle and gold served not merely as a political instrument, but was intrinsically linked to the *vrātyastoma* ritual, which aimed to elevate

the status of a local Austronesia ruler to attain a rank equivalent to that of a Hindu-Buddhist monarch (Vogel, 1918; Wirawan et al., 2025).

The objects of endowment documented in the aforementioned inscriptions generally comprise agrarian and spatial assets, public infrastructure, or alms in the form of livestock and gold bullion. The predominance of agrarian and spatial endowments in inscriptions such as, Muñcaṅan, Mentyasih B, Sukawana A1, and Turun Hyaṅ A underscores the nature of an agrarian kingdom, whose political, religious, and economic structures were fundamentally contingent upon the agrarian sector (Boechari, 2012; van Leur, 1967). Sacred worship structures (*caitya*) such as Canggal, Kalasan, Ligor A, etc. Control over agrarian and spatial assets formed the bedrock of political and social legitimacy, serving as an instrument for power bargaining by local rulers to secure religious and customary sanction.

This contrasts with public infrastructure endowments, such as the river canal construction in the Tugu Inscription, which was primarily initiated for functional reasons to resolve technical flooding issues arising from Tarumanegara's lowland topography and to provide agricultural irrigation (Cœdès, 1975; Muljana, 1980). Similarly, the construction of the public park designated as *Śrīksetra* in the Talang Tuwo Inscription was underpinned by spiritual motivations within Buddhist teachings specifically the *Sarvāstivāda* school aimed at disseminating happiness to all sentient beings. Furthermore, the Sukawana A1 Inscription records the establishment of a hermitage complex (*kuṭi*) and a hospice (*satra*) (Cœdès, 1918, 1975). Conversely, others, such as the Mulawarman Yupa inscriptions, manifest the practice of financial asset endowments or *dāna* (*bhūmidāna*), as demonstrated by Mulawarman through the offering of abundant gold (*bahu-suvarṇaka*) and twenty thousand cattle. This practice of *dāna* performed by Mulawarman represents a specific case dictated by the necessity for spiritual and political legitimacy of local power (Djoened & Poesponegoro, 2008; Minattur, 1964).

The objectives of these endowments encompass the establishment of sacred structures (*caitya*) and the funding of their operations, the development of public infrastructure, the performance of religious legitimacy rituals, and the remuneration of local authorities. The vast majority of the epigraphic record including the Canggal, Kalasan, and Ligor A inscriptions explicitly dictates the founding of sacred worship structures (*caitya*). This was presumably driven by the ritualistic necessity to venerate an *iṣṭadevatā* or *yidam* serving as a patron



deity for both religious rites and the political consolidation of power (Cœdès, 1918; Colless, 2009; Zakharov, 2012). A subset of these records, such as the Sukawana A1, Muñcaṅan and Turun Hyaṅ A inscriptions, further includes endowments specifically allocated to finance the operational maintenance of these religious edifices.

Conversely, the Tugu and Talang Tuwo inscriptions, which detail the development of public infrastructure, demonstrate that the primary objective was the provision of social and collective benefits, functioning both pragmatically and altruistically (Muljana, 1980, 2006). In contrast, the Mulawarman Yupa inscriptions explicitly indicate that the primary objective was to secure political and spiritual legitimacy from the Brahmanical order (Cœdès, 1975; Vogel, 1918). Meanwhile, the Mentyasih B inscription implies that the objective of the endowment was to provide remuneration and official perquisites for administrative offices (Wurjanto, 2018).

Based on the epigraphic evidence detailed above, the beneficiaries of these endowments comprise religious authorities such as Brahmins and monks (*wiku*), the general public, and local administrative officials (Boechari, 2012; Cœdès, 1975; Zakharov, 2012). In the Mulawarman Yupa, Kalasan, and Muñcaṅan and Turun Hyaṅ A inscriptions, the beneficiaries are specifically the Brahmanical and monastic orders, tasked with executing religious rituals and conducting education. Conversely, records such as the Tugu and Talang Tuwo inscriptions demonstrate the development of public infrastructure intended for the general public and all sentient beings dependent on the surrounding ecosystem (Muljana, 1980; Wolters, 2018).

Meanwhile, the Mentyasih B inscription represents endowments directed toward local administrative officials at the bureaucratic level of *patih*. Other inscriptions do not explicitly specify the beneficiaries; however, the context of establishing sacred structures (*caitya*) as seen in the Kalasan, Ligor A, and Sukawana A1 inscriptions implicitly indicates that the beneficiaries belonged to the Brahmin and *wiku* communities, utilizing the endowments for devotional rituals as well as monastic educational institutions.

In the majority of the epigraphic record, the administrators of the endowments are not explicitly named, with notable exceptions found in the Kalasan, Ligor A, Muñcaṅan, and Sukawana A1, and inscriptions, which mention officials such as the *Pangkur* and *Tirip* (Kalasan), *Śrīvijayavarabhūpati* (Ligor A), *Samgat Daṅ Ācāryya Hitam* (Muñcaṅan), *Patih* Dadang Kumpi (Sukawana

A1), and the Śaiva-Buddhist priests (Turun Hyaṅ A) (Cœdès, 1975; de Casparis, 1975; Wurjanto, 2018). Conversely, other inscriptions omit any clear indication of the authorities designated to manage these endowments. This omission may stem from the primary urgency of these edicts, which were issued to consolidate the hegemony and moral-political legitimacy of the ruler as exemplified by the Mulawarman Yupa, Tugu, and Talang Tuwo inscriptions (van Leur, 1967; Vogel, 1918). In contrast, records such as Kalasan, Ligor A, Muñcaṅan, and Sukawana A1 were primarily promulgated as administrative inventories to document royal endowment policies.

The Reception of Pre-Islamic Endowment in Waqf's Institution

The Codification of Traditional Islamic Waqf's: *Safīnat al-Hukkām* & *Salokantara*

The assimilation of pre-Islamic endowment ordinances derived from the *Dharmaśāstra* and practiced by Hindu-Buddhist monarchs into the codification of Islamic waqf law occurred through a mechanism of recognition toward established customary practices (‘*urf*) and common usage (*ta'āmmul*) within the Islamised society (Adha, 2018; Hoadley, 2025). A significant portion of these societal traditions including traditional pre-Islamic endowment practices originated from ordinances promulgated by Hindu-Buddhist rulers, which the populace continued to preserve and maintain as traditional endowment assets. The acceptance of tradition (‘*urf*) and public common pratice (*ta'ammul*) aimed to institutionalise existing pre-Islamic endowment frameworks, both in the form of tangible assets and structural institutions, into the asset management systems of the Islamic sultanates (Chambert-Loir, 2017; Hassan, 2014).

The text of *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām*, authored by Al-Faqīh Jalāl ad-Dīn at-Turāsānī, was compiled as a compendium of Islamic law to guide the governance and judiciary of the Islamic Sultanate of Aceh. This text recognizes the existence of prevailing customary practices (*'urf*) within post-Islamised Acehnese society (Azzuhri, 2026; Hasjmy, 1990). A number of these customs and traditions were previously integrated through royal decrees (*adat*), state legislation (*qanūn*), or local traditions (*reusam*). However, Islamic law (*syarī'at*) initially stood apart as an independent ordinance disconnected from the existing customary fabric of the Acehnese populace. This separation occurred because the codification of *syarī'at* was deemed the exclusive domain of clerical authority and the absolute

competence of the *faqīh* (jurists), strictly insulated from the interference of customary and court (*keraton*) authorities (Azzuhri, 2026; Hadi, 1999). In practice, this rigid positioning caused Islamic law to encounter resistance from the local population.

Jalāl ad-Dīn at-Turāsānī subsequently initiated the compilation of the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* to formalise prevailing societal customs (*'urf*) as recognised components of Islamic law (*syarī'at*). This recognition functionary served as an epistemological-political strategy toward local customs by legislating them as Islamic law, the state brought them under the direct oversight of religious and political authorities (Azzuhri, 2026). Consequently, this assimilation implied that all customary norms and values were validated by clerical authority as Islamic law, meaning that the moving social structures and mechanisms of these customs had to integrate themselves into the bureaucratic, administrative, and judicial systems of the Islamic Sultanate of Aceh (Azzuhri, 2026; Hassan, 2014).

One of the critical implications of recognizing custom as an integral component of Islamic law pertains to the pre-Islamic endowment institutions managed by the community. The customary community, designated as *gampong* in the Acehnese context, had functioned as the owners and administrators of pre-Islamic endowment assets since the era of their ancestors (*indatu*) (Dewi, 2008; Hurgronje, 1893). These pre-Islamic endowment assets had been utilised for various purposes: sacred sites such as the former temple (*candi*) monument in Indrapuri which was subsequently converted by Sultan Iskandar Muda into the Indrapuri Masjid the settlement of Tanôh Abée, and the Indrapatra Fortress represent pre-Islamic endowment assets established since the period of the Triloka-Indrapurā confederation (comprising Indrapuri, Indrapatra, and Indrapurwa) (Hasjmy, 1990; Ibrahim, 2016). These pre-Islamic endowment assets could only be transformed into *waqf* assets and subjected to Islamic legal frameworks if the underlying customs governing their administration could be formally legislated as an active Islamic legal praxis implemented by the populace.

The text *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* explicitly recognizes customary authority (*adat*) as being anchored to the prerogative of the monarchs on the grounds of public interest (*maṣlaḥah*), extending this even to instances where the monarch or ruler perceives a lack of utility within specific customary realms (Azzuhri, 2026; Chambert-Loir, 2017). This constitutes an explicit affirmation of the ruler's

authority within Islamic political theory (*siyāsah ash-sharʿiyyah*) to engage in statutory codification (*taqnīn*) based on *maṣlaḥah*, without being rigidly constrained by definitive textual precedents (*shahādat aṣl al-muʿayyan*). To facilitate the consideration and recognition of prevailing societal customs, any legal school whether Shafi'ite or Hanafi that offers supportive evidence may be adopted (Azzuhri, 2026). This perspective demonstrates that the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* upholds the principle of the supremacy of custom as an integral component of Sharia law. Jalāl ad-Dīn at-Turāsānī states:

> *...bermula adat apabila berlaku ia dalam satu pahak negeri. Adakah didirikan akan dia pada tempat syarat atau tiada, maka dalamnya beberapa shurah. Dan murad daripada ―berlaku itu yaitu tsabitlah hukum dengan sebab diperoleh illat dalamnya. Dan aksnya, ketiadaan tsabit hukum karena ketiadaan diperoleh illat dalamnya* (At-Turāsānī, 2012).
>
> Translation:
> "...as for custom (*adat*), when it prevails within a region of the state, whether it is established in place of a legal condition (*syarat*) or not, there are several perspectives regarding it. The meaning of 'prevails' is that a legal ruling (*hukum*) is substantiated due to the presence of its underlying legal cause (*ʿillat*) within it. Conversely, the absence of a substantiated legal ruling is due to the absence of its underlying legal cause within it."

Within the context of *waqf* law, although the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* does not explicitly delineate the modalities of accepting pre-Islamic endowment practices, this acceptance is implicitly demonstrated through the following dimensions:

> *...bersalahan segala syarat wakaf dan segala rukunnya dan segala perintahnya, maka tiada masuk sekalian itu kepada asal wakaf dan tiada ia mengikat baginya melainkan jikalau ada yang naik saksi sertanya maka yaitu didengarkan karena hasilnya itu kembali kepada menyatakan sifat wakaf dan segala kelakuannya jua* (At-Turāsānī, 2012).
>
> Translation:
> "...regarding discrepancies in the conditions (*syarat*), pillars (*rukun*), or operational decrees of a *waqf* (endowment), such elements do not infringe upon the foundational essence (*aṣl*) of the *waqf*, nor are they binding upon it, unless there is a witness who testifies alongside it; such



> testimony shall be heard, as its ultimate utility serves merely to clarify the intrinsic nature (*ṣifat*) and the operational modalities of the *waqf*."

The aforementioned description in the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* implicitly demonstrates that verbal testimony constitutes the primary evidentiary basis for recognizing the existence of an endowment object, its inherent socio-economic attributes (*ṣifah*) tied to the designated object (*mawṣūf*), and its subsequent modalities of utilization (*taṣarruf*) (Azzuhri, 2026; Hassan, 2014; Jamhuri, 2012). This formulation, however, does not encompass the operational validity of traditional endowments portions of which originated from the pre-Islamic period nor those practiced during the era of the Islamic Sultanate of Aceh. This omission indicates that the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* acknowledged pre-Islamic endowments in Aceh, alongside their attendant socio-economic norms and consequences, as integral assets under the purview of customary authority (Azzuhri, 2026; Hadi, 1999; Hassan, 2014). The recognition of these pre-Islamic endowment assets, institutionalised through customary domains, represents a form of functional-formalist reception and recognition. It ensured that the Sultanate, as the dominant political authority, secured its political legitimacy and access to these pre-Islamic assets without engendering societal resistance.

A parallel perspective is manifest in the *Salokantara* manuscript, an Islamic legal text from the era of the Demak Sultanate, which is putatively attributed to the compilation efforts of Sultan Trenggana or Senopati Jinbun (Pigeaud, 1967). This manuscript delineates the structural transition from the late Majapahit epoch characterised by its *Śaiva-Buddhist* fabric into the framework of the Islamic Sultanate of Demak (Hoadley, 2025). The compilation of this text underscores the deliberate endeavors of the *Wali Songo* (the nine saints) to formulate a novel socio-legal order for the Demak Sultanate distinctly demarcated from the Majapahit precedent. The compendium comprises 1,044 legal jurisprudences systematically organised based on the adjudications of the *Wali Songo* Judicial Council to reflect the shifting socio-cultural landscape of Javanese society (Adha, 2021; Pigeaud, 1976). Despite functioning as a statutory instrument of a new political order, the *Salokantara* demonstrates a profound dialectical relationship, operating through dialogue and structural recognition between the legal norms and values inherited from the Hindu-Buddhist tradition and those introduced by Islam (Adha, 2018; Hoadley, 2025).



Although the *Salokantara* manuscript can no longer be found in its entirety today, the foundational legal statutes underlying its jurisprudence were drawn from the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* which is estimated to have been composed during the era of Adipati Jinbun (Pigeaud, 1967). Within this framework, jurisprudential inquiries into civil matters within the *Salokantara* were evaluated from a customary perspective and subsequently legitimised by the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* from the standpoint of Islamic Sharia (Riyadi & Umami, 2021). |legal text foundation that validated the *Salokantara* in preserving customary traditions and pre-Islamic institutional norms (Hoadley, 2025; Riyadi & Umami, 2021).

The *Serat Angger Suryangalam* text explicitly cites its authoritative references as the *Adilullah* or *Kukumullah* (referencing the Qur'an and Sunnah), the *Kutara Māṇawa Dharmaśāstra* (alternatively referred to by some sources as the *Jugul Muda*), and the *Kitab Tanzil* which putatively refers to *Anwār at-Tanzīl wa Asrār at-Ta'wīl* (Hoadley, 2025; Riyadi & Umami, 2021). Furthermore, Chapter XXXIX of the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* elucidates the structural position of these texts within legal formulation as follows:

> "*Kelawan malihipun yen ngukumi kuno den elih ora kukuh ing syara', dadi mincar-mincar. Yen kaweruhan kang sujana angulati ing ngilmu kang kaot kadim lumuh gelem kasoran* (Riyadi & Umami, 2021)"
>
> Translation:
> "...likewise, if a legal judgment is rendered solely through ancient [pre-Islamic] statutes, it fails to uphold the ordinances of Sharia (*syara'*), thereby engendering societal fragmentation. Conversely, if learned scholars scrutinise it and adjudicate the matter through the lens of primordial knowledge (*'ilm al-qadīm*, referencing Islamic jurisprudence), they shall undoubtedly remain unassailable."

The aforementioned statement demonstrates that *ngukumi kuno* (ancient adjudication), which references pre-Islamic norms including the *Kutaramanawa Dharmasastra*, remained operational within societal praxis (Hoadley, 2025). However, its enforcement within the theocratic domain of the Demak Sultanate necessitated the concurrent application of *ngilmu kang kaot kadim* (transcendent Islamic knowledge) to ensure harmony with the Sultanate's Islamic order (Hoadley, 2025; Riyadi & Umami, 2021). The application of Islamic law to fortify the institutional frameworks of pre-Islamic



legal norms from the Hindu-Buddhist era represents a synthesis of values designed to maintain continuity within the prevailing customary legal landscape while reinforcing it through Sharia ordinances.

One of the critical matters addressed within the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* pertains to the legality of land ownership and its utilization. This text explicitly delineates the legal foundations that were subsequently referenced in the *Salokantara* as jurisprudence for adjudicating agrarian disputes (Hoadley, 2025). The authoritative institution tasked with resolving these agrarian conflicts was the *Balemangu* (the judicial pavilion of the Grand Vizierate), as articulated in the clause, *"yen si bumi maksih dadi celathu kang pepatih podo sinapih"* (if a dispute arises regarding land matters, it shall be arbitrated and settled by the *Patih*) (Hoadley, 2025; Riyadi & Umami, 2021). Furthermore, Chapter IX of the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* outlines a specific category of agrarian disputes as follows:

> *"Punika bebenerane wong rebut saba wates kang pada tumuwuh arebut saba (pereslisihan) lan kipande Kaki lan ki banyurata. Arebut saba lan ki Silem, ki Tarewel arebut saba lan ki Adri, ki Pramana* (Riyadi & Umami, 2021)*."*
>
> Translation:
> "This constitutes the tribunal for individuals disputing land boundaries. The parties precipitating the conflict comprise: Ki Pandhé-kaki versus Ki Banyurata, Ki Silêm versus Ki Taréwél, and Ki Adri versus Ki Pramana."

Although it does not explicitly formulate statutory provisions regarding waqf lands, the *Serat Anger Suryangalam* clearly articulates the recognition and protection of agrarian lands held by the populace. This framework encompasses not only private assets but also communal endowment assets inherited from the Hindu-Buddhist epoch, as elucidated below:

> *"Karang Kirna pager bata lelurung tinangguh jaga kramannya, yen ana wong angrusak tanem tuwuh ing wang kang ana bumi prawala kang sampun kaprentahan dating sang apatih kadendoa sekawan leksa* (Riyadi & Umami, 2021)*".*
>
> Translation:
> "...regarding the surrounding perimeter and brick walls erected to safeguard security, if any individual destroys vegetation belonging to another within the public lands under the administrative jurisdiction of

> the *Patih*, they shall be penalised with a fine of forty thousand (40,000)."

The recognition of pre-Islamic endowment assets within both the *Salokantara* and the *Serat Angger Suryangalam* notably extends to *sīma* (tax-exempt charters) granted by Majapahit sovereigns to facilitate the expansion of Islam. King Wikramawardhana (r. 1389–1429), for instance, granted the Gapura territory in Gresik to Maulana Malik Ibrahim to serve as a propagation center and a commercial port administered by the Muslim community (Azra, 1992). Similarly, the *Hikayat Banjar* explicitly records that Dipasti Angrok bestowed the Ampel Denta region in Surabaya upon Raden Rakhmat later venerated as Sunan Ampel to establish a center for Islamic education and instruction, which became the site of the oldest *pesantren* (Islamic boarding school) on the island of Java (Ras, 1990). Furthermore, King Brawijaya is documented to have granted the Gunung Gajah region to Sunan Giri (Raden 'Ainul Yaqin) titled Prabu *Satmata* a territory that subsequently developed into a prominent spiritual nucleus and an Islamic theocratic principality in Java known as Giri Kedaton (Adha, 2021).

The centers of education and Islamic propagation constructed upon the royal land grants of the Majapahit Kingdom preserved both their institutional existence and structural roles, they functioned not only as *pesantren* (monastic Islamic academies) but also as autonomous Islamic political and administrative entities, a status maintained since the late Majapahit era through the Demak Sultanate (Burhanudin, 2012). The recognition of exclusive administrative rights over these pre-Islamic endowment lands by successive Islamic sultanates positioned these educational hubs most notably Giri Kedaton during the reign of Sunan Giri III Sunan Prapen (r. 1548–1605) as geopolitical and religious epicenters capable of extending propagation networks across Bali, Eastern Indonesia, Sulawesi, and as far as the Raja Ampat archipelago (Azra, 1992; Pigeaud, 1976).

The Reception of Pre-Islamic Endowment in Post-Islamised Waqf

The practice of pre-Islamic endowments during the Hindu-Buddhist era did not merely undergo a process of reception (*receptio contraria*) through quasi-customary texts that functioned to bridge Islamic law and societal traditions (*ʿurf*), such as the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* and *Salokantara* (Azzuhri, 2026; Burhanudin, 2012; Hasjmy, 1990). Practical reception was further



demonstrated by Muslim sultans and rulers who relinquished ownership of royal assets, dedicating them as *waqf* for the benefit of places of worship, proselytization, and Islamic instruction administered by the *ʿulamāʾ* and emissaries (Syarifuddin & Sakti, 2021). These Muslim sultans and monarchs, operating as patrimonial rulers akin to the *datu*, possessed autonomous royal land assets, a prerogative shared by other aristocrats and subordinate rulers (Hoadley, 2025; van Leur, 1967). Guided by political, social, and religious imperatives, these rulers allocated portions of the kingdom's agrarian and spatial assets to advance the propagation of Islam. Thereby consolidating the legitimacy of their political authority through the lens of Persian statecraft ethics (Al-Ghazālī, 1964; Peacock & Tor, 2017; Siddiqui, 2019).

One notable manifestation of such *waqf* practices is the endowment of the *Blang Padang* land instituted by Sultan Iskandar Muda (r. 1607–1636). The *Blang Padang* tract comprised real property acquired through personal purchase by Sultan Iskandar Muda, subsequently designated as *Oemong Sara* (*umeung syara'*) to financially sustain the livelihoods of the imams (*imeum*) and to ensure the operational prosperity of the Baiturrahman Grand Masjid. The descriptive stipulations governing the *Blang Padang waqf* were documented by Van Langen (1888) as follows:

> *Dese rijstvelden bij de Atjehers bekend onder den naam van oemong sara waren te Blang Poengai en Blang Padang gelegen. Zij mochten niet verkocht worden of als erfgoed overgaan, doch waren speciaal bestemd tot levensonderhoud van den Imâm, die er de schatting van kon trekken, of se zelve bebouwen.*
>
> Translation:
> These rice fields, designated among the Acehnese under the nomenclature *oemong sara*, were situated in *Blang Poengai* and *Blang Padang*. They were structurally immune to alienation through sale or devolution as hereditary estate; rather, they were exclusively earmarked for the sustenance of the Imam, who was empowered either to extract the revenues derived therefrom or to engage personally in their cultivation.

The term *oemong sara*, a historical transcription of the phrase *umeung syara'*, is consistently defined as endowed land or paddy fields whose yields are dedicated to religious imperatives and public utilities. Hurgronje and Badru'd-din (1889) elucidate that *oemong sara* (*umeung syara'*) represents a customary law (*adat*) terminology variant designating communally or religiously held

paddy tracts that closely mirror the concept of *waqf*, wherein ownership is strictly inalienable due to its permanent dedication to masjid operations and religious welfare. Furthermore, Abu Bakar et al. (1981) interpret *umeung syara'* literalistically to signify paddy fields belonging to the *sharaʿ* (religious law). Furthermore, Syah (1974) explains that *umeung syara'* constitutes an institutionalization of both *Waqf Ahlī* (family endowment) and *Waqf Khayrī* (charitable endowment) substantiated by royal charters or oral traditions persisting since the era of the Acehnese Sultanate. These collective testimonies legally substantiate that the *Blang Padang* tract, designated as *oemong sara* (*umeung syara'*), possessed the definitive status of an endowed agrarian estate (*waqf* land) earmarked for the daily sustenance of the imam, operationalised either through revenue collection or direct agricultural management.

Another manifestation of *waqf* practices within Islamic polities is exemplified by the endowments of the Cirebon Sultanate, specifically concerning the development of the *Astana Gede* Cirebon complex and the Great Masjid of *Sang Cipta Rasa*. In its primordial phase, Caruban Nagari constituted an autonomous territory along the northern coast of Java, bound within the *maṇḍala* geopolitical framework of a *Cakravartin* centering on Pakuan-Pajajaran. Caruban Nagari was initially under the administrative authority of Ki Gede Alang-Alang the younger brother of Ki Danuarsih who functioned as the territorial chieftain (*kuwu*). He was subsequently succeeded by Walangsungsang, also known as Prince Cakrabhuana, the offspring of Prabu Siliwangi, who assumed office as the second *kuwu* (Sunyoto, 2016). Syarif Hidayatullah, widely revered as Sunan Gunung Jati and the son of Walangsungsang's sister Rara Santang, later succeeded his maternal uncle as the sovereign of Caruban Nagari. In 1482 CE, he severed tributary ties and declared independence from Pakuan-Pajajaran (Sunyoto, 2016; Zaedin & Sutarahardja, 2018). This declaration of sovereignty marked the acquisition of absolute territorial rights by the Cirebon Sultanate over the agrarian and spatial assets of Caruban Nagari.

The *Babad Cĕrbon* edited by Brandes (1911) subsequently elucidates the existence of the *Sang Ciptarasa* Masjid through the following poetic chronicle:

> *namaning koeta Tjerebon nenggi(h) winarna*
> *sang Esoe nama djati*
> *doepi ingkang nama*
> *dalem agoeng winarna*



ikoe sang Sirroe'llah ngarsi
mangka nama
masdjid agoeng winarni
sang Tjiptarasa nama masdjid ika
kang anèng Pakoengwati
djihat qiblatira
pon kadi masdjid Demak
jasaning kang para wali

Translation:
The naming of the city of Cirebon is thus described,
Sang *Ismu* is its true essence,
As for that which is designated
As the great palace (*Dalem Agung*),
It stands before the presence of *Sang Sirrullah*
Furthermore, the name of the grand masjid is thus related,
Sang Ciptarasa is the name of the said masjid,
Situated within the precinct of Pakungwati
The orientation of its *qibla* is virtually identical to the Masjid of Demak
Constructed by the saints.

The *Babad Cĕrbon* manuscript cataloged under inventory code 017/SAJA/TS/BC provides a more granular narrative, elucidating that during the primordial phase, the palatial complex constructed in the *Kawedrahan* (Kasepuhan) precinct functioned merely as a *puri* (sanctuary), and the Grand Masjid had yet to be erected. The architectural development of the *Kawedrahan* precinct spanned a triennial duration, initially accompanied by the construction of the Jalagrahan *langgar* (prayer hall) to serve as a designated locus for communal prayers (Zaedin & Sutarahardja, 2018). The *Wali Songo* (the Nine Saints) are explicitly recorded as having participated in the structural execution of the *Padelaman Agung* (Grand Palace) and the subsequent masjid (Brandes, 1911). A collective endowment was materialised as the saints and the surrounding populace consecrated raw materials and structural components such as bricks and timber which accumulated in monumental proportions. During this epoch, the Grand Masjid functioned as the primary assembly locus for the saints serving as a deliberative forum for theological discourse and the strategic delegation of duties regarding the dissemination of Islam across the Javanese landscape (Zaedin & Sutarahardja, 2018).

The aforementioned exposition demonstrates that the *Padelaman Agung*, serving as the administrative nexus of the Cirebon Sultanate, and the Grand

Masjid, functioning as the epicenter of religious activity, were constructed upon the *Kawedrahan* territory, which initially constituted the seat of governance for Prince Cakrabhuana as a subordinate realm of Pakuan-Pajajaran. In its primordial state, the *Kawedrahan* precinct originated from the settlements of Dukuh Pasembangan and Lemahwungkuk, cleared and established within a coastal forest zone. It was within this specific locus that the *Dalem Agung Pakungwati* which subsequently evolved into the Keraton Kasepuhan palatial complex and the Jalagrahan *langgar* were erected (Zaedin & Sutarahardja, 2018). The proprietary rights over the land and structures within the *Kawedrahan* precinct were systematically relinquished by the royal court to be dedicated for the Grand Masjid, materialised through the collective endeavor of the saints (*jasaning kang para Wali*), which serves as a potent indicator of *de facto* communal land tenure. Beyond the confines of the Astana Agung and the *Sang Ciptarasa* Masjid, this spatial layout also encompassed the pristine Pakungwati garden, constructed as a highly aestheticised botanical and biotic preserve enveloping the *Kawedrahan* precinct.

The fundamental divergence between the pre-Islamic endowment practices instituted by Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms and the *waqf* policies promulgated by the Islamic sultanates of Aceh and Cirebon resides primarily in the nature of endowment documentation (Ibrahim, 2016; van Leur, 1967). Pre-Islamic epigraphic inscriptions documenting land grants functioned both politically and spiritually to provide Tantric-cosmic and customary (*adat*) legitimacy to royal sovereignty (Kulke, 1991). Conversely, within the Islamic sultanates, there is a total absence of contemporary physical documentation regarding the *waqf* practices instituted by the courts of Aceh and Cirebon. Instead, oral tradition and the institutional presence of *nāẓirs* (endowment trustees) managing the properties constituted the authentic evidence in the form of judicially and socially accepted testimony. Despite the lack of physical codification, the practice of *waqf* for the construction and capitalization of masjids (*langgar*) or Islamic boarding schools (*pesantren*) carried profound implications for the spiritual, moral, and customary legitimacy of the sultans, who were consequently revered as the ultimate protectors and patrons of both religion and tradition.

Further indications demonstrate that pre-Islamic endowment practices exhibited a significantly higher degree of diversification compared to those of the post-Islamisation era. The Tugu and Talang Tuwo inscriptions, for instance, exemplify endowment practices centered on the development of public



infrastructure driven by functional or altruistic imperatives for communal utility. Conversely, the Mūlavarman Yūpa inscriptions document endowments consisting of substantial quantities of gold and ten thousand head of cattle dedicated strictly for religious ritualistic purposes. Although the analytical scope of this study specifically highlights the *waqf* policies of *Blang Padang* and *Kawedrahan*, there is a discernible trajectory wherein the *waqf* practices operationalised by the Islamic sultanates were strictly confined to agrarian and spatial assets for religious objectives (van Langen, 1888; Zaedin & Sutarahardja, 2018). This trend is highly correlated with the reality that the *waqf* practices of these Islamic sultanates were rigorously regulated by the Shāfiʿī school of jurisprudence, which restricted the subject matter of endowments to immovable property (*muʿāqar*) rather than movable assets (*manqūl*), thereby implying that only agrarian land and spatial assets could be legitimately dedicated as *waqf* (Al-Ḥanafī, 2019; Syarifuddin & Sakti, 2021).

From an institutional perspective, the *Blang Padang waqf* practice instituted by Sultan Iskandar Muda exhibits a precise structural analogy with pre-Islamic endowments documented in the Muñcaṅan, Sukawana A1, and Turun Hyaṅ A inscriptions. Legally, the charter of the *Blang Padang waqf* entails the alienation of proprietary and usufructuary rights over the *oemong sara* (*umeung syara'*) specifically agrarian paddy tracts to the imams of the Baiturrahman Grand Masjid as a sustainable source of daily capitalization. This objective directly mirrors the pre-Islamic endowment policies recorded in the aforementioned inscriptions, which dictate the transfer of agricultural lands, such as paddy fields, to finance religious sanctuaries (*prāsāda kabhaktyan*) and to subsidise their management by designated ecclesiastical authorities.

The *waqf* policy implemented by Syarif Hidayatullah concerning the *Kawedrahan* precinct for the construction of the administrative seat and the Great Masjid of *Sang Ciptarasa* demonstrates a precise structural analogy with pre-Islamic endowment practices, as documented in the Caṅgal, Kalasan, and Ligor A inscriptions. These epigraphic records demonstrate that lands held as proprietary estates by patrimonial rulers, both in Mataram and Ligor, were systematically alienated for the erection of sacred monuments (*caitya*). Within this framework, the construction of the Pakungwati Palace and the *Sang Ciptarasa* Masjid was executed upon the *Kawedrahan* (*Kasepuhan*) territory, which was originally under the administrative control of Cakrabhuana, or Walangsungsang, during his tenure as a subordinate ruler to Pakuan-Pajajaran.

Consequently, the tenure and institutional management of this land functioned to preserve the underlying structural mechanics of pre-Islamic endowments.

CONCLUSION

The endowment practices (*waqf*) within the Indonesian archipelago did not emerge *ex nihilo*, rather they drew substantively from the precedents established by pre-Islamic endowment mechanisms. This continuity is attributable to the fact that the underlying patrimonial political architecture predicated upon the sovereign ownership and redistribution of landed estates underwent no structural transformation. Pre-Islamic endowment practices were not exclusively circumscribed by agrarian land assets, but expanded to encompass public infrastructure and movable assets of high intrinsic value. Furthermore, the pre-Islamic institutional framework had already conceptualised the alienation of crown lands, systematically relinquishing royal domain to vest absolute proprietary and managerial rights in ecclesiastical or customary (*adat*) authorities, thereby facilitating both the erection and the long-term capitalization of religious sanctuaries.

These pre-Islamic practices achieved institutional reception as customary law (*ʿurf*), mediated through legal digests such as the *Safīnat al-Ḥukkām* and *Salokantara*, which exhibited greater plasticity toward royal ordinances and the generalised conventions (*taʿammul*) embedded within the socio-cultural fabric. This reception of tradition operated not merely as an exercise in normative validation, but functioned strategically within a political-economic matrix to ensure that the preservation and administration of pre-Islamic endowment assets could be continuously sustained by the populace, thereby securing the requisite legal guarantees for their institutional legitimacy.

Conversely, post-Islamised *waqf* practices manifested a distinct trajectory of divergence, wherein contemporary endowments became strictly confined to agrarian and spatial assets categorised as immovable property (*muʿāqar*). This structural contraction was heavily influenced by the orthodoxy of the Shāfiʿī school of jurisprudence, which restricted the subject matter of *waqf* exclusively to fixed assets capable of enduring in perpetuity. Nonetheless, these localised *waqf* practices remained fundamentally oriented toward fulfilling the socio-economic exigencies and structural maintenance of religious operations.



The findings of this inquiry carry profound implications for contemporary legal policy, highlighting the imperative to execute a comprehensive institutional inventory of historically neglected and abandoned endowment assets from antiquity. Furthermore, there is an urgent necessity to expand modern Islamic *waqf* frameworks beyond the classical agrarian and spatial paradigms. Modern frameworks must evolve to encompass diverse endowment models such as public infrastructure vital for collective societal welfare, as well as cash *waqf* (*waqf al-nuqūd*) and other high-value liquid assets to catalyse socio-economic empowerment, particularly within the sectors of religious administration and public education.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, M. Z. (2012). The classical Islamic law of Waqf: A concise introduction. *Arab Law Quarterly*, *26*(2), 121–153.

Abu Bakar et al. (1981). *Kamus Bahasa Aceh*. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Adha, S. I. (2018). *Saivaisme-Sufisme: Akulturasi, Sinkretisme dan Konflik dalam Islamisasi Jawa*. CV. Syifah Group.

Adha, S. I. (2021). *Kropak Ferrara Reconsidering The 16th Century Javanese Muslim Identity*. *40*(1), 67–98.

Admin. (2015). *Koleksi BCB: Prasasti Muncangan*. Dinas Kepemudaan, Olahrraga Dan Pariwisata Kota Malang. https://disporapar.malangkota.go.id/koleksi-bcb-prasasti-muncang/

Alatas, S. F. (1985). Notes on various theories regarding the Islamization of the Malay archipelago. *Alatas, SF (1985). Notes on Various Theories Regarding the Islamization of the Malay Archipelago. The Muslim World*, *75*, 162–175.

Al-Fairūzzābadī, M. A. T. M. ibn Y. (2005). *Al-Qamus Al-Muhith* (Vol. 4). Muassasah Al-Risalah lith Thaba'ah wa An-Nasyar wa Al-Tawzi'.

Al-Ghazālī. (1964). *Ghazālī's Book of Consel for Kings* (F. R. C. Bagley, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

Al-Ḥanafī, A. A.-S. M. B. M. B. M. A.-'Imādī. (2019). *Mauqif Al-'Uqūl Fī Waqafi Al-Manqūl* ('Abd. Al-'Aẓīm Ḥusain Salhab & R. M. J. Salhab, Eds.; 1st ed.). Arūqah.

Al-Qalyūbī, S. A. bin S. (n.d.). *Hasyiyah Al-Qalyūbī*. Dar Ihya al-Kutub al-Arabiyah.

Al-Zuḥaylī, W. (1985). *Al-Fiqh Al-Islāmī wa adillatuhu asy-Syamil li-l' adillah asy-syar'iyah wa al-ārāi al-madzhabiyah wa uhimma an-nazhariyāt wa taḥqīq al-aḥādīts an-nabawiyyah wa takhrījuhā* (2nd ed., Vol. 4). Dār Al-Fikr.



An-Nawāwī, A. Z. Y. bin S. (n.d.). *Al-Minhāj aṭ-Ṭālibīn*. Mustafa Muhammad.

Ardika, I. W., Setiawan, I. K., Wiguna, I. T., & Srijaya, I. W. (2018). Sapatha dalam relasi kuasa dan pendisplinan pada masyarakat Bali kuno abad IX-XIV masehi. *Berkala Arkeologi Vol. 31 No. 1, Mei 2018*, *38*(1), 1–16.

Ar-Rūyānī, A. A.-Ḥasan b. ‘Abdul W. b. I. (2009). *Baḥrul Madzhab fī Furū’ Al-Madzhab Asy-Syāf’ī* (Ṭāriq Fathī as-Sayyad, Ed.). Dār Kutub Al-Islāmī.

At-Turāsānī, J. ad-Dīn. (2012). Safīnat al-Ḥukkām fī Takhlīṣ al-Khaṣṣām. In Jamhuri (Ed.), *Studi Analisis Pemikiran Hukum Islam Jalaluddin Al-Tarusani*. Teratai Publisher.

Azra, A. (1992). *The transm ission of Islamic reformism to Indonesia: Networks o f M iddle Eastern and M alay-Indonesian ‘Ulama’ in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* [Doctoral Thesis]. Columbia University.

Az-Zubaidī, M. M. (1966). *Taj al-‘Arus*. Dar Shadir.

Azzuhri, A. (2026). *The Politics of Knowledge and Jurisprudential Reform in The Eighteenth Century Aceh (Historical Anthropology On Jalāl al-Dīn al-Tarasānī)*. International Islamic University of Indonesia.

Boechari. (2012). *Melacak Sejarah Kuno Indonesia Lewat Prasasti*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

Bosch, F. D. K. (2013). *Selected studies in Indonesian archaeology*. Springer.

Brandes, J. L. A. (1911). *Babad Tjerbon: Uitvoerige inhoudsopgave en noten* (D. A. Rinkes, Ed.). Albrecht.

Burhanudin, J. (2012). *Ulama dan kekuasaan: Pergumulan elite politik muslim dalam sejarah Indonesia*. NouraBooks.

Chambert-Loir, H. (2017). Islamic law in 17th century Aceh. *Archipel. Études Interdisciplinaires Sur Le Monde Insulindien*, (94), 51–96.

Christie, J. W. (2004). The agricultural economies of early Java and Bali. In *Smallholders and Stockbreeders* (pp. 47–67). Brill.

Çizakça, M. (2000). *A history of philanthropic foundations: The Islamic world from the seventh century to the present*. Boğaziçi University Press Istanbul.

Cœdès, G. (1918). *Le royaume de Çrivijaya* (Vol. 18, Issue 6). Impr. d’Extrême-Orient.

Cœdès, G. (1975). *The indianized states of Southeast Asia* (1st ed.). University of Hawaii Press.

Colless, B. E. (2009). Historical Geography of Maritime Southeast Asia: Synthesis And Synopsis. In *The Maharajas of the Isles: The Sailendras and the problem of Srivijaya*. Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania, University of Leiden.

de Casparis, J. G. (1967). The Date of the Grahi Buddha. *The Journal of the Siam Society*, *55*(1), 31–40.



de Casparis, J. G. (1975). *Indonesian Palaeography: A History of Writing in Indonesia From The Beinnings to C. A.D. 1500*. Brill.

De Graaf, H. J. (2012). Islamic States in Java 1500-1700: Eight Dutch Books and Articles by Dr. HJ de Graaf. In *Islamic States in Java 1500-1700*. Brill.

Dewi, K. H. (2008). Perubahan Sosial dan Demokrasi Desa: Gampong dan Kampung di Aceh Masa Kesultanan Aceh Darussalam Sampai dengan Revolusi. In *Runtuhnya Gampong di Aceh* (pp. 121–179). Pustaka Pelajar.

Djoened, M., & Poesponegoro, N. N. (2008). *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia Jilid 2: Zaman Kuno* (Vol. 2). Balai Pustaka (Persero), PT.

Fahmi, N., Hasbi, H., Gobo, B., Mirnawati, M., & Helmi, M. (2024). The complexity of waqf land in the context of customary law in Indonesia. *Tadayun: Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, *5*(1), 29–50.

Fang, L. Y. (2013). *A history of classical Malay literature*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Furqani, H., & Adha, S. I. (2021). Ekonomi Humanistik dan Tradisi Pertanian Masyarakat Aceh. In *Membangun Ekonomi Manusiawi* (pp. 149–162). Persatuan Forum Ekonomi Manusiawi.

Goris, R. (1954). *Prasasti Bali II*. N.V. Masa Baru.

Hadi, A. (1999). *Islam and State in Seventeenth Century Aceh* [Doctoral Thesis]. McGill University.

Hall, K. R. (2010). *A history of early Southeast Asia: Maritime trade and societal development, 100–1500*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.

Hasjmy, A. (1990). *Sejarah Kebudayaan Islam di Indonesia*. Bulan Bintang.

Hassan, M. (2014). *Islamic legal thought and practices of seventeenth century Aceh: Treating the others*.

Hoadley, M. (2025). *The Javanese way of law: Early modern sloka phenomena*. Routledge.

Hooker, M. B. (1978). *A concise legal history of South-East Asia*. Clarendon Press.

Hurgronje, C. S. (1893). *De Atjehers*. Landsdrukkerij.

Hurgronje, C. S., & Badru'd-din, T. CH. (1889). *Atjeh-Nederlandsch Woordenboek: I*. Martinus Nijhoff.

Ibn Mandzūr, M. bin B. (1301). *Lisan al-Arab*. Penerbit al-Muniriyyah.

Ibrahim, H. (2016). *Awal Masuknya Islam ke Aceh: Analisis Arkeologi dan Sumbangannya Pada Nusantara*. Aceh Multivision.

Istari, R. (2007). Saphata dalam Beberapa Prasasti. *Berkala Arkeologi*, *27*(1), 43–52.

Jagn, J. (1936). VIII. Method of analogy in the theory of structures. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, *22*(145), 113–132.

Jamhuri. (2012). Prolog. In Jamhuri (Ed.), *Studi Analisis Pemikiran Hukum Islam Jalaluddin Al-Tarusani*. Teratai Publisher.



Jones, A. M. B. (1984). *Early Tenth Century Java from the Inscriptions*. BRILL.

Jordaan, R. (1999). The Sailendras the Status of the Ksatriya Theory and the Development of Hindu-Javanese Temple Architecture. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-En Volkenkunde*, *155*(2), 210–243.

Jordaan, R. E. (2007). *Exploring the role of the Sailendras in early eastern Javanese history* [Working Paper Seriees]. Monash University Press.

Kahn, J. (2020). *Constituting the Minangkabau*. Routledge.

Kartakusuma, R. (1993). Dapunta Hiyam Sri Jayanasa: Kajian Atas Makna Dari Prasasti Telaga Batu. *Amerta*, *13*, 17–32.

Kozok, U., & Mahdi, W. (2015). Tanjung Tanah Manuscript TK 214. In *A 14th Century Malay Code of Laws: Nîtîsârasamuccaya* (pp. 50–161). ISEAS Publishing.

Kulke, H. (1991). Epigraphical references to the" city" and the" state" in early Indonesia. *Indonesia*, (52), 3–22.

Lombard, D. (1986). *Kerajaan Aceh: Jaman Sultan Iskandar Muda,1607-1636* (W. Arifin, Trans.). Balai Pustaka.

Markman, A. B., & Moreau, C. P. (2001). *Analogy and Analogical Comparison*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Minattur, J. (1964). A Note on the King Kundungga of the east Borneo inscriptions. *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, *5*(2), 181–183.

Muljana, S. (1967). *Per-undang2an Madjapahit*. Bhratara.

Muljana, S. (1980). *Dari Holotan ke Jayakarta*. Yayasan Idayu.

Muljana, S. (2006). *Sriwijaya*. LKis.

Munoz, P. M. (2016). *Early Kingdoms of the Indonesian Archipelago and the Malay Peninsula*. Continental Sales, Incorporated.

Noorduyn, J., & Teeuw, A. (2021). *Three old Sundanese poems* (Vol. 29). Brill.

Panji, T. (2015). *Kitab sejarah terlengkap Majapahit: Ulasan lengkap pengaruh Kerajaan Majapahit terhadap wajah Indonesia*. Laksana.

Paterson, H. S. (1924). An early Malay inscription from Trengganu. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, *2*(3 (92), 252–258.

Pauker, G. J. (1956). *Indonesian Trade and Society: Essays in Asian Social and Economic History: By JC van Leur. The Hague and Bandung: W. van Hoeve, Ltd.(New York: Institute of Pacific Relations). 1955. 465 pp. $4.00.* Taylor & Francis.

Peacock, A. C., & Tor, D. G. (2017). *Medieval Central Asia and the Persianate World: Iranian Tradition and Islamic Civilisation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pigeaud, T. G. (1967). *Literature of Java: Volume I Synopsis of Javanese Literature 900-1900 A.D.* Springer.

Pigeaud, T. G. (1976). *Islamic states in Java 1500-1700*. Brill.

Poerbatjaraka. (1958). Çrīvijaya, De Çailendra-En De Sanjayavamça. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-En Volkenkunde*, (3de Afl), 254–264.



Ras, J. J. (1990). *Hikajat Banjar* (S. H. Salleh, Trans.). Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia Kuala Lumpur.

Ricklefs, M. C. (1998). *The Seen and Unseen Worlds in Java, 1726-1749: History, Literature, and Islam in the Court of Pakubuwana II*. University of Hawaii Press.

Ricklefs, M. C. (2006). *Mystic Synthesis in Java: A History of Islamization from the Fourteenth to the Early Nineteenth Centuries*. EastBridge.

Riyadi, M. I., & Umami, K. (2021). Integrasi Hukum Islam Di Kerajaan Demak Abad XVI M (Telaah Terhadap Serat Angger Suryo Alam). *Ascarya: Journal of Islamic Science, Culture, and Social Studies*, *1*(2), 252–265.

Romdhoni, A. (2021). *Kesultanan Demak Bintara*. Pesona Bahasa.

Schrieke, B. J. O. (2021). *Indonesian Sociological Studies; Selected Writings; 1*. Creative Media Partners, LLC.

Siddiqui, S. Z. (2019). *Law and politics under the Abbasids: An intellectual portrait of al-Juwayni*. Cambridge University Press.

Sunyoto, A. (2016). *Atlas Walisongo* (2nd ed.). Pustaka Iman.

Syah, M. S. (1974). *Menggali Hukum Tanah dan Hukum Waris Adat Aceh*. Dinas Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Aceh.

Syarifuddin, F., & Sakti, A. (2021). *Praktik Ekonomi dan Keuangan Syariah oleh Kerajaan Islam di Indonesia*. PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Tjandrasasmita, U. (2009). *Arkeologi Islam Nusantara*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

van Langen, K. F. H. (1888). De inrichting van het Atjehsche staatsbestuur onder het sultanaat. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-En Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 381–471.

van Leur, J. C. (1967). *Indonesian trade and society: Essays in Asian social and economic history*. W. van Hoeve Publishers Ltd - The Hague.

van Naerssen, F. H. (2022). *The economic and administrative history of early Indonesia* (Vol. 7). Brill.

Vogel, J. P. (1918). The Yupa Inscriptions of king Mulavarman, from Koetei (East Borneo). *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land-En Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, (1/2de Afl), 167–232.

von Benda-Beckmann, F. (1979). *Property in Social Continuity*. Brill.

Wirawan, I. G. B., Suda, I. K., Adnyana, I. G., Sukadana, I. W., Winyana, I. N., & Yudabakti, I. M. (2025). The role of Yupa inscription as Yantra in Shiva worship: Interpreting stone relics through contemporary practices in Kutai Kartanegara. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *12*(1), 2521981. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2521981

Wolters, O. W. (1962). *Early Indonesian Commerce and the Origins of Srivijaya.* SOAS University of London.

Wolters, O. W. (2018). *History, culture, and region in Southeast Asian perspectives*. Cornell University Press.

Woodward, M. (1989). *Islam in Java: Normative piety and mysticism in the sultanate of Yogyakarta* [Doctoral Thesis]. University of Arizona.

Wurjanto, E. (2018). *Anugerah Sri Maharaja: Kumpulan Alihaksara dan Alihbahasa Prasasti-prasasti Jawa Kuna dari Abad VIII-XI*. Departemen Arkeologi Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia.

Zaedin, M. M., & Sutarahardja, K. T. (Eds.). (2018). *Babad Cirebon* (Vol. 2). Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia.

Zakharov, A. O. (2012, August). *The Śailendras Reconsidered* [Working Paper No. 12]. Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Institute of Southeast Asia.

