SELECTED INSCRIPTIONS
FROM THE 7TH TO THE 9TH
CENTURY A.D.

BY

Dr J.G. de CASPARIS

II

.

PREFACE

The present volume may be considered a continuation of Prasasti Indonesia I, Bandung 1950, although it is written in a different language and in a different form. As the first volume, this publication aims at making accessible some of the most important epigraphic remains discovered in Indonesia. The present writer hopes that series may be continued in order to furnish new materials for the study of the political and cultural history of this country.

Except for No. I, *d* and *e* and No. IX, all the texts are published for the first time. They all originate from Indonesia [1]) and belong to the 7th to 9th centuries A.D. ; as far as possible, they are chronologically arranged [2]). The texts were chosen on account of their importance. The last five texts (Nos. VIII to XII inclusive) belong close together and constitute an attempt at elucidating important events in 9th century Indonesia.

I profoundly regret that it has not been possible to add reliable photographs of the inscriptions. The clichés proved hardly satisfactory and suitable paper for the copies was unobtainable here. I hope that it will be possible to prepare a volume of separate photographs in the future.

During a visit to Burma, India and Europe in the second half of 1954 I had the occasion to go through part of the proofs with Dr G. H. Luce (Rangoon), Dr B. Ch. Chhabra (Delhi), Dr Georges Cœdès (Paris) and Dr D. L. Friedmann (London). As far as was still possible in view of the advanced state of the proofs, I took account of the valuable remarks I got from these scholars.

In preparing the English text of the present publication I received very substantial help from Prof. L. A. Hill of the University of Indonesia at Djakarta. Mr Hill showed admirable patience in making readable English out of my manuscript with as few changes as possible. After Mr Hill had left for Britain in the spring of 1954, I got help from others, especially from Mr A. H. Christie of the British School of Oriental and African Studies when on tour in Indonesia. I am fully aware that, in spite of all the assistance I received, the English text does not run as smoothly as it should, but it seemed undesirable to delay this publication still longer. The long time needed to print this volume (it has been in the press for more than two and half years) also made some additions necessary.

Finally, I express my profound gratitude to the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Indonesia for all the help and facilities which alone made this publication possible.

Malang (East Java), August 1955.

---

[1]) There is no absolute certainty for No. III, the place of origin of which is unknown. It seems, however, safe to assume that they originate from somewhere in Indonesia, unless the contrary should be made acceptable.

[2]) I made an exception for Nos. IV, V and VI, all three of them undated, which were placed after No. III only on account of their subject matter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Introduction

INTRODUCTORY

In editing these texts I followed the same principles as in Prasasti In-donesia I (1950), each separate text edition consisting of a, sometimes lengthy, introduction, transcription with foot notes, translation also with foot notes, with, at the end, several indices. These different parts necessitate a few remarks.

(a) *Introduction.* In the introductions a definite order is preserved, *viz.* 1st : site and time of discovery of the epigraph, its state of preservation, measurements, material etc. ; 2nd : previous publications of or with ref-erence to the document ; 3rd : script, spelling, language and, in the case of metrical texts, metrics ; 4th , various aspects of the meaning, historical, religious or otherwise, of the text.

(b) *Transcription.* To facilitate reading, metrical texts are printed in stanzas, but the ordinal numbers of the lines of the original document are added between square brackets. Prose texts, however, are printed in lines as in the original.

If either side of a stone of metal document is inscribed the front is invariably denoted by A, the back by B. If a text is engraved on a number of metal plates, the plates are denoted by small Roman letters, wheieas Arabic ciphers are reserved to indicate the lines of the inscription. Thus, III, c-A-4 denotes the 4th line of the front side of the third plate of inscrip-tion No. III. Small Roman letters are also used for separate inscriptions going under the same number, whereas the italics frum *a* to *d* refer to the *pādas* of a strophe.

Italics in the transcription denote uncertain reading. Deletions are mark-ed by square, additions by pointed, brackets. Usually, however, I also added a note in such cases in order to make clear what exactly is visible on the stone.

A lacuna at the beginning of the line is indicated by], at the end of the line by [. Lacunae in the middle of the line are indicated by points the number of which is based upon my estimation of the length of the lacuna. In metrical texts, however, the prosodic scheme of the missing syllables is filled in (*viz.* — for a long, ⏑ for a short, ⏑ for either long or short, and ⏑⏑ for either one long or two short syllables).

Words are separated in the way usual in transliterated texts. If word separation is made between the elements of a consonantal ligature, the = mark is used. However, I omitted the use of = in the case of vowel con-traction, since it makes the text awkward to read. If no such mark is used

after a final consonant, it follows that the original has a consonant with *virāma*.

Marks of punctuation follow the original as closely as possible. A *daṇḍa* is rendered by /, a double *daṇḍa* by //. In metrical texts, / denotes the end of the first *ardha*, twice / with a cipher between the end of the stanza. Capitals are limited to the beginning of strophes.

Both in Sanskrit and in Old Malay texts the *anusvāra* is rendered by *m*, in Old Javanese, however, by *ng*, whereas the velar nasal is always transcribed by *ṅ*. I am fully aware that there is something inconsistent in this mode of transliteration. It is, however, essential that the transcription should show whether an *akṣara ṅa* or an *anusvāra* was used in the original (especially because there is sometimes a possibility that one might render something which is only an accidental tiny hole in the stone), whereas it is, on the other hand, wise to keep as close to the usual methods of transliteration as possible. This is mainly why I maintained *ng* in Old Javanese.

The mark for vocalic *ṛ* is rendered by *ṛ* in Sanskrit, but by *rĕ* in Old Javanese, again according to the usual practice.

Notes are added to the transcription in any case of doubt as to the correct reading, word separation etc. Conjectural readings, too uncertain to be printed in the texts even in italics, are referred to in the notes. As a rule, notes are copious, partly in order to compensate for the lack of photographs.

(c) *Translation*. Translations of prose texts are divided into paragraphs on account of the subject matter, but the numbers of the original lines are put in between brackets. It is not, of course, possible to translate line for line of the transliterated text since it is impossible to maintain the order of words of the original in the translation; numbering of lines in translations agrees only approximately with that of the transliterated texts; it only serves the practical purpose of facilitating the comparison with the transcriptions. Metrical texts are translated by stanzas; it appeared superfluous to add also the original line numbers in that case.

Translation of Old Malay and Old Javanese epigraphic texts still poses enormous difficulties, especially, though not exclusively, on account of the numerous technical terms to denote functions, different kinds of taxes, traditional definitions of crimes etc. Such difficulties are further increased owing to uncertain readings and lacunae. The type of language is official and, usually, rather archaic. Old Javanese literary texts are not only dated centuries later (with one or two possible exceptions), but they also deal with completely different matters. In addition, critically edited and translated texts are still few in number. What is especially needed is the publication of more Old Javanese prose texts (such as *dharmaçāstras*).

In order to make the materials accessible to others as well as Old Javanese experts and Buddhologists I had to go further in translating than is usual in most of the former publications. As a matter of fact, I translated

as much as possible in order to avoid that kind of translation which keeps all the more difficult terms in their original forms. Whenever there existed an acceptable, though by no means precise, equivalent term in English, I adopted it, if necessary, with a point of interrogation. The relative degree of certainty follows from the notes. As a matter of principle, the more important problems of interpretation are discussed in the introductions, whereas the details which are not essential for the interpretation of the text as a whole are referred to in the notes to the translations.

In No. III and elsewhere, I had translations of Buddhist technical terms printed with initial capitals in order to mark those words as mere conventional substitutes. This method, used especially by Sylvain Lévi (*e.g.* in his translation of the Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra), has the advantage of yielding a translation which is not half-Sanskrit, while it shows at the same time that the translated terms are nothing but substitutes having only a part of the connotations of the terms.

Almost all of the translations from Old Javanese hitherto published were in Dutch; so I had almost always to refer to Dutch publications in the notes to the translations. In order to facilitate the study of the documents for those who are unable to read or to procure themselves those publications, I thought it advisable to render the opinions and arguments of previous scholars with far greater detail than I should have done in a Dutch publication, where mere references would often have been largely sufficient. On the other hand, I intended the Prasasti Indonesia publications in the first place for Indonesian readers not specialised in epigraphic studies, especially in order to arouse a greater interest in historical research. Both factors together are an apology for the considerable length of introductions and notes to the translations

(d) *Indexes*. In order to assist readers to find their way in the materials scattered in notes and introductions I added three Indexes. References in the indexes are as brief as possible, but they seem sufficiently clear and need no further comment.

These are the main considerations which determined the peculiar form of this publication, I sincerely hope that the readers will not spare their remarks, which will only help to ameliorate the value of future publications in this series.

I. FIVE FRAGMENTARY INSCRIPTIONS OF SOUTH SUMATRA

In addition to the well-known inscriptions of Kĕdukan Bukit and of Talang Tuwo [1]), the town of Palembang (South Sumatra) and environs has yielded a considerable number of smaller stone inscriptions. Except for the large stone inscription of Tĕlaga Batu, which will be discussed separately [2]), these texts are either very short or fragmentary. Nevertheless, some of them might furnish important additional information as to the earliest history of the empire of Çrīvijaya.

Some of these inscriptions were conveyed to the Djakarta Museum and of these brief descriptions have been published among the acquisitions [3]). Other stones, however, remained at Palembang [4]).

Most of the short inscriptions consist of the word *siddhayātra*, either alone (e.g. No. D. 157) [5]), or preceded by *jaya-* (D. 156 and 159), or even preceded by *jaya-* and followed by *sarvvasatvāḥ* (D. 158) or by *sarvvasatva* (D. 160).

The exact meaning of *siddhayātra* has given rise to discussions.

Cœdès, taking the word as a synonym of *siddhiyātra*, described its meaning as "un voyage ou un pèlerinage dont on revient doué de pouvoirs surnaturels" [6]), with a reference to the inscription of Nhan-Biêu, where the same meaning appears to be required by the context. The expression *mañambil*

---

[1]) G. Cœdès, *Les inscriptions malaises de Çrīvijaya, B. E. F. E. O.*, 30 (1930), pp. 29 — 30, where all previous literature is mentioned. — Important later contributions are : R.A. Kern, *Bijdr. K. I.*, 88 (1931), pp. 508-513 ; G. Ferrand, *Quatre textes épigraphiques malayo-sanskrits de Sumatra et de Banka, journ. As.*, CCXXI (1932), pp. 271-326 ; J.W.J. Wellan, *Çrīvijaya, 1250 jaren geleden gesticht* (i.e. Çrīvijaya, founded 1250 years ago). *Tijdschr. Kon. Aardr. Gen.*, 51 (1934), pp. 348 (including the reduction of the precise dates of the Kĕdukan Bukit and Talang Tuwo inscriptions by W. E. van Wijk) : Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.*, 33 (1933), pp. 1002-7 (discussion of the interpretations by R.A. Kern, Ferrand and Wellan) ; B. Ch. Chhabra, *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture during Pallava Rule, J.A.S.B., Letters*, I (1935), pp. 28-31 ; F.M. Schnitger, *Oudheidkundige vondsten te Palembang* (i.e. Archaeological discoveries in Palembang), 4 vols. (1935-36), especially the 2nd volume composed by Stutterheim ; F.M. Schnitger, The *Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra* (1937), pp. 1-4 ; Nilakanta Sastri, *J.G.I.S.*, IV (1937), pp. 128 sq. ; Krom, *Oudheden van Palembang. Meded. K.A.W., N.R.*, I, No. 7 (1938), pp. 397-423 ; V. Obdeyn, *Volk en Taal der oude Maleise Rijken* (People and Language of the oldest Malay Empires), *Tijdschr. Kon. Aardr. Gen.*, 60 (1943), pp. 706-723 ; R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, *Riwajat Indonesia* (1952), pp. 33-42.

[2]) *Infra, No. II.*

[3]) *Jaarboek B. G.*, 3 (1936), p. 198 sq.

[4]) *Infra*, inscription a and most of the *siddhayātra*-stones.

[5]) The numbers preceded by *D* always refer to the Djakarta Museum.

[6]) *Art. cit.*, p. 58.

siddhayātra, occurring in line 3 of the inscription of Kĕdukan Bukit, was translated by the same scholar as "(pour) aller chercher de la puissance magique" [7]. R. A. Kern, very appropriately, compared the modern Sundanese expression *ṅalap bĕrkat* [8]. A different interpretation was proposed by Chhabra [9]), but Nilakanta Sastri [10]) and Krom [11]) confirmed the view of Cœdès. — It might be of interest to refer the reader to a passage in an Old Javanese inscription to be edited below, though the text seems to be rather obscure there [12]). Anyhow, it appears that *siddhayātra* is used with reference to merchants and several kinds of birds coming from a long distance to a *tīrtha,* presumably to acquire supernatural forces.

Besides the *siddhayātra* stones, there remain still five fragmentary inscriptions not yet discussed in detail. Palaeographically, they clearly belong to the same period as the dated inscriptions of Kĕdukan Bukit, Talang Tuwo and Kotakapur, i.e. end of the 7th (perhaps first half of the 8th) century A. D. [13]), and must be assigned to the first period of the empire of Çrīvijaya.

---

a

The first fragment to be discussed has the following measurements : height 56 cm, breadth 17 cm (average). It was discovered in 1928 during the construction of a road in the neighbourhood of a hill, called Bukit Sĕguntang, at a few miles' distance to the west of the town of Palembang [14]). The fragment forms the left part of a presumably extensive stone inscription

---

[7]) *Art. cit.,* p. 34. Cf. also the same scholar in *B.E.F.E.O.,* 33 (1934), pp. 1002-7.

[8]) *Bijdr. K. I.,* 88 (1931), p. 511.   [9]) *Op. cit.,* pp. 19 sq. and p. 29.

[10]) *Art. cit,* pp. 128 sqq. [11]) *Oudheden van Palembang,* p. 9 ; cf. *Geschiedenis²,* p. 121.

[12]) *Infra,* No. XI, strophe 22. — As to the strange combination of merchants, herons, crows and *haṃsas,* it is noted that the three kinds of birds mentioned all belong to the group of migratory birds. In addition, they have some connection with water. As far as crows are concerned, reference may be made to the Sanskrit expression *tīrthakāka.* The merchants, of course, are "migratory men". In the Kedah inscription, discussed by Chhabra, the term *siddhayātra* occurs in connection with the merchant *(mahānāvika)* Buddhagupta, and the tales of the Kathāsaritsāgara, quoted by Chhabra, also refer to voyages oversea.

[13]) Stutterheim in his description of these stones *(Jaarboek B. G.,* 3. 1936, pp. 198 sq.) uses sometimes the term „late Pallava script", mostly however „Old Javanese script". Especially the latter term might be misleading, as it suggests a relation with Java later than the Tjangal inscription. Apart from minor differences (which sometimes occur in one and the same text, such as the single and the double-stroked *ra,* both of which are used in the Talang Tuwo inscription), they all clearly represent the same type of script, which seems a little more archaic than the type used in the Tjangal inscription.

[14]) *Oudh. Versl.,* 1928, p. 101. Cf. also *Annual Bibl. I. A.,* 1931, p. 29. — According to local tradition, the low hill of Bukit Sĕguntang is closely connected with the empire of Çrīvijaya. In addition, the Malay annals *Sĕjarah Malayu* consider the same hill as the place of origin of the kings of Malacca. For these and other traditions we refer the reader to the article by L. C. Westenenk, *Uit het land van Bittertong (Zuid-Soematra), Djåwå,* I (1921), pp. 5 — 11, to which also a map of the Palembang region is added.

and contains the initial portions of 21 lines of script. The remaining portion, probably much larger than the existing fragment, has not been recovered.

As far as we know, only Chhabra (with the help of Van Ronkel) made a study of the inscription [15]), evidently without sufficient material at his disposal. Nevertheless, he succeeded in reading some Sanskrit words occurring in the text and, besides, rightly concluded that the text was composed in Old Malay. It did not prove to be correct, however, that an illness of the prince is mentioned in the epigraph. The good estampage at our disposal allows for the reading of almost the whole text on the fragment. As, however, only the initial words of the lines have been preserved, the result remains rather unsatisfactory. There are, however, sufficient interesting points to justify publication.

As Chhabra already pointed out, the type of script corresponds closely to that used in the dated Çrīvijaya inscriptions of the end of the 7th century A. D. The text must undoubtedly be assigned to the same period. The only point worthy of note is the form of the akṣara *ra*, written everywhere else with two strokes, but in one word (*muara*, line 16) with a single stroke. Both the single- and the double-stroked form occur in the Talang Tuwo inscription, whereas the Kotakapur inscription (and, e.g., the Tjangal inscription from Central Java) only uses the double form. It seems that during some time both forms could be used side by side.

As noted before, the text is entirely composed in the Old Malay language. The dialect shows the same peculiarities as the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions. Thus, the prefix *mar-* is used instead of the common Malay *bĕr-* (e.g. in *marsvastha*, line 8), and *ni-* instead of *di-* (e.g. in *nikāryyākan*, line 19) [16]). As possessive suffixes we find *-ña* and *-(n)ḍa*, the latter being the honorific equivalent of the former [17]). As a rule, a final vowel of the root is lengthened if these suffixes are added [18]). Finally, we note the occurrence of the word *parāvis*, meaning „all" [19]), of *dañan*, „companion", but *dñan*, „with" [20]), and of the remarkable orthography *raijya*, presumably for *rājya* (line 8).

---

[15]) *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture* (1935), p. 31.

[16]) The prefixes *mar-* and *ni-* both occur in the Batak language (Northern Sumatra) and in some other places; cf. Van Ronkel, *Acta Orient.*, II (1924), pp. 14 sqq. On the other hand, the Old Malay inscription of Gandasuli (Central Java) uses the prefixes *war-* (corresponding to modern Malay *bĕr-*) and *di-*; cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 54 sqq.

[17]) The form *-nḍa* is used after vowels, *-ḍa* after consonants; it is remarkable that these are almost the only examples of the use of lingual consonants in words which are not of Sanskrit origin.

[18]) Cf. *maryyādānḍa* (line 2) and *makāryyaña* (line 4). As appears from these examples, Sanskrit words are not excepted.

[19]) As to the meaning of *parāvis*, cf. Cœdès, *art. cit.*, pp. 72 sq.

[20]) Cf. *dañan* (line 5) at the beginning of a new sentence (therefore it does not appear to be a preposition), but *dñan* (line 21), meaning „with".
It is, however, probable that this difference was not always made; cf. line 12 of inscription II *(infra)*, where *dañan* is used in the meaning of *dñan*. Most probably, the latter is nothing but the enclitic form or an orthographic variant of the former; cf. the spelling *marlapas*, *infra*, note 50.

Although it is impossible to give a regular translation of this very lacunary text, it seems that the main purport of the inscription is not doubtful. The loss of the major part of the text is to be regretted.

Several passages refer to battles. In line 10 the words *tīda tāhu pira marvyū(ha)*, „it is not known how many were drawn up in battle array", seem to refer to the forces of the (internal or external) enemy. Another passage (line 5), *vañak pramirahña*, „much was their blood (shed)", may refer to the losses either of the enemy or of the army of Çrīvijaya. The word *pauravirakta*, „red with (the blood of) the citizens", referring to either the soil or the big river (Sungai Musi) of Çrīvijaya, might point to heavy losses of the Çrīvijaya army, too. The words *mamañcak yaṃ prajā ini* (line 13) may refer to fighting itself or, more probably, to a victory dance [cf. modern Malay *mĕmĕñcak* for a kind of sword-dance with an imaginary opponent and the well-known Balinese *pĕñcak*, a martial dance]. This word *mamañcak* does not seem to be related to *mañcak*, which occurs twice in the inscription of Talang Tuwo [21].

The last lines of the text appear to contain a curse directed against possible malefactors, such as those guilty of (prohibited) love, anger and greed (line 15 : *kāma krodha lobha*, three well-known *kleças*) : they will be swallowed by the river *(prajā ini muara ya umaṃgap)*. At the very end (line 20), there is mention of women who might make their husbands crazy [22]. Similar passages occur also in the inscriptions of Kotakapur [23] and of Tĕlaga Batu [24]. The end of the inscription might be a sort of epilogue warning any future insurgents.

Transcription

1. // çrī yā.. [25] // parddātva .... [26]
2. ña maryyādāṇḍa dari .... [27]

---

[21] In lines 5 and 12. — As Cœdès pointed out (*art. cit.*, p. 74), the meaning required by the context and supported by etymology, is "full".

[22] *Makalñit daṃ svāmi.* — *Svāmi* (Sanskrit *svāmin*) also means "lord". Therefore, the passage might as well refer to slaves who make their lord crazy. The loss of the context makes it impossible to decide which of the alternatives is to be preferred.

[23] Line 11. — The spelling *makalañit* in the Kotakapur inscription, as compared to *makalñit* of our text, offers a parallel to *dañan* and *dñan*, note [20].

[24] Lines 8 and 13.

[25] The akṣara following *yā*, which is not distinct, seems to be *na*. This would however be a strange beginning of an inscription.

[26] The length of the lacunae at the end of the lines cannot be estimated with any degree of probability, but it is evident that there is an extensive portion missing. The number of the points in the transcription is therefore arbitrary. — The last word is probably to be completed as *parddātvan*, "province of a *dātu*" (or: "office of a *dātu*"?). The meaning of the term is probably different from that of *kadatuan* in No. II; the latter seems to mean "royal palace, empire" there.

[27] After *dari*, the next sign is still partly visible; it seems to be a ligature the lower part of which is a *da*.

3. *dyata* [28]) jādi anakda valuṃ uraṃ ....
4. ... mā ini makāryyaña ta ....
5. vañak = pramiraḥña . daṅan ....
6. cūrikāṅku [29]) jādi vyasta dari [30]) ....
7. mira mana [31]) parāvis // 0 // *da* ....
8. marsvastha di iya raijya [32]) pra ....
9. pauravirakta nitāpik ma ....
10. tīda tāhu pira marvyū<ha> ....
11. bharu nir*bhāra* [33]) nitāpik parvvā<ṇda> [34]) ....
12. *risir* = nibharu l*pas* [35]) yaṃ mati ....
13. mamañcak yaṃ prajā ini ....
14. saṃkṣepa dua tāṇda sanyā<sa> [36]) ....
15. kan pasaṃ kāma krodha lo<bha> [37]) ....
16. <pra>jā ini muara ya umaṃgap [38]) ....
17. yan = tīda nari*yāt* = saṅkaṭe [39]) ....
18. hat [40]) apa ta krama amithyā [41]) ....
19. ṇda nikāryyākan sida lilu [42]) ....

---

28) Other possibilities are *nyaka* or *nyata*.
29) Evidently for *chūrikāṅku,* "my knife". — One is inclined to conclude that the king (if, at least, the first person refers to the king as seems to be the case in the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions) took part in the battle.
30) These words might mean: "they (the enemy) became isolated from" (their allies?).
31) Presumably to be separated in this way. The first word might be the end of *timira;* the two following words could perhaps mean: "everywhere". In that case, this portion of the inscription ends in: "(it became?) dark everywhere".
32) We referred to this strange spelling of *rājya* (?) in the Introduction.
33) These words, if correctly transcribed, might mean: "lord(s) without a charge (function)", but *bhᵃru* is archaic in this meaning. The text might refer to the tactics of Çrīvijaya, which consisted in isolating the enemy commanders from their troops.
34) *Nitāpik parvāṇda* might mean: "(the commanders, isolated from their troops) were punished by the *parvāṇdas*"; the latter term seems to be the title of rather high officials in Çrīvijaya, though lower in rank than a *dātu;* cf. *infra,* No. II, note 10 to the Introduction and note 83 to the translation.
35) Except for the two last words, the reading of this line is rather uncertain.
36) *Sanyāsa* (cf. Sanskrit *saṃnyāsa*) is rather often found in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions, where it is used in the meaning "charged with"; cf. the Introduction to No. II. Does *tāṇda* mean "officer" here, as is often the case in Old Javanese? In that case, the meaning of this line would be: "in brief, two officers were charged with ....".
37) As noted above, most of this line has already been read by B. Ch. Chhabra.
38) The completion to *prajā* seems evident. — About the passage itself, which seems to be a sort of curse, cf. the Introduction.
39) Owing to damage, the reading of this line is uncertain.
40) This syllable might constitute the end of *nipāhat,* "was engraved". We find the same term in the last line of the Kotakapur inscription.
41) The beginning of *amithyāvāda* or *amithyācāra?* — The compounds with *mithyā* are very common in Buddhism *(mithyādṛṣṭi, mithyājñāna* etc.), but their opposites are almost always replaced by compounds with *samyag- (samyagdṛṣṭi* etc.).
42) Whereas *nikāryyākan* is perfectly clear, the following words appear to be rather strange. *Sida* occurs in the Gaṇḍasuli inscription as a particle used for introducing names of

20. makalñit = daṃ svāmi maka ya lñit daṃ ....
21. trāṅku [43]) dñan yaṃ uraṃ pradhāna ....

b

The next fragment appears in its present state as an irregular block
of hardened clay of which only the front side has been smoothed in order
to engrave the akṣaras of the inscription. Owing to its irregular form, only
its average dimensions can be given; they amount to 45 cm in length and
31 cm in height. It was discovered at a place called Tĕlaga Batu ("Stone
Pond"), kampung Sabukingking, 2 Ilir, in the eastern part of the town of
Palembang, and was taken from there to the Djakarta Museum in 1936
(No. D. 162) [44]).

The inscription consists of three very fragmentary lines of Pallava script,
which seem to form only a slight portion of a lengthy text.

The script agrees in every detail with No. a above, thus making it probable
that this fragment should also be assigned to about the end of the 7th
century A. D. and to the empire of Çrīvijaya. The only ra occurring in the
text is written with a single stroke.

The inscription, unlike most of the epigraphic documents known to
belong to the Çrīvijaya empire, is written in Sanskrit [45]). It is moreover
undoubtedly metrical; in line 2 a portion of an Anuṣṭubh and in line 3 a
part of a Çārdūlavikrīḍita may be recognized. The text presumably contains
the poor remains of a lengthy praçasti issued on the occasion of a victory
of the king of Çrīvijaya over an army of revolting subjects (line 2 : netā
maddāsasenāyāḥ, „commander of an army of my slaves"). — The inscription
seems to be composed in a personal style, as if it is pronounced by the king
himself. This appears still more clearly from line 3, where the king, as a
result of considerations which must have been contained in the lacuna
(iti vyatarkyata mayā), concludes that the enemy army (sā, viz. senā) must
be destroyed (varjanīyā, if correctly completed) [46]). Here it is perfectly
clear that fighting took place with internal insurgents, not with an enemy
from without. The extensive insular empire of Çrīvijaya, as we know it

---

apparently high-class people (vide Pras. Indon., I, 1950, p. 52). Dr Goris informed
me that sida occurs in the same meaning also in Old Balinese inscriptions. Therefore,
it seems rather improbable that this word should be related to Sanskrit siddha, like
we conjectured. — Sida Liïu might be the title and name of the person by whom was
made (nikāryyākan) something which, owing to the lacuna, is unknown.

[43]) Possibly, °trāṅku is the end of mitrāṅku, "my friends".

[44]) Jaarboek B. G., 3 (1936), p. 199.

[45]) Agreeing in this respect, however, with the large stone inscription of Ligor and with
the inscription fragments c and (probably) d below.

[46]) Another possible interpretation of varjanīyā would be "has to be avoided, shunned".
In that case, the king would avoid an open fight against too strong forces and use
other means to beat them.

from the 8th century onwards especially from the Chinese and Arabic accounts, must have struggled with much internal resistance before being consolidated. The imprecations which fill up almost the entire texts of Kotakapur, Karangbrahi and Tëlaga Batu (*infra* No. II) form together more than half of the epigraphical remains of Çrīvijaya; they seem to be mainly, if not exclusively, directed against internal foes. The fragments *a* and *b* are of special interest, because they prove that internal struggles did really take place, at least during the initial period of the empire.

Transcription

1.]m=<p>rth<i>vyāḥ patibhiḥ pañcatvam[[47])
2.]rīṣadaḥ netā maddāsasenāyāḥ pratyala[[48])
3.]rvva iti vyatarkyata mayā sā varja<nīyā>[

---

[47]) The first line of this fragment suffered at several spots; the transcription seems however certain. In *prthivyāḥ*, both the first consonant and the vowel sign of the *tha* have disappeared, but the rest of it being certain, the reading of this word is not doubtful. There is a curious problem about the metre of this passage; we see only one possibility, viz. a Vipulā an uneven pāda of which ends after *patibhiḥ*. Vipulās of the metrical scheme ⏒ — ⏑ — — — ⏑ ⏑ — are by no means rare; they not only occur in the Epics, but also in the poems by Açvaghoṣa (cf. E. H. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita*, Part II, 1936, Introduction, p. lxv, No. 4 of the lists there given). If this presumption is correct, we know that there are two syllables missing at the beginning of the pāda ending in *patibhiḥ*. The next pāda, beginning with *pañcatvam*, is then a second or fourth one of the strophe, so that the missing portion of it consists of five syllables tne metrical structure of which is known. We then get the following reconstruction of the two vādas:

⏒ — m=prthivyāḥ patibhiḥ pañcatvam ⏒ ⏑ — ⏑ ⏒ /

This portion shows some peculiarities worthy of note. First of all, there is the use of *pañcatva*, "fivefoldness", which is almost always used for denoting the dissolution cf the individual into its five elements of earth, water, fire, wind and empty space *(ākāça,* together the *pañca mahābhūtāni)*, i.e. death. The examples given in the *Pet. Dict.* show that the term usually occurs together with words meaning either „going to" or „bringing to". If we notice the fact that the three words which can be read all begin with a *p*, then there is some reason to suppose that the last word of the pāda was *pratipāditaḥ*. Considering that in line 3 the king or, possibly, another person bases his action on a thought which is quoted, we suppose that the words to be read in the first line should be interpreted in a similar way. Then the king says to himself that old examples show that insurgents "were brought to grief by the (real) lords of the earth" (presumably, because they acted *adharmeṇa*), so that now when an insurgent leads "an army consisting of the king's proper slaves" up against him, he need not refrain from action, for it is certain (on account of other considerations) that the insurgents will be wiped out. This seems to be the only reasonable way of connecting the different fragments; it makes us conclude that the text refers to a very serious episode in the oldest history of Çrīvijaya. Obviously, the menacing tone of the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Tëlaga Batu (No. II below) aimed at avoiding episodes like this one in the future.

[48]) The first word of this line is undoubtedly to be completed to *pariṣadaḥ* („of the assembly"); very probably, *pratyala-* should be completed to *pratyalabdha* („took, obtained"). As to the last line, cf. the Introduction and note 46 above.

c

The third fragment, at present No. D. 163 in the Djakarta Museum, was discovered at the same place and at the same time as *b*. It is likewise an irregular block of hardened clay ; its average dimensions amount to 37 cm in length and 24 cm in height [49].

As, in addition, other features like script, language and metrical structure seem to correspond as well, it is not impossible that *b* and *c* are two fragments of a single inscription ; in that case, however, the two fragments did not belong to the same part of the original stone, for they cannot be joined.

Fragment *c* contains parts of four lines of script. Shape and size of the akṣaras correspond in every detail with inscription *b*. The inscription on this fragment, too, is composed in metrical Sanskrit. In the first two lines, its metre can be identified as Sragdharā, in lines 3 and 4 as Çārdūlavikrīḍita.

Here, too, fighting is alluded to. In line 2, a troop of enemies *(ripugaṇam)* is mentioned ; presumably, the latter either fled or surrendered (this is not expressed in the preserved portion) „at the approach of my army" *(madvale praviṣṭe* ; the latter term may refer to entering the walls of a fortress, but this is not necessarily the case) ; as in inscription *b*, the text is as it were pronounced by the king himself.

In the first line of this fragment, the four long syllables *tatsaptamyām* constitute the beginning of a second or fourth Sragdharā pāda (not of a first or third pāda, since in that case there would have been a daṇḍa before *tatsaptamyām).* ; the three syllables *tyamuñcat,* to be completed to *pratyamuñcat,* then constitute the end of a first or third pāda ; after *tatsaptamyām,* the syllables *ala,* the second of which must have been followed by more than one consonant, are undoubtedly to be completed to *alabdha* (followed by two consonants again) ; it is noted that the word following *tatsaptamyām* necessarily was trisyllabic, for the Sragdharā has a caesura after each seventh syllable.

This metrical analysis makes it very probable that in the first line of this fragment two different events were mentioned, the first of these indicated by *pratyamuñcat,* the second by *alabdha.* Evidently, *tatsaptamyām* refers to the second event. As to *tatsaptamyām,* it does not seem doubtful that the „seventh" refers to a lunar day *(saptamyāṃ tithau).*

Now it is very striking that the same date *saptamī* is mentioned in line 3 of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription ; this correspondence would hardly be worthy of note (it is just one chance out of fifteen), if there were not two other details in our text which appear to agree with the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. The meaning of *(pra)tyamuñcat* in our text corresponds rather

---

[49] *Jaarboek B. G.,* 3 (1936), p. 199.

well with that of *marlapas* in line 4 of the Kĕdukan Bukit stone [50]), *ala(bdha)* with *mamāva* in line 5 of the latter. In view of these correspondences it seems almost certain that the first line of our fragment refers to the events about which the lines 3 to 8 of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription (the events of the second date) give us a still rather obscure account. Unfortunately, the very fragmentary state of our text makes it impossible to conclude how far the correspondence goes. As far as we are able to judge, no military action like that referred to in line 2 of our fragment is mentioned in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription, although the more than twenty thousand soldiers accompanying the *ḍapunta hiyaṃ* make it very probable that such action did take place [51]).

If our presumption of a close correspondence of the first line of our fragment with the events at the second date of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription is correct, we might arrive at a conclusion, unfortunately only negative, about the identity of the *ḍapunta hiyaṃ* in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. If *madvale* in line 2 refers to the king's army, which is very probable, then the text is issued by the king himself; the same is the case in the inscriptions of Kotakapur, Karangbrahi and Tĕlaga Batu (*infra,* No. II), where the king refers to himself by *āku,* „I". But then it follows that the third person *(pra)tyamuñcat (alabdha* may of course be either first or third person) could not refer to the king. Presumably, *(pra)tyamuñcat* refers to the person who is the subject of *marlapas* in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription, i.e. the *ḍapunta hiyaṃ,* but then it follows that the latter, whatever his identity was, cannot be the same as the king of Çrīvijaya [52]).

---

[50]) G. Cœdès (*art. cit.,* p. 35) translated *marlapas* by "se libéra de". As a matter of fact, the meaning of *lĕpas* corresponds as closely as possible to that of the Sanskrit root *muc;* *kalĕpasan* is the exact equivalent of *mokṣa.* But how do the derivatives correspond? *Pratyamuñcat* would rather mean "liberated, set free", whereas *marlĕpas* is probably intransitive (*art. cit.,* p. 63, about the prefix *mar-*); on the other hand, *mar-* has sometimes a clearly active meaning, e.g. in the frequently occurring *marvuat.* Although the exact meaning remains obscure, the equivalence of the two forms does not seem doubtful.

[51]) N. J. Krom (quoted note 1 above) combined a very doubtful reading at the end of line 7 of the Kĕdukan Bukit epigraph with the well-known statement by I-tsing about the country of Malayu and therefore concluded that a part of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription referred to an expedition against Malayu; although there is hardly any doubt that such an expedition did take place in about the same period, there are serious objections against the presumption that the fact should be mentioned in the Kĕdukan Bukit epigraph; cf. note 68 below. Others took the text to refer to the conquest of the Palembang region, where the capital of the empire was established. Neither theory is satisfactory; since the fragments *a* and *b* seem to refer to an internal revolt, it is possible that the same is the case in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription (and our fragments *c* and *e*).

[52]) As to the meaning of the title of *(ḍa)punta hiyaṃ,* cf. Cœdès, *art. cit.,* p. 52, where some reserves are made. It cannot be doubtful that the Kotakapur inscription emanates from the king himself. But there (and in the Karangbrahi and Tĕlaga Batu inscriptions), the term *(ḍa)punta hiyaṃ* is not mentioned. As to the inscriptions of Kĕdukan Bukit and Talang Tuwo, not much may be concluded on general grounds: In the Campese

Although the above does not appear to convey any substantial contribution to the solution of the main problems, it is not devoid of interest in as far as it draws attention to the brittleness of some of the conclusions hitherto accepted.

The last two lines of our fragment seem to contain only laudatory verses addressed to the victor. It is mentioned that the rays of the sun are obscured (lit. : „put aside") by the essence *(sāra)* of something which is illegible, while at the end it seems that, as the king is away, the poet is obliged to praise him during his absence *(parokṣam)* with beautiful akṣaras. The next word *candra* suggests a simile in which the poet's task of praising the invisible king is compared to somebody trying to glorify the sun during an eclipse [53].

Transcription

1.]tyamuñcat=tatsaptamyām=ala[
2.]naripuganam=madvale ye praviṣṭe [
3.] api ca // mā—sāratiraskṛtārkkakiraṇāh [54] [
4.] parokṣam=akṣaravaraiç=candrā [55] [

.d

The next fragment was described by Stutterheim as „a stone, carved into the form of a wedge with smoothened, triangular front side" [56]. Its dimensions are : length 13 cm. height 6 cm. The fragment was bought at the Bukit Sĕguntang to the west of the town of Palembang, South Sumatra. Afterwards it was taken to Djakarta and placed in the Museum as No. D. 164.

Close examination proves that the wedge-form is not original. At the right and under sides, traces of breaking are visible, thus making it probable

inscription quoted by Cœdès (p. 58) it is the *rājapurohita* who goes to *Javā* in order to acquire *siddhayātra* for the empire. The *praṇidhāna* in the Talang Tuwo inscription might have been pronounced by any distinguished person, provided that he be sufficiently rich to afford the donation of a park, thus following the illustrious example of Anāthapiṇḍada. — The title *(da)punta hyang* (also *ḍapu hyang*) occurs in Old Javanese inscriptions, where it is evident that it does not refer to the king (in O. J. O., XIX, dated 891 A. D., a *ḍapunta ramyah*, a *ḍapu hyang bhāratī* and some others are granted some privileges, and numerous other examples may be added ; these and similar titles are frequent in the Diëng inscriptions). These Old Javanese examples may not be decisive for the interpretation of Çrīvijaya inscriptions, but in any case they do not confirm Cœdès' interpretation of the title ; this point deserves a detailed treatment.

[53] Cf. the two notes following.

[54] One syllable, metrically long, has almost disappeared. It might have been *yā*. In that case, the beginning of this Çārdūlavikrīḍita strophe might be translated : "The rays of the sun, concealed by the quintescence of Illusion".

[55] Possibly to be completed to : *candrāvṛtaṃ bhāsvaram* or something similar.

[56] *Jaarboek B. G.,* 3 (1936), p. 199.

that the stone is only a left upper corner. This detail is not irrelevant, as it renders the interpretations of Stutterheim and Schnitger, who both took the inscription as a short, but complete text, very improbable. Stutterheim read the inscription as çikṣyaprajña [56]), and was followed by Schnitger [57]), who, in addition, proposed as a translation : „teachings, words of wisdom".

The reading hitherto accepted does not seem quite correct. Besides, there does not exist any Sanskrit form çikṣya having the supposed meaning. We presume that the stroke interpreted by Stutterheim as the ya after a consonant should be read as a long -ā. In the Pallava script, several varieties of the normal stroke for the -ā appear to have been in use. As a rule, there are obvious reasons [58]), but not rarely, it seems, only aesthetic considerations determined the use of some special variant. An exact parallel of the form occurring on this fragment is found, for instance, at the end of line 1 of the Ligor inscription (face A) [59]), where there is no doubt that mā, not mya, is to be read.

As to the last sign just before the break, the ligature jña is perfectly clear, but, in addition, we discern a distinct loop starting from the end of the middle horizontal stroke of the ja and running round the top of the akṣara. This is the usual way of expressing the -ā after ja.

So we think that the reading should be corrected to çikṣāprajñā-, forming the two initial terms of a compound. They probably once stood at the very beginning of a perhaps extensive praçasti. The four long syllables might indicate the use of the Sragdharā (or possibly, Āryā or Anuṣṭubh) metre. Çikṣā and prajñā are two fundamental notions in Mahāyāna (and in some Hīnayāna sects, too) : the first indicating the ordinary, mundane knowledge (including the rules of discipline), which is acquired from others, the second the highest intuitive wisdom, which, in Mahāyāna, is inseparable from the true vision of the Çūnyatā. The two words together may have been used in an invocatory verse addressed to a perfect Buddha (or, possibly, to Mañjuçrī or Avalokiteçvara). We can only hope that more fragments will be discovered.

c

The last fragment to be discussed here was discovered at the same place as b and c above (Tēlaga Batu) ; its dimensions are 33 cm in length and 41 cm in height [60]). Both at the left and at the right hand side, parts of the stone are missing, thus leaving only the middle portion of the epigraph with

[57]) *Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra* (1937), p. 3.

[58]) Especially in cases where the use of the normal form would involve confusion, as is the case with *pa* and *la* which, with the normal ā-stroke, would be read as *ha* and *na*, respectively.

[59]) Cf. the photograph published in the article by Cœdès, *Le royaume de Çrīvijaya*, *B.E.F.E.O.* 18 (1918), Pl. 1, and by Chhabra, *op. cit.*, Pl. 4.

[60]) Description by Stutterheim in *Jaarboek B.G.*, 3 (1936), p. 199.

probably eight lines of script in a badly weathered condition [61]. The stone is at present in the Djakarta Museum (No. D. 161).

Only parts of the text can be deciphered. As Stutterheim pointed out, at least a part of the text agrees with the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription [62]. Closer examination, however, made it clear that this fragment contains an additional passage in the lines 7 and 8 which does not correspond to anything in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. Besides, this fragment permits us to re-establish an important detail in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. At the end of line 8 not only the final n of $vulan$, but also the name of the month has been lost. Now, we read in line 6 of our fragment the word $\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{a}\dot{d}a$ just preceding $laghu\ mudita$, the first words of line 9 of the Kĕdukan Bukit epigraph. So it seems certain that the lacuna at the end of line 8 of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription contained just the final n of $vulan$ and the name $\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{a}\dot{d}a$ ($\bar{A}\bar{s}\bar{a}\dot{d}ha$).

There is still a considerable amount of uncertainty as to the correct interpretation of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription; therefore, a small detail like this one might deserve attention. Even if it does not seem that it would allow us to arrive at a definite solution of the main problems, it enables us to construct a sort of „time scheme" of the movements of the $\dot{d}apunta\ hiyam$ in the expired Çaka-year 605. The result would be as follows:

(a) At 11 çuklapakṣa of Vaiçākha : $n\bar{a}ik\ di\ s\bar{a}mvau$;
(b) At 7 çuklapakṣa of Jyaiṣṭha : $marlĕpas\ dari\ min\bar{a}\dot{n}a$;
(c) At 5 çuklapakṣa of Āṣādha : $laghu\ mudita\ d\bar{a}tam$.

If, as seems plausible enough, these dates have been calculated according to the Sūryasiddhānta system with mean reckoning of the movements of sun and moon [63], the three months would follow each other without $adhim\bar{a}sa$, while between the dates (a) and (b) there would be one expunged $tithi$ [64]. Then the distance in mean solar days between (a) and (b) amounts to 25, and between (b) and (c) to 28.

---

[61] Stutterheim (loc. cit.) mentions only seven lines of script; this would not be impossible. It seems to us, however, that above the first line in which definite akṣaras can be recognized (line 3 of our transcription), two more lines with feeble traces of lettering may be discerned. Besides, two lines instead of one would better agree with the length of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription.

[62] Art. cit. — In addition, Stutterheim gave the transcription of most of line 5.

[63] W. E. van Wijk, in the article quoted in note 1 above, calculated the first two dates on the same premises.

[64] With the help of the simplified tables published by W. E. van Wijk, Reduction of Hindu Dates from the data of the Sūryasiddhānta (1938), we find for the Julian equivalent of True Mīnasaṃkrānti preceding the beginning of the Çaka year 605 the number of 49,362 days and for the distance to the first New Moon 13,496 days. The 11th tithi of Vaiçākha again begins 29,531 + 9,844 days later, totalling 102,233 days. The fraction 0,233 represents about fifteen times the difference between a tithi and a mean solar day, thus denoting the expunction of a tithi about half a month later, in any case between the dates (a) and (b). Then, of course, there cannot have been any expunged tithi between the dates (b) and (c).

Might these dates, the third of which was hitherto unknown, contribute to a solution of the mysterious movements of the *dapunta hiyaṃ*? — In view of these two periods, it is not probable that the inscription records a return journey from the capital of Çrīvijaya (if already situated in the neighbourhood of the town of Palembang, as seems probable) to the estuary of the river Musi, since that journey would not take 28 days [65]. Another point which is difficult to understand in the case of a return journey is that the *dapunta hiyaṃ* would have taken his army *(mamāva vala)* from the place where he went in order to acquire *siddhayātra,* whatever that means. If the possibility of a return journey is excluded, there remain two other possibilities : one single journey, which is in some way interrupted at the second date, or two different journeys starting at the dates (a) and (b) and the return from the latter of these at or before date (c). The possibility of one throughout journey was suggested several times before [66] ; recently, Poerbatjaraka added new arguments to this conjecture [67]. It seems however difficult to account for the fact that the *dapunta hiyaṃ* would have begun his journey without an army to join his troops during that journey and twenty-five days later. This does not seem probable. We rather suppose that the text records two different journeys at the dates (a) and (b) and a third event at date (c) ; this, in fact, is the interpretation given by Cœdès. Then we have : (a) a journey undertaken for the acquisition of *siddhayātra,* (b) a military expedition, or, more exactly, a journey undertaken with twenty thousand men, (c) some prosperous arrival *(laghu mudita dātaṃ)* followed by the „making" *(marvuat)* of something unknown. There must have been a direct connection between these three events.

How does this third date fit in with Krom's hypothesis that the date (b) should refer to an expedition to Malayu ? [68]. It is obvious that it does not confirm such an explanation ; twenty-eight days are rather a short period.

[65] This, of course, would not exclude the opinion of R. A. Kern, who identified the enigmatic Mināña Tāmvan (?) with the mouth of the river Musi *(Bijdr. K.I.,* 88, 1931, p. 510). Instead of Cœdès' reading *tāmvan,* the word has also been transcribed *hamwar* (Van Ronkel), *tāmbar* (Ferrand), *tamban* (Wellan); cf. Cœdès, B.E.F.E.O., 33 (1933), p. 1007.   [66] Especially by V. Obdeyn, quoted in note 1 above.

[67] Quoted in note 1 above. Poerbatjaraka explains (pp. 34 sq.) the name Mināña Tāmvan as the place where two rivers meet. *Tāmvan* is explained as the equivalent of Old Javanese *těmwan,* derived from the base *těmu,* „to meet". This etymology is however in direct conflict with the fact that the equivalent of Old Javanese *těmu* occurs six times in the inscription of Talang Tuwo (lines 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 14), but spelt *tmu,* thus pointing to an original *pěpět.* The long *ā* of the name indicates however an original *a.* It seems moreover doubtful whether *mināña* may be interpreted as "the confluence of two rivers" (presumably, in that case, of the Kampar Kanan and the Kampar Kiri) ; the data collected by R. A. Kern *(art. cit.,* p. 510, with the notes to that page) seem rather to suggest the meaning "estuary" or "lower course" of a river.

[68] Quoted in note 1 above. Krom's reading of *malayu* at the end of line 7 does not agree very well with the traces still visible on the original stone. As to the second *akṣara,* it seems certain that the second and third verticals are connected at the upper side, a feature which excludes *la.* The akṣara is either a *ta* (as Cœdès read), or, more probably to our opinion, a *ka.*

Our fragment contains an additional passage, which is not found in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription; the words legible in the lines 7 and 8 do not correspond with anything in the latter. They seem to refer to a fourth event on a fourth date [69]. Since the reading of line 8 is relatively certain, we may conclude that either the foundation of, or the royal visit to, „this Vihāra in this country" *(vihāra ini di vanua ini)* is mentioned. The twofold use of *ini* makes it probable that the Vihāra was situated in the neighbourhood of Tĕlaga Batu, where the fragment was discovered. F. M. Schnitger, in 1935 and '36, discovered only some heaps of bricks in that region [70].

Our fragment is not an exact copy of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. Presumably, the latter was engraved after date (c) and this one at least eight months later. Probably, the fourth event was closely connected with the preceding ones so that therefore the whole line of events was taken up again. This might lead us to suppose that the foundation of, or the visit to, the Vihāra was a direct consequence of the expedition which is presumably referred to in the date (b) ; it may have been the fulfilment of a vow made before the expedition. If such a vow implied the construction of a Vihāra, the considerable lapse of time between the dates (c) and (d) could be accounted for. The same lapse of time might furnish an explanation for the fact that the whole string of events was taken up again.

Although this fragment, too, leaves us in the dark about the main problems connected with the foundation and the early history of Çrīvijaya, it gives us a few details which might prove interesting.

Transcription [71]

3:]ptamī çuklapakṣa *vulan* ....

4.]va [72]) yaṃ vala dua lakṣa ....

5.] sapuluḥ dua vañakña dātaṃ *di*

6.] āṣāda [73]) laghu mudita dātaṃ ....

---

[69]) We read *varṣā* at the end of the line. The two preceding *akṣaras*, which are only very faintly visible, might well have been *çaka*. In that case, it is certain that the date did not fall in the same year. Otherwise, the formula introducing the numbers of the year would not have been repeated.

[70]) *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra* (1937), pp. 1 sq.

[71]) Nothing definite can be read of the first two lines, although the few traces, which are still visible, make it very probable that there were two lines of script. This would agree with the length of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription, two lines of which nearly correspond to one line of this stone. This fact appears clearly from a comparison of the readable words in this text with the place where they are found in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription. We therefore consider the first line of our transcription to correspond to line 3 of the complete text.

[72]) Obviously, the end of *mamāva* occurring in line 5 of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription.

[73]) Read : *āṣādha*. Only very few examples of the akṣara *dha* are known from Indonesian inscriptions (the only examples known to us are found in the Karangtĕñah inscription ; cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, p. 29) ; in the name of the month *Āṣādha*, which seems to be the only Sanskrit word with *dha* adopted in Old-Javanese, it is always replaced by either *da* or *dha*.

7.] .... raḥ gī .... varṣā [74])
8.] vihāra ini di vanua ini // [75])

II. THE OLD MALAY INSCRIPTION OF TĔLAGA BATU
(SOUTH SUMATRA)

As was stated in the introduction to No. I above, the discoveries at the place called Tĕlaga Batu to the east of the town of Palembang (South Sumatra) include not only a large number of *siddhayātra* stones aᵤd three fragmentary inscriptions (No. I, b, c and e), but also a very large stone inscription, measuring 118 cm in height and 148 cm in breadth [1]). The stone was afterwards carried to the Djakarta Museum (D. 155).

The stone as a whole is of a very peculiar form. We cannot do better than to quote most of the meticulous description by Stutterheim [2]) :

— „The stone is hooded by seven cobra heads with flat, round crown jewels, broad necks and neck wrinkles, which at the back of the stone gradually merge into the flat surface of the stone. On the front side, 28 lines of script are visible, badly weathered and illegible but for a few akṣaras. The inscribed part of the stone is separated from the roughly flattened under part by a protruding horizontal ledge, which descends a little before joining the surface of the stone; thus a groove is formed, passing in the middle part into a spout in the form of a yoni".

As will appear below, the text of the inscription gives a clear indication as to the meaning of that curious form.

Others, too, emphasized the illegibility of the inscription. It seems, however, that this is partly due to the dark corner in the Museum where the stone is at present situated. The estampages show that this stone is not at all a hopeless case, and it has gradually been possible to decipher most of the inscription. It is quite possible that in due course of time those passages of which it has not up till now been possible to give any certain reading will also become clear. As this inscription offers by far the most extensive text of the empire of Çrīvijaya, it might deserve full attention.

Whereas Stutterheim does not mention any conclusion as to the variety of script, Schnitger was more definite and assigned the inscription to the

---

[74]) The reading of this word, though not perfectly certain, seems probable. The two akṣaras preceding are very faint on the stone, but might well have been *çaka*. The reading of *gī* seems certain. Between the latter and the presumed *ça*, there are traces of three or four akṣaras, possibly to be read *todyāna* followed by a mark of punctuation. *Gītodyāna*, if this conjectural reading may be relied upon, would appear to be the name of a park (?) ; as to the (presumably two) akṣaras preceding *raḥ*, no identification is possible.

[75]) The reading of the last line is relatively well preserved and does not seem doubtful.

[1]) *Jaarboek B. G.*, 1936, p. 198. with a photograph opposite p. 203.

[2]) *Ibid.* The translation of the passage is as literal as possible.

ninth or tenth century A. D. [3]). We do not know upon what details the above conclusion was founded. On the contrary, both form and style of the akṣaras appear to agree in every possible detail with the variety used on the stone of Kotakapur (Bangka), dated, as is well-known, 686 A. D. It seems quite possible that both inscriptions were engraved by the same scribe [4]). Though no date can be made out in the text, the form of script makes it rather probable that the inscription of Tĕlaga Batu should be assigned to about the same year as the Kotakapur stone, i.e. the two last decades of the seventh century A. D. As will appear from the transcription, the text itself also shows a close affinity to the Kotakapur epigraph, thus confirming the conclusion arrived at above.

The text is entirely composed in the Old Malay language, showing the same peculiarities as the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions. The long text furnishes, moreover, copious data for our knowledge of that language. Some of the most interesting words will be discussed before the transcription.

Some Sanskrit words have a slightly different meaning from that which they have in the classical language. *Tathāpi* does not mean „all the same, nevertheless", but only „and, moreover". As in the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions, we find *kadāci* instead of *kadācit* (*-d*). As words with final dentals are very common in Indonesian languages, the difference cannot well be attributed to Indonesian adaptation, while the frequent use of the word excludes an error by the scribe. Forms without the final dental are however frequently met with in the so-called Gāthā dialect, where forms like *kadāci, keci, karhici, kiṃci* etc. are the usual ones [5]). *Kadāci* is always used as a 'conjunction' in our text, if we may use this, for Indonesian languages very inappropriate, term; everywhere the translation by „if, when" is satisfactory. As a matter of fact, this development may be observed in other cases, too; thus, *tatkāla* always means „when" in modern Indonesian (spelt *tatkala*) [6]).

A curious word is *paracakṣu*, which occurs quite a number of times

---

[3]) *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra* (1937), p. 1.

[4]) It is remarkable that the differences in script between the almost contemporary Çrīvijaya inscriptions are far from being negligible. On account of that very peculiarity, the perfect identity is in this case the more striking. In both cases we note the same style of the akṣaras with their slender forms (in relation to their breadth, the akṣaras are very high). The *ra* is double-stroked everywhere.

[5]) Also in the metrical parts of texts like the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, these forms are often met with. For details, cf. F. Edgerton, *Bull. School Or. Stud.*, 8 (1936), pp. 510 — 516.

[6]) Indonesian languages may use the same forms for the 'adverbs' and the corresponding 'conjunctions' of our grammar; thus, *kĕtika* may correspond both to English "then" and "when". Mostly, however, the terms become specialized to either the former or the latter use, but such a limitation of the meaning does not always agree with the original function of the word; this appears to be the case for *tatkāla*, for instance, which in Sanskrit is always an adverb, although it is used as a conjunction meaning "when" in modern Indonesian. This is exactly the same development that we note in *kadāci(t)*. Similar developments may be observed in present-day Indonesian; cf. A. A. Fokker, *Indonesische Syntaxis* (1951), pp. 151 sqq.

in this text; obviously, it denotes some kind of enemy, presumably a „spy". The term would correspond to the use of *cakṣus* in Indian political literature, and to that of *mata-mata* in modern Indonesian. The combination *paracakṣus* is unusual in Sanskrit; as to the first part of the compound, one could refer to the use of *para* to indicate a (usually honorific) plural in the modern language, if that use was not a direct borrowing from Javanese. Very probably, *paracakṣu* should be explained as a Sanskrit compound, the first half of which means „enemy" (cf. *paradeça* etc.) ; *paracakṣu* would then mean: „the eye of the enemy, spy", and the addition of *para°* is probably due to the necessity of stressing that the term does not apply to the spies in service of the king of Çrīvijaya. In *cakṣu*, the loss of the final sibilant (or visarga) is remarkable; here, too, one might consider the possibility of Buddhist Sanskrit influence, where the same tendency is obvious [7]).

In this connection, we should also mention the word *drohaka*, which occurs in the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Karangbrahi, too ; it appears to have a more limited meaning than in Sanskrit, probably that of „traitor", as is the case with *durhaka* in modern Indonesian (the metathesis may be due to so-called popular etymology in view of the numerous words borrowed from Sanskrit with *dur-* in a pejorative sense).

An important group of terms deserve to be treated with greater detail, viz. the designations for the various groups of people in service of the state. If these terms were clear, which unfortunately is not the case with all of these, they would allow us a kind of peep into the organization of the empire. First of all, the Tĕlaga Batu inscription mentions several sorts of princes and an extensive list of functionaries. Almost all the terms are Sanskrit. In the latter portion of the text, a group of three sorts of princes is mentioned several times (lines 20, 21, and 22), running as follows: *yuvarāja, pratiyuvarāja, rājakumāra*, probably respectively the crown prince (but taking part in the government after a special consecration), the prince immediately following in age (who would be supposed to take the place of the first prince if something should happen to him) [8]) and the other princes. It appears

---

[7]) Since many words in the Indonesian languages end in *-h* and in *-s*, it is not probable that the loss of the visarga or of the *-s* should be attributed to a proper Indonesian development; the examples are all but rare (cf. Indonesian *tapa*, „asceticism", from Sanskrit *tapas* or *tapaḥ;* Javanese *teja* from Sanskrit *tejaḥ*, etc.). In Buddhist Sanskrit, however, the loss of the final visarga is frequent; it even leads to sandhi forms such as *tejeva* for *teja iva*. Cf. *tama*, „nouveau thème pracritisant pour *tamas*" (E. Sénart, *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 392). It is not relevant to our purpose, whether the loss of the final consonant should be considered phonetical or morphological (consonantal stems being absorbed by the far more frequent vowel stems); the main point is that we have not an Indonesian, but an Indian development here. As is also the case with the examples quoted in the preceding notes, there are indications that Buddhist Sanskrit texts might have been an important source from which words were incorporated in Indonesian languages, but the subject requires a detailed investigation on broader lines.

[8]) We do not know of any instance of *pratiyuvarāja* in Sanskrit.

that these princes could hold the office of *dātu* [9]), in order to protect all the provinces of the empire [10]). Cœdès' interpretation of *dātu* as a „governor of a province" [11]) is undoubtedly correct. We learn moreover the interesting fact that this office could be held by the crown prince and other princes; at the same time it appears that there were also *dātus* who did not belong to the royal family and probably had less authority; at least, they undergo a less severe punishment for the same crimes than the princes [12]). It is hardly astonishing to learn that the royal princes were considered the more dangerous menace, especially when they held important offices far from the capital.

A long list of lower functionaries is mentioned in lines 3 to 4. It consists of twenty-five terms, beginning with *rājaputra* and ending with *hulun hāji*. Although the list still offers considerable difficulties, which are only in part due to uncertain reading, it is almost sure that it will prove important. It may cast some light upon the organization and administration of the largest insular empire of the Far East during the Middle Ages, an empire known

---

9) Cf. line 20 : *yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja . rājakumāra yaṃ nisaṃvarddhiku akan datūa,* "who are distinguished by me with the function of a *dātu* (lit.: to be a *dātu)".* *Nisaṃvarddhiku,* which occurs several times in this form, is a derivative from the base *saṃvarddhi* by means of the affixes *ni-* and *-ku.* There might be some doubt whether the original Sanskrit form from which *saṃvarddhi* is derived is *saṃvṛddhi* or *saṃvardhita.* The meaning of the form found in the inscription is not doubtful. The expression *nisaṃvarddhiku* is reserved for the princes; for the lower rank state servants performing the function of a *dātu,* the expression *nigalarku,* "are charged by me with", is used (also in line 4 of the Kotakapur inscription).

10) Cf. line 20 : *maṃrakṣāña sakalamaṇḍalāña kadatuanku. Kadātuan* cannot possibly mean "office of a *dātu"* (Cœdès, *art. cit., p.* 57) here, and the meaning of Javanese *kĕraton,* "royal palace", is also out of the question. Here, at least, *kadatuan* has clearly the mean- ing of "empire" as a whole; the latter is divided into a large number of (this seems implied in *sakala°*) maṇḍalas. For the latter term, an exact translation is difficult to be given; presumably it is the main administrative division of the empire; other terms like *viṣaya, bhukti* etc. do not occur in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions. Probably, the empire was divided into a considerable number of *maṇḍalas,* each of these under the authority of a *dātu.* It appears from line 21 that not all the *dātus* were princes; if we understand that passage, it is stated that the *dātus* who are not princes are not killed by the curse for the same offences for which the princes would have been punished by death. — A function lower than that of a *dātu* is that of a *parvvāṇḍa;* the latter term does not mean "order" or "under command of" (Cœdès, *art. cit.,* p. 73), but rather some sort of army commander, the meaning suggested by line 15 *(sanyāsa parvāṇḍa dy=āku,* on a line with *sanyāsa datūa).* In line 26, where the same term occurs, the same appears to be the case *(nisaṃvarddhiku parvvāṇḍa* is to be compared to *nisaṃvarddhiku datūa).*

11) *Art. cit.,* p. 54, more precisely : "(le roi) nommait des *dātu,* qui devaient gérer chacun un *kadatuan,* et éventuellement diriger des expéditions militaires"; we learn from our inscription that the territory under command of a *dātu* was denoted by *maṇḍala,* whereas *kadatuan* seems to refer to the empire as a whole; cf. note 10 above. We suppose that the relation between *kadatuan* and *dātu* should be taken in a less direct way, the latter *en bloc* protecting the former.

12) This seems to follow from the lines 21 sq. of our text; cf. the notes to the translation there.

as far as Arabia, Nepal and Peking, which, moreover, was able to maintain itself during more than five centuries. In addition, since most of the technical terms are Sanskrit, it would be important to examine on which of the Indian empires this administration was based. Such a piece of research would however fall outside the scope of this publication ; we confine ourselves to the meaning of the actual terms.

The meaning of *rājaputra,* the first item of the list, is difficult to be ascertained ; in Sanskrit, the use of the term varies according to time and place. Here, it is anyhow clear that *rājaputra* should be sharply distinguished from the three kinds of princes mentioned above ; they may have been princes born of concubines and holding an office, but vassal princes (usually *sāmantarāja*) would also be possible [13]). Owing to uncertain reading, the second term is obscure [14]), whereas the third one, viz. *bhūpati,* seems rather vague ; here, too, one might consider the possibility that vassals should be meant.

Among the next five terms, viz. *senāpati, nāyaka, pratyaya, hājipratyaya* and *daṇḍanāyaka,* neither the first nor the last item offer real difficulties ; they have probably been army-commanders and judges, respectively. The three remaining terms are however all but lucid. *Nāyaka* and *pratyaya* are frequently met with in Old Javanese inscriptions, where they are regularly mentioned in the initial portion of the usually very detailed lists of people not allowed to enter the grounds of a religious foundation [15]).

Almost everywhere, the two terms occur together, which does not seem to be the case in Indian inscriptions. Presumably, they are two categories of district officers, or, more probably, administrators of the properties of the king and of other members of the royal family [16]). *Hājipratyaya* is strange as a compound, the first term being Indonesian, the second Sanskrit, whereas the compound as a whole seems to follow the rules of a Sanskrit *tatpuruṣa* [17]). The whole could mean something like "royal sheriffs".

Of the next term, only the end, *mūrdhaka,* can be deciphered. It must

---

[13]) In that case, however, these feudal chiefs would have come under the direct authority of the king of Çrīvijaya. We consider the latter explanation less probable than the former one, since the composition of the list as a whole would rather suggest more direct servants of the king.

[14]) Cf. note 4 to the transcription.

[15]) We mean the so-called lists of *mañilala drawya haji,* „those who claim the king's property" ; cf. the detailed study by W. F. Stutterheim in *T.B.G.,* 65 (1925), pp. 245 — 267, and by F. W. van Naerssen, *Oud-Javaanse oorkonden in Duitse en Deense verzamelingen* (1941), the Introduction and *passim.*

[16]) The meaning of *nāyaka* in Sanskrit is rather vague ("leader" e.g. of an army), whereas in the modern Central Javanese courts the *nayâkâs* are councillors of the king. None of these meanings is satisfactory in the Old Javanese inscriptions, where in any case a functionary of intermediate rank is meant.
The *pratyaya* „(man of) confidence" seems to be an administrator of the property of deceased persons (cf. G. Cœdès, *Inscr. du Cambodge,* I, p. 180, who translates "curateur").

[17]) The reading of the first part of the compound seems certain. There might be influence of *rājapratyaya.*

be somebody at the head of some group of people. So are also the two following items, viz. „surveyors of a group of labourers" [18]) and „inspectors of the low-castes" [19]). Then follow *vāṣikaraṇa*, „cutlers".

The next three items are *kumārāmātya, cāthabhaṭa and adhikaraṇa.* They are all well-known from Indian inscriptions, but their exact meaning is not quite clear and may have varied considerably according to place and time. *Kumārāmātya* is explained by M. C. De and by K. P. Jayaswal as a minister *(amātya)* not of royal blood, but on account of merits considered by royal decree as an equal of a prince [20]). It seems, however, that in this inscription the term indicates a lower rank, for it would be strange if a prince were mentioned after cutlers and inspectors. Also in Indian inscriptions *kumārāmātyas* are found together with *cāṭabhaṭas* and *adhikaraṇas* [21]). It is interesting to note that all these terms seem to be confined to inscriptions from Northern India (with the inclusion of Kaliṅga).

The other terms present less difficulties. We meet there with clerks *(kāyastha)*, architects *(sthāpaka)* [22]), shippers *(puhāvaṃ,* one of the few Indonesian terms in this list), merchants *(vaṇiyāga)* [23]), commanders *(pratisāra)*, royal washermen *(marsī haji,* if our translation is correct) and royal slaves *(hulun hāji)*.

At first, the composition of the above list seems to be very heterogeneous as it includes princes, army commanders, merchants and washermen. It is, however, to be noted that the enumeration as a whole is clearly hierarchical, and in the case of most of the categories it is clear that they are royal servants. On the other hand, it is evident that, as such, the list cannot be complete. So the next question which arises is why it is the above categories that are mentioned and not any others. It appears that the contents of the entire inscription allow, at least partially, of an answer. As will be shown by examination in detail. the inscription consists of one extensive imprecation

---

[18]) *Tuḥān vatak=vuruḥ,* — cf. the note the translation.

[19]) *Adhyakṣa nīcavarṇa.*

[20]) *Journ. Beh. and Or. Soc.,* 17 (1931), pp. 198 — 201 and p. 399.

[21]) *Art. cit.,* p. 199. — *Ibid.,* p. 200, a copper-plate grant is mentioned, the seal of which bears the legend *Kumārāmātyādhikaraṇasya.* Some other officers, frequently mentioned in Indian inscriptions in this connection, such as Mahattaras and Rājasthānīyas, do not occur in our text.
Cāṭabhaṭas are often mentioned in Indian inscriptions among the persons who are not allowed to enter temple grounds, just like, e.g., the *nāyakas* and *pratyayas* in the Old Javanese inscriptions. Cf. H. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.,* VII (article dated in 1881), p. 24, who wrongly translated the term by „landloopers" (vagabonds). None of the three terms have as yet been met with in Old Javanese inscriptions.

[22]) Including also sculptors. In later Old Javanese texts, *sthāpaka* seems to denote a sort of priest who has an important function in funeral ceremonies (cf. Stutterheim, *T.B.G.,* 72, 1934, p. 87) ; cf. note 11 to the translation.

[23]) Wrong spelling for *vaṇyāga.* It is however curious that the word occurs in exactly the same orthographical form in an Old Javanese inscription to be discussed below.

against all kinds of possible insurgents and traitors. So only those categories of people need be mentioned that might constitute a possible danger. Seen from that point of view, the composition of the list is self-explanatory. The dangerous persons in the empire are not only the princes and army-commanders, who could organize revolts when they were far from the capital, but also some lower servants who had easy access to the king, such as clerks, washermen and slaves. Even they would not, in general, act of their own accord, but they would be easy tools to the hand of revolting princes. As will appear below, the inscription mentions some interesting harem intrigues. Shippers and merchants could be very dangerous because they came into contact with foreign powers. The special mention of these last groups quite fits in with the naval and commercial power of Çrīvijaya.

For our knowledge of the Old Malay language, too, the inscription of Tĕlaga Batu furnishes ample materials. Referring the reader to the Word Index for the details, we shall note here only some of the more important points which require some explanation, or which are interesting to note individually.

As in the modern language, the word *kāmu* means „you" (plural). Here we find also the enclitic form *-māmu*, „your". It seems that *kita* (enclitic *-ta*) in Old Malay has the function of a polite equivalent. It does not occur in this text, but is used in the Kotakapur inscription. It is easily explained by the fact that the latter text is not directly addressed to the possible malefactors, but, on the contrary, to the divine powers who will carry out the punishments, whereas our text is directed against the male-factors themselves.

The word *malūn*, which occurs several times in this text (e.g. in line 11), undoubtedly corresponds to modern Indonesian *bĕlum* (or : *bĕlon*). It seems that in a small number of words the Çrīvijaya dialect has an initial *m* instead of the *b* in classical Malay and modern Indonesian. An example, which is sufficiently certain, is the well-known prefix *mar-*, corresponding to *bĕr-* in the modern language. Anticipating a more detailed discussion, we note the difficult word *muah*, which may correspond to *buah* in modern Indonesian.

The word *lai* was rightly considered a *crux* in the inscriptions hitherto published. Van Ronkel had taken it as meaning "being present", Cœdès explained it as meaning "being hungry" [24]. It appears that in this text, where the word occurs rather frequently, neither interpretation is satisfactory, though it is difficult to determine its real meaning. In most of the places where the word occurs, the meaning corresponding to that of *lain* in the modern language seems to fit in with the context. From a linguistic point of view, there does not seem to be any serious objection, as extension of an original root, mostly monosyllabic, by adding final *-n* is frequently

[24] Ph.S. van Ronkel, *Acta Orient.*, II (1924), p. 16; G. Cœdès, *art. cit.*, p. 75.

met with in several Indonesian languages [25]. In line 5 of the inscription of Talang Tuwo, the words *di antara mārgga lai* could well be translated „on another road", i.e. on a road they were not used to go [26].

In line 13 of our text, we read *kuṣṭa kasīhan vaçīkaraṇa lai* ; the Kotakapur inscription, in the corresponding passage (line 6), reads *kasīhan vaçīkaraṇa . ityevamādi*. One gets the impression that *lai* might more or less correspond in meaning to *ityevamādi*. This would indeed be the case if the words *kuṣṭa kasīhan vaçīkaraṇa lai* were to be translated : "*kuṣṭha* (cf. note 51, below), philtres and other means to make people submit to their will". *Vaçīkaraṇa* is the general term for such practices, including the use of various kinds of herbs to that purpose ; although some of these means are referred to in the two inscriptions, it is evident that such a list could never be complete ; we then expect that an expression meaning "et cetera" or something of that kind should be added. Since this is the case in the Kotakapur inscription *(ityevamādi)*, the use of *lai* would exactly come up to our expectations if the word may be translated as we suggested.

In addition, we find our word three times after *paracakṣu* (lines 6 and 7). *Cakṣus*, in the meaning "spy", is a well-known term in the Arthaçāstras ; its combination with *para°* is unusual in Sanskrit, but affords no difficulty ; the compound is obviously used to avoid other possible interpretations of the word. Besides, Indian political science considered the use of spies quite normal for the *vijigīṣu* ; spying for the enemy was however something quite different and the passage in cur text contains a sanction against it. If, then, *lai* means "other", its addition to *paracakṣu* may be understood in view of the necessity for an absolutely unambiguous expression in a document of this kind [27].

In the *loci* just mentioned, this interpretation of *lai* appears satisfactory, but some reservations should be made in view of the rather frequent use of *lai* in combination with the pronoun *kāmu* (either as *lai kāmu* or, more frequently, as *kāmu lai*). What is the exact meaning of this combination ? — As is stated above, the imprecation is, unlike the Kotakapur inscription,

[25]) Thus, in Old Javanese the negative particle *tan* seems to be a more recent form than *ta*, which occurs, for instance, in the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* (II, 57), and is implied in *tak, tat*, etc. ; cf. H. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, 8 (1903), pp. 282 sqq. Originally, the particle *n* belonged only to the third person. The Sanskrit conjunction *yadi* occurs in the form *yadin* (or *yadyan*) in Old Javanese (*art. cit.*, p. 287).

[26]) The idea that dying people should be hungry seems strange ; therefore, Cœdès was forced to correct *āsannakāla* to *āsanakāla*. In that case, the statement makes sense, but the main objection is that it would constitute an anticlimax after the preceding statement according to which the park is the most effective means *(varopāya)* to obtain bliss *(sukha)*. The general idea expressed by the latter passage is probably that all living beings will participate in the *puṇya* acquired by the foundation. The Hindu practice of transporting people to die in a holy spot is well-known and would not be contrary to Buddhism of this age.

[27]) As Dr R. Goris informed me, the term *cakṣu* is frequently found in Old Balinese inscriptions. There, however, it denotes a lower category of officials, possibly charged with the collection of taxes.

directly addressed to the possible criminals. who are all referred to by *kāmu.* Usually, no special difficulties of expression arise, but what is to be done if several of the groups of criminals choose to work together ? Then the different groups such as those who conceive and organize and those who actually perpetrate the crimes should clearly be distinguished. The use of *kāmu* without further definition would be ambiguous. In such cases, we suppose that *kāmu* refers to those directly addressed in one of the paragraphs, whereas *kāmu lai* is used if, in addition to the *kāmu* group, other people (e.g. complices) are addressed. Thus, in line 7 of our text a sanction is pronounced against people who are in contact with different kinds of enemies. The latter, however, were already cursed before. If, in that case, *kāmu* alone were used, the text might be interpreted to refer to the different kinds of enemies, not to those who, abiding in the capital or even within the royal palace, might be in regular contact with them ; so we presume that the latter group of collaborators is addressed by *kāmu lai* in order to avoid such a misunderstanding.

A similar case occurs in line 10. The curse is there directed against people who manage to escape after having committed various crimes against king and state. In addition to these. there is a less obvious group of guilty ones, who assist the above group in escaping. If now *kāmu* alone were used, the sanction could be taken to refer to the first category alone, i.e. those who really do the work, whereas the assistants would go free. Such a wrong interpretation is avoided by the use of *kāmu* to address the principal group, and of *kāmu lai* for their assistants. We may then translate the combination by „others among you". We therefore presume that in combination with *kāmu,* too, the use of *lai.* apparently strange. agrees well with the meaning „others".

It is obvious that most of these difficulties are due to the fact that in the Tëlaga Batu inscription the king's servants are directly addressed. All the categories mentioned in the lines 3 to 5 must therefore be referred to in the second person. Mostly, no special difficulties arise ; *kāmu* then refers to all of the king's servants should they commit the crimes defined in each separate paragraph ; if, however, a kind of criminal action in which one group of king's servants collaborates with another of them is to be defined, the expression becomes a little awkward : *kāmu* has to be reserved for the principal group, whereas the assistants have to be referred to by an expression meaning „others of you" ; we presume that this is what has been expressed by *kāmu lai.*

If people belonging to the king's servants mentioned in the lines 3 to 5 work together with those not in direct service to the king, the definitions of the crimes afford no difficulty. In that case, the latter are referred to in the third person. Such a case occurs, for instance, in the lines 13 sqq., where the curse is directed against the king's servants should they be in contact with various sorts of people well-versed in the use of magical

practices [28]). In that case, of course, the latter are referred to by the third person (*ya* and *-ña* respectively) and there arise no difficulties of the kind mentioned above. In the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Karangbrahi, the expression and distinction of different groups of possible criminals is much easier since the text is there addressed to the supernatural powers supposed to execute the sanctions directed against the criminals; consequently the latter are always referred to in the third person.

Another awkward word, occurring rather frequently in the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions, too, is *muah*. H. Kern [29]) and Van Ronkel [30]) connected it with Old Javanese *muwah*, „again", whereas Cœdès took it as an equivalent of *āda (ada)*, „to be" (presumably not occurring in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions), indicating the mere presence of something and often used as an emphatic particle [31]). It appears, however, that no argument can be based upon the absence of *āda*, for the same word proves to be frequent in the Tĕlaga Batu inscription (lines 10, 12, 13, 16, 18 and 25). Besides, at least in one passage in the texts hitherto known neither interpretation is satisfactory, viz. in line 5 of the Talang Tuwo inscription *(tmu muah ya āhāra dñan air niminumña)*. Here, it is difficult to account for any special reason why *tmu* should have been stressed; if it had been the intention to stress the presence of food and water, one would have expected *tmu muahña āhāra*; the meaning „again", presumed by Kern and Van Ronkel, does not yield a suitable meaning for the sentence. Similar arguments may be adduced with reference to the expression *tālu muah* (lines 5 and 7 of the Kotakapur inscription), which occurs also in this text (lines 8 and 22).

We are therefore inclined to consider another possibility. In a small number of cases some of which are beyond doubt (viz. the prefix *mar-* in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions corresponding to *bĕr-* in classical Malay and modern Indonesian, and *mamāva* corresponding to *mĕmbawa*; in addition, we consider *malūn* corresponding to *bĕlon* hardly doubtful) we see that the initial *m* of the Çrīvijaya inscriptions corresponds to a *b* in classical and modern Malay. *Muah* could then be taken to correspond to the well-known word *buah*, „fruit" (with many derived meanings). In the passage quoted from the Talang Tuwo inscription, such a translation would make good sense : „they find fruits as food with water to drink" (lit. : „which may be drunk by them") ; especially those trees that yield edible fruits were planted in the park.

In Buddhism, the word for „fruit" *(phala* ; cf. also terms like *vipāka* and *paripāka*, based upon the same simile) is technically used to denote the consequences of an act in this life or another ; this use might account

[28]) This passage will be discussed with greater detail towards the end of the Introduction.

[29]) *Verspr. Geschr.*, VII, p. 211.

[30]) *Art. cit.*, p. 16.

[31]) *Art. cit.*, pp. 75 sq. According to this opinion, *muah* would especially be used to attach the notion of an optative to the preceding word. An optative, however, is not the form to be expected in some of the cases.

for the combinations *tālu muaḥ* (Kotakapur, lines 5 and 7 ; our text, lines 8, where it occurs twice, 19, 21 and 22), *vṛddhi muaḥ* (Talang Tuwo, line 6), *jāñan muaḥ ya siddha* (Kotakapur, line 6), *pulaṃ ka iya muaḥ yaṃ doṣāña vuatña jāhat inan* (*ibidem*), *çānti muaḥ kavuatāña* (*ibidem*, line 7), *subhikṣa muaḥ yaṃ vanuāña parāvis* (*ibidem*, line 9), *çānti muaḥ kavuatanāña yaṃ sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini* (our text, line 26), *dīya siddha muaḥ* (*ibidem*, line 28). It appears that in all the *loci* quoted there is question about the consequences of acts. There where acts against the king are concerned, the fruit is qualified as *tālu* (presumably : „punishment"), or defined by a negative turn of speech (*jāñan .... siddha*, „will not reach its perfect state", i.e. applied to a revolt, "will not succeed"). In the opposite case, if the king's orders are duly carried out, the fruit is qualified by *vṛddhi* (growth, pros- perity), by *subhikṣa* (prosperity), by *siddha* (arriving at its perfect state, successful) and even by *çānti* (the eternal quietude of Nirvāṇa) [32]. The second passage quoted from the Kotakapur inscription would then yield a satisfactory meaning, viz. : „to them(selves) [i.e. those planning revolts etc.] the fruits of the sins contained in their wicked deeds will be turned". The meaning is probably that their plans are not only doomed to fail, but that the result planned for others (i.e. violent death) will be their proper sort.

The meaning of *muaḥ* seems to imply the different shades of meaning which may be observed for Sanskrit *phala*; curiously enough, the word is often used as a kind of apposition to a preceding term as if it were translated from a Sanskrit compound. Finally, we mention the use of *nimuaḥ* in line 26 ; its subject seems to be the preceding word *sumpah*. The meaning required by the context is : „(the day on which the curse) takes effect", or, if we retain the simile suggested by *muaḥ* : „bears fruit" ; here, too, the use of *phalati* in Sanskrit may be compared (cf. Buddhac., VII, 26 : *tasmād adharmaṃ phalatīha dharmaḥ*, „then *dharma* in this world bears as its fruit what is contrary to *dharma*" (Johnston).

Another very awkward word is *mulaṃ* which Kern and Blagden con- nected with Malay *pulang*, „to come back", but Cœdès with Cham *mulañ*, „at once". This new inscription makes us prefer Kern's interpretation, although it does not solve all the difficulties. Our preference for Kern's translation is mainly due to a passage in line 21, which is hardly susceptible of another interpretation. There the text runs : *pūrvvāña mulaṃ kāmu tālu*

---

[32] We presume that *çānti* has the precise and technical meaning known from the Buddhist texts in this context, viz. the state in which the forces which determine the continuation of the Saṃsāra have come to complete rest ; it has almost become a synonym of Nirvāṇa ; cf. the definition of the latter by *çāntyekalakṣaṇatvāt*, „car le Nirvāṇa a pour unique caractère la cessation des passions et de la souffrance de soi et d'autrui" (translation by L. de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakoça de Vasubandhu*, IV, 1924, p. 78). To a Buddhist, there might be something strange in defining notions like *çānti, nirodha, nirvāṇa* as the fruit of something (as we supposed). As a matter of fact, the Buddhists had a very special kind of fruit to that purpose, i.e. the *visaṃyogaphala*, „fruit de disconnexion" (*Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 291).

muah kāmu, presumably meaning : „before you return home, you will be punished"; the idea is probably that the execution of the punishment is not delayed until the moment the guilty ones come home and fall into the hands of the king; the imprecation automatically takes its effect at the moment the crime has been committed. Very often, the word *mulam* follows either *tuvi* or *athavā,* especially in those cases where a new category of criminals is introduced or, more often, when a further definition of crime is added to the fundamental definition. The combination *tuvi mulam* would correspond exactly to modern Indonesian *lagi pula* and should be translated by "moreover, once again". The latter meaning of *mulam* is clearly derived from the one based on the passage quoted from line 21 ; as a matter of fact, we see exactly the same in Old Javanese, where *muwah* and *(u)maluy* may both mean „to come back" and "again, at his turn". As to *kamulam* and *nimulam,* conjectural explanations are proposed in the notes 49, 57 and 69 to the translation.

A small number of other words and expressions for which the Tělaga Batu inscription might be of some importance will be briefly mentioned.

An interesting expression not yet known from the other Çrīvijaya inscriptions is *huluntuhānku,* apparently meaning „my empire" (lines 7, 11, 12, 14, 17 and 23) ; the literal meaning seems to be : „my slaves *(hulun)* and lords *(tuhān)*", implying classification of the subjects into two large groups, either slaves and free men or, more probably, the common people and the ruling class, the former comprising also the population of the conquered territories.

With reference to the word *hañun* in line 3 of the Kotakapur inscription, Cœdès noted : "mot de sens inconnu" [33]), whereas R. A. Kern considered it to be a derivative of an ancient Indonesian root *ñun* (from which also *bañun,* „to build" and „to awake", is derived) by means of the prefix *ha-,* which however in Old Malay and Old Javanese was no longer productive [34]). R. A. Kern's conjecture is fully confirmed by our text, which in the same context gives *vāñun* instead of *hañun* (cf. line 5 : *drohaka vāñun,* and line 7 : *drohaka vāñun=dy=āku*). One would even be inclined to consider the possibility of an error by the scribe in the case of *hañun* in the Kotakapur inscription, since in this type of script *va* with a daṇḍa is very similar to *ha.* A small hint in this direction might be the fact that in *hañun* the first syllable is written with a short *a,* not with a long one as we should have expected. Anyhow, the meaning seems clear : it is undoubtedly a euphemistic term for „building", i.e. organizing something against the safety of state and king. We find a similar tendency in many other expressions of this kind, e.g. in *mañujāri drohaka,* „to speak to, i.e. to plot with, traitors" (line 7); in *ārambha kadatuanku,* „to organize, i.e. to attack, my kraton", negative

[33]) *Art. cit.,* p. 79.
[34]) *Bijdr. K.I.,* 88 (1931), p. 512 sq.

expressions like *tīda bhakti,* „not worshipping, i.e. revolting against", and several other expressions; probably, *drohaka,* in the meaning of „traitor", might also be included in this list. These euphemisms, common to all languages, appear to be limited here to actions directed against king and state.

Finally, we draw attention to the expression *daṇḍaku daṇḍa* in line 15, meaning "are fined by me with a fine", in contrast to the graver sentences, almost always death, pronounced against most of the criminals. It is curious that the expression *daṇḍaku daṇḍa* occurs dozens of times in Old Javanese records from the 10th century onwards, where it is mentioned regularly near the end of the lists of crimes [35]). Such lists belong to the privileges granted to so-called free villages, which enjoy autonomous rights. As Stutterheim pointed out [36]), the main purport of these regulations is the right of the future free village to collect the fines imposed on those found guilty of a number of crimes mentioned in detail. Normally, the amount of such fines constituted a part of the income of the king. Stutterheim took *daṇḍa-kudaṇḍa* to mean „all sorts of fines", but made no attempt at explaining the strange form of the compound. His translation seems to suggest that he took the form for a Sanskrit *dvandva* of the type *jīvitamaraṇam,* „life and death". But *daṇḍa-kudaṇḍa* meaning „fines, bad fines" (?) does not yield a suitable meaning [37]). The occurrence of exactly the same expression in a Çrīvijaya text dated some three centuries before the oldest Old Javanese example known before makes it very probable that the whole phrase was borrowed from the administrative system of Çrīvijaya. It is only natural that the first extensive Indonesian empire exercised an important influence on all later states, but the paucity of epigraphic documents of Çrīvijaya rarely enables us to get an impression of its extent [38]).

The discussion of some linguistic peculiarities of this inscription leads us almost automatically to an examination of its contents. As is briefly indicated above, the text consists of a long imprecation directed against the

---

[35]) Such passages occur only in inscriptions originating from Eastern Java.

[36]) *T.B.G.,* 65 (1925), pp. 268—273.

[37]) In view of such an interpretation, our printed transcription of Old Javanese edicts usually separate *daṇḍa kudaṇḍa.* Compounds of this kind are unknown in Sanskrit; one might compare such curious compounds as *phalāphala,* „all kinds of fruits" *(Mahāvastu,* ed. Senart, III, p. 45, line 3 and elsewhere; cf. the Index s.v.), but the formation is different. We take the expression to be a petrified little sentence, which in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions had the original meaning of „will be fined by me with a fine", but was not understood afterwards so that it came to mean the (minor) „offences liable to punishment with a fine". The curious repetition of *daṇḍa* in a verbal and then in a nominal form may be due to the influence of the common Sanskrit combination *daṇḍaṃ daṇḍayati.* It is quite possible that some other strange definitions of crimes occurring in Old Javanese records should also be explained in a similar way. A term like *maṇḍihālādi,* also spelt *bhaṇḍihālādi,* is not susceptible of explanation by Old Javanese alone.

[38]) Other probable borrowings are to be found in the list of functionaries, (lines 3 — 4), especially the combination *nāyaka pratyaya* (cf. *supra* p. 19) and perhaps also other terms.

perpetrators of all possible crimes against the king and the state of Çrīvijaya. So the tenor of the text agrees with those of the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Karangbrahi, but is elaborated into far greater detail. The two inscriptions mentioned seem to be abbreviated copies of this stone, which once stood near the presumed capital of the empire [39]). The Tĕlaga Batu inscription likewise begins with the hitherto almost entirely incomprehensible passage known from the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Karangbrahi, presumably the curse in the narrower sense of the term. As Cœdès pointed out, it is probably a magical formula, addressed to the protecting divinities of the empire, which was intended to kill automatically all those guilty of the crimes mentioned [40]). As if this menace was not considered sufficiently effective, it is sometimes added that an expedition will also be sent out against them (line 21). With reference to some rebels of minor importance, it is stated in line 21 that the imprecation will not take effect, but that they will be directly punished by the king. If, however, the same rebels try to get into contact with the princes (viz. for assistance), they will immediately be killed by the imprecation. Evidently, the curse is especially directed against those foes that were considered the most dangerous. As to the others, military power would be sufficiently effective.

In this connection, it would be important to examine whether the inscription itself could give some clue as to the meaning of the strange form of the stone. It is clear that it cannot have been used in order to prepare holy water, as has been previously proposed [41]), for instead of holy texts we find imprecations. Nevertheless, the form of the stone proves that it must have been used for a similar purpose. The groove and spout under the inscribed portion of the stone were evidently used to catch water poured out over the stone. The liquid thus obtained might well be termed

---

[39]) At the same time, the Kotakapur inscription contains an additional passage at the end referring to the much discussed expedition to *java*. It must probably be considered an addition specifying the time and circumstances of the erection of the copy stone. There is some chance that similar copies were erected in other parts of the empire, not only in Upper Djambi and Bangka.

It seems that the very last lines of the Tĕlaga Batu inscription also refer to special circumstances. In line 26 there is question of a date on which the army is provided with commanders for an expedition, whereas in the very last line (28) the name of the month Āṣāḍha can still be deciphered. It seems obvious that an imprecation like this one would not have been erected at a moment when all was quiet in the empire. The absence of any mention of the possibility of a direct attack on the king would suggest that the king himself was at the head of the expedition, so that the imprecation was necessary to guarantee order during the absence of king and army. It is particularly regrettable that of the two last lines of the text only some isolated words can be deciphered.

[40]) *Art. cit.*, p. 50. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, VII, p. 210 sq., tried to translate the formula, but the result necessarily remains quite conjectural. — Recently a new attempt by V. Obdeyn (*Tijdschr. Aardr. Gen.* 60, 1943, pp. 721 — 723) tries to explain the strange forms as belonging to the old Minangkabau language.

[41]) This is, for instance, expressed in the explanation in the Museum.

„imprecation water". A passage in the text itself informs us of the manner in which the liquid was used. In line 21 sq. the text gives twice an extension of the stereotypical „you will be killed by the imprecation" by adding *niminumāmu,* „which is drunk by you" [42]). Evidently, the imprecation water was offered to the high officials to drink, after which they were impregnated with the curse, so that it would immediately take effect if they committed one of the crimes mentioned. The text is an oath which all important officials in Çrīvijaya must have had to take before they could assume their task.

The idea of drinking an oath is not unusual in the Indian world : as a matter of fact, analagous ceremonies are known from the Indian law books. Santosh Kumar Das, following the Dharmaçāstras of Nārada [43]) and Yājñavalkya [44]), describes the oath as follows :

„The person to be tested has to drink three mouthfuls of water in which (an image of) the deity whom he holds sacred has been bathed and worshipped. If he should meet with any calamity within a fortnight (after having undergone this ordeal) it shall be regarded as a proof of his guilt" [45]).

Similar ceremonies have been accomplished in recent times at the Cambodian court. Cœdès, referring to the rites described by Moura [46]) and Leclère [47]), mentions functionaries travelling to Phnom Pénh in order to „drink the water of the oath" ; in addition, he pointed out the existence of ancient oath formulae in an inscription of 1011 A. D., used during the reign of Sūryavarman I [48]).

Finally, we briefly mention sundry points of interest contained in the definitions of the crimes.

Cœdès has pointed out that in the seventh century A. D. Buddhism in Çrīvijaya already contained Tāntric elements [49]). Our inscription very definitely refers to Tāntric rites. In line 25, a *tantrāmala,* probably a secret formula leading to Final Liberation, is promised by the king to his obedient subjects. In line 12, however, reference is also made to conjurators who make use of magical Tāntric means to attain their objects. First, mention

[42]) Cf. also lines 18, 24 and 27, where there also seems to be some question of „drinking" the imprecation.

[43]) Probably of the 4th century A. D. or later; cf. Winternitz, *Geschichte der Indischen Literatur,* 1907 — 22, III, p. 496.

[44]) Probably of the 3rd or 4th century A. D.; cf. Winternitz, *o.c.,* III, p. 498.

[45]) Santosh Kumar Das, *Economic History of Ancient India,* 1925, p. 283.

[46]) J. Moura, *Le royaume du Cambodge,* 1883, I, pp. 251 sqq.

[47]) *Revue Indochinoise,* II (1904), p. 735.

[48]) *Etudes Cambodgiennes, IX, B.E.F.E.O.,* 13 (1913), pp. 11 — 17.
Similar ceremonies at the Laotian court are known to have existed in recent times. A French translation of the oath formula was published by P. Nginn in *France-Asie,* 66—67 (1951), pp. 573—576; cf. the last lines (*ibidem,* p. 576) „des Fonctionnaires grands et petits, militaires et civils, ci-devant et à l'intérieur, qui acceptent de bon coeur de boire tous ensemble l'eau de la Cérémonie Royale du Serment".

[49]) *B.E.F.E.O.,* 30 (1930), p. 55.

is made of a group of conspirators working with a jar filled with blood
(āda pātra dañan darah). After that, mention is made of the use of the
çrīyantra by conspirators. This very complicated figure (saṃsthāna, which
is also mentioned in the text) consists of a large number of triangles over-
lapping each other, which are surrounded by concentric circles with lotus
petals and akṣaras, the whole being placed again within a bhūpura [50].

Line 13 refers to rites by means of which people may be made crazy.
Probably, this passage again alludes to vaçīkaraṇa ceremonies used by rebels
to bring others into their power by bereaving them of their common-sense.
As to the means applied for that purpose, the text mentions, among other
means, rūpa (images or drawings of the people to be bewitched), bhasma
(ashes), vaidi (a strange form which might be interpreted either as vaidya :
"doctors" presumably well acquainted with the use of magical herbs; or
as vaidika : Vaidic texts such as some Atharvaveda hymns or other mantras)
and mantras (spells). It seems that an image of the king himself is also
referred to in these practices (rūpiṇāṅku). Also a special plant is mentioned,
viz. kuṣṭa (Sanskrit kuṣṭha). We know that it was frequently used for
magical purposes. It is mentioned in the Kauçikasūtra among the means used
in order to win the love of a woman (which is also a kind of vaçīkaraṇa) [51].
It here occurs together with philters (kasīhan) [52]. On the whole, one does
not get the impression that in general the use of such means should have
been prohibited. These passages refer rather to their use in order to foment
resurrections.

There is nothing particularly Buddhistic in all this. On the other hand,
it is well-known that Buddhist Tāntrism made an extensive use of such
means. As to the vaçīkaraṇa ceremonies, we refer the reader to
Bhattacharyya [53] who states that „Kurukullā [54]) is said to confer success
in the Tāntric rite of vaçīkaraṇa of the rite of subduing or bewitching men,
women, ministers or even kings".

[50] Gopinath Rao, Elements, I (1914), p. 330. For a more detailed description with references, cf. P. H. Pott, Yoga en Yantra (1946), pp. 43 sqq.

[51] Kauçikasūtra, 35, 12; cf. the translation by W. Caland, Verh. Kon. Acad. Wet., Afd. Lett., N. R., III, No. 2 (1900), p. 118: "Einen mit frischer Butter (unter Aussprechung des citierten Liedes) bestrichenen Costus Speciosus (kuṣṭha) waermt er dreimal taeglich, drei Tage hindurch, am Feuer". It is hardly doubtful that this, or a very similar, rite is alluded to in our text. — Kuṣṭha is also mentioned as a medicine in an inscription from Indochina; cf. Cordier in B.E.F.E.O., 6 (1906), p. 85, who translates: "racine de costus (Saussurea Lappa, composées)". — Thirdly, kuṣṭha is well-known from Indian medicine as the name of a disease (a sort of leprosy); cf. Sten Konow's edition of a medical text from Khotan, Avhandl. Norske Vid. Ak., Oslo, 1940, II (Hist. fil. klasse, 88), passim, but cf. the Word Index, where Konow translates it by "black leprosy". — As a matter of fact, the Mahāvyutpatti mentions kuṣṭha as the name of a medicinal plant (231, No. 32, edition by Minaiev-Mironov, p. 76), but also in the list of diseases (284, No. 6; p. 116).

[52] The term kasīhan is also mentioned in line 6 of the Kotakapur inscription.

[53] Buddhist Iconography (1924), p. 55. Cf. the additions.

[54] One of the çaktis of Amitābha, especially worshipped in Nepal.

It is evident that all these Tāntric rites must have been very well-known in 7th century Çrīvijaya; they must have constituted a real menace to the State. — On the other hand, it is stated in line 25 that the good citizens, who remain submissive to the king and to those who are invested with executive power, will be recompensed with a Tantrāmala — presumably a secret formula which will give them all kinds of bliss in this life and hereafter. The text does not give any hints in which way this „Immaculate Tantra" [55] was supposed to be effective; possibly, special rites were performed to that effect, but it seems more probable that we ought to imagine the Tantra as something concrete, which may have been conferred by the king in exchange for the good conduct of his subordinates [56]. At the same time, it is stated that the çapatha itself has the effect of conferring eternal bliss (çānti) on the submissive subjects.

It is possible that these imprecations were not considered sufficiently convincing to all the subjects of the king. As in other societies, the higher classes may have been sceptical; and even if they were not, they may have disposed of private means, viz. other mantras, which had effects which might neutralize the king's imprecations. For that reason, real punishment is also referred to. Unfortunately, the portion of the text in which this sanction is mentioned could only partially be deciphered; it is contained in the last three lines of the inscription, which are far more weather-beaten than the rest of the stone. It is however certain that a military expedition is referred to in line 26 of the inscription; in the very last line of the text, the name of a month is mentioned (Āṣāḍha), presumably that for which the expedition was planned. It is to be regretted that these last lines, which may have contained valuable historical information, have become illegible except for a few words. The latter are however sufficient for establishing the fact of there having been an expedition. It is well-known that this is also the case with the last line of the Kotakapur inscription. In both cases, we find a combination of magical and military means used for subduing revolts. In both cases, the reference to a military expedition is reserved for the very end of the text. As in modern law, the punishment for perjury is not left to the divine powers alone.

The very elaborate text of this imprecation makes it probable that there were strong reasons for inaugurating ceremonies such as those alluded to in our text. It is only natural that an extensive insular empire such as Çrīvijaya is known to have been, should have faced tremendous difficulties

---

[55] *Tantrāmala*, — the order of the two parts of the compound is the inverse of what would have been expected. The literal translation is: "immaculate as a consequence of Tantra"; the form of this compound might confirm our assumption (cf. note 56) that something concrete is referred to, such as a definite object (a metal plate or a clay tablet) on which the secret text was engraved.

[56] The inscription reads (line 25): *tantrāmala pamvalyaṅku;* the latter form (cf. Modern Indonesian *pěngěmbalian*) probably means: that which is given in return (by me), and would thus refer to something concrete. It may be supposed to be the recompense which is to be handed over to the submissive chiefs at the end of the expedition.

before succeeding in becoming a real state. The preservation of unity depended mainly on the reliability of the chiefs charged with almost royal powers over territories and islands far away from the central authority. An oath ritual, to which all chiefs should be submitted before starting for their respective dominions, was necessary. It may have been inaugurated at an early period, when the empire was not yet consolidated — very probably at a moment when the necessity for such measures became evident.

The Tělaga Batu inscription does not supply us with any details as to the way in which the empire of Çrīvijaya acquired supremacy over so large a territory. It gives us, however, some idea about the way in which it was organized, especially about the methods used for maintaining order and unity.

The following transcription and translation are considered provisional; it is possible that further study may reveal many interesting and more reliable details.

Transcription

1. // oṃ siddhaṃ // titaṃ hamvan vari avai . kandra kāyet nipaihumpa . [1] an umuha [2] ulu
2. lavan tandrun luaḥ makamatai tandrun luaḥ an hakairu muaḥ kāyet nihumpa unai tuñai . ume-
3. nteṃ bhakti ni ulun haraki . unai tuñai [3] // kāmu vañak=māmu rājaputra . prostāra [4]. bhūpati . senāpati . nāyaka . pratyaya . hāji-pratyaya . daṇḍanāyaka .
4. .... mūrddhaka [5]. tuhā an vatak=vᵘrᵘḥ . adchvākṣī nījavarṇa [6]. vāsīkarana . kumārāmātya . cāthaḷhaṭa . adhikaraṇa . karmma .... [7]. kāyastha . sthāpaka . puhāvaṃ . vaṇiyāga . pratisāra . dā .. [8]
5. kāmu marsī hāji . hulun=hāji . vañak=māmu uraṃ nivunuḥ sumpaḥ

---

1) There seems to be a punctuation mark between *nipaihumpa* and *an* (unlike the Kotakapur inscription).

2) Kotakapur inscription: *namuha*.

3) The Kotakapur inscription gives after the second *tandrun luaḥ* the words *vinunu paihumpaan*. For the rest, the formulae are identical. — As long as the meaning of these lines is quite uncertain, word separation is hardly more than a guess. Only the *visarga* is a certain indication of the end of a word (or at least of the end of a part of a compound) and likewise the use of the *virāma*, of the punctuation mark and of groups of syllables occurring more than once in the same order.

4) Uncertain reading. Only the *cakra*, the combined vowel signs for *-o* and the last syllable *na* seems certain. Instead af *ṣṭā*, apparently the most probable reading, *ṃvā* of *ṃbhā* would also be possible. We do not see any acceptable term which might satisfy these conditions.

5) Two *akṣaras* at the beginning of the line are too vaguely visible for being identified.

6) Read: *adhyakṣa nīcavarṇa*.

7) One, perhaps two, *akṣaras* illegible.

8) Only the *da* is certain. At the end of the line, there is room for one more *akṣara*. *Dñan* would be possible.

dari maṃmaṃ kāmu . kadāci kāmu tīda bhakti dy=āku nivunuḥ kāmu
sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ kadāci kāmu drohaka vañun luvī yaṃ marvu*ddhi*

6. lavan çatruṅku . athavā larīya [9]) ka dātu paracakṣu lai nivunuḥ kāmu
   sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ kadāci kāmu makānucāra dari çatruṅku dari
   dātu paracakṣu lai . dari kulamāmu mitramāmu . dari vaduamāmu .
   dari hulu vukan paracakṣu

7. lai . maṅujāri kāmu drohaka vañun=dy=āku malūn āda di kāmu .
   tīda ya marppādaḥ dy=āku di huluntuhāṅku . kadāci kāmu lai larī
   nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ kadāci kāmu miāyuāyu maṃmaṃ
   dari *vātu* ... [10])

8. athavā marcorakāra [11]) hīnamadhyamottamajāti . *yadi* [12]) makalaṅit=
   tāmva yaṃ prajā nirakṣāṅku . athavā makatālu muaḥ uraṃ *kalpita*
   *pūrva k*atālu muaḥña [13]) uraṃ ārambha kadātuanku nivunuḥ kāmu
   .sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ dari kāmu ...... [14])

9. kāmu marvuat vini hāji an tāhu an tñaḥ rumaḥ maṅujāri yaṃ mamāva
   mas dravya athavā maṅujāri *dirīña* [15]) uraṃ an tñaḥ rumaḥ malūn
   uraṃ maṃlāri yaṃ jana mamāva dravya di luar huluntuhāṅku lai
   varopāya ka kāmu larī-

10. yākan ka çatruṅku ka dātu paracakṣu lai nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ //
    athavā kadāci kāmu māti malūn maṃruruā athavā kāmu larīya maṃla-
    rīya lai kāmu . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ // athavā kāmu nicāri lai
    marvuat=*n*icāri parddātuan [16])

11. maṅalit mas mani [17]) malūn maṃruruā kadātuanku . marvuddhisāraṇa
    ri lai kāmu . uraṃ vukan vaidika tahūña kāmu marvuat sākit . tīda
    kāmu marppādaḥ dari huluntuhāṅku . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . kāmu
    tuvi nigalarmāmu marsaṃjñāvuddhi kulamāmu mañcaru .... [18])

---

[9]) O₁ : *larī ya* as two words. [10]) Or *dariy=āku* (?).

[11]) The second akṣara is damaged. Other possibilities would be *bhā* and *sā*. Co seems
however more probable on palaeographic grounds. As to the meaning, *marcorakāra*,
though not at all impossible, is not quite satisfactory.

[12]) The first akṣara is uncertain. It might be a *ya* the three verticals of which are
placed very close to each other. *Tadi* and *kadi* would also be possible. As to the
meaning, none of the three possibilities seems satisfactory. (Sanskrit) *yadi* does not
occur in any Çrīvijaya text. For 'if' or 'when', these texts always seem to use
kadāci (sic).

[13]) The italics are very uncertain; the rest is however clear. Instead of *pūrvaka* we
note the possibility of *mūrdhaka*, while instead of *kalpita* the possibility of *çilpita*
cannot be excluded. The reading *çilpitamūrdhaka*, though in part conjectural, would
not be unsatisfactory.

[14]) Two or three akṣaras at the end of the line have become illegible.

[15]) *Vinīña* would also be possible.

[16]) The last two syllables of the word are very vague. The reading is conjectural.

[17]) Except for the very end of the line, the whole of it is very clear. We suppose that
mani is a wrong orthography for *maṇi*. It is curious that this word is always given
as *manik* in Old Javanese.

[18]) Two or three akṣaras at the end of the line have almost disappeared. *Rūpiṇaṅku*,
occurring also in line 13, might be in accordance with the traces, but remains
conjectural.

12. ṅku kāmu āda pātra daṅan daraḥ nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ
tāhu kāmu di sthānāña çatruṅku lai *nipiṅanña* [19]) makaçrīyantra di
kata [20]) luar saṃsthāna tīda kāmu .... [21]) marppādaḥ dy=āku
di huluntuhāṅku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . tathāpi kāmu ....

13. .... *di* [22]) samaryyādapatha di vanuā vāṅun=dy=āku . tīda
kāmu marppādaḥ nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . ini makalaṅit=prāna [23])
uraṃ marūpabhasmavaidimantraprayoga . tīda *āhāra* [24]) dari sama-
yaṅku rūpiṇaṅku kuṣṭa kasīhan vaçīkaraṇa lai . kadāci kāmu .... [25])

14. *marvuddhisāraṇa mara maryyāda* [26]). yathā vaçīkaraṇa . tīda makagīla
makalaṅit prāṇāña . athavā vuatña tāhu kāmu di deça . tīda ya kamulaṃ
dy=āku di huluntuhāṅku . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . athavā cihna dīri
kāmu lai marvuat yaṃ vuat jāhat ini. .i.i prati .... [27])

15. ti dirīña .... [28]) di kāmu . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . athavā
mulaṃ dari kāmu tālu dīya . tīda āku daṇḍaku daṇḍa . tuvi kāmu lai
yaṃ sanyāsa datūa . sanyāsa ......ṇḍa [29]). sanyāsa parvvāṇḍa diy=āku .
kadāci kāmu āçrayamāmu makalaṅit vuatāña *sata.* . [30])

16. *taḥ* nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . athavā mulaṃ āda uraṃ dari kāmu
.... [31]) savañakña kriyākarmmakāryyakarādi ....i [32])
nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . athavā mulaṃ kadāci āda ....
prakārāña tīda nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ ....

17. kāmu sumpaḥ . tuvi mulaṃ kadāci kāmu māntrika ....

---

[19]) Most of the middle part of this line is very difficult to be read. *Nipiṅanña* is not satis-
factory. Other possibilities such as *nipananña*, *ditananña* (?) cannot be excluded.

[20]) One might suppose *dikit=ka(luar)*.

[21]) Possibly: *(tīda kāmu) bhakti tīda kāmu (marppādaḥ)*.

[22]) Of the four or five akṣaras at the beginning of the line only vague traces remain.

[23]) For *prāṇa?* — The spelling of the word with a dental instead of a lingual is strange.
Everywhere else, this common word is spelt as it should be. As a rule, the orthography
of Sanskrit words is remarkably correct; most anomalies may be explained in another
way, such as the influence of Buddhistic Sanskrit (this may be the case with *kadāci*).
There is however one, apparently certain, example of a replacement of the lingual
by the dental nasal (*mani*, l. 11).

[24]) Except for the initial *ā*, the reading is uncertain. It seems, however, that none of
the alternative possibilities (such as *ākāra*, *āpāra*, *ādhāra* etc.) is acceptable. The
meaning required by the context is: "shrinking back from (the use of)", or something
similar.

[25]) About eight akṣaras have become illegible.

[26]) Except for the first word of the line, uncertain.

[27]) Five or six akṣaras at the end of the line have almost disappeared from the stone.
The lines 14 to 19 (inclusive) and the very last lines of the text have suffered
much more than the rest.

[28]) Five akṣaras of which no reliable reading can be obtained.

[29]) Possibly: *dviliṇḍa*, which, however, does not make sense. We should expect the name
of a function to be mentioned here.

[30]) The three last akṣaras of the line are very uncertain.

[31]) About ten akṣaras illegible. Only about in the middle of the passage, the words
dy=āku can still be recognized.

[32]) The end of the compound seems to be *sthiti*, which, however, does not seem to
make sense.

marswasthā samaryyāda a*tha*vā lai katāhumāmu .... dia lai ....
.. prakārāña . tīda kāmu marppādaḥ dy=āku di huluntuhaṅku .
dṅan=kāmu parvuatāña . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ // tuvi mulaṃ
kadāci ....

18. *mu* [33]) niminuṃña nidaṇḍa kāmu tīda lai āda kāmu kadāci ....
.... dy=āku tīda kamulaṃña sarvvaprāṇa nivunuḥ kāmu suṃpaḥ .
athavā dātaṃ kāmu di sthānamāmu tīda āku daṇḍa çānti yaṃ uraṃ
nigalarku maṃrakṣa di kāmu .... nivunuḥ [34])

19. .... [35]) dṅan vinimāmu anakmāmu .... [36]) pallavamāmu
daṇḍaṅku . tathāpi di luar ..... uraṃ nigalarku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ .
tālu muaḥ kāmu dṅan anakmāmu vinimāmu santānamāmu gotramāmu
mitramāmu // tathāpi .... [37])

20. dy=āku sanyāsa datūa kāmu maṃrakṣāña sakalamaṇḍalāña kadātu-
anku . yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja . rājakumāra yaṃ nisamvarddhiku
akan=datūa niparsumpahakan=kāmu . kadāci kāmu tīda bhakti tīda
tattva dy=āku marvuddhi dṅan çatruṅku kāmu di yaṃ lai nivunuḥ kāmu

21. sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini . nisuruḥ tāpik=kāmu . pūrvvāña mulaṃ kāmu
tālu muaḥ kāmu //tuvi mulaṃ jana vāṅun=kulagotramitrasantā*n*amāmu
dy=āku . tīda yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja . *rāja*kumāra yaṃ nisamvard-
dhiku akan=datūa . yaṃ marvuat=tīda kāmu nivunuḥ

22. sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini . nisuruḥ tāpik=kāmu dṅan gotramāmu san-
tānamāmu tālu muaḥ iya . ini graṃ kadāci ka yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja .
rājakumāra yaṃ nisamvarddhiku akan=datūa lai kadāci akan=nimulaṃ
çāsanāña . akan=dari kāmu ni-

23. muaḥña prajā abhiprāyāña . niujāri kāmu pūrvvāña . uraṃ vukan
nisuruḥ ya maṅujāri kāmu sanmata . kāmu tīda marppādaḥ dy=āku
di huluntuhaṅku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . athavā tuvi vañak=māmu
man*tr*ī [38]) dūruṃ vala yaṃ nisamva.ddhiku akan

24. .... [39]) luviḥ dari samaryyādamāmu . dari lābhamāmu .
nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . sārambha dari uraṃ drohaka . tīda bhakti
tīda sārjjava . dhava vuatmāmu nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ . *ini* vuatmāmu
minuṃ sumpaḥ .... [40])

---

[33]) Presumably, the end of *kāmu* or *māmu*. After *kadāci* of line 17, we suppose vuatmā*(nu)*, which seems to be in accordance with the traces still visible.

[34]) After *kāmu*, there are faint traces of about ten akṣaras. *Nivunuḥ*, at the end of line 18, is however clear.

[35]) Presumably : *kāmu sumpaḥ*.

[36]) About ten akṣaras have become illegible. As *māmu* about in the middle of this passage may be recognized, there was probably an enumeration here as at the end of the line.

[37]) The end of the line is illegible.

[38]) This reading is given with reservation. Most of the word seems certain, but other possibilities might also be considered.

[39]) Some six akṣaras at the beginning of the line are very difficult to be read. The last word before the transcribed portion of it might well be *vāñun*.

[40]) Our reading of the last eight or nine akṣaras at the end of this line seems too uncertain to be reproduced here.

25. .... *kadāci* kāmu mulaṃ *kāryya* [41]) nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ niminu-
māmu ini . ini graṃ kadāci kāmu bhakti tattva sārjjava diy=āku .
tīda marvuat kāmu doṣa ini tantrāmala pamvalyaṅku // tīda iya akan=
nimākan kāmu dṅan anakvinimāmu . kadāci kāmu *minuṃ sumpaḥ* ....

26. *vala* yaṃ nivava di samaryyāda muaḥ yaṃ muaḥ niminumāmu . athavā
kvara [42]) lai . çānti muaḥ kavuat*anāña* yaṃ sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini .
nimuaḥ di divasāña vala yaṃ nisamvarddhiku parvvāṇḍa manāpik .
tathāpi yaṃ nitāpik ....

27. .... tīda kāmu nisaṃjñā kalpana akan .... makāryya avadya
āsannaphalāña savātu gulas=savātu .... samālam .
athavā niminumāmu .... [43])

28. .... *maka* tīda tamūña dīya siddha muaḥ yaṃ kamāna iya nitamūña
vala .... yaṃ kāmu vulan āṣāḍha .... [44])

Translation

[1-2] Oṃ ! Success ! .... [1]).

[3] All of you, as many as you are, — sons of kings [2]) .... (?) [3]),

---

[41]) The first syllable is uncertain, except for the long -ā. There might be other possibilities than that given in the transcription, but they seem less likely.

[42]) The lower part of this ligature is very uncertain. Instead of *kva*, *kma* would also be possible. Neither reading is satisfactory. Or are we to read: *athavākṣara lai?*

[43]) In this line and the very last one, only some isolated passages have been preserved. Extensive portions have almost completely been wiped out. This state of preservation may well be explained by the way in which the stone was probably used. Water poured upon the stone from above did not spread evenly over the surface of the stone, but chose the easiest way, which was along the side parts. As a consequence, the latter suffered much more than the central portion. A little above the protruding rim, however, there are some irregularities in the stone surface which make the liquid almost always traverse certain special paths. So one can understand why some isolated portions in these two lines are at present in rather a good state of preservation (better than the upper part of the stone), whereas other parts of the same lines hardly show any traces of script.

[44]) It is not certain that this line was inscribed up to the right edge.

[1]) There follows an almost entirely unintelligible oath formula, which agrees with the one occurring at the beginning of the inscriptions of Kotakapur and Karangbrahi. It is the çapatha in its narrow sense. — A partial and conjectural translation has been given by H. Kern (*Verspr. Geschr.*, 7, pp. 210 sq.) and by V. Obdeyn (*Tijdschr. Aardr. Gen.*, 60, 1943, pp. 721-723). Although a number of words which are not obscure by themselves occur in the formula, we completely agree with Cœdès (*art. cit.*, p. 61) that translation is impossible and will probably remain so for ever.

[2]) *Rājaputra,* — the word probably has some special meaning here, which it is difficult to ascertain. As noted above (*supra,* p. 19), one might suppose either „vassal kings", or „princes born of lower queens", who were in either case charged with a special function.

[3]) The reading is uncertain; cf. the note to the transcription, where different possibilities were suggested.

chiefs [4]), army commanders, *nāyakas* [5]), *pratyayas* [6]), confidants (?) of the king [7]), judges, [4] chiefs of the ..... (?), surveyors of groups of workmen [8]), surveyors of low-castes, cutlers, *kumārāmātyas* [9]), *cāṭabhaṭas* [9]), *adhikara-ṇas* [9]), ... (?) [10]), clerks, sculptors [11]), naval captains, merchants, commanders, ... (?) [12]), and you — [5] washermen of the king [13]) and slaves of the king [14]), — all of you will be killed by the curse of (this)

---

[4]) *Bhūpati*, — although this word is very well-known, we suppose it has some special meaning here. In Indian inscriptions, it means mostly „vassals", which would be possible here (in that case, *rājaputra* would have the second of the meanings mentioned above). In present-day Java, a *bhūpati (bupati)* is a high district officer (chief of a regency) and a similar meaning seems probable here.

[5]) As noted above (note 16 to the Introduction), *nāyaka* (often spelt *nayaka*) is a term frequently met with in Old Javanese inscriptions. The exact meaning is, however, unknown; in any case, they must be lower officials, probably in some way connected with the collection of the king's revenue; they may have been lower district officers.

[6]) *Pratyaya*, — usually mentioned in combination with *nāyaka* in Old Javanese inscriptions. They must have been some kind of 'confidants' (cf. note 7 below), possibly administrators of deceased persons' property. Such, at least, seems to be the meaning of *pratyaya* in Cambodian inscriptions (cf. *supra*, note 16 to the Introduction).

[7]) Here, the same term *pratyaya* occurs in combination with *hāji*. The translation "confidants of the king" is conjectural; a Tatpuruṣa compound the first half of which is Indonesian is very strange, but we do not see another alternative.

[8]) *Tuhā an vatak=vuruh*, — *vatak* is probably the same word as Old Javanese *watĕk*, „group", often used to confer a plural meaning on the term following [*sang watĕk dewatā* = the gods]. In Old Javanese inscriptions, *tuhā*, „old, elder", is often technically used to denote some lower officials, who are always more closely identified by some further term. Usually, but not always, they seem to be charged with the supervision of trades and crafts (*tuhā ning mangrakĕt*, etc.).

[9]) As to these three terms, cf. the Introduction.

[10]) Only the beginning of this term (*karmma°*) could be deciphered.

[11]) *Sthāpaka*, — "erector", presumably of images or of buildings. In strophe 6 (line 16) of the Sanskrit inscription of Dinaya, Eastern Java, *vide T.B.G.* 81 (1941), p. 500, the *sthāpakas* are the first mentioned among the priests, well-versed in the Vedas, who erect the Agastya image (*ṛtvigbhiḥ vedavidbhiḥ ..... sthāpakādyaiḥ ..... sthāpito agastyaḥ*). — *Sthāpakas* are often mentioned in later Old Javanese literature; they seem to play an important role during several ceremonies (cf. *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, 57, 2, and the Old Javanese *Ādiparvan*, ed. Juynboll, p. 19). Presumably, they do not really do the work on the sculptures or buildings, but only give the important instructions and play a role in the inauguration ceremonies. The translation 'sculptors' is only approximate. The *sthāpakas* seem to have been priests rather than craftsmen.

[12]) As appears from note 8 to the transcription, it is not certain whether there is a new term here.

[13]) *Marsī haji*, — conjectural translation. The first word might well correspond to modern Indonesian *bĕrsih*, „clean". The correspondence *mar-* : *bĕr-* is regular. As to the loss of the *visarga* with compensatory vowel lengthening, this same line appears to give another example (*luvī* : *luviḥ*). — It is not astonishing to find this group mentioned here. The washermen, who e.g. form a separate caste in India, might be dangerous people. One would have expected to find cooks also mentioned here, but they may be included in the next term.

[14]) *Hulun=hāji*, — probably the personal slaves or servants of the king. As pointed out in the Introduction, the term frequently occurs in Old Javanese inscriptions, where

imprecation [15]) ; if you are not faithful to me, you will be killed by the curse.

Besides, — if you behave like a traitor, plotting with those (?) [16]) who are in contact with my enemies, or if you [6] go over to Dātus spying for the enemy [17]), you will be killed by the curse.

Besides, — if you form part of the retinue (?) [18]) of my enemies, or of Dātus spying for others, or of your families or friends, of your servants, or of other chiefs [19]) spying for [7] others, — if you are in contact with traitors plotting against me, before they are (actually) together with you,

---

it is mostly immediately followed by *watĕk i dalĕm* (or: *watĕk i jro)*, „groups of the interior (the part of the *kĕraton* where the king lives with his spouses and personal servants)". — In this connection, we might refer to the preceding note. The Old Javanese inscriptions regularly mention, together with *hulun haji* and *watĕk i jro*, the *pamrĕsi*, a term which strongly reminds one of the *marsī haji* of our text. Stutterheim, on whose detailed discussion of these three terms (in *T.B.G.*, 65, 1925, pp. 266 sq.) most of the above is based, is also inclined to connect *pamrĕsi* with *bĕrsih*, „clean".

[15]) *Maṃmaṃ*, — undoubtedly the Old Javanese word *maṅmaṅ*, which is almost a synonym of *sumpah*. In the imprecations which are regularly found in the later Old Javanese inscriptions the three terms *maṅmaṅ çapatha sumpah* are often used together.

[16]) Whereas the first paragraph refers to the officials mentioned in the list should they themselves revolt, the second paragraph refers to the same should they collaborate in different ways with enemies or rebels. It is quite possible that by *vañun luvī lāvan* is not meant plotting in the narrow sense of the word, but rather the execution of plots. For *vañun*, cf. the Introduction; the tendency to use rather innocent-looking words for grave offences is seen in several terms in this context; besides *vañun*, we find also *mañujāri*, „to speak to", i.e. „to plot with", *marbuddhi lavan* and, of course, negative expressions such as *tīda bhakti* and *tīda marpĕdah*.

[17]) As noted in the Introduction, we take *dātu paracakṣu lai* to mean: *"dātus* [a title, probably: governors of provinces] who are the eyes of others [i.e. the enemies]". If this explanation is correct, *lai* is only used for laying stress on *para-*.

[18]) *Makānucāra*, — undoubtedly Skr. *anucāra* with the prefix *maka-*. The prefix does not seem always to have a causative meaning in Old Malay. Its use would agree fundamentally with that of Old Javanese *maka-*. — The word *anucāra* does not appear to occur in Sanskrit in this very form, but *anucara* and *anucārin* do, both in the sense of „attendant, follower".

[19]) *Hulu vukan paracakṣu lai*, — there has been some disagreement on the meaning of *vukan*, which corresponds to modern Indonesian *bukan*. Van Ronkel (*Acta Orient.*, II, 1924, p. 18) took *vukan* in exactly the same meaning as modern *bukan*, i.e. an emphatical negation which implies the affirmation of the opposite alternative; Cœdès (*art. cit.*, p. 78), however, made it probable that the modern use of *bukan* should be traced back to the more original meaning of „other", which it has in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions; R. A. Kern, however, did not adopt the conclusion arrived at by Cœdès (*Bijdr. K.I.*, 88, 1931, p. 512), and came back to Van Ronkel's explanation. — This passage in our text makes us prefer Cœdès' interpretation; this paragraph is directed against the king's servants should they serve the enemy or revolting subjects. The latter point is specified into a number of cases: the king's servants might collaborate with revolting subjects who are provincial governors (*dātu*) or to whom they stand in the relation of a family member, friend or servant. After this specification, an additional stipulation is needed should the king's servants collaborate with chiefs who did not belong to the above categories.

people who are not submissive to me and to my empire [20]), and if, (at last),
you go over to them, — you will be killed by the curse.

Besides, — if you embellish this curse on this stone (?) [21]), [8] or if
you commit theft [22]) — whether you are of low, middle or high descent, —
if by means of herbs (?) [23]) you make the subjects, protected by me,
mad [24]), or, — if you .... (?) [25]) of people who attack [26])
my kĕraton, — you will be killed by the curse.

Besides, — if from you .... [9] [27]) that you induce my harem
women [28]) to get knowledge about the interior of my palace (?) [29]) and
get into contact with those who transport gold and property, or, if you
are in contact yourselves with people working in the interior of the palace (?),

---

[20]) The second part of this paragraph seems to refer to functionaries staying in the
capital. They have not actually joined the traitors, but are in contact with them :
obviously, they make all preparations necessary for action, such as getting informations.

[21]) *Miāyuāyu mammam*, — this is the first known example of the prefix *mi-* in Old
Malay. Its use agrees with that in Old Javanese, where it is always causative (*vide*
H. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, 8, pp. 224 sqq.). *Mi-āyu-āyu* would mean: „to make beautiful";
if applied to the text of the imprecation, this could mean either to wipe out words
like „you will be killed by the curse", or even to write other words instead of them,
such as „you will succeed by the curse" (*muah siddha kāmu sumpah*).

[22]) This may also apply to the stone itself ; instead of changing the text of the imprecation,
the traitors could take the whole stone away.

[23]) Conjectural translation. If *tāmva* has been read correctly, it might be connected with
Old Javanese *tamba*, "medicine".

[24]) *Makagīla*, — cf. line 5 of the Kotakapur inscription. — This term presumably refers
to the use of sundry means to bereave people of their common-sense and thus
make them take the side of revolting chiefs.

[25]) The difficulties of arriving at an acceptable translation are mainly due to uncertain
reading. — If our interpretation of *tālu muah* (cf. the Introduction) proves to be
correct, it might as well refer to punishment as to a recompense. Here, we are
inclined to choose the second alternative ; in that case, the text refers to the king's
servants should they recompense subjects who intend to attack the king.

[26]) *Ārambha*, — „enterprise", probably used as an euphemism (undoubtedly due to some
taboo about mentioning in an inscription a direct attack on the king).

[27]) We expect in the lacuna something like : „if by you measures are taken" or „if by
you orders are issued with the intention to".

[28]) *Vini haji*, — in Old Javanese, this term is generally (but not always) used with
reference to the lower-rank spouses of the king, sometimes however for the highest
queen herself (cf. Van Stein Callenfels, *Oudh. Versl.* 1922, p. 82 ; Krom, *Geschiedenis²*,
p. 214, and Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 65 (1925), p. 212).

[29]) *Tñah rumah*, — cf. (classical Malay) *tĕñah astana*, "the centre of a royal residence,
formed by the two central rows of pillars along the whole length of the building"
(H. von de Wall and H. N. van der Tuuk, *Dictionary*, I, p. 374). *Tañah rumah*,
in the Minangkabau region, is the living room for the family, as opposed to the
more private parts of the house ; cf. M. Joustra, *Minangkabau*, 1923, p. 155 and
Plate 11. As appears from the reference to the transport of gold and jewels, which
immediately follows the words *tñah rumah*, the latter here probably means especially
that interior part of the *kĕraton* where, among other things, the treasury is situated.
The sanction presumably refers to people who with the help of harem women try
to obtain information as to the place where gold and jewels are kept. During many
centuries, the riches of the kings of Çrīvijaya were almost proverbial.

before these people flee [30]) with the men (?) who transport property outside my empire and use shrewd means to you (?) to have it taken away [10] to my foes (or) to Dātus spying for the enemy [31]), — you will be killed by the curse.

Or, if you die (?) [32]) before having succeeded in destroying (my palace) (?) [33]), or flee or help others to flee, — you will be killed by the curse.

Or, if you .... (?) [11] spend [34]) gold and jewels in order to [35]) destroy my kĕraton or use shrewd means together with others among you, (or) physicians (?) [36]), who know how to make people sick [37]), — then you are not submissive to me and to my empire and will be killed by the curse.

And you, too, who charge members of your family to conspire ....

---

[30]) *Malūn*, — probably modern Indonesian *bĕlon* (often written *bĕlum*). — The meaning is evidently that if gold and jewels are stolen and later on it appears that provincial governors and other officials have been in contact with people inside the *kĕraton*, the governors etc. will be held responsible and are cursed by the imprecation.

[31]) The words *yaṃ jana*, if read correctly, are not clear. *Mamlāri* could possibly mean : „to flee with something" (as an active form), though one would rather have expected *mamlariyākan* in that meaning. The last mentioned form, however, seems to mean : „to make (others) flee". — The general sense of the passage seems clear enough. It refers to rebels who conspire with servants inside the palace to make them steal gold and jewels and help them to flee with the valuables. The gold could be used by the rebels to finance revolts, not only by hiring troops, but especially by bribing vassals inside the empire and also potential enemies outside. The use of the word *upāya* at the end of the line confirms such an interpretation. It is a well-known term in the Arthaçāstras for the (usually four) sorts of means used to obtain success in politics ; references will be given infra. No. III, note 125 to the translation. Gifts (*dāna*) is one of those means.

[32]) *Māti* is strange ; if read correctly (the passage seems clear from a palaeographic point of view), we have to presume that the curse remains effective against those who die in an attempt at rebellion. In that case, the words *nivunuḥ sumpaḥ* should be taken to mean more than death only (to include, for instance, suffering in hell).

[33]) *Malūn*, — for *malūn*, cf. note 30, above, and note 35, below. — *Mamrurua* is clearly causative. The final -ā must almost necessary be explained as the so-called conjunctive suffix, known from several Indonesian languages (e.g. Javanese). — The root *ruru*, „to fall", occurs frequently in Old Javanese ; it is probably the same word as modern Indonesian *luruh*, "to fall" (usually applied to leaves falling off a tree).

[34]) *Mañalit*, — probably to be connected with Old Javanese *(a)lit*, "small". The word disappeared in later Malay, but has been readopted into modern Indonesian, probably from Javanese. H. D. van Pernis' dictionary mentions it as characteristic of Java and Medan (the town of Medan has a large Javanese colony). — *Mañalit* would mean : "to make small, to divide into small parts", presumably for distributing the treasures among possible rebels.

[35]) For *malūn*, cf. note 30 above. We have translated "in order to" instead of "before" : the action performed with a view to a certain result is represented as only preceding the latter. The passage undoubtedly refers to rebels trying to bribe servants inside the kĕraton.

[36]) Cf. the Introduction (p. 30 above) and note 42 below. *Vukan* probably means 'other' (Coedès, art. cit., p. 78, but cf. the criticism by R. A. Kern in Bijdr. K. I., 88, 1931, p. 512).

[37]) "To make sick" (*marvuat sākit*), so that they would offer no resistance to the rebels.

.... [38]) [12], making use of a bowl filled with blood [39]), — you will be killed by the curse. Moreover, if you are familiar with the whereabouts of my enemies and .... (?) [40]) by means of magical figures ....
.... (?), then you are not submissive to me and to my empire and will be killed by the curse. Also (if) you .... [13] .... plot against me in the frontier regions [41]) of my empire, (then) you are not submissive and will be killed by the curse.

Those who make the minds of (other) people crazy by means of forms, ashes, medicines (or) *mantras* [42]), without shrinking back from the use of (?) [43]) my orders (?) [44]), my pictures, [45]), *kuṣṭha* [46]), philtres and other means

---

[38]) *Mañcaru,* — undoubtedly a derivative of Sanskrit (and Old Javanese) *caru*: "to sacrifice to demons". The term evidently applies to rites by means of which some symbol of the king (cf. *-ṅku* at the beginning of line 12, possibly an image) is sacrificed to demons.

[39]) The passage probably refers to rites by means of which conspirators confirm their oath by drinking blood (a mixture containing drops of blood of all the conspirators?). It is, however, also possible that it refers to some Tāntric rite.

[40]) For the *çrīyantra,* cf. the Introduction. It is to be regretted that our text does not make it clear how this symbol is used. For this point, we refer the reader to the notes to the Transcription.

[41]) *Samaryyādapatha,* — this term probably refers to frontier provinces (or rather: to frontier roads, for it is strange that a word like *viṣaya* has not been used). These, of course, are the regions where contact with the enemy would be relatively easy.

[42]) About these means, cf. the Introduction. — By „forms" may be meant images or pictures of any kind, perhaps to be buried under the houses of the persons whom traitors attempt to bewitch. *Rūpa* might refer to *yantras,* too. The use of ashes for a similar purpose is also well-known. It is however difficult to give a correct translation of *vaidimantra.* One possible interpretation is *vaidikamantra,* "Vedic mantras"; cf. e.g. the Atharvavedasaṃhitā, which contains numerous spells to be used for *vaçīkaraṇa* purposes. Another possibility is, however, that *vaidi* is used for *vaidya,* which suggests the use of medicaments (herbs) for the same purpose (cf. *kuṣṭha* in note 51 to the Introduction).

[43]) Conjectural translation; cf. the note to the Transcription.

[44]) *Samayaṅku,* — among the many meanings of *samaya,* we especially consider that of "orders" written by the king, which could be used for magical purposes. In Java, an order from the king was received with the same ceremonies as if the king had come himself. Written *akṣaras* such as those on the royal seal, symbolized the king himself. Their ceremonial burning could be an effective means of fomenting revolts. — Another possible explanation would be the forging of royal orders for the use of rebels.

[45]) *Rūpiṅaṅku,* — presumably, Sanskrit *rūpin* with the suffix *-ṅku.* The insertion of a vowel (always a) between the stem and the suffix is unusual, but not impossible. Similar cases occur in modern Javanese between the suffix *-an* and a possessive suffix. In Old Malay, however, there are no other examples known. It is therefore also possible that *rūpina* is an incorrect adaptation of Sanskrit *rūpin.* The latter means: „provided with form, material". So *rūpiṅaṅku* might refer to some material representation of the king such as an image or a picture. Since, in the latter case, one would rather have expected to find *rūpaṅku,* one might consider the possibility that *rūpiṅaṅku* should refer to something really belonging to the king, like hairs and nails, which are frequently used for magical purposes.

[46]) *Kuṣṭha,* — the name of a plant which could be used for different ceremonies; cf. note 51 to the Introduction.

to bring (others) into their power [47]; if you .... [14] sly means ...., frontier (?) such as means to bring (others) into your power, without (however) succeeding in making their minds mad and crazy, or if (such) actions (of other persons) [48]) are known to you in your region, when these other persons will not be .... (?) [49]) to me and to my empire, you will be killed by the curse. Or, if you give orders (?) [50]) yourselves to others among you in order to accomplish these wicked actions .... [15] ...., you will be killed by the curse. If, however, those persons have been punished by you, I shall not take measures against you [51]).

Also you others who are charged by me with the function of a Dātu, with the function of ...... (?) (or) with the function of a *parvānda* [52]), supply means to make crazy .... [16], you will be killed by the curse. Or, if there are people under your control .... to me .... as many actions as there are in present, past and future [53]) ...., you will be killed

[47]) *Vaçīkarana*, — presumably the general term referring to all those actions; cf. *supra*, p. 22.

[48]) *Vuatña*, — „their actions"; the suffix *-ña* cannot refer to the groups addressed (which are always referred to as *kāmu*); the latter, however, are held responsible for crimes committed by those 'other people', if they may be supposed to have known of them.

[49]) *Kamulam*, — the meaning is not clear. Perhaps the word is not directly connected with *mulam* in *tuvi mulam* etc., but related to Javanese *wulang*, „to teach, to instruct". In that case, the meaning would be clear, and the words *tīda ya kamulam dy=āku di huluntuhañku* could then be translated: „they [i.e. the persons committing those crimes] are not reported to me and to my empire [i.e. the authorities acting on my behalf all over the empire]". The Çrīvijaya dialect gives other examples of initial *m-* corresponding to *b-* or *v-* in Malay and Javanese. Although this explanation is conjectural (this use of *kamulam* is not confirmed by classical Malay, nor by modern Indonesian), it would certainly make good sense. The passage would refer to those cases in which governors of provinces belonging to the Çrīvijaya empire, or other authorities, know that insurrection is being prepared, but do not take the appropriate measures (which consist, among other things, of reporting to the king). This amounts to passive aid or complicity.

[50]) *Cihna*, — lit.: „signs, indication"; we should have expected the use of a verb such as *marvuat* before *cihna*. If this explanation is correct, the passage would especially refer to those cases in which governors etc. lend a hand to rebels by giving them information as to the proper time and place to strike.

[51]) Conjectural translation. This stipulation would seem rather self-evident.

[52]) We see in the use of *sanyāsa* (Sanskrit *samnyāsa*) *parvānda* a clear indication that *parvānda* is to be considered the title of a rather high official, in command of troops or of a small district. The function must in any case be lower than a *dātu*. The term between *dātu* and *parvānda* is obscure; the stone seems to give *dvilinda*.

[53]) *Kriyākarmmakāryya,*—*kriyā* is action in general (it is used in grammar as an equivalent of our 'verb'); *karman* is especially 'action' with reference to retribution in this life or another; whereas *kārya* is always 'future (intended) action'. So the three terms might refer to the common classification of acts into present (*vartamāna*), past (*atīta*) and future (*anāgata*). Of course, *karman* is not — properly speaking — a past act; but if the term is used with reference to an actual situation, as is mostly the case, it applies to action effected in the past, just as when it is said that a certain person 'has a lot of good *karman*'. — Probably as a consequence of uncertain reading, the end of the compound is not clear. *Kara* might be the 'perpetrators' of these three forms of action, and *-ādi* might stress the fact that not only actual perpetrators, but likewise

by the curse. Or if, on the other hand, there are .... their affairs, you will not be killed by the curse .... [17] by the curse. Moreover, if you use spells (?) [54] .... to make all the frontier provinces independent (from me), or, if others are known to you .... their affairs, then you are not submissive to me and to my empire and (since) you are those who act for them (?) [55], you will be killed by the curse.

Moreover, — if your .... [18] ..... are drunk by them [56]), you will be punished, but no other, and if you .... to me, ... [57]), you will be killed by the curse. (But), if you go back to your dwelling places [58]), you will not be punished by me. Blessed are those people whom I ordered to watch over you .... will be killed [19] .... with your wives and children .... your posterity will be punished by me. Also outside .... [59]), you will be killed by the curse. You will be punished with your children, your wives, your posterity, your clans and your friends.

In addition, ... [20] (invested by me with the charge of a Dātu, you who protect all the provinces of my empire : Crown Prince, second Crown Prince and other Princes [60]), who are invested with the charge of a Dātu, you are cursed if you are not submissive to me, if you are not sincere to me, if you are in league with my enemies, yourselves and the others (?) [61]) you will be killed by this [21] curse which is drunk by you. I shall give

assistants and all kinds of accessories are implied. The end, *sthiti*, if correctly read, does not seem clear. — We therefore suppose that this whole compound refers to the crimes mentioned before, and underlines the fact that not only those who commit these crimes at present are to be punished, but also those who formerly committed them, or who will commit them in future. The entire text strongly reminds one of a penal code (Chapter: „Crimes against the security of the state").

[54]) *Māntrika*, — might also mean: „advisers, give advice".

[55]) *Dñan kěmu parvuatāña*, „with you (who are) their action", which may mean : „you who are the tools to the hand of others". The curse is directed not only against the organizers, but also against the executors.

[56]) It is possible that this lacunary passage refers to people who make others „drink the curse" with the purpose that it should not be the criminals, but those 'others' who should undergo the sanctions. For the expression *minum sumpaḥ*, cf. *infra*, lines 21, 24 etc.

[57]) The words *tīda kamulaṃña sarvaprāṇa* are obscure. As to *kamulaṃ* cf. note 49, above. If the meaning of *kamulaṃ* presumed in the latter case proves to be correct, these words could be translated: „all the living beings are not informed by them", „without giving notice to all the living beings". It is, however, difficult to explain such a statement in connection with the portion which precedes.

[58]) Although these words are clear by themselves, it is not possible to establish their exact meaning in this context.

[59]) Although the words *uraṃ niɡalarku*, "people ordered by me", are clear by themselves, it is, owing to the lacuna, not clear how they fit in with the context.

[60]) For these princes, cf. the Introduction, *supra*, p. 17.

[61]) *Kāmu di yaṃ lai*, "you to (for) the others" (?) ; the purport of these words is not at all clear. It would be possible that these words were added to indicate that the princes were not only guilty if they were not faithful to the king, but also if they were not to one another, e.g. the *rājakumāra*s to the *yuvarāja*.

orders to punish you, (but) before your return (?) [62] you will have expiated (your sins).

Moreover, — if others [63] instigate [64] your families, clans, friends or descendants against me, without being a Crown Prince, a second Crown Prince of another Prince invested by me with the charge of a Dātu [65], if you are guilty (?) [66], you will not be killed [22] by this curse which is drunk by you, (but) orders will be issued to have you punished : with your clans and descendants you will expiate. If, however, these (criminals) [67] (resort) to [68] the Crown Prince, the Second Crown Prince (or) the other Princes who are invested by me with the charge of a Dātu and if their orders should be communicated (?) to you [69], with the object that owing

---

[62] *Pūrvvāña mulam kāmu*, — as we noted at several occasions, the meaning of *mulam* is still rather obscure. Here, the meaning "come back, return" would certainly make sense. As soon as the king would receive information about suspect action by one of the princes, he would immediately take measures. He would organize an expedition in order to have the culprit brought to the capital, where he would be liable to punishment; but, it is added, the expedition would hardly be necessary; the culprits would already have been killed by the effect of the imprecation. — In spite of all that, we are by no means certain that this is indeed the meaning of the words. The meaning of *mulam* is doubtful, and the use of the suffix *-ña* is strange, although it could be explained (cf. the corresponding term *sĕbĕlumña* in the modern language).

[63] *Jana*, — presumably the Sanskrit word *jana*, „people"; as appears from the words following in the text, *jana* should be taken to refer to those not being princes, but also charged with the function of a *dātu*.

[64] *Vāñun*, — for this word cf. note 15 above. In this text, it has always a pejorative meaning.

[65] Presumably, this is directed against those *dātus* who do not belong to the royal family. Because they are considered less dangerous, the sanction is lighter.

[66] Although the reading is perfectly clear, it is not easy to establish the exact meaning of this passage. Here and in the immediately following, there appear to be three groups. The first of these is referred to in the third person (either as *jana*, „people", or simply as *ya*, "they"); the second is denoted by *kāmu* and *-māmu* and refers to the people addressed in the whole inscription, i.e. the state servants of Çrīvijaya; the third group are the princes of Çrīvijaya charged with the function of a *dātu*. Now it may happen that some people not specified (our first group) should prepare a revolt, but need collaboration; they do not contact the state representatives themselves to that purpose, but their relatives and friends. In such a case, it is probable that the state servants know something about the revolt, although they do not participate themselves. They are considered guilty since they should have enough control on their relatives to make such an event impossible. It is passive collaboration. They are therefore punished, but will not be killed by the curse.

[67] *Ini* probably refers to the first of the groups mentioned in note 66.

[68] Only *ka*, „to", is used here, obviously for „going to" or something similar. The inverse occurs, for instance, in modern Javanese *mĕñang* and *datĕng*, both meaning „to go", but often used in the meaning „to, towards".

[69] *Akan nimulam çāsanāña*. The meaning of *mulam* is very doubtful; as in line 14 above, the translation „to teach, to communicate" (cf. Javanese *wulang*) seems satisfactory. If the explanation proposed in note 66 proves to be correct, this passage treats about the case in which a group not specified (the first of the three mentioned

to your collaboration (my) subjects [23] should have the consequences of your deeds (?) — if these (criminals) have been in contact with you before, to the effect that other people should be charged by them to speak according to your approval (?) [70]) — then you are not submissive to me and to my empire and will be killed by the curse.

Or also, — all of you who are advisers (?) [71]) before (the time when) the army charged by me to [24] .... [72]) beyond your realms (or) your (newly) acquired regions [73]), you will be killed by the curse. (As to) those who organize something according to the advice of traitors, not being submissive and straight — the executors of your plans will be killed by the curse. These deeds of your drink the curse (?) [74]) .... [25] ..... if you transfer (the execution of) the actions, you will be killed by this curse which is drunk by you [75]). However, if you are submissive, faithful (and) straight to me and do not commit these crimes, an immaculate *tantra* will be my recompense [76]). You will not be swallowed [77]) with your children and wives. If you drink the curse .... [26] the army which is sent to all the frontier provinces [78]); you will get the fruits which are drunk by

---

in note 66) takes up contact with one of the princes (the third group). In this case, the state servants of Çrīvijaya, who are submitted to the oath, are considered responsible if they may be supposed to have known about the affair.

[70]) This passage was presumably added in order to stress the fact that the state servants will only be killed by the curse if they have actually collaborated. Such a collaboration would be possible if people planning a revolt get into contact with the state servants and explain them what they intend to do. The state servants would think active participation too dangerous, but approve of the plans, promising, of course, to offer no resistance. In that case, which is much more serious than the preceding one, the imprecation would take effect.

[71]) *Mantrī;* the reading is however very uncertain.

[72]) In the lacuna, we suppose that first a word like *manapika* is mentioned and after that a term meaning „to retire from, to flee from". Cf. note 73.

[73]) *Luvih dari samaryyādamāmu . dari lābhamārːu. Maryāda* seems to refer rather to delimited pieces of grounds than to the limits themselves; possibly, districts are meant. *Lābha* then refers to territories obtained (legally or illegally). In Java, loyal civil and military servants were often rewarded pieces of ground.

[74]) *Vuatmāmu minum sumpah,* — „your actions drink the curse (or: oath)", i.e.: it is your actions that are submitted to the effect of the curse. Probably, the meaning is that only the higher officials, who take the oath, are directly subjected to its consequences; if they do not do the work themselves but leave it to others, the effect is the same, for it is their action which is punished.

[75]) Owing to the uncertain meaning of *mulam* (cf. notes 49 and 62), the translation is conjectural. Here, it might mean: "to teach, to order", thus leaving the execution to other persons.

[76]) Cf. the Introduction, *supra* p. 31.

[77]) *Nimākan,* — the use of this word is a change from the usual *nivunuh.* It is a hint to the kind of death which the criminals were menaced with. They would be swallowed by the Nāgas, which are sculptured on the head of the stone and probably invoked at the beginning of the oath (at least, if Kern's conjecture as to the meaning of *tandrun luah* proves to be correct).

[78]) In the lacuna, one would suppose something like: „you need not be afraid of".

you (?), or other ...... (?) [79] : eternal peace will be the fruit produced by this curse which is drunk by you [80] ; (the curse) will bear fruit (?) [81] on the day when [82] the army which is distinguished [83] by me with officers (?) [83] will undertake a punitive expedition. In addition, those who are punished .... [84] [27] .... [28] .... (end).

---

[79] Conjectural translation. The words *muah yam muah* are difficult in combination with *niminumāmu*. If we are allowed to read *sumpah* instead of the second *muah*, the meaning of the words becomes completely lucid: „the fruits (consequences) of the curse which is drunk by you". Although *muah* and *sumpah* resemble each other from a palaeographic point of view, the stone appears to give the former; but even then, it might be considered a mistake made by the stone-cutter. The meaning of *athavā kvara lai*, the reading of which is not beyond doubt, is obscure; we might read *athavākṣara lai* instead, but although these words would be clear by themselves, they would not seem to make sense in the context.

[80] The meaning of *çānti* has been discussed in the Introduction.

[81] The subject of *nimuah* cannot be anything else than the *sumpah* ..... *ini* just before the punctuation mark. Presumably, the passive form *ni-muah* corresponds to *bĕrbuah* in modern Indonesian; but from a grammatical point of view, the form is passive; its literal meaning might be: „(the curse) is transformed to its fruit".

[82] As in modern Indonesian, the suffix -*ña* is used to introduce a dependent clause. One could translate the sentence word for word into modern Indonesian as: „harinja balatĕntara jang dipĕrkuatku dĕngan prawira bĕrangkat", although it would certainly be preferable to put the last word more in the beginning of the sentence (hari bĕrangkatnja balatĕntara, etc.); obviously, *manāpik* is put at the end of the sentence to lay particular stress on it.

[83] *Nisamvarddhiku parvānda*, — the use of *parvānda* in line 15 above makes it probable that this term refers to a rank, so that it could not mean "orders" as was presumed before; here, the latter meaning could make sense, but this is not the case with the combination *saṁyāsa parvānda* in line 15. As to the etymology of *parvānda*, the explanation proposed by Cœdès (*art. cit.*, p. 73) is not necessarily correct; the root *vā.* though known from related languages, does not actually occur in this form in Malay, and the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription uses the double form (*mamāva*, line 5) as in the modern language; in addition, the use of the prefix *par-* cannot easily be accounted for. We might suggest a different interpretation by connecting the word with Sanskrit *parva(n)* with the suffix *(n)da* (the use of which may be compared with that in *ayahanda* or *ayanda, ibunda* etc.). The Sanskrit term is regularly used for all kind of divisions, especially for divisions of time. Its use for army divisions, though not attested, would not be astonishing. — *Nisamvardhiku*, whether derived from Sanskrit *samvṛddhi* or from Sanskrit *samvardhita*, is used everywhere (cf. lines 20 sqq.) in the meaning of "distinguished with"; here, too, we have a word used in a meaning which differs from that which the word has in classical Sanskrit, and numerous other cases may be added (such as *drohaka, paracakṣu, kadāci, marsamjñāvuddhi, (s)ārambha*). There are some slight indications that there is influence from Buddhist Sanskrit, but the subject requires a detailed study.

[84] We prefer not to try to give a translation of the last lines of the text, in which there are very serious lacunae. Some points, however, deserve attention. *Makāryya avadya* (line 27) obviously means "doing misschief"; *avadya* is a well-known technical qualification of *karman* in Buddhism (cf. *infra* No. III, note 29 to the translation). *Āsannaphalāña* is interesting in view of the interpretation of *āsannakāla* in a difficult passage in the Talang Tuwo inscription (cf. note 26 to the Introduction); it appears, however, that no definite conclusions may be drawn on account of the use of the term

III. A BUDDHIST TEXT ENGRAVED ON GOLD PLATES

For several years, the Djakarta Museum has been in possession of a set of eleven gold plates, catalogued No. 7861, *a — k*. Of these, eight are of equal size, measuring 25,5 cm in length and 9,5 cm in height. In the transcription, they are marked *a — h*. The three remaining plates (*i — k*) are considerably smaller, measuring about 21 to 6,5 cm.

In general, the state of preservation of all these plates is excellent. On some of them, however, some curious black spots are visible, which cannot be removed by any means. It may be supposed that they are due to some carbonlike matter, which penetrated into the gold when it was melting on the surface. The akṣaras have nowhere been seriously affected [1] ; the difficult reading of the text is mainly due to the fact of the akṣaras having been engraved in a very superficial way, as is almost always the case with gold plates.

Except for *k*, all the plates are inscribed on either side. Owing to considerable differences in the size of both akṣaras and interlinear space, the number of lines inscribed is far from being equal on each plate : it varies between eight and eleven on the larger-sized plates, and between two and four on the smaller ones. The exact numbers appear from the Transcription.

As to the plate marked *k*, it is not inscribed in the usual way. Instead of akṣaras, a number of remarkable figures have been engraved on either side. The lines are too vaguely sketched for making photographic reproduction possible. In the drawing attached to this description, copying has been limited to those details which seem perfectly clear and unambiguous. It may not be complete : it seems as if there are some more lines, the exact form of which cannot be fixed with any degree of certainty.

The figures engraved offer several points of interest. Two of these seem to represent terrace-like constructions, whereas the two forms in the middle of the front side recall the so-called *maésans*, which occur on Mohammedan graves in Indonesia. On the other side, a beautifully engraved lotus flower is visible beneath a *cakra* with eight rims [2]), a moon (?) and two

---

in line 27, since the context is too uncertain. In *savātu* (line 27), *vātu* might refer to a unity of weight; cf. the use of "stone" in English; one would then be inclined to consider *gulas* as a variant of Sanskrit *guḍa;* the form with an *l* of probably Pracritic origin is known from Indian dictionaries only, but it has become the usual form in Indonesian languages. The final sibilant is however strange. The most interesting word in the final line is the name of the month Āṣāḍha ; the words legible in the beginning of line 28 (especially *nitamūña vala*) suggest that this is the month for which the military expedition (often alluded to in the text) was scheduled.

[1]) It is not impossible that spectroscopic examination, which it has not been possible to effect up to this moment, may establish the origin of the black spots with certainty. Since the akṣaras are not damaged in the black-coloured portions, it is highly probable that the plates were already in the same condition at the moment when they were inscribed.

[2]) Or a sketch of the sun ?

weapons, which may be identified as a *triçūla* and an *ankuça*. — The meaning of these vaguely visible figures seems rather difficult to be settled. It appears probable, though, that there is some kind of relation with the text engraved on the other plates. As will appear in the course of this Introduction, the text constitutes a small treatise about Dependent Origination (*pratītyasamut-pāda*), one of the principal tenets of Buddhism. It is obvious, however, that there is nothing in the figures which is particularly Buddhistic, though, on the other hand, there is not anything either which would be opposed to Buddhism. It is not impossible that the engraved figures represent some of the manifold symbols of meditation, common in older Mahāyāna and much more so in the Tāntric Schools. In spite of this uncertainty, these drawings offer a point of special interest : both the terracelike buildings and the form of the *maésan* convey the impression of being Indonesian, — in any case, these symbols are more commonly met with in Indonesia than elsewhere.

The latter conclusion is of some particular interest, since nothing is known about where the plates were discovered. As they were unknown before the last war, but proved to be in the Djakarta Museum in 1946, they must have been brought there during the war or immediately after. Unless some reliable data emerge from an unexpected quarter, the only information available is contained in the plates themselves. Sundry peculiarities, such as the type of script and the orthography, seem to confirm the provisional conclusion suggested by the figures of plate *k*. Unless new details come to light in the future, which might make us conclude to another place of origin, it seems safe to assume that the plates were engraved in the country where their presence was noted for the first time, viz. Indonesia.

This lack of information as to the place of origin necessitates a close examination of the type of script in which the text was engraved. As, moreover, the text is not dated, palaeographic analysis is almost the only means by which it is possible to arrive at a rough estimation of the period in which the plates were engraved.

As was stated above, the akṣaras are very shallow. As to their size, considerable differences can be observed. These differences in size are the chief reason for the varying number of lines on the plates. Thus, the very first plate of the series (*a*) is inscribed with 11 lines on the front and only eight on the back. As to the manner in which the plates were engraved, it is very probable that a sharp metal instrument was used. Although gold is rather soft, this method requires a great amount of practice and, as a matter of fact, the result is not always satisfactory. Owing to changes either in the instrument or in the scribe, the forms of the akṣaras are reproduced far better on one plate than on another. Not seldom, the result gives an impression of carelessness (e.g. plate *a*), but just as often the engraving has been executed with great care (e.g. plate *e*). Notwithstanding these differences, the *type* of script is everywhere the same.

From a palaeographic point of view, the script of our plates could be defined as a transitional phase between the Pallava script and the Old Javanese script of the oldest period. Very archaic forms frequently occur side by side with relatively modern forms. As a characteristic example, we may quote the form of the akṣara *ka*. In most cases, the *ka* is written as a long vertical line (descending considerably below the level of most of the other akṣaras), on which the horizontal part, which is only a small curve, is attached not far below the top, i.e. ⌐ . The latter form agrees with that found in the fifth century inscriptions of Western Java [3]). On the other hand, we often find, on the same plate, forms of the same akṣara which could hardly be distinguished from the type occurring in Old Javanese inscriptions of the ninth (and even the beginning of the tenth) century A. D., i.e. ⌒ .

A characteristic feature of the older Pallava script is the similarity of the akṣaras *ta* and *na*. In the inscriptions from Western Java quoted above, the two akṣaras are often very difficult to be distinguished [4]). Usually, the loop of the *ta*, ⌀ , is larger than that of the *na*, ⌀ , but there occur medium-sized loops where it would have been impossible to decide whether *ta* or *na* was meant if the akṣara had stood by itself. In later Pallava script, however, the two forms developed in just the opposite direction: the loop of the *ta* increased in size, whereas the similar one of the *na* was reduced to a very small curve at the lower end of the akṣara. In the Çrīvijaya inscriptions dated the end of the 7th century A. D., the forms of the *ta* and of the *na* became ⌀ and ⌐ , respectively, so that their confusion is out of the question. During the eighth and ninth centuries no substantial change in the form of these akṣaras can be observed, but it is interesting to note that in the Eastern Java inscriptions of the 10th century onwards, the loop was re-established at the bottom of the *na* [5]), but owing to several minor changes in the forms there was no possibility of the two forms being mistaken one for the other: *ta* was written ⌀ but *na* : ⌐ .

If now we compare these two akṣara forms on our plates, it is obvious that, as a rule, there is no possibility whatever of their being confounded. Both the *ta* and the *na* are characterized by a loop, but the difference in size is rather pronounced. On the other hand, there are quite a few examples of ambiguous loops, and this does not appear to be a question of careless

---

[3]) Cf. the publication with clear photographs by J. Ph. Vogel, *The Earliest Sanskrit Inscriptions of Java, Publ. Oudh. Dienst*, I (1925), pp. 15—35, Pl. 27—35.

[4]) As a typical example we may quote the name of the capital mentioned in these inscriptions. Their first editor, Kern, read it as *Nārumā*, which reading was later on corrected to Tārumā (Vogel, *art. cit.*, p. 25). In a single case (*bhūnena*, in line 2 of the Tugu rock inscription), the workman who carved the text in the rock presumably mistook the *ta* of his example for a *na* (*ibid.*, p. 33).

[5]) This fact may be due to the habit of writing on lontar; there, just as in our cursive writing, it is easier to execute a little loop, which requires no lifting of the instrument, than a separate little curve (cf. our written *t* with its printed form).

engraving, for the examples are mainly found in those parts of the text which make the impression of being very accurately written. In the first two lines of the front side of plate *b*, for instance, the word *āyatana* occurs no less than five times, but in all these cases the third and fourth akṣaras of the word appear to be perfectly alike; these two lines, however, are very neatly written. We presume that these difficulties may be accounted for in a satisfactory way only if we assign the time of engraving to a period in which the newer akṣara types were the current ones, although they had not yet completely superseded the older types. The latter being mainly limited to the neatly written portions of our text, it seems probable that they were due to conscious effort.

Similar remarks apply to the different forms of the akṣara *la*. More often than not, the three verticals are equal in height and then, the form of the *la* would completely agree with the type of *la* which was in common use from the late 7th century inscriptions of Çrīvijaya onwards. On the other hand, there also occurs on our plates a very different form of the akṣara; although it is less common than the form mentioned above, it is by no means rare. Its most characteristic feature is the prolongation of the third, ascending, vertical, which bends to the left and runs round the whole of the akṣara, i.e. ⊘. One of the few dated inscriptions in which this form is met with is a Cambodian Sanskrit inscription of 627 A. D. [6]. The only example in Indonesia is the Tuk Mas rock inscription (Central Java), which, unfortunately, does not bear any date, but was assigned to the seventh century A. D. on palaeographic grounds [7]. This type differs as much from the Pūrṇavarman *la* (5th century A. D.) as from the Çrīvijaya *la*, which is expressed as ⋔ . It might constitute a link in the development of the form of the akṣara and would then confirm our conclusion arrived at above.

Some other peculiarities, which will not be examined in detail, appear to be in keeping with the above considerations, e.g. the two forms of the initial *a*: ⊢ and ⊣ and of medial *i*: ⊙ and ⊖ [8].

These features, though apparently contradictory, may enable us to arrive at an approximate result concerning the period in which our plates were engraved. It is a well-known principle in palaeographic discussions that, if chronologically different types of the same akṣara occur in one text, the inscription must be dated in the period during which the newer forms

---

[6] Finot, B.E.F.E.O., 28 (1928), pp. 43-46 (with an excellent photograph); cf. also *Corp.* No. XIII (K 577 and 600), dated 611 A.D. (Cœdès, *Inscr. du Camb.*, II, pp. 21 sqq.), *Corp.* No. XCI, dated 693 A.D. (Cœdès, II, pp. 200 sq.), *Corp.* No. VIII-IX, assigned to the 6th century by Cœdès, II, p. 16.

[7] Krom, *Not. Bat. Gen.*, 1910, p. 77, and (in abbreviated form) *Gesch.²*, p. 103; photograph in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 65 (1911), p. 335, where Kern had assigned the inscription to a much earlier date (about 500 A.D.); the article was reprinted with a few additions, but without the good photograph, in *Verspr. Geschr.*, VII, pp. 199 sqq.

[8] A characteristic example of the former occurs in line 2 (in *çrī*) of the inscription of Ci-Arutön (Vogel, *op. cit.*, Plate 29).

were in use. As a matter of fact, a scribe may, on account of various considerations, well use rather archaic forms, but he cannot possibly write down any forms of akṣaras which belong to a later period. Archaisms may have a very wide scope. In this case, there are very special circumstances in favour of the use of archaisms. As will appear during this introduction, the text of our plates does not constitute an original inscription. Presumably it was copied on the precious metal from some manuscript. Such copies are usually reproduced in the type of script which was current in the time of the scribe. But at the same time, there is often a tendency towards keeping the copy as similar to the original as possible. In addition, the text constitutes a religious treatise, so that it is only natural that respect for the holy words would have induced the scribe to reproduce his original as accurately as he could. As may be expected in such circumstances, the result is unequal : sometimes the scribe went to very much trouble, and then the copy was very similar to the original manuscript ; but almost as often, relatively modern forms slipped into the copy — the akṣara forms which the scribe was used to writing when he was not copying anything. Sometimes one has the impression that the script of the initial lines of the plates shows a more archaic style of writing than that of the following ones. When taking all these circumstances into consideration, one arrives at the conclusion that the result which we have before us on the gold plates could be explained very well if one presumed that the scribe was reproducing a manuscript written several centuries earlier.

Before considering other consequences of copying an older text, we shall try to arrive at a conclusion concerning the date the copy was made. In the examples quoted above, there are no features which are necessarily later than the Çrīvijaya inscriptions dated the end of the 7th century. On the other hand, it is to be noted that this 7th century Çrīvijaya script does not show any substantial differences if compared with that of the Tjaṅgal inscription (732 A. D.), or even with that of the Ligor inscription (775 A. D.) [9]. It would not probably be much later, as there are no definite examples of those innovations which appear in the Dinaya stone inscription (760 A. D.) [10]. We should, however, remain conscious of the fact that little

---

[9] Cf. the photograph published by Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.*, 18 (1918), No. 6, facing p. 30. In our text, we do not find any example of the peculiar way in which the syllable *bhū* is regularly written in the inscriptions of Ligor and Tjaṅgal. It is an obvious archaism, which appears in the Cambodian inscription of the year 627 A.D., too. As a matter of fact, the inscription of Kotakapur shows the same form in *bhūmi* (line 3), but the later form in *bhūmi* in the last line. Therefore, it seems that no sound conclusions could be based on the form of *bhū*. The same applies to the form of the *ra*, which, in our text, is always single-stroked.

[10] A photograph was published in the article by F. D. K. Bosch, *Het Lingga-heiligdom van Dinaja*, *T.B.G.*, 64 (1924), facing p. 228. — In the Dinaja inscription, the akṣaras are rather cursive, whereas in our text they are everywhere straight. This cursive style of writing is a typical feature of the Old Javanese script up to the beginning of the 10th century A.D.

weight should be attached to this last argument. The archaistic style of writing makes it almost impossible to base any conclusions on the absence of innovations. Allowing a wide margin, we might conclude that the most probable time of engraving would be between about 650 and 800 A. D.

As to the place of origin, it is obvious from the preceding remarks that no certain conclusions can be based on palaeographic considerations. At best, we may state that there are no peculiarities which do not occur in inscriptions from Indonesia and Malaya, whereas it is doubtful whether all of them occur elsewhere, too. In any case, the analysis of the type of script would not oppose our provisional conclusion that it is probable that the plates were inscribed somewhere in Indonesia.

The text itself exhibits numerous examples of typically clerical errors. Among these, omissions of one or more akṣaras, or, less frequently, of whole words, are very common. The very first lines of the text contain quite a number of them. As a rule, the correction of such errors hardly offers any difficulty, but they make it probable that the scribe did not understand much of the text he copied [11]). Diplographies are far less frequent, but they do occur. Other mistakes are relatively rare.

It is striking that these sorts of mistakes are far more frequent in one part of the text than in another. Sometimes we meet with passages which are full of obvious lapses, whereas, on the other hand, there are relatively long portions in the text in which only a very few lapses can be detected. The difference might be due to the state of preservation of the manuscript from which the text was copied. Wherever the text was difficult to decipher, the scribe made the best of it he could. If we presume that in a number of cases he had no idea of what would have been the correct reading, and then preferred to give no reading rather than a text which would most certainly be wrong, we might arrive at a plausible explanation of the relative frequency of omissions.

The text is completely written in Sanskrit. The most striking difference from the classical language is the way in which the rules of sandhi are applied. These rules are often observed correctly, but almost as often neglected, and, in a few cases, wrongly applied. This third case is relatively rare — except for two passages which, on account of other peculiarities, too, may be considered interpolations not belonging to the original text [12]). In any case, wrong sandhi is rare : it would not probably be more frequent than it is in the average Sanskrit inscription from India [13]). These cases do not offer any special interest.

---

[11]) Unlike the original manuscript, the text engraved in the plates was not probably copied for the purpose of being read. We shall come back to this point at the end of this Introduction.

[12]) These two portions of the text will be discussed towards the end of this Introduction.

[13]) As to the Sanskrit inscriptions from Indonesia (and from Indochina), it is even striking that sandhi is almost always correctly applied. The Ādityavarman inscriptions (14th century A.D.), where this is not the case, obviously mark the decline of Sanskrit scholarship.

As to the second case mentioned above, it is not quite correct to state that the rules of sandhi were often not observed at all. As a matter of fact, in all of these cases, the words were written in the form which they ought to have had if they had stood *in pausa*. Examples may be found in every line of the text. As a result, the text very often makes the impression of being cut into tiny separate sentences often consisting of one word only. Thus, we read in b — A — 9 [14]): *kāmabhavaḥ rūpabhavaḥ ārūpyabhavaḥ,* each word constituting a unity by itself. In all enumerations of this kind, omission of sandhi is regular; it produces a rather clumsy effect, which makes the text almost unreadable. It is as if a guru were pronouncing the words to his pupils with a considerable pause after each term, thus giving them sufficient time to memorize every single word. It seems probable that the omission of sandhi especially aimed at avoiding quick reading. Nevertheless, not all the cases of omitted sandhi are classifiable under this heading; other cases do occur, but they are relatively few. Almost always, definite reasons can be found accounting for the omission of sandhi. As a rule, it is omitted in those cases where there might be some chance of misunderstanding the passage. Such cases occur, for instance, if the negative prefix *a-* would have disappeared by vowel contraction; thus, in f — A — 4, *pañcavidhā avidyā* is written in order to prevent the ignorant from reading *pañcavidhā vidyā*. This method, though not very elegant, is sufficiently clear; in normal Sanskrit, one would have used different means to avoid misunderstanding, e.g. by writing *pañcavidhā cāvidyā*. As may be expected for this period, the *avagraha* is unknown; its use would have avoided the *hiatus* in cases such as *pūrvvānte ajñānam* (a — A — 7).

There remain a few cases which could not well be accounted for in this manner. In a — A — 9, it is evident that *hetāv=ajñānam* would have been easier to understand than *heto ajñānam,* which is, at first, startling [15]). These few remaining cases may however easily be understood : non-application of sandhi became a matter of principle in all these combinations with *ajñāna*.

The impression that the omission of sandhi is not due to the ignorance about these rules, but to definite considerations, is confirmed by those cases in which even the less common rules are correctly applied. Examples occur everywhere in the text, e.g. in a — A — 2 : *bhagavāṃs tān* and in a — A — 1 : *bhagavāñ chrāvastyām.* In the latter case, the conversion of *ç* to *ch* is considered preferable but not necessary by most of the grammarians [16]). The use of sandhi rules in these examples gives the impression that the author wanted to show that he knew the rules very well, even if he did not apply them in special cases for a definite purpose.

---

[14]) In these abbreviations, the first letters refer to the plates, the capitals A and B to *recto* and *verso* respectively, and the figures to the lines.

[15]) This effect is partly due to the spelling *o* instead of *au*. In Old Javanese inscriptions, this is almost always the case, whereas *e* and *ai* are usually distinguished.

[16]) Whitney's *Grammar,* p. 68. § 203 ; Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.,* I, 1 (1896), p. 332, § 282.

Though it is not probable that the above cases of omission of sandhi are to be explained by reference to Vedic hymns or to Buddhist *gāthās* [17]), there may be some chance that the occurrence of similar instances in the latter group of scriptures should have facilitated a certain freedom from the rigid sandhi rules. It is perhaps not a mere accident that irregular sandhi is sometimes found in the so-called Buddhist Article of Faith and in older Buddhist Sanskrit texts in general [18]); in the older Buddhist texts, the use of sandhi may not have been as regular as it was elsewhere : there was a certain tradition of laxness in sandhi.

It is however evident that these parallels could not supply us with a full explanation of the very peculiar way in which sandhi is used in our text. We presume that these facts should rather be explained by referring to the obviously didactic character of our text. It is well-known that the rules of sandhi constitute one of the main difficulties for the primary Sanskrit reader, because they often make the words and grammatical forms, as they were taught in dictionaries and grammars, hard to recognize. If the text was especially intended for pupils, we can understand the author making the task of reading and studying the text as easy as possible, thus avoiding the possibility of misunderstanding. As to this latter point, we may especially refer again to those very numerous cases in which the initial *a* of words such as *avidyā*, *ajñāna* and the like would have disappeared as a consequence of sandhi.

---

[17]) One of the main difficulties in judging about the sandhi in these cases is that our manuscript traditions are not reliable on this point; they contain numerous corrections, but the original forms can often be reconstituted to a certain extent with the help of metrics. In Buddhist *gāthās*, forms such as *bodhiaṅgam, samuddeçyate ayam, bud-dhacandra samuddeçyate, sarvamitra bhajate atandritaḥ, yādṛço ayu* (examples from the Gaṇḍavyūha in Çikṣāsamuccaya, pp. 101 sq.) are frequently met with. It appears, however, that these examples are rather different from what we see in our text.

[18]) Cf. e.g. Quaritch Wales, *Archaeol. Researches, Journ. Mal. Br. R. A. S.*, 18 (1940), p. 7 : *nirodho evam°*. Also in the Indonesian examples of the formula, we often find *prabhavāḥ* instead of *prabhavā* (before the *h*) and *nirodhaḥ* or *nirodho* instead of *nirodha* (followed by *evam*). — It is striking that some of the Sanskrit texts found in Central Asia as a result of the Mission Pelliot show a very similar attitude towards sandhi as our text does. Cf. Sylvain Lévi, *Textes sanscrits de Touen-Houang, Journ. As., 10ième Sér.*, XVI (1910), pp. 433 sqq. Lévi notes (*ibid.*, p. 437) : „Le scribe, ou le modèle qu'il reproduit, suspend volontiers l'application du sandhi, soit pour marquer un léger arrêt de la voix ....., soit pour éviter une équivoque fâcheuse : *sparçe asati*, f(euillet) *r*, V 5, *sadāyatane asati, ibid.*, 3, etc. La chute de l'a initial réclamée par le sandhi aurait effacé la négation nécessaire". These remarks could almost have been written in an introduction to our text. Although the explanations given by Lévi are quite sufficient by themselves, it is nevertheless striking that here, like in the case of our text, the Dinaya inscription and the examples of the Buddhist formula of creed, the texts were composed outside India. This is hardly astonishing : the chances for misunderstanding the text, e.g. by concluding to *jñāna* instead of *ajñāna*, were not so great in India with her countless Paṇḍits than in other countries. Besides, and this might be even more important, the omission of sandhi rules in some particular cases must have been less shocking to Central-Asian and Indonesian ears than they would have been to Indians.

In Indonesian epigraphy, there is one example of a Sanskrit inscription in which all the rules of sandhi have been omitted from the beginning to the end. It is the Dinaya inscription dated 760 A. D. [19]). There, all the words are given in the forms to be used *in pausa,* but it appears that the correct metrical form of the text can only be re-established by applying the Sanskrit rules of sandhi. Obviously, the poet had first written the text in the normal way, but changed it afterwards to the form in which it was engraved on the stone. Now the question arises why the text should have been put into this, apparently clumsy, form ? There seems to be only one plausible reply to this question : the scribe preferred to make the inscription as easy as possible for his readers. There may have been additional circumstances, too. The text was composed on Indonesian soil, and to Javanese readers the use of sandhi rules must have appeared rather strange. In Indonesian languages, the word constitutes a phonetic unity, and as such, its form is not influenced by words immediately preceding or following it [20]). A Sanskrit text in which words follow each other without sandhi would therefore have seemed less strange in Indonesia than would have been the case in India.

If some weight may be attached to the above considerations, four different arguments, none of which decisive by itself, may be adduced in favour of an Indonesian origin of our plates : (*a*) the plates were noticed in Indonesia for the first time ; (*b*) the figures engraved in plate *k* seem to show Indonesian features ; (*c*) the type of script is in accordance with the development which we observe in Indonesia ; (*d*) the peculiar way in which the rules of sandhi are applied point to a non-Indian origin, whereas we find analogies in Indonesian epigraphy, where, in addition, this feature is in part explicable by the linguistic structure of Indonesian languages. Although it cannot be denied that one definite statement about the site of discovery would have had more weight than all these points together have,

---

[19]) Cf. Bosch, *T.B.G.,* 57 (1916), pp. 410 sqq., and *T.B.G.,* 64 (1924), pp. 227 sqq. ; Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya* (1926), pp. 51 sqq. and 109 sqq. ; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *T.B.G.,* 76 (1936), pp. 512 sqq., and our transcription, *T.B.G.,* 81 (1941), pp. 499 sqq.

[20]) The question is however more complicated. There are some obvious exceptions, mainly enclitic words ; cf. Javanese *mbotěn,* derived from *tan wwantěn* in Old Javanese, and *tambuh* from *tan wruh :* in these two examples, the final *n* of *tan* was assimilated. In such cases, it is probable that the assimilation took place when the combination was no longer a word group but had already developed into a new word (the semantic development confirms this explanation). — On the other hand, it is well-known that the Sanskrit rules of sandhi are often applied in Old Javanese, especially in inscriptions and in poetry. In the former, however, cases of sandhi, though far from rare, constitute only a small portion of the cases where sandhi could have been used if the Sanskrit rules were adhered to. On the whole, sandhi is exceptional and should probably be explained as an occasional display of learning by the scribes. In Old Javanese poetry, the use of sandhi is only natural since also the metrical and prosodic laws of Sanskrit are applied. In the (presumably) older phase, represented by the Old Javanese Rāmāyana (for which cf. the Introduction to No. XI below), even the vowel *hiatus* is common.

it seems safe to assume that they were discovered somewhere in Indonesia ; we may only hope that a tip of the veil covering the origin of the plates will be lifted in the future [21]).

In view of this uncertainty, it seems rather futile to examine from what part of Indonesia the plates would originate. All we can state is that if (a) they do originate from Indonesia, and (b) they are to be assigned to the period between about 650 and 800 A. D., there are only two centres which seriously come into consideration : the empire of Çrīvijaya [22]) and the Çailendra empire in Central Java [23]).

The peculiar way in which the rules of sandhi are applied is the outstanding feature of our text as far as language is concerned. Some minor details may be added.

Ignoring clerical errors, frequent only in those portions where the original text may have been in a bad state, the language may be considered correct. Grammatical mistakes are almost limited to two particular portions of the text, in which they are however common ; on account of other arguments, too, these passages should be considered later additions to the text [24]). Outside these two passages, the following peculiarities are worthy of note.

There are a few examples of wrong grammatical genders. In a — B — 7, *rūpa* is masculine ; *puṣpa* is used as a masculine in c — A — 10. A mistake of a different kind is the confusion between *pattra* and *pātra* in the same line. Forms like *vitarkayitvā* and *vicārayitvā* (instead of *vitarkya* and *vicārya ;* f — B — 5 to 6) are sometimes met with in the Epics and in classical

---

[21]) The most probable explanation is that the plates were acquired during the period in which the Museum was under Japanese direction ; in that case, there may have been particular reasons for not putting down their origin. But in that case, it is difficult to imagine that they should have been imported into Indonesia.

[22]) Some of the minor Buddhist centres, such as Western Borneo, could hardly come into consideration ; the luxury displayed in engraving a text in twelve heavy gold plates would rather point to a great and rich state. The Malay peninsula, or at least a part of it, should be included in Çrīvijaya in this period. There might even be a slight indication in favour of the latter in view of the remarkable parallel between some of the strophes mentioned in our text and those found inscribed in a clay tablet from Malaya. This point will be examined with greater detail towards the end of this Introduction.

[23]) There might be a slight indication in favour of Java, viz. the way in which the rules of sandhi are applied. The only real parallel in South-East Asia seems to be the Dinaya inscription. In view of the very few Sanskrit texts known to us from Sumatra or the Malay peninsula, the argument is rather weak. There is however another point which would be in favour of Java. The luxury mentioned in note 22 agrees far better with all we know about Central Java with its numerous religious foundations than with Çrīvijaya, where we did not discover anything comparable. This point may be especially interesting because there is hardly any doubt that the plates once belonged to an important religious foundation (cf. the end of this Introduction). At present, it seems impossible to decide what weight should be attached to either these arguments or those mentioned in note 22.

[24]) These passages will be treated in detail at the end of this Introduction. They contain very serious mistakes.

Sanskrit; they are common in Buddhist Sanskrit. In addition, there are two strophes in our text which are unfortunately very badly copied, but in spite of that, it may be concluded that they were written in the so-called Gāthā dialect. They will be analyzed below. It is very probable that the abnormal metrical and linguistic features were the very reason why the text of the strophes was badly copied: as a rule, copying a hand-written text that one does not understand is always difficult. Fortunately, our copyist did not attempt to 'correct' this passage (c — A — 4 to 5); as a matter of fact, he almost never did. He even seems to have worked mechanically and omitted the words that he could not read.

The style of our text makes the impression of clumsiness, which is mainly due to the excessive number of repetitions also in cases where they could easily have been avoided. This is a common feature in the older Buddhist scriptures such as the Pāli Nikāyas and the Prajñāpāramitā versions. The repetitions are mainly due to the didactic purposes of these texts: things are better retained the more often they are repeated [25].

After these more external details, we now proceed to a short examination of the contents.

On two of the three smaller plates (i and j) — the third one, k, does not bear any script — some presumably fundamental formulae of Buddhism are inscribed. They both begin with the Çloka *Ajñānāc cīyate karma*, which is already known from epigraphic records discovered in Western Borneo and Malaya [26], but has not been traced in Buddhist literature. It is stated that want of knowledge (*ajñāna*) produces the accumulation of Karman, which, in its turn, will lead to re-birth; if, however, knowledge (*jñāna*) takes the place of ignorance, there will be no accumulation of Karman and, therefore, one will not be reborn. Thus, a causal relation between Ajñāna, Karman and Janman is established, the arrangement is positive in the pādas *a-b*, and negative in *c-d*. As Chhabra noticed, the doctrine contained therein is not exclusively Buddhistic: it rather belongs to the common property of different systems of Indian thought, such as Vedānta and Sāmkhya [27]. According to the Buddhist interpretation, the Çloka gives one of the principal aspects of the philosophical doctrine of Dependent Origination; this is obvious in our text, where it is used as a kind of *motto* to a text dealing with the latter subject [28]. The two Çloka halves correspond

---

[25] Winternitz, *Geschichte*, II, 1 (1913), p. 42, pp. 52 sq., p. 248, etc.

[26] Published by Chhabra, *Expansion*, p. 15 and pp. 42 sqq.

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 15: „The doctrine herein expressed seems to be more closely related with the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta than with the Buddhist philosophy. It is however not alien to the latter." — The last part of this statement is rather too weak in the light of our present knowledge of Buddhism.

[28] Its main assertion agrees with that expressed in the most famous strophe of Buddhism, in which a similar parallelism between its two halves is worked out. The same is the case with the Samudaya and Nirodha parts of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula. The relations between Buddhism and Sāmkhya, and between Buddhism and the

with the positive (*anuloma*) and the negative (*pratiloma*) arrangements of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula. There is also a close correspondence with the well-known Mahāyāna distinction of the twelve Nidānas as being either *sāṃkleçika*, "favourable to the continuation of the Saṃsāra", or *vaiyavadā-nika*, "favourable to ultimate Liberation". In the former case, the Angas are classified into three groups, which are styled *saṃkleças*, „great Impediments", viz. those of Kleça, Karman and Jāti [29].

It appears that our text attaches great importance to the *Ajñānāc cīyate karma* strophe : it not only occurs on both of the smaller plates (i — A — 1 to 2, and j — A — 1 to 2) and is repeated a third time in the text itself (c — A — 1 to 2), but it is even mentioned before the famous *Ye dharmā* strophe in each of the three cases.

As to the latter, we may be short. It is undoubtedly the most famous strophe of Buddhism and has often been styled the 'Buddhist Creed' [30]. Buddhists, as a rule, considered it the very essence of the doctrine [31]. The Tathāgata is glorified as the Expounder of the *dharma* theory : the way in which the *dharmas* originate, and the Path leading to their extinction. It is therefore closely associated with the theory of Dependent Origination.

Plates *i* and *j* each contain a third strophe, but not the same on the two plates. The additional strophe occurring on plate *j* (j — B — 2 to 3) is also mentioned in c — A — 1. In each of these cases, the text has been

---

Upaniṣads are still very obscure ; the essential difference is, however, that Ignorance is never considered an 'original' cause in Buddhism : it is 'created' at every moment of phenomenal existence. For the many problems connected with these relations, cf. especially the sober survey given by De la Vallée Poussin in *Indo-Européens* etc. (1936). pp. 277 sqq. and pp. 310 sqq.

[29] There is some doubt as to the exact term applied to the third *saṃkleça*. Th. Stcherbatskij. *Buddhist Logic*, I (1932), p. 137, notes : „In Mahāyāna, the 12 *nidānas* are called *saṃkleças*, „great impediments" and are distinguished into three classes : the *kleça-saṃkleça* — *avidyā, tṛṣṇā, upādāna*, twc *karma-saṃkleça* — *saṃskāra, bhava*, — and the remaining members are styled *jāti-saṃkleça*". E. Obermiller, *Sublime Science, Acta Or.*, 9 (1931), p. 136, reconstituted that very term from the Tibetan translation of the Uttaratantra [which in Obermiller's translation corresponds to "repeated births"]. The *Siddhi*, however, mentions the third term as *phalasaṃkleça*; cf. De la Vallée Poussin's translation, I, p. 215 : "Par saṃkleça, il faut entendre *kleça, karman* et *phala*". The same scholar, referring to Obermiller's translation just mentioned, states in *Mélanges chin. et bouddh.*, I (1931-32), p. 403 : "Obermiller lit *jāti* ce qui pour moi est douteux". The conjecture made by Obermiller and Stcherbatskij is confirmed by the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*, ed. by Yamaguchi, Tokyo, 1934, p. 35, reading *kleça-karmajanmasaṃkleça*, in the translation by D. Friedmann (1935), p. 46 : "the defilements of passion, action and birth" (cf. also the notes to that translation, note 1 on p. 123, and note 147 on p. 132). As our Çloka establishes the series Ajñāna, Karman, Janman, there is essential accordance with the Saṃkleça classification.

[30] For a full discussion (including the metrical anomalies and a comparison of the Pāli and Sanskrit versions), cf. Kern, *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indië*, I (1882), pp. 285-287.

[31] Cf. especially H. von Glasenapp, *Zur Geschichte der Buddhistischen Dharma-Theorie*, Zeitschr. D. Morg. Ges., 92 (1938), pp. 383 sqq.

very carelessly written [32]), so that the exact wording is open to doubt. Owing to this uncertainty, the meaning of the Çloka remains doubtful; its main assertion seems to refer to the famous 'non-soul' doctrine of Buddhism [33]).

The third strophe of *i* (B — 1 to 3), which does not occur anywhere else in the text, is incomplete; if it really is an Anuṣṭubh strophe — this seems probable in view of the choice of the words and the rhythm — no less than thirteen syllables, almost the half of the strophe, are missing. Here, we have been fortunate enough to trace the strophe; it occurs in the Mahāvastu, but, as Senart pointed out [34]), its Pāli version is known from the Dhammapada (V, 183). It is therefore probable that the strophe was borrowed from the Sanskrit Dharmapada, although it is not found in the few fragments preserved. The term *upasampadā* might suggest a reference to Buddhist ordination ceremonies, but this does not prove to be the case here [35]) : the Çloka extolls the excellent qualities of the Buddha's instructions

---

[32]) The same applies to the other strophes on the same plates. Obviously, these strophes were so well-known that it did not matter whether they were distinctly written or not. Therefore, it is the more striking that it has not yet been possible to trace any of these strophes (except, of course, the *Ye dharmā* formula and, probably, the strophe i — B — 1 to 3 to be discussed hereafter).

[33]) This statement might not be precise with a view to the uncertainty about the last word of pāda *b,* which seems to be *nirātmikāḥ* in plate *i,* but *nirāmaṇāḥ* in *c.* It is all but evident that the latter should be corrected to the former; one would rather correct it to *nirāmaṇāḥ* (i.e. the correction of the dental to the lingual nasal), but then, the meaning becomes quite different. Probably, we have one of the interesting cases here in which different sects read a Çloka in different ways: the reading *nirāmaṇāḥ* is clearly Mahāyānic. For the non-soul doctrine, a famous topic in Abhidharma literature, cf., for instance, *Abhidh. Koça,* IX (Pudgalapratiṣedhaprakaraṇa).

[34]) *Mahāv.,* III, p. 420, lines 12 sq.; cf. also the note on p. 523. The pādas *c* and *d* are omitted in our text.

[35]) For the Upasampadā, the 'full' ordination of Buddhist monks, cf. Kern, *op. cit.,* II, pp. 25 sq.; Oldenberg, *Buddha*[8] (1923), pp. 386 saq.; Demieville, *Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha, B.E.F.E.O.,* 24 (1924), p. 159 : „*upasampadā*, qui designe l'ordination comme *thera* à la fin du noviciat"; *Mahāvyutpatti,* ed. Minaiev-Mironov, *Bibl. Buddh.,* 13 (1911), p. 108, No. 270, 2. — In Mahāyāna, ordination ceremonies were of two kinds: Pravrajyā and Upasampadā; they took place under the guidance of an Ācārya and an Upādhyāya respectively (cf. Nalinaksha Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism,* 1930, pp. 311 sqq.). — An important fragment of an ordination ritual in Sanskrit was published by Bendall in *Album Kern* (1903), pp. 373-376; it probably belonged to the Sarvāstivādin School. It does not contain anything similar to our Çloka. *Upasampadā* literally means „joining" (cf. Kern, op. cit., p. 24, who tranlates „toe-treding"). In Mahāyāna, the derivatives of *upasampad-* are especially used to denote the 'arrival' at states of Dhyāna and Samādhi (or at the eight Vimokṣas); cf. the *Daçasāhasrikā,* published by Sten Konow, *Avh. Norske Vid.-Ak.,* 1941, II, pp. 97 sq.: *katamāni catvāri dhyānāni? Yaduta viviktaṃ kāmair viviktaṃ pāpakair akuçalair dharmaiḥ ..... prathamaṃ dhyānam upasampadya viharati.* In a similar way, the derivatives of *upasampad* are used to denote the arrival of the Bodhisattva on the different *bhūmis (cq. vihāras)* of the Path. As appears from the above examples, *upasampad-* always refers to a definite transition to a higher sphere, either due to special ceremonies or to the accumulation of elements of virtue and wisdom, the

(*buddhānuçāsana*) with reference to the destruction of all kinds of Evil and the inauguration into the Good Path. The main purpose of the strophe is to stress that the Doctrine, including, for instance, the Pratītyasamutpāda theory, has a moral bearing.

The text on the larger plates begins with the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra. This Sūtra is very well-known from Pāli literature [36]), from Buddhist Sanskrit literature [37]), from Indian epigraphy both in Prākrit [38]) and Sanskrit [39]) versions, and also from Burmese epigraphy in a Pāli version [40]). In Nālandā, this Sūtra must have been considered of paramount importance; A. Ghosh states that the brick inscriptions discovered in Nālandā consist either of the so-called Buddhist creed or of the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra [41]). The above references leave no doubt that this Sūtra was studied all over the Buddhist world. Our text enables us to add Indonesia to this list. In addition, several versions of the Sūtra are preserved in Chinese translations [42]).

The text begins with the introduction usual in Buddhist Sūtras. It is mentioned that once upon a time the Bhagavat stayed at Çrāvastī in the Jetavana, surrounded by monks, and revealed them the twelve-linked formula

---

necessary equipment for the transition to a higher sphere. This whole question is important for the problem about the main purpose of the text engraved in our gold plates. If the strophes ought to be considered a kind of motto above the text as a whole (and this seems to be the case), it follows *not* that the text served for the ordination of Buddhist monks, but rather that the doctrine expounded was a means to arrive at a higher state and to be delivered from the Evil.

[36]) Thus it constitutes the beginning of the entire Vinayapiṭaka (*Mahāvagga*, p. 1). Other references to the Pāli canon are given by Chakravarti in the article quoted in note 39 below.

[37]) Examples are given in the articles quoted in note 39. The complete text is also given in the Daçasāhasrikā (cf. note 35 above), p. 96, 5. A Sanskrit version of Sūtra and Vibhaṅga (the latter however completely different from the Vibhaṅga version in our text) was found by the Mission Pelliot in Central Asia. It was discussed in detail by Sylvain Lévi, *Journ. As.*, Xième Série, XVI (1910), pp. 435-440.

[38]) It is written in Kharoṣṭhī script on the Kurram casket and edited by Sten Konow, *Corp. Inscr. Ind.*, II, 1 (1929) No. LXXX.

[39]) The Gopalpur brick; cf. *Proc. As. Soc. Bengal*, 1896, p. 99; the Kasiā copper-plate, *Arch. Surv. India, Ann. Rep.*, 1910-11, pp. 76 sqq.; many examples have been found in Nālandā; cf. the survey by Hirananda Sastri, *Nālandā and its Epigraphic material*, *Mem. Arch. Surv.*, No. 66 (1942), pp. 75 sq.; two of these are especially interesting: (a) the text inscribed on a brick which was published by Ghosh in *Epigr. Ind.*, 24 (1938), pp. 20 sqq.; it gives a version of the Sūtra which is essentially different from the other ones and, in addition, it is dated, probably in the Gupta era; (b) two Nālandā bricks which each give both the Sūtra and the Vibhaṅga texts, published by Chakravarti, *Epigr. Ind.*, 21 (1934), pp. 199 sqq.

[40]) Viz. the gold plates of Hmawza (Prome District); cf. *Ann. Rep. Arch. Surv. India*, 1926-27, p. 200, and Nihar Ranjan Ray, *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma* (1936), p. 4.

[41]) *Art. cit.*, p. 21.

[42]) The Chinese version corresponding with the Nālandā text of the Sūtra and the Vibhaṅga, was translated into English by P. C. Bagchi, *A note on the Pratītya Samutpāda Sūtra, Epigr. Ind.*, 21 (1934), pp. 199 sqq. Also other Chinese versions, mainly of the Sūtra alone, are mentioned there.

of Causation. The enumeration of the twelve links is preceded by the words *asmin satīdam bhavati,* which contain the fundamental expression of the relation between the successive Aṅgas. This is, as Vasubandhu explains, the Pratītyasamutpāda in its general form, in which the separate Aṅgas are not specified (*abhedena*) ; if the formula is given in the form *Avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ* etc., Pratītyasamutpāda is expressed *bhedena* [43]).

As a rule, the words *asmin satīdam bhavati* [44]) are followed by *asyotpādād idam utpadyate, asya nirodhād idaṃ nirudhyate.* This is, however, not the case in our text : only the first clause is mentioned, immediately followed by the enumeration of the twelve Aṅgas. The formula is given in its usual form, each following notion being stated to have the preceding term as its *pratyaya.* The very last link of the chain, Jarāmaraṇa, is taken to imply a large 'complex' of different aspects of suffering, which consist of çoka, parideva, duḥkha, daurmanasya and *upāyāsa* [45]). The enumeration ends with the conclusion that "thus is the origin of this 'autonomous' and 'powerful' complex of suffering" (*evam asya kevalasya mahato duḥkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati*) [46]). The Pratītyasamutpādasūtra as a whole is stated to be the 'beginning' (*ādi*), i.e. the fundamentals [47]), of Dependent Origination.

Very often, this portion of the Sūtra — which may be styled the Samudaya portion — is followed by quite an analagous portion, in which it is stated that after the cessation (*nirodha*) of the first Aṅga, the second one also ceases to exist (or rather, is not produced at all) ; the third and following Aṅgas will not arise and the last Aṅga, Jarāmaraṇa, implying the great complex of suffering, is not produced owing to the absence of the essential factor (Jāti) conditioning its arising. Then, the Sūtra ends with the conclusion that "thus is the cessation of this 'autonomous' (i.e independent of external factors) and 'powerful' (i.e. without beginning or

---

[43]) Cf. G. Tucci, *A fragment from the Pratītya-samutpāda-vyākhyā of Vasubandhu,* J.R.A.S., 1930, pp. 611 sqq. This commentary will be discussed in the course of this Introduction. For the title, cf. note 97 below.

[44]) There are often small differences in the wording of the formula, such as *imasmin* instead of *asmin,* or *bhavatīdam* instead of *idam bhavati.*

[45]) *Infra,* a — A — 5 and e — A — 6. The omission of çoka in the first of these references is probably only an error by the copyist; in the second reference it is mentioned in the right place. In the passage from g — B — 2 to g — B — 10, a causal relation between these aspects of suffering is established. The term *vyādhi,* "disease", does not occur in our text in this connection. As a matter of fact, some of the sources mention it (after *maraṇa ;* cf. *Divya,* p. 210, and the *Daçasāhasrikā, loc. cit.*), whereas most of the versions leave it out (also the Sūtra version at the beginning of the Mahāvagga does). The main reason is the difficulty where to place it: there is something strange with disease mentioned after death, whereas the traditional form of the formula did not allow to insert it, e.g. between *jarā* and *maraṇa.*

[46]) Cf. note 18 to the Translation.

[47]) Cf. note 99 to this Introduction. It is to be noted that the Vibhaṅga, which is to be discussed hereafter, is also a part of the Sūtra; the latter consists of *ādi* and *vibhaṅga.* Here, we denote the former by Sūtra.

end) complex of suffering". This second portion of the Sūtra stands in the same relation to the Nirodhasatya as the first portion to the Samudayasatya.

The Nirodha portion of the Sūtra is not given on our plates, and the same is the case with the copper-plate from Kasiā and the two Nālandā bricks which give the text of the Vibhaṅga. The absence of the Nirodha portion might be connected with the fact that the third and last part of the introductory formula (asya nirodhād idaṃ nirudhyate) is also omitted.

In a single case [48]), we find at the end of the Samudaya portion the words iyaṃ mithyāprakṛtiḥ saṃskṛtavartinī, and at the end of the Nirodha portion iyaṃ samyakprakṛtir asaṃskṛtaniyāmāvakkrāntiḥ. There is something strange in the definitior. of the two aspects of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula as the wrong and the right prakṛti ; the use of the latter term recalls the prakṛti conception of the Sāṃkhyins and suggests the interpretation of the twelve Aṅgas as a series of pariṇāmas of the prakṛti either in the wrong (mithyā°) or in the right (samyag°) direction. If this interpretation is considered correct, it is obvious that the opinion here expressed is an unusual one. It seems closely related with the view attributed to the Mahīçāsakas, who considered Pratītyasamutpāda a dharma and even asaṃskṛta, i.e. a transcendental conception beyond the Twelve Aṅgas which are saṃskṛta [49]).

Apart from this remarkable use of prakṛti, we here found the usual division of Pratītyasamutpāda into its two aspects. Usually, the former is denoted by saṃkleça and then Pratītyasamutpāda expresses the Path of Defilement ; the latter is vyavadāna, and after the destruction of Avidyā the Aṅgas then constitute the Path of Purification [50]). These two aspects are

[48]) Viz. the Nālandā brick published by Ghosh, Epigr. Ind., 24 (1938), pp. 20 sqq.

[49]) References by De la Vallée Poussin, Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 77, note 1. Not all of our sources agree in attributing this interpretation to the Mahīçāsakas ; as a matter of fact, Vasubandhu uses the expression nikāyāntarīyāḥ, „certaines écoles", but Yaçomitra (Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣ., 40, 21, in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 165, line 12) comments upon Vasubandhu's explanation by ity Āryamaṇīçāsakāḥ ; the Vibhāṣā, however, attributed this opinion to the Vibhajyavādins. It is not however certain that the Vibhāṣā refers to a definite school by that expression ; cf. the detailed notes by De la Vallée Poussin in Abhidh. Koça, Introduction etc. (1931), pp. lv — lviii, and pp. 133 sq. The interpretation of pratītyasamutpāda as an asaṃskṛtadharma is based upon an interesting Nikāya passage quoted in the Vyākhyā (loc. cit.) ; there, the well-known formula yo bhikṣavaḥ pratītyasamutpādaṃ paçyati sa dharmaṃ paçyati, yo dharmaṃ paçyati sa buddhaṃ paçyati is taken to refer to eṣā dharmāṇāṃ dharmatā, an interpretation accepted only by some schools. Vasubandhu's refutation (Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 77) is scholastic and hardly convincing for a modern reader ; his main argument is that utpāda is one of the saṃskṛtalakṣaṇas ; how, then, could pratītyasamutpāda be an asaṃskṛta ? As a matter of fact, the law expressing the unstableness of things may be stable and eternal itself. The latter is essentially the Mahāyāna view, which leads to the conception of Nirvāṇa as Saṃsāra viewed sub specie aeternitatis.

[50]) De la Vallée Poussin, Siddhi, I, p. 215 (with references). This distinction is prevalent in Mahāyāna, but it is all but strange to Hīnayāna sources either. For saṃkleça and vyavadāna, cf. Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 105, and III, p. 115 ; Mahāv., III, p. 321 line 6 : saṃkleçavyavadānaṃ yathābhūtaṃ prajānanti. The division of the pratītyasamutpādāṅgas into three saṃkleças seems to be confined to Mahāyāna (cf. Stcherbatskij, quoted in note 29 above).

also defined as *sāsrava* and *anāsrava* [51]). In addition, this same Nālandā text uses two other curious terms for these two aspects, viz. *dharmāṇām ācayaḥ* and *dharmāṇām apacayaḥ,* „increase and decrease of *dharmas"*. The terms *ācaya* and *apacaya* are probably based on a comparison with the different kinds of food (*āhāra*), the effect of which is stated to be either *upacaya* (= *ācaya*) or *apacaya* [52]).

Among all the examples of the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, this Nālandā brick is especially important because it is the only one which is dated. Although no era is mentioned, Ghosh rightly concluded that its date could only refer to the Gupta Era, which brings the year to 516/17 A. D. [53]). Ghosh also noted the very frequent occurrence of this Sūtra among the discoveries at Nālandā [54]), where the text must have been as well-known as the famous *ye dharmā* stanza [55]).

Another point to be noted is that in almost all of the cases the Pratītya-samutpādasūtra was found in votive stūpas, in which it took the place of a relic [56]). These points might be of interest in connection with the incertitude as to where our plates were discovered [57]).

As was noted above, the Nirodha portion is omitted on our gold plates; on the other hand, these plates give the text of a detailed commentary on the Sūtra, which is termed Vibhaṅga or Vibhāga [58]). The translation by „commentary" is not quite correct and might convey a wrong impression: the twelve Nidānas are the only items explained in it; there is, for instance, no account of the notion of *pratyaya* and no definitions of the series from *çoka* to *upāyāsa* are given.

The text of the Vibhaṅga is not as well known as that of the Sūtra, but it is far from being new. We find it written, together with the Sūtra,

[51]) Stcherbatskij, *Central Conception*, pp. 1 sqq.; Sten Konow, *Daçasāhasrikā*, p. 112, §§ 63 and 64, and p. 86 (with numerous references).

[52]) *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 128 (*apacaya* in hell). The thing which either increases or decreases is *karman*, as is expressed in the *ajñānāc cīyate karma* formula.

[53]) *Art. cit.*, p. 21.

[54]) *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[55]) Cf. also Hirananda Sastri, *Nālandā and its Epigraphic Material, Memoirs Arch. Surv. India*, No. 66 (1942), pp. 75 sq.

[56]) Cf. Chakravarti, *Epigr. Ind.*, 21 (1934), p. 196, and Hirananda Sastri, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[57]) It seems probable that our plates, too, served as relics; cf. the end of this Introduction, where this point will be examined with greater detail. As to the Nālandā point, it is as yet difficult to determine how much weight should be attached to it. The fact that there are important differences to be noted between our Vibhaṅga version and the Nālandā one, is not in favour of the assumption that our text should be attributed to direct influence from Nālandā, although it does not, of course, exclude such a possibility.

[58]) *Vibhaṅga* in a — A — 6 and in h — A — 1; *vibhāga* in b — B — 10. The true meaning of the term is „division, analysis (into sets of categories)". Thus, the Vibhaṅga explains Saṃskārāṅga by enumerating the three groups of *kāya-, vāk-* and *manas-saṃskāras*. *Vibhaṅga* is therefore opposed to *ādi*; its Chinese equivalent means "derivatives" (Bagchi, quoted in note 60 below). Vasubandhu explains *ādi* by *uddeça*, *vibhaṅga* by *nirdeça*; cf. *infra*, note 99.

on two other bricks discovered at Nālandā [59]. Our text is fundamentally the same as the Nālandā text of the Vibhaṅga, but there are a number of differences in details.

The Vibhaṅga text is also preserved in a Chinese translation prepared by Hiuan Tsang in the year 661 A. D. [60]. Hiuan Tsang's translation corresponds closely to the Sanskrit text from Nālandā, but there are a number of minor differences again. The translation provides us with a reliable date ; the Nālandā text is not dated ; Chakravarti assigned it to the 6th century A. D. on account of sundry palaeographic features [61].

Not only the Sūtra (Samudaya and Nirodha portions) but also the Vibhaṅga is preserved in a Pāli version in the Saṃyuttanikāya [62]. As Bagchi pointed out, the Sūtra portion corresponds closely with its Sanskrit version, but the Vibhaṅga, though fundamentally the same, shows considerable differences. Not only are the Aṅgas explained in the converse order (beginning with Jarāmaraṇa), but the Vibhaṅga portion is also much more amplified than in the Nālandā text. As a matter of fact, this Pāli version corresponds to section 298 of the Chinese Saṃyukta, translated by Guṇabhadra at the beginning of the 5th century A. D., as Bagchi concludes. Also the Sanskrit version discovered in Touen-Houang by the Mission Pelliot agrees with the latter (Sylvain Lévi, art. cit., p. 435). Our Vibhaṅga texts are therefore to be divided into two great groups, one of which is represented by our text, the Nālandā bricks and Hiuan Tsang's translation, the other by the Pāli Saṃyutta, the Chinese Saṃyukta and the Sanskrit fragment from Central Asia. Since a comparison between these two lines of tradition would fall outside the scope of this introduction, we confine ourselves to a brief comparison between the three texts belonging to the former group.

Although these three versions are almost identical, there are some curious differences, which may help us in determining their relation. The most interesting point is the very beginning of the Sūtra. In our text, the audience of the Bhagavat at the time when he promulgated the Sūtra consists only of Bhikṣus without any further detail. The Nālandā text adds that the Bhagavat was surrounded by a large group of Bhikṣus (mahatā bhikṣu-saṃghena sārdham); the number of monks is also added, viz. 1250 (ardhatra-yodaçabhir bhikṣuçataiḥ) [63]. In the Chinese version, this modest number of monks was increased to „innumerable", and the audience is not limited

---

[59] Published by N. P. Chakravarti in Epigr. Ind. 21 (1934), pp. 193 sqq.

[60] Translated into English again by P. C. Bagchi, ibid., pp. 199-204 (preceded by an important introduction). Sylvain Lévi, art. cit., p. 436, assigns a different date to the translation by Hiuan Tsang, viz. 649 A.D.

[61] Art. cit., p. 193.

[62] Saṃyutta, II, pp. 1 sqq.

[63] Chakravarti (loc. cit.) translates „650". We prefer „1250", which is the usual meaning of ardhatrayodaça; cf. Monier-Williams' Dictionary, s.v. ardha; in addition, 1250 seems more plausible as a round number. Very often, this number is even multiplied by 10 (°sahasraiḥ instead of °çataiḥ; cf. Nalinaksha Dutt, A Buddhist manuscript from Gilgit, in Ind. Hist. Qu., VIII (1932), p. 101).

to monks but consists of „Çrāvakas, Bodhisattvas, gods and men " [64]. We generally assume that such an increase in numbers points to a later age. As we saw above, the Nālandā bricks were assigned to the 6th century A. D. on account of their palaeography ; since the Chinese translation by Hiuan Tsang was prepared in 661 A. D., it is considerably younger. These data confirm our assumption based upon the beginning of the Sūtra.

There is a similar example in the enumeration of the different aspects [65] of Avidyā. In line 8 of the Nālandā text we read the passage : *hīna-praṇīta-kṛṣṇa-çukla-sapratibhāga-pratītyasamutpanneṣu dharmeṣv ajñānam*, which does not occur at all in our text. The Chinese translation closely follows the Nālandā text, but there is one small difference : the terms in the Chinese version corresponding to *hīna-praṇīta-* are „low and bad and noble and good"; since, as a rule, the Chinese translation renders a single Sanskrit term by a single Chinese word, it is probable that Hiuan Tsang used a slightly more elaborate version, and perhaps translated *hīnāçubha-praṇītaçubha*. These, however, are the only certain points of difference. Some other points have been noted by Chakravarti in the foot-notes to Bagchi's translation, but they may be due to a more or less free translation rather than to a difference in redaction [66].

The differences between our Vibhaṅga text and that of the Nālandā bricks are far more important. In quite a few cases, the Nālandā text is far more elaborate ; this proves to be especially the case with the definition of Avidyā, and, in a lesser degree, with those of Nāmarūpa, Jarā and Maraṇa, whereas Tṛṣṇā is divided into a very different set of categories.

In the definition of Avidyā, we referred to the compound beginning with *hīna-praṇīta°*, which is absent in our version. These terms belong to the manifold classifications of Karman ; as a matter of fact, they can hardly be considered necessary, since they do not introduce any new elements in the definition of Avidyā : they were probably added only for completeness' sake. *Hīna* refers to the *dharmas* of Phenomenal Existence in as far as

---

[64] *Art. cit.*, p. 199. In our text, we represent us the Bhagavat addressing a small number of pupils ; in the Nālandā text, the Bhagavat could hardly reach his audience without making use of his supernatural faculties (*siṃhanāda*) ; in the Chinese version, however, the Jetavana itself was raised to a supernatural scene with gods resting upon clouds.

[65] 'Aspects' may not be the correct term. The Vibhaṅga defines Avidyā by enumerating various important notions in Buddhism to which Ignorance applies, technically, the *ajñānasthānāni* (Vyākhyā in *Cosmol. Bouddhique*, p. 164, line 21). Only at the end of the definition we find what we may designate by 'aspects', viz. the terms *anabhisamaya, tamas* and *saṃmoha*, which, together with *ajñāna*, constitute Avidyā. No attempt at giving a real definition and determining the *svabhāva* of Avidyā is made.

[66] The Chinese version has an addition : "It is nescience in cause and nescience in its fruit" (*art. cit.*, p. 202, note 9), where the Nālandā text has only : *hetāv ajñānam ;* in addition to the latter, the text used by Hiuan Tsang may have had *phale 'jñanam ;* the Chinese pilgrim probably read the whole passage : *hetāv ajñānam, phale 'jñānam, hetuphalayor ajñānam.* — It is curious that our text (a — A — 9) has in this connection: *pratītyasamutpāde ajñānaṃ*, which occurs neither in the Nālandā text, nor in the Chinese version. It is the only instance of our text having extra terms.

they lead to re-birth, viz. if they belong to the Duḥkha and Samudaya Truths. *Praṇīta*, on the contrary, is especially applied to the Nirodha and Mārga [67]. *Kṛṣṇa* and *çukla* are other terms which refer to Karman. *Çukla* is technically defined as *kuçalāvyākṛta* [68]), the remaining Karman is *kṛṣṇa*.

Then, we have the term *yathābhūtasamprativedhe 'jñānam* (Chinese version : „nescience in the insight into real nature of things") [69]). The same form *yathābhūta* is also added at the very end of the Avidyā definition. There, our text (a — B — 1) reads : *ajñānam anabhisamayaḥ tamas saṃmohaḥ* but the Nālandā text gives : *yathābhūtasyājñānam adarçanam anabhisamayaḥ tamaḥ saṃmohaḥ*. Neither *yathābhūta* nor *adarçana* are limited to Mahāyāna [70]), but both notions are certainlv more developed there.

In the explanation of the other Aṅgas, the additions are less obvious, but they are not absent. The Aṅgas Nāmarūpa and Jarāmaraṇa both consist of two parts ; accordingly, in both cases the definitions comprise two distinct portions with a statement at the end implying that, in the Aṅgas, these components should be conceived of as a unity. In our text (respectively in a — B — 8 and in b — B — 9) this 'unity' is only expressed by the words *tad ubhayam*, but the Nālandā text adds after these : *aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya*, literally : „throwing them together into a unity" [71]).

---

[67] *Abhidh. Koça*, VII pp. 32 sq.; *Mahāvyutpatti*, 54, No. 12 (edition Minaiev, p. 19). Cf. also *Abhidh. Koça Vyā.*, edition by Lévi and Stcherbatskij in *Bibl. Buddh.* XXI (1918), ad *Bhāṣ.* I, 33, 14, where Yaçomitra defines *hīna* and *praṇīta* by *kliṣṭa* and *akliṣṭa* respectively.

[68] *Abhidh. Koça*, IV, pp. 129 sq.; *Mahāvyutpatti*, 48, No. 43 (p. 18).

[69] The term *samprativedha* does not seem to occur in the *Abhidharmakoça*, but it occurs *Divya*, p. 46: *caturāryesatyasamprativedhakī dharmadeçanā*, in connection with splitting up the mountain of Satkāyadṛṣṭi by means of a *vajra*. But the Divyāvadāna contains additions in Mahāyāna spirit (Winternitz, *Geschichte*, II, 1, pp. 221 sq.) and this might well be one of them. For *yathābhūta*, cf. note 70.

[70] Both terms are used in the Abhidharmakoça. In Mahāyāna, however, they play a very prominent role : *yathābhūtā*, „as it really is", applies to the Highest Truth *(peramāιthasatya)* ; cf. the expression *yathābhūtam prajānāti*, which occurs innumerable times in the Prajñāpāramitās and in Mahāyāna in general (cf. E. Obermiller, *Ind. Hist. Qu.*, 9, 1933, p. 1028). *Darçana* refers to the mystic vision of that Truth. The important point is not whether these terms occur in Hīnayāna, too, — there is not much which is really 'new' in Mahāyāna — but the fact that the addition of these terms was considered necessary. And this is obviously due to Mahāyāna.

[71] The other versions of the Nāmarūpa definition, which differ from each other in some small details only, have this same additional passage ; cf. notes 85 to 90 to this Introduction and note 36 to the Translation, where the versions in the Madhyamakavṛtti, Çikṣāsamuccaya and Bodhic.-pañjikā are compared. The Abhidharmakoça, i.e. the Bhāṣya by Vasubandhu, seems to agree with our version ; cf. the translation by De la Vallée Poussin, *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 85 : „Le *nāman* et le *rūpa*, ces deux sont nommés *nāmarūpa*". The Vyākhyā ad III, 44, 29 *(Cosm. Bouddhique*, p. 172) adds that this is the explanation of the Vibhaṅga *(vibhaṅga evam nirdeçād iti)* in the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, the explanation of Nāmarūpa *(Pratītyasamutpādasūtre nāmarūpavibhaṅga evam nirdeçāt)*, after which the beginning *(nāma katamat ? Catvāro 'rūpiṇaḥ skandhā iti. Rūpam katamat ? Yat kim cid rūpam . . . . .)* and the end *(yac ca rūpam yac ca nāma tad ubhayam nāmarūpam ity ucyata iti)* are quoted.

Among the characteristic features of Old Age, the Nālandā text adds the expressive compound *khulakhulapraçvāsakāyatā*, referring to difficiult breathing, and among those of Death it gives the additional term *ūṣmaṇo hāniḥ*, which refers to the coldness of a corpse.

It is evident that almost all the differences consist of additions in the Nālandā text [72]. They prove to be rather frequent if compared to the small differences (in two passages only) between the Nālandā text and the Chinese version. In the latter case, the difference in age cannot well amount to much less than a century, if the Nālandā bricks should be dated sixth century A. D. [73]. As the differences between our Vibhaṅga text and that of the Nālandā bricks are far more pronounced, it seems only natural to assume at least a century's difference, if not more. In any case, our version must be considered substantially older.

There is one detail which might be very important because it concerns a real difference in definition. In the Nālandā text of the Vibhaṅga, Tṛṣṇā, Thirst, is taken to be of three kinds : *kāmatṛṣṇā*, *rūpatṛṣṇā*, and *ārūpyatṛṣṇā* (line 15). This is the only usual division in Mahāyāna sources. The Hīnayāna sources, however, give a great variety of kinds of Thirst and the three items given here constitute only one of the possibilities [74]. As a matter of fact, the division into Kāma, Rūpa and Ārūpya is the usual one for Bhava in all of the sources, whether Hīnayāna or Mahāyāna. Existence is analyzed into the three levels, the three realms (*dhātu*) in which existence is possible. If then the same division is applied to Tṛṣṇā, this means that the latter is interpreted as Thirst for Existence (*bhavatṛṣṇā*). Although such an interpretation is logical enough, there is a slight objection against it : the Aṅgas Tṛṣṇā and Bhava do not follow each other in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, but are separated by Upādāna. The latter is of the utmost importance from a dogmatic point of view : it is essentially attachment to either pleasures or wrong views [75]. Owing to such attachment, Karman is produced

---

[72] For a single exception, cf. note 66 above. The addition of *pratītyasamutpāde 'jñānam* is however totally superfluous; it could not be considered an addition in the true meaning of the term; on the contrary, in cases like this one, it is probable that the omission of the words is due to a later recension avoiding the verbosity of the previous one, but adding a number of terms considered necessary. One notes the same tendency in a small number of other cases; thus, the Nālandā text replaces the awkward and completely useless repetitions in *vuddhe ajñānaṃ dharmme ajñānaṃ saṃghe ajñānaṃ* by *vuddhadharmasaṃgheṣv ajñānaṃ* and may therefore be considered normalizing: nothing is omitted, but the text becomes much clearer. The Vyākhyā ad *Abhidh. Koça*, 40, 5 (p. 164; cf. the quotation by De la Vallée Poussin, *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 75, note 2) quotes the Vibhaṅga (without however mentioning the source) in the same form as in our version with six terms; in other respects the *avidyāvibhaṅga* is shorter there.

[73] This is the approximate date suggested by Chakravarti on account of the type of script used. Cf. *Epigr. Ind.*, 21 (1934) p. 194.

[74] References will be given in note 137 to the Translation.

[75] Properly speaking, these are only the first two kinds of Upādāna. The third and fourth items are less important since they are already implied in *dṛṣṭyupādāna*:

which will lead to re-birth. The consequence was that Upādāna had to be interpreted as Thirst in a very high degree — the conclusion which was indeed drawn in Mahāyāna [76]).

This, however, represents a later development. The Pāli sources, as a rule, take Trsnā in the meaning of 'desire' in a general sense and divided it into six kinds, each of them linked with one of the six classes of sense objects (ṣaḍ viṣayāḥ : visible, audible etc. matter) which may become the objects of desire ; in other words, they interpret Trsnā as kāmatrsnā. Other interpretations, however, are also not unknown. Buddhaghosa, systematizing the different kinds of Thirst mentioned in the Nikāyas, arrives by means of various combinations at the impressive number of a hundred-and-eight kinds of Thirst [77]).

The Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir, in their turn, also arranged the different kinds of Thirst in order. They laid the main stress upon the set of kāma, bhava and vibhava [78]), which they interpreted as thirst for pleasure, for existence and for non-existence respectively. The first item was taken to refer to pleasure in this life, the second to eternal existence, the third to

---

çīlavratopādāna cannot be separated from çīlavrataparāmarçadrṣṭi, and ātmavādopādāna is almost identical with satkāyadrṣṭi.

[76]) Upādāna is defined as trsnāvaipulya (Çālistambhas. in Çikṣās., p. 222, and Bodhic.-pañj., p. 388) or as trsnāvivṛddhi (Daçabh., p. 48); important references by De la Vallée Poussin, Siddhi, II, pp. 488 sq.

[77]) Visuddhimagga, chap. XVII; the passage was translated by Warren, Buddhism in Translations (1922), pp. 178-189. The number 108 is based upon the combination of the six kinds of objects of sense, the triad kāma, bhava, vibhava, the triad past, present and future and the 54 combinations of the above categories either exterior or interior.

[78]) Cf. the Vibhāṣā quotation in Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 29, note. The Sautrāntikas and Vasubandhu only recognize the triad of Kāma, Rūpa and Ārūpya (Abhidh. Koça. III, pp. 85 sq.; Vyākhyā in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 172, ad Bhāṣya 45, 2; cf. Vasubandhu's commentary to the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, Tucci, art. cit., p. 616 : tisra<s> trsnā iti vistarah / atːāpi bhagavatā kāmarūpārūpyabhedena trsnāyāh prabheda ukto nā tu svabhāvatāₐ „(in trsnāpratyayam upādānam), the three thirsts (are referred to) ; here, however, the Bhagavat explains (only) the variety of thirst by analyzing it into Kāma, Rūpa and Ārūpya, not, however, its real nature"; this division is considered intentional : vineyaviçeṣāpekṣayeti, „considering the different kinds of people to be converted". We understand that Vasubandhu explains that this division of Thirst was given by the Bhagavat not because it is essential, but because it is important to distinguish these three kinds in view of the people to be converted. People suffering from thirst for Kāma should be explained that the body they love is nothing but a mass of bones, blood, etc., doomed to decay ; but those suffering from thirst for Ārūpya all know this very well and should be converted by other arguments (by refuting, for instance, the theories about an eternal soul). It does not appear what division Vasubandhu did consider essential ; in any case, it was not the Vaibhāṣika definition, which is not less ābhiprāyika. It is in any case clear that Vasubandhu used the version as we have it in the Nālandā bricks. — For the terms bhava and vibhava, cf. also Mahāvastu, III, p. 448, where we have bhavadrṣṭi = çāçvatadrṣṭi, and vibhavadrṣṭi = ucchedadrṣṭi. Buddhist texts often use vibhava as the opposite of sambhava; cf. Daçabh., ed. Rahder, p. 47, sub VI B : mahākaruṇāparipūraṇārtham lokasya sambhavam ca vibhavam ca vyavalokayate.

extinction after death. Thus, the two latter kinds of Tṛṣṇā refer to the wrong views about the two extremes (antagrāhadṛṣṭi). The reason why Mahāyāna confined itself to the set of kāma, rūpa and ārūpya may be conjectured: it is difficult to see how vibhava-tṛṣṇā should be interpreted; in order to arrive at the interpretation mentioned, it is necessary to take vibhava in a very special sense, its usual meaning being „power", „richness", etc. If vibhava can be interpreted as „liberation from Existence", there is nothing wrong with it. In addition, the interpretation of bhavatṛṣṇā as çāçvatabhavatṛṣṇā is not self-evident.

Now it is interesting to note that our Vibhaṅga text, in contrast to the Nālandā version, mentions the set kāma, bhava, vibhava (b — A — 6), which is presumably considered the essential classification of Tṛṣṇā, thus following the orthodox Sarvāstivādin view.

Although it is not doubtful that the kāma, bhava, vibhava division represents an older stage of speculation than that into kāma, rūpa, ārūpya, it is very difficult to state anything definite about when the substitution took place. Moreover, a simple substitution would be out of place here; these two classifications may have existed together for centuries, but in different sects. The most interesting point is that our text here follows the Sarvāstivādin point of view, whereas the Nālandā version gives the usual Mahāyāna division of Tṛṣṇā. This point alone, though very characteristic, is not sufficient for assuming a direct relation between our Vibhaṅga text and the Sarvāstivādins. There are however some minor points which would point to the same direction. In our Vibhaṅga version no influence of Mahāyāna can be traced; the few points, however, in which the Nālandā version differs from our text, consist of additions in the former text which are undoubtedly due to Mahāyāna influence, especially in the case of the very beginning of the text. The same applies to the addition of the terms yathābhūtasaṃprativedhe 'jñānam and yathābhūtasyājñānam. One has the clear impression that the Vibhaṅga text, such as we have it in the Nālandā bricks, is an adaptation to Mahāyāna of a text which originally belonged to Hīnayāna. Only some slight additions were necessary for that purpose. This case seems to have been a common one. It is very probable, for instance, that the Lalitavistara, one of the most famous Mahāyāna texts, is in its present form a vaipulya version of what originally was a treatise of the Sarvāstivādins [79]. Our case could be compared with that of the Lalitavistara.

Among the Hīnayāna Schools writing in Sanskrit, the Sarvāstivādins were the only ones known to have possessed a real canon; in addition, they were the only ones known to have developed missionary activity outside India and it is evident that the presence of our text in Indonesia is to be attributed to such an activity. Since our Vibhaṅga version shows no Mahāyāna influence and, in addition, is written in correct Sanskrit, there is another

[79] Cf. Winternitz, Geschichte, II, 1 (1913), p. 194, and Nalinaksha Dutt, Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism (1930), p. 105.

argument in favour of a direct connection between our Vibhaṅga and the Sarvāstivāda School of Buddhism.

Only one Sarvāstivādin missionary, who stayed for many years in Indonesia, is known by name. It is Guṇavarman, the son of a king of Kashmir, who visited the country of Chö-po in the beginning of the fifth century A. D. [80]) in order to preach Buddhism there. The time of his visit, which preceded the Nālandā text by about one and a half centuries, would agree with the period which we assumed above on account of the differences between the Vibhaṅga versions of the Nālandā bricks and of our gold plates. From a palaeographic point of view, so early a date would hardly present any difficulty. Although the text in its present form cannot be considered very old (it might be referred to the eighth century), we already drew attention to some palaeographic features which belong to a much earlier age. We concluded that these obvious archaisms could only be accounted for satisfactorily by presuming that the text was copied from a manuscript which had been written several centuries before.

Now we have the famous testimony by I-tsing that about one and a half centuries after Guṇavarman's visit, the Sarvāstivāda School had great influence in the lands of the South Sea — a testimony which has never yet been confirmed by epigraphy [81]). Like many other texts, no doubt, our Sūtra and Vibhaṅga must have been copied and re-copied during some centuries, until they were reproduced on these gold plates for some unknown reason; at the same time different texts, which will be examined below, were added to the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga. Although it is evident that any special connection with the activity of Guṇavarman is conjectural, several indications would agree with the view that our text was brought to Indonesia in about the 5th century A. D.

There is no doubt that both the Sūtra and the Vibhaṅga texts were famous in Buddhism. The Vibhaṅga definitions of the Pratītyasamutpādāṅgas have been well-known and were frequently quoted in Buddhist Sanskrit texts. Curiously enough, these quotations almost always exhibit small differences. A few examples will be sufficient.

The Vibhaṅga definition of Avidyā is referred to in the Abhidharmakoça and quoted by the mere mention of its first term *pūrvānte 'jñānam* in Vasubandhu's *Bhāṣya* and with some greater detail (though also in a abbreviated form) in Yaçomitra's *Vyākhyā* [82]). The Vibhaṅga definition of Avidyā known by Yaçomitra seems to agree with that extant in the Chinese Samyukta

[80]) P. Pelliot, *Deux Itinéraires*, B.E.F.E.O., IV (1904), pp. 274 sq. — Cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 82 sq. An important account of the life and travels of Guṇavarman was translated by Ed. Chavannes in *T'oung Pao*, Série II, Vol. V, pp. 193 — 206. Guṇavarman lived between 367 and 431 A. D.

[81]) Cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 108; Cœdès, *Histoire*, p. 146. Both scholars agree in trusting I-tsing's statements; there really is no reason to doubt the correctness of the account by the Chinese pilgrim, who was not only perfectly honest, but also learned and well informed.

[82]) Bhāṣya ad *kār*. III, 28, a-b, translated by De la Vallée Poussin in *Cosmol. Bouddh.*,

translation, which is however decidedly shorter than the definitions in our text, in that of the Nālandā bricks and Hiuan Tsang's translation [83]), especially in its latter part. Thus, the only definition of Karman mentioned there is that into kuçala, akuçala and avyākṛta, whereas our text adds its divisions into sāvadya and anavadya and into sevitavya and asevitavya (a — A — 9 to 11). As we saw above, the Nālandā text and (still more) Hiuan Tsang's translation add a number of other terms (hīnapraṇīta etc.). It is curious that the Vyākhyā and the Chinese Saṃyukta have madhyānte ('jñānam) instead of our purvāparānte (a — A — 7) ; the Saṃyukta probably read avyākṛteṣv (ajñānam) instead of kuçalākuçaleṣu in our text.

The Vibhaṅga definition of Jarā is also quoted in the Vyākhyā and proves to have been famous in Buddhism in general ; most descriptions of Old Age in Buddhism reproduce some of the Vibhaṅga terms [84]).

An interesting portion is the Vibhaṅga definition of Nāmarūpa, which is often reproduced but with more or less differences in details. It is briefly referred to by Vasubandhu in the Abhidharmakoça (Bhāṣya) and quoted by Yaçomitra in an abbreviated form [85]) ; more or less full versions occur in Candrakīrti's commentary to Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (the Prasannapadā) [86]), the Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā [87]) and the Çikṣāsamuccaya (in all of the three cases based upon the Çālistambhasūtra) [88]). As was

---

p. 39, lines 17 sq., and Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 75; the Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya, 40, 5, in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 164.

[83]) Saṃyukta, 12, 21, and 18, 3 ; cf. De la Vallée Poussin's note 1 to Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 92, and note 2 to ibid., p. 75. It is curious that the Saṃyukta reads āvaraṇam instead of saṃmohaḥ at the end of the Avidyā explanation (our text, a -- B — 1) ; as we noted above, this translation was prepared by Guṇabhadra in the beginning of the 5th century A. D. Numerous references to definitions of Avidyā are given by De la Vallée Poussin, Théorie des douze causes (1913), pp. 6-9.

[84]) Abhidh. Koça, III, note 2 to p. 88 ; Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya, 45, 31, in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 173. Further references are given by De la Vallée Poussin at the place first quoted here. Cf. also notes 60 sqq. to the Translation, below. — The differences from the Pāli versions are interesting ; cf. Digha, II, p. 305 (Majjhima, I, p. 49 ; Rhys Davids-Stede, s.v. jarā): yā tesaṃ sattānaṃ taṃhi sattanikāye jarā jīraṇatā khaṇḍiccaṃ pāliccaṃ valittacatā āyuso saṃhāni indriyānaṃ paripāko. The beginning yā ..... jarā does not occur in any of the Sanskrit versions; it may be considered superfluous : if an individual creature is born in a definite sattvanikāya, it is self-evident that he becomes old in the same group of creatures. To khaṇḍicca („the state of being broken, of teeth", Rhys Davids-Stede, Pāli Dictionary, s.v.) corresponds, in the Sanskrit versions, khālitya, "baldness". There is no doubt that the Pāli version is more satisfactory here ; the order in which the different lakṣaṇas of Old Age are given is not irrelevant and, in addition, the loss of teeth is certainly more characteristic of Old Age than that of hairs. But for that very reason, the term khaṇḍicca might well be a later correction, or, at least, there is no indication that it should be more archaic.

[85]) Quoted in note 71, above.

[86]) Madhyamakavṛtti, edition by De la Vallée Poussin in Bibl. Buddh., 21 (1931), p. 9.

[87]) Edition by De la Vallée Poussin, Bibl. Indica (1901-14), p. 388 ; cf. note 130 to the Translation.

[88]) Edition by Bendall, Bibl. Buddh., I (1902), p. 222 (with important notes to the text).

noted by De la Vallée Poussin [89]), all these quotations differ in detail, though agreeing in the main points. Obviously, the definition presented difficulties to the copyists. In our text the Nāmarūpa definition occurs twice (a — B — 5 to 8, and e — A — 8 to 10), both times with numerous mistakes [90]). The division of Vijñāna into *ṣaḍ vijñānakāyāḥ*, of Ṣaḍāyatana into *ṣaḍ ādhyātmikāny āyatanāni*, and of Sparça into *ṣaṭ sparçakāyāḥ*, all occur in the Abhidharmakoça [91]). Saṃskāra, in the Vibhaṅga, is divided into the *saṃskāras* of body (*kāya*), speech (*vāc*) and mind (*manas*). This is one of the usual divisions for *karman* [92]). Since the notions of *saṃskāra* and *karman* are very much related [93]), this division is comprehensible, but the use of the division into *kāya, vāc* and *manas* is not in accordance with the texts. *Saṃskāra* has several different, though related, connotations, but here we are only concerned with the second link of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, technically, *saṃskārāṅga* [94]), i.e. those *saṃskāras* which condition Vijñāna. In this connection, it is irrelevant whether action has been accomplished by body, speech or mind; the essential point is the moral tenor of action. Therefore, the usual division of *saṃskārāṅga* is into *puṇya, apuṇya* and *āneñjya* [95]). Now it is remarkable that in another passage of the text

---

[89]) *Madhyamakavṛtti*, p. 5 (note). It is curious that the three versions quoted in notes 86 to 88 are all quoted from the Çālistambhasūtra, but their wording is far from being identical; the Tibetan translations show differences again. It is remarkable that already in a comparatively early age (none of these texts seems to be later than the 7th century A. D.) the textual tradition of important definitions was rather uncertain; in this particular case, there is no question of different schools since the definitions are quoted in the same contexts and lead to the same conclusions. The MS traditions are only partly responsible for these differences; only some of the lesser differences may be considered scribal errors.

[90]) But the second quotation is much worse than the first one. There, for instance, Rūpa (in Nāmarūpāṅga) is wrongly explained as visual matter (i.e. *rūpāyatana*). For reasons to be expounded at the end of this Introduction, we consider it a part of a clumsy interpolation.

[91]) *Vijñānāṅga: Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 85, note 1; cf. the Vyākhyā (ad *Bhāṣ.*, 44, 21-23) in *Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 172. — *Sparçāṅga: Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 95; *Vyākhyā* (ad *Bhāṣ.*, 49, 26) in *Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 177; cf. *Abhidh. Koça, Index Général*, p. 89. — *Āyatana: Abhidh. Koça*, I, p. 65.

[92]) *Abhidh. Koça*, IV, kārikā 1; cf. the references in the notes to the Translation.

[93]) Warren (*Buddhism in Translations*, p. 116) even 'translated' *saṃskāra* in the Pratītya-samutpāda formula by *karman*. Most of the Hīnayāna sects (*Abhidh. Koça*, III, kār. 21 b: *saṃskārāḥ pūrvakarmaṇaḥ*) limited Saṃskārāṅga to *karman* during past existence in as far as it 'produced' (*abhisaṃskaroti*) present existence and will produce new existences as long as it will not have lost its effect.

[94]) Cf. *infra*, note 33 to the Translation.

[95]) Cf. *Çālist. Sūtra* quoted *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, p. 223, and *Bodhic. pañjikā*, p. 479: *puṇyopagā apuṇyopagā āneñjyopagāç cema ucyante 'vidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārā iti*. — A combination of the two modes of division occurs in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 84: "Il accomplit la triple action, corporelle, vocale, mentale ..... action non-méritoire (*apuṇya*), ... action méritoire (*puṇya*), ... action "invariable" (*āniñjya*) ..... Ces actions sont les *saṃskāras* qui sont en raison de l'*avidyā*". Here, it does not seem doubtful that Vasubandhu considered the division into *puṇya* etc. the more important one.

engraved in the gold plates, the Vibhaṅga division of Saṃskārāṅga is not considered correct, or rather, is considered a secondary division only [96] ; it is there attributed to the opinion of „others" (anye punar āhuḥ ......, g — B — 4 to 5). The point is that more than one division of Saṃskārāṅga is mentioned in the canonical texts, so that the problem arose which of these should be considered primary ; this point is the more complicated since Saṃskāra is also implied in the third link of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula (Sāṃskāraskandha in Nāmarūpāṅga). This detail is especially important because it may cast some light upon the relation between the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga and the rest of the text to be discussed hereafter.

The importance of the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra and its Vibhaṅga appears not only from the quotations in Buddhist literature, but also from the translations and commentaries. We already mentioned the translation by Hiuan Tsang. A detailed commentary was written by Vasubandhu ; its complete text is preserved in a Tibetan translation, but important fragments of the original were discovered by Tucci in Nepal [97]). The latter appears to be an interesting text, in which almost every word of the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga is accounted for. As this commentary is important for the correct understanding of the text, a few examples will be quoted.

In the beginning of the Sūtra, the expression pratītyasamutpādasyādiḥ is used with reference to the formula of Dependent Origination (a — A — 2) ; this might suggest the opinion that Pratītyasamutpāda has a beginning in its narrow sense, viz. a beginning which would be uncaused in that case. In order to avoid such a wrong opinion [98]), Vasubandhu explains that the term ādi is used with reference to the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga as a whole : the Sūtra is termed ādi because it precedes the more detailed exposition in the Vibhaṅga ; it is the uddeça preceding the nirdeça [99]). — The words sādhu

[96]) Cf. the whole passage from g — A — 10 to g — B — 4. There, the division into kāya, vāc and manas is considered a subdivision of that into kuçala etc. A similar combination of the two modes of division of Saṃskārāṅga is given in the Madhyamakavṛtti, p. 543.

[97]) Quoted in note 43, above. The original title of Vasubandhu's commentary may have been Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅganirdeça, rather than Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā as Tucci presumed (with Vibhaṅga as the designation of the separate chapters); cf. De la Vallée Poussin, Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 281, and the references given there.

[98]) Cf. also Abhidh. Koça, III, kārikā 19 d ; Bhāṣya, translation in Abhidh. Koça, III, pp. 70 sq. (about ayoniçomanasikāra as the cause of Avidyā). The importance attached by Vasubandhu to this point might be the indication of a controversy among Buddhist schools. Especially the Vaibhāṣika conception of Pratītyasamutpāda as twelve different 'states' (avasthā) might easily lead to the conception of the first state as some original stuff, a conception that may be traced in Brāhmaṇic schools (Vaiçeṣika, Vedānta). The idea of an asaṃskṛtadharma called Pratītyasamutpāda is attributed to various Buddhist schools (cf. supra, note 49).

[99]) Art. cit., p. 61 : ādir uddeço nirdeçasya tatpūrvakatvāt ; tena cādīyate yasmāt pratītyasamutpādaḥ, „ādi (here) means 'statement'; (it is denoted as ādi, 'beginning') because it precedes the explanation (i.e. the Vibhaṅga); so (it is styled 'beginning'), because (the exposition of) Pratītyasamutpāda begins with it (i.e. with the Sūtra)". — Cf. also

ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuruta, „bear it well and firmly in mind", are not to be taken as a needless repetition of three rather similar terms : they have a pregnant meaning and are used to avoid three particular *doṣas,* viz. bad listening, bad understanding and bad memory [100]).

For our purpose the most interesting question concerns which text Vasubandhu used. Did the Bhagavat address himself to the *bhikṣus* (as in our text), to a definite number of *bhikṣus* (as in the Nālandā text), or to „Çrāvakas, Bodhisattvas, gods and men" (as in the version which Hiuan Tsang translated into Chinese)? This point is difficult to be ascertained, although we have a slight indication that Vasubandhu used a relatively elaborate version. He makes a remark about *bhikṣavaḥ* in a — A — 2 [101]) and tries to explain why the Bhagavat addresses the monks and no others. At first, one would conclude that Vasubandhu used a text in which only *bhikṣus* are mentioned, but this does not prove to be the case : such a conclusion would be correct only if the word *bhikṣūn* in a — A — 1 had been concerned. The Chinese version, however, makes Vasubandhu's remark understandable. There, it appears that the Bhagavat, although surrounded by a large group in which gods are also included, always uses "o monks" as a mode of address. This is a point which needs explanation. Now Vasubandhu states that the reason is that the monks are the best *bhājana,* etc. ; therefore, he especially addresses the monks in the small intercalated sentences, in spite of the fact that many others are listening, too. Only in that case, Vasubandhu's explanation makes sense. Thus, the obvious conclusion is that the audience did not consist only of monks. Then, Vasubandhu's version must have been more elaborate than ours ; on the other hand, it certainly was less elaborate than the version used by Hiuan Tsang, for it is easy to see that the explanation of the monks being the best *bhājana* could not possibly have been given if there were Bodhisattvas among the audience of the Bhagavat (as in the Chinese version). This fact does not necessarily prove that the text used by Vasubandhu was later than our version (slightly different versions may have been used by different, though contemporary, sects), but in view of the authority of Vasubandhu all over the world of Sanskrit Buddhism, it would not seem very probable that, at least in the great Buddhist centres,

---

the very beginning of the first fragment : *ktvā vidhir vijñāyate* ; *na pūrvakālakriyārtha iti.* The text of the Sūtra proves that *vidhir* does not belong to the Sūtra text, as Tucci wrongly supposed : it appears that *vidhir* is the explanation of another term in the Sūtra, presumably of *ādi* ; we may reconstitute : $<$*ādir ity*$>$*uktvā vidhir vijñāyate.*

[100]) The third of these is illustrated by the simile of a water-cask, which does not catch rain because its opening is placed at the wrong side.

[101]) Presumably, Vasubandhu read the sentence : *pratītyasamutpādasyādim vo bhikṣavo vibhaṅgam cādeçayiṣyāmi.* Our text of this passage has been badly copied [*vo* was omitted and instead of *vibhaṅgam,* °*ādim* (written *ādiñ,* with *saṃdhi*) is repeated]. The order of the words explained makes the reconstruction of the text, which was explained, possible, and it follows that *bhikṣavaḥ* in the sentence just quoted and not in any other place, was commented upon.

a pre-Vasubandhu version would have remained in use for centuries afterwards [102]). Unfortunately, the problem of when Vasubandhu lived has not yet been completely solved; after a long controversy, the most generally accepted opinion is fifth century A. D. [103]). Then, our version could be earlier and, probably, it could not be very much later. Although this line of argument necessarily remains rather vague, it might agree very well with the conclusion arrived at above, where we presumed about a century's difference with the Nālandā text. In that case, the following chronological table can be established :

(1)   The Indonesian Vibhaṅga text (beginning of Vth century ?) ;
(2)   The text used by Vasubandhu (first half of Vth century ?) ;
(3)   The Nālandā text (VIth century) ;
- (4)   The Vibhaṅga text translated by Hiuan Tsang in 661 [104]).

The relation between the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga and the following part of the text engraved on the plates is rather a loose one. This appears clearly from the way in which these parts are connected. In b — B — 10, we read the beginning of the final formula in the same form as it is given in the Nālandā text. The sentence, however, is not continued up to the end since it did not agree with the fact that a new portion was following; as a matter of fact, the sentence is terminated only in h — A — 1 to 2. Thus, the entire following portion was intercalated, as it were, into the final sentence of the original Vibhaṅga. Only a slight change in the wording has proved necessary : it is stated that the Bhagavat, after having terminated the Sūtra (plus Vibhaṅga), will now proceed to explain also the 'meaning' (artha) of Dependent Origination. The term artha here refers to the deeper meaning of Pratītyasamutpāda and is contrasted with vibhaṅga, which refers only to the analysis of the separate Aṅgas into various sub-categories. The 'meaning' of Dependent Origination is stated to be expressed in a number of Çlokas, which are worked out in rather a long treatise. There, the meaning of Dependent Origination is discussed from two different points of view, both

---

102) Cf. the remarks by De la Vallée Poussin on the attitude of later Buddhism towards the Abhidharmakoça, a work which soon after its appearance eclipsed most of the older Abhidharma literature (Abhidharmakoça, Introduction, 1931, p. XIV). Initially, there was however much opposition in the 'orthodox' Sarvāstivādin circles (op. cit., p. XII). Vasubandhu's commentary on the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra and °vibhaṅga seems to give the same views as the Koça. There are no apparent Vijñānavāda influences, so that the commentary must be assigned to the earlier period of Vasubandhu's activity.

103) The problem of when Vasubandhu lived is closely connected with that of when his brother Asaṅga did (and therefore, indirectly, with the question of the authorship of the Çāstras attributed to Maitreya-Asaṅga). 'Early fifth century A. D.' is the conclusion arrived at by De la Vallée Poussin in chapter 11 of the Introduction to his Abhidharmakoça translation (where full references to other opinions are given). Cf. also D. Friedmann, Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā (1935), Introduction, pp. I sqq.

104) As mentioned above, the Pāli recensions, showing too many differences, are left out of account. On the date of Hiuan Tsang's translation, cf. also note 60, above.

connected with the relations supposed to exist between the different Aṅgas. Thus, this portion of the text may roughly be divided into two parts. In the first of these, the twelve *nidānas* are divided into one to twelve groups, based upon various modes of classification. In the second portion, the relation between the two first links of the chain is examined in detail and conclusions are drawn there-from. Both portions together constitute a very small treatise about Pratītyasamutpāda.

The name of this treatise is not mentioned in the text, but may perhaps be inferred from an allusion in f — A — 1, where we read the words : *evam upadiṣṭaḥ pratītyasamutpādavidhiḥ* ; the use of *upadiṣṭaḥ* there might show that the text was considered to be an Upadeça, „instruction" [105]). Its complete title may have been : Pratītyasamutpādavibhaṅgopadeça or something similar. The text seems to be unknown from other sources.

As to its external form, the Upadeça, as we shall henceforward indicate this part of the text, consists of a number of Çlokas, which are subsequently explained in the prose text. The relation between Çlokas and prose is a rather loose one ; the latter is all but a commentary on these Çlokas. We might rather consider the Çlokas a kind of motto above the treatise.

Three of these (the first ones) are only indirectly connected with the Upadeça ; they also occur on the small plates of our set (*i* and *j*) and have already been referred to above [106]). The three following Çlokas bear directly upon the prose text.

The first of these is perfectly clear. It is stated that Pratītyasamutpāda may be considered to be single, twofold, etc., up to twelvefold. The form of the strophe is rather clumsy ; it could hardly be expected otherwise in view of the necessity of mentioning all the numerals from one to twelve. Its meaning is however clear. *Pratītya* (here used substantivally) is stated

---

[105]) On the exact meaning of *upadeça*, cf. Nalinaksha Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhisḥa* (1930), pp. 10 sqq.; p. 10: "It certainly means 'Instruction' and this is supported by the Tibetan rendering of the term". Cf. also De la Vallée Poussin, *Abhidh. Koça, Introduction*, etc. (1931), p. XX, translating a passage from Guṇamati's Çāstra : "Apres la disparition du Bouddha, Ānanda, Kātyāyana, etc. lirent-publièrent ce qu'ils avaient entendu. Pour expliquer le sens du Sūtra, comme les disciples font, ils firent un Çāstra expliquant le Sūtra, qui est donc nommé *sūtra-upadeça*. La Vibhāṣā ensuite, de ce qui se trouvait dans cet *upadeça*, tira un *upadeça*". It is in any case clear that, unlike Sūtra and also Vibhaṅga, the use of Upadeça is limited to scriptures which, in the form of Çāstras (i.e. not, for instance, in that of a word-for-word commentary) giving a more or less systematic account, aimed at explaining the Doctrine. The term is never used for the words of the Buddha, although the Upadeças are always based upon the latter. The three portions of our text may be defined Uddeça (the Sūtra), Nirdeça, (the Vibhaṅga) and Upadeça (the Çāstra). Upadeça is one of the nine or twelve divisions of the scriptures, but only in the Mahāyāna lists ; cf. Kern, *Geschied.*, II, p. 370. The Mahāyāna list of ten Aṅgas is given in *Mahāvy.* 62, 1-12 (p. 21); *Dharmas.*, sect. LXII (p. 13), *Saddharmap.* and other sources mention nine divisions (references in *Dharmas.*, p. 48). In either case, Upadeça is the last item mentioned.

[106]) *Supra*, p. 57 sqq.

to grow out of (°*ja*) all of nine links (*anga*) and to have originated (*utpanna*) in a ten- and eleven-fold state, though it is to be considered twelvefold. A large portion of the text explains in what ways Dependent Origination is single, twofold etc. (from c — A — 7 to e — A — 7).

The last two Çlokas are in a very bad state; in the first one some words have been left out, as appears from the metre, but the second one has not been copied at all; it may however be reconstructed out of the words which are explained in a kind of commentary one after the other. Obviously, these Çlokas were difficult to understand (and, perhaps, difficult to read in the original manuscript). Since they refer to the second portion of the Upadeça (from f — A — 1 to h — A — 2), they will be discussed after the first portion.

After the last of these strophes, the prose text dealing with the first of them does not begin immediately. First, by way of an introduction, the etymology of the term *pratītyasamutpāda* is given. 'Etymology' should be taken is its 'etymological' meaning here : the true, real meaning of the term as it may be established by analysis. Such etymologies often serve as a kind of peg on which theories may be hung ; they are frequently used to that purpose in Buddhist literature. The Abhidharmakoça gives numerous examples [107]), including the term *pratītyasamutpāda* [108]). The latter discussion appears to be of direct importance for the interpretation given in our text.

From a grammarian's point of view, the form *pratītya* can be interpreted either as a gerund, or (theoretically) as a gerundive. In the Abhidharmakoça, the Vaibhāṣika doctor takes the former view (as we do) and interprets *pratītyasamutpāda* as : "combined origination (*samutpāda*) in dependence on (lit. : going towards, *prati-itya*) [other *dharmas*]". The Sautrāntika doctor disagrees and argues that the gerund denotes preceding action ; but how, then, could something go towards something else before it is actually in existence ? That would be absurd. Therefore, he takes *pratītya* as a gerundive ; *itya* means "what must go" [109]), i.e. "perishable" "doomed to destruction"

---

[107]) Thus, *dharma* is derived from the root *dhṛ* "because it 'holds' (possesses) its own characteristic marks" (*svalakṣaṇadhāraṇāt*, *Abhid. Koça*, I, p. 4). *Gandharva*, an important concept in some of the Buddhist Schools for the definition of the intermediate state between death and re-birth (*antarābhava*; for the background of the Gandharva theory, cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Indo-Européens*, etc., 1936, p. 288), is explained as *gandha* + the root *arv* (known from the Dhātupāṭha), thus meaning "il mange l'odeur" (*Abhid. Koça*, III, p. 47). This agrees with the Buddhist conception of an intermediate being consisting of Karman only, and conceived of as something semi-material. By means of this etymology, a popular belief could be incorporated into Buddhism.

[108]) *Ibidem*, III, pp. 78-81 ; the Vyākhyā in *Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 166, line 3 to p. 169, line 8.

[109]) Cf. *ibidem*, III, p. 80, note 3 ; the Vyākhyā in *Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 168 : *itau gatau sādhava ityāḥ / tatra sādhur iti yatpratyayaḥ / itau vinaṣṭau sādhavaḥ / anavasthāyina ity arthaḥ / samupasargaḥ samavāyārtham dyotayati*, i.e. "things which are *itya* are 'good to *iti*', i.e. to go ; the suffix *yat* (i.e. -*ya* of the gerundive) means 'good for that' ; the meaning is that they are 'good to go', i.e. 'good for destruction', i.e. 'unstable' ; the particle *sam* conveys the meaning of contact". This explanation of *itya* is based on Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhy.*, III, 1, *kār.* 109 (*eti-stu-ças-vṛ-dṛ-juṣaḥ kyap*), and the form

(*vinaçvara*) ; *prati* is distributive, utpāda means apparition. Therefore, *pratītyasamutpāda* means : „combined origination of perishable things, due to such and such a complex of causes" [110]. Thus, the Sautrāntika's view on Dependent Origination lays particular stress on two aspects of it : (1) each result is due to a complex of causes, (2) each result is necessarily unstable.

If now we return to the definition given in our text (c — A — 5 sq.), it is evident that the latter agrees in the main with the Sautrāntika's point of view. In *pratītya*, *prati* is explained as *aṅgaṃ prati*, „with reference to each link" and is therefore interpreted *vīpsārtham*; the form *itya* is taken as a gerundive, too, since it is explained by *kotha*, „decay" [111].

The Sautrāntika's view is especially important because it has become the main base of the Mahāyānic conception of Dependent Origination. Nāgārjuna, in his Mūlamadhyamakakārikās, takes up the Sautrāntika interpretation and uses it to prove the voidness (*çūnyatā*) of all that arises in dependence [112]. Whatever is doomed to decay as soon as it arises does not possess any „nature of its own" (*svabhāva*), it is 'void'; how could there be any real arising of entities which have no real existence ? [113]. Oppositions such as *samudaya* and *nirodha* lose their force if both are void. As will appear in the course of this Introduction, the main points of this conclusion have been accepted in our treatise, too.

The first portion of the Upadeça refers to the Çloka in which Dependent Origination is stated to be simple, twofold, etc., up to twelvefold. Like the whole text, it is composed in the form of questions and answers. — In what way is Dependent Origination twofold ? — Because it means Cause and Fruit. — After that, the Aṅgas which are Cause and those which are Fruit are enumerated. In this way, the different divisions of the links of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula are discussed. The arrangement is progressive, based on numerical categories.

Such a 'numerical' arrangement of thoughts is frequently met with in

---

actually occurs in the Bhaṭṭikāvya (probably to illustrate Pāṇini's rule), but it could not have the meaning supposed by the Bhadanta (it would rather mean „to whom or to what one should go"; cf. *gamya*). The meaning presumed by the Bhadanta might be due to a (wrong) etymology of *nitya* (explained as *na-itya*, „permanent", from which *itya* could be isolated in the opposite meaning ?).

[110]) In this way, the view of the Bhadanta is summarized in the Bhāṣya (in De la Vallée Poussin's translation „naissance ensemble, en raison de tel ou tel complexe de causes, de choses périssables", i.e. *samutpādas tāṃ tāṃ sāmagrīṃ pratītyānām*).

[111]) We do not know any example of the use of *kotha* in this connection. In addition to the use of the term in Indian medicine (Suçruta) mentioned in the dictionaries, we have only a single reference for the term in this connection, viz. Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā, edited by Finot, *Bibl. Buddh.*, II (1901), p. 46: *tṛṇakāṣṭhakothasama paçyati satvarūpaṃ*, „the (viz. the Bodhisattva) sees the body of a being as if it were rottening grass and wood". Cf. note 149 below.

[112]) De la Vallée Poussin, *Madhyamaka, Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, II (1933), pp. 4 sqq. (with an extensive bibliography).

[113]) This line of argument is reproduced from a quotation from the Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā written on a clay tablet from Kĕdah (Malaya); cf. the end of this Introduction.

Indian religion and science ; it is indeed an excellent help to the memory.
In Buddhist literature, especially in the scholastic type, almost any important
notion has a kind of numerical value which can hardly be separated from
the intrinsic meaning of the terms. There, Upādāna, Attachment, means
'four' as much as anything else. A striking example of the fascination of
numbers has already been discussed : the Buddhist sects may disagree on
the kinds of Thirsts which exist, but they do agree, as a rule, that there
are three kinds of it. We know its divisions into : (a) *kāma, bhava, vibhava,*
(b) *kāma, rūpa, ārūpya,* (c) *bhava, itibhava, vibhava,* and (d) *rūpa, arūpa,*
nirodha. An even more striking example is given by our text itself in a
portion in which the divisions of *saṃskāra* are given [114]) : the latter can
be divided into : (a) *puṇya, apuṇya, āneñjya,* (b) *kuçala, akuçala, avyākṛta,*
(c) *kāya, vāc, manas,* (d) *prātisattvika, aupapattyaṃçika, ābhisāṃsārika.*
Whatever one may think about the different kinds of *saṃskāra,* the fact
that there are three of them is beyond any reasonable doubt.

It is well-known that such a numerical arrangement served as the
basis of composition of the Pāli Aṅguttaranikāya [115]), the Ekottarāgama (the
'one-more' collection of Sūtras) of the Sanskrit canon. De la Vallée Poussin
stresses the importance of various numerical lists (*mātṛkās*) in the early
history of the Abhidharma Schools [116]). These lists may have constituted
an essential element in early Buddhist teaching, especially to young or
simple people ; this method, of course, is not alien to Western forms of
teaching either.

The different possibilities for division of the Twelve Nidānas are cf
obvious interest for a full comprehension of Dependent Origination. The
survey given in our text is not devoid of a more general interest either,
since it conveys a clear impression of the extreme subtleness of this doctrine,
which is liable to be interpreted in many ways.

At present, most scholars agree that the theory of Pratītyasamutpāda
occupies a central position in Buddhism of all countries and of all ages [117]).

---

[114]) *Infra,* from f — A — 10 to f — B — 8.

[115]) Cf. *Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Rel. and Ethics,* sv. *Aṅguttara* (article by Rhys Davids).
— Some characteristic examples are given by Winternitz, *Geschichte,* II, 1 (1913),
pp. 45-50.

[116]) *L'Abhidharmakoça de Vasubandhu, Introduction* (1931), p. VII, reprint with additions
of the *Avant-Propos* to *Cosmologie bouddhique* (1919) ; cf. also the Saṃgītisuttānta
in the Dīghanikāya and its Sanskrit version the Saṃgītiparyāya, which is one of
the seven 'feet' of the Abhidharma (*op. cit.,* p. XLII). — Similar numerical lists,
but not in progressive arrangement, are well-known in Mahāyāna, too. Typical examples
are : the entire *Mahāvyutpatti,* 2nd edition by I. P. Minaiev and N. D. Mironov,
Bibl. Buddh. XIII (1911), and considerable portions of the different Prajñāpāramitā
versions, cf. Sten Konow, *The first two Chapters of the Daçasāhasrikā, Avh. Norske*
Vid.-Ak., 1941, II, pp. 1-17 (where numerous accordances with other versions
are also given).

[117]) Cf. H. von Glasenapp, *Die Dharma Theorie des Buddhismus,* Z. D. Morg. Ges., 1938,
pp. 383 sqq. Different opinions, mainly belonging to an older phase of Buddhist
research, are also mentioned there.

The *Ye-dharmā* formula, undoubtedly the most famous and most often reproduced strophe of Buddhism, is closely connected with the theory of Dependent Origination; the same applies to the Four Truths (*āryasatya*), the *dharma* theory as a whole (which is the 'central conception of Buddhism', as Stcherbatskij put it), and, in Mahāyāna, the philosophical doctrines of Çūnyatā and Vijñānavāda.

The different interpretations of Pratītyasamutpāda may all be reduced to (a) one general, and (b) several special interpretations based on the general one [118]. The general interpretation is expressed in its most pregnant way by the formula *asmin sati bhavatīdam* [119]) : the existence of one thing depends on the existence of something else; it is the formula which in the Sūtra text immediately precedes the enumeration of the separate Aṅgas. Vasubandhu informs us [120]) that the Discourses of the Buddha do not directly refer to the general theory, because they are intentional; the general interpretation is however implied in them [121]).

According to the general interpretation, each Aṅga is a Cause (*hetu*) and a Fruit (*phala*) at the same time : a Cause of the next Aṅga and a Fruit of the preceding one [121]). One of the special interpretations (c — A — 7 sq.), however, considers five Aṅgas as Cause, but the remaining seven ones as Fruit; the obvious reason is that for some Aṅgas the aspect of their being a Cause is more important, whereas the Fruit aspect dominates for some other Aṅgas. This special interpretation is not considered essential from a philosophical point of view, but intentional, having a moral bearing : Upādāna, Attachment to pleasures and to wrong views, may be the effect of Tṛṣṇā, Thirst; it is however far more important from a religious point of view that one shculd realize that it is the main cause of re-birth. On the other hand, Jarāmaraṇa, Old Age and Death, cannot be the end of everything (that would amount to *ucchedavāda*) and must therefore be a Cause [122]) ; but from a psychological point of view, it is far more important

---

[118]) Th. Stcherbaiskij, *Buddhist Logic*, I (1932), p. 135.

[119]) In its complete form, this formula consists of three distinct parts, referring to dependent existence, dependent origination *(utpāda)* and dependent cessation, respectively. Different interpretations, with reference to Pāli sources, too, are given in the *Abhidh. Koça*, III, pp. 81 sqq., cf. also Vyākhyā, III, 42, 25 sqq. in *Cosm. Bouddh.*, pp. 169 sqq.

[120]) *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 67 (Bhāsya).

[121]) Stcherbatskij, *op. cit.*, p. 135, note, infers from the passage by Vasubandhu quoted in the preceding note, that „the generalized theory is a later development of the special one", supposed to have originated in the Abhidharma Schools. In any case, such a conclusion cannot be based on Vasubandhu's statement quoted in the preceding note. There, it is only stated that the Bhagavat, whose teaching was adapted to his audience, did not mention it expressly, though it was implied in the Discourses. We have no reason to distrust Vasubandhu's statement: the early existence of the 'general' interpretation may be inferred from the formula *asmin sati* etc., which in the Pāli sources, too, usually precedes the teaching of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula.

[122]) Th. Stcherbatskij, *Buddhist Logic*, I (1932), chapter IV (and *passim*), has given a full analysis of the Buddhist conception of 'being'. If reality is conceived of as a continuous play of causes and effects, in which nothing is eternal and nothing is

to stress its Fruit aspect : thus, the Bhagavat shows that all existence inevitably leads to Jarāmaraṇa, with the entire complex of suffering implied in it [123]).

Some of the other classifications are all variations on the *hetu-phala* theme. The Cause comprises different aspects : the direct cause of re-birth is the existence of *karman* leading to re-birth ; but the existence of *karman* itself is conditioned by Defilement (*kleça*). Therefore, the Cause may be analyzed into either *karman* or *kleça*, and this leads to the important threefold division of the Aṅgas into *kleça, karman* and *phala*. At the same time, the interpretation of *karman* as the more direct cause of suffering may lead to a more pregnant expression of the Fruit aspect : it is then conceived of as the result of the 'ripening' of *karman* and is then called Ripening, Maturation (*vipāka*). This result, in Buddhism, is always some kind of 'suffering' ; it is not suffering in its narrow meaning (which is the case with Jarāmaraṇa), but always suffering in a broader sense : the result produced by *karman* is inevitably unstable (*anitya*), since not only pleasant feelings in general (*sukhavedanīya*), but even heavenly existence comes to an end. Accordingly, the terms *phala* and *vipāka* may be substituted by *duḥkha*. In the fourth place, the same group of Aṅgas may be considered the object of Defilement and Karman, and therefore be termed *vastu*. This last term, however, is not mentioned in our text, perhaps because it is too neutral [124]). All the classifications mentioned are only variations of the Hetu-Phala classification : twofold (c — A — 7 sq.), threefold (c — B — 4 to 6), fourfold (c — B — 8 to 10) and sixfold (d — A — 3 to 5).

Some other special interpretations are based on a rather different principle. The twelve Aṅgas are often considered as many states (*avasthā*) of Existence, each of them corresponding to a definite period. Then, the Aṅgas become *bhavāṅgas*. This interpretation is accordingly termed 'static' (*āvasthika*), or 'extended' (*prākarṣika*) [125]). As 'Existence' (*bhava*) is often

---

destroyed, then 'being' becomes synonymous with 'being efficient', 'being a cause' (and a fruit as well). Consequently, something which is not a cause of something else, such as a lotus in the sky, cannot exist. Therefore, if Jarāmaraṇa were not cause, it would not exist. Its direct effect is the powerful 'complex of suffering' on the one hand, and re-birth on the other.

[123]) In our text (*infra*, f — B — 2 sqq.), the different compounds of the *duḥkhaskandha* are analyzed and conceived in mutual interdependence, just like the *pratītyasamutpādāṅgas*. This conception is unusual ; as a rule, the whole complex (*çoka* etc.) is taken to arise together (*samudbhavanti*) in dependence on Jarāmaraṇa.

[124]) *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 68, *kārikā* 26, a-b: *kleças trīṇi dvayam karma sapta vastu phalam tathā;* so, the seven Aṅgas which are neither *kleça (avidyā, tṛṣṇā, upādāna)*, nor *karman (saṃskāra, bhava)* are named *vastu* or *phala. Vastu* is explained as *āçraya*, "point d'appui", in the Bhāṣya. It is the chain interpreted as being partly subject (the forces of *kleça* and *karman*) and partly object ; cf. the Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya, 35, 23 (*Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 158): *kleçakarmāçrayatvād iti / vijñānādīni saptāṅgāni vastūni / adhiṣṭhānāni kleçakarmaṇām ity arthaḥ*. De la Vallée Poussin (*op. cit.*, p. 68, note 3, and *Théorie des douze causes*, p. 34) notes that the term *vastu* is not found elsewhere in that meaning.

[125]) *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 66. — Cf. *ibid.*, note 5, where it becomes evident that the Sautrāntikas (including Vasubandhu) did not accept this interpretation.

explained as 'existence of the five *skandhas*', the twelve Aṅgas would represent twelve stages of evolution or development (*pariṇāma*) ; or rather, each of the twelve stages is named after the Aṅga which is prevalent in it [126]. Thus, the period in which the passions begin to arise, early adolescence, is denoted by Tṛṣṇā; the period in which these passions are carried out, by Upādāna. The division of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula into twelve states is usually expressed by the simile of a tree, i.e. the Tree of Sorrow (*duḥkhavṛkṣa*). Then, the twelve Aṅgas are represented as its different stages of development from seed to fruit. Since the fruit contains the seed from which a new tree may arise, the twelfth link (Jarāmaraṇa) conditions a new series : the cycle of re-birth (Bhavacakra). This cycle is without a beginning, but it may end when one of its stages is destroyed : without the seed, the germ cannot arise. This is the 'exterior' interpretation of the chain of causation, explained in our text in the passage from c — A — 9 to 10. Also the fivefold (d — A — 1 to 3) and the sevenfold (d — A — 5 to 8) divisions are based on the above interpretation.

The simile of the seed and the germ (*bīja* and *aṅkura*) has become famous in Buddhism and does not seem to be limited to any particular form of Buddhism; on the other hand, its definition as the 'exterior' Pratītya-samutpāda opposed to the 'interior' (*ādhyātmika*) interpretation (according to which the twelve-linked formula is the expression of the general rule of causation) seems to be limited to Mahāyāna [127]. This is an important

---

[126] The reason why the *āvasthika* interpretation was condemned by the Sautrāntikas was probably that it resembled too much the theories of *satkārya* and *pariṇāma* of Sāṃkhya and other heretical systems. The term *pariṇāma* is however used with reference to *çoka, parideva,* etc., considered to be 'transformations' of Jarāmaraṇāṅga (and not separate Aṅgas); cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* III, p. 83, note 5.

[127] This is the opinion of De la Vallée Poussin, *Bouddhisme, Histoire de la Dogmatique,* p. 46, who makes, however, some reserves. It cannot be denied that the problems herewith connected are very complicated. Saṃghabhadra, who was an orthodox Vaibhāṣika (cf. *Abhidh. Koça, Introduction* etc., 1931, p. LIII), „établit que la série causale soit intérieure, soit extérieure, — le *kalala,* etc. d'une part; la graine, etc., de l'autre — c'est ce qu'on nomme Pratītyasamutpāda" (*Abhidh. Koça,* III, note 1 to p. 60); this is, however, something very different from what is stated in our text. The simile of the seed and the germ is known in Yaçomitra's Vyākhyā (cf. *Cosm. Bouddh.,* p. 133, line 11 and p. 163, line 12), but there is not the slightest indication that it should have been considered the 'exterior' interpretation of Pratītyasamutpāda. The distinction made by Saṃghabhadra, on the other hand, uses the terms 'interior' and 'exterior' in a way quite different from our text, viz. as either *pañcaskandhikā avasthāḥ,* or *bījāṅkurādi,* i.e. in about the same way as the distinction is made for the *āyatanas* and the twelve first *dhātus.* In our text, however, 'exterior' refers to the 'special' interpretations of the chain, but 'interior' to the 'general' rules fixed by the laws of causation (*hetūpanibandha).* Stcherbatskij (*Buddh. Logic,* I, p. 121, note) rightly concludes that Vasubandhu (Abhidharmakoça) sharply distinguished the two inter-pretations (Koçasthāna II : the general theory in connection with the exposition of Hetu, Pratyaya and Phala ; III : the special interpretations in connection with Lokanir-deça), but the terms *ādhyātmika (abhyantara)* and *bāhya* are not used in this connection. Some references to the Mahāyāna conception will be given in note 89 to the Translation.

point in view of an attempt at tracing the origin of our Upadeça text. It is moreover noted that this twofold aspect of the chain of causation is not equally important in the two great Schools of Mahāyāna ; it is very often referred to in Mādhyamika texts, but considered of a secondary importance in Vijñānavāda [128]).

As has already been noted above, this classificatory portion of our text may be considered an elaboration of the first introductory *kārikā*. The following part of the Upadeça is based upon the second and third *kārikās*, but the relation is less obvious. It is all but a kind of commentary, but rather an independent 'instruction' (Upadeça) for which the *kārikās* serve as what might be termed a motto. These two Çlokas were undoubtedly taken from an authoritative source, but our attempts at tracing them had no definite results as yet. An additional difficulty is the fact that the two strophes occur in a rather bad state in our treatise. Presumably, they were not understood by the copyist (or rather, by the 'chain' of copyists) ; the result has been that the first of these Çlokas is incomplete, whereas the second does not occur in the text as a strophe. As a matter of fact, the latter is found in our text in a word-for-word commentary ; the Çloka can however be reconstructed by adding the words which are explained and connecting them by means of particles that would not probably require any explanation. Although the result thus obtained might not be literally correct, we think that there could be little doubt as to its meaning.

For the first strophe, we arrived at the following reconstruction :

Yaḥ kaçcit samyag<uddiṣṭān sam>avadhāryya pratyayā /
<a>vaçya<m> parinirvṛt<t>e bhagavati çaraṇaṃ yayau //

---

128) The 'special' interpretation (*bījad aṅkuraṃ, aṅkurāt pattram*, etc.) is very important in Mādhyamika (Aṣṭasāhasïkā, Lalitavistara, Madhyamakavṛtti, chapter Dṛṣṭiparīkṣā, Madhyamakāvatāra, chapter VI), where it serves mainly to explain the conception of Buddhism as *madhyamā pratipad* : just as the *aṅkura* is neither identical with, nor different from the *bīja*, in the same way two *pratītyasamutpādāṅgas* succeeding one another are neither different nor identical ; there is therefore no eternal matter (*çāçvata*), but also no annihilation (*uccheda*). The conception of Çūnyatā avoided such an alternative. Cf. especially the analysis by De la Vallée Poussin mentioned in note 112 above. — It is obvious that the simile of the seed and the germ is much older than the philosophic interpretations in Buddhism. A remarkable feature is that the symbolism suggested by the simile is that of the tree (*duḥkhavṛkṣa*), but at least one of the elements, viz. *nāla*, would remind one of a lotus; its usual meaning is a „hollow stalk" (esp.) of a lotus", but also „reed". Another curious detail is the use of *garbha*, which represents the stage between *nāla* and *puṣpa* and therefore means „bud" here, i.e. the 'womb' of the flower. *Bīja* and *aṅkura* represent Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa respectively (cf. Çālistambha in Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā, p. 481, lines 11 sq.: ..... *vijñānabījaṃ tatra tatropapattyā mātuḥ kukṣau nāmarūpāṅkuram abhinirvartayati*). Not only phenomenal existence, but also the Mārga is often compared with a tree, but a very different one ; then, the seed is *bodhicitta* (*citta* is often used as a synonym of *vijñāna*); the stem, *skandha*, is *karuṇā*, etc. ; this simile is well-known in Mahāyāna (Madhyamakāvatāra, VI) and is also referred to in the inscription of Kĕlurak (strophe 17, vide *T.B.G.*, 68, 1928, p. 20).

A few points require explanation in view of a number of corrections introduced into the text such as it was copied on our plate. They are based upon two distinct factors : (1) among the mistakes by the copyist, only omissions are frequent, (2) the wording of the passage clearly suggests that the passage is metrical and probably a Çloka ; it is unnecessary to add that the mistakes should be understandable from a palaeographic point of view. It is then easy to see where we have to assume an omission. The words *samyag avadhāryya* in the text are not only unmetrical, but also difficult to be combined. We expect after *samyag* a word meaning "revealed", "taught"; *uddiṣtān* would be satisfactory, although it is not of course the only possibility (*nirdiṣtān*, for instance, might also be possible), but for the meaning of the strophe this point is not very important. After that word, another syllable is missing at the beginning of pāda *b*. *Sam-* is the easiest conjecture, but not the most satisfactory one ; no instances of *sam-ava-dhṛ* seem to be known, and, in addition, it is strange to find a gerund in the meaning of a conjugated form here [129]). It is not difficult to recognize *avaçyaṃ* in *vaçya* given in the plate ; the loss of the initial vowel is obviously due to a breach of sandhi [130]). The loss of the anusvāra and the spelling of *parinirvṛte* by a single instead of a double *t* require no comment [131]). At the end of the strophe, the text on the plate reads *çaraṇatrayaṃ yaiyā* (sic). There is no doubt that the second word is a mistake for *yayau*, easy to be understood from a palaeographic point of view [132]) ; *çaraṇatrayaṃ* could be retained (in that case, *yayau* would have stood at the beginning of the next Çloka), but this is not likely (the Bhagavat being only one of the Three Refuges), and the addition of °*trayaṃ* is easy to be accounted for since *çaraṇatraya* (= *triçaraṇa*) is a very usual compound.

Whatever one may think of this attempt at reconstruction, a few important points appear beyond doubt. First of all, the strophe cannot be a classical Çloka. Not only is the syllable preceding *pratyayā* considered a *brevis*, but pāda *d* also contains an inundant syllable. Either of these details is however frequently met with in older Buddhist poetry, which is based upon somewhat different principles. After the studies by Senart (the notes to the Mahāvastu edition, finished in 1897), Kern (Saddharmapuṇḍarīka), Bendall (Çikṣāsamuccaya), Buddhist metrics have especially been studied

---

129) In view of the objections, we consider a different possibility (cf. *infra*, note 138).

130) We presume that the original manuscript read *pratyayāḥ avaçyaṃ*. In the Gāthā dialect, the nominative plural is commonly used in the meaning of an accusative (cf. note 137 below). Vowel contraction after the correct omission of the visarga (i.e. a sort of double sandhi) is frequently found in the less carefully written manuscripts (cf. Whitney's *Grammar*, § 133 *c*).

131) The correction of *parinirvṛte* to *parinirvṛtte* might not be necessary, although a diiambos at the end of an uneven pāda seems very strange. Spelling by a single *t* might well have been a attempt at correction.

132) The -*au* vowel must have been expressed by a double *taliṅ* before, and a *daṇḍa* behind the second *ya*; the error made by the copyist was that he put the double *taliṅ* before the first *ya*.

by Edgerton [133]). One of the typical features of this old Buddhist prosody is the possibility of replacing a long syllable by two short ones in almost any kind of metre — a principle which in classical poetry is limited to the Āryā group of metres [134]). This seems to be the case with the fourth pāda of our Çloka, where *bhagavati* counts as three syllables [135]). Another typical feature of this prosody is that a syllable preceding an initial consonant group may be reckoned a *brevis*; this is undoubtedly due to the prakritizing pronounciation of the Sanskrit words in Buddhist Gāthās (*pratyaya* in our text being pronounced *paccaya*, as in Pāli) [136]). Further we note *pratyayā* used as an accusative [137]) and, apparently, the gerund *samava-*

---

[133]) F. Edgerton, *The Prākrit underlying Buddhist hybridic Sanscrit*, Bull. School Or. Stud., VIII (1936), pp. 501-516. The principles of Buddhist metrics were treated with greater detail in an article by the same scholar which was published in the volume in honour of Professor Kuppusvami Sastri; the latter article is not at our disposal.

[134]) Edgerton, *art. cit.*, p. 505. Especially the long syllables at the beginning of the pādas of metres such as Vasantatilakā are often replaced by two short ones. Cf. also Louis Finot, *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, Introduction, p. XIV: "La résolution d'une longue initiale en deux brèves est un fait normal"; this particularity is not however limited to an initial long syllable. Especially in the Triṣṭubh and Jagatī groups of metres, which really form a single class because in the Triṣṭubh one syllable may be added, entire passages in which Indravajrā and Vaṃçastha pādas are mixed up are very common (cf. *Rāṣṭr.*, pp. 35 sq., pp. 18 sq.; Bendall, *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, Bibl. Buddh., I, 1902, Introduction, p. XXII, and Text, p. 92, note 4); if we consider these strophes to be Indravajrā (which might be arbitrary), the Vaṃçastha pādas are to be considered hypermetra. For the frequent hypermetron in the Çloka, cf. Bendall, *op. cit.*, pp. XXI sq.; *Hopkins, Great Epic*, p. 253. There are many examples in the Mahāvastu; an example in which the additional syllable occurs about in the same place of the strophe as in our strophe is Senart's edition, I (1882), p. 15, line 10, viz. the pāda *macchakaṭallagatā yathā*, "(les damnés) s'agitent comme des poissons jetés sur la berge" (cf. the note by Senart to *ibid.*, p. 382).

[135]) In this particular case, one might also consider the possibility that *bhagavati* was pronounced *bhagvati* or even *bhavati*; such a development did probably take place, since *bhavant*, frequently used in respectful address, is "doubtless a contraction of *bhagavant*" (Whitney's *Grammar*, § 456). We found a similar case in the Gaganagañja extract, *Çikṣās.*, p. 45, line 1, where the vocative *bhagavan* is a disyllable (pāda *a: vayam utsahāmo bhagavan*).

[136]) Edgerton, *loc. cit.*; cf. also Bendall, *op. cit.*, p. XIX, on the prosody of the Gaṇḍavyūha quotation in *Çikṣās.*, p. 101, lines 15 sqq. and the following pages (up to 104, line 8). A group of consonants at the beginning of a word never makes position, presumably because a single consonant was pronounced (as in Pāli and most of the Prākrits; it is needless to add that this peculiarity is not limited to the case of a mute followed by a liquid). If, however, the consonantal group comprises consonants belonging to two different words, the preceding syllable is always considered long.

[137]) The original reading probably was *pratyayā(ḥ) / avaçyam*. The use of nominative forms instead of accusatives is very common in the Gāthā dialect. It is not necessary to add the visarga after *pratyayā*; as a matter of fact, it is usually omitted in the plural forms; if necessary for the metre, the *-ā* is even shortened. Cf. Bhadracarī, strophe 26 *d: sarvi anāgatakalpa careyam* (Dodhaka metre); *sarvi* is the usual shortening of *sarve*, corresponding to Sanskrit *sarvān* in meaning. As a rule, this protocanonical Buddhist Sanskrit permits both the nomin. plur. and the regular acc. plur. (the final *n* of which is replaced by the anusvāra in many texts) and may even use such different forms

dhārya used as a *verbum finitum* (?) [138].

Even if this reconstruction is not literally correct, there cannot be any reasonable doubt that it is a Buddhist Gāthā, the meaning of which is clear in its essentials. In view of the strophe which precedes, we should expect something about the purpose of the one- to twelve-fold divisions announced there. An opponent might even suggest that these divisions are hardly relevant [139]. This strophe anticipates such an objection by stating that insight into the structure of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula automatically leads to seeking Refuge in the Buddha [140]. Since the formula reveals the eternally active laws of Causes and Effects, it gives an explanation of the

together. Edgerton *(loc. cit.)* quotes the combination *sattvān magnāḥ* from the Saddh. Puṇḍ. This point is worthy of mention, since it proves that there is no objection against our conjectural restitution of *uddiṣṭān;* if one prefers not to maintain the combination *uddiṣṭān* .... *pratyayā(ḥ),* one could however restitute *uddiṣṭā(ḥ).* An argument in favour of the hypothesis that there was no visarga after *pratyayā* is the fact that the copyist dropped the initial *a* of *avaçyaṃ;* it is easy to understand how somebody seeing *pratyayā avaçyaṃ* (and being unaware of the metrical structure), presumed a mistake and put down *pratyayāvaçyaṃ* as a compound. The result would be less easy to be explained if the original read *pratyayāḥ avaçyaṃ.*

[138] This point is however extremely doubtful; as a matter of fact, no other examples are known. In addition, it was necessary to add the prefix *sam-,* since *avadhāryya,* the form given on the plate, is unmetrical. We therefore prefer another solution, which does not meet with the difficulties just mentioned, but has the disadvantage of being less easily explained as a copyist's mistake. In protocanonical Sanskrit, we frequently meet with forms ending in *-ī* or *-e,* which are usually optatives (corresponding with *-et* in normal Sanskrit), but sometimes aorists (corresponding with *-īt*); cf. Edgerton, *art. cit.,* p. 515. In some texts (Ratnolkādhāraṇī in Çikṣāsamuccaya, pp. 2-5, and pp. 327-347; Bhadracarī) they are extremely common; we note from the Bhadracarī (Watanabe's edition not being at our disposal, we quote from Bosch, *T.B.G.,* 97, 1938, pp. 255 sqq.): *pravartayi cakraṃ dharṣayi māraṃ* (strophe 53, c-d), *dhārayi vācayi* (54 b), *pūrayi* (38 d), *janayi* (45 d), *bhavi* (16 b, 27 d). In all these cases, the forms clearly have the value of an optative (either first or third person singular); the *-i* is always short here (examples of *-e* and *-ī* as in the Saddh. Puṇḍ. do not seem to occur); it is remarkable that almost all of the cases are causative verbs. In view of the above one is tempted to correct *avadhāryya* to *avadhārayi* (= *avadhārayet;* cf. *dhārayi* above). An optative would be just the form expected here, and the metre would be in order. It would no bet too difficult to understand how a copyist knowing classical Sanskrit was startled on seeing the form *avadhārayi* and wrongly concluded that the latter was a mistake for *avadhāryya,* a form he knew.

[139] As a matter of fact, such an objection is only natural. The point is that these divisions aim at stressing the fundamental aspect of Pratītyasamutpāda, the explanation of the continuous processus of births and deaths *(janmamaraṇaprabandha),* which does not depend on external causes; cf. *Siddhi,* II, p. 502.

[140] We may understand this connection almost literally. The Mahāvagga explains us how the wandering ascetics Sāriputta (Çāriputra) and Moggallāna (Maudgalyāyana) are converted by hearing the formula *ye dharmā,* etc. (Warren, *Buddhism in Translations,* pp. 89-91). An even more striking example of a Brahmin being converted by hearing our dry Pratītyasamutpādasūtra is the second tale of Açvaghoṣa's Sūtrālaṃkāra, "où le brahmane Kauçika est converti par la lecture fortuite du texte, acquis dans l'intention d'en préparer simplement un palimpseste" (Sylvain Lévi, *Journ. Asiat.,* 10ième Série, Tome 16, 1910, p. 436).

origin of Suffering (*samudayasatya*) and so suggests the possibility of bringing it to an end (*nirodhasatya*) by following the Mārga. But now the question arises : in what exactly have we to seek Refuge ?

A very definite reply to this question is given in our strophe in the words *parinirvṛtte bhagavati*, „in the completely 'nirvāṇed' Bhagavat". In one of his elucidating articles, De la Vallée Poussin examined the problem of *caraṇagamana* throughout the history of Buddhism [141]). The earlier Buddhists did not, as a rule, pose that problem as pregnantly, but later on it was argued that 'Refuge in the Buddha' could not mean 'Refuge in the Buddha's body', which was materially the same as the Bodhisattva's body before the Enlightenment and, although it was distinguished with many special marks, it was also subject to death and decay. Refuge in the Buddha's soul was of course out of the question since no such thing existed. The profound doctrine of the Three Bodies of a Buddha (in Lokottaravāda and Mahāyāna) provided a solution of this dilemma : Refuge in the Buddha was interpreted as a refuge in the eternal Body of the Law (*dharmakāya*) [142]).

Although the latter term does not occur in the text of the Çloka, this or a related notion seems to be implied by the words *parinirvṛtte bhagavati*. As to *parinirvṛtta*, this term could well be rendered by „transcendental". It is the incomprehensible state in which no such relative notions as life and death exist : it is beyond thought.

We have analyzed this strophe in detail in order to examine whether it would enable us to arrive at a conclusion as to the form of Buddhism to which it belongs. Owing to the vagueness of the terms, no definite conclusion seems possible ; the term *dharmakāya* in its technical meaning is not used here and it is well-known that the Hīnayāna sects had all the elements necessary for the full development of the doctrine of the Dharmakāya. It is however obvious that our strophe would better fit in with Mahāyāna than with Hīnayāna thought.

Fortunately, the last introductory strophe makes it very probable that our surmise about the Mahāyānic character of the strophes is correct. This last strophe itself is omitted in the text, but its important, technical, notions are quoted one after the other (by means of *iti*) and more or less explained. So it appears that the kārikā must have contained the following words : *ataimirika, cakṣuṣmān* [143]), *pratītyasamutpāda, kotha* and *upādāna*. As these words contain twenty-one syllables in all, we need eleven more syllables

---

[141]) *Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, I (1931-32), pp. 65-109.

[142]) The words *parinirvṛtte bhagavati* most certainly exclude the worship of relics in a *stūpa*. The words could even point to a conscious effort to avoid such an interpretation. As a matter of fact, parts of the Law (such as the famous *Ye-dharmā* formula) may be considered a portion of the Dharmakāya ; it is well-known that plates, preferably gold plates, inscribed with this famous text, gradually took over the function of relics in ancient times. This point will be referred to at the end of this Introduction.

[143]) *Cakṣuṣmān* is certainly not a gloss on *ataimirika*, for *iti* is placed after *cakṣuṣmān*, not after *ataimirika*. Instead of the latter, the reading on the plate runs : *atairika*, which could not, however, well represent anything else; cf. note 144.

to complete the Çloka. These latter syllables must, of course, have constituted non-technical notions, for which there was no need of explanation. It is easy to put the above words together and connect them in such a way that they form a Çloka. The result, then, may not be literally correct, but that is a matter of secondary importance. The meaning of the technical notions is sufficiently pregnant to allow for a reconstruction the meaning of which is at any rate certain. The result would then be as follows :

Ataimirikaç=cakṣuṣmān upādānavivarjitaḥ /
Sa pratītyasamutpādaṃ kotha iti vipaçyati // [144])

Instead of *vivarjitaḥ* there might have been a synonym, but the only word which is metrically possible, *niraṅkuçaḥ*, affords an image which would not probably have suggested itself [145]). As to the last word of pāda *d, vipaçyati* [146]) is not the only possibility, but by far the most satisfactory term. As we noted above, Buddhism attached a great importance to etymology, which is only natural in a religion in which the correct interpretation of canonical texts was essential. Buddhism created a precise philosophic terminology and fully utilized the almost unlimited possibilities of the Sanskrit language, including those subtle changes due to the use of various prefixes. The latter often obtain a pregnant meaning [147]). Thus, *vi-*, prefixed to words pertaining to empirical knowledge, is regularly taken to convey the shade of discriminative knowledge implying the refutation of another alternative [148]). This is exactly the case with our kārikā : the wise

---

[144]) A small detail, not essential for the meaning of the strophe, is whether we should read *ataimirikaç cakṣuṣmān* as two words, or *ataimirikacakṣuṣmān* as a single compound. From a metrical point of view, the latter is undoubtedly preferable. Although *vipulās* with four long syllables at the end of the uneven pādas are not rare (with a necessary caesura after the fifth syllable of the pāda, which would be the case here if the former reading is accepted), it is usual that in this case the first four syllables of the same pāda constitute a diiambos. Açvaghoṣa, to take a Buddhist poet, is strict in this respect in the sixteen examples of this *vipulā* in the Buddhacarita and the Saundarananda together; cf. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita*, Part II, Introduction, p. lxv. The first pāda of *Buddhac.*, XII, 49, viz. *atho viviktaṃ kāmebhyo*, is a good example. Another argument in favour of the latter reading is the occurrence of a very similar compound in a quotation from the Vajradhvajasūtra in Çāntideva's *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, Bendall's edition, p. 30, line 13, viz. *apratihatacakṣuṣmattāṃ (ca sarvajagaty utpādeyuḥ)*, "may they produce 'the state of possessing unrestrained vision' with reference to the entire world". *Apratihatacakṣuṣmant* comes very near to *ataimirikacakṣuṣmant*.

[145]) For this use of *vivarjita*, "free from", cf. *Buddhac.*, XII, 54 : *sukhaṃ prītivivarjitam*, "blissful but void of ecstasy" (Johnston).

[146]) The term *jānāti* in our text (c — A — 5) may well be a gloss on *vipaçyati*. For the meaning of the latter, cf. note 148 below.

[147]) There are many examples of *sam- (sampratyaya)*. It may be interpreted *samavāyārtha* (in the meaning of contact), *saha* (together), *sambandhārtha* (in the meaning of connection); cf., for instance, *Abhidh. Koça*, Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya 55, 17, in *Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 184 ; ad 42, 14, *ibid.*, p. 168. For *anu-*, cf. *Siddhi*, II, p. 566, note 1.

[148]) For the meaning of *vipaçyati*, cf. the well-known expression *dharmaṃ vipaçyati*, e.g. in the Sanskrit redaction of the Dharmapada ; Sylvain Lévi, *Textes sanscrits de Touen-*

not only see that Dependent Origination is a process of decay (*kotha*), but they understand that a process which is usually expressed by terms meaning 'arising, origination' (*bhava, utpāda, dharmāṇām upacaya*, etc.) really is a process of decay; we noted already above that this interpretation is supported by an etymology of *itya* (= *vinaçvara*) in the term *pratītyasamutpāda* [149]).

The meaning of the Çloka now becomes clear. Its main purpose is to stress that he who does not suffer from optical illusions (*timira*) and therefore sees things as they really are, conceives of Dependent Origination as a process of decay, but the true insight into the real nature of things is only possible for those liberated from attachment to pleasures and wrong views (*upādāna*), which is the direct factor conditioning phenomenal existence (*bhava*) [150]).

The most interesting detail in our strophe, which gives a clue as to the type of Buddhism to which the Çloka belongs, is the designation by *ataimirika* for those possessing the true insight into the nature of things. Its opposite, the *taimirika*, i.e. a person suffering from a peculiar type of eye-disease which makes him perceive all kinds of objects such as hairs (*keçādi*), which are not seen by people with normal vision, is the famous Mahāyāna simile used to denote the Pṛthagjana, who attaches himself to

---

Houang, Journ. Asiat., 1910, p. 450, feuillet b' verso, line 2; the form does not exactly mean 'seeing' the *dharma* but rather distinguishing *dharma* from *adharma*; cf. also *vipaçyanā* (*Mahāvastu*, I, p. 120, line 10; *Mahāvyutp.*, 90, 2 on p. 29; especially *Siddhi*, II, pp. 596 sq., note b with important quotations from the Bodhisattvabhūmi). This meaning of *vi-* is also assumed for *vijñāna (skandha)*, explained by *prativijñapti*. "l'impression relative à chaque objet" (*Abhidh. Koça*, I, p. 30, kār. 16; Vyākhyā in *Bibl. Buddh.*, XXI, p. 39, lines 23 sqq.; cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, p. 16 and p. 63); it includes the distinction of one object from the other but excludes the perception of various secondary marks belonging to the domains of other *skandhas*.

[149]) Cf. *supra*, p. 77. For *kotha*, cf. note 111 above, where a passage is quoted from the Rāṣṭrapāla. A particular state of mind is needed to see Dependent Origination as a process of decay; this may be the case with those practising *açubhabhāvanā* and other kinds of concentration of the mind, for only *samāhitacitto yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti* (*Abhidh. Koça* VIII, p. 130, with numerous references by De la Vallée Poussin in note 5 to that page; *Mahāvy.*, 81, 6; *Çikṣās.*, p. 119, etc.). Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Mor. Bouddh.*, p. 83: "La méditation de l'horrible est assurée quand l'ascète n'aperçoit plus qu'un squelette sous les appâts féminins". During such practices, the ascetic may also see *pratītyasamutpāda* as it really is, i.e. as a process of putrefaction (*kotha*); if this is correct, the latter term should be taken in its literal meaning. The mystical vision (*vipaçyati*) is primary, reasoning is only a means to make such a vision possible. It is hardly necessary to add that also the vision itself is nothing but a means to arrive at a correct view about the Voidness of notions such as origination and decay and, therefore, of the *dharmas* themselves; one can go further: if a same process can be defined in terms of origination as well as in those of decay, it amounts to about the same if we conclude that there is neither origination nor decay, so that the *dharmas* should be considered to be in the absolute state of rest (*nirvṛta*): the Saṃsāra, viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*, is Nirvāṇa; the *ataimirika* becomes an *advaita*. Although the latter conclusions are not expressed in our *kārikā*, it seems to us that they are clearly implied by the use of the terms.

[150]) To be more precise: conditioning the arising of Karman leading to re-birth (Jāti).

the notion of a presumed reality and so produces Karman leading to re-birth. Just as the person suffering from *timira* may be cured by an able physician who removes the veil which is the direct cause of the fool's illusions, in the same way the Prthagjana whose vision is impeded by the screen of Ignorance may be cured from his naive realism by the King of the Physicians, the Teacher of Gods and Men [151]). Among the means used by the Buddha to that purpose, teaching of Pratītyasatmutpāda occupies a prominent place : the analysis of Dependent Origination shows that nothing is stable ; all elements of existence depend upon each other and are therefore devoid of existence of their own ; the *dharmas* are doomed to decay as soon as they arise owing to well-known causes and conditions ; the analysis of this process shows that the *dharmas* are as unreal as the disc of the moon reflected in the water and the hairs and others objects perceived by the *taimirika*. If applied to things which have only illusionary existence, oppositions such as origination and decay are bound to lose their force, just as, for instance, there can be no question about beauty or ugliness of the daughter of a sterile woman. Pratītyasamutpāda, usually defined as the general law of origination, may just as well be called a process of decay.

We have no doubt that this is the line of thought implied by our last introductory Çloka. Not only are all the important words mentioned in the text, but it becomes also clear that the etymology discussed above is an explanation of the Çloka and quoted to confirm the thought suggested by the strophe. Then, there could be no doubt that the strophe belongs to Mahāyāna with its typical theory of *dharmanairātmya* [152]) and thus confirms our provisional conclusion based upon the preceding Çloka (*parinirvrtte bhagavati çaranam*).

The fact that the two last Çlokas on which the Upadeça is based belong to Mahāyāna is in an obvious contrast with the Sūtra-Vibhanga version, which gives the point of view of the 'orthodox' Sarvāstivādins (Vaibhāsikas). This might seem strange at first, but we should not forget that such a combination would completely agree with what we know about Mahāyāna teaching. The doctrine of Çūnyatā is considered very dangerous for those who have not yet acquired a thorough knowledge about the Abhidharma

---

[151]) Cf., for instance, Prajñākaramati's commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra, VI, 2 (edition by De la Vallée Poussin, p. 364 sq.) ; a detailed analysis, De la Vallée Poussin, *Madhyamaka, Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, II (1932-33), especially pp. 30 sq., p. 42 and p. 44. When *taimirika* is used to denote the Prthagjana, *caksusmant* remains its opposite and denotes the Buddhā Bhagavantah who see things as they really (*paramārthatah*) are. These distinctions lead to three 'levels' of reality : (a) the imaginary truth (*udakacandra, indrajāla, marīci*, etc.), (b) relative (*sāmvrta*) truth (the reality of the *dharmas*, of *pratītyasamutpāda*) and (c) the highest truth (in which there is no *utpāda*, no *nirodha*, no distinction between *grāhaka* and *grāhya*, etc.). These distinctions developed into the Vijñānavādin theory of the three *svabhāvas* (*parikalpita, paratantra* and *parinispanna*); cf. the literature mentioned by De la Vallée Poussin, *Siddhi*, II, pp. 514-533 ; Friedmann, *Madhyāntavibhāgatīkā* (1937), p. 93.

[152]) In contrast to the *pudgalanairātmya* in Hīnayāna ; cf. *Siddhi*, II, pp. 567 sqq. : *pudgalanairātmya* is the antidote against *kleçāvarana, dharmanairātmya* against *jñeyāvarana*.

theories, otherwise it might lead them to nihilistic views [153]): the *saṃvṛta*
Truth should be understood before the *paramārthikasatya* could be
explained [154]).

The entire final part of the Upadeça (from f — A — 1 to h — A — 2)
is based upon the Çloka just mentioned. The preceding portion aimed at
giving a true insight into the internal structure of Dependent Origination ;
its main conclusion was that Ignorance constitutes its basis. But Avidyā,
which dominates the Saṃsāra throughout its entire extent, is essentially
located in past existence. It cannot therefore be combatted directly. There
is however a more direct factor leading to re-existence, viz. fourfold Upādāna.
This is how our author understands the term *upādānavivarjita* in the
strophe : by becoming liberated from attachment to passions and wrong
views, one becomes a *cakṣuṣmant*. and *ataimirika*. One might object that
this is not the opinion suggested by the strophe, but that is a matter of
secondary importance. The Upadeça is obviously intended for people with
limited intellectual faculties, such as pupils, and an exposition about such

---

[153]) De la Vallée Poussin, *Morale Bouddhique*, p. 163, note : „Le Bouddhisme prend
parfois les aspects d'une thérapeutique : ce qui est poison pour l'un est remède
pour l'autre ; les doctrines et les pratiques valent par leurs effets". Even Çūnyatā
itself is not the ultimate truth : in Mahāyāna, one of the forms of Çūnyatā is
çūnyatāçūnyatā (Mahāvyutp., 37, 4. on p. 15 : *Dharmasaṃgraha*, No. XLI, p. 8 of
the edition by Kasawara, Müller and Wenzel in *Anecd. Oxon.*, Vol. I, Part V, 1885);
cf. Friedmann, *Madhyāntav.*, p. 74 : „In order to reflect on these two kinds of false
discrimination (i.e. *adhyātma-* and *bāhyaçūnyatā*) ......, we have (as antidote) respec-
tively the Non-Substantiality of Non-Substantiality ....." ; cf. also Obermiller, *A Study
of the Twenty Aspects of Çūnyatā, Ind. Hist. Qu.*, IX (1933), pp. 170 sqq., and *Sublime
Science, Acta Orient.*, IX (1931), pp. 161 sq. (quotation from the *Kāçyapapariprcchā*):
„O Kāçyapa, the views maintaining the existence of real individuals are a blunder
as great as the mount Sumeru. However those who, being full of pride, cling to
the conception of Non-substantiality (as an absolute principle) commit an error still
greater". In Mādhyamika, the doctrine of Çūnyatā is sometimes compared with a ship,
necessary to cross the ocean of Saṃsāra, but to be left as soon as the 'other bank'
is reached ; it is only of temporary use ; cf. the article *Madhyamaka* by De la Vallée
Poussin, quoted in note 151 above.

[154]) Cf., for instance, *Bodhic.-pañj.*, p. 365. the strophe quoted from the Çāstra (i.e. *Mūlama-
dhyamakakārikās*, XXIV, 10, as De la Vallée Poussin notes): *vyavahāram anāçritya
paramārtho na deçyate*, „the highest truth cannot be explained unless one accepts the
dialectic truth (*vyavahāra*, including the differenciation between *grāhya* and *grāhaka*,
is almost a synonym of *saṃvṛti*) as a base. The commentator, Prajñākaramati, explains
vyavahāra by *upāya*, *paramārtha* by *upeya*, „for otherwise it (i.e. the latter) cannot be
explained *(anyathā tasya deçayitum açakyatvāt)*. The same strophe considers *paramārtha*
in its turn as nothing but a means to reach Nirvāṇa *(paramārtham anāgamya nirvāṇaṃ
nādhigamyate)*. This explains the relation between the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga text on one,
the Upadeça on the other hand ; the contradiction is only apparent since the Sūtra-
Vibhaṅga represents the *saṃvṛtisatya* as a necessary introduction to the teaching of
the *paramārthasatya* included in the Çlokas upon which the Upadeça is based. Such
a gradual instruction is typical of Mahāyāna with its interpretation of the successive
dharmacakrapravartanas ; cf. the Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra quoted by Obermiller, *The
Doctrine of Prajñāpāramitā, Acta Orient.*, XI (1932), pp. 93 sqq. ; cf. also Stcherbatskij,
Ind. Hist. Qu., X (1934), pp. 739-760.

difficult problems as the true meaning of the Triple Refuge would only cause misunderstanding; therefore, no explanation of the difficult terms in the Çlokas is given. The author concentrates his efforts on *upādānavivarjita* and tries to explain what this term includes and especially why the Bhagavat used the term Upādāna in this connection and not Avidyā. Most of the classificatory portion definitely suggests that Avidyā is at the basis of the Pratītyasamutpāda ; why then did not the Bhagavat use the term *avidyāvivarjitaḥ* at the end of pāda *b* ?

It would not seem very difficult to give a direct answer to this question ; a few lines, in the same style as we gave above, would be sufficient to this purpose. The author of our treatise does not, however, give such a direct reply. With his usual verbosity, he seems to utilize any possible occasion for a digression. These digressions, often rather lengthy, make it rather difficult to follow the argument. Immediately after the classificatory portion of our text, the conclusion that Ignorance is the basis of Dependent Origination and, therefore, of the Saṃsāra as a whole, is formulated. But what exactly is Ignorance ? — Instead of a direct answer, there follows a digression of considerable length, in which it is stated that Ignorance may be 'one', 'twofold', etc. up to 'fivefold'. Ignorance is 'one' because it comprises all *kleças* together. The four- and five-fold Ignorance refer not to Ignorance itself, but to the way in which it is shunned (*heya*), respectively by the Four Truths and by the same with the addition of intense meditation (*bhāvanā*). The categories themselves, which for didactic purposes are given in numerical order again, do not contain any points of special interest, except that this one- to five-fold classification may not be known from other sources [155].

The next portion of our text (f — A — 6 to 9) deals with the meaning of *pratyaya* in *avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ*, especially in connection with a possible question why *avidyā* is not called the *hetu* of the *saṃskāras*. Here the rather strange reply is given that there is only one *hetu*, but there are many *pratyayas* ; the meaning is obviously that not only Avidyā is required to produce the Saṃskāras, but also a number of other conditions must be present. Usually, however, the relation between the successive Aṅgas of the formula is taken to be both *hetu* and *pratyaya*. In fact, all *hetus* are comprised in one of the *pratyayas*, viz. the *hetupratyaya* [156], and in one of the divisions in the preceding part of the text, Avidyā was emphatically comprised in the *hetu* part of Pratītyasamutpāda [157].

---

[155] It is however noted that the twofold Avidyā is strange. It is explained (in f — A — 2 to 3) as *hetutayāçrayatvāt* and *vijñānāçrayatvāt*, "since it is based either on causation (read : *hetutvāçrayatvāt* ?) or on consciousness". It seems that these two categories of Ignorance refer to the transcendental and empirical forms of it. The latter distinction is well-known in Buddhist philosophy ; cf. the terms *mukhyā* and *pratibhāsikī bhrānti*, discussed by Stcherbatskij in *Buddhist Logic*, I, p. 154.

[156] *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 299 ; *Siddhi*, p. 229 and p. 436.

[157] *Infra*, c — B — 9 in the text.

Probably, we are to understand that the Sūtra uses *avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ* because Avidyā is neither necessarily nor always the direct cause of the Saṃskāras. The direct cause may be something else, but even in that case, the presence of Avidyā is always required ; it is the *conditio sine qua non*, for the Saṃskāras cannot possibly arise if there is no Avidyā present. In this way, the passage would agree with the immediately preceding argument, where it is stated that the *hetu* is inherent (*saṃçliṣṭa*), but the *pratyaya* is detached (*viçliṣṭa*).

The exposition would not be complete without a full treatment of the Saṃskāras, too. The Saṃskāras are however always threefold ; only the three groups are not always conceived of in the same way. We already quoted this passage in another connection, viz. in our survey about the fascination of numbers in scholastic Buddhism. Although the text was copied very carelessly here (from f — A — 10 to f — B — 8), it is clear that the Saṃskāras are classified in the following ways ·

a) *puṇyamaya, apuṇyamaya* and *āneñjya* (?) [158];
b) *kuçala, akuçala* and *avyākṛta* [159]);
c) *kāyakarman, vākkarman* and *manaskarman ;*
d) *prātisattvika, aupapattyaṃçika* and *ābhisāṃsārika.*

Now somebody may ask (f — B — 8 to 9) whether all these sorts of Saṃskāras are conditioned by Ignorance. Somebody might suppose, for instance, that only bad action is conditioned by Ignorance, good action, on the contrary, by Knowledge. Though such a supposition might seem reasonable enough, it is not correct since the Saṃskāras are, by definition, the actions of former life which lead to re-birth.

Owing to a small lacuna in the text, the argument which follows is not perfectly clear. If we understand the line of argument, the treatise insists on the incorrect opinion mentioned just before. If somebody believes that some of the Saṃskāras, especially those defined as *kuçala,* may be due to Jñāna, not to Avidyā, he gets into direct conflict with the text of the Pratītyasamutpāda ; for the Bhagavat did not state that only the bad Saṃskāras are due to Avidyā : the consequences of such a wrong opinion would even be serious. For those who are convinced that some of the Saṃskāras, e.g. those which conditioned their own existence, are due to Knowledge inevitably conclude that such an existence is not defiled ; therefore they would consider their life something excellent. This is a very wrong opinion, technically denoted by *dṛṣṭiparāmarça* : the error of esteeming

---

[158] The term *āneñjya* does not occur in the text as we have it. Presumably, the copyist got confused by the numerous repetitions. It is, however, hardly doubtful that tne original had *āneñjya* as the third category ; cf. the notes to the transcription and to the translation of this passage.

[159] As a matter of fact, the classifications (b) and (c) are combined and constitute a ninefold classification not given in any other source known to us ; there is however nothing remarkable in such a combination.

good what in reality is bad, and the converse [160]). From one wrong view he attaches himself to another : conceiving of existence as something which might be good, he falls a victim to the wrong view of Eternalism, one of the Extreme Views (antagrāhadṛṣṭi) [161]). Owing to the latter, he is forced to deny the Four Truths of a Saint (mithyādṛṣṭi), and, consequently, he attaches himself to one of the many kinds of heretical doctrines according to which good behaviour and rites alone would suffice to gain Final Liberation. This would imply that there was some eternal matter which could be purified in different ways. He then necessarily concludes that an Ātman exists, and falls into the Satkāyadṛṣṭi.

Up to this point there is nothing irregular in the connections, although they might not seem convincing to everybody. The connection between dṛṣṭiparāmarça and antagrāha, for instance, is all but clear ; it would be easier to explain how dṛṣṭiparāmarça leads to satkāyadṛṣṭi. Presumably, the author of our treatise tries to make us believe that the five dṛṣṭis constitute a small causal chain. We have not succeeded in tracing this view elsewhere ; usually, the dṛṣṭis are considered to constitute a kind of complex the different elements of which cannot well be separated. The belief in the efficacity of sundry rites of purification is an aspect of çīlavrataparāmarça-dṛṣṭi ; it may however also be called an aspect of dṛṣṭiparāmarça, since it implies the attachment to something hīna which is wrongly conceived of being ucca ; as a rule, the same belief would also imply antagrāhadṛṣṭi, since those adhering to the view that purity may be obtained by means of rites believe in eternalism; the same view may again be termed satkāyadṛṣṭi because it is usually associated with the belief in an eternal soul. The order in which the dṛṣṭis are connected does not show a climax. The third item, mithyādṛṣṭi, "the completely wrong view", is by far the worst of the five. It is often repeated in Buddhist texts that the adherence to this view, which is essentially the denial of the four Truths, destroys all the kuçala gathered during myriads of existences in a single moment [162]). The Satkāyadṛṣṭi, on the other hand, is undoubtedly incorrect and therefore constitutes a serious obstacle for

---

[160]) Usually (cf. Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 18, quoted in note 163 to the translation), dṛṣṭiparā-marça is twofold, conceived of in the way formulated in the text. Our treatise, however, states that it is fivefold. Presumably, dṛṣṭiparāmarça is explained there as attachment to each of the five dṛṣṭis, including. of course, dṛṣṭiparāmarça with reference to dṛṣṭiparāmarça. As a matter of fact, the dṛṣṭis overlap one another and cannot always be distinguished. A clear survey is given by De la Vallée Poussin, Morale Bouddhique (1927), pp. 154-163.

[161]) Both dṛṣṭiparāmarça and antagrāhadṛṣṭi are twofold, and this might be the main reason why the two were put together : those who are attached to the first aspect of dṛṣṭiparāmarça conceive of existence, which is always hīna, as something which is ucca ; thinking that it is ucca, they go a step further and conclude that it is also çāçvata. The other group, however, conclude that existence leads to uccheda because they think that Nirvāṇa is hīna.

[162]) Abhidh. Koça, IV, p. 170 ; cf. Morale Bouddhique, pp. 155 sqq.

those striving after Final Liberation, but it is not fundamentally bad [163].
The author of our treatise, however, thinks that *satkāyadṛṣṭi* necessarily
leads to *kāmopādāna,* and the beginning of a text is quoted to support
this view [164]. Nevertheless, the last conclusion is weak ; a Vedāntin, for
instance, would not have much trouble in refuting the conclusion that the
belief in an eternal soul would lead to attachment to passions. It is evident
that the whole line of argument in this part of our text is rather clumsy,
at least in the form in which it is given ; one could consider the possibility
that an original text was abridged for the use of pupils [165].

The aim of this whole portion is to point out that right knowledge of
the relations between the different links of the twelvefold formula is essential.
Especially the non-comprehension of the connection between the first two
links leads to all kinds of wrong views and is therefore the ultimate cause of
adherence to passions and the like. As is explained in the portion which
is following in the text, adherence to passions and wrong views leads to
re-birth and the latter to old age and death and the 'great complex of
suffering' (*mahāduḥkhaskandha*).

A rather long passage (g — A — 6 to h — A — 2) is especially
concerned with the latter. After it has been argued that non-comprehension
of the relations between Avidyā and the Saṃskāras leads to attachment
to phenomenal existence, it is now pointed out that the relation between
the latter and suffering in its manyfold aspects is rather similar to that
existing between the first two Aṅgas of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula.
The only difference between the Avidyā-Saṃskāra and the Upādāna-Bhava

---

[163] Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Morale Bouddhique,* p. 161. Buddhism does not deny that
those believing in the reality of an *ātman* and other conceptions of an eternal soul
may accomplish good acts *(kuçala),* but as long as they do not 'break' *jñeyāvaraṇa*
the road leading to Nirvāna is barred. Without scholastic subtleties, it is impossible
to distinguish *satkāyadṛṣṭi* from *çāçvatadṛṣṭi,* one of the two *antas,* and this is one
of the unsatisfactory points in this passage of our text.

[164] For this Sūtra fragment, cf. *infra,* pp. 97 sq. If we understand the connection suggested
by the text, the point is that somebody who believes in the real existence of a soul,
whatever he chooses to call it (*jīva, poṣa, puruṣa, ātman, pudgala,* etc.), attaches
himself to something which is as imaginary as a flower growing at the sky *(khapuṣpa),*
as unreal as the vision of a beautiful woman in a dream. Just as the fool who
conceives passion for his illusion seen in a dream, the person believing in the real
existence of his soul gets attached to this imaginary thing and conceives *rāga* at
its regard ; he then falls a victim to *kāmopādāna.* The passage which is quoted to
support this connection will be discussed below.

[165] As a rule, no arguments are given and the author confines himself to the enumeration
of the categories. Often, the categories themselves are not even mentioned, but only
their number is stated ; thus, *dṛṣṭiparāmarça* is fivefold (g — A — 1) and *çīla*
(in *çīlavrata*) is sevenfold (g — A — 2), although it is all but clear which five
(respectively seven) categories are alluded to (cf. the Translation). The text had
to be explained by an able teacher, and the pupils were supposed to remember the
categories when they knew how many there were. One might compare modern school
books in which a summary states that there were, for instance, five coalitions against
Napoleon in which so and so many powers took part.

relations is that the former applies to present, the latter to future existence (g — A — 6 to 7). One could well conceive of a sort of Pratītyasamutpāda series which just begins with the term Upādāna. It is argued that the separate forms of suffering, contained in the „great complex", are interdependent. Death, as a rule, depends on old age (it may of course depend on disease or accident, but this is considered exceptional and therefore left unmentioned) [166]. Sorrow (çoka) depends on death since it is essentially sorrow about death, or rather, about the certainty that everything in the phenomenal world will necessarily lead to death. On sorrow depends lamentation (parideva), and thus a series of different aspects of sorrow, ending in despair (upāyāsa), have their origin in Jarāmaraṇāṅga. These forms of suffering are here considered to constitute a regular Pratītyasamutpāda. This is at least unusual : as a rule, all these aspects of suffering are stated to constitute a complex ; this is even expressed by the formula of Dependent Origination itself, where the whole complex is said to „arise together" (samudbhavanti), in dependence on Jarāmaraṇa. In order to underline these relations, our anonymous author treats the whole chain in the prātilomika order, too, beginning with upāyāsa and ending with upādāna. Most of the notions belonging to this partial Pratītyasamutpāda are characterized by a brief definition. Almost the only point worthy of note is the relation assumed to exist between duḥkha and daurmanasya ; it is stated that the latter depends on the former, but the former on the latter, too : these two notions arise together in mutual interdependence. It is well-known that in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, a similar reciprocity is often (especially in the Pāli sources) understood with reference to the relation between the Aṅgas Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa. Almost all the sources explain the relation existing between the mind (citta, usually conceived of as a synonym of Vijñāna, Consciousness) and the mental faculties (the caitta-dharmas such as

---

[166] A number of questions are connected with the points here mentioned. In the formula of causation, the group çoka etc. is almost always added to jarāmaraṇāṅga ; cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, Théorie des douze causes (1916), p. 31 : "quelques rédactions seulement mentionnent Vieillesse-Mort, la plupart ajoute chagrin etc.". — It is remarkable that disease (vyādhi) is never mentioned in this context in our treatise, as is usually the case (e.g. Divya, pp. 314 and 676 : jātijarāvyādhimaraṇaçokaparide- vaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsā°). Why jarā and maraṇa form only one Aṅga together, is explained in Siddhi, p. 485 : "La vieillesse n'est pas nécessaire (niyata), on l'associe donc à la mort pour en faire un Aṅga". The same applies to vyādhi as well, but the latter is not even mentioned, because it is not only not necessary, but also not universal. This explains why vyādhi is often omitted. — In this passage, however, jarā is treated as if it were a real Aṅga. For the problem of accidental death (antarāmṛtyu), cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 176. For the internal structure of the duḥkhaskandha, cf. op. cit., III, p. 83, note 5 : "Les termes çoka ..... upāyāsas sont compris (saṃgrhīta) dans jarāmaraṇa et ne sont pas des membres à part (nāṅgāntaram). Ils proviennent des diverses transformations (pariṇāma) des objets (viṣaya) et de la personne (ātmabhāva)". The definitions of the constituents of the duḥkhaskandha and their mutual relations are also explained in the Daçabhūmikasūtra, ed. Rahder, p. 49, and in the Madhyamakavṛtti, ed. L de la Vallée Poussin, p. 563.

Saṃjñā, Vedanā, Sparça etc.) in the same way : no mental faculties exist without the mind, but, on the other hand, it is difficult to conceive of the mind without the existence of mental faculties [167]. On the basis of the above examples, one may conclude that *duḥkha* refers to (bodily) pain, *daurmanasya* to mental sorrow. The former is used in a very narrow meaning, if we compare its use in the expression *mahāduḥkhaskandha*, which also includes *daurmanasya*.

This repetition of the terms in *prātilomika* order serves a very definite purpose. It is not only important to know that Upādāna conditions the various kinds of suffering, but even more essential to be aware of the fact that all these kinds of suffering have Upādāna as their ultimate cause. This point is almost evident if we bear in mind that the whole final portion of our treatise is a commentary on *upādānavivarjitaḥ*, the last word of the last introductory strophe. The words *upādānam=iti* (g — B — 9) constitute the end of the words of the Bhagavat. In the lines immediately following (h — A — 1 to 2) we read the usual end of Buddhist Sūtras.

This is therefore the end of the Upadeça, but it is not yet the end of the text on our gold plates. There still follows some kind of epilogue, which will be examined at the end of this Introduction.

We noticed at several occasions some characteristic differences between the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga on one, and the Upadeça on the other side — differences in the type of Buddhism. The Sūtra-Vibhaṅga shows no Mahāyāna influence and the comparison with its slightly different version on the Nālanda bricks makes it clear that the latter version (and still more so the Chinese version by Hiuan Tsang) is an adaptation to Mahāyāna. The Upadeça, however, makes the impression of being Mahāyānic, especially the taking of Refuge in the Bhagavat who passed completely in Nirvāna and the reference to the *taimirika*. The conception of the Pratītyasamutpāda as either an 'internal' or an 'external' series, the latter of which is represented by a comparison with the various stages of a tree from the seed to the fruit, is almost entirely limited to Mahāyāna [168].

Another reference, which is not however beyond doubt, may be found in g — A — 4 to 5. There, a direct link between the wrong view on the existence of a real personality (*satkāyadṛṣṭi*) and attachment to passions (*kāmopādāna*) is established by means of an unfortunately uncomplete quotation. Only the first words. *vālaḥ açrutavān pṛthagjanaḥ prajñaptim= anupatitaḥ kāmopādānam*. were copied : „the fools. the ignorant and the common people [169]), following the generally accepted opinion, ...

---

[167] Another example is the relation between primary *(mahābhūta)* and secondary *(bhautika)* matter. In the Buddhist theory of causation, the concept of *sahabhūhetu* (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 248 : "cause en tant que coexistents, les *dharmas* qui sont effets les uns des autres") explained these relations.

[168] Cf. *supra*, p. 82.

[169] *Vāla (bāla)*, *açrutavant* and *pṛthagjana* are technical notions ; cf. note 177 to the Translation.

attachment to passion". Since this passage is to explain why belief in the existence of a soul leads to attachment to passion, it is possible to reconstruct the main line of the argument. Those who believe in the existence of an Ātman or some other eternal principle in phenomenal existence live in a dangerous illusion, owing to which they attach themselves to perishable things. They may be compared to somebody falling in love with a woman seen in a dream (as is often the case in Indian novels) and feeling miserable because his desire cannot be fulfilled.

Similar passages are well-known from Buddhist literature. In the last book of the Abhidharmakoça dealing with the refutation of those Buddhists (the Vātsīputrīyas and related sects) who believed in the existence of a *pudgala* (Pudgalapratiṣedhaprakaraṇa), the words are quoted in about the same form as here ; cf. p. 249 of the translation of the Bhāṣya by De la Vallée Poussin, where the Vyākhyā is quoted in the notes. In the third book of this text, this passage occurs again ; there it is stated that the Bhagavat pronounced these words in the Bimbisārasūtra [170]). The passage is quoted in connection with *ātmavādopādāna*. As a matter of fact, De la Vallée Poussin considered it a canonical fragment in prose [171]).

There is however an important difference between the quotation in our text and that given in the Abhidharmakoça. Although in our text there is a lacuna after the first words, it is obvious that the aim of our author was not to point out how the ignorant etc. fall a victim to wrong notions about the existence of an Ātman and the like (*pudgala, kāraka, poṣa, jīva, kṣetrajña* etc.), but rather how those attached to a wrong notion about an Ātman etc. fall a victim to Attachment to passion (*kāmopādāna*). It is evident that this is not explained by the Abhidharmakoça quotations. It is therefore natural to look for references where similar passages occur in a connection which would make us understand the line of argument used in our text.

This appears to be the case in the Madhyamakāvatāra, where we read [171]) : „Comme il est dit dans le Bhavasaṃkrāntisūtra (Sūtra de la Transmigration): 'De même, ô grand roi, qu'un homme endormi rêve qu'il possède la belle de l'endroit, et réveillé de son sommeil, il pense avec regret à la belle ....., de même, ô grand roi, le sot, l'homme ordinaire, l'ignorant, voyant avec les yeux les objets, s'applique (*abhiniviç*) aux objets agréables, s'y étant appliqué il produit attachement .....' ". Other Mahāyāna works give almost the same text, especially the Pitṛputrasamāgama, in which far

---

[170]) *Madhyama*, 11, 9, as De la Vallée Poussin adds ; the same scholar notes that the Pāli version in the Majjhima is rather different. Cf. *Abhidh. Koça Vyā.* in *Cosmologie Bouddh.*, p. 173, lines 1 to 6.

[171]) Cf. the Index of Fragments of Sūtras and Çāstras in the last volume of his Abhidharma-koça translation (*Introduction* etc., 1931), p. 1

[172]) In Chapter VI (treating about the *pratītyasamutpāda* theory), translated from Tibetan by De la Vallée Poussin in *Muséon*, N. S., 11 (1910), pp. 271-358 ; the quotation is found on p. 319.

greater details are given [173]). In all of these Mahāyāna works, the quotation is taken to refer to the Çūnyatā [174]); the Bhavasaṃkrāntisūtra, from which the passage is taken according to the Madhyamakāvatāra, is mentioned among works belonging to the Mādhyamika School in the Mahāvyutpatti [175]). It seems probable that the quotation in our text may be better understood in this context if it is interpreted in a similar way as in the Mahāyāna texts quoted, than if it is compared with the *loci* taken from the Abhidharmakoça. Although our copyist, who omitted the latter part of the quotation, made it impossible for us to arrive at a definite conclusion, we think that this detail, too, confirms the opinion arrived at above, according to which the Upadeça belongs to Mahāyāna.

Finally we think that some argument in favour of Mahāyāna may be found in the composition of the treatise as a whole. The text begins with an exposition of the 'general' theory of Dependent Origination by quoting the text of the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga. Only after that are the new elements introduced in some Çlokas pointing out that all that is subject to the laws of causality is void; this voidness is however 'seen' only by those liberated from attachment to passions and wrong views.

Now it is remarkable that roughly the same line of thought may be traced in the fundamental treatise of the Mādhyamika School of Mahāyāna, the Mūlamadhyamakakārikās of Nāgārjuna, with the commentary Prasannapadā by Candrakīrti [176]). This text begins with an analysis of the important notion of *pratyaya,* especially in connection with the Pratītyasamutpāda formula. This first chapter, named Pratyayaparīkṣā, gives the general theory of Causation. On this basis, many other subjects are treated : the principle of the identity of *pratītyasamutpāda* and *çūnyatā* is applied to all the fundamental concepts, which thus appear in a new light. Only in the two last chapters, the main conclusions are drawn ; the results of the preceding chapters are applied to the 'special' interpretation of the Dependent Origination formula (Chapter XXVI : Dvādaçaṅgaparīkṣā), and, finally, in

---

[173]) Quoted in the Çikṣāsamuccaya, ed. C. Bendall, *Bibl. Buddh.,* I (1902), pp. 244-256. Cf. especially p. 252, lines 3 sqq. : *tadyathāpi nāma mahārāja puruṣaḥ svapnāntare janapadakalyānyā striyā sārdham paricaret ; sa çayitavibuddho janapadakalyānīm striyam anusmaret ; tat kiṃ manyase mahārājāpi nu sa puruṣaḥ paṇḍitajātīyo bhavet ? ..... Evam eva mahārāja bālo 'çrutavān pṛthagjanaç cakṣuṣā rūpāni dṛṣṭvā ..... saṃrajyate.* References to similar passages are given by De la Vallée Poussin in the Abhidh. Koça loci quoted.

[174]) This is especially clear in the Pitṛputrasamāgama quotation, where the beauty seen in a dream is the tertia comparationis between the fool believing in the reality of his vision and the Pṛthagjana believing in the reality of the phenomenal world.

[175]) Ed. Minaiev-Mironov, *Bibl. Buddh.,* XIII (1911), 65, No. 54 (p. 22).

[176]) Edited by L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Bibl. Buddh.,* IV (1903-13). At present, the entire work is available in translation, a result due to different scholars. Five chapters were translated by J. W. de Jong, *Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā, Buddhica, 1-ière Série, Mémoires,* IX, 1949. In the Introduction to the latter study (pp. XIII-XVI), the translations of the other chapters, which existed already, and other materials important for the interpretation of the text, are mentioned.

the analysis of the five wrong views (Chapter XXVII : Dṛṣṭiparīkṣā). So right understanding of the principles of Dependent Origination literally constitutes the beginning and the end of the treatise. Candrakīrti himself stressed the fact that Nāgārjuna intended his detailed exposition in the first place to destroy the wrong views [177]).

The main lines of argument agree, although they are developed in a rather different way. Our text, clumsy and scholastic as it is, seems to reproduce the main argument which was developed by Nāgārjuna and Candrakīrti in such a masterly and fervent way. Only to some extent is the impression of clumsiness produced by our treatise due to incompleteness. We should never forget that it is evident that the plates themselves were never intended to be read : they are difficult to decipher now, but in all probability they have been so ever since the moment they were engraved. As a writing material, gold is not very appropriate. The plates were undoubtedly intended to serve as deposits in a Stūpa or other foundation. The text, inscribed on the pure metal, could be considered more or less a relic, a portion of the Dharmakāya of the Buddha. In that case, some important parts of the text, just sufficient to fill up the number of gold plates available, would have been sufficient. It was not of primary importance that everything should be copied and, if here and there a passage was too difficult to be read, it was just left out by the copyist. The number of omissions is considerable, and there are quite a few portions of the text that could not be understood by the reader unless he either was well trained in the subject, or had sufficient materials for comparison at his disposal. In view of these facts, it might seem contradictory that at the same time every possible attempt to avoid misunderstanding was made ; the countless repetitions and the suspension of sandhi rules in cases where a not very intelligent reader could misunderstand the text, would make it probable that the text was well graduated to the pupils' powers. The contradiction is only apparent : whereas the original text(s) undoubtedly served didactic purposes, its (their) copy on our set of gold plates was only made with a view to gathering merit.

This presumption explains several characteristic features of the text copied on our plates. In addition to those which were just mentioned, it makes it possible to understand how such different portions of texts and even pictures (plate k) could be combined. After all, we have : (a) the strophes engraved in the plates i and j, (b) the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra and its Vibhaṅga, engraved in plates a and b, (c) the Upadeça, engraved in the plates c, d, e, f, g and h, (d) the mysterious figures of the plate k. To these, a fifth item may be added. Our text contains two passages which cannot have belonged to the original texts which were copied.

After the discussion of the various modes of division of the *pratītya-samutpādāṅgas* (c — A — 1 to e — A — 7), the second part of the Upadeça

---

[177]) Cf. the Vṛtti, p. 364 : *pratītyasamutpādasaṃjñayā hi deçitavān sarvadṛṣṭiprahānārtham iti.*

does not begin immediately; the two portions are separated by twelve lines of the text (from e — A — 8 to e — B — 9), which do not fit in with the line of argument. It appears that this entire passage gives a different Vibhaṅga version of the six Aṅgas from Nāmarūpa to Upādāna inclusive. It is indeed a rather different version. Rūpa is not defined as 'primary' (the *mahābhūtas*) and derived (*bhautika* or *upādāya*) matter, but as 'long and short, square and round' etc. The latter definition is due to obvious misunderstanding: it is the explanation of *rūpāyatana* (the objects of vision) which is given here [178]). How far this misunderstanding goes appears from the different categories mentioned. In the Abhidharmakoça twenty categories are enumerated: the eight kinds of shape (*saṃsthāna*), the four 'primary' colours (white, red etc.) and the eight 'secondary' colours (light, shadow etc. [179]). In our text, only the eight *saṃsthāna* categories are enumerated, followed by the strange conclusion that in this way Rūpa is twentyfold. It is obvious that the definition of Rūpa would be wrong even if it were complete. In Nāmarūpa, Rūpa includes not only visible matter characterized by shape and colour, but matter in general, whether visible or audible (eight kinds of sounds) or capable of being perceived by the other senses (such as eleven categories of tangible matter, soft, hard, light, heavy etc.) [180]). In another passage in this portion of the text, eighteen kinds of Sparça are mentioned, followed by the conclusion that these are the *pañcadaça sparçāni* (sic) [181]). The set of three thirsts (*kāma-, ārūpya-* and *ati-tṛṣṇā,* e — B — 5 sq.) has never been met with; it is impossible to guess how the interpolator got this triad together. We have already examined the explanation of Rūpa in Nāmarūpāṅga; the rest of the definition of Nāmarūpa is also full of mistakes: it would be completely incomprehensible if we did not have other versions of the same definition at our disposal [182]). In addition, the entire passage contains all sorts of mistakes against grammar and sandhi rules. It is not probable that the text of this passage is based on any authorized source. It should rather be considered an addition due to some pious monk, perhaps to the copyist himself. Such an addition was possible, because the

---

[178]) According to the Abhidharma definitions, Rūpa (in Nāmarūpāṅga) comprises the five sense organs *(indriya),* their five particular spheres of activity *(viṣaya),* and, according to the Sarvāstivādins, *avijñapti;* cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* I, pp. 20 sqq.; Stcherbatskij, *Central Conception, passim.* This Rūpa notion may be translated by „matter"; according to the etymology *rūpyateti rūpaṃ, bādhyata ity arthaḥ,* it is characterized by 'resistance'. *Rūpa* in Rūpāyatana, however, is the 'external' *āyatana* which is the object of the 'internal' *cakṣurāyatana,* i.e. everything which may be observed by the eye *(Abhidh. Koça,* I, p. 16).

[179]) *Ibidem,* I, pp. 23 sqq.

[180]) *Abhidh. Koça,* I, pp. 16 sq.

[181]) It seems that the three kinds of *manaḥsaṃsparça* (agreeable, disagreeable or neutral) were not comprised in the total. The form *sparçāni,* no other example of which is known, is probably only due to poor knowledge of Sanskrit grammar.

[182]) For the details, the reader is referred to the notes to the transcription and the translation.

first part of the Upadeça ended in line 7 of the front side of plate e, and its second part should begin on a new plate. It would have been a pity to leave such a large portion of the precious metal empty [183]. Therefore, the pious monk thought it a good idea to repeat some of the important points in a slightly different form; although the idea was certainly good, the result was very unsatisfactory.

Similar considerations might account for another insertion in our text, viz. the passage from h — A — 2 (after the punctuation mark) to the end (h — B — 3). The latter passage is not even considered to have been pronounced by the Bhagavat, since the lines immediately preceding contain the usual final formula of Buddhist Sūtras. Here, too, the copyist (or whoever it was) may be supposed to have grasped the opportunity of adding a few details of his own on a portion of the plate which would otherwise have been left empty. This passage begins suddenly with the statement that there are four continents (dvīpa), which are enumerated in due order, but with several mistakes. Then follow similar enumerations of the heavens and hells. These lists end with the strange conclusion that all the above is called Attachment to pleasure (kāmopādāna). Presumably, the author intended to argue that the term kāmopādāna means „Attachment to the Kāmadhātu in its twentyfold aspect" (i.e. viṃçatividhakāmadhātū-pādāna). According to the Buddhist point of view, this cannot be correct : attachment to some of the Kāmadhātu divisions, such as animal existence or Avīcinaraka, is not easy to imagine. As a matter of fact, Kāmopādāna is taken to refer to the five kinds of objects which may afford pleasure (pañcakāmaguṇāḥ) in all our sources.

After this explanation of Kāmopādāna, the author procedes to a similar analysis of dṛṣṭyupādāna; he there mentions, among other points, the famous twentyfold division of satkāyadṛṣṭi. Two other dṛṣṭis are also analyzed (viz. antagrāha- and mithyā-dṛṣṭi), but the account is very confused [184]. The final sentence of our text is hardly comprehensible : it must have been composed by somebody who had not the least idea of Sanskrit grammar, although he knew the words [185].

In spite of the clumsyness of the additional passage, there is one point which might deserve attention. The addition might convey an idea of what the writer of the additional passage considered the implicit conclusion of our text. As we have seen above, the discourse of the Bhagavat ends with

---

183) It is not probable that the addition should be attributed to *horror vacui*; not only would such considerations hardly be fitting to a Çūnyavādin, but they also would not explain why the plate h — B was inscribed up to the third line only.

184) Thus, *antagrāha* is considered threefold; such a division is not only unknown, but also very suspect: the two extremes (in the strict sense of the word there cannot be more than two *antas*) touch upon the very essence of Buddhism defined as the Madhyamā Pratipad. We do not understand what the interpolator could have meant by his definition of *mithyādṛṣṭi*; it hardly seems worthwhile to try to explain it.

185) Cf. note 120 to the Transcription.

an argument in which the origin of Suffering is traced back to Upādāna as its principal agent. The foundation of this argument is implied in one of the introductory Çlokas, in which it is stated that he who is free from Attachment sees Existence as it really is, so that for him the Path leading to Final Liberation will no longer be obstructed. Possibly, the copyist did not think this line of argument sufficiently clear for his readers. In order to help them, he tried to give this additional explanation. If we know Attachment to be the principal agent of Suffering, it is essential to know what exactly this Attachment amounts to. Although this point was treated several times in the Vibhaṅga and Upadeça texts, the copyist did not think it useless to analyze this important notion again. He rightly noticed that not all aspects of Upādāna were equally bad. Of course, Satkāyadrṣṭi is a great hindrance to Final Liberation; it certainly is a wrong view, but if it is accompanied by much good Karman, as may be the case in non-Buddhist doctrines, it may even lead to existence in some of the heavenly spheres. It is nothing compared to Mithyādrṣṭi, the view of those who assert that the Mārga is not a Mārga at all, that the Dharma is not a Dharma. This view is the worst obstruction; it must be eradicated by all possible means.

Since Mithyādrṣṭi is essentially the view of those who are hostile to Buddhism, the insistence on this point might indicate a special tendency of the text as it was conceived by the person who added the passage at the end of the text. It would be an exaggeration to use the term 'missionary' in this connection, but it would certainly come near to the truth.

At the end of this Introduction, we briefly refer to two points of obvious interest: the sources of our text and the possible reasons why it was engraved on our gold plates; both questions are now capable of being partially answered.

The sources of the Sūtra, of the Vibhaṅga and of the separate strophes engraved in the plates *i* and *j* have been treated in detail [186]; we limit ourselves to the Upadeça. As we pointed out above, this 'Instruction' is based on three Çlokas the reconstruction of which was attempted in the preceding pages. With the limited sources at our disposal, it was impossible to trace the strophes, but we could arrive at a probable conclusion as to the type of Buddhism to which they belong: the references to the *taimirika*, to the Refuge in the „completely *nirvāṇed* Bhagavat" and to the division of the Pratītyasamutpāda in an 'internal' and an 'external' series, make it probable that the main part of the text belongs to Mahāyāna and there being not the least allusion to any of the characteristic tenets of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda School, it should be attributed to either the Mādhyamika School or a type of early Mahāyāna reasonably near to it [187].

---

[186] *Supra*, pp. 57 — 70.

[187] Whereas the Mādhyamikas appear to have followed the Sarvāstivādins in all or nearly all of the details of the Pratītyasamutpāda and of the *dharma* classifications in general (although they considered it to belong to the domain of relative Truth to be necessarily abandoned later on by the vision of the highest Truth), the Yogācārins introduced

With reference to the latter point, it might not be devoid of interest to refer the reader to a definite proof of early influence of Mādhyamika ideas in the Indonesian world. Among the important discoveries in the neighbourhood of Kĕdah (Malaya) [188], there is a small clay tablet inscribed with three Çlokas which all have been traced in the Sāgaramatipariprcchā [189]. The type of script used there corresponds rather closely to that of the more archaically written portions of our text. Quaritch Wales assigned it to „not later than early VIth century A. D." [190]. This date might be too early; the forms of most of the aksaras agree with those found in the Çrīvijaya inscriptions from the end of the seventh century A. D. The form of the *la* (in *balāni*, line 1) agrees however with the more archaic type of the aksara which occurs in our plates. In either case, the text was probably copied from some existing and presumably much older manuscript. It may not be due to mere chance that the clay tablet from Kĕdah is inscribed with three Anuṣṭubh strophes, whereas on our gold plates there are three strophes in the same metre, too. Only in our case, the strophes are followed by a lengthy prose text based thereon. It is moreover evident that the two sets of three strophes belong to a very cognate sphere of thought. The parallel

---

very important changes: the total number of *dharmas* was increased to a hundred (cf. the comparison between the Sarvāstivādin and Yogācārin lists of *dharmas* in *Muséon*, 6, 1905, pp. 178 sqq.) and important new notions (such as *ālayavijñāna* and other sorts of *vijñāna*, also new divisions of the Pratītyasamutpāda chain) were introduced; no traces of this development appear in our text.

[188] H. G. Quaritch Wales, *Archaeological Researches*, *Journ. Malay Br. R. A. S.*, 18, Part II, 1940, pp. 1 — 85.

[189] The strophes were identified by Lin Li-kouang. Prof. Johnston (quoted *art. cit.*, p. 9) rightly took offence at *svabhavān* in line 4, but this difficulty is probably due to a lapse in the transcription, for on the photograph (*ibidem*, plate 8) we read: *yā svabhāvā na vidyante na teṣāṃ sambhavaḥ kvacit*, i.e. „there could nowhere be any (possibility of) arising for those 'realities' which do not even exist". The first thesis is that the *dharmas* which arise in dependence (on other *dharmas*) cannot have any existence of their own (*svabhāva*). Having no independent existence, they cannot even originate, — a line of thought familiar in Mādhyamika.

[190] *Art. cit.*, p. 10; cf. the opinion expressed by Dr Chakravarti quoted on p. 9, where the conclusion „in any case much earlier than the dated seventh century Sumatran inscriptions" is added (i.e. the dated Çrīvijaya inscriptions which, however, belong to the end of the seventh century). We think that the differences from the latter should not be exaggerated; the two types of script agree rather closely and the only real difference is the curious form of the *la*, which is however common in seventh century inscriptions (cf. *supra*, p. 50). The agreement with the Çrīvijaya inscriptions is the more striking if one compares also the Pūrṇavarman inscriptions which are usually dated about in the middle of the fifth century. The differences from the latter are far more pronounced, especially for the *na*, the *ka*, the *la* and the *bha*. The script of the Kĕdah tablet agrees with that of the Tuk Mas inscription from Java and some dated inscriptions from Indochina which were quoted on p. 50. If we allow about half a century's difference from the dated Çrīvijaya inscriptions, we arrive about in the same period as the Indochinese inscriptions mentioned and, at the same time, we remain at a respectable distance from the Pūrṇavarman inscriptions. For these reasons, we consider the first half of the 7th century the most probable conjecture

ls very interesting, although the correspondence seems too vague to allow any conclusions based thereon [191]). An essential condition to arrive any further is the possibility of tracing the strophes mentioned in our text, as it was possible in the case of the clay tablet from Kĕdah.

With reference to the second of the questions posed above, the reason why and the time when a number of different texts (and even drawings) were combined and engraved in a number of gold plates, we may take up a line of argument already referred to several times. The use of the pure and precious metal, which is not an excellent writing material, makes it probable that the plates were inscribed to constitute a deposit in a religious foundation such as a *stūpa.* Fundamental portions of the Dharma, which in Mahāyāna is often conceived of as the most universal of the bodies of a Buddha, gradually took the place of relics in older times ; relics not only became very rare, but they also were nothing but the poor and perishable remains of an only apparitional body in which a Mahāyānist should not take refuge [192]). The Dharma, however, especially the eternal laws of origination and decay explained by the *pratītyasamutpāda* theory, was not only considered unperishable but also universal.

If then the size and value of the deposit were in some relation with the importance of the foundation. which is a reasonable presumption, our plates must have belonged to one of the large Buddhist temples in Indonesia. Long before the inauguration of the sanctuary, a clever monk was charged with copying a number of texts to be chosen by himself, but necessarily treating of Dependent Origination and related subjects, in a

---

[191]) A close examination shows further points of agreement. A typical point is that in both cases the first Çloka is a numerical one, referring to numbers of categories (in our text the divisions of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula ; in the Kĕdah tablet, the *balas, vaiçāradyas* and *āveṇikadharmas*), whereas the second and, still more, the third Çlokas draw conclusions in view of the acquisition of perfect knowledge (*ataimirika* in our text, *tasya koṭīṃ gataṃ jñānaṃ* in the Kĕdah tablet). As we have noted above, the Kĕdah strophes could be traced ; ncw the curious point is that the three strophes do not follow each other in the Sāgaramatiparipṛcchā from where they were probably taken („the first verse after the other two with some verses in between". *art. cit., p. 9*). There is no reason to conclude to a different version of the text ; the above considerations could account satisfactorily for the order in which the strophes were reproduced on the clay tablet : just as in our text, there may have been a definite reason to start with a Çloka referring to categories and to continue with two Çlokas in which the difficult problems of Çūnyatā and perfect wisdom are touched upon. Such a reason might be discovered if we presume that also the Kĕdah strophes were to be used as the basis of a Upadeça. Then we get a kind of 'progressive' instruction. The exposition of the supernatural forces, assurances and independent *dharmas,* provided with adequate explanations, would be an excellent means to introduce a supposed pupil into the material needed for an exposition of the difficult problems of Mahāyāna metaphysics. If this assumption based on the order of the strophes is correct, the correspondence with the text on our gold plates goes much further than it would seem at first. It would be very interesting to know whether there exist more examples where three strophes quoted from an authoritative Mahāyāna text were used as the basis for instruction.

[192]) Cf. the study by De la Vallée Poussin quoted in note 141 above.

set of gold plates especially prepared to that purpose. This monk, whom we designate by the term "copyist" although he did much more than copying alone, was rather free in his choice: he was allowed to take whatever texts were at his disposal, provided that they treated of the subject just mentioned. The 'copyist' did his work as could have been expected in those circumstances; he chose the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra with its Vibhaṅga in the version he disposed of (which, as we pointed out above, probably belonged to the Sarvāstivādin School and might have been brought to Indonesia by Guṇavarman in the fifth century A. D.). He managed to engrave the complete texts of the Sūtra and the Vibhaṅga in two of the eight large-sized plates at his disposal. For the remaining six large plates, he chose the text of an Upadeça, which was at his disposal. The latter was a prose text of considerable length, based on three (or more) Çlokas treating of some special aspects of the deeper meaning of Dependent Origination. This Upadeça may have been a lengthy text, but this was not an objection: the monk limited himself to those portions which he thought particularly important for his purpose, viz. the portion in which it is explained how the twelve links of Dependent Origination are single, twofold, threefold etc., and that which traced the ultimate cause of Phenomenal Existence back to Upādāna. It is probable that these two portions did not follow each other in the original Upadeça text; the copyist therefore preferred to begin his second extract on a new plate (our letter f). This second extract ended in the second line of the eighth large-sized plate. This method of engraving left two portions of the gold plates blank; the copyist, considering it a pity not to make use of this occasion, filled these portions in with two clumsy interpolations, which may have been composed by the copyist himself. Not considering these two passages, the Upadeça is certainly not clumsy, but it is rather schclastic; it was undoubtedly intended to be used by those „children, ignorant and crdinary people" (g — A — 4 to 5) who were likely to attach themselves to sensual pleasures and the like. Endless repetitions and the suspension of sandhi rules wherever there would be the least chance of misunderstanding were considered excellent means to instruct the ignorant [193]). As we tried to point out above, the Upadeça probably belongs to (early) Mahāyāna and sometimes is in direct conflict with the Vibhaṅga text [194]), but the copyist did not consider this point a serious objection against combining them: his resources may have been limited and the essential point was that the texts should be considered sufficienly authoritative

---

[193]) The contradictions to be mentioned in note 194 below, would be confusing, but they were not due to the original texts used for instruction, but to their combination on the gold plates.

[194]) The most obvious detail is the different divison of Jāti in the Vibhaṅga (b — A — 1 to 3) and in the Upadeça (g — A — 10 to B — 1); we also noted that the division of the Saṃskāras in the Vibhaṅga (a — B — 2) and in the Upadeça (f — B — 1 to 8) do not agree; the Vibhaṅga analysis is considered a subdivision of a different analysis in the Upadeça. There are some minor points, too.

to serve as a deposit in an important foundation. If we knew the foundation for which the plates were intended, the latter might be much more important than they are now. Nevertheless, their importance should not be underestimated even with the scarce data at our disposal. Not only does our Vibhaṅga version give us some badly wanted additional data about the history of a part of the Sanskrit canon, but the Upadeça, although not particularly interesting for the ideas explained therein, gives us some idea about how Buddhism was taught and studied in the countries of the "Southern Seas", and this is a point of an obvious interest, since it may indirectly help us in arriving at a full understanding of the Buddhist monuments.

Before proceeding to the text and translation, we express our regret of not having some of the publications at our disposal which would have made the interpretation of the text more satisfactory [195].

Transcription

a

A. 1. // [1] evam=mayā çrutam=ekasmin=samaye bhagavāñ=chrāvastyāṃ
<vi>harati [2] sma jetavane anāthapiṇḍa<da>syārāme tatra bha-
gavāṃs=tān=āma<n>trayati [3] sma bhikṣavo

---

[195] We especially regret not having been able to use L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Théorie des douze causes,* Univ. de Gand, Rec. No. 40, 1913 ; Nyanatiloka, *Paticca Samuppāda,* Calcutta, 1934 ; ard V. Gokhale, *Ullaṅgha's Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra,* Bonn, 1930.

[1] Instead of the double dash, C reads : *siddham,* G : *namaḥ.* — In the notes to the transcription, the following abbreviations are used :

    C — the Nālandā bricks the transcription of which was published by Chakravarti ; cf. note 39 to the Introduction.

    G — the Nālandā brick published by Ghosh ; cf. *ibidem.*

    Chinese version — the Chinese version of the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga translated by Bagchi ; cf. note 42 to the Introduction.

    P — the Kasiā copper plate published by Pargiter ; cf. note 39 to the Introduction.

[2] All the other texts read *viharati,* which moreover is evident. — It is remarkable that just the initial part of the text is full of mistakes. On the first plate, there are almost as many lapses as on all the other plates together. Presumably, the beginning of the manuscript from which the text is supposed to have been copied was in a rather bad state of preservation. It is obvious that the copyist cannot have understood much of the text he copied ; omissions are relatively very frequent (cf. the Introduction).

[3] Instead of *tān,* G reads *bhikṣūn,* C, however, *bhikṣūnām.* The Sūtra text on which Vasubandhu wrote his commentary (cf. note 43 to the Introduction) appears to have read *bhikṣūn,* too. — In the form in which the text is given here, *tān* cannot be correct ; it cannot be clear from the context to whom it refers. There are two possibilities : either the copyist has omitted a small passage in which it was stated that the Bhagavat, when abiding in the Jetavana, was surrounded by monks (as is the case in the other versions), or the copyist might have put down *tān* instead of the *bhikṣūn* of his original. The latter possibility is not probable from a palaeographic point of view.

2. āmantrayati <ta>smin pratyaçrokṣur [4]) bhagavāṃs=tān=idam=
avocat [5]) pratītyasamutpādasyādiṃ bhikṣavaḥ ādiñ=cādeçayiṣye [6])
çṛṇu-

3. ta [7]) sādhu ca suṣṭu [8]) ca manasiku<ruta> [9]) // bhāsiṣye pratītya-
samutpādasyādiḥ katamaḥ yad=utāsmin=sati bhavatīdam=ucyate
yathāvat [10]) avi-

4. dyāpratyayās=saṃskārāḥ saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānaṃ vijñānapra-
tyayaṃ <nāmarūpaṃ nāmarūpapratyayaṃ> [11]) ṣaḍāyatanam ṣaḍā-
yatanapratyayaḥ sparçaḥ sparçapratyayā

5. vedanā vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā tṛṣṇāpratyayam=upādānaṃ upādāna-
pratyayo bhavaḥ bhavapratyayā jātir=jātipratyayaṃ jarāmaraṇapa-
ridevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyā-

6. saṃ [12]) sambhavati evam=asya ke<va>lasya [13]) mahato duḥkha-
skandhasya samudayo bhavati ayam=ucyate pratītyasamutpadasyā-
diḥ [14]) vibhaṅgaḥ [15]) avidyāpratyayāḥ

---

[4]) Read: *pratyaçrauṣur.* The form given in our text may be due to analogy (association
with *adrākṣur ?*). — The words *bhikṣavo* ..... *pratyaçrauṣur* do not occur in the
other versions known. The form *bhikṣavo* is a breach of sandhi; it is however possible
that the sandhi is correct, but that between *bhikṣavo* and *āmantrayati,* a word
was omitted.

[5]) *Bhagavāṃs* ..... *avocat,* omitted by C and G.

[6]) C reads: *ādiṃ vo deçayiṣyāmi vibhaṅgaṃ ca;* the repetition of *ādi* cannot be correct
in our text. Since it is not probable that the copyist should have replaced *vibhaṅgañca*
in his original by *ādiñca,* one might consider the possibility that the original read
arthañca; from a palaeographic point of view, *ādiñca* and *arthañca* resemble each
other very much.

[7]) C reads: *tac=chṛṇuta.*

[8]) Read: *suṣṭhu.*

[9]) *Manasikuruta* occurs in all the versions. — In G, the following portion is introduced
in quite a special way, i.e. as *dharmāṇām ācayaḥ* and *apacayaḥ,* referring to the
Samudaya and to the Nirodha portions, respectively; cf. the Introduction.

[10]) C and G read: *yad uta,* probably the correct form; as a matter of fact, it occurs
also in Vasubandhu's commentary and in the Pāli and Prākrit versions. Also the Chinese
translation seems to be based on *yad uta;* at least, there does not occur any equivalent
of *yathāvat.*

[11]) The whole *nāmarūpa* link was omitted by the copyist. Although versions of the
Pratītyasamutpāda formula in which all the Aṅgas are not enumerated do occur (in
the Pāli canon; cf. Von Glasenapp, *art. cit.*), there is no reason to consider the
possibility of a Pratītyasamutpāda version without *nāmarūpāṅga;* everywhere else
in our text, this link is mentioned regularly.

[12]) All texts read *çoka* between *maraṇa* and *parideva.* Here again, there is hardly any
doubt that the term was omitted by the copyist, as is seen *infra* in e — A — 7 and
g — B — 2 sq., where *çoka* is mentioned in its usual place.
Usually, the whole compound is put in the plural (*jātipratyayā jarāmaraṇaçokaparide-
vaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsāḥ samudbhavanti;* cf. *Vyākhyā* quoted *Abhidh. Koça,* III,
p. 84; *Daçasāhasrikā* § 5, ed. S. Konow, p. 96 and p. 14; *Çālistambha,* quoted
Çikṣāsamuccaya, p. 222; De la Vallée Poussin, *Théorie des douze Causes,* pp. 31 sq.).

[13]) All texts: *kevalasya.*

[14]) G: *ayam ucyate dharmāṇām ācayaḥ;* cf. *supra,* note 9.

[15]) C: *vibhaṅgaḥ katamaḥ;* the second term is almost indispensable.

7. saṃskārā iti avidyā katamā yattat=pūrvvānte ajñānaṃ aparānte
ajñānaṃ pūrvvāparānte ajñānaṃ āddhyātmany=ajñānaṃ [16]) vāhye

8. ajñānaṃ karmmaṇy=ajñānaṃ karmmavipāke ajñānaṃ [17]) vuddhe
ajñānaṃ dharmme ajñānaṃ saṃghe ajñānaṃ duḥkhasamudayaniro-

9. dha<mārggeṣv> [18]) ajñānaṃ heto [19]) ajñānaṃ hetusamutpanneṣu
dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṃ pratītyasamutpāde ajñānaṃ [20]) kuçaleṣu dhar-
meṣv=ajñānaṃ akuça-

10. leṣu dharmeṣv=ajñānaṃ kuçalākuçaleṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṃ [21])
sāvadyeṣu dharmeṣv=ajñānaṃ anavadyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṃ
sāvady<ānavadyeṣu> [22]) dharmeṣv=a-

11. jñānaṃ asevitavyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṃ sevitavyeṣu dharmeṣv=
ajñānaṃ ṣaṭsu vā sparçāyataneṣu yat=tatra teṣu [23])

B. 1. ajñānam=anabhisamayaḥ tamas=sammohaḥ avidyāndhakāram=iyam
=ucyate avidyā avidyāpratyayā bhikṣavaḥ

2. saṃskārā iti katame saṃskārāḥ trayas=saṃskārāḥ <kāyasaṃskā-
rāḥ> vāksaṃskārāḥ manassaṃskārāḥ [24]) idam=ucyate saṃskārāḥ

3. [sa] [25]) saṃskārapratyayaṃ bhikṣavo vijñānam=iti vijñānaṃ katamat
ṣaḍvijñānakāyāḥ cakṣurvijñānaṃ çrotra-

4. vijñānaṃ ghrāṇavijñānaṃ jihvāvijñānaṃ kāyavijñānaṃ manovijñānaṃ
ity=ucyate vijñānaṃ vijñāna-

---

[16]) Read: *adhyātmany ajñānaṃ*. The vṛddhi of the form in our text is probably due
to the confusion with *ādhyātmikam*. C, however, reads: *adhyātmam*. The latter version
gives also *vahirddhā* instead of *vāhye*. — In the portion which now follows, the
text of C differs considerably from our version; instead of the continuous repetition
of *ajñānam* with each term, the former brings a number of terms together into
compounds. These differences will not be noted here in detail. There are, however,
also some differences which are more substantial; cf. the Introduction, *supra*, pp. 65 sqq.

[17]) C reads: *vipāke ajñānaṃ* (between *karmmaṇy=ajñānaṃ* and *karmmavipāke ajñānaṃ*).
This term is rather superfluous, since *vipāka* is always *karmavipāka* in this context.

[18]) It is obvious that the last term, *mārga*, which is indispensable, was omitted by the copyist.

[19]) Read: *hetau*, or, with sandhi, *hetāv*. In Sanskrit texts from Indonesia, *au* is almost
always replaced by *o*. In our text, however, *au* does occur in a few cases (f — B — 7
and h — A — 4).

[20]) In C, *pratītyasamutpāde ajñānaṃ* is not mentioned. As a matter of fact, it is nothing
but a repetition of the preceding terms.

[21]) Here, our text is a little more detailed than C. Instead of *kuçaleṣu ..... akuçaleṣu .....
kuçalākuçaleṣu*, C mentions the last item only. The Madhyamāgama, quoted in the
Vyākhyā to the Abhidharmakoça (*vide Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 92, note 1) mentions
three terms, too, but replaces *kuçalākuçaleṣu* by *avyākṛteṣu*.

[22]) This correction seems obvious, since *sāvadyeṣu* was already mentioned before.

[23]) After *sparçāyataneṣu*, C adds: *yathābhūtasamprativedhe*, which is also reproduced in
the Chinese translation (Bagchi: „it is nescience in the insight into real nature
of things").

[24]) The first of these three groups of *saṃskāras* was evidently omitted by the copyist.
In C the singular (°*raḥ*) is used for each of the three groups.

[25]) Probably due to diplography.

5. pratyayaṃ bhikṣavo nāmarūpam=iti nāmarūpaṃ katamat [26]) catvāraḥ arūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ vedanāskandhaḥ

6. saṃskāraskandhaḥ saṃjñāskandhaḥ vijñānaskandhaḥ idam=ucyate nāma rūpam=iti nāmarūpayor=iti [27])

7. yat=kiñci [28]) rūpaḥ [29]) sarvvan=tañ=catvāri mahābhūtāni catvāri ca mahābhūtāny=upādāya ca rūpam=iti cai-

8. tac=ca rūpaṃ pūrvvakañ=ca rūpaṃ [30]) tad=ubhayam nāmarūpam= ity=ucyate nāmarūpam=iti // <nāma>rūpapratyayaṃ [31])

---

[26]) C reads: *nāma katamat,* which was probably the reading on which the Chinese version was also based. Our reading may be preferred, it being probable that the monks would have asked the meaning of the entire term such as it occurs in the *pratītyasamut-pāda* formula. The Bhagavat then replies by first defining *nāman* and *rūpa* separately, and concluding with the statement that the two notions, such as they were defined before, together constitute *nāmarūpáṅga.*

[27]) *Nāmarūpayor=iti,* omitted by C and the Chinese version. These words are not entirely superfluous, since Rūpa included in *nāmarūpáṅga* is not identical with the Rūpa implied, for instance, in Rūpāyatana or in Dharmāyatana, referring to visible matter and *avijñapti* respectively.

[28]) C reads: *kiṃcid,* the correct Sanskrit form. In older Buddhist Sanskrit, the final dental is usually dropped in words like this one. In the Çrīvijaya inscription discussed before, the form *kadāci* instead of *kadācit* occurs many times; cf. *supra* note 5 to the Introduction to No. II.

[29]) Read: *rūpaṃ,* the correct Sanskrit form. The form *rūpaḥ* cannot however be due to a mere lapse by the scribe, for the text continues with *sarvvan=tañ (catvāri)* instead of *sarvvan=tac (catvāri).* Confusion between the grammatical genders, especially between masculine and neutʒr, is very common in older Buddhist Sanskrit; cf. C. Bendall, *Çikṣāsamuccaya, Bibl. Buddh.,* I (1902), *Introduction,* p. XV; a number of examples occur in Açvaghoṣa (cf. E. H. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita,* II, 1936, *Introduction,* p. lxix). A strange example occurs in this text, *infra* e — B — 4, viz. the plural *sparçāni* instead of *sparçāh;* the laʇter example occurs in a rather suspect portion of our text and is perhaps a mistake only. Everywhere else in cur text, *sparça* has its usual gender. Cf. also *puṣpaḥ* instead of *puṣpam, infra* c — B — 10.

[30]) Probably an error for *nāma,* which is the reading in C. In the other versions of the Nāmarūpa definition (cf. note 130 to the Translation), the wording of the end of the formula is too different to make a close comparison possible, but *nāma* is also required for the meaning of the definition. It is obvious that *rūpaṃ* in our text is not a mere lapse by the copyist, but rather an error due to the misunderstanding of the definition; as a matter of fact, two kinds of *rūpa (bhūta* and *bhautika)* were mentioned just before, and the copyist therefore concluded that there should have been a statement that both the former and the latter constitute *rūpa;* he probably did not notice that the end of the definition should also be changed in that case. The reason for the repetition of *nāmarūpam=iti* might be connected with the change of *nāma* to *rūpaṃ* mentioned above; before the conclusion that the whole of the above constituted *nāma-rūpaṃ,* he missed something about the two kinds of *rūpa* to be comprised into Rūpa; if he had been consistent, he would have changed the first *nāmarūpam* (in line 8) to *rūpam,* but he did not go as far as that. Cf. also note 31.

[31]) The omission of *nāma* may be nothing but a lapse; it is not however impossible that it is a mistake connected with the wrong interpretation mentioned in note 30 (owing to the two kinds of *rūpa* mentioned there ?).

b

A. 1. bhikṣavaḥ ṣaḍāyatanam=iti ṣaḍāyatanaṃ katamat ṣaḍ=ādhyātmi-
kāny=āyatanāni cakṣu<ḥ>çrotraghrāṇa-

2. jihvākāyamanāṃsy=ādhyātmikāni idam=ucyate ṣaḍāyatanaṃ [ka-
tamat] ³²) ṣaḍāyatanapratyayo

3. bhikṣavaḥ sparça iti sparçaḥ katamaḥ ṣaṭ=sparçakāyāḥ cakṣus-
saṃsparçaḥ çrotrasaṃsparçaḥ ghrāṇajihvā-

4. kāyamanassaṃsparçaḥ ayam=ucyate sparçaḥ / / sparçapratyayā
bhikṣavo vedanā iti vedanā katamā

5. tisro vedanā<ḥ> sukhavedanā duḥkhavedanā aduḥkhāsukhavedanā
iyam=ucyate vedanā // vedanā-

6. pratyayā bhikṣavaḥ tṛṣṇā iti tṛṣṇā katamā tisraḥ <tṛṣṇāḥ> kāma-
tṛṣṇā bhavatṛṣṇā vibhavatṛṣṇā iyam=ucyate <tṛṣṇā> ³³)

7. tṛṣṇāpratyayaṃ bhikṣavaḥ upādānam=iti upādānaṃ katamat ca-
tvāry=upādānāni kāmopādānaṃ dṛṣṭyo-

8. pādānaṃ ³⁴) çīlavratopādānam ātmavādopādānam=ity=ucyate upā-
dānam // upādānapratyayo

9. bhikṣavo bhava iti bhavaḥ katamaḥ trayo bhavāḥ kāmabhavaḥ rūpa-
bhavaḥ ārūpyabhavaḥ ayam=ucya-

B. 1. te bhavaḥ bhavapratyayā bhikṣavo jātir=iti jātiḥ katamā yattat
teṣāṃ satvānāṃ tasmin=tasmin satvanikāye

2. jātiḥ saṃ[jñā]jātiḥ ³⁵) avakrāntiḥ abhinirvṛttiḥ skandhapratilābho
dhātupratilābhaḥ āya<ta>napratilā-

3. bhaḥ skandhābhinirvṛttiḥ jīvitendriyaprādurbhāvaḥ iyam=ucyate
jātiḥ // jātipratyayaṃ bhikṣavo jarāma-

4. raṇam=iti tatra jarā katamā yat ⁸⁶) khalatatvaṃ ⁸⁷) valita-

---

³²) This term may be due to the fact of the copyist looking at the line above, where ṣaḍā-
yatanaṃ is followed by katamat.

³³) The omissions of tṛṣṇā are easily explained by the frequent repetitions of the word. This
very term should have occurred no less than eight times in line 6 (and the first word
of line 7).

³⁴) Read: dṛṣṭyupādānam; the o is undoubtedly due to analogy with the other kinds of
Upādāna.

³⁵) C (and all the other comparable texts) : saṃjātiḥ, undoubtedly the correct form (saṃjñā
belongs to a later stage ; it is included in skandhapratilābho). Probably, the original
used by the copyist read saṃjātiḥ, which was misunderstood and considered a mistake
for saṃjñājātiḥ, a combination of two well-known terms.

³⁶) C : yattat.

³⁷) This term and the next one are certainly not correct in the form given on the plate. It
seems however very difficult to determine the original reading, as the textual tradition
is rather uncertain. C reads khālatyam, which seems to be the most probable form ;
a quotation from the Madhyamāgama in the Spuṭārtha, commentary to the Abhidhar-
makoça (Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 88, note 3), reads khālityaṃ, whereas the Pāli versions
in Aṅguttara, I, p. 138, and Visuddhi, p. 449, have a different term at this place, viz.
khaṇḍiccaṃ („the state of being broken, of teeth", Rhys Davids). We presume that our
copyist, reading khālatyam in his original, assumed a mistake in the ending tyaṃ and
substituted the well-known tatvam. — The other versions of this passage cannot well

tvaṃ [38]) valipracu<ra>tā jī<rṇatā> [39]) bhugnatā kubjatā [40])
gopānasīvaṅkatā

5. daṇḍaviṣkambhanatā purataḥ prāgbhārakāyatā tilakādikagātratā [41])
mandatvaṃ andhatvaṃ hāniḥ parihā-

6. niḥ indriyāṇāṃ paripākaḥ paribhedaḥ saṃskārāṇāṃ purāṇībhāvaḥ
jarjarībhāvaḥ ayam=ucyate

7. jarā [42]) maraṇaṃ katamat yat=teṣān=teṣāṃ satvānāṃ tasmāt=
tasmāt satvanikāyacyutiḥ cyavanatābhedaḥ [43])

8. antahāniḥ [44]) āyuṣo hāniḥ [45]) jīvitendriyanirodhaḥ saṃskārāṇāṃ
nikṣepo maraṇakālakṣaya [46])

---

be compared. The Chinese version translated by Bagchi is difficult to be used because the order of the terms has been changed there. The Lalitavistara, describing the Bodhisattva's encounter with a old man (edition Lefmann, 1902, p. 186), is clearly based on the Vibhaṅga terms, but is not literal enough for a comparison; cf. the notes to the translation of this passage.

[38]) *Valitatvaṃ*, though not completely impossible (it could be explained as *vali*, „wrinkles" +*tatva*, „truth, reality"), is not likely since it would be duplicated by the next term. We suppose *pālityam*, which is the reading of C and of the Madhyama quotation in the Abhidharmakoçavyākhyā mentioned in note 37.

[39]) The correction of *pracutā* to *pracuratā* is evident. — The correction of *jī* to *jīrṇatā* seems rather far--fetched; it is however not doubtful since all comparable versions (including the Pāli definition in *Dīgha*, II, p. 305, which has *jīraṇatā*) give the same term here. Besides, the omission of one or more akṣaras is the most common mistake found in our text.

[40]) In C, *kubjatā* is not a term by itself, but *kubja°* is compounded with the following. The Chinese version seems to agree with our text (Bagchi translated: „hunchbackedness, .crookedness", corresponding to *bhugnatā kubjatā*).

[41]) C reads; *tilakālakācitagātratā*, probably the original reading. Other texts give slightly different forms; cf. note 63 to the translation.

[42]) After the term mentioned in note 41, C agrees almost completely with our text, except that it gives *dhandhatvaṃ* instead of our *andhatvaṃ*; on account of considerations exposed in note 64 to the translation, we presume that the reading of C was the original one. Besides, C has an additional term at the end, viz. *khulakhulapraçvāsakāyatā*, „shortness of breath" (a colourless translation if compared with the expressive Sanskrit compound). The latter term does not occur in the Chinese translation either.

[43]) *Cyavanataḥ bhedaḥ*, „after breaking up, cleavage". Since *cyavana* and *bheda* would be synonyms in that case, and it is not clear why *cyavana* should be a process preceding *bheda*, the reading of our plates is more satisfactory. The Chinese translation runs (in Bagchi's translation): „(death is) complete dissolution and cessation from existence", which might correspond to *cyavanatā bhedaḥ* if we presume that the second term has been translated rather freely. — However, *bheda*, in Buddhist Sanskrit, rather often means: „special form of (something more general)"; cf. *infra* note 105 to the Translation. Then, *cyavanatābhedaḥ* should be taken as a single compound meaning „a special form of decay", which seems preferable to the Chinese interpretation.

[44]) C: *antarahāniḥ*, „interior exhaustion", presumably, exhaustion of the internal organs such as the heart; our reading *antahāniḥ* could however be maintained if this term may be interpreted as „ultimate (final, irreparable) exhaustion"; it would then be more characteristic of death than *antarahāni*.

[45]) C adds *ūṣmaṇo hāniḥ* after *āyuṣo hāniḥ*.

[46]) C reads: *maraṇaṃ kālakriyā;* the Chinese version gives: „death is the arresting of the product of time", probably rather a free translation of the same. The main objection

9. idam=ucyate maraṇaṃ [etad=] etac=ca [47]) maraṇaṃ pūrvvikā ca
   jarā tad=ubhayañ=jarāmaraṇam ity=ucyate pratī-
10. tyasamutpādasyādiḥ vibhāgaḥ katamaḥ pratītyasamutpādasya vo
    bhikṣavaḥ arthañ=cādeçayiṣye [48]) //

c

A. 1. rūpiṇas=sarvvasattvā hi sarvve santu [49]) nirāmanāḥ [50])
      sarvve bhadrāṇi paçyanti mā kaçcit=pāpam=āgamat [50]) //
      ajñānāc=cīyate karma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaḥ

---

to the Chinese version is that it presumes the repetition of *maraṇam* in the definition
itself, which is unusual. On the other hand, our definition, though perfectly clear, does
not add anything new.

[47]) It seems that the copyist first intended to write *etad ca,* but then thought it too
strange to put down *ca* after *etad,* so he repeated the sandhi form after *etad.*

[48]) C ends as follows (after *jarāmaraṇam*) : *ayam=ucyate pratītyasamutpādasya vibhāgaḥ.
pratītyasamutpādasya ādiṃ vo deçayiṣyāmi vibhaṅgañ=ca iti vo yad=uktam=idam=
etat=pratyuktam . idam=avocad=bhagavān=<atta>manasaḥ [s]te bhikṣavo bha-
gavato bhāṣitam=abhyanandann=iti.*
Most of the text of C occurs in our text at the very end of the treatise (h — A — 1/2).
The Chineso text lacks this concluding portion.
This passage may not be without interest for a determination of the relation between
the different versions, cf. the Translation.

[49]) Read : *santi* (?) ; the latter is the reading of j — B — 2. The form *santu* is however
capable of being explained ("they should be". i.e. "they should be considered to be").
Neither *santi* nor *santu* is completely satisfactory; the point just mentioned is only one
of the difficulties in the reading and in the interpretation of this strophe. Cf. note 50.

[50]) The open space at the end of lines 1 to 3 and at the beginning of line 3 does not denote
any lacuna in the text ; it only serves to maintain the metrical divisions. — In spite
of the fact that this whole strophe is repeated on plate j, it seems hardly possible to
establish its correct reading. This is not only due to the careless way of engraving ;
the real cause was probably that the copyist did not understand what he read in the
original and tried to make the best of it he could. Presumably, this strophe, which
precedes two other ones which are well-known from other sources, occurs in Buddhist
literature, though we have not been able to trace it. Before that, any attempt at
reestablishing the correct form of the strophe remains conjectural. — The last word
of the first çloka half is clearly *nirāmanāḥ* ; this form cannot possibly be correct ; the
easiest correction is *nirāmaṇāḥ,* implying a confusion between the dental and lingual na-
sals. This correction would be obvious if j — B — 2 did not give the reading *nirātmikāḥ.*
For the meaning of the strophe, the latter reading is not unsatisfactory ; it is however
difficult to see how in that case the copyist came to put down *nirāmanāḥ,* which is not
very similar from a palaeographic point of view. As a matter of principle, one might
prefer the reading *nirāmaṇāḥ,* which is the *lectio difficilior.* We have then to conclude that
the copyist, of plate j, who may not have been the same person at the scribe who copied
the large plates, substituted the well-known *nirātmikāḥ* for a reading in his original
which he did not understand. The point as to which reading is the correct one is of
an obvious interest. The statement that the beings are *nirātmika* is a common-place
of all Buddhism ; however, if they are stated to be *nirāmaṇa,* there is no reasonable
doubt that the strophe belongs to Mahāyāna. The idea that the factors constituting
a living being are "naturally quiet" *(prakṛtiçānta)* or "originally quiet" *(ādiçānta),*
their continuous movement being only apparent and due to the defilement of those

2. jñānān=na cīyate karma karmābhāvāt na jāyante [51] //
   ye dharmmā hetuprabhavā hetun=teṣān=tathāgata uvāca
   teṣāñ=ca yo nirodhaḥ

3.   evamvādī mahāçrama<na>ḥ [52] //
   ekadvitricatuṣpañcaṣaṭsaptāṣṭanavāṅgajaḥ
   daçaikādaçadhotpannaḥ pratītyaḥ dvādaçaḥ smṛtaḥ //

4. yaḥ kaçcit samyag=avadhāryya pratyayā vaçya<m>parinirvṛte bha-
   gavati çaraṇatrayaṃ yayau [53] upadāna iti ajñāndhakāre-

5. ṣu bhavaty=asāv=atai<mi>rikaç=cakṣuṣmān=iti [54] kiñ=jānāti
   pratītyasamutpādaṃ pratītya iti kothaḥ aṅgam=prati ya utpadyate
   sa pratye-

6. tītyaḥ [55] pratītya sas=tāvat=katividhaḥ samāsataḥ ekavidhaḥ
   sarvvakleçāçrayatvāt pṛthivīvad=iti dvividhaḥ pratītya-

7. samutpādaḥ hetuphalārthena avidyātṛṣṇopādānasaṃskārabhavā iti
   pañcavidhā hetavaḥ vijñānanāmarūpa-

8. ṣaḍāyatanasparçavedanājātijarādir=iti saptavidhaṃ phalam=iti ayan
   =dvividhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ ayam=apy=aparaḥ pratītya-

9. samutpādaḥ dvividhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ vāhyaḥ pratītyasa-
   mutpādaḥ abhyantaraç=ca [çca] [56] vāhyas=tāvad=vījād=aṅkuram

10. aṅkurāt=pātraṃ [57] pātrāt=kāṇḍaṃ kāṇḍān=nālaṃ nālād=garbhaḥ

---

who get the impression of movement, is typical of Mahāyāna. Unfortunately the
uncertain reading makes it impossible to decide whether this is indeed the idea implied
in our strophe. Although the allusion to the *ataimirika* in one of the other introductory
strophes seems to confirm the latter interpretation, it is difficult to see in what manner
the third and fourth pādas should be connected with the thought expressed in the first
half of this çloka. For a further discussion, the reader is referred to the notes to the
Translation. Cf. also the Introduction to these plates and Addenda, pp. 338 sq.

[51] Read : *jāyate.*

[52] There is no lacuna at the beginning of this line.

[53] This line and the next one are very carelessly written, and appear to be full of mistakes.
These two lines (and the very beginning of line 6) form a remarkable contrast to most
of the following, which is very correctly copied.

The order and choice of the words form a clear indication that parts of the text of
lines 4 and 5 are metrical, whereas other portions contain dispersed fragments of a
commentary *(iti* occurring in several places). It is this mixture of *çlokas* and com-
mentary that offers the possibility of a conjectural reconstruction. Considerable parts
of the text must have been omitted by the copyist.

Referring the reader for a detailed discussion to the notes to the Translation, we confine
ourselves here to some minor corrections which would seem evident.

Parinirvṛte, — read : *parinirvṛtte.*

Instead of *yayau* the plate seems to give *yaiyā.* Presumably, the sign for *-ai* has been
placed before the first of the two *yas.*

Ajñāndhakāreṣu, — read : *ajñānāndhakāreṣu,* evidently a case of haplography.

[54] *Atairikaç* — read : *ataimirikaç.* One akṣara has been omitted.

[55] One would have expected here something like : *sa pratītyasamutpādaḥ.* In any case,
the text cannot be correct as given on the plate.

[56] Obviously due to diplography.

[57] *Pātram* instead of *pattram* is a confusion which is common in the Old Javanese inscrip-
tions, too.

garbhāt=puṣpaḥ [58]) puṣpāt=phalam=iti ayaṃ vāhyaḥ pratītya-
samutpādaḥ

B. 1. kathaṃ abhyantaraḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ // tadyathā avidyāpratyayāḥ
saṃskārāḥ saṃskārapratyayaṃ <vijñānaṃ vijñānapratyayaṃ>

2. nāmarūpaṃ nāmarūpapratyayaṃ ṣaḍāyatanaṃ ṣaḍāyatanapratyayaḥ
sparççaḥ sparççapratyayā vedanā

3. vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā tṛṣṇāpratyayaṃ upādānaṃ upādānapratyayo
bhavaḥ bhavapratyayā jātiḥ jātipratyayaṃ

4. jarāmaraṇam=iti // vistareṇa ayam=abhyantaraḥ pratītyasamutpā-
daḥ // kathaṃ trividhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ kleçakarma-

5. duḥkhādinaḥ avidyātṛṣṇopādānam=iti kleçaḥ saṃskārabhava iti
karmma vijñānanāmarūpaṣaḍāyatanādīnām=iti [59])

6. duḥkhaṃ ayaṃ trividhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ ayaṃ cāparas=tri-
vidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ // avidyāsaṃskārā ity=atītaḥ

7. prathamaç=ca jātijarādir=ity=ayam=anāgataḥ dvitīyaç=ca vijñā-
nanāmarūpaṣaḍāyātanasparçavedanā-

8. tṛṣṇopādānabhava ity=ayaṃ varttamānaḥ tṛtīyaḥ pratītyasamutpā-
daḥ // kathaṃ caturvidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ

9. avidyāsaṃskārā iti hetukāṇḍaḥ vijñānanāmarūpaṣaḍāyatanasparça-
vedaneti vipākakāṇḍaḥ tṛṣṇopādā-

10. nabhava iti hetukāṇḍaḥ jarādi iti vipākakāṇḍaḥ <kāṇḍa>bhede-
na [60]) caturvidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ //

d

A. 1. kathaṃ pañcavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ avidyāsaṃskārā iti kārakaḥ
vijñānanāmarūpa iti garbhaḥ ṣaḍāyatanasparçaveda-

2. neti viṣayapravṛttiḥ tṛṣṇopādānabhava iti prabhavaḥ jātijarādir=iti
pravāhaḥ iti pañcavidhaḥ pratītyasamu-

3. tpādaḥ kathaṃ ṣaḍvidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti kleçakāṇḍaḥ
saṃskārā iti karmakāṇḍaḥ vijñāna-

4. nāmarūpaṣaḍāyatanasparçavedanā iti phalakāṇḍaḥ tṛṣṇopādānam=iti
kleçakāṇḍaḥ

5. bhava iti karmakāṇḍaḥ jātijarādir=iti phalakāṇḍaḥ ayaṃ ṣaḍvidhaḥ
pratītyasamutpādaḥ kathaṃ saptavidhaḥ

6. pratītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti bhūmiḥ saṃskārā iti varṣikāḥ vijñānam=
iti vījaṃ nāmarūpaṣa-

7. ḍāyatanam=iti pātraṃ [61]) sparçavedaneti puṣpaṃ tṛṣṇopādānabhavā
iti phalam jātijarādir=iti

8. punarbhavavṛkṣabījaṃ ayaṃ saptavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ kathaṃ
aṣṭavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ

---

[58]) Read : *puṣpam.* Some other mistakes in grammatical gender occur in this text ; cf.
rūpaḥ, supra b — B — 7, and *sparçāni, infra* e — B — 4. Cf. also note 29 above.

[59]) The genitive plural is a little strange here.

[60]) *Kāṇḍa* was obviously omitted by the copyist.

[61]) Cf. *supra,* note 52.

9. avidyeti saṃmohaphalaṃ saṃskārā iti ārambhaphalaṃ vijñāna-
nāmarūpam=iti

B. 1. vipākaphalaṃ ṣaḍāyatanasparçavedaneti niṣyandaphalaṃ tṛṣṇopādā-
nam=iti santānaphalaṃ <bhava>-

2. jātir=iti nirvṛttiphalaṃ jarāmaraṇādir=iti aniṣṭaphalaṃ phalabhedena
ayam=a-

3. ṣṭavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ kathaṃ navavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ
avidyeti mithyāndhabhedaḥ [62])

4. saṃskārā iti kriyābhedaḥ vijñānam=iti santānabhedaḥ nāmarūpam=
iti ekṣaṇabhedaḥ ṣaḍāyatanam=iti

5. āçrayabhedaḥ sparça iti samavāyabhedaḥ vedaneti cittabhedaḥ
tṛṣṇopādānabhavā iti anāgatabhedaḥ

6. jātijarādir=iti vināçabhedaḥ ayaṃ navavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ
kathaṃ daçavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti

7. kleçamūlaṃ saṃskārā iti karmamūlaṃ vijñānam=iti kalalamūlam
nāmarūpaṃ <iti> [63]) skandhamūlaṃ ṣaḍāyatanam=iti

8. āçrayaphalamūlaṃ [64]) sparça iti trikamūlaṃ vedaneti vipākamūlaṃ
tṛṣṇeti hetumūlaṃ upādā-

9. nam=iti grahaṇamūlaṃ bhavajātijarādir=iti punarāvarttakamūlaṃ
// iti ayaṃ daçavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ

10. katamā [65]) ekādaçavidhaḥ pratītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti svāmī saṃskārā
iti valāddhyakṣāḥ vijñānam=iti

e

A. 1. āmātyā nāmarūpam=iti puraṃ ṣaḍāyatanam=iti gṛhaṃ sparçr iti
pañca kāmaguṇāni vedaneti mitrāmitrodāsīnādi

2. tṛṣṇeti parasparajiyāṃsaḥ upadānam=iti ātmabhedadaṇḍāṇḍāva-
pradāni [66]) bhavajātir=ity=aiçvaryasaṃpattir

3. jarāmaraṇādir=ity=aiçvaryyavipattir=ity=ayam=ekādaçavidhaḥ
pratītyasamutpādaḥ kathaṃ dvādaçavidhaḥ pratītyasa-

4. mutpādaḥ avidyāpratyayās=saṃskārāḥ saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñā-
naṃ vijñānapratyayaṃ nāmarūpaṃ nāmarūpapra-

---

[62]) Probably to be corrected to *mithyāndhakārabhedaḥ*.

[63]) Obviously omitted by the copyist.

[64]) Though perhaps not completely impossible, the use of *phala* and *mūla* together seems suspect. We presume that the copyist erroneously put down *phala* instead of the *mūla* of his example, realized his mistake and, being unable to erase and correct the first syllable, added the correct form thereafter. The error is the more comprechen-sible because *phala* and *mūla* resemble each other from a palaeographic point of view; in addition, the two notions are natural opposites and therefore closely associated.

[65]) To be corrected to *katama*, or rather to *katamaḥ* since as a rule no sandhi is used in cases like this one.

[66]) This compound was badly copied. We suppose that the original read *sāmabhedadaṇḍasaṃpradānāni* or something similar, for there is no doubt that the four *upāyas* are here referred to.

5. tyayaṃ ṣaḍāyatanaṃ ṣaḍāyatanapratyayaḥ sparçaḥ sparçapratyayā
vedanā vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā tṛṣṇā-

6. pratyayaṃ upādānaṃ upādānapratyayo bhavaḥ bhavapratyayā jā-
tir=jātipratyayā jarāmaraṇa-

7. çokaparidevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopayāsāḥ <evaṃ> [67]) mahato duḥ-
khaskandhasya samudayo bhavati // [68])

8. dīrghahrasvaṃ maṇḍaparimaṇḍaṃ unnata-avanataṃ çātaviçātaṃ iti
ataḥ viṃçatividhaṃ rūpam=iti nāma iti [69])

9. catvāra<ḥ arūpiṇaḥ> skandhāḥ [70]) tad=ubhayam nāmarūpam=ity=
ucyate kiṃ tatra nāmarūpam yatra nāma tatra rūpaṃ vā āha [71])
yatra rūpaṃ

10. tatra nāma yatra nāma tatra rūpaṃ [72]) ākāçavat [73]) nāmarūpapra-
tyayaṃ ṣaḍāyatanam=iti tatra ṣaḍvijñānakā-

11. ye ṣaḍ=āyatanāni bhavanti tadyathā cakṣu-āyatanaṃ [74]) çrotrā-
yatanaṃ ghrāṇāyatanaṃ jihvāyatanaṃ

B. 1. kāyāyatanaṃ mano-āyatanaṃ [75]) ṣaḍāyatanapratyayāḥ sparçā [76]) iti
ṣaṭ sparçā bhavanti cakṣuṣā sparçaḥ [77])

2. çrotrasaṃsparçaḥ ghrāṇasaṃsparçaḥ jihvāsaṃsparçaḥ kāyasaṃspa-
rçaḥ manassaṃsparças=trikasamavāyaḥ

3. sparçaḥ cakṣurādivijñānasamavāyaḥ sparçaḥ cakṣuṣi sparçaḥ [78])
trividhaḥ [sparçaḥ] sukhasparçaḥ duḥkhasparçaḥ <aduḥkhāsukha-
sparçaḥ> [79]) evaṃ

4. saṃkṣepataḥ pañcadaça sparçāni [80]) bhavanti sparçapratyayā vedanā
anubhāvanālakṣaṇā ve[sukha]danā [81]) ti-

---

67) Probably, not only *evam* but also some more words were omitted by the copyist. After the compound ending in °*sāḥ*, one would have expected: *saṃbhavanti. evam asya kevalasya* before *mahato.*

68) After this punctuation mark, a rather long passage follows (up to e - B - 8), which is hardly if at all connected with either the preceding or the following passage. It is probably to be considered an interpolation; cf. the Introduction, where this passage was discussed in detail. This whole portion is full of omissions and other mistakes, some of which are rather serious. In the following, only the most obvious cases will be mentioned.

69) *Viṃçatividham,* — the word itself is correct, since the twentyfold division of Rūpa is regular; the contradiction is due to the fact that only the eight *saṃsthāna* categories ('form' in the narrow sense of the word) are enumerated.

70) *Arūpiṇaḥ* cannot be dispensed with here.

71) *Vā āha* cannot be correct in this form. The intention is however clear.

72) The last four words are evidently only a repetition.

73) This comparison is obscure. For its possible meaning, cf. note 127 to the translation.

74) Read: *cakṣurāyatanaṃ.*

75) Read: *manaāyatanam.*

76) The plural, though perhaps not impossible, is at least unusual.

77) Probably a mistake for *cakṣus-* or *cakṣuḥ-saṃsparçaḥ.*

78) One would have expected something like *cakṣurādisaṃsparçaḥ.*

79) The third category has evidently been omitted.

80) Read: *sparçaḥ,* or with sandhi: *sparça.*

81) *Sukha* might have got into this line from the preceding one, where the word occurs almost at the same place.

5. sro vedanā<ḥ> sukhavedanā duḥkhavedanā aduḥkhāsukhavedanā vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā sutṛptilakṣa-

6. nā tṛṣṇā tisraḥ tṛṣṇā<ḥ> kāmatṛṣṇā ārūpyatṛṣṇā atitṛṣṇā [82]) tṛṣṇāpratyayam=upādānaṃ kim=upādānaṃ bhavati catvā-

7. ryy=upādānāni bhavanti kāmopādānaṃ dṛṣṭiupādānaṃ [83]) çīlavratopādānaṃ ātmavādopādānaṃ kāmo-

8. pādānaṃ viṅçatividhaḥ [84])

f

A. 1. vistareṇa evam=upadiṣṭaḥ pratītyasamutpādavidhiḥ evaṃ avidyā tāvad=avidyā na mitthyaivāvidyā tad=evājñānaṃ kim=anyad= ajñānaṃ vṛçcati prati-

2. çiddhaty=avidyā [85]) avidyā tāvat katividhā samāsataḥ ekavidhā sarvvaklecānām=avitathārthena dvividhā cāvidyā hetutayā-

3. çrayatvā <d> vijñānāçrayatvāc=ca trividhā cāvidyājñānaṃ saṃçayajñānaṃ mithyājñānam=iti caturvidhā cāvidyā

4. duḥkhapraheyā samudayapraheyā nirodhapraheyā mārgapraheyā pañcavidhā avi-

5. dyā <duḥkha>praheyā [86]) samudayapraheyā nirodhapraheyā bhāvanāpraheyā evamādi

6. yāvat pañcavidhā avidyā jñeyeti avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārā iti kasmād=avidyā hetur=i-

7. ti noktā eko hetuḥ vahavaḥ [87]) pratyayāḥ svārthakārī hetuḥ parārthakārī hetuḥ [88]) ya-

8. s=saṃçliṣṭahetuḥ viçliṣṭapratyayaḥ tasmād=avidyā pratya<ya i-> ti nāvidyā hetuḥ

9. hetu[ḥ]pratyayor pratyayaṃ prativibhesu avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ

10. saṃskārā iti trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ puṇyamayāḥ saṃskārāḥ apuṇyamayās=saṃskārāḥ

B. 1. apuṇyamayās=saṃskārāḥ [89]) puṇyamayāḥ saṃskārā iti trividhaṃ kuçalaṃ kāyakarmakuçalaṃ

---

82) Undoubtedly not correct in this form; cf. the Translation.

83) Read: dṛṣṭyupādānaṃ. Elsewhere, the rules of sandhi are always applied between the parts of a compound. Here, the reason for their non-application is probably the tendency to avoid the ligature ṣṭyu, which would have ended far too much below the line.

84) Viṅçatividham; — the use of the guttural nasal instead of the anusvāra before sibilants, though occurring elsewhere, too, is the usual orthography in Sanskrit inscriptions from Indonesia. Though far from being decisive, this small detail may be considered some indication in favour of an Indonesian origin of the plates.

85) Sic. We suppose pratiṣidhyate (or °ti); cf. the Translation.

86) Duḥkha was probably omitted by the copyist. In that case, fourfold Avidyā applies to the four āryasatyāni, whereas it is fivefold if referred to the latter with the addition of bhāvanā. If we accept the reading given by our text, the first category would be apraheyā, which, though unknown from other sources, would not be completely out of place.

87) Read: bahavaḥ.

88) Obviously an error for pratyayaḥ (°yo with sandhi).

89) Instead of the third category of saṃskāra (usually given āneñjya), the second one

2. vākkarmakuçalaṃ manaskarmakuçalaṃ apuṇyamayāḥ saṃskārā iti trividhaṃ akuçalaṃ kāyakarma-

3. akuçalaṃ vākkarma-akuçalaṃ manaskarma<-akuçalaṃ> [90]) akuçalamayāḥ saṃskārā iti trividhāḥ [91]) akuçalakāyakarma

4. kāyakarma [ma] avyākṛtamanaskarma [92]) avyākṛtamanaskarma anye punar=āhuḥ trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ kāya[s]saṃskārāḥ [93])

5. vāksaṃskārāḥ manassaṃskārā iti kāya[s]saṃskāro dvividhaḥ āçvāsapraçvāsaḥ [94]) vāksaṃskṛta iti vitarkayitvā

6. vicārayitvā bhāṣate manassaṃskāra iti cetanā anye punar=āhuḥ trividhāḥ samskārāḥ kuçala-

7. akuçala-avyākṛtāç=ca anye punar=āhuḥ trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ prātisattvikaḥ aupapat<t>yaṃçikaḥ ābhisaṃsā-

8. rikaḥ kim=ime saṃskārā avidyāpratyayā<ḥ> syuḥ iti neti syuḥ saṃskārā avidyāpratyayāḥ syuḥ saṃskārā vidyāpratya-

9. yāḥ syuḥ saṃskārā vidyāvidyāpratyayāḥ syuḥ saṃskārā naivavidyānāvidyāpratyayāḥ praçnaḥ catuṣkoṭikaḥ [95])

g

A. 1. çāntiḥ [96]) astimānena dairyyāṇiko [97]) iti dṛṣṭiparāmarçaḥ pañcavidhaḥ yuktaiṣā atidṛṣṭir=iti yuktai-

---

apuṇyamaya) was wrongly repeated. A similar mistake occurs in line 3 below. Probably, the word *anenjya*, which is not very common, was not recognized by the copyist. The whole following passage became very confused.

[90]) The insertion of this term is necessary ; its omission is undoubtedly due to haplography. The omission of sandhi in the compounds with *akuçala* is certainly due to the necessity of avoiding misunderstanding with *kuçala*.

[91]) As we noted in note 39 above, this whole passage is very confused. Instead of *akuçalamayāḥ samskārā iti*, we have to read *anenjyāḥ saṃskā-ā iti*. The last word of this line, *akuçalakāyakarma*, cannot be correct ; it should have been *avyākṛtakāyakarma*. There is one excuse for the copyist : the very numerous repetitions in this portion of the text are really confusing ; the editor, when typing the text of his pen-written transcription had similar experiences.

[92]) The first word of this line should have been *avyākṛtavākkarma*. The second *avyākṛtamanaskarma* should be omitted.

[93]) The double *s* here and in line 5 is probably due to analogy with *manassaṃskāra*.

[94]) Read : *āçvāsapraçvāsau* (or possibly : *āçvāsapraçvāsiko*).

[95]) Before *praçnaḥ*, some words must have been omitted, probably *syur=iti*.

[96]) This reading is very uncertain. The word which we should have expected to find here is *iti*. Although the first akṣara, which is very carelessly written, might represent an initial *i* (the lower part of which was erroneously written above instead of below the line), the following is certainly a ligature consisting of either *nt* or *tt* (the akṣaras *na* and *ta* are sometimes undistinguishable) surmounted by vowel sign for medial i. We suppose that the original read *iti;* the copyist, however, mistaking the initial *i* for a *ça*, did not understand the meaning of *çati* and therefore corrected the latter to *çāntiḥ*. Since the next two words are incorrect, too, the restitution of *iti* remains conjectural.

[97]) *Sic.* The word is obviously a copyist's error for *nair(y)yānika*. The word which precedes, *astimānena*, is most certainly wrong : it does not make sense. We suppose that it is a copyist's error for *asti mārgo ;* from a palaeographic point of view such

2. ṣā antagrāhadṛṣṭir=iti yuktaiṣā mithyādṛṣṭir=iti yuktaiṣā çīlavrata-
paramarçadṛṣṭir=iti saptavidhena

3. çīlena çuddhidṛṣṭir=iti anekavidhena bhavitena çuddhidṛṣṭir=iti asti
pudgalaḥ kāraka itye-

4. vamādi yathāha ātmātmīya iti bhikṣavaḥ vā- [98])

5. laḥ açrutavān pṛthagjanaḥ prajñaptim=anupatitaḥ kāmopādānam [99])
ukteme [100]) ca avidyāpratyayāḥ

6. saṃskāra iti upādānapratyayasya bhavasya ca tayoḥ kin=nānā-
kāraṇaṃ avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārā iti a-

7. tītaṃ bhavaṃ pradiça[n]ti [101]) upādānapratyayo bhava iti anāgataṃ
bhavaṃ prakāçayati ayaṃ tayor=vi-

8. çeṣaḥ upādānapratyayo bhava iti trayo bhavāḥ kāmabhavaḥ rūpa-
bhavaḥ ārūpyabhavaç=ca kāmabha-

9. vaḥ viṃçatividhaḥ rūpabhavaḥ ṣodaçavidhaḥ ārūpyabhavaḥ catur-
vidhaḥ bhavo nāma janmakāmabhavaḥ [102]) kāma-

10. bhavaḥ tathā rūpārūpyā iti bhavapratyayā jātiḥ skandhaprā-
durbhāvāj=jātiḥ jātiç=caturvidhā

B. 1. garbhajā sopapattijā svedajā aṇḍajeti jātipratyayā jagati [103]) paripā-
kendriyadaurvyāhāra-

2. rūpavaivarṇatā jarā jarāyāḥ samanantaraṃ maraṇaṃ skandhabheda-
tattvāt maraṇam=iti maraṇapratyayaḥ çokaḥ

3. çokaḥ tac=chokaḥ çūnyendriyavyavasthāna[n]dhātuçokaḥ [104]) çoka-
pratyayaḥ paridevaḥ abhilāpatā-

4. lakṣaṇaḥ paridevaḥ paridevapratyayaṃ duḥkhaṃ daurmanasyatvāt
duḥham=iti duḥkhapratyayañ=ca

---

an error can easily be understood. The *ga* was mistaken for two *nas*. In addition,
the mistake was reasonable: obviously, the copyist knew some lists of *kleças* by
heart. That *astimānena* did not yield a satisfactory meaning here, is a different
question.

[98]) Only the first half of this line was filled in. This is due to the fact that here, as in
schoolboy writing, the preceding lines on the plate slope down considerably in the
right hand part of the lines.

[99]) Here, at least one word (possibly *upādatte*), but probably more, must have been
omitted by the copyist. Cf. the notes to the translation of this passage.

[100]) Read: *uktā ime;* such cases of wrong sandhi are frequent in Sanskrit MSS, too.

[101]) *Pradiçanti* is very probably a mistake for *pradiçati;* the plural is out of place here.

[102]) Read: *janmakarmabhavaḥ*. As we saw above in note 97, the copyist probably knew
many Buddhist lists by heart. Thinking of the well-known set of *kāmabhava, rūpa-
bhava,* and *ārūpyabhava,* which also occurred just before (in line 8), he substituted
the first of these three terms for *karmabhava,* although the latter is very common, too.

[103]) *Jagati,* — this word, perfectly clear on the plate, does not make sense here, although
it would not be impossible to defend it. It is obviously a copyist's error for *jareti;*
probably, the copyist did not understand the latter owing to the sandhi; in addition,
the syllables *re* and *ga* are very similar in this type of script.

[104]) The *n* after *sthāna* does not appear to make sense, since the meaning of the sentence
seems to require a single compound. But even then, the form could hardly be correct;
cf. the note to the Translation.

5. daurmanasyaṃ hṛtparitāpaṃ daurmanasyaṃ daurmanasyapratya-
   yo [105]) upāyāsaḥ upāyāsa-
6. lakṣaṇam [106]) upāyāsahetujñatvā<d> daurmanasyam=iti vyastaṃ
   daurmanasyaṃ daurmanasyahetuṃ duḥkham=iti
7. vyastan=duḥkham=iti vyastaduḥkham [107]) duḥkhahetum paridevam
   =iti vyastaḥ paridevaḥ paridevahetuṃ çokam=iti vyasta-
8. ç=çokaḥ çokahetuṃ maraṇam=iti vyastaṃ maraṇaṃ maraṇahetukā
   jarīti [108]) vyastā jarā jarāhetukī jāti-
9. r=iti vyastā jātiḥ jātihetuko bhava iti vyasto bhavaḥ bhavahetukaṃ=
   upādānam=iti [109])

h

A. 1. vibhaṅga iti me [110]) yad=uktam=idam=etad [111]) pratyuktam=iti
   idam=avocad=bhagavān=āptamanasas=te [112]) bhikṣavo bha-
   ga<va>-
   2. dbhāṣitaṃ [113]) anandyan [114]) maunyam=bhagavato ntikāt=pra-
   krāntāḥ // ○ // ○ // [115]) catvāro dvīpāḥ tadyathā

---

[105]) Read: ya; in this passage, there are relatively many breaches of sandhi.

[106]) Here, probably, one or more words have been left out; cf. the note to the Translation.

[107]) A diplography? — the second term, however, might be either a correction or an explanation of the former.

[108]) Read: jareti. As we saw in note 103 above, this unlucky combination fell already a victim to the copyist's attempts at correction; how he came to put down jarīti is less clear; he may have thought of jerjarīti.

[109]) This line was not completely filled in; there would have been room for two or three akṣaras more.

[110]) Me, though not impossible, seems rather strange; one would have expected to find vo here. Not only C, which contains this final sentence at the end of the Vibhaṅga text, but also a number of other texts which give this stereotyped formula read vo.

[111]) Read: etat. Real breaches of sandhi are relatively frequent in this final part of the text.

[112]) All other versions of the formula read either āttamanās or āttamanasas. The reading āpta° in the first part of the compound is difficult to be explained as a copyist's mistake; cf. note 200 to the Translation.

[113]) These words were carelessly copied; the last syllable of bhikṣavo could hardly be recognized; there seems to be a va with the vowel signs of -e and -u attached to it. The ga of bhagavad was omitted; in spite of our remarks about this word in view of its disyllabic reading in verse (cf. note 135 to the Introduction), we consider it a mere copyist's lapse.

[114]) The other versions read abhyanandan.

[115]) There is a very elaborate mark of punctuation here. It is expressed by pairs of small vertical strokes; between the first and the second, and again between the third and the fourth pair, there are three small horizontal strokes, whereas two concentric circles are placed between the second and third pairs of verticals. This elaborate mark of punctuation presumably aims at clearly separating the last portion of the text from the passage which follows.

3. jambhudvīpaḥ [116]) uttarakurukodvīpaḥ [117]) pūrvvavidehadvīpaḥ avaragodhānīdvīpaḥ [118]) ceti aṣṭamahā-

4. narakāḥ tadyathā sañjīva-kālasūtra-saṃghāta-raurava-mahāraurava-tapana-sampratāpaka-

5. avīciç=ceti [119]) saḍḍivokasamālayāḥ [120]) cāturmahārājika-trāyastriṃ-ça-yāma-tuṣita-nirmā-

6. narati-parinirmitavaçavartti<na>ç=ceti pretalokaḥ tiryyagjātiç=ca teṣāṃ samavāyaḥ

7. *viñçati*vidhā [121]) kāmadhātur=idam=ucyate kāmopādānam dṛṣṭyu-pādānam=iti pañcadṛṣṭa-

8. yaḥ satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ antagrāhadṛṣṭiḥ mithyādṛṣṭiḥ dṛṣṭiparāmarçaḥ çīlavrataparāmarçaḥ

9. satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ viñçatividhā [122]) rūpe caturvvidhā vedanāyāñ= caturvvidhā [123]) saṃjñāyāñ=caturvvidhā

B. 1. saṃskāreṣu caturvvidhā vijñāne caturvvidhā tesāṃ samavāyaḥ viñçatividhā satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ antagrāha-

2. dṛṣṭiḥ trividhā ucchedātmā çāçvatātmā asti vā nāsti veti mithyādṛṣṭiḥ dvividhā saṭnatanāçī [124]) kiṃ vipra-

3. tyāgamī kiṃ nāstīdann=ādiḥ [125]) astiduḥkhaṃ kiṃ na nityaṃ iti a-astisamudayo na hetuḥ astinirodhaḥ [126]) ///

---

[116]) Read either *jambudvīpaḥ* or *jambūdvīpaḥ.*

[117]) Read: *uttarakurudvīpaḥ.*

[118]) Read: *avaragodānīyadvīpaḥ.*

[119]) Read: °*avīcayaç=ceti,* since the plural is required in a copulative compound of this kind. Even then, the mode of expression remains clumsy; one would have expected separate terms instead of a compound (especially in view of the use of *ca* after the last terms). Similar remarks apply to the enumeration of the heavens below.

[120]) Read: *saḍḍivaukaḥsamālayāḥ.*

[121]) The three first akṣaras of the line are very undistinctly expressed; ° *vidhā,* which is perfectly clear, should be corrected to ° *vidhaḥ.*

[122]) Note the curious spelling *viñçati* instead of *vimçati* here, in line 7 above (?) and in h - B - 1.

[123]) The plate seems to read *citurvvidhā.*

[124]) *Sic.* The writing on the plate seems clear, but it is not clear what the copyist may have meant by this word. If the beginning and the end are correct, we have to look for something sixfold *(ṣaṭ),* which is destroyed by *(°nāçī)* Mithyādṛṣṭi. The only term which resembles a little the reading of the plate is *ṣaḍāyatana.* but this does not make sense.

[125]) The words *nāstīdannādiḥ* might be capable of being understood, if we presume that they were written by somebody who had only a shadowy knowledge of Sanskrit grammar. Since *idam* becomes *idan* in a number of cases (e.g., in *asya nirodhād idan nirudhyate),* the writer may have considered *idan* the normal form, the final *n* of which he doubled before an initial vowel. Cf. the Translation.

[126]) Obviously, this is barbarous Sanskrit: the forms are neither declined nor even connected with each other. We suppose: *a-asti-samudayo,* „(there is) no (the prefix *a-)*

i [127])

A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karma jaṇmanaḥ karma kāraṇaṃ
   2. jñānā<n> na cīyate karma karmmābhāvān=na jāyate [128])
   3. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavāḥ [129]) hetun=teṣāṃ
   4. tathāgato avadat teṣāñ=ca yo

B. 1. nirodha <e>vamvādī mahāçramaṇaḥ [130]) kuçalaṃ
   2. sarvapāpasya kāraṇaṃ kuçalasyopasaṃ-
   3. padā [131]) //

j

A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karmma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaḥ jñānān=na
   2. [c]cīyate karmma karmmābhāvān=na jāya[n]te [132]) //

B. 1. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavā hetun=teṣāṃ tathāgata uvāca [133]) teṣāñ=
   ca yo niro-

---

arising of (new) existence *(asti)"*, na *hetuḥ*, „(because there is) no cause", so that there will be *astinirodhaḥ*, „cessation from existence", i.e. *astisamudayābhāvād dhetur na vidyata ity astinirodhaḥ*.

[127]) No translation of the texts on the plates *i* and *j* will be given; except for a single *çloka* (?) to be discussed in note 130 below, all these strophes also occur in the beginning of plate c - A.

[128]) Instead of *jāyate*, the Çloka reads *jāyaṇte* in *supra*, c - A - 2 and *infra*, j - A - 2. The latter is unmetrical, but the pluial is easier to be understood.

[129]) Cf. *supra*, c - A - 2 to 3 and *infra*, j - B - 1 to 2; there are slight differences in spelling (and even in the terms used; cf. note 133 below).

[130]) The initial *e* was obviously overlooked The whole strophe was very carelessly written; it would have been impossible to give a transcription of these lines if the strophe had not been known. This was probably the very reason why the copyist considered it useless to put it down in a form which could be read.

[131]) About the meaning of this ‚strophe', cf. the Introduction. Although only about half of it was transcribed by the copyist, there is no doubt that the same Çloka is meant which is quoted in *Mahāvastu*, III, p. 420, lines 12 sq.:
Sarvapāpasyākaraṇaṃ kuçalasyopasampadā /
svacittaparyādāpanam etad buddhānuçāsanam //, i. e.
„The destruction of all evil, inauguration into the good, teaching (?) of one's own thoughts — this is the instruction of the Buddha(s)".
Svacittaparyādāpana probably means: „giving over one's own conclusions about the doctrine to others", the proper task of a Buddha and of a Bodhisattva, especially in a higher stage. The strophe was probably mentioned here because this was just what our text aimed at. The omission of the pādas *c* and *d*, for which there was sufficient room left on the plate, may be due to the copyist, who often seems to have preferred to leave a passage out rather than reproducing something about the reading of which he was completely uncertain.

[132]) Cf. note 128 above.

[133]) An unusual variant for *hy* = *avadat*.

2. dha evamvādī mahāçramaṇaḥ // rūpiṇas=sarvvasattvā hi sarvva [134])
   santi [135]) nirātmikāḥ
3. sarvve bhadraṃ vipaçyanti [136]) mā kaçcit=pāpam=āgaman [137]) //

Translation

[a — A — 1] Thus have I heard :
— Once upon a time the Blessed One was dwelling at Çrāvastī in the Jetavana in Anāthapiṇḍada's park. There the Blessed One addressed the monks, [2] who listened while he spoke [1]). The Blessed One spoke to them the following :
— I will expound, o monks, the principle of Dependent Origination and its meaning (?) [2]), listen [3] and bear it well and firmly in mind. I will explain to you what the principle of Dependent Origination is : it means that „that being this is" [3]), in the following way [4]) :

---

[134]) Read : sarv(v)e.
[135]) Cf. note 49 above.
[136]) In c - A - 1, the strophe seems to read sarvve bhadrāṇi paçyanti.
[137]) Read : āgamat.

[1]) The translation is based upon the corrections proposed in notes 1 to 4 to the transcription (bhikṣava āmantrayati tasmin pratyaçrauṣur). It is the usual beginning of Buddhist Sūtras. In the Introduction, we drew attention to the fact that here the audience consists of monks only, whereas the text on the Nālandā bricks adds the number of the monks (1250) and the Chinese version makes the audience consist of Çrāvakas, Bodhisattvas, gods and men.

[2]) The translation is based on the corrected reading (pratītyasamutpādasyādim bhikṣavo 'rthañ = cādeçayiṣye). The reading of (a)rthañ, translated by „meaning", is however uncertain ; it is possible that the original read vibhāgaṃ (-ñ), which is the reading of C, and in that case, the mistake would be due to a mere repetition of the preceding term. For the meaning of ādi, cf. the Introduction, in which Vasubandhu's explanation is quoted (vide p. 73).

[3]) Asmin satīdaṃ bhavati, — the fundamental expression of the relation between the successive links of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula : the existence of each link depends on the (previous) existence of the link mentioned just before. Usually, this statement is followed by two corresponding passages implying that also the origination and the cessation of each link are conditioned by the origination and the cessation of the previous link. As a matter of fact, this formula gives the most general interpretation of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula (in contrast with its many special interpretations) ; it is even applied to all relative notions, e.g. in the Ratnāvali, I, 48 sqq. (cf. the fragments published by G. Tucci, J.R.A.S., 1934, pp. 307 sqq.), where the example is given that „short" can only exist if there is also „long" (dīrghe hrasvaṃ yathā sati). In Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 81, different interpretations of the formula are given ; the notes by De la Vallée Poussin (l.c.) give full references, including those to the many existing variants of this formula in Sanskrit and in Pāli.

[4]) Although the yathāvat of our text would not be quite impossible (but in that case, it would rather have been placed before, instead of after, ucyate), we prefer the reading of the other versions. As a matter of fact, the Pratītyasamutpāda may be considered a special form of the more general rule expressed by asmin sati etc.

— Ignorance [5]) conditions the Formative Forces) [6]), [4] the Formative Forces condition Consciousness [7]), Consciousness conditions Name-and-

---

[5]) *Avidyā* is analyzed in detail in the passage from a - A - 6 to b - A - 1 (mainly in view of the different objects to which it may apply), and from f - A - 1 to 8 (according to the different aspects of Avidyā, which are arranged in numerical order). Its relation with Saṃskārāṅga is discussed from f - A - 6 to g - A - 8. and the same passage deals with the association of Avidyā with the Wrong Views *(dṛṣṭi)*. The classificatory portion of our text (from c - A - 6 to e - A - 7) contains many similes which are important because they explain, in a popular way, some of the essential aspects of Avidyā: it is, for instance, considered as the *hetu* of phenomenal existence, as the soil on which the passions grow, as the *vijigīṣu* of the Arthaçāstras, and, if the twelve *nidānas* are distributed between the past, present and future existences, it belongs to the first category. Its relation with *ajñāna* is referred to in a - B - 1 and, especially, in f - A - 1 (Avidyā there comprises *ajñāna, saṃçayajñāna* and *mithyājñāna)*. — The translation of Avidyā by „Ignorance" is conventional, Avidyā being a „notion assez complexe" (cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Abhidh. Koça, Introduction* etc., 1931, p. 25) ; it is narrowly associated with the *kleças sarvakleçānām avitathārthena*, f - A - 2, but its double aspect as *kleçāvaraṇa* and *jñeyāvaraṇa*, and sometimes (in the case of Hīnayāna Arhats) the latter only, is not mentioned in our text. It seems, however, that *jñeyāvaraṇa* is alluded to in the term *tāvad-avidyā*, „mere, exclusive, Ignorance" (probably: Ignorance which is not associated with *kleças*, thus corresponding with the *avidyā āveṇikī* mentioned, for instance, in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 84). — Avidyā is essentially the non-comprehension of the Four Truths of a Saint and must be eliminated by the vision of these (f - A - 4 to 5) ; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 71. The latter point is one of the characteristic differences from the Avidyā conception of other Indian systems (Sāṃkhya, Vedānta).

[6]) *Saṃskāra*, as a link in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, does not comprise all the *saṃskāras* which ccntitute *saṃskāraskandha (infra,* a - B - 6). The latter is the ‚collection' of all sorts of forces (their number varies in the different Buddhist sects ; the Abhidharmakoça mentions 58 *saṃskāras)*, but *saṃskārāṅga* only refers to those forces which themselves conditioned by Aviɟya, make the arising of the *vijñānāṅga* possible. As, in one of the most common interpretations of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, the arising of Vijñāna marks the beginning of actual life, Saṃskārāṅga may refer to action during former existences (it is defined by *pūrvakarman* in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, *kārikā* 21), and is conceived of as forces producing new existence *(punarbhavam abhisaṃskaroti,* ə. g. in the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā ; cf. the translation by D. Friedmann, 1937, p. 47, and notes, p. 125). In view of the latter definition, the best translation for *saṃskārāṅga* is „Formative Forces" as Friedmann translated. Most of the similes in our text stress „activity" as one of the main aspects of the Saṃskāras (they are, for instance, the army commanders of the *vijigīṣu*, the rains which make the seed develop into a sprout, etc.). For their analysis, cf. *infra* a — B — 2 and, with greater detail, from f — A — 10 to f. — B — 8.

[7]) For Vijñāna, too, we have to distinguish between *vijñānāṅga* and *vijñānaskandha* (one of the five divisions of Nāmarūpāṅga; *infra,* a — B — 3). In the special interpretation of the chain, Vijñāna is considered the first moment of present existence *(Abhidh. Koça,* III, p. 88 ; Th. Stcherbatskij, *Central Conception,* p. 6) and is therefore compared with the seed *(bīja)* of the Tree of Life growing on the soil which is Ignorance and developing if the rains, sunshine etc., which are the Saṃskāras, are also present *(infra,* d — A — 6). In another simile (d — B — 7), Vijñāna is compared with the most primitive stage of embryonic life *(kalala)*, the arising of which depends on the existence of Ignorance as its general conditioning factor and on that of those deeds in former existences that produce some form of new existence as its more direct factors (Saṃskārāṅga). — In the 'general' interpretation, however, Vijñāna

Form [8]), Name-and-Form conditions the Six Bases of Cognition [9]), the Six Bases of Cognition condition Contact [10]), Contact conditions

(in this respect undistinguishable from Vijñānaskandha) is conceived of as an uninterrupted stream *(saṃtāna, infra,* d — B — 4) of moments of being conscious. Technically, these two aspects are distinguished by the terms *bīja-* and *pravṛtti-vijñāna* respectively (especially in Mahāyāna). The latter is conceived of as a 'stream' extending over all the separate existences and thus constituting a perpetual link. The Vijñānavāda School of Mahāyāna laid a very special stress on this Vijñāna conception (the elements of which exist in all forms of Buddhism) and elaborated it under the influence of Vedāntic ideas; it thus became the nearest Buddhist equivalent of a 'soul', with the essential difference, however, that Vijñāna is only an apparent unity: just as a river, which only seems one but really is a conglomeration of innumerable interdependent particles, in the same way the conception of a unique Vijñāna is due to the forces of illusion. — Cf. also *infra,* a — B — 3 to 4.

[8]) *Nāmarūpa* is analyzed *infra,* a — B — 5 to 8, and, in a different but very clumsy form, *infra,* e — A — 8 to 10. Cf. also the Introduction, *passim.* Together with Vijñāna, it is *vipākaphala* of former existence (d — A — 9) and compared to the fortress of the *vijigīṣu* (e — A — 1). Nāmarūpa is a very old compound (cf. H. Kern, *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme,* I, pp. 335 — 341); it is based on the analysis of the individual into material and spiritual compounds, originally identified with the thing (the person) and its name (his soul). The main innovation in Buddhism consisted in splitting up the name ('soul') into four non-material groups.

[9]) *Ṣaḍāyatana* is analyzed *infra,* e — B — 1 to 2 and (in the repetition with many mistakes) from e — A — 11 to e — B — 1. Ṣaḍāyatana is based upon the classification of all the *dharmas* (including the *asaṃskṛtas*) into the six senses *(indriya)* and their respective classes of objects *(viṣaya).* For details, cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.,* pp. 7 sqq. — The addition of *ṣaḍ-* is necessary, since in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula only the six 'internal' bases are referred to. — Āyatana is explained as *āyatana* = *āya-dvāra,* „entrance door" *(Abhidh. Koça.* I, kār. 20: *rāçāyadvāragotrārthāḥ skandhāyatanadhātavaḥ),* for they (i.e. the six *abhyantarān* *āya-tanāni)* are the gates through which the impressions of the outer world may reach Consciousness. A better explanation considers Āyatana as the 'abode' *(āyatana),* i.e. the material support *(āçraya)* of the mind and the mental functions *(cittacaitta).* This explanation is suggested by its comparison with a house *(gṛha,* e — A — 1), with a kind of support *(āçrayabheda,* d — B — 5), and, in the representations of the *bhavacakra,* Ṣaḍāyatana is expressed by a palace with six doors.

[10]) *Sparça* is analysed *infra* in b — A — 3 to 4 and in e — B — 1 to 4. Its main characteristic is the triple contact between one of the interior *āyatanas,* the corresponding exterior *āyatana* and Vijñāna. There was however a controversy in the Abhidharma Schools about the question whether Sparça referred to the triple contact itself, or to the sensations arising from that contact. The Abhidharmakoça (III, p. 98) contains a discussion between a Sarvāstivādin and a Sautrāntika on this point, in which each of the parties quotes a Sūtra in a different way. It is evident that the correctness of the translation of the term depends on the point of view adopted by our text. Stcherbatskij's discussion on the term *(Central Conception,* p. 55) is not quite up to the point; he considers the usual translation by „contact" incorrect, but this is only true if we cling to the Sarvāstivādin interpretation; Stcherbatskij's main argument that Sparça is usually classified as a *caittadharma* is hardly convincing since any *dharma* in which Vijñāna takes an active part is bound to be *caitta.* Our text agrees with the Sautrāntika point of view. The Vibhaṅga *(infra,* b — A — 3 to 4) defines Sparça as sixfold *saṃsparça,* „mutual contact", thus explaining it as the contact itself. In d — B — 5, Sparça is considered „a special form of meeting, of coming together" *(samavāyabheda).*

Feeling [11]), [5] Feeling conditions Thirst [12]), Thirst conditions Attachment [13]), Attachment conditions Existence [14]), Existence conditions Birth [15]), Birth conditions Old Age and Death, sorrow [16]), lamentations, pain, grief and despair. [6] Such is the origin of this exclusive [17]) and powerful mass of

---

[11]) *Vedanā* is analyzed in b — A — 5 and in e — B — 5.

[12]) *Tṛṣṇā* is analyzed in b — A — 7 to 8 and in e — B — 6 to 7; cf. also g — A — 5 sqq. and h — A — 7. For the different kinds of Tṛṣṇā occurring in Buddhist literature, cf. *infra*, note 134. — Tṛṣṇā, Thirst, has to be taken in a very broad sense: the term may well be translated by „desire". In Chinese it is usually rendered by a term meaning "love" (cf. P. Demiéville, *Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha, B.E.F.E.O.*, 24, 1924, p. 131 and p. 135, who translates it by "amour").

[13]) *Upādāna*, "seizing" of the objects of thirst or desire, is always stated to be fourfold; cf. *infra*, b — A — 7 to 8 and e — B — 6 to 7. The Aṅgas Tṛṣṇā and Upādāna are very closely related, the latter being defined as *tṛṣṇāvivṛddhi*, "increasing of Thirst" (*Daçabhūmika*, p. 48), or as *tṛṣṇāvaipulya* (Çālistambhasūtra, quoted *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, p. 222, where *tṛṣṇāvaipulyam* was however erroneously printed as two words in Bendall's edition). Cf. also *Bodhic.-pañj.*, p. 480: *aparityāgo bhūyo bhūyaç ca prārthanā idaṃ tṛṣṇāpratyayam upādānam ity ucyate.*

[14]) *Bhava* is analyzed *infra*, b — A — 9 and g — A — 8 to 10. — *Bhava* is a difficult notion. It means: becoming, existence in general as opposed to final liberation. As such, it includes the Saṃsāra as a whole, which is subject to the twelve-linked *pratītyasamutpāda*. Accordingly, these links are often termed *bhavāṅgas* (e.g., *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 69). If the twelve *nidānas* are attributed to the three different time periods (past, present and future), *bhava* belongs to present existence (*infra*, c — B — 8). Therefore. it is not explained as *punarbhava*, but as *karmabhava*, „arising of *karman*". The latter is due to Attachment (to pleasure and wrong views): without Attachment no *karman* arises which would lead to re-birth, cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, V, pp. 1 sqq. — Both *saṃskāra* and *bhava* belong to the *karman*-portion of the *pratītyasamutpāda* (*infra*, c — B — 5), the former representing *karman* of past existence, the latter of present life, cf. *infra*, g — A — 6 to 7. *Bhava* is often taken as a synonym of the five *upādānaskandhas* (*Abhidh. Koça*, I, p. 14, cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, p. 98). In the 'static' (*āvasthika*) interpretation of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, according to which the twelve Aṅgas represent as many states in the development of the five Skandhas (*Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 66; cf. Vyākhyā ad 33, 22, *Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 156: *dvādaça pañcaskandhikā avasthāḥ*), Bhava denotes the stage during which the living being accomplishes those acts which condition repeated existence (*bhaviṣyadbhavaphalaṃ karma*, Vyākhyā ad 33, 7, *op. cit.*, p. 155). Cf. *infra*, g — A — 7. Vasubandhu considers this interpretation intentional (*ābhiprāyika*), not essential (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 67). The interpretation of Bhava as the link connecting present and future existence leads to its interpretation as the transmigrating factor (*antarābhava*); cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, pp. 36 sqq. and *infra*, note 53.

[15]) *Jāti* not only implies physical birth in its narrow sense, but includes the entire embryonic and foetal periods as well. Cf. the analysis, *infra*, b — B — 1 to 3.

[16]) *Çoka*, not occurring in the text, has been translated since its omission is obviously due to a mere lapse by the copyist. Cf. note 12 to the Transcription. As to the translations of the terms *çoka* .... *upāyāsa*, cf. *infra*, g — B — 2 to 6.

[17]) According to the Vyākhyā (*Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 170), *kevala* denotes that the entire complex of suffering depends on Jāti only, not, for instance, on the existence of an Ātman (*jātyāṃ eva satyāṃ jarāmaraṇādayaḥ sambhavanti nānyasminn ātmani*). *Kevalasya* is therefore explained by *ātmarahitasya;* cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 83, note 5. It is obvious that this is a scholastic interpretation. It seems much simpler to interpret

Suffering [18]). (All) this is called the principle of Dependent Origination [19]).
The explanation (is as follows) [20]) :

— As to „Ignorance conditions [7] the Formative Forces", what Ignorance (is referred to) ?

— It is want of knowledge [21]) concerning the past, want of knowledge concerning the future, want of knowledge concerning that which is both past and future [22]), want of knowledge concerning the interior, want of knowledge concerning the exterior [23]), [8] want of knowledge concerning the Act, want of knowledge concerning the ripening of the Act [24]), want of knowledge concerning the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṃgha, want of knowledge concerning Suffering [25]), Origine, Cessation and Path, [9] want

---

kevala as a term denoting that the result of Jāti is exclusively *duḥkha* without any *sukha* implied in it.

[18]) *Mahato duḥkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati.* The twelfth link of the chain, though expressed by Jarāmaraṇa only, is taken to consist of many different aspects. Cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* III, p. 83, note 5: „Les termes *çoka* ...... *upāyāsas* sont compris *(saṃgṛhīta)* dans *jarāmaraṇa* et ne sont pas des membres à part *(nāṅgāntaram).* Ils proviennent des diverses transformations *(pariṇāma)* des objets *(viṣaya),* être vivant ou non-être vivant, et de la personne *(ātmabhāva)".* Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Théorie des douze causes* (1916), pp. 31 sq.

[19]) For the meaning of *ādi* (opposed to *vibhaṅga),* cf. notes 97 and 99 to the Introduction.

[20]) After *vibhaṅgaḥ,* the word *katamaḥ* was probably omitted by the copyist. Up to the end of plate b, the twelve links of the formula are explained by enumerations of the different elements (aspects) into which they are divided.

[21]) As to the relation between *ajñāna* and *avidyā,* cf. *infra,* f — A — 3, where Avidyā is stated to be threefold since it comprises *ajñāna, mithyājñāna* and *saṃçayajñāna.* Here, at least, *ajñāna* is only the negative aspect of Avidyā, i.e. want of knowledge. It appcars from a — B — 1 that the definition of Avidyā as *ajñāna* with regard to the essential notions in Buddhism is only partial, since *tamas* and *sammoha* must everywhere be understood in addition to *ajñāna.* With the passage waich follows, cf. the whole passage from f — A — 1 to 7, where Avidyā is treated from another point of view (essentially numerical).

[22]) The terms *pūrvānte* and *aparānte* probably refer to *hetu* and *phala* respectively. Then, *pūrvāntāparānte* (instead of which most of the other versions read *madhyānte)* refers to that which is both *hetu* (of future existence) and *phala* (of past existence), i.e. present existence. Cf. Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya, 35, 1, in *Cosmol. Bouddh.,* p. 157: the first two Aṅgas (Avidyā-Saṃskāra) are taught to eliminate *pūrvāntasammoha,* the last two (Jāti-Jarāmaraṇa) to eliminate *aparāntasammoha,* the remaining eight (from Vijñāna to Bhava) to eliminate *madhyāntasammoha.* Cf. *infra,* c — B — 6 to 8.

[23]) *Ādhyātmika* and *bāhya* are applied to the chain of Dependent origination, *infra,* c — A — 9 sqq. A similar distinction is also made for the twelve *āyatanas;* cf. *infra* b — A — 1 sq.

[24]) *Karmavipāka,* i.e. retribution of action. Cf. the *vipākaphala,* the morally qualified fruit, *Abhidh. Koça,* II, pp. 275 sqq.; *Siddhi,* II, p. 464; De la Vallée Poussin, *Morale Bouddhique,* 1927, pp. 174 sqq.

[25]) In the Abhidharma, *duḥkha* has become a technical term denoting the unrest of the *dharmas* (cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc., passim).* It is however advisable to retain the notion of „suffering, misery" in the translation. *Duḥkha* is used in different technical meanings; cf. the three *duḥkhas* mentioned in the *Abhidh. Koça,* VI, pp. 124-136; *Siddhi,* II, pp. 498 sq.

of knowledge concerning the Cause and the *dharmas* sprung from a Cause [26]), want of knowledge concerning Dependent Origination [27]), want of knowledge concerning the good *dharmas*, want of knowledge concerning the bad *dharmas*, [10] want of knowledge concerning the *dharmas* which are both good and bad [28]), want of knowledge concerning the blamable, unblamable and both blamable and unblamable *dharmas* [29]), [11] want of knowledge concerning the *dharmas* to be shunned and those to be practised [30]), — or whatever want of knowledge there may be concerning the six bases of contact [31]), whatever want of knowledge there is concerning the

---

[26]) *Hetusamutpanneṣu dharmeṣu,* the *dharmas* stated to be *hetuprabhava* in the so-called Buddhist Article of Faith. In most of the Buddhist texts, *sam-* (in *samutpanna)* is supposed to include the notion of 'arising together'. The *dharmas* here referred to are the *saṃskṛtadharmas* (72 in all, according to the Abhidharma Schools, but 94 in the Yogācāra system, in which *vijñāna* was analyzed into a number of *dharmas* beginning with *ālayavijñāna,* and the number of *saṃskāras* greatly increased; cf. the comparative account given by De la Vallée Poussin, Suzuki and Cordier, *Les Soixante-quinze et les Cent Dharmas, Muséon, Nouv. Sér.,* 6, 1905, pp. 178 — 194).

[27]) As we stated in the Introduction, this term is not found in the other Vibhaṅga versions. Originally, it may have been a mere gloss on the preceding term.

[28]) *Kuçalākuçala,* — the meaning is probably: *kuçala* with reference to one aim, but *akuçala* with reference to another; usually, we find *avyākṛta,* „undefined as to moral consequences" as the third category: some of the *saṃskāras,* for instance, are always *kuçala* (the *kuçalamāhabhūmikas* such as *çraddhā, vīrya* etc., vid. *Mahāvyutp.,* 104, 12 — 22), other *saṃskāras* necessarily are *akuçala* (the *kleçamahābhūmikas* such as *moha* etc.), whereas most of the *dharmas* not included in these lists are *avyākṛta* (such as the *cittaviprayuktas).* Cf. E. Lamotte, *Traité de la démonstration de l'acte, Mél. chin. et bouddh.,* 4 (1936), p. 224; Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.,* pp. 29 sq.; *Siddhi,* pp. 319 — 395, where the third category is denoted by *aniyata; Daçasāhasrikā* (quoted note 117 to the Introduction), pp. 111 sqq.; cf. also pp. 81 — 85. For the definition of *kuçala,* cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* IV, p. 106, where it is explained as *iṣṭavipākatva:* „those acts which produce agreeable consequences (such as re-birth in heaven) and which, eventually, may lead to Nirvāṇa".

[29]) *Sāvadya* and *anavadya* are synonyms of the more usual terms *sāsrava and anāsrava* (*Abhidh. Koça,* IV, p. 255). In the former case, the *dharmas* are influenced by defiling agencies (*kleça*); in the latter, they are purified by superior wisdom. It is evident that this distinction does not at all cover that mentioned in note 28. An act may be 'good' and lead to re-birth in heaven, for instance, although it is influenced by Ignorance (*kuçalasāsrava, Abhidh. Koça,* IV, p. 106): a Vedāntin, ignorant of the Buddhist Truth, may accumulate good *karman.* It is not clear to us what *dharmas* may be considered *sāvadyānavadya;* the two notions seem to exclude each other.

[30]) *Sevitavya,* „to be practised", is defined as *kuçalasaṃskṛta* in *Abhidh. Koça,* IV, p. 225. It is not exactly the same as *kuçalasāsrava.* The example is given (*loc. cit.)* that the five *skandha*s of a Saint may be pure *(vaiyavadānika),* although they are always produced by causes.

[31]) *Sparçāyataneṣu* is translated according to the Chinese version (*Epigr. Ind.,* 5, 1932, p. 203), but the expression is not perfectly clear. In any case, *sparçāyatana* does not refer to the external base, the object of *kāyāyatana,* which is its usual meaning; the use of the plural and the addition of *ṣaṭsu* make such an interpretation impossible. Possibly, the expression should be taken to refer to the six *bāhyāyatanāni,* which were not unambiguously included in the preceding categories.

a — B above, [1] (including) not-understanding, obscurity and infatuation [32]), the darkness of Ignorance, (all) that Ignorance is referred to.

— As to „Ignorance, o monks, conditions [2] the Formative Forces", what formative forces (are referred to)?

— The three (kinds of) formative forces : those of body, speech and mind [33]). These formative forces are referred to.

— [3] As to „the Formative Forces, o monks, condition Consciousness", what consciousness (is referred to) ?

— The six groups of consciousness [34]), viz. eye-consciousness, ear-consciousness, [4] nose-consciousness, tongue-consciousness, skin-consciousness [35]) and mind-consciousness. That is the consciousness referred to.

— As to „Consciousness, o monks, [5] conditions Name-and-Form", what name-and-form (is referred to)?

— The four immaterial aggregates [36]), (viz.) the aggregate of

---

32) The purpose of this addition is evident. In the entire preceding portion of the *avidyā* definition, the latter is only referred to by *ajñāna*, which is the negative aspect of *avidyā*; the definition is not complete, for *avidyā* includes wrong and uncertain knowledge about the Truth (*infra*, f — A — 3). Cf. *Rāṣṭrapālap.*, ed. Finot, *Bibl. Buddh.*, II (1901), p. 48, lines 3-4: *yathā sammoham cāvidyāndhakāram.*

33) *Saṃskārāṅga* does not comprise all the *dharmas* included in *saṃskāraskandha* (cf. note 6 above). Here, the forces referred to are those of body (such as *āçvāsa* and *praçvāsa*), speech (*vitarka* and *vicāra*) and mind. The mental forces are essentially *cetanā*, „will", since only willful action is included in *saṃskārāṅga* (not, for instance, the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras*). Although this threefold division is natural enough, it · is a little strange to find it mentioned at this very spot; it is irrelevant for *saṃskārāṅga* whether acts are produced by body, speech or mind ; the essential point is the moral aspect of the act. In all other sources known to us, *saṃskārāṅga* is analyzed into *puṇyopaga* etc. (*infra*, f — A — 9 sqq.; the Vibhaṅga text of C; *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 84; *Çālistambhasūtra*, quoted *Çikṣās.*, p. 223, and *Bodhic.-pañj.* p. 479).

34) The same definition is given in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 70, note (quoted from the Vyākhyā) and *passim*. Consciousness, though constituting one single *dharma*, is conceived of as a stream consisting of innumerable moments of being conscious (cf. note 7 above). All these flashes of consciousness may however be classified into six 'collections' (*kāya*).

35) It is remarkable that *kāya* may be used in one sentence in two completely different meanings. The use of *kāya* in the meaning „heap, collection, group" seems to be limited to Buddhism ; it reposes upon the (probably correct) etymology of *kāya* derived from *ci(noti)*, „to accumulate" (cf. the use of the latter in the *ajñānāc cīyate karma* formula) ; cf. Pāṇini, III, 3, 41. The Buddhists made a full use of the possibilities offered by etymological analysis of words ; in this case, the etymology of *kāya* fully confirmed the Buddhist conception of the body as a heap of bones, blood, hairs etc. without real unity (the *açubhabhāvanā* was considered an excellent exercise ; cf. the Ratnamegha quotation in *Çikṣāsam.*, p. 209).

36) For the definition of Nāmarūpa as a whole, cf. the Introduction. The translation of *arūpin* by „immaterial" is not quite correct, for Buddhism rejects any real distinction between the material and immaterial world. It is rather a question of more or less ; it is often argued that the usual order in which the five *skandhas* are enumerated, viz. *rūpa, vedanā, saṃskāra, saṃjñā* and *vijñāna*, demonstrates a gradual decreasing

Feeling, [6] the aggregate of the Forces [37]), the aggregate of Ideation [38]) and the aggregate of Consciousness [39]) — such is the meaning of Name. Form, in the compound Name-and-Form [40]), means : [7] whatever kinds of form there may be (?): the four Great Elements (themselves) and the form derived from the four Great Elements [41]).

---

of the material aspect (cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* I, pp. 11 sqq.). A more precise translation of *arūpin* is „not provided with *rūpa"* or „other than *rūpa".*

[37]) For *samskāra,* cf. note 33 above. For *samskāraskandha,* cf. the excellent survey given by Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.,* p. 98. We accept Stcherbatskij's translation by „forces". The Sarvāstivādins include 58 *dharmas* into this *skandha,* the Yogācārins no less than 73. They are essentially divided into moral forces (such as *kleças, upakleças* and *kuça-lamahābhūmikas)* and those independent of the will *(cittaviprayukta,* such as *jarā, prāpti, sabhāgatā,* the forces which make *akṣaras,* words and sentences have a definite meaning and/or function, etc.). A full analysis of *samskāraskandha* and the *dharmas* included in it is found in the article mentioned in note 26 above.

[38]) *Samjñā* is the faculty of forming concepts capable of being expressed in speech. Whereas *vijñāna* implies only being conscious of the mere presence of something within the field of perception, *samjñā* includes the definite perception of an object with its characteristic properties. Cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.,* p. 16: „the definite perception of a colour will be an 'idea' "; *Abhidh. Koça,* I, p. 30, note 3 : „elle i.e. la connaissance est associée à un certain mental, nommé *samjñā,* notion, qui appréhende un certain caractère de la couleur et de la figure considérées : c'est un homme, c'est une femme, etc."; *op. cit.,* I, *kār.* 14, c-d : *samjñā nimittodgrahaṇātmikā,* „la notion *(samjñā)* consiste dans la préhension des caractères", and *op. cit.,* II, p. 177, note 5 : „la notion perçoit l'objet en tant que susceptible d'être défini *(paricchedyatārūpam)"* ; D. Friedmann, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā,* p. 45 : „*samjñā,* Ideation, is the exact discernment *(pariccheda)* of that which has been felt"; *Siddhi,* I, p. 148 : "La Samjñā a pour nature de saisir les 'caractères' de l'objet. Elle a pour acte (quand elle est mentale) de produire les divers noms-et-paroles"; *cf.* also E. Lamotte, *Mél. chin. et bouddh.,* 4 (1936), p. 209, and S. Dasgupta, *Study of Patañjali* (1920), pp. 192-201.

[39]) *Vijñānaskandha* is not quite identical with *vijñānānga;* cf. note 7 above. As a *skandha,* „collection", *vijñāna* is defined by *prativijñapti* in the *Abhidh. Koça,* I, *kār.* 16 ; cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.,* p. 16, who translates the latter term by „an intimation, or awareness, in each single case"; cf. also *Buddh. Logic,* II, 1930, p. 173, note : „undifferentiated pure sensation, the mere sensation of something definite in the ken of our sense-faculties".

[40]) *Nāmarūpayor=iti* ; these words, not occurring in C, are not quite meaningless. They were probably added as a kind of gloss, which aimed at stressing that the definition of *Rūpa,* which follows, only applies to *rūpa* in *nāmarūpānga,* not, for instance, to the *rūpa* included in *rūpāyatana.* It is curious to note that in spite of this gloss, the interpolator of the passage from e — B — 8 to 11 misunderstood the meaning of *rūpa* in *nāmarūpa* and gave an interpretation of it which was evidently based on *rūpāyatana.* Finally, it is noted that the Sarvāstivādins and the Yogācārins knew a third kind of *rūpa* to be included in *manaāyatana,* viz. the *avijñapti,* for which they were attacked by most of the other Buddhist sects.

[41]) *Upādāyarūpa,* also called *bhautikarūpa,* is the matter composed of the five elements. The five elements themselves can hardly be called 'material', at least in later Buddhism. Stcherbatskij, *Buddh. Logic,* I, pp. 98 — 101, showed that in the dynamic conception of matter in Buddhism the five elements were considered to be conventional expressions of forces present in all kinds of matter. Thus, 'water' refers to the property of cohesion between the particles constituting an object, 'fire' to its possessing a definite temperature, 'ether' to its occupying a definite space, etc. Derived matter is analyzed

Both this (latter) [8] form and the preceding name (?) [42], together [43], are name and form. That Name-and-Form is referred to.

b — A — As to „Name-and-Form conditions, [1] o monks, the Six Bases of Cognition", what six bases of cognition (are referred to) ?

— (Only) the six 'internal' bases of cognition : the internal bases of eyes, ears, nose, [2] tongue, skin and mind. These are the Six Bases of Cognition referred to [44].

— As to „the Six Bases of Cognition, [3] o monks, condition Contact", what (kind of) contact (is referred to)?

— The six groups of contact [45], viz. mutual contact [46]) of the eyes, mutual contact of the ears, mutual contact of the nose, tongue, [4] skin and mind . This contact is referred to.

— As to „Contact, o monks, conditions Feeling", what (kind of) feeling (is referred to)?

— [5] The three (kinds of) feeling, viz. agreeable feeling, disagreeable feeling and neither-disagreeable-nor-agreeable feeling [47]. This feeling is referred to.

---

into the five organs and the five categories of objects of sense, to which some sects added avijñapti (Abhidh. Koça, I, kār. 9; Mahāvy. 101, 17 — 27; Nos. 60 — 70 of the Vijñānavādin list = Nos. 48 — 58 of the Sarvāstivādin list in the comparative account mentioned in note 25 above.

[42]) The translation is based on the correction of rūpa to nāma, proposed in note 30 to the Transcription.

[43]) Tad=ubhayam, i.e. nāma and rūpa, which were defined separately before. The other versions of the Nāmarūpa definition (cf. note 71 to the Introduction) add after tad= ubhayam: aikadhyam abhisamkṣipya (Çikṣāsam., p. 222; Bodhicaryāvatāɪapañjikā, p. 388; Madhyamakavrtti, p. 10; the text of C), but these words were wrongly copied in the second and third of these quotations; thus, in the Madhyamakavrtti, the MSS read ekamadhyam instead of aikadhyam (cf. the note by De la Vallée Poussin), whereas the Bodh. Pañjikā seems to have omitted a number of words (it reads: catvāri mahābhūtāni cupādānāni rūpam aikadhyarūpam.). The purpose of the addition aikadhyam abhisamkṣipya is evident: in Nāmarūpāṅga, the five skandhas do not constitute a real unity (which might lead to the wrong conception of a real individual), but are only 'thrown together'; in a simile not devoid of humour, the apparent unity of the five skandhas in Nāmarūpa is compared with that of a good dish, in which the cook mixes a number of ingredients.

[44]) For ṣaḍāyatana, cf. note 9 above.

[45]) Sparça is defined as the 'collection' of innumerable moments of sparça, classified into six groups. This sixfold division is common to the aṅgas Vijñāna, Ṣaḍāyatana and Sparça, which represent three distinct stages in the process of cognition, the result of which is Vedanā.

[46]) „Mutual" translates the prefix in samsparça; this prefix almost always has a pregnant meaning in the technical terms of Buddhism. In every moment of Sparça, three elements are implied: an 'internal' āyatana, the corresponding 'external' āyatana, and Vijñāna.

[47]) Vedanā is defined by anubhāva in Abhidh. Koça, I, p. 14, Cf. our text, infra e — B — 4 : anubhāvanālakṣaṇā; the Vyākhyā ad Abhidh. Koça, I, p. 14, quoted in the Index Général, p. 85, gives a more detailed definition, viz. vastuno hlādaparitāpa-tadubhaya-vinirmuktasvarūpasākṣātkaraṇasvabhāvah, „the proper nature (of Vedanā) consists in producing such special characteristics of an object as cold, heat or neither of the two".

— As to „Feeling, [6] o monks, conditions Thirst", what (kind of) thirst (is referred to)?

— The three thirsts : thirst for pleasure, thirst for existence and thirst for non-existence [48]. This thirst is referred to.

— [7] As to „Thirst, o monks, conditions Attachment", what (kind of) attachment (is referred to)?

— The four attachments : attachment to pleasure, attachment to Wrong Views [49], [8] attachment to (non-Buddhistic) moral rules and vows [50], and attachment to the doctrine of (the existence of) an Ātman [51]. This is the Attachment referred to.

— As to „Attachment, o monks, conditions [9] Existence", what (kind of) existence (is referred to)?

— The three (forms of) existence, i.e. existence in the Realm of Carnal Desire [52], existence in the Realm of Pure Forms and

Cf. the text of the Sputārthā in *Bibl. Buddh.* XXI (1931), p. 38, lines 6 sqq., where also a different definition is given.

[48] As we have already noted in the Introduction, there exist several sets of thirsts in Buddhism. A set of six thirsts is known from the Pāli sources: they correspond with the six *vijñānas*, the six internal, and the six external *āyatanas*. The Nālandā bricks (C) give the usual triad of *kāma, rūpa* and *ārūpya*, whereas our set of thirsts agrees with that attributed to the Vaibhāṣikas in *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 29, note. The latter is explained there as (a) thirst for pleasure in this life, (b) thirst for existence, i.e. for existence for ever (*bhava* = *çāçvatabhava*), (c) thirst for non-existence, i.e. for annihilation after death. The second and third thirsts are therefore directly connected with the two Extremes (*antagrāhadṛṣṭi*).

[49] The five *dṛṣṭis* are explained *infra*, g — A — 1 to 4, and enumerated in the portion, which was presumably added, from h — A — 8 to 9.

[50] *Çīlavratopādāna* is stated to be sevenfold, *infra* g — A — 1 to 3. Attachment to *çīla* implies the wrong view that moral conduct as explained in the Dharmaçāstras etc. would alone be sufficient for reaching final liberation. *Çīla*, of course, does not refer to the second *pāramitā*. Examples are given in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 86, where *çīla* refers to the belief according to which purity may be obtained by *tīrthas*, sacrifices and the like ; *vrata* refers to all kind of vows, such as living naked, living as a dog, all kinds of *tapas* etc. *Çīlavrata* is not only an *upādāna* by itself, but it is also included in *dṛṣṭyupādāna* (*çīlavrataparāmarçadṛṣṭi*).

[51] In *ātmavādopādāna*, °*vāda* may be translated by „doctrine" ; thus, Buddhism is *anāt-mavāda* or *çūnyavāda*. *Ātman* here refers to any kind of soul, not only to the *ātman* of the Upaniṣads etc. ; it thus includes such notions as *pudgala, poṣa, puruṣa, jīva,* etc. ; sixteen different items are enumerated in *Mahāvyutpatti*, 207, 1 to 16 (edition Minaiev-Mironov, p. 64). Most of these terms refer to definite doctrines. As *çīlavrata, ātmavāda* also occurs more than once in the list : it cannot well be separated from *satkāyadṛṣṭi*.

[52] For *bhava*, cf. *infra*, note 54 (*antarābhava*) and *supra*, note 14. The explanation here given is the usual one in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti*, 155, 1 — 3): it is taken to refer to existence in one of the three realms into which the entire phenomenal world is divided. They are narrowly associated with the cosmological ideas in Buddhism, explained by De la Vallée Poussin in *Cosmologie Bouddhique, Troisième chapitre de l'Abhidharmakoça, kārikā, bhāṣya and vyākhyā, avec une analyse de la Lokaprajñāpti et de la Kāraṇaprajñāpti de Maudgalyāyana,* 1914 — 19 ; numerous additions in De la Vallée Poussin's translation of *Abhidh. Koça*, III ; cf. also the

b — B Existence in the Realm of Formlessness. This is the Existence [1] referred to.

— As to „Existence, o monks, conditions Birth", what birth (is referred to)?

— Birth into one special category among all kinds of living beings [2] that exist [53]), (comprising in due order the following

---

Introduction to the latter (1931), *Additions et Corrections*, pp. 145 — 147; substantial survey in *Hasting's Encyclopedia*, s.v. *Cosmology*. — The compound *tribhava* is very common in Buddhism, also in Indonesia (cf. line 21 of the Ligor inscription and line 13 of the Kalasan inscription). The three realms comprise all the manifold forms of existence, conceived of as different worlds all situated on different levels from the hell Avīci up to the highest sphere, in which there is neither notion nor non-notion *(naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana)*. The divisions of the three *dhātus* are explained *infra*, h — A — 2 to 7; cf. also *infra*, g — A — 8 to 10. *Kāma* and *rūpa* have a special meaning here, which we tried to render by the almost too well sounding translations by Obermiller. *Kāma* comprises all those forms of existence where there is some carnal desire left, even if it is very refined like in the highest Kāmadhātu heavens. The most difficult concept of the three is however Ārūpyadhātu: though formless, it still belongs to existence and is even subdivided into four different realms, which are not however considered real 'places' (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, *kār.* 3: *ārūpyadhātur asthāna upapattyā caturvidhah*: the difference between the four divisions is only a difference in mode of birth). Many references about the problem whether there is some kind of subtle *rūpa* in the Ārūpyadhātu are given by De la Vallée Poussin, *Abhidh. Koça*, VIII, pp. 135 sq., notes.

[53]) *Jāti*, Birth, may be defined in several ways in Buddhism; *infra*, in g — B — 1, a much simpler definition is given, by which birth is stated always to take place within one of the four great classes (technically, the four *yonis*, „wombs", taken in a very extended meaning which includes eggs as in the case of birds, etc.). The very usual division of birth into either five or six *gatis* is not mentioned in our text. Instead of these simple definitions, the Vibhaṅga gives a lengthy analysis in which the succeeding stages of the birth process are enumerated; as usual, birth is taken to include the entire prenatal development, of which birth in its narrow meaning is only the final stage *(upapatti)*. which is only its most obvious aspect (manifestation, *prādurbhāva*, of the five Skandhas) Our lengthy analysis serves a very definite purpose : the entire process is explained in detail in order to stress that no eternal stuff, such as a soul going over from one existence to another, is required. In the second place, but this is more striking in other versions than in the sobre terms here given, the analysis is meant to provoke disgust, for it shows the continuous defilement during the process.

In the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, the link *bhavapratyayā jātih* is one of the most difficult parts. Here, there is a sharp distinction between the general and the special interpretation of the formula. In the latter, Bhava comprises present existence as far as accumulation of Karman is concerned *(karman* which is due to *upādāna*, as it is expressed in the preceding link of the chain). It is this karman which conditions Jāti and Jarāmaraṇa, which comprise future existence. This implies that Karman is the only factor going over from one existence to another. On the other hand, Bhava, in the general interpretation of Pratītyasamutpāda, is existence in general, i.e. not limited to present life. How does this existence condition birth in general ? As we have seen, Bhava is analyzed into the Three Realms in which existence is possible. Jāti therefore introduces the more special forms within these realms. This is expressed by the initial part of the formula, viz. *yattat teṣām (yeṣāṃ yeṣāṃ* would have been clearer) *satvānāṃ tasmin tasmin satvanikāye jātih*. All living beings belong

stages): becoming [54]), descent (into a mother's womb) [55]), further

to a special category by birth; each of these special groups, such as dogs, worms, birds, men of the different types etc., have characteristic marks, which make them constitute separate *nikāyas*. Many Buddhists (Sarvāstivādins, Yogācārins etc.) conceived of a special *dharma* called *nikāyasabhāgatā*, a force included in the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* that makes all beings belonging to the same group (such as all dogs) resemble each other; the direction of this force depends on Karman.

[54]) *Saṃjāti*, Pāli *sañjāti*, is an unusual word outside Buddhism. It is obviously a kind of birth preceding the descent into a womb (which is the next term), but its exact meaning is difficult to be fixed. The corresponding term of C means „becoming" *(Ep. Ind.*, 21, 1932, p. 293), but this is not exact; such a translation might as well correspond with Bhava, for instance. In addition, C is to be used with care, since it does not agree word for word with the Sanskrit Vibhaṅga text; cf. Bagchi's translation: „there is becoming and production (if becoming corresponds to *saṃjāti*, production should be taken to comprise both *avakrānti* and *abhinirvṛtti* of the Sanskrit text), there is becoming of the *skandhas* ('becoming' does not quite correspond to *abhinirvṛtti*), there is acquisition of *dhātu*, *āyatana* and *skandha* (the order is different) and there is becoming of the faculty of life (here, 'becoming' corresponds to °*prādurbhāva* in the Sanskrit text)". It seems certain that the Chinese translation reposes on essentially the same Vibhaṅga version, though there might be slight differences. It is known that Hiuan Tsang was extremely accurate and always tried to translate each word. Now, 'becoming' seems to correspond to three different Sanskrit notions, viz. *saṃjāti*, *ibhinirvṛtti* and *prādurbhāva*, which are by no means synonyms; 'production' rather corresponds to (*sam*)*utpāda* than to either of the notions which it is supposed to translate; finally, the order *dhātu*, *āyatana*, *skandha* is less satisfactory than *skandha*, *āyatana*, *dhātu* in our version, since the order should be progressive and in the latter form there is progression (the *skandha* classification of the *dharmas* into five groups is the 'coarsest' one). It is not our intention to base any conclusions on this comparison (an English translation of a Chinese text is not a reliable basis), but it should be stressed that here, at least, the Chinese version cannot be relied upon. — For the meaning of *saṃjāti*, the Chinese rendering of the term is of no use to us. In Buddhist texts, the prefix *sam*- is often used to convey a vaguer meaning to the original term (*saṃkleça* opp. *kleça*; *saṃmoha* in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 67, kār. 25, c-d, which is less definite than *moha*; it seems that *sam*- is sometimes technically used by Buddhists to include related notions into the original term; thus, *saṃkleça* means „all that is associated with *kleça*" (such as the whole Pratītyasamutpāda formula if Avidyā is not eliminated). If *saṃjāti* is meant to be a vaguer equivalent of *jāti*, it can only denote the 'birth' of that which will descend into the womb, since *saṃjāti* precedes *avakrānti*. If we consider that according to orthodox Buddhist opinion Karman is the only thing remaining after physical death and continuing the Saṃsāra, it is evident that a lot of imagination is necessary to conceive of a „mass of Karman" going into a *yoni*. We therefore think that *saṃjāti* denotes a sort of preliminary 'birth' during which the Karman was supposed to adopt a more concrete form. The latter is an elephant in the case of a future Buddha. Some Buddhists knew the interesting conception of the Gandharva, a semi-material being consisting of Karman only and irresistibly drawn towards the *yoni* corresponding to its Karman (for the metaphysical background, cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Indo-Européens* etc., 1936, pp. 287 sqq.), and all Buddhists accepted the *antarābhava*, „intermediate existence" between two distinct forms of existence.

[55]) *Avakrānti* is *garbhāvakrānti*; cf. the Prākrit and Pāli forms *ukraṃti*, *okkanti* and *avakkanti;* there is an inscription *bhagavato okkanti* on one of the Bharhut reliefs (Barua and Singha, *Barhut inscription*, 1926, p. 52).

development [56]), the grasping of the Groups (of *dharmas*) [57]), grasping of the (eighteen) Constituents [58]), grasping of the Bases of Cognition [59]), [3] further development of the Groups (of *dharmas*), and apparition of the vital sense [60]). This is the Birth referred to.

— As to „Birth, o monks, conditions Old Age and Death", [4] what old age and death (are referred to)?

— Old Age means [61]): baldness, greyness [62]), wrinkled skin,

---

[56]) *Abhinirvṛtti*, in *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 123, and VI, p. 126, refers to the *antarābhava*, which cannot be the case here. D. L. Friedmann, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā* (1937), note 127 to p. 52, translates it by „realization"; in *op. cit.*, note 84 to p. 50, *abhinirvṛtta* (of the *ṣaḍāyatana)* is translated by „accomplished". In *Daçabhūmika*, p. 49, *abhinirvartate* is used with reference to the growth of the *duḥkhavṛkṣa* representing phenomenal existence in a symbolic form. There, each preceding link of the Pratītyasamutpāda chain is also stated to bring about the cause for the *abhinirvṛtti* of the following link e.g. *avidyā* ..... *hetuṃ ca dadāti saṃskārābhinirvṛttaye)*. Here, the term might refer to the further development of the result of *saṃjāti* into the different prenatal stages (*kalala, arbuda* etc.). We then consider the next terms, which are compounded with *pratilābha* (or *pratilambha)* as a kind of explanation of *abhinirvṛtti*, so that one could translate: „further development by grasping *skandhas*, *āyatanas* and *dhātus*".

[57]) *Pratilābha* or *pratilambha* is considered the first stage of *prāpti*, „acquisition", in *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 179. For the concept of *prāpti*, which is one of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃkāras* in the Sarvāstivāda and Yogācāra systems, cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, p. 105, and *Mahāvyutp.*, 104, No. 64. The existence of such a force is necessary, since without that it would be impossible to explain why the embryo in its initial stage should try to acquire such nasty things as *skandhas* etc. *Skandha*, *āyatana* and *dhātu* are the three main classifications of the *dharmas* (*Abhidh. Koça*, I, kār. 20); they are based on three different principles. For the five *skandhas*, cf. *supra*, note 36.

[58]) The *dhātu* classification is based on the incorporation of the *saṃskṛtadharmas* into eighteen components of an individual stream of life (*saṃtāna)*; cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, pp. 9 sq. *Dhātu* is however also used for the five great elements with *vijñāna*; cf. the important *Pitṛputrasamāgama* quotation in *Çikṣās.*, p. 244, which explains the well-known words *ṣaḍdhātur ayaṃ puruṣaḥ* (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, I, p. 49, note 2, where references are given). Four great elements, viz. earth, water, heat and wind, are denoted by *dhātu* in *Mahāvyutp.*, 101, 2 — 5 (p. 31). The term *dhātu* occurs also *infra* in g — B — 3 in the definition of *çoka*.

[59]) For *āyatana*, cf. note 9 above. It is based on the incorporation of *all* the *dharmas* (including the *asaṃskṛtas*) into the six senses (the internal or subjective part) and the six kinds of objects particular to each of these senses (the external part).

[60]) *Jīvitendriyaprādurbhāva* is the moment of physical birth, the final stage in the Jāti process. Life, in its narrow sense (*jīvita)*, is contained between this moment and the *jīvitendriyanirodha*, mentioned below in the definition of Maraṇa.

[61]) As may be expected, the definition of Jarāmaraṇa consists of two definite parts: first, Jarā is defined, then Maraṇa, followed by a statement that Jarāmaraṇa comprises both notions together: as Nāmarūpa (cf. note 43 above), Jarāmaraṇa is composed of two notions, but constitutes a single Aṅga. The definitions of both Jarā and Maraṇa consist of an enumeration of a number of characteristic features and additional circumstances. As in the case of Jāti, there are obvious reasons which account for the lengthy descriptions as compared with many other Aṅgas. The numerous descriptions of Old Age in Buddhism usually correspond to the cliché here given, although with differences in detail. The poetical version in Açvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* in the description of the Bodhisattva's encounter with the old man (III, 28 sqq.)

decrepitude, bowed-ness, hunchbackedness, crookedness like a
roof (?) [63], [5] (the necessity of) leaning on a stick, the body weight

is undoubtedly based on it (cf. terms such as *yaṣṭiviṣaktahasta* corresponding with
daṇḍaviṣkambhanatā in the Vibhaṅga, *abhyupetaḥ keçaiḥ sitair* with our *pālitya*, etc.);
the *Lalitavistara* version of the same encounter corresponds still more closely to the
Vibhaṅga (ed. Rajendralal Mitra, 1877, p. 226, lines 4 to 11; Krom, *The Life of Buddha
on Barabuḍur*, 1926, p. 62, translated this passage from Lefmann's edition, which,
unfortunately, is not at our disposal), but gives a more detailed version with a
considerable number of additional terms; cf. also *Mahāvyutp.*, 192, 1 — 11, pp. 57 sq.,
where the following list is given, which may be compared with the Vibhaṅga:
kubjaḥ, jīrṇatā, valipracuratā, pālityam, daṇḍa avastambhanatā, khālityam, kāsaḥ (the
'cough' is not mentioned in our definition, nor in the Lalitavistara passage; it may
be a later addition), *kharukharāvasaktakaṇṭhaḥ* (not mentioned in our text, but C has
khuḷakhuḷapraçvāsakāyatā, expressing difficult breathing), *prāgbhāreṇa kāyena daṇḍam
avastabdhaḥ, dhamanisaṃtatagātraḥ* (referring to the veins of the leg? The same
expression occurs in the Lalitavistara in the passage quoted; it seems to replace the
compound *tilakālakagātratā* in the Vibhaṅga; for the latter cf. note 63 below), *jīrṇaḥ,
vṛddhaḥ, mahallakaḥ, gatayauvanaḥ* (of the last terms, the first is a repetition of
jīrṇatā, the second term of this list, whereas the three other terms are mere synonyms
of 'old'), *valinicitakāyaḥ* (a useless repetition of *valipracuratā* mentioned above),
vibhugnaḥ and *āturaḥ*. The *Abhidh. Koça* (III, p. 88, *Bhāṣya*) refers to the Vibhaṅga
definition in general terms („le *jarāmaraṇa* tel qu'il est défini dans le Sūtra") and
the *Vyākhyā* (cf. *loc. cit.*, note 2) quotes the text of the definition such as it is
found in the Madhyamāgama. The latter definition gives not so many terms as our
version; it rather corresponds to the Pāli version in *Majjhima*, I, p. 49 (cf. also the other
Pāli versions, quoted by Rhys Davids and Stede, *Pāli Dictionary*, s.v. *jarā*). revised.

of this definition represent a very old list (*mātṛkā*), which was frequently The terms

[62] It is a little strange to find 'greyness' of the hairs mentioned after 'baldness'. The
Pāli versions have instead of *khālityam: khaṇḍiccam*, explained as „the state of being
broken (of teeth)" in the Pāli Dictionary quoted above.

[63] *Gopānasīvaṅkatā* occurs in most of the Buddhist descriptions of Old Age (the *Mahāvyutp.*
list omits it). The usual translation is „crookedness as a roof" (cf., for instance,
Krom, *op. cit.*, p. 62; here, Rajendralal Mitra's edition reads *gopānasīvaktro*, which
cannot be correct). *Gopānasī* is not clear; the data of the *St. Petersb. Dict.* (II, p. 803)
are a little confusing; as a matter of fact, *gopānasī* is explained as a compound of
gopa and *anas*, but then one would expect it to mean „a shepherd's cart"; the
translation given is however „eine ausgehöhlte Dachfette", disagreeing with the etymo-
logy. The translation is probably correct; the word is mentioned between other
architectural details in *Mahāvyutp.*, 226, 87 (p. 74) and occurs rather often in the
Mahāvastu (cf. the loci enumerated in III, p. 546; both *gopānasīvaṅka* and *gopānasīvakra*
occur in the Mahāvastu and Senart in I, p. 450 of his edition considers *vaṅka* as a
„forme prâcrite du sanscrit *vakra* dans le sens moral" (the last words cannot apply
to the compound *gopānasīvaṅkatā*, where there is no question of morals). These
contradictory data do not make the meaning of the compound clear. If the etymology
given in the *Pet. Dict.* is correct (it seems reasonable enough), then *gopānas* would
be a „shepherd's cart". *Vaṅka* could well be combined with it; cf. Monier Williams'
Dict., where s.v. *vaṅka* the translation "roaming about, vagabond" is given; cf. also
ibid., s.v. *vak* 2, where *vavakre*, „they rolled", is quoted from the Rigveda. Then
gopānasī (better: *gaupānasī*) *vaṅkatā* would mean „going about as a shepherd's cart
does", i.e. slowly wobbling on a bad country road. In that case, the term would
be an adequate comparison with an old man's gait. This explanation is however given
with reserves: it is not yet clear to us how *gopānasī* could be used as an architectural
detail in that case.

leaning forward, the appearance of black spots on the limbs [64]), slowness, blindness ([65]), tiredness, exhaustion, [6] ripening and splitting up of the sense organs [66]), return of the forces to their previous state (?) [67]) and demolition. That is the old age referred to.

[64]) *Tilakālakagātratā*; C reads *tilakālakācitagātratā*, the Chinese version corresponds to „the spread of black spots" (the end of the compound, *gātratā*, is not rendered there). The *Mahāvastu* gives a slightly different compound, viz. *tilakāhatagātro*, meaning „having the legs struck by (covered with) moles", but *tilaka* is also the name of a definite disease. *Tilakālaka* undoubtedly refers to dark spots on the lower limbs, probably those due to lack of resistance of the veins (*varices*). The absence of such spots is mentioned among the eighty secondary marks *(anuvyañjanāni)* of a Mahāpuruṣa; cf. *Mahāvyutp.*, 18, 41 (p. 6): *vyapagatatilakālakagātrah*; further references are given by Sten Konow, *Avhandl. Nnrske Vid. Ak.*, Oslo, 1941, II, p. 62.

[65]) It is hardly strange to find *andhatva*, „blindness", mentioned in this list, although the term is hardly necessary since blindness is already included in *indriyānām paripākah paribhedah*, which follows. There are however strong reasons to suppose that the reading *andhatvam* is not correct. As a matter of fact, C reads *dhandhatvam*, and it is easy to understand that one of the series of copyists working on the text substituted the more common term *andhatvam*. Here, it is almost obvious that the *lectio difficilior* should be considered the correct one. The reverse substitution would not have been likely. *Dhandha* was often mistaken by copyists; cf. *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, p. 7, line 9 : *sa tena [dha]nvaprajño bhavati so 'nuttarajñānamārgāt pratyākrṣyate pratyudāvartyate and prajñendriyam prajñācakṣuh tad api tasya dhanvīkriyate.* Bendall (Index II, p. 381), translates „dull", which is the meaning required by the context, and remarks (*Additional Notes*, p. 395) that *dhanva* (c.q. *dhanvī*) should perhaps be corrected to *dhandha* (*dhandhī*), as *dha* and *va* are hardly distinguishable in the only existing MS. As for *dhandha*, Bendall refers the reader to Sanskrit *dhāndhya*, „dullness", to Pāli *dandha* and to De la Vallée Poussin's *Pañcakrama* edition, p. 53, where *dadhva* is an evident corruption of *dhandha*. The term *dhandhābhijñā* occurs in the *Abhidh. Koça* (VI, p. 280). In the "Additions et corrections" to the *Abhidh. Koça* (in *Introduction*, etc., 1931), n. 152, De la Vallée Poussin refers to Wogihara's thesis about the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (1908) and does not consider Leumann's interpretation of the term as *dhy-andha*, „verstandes blind", very probable („ne s'impose pas"). The Chinese Vibhaṅga version translated by Bagchi (*art. cit.*, p. 204) gives, among other terms, „mental debility", which may correspond to *dhandhatvam*, but this is not completely certain (the Chinese translation gives the terms in a slightly different order). — Altogether, we think that *dhandhatvam* was the original reading, so that instead of „blindness" we have to translate: „mental slowness".

[66]) The *indriyas* are obviously compared to a fruit, which, especially in the tropics, becomes rotten almost immediately after having become ripe.

[67]) If the reading *purānibhāvah* of our text, which here agrees with C, is to be accepted. The meaning could be that the *samskāras*, which in that case refer to 'forces' in general, especially forces of the body such as breathing, and mental forces such as those which condition speech, reassume in old age the state which they had in the earliest years of life. But *purāna* is mostly used to denote a very remote past, ancient times. The Chinese version gives „rotting of the *samskāras*", which might point to an original reading *pūtibhāva*. In any case, *samskāra* must be taken in a non-technical sense, i.e. as vital forces; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, II, pp. 122 sqq.: *āyuhsamskāra* and *jīvitasamskāra*, not occurring in the lists of *dharmas* (*Muséon*, N. S., 6, 1905, pp. 178 — 194). Thus *samskāraskandha* includes forces the activity of which should be supposed to increase as age advances, such as *jarā* (No. 68 of the Sarvāstivādin list and No. 79 of the Yogācāra list). It is obvious that *samskārāṅga* should be excluded here : the karmic forces cannot be destroyed *na kalpakoṭiçatair api.*

[7] — What Death is referred to ?

— Death means : of all sorts of living beings as there are, the act of falling out of their special groups [68], a distinct form of decay [69], [8] exhaustion of the interior (?) [70], exhaustion of life, cessation of (the activity of) the vital sense [71], destruction of the (vital) forces [72], and dissolution at the hour of death [73]. [9] That is the Death referred to. This Death and the preceding Old Age, both together are called Old Age and Death.

The above [10] is called the 'beginning' [74] of Dependent Origination, and (an answer to your question): what is the explanation thereof [75]. (In the following portion) I will teach you, o monks, also the (deeper) meaning of Dependent Origination [76].

---

[68] Cf. *supra*, note 53. At the time of death, the living being ceases to belong to a special group.

[69] On *bheda* in the meaning „a special form or aspect of something more general", cf. note 107 below. C reads : *cyavanatah bhedo*, „and, after having fallen out (of their special group), dissolution". Cf. also note 43 to the Transcription. This means that, at the hour of death, man ceases to belong to the species 'man'; he may or may not become man again, but that is another question. Having ceased to exist as a man, his body is subject to complete dissolution. — The main objection to C's reading is that the following *laksanas* necessarily precede dissolution; as a matter of fact, dissolution is implied in the last term of the Marana definition (at least, if our reading *marana-kālaksaya* is accepted). The Chinese version seems to be based on *cyavanatā bhedah* (*art. cit.*, p. 204); cf. note 43 to the transcription. There exist many kinds of „falling off", so that death cannot be defined by that term only. This 'fall' is sometimes interpreted in its literal meaning; cf. the nice tale in the *Dhammapada*, translated by Warren as „The Devoted Wife" *(Buddhism in Translation, Harv. Or. Ser.*, III, 1922, pp. 264 sqq.), where a celestial nymph, while „playing on the bough of a tree, fell from that existence, her body vanishing like the flame of a lamp", — to be reborn on earth.

[70] We translated according to the reading in C (cf. note 44 to the Transcription).

[71] Cf. *supra*, note 60.

[72] We interpreted *niksepa* in the meaning of *nihksepa* : confusion between the two prefixes is not rare. The *samskāras* (here : „vital forces"; cf. note 67 above) are co-ordinated during life-time (*samskāras* may be defined as 'co-operating forces'; cf. Stcherbatskij, *Buddhist Logic*, II, p. 311), but 'thrown asunder' at the moment of death ; they do not really disappear as long as there is Avidyā.

[73] *Maranakālaksaya* is the reading in our text; C reads *maranam kālakriyā;* Chin. version : „death is the arresting of the product of time", which is a translation of C's reading. In C, the repetition of the word to be defined (*marana*) seems strange, especially if it is taken to correspond to *kālakriyeti maranam.* In our version, the compound gives a kind of comprehensive notion at the end : in short, it is (that kind of) annihilation (which we regularly observe) at death. Cf. the last term of the Jarā definition : *jarjarībhāvah,* also comprising the whole process.

[74] Cf. note 19 above.

[75] *Katamah* refers to *vibhāgah* only. This quite agrees with the external form of the text. The *ādi* is expounded by the Bhagavat without there being any preceding question on the part of the monks ; the Vibhanga however, consists of explanations given by the Bhagavat in reply to a number of questions about the meaning of the separate links of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula.

[76] *Artha,* „meaning", is opposed to *vibhāga (vibhanga),* „explanation" in the form of an

- A   [1] (This meaning is expressed in the following strophes) :

        — „Material, indeed, all living beings are,

                they are all devoid of Soul [77]);

        They all see the Good Path (?) [78]:

                may nobody commit evil".

        „From Ignorance Acts accumulate,

           of Birth, Acts are the Cause ;

     [2] From Knowledge no Acts accumulate,

           through absence of Acts they are not re-born" [79].

        „The Buddha has the causes told

        Of all things springing from a cause,

        And also how things cease to be —

     [3] 'T is this the Mighty Monk proclaims" [80].

        „From one, two, three, four, five,

           six, seven, eight, nine sections grown,

       Ten- and eleven-fold arisen,

---

analysis of the separate terms into their different aspects. *Artha* refers either to the direct meaning (*nītārtha*), the 'letter' (*vyañjana*) of the Law, or to the indirect meaning (*neyārtha*), which is always more or less 'hidden' (*gūḍha*) in the wording of the Sūtras, but considered to be of paramount importance for a real understanding. Cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, IX, pp. 246 sqq. and the important references given by De la Vallée Poussin in his *Siddhi* translation, II, p. 558. If *artha* is used without further indication, as it is here, it should be taken to include the *neyārtha*, too. Usually, the latter is especially referred to in such cases; cf. *Mahāyānasūtrāl.*, I, strophe 4, with Lévi's translation (II, p. 5). It appears from the following that this is indeed the meaning of *artha* required here.

We translated *nirātmikāḥ*, which is the reading given by j — B — 2 In c — A — 1, the text is not in order; cf. note 50 to the transcription, where the corrected reading *nirāmaṇāḥ* is proposed. The latter is much more similar to the corrupt form on the plate and if it is accepted, it has important consequences for the interpretation of the Çloka — which it is however better not to include in the translation. Full details are given in the note to the transcription. Cf. also Addenda, pp. 338 sq.

Sarvve bhadraṃ na paçyanti, but plate j reads *sarvve bhadraṃ vipaçyanti*. Neither reading is satisfactory; it seems that the correct form of the Çloka can only be determined if it could be traced in literature. In the form in which the strophe is given in the text, it might be explained to mean that if it is fully realized that the living beings are devoid of an eternal soul, one of the main conditions for following the Path is fulfilled.

It is irritating that this strophe, which is found a few times more in the epigraphy of South-East Asia, could not be traced. Its meaning is however perfectly clear: it aims at establishing the well-known triple division of Pratītyasamutpāda into *kleça* (here called *ajñāna*), *karman* and *duḥkha* („suffering") or *jāti* (here called *janman*); it is the *pratītyasamutpādas trikāṇḍakaḥ* (*Abhidh. Koça*, III, kār. 19 ; Nāgārjuna's *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdaya* ; *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, p. 386); in the work last mentioned, p. 351, the same division is called *trivartman* instead of *trikāṇḍaka*, although the former term is usually reserved for the division of the *pratītyasamutpādāṅgas* into past, present and future; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 61 ; both threefold divisions are mentioned in our text, *infra* from c — B — 4 to 8).

Translation by Warren (*Buddhism in Translations, Harv. Or. Ser.*, III, 1922, p. 89).

is twelve-fold 'in dependence' " [81]).

[4] „Whosoever retains correctly
all conditions, well taught (?),
To the Triple Refuge surely he will come,
Refuge in the completely Nirvāned Bhagavat" [82]).

(The term) 'attachment' means : such a man moves in the darkness of Ignorance [83]); as to [5] 'Him who does not suffer from visual illusions, whose vision is pure' [84]), what does he consider Dependent Origination ? — (As follows): 'Dependent' means 'decay', which originates with reference to each link (of the twelve-fold formula), that is : [6] 'with reference to things doomed to perish' [85]).

— How manifold, then, is this Dependent Origination ?

— Conceived as a whole [86]), it is one because it constitutes the common base of all Defilement, like the Earth (which is the base of all animal and vegetable life) [86]).

— Dependent [7] Origination is t w o f o l d on account of its being partly Cause, partly Fruit [87]): Ignorance, Thirst, Attachment, Form-

81) *Pratītya* is used as a substantive (= *pratītya-saṃjñā*, „the concept *pratītya"). This is quite normal in grammars and commentaries *(Paṇ.,* 6, 1, 15 : *prateç ca,* „and of (the prefix) *prati."* But the use of *dvādaçaḥ* (for *dvādaçavidhaḥ?)* is strange. In view of the etymology given below, we are inclined to correct to *pratītyāḥ dvādaça smṛtāḥ,* „the perishable things are known to be twelve (in number)".

82) For this strophe, which occurs in a mutilated state in our text, cf. the Introduction. The translation is based upon the reconstruction proposed there.

83) This is the explanation of another strophe, which was however omitted in the copy. An attempt at reconstruction was made in the Introduction, to which the reader is referred.

84) *Ataimirikaç=cakṣuṣmān* ; for this clear reference to the Mahāyāna doctrine of *satyadvaya (saṃvṛti* and *paramārtha),* cf. the Introduction. Although the Pratītyasamutpāda theory is usually considered to belong to the domain of *saṃvṛti,* it is at the same time the most effective means to arrive at an intuition of *paramārtha;* only after having understood its theory, one may have a vision of the real Truth implying, among other things, that Pratītyasamutpāda is *anutpāda* and *anirodha.* Unfortunately, our treatise leaves these terms completely unexplained ; for a scholastic manual, they may have been considered too difficult and the author thinks it more important for his pupils that they should know how to become an *ataimirika,* i.e. by becoming *upādānavivarjita.*

85) This explanation is clearly based on the etymology of *pratītya* attributed to the Sautrāntikas in the Abhidharmakoça. References have been given in the Introduction.

86) *Samāsataḥ* is opposed to *vyāsataḥ,* „considering the different Aṅgas by themselves" : it is the synthesis opposed to the analysis, which was typical of the Vibhaṅga. In Vasubandhu's commentary (quoted in note 43 to the Introduction), the *samāsa* aspect of Pratītyasamutpāda is explained by *asmin sati* etc., the *vyāsa* aspect by *avidyā-pratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ* etc. A similar distinction is made in the explanation of the different aspects of Avidyā, *infra, f — A — 2. —* The conception here expressed is that the formula of Dependent Origination, conceived as a whole, is identical with the Saṃsāra, which is the base (*āçraya*) of all forms of Defilement (*sarvakleça*).

87) For the *hetu-phala* division, which is essential, cf. the Introduction. The strange order in which the Aṅgas belonging to the former group are given is due to the fact that

ative Forces, and Existence are the five-fold causes ; Consciousness, Name and Form, [8] the Six Bases of Cognition, Contact, Feeling, Birth and Old Age etc. [88]) are the sevenfold fruits. This is twofold Dependent Origination. — There is, however, another twofold (division of) Dependent Origination : [9] 'exterior' and 'interior' Dependent Origination. (Conceived of as) 'exterior', (it may be explained by the following simile): from the seed, the germ ; [10] from the germ, the leaf ; from the leaf, the stem ; from the stem, the bough ; from the bough, the bud ; from the bud, the blossom ; from the blossom, the fruit [89]). This is 'exterior' Dependent Origination.

c — B   — [1] What is 'interior' Dependent Origination like ?

— (As follows): Ignorance conditions the Formative Forces ; the Formative Forces condition Consciousness ; Consciousness conditions [2] Name and Form ; Name and Form conditions the Six Bases of Cognition ; the Six Bases of Cognition condition Contact ; Contact conditions Feeling ; [3] Feeling conditions Thirst ; Thirst conditions Attachment ; Attachment conditions Existence ; Existence conditions Birth ; Birth conditions [4] Old Age and Death. This is 'interior' Dependent Origination explained in extenso [90]).

— What is t h r e e f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

— (It is its division into) Defilement, Act, [5] and Suffering [91]).

---

the hetu itself may be analyzed into the indirect hetu (kleça) and the direct hetu (karman); cf. infra c — B — 4 to 6.

[88]) 'Etc.' is of course Death (marana); the different concepts which constitute the duhkhaskandha (çoka etc.) may also be included into "ādi.

[89]) The distirction between an 'exterior' and an 'interior' chain is typical of Mahāyāna (cf. the Introduction): it is pratītyasamutpāde viewed either aɔ the general rule of causation in the form in which it is conceived by Buddhism ('interior'), or as a chain of development of a living being ('exterior'). In either case, the chain may be considered hetūpanibandha or pratyavopanibandha (Stcherbatskij, Buddh. Logic, I, p. 84, note); according to the Çālistambhasūtra, which is one of the most authoritative texts on pratītyasamutpāda in Mahāyāna, the simile in our text applies to the hetūpanibandha (or: sahetuka) interpretation, whereas the pratyayopanibandha (sapratyaya) interpretation considers the pratītyasamutpāda as consecutive stages due to the contact with the six dhātus (earth, water etc.); cf. the lengthy Çālistambha quotation in the Bodhic.-pañj., p. 576, line 13, to 579, line 15. The latter quotation gives a slightly different version of our simile by giving two terms more, viz. ganda (between nāla and garbha), and çūka (between garbha and puspa). In Mādhyamikā treatises, this simile is especially used in explaining that there is neither eternity nor annihilation : the seed is not really destroyed when the germ arises, but the germ is not the same as the seed. It need not be stressed here that the simile itself is common to all Buddhism ; cf. for instance Abhidh. Koça, Vyā. ad Bhāṣ. III, 30, 29 ; Cosm. Bouddh., p. 153, line 31, to p. 154, line 8. The comparison of Pratītyasamutpāda with the development from seed to germ is probably very old ; but the Hīnayāna sources do not appear to have considered it an 'external' interpretation of Pratītyasamutpāda.

[90]) Vistarena i.e. by enumerating the different Aṅgas ; the 'internal' series could also briefly be explained by the formula asmin sati etc.

[91]) The division of the twelve Aṅgas into kleça, karman and duhkha is fundamental. It is closely related with the twofold division mentioned above (fivefold Hetu and

Ignorance, Thirst and Attachment are Defilement; the Formative Forces and Existence are Act; Consciousness, Name and Form, the Six Bases of Cognition and the remaining (Aṅgas) are [6] Suffering. This is threefold Dependent Origination. — There is, however, another threefold (division of) Dependent Origination: Ignorance and the Formative Forces are the past [7] and first portion; Birth and Old Age etc. are the future and second portion; Consciousness, the Six Bases of Cognition, Contact, Feeling, [8] Thirst, Attachment and Existence are the present and third portion of Dependent Origination [92].

— What is f o u r f o l d Dependent Origination like?

— [9] Ignorance and the Formative Forces are the section 'Cause'; Consciousness, Name and Form, The Six Bases of Cognition, Contact and Feeling are the section 'Result'; Thirst Attachment, [10] and Existence are the section 'Cause'; Old Age etc. is the section 'Result'. This is fourfold Dependent Origination [93].

d — A   — [1] What is f i v e f o l d Dependent Origination like?

— Ignorance and the Formative Forces are the producer; Consciousness and Name and From are the womb; the Six Bases

---

sevenfold Phala), but the Hetu is divided into an indirect cause (the cause 'in the back-ground') and a direct one, the active cause. *Duḥkha* is taken in a broader sense than in *Abhidh. Koça*, VI, p. 124, where it refers to the two last Aṅgas only and may then be conceived in its triple aspect of *saṃskāraduḥkha* (Jāti), *pariṇāmaduḥkha* (Jarā) and *duḥkhaduḥkha* (Maraṇa). The division here given is usually referred to by the three *saṃkleças*, the two first of which are *kleça* and *karman*, whereas the third is denoted by *phala*, *vipāka* or *jāti*. Cf. *Siddhi*, Ii, p. 487: „En fait, lorsqu'on envisage le fruit qui doit être engendré (*janya*) comme futur, on le décrit dans les termes Naissance-Vieillesse-Mort, pour provoquer le dégoût. Lorsqu'on l'envisage comme arrivé au présent, pour enseigner la naissance complexe (siang cheng, 109, et 4, 100) de ses divers stades, on le décrit comme Vijñāna, etc.". The threefold division is discussed in detail in *Siddhi*, II, pp. 500 sq., where numerous references are given. As to *duḥkha*, it has almost a technical meaning, which Stcherbatskij (*Centr. Conc.*, *passim*) denotes by the 'unrest of the elements': the fruit of *karman* is *anitya* and therefore *duḥkha* Only the fools may consider it *sukha* if it is *sukhavedanīya*.

[92] The distribution of the twelve Aṅgas to past, present and future existences is very usual: the first two Aṅgas belong to the past (*Avidyā* = *pūrvakleça*; *Saṃskāra* = *pūrvakarman*; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, *kār*. 21 a-b); present existence begins with the descent of Vijñāna (*vijñānāvakrānti*) and includes the following Aṅgas up to Bhava, which constitutes *karman* belonging to present existence and conditioning future Jāti; future existence is included in the last two Aṅgas (lying between re-birth and re-death). Cf. the references in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, pp. 60 sqq. and H. von Glasenapp, *art. cit.*, p. 401. The Yogācārins agree with the Sautrāntikas in condemning this classification; cf. *Siddhi*, II, p. 490: „il est parfaitement inutile de supposer avec le Petit Véhicule (*Koça*, III, 67) que les douze Aṅgas indiquent deux fois la cause, deux fois le fruit" (Avidyā-Saṃskāra: causes of present existence, Tṛṣṇopādāna-Bhava: causes of future existence).

[93] The fourfold division of Pratītyasamutpāda reposes on the twofold one into Hetu and Phala, but the former is subdivided into past and present causes, the latter into present and future fruits. Instead of *phala*, the term *vipāka*, „ripening", is used; it is the fruit due to ripening of *karman*, i.e. the morally qualified fruit. The *niṣyandaphala*, which is only the mechanical fruit, has no moral bearing.

of Cognition, Contact and Feeling [2] are the activity with regard
to the objects of sense [94]; Thirst, Attachment and Existence are
origination [95] ; Birth and Old Age are the 'series' [96]. [3] This is
fivefold Dependent Origination.

— What is s i x f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

— Ignorance is the section Defilement; the Formative Forces
are the section Act; Consciousness, [4] Name and Form, the Six
Bases of Cognition, Contact and Feeling are the section Fruit; Thirst
and Attachment are the section Defilement; [5] Existence is the section
Act; Birth, Old Age etc. are the section Fruit [97]. This is sixfold
Dependent Origination.

— What is s e v e n f o l d [6] Dependent Origination like ?

— Ignorance is the soil; the Formative Forces are the rains;
Consciousness is the seed; Name and Form and the Six [7] Bases
of Cognition are the leaf [98]; Contact and Feeling are the blossom;
Thirst, Attachment and Existence are the Fruit; Birth, Old Age etc.
are [8] the seed of the tree of re-birth [99]. This is sevenfold Dependent
Origination.

---

94) The fivefold division is clearly based on the threefold one into past, present and
future: the Aṅgas belonging to past and future constitute one division each, but
present existence has again been subdivided into three categories. It is not exactly
clear what the author meant by calling Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa the garbha, „womb";
possibly, he wanted to stress that Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa refer to the presence of
Consciousness and of the five Skandhas only, whereas Ṣaḍāyatana etc. imply the
development of the dharmas so that they are in mutual relations towards each other
(indriya opposed to viṣaya in Ṣaḍāyatanāṅga; three groups in Sparça, the result of
which is Vedanā); the latter group of three therefore constitute viṣayapravṛtti.

95) Prabhava, „origination", i.e. of Karman; the three Aṅgas included into this group are
Bhava, existence viewed as production of Karman leading to re-birth, with its direct
(Upādāna) and indirect (Tṛṣṇā) causes. According to the āvasthika interpretation
(Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 64), Tṛṣṇā is explained as: „l'état de celui qui désire les jouis-
sances et l'union sexuelle", Upādāna as: „l'état de celui qui court à la recherche
des jouissances", and Bhava as: „l'acte qui aura pour fruit l'existence à venir". —
This fivefold division of Pratītyasamutpāda is the clearest example of the āvasthika
interpretation. The twelve states represent five stages, viz. (a) past existence viewed
as the producer of present existence (1-2), (b) the beginning of present existence in
its embryonic state (the different dharmas being formed, 3-4), (c) conscious existence
as far as the relation between subject and object is concerned, but before the arising
of desire during puberty, (d) adult existence with its passions and the Karman due
to these, (e) future existence viewed as a 'series' due to 'ripening' of d (11-12).

96) Pravāha, a synonym of saṃtāna, denotes the 'stream' of dharmas constituting phenomenal
life in its narrow sense, limited by Birth on the one, and by Old Age and Death
on the other side.

97) This sixfold division is based on the first threefold one; cf. supra, c — B — 4 to 6.

98) The spelling pātra for pattra, frequent in Old Javanese inscriptions, also occurred
supra, c — A — 10.

99) This sevenfold division is closely related with the so-called 'external' interpretation
of the chain (supra, c — A — 9 to 10). Here, the first two Aṅgas are the general
conditioning factors of existence.

— What is e i g h t f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

— Ignorance is the fruit of infatuation [100]); the Formative Forces are the fruit of enterprise [101]); Consciousness and Name and

d — B Form are the [1] fruit of retribution [102]); the Six Bases of Cognition, Contact and Feeling are the fruit of efflux [103]); Thirst and Attachment are the fruit of the 'series' (?) [104]); Existence [2] and Birth are the fruit of annihilation (?) [105]); Old Age and Death is the undesirable fruit [106]). Thus, according to the different sorts of fruits, [3] Dependent Origination is eightfold.

— What is n i n e f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

---

[100]) This eightfold division is difficult. Whereas the twelve Aṅgas are partly defined as fruit and partly as cause in the twofold interpretation, this is by no means necessary : all of them may be considered fruit (and all may be considered causes, too), but they are fruits of different kinds ; here, the twelve Aṅgas are comprised into eight fruits. Only some of them are technical terms, viz. *vipākaphala*, the fruit of retribution due to 'ripening' of Karman, and *niṣyandaphala*, the natural outflow or mechanical result such as this is the case in the world of dead matter (e.g. the ashes as the 'fruit' of a burning object; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 289 ; *Siddhi*, II, p. 464 ; Stcherbatskij, *Buddh. Logic*, I, p. 224 ; *Mahāvyutp.*, 116, 1-5). The other six fruits mentioned here are no technical terms. Avidyā is called 'infatuation fruit' ; cf. the definition of Avidyā in *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 71 („saṃmoha à l'endroit des vérités"); although Avidyā is usually considered a cause rather than a fruit, it is of course the latter, too ; if not, it would be an original cause as in heretical systems. On the causes of Avidyā, cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, pp. 70 sq., and the quotations given there.

[101]) *Ārambhaphala*, — most of the divisions lay stress on the interpretation of Saṃskāra as the active forces (essentially the power of Karman) producing new existence (*punarbhavam abhisaṃskaroti*), passim ; cf. Friedmann, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā* (1937), p. 47. *Ārambhaphala* could be translated freely as an 'acting fruit'.

[102]) Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa, the first Aṅgas belonging to present life, are considered in their main aspect of being retribution of former existence. There is of course something arbitrary in this definition, since Jāti, for instance, may as well be considered a fruit of retribution as the two Aṅgas mentioned.

[103]) Cf. note 99 above. If the two first Aṅgas of present life are considered retribution of former existence, the following three, which were defined *viṣayapravṛtti* in the fivefold division, do not contain any new moral elements (i.e. except for those already contained in Vijñāna and Nāmarūpa): their relation with the two preceding Aṅgas may then be considered a natural outflow (i.e. the use of factors already present).

[104]) The meaning of *santānaphala*, the fruit which is a 'series' (viz. of *dharmas*, apparently composing an individual), is not clear to us.

[105]) *Nirvṛttiphala*, the fruit which is destruction, seems as obscure, in this connection, as *santānaphala* mentioned above. The only explanation that we can see is that Bhava is interpreted as *antarābhava*, the Karman remaining after the destruction of an 'individual' existence ; in that case, it might be termed a fruit which is destruction. But why is Jāti also included in *nirvṛttiphala* ? One might suppose that it is because Jāti may be considered a pure mechanical outflow of Bhava so that it might be included into the same category. The idea of Birth being destruction remains strange ; it seems that the Aṅgas have sometimes been forced rather violently into some of these classificatory categories.

[106]) *Aniṣṭaphala* is perfectly clear. The fools may be attached to prenomenal existence, but naturally they do not care for its undesirable consequences (Jarāmaraṇa with all the çokas implied). For this division, cf. *infra*, pp. 340 sq.

— Ignorance is a kind of false infatuation [107]; [4] the Formative Forces are a kind of action [108]; Consciousness is a kind of series [109]; Name and Form is a kind of looking at something (?) [110]; the Six Bases of Cognition are [5] a kind of support [111]; Contact is a kind of meeting [112]; Feeling is a kind of thought [113]; Thirst, Attachment and Existence are a kind of future [114]; [6] Birth and Old Age etc. are a kind of annihilation [115]. This is ninefold Dependent Origination.

— What is t e n f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

— Ignorance [7] is the root of Defilement [116]; the Formative Forces are the root of Karman [117]; Consciousness is the root of the embryo [118]; Name and Form is the root of the five Groups (of

---

[107] *Bheda* seems to mean a 'special form of something more general' here (cf. note 43 to the Transcription, where it seems to have the same meaning), but this is unusual. The *bheda* categories here mentioned are all common words (no technical terms). As to *mithyāndhabhedaḥ*, cf. note 62 to the Transcription, where we proposed to correct this incomprehensible form to *mithyāndhakārabhedaḥ*. The comparison of Avidyā with 'darkness' is usual (a — B — 1), but then only one aspect (i.e. its *ajñāna* aspect) is referred to; the addition of *mithyā* may then be understood : it probably serves to include also the positive aspect of Avidyā, i.e. *saṃmoha*, infatuation, into the definition.

[108] Since it represents *atītakarman* (cf. note 92 above).

[109] This is the conception of Vijñāna as *pravṛttivijñāna* (cf. note 7 to this Translation).

[110] *Ekṣaṇabhedaḥ*. The word *ekṣaṇa* is unknown from other sources and therefore suspect ; its meaning, if applied to Nāmarūpāṅga, is obscure.

[111] *Āçraya* agrees with the usual meanings of *āyatana* („base, dwelling place, temple", etc.). The (internal) *āyatana*s such as eyes etc. are conceived of as the bases of *cittacaitta* ; cf. Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, p. 3 ; *Ṣaḍāyatana* is compared with a house (*gṛha*); cf. *infra*, e — A — 1. This undoubtedly is the correct interpretation of *āyatana* ; a completely different one is given in *Abhidh. Koça*, 1, kār. 20 (*āya-tana* = *āya-dvāra*, „entrance door" for the impressions from outside).

[112] As to Sparça, usually interpreted as the triple contact between an *ādhyātmikāyatana* a *bāhyāyatana* and *vijñāna*, cf. note 10 above.

[113] *Cittabheda* is strange ; Vedanā is a *caittadharma*, but this it has in common with many other *dharma*s, such as Sparça.

[114] Obviously, the meaning is that these three Aṅgas are those factors in present existence which condition the future.

[115] Cf. note 105 above. Life in its narrow sense may be considered a kind of annihilation, because it necessarily leads to annihilation.

[116] As appears from the similes, 'root' (*mūla*) does not mean „cause" here, but rather „essence, principal aspect" ; thus, Nāmarūpa may be denoted as *skandhamūla* : the most characteristic aspect to Nāmarūpāṅga is that it comprises the five Skandhas.

[117] As in most of the classifications given here, the essential feature of Saṃskārāṅga consists in its being *karman*.

[118] *Kalala* is the very first stage of embryonic life, the four other stages being *arbuda*, *peçin*, *ghana* and *praçākhā* (*Mahāvy.*, 190, 1-5, and *passim*). The comparison with Vijñāna is probably suggested by the common Buddhist theory according to which life begins with the descent of Vijñāna into the womb (*vijñānāvakrānti*, *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 88 ; cf. Çālistambha quoted in *Çikṣās.*, pp. 224 sq. ; p. 225, lines 2-4 : *atha ca mātāpitṛsaṃyogād ṛtusamavāyād sarveṣāṃ ca pratyayānāṃ samavāyād āsvādānupraviddhaṃ vijñānabījaṃ mātuḥ kukṣau nāmarūpāṅkuram abhinirvartayati*).

dharmas); the Six Bases of Cognition [8] are the root of support [119]);
Contact is the root of the three; Feeling is the root of 'ripening' [120]);
Thirst is the root of the cause, Attachment [9] is the root of
'seizing' [121]); Existence, Birth, Old Age etc. are the root of re-birth.
This is tenfold Dependent Origination.

    — [10] What is e l e v e n f o l d Dependent Origination like ?

    — Ignorance is the lord; the Formative Forces are the army
e — A commanders; Consciousness is [1] the ministers; Name and Form
is the city; the Six Bases of Cognition are the house [122]); Contact
is the five objects of sensual pleasure [123]); Feeling is the friends, foes
and neutrals etc. [124]); [2] Thirst is, that they wish to gain the victory
over each other; Attachment is negociation, provocation of discord,
force and gifts (?) [125]); Existence and Birth are acquisition of
sovereignty; [3] Old Age and Death are loss of sovereignty. This
is elevenfold Dependent Origination [126]).

---

[119]) Cf. note 111 above.

[120]) The relation between Sparça and Vedanā is a very narrow one; cf. *Siddhi*, II, p. 483 :
„le Sparça est cause et la Vedanā est effet"; but this hardly accounts for the expression
vipākamūla, which would be better suiting for the relation between, for instance,
Bhava and Jāti.

[121]) Cf. *Siddhi*, p. 484: „Le Bīja peut rester 80000 kalpas sans engendrer: pour engendrer
il doit être mouillé par la Tṛṣṇā". The latter is the primary cause of re-birth, as
far as the present life factors are concerned. Then, Upādāna becomes only 'augmentation
of Thirst' (*tṛṣṇāvivrddhi, Daçabh.*, p. 48; *tṛṣṇāvaipulya*, Çālist. quoted *Çikṣās.*, p. 222;
the latter should be considered a single compound, not two words as in Bendall's
edition). Grahaṇa is almost a synonym of *upādāna* in its etymological sense (*upādatte =
grhṇīte*).

[122]) Cf. notes 111 and 11? above. Ṣaḍāyatana is often represented as a house with six doors.

[123]) The *pañca kāmaguṇāh* are mentioned in *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 56; cf. Rhys Davids
and Stede, s.v., and *Mahāvastu*, III, p. 109, line 15. The five *kāmaguṇāh* correspond to
the five senses, although there are six *sparças*.

[124]) Corresponding to the three kinds of Feeling, viz. *sukha, duhkha* and *aduhkhāsukha.*

[125]) The text reads *ātmabhedadandandāvapradāni*, which cannot be correct in this form.
Bheda and *danda* are two of the four means which are recommended by the Arthaçāstra
to beat enemies. Then, it becomes evident that the other two means are 'hidden'
somewhere in the compound. *Ātma°* is obviously an error by the copyist for *sāma*,
the first of the means; such an error is understandable, since *sā* and *ā* resemble each
other much in writing; presumably, the copyist read *āma* in his original and not
understanding that word, changed it to the well-known term *ātma*. The end of the
compound gives more difficulties; the word to be expected there is *dānāni*, „gifts",
or some synonym (*sampradānāni* ?). The repetition of *nda* is probably due to diplography.
Although there may be some doubt about the correct restitution of the original form
in our text, the meaning is perfectly clear: the four *upādānas* are compared with the
four means used by the *vijigīṣu*; just as these four means might lead him to sovereignty,
the four *upādānas* may lead one to repeated existence.
These four 'means' (*upāya*) are frequently alluded to in literature and epigraphy;
for the latter, cf. one of the Mī-son inscriptions, *B.E.F.E.O.*, IV (1904), p. 938, in the
translation by Finot; "les quatre moyens, à savoir : la négociation (*sāma*), la libéralité
(*dāna*), l'attaque (*danda*), la discorde (*bheda*)".

[126]) The similes are interesting from several points of view; cf. the Introduction. Dependent

— What is t w e l v e f o l d Dependent [4] Origination like ?

— Ignorance conditions the Formative Forces ; the Formative Forces condition Consciousness ; Consciousness conditions Name and Form ; Name and Form conditions [5] the Six Bases of Cognition ; the Six Bases of Cognition condition Contact ; Contact conditions Feeling ; Feeling conditions Thirst ; Thirst [6] conditions Attachment ; Attachment conditions Existence ; Existence conditions Birth ; Birth conditions Old Age and Death [7] (including sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief and despair [127]). Such is the origin of the powerful mass of suffering.

[8] [[128]) Long and short, round and square, high and low, like and unlike, — these constitute twentyfold Form [129]). 'Name' means : [9] the four immaterial groups (of *dharmas*). Both together are called 'Name and Form'. — What does 'Name and Form' (as a compound) mean there ? — (It means that) wherever there is Name, there is also Form, or — He said — wherever there is Form, [10] there is also Name and wherever there is Name, there is also Form, just like the sky (?) [130]).

Origination is compared with the history of some of the many petty kingdoms in Indian history. It is the prince who, with the help of his army commanders and ministers, attacks his neighbours and succeeds in building up an empire, — which, however, he loses afterwards. The use of similes like this one is an excellent *upāya* ; from its very beginnings, Buddhism needed royal favour, and dialogues between Buddhist monks or Bodhisattvas and kings must have been popular ; the Milindapañha and the various Paripṛcchās give us excellent examples of this kind of literature, in which it was essential to stress that Buddhist Dharma could be combined with *rāja-dharma*. In such dialogues, it is only natural that many examples should have been borrowed from Rājanīti and Arthaçāstra literature. The simile given here illustrates in a popular way some of the most important aspects of Dependent Origination. The king Avidyā with the army commanders dependent on him (the Saṃskāras) dominate this *maṇḍala*, which is directed towards universal domination, just as the *pratītyasa-mutpādāṅgas* are directed towards re-birth ; but just as the foundation of an empire is necessarily followed by its dissolution, in the same way re-birth is always followed by re-death.

[127]) Some words have been left out in the text ; cf. the notes to the Transcription.

[128]) The following passage (up to the end of plate e — B) has probably been added by the copyist. It is rather confused and full of mistakes.

[129]) On the twenty categories of Rūpa (i.e. *rūpāyatana*), cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, I, p. 16 ; IV, pp. 9 sqq. ; Lamotte, *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa, Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, IV (1935-36), pp. 211 sqq. ; Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc.*, p. 11 ; A. B. Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy* (1923), pp. 188 sqq. ; McGovern, *Manual* (1923), p. 114, etc.

Rūpa comprises eight categories of shape (*saṃsthāna*), the four principal and the eight secondary colours (*varṇa*), in all twenty categories. Since Rūpa is stated to be twentyfold in our text, there is no doubt that the latter division is alluded to ; probably, the copyist (or his source) did not understand why colours should be included into Rūpa ; he was quite right, since Rūpa, in Nāmarūpāṅga, is characterized by impenetrability (*sapratigha*). He therefore left the colours out, without realizing, however, that he was copying a portion about *rūpāyatana* including the statement of its being twentyfold.

[130]) The Nāmarūpa definition as it is given here partly agrees with its Vibhaṅga version

·· — (As to) „Name and Form, o monks, conditions the Six Bases
of Cognition", [11] there, the Six Bases of Cognition originate .in

---

(*supra,* a — B — 5 to 8). As to the latter, cf. note 36 .above and the Introduction.
It is interesting to compare the existing versions of this definition . in Buddhist
Sanskrit literature in Yaçomitra's *Sphuṭārtha,* Çālistambhasūtra (quoted in three dif-
ferent forms in the Madhyamakvṛtti, Çikṣās. and Bodhic.-pañjikā), the two versions
of our text, the text of C and a few others. The most striking point is that the
text is never exactly the same. This is partly due to the fact of there having existed
more or less elaborated versions (cf. note 71 to the· Introduction), partly, however,
to the fact that the definition appears not to have been understood by copyists in
rather early times. Cf. *Çikṣās.,* p. 222 : *vijñānasahajāç catvāro 'rūpiṇa upādānaskandhās
tan nāma, catvāri ca mahābh'ūtāni copādāya upādāyarūpam aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya
tan nāmarūpam.* The corrections proposed by Bendall in a time when the other versions
were as yet unknown .cannot be accepted (such as the correction of *nāma,* before
the punctuation mark, to *nāmarūpam*); the only changement needed is to supply
the words *catvāri mahābhūtāni* after *mahābhūtāni :* „both the four Great Elements
(themselves) · and the secondary (*upādāya°*) Form derived from (lit. : which 'adopts'
the different elements in the right proportions by the process called *prāpti*) the
Great Elements". The words added have probably been omitted by haplography
(or because the copyist thought that they were due · to diplography ?). Still more
words were omitted in the version in the· *Bodh.-pañj.* (p. 388 : *catvāri mahābhūtāni
copādānāni rūpam aikadhyārupaṃ ; vijñānasahajāç ρatvāro 'rūpiṇa upādānaskandhā
nāma ; tan nāmarūpam*); the latter text is due to a complete confusion ; the strange
aikadhyārūpaṃ is obviously due to the expression *aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya,* which was
misunderstood ; *upādāya,* too, was not understood and changed to *upādānāni* . (owing
to a kind of anticipation of *upādānaskandha ?*), and the order of *nāman* and *rūpa*
was converted in the explanation. For the Tibetan version, which is less confused, cf.
note 1 to p. 388 of De la V. Poussin's edition. The version found in the Prasannapadā
is discussed by the same scholar in the note to p. 9 of his edition in *Bibl. Buddh.* XXI.
We noted witn referei.ce to the Vibhaṅga definition of Nāmarūpa that a relatively
simple form of the definition was given there — · without, for instance, the wcrds
aikedhyam abhisaṃkṣiṇya, which seem characteristic of all of the versions used in
·Mahāyāna. It is interesting to examine whether the same is the case with the definition
given in this interpolated portion, which belongs to what we .may. call ᵗhe Upadeça.
Obviously, it is not. This appears clearly from the words *yatra nama tatra . rūpam*
with its clumsy repetitions. Iᶠ we assume that the author of this passage· meant
something ·by stressing these words, it is obvious that they can only be a kind of
popular explanation of the words *aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya:* „thrown together into
a unity" means that „where there is Nāma there is also Rūpa" etc., as a gloss given
by the teacher. Then we also understand how *āha,* „he said", was added to the text :
the words *yatra nāma* etc. represent the popular explanation given by the teacher to
make the pupils understand the difficult expression *aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya* ; the
teacher's idea · is that Nāmarūpāṅga is something else than *nāman + rūpa :* it is
an apparent unity, the first stage of prenatal existence, composed of the five *skandhas.*
The copyist then substituted the popular explanation for the original terms. If this
interpretation is correct; it follows ·that the version of the Nāmarūpa definition used
in the. Upadeça was different from the Vibhaṅga one ; the former has the additions
occurring in our Mādhyamika sources.
·The next point is what our author meant by adding *ākāçavat,* „like the sky" or
„like empty space" ; it is not quite clear what could have suggested the comparison
· between Nāmarūpa and Ākāça. About the latter, there has been a famous controversy
in the Abhidharma Schools (cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* II, p. 279), continued· in· Mahāyāna,

the six groups of Consciousness (?) [131]), such as the bases of eyes,
e — B ears, nose, tongue, [1] skin and mind.

— (As to) „the Six Bases of Cognition condition Contact", there
are six (groups of) contact [132]): eye-contact, [2] ear-contact, nose-
contact, tongue-contact, skin-contact and mind-contact. Contact is the
meeting of three (elements): Contact is [3] the meeting of the eye
etc. with Consciousness [133]); eye-contact is threefold : agreeable con-
tact, disagreeable contact and neither-agreeable-nor-disagreeable con-
tact [134]). In this way, [4] there are, in all, fifteen kinds of Contact [135]).

---

whether Ākāça is an *asaṃskṛtadharma* or not. The Sarvāstivādins and the Yogācārins
consider it to be one of the three, respectively six, *asaṃskṛtas* (*Abhidh. Koça*, I,
p. 8; McGovern, *Manual*, p. 112; *Siddhi*, pp. 72 sqq.), whereas the Sautrāntikas
(*Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 279) and the Mādhyamikas think the idea of Ākāça being
an *asaṃskṛta* absurd; the latter attribute it to the opinion of Pṛthagjanas (*Madhyama-
kavṛtti*, p. 505: *ākāçādīni kalpyante nityānīti pṛthagjanaiḥ*); Ākāça is nothing but
absence of matter (cf. the Ratnāvalī, ascribed to Nāgārjuna, quoted *Madhyamakavṛtti*,
p. 413: *rūpasyābhāvamātratvād ākāçam nāmamātrakam*). Could the remarkable com-
parison in our text be due to a misunderstanding of the passage last mentioned or a
similar one ? *Nāman* and *rūpa* are here mentioned together with *ākāça*, and owing to
a wrong reading (e.g., *rūpasya* instead of *rūpasyā°*) one might arrive at a strange
opinion about *ākāça*. In any case, the statement in our text could only be due to some
misunderstanding of an isolated passage.

[131]) This explanation must also be due to the interpolator. It seems to be an attempt at
bringing the six 'internal' Āyatanas into connection with the six groups of Vijñānas.
The converse statement (i.e. the *ṣaḍ vijñānakāyāḥ* being in the *ṣaḍ āyatanāni*) would
have been less strange; in any case, there must have been some misunderstanding.

[132]) *Ṣaṭ sparçāḥ*, — read: *ṣaṭ sparçakāyāḥ*; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 95, and *supra*,
b — A — 3. *Sparça* is defined as the total of an innumerable number of separate
moments of contact, classified into six groups.

[133]) This explanation is rather clumsy, since only two items are mentioned. The meaning
is of course: contact of Consciousness with visible matter (*rūpāyatana*) by means of
the eyes, with audible 'matter' (*çabda*) by means of the ears, etc.; the internal
āyatana is always the *dvāra* in this process (cf. note 111 above).

[134]) This is the division which is usually given for Vedanā, not for Sparça. The point
is that if Sparça may be agreeable etc., it does not really differ from Vedanā.
As a matter of fact, the Sarvāstivādins (i.e. the Vaibhāṣikas) drew this conclusion,
which they based on the fact that the triple contact could not be a *caittadharma*
by itself and its mention in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula would be superfluous
in that case (*Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 97). The interesting point is therefore that this
interpolation is based upon the Sarvāstivādin interpretation — which is not the
case with the Upadeça in general (cf. especially d — B — 8: *sparça iti trikamūlam*;
cf. also d — B — 5: *samavāyabhedaḥ*, and note 10 to this Translation). The point
might not be devoid of interest in view of the possibility of tracing the source of
our interpolation, which was certainly not our Vibhaṅga; unfortunately, the text of
this interpolation is so very clumsy that it does not make the impression of being
based on an authorized source.

[135]) The number 'fifteen' is obviously due to a mistake in multiplication; there is however
a slight chance that the interpolator shrank back from the consequences of his multi-
plication: how to imagine direct contact between the mind, the objects of the mind
(*dharmāyatana*) and Consciousness ?

— (As to) „Contact conditions Feeling", the characteristic feature of Feeling is sensation. There are three [5] (kinds of) feeling: agreeable feeling, disagreeable feeling and neither-agreeable-nor-disagreeable feeling.

— (As to) „Feeling conditions Thirst", the characteristic feature of Thirst is contentment [136]. [6] There are three (kinds of) thirst: thirst for pleasure, thirst for formlessness and excessive thirst (?) [137].

— (As to) „Thirst conditions Attachment", what is Attachment (there)? [138].

— There are four (kinds of) Attachment [7]: attachment to pleasure, attachment to Wrong Views, attachment to (non-Buddhistic) moral rules and vows, and attachment to the doctrine of (the existence of) an Ātman. Attachment to pleasure is twentyfold [139].

It is evident that such contact could only be effected by means of preceding *cakṣuhsaṃsparça* etc., so that in that case there would be four factors getting into contact (for the difference between the first five, *pratigha*, Sparças and the sixth one without direct *pratigha*, cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, kār. 30 c-d). The interpolator may have realized this difficulty and therefore concluded that the three kinds of *manahsaṃsparça* should be excluded from the total. This seems more probable than a mere mistake in multiplication.

[136] *Sutṛptilakṣaṇā tṛṣṇā*, — usually, the characteristic element of Tṛṣṇā is *āsvādana*, „enjoying"; cf. Çālistambha in *Çikṣās.*, p. 223, lines 8 sq.: *yas tām* (viz. *vedanāṃ*) *vedayati viçeṣenāsvādayati, abhinandaty adhyavasyaty adhitiṣṭhati, sā vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇety ucyate*. *Sutṛpti* is strange since it denotes rather the aim than a characteristic feature of Thirst.

[137] The three sorts of Tṛṣṇā mentioned here form a strange group, which appears to be unknown from other sources. A group which is often found is the triad *kāma, bhava* and *vibhava* (e.g. in the Mahāvibhāṣā; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 29, note). The usual Mahāyāna triad is *kāma-rūpa-ārūpya*, which occurs in the text of C, but also in Hīnayāna sources *(Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 85; Vasubandhu's commentary on the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, *J.R.A.S.*, 1930, p. 616; references to Pāli sources in Rhys Davids-Stede, s.v. *taṇhā*). Six thirsts (corresponding to the six kinds of Sparça) are mentioned in the Chachakkasutta, *Dīgha*, III, p. 243. The Dīghanikāya also mentions the triad *rūpa, arūpa, nirodha* (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, V, p. 29, note, from which most of these references are borrowed). As to the relation between these different divisions of Tṛṣṇā, cf. the Introduction. The set of three thirsts given in our text is very strange indeed; it does not make sense. It is presumably based on the division *kāma-rūpa-ārūpya*, but the second item was omitted and a new third item, viz. *atitṛṣṇā*, was added. It might seem futile to examine how the interpolator came to mention it; it is certainly due to some misunderstanding (perhaps of *itibhavatṛṣṇā*, „thirst to become like 'that'", mentioned in *Abhidh. Koça*, VI, p. 137; there the example of somebody who wants to become Indra is given).

[138] The use of *bhavati* (and of *bhavanti* in the beginning of line 7) is strange; it seems to be a mere copula.

[139] The origin of twentyfold *kāmopādāna* can be traced; it is undoubtedly due to the twentyfold division of *kāmadhātu (Abhidh. Koça*, III, kār. 1: *kāmadhātuḥ sa naraka-dvīpabhedena viṃçatiḥ*; cf. also note 202 below). The interpolator therefore interpreted *kāmopādāna* as *kāmadhātūpādāna*. This is certainly wrong, especially if the twentyfold division of *kāmadhātu* is stressed: what to think about attachment to the hell Avīci? Such an idea would not have entered the head of even the most systematizing Buddhist.

f — A [1] Thus, the rule [140]) of Dependent Origination was taught in detail [141]). So Ignorance (is its origin) [142]), (i.e.) 'pure' [143]) Ignorance, Ignorance which is not wrong knowledge but only want of knowledge. — Is want of knowledge something different (from Ignorance)? — (Certainly,) Ignorance cuts (?) and is [2] denied (?) [144]). — How many-fold, then, is Ignorance ?

It is curious that the same mistake of confounding the different meanings of *kāma* occurs in h — A — 7; it is a clear hint that the two interpolations in our text were made by the same hand.

[140]) After the interpolation, the thread left at e — A — 7 is taken up again. The term *vidhi* is not usual in this connection, but its meaning is evident: it refers to the different classifications (*ekavidha* etc.) and might be rendered by „distribution" (of the twelve Aṅgas among the different notions such as *hetu-phala* etc.).

[141]) *Vistareṇa* is the opposite of *samāsataḥ* (cf. note 86 to this Translation), but in a different way than *vyāsena* would have been. The whole preceding portion of the Upadeça (without, of course, the interpolation) may be considered an 'extension' of the last but one introductory çloka (c — A — 3).

[142]) There may be a small lacuna in the text here; we should have expected something like : *evam avidyā pratītyasamutpādādiriti niçcayaḥ,* followed by a question *avidyā katamā?* Then, the words *tāvad=avidyā* are an answer to the latter question.

[143]) *Tāvad-avidyā,* "only-ignorance", seems to be a synonym of *avidyā kevalā* or *avidyā āveṇikā,* „independent ignorance" (*Abhidh. Koça,* III, p. 84: „not polluted by *kleças",* but mere ignorance in its negative aspect; cf. also *ibid.,* II, p. 167, note 3, where *āveṇika* is explained by *rāgādipṛthagbhūta*; cf. also *Siddhi,* I, pp. 277 sqq.); it is the most subtle kind of Avidyā in its aspect of *jñeyāvaraṇa.* This *akliṣṭam ajñānam* is considered the basis of the Saṃsāra here : abstention from the evil is not sufficient to be liberated from the Saṃsāra; as a matter of fact, it would only lead to liberation from the bad *gatis.* Since Avidyā itself is one of the six fundamental *kleças,* it is difficult to imagine Avidyā which is not associated with *kleças*; the *Abhidh. Koça* (II, p. 165) therefore uses the term *parīttakleça,* „a limited *kleça",* for this peculiar kind of Avidyā The statement that *tāvad-avidyā* (or *ajñāna)* is at the basis of the Saṃsāra, elicits the question whether this is true for all kinds of Avidyā.

[144]) The reply to the question last mentioned begins with the remarkable words *avidyā vṛçcati pratiçiddhyati* (sic), which cannot be correct in this form. In the passage which follows, Avidyā is analyzed from two different points of view : what is Avidyā and how is Avidyā abandoned? In view of these two points of view, one would expect the two terms in the beginning of the exposition to refer to either aspect of Avidyā, e.g. the effect of Avidyā and the way in which it is destroyed. *Vṛçcati,* „cuts", could only be applied to Avidyā if the latter could be taken to imply *mithyādṛṣṭi,* about which it is often stated that it 'cuts' (*chinatti*) the 'roots of salvation' (*kuçala-mūlāni;* cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* IV, pp. 170 sqq. and *passim),* but it is by no means necessary that Avidyā should imply this completely wrong view; we therefore presume that *vṛçcati* is a mistake by the copyist, but do not see a suitable term which is sufficiently similar to the form given in the text to make the mistake understandable ; the only form wich resembles it a little is *badhnāti* (which would have been written *vadhnāti,* which also begins with a *va,* followed by a not frequently occurring ligature, and ends in *ti) ;* the correction suggested would mean „binds" (the creatures to the Saṃsāra), and might be supported by *Abhidh. Koça,* III, p. 89, where also a number of other synonyms referring to the action of Avidyā are mentioned. *Pratiçiddhyati* could be corrected to *pratiṣiddhyati* (or °*te,* but the latter correction would hardly be necessary in Buddhist Sanskrit); the advantage above other possible conjectures is that the difference is but slight; confusion between the sibilants is common, and the triple

— Conceived of as a whole [145]), Ignorance is o n e, since it is identical with all the defilements [146]). Ignorance is t w o fold, too, in as far as it is based either on causation, [3] or on Consciousness [147]). Ignorance is t h r e e fold, too, in as far as (it comprises) want of knowledge, uncertain knowledge and wrong knowledge [148]). Ignorance is f o u r fold, too, [4] in as far as it is to be abandoned by (a) Suffering, (b) the Origin (of Suffering), (c) the Cessation (of Suf-

---

ligature ddhy (with doubling of the consonant preceding ya) was copied with the omission of the lowest portion. Pratiṣidhyate, „is driven back, suppressed", is just the term we should have expected. It then refers to the different heya categories to be mentioned below. The relation with the preceding portion of the text now becomes clear: after the lengthy exposition of the different categories to which the twelve Aṅgas can be attributed, the conclusion that Avidyā as a transcendental factor (āveṇikā) is at the basis of Dependent Origination is reached. With reference to the latter conclusion, it is asked in how far this Avidyā is the basis of the Saṃsāra; the reply is that the relation between Avidyā and the Saṃsāra may be considered from two different points of view corresponding to either the sāṃkleçika or the vaiyavadānika aspect. This samāsataḥ statement is consequently discussed vistareṇa.

[145]) Cf. supra, c — A — 6, where essentially the same statement refers to the formula of Dependent Origination.

[146]) To explain the use of avitathārthena, we refer the reader to the Bodhisattvabhūmi, edition by Wogihara (1930-36), p. 292, and De la Vallée Poussin, Documents d'Abhidharma, in Mélanges, V (1936-37), p. 159. There, the same kind of analysis is applied to what might be termed the opposite of Avidyā, viz. Satyam; the latter is analyzed into one to six aspects there; cf. the beginning of that passage: „avitathārthena tāvad ekam eva satyaṃ na dvitīyam asti . dvividhaṃ satyaṃ saṃvṛtisatyaṃ paramārthasatyam ...." : „In as far as the Truth means 'not differing from tie 'thus-ness' of things, it is just one and without a second; the Truth is twofold in its double aspect of relative and absolute Truth ....". For the exact meaning of avitatha (and ananyatha) and its relation with the Tathatā in Mahāyāna, cf. the copious notes in Appendice II to De la Vallée Poussin's Siddhi translation (II, pp. 743 sqq.). Cf. Yaçomitra, Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya 40, 22, in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 165, where the term occurs in a quotation from a Yogācāra source (Maitreyavacanam).

[147]) It is remarkable that the most common twofold division of Avidyā, viz. the two 'screens' (āvaraṇa) of Kleça and Jñeya, is not mentioned in this place (for this division, cf. Siddhi, II, pp. 566-572, with numerous references by De la Vallée Poussin). We do not understand what exactly the division mentioned in our text refers to. One may distinguish (a) transcendental Avidyā, which constitutes the basis of phenomenal existence and is essentially 'non-vision of the Truths' (cf. note 143 above) and (b) phenomenal Avidyā, which arises at every moment and is due to wrong apperception (as in the case of the taimirika suffering from optical illusions) or to wrong interpretation of phenomena correctly perceived (such as the man in the desert who believes in the reality of the fata morgana that he sees). The first of these (a) might well be expressed by hetutvāçraya, „having (the laws of) Causation (fixed in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula) as its 'point d'appui' " ; the second form of Avidyā may well have been expressed by vijñānāçraya, since it is based upon the numerous moments of Consciousness. This makes sense and is implied in numerous passages in Buddhist literature, but we have no precise references to the terms mentioned in our text; the nearest approach is the distinction between mukhyā and pratibhāsikī bhrānti, made by the Buddhist logicians (cf. note 153 to the Introduction).

[148]) Cf. supra, a — B — 1, and note 32 to this Translation.

fering), and (d) the Path [149]. Ignorance is f i v e fold, too, [5] in as far as it is to be abandoned by (a) Suffering [150], (b) the Origin (of Suffering), (c) the Cessation (of Suffering), (d) the Path, and (e) Meditation [151]. In this and other ways [152], [6] Ignorance must be known to be up to fivefold.

— (As to) „Ignorance conditions the Formative Forces", why is not Ignorance called the 'cause' (of the Formative Forces)?

— [7] (The term 'condition' and not 'cause' is used in this connection), because there is only one 'cause' (in every single case), (whereas there always are) many conditions [153]. The 'cause' is the

---

[149] This classification and the next one consider Avidyā from the point of view how it is eliminated. Avidyā is an immense complex of dṛṣṭis, kleças, upakleças, which cannot be abandoned all at the same time and in the same way. In principle, they are all abandoned by the 'vision' of Truth, but the latter being analyzed into the famous Four Truths, the question arises what part of Avidyā is abandoned by duḥkhasatya, what part by samudayasatya, etc. On this basis, one arrives at the fourfold division mentioned in our text. This question is discussed in detail in Abhidh. Koça, V, pp. 31 sqq.; their elimination constitutes the darçanamārga (cf. Siddhi, II, pp. 588 sqq., and the references given there). Cf. also Siddhi, II, pp. 496 sq.

[150] One arrives at a fivefold division of Avidyā by adding meditation (bhāvanā) to the 'vision' of the Four Truths. The darçanamārga is therefore followed by the bhāvanāmārga. It can hardly be doubtful that this is the fivefold division referred to by our author, but obviously, the copyist got entangled by the repetitions. Thus, duḥkha was omitted in the copy before the first heyā; since the preceding vowel is a long ā, an ignorant reader might understand that the first category mentioned is aheyā, but this would of course be in direct contradiction with the Mārgasatya.

[151] Cf. the preceding note. In the Abhidh. Koça (V, pp. 11 sqq.), the examples of kleças to be eliminated by bhāvanā are rāga, pratigha, avidyā and māna, but this only applies to the more subtle forms of these; for their grosser forms the vision of the Four Truths is already sufficient. In Mahāyāna, the bhāvanāmārga became more and more important; this appears clearly from the bhūmi system, where the entire darçanamārga is confined to the first bhūmi, whereas the bhāvanāmārga occupies the second up to the ninth bhūmis (cf. Siddhi, II, pp. 562 sqq. and 606 sqq.. Obermiller, the Doctrine of Prajñāpāramitā etc., Acta Orient. XI, 1932, pp. 41 sqq.).

[152] Evamādi is rather superfluous here; it probably suggests that Avidyā may be analyzed in many other ways, too.

[153] The distinction between hetu and pratyaya in our text is rather curious since the former is always included in the latter from a logical point of view; all the hetus are included into hetupratyaya, the first among the four kinds of pratyayas (Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 299; Siddhi, II, pp. 436 sq.). The meaning which is required here is hetu opposed to those pratyayas which are not hetu viz. the three other categories, and this leads to the opposition of pratyayopanibandha and hetūpanibandha in the interpretation of the relation between the Pratītyasamutpāda links. This is the interpretation of the Çālistambhasūtra, rightly termed locus classicus by Bendall (Çikṣās., Intr. p. XXXVI). In the twelve-linked chain, each preceding Aṅga is not only the pratyaya, but also the hetu of the following, but the hetuphalopanibandha can only take place if in addition to the hetu, which in that case is always one, viz. the preceding Aṅga, there are a number of other pratyayas, too: for the arising of the aṅkura, not only its hetu, i.e. the bīja, but also a varying number of additional causes such as rains, sun, earth etc. are required. Obviously, this is meant by our author when he states eko hetuḥ, bahavaḥ pratyayāḥ.

herent (factor), whereas a condition is an exterior factor. [8] The 'cause' is inseparable (from the effect), the 'condition' is only loosely connected [154]). For that reason, Ignorance is defined as a condition, not as the cause. [9] Of the two (notions) Hetu (cause) and Pratyaya (condition), the latter (applies to factors which) 'throw light upon something' [155]).

(In the Sūtra passage) „Ignorance conditions the Formative Forces", [10] the latter are of three kinds: those constituted of meritorious, non-meritorious and [1] non-agitated acts [156]). The

---

The difference between *hetu* and *pratyaya* is examined from three different points of view. For the first of these, cf. note 153. The second point of view is related with the first one: *hetu* is *svārthakārin*, lit.: „effecting its own object", such as the seed effecting the germ, which may not be styled different from the seed; *pratyaya*, on the contrary, is a factor separated from its object, such as the rains required for the origination of the germ; it is therefore styled *parārthakārin*, „working on behalf of something else". The third point of view, according to which the *hetu* is *samçlista,* and the *pratyaya viçlista*, cannot be separated from the two other differences. This division is important for a correct understanding of the relation between Avidyā and Samskāra. Why did the Bhagavat designate the former as the *pratyaya*, not as the *hetu*, of the latter? The explanation here proposed is that Avidyā does not itself develop into the Samskāras, or at least, this need not be the case (properly speaking, this is only the *āvasthika* interpretation of the chain, which is only one of its special aspects); the point is rather that the existence of Avidyā is a necessary condition for the origination of the Samskārānga, i.e. without Avidyā, the Samskārānga will not possibly arise (cf. Çālistambha, quoted *Çiksās.*, p. 220, line 2: *avidyā cen āntariçyan naiva samskārāh prājñāsyanta;* note: the last word, reproduced according to Bendall's edition, should be considered a lapse for *prājanisyanta*, due to the rare occurrence of the conditional).

This is a literal translation of the words such as they are given in the text. *Prativibheṣu* has a locative meaning „in the meaning of" (common in the Indian Koças: cf. Speyer, *Syntax*, § 140, Rem. 2); *prativibha* would mean: „shining forth *(vibha)* towards *(prati)"*, but *prati* may also be interpreted in a distributive sense (cf. note 111 to the Introduction). The etymology implied by the term *prativibheṣu* would therefore be *prativibhātīti pratyayah*. As a matter of fact, the activity of a *pratyaya* may be compared with that of the sunlight in the case of the development of a seed into a germ. There is however a strong objection against this explanation: obviously, the author explains *pratyaya* by some kind of etymology (especially the repetition of *prati* in the explanation points to an etymology), but here is nothing in the second part -*aya* which could have suggested „shining". There is something which must have gone wrong. The portion -*aya* could only have suggested the root *i* (*gatau*); the etymology of *pratyaya* therefore is: *(angam) praty etīti pratyayah*. It is probable that something of this kind should be read in our text. One might propose to correct *prativibheṣu* to *prativigeṣu*; as a copyist's error, this hardly requires explanation: the *bha* and *ga* are very similar in this type of script, but the objection is that -*vi*- remains unexplained.

We already noted in the Introduction that this division of the Samskāras does not agree with that given in the Vibhanga (cf. *supra*, a — B — 2), where the Samskāras are analyzed into *kāya*, *vāc* and *manas;* it is true that the latter division is also mentioned here, but it is only a secondary division, whereas the analysis into *kāya*, *vāc* and *manas,* conceived of as the primary division, is considered the 'opinion of others' (*anye punar āhuh,* f — B — 4). The obvious conclusion is that the author

meritorious formative forces (constitute) the threefold 'good' [157] :
good on account of acts of the body, [2] of the voice and of the mind ;
the non-meritorious formative forces (constitute) the threefold 'evil' :
evil on account of acts of the body, [3] of the voice and of the mind ;
the non-agitated formative forces (constitute) the threefold 'undefined' :

---

of the Upadeça is another than that of the Vibhaṅga. The former is not the Bhagavat,
although the final redactor (whom we denote by 'copyist') incorporated the Upadeça
into the words pronounced by the Bhagavat (this appears from h — A — 1), but
this was effected in a rather clumsy way (the entire Upadeça having been inserted
into the final sentence of the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga). The external form of the Upadeça
clearly shows this difference, especially by the absence of bhikṣavaḥ as an address
(whereas the latter is used throughout the Vibhaṅga text). The author of the Upadeça
did not see any objection in coming into conflict with the Vibhaṅga : there may
have been some doubt about the canonical character of the Vibhaṅga (cf. the remark
made by Bagchi, art. cit., p. 201), but even if our author had no such doubt, he
could have considered the Vibhaṅga division intentional. The text of this portion
was very carelessly copied ; cf. note 89 to the Transcription. The verbosity of our
author makes it however easy to correct the text ; the translation here given is
based upon this corrected text, for which cf. the notes to the Transcription. It was
noted there that the third primary division, āneñjya, does not occur at all in the
text ; it was not probably understood and therefore replaced by a clumsy repetition
of apuṇya. For the exact meaning of puṇya, apuṇya and āneñjya, cf. Siddhi, pp. 473
sqq. ; S. Lévi, Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi (1925), p. 36, and Matériaux (1932), p. 108 ;
Lamotte, Mél. chin. et bouddh. IV (1935-36), passim (translation of the Karmasiddhi-
prakaraṇa), etc. Properly speaking, the terms puṇya etc. apply to Karman, not to
Saṃskārāṅga, but since the latter consists of action, the suffix -maya is added ; the
usual terms however are puṇyopaga etc. ; cf. Çālistambha quoted Çikṣās., p. 223, and
Bodhic., p. 479. For āneñjya (variants : āniñjya, āneñja ; Pāli ānejja), cf. the note
by Senart on p. 399 of Vol. I of his Mahāvastu edition ; cf. also Kern in a personal
communication to De la Vallée Poussin in the latter's Bodhic.-pañj. edition (1901),
p. 80, note 4 : „ānejya et āniñja n'ont rien de commun, sauf le son, avec iñj-iṅg ......
Vous avez bien vu qu'il est à peu près synonyme de çubha". Whereas the two first
categories of Karman are retributed in the Kāmadhātu, the third is retributed in
the two higher Dhātus (Siddhi, II, p. 474); the three categories are connected with
the three kinds of Vedanā in Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 84 (āneñjyakarman is produced
to obtain aduḥkhāsukhavedanā). This portion of our text is interesting because the
division does not agree with anything known to us, at least, as far as the smaller
details are concerned. We do not know any other examples of the use of the
suffix -maya in this connection (although variants of -upaga do occur ; cf. āniñjyaprāptena
cittena in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka quoted by Senart, loc. cit.); a far more important
point is however the relation between the puṇya-apuṇya-āneñjya and the kuçala-
akuçala-avyākṛta classifications ; cf. note 157.

[157]) The Saṃskāras which are puṇyamaya are explained as threefold kuçalakarman. One
concludes that puṇya and kuçala (and also apuṇya and akuçala, āneñjya and
avyākṛta) are considered synonyms, which is in a direct conflict with Abhidharma, where the
two triads are sharply distinguished. Cf., for instance, Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 84 (puṇya
are those actions retributed by agreeable sensations within the domain of the Kāmadhātu)
with op. cit., IV, p. 106 (kuçala are those actions which are retributed in any of
the three dhātus and may even lead to Nirvāṇa ; cf. note 28 above). As a matter
of fact, kuçala includes both puṇya and āneñjya, and even a little more ; akuçala
is essentially identical with apuṇya, whereas there is nothing in the puṇya etc. classi-
fication that agrees with avyākṛta (cf. note 158).

undefined on account of acts of the body, [4] of the speech and of
the mind [158]).

Others, however, assert that the formative forces are of three
kinds, viz. formative forces of the body, [5] of the speech and of
the mind [159]). The formative forces of the body are twofold, viz.
inhalation and exhalation [160]) ; those of the speech are the gross and
refined forms of thought preceding [6] speech [161]) ; those of the mind

---

[158]) For *avyākṛta,* „undefined" (as to its consequences), cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* IV, pp. 105 sq.;
Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa (quoted in note 156 above), p. 224, which gives a good idea
about the complexity of the different Karman classifications. In the classifications
of Karman, the concept *avyākṛta* is very important because it comprises the majority
of acts: those acts which have no consequences whatever in future life, i.e. the
acts not morally qualified. For that reason, they are not included in Saṃskārāṅga,
which only comprises morally qualified action which bears fruit in the form of
retribution; cf. *Madhyāntavibh.,* translation by Friedmann, p. 47: „But [they do]
not [comprise] all [karma]" (i.e. excluding undefined acts, and also those which
are retributed in the same existence). But then, it is very strange to find in our
text *avyākṛtakarman* included in Saṃskārāṅga, which should comprise only that Karman
which *punarbhavam abhisaṃskaroti.* The only reasonable explanation is that our author,
trying to arrive at an 'exhaustive' treatment of the possible Saṃskāra divisions, con-
founded Saṃskāra with Karman.

The division of the Saṃskāras into *kāya, vāc* and *manas* is that of the Vibhaṅga
(*supra,* a — B — 2, but not in the Nālandā version !); here, however, it is considered
a sub-division only. As a matter of fact, the division is important for action in
general, but not for Saṃskārāṅga, where only the moral qualification of the act is
relevant. Cf. note 159.

[159]) This is the general classification of Karman. Buddhism, as a rule, did not however
consider these three categories equivalent ; *manaskarman* (i.e. *cetanā,* „will") is primary,
and *kāya-* and *vāk-kārman* depend on it (*Abhidh. Koça,* IV, kārikā 1, c-d: *cetanā
mānasaṃ karma tajje vākkāyakarmaṇī*); unwillful action, i.e. that which is either *kāya-*
or *vāk-karman* without depending on *manaskarman,* is deliberately excluded. Stcher-
batskij *(Buddh. Logic,* I, pp. 161 sqq.) devotes an interesting chapter to the Buddhist
treatment of the universal problem of the free will (especially in connection with
the Buddhist theory of Causation). An excellent survey of the Buddhist theories of
Karman and Vipāka and of the related problem of the free will is given by De la
Vallée Poussin, *Morale Bouddhique,* 1927, pp. 119-217. Important materials are
contained in Lamotte's translation of the Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa in *Mél. chin. et bouddh.,*
IV. Here, however, the three *saṃskāras* are treated as being equivalent. The difficult
point in our text is what exactly is the opinion of 'others', for the threefold division
here given is common to all forms of Buddhism. Although this point is not clearly
expressed in our text, it seems probable that the 'others' considered this division
of primary importance, whereas the 'correct' opinion of our Upadeça is that the
definition of Saṃskārāṅga as *kāya-, vāk-* and *manas-karman* is only a subdivision of
puṇya etc. We noted above that the opinion of 'others' is exactly the opinion given
in the Vibhaṅga.

[160]) The particular importance attached to these two factors is remarkable ; it is undoubtedly
due to influence from Yoga. Obviously, the two factors mentioned are only examples.
On the other hand, most of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras* are irrelevant here, because
they are not subject to the will (such as *prāpti,* etc.).

[161]) In *Abhidh. Koca,* II, p. 174, the interpretation of *vitarka* and *vicāra* as *vāk-saṃskāras*
is attributed to the Sautrāntikas, who quote as evidence the Sūtra passage *vitarkya*

are volition [162].

Others, however assert that the formative forces are threefold; viz. good, [7] bad and undefined [163].

Others, again, assert that the formative forces are threefold: effective with reference to each living being, constituting a part of birth and directed to the Saṃsāra [164].

[8] — Are all of these Formative Forces conditioned by Ignorance? Or are (all of these) Formative Forces conditioned not by Ignorance, (but) by Knowledge ? Or, (third possibility) [9] are these Formative Forces conditioned by Ignorance and Knowledge ? Or (finally), are they conditioned neither by Ignorance, nor by Knowledge ?

— This is a 'four-edged' question [165]. Owing to such

---

vicārya vācaṃ bhāṣate (cf. also *ibid.*, VII, p. 93). In the *Abhidh. Koça, ·vitarka* is defined *paryeṣako manojalpaḥ,* „searching internal conversation", *vicāra* by *pratyavekṣako manojalpaḥ,* „with reference to a definite object". The two notions represent „la grossièreté et la subtilité de la pensée" respectively (cf. *Abhidh. Koça, Introduction,* p. XLVIII). Very detailed references, mainly to Pāli Buddhism, in F. Heiler, *Buddh. ·Versenkung* (1922), pp. 74 sqq.

[162]) Cf. note 159 above.

[163]) I.e., these doctors consider this the primary classification instead of *puṇya-apuṇya-āneñjya*; as we noted above (note 158), action of the group *avyākṛta* should not be included into Saṃskārāṅga.

[164]) The division of the Saṃskāras into *prātisattvika, aupapattyaṃçika* and *ābhisāṃsārika* is unknown to us. The three terms used make it probable that the division refers rather to Saṃskāraskandha than to Saṃskārāṅga. *Prātisattvika* is a derivative from *pratisattvam,* in which *prati* probably has a distributive meaning (*vīpsā;* Pāṇ. I, 4, 90 ; cf. Wackernagel, II, 1, pp. 257 sqq.; cf. also the etymology of *pratītyasamutpāda* discussed in the Introduction): „belonging to each (separate) living being"; the expression might then refer to those forces which make one belong to a definite group of living beings (*nikāyasabhāgatā*; cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* II, pp. 195-198), and associated forces (such as *prāpti, aprāpti, jīvitendriya* (*op. cit.,* pp. 178 sqq.). The last *saṃskāra* should perhaps be included into the second category, whereas the third category comprises the karmic forces. As a rule, only the forces last mentioned are included in Saṃskārāṅga, and therefore, this threefold division is strange. It seems as if this whole division does not apply to Saṃskāra, but to Vijñāna, where it is far more natural; we actually find it as such in a passage from the Bhavasaṃkrāntisūtra (*Mahāvy.,* 65, 54 ; ed. Minaiev-Mironov, p. 22) quoted Madhyamakāvatāra, VI, 40 ; cf. the translation by De la Vallée Poussin *Muséon,* XI (1910), p. 319, where the *vijñānas* are analyzed into (a) those of birth represented as entering the womb, (b) those of a separate living being, and (c) those of death, leaving the body and continuing the Saṃsāra.

[165]) In Buddhism, the four *koṭis* comprise the four logical possibilities implying that something (*a*) is, (*b*) is not, (*c*) is and is not, (*d*) neither is nor is not. They are frequently met with in Buddhist discussions ; cf. Keith, *Buddh. Philos.* (1923), pp. 39 sqq. If such questions are posed to a Buddhist, each part should be answered separately as a rule. With reference to a truth, as is the case in our text, the first alternative is answered with an unambiguous 'yes', the second with a no less clear 'no'; as to the third, the Buddhist should reply *vibhajya,* stating that the first half of the statement is correct, the second wrong; the fourth alternative is absurd and should not be answered at all (*sthāpanīya*; cf. *Abhidh. Koça,* V, p. 48). But this does not

g — A [1] considerations [166]), he mistakes the Path leading to repeated existence for the Path of Final Liberation [167]) and falls into fivefold Attachment to Wrong Views (?) [168]). Thinking (of) the wrong view about existence (?) [169]) is associated with it; [2] the wrong view

apply to all questions. As a matter of fact, most Buddhists admit a number of questions to which no definite answer can be given. The most famous one refers to the point whether the Tathāgata exists, does not exist, exists and exists not, neither exists nor exists not after death. The first alternative implies çāçvatadṛṣṭi, the second ucchedadṛṣṭi, the third is impossible, and the fourth is absurd. The state of Nirvāṇa cannot be expressed by dialectic methods (anabhilāpya). The important Pāli text about this subject is the Brahmajālasutta in the Dīghanikāya (cf. Keith, loc. cit.), where fourteen so-called 'undefined' points (caturdaça avyākatavastūni) are mentioned. Nalinaksha Dutt, The Brahmajālasutta, Ind. Hist. Qu., VIII (1932), pp. 706-746, has proved that the whole discussion given there could only be understood in the light of Mādhyamika philosophy; cf. the same scholar in Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism (1930), pp. 49 sqq. Thus, the highest Truth is often described in Mahāyāna as being catuṣkoṭivinirmukta (Laṅkāv., p. 96), which may be translated as „non-dialectical"; cf. Madhyamakavṛtti, p. 57: paramārtho hy āryāṇāṃ tuṣṇībhāvaḥ, „la realité absolue, c'est le silence des Saints" (J.W. de Jong, Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā, Buddhica, 1-ière Sér., IX, 1949, p. 6, note 18, where other important references are also given; the question is discussed in detail, ibid., pp. 82 sqq.). Cf. also Prabhubhai Patel, Catuḥstava, Ind. Hist. Qu., VIII (1932), p. 692 (= Acintyastava, 36): yan naikaṃ nāpy anekaṃ ca nānubhayaṃ na cobhayam, and Subhāṣitasaṃgraha, edition by Bendall, Muséon, N. S. IV (1903), p. 389 (= Madhyamakavṛtti, p. 12, line 13). In our text, an opponent seems to suggest that the relation existing between the first two Aṅgas of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula belongs to the group of avyākṛtavastūni, or, at least, that there are other possibilities than the first alternative. This is a grave misunderstanding of Pratītyasamutpāda, and the consequences of such a wrong opinion may be very serious.

[166]) Cf. note 96 to the Transcription. The translation is based upon the correction of çāntiḥ, undoubtedly an error by the copyist. to iti, the word we should have expected here.

[167]) Cf. note 97 to the Transcription. We translate the corrected reading there proposed (ity astimārgo nairyāṇika). For the meaning of nairyāṇika, cf. Abhidh. Koça, VII, pp. 32, where it is translated by: „sortie définitive, parce qu'il (i.e. the Mārga) fait passer au delà d'une manière définitive". This term always refers to the Mārga, which is essentially a „way out" (viz. out of the Saṃsāra). This is also the case here. The ignorant, who do not understand the relation between Avidyā and Saṃskāra conclude that some of the Saṃskāras (viz. their own Karman) are not due to Ignorance, but to Knowledge; they therefore wrongly conclude that their own existence is a path towards final liberation. Such a misunderstanding of the principles of Pratītyasamutpāda is very dangerous since it leads to dṛṣṭiparāmarça (cf. note 168). It is therefore unnecessary to presume a lacuna between f — B and g — A. Some small corrections in the beginning of g — A make the line of thought perfectly clear.

[168]) Dṛṣṭiparāmarça is „la dṛṣṭi qui consiste à considérer bon, 'haut' (ucca), ce qui est mauvais, bas, abandonné (hīna)" (Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 18); cf. also De la Vallée Poussin, Morale Bouddh., pp. 154-163, especially p. 160. This is exactly the definition of the preceding conclusion, if the corrections proposed in note 167 are accepted. Dṛṣṭiparāmarça, implies all the other dṛṣṭis and is therefore fivefold. How the four other dṛṣṭis are associated with dṛṣṭiparāmarça is shown in the following portion of the text.

[169]) Atidṛṣṭi in the text, which does not make sense, might be a lapse for astidṛṣṭi. As appears from the following, the four other views are associated with dṛṣṭiparāmarça; since antagrāha-, mithyā- and çīlavrata-dṛṣṭi are mentioned in the following passage,

about the Extremes [170]) is associated with it; the 'totally' wrong view [171]) is associated with it; (and also) the wrong view (implying) attachment to moral rules and vows [172]) is associated with it. Therefore (he infers that) by means of sevenfold moral rules [173]), [3] purity is obtained (and concludes that) purity is obtained by being in some special condition [174]). (This leads him to the wrong view that) there exists a Pudgala, a maker etc. [175]) ; [4] as has been said with reference

---

there remains only one possibility for *atidṛṣṭi*, viz. *satkāyadṛṣṭi*. *Astidṛṣṭi*, which has the advantage of being the easiest correction, might be considered a synonym of *satkāyadṛṣṭi (asti*, „existence", interpreted as „real existence"), but this is unusual. It might therefore be preferable to correct *atidṛṣṭi* to *ātmadṛṣṭi*, „the wrong view about the existence of an (eternal) Ātman".

[170]) Viz. *çāçvata* and *uccheda*, in this case, the former: the belief in the existence of an Ātman leads directly towards conceiving of it as something eternal.

[171]) *Mithyadṛṣṭi* is by far the worst *dṛṣṭi*. It is essentially the denial of the four Truths in Buddhism. Those attached to the doctrine of Çāçvata get into conflict with the Nirodha and Mārga truths, which they are forced to deny. The strange order in which the five *dṛṣṭis* are given here (the usual order is *satkāya*, *antagrāha*, *mithyā*, *dṛṣṭiparāmarça*, *çīlavrata*; cf. *Mahāvy.*, 104, 34-38) is due to an attempt at establishing a causal relation between them; this relation is expressed by *yukta*. „connected", in the text.

[172]) The person who denies the Four Truths is forced to find a Refuge in another doctrine than Buddhism and therefore attaches himself to heretical systems such as those of Brahmans or Jains; cf. note 173. *Çīla* here refers to non-Buddhist practices, which according to other sects would be conducive to Liberation.

[173]) We do not now what is meant with 'sevenfold' *çīla* here; it probably refers to a list of seven different means by which non-Buddhists presumed to obtain purification (*çuddhidṛṣṭi*). These seven means may have belonged to seven different sects. Cf. the *Vyākhyā* quoted in the *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 86, note 3, where a number of heretical means are enumerated; the number there given amounts to seven; we find the mention of the ashes of the Pāçupatas, the skulls of the Kāpālikas, the triple *daṇḍa* of the Parivrājakas there. It is not however probable that the Vyākhyā list is referred to here; two of the seven groups mentioned there are sorts of *vrata*, not of *çīla*. In the Vibhāṣā, *çīlavrata* is considered twofold: 'exterior' (rites etc. practised by non-Buddhists) or 'interior' (Buddhists attached to ritual bathing etc.).

[174]) This probably refers to *vrata*, for which cf. the Vyākhyā quoted in note 173. There, the example of *kukkuravrata*, "the vow of living like a dog", and a few others are mentioned. *Cosmol. Bouddh.*, p. 172 (Vyākhyā and Bhāṣya, 45, 9).

[175]) Belief in the efficiency of rites and vows implies that there exists something that can be purified by such means, i.e. something originally pure but contaminated by various causes, which by means of *çīla* or *vrata* could be brought back to its original state of purity. This implies the belief in some eternal stuff, such as an *ātman*, a *jīva* etc.; (cf. the list consisting of sixteen items in *Mahāvy.*, 207, 1-16 (p. 64). The conception of a *pudgala* was developed within Buddhism (Vātsiputrīyas, Saṃmitīyas) and may have constituted the gravest conflict in the older phase of Buddhism. An entire book of the Abhidharmakoça (IX : Pudgalapratiṣedhaprakaraṇa) was devoted to the refutation of the *pudgala* theories. There were several kinds of Pudgalavādins, most of whom based their conception on various Sūtra passages, especially the Bhārahārasūtra. The most subtle Pudgalavādins conceived of a *pudgala* neither different from nor identical with the five Skandhas. A full documentation, from which the above details are taken, is given by De la Vallée Poussin in his introduction to *Abhidh. Koça*, IX, and *Abhidharmakoça, Introduction* (1931), pp. XXXIV — XXXVI.

to 'me' and 'mine' [176]) : "O monks, the child, the ignorant, the ordinary people [177]), [5] following the current opinions, attach themselves to the objects of pleasure" [178]). These are the Formative Forces [6] conditioned by Ignorance [179]). — What is the difference between these (Formative Forces) and Existence conditioned by Attachment ? — The Formative Forces conditioned by Ignorance refer to [7] past existence, (but) Existence conditioned by Attachment refers to future existence [180]) ; this is the difference between the two. [8] Existence con-

---

[176]) *Ātmātmīya* is the usual reference to *satkāyadṛṣṭi*, for which cf. *infra*, h — A — 9 to h — B — 1.

[177]) *Bāla, açrutavant* and *pṛthagjana* are technical terms. *Bāla* is explained as those devoid of 'natural' knowledge, *açrutavant* as those who have not 'heard' the Truth and therefore remain ignorant, *pṛthagjana* as those who do not understand the Highest Truth (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 87, and I, pp. 79 sq.); cf. the definitions in the Vyākhyā, *Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 173. The exact meaning of *pṛthagjana* is open to doubt since it depends on the exact sources of our text; the word is usually the exact 'opposite' of *ārya* (the former defined as *mārgasyāprāpti*, the latter as *mārgasya prāpti*) ; *pṛthagjanatā* is conceived of as a separate *dharma* (one of the *cittaviprayuktasaṃskāras)* in the Yogācāra system (No. 74 of the list published in *Muséon*, N.S., 6, 1905, pp. 178 sqq) ; the important sources with reference to the different opinions in Buddhist Schools are mentioned in *Siddhi*, pp. 639 sqq. — In many Buddhist texts, *āha (āhuḥ)* is used to quote an opponent's opinion (unlike *ucyate* referring to the words of the Bhagavat) ; this is indeed the use of *āhuḥ* in the passage about the Saṃskāras, *supra*, f — B — 4 to 7; cf. also *Siddhi*, p. 736. This cannot be the case here, at least if we understand the line of thought, which is not exactly clear ; cf. notes 178 and 179 below.

[178]) Cf. note 99 to the Transcription. This passage, occurring in different versions in several Buddhist texts, has been discussed in the Introduction. The line of the argument is not clear in our text, probably because it was quoted in an incomplete way. It appears from the question following that the passage could be understood in such a way that the Saṃskāras due to Avidyā are identical with Bhava due to Upādāna. The latter point is refuted by a reference to the difference in *adhvan* only. One may therefore conclude that the quotation proved the identity of Avidyā and Upādāna (and cf Saṃskāra and Bhava), apart from the *adhvan* difference. It is to be noted that the Yogācāra system stresses the fact that the distinction of the twelve Aṅgas according to past, present and future is completely useless ; cf. *Siddhi*, II, p. 490 : „il est parfaitement inutile de supposer avec le Petit Véhicule (Koça, III, p. 67) que les douze Aṅgas indiquent deux fois la cause (la cause dans les deux existences, d'une part Avidyā-Saṃskāras, d'autre part, Tṛṣṇā, etc.), deux fois le fruit (le fruit dans les deux existences, etc.)". The point is that the mechanism of causes and fruits can be satisfactorily explained by the complicated theory of *vāsanā* (and *bīja* etc.). It is not however correct to state that the *tryadhvan* conception is characteristic of Hīnayāna only ; it is even very important in Mādhyamika treatises (last chapter of the Madhyamakavṛtti ; cf. also *Bodhic.-pañj.* pp. 479 sq.), but its instruction is considered intentional, and does not belong to the Highest Truth.

[179]) Cf. the Introduction, pp. 97-99 and note 99 to the Transcription (p. 120).

[180]) „These" *(ime)* does not, of course, refer to the objects of pleasure. Obviously, some words have been omitted. The meaning of the omitted passage becomes clear by comparing the passage quoted from the Madhyamakāvatāra on p. 98 above : the ignorant and the fools, having fallen a victim to *kāmopādāna*, do anything to satisfy

ditioned by Attachment (comprises) the three forms of existence : existence in the Realm of Carnal Desire, in the Realm of Pure Forms and in the Realm of Formlessness. Existence in the Realm of Carnal Desire [9] is twentyfold [181]), existence in the Realm of Pure Forms is sixteenfold [182]), existence in the Realm of Formlessness is four-fold [183]). 'Existence' means [10] 'existence of desire (?) for re-birth [184]) in the Realm of Desire, and also in those of Forms and Formlessness'. The „Birth conditioned by Existence" is birth due to the manifestation

g — B of the Groups (of *dharmas*) [185]). Birth is fourfold : [1] born from a womb, born by sudden appearance, born from exsudation, and born from an egg [186]). The „Old Age conditioned by Birth" is Old Age (characterized by) 'ripening' of the senses [187]), difficult speech and

---

their desires, — such acts are the *avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ*. For the line of thought, cf. also Friedmann, *Madhyāntavibhāga*, Transl., p. 47, and the notes on pp. 125 sq.

[181]) I.e. the four *dvīpas*, eight hells, six heavens, the abode of the *pretas* and that of the animals; cf. *infra*, h — A — 2 sqq.

[182]) The sources do not agree on the number of 'places' (*sthāna*) in the Rūpadhātu. The *Abhidh. Koça* (III, *kār.* 2) mentions seventeen places (*saptadaçasthāno rūpadhātuḥ*) and a small detail like this one proves that this text cannot have been the direct source of our text. As to the different opinions about the number of 'places' in the Rūpadhātu, cf. the lengthy notes by De la Vallée Poussin *(Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 2-4) Seventeen places is the opinion of the Vaibhāṣikas of Gandhāra and other Western countries; eighteen places is the opinion of the Yogācāras and some of the Sautrāntikas. Most of the other Buddhists (including, for instance, the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir) accepted the number sixteen.

[183]) Here, all sources agree. The four divisions (they are not 'places' but differ in the modes of existence) are mentioned in *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 5; *Mahāvy.*, 162, 1-4, p. 46, etc.

[184]) Cf. note 102 to the Transcription, where it is considered probable that *kāmabhavaḥ* is a lapse for *karmabhavaḥ* due to the frequent occurrence of the former (it occurs, for instance, twice in lines 8-9). *Janmakarmabhavaḥ*, „the existence of *karman* leading to re-birth" is more satisfactory.

[185]) The usual explanation. Cf. *Çikṣās.*, p. 222 : *skandhaprādurbhāvo jātiḥ; Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 64 : „après la mort, les cinq skandhas au moment où a lieu la réincarnation, c'est la *jāti*".

[186]) This explanation is very different from the lengthy exposition in the Vibhaṅga (b — B — 1 to 3). Birth is defined by a reference to the four *yonis* (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 26-28). There are some variations in the terms; instead of *svedaja*, the usual term is *saṃsvedaja*; the prefix might be used for making the notion a little less precise (cf. *saṃjāti*, *saṃkleça*, *saṃmoha*, in which *sam-* is not used *samavāyārtham*, but rather to include kindred notions into the simplex; *saṃkleça* is all that is associated with *kleça*; in a similar way, *sveda* in its narrow meaning is not the origin of insects etc.); instead of *garbhaja*, the usual term is *jarāyuja* (*garbha* being used in many derived and less precise meanings; *aṇḍa* may be called a *garbha*, too); instead of *upapattija*, the usual form is *upapāduka*, but there are many variants (cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 27 note 3). The term refers to birth without preceding pregnancy (the Devī suddenly finds a small Deva on her knees).

[187]) For this short definition and the following ones, cf. Çālist. quoted *Çikṣās.*, p. 222 ; *Madhyam.-vṛtti*, p. 209; *Daçabh.*, p. 49; *Bodhic.-pañj.*, p. 480 (abbreviated by *peyālam);* Vyākhyā quoted *Abhidh. Koça*, III, p. 83, note 5, where other references (to Pāli

[2] decoloration of the matter (constituting the body) [188]. The immediate consequence [189]) of Old Age is Death; the latter is due to the splitting up of the Groups (of *dharmas*). Death conditions Sorrow; [3] Sorrow means 'sorrow about that (death)', 'sorrow about (the fact that) the constituents have become void of the senses' [190]). Sorrow conditions Lamentation; the characteristic feature of lamentation is weeping. [4] Lamentation conditions pain; pain is due to grief, but pain (at the same time) conditions grief [191]); [5] the characteristic feature of grief is torment of the heart. Grief conditions despair; the

sources and to De la Vallée Poussin's *Théorie des douze causes,* pp. 32 sq. and p. 80), are also given. Although agreeing in their essentials, the definitions are nowhere identical. Thus, *Daçabh.,* p. 49: *skandhaparipāko jarā, jīrṇasya skandhabhedo maraṇam,* etc.; *Çikṣās.,* p. 222: *skandhaparipāko jarā vināço maraṇam; Madhyam.-vṛtti,* p. 209: *jīrṇasya skandhasya vināço maraṇam.* Cf. also the Vibhaṅga, *supra,* b — B — 4 to 9 and the references given in notes 61 to 73 to this Translation. *Skandhaparipāka* occurs in almost all the descriptions, but the Vibhaṅga gives *indriyāṇām paripākaḥ.* As appears at several places, the definitions in the Upadeça are not based on those of the Vibhaṅga; cf. the division of Jāti (note 186 above) and especially that of Saṃskāra (note 156).

[188]) *Rūpa,* „matter", is characterized by *saṃsthāna* and *varṇa* (cf. the definition of *rūpāyatana,* note 129 above). During Old Age, Rūpa more and more becomes *vivarṇa.*

[189]) The use of *samanantara* suggests *samanantarapratyaya,* „condition en qualité d'antécédent égal et immédiat" (*Abhidh. Koça,* II, p. 100; cf. *Siddhi,* II, p. 437).

[190]) Conjectural translation. The term reads *çūnyendriyavyavasthānandhātuçoka,* which cannot be correct in this form. The easiest correction is the omission of the *n* preceding °*dhātu*°, as was proposed in note 104 to the Transcription. Then *çūnyendriyāvasthāna* could be explained as a bahuvrīhi: „being in the condition of empty *indriyas*"; it is of course not the *indriyas* that become empty, but the organs (*āçraya,* i.e. eyes etc.) that lose the faculties *(indriya)* of vision etc. *Dhātu* refers to the eighteen *saṃtāna* compounds analysed into three groups: six internal *āyatanas* or *indriyas,* six external *āyatanas* or *viṣayas* and the six *vijñānas* (*Abhidh. Koça,* I, pp. 51 sqq.; enumerated in *Mahāvy.* 107, 1-18, p. 33; discussed by Stcherbatskij, *Centr. Conc., passim*). The meaning of our compound could then be that at the moment of death, the first group (and the third) disappear; the eyes etc. do not disappear at that very moment but they become 'void', and this is the cause of sorrow for the others.

[191]) *Duḥkha* and *daurmanasya* are usually distinguished as physical pain and mental grief, respectively; thus, *daurmanasya* is defined as *mānasaṃ duḥkham* (*Çikṣās.,* p. 222). Cf. also *Abhidh. Koça,* II, p. 133: *duḥkham = kāyikī vedanā,* and p. 115: *daurmanasya = caitasī vedanā; Daçabh.,* p. 49: *pañcendriyaṇipāto duḥkham, manodṛṣṭinipāto daurmanasyam;* in the *Çikṣās.* passage quoted above (which is taken from the *Çālist.-sūtra*), *duḥkha* is stated to be associated (*samprayukta*) with the five groups of Consciousness (i.e. the six without *manovijñāna*), whereas *daurmanasya* is associated with *manasikāra.* It is a well-known problem, also in Western psychology, whether mental grief depends on physical pain or the converse. In Buddhism, they are considered interdependent factors (*anyonyahetuka*): the technical term for such reciprocal causation is *sahabhūhetu,* „cause en tant que coexistants, les dharmas qui sont effet les uns des autres" (*Abhidh. Koça,* II, p. 248), such as the Mahābhūtāni and their *lakṣaṇas* (*varṇa, saṃsthāna*), or the mind (*citta*) and the mental functions (*caitta*). Cf. also *samprayuktahetu,* „cause en qualité d'associés" (*op. cit.,* II, p. 268), which is a subdivision of *sahabhūhetu.* On these aspects of causation, which touch us as strikingly 'modern'. cf. Stcherbatskij, *Buddh. Logic,* I (1932), pp. 138 sq.

characteristic feature of despair is ..... (?) [192] ; [6] grief is due to the fact that it is known to be the cause of despair — that is grief taken by itself [193]). The knowledge that [194]) pain is the cause of grief — that is pain [7] taken by itself (or) pain isolated (from the complex of suffering ?) [195]). The knowledge that lamentation is the cause of pain — that is lamentation taken by itself. The knowledge that sorrow is the cause of lamentation — that is sorrow [8] taken by itself. The knowledge that death is the cause of sorrow — that is death taken by itself. The fact that [196]) Old Age causes Death — that is Old Age taken by itself. The fact that Birth causes Old Age — [9] that is Birth taken by itself. The fact that Existence causes Birth — that is Existence taken by itself. Existence is caused by Attachment [197]).

---

192) There must be a small lacuna in the text here.

198) The çokas are not real Aṅgas, but constitute a great complex (mahāduḥkhaskandha) comprised in Jarāmaraṇāṅga (cf. supra, note 18; cf. also Siddhi, II, pp. 485 sq.). Çoka, parideva, duḥkha, etc. do not therefore constitute a causal chain; they all constitute different forms of suffering, which often occur together. We may however lift one of these forms out of the complex and consider it by itself in its relation to other forms of suffering; this probably is the meaning of vyasta (opposite : samasta, the complex as a whole); it is not „analyzed" but the result of analyzing.

194) Here, and in the following lines, there are a number of small intercalated sentences followed by iti. These sentences are to be taken in the accusative (cf. in line 7: duḥkhahetum paridevam; the latter is a masculine noun), which must be considered to depend on a word like jñātvā, „knowing that", which is not expressed in the text, but suggested by upāyāsahetujñatvād (line 6). It is even possible that the latter word, the final d of which is omitted on the plate should be corrected to upāyāsahetum jñātvā, which is more satisfactory; as to upāyāsa, this word is treated as a masculine (instead of upāyāsas. c.q. upāyāsohetum) here and in line 5, but this is very common.

195) The addition of vyastaduḥkham after vyastan = duḥkham seems quite useless.

196) The formulation becomes different as soon as the text treats about real Aṅgas; in maraṇahetukā jarā, the relation is a very close one; it is accepted as a fact, whereas the causal relation between çoka and parideva, e.g., is not necessary: it is rather one of the possible opinions about their relation and therefore subjective (cf. the use of jñātvā concluded to in note 194), it may be considered in such a way (although, properly speaking, it is only a complex of associated notions). According to the dictionaries, hetuka at the end of compounds is always used in the meaning 'causing' and this is also the case here.

197) Here, the text of the Upadeça ends; in the text such as we have it on the gold plates, the end was clearly indicated by (a) not filling in the line up to the end (there is sufficient room left for two or three akṣaras more), and (b) by writing only nine lines of the plate, although a tenth one could have been added easily. The line of thought traced in the preceding portion is not continued any further back (upādānahetukā tṛṣṇā) etc. up to Avidyā. That there was a definite reason to end with Upādāna, appears from the line of argument which precedes. This line begins in g — A — 7 : upādānapratyayo bhavaḥ and after that, the pratyaya chain is continued up to upāyāsa. When we see that in the portion following the line is drawn back again, it is only natural that it should end at Upādāna. In addition, it is obvious that the final part of the text inscribed in the plates was added later on (cf. the notes that follow) to give a new (but clumsy) explanation of Upādāna again. But then, it becomes

h — A   [1] — (The above is the) Explanation [198]). (The first part is) what has been enounced to you, (the second), what has been said in reply (to your questions) [199]).

Thus spoke the Bhagavat; the monks, whose minds were enlightened (?) [200]), [2] rejoiced at his discourse and silently withdrew from his neighbourhood.

— There are four continents [201]), viz. [3] Jambudvīpa, Uttarakurudvīpa, Pūrvavidehadvīpa, Avaragodhanyadvīpa; eight great [4] hells, viz. Sañjīva, Kālasūtra, Saṃghāta, Raurava, Mahāraurava, Tapana, Saṃpratāpaka, and [5] Avīci; six divine abodes, viz. (those of the) Four Mahārājikas, Trāyastriṃças, Yāmas, Tuṣitas, Nirmāṇaratis, [6] and Parinirmitavaçavartins; (in addition) the abodes of

---

obvious that there should have been a definite reason owing to which the text should end in Upādāna: as we pointed out in the Introduction, the probable reason is that the Upadeça is a commentary to the introductory strophes, and the latter part of the Upadeça explains the term *upādānavivarjitaḥ*. Cf. *supra*, p. 91.

198) It seems that this final formula was directly taken from the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga text, for no reference to the Upadeça is mentioned. As we saw above (notes 75 and 76) the final formula begins already in b — B — 10, but is changed there by intercalating a sentence referring to the (deeper) meaning of Pratītyasamutpāda. After that, the entire Upadeça could be added and at the end, the final sentence of Sūtra-Vibhaṅga text was continued.

199) The entire text may be considered to consist of two portions, very unequal in length, viz. (a) the principle (*ādi = uddeça =* the Sūtra), which is the nucleus of the Pratītyasamutpāda theory, and (b) the explanation of the direct (Vibhaṅga) and indirect (Upadeça) meaning of the principle. The Vibhaṅga and the Upadeça are not exactly enounced by the Bhagavat as the Sūtra is, but consist of lengthy replies to the questions rising about the meaning of the Sūtra. The first portion (a) is therefore *uktam*, the second (b) *pratyuktam*.

200) *Āptamanasas* is at least unusual; it could be a mistake by the copyist for *ātta°*, the usual form. The mistake is however, difficult to be explained from a palaeographic point of view: *pa* and *ta* do not resemble each other at all. It seems that *ātta* (from *ādadāti)* was interpreted as a Prākritism instead of *āpta*. The latter means „fit, capable" (to understand the meaning of the words pronounced by the Bhagavat) and therefore makes good sense. Another point is the plural *āptamanasas*. Buddhist texts giving this stereotyped formula at the end of the Sūtras often read *āttamanās* (cf. *Saddharmapuṇḍ.*, ed. Kern-Nanjio, *Bibl. Buddh.*, X, 1909, p. 487: *idam avocad bhagavān āttamanās,* and the same words occur at the end of the Lalitavistara). It is noted that C and G read *āttamanās,* too. Although the plural (in our text and elsewhere) is easier to understand than the singular (in which case the term must either be referred to the Bhagavat or explained as an s-stem treated as an a-stem — for other examples, cf. note 7 to the Introduction to No. II above), it seems impossible to decide which form is the original one. Speyer *(Album Kern,* 1903, p. 43, note) proposed to correct *āttamanās* in the Lalit. to *āttamanasas* and to replace the mark of punctuation adopted in Lefmann's edition, but this seems very doubtful. Cf. also Mahāvastu, II, p. 54, line 19: *tān dṛṣṭvā anāttamanā puraṃdaro, ity abravīt āttamano sarveṣu. Anāttamanā* is acc. plur. fem. (cf. Sénart, *ibid.,* p. 505).

201) The portion of the next now following (up to the end) is an obvious addition; as a matter of fact, the Bhagavat has already finished his discourse and the monks have left him. As we pointed out in the Introduction, the passage is however interesting because it gives an idea of what our author considered the principal aim of the Upadeça.

Pretas and animals [202]. The total of (the above divisions) constitutes [7] the twentyfold Realm of Carnal Desire. This is called 'Attachment to pleasure' [203].

'Attachment to Wrong Views' (means) the five wrong views : [8] the wrong view of a real personality, of the Extremes, the 'totally' wrong view, attachment to wrong views [204], and attachment to (non-Buddhist) moral rules and vows. [9] The wrong view of a real personality is twentyfold : fourfold with reference to Form, fourfold with reference to Feeling, fourfold with reference to Ideation, fourfold h — B [1] with reference to the Forces and fourfold with reference to Consciousness. The total of the above (amounts to) the twentyfold

---

202) This enumeration of the twenty Kāmadhātu divisions corresponds to Abhidh. Koça, III, kār. 1 :

Nārakapretatiryañco mānuṣāh ṣad divaukasah /
Kāmadhātuh sa narakadvīpabhedena viṃçatih //

Very detailed references are given in De la Vallée Poussin's Abhidharmakoça translation, III, pp. 1 sqq. ('vingtquatre', in the translation of this Çloka, is a lapse). Important additions are given in the Introduction to the same publication (1931), p. 145. The Vyākhyā by Yaçomitra to the third Koçasthāna was published by the same scholar in Cosmologie Bouddhique (1914-19), together with other materials ; a brief survey is found in De la Vallée Poussin's article 'Cosmogony and Cosmology' in Hasting's Encyclopaedia ; among the other, extensive literature on the subject, we mention especially McGovern, Manual, I, Cosmology (1923), especially pp. 60 sqq. (comparison of the Theravāda, Sarvāstivāda and Yogācāra systems). — Although the enumeration here given agrees exactly with that cf the Abhidh. Koça, it is curious that the order differs. The Koça enumerates the different portions systematically from the lowest to the highest regions (as is also the case with the dhātu enumerations), whereas our text starts with the mānuṣaloka.

203) This is a curious misunderstanding, foi it is obvious that kāmopādāna does not mean kāmadhātūpādāna, as our author seems to conclude. Cf. the Introduction ; Vasubandhu thought it even necessary to avoid such a misunderstanding (Abhidh. Koça, III, pp. 7 sqq.). Attachment to some of the Kāmadhātu divisions (infernal, animal or Preta existence) is something absurd.

204) This translation might give a wrong impression ; dṛṣṭiparāmarça is not of course the same as dṛṣṭyupādāna ; cf. note 168 above.

205) The usual explanation of satkāyadṛṣṭi is ātmātmīyadṛṣṭi, „the Wrong View on the existence of an Ātman or what belongs to an Ātman" (Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 15; cf. supra, g — A — 4 : ātmātmīya). For the explanation of the term satkāyadṛṣṭi, cf. the copious notes by De la Vallée Poussin, Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 15, note. The suggestion by Senart (cf. Stcherbatskij, Buddh. Logic, I, p. 109), according to which satkāyadṛṣṭi was originally a corruption of satkāryadṛṣṭi, so that the fundamental tenet of Sāṃkhya became the fundamental error in Buddhism, is very attractive, although it is not capable of proof. As a matter of fact, Liebenthal (Satkārya in der Darstellung seiner buddhistischen Gegner, 1934) has tried to prove (pp. 11 sqq.) that satkāryavāda did not belong to early Sāṃkhya; Keith, Ind. Hist. Qu., XII (1936), pp. 15 sq., seems to accept Liebenthal's arguments, though with some reservations. On the striking resemblance between the dharmas of Buddhism and the guṇas of Sāṃkhya, a point closely connected with the above, cf. Stcherbatskij, Ind. Hist. Qu., X (1934), pp. 737-760 ; a substantial survey of the relations between Sāṃkhya and Buddhism is given

wrong view of a real personality [205]). The wrong view of the Extremes [2] is threefold, (referring to) annihilation, eternal existence of an Ātman (?), and (doubt) whether an Ātman exists or not (?) [206]. The 'totally' Wrong View is twofold ...... (?) [207] : is there a Path [3] leading to Liberation (?), why is this a beginning (?), why is not the Suffering of Existence ever-lasting ? (Therefore, it is evident that after the destruction of Mithyādṛṣṭi ?), there is no origin of (new) existence, no cause, cessation of Existence [208]).

---

by De la Vallée Poussin, *Indo-Européens* etc., *Hist. du Monde*, III (1936), pp. 310 sq. — The twentyfold division of *satkāyadṛṣṭi* is the usual one; it is due to the fact that the Buddhists, when refuting any doctrine about the existence of a soul, almost always refer to the classification of all the elements of conditioned existence into the five Skandhas. If there is a soul, either it must be identical with one of the five, or it must stand in some relation to one of the Skandhas; in the latter case, there are three possibilities: the Ātman is the possessor of Rūpa etc. (*rūpavant*), the Ātman is dependent on Rūpa (like a servant, *bhṛtyavat*), or the Ātman is simply in Rūpa (like in a vessel, *bhājanavat*); cf. *Mahāvyutp.*, 208, 1-20 (p. 64). Although the twentyfold division of *Satkāyadṛṣṭi* is the usual one (cf. *Divya*, p. 46: *viṃçati-çikharasamudgataṃ satkāyadṛṣṭiçailam*, to be split up by the *vajra* of Knowledge), the twenty categories themselves are not always enumerated in the same way; many variants have been discussed by Rahder, *La satkāyadṛṣṭi d'après Vibhāṣā, 8*, in *Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, I (1931-3?), pp. 227 sqq.

[206]) It seems useless to try to find out what the interpolator meant by the obscure words; as far as one may judge, he did not understand much of the meaning of the Dṛṣṭis. *Antagrāhadṛṣṭi* is a fundamental concept of Buddhism, which was always considered the Middle Path *(madhyamā pratipad)* between the two extremes of Çāçvata and Uccheda, and if there is one point in which all forms of Buddhism agree, it is this one.

[207]) If we understand the meaning of these words, which show a very poor knowledge of Sanskrit grammar so that the author's intention could only be guessed at, Mithyādṛṣṭi is considered to be twofold, although three categories are mentioned, whereas the only reasonable division is fourfold (the denial of each of the Four Truths). The three categories mentioned in the words following seem to refer to a denial (put into the form of questions) of the Mārgasatya, Duḥkhasatya (or Samudayasatya?) and Nirodhasatya respectively.

[208]) The translation is based on the (conjectural) interpretation of the obscure words, suggested in note 126 to the Transcription. No translation of the texts inscribed in plates *i* and *j* is given here; the strophes occurring there have been discussed in the Introduction.

IV. GOLD PLATE WITH VAJRA AND SHORT INSCRIPTIONS

Together with the gold plates discussed as No. III above, another gold plate, certainly not belonging to the same series, proved to be in the Djakarta Museum after the last war. Its site of discovery as well as the way in which it came into the Djakarta Museum are completely unknown. The plate is very thin, but considerably larger than the plates discussed as No. III; its measurements are 24,5 cm in length and 12 cm in breadth. The plate is numbered No. 7862 [1]).

The vague lines of a *viçvavajra* are visible on the surface of the plate. The contours of the entire central part of the vajra are, however, hidden owing to the presence of a two-petalled lotus, which is represented to lie upon the vajra. One has the impression that the round forms of the lotus were engraved by means of a sharp-pointed metal instrument, whereas the straight lines of the vajra must have been hammered in afterwards [2]). In the heart of the lotus and in its two petals, some short inscriptions are visible. The inscription in the heart of the lotus runs longitudinally, whereas the two inscriptions in its petals run latitudinally and in such a way that if the inscription in the upper petal is placed to be read in the usual way, that in the lower petal is turned upside down and conversely. In addition, a few akṣaras are visible outside the lotus contours, but still within the vajra.

The akṣaras are written in a form of Nāgarī which gives the impression of being rather late. Since the line to which the akṣaras proper are attached proves to be perfectly closed, there is no doubt that the plate belongs to a considerably later period than, for instance, the Kalasan and Kĕlurak inscriptions from Central Java dated 778 and 782 A. D. respectively. The form of the akṣaras resembles much more the Nāgarī type used in the inscriptions on images of Tjaṇḍi Djago (13th century A.D. ?), but the materials for comparison are too scarce to assign the plate to a definite period.

---

[1]) There are some indications that this plate is connected with the set discussed in No. III in some way or other. As a matter of fact, Nos. III and IV are the only gold plates suddenly found in the Museum after the Japanese occupation, which is also the reason why they got subsequent numbers. They may have been brought by the same man and this might be a hint to a common place (or region) of origin. The suggestion to be made at the end of the discussion of this gold plate might therefore be indirectly of some importance with a view to the problems connected with the origin of No. III. Although the above is extremely vague, it might give a hint in what direction further data could possibly be looked for.

[2]) This difference in technique clearly appears from an examination of the reverse. There, we see only the 'negative' of the vajra lines and of the akṣaras, but not the slightest traces of the lotus. It is obvious that hammering should necessarily leave pronounced traces in the reverse of the plate, whereas engraving by a sharp needle would not. Presumably, the lotus was engraved first; thereupon, the contours of the *viçvavajra* were hammered in and, finally, the akṣaras were expressed by the same method.

The lettering exhibits some abnormal features due to the way in which the, plate was inscribed : the akṣaras were probably hammered in the plate by means of a sharp-edged metal instrument. The consequence is that the akṣara forms are broken up into a considerable number of small, straight strokes.

Transcription

a *(upper part)* : 1. hūṃ amoghasiddhi / oṃ oṃ [3])
               2. oṃ oṃ oṃ phaṭ / oṃ phaṭ
b *(centre)* : hūṃ akṣobhya oṃ oṃ oṃ phaṭ
c *(lower part)* : hūṃ ratnasambhava / oṃ [4])

Meaning

The two-petalled lotus lying on the vajra is inscribed with the names of three Dhyānibuddhas and a number of *bījākṣaras*. If one holds the plate horizontally facing the East, the Akṣobhya inscription is directly in front, Amoghasiddhi to the left, and Ratnasambhava to the right hand side. The three Jinas are then located in the directions with which they are associated. It then becomes evident why the inscriptions were engraved in that particular way.

The two-petalled lotus is undoubtedly a representation of the so-called Ajñācakra, one of the six mystical centres in the human body. It is located between the two brows and plays an important role in both Buddhistic and non-Buddhistic Yoga [5]). The forms known in Tāntrism usually represent the *çakti* Hākinī and other mystical figures together with bījas. Our plate appears to represent a more archaic and specifically Buddhistic form of the *cakra* : the different parts of the lotus bear only the names of Dhyānibuddhas with bījas. Presumably, the plate as a whole served as a *yantra*.

In the Djakarta Museum, there is a very similar plate (No. 785 b), which was discovered in the pit of the Stūpa ruin at Tandjung Medan, district Rau, Western Sumatra. The latter plate was described by Brandes [6]) and, more recently, by Bosch, who assigned the plate to the twelfth century A. D. [7]). There we find a lotus flower, too, inscribed with the names of

---

[3])   The syllables added to the right of the dashes in the transcription are found outside the lotus but still within the vajra contours.

[4])   After this *oṃ*, the same akṣara was probably repeated twice and followed by a single *phaṭ* ; the forms have, however, become very undistinct.

[5])   Cf. the drawing reproduced by Pott, *Yoga en Yantra* (1946), p. 40 ; description by Avalon, *The Serpent Power* (1933), p. 411, with additions by Pott, *op. cit.*, pp. 39 sqq. As to the general meaning of *yantras*, cf. Pott, *op. cit., passim* and his *Introduction to the Tibetan collection of the National Museum of Ethnology, Leiden* (1951), pp. 31 sqq.

[6])   In W. P. Groeneveldt, *Catalogus der Archaeologische Verzameling van het Bataviaasch Genootschap* (1887), p. 224, note 1.

[7])   *Oudh. Versl. 1930*, p. 134.

Dhyānibuddhas in practically the same type of Nāgarī script, and also lying on a viçvavajra. The main difference from our plate is that in the Tandjung Medan yantra the lotus is eight-petalled and inscribed with the names of all of the five Dhyānibuddhas [8]). The similarity of these representations is very striking and seems to suggest that the two plates originally belonged to a same set of yantras. Unfortunately, the absolute lack of data on the origin of our plate excludes any possibility of control.

V. A GOLD PLATE FROM TJANDI PLAOSAN

During the excavations effected in the Buddhistic temple complex of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan Lor (Central Java), a plate of gold leaf was discovered between two small stūpa structures belonging to the second row of small buildings which surround the two main temples ; the two stūpas are designated as II, 21 and 22 [1]). The plate measures 20,2 cm in length and 2,2 cm in breadth ; eight folds are visible, so that, originally, the plate must have been folded into nine.

The plate is inscribed with four lines of script ; the fourth line, however, is not continued up to the end, but finishes at about a quarter of the line. The akṣaras were rather superficially engraved ; they are rather cursive and not capable of being dated within a short period. Obviously, the engraver met with considerable difficulties to execute the akṣara forms with the means at his disposal. Technical reasons account for the strange forms of some of the akṣaras ; thus, the va is expressed by a small equilateral triangle.

The inscription, entirely written in Sanskrit, gives the text of a dhāraṇī. After an invocation addressed to the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṃgha, the text of the dhāraṇī proper is introduced by tadyathā, a word well-known from Buddhist Sanskrit [2]). The text ends in the akṣara pha five times, followed by svāhā.

---

[8]) This yantra, too, has Akṣobhya as its central figure. The transcript added by Brandes to his description mentioned in note 6 is not quite correct: there seems no doubt that the word preceding the names of each of the Dhyānibuddhas is hūṃ, not hyang as Brandes presumed. — The eight-petalled lotus might be the representation of the Ānandakandapadma ; cf. Pott, Yoga en Yantra, pp. 16 sqq. Two of the internal padmas are clearly alluded to in the Plaosan inscription (infra, No. VII), viz. the Ānandakandapadma in strophe 13 c (hṛdayanīraja) and the Sahasrārapadma, the thousand-petalled mind-lotus in strophe 8 d (dhībhūridalayoja<nah>). These loci will be discussed in the introduction to No. VII below.

[1]) Oudh. Versl., 1948, p. 30 ; cf. also ibid., p. 28, the situation sketch. The numbers assigned to the small temples are based upon the same principles as those indicated in Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 116 sq., i.e. the inner row is designated by I, whereas the second and third rows from the centre of the complex are denoted by II and III. The Arabic ciphers indicate the running number, starting from the South-Western corner.

[2]) Tadyathā is frequently used in Buddhist Sanskrit not only at the beginning of dhāraṇīs, but also as an introduction to an analysis of something more general (corresponding to our „viz."). Cf. Cowell and Neill, The Divyāvadāna (1886), Index, p. 680, who compare Pāli seyyathā.

The text belongs to the simpler sorts of dhāraṇīs without the frequent meaningless, we should rather say mystic, syllables. Its most characteristic feature is the frequent occurrence of derivatives of the root çudh in different forms, all conveying the idea of purification ; such derivatives occur no less than eleven times in our short text. Among these, we note the compounds pāpāvaraṇaviçodhani (line 1/2 and karmmāvaraṇaviçodhani (line 2): purification from the obstructions which are either evil or karman [3]).

In view of the above, the dhāraṇī was probably considered a means of purification from the obstructions on the Mārga. The exact name is not mentioned in the text ; it probably was Sarvāvaraṇaviçodhanī-nāma-dhāraṇī or something very similar.

The text seems unknown from other sources. A text named Sarvakarmāvaraṇaviçodhanī-nāma-dhāraṇī, mentioned in the catalogue of the Mdo-man of the Tibetan collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris [4]) proved to be very different according to a reference kindly supplied by Professor Filliozat at our request [5]). Another dhāraṇī, named Sarvadurgatipariçodhana, shows a closer affinity with our text, but is not identical either [6]).

Transcription

1 oṃ [7]) namo vuddhāya [8]) namo dharmmāya namaḥ saṃghāya tadyathā
çuddhe viçuddhe çodhani viçodhani gagaṇaviçodhani [9]) cittaviçodhani pā-

---

[3]) The usual technical term for the former kind is kleçāvaraṇa, i.e. the kleças viewed as factors which obstruct the Mārga. Karmāvaraṇa is the production of karman leading to re-birth, viewed as another kind of obstruction on the Mārga ; the latter is not necessarily due to the effect of evil actions, since also akliṣṭam ajñānam produces karman. Karmāvaraṇa, if opposed to pāpāvaraṇa, might refer especially to those forms of subtle ignorance which obstruct the clear intuition of the Truth, and would then be closely related to jñeyāvaraṇa. It is almost impossible to draw a clear line of separation between the two kinds of āvaraṇa : the dharmas which constitute jñeyāvaraṇa (such as pudgalagrāha and dharmagrāha) are a part of satkāyadṛṣṭi, which is a kleça ; cf. especially the references given by De la Vallée Poussin, Siddhi, II, pp. 566 sqq.

[4]) Marcelle Lalou, Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Buddhica, 2ième série, No. IV (1931), No. 40 on p. 20.

[5]) After a Tibetan introduction, in which it is stated that the dhāraṇī is addressed to mi 'khrugs pa (Akṣobhya), it begins : // namo ratnatrayāya / oṃ kaṃkani / kaṃkani / rocani rocani / trotani trotani / trāsani trāsani / pratihana pratihana / sarvakarma-paramparāṇi me svāhā // .... Almost the same text as this quotation in the Bka' 'gyur, Rgyud XVII. 1 (Bibl. Nat. tib. 454, fol. 1).

[6]) Bibl. Nat. sanskrit 59, fol. 6a 1. 3 : oṃ, çodhani çodhani viçodhani viçodhani sarvapā-paviçuddheḥ sarvakarmā[h]varaṇāni viçuddheḥ svāhā; Bibl. Nat. sanskrit 62, no. 25, fol. 58a, 1. 3-4 : oṃ çodhani çodhani sarvapāpaviçodhani çuddhe viçuddhe sarvapāpa-viçuddhe sarvakarmāvaraṇaviçuddhe svāhā. References by Prof. Filliozat.

[7]) Not distinct.

[8]) Read buddhāya.

[9]) Instead of a na, the plate shows two curves one above the other ; it does not however seem doubtful that the engraver intended to express a na. This appears from a

2. <pā>varaṇaviçodhani [10]) karmmāvaraṇaviçodhani viçuddhe viçuddhe
    kṣīṇe sarvakṣīṇe puṣpe supuṣpe rajoharaṇe sarvapāpa-
3. viçodhani hare hare sarvāvaraṇāṇi daha daha sarvakarmāvaraṇāni paca
    paca sarvasthānagatāni [11]) padme padmākṣi padmaviçā-
4. le pha pha pha pha pha svāhā

Translation [12])

[1] Oṃ ! Homage to the Buddha, Homage to the Dharma, Homage to
the Saṃgha. Thus (is the text):

— Thou who art pure, perfectly pure, a purifier, a perfect purifier,
a purifier of the atmosphere, a purifier of the mind, [2] a purifier from
the obstructions of Karman — thou, perfectly pure, perfectly pure, lean,
perfectly lean, flower-like, perfectly flower-like [13]), a remover of passion,
a purifier from all evil — [3] take away, take away all obstructions ; burn,
burn all obstructions of Karman ; consume, consume (the impurities) gone
into all the organs (?) [14]) — thou who art a Lotus, lotus-eyed, powerful
in the lotus.

[4] Pha-pha-pha-pha-pha Svāhā·

VI. A SMALL GOLD PLATE FROM TJANDI IDJO (CENTRAL JAVA)

A small gold plate, measuring 16 cm in length and 3,5 cm in breadth,
was discovered in the lowest part of the pit of the main temple of the
Tjaṇḍi Idjo complex, which is situated on a hill at about 6 km's distance
to the south of Prambanan in Central Java. For further particulars, the
reader is referred to Brandes, who gave a detailed description, together

---

comparison with other forms of the *na* in this plate, such as the fourth akṣara from
the left of line 3, and, more clearly, the fourteenth (the last akṣara of *sarvāvaraṇāni*);
there it appears that the engraver expressed the *na* by two distinct strokes, and then
a missformation as that which we have here could easily occur.

[10]) The omission of the second *pa* is easily explained as a haplography.

[11]) The *ĝa* is not distinct on the plate. The lower side of the akṣara seems almost closed.
Although °*ĝatāni* might not be completely satisfactory, it seems difficult to consider
other possibilities.

[12]) No real translation of a text in which the exact wording, or rather, the external
form is at least as important as the meaning of the words can be given. The translation
which follows is only an attempt at giving an idea of the text.

[13]) *Puṣpe* is of course the vocative of the feminine form *puṣpā*. The ending in -*e* is even
found in *hare hare* (line 3), where it replaces the -*a* of the imperative.

[14]) The compound is not perfectly lucid. If the reading is correct, *sarvasthānagatāni*
should be considered to depend on a term such as *malāni* (cf. *Mahāvy.*, 189, No. 132,
edition by Minaiev-Mironov in *Bibl. Buddh.*, XIII, 1911, p. 57). *Sthāna* is used
especially to denote the organs of sense and of speech. Cf. *Mahāvy.*, 217, 24 (p. 68):
pañcasu sthāneṣu kṛtāvī saṃvṛttaḥ.

with his transcript and translation of the text engraved in it as early as 1887 [1]). Since, however, our transcription is rather different from that prepared by Brandes in the very beginning of epigraphic studies in Indonesia, the inscription will be briefly discussed again.

The plate is divided into four portions by means of three horizontal lines. The upper portion contains seven lines of Old Javanese script. In the second portion from above, we see a two-armed figure, to the left of which a single akṣara is engraved; to its right, three akṣaras, running from the top to the bottom, are visible. As Brandes correctly concluded, the three akṣaras form the name *kuvera*. It is therefore certain that the figure is meant to represent Kubera, although this identification would not have been suggested by the only attribute, viz. a *daṇḍa* in the left hand [2]). The single akṣara to the left of the figure was transcribed *khaṃ* by Brandes, which seems doubtful to us, though not impossible; the akṣara could be described as an initial *u* preceded by a *taling* and followed by a daṇḍa, the combination used to express *-o* after a consonant; the anusvāra is clear. The whole might represent *oṃ*, but expressed in an unusual way.

The third portion of the plate is engraved with two sets of four concentric circles each. Above the left set, the akṣara *o* is clearly visible; it is probable, though not certain, that an anusvāra should be read above the vowel. Above the right hand set of circles, we distinguish faint traces of an akṣara, which should probably be identified *oṃ*, too. Again, there is a line of writing below the two sets of circles, but no certain reading could be made out of it. Our conjectural reading is : *sāvithuççikha*, but this does not make sense. Possibly, the word represents a vocative of a compound (probably a bahuvrīhi) ending in *-çikha* [3]).

The main inscription, engraved in the upper portion of the plate, consists of thirty syllables, probably to be considered two groups of fifteen syllables each. The text makes the impression of being a *sādhana* addressed to Kubera. Among the epithets, we find *virūpa*, „deformed"; the term could well be applied to the pot-bellied god. In addition, it agrees with the usual Indian etymology of the name Kubera (Kuvera), the literal meaning of which would be : „a person with a deformed body" [4]).

---

[1]) *Notulen B. G.*, 25 (1887), pp. 71 sqq. — Brandes' account was reprinted in an article by J. Groneman, *Tjandi Idjo nabij Jogjakarta*, *T. B. G.*, 32 (1889), pp. 313 sqq. especially pp. 327 sqq. Cf. also Krom, *Inleiding*, I (1923), pp. 249 sq.

[2]) Kubera images known from Buddhist iconography are very different. As to the Brāhmaṇic images of the god, cf. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. II, Pt. II (1916), pp. 535 sq. The description of the two-armed form there given resembles the drawing on the plate ; the god should have a mace (*gadā*) in his right hand.

[3]) The syllable transcribed *thu* is very uncertain. The two first syllables, *sāvi*, do not seem doubtful on the plate, but they do not make sense. It is possible that the carelessly written *ulu* above the *va* should be interpreted as a *layar* (an *r* preceding a consonant) with a *taling* (an *e* vowel after a consonant) to its left. In that case, we should read *sarve;* but the words do not become clearer then.

[4]) Cf. Gopinath Rao, *Elements*, II, Pt. II, p. 533.

Among the other epithets we note *jaṭila,* which might be connected with Kubera's period of ascetism owing to which he acquired the lordship over the riches in the Northern quarter of the universe. The word *bhasma,* „ashes", occurs three times (twice in compounds). The most curious combination. is *pāṇḍuraṅgabhasmaja,* „born out of pale-red ashes". The term could not be connected with any well-known legend about Kubera, but it would fit in with the site of discovery of the gold plate, viz. the temple pit of the main building of Tjaṇḍi Idjo. Might the compound refer to the resurrection from the material remains to the divine form of Kubera ? The compound *bhasmacitta* is strange ; it could, however, be connected with the conception here suggested : the now divine being should sometimes think of the mortal remains left on earth. This explanation of the text remains, however, conjectural ; perhaps the *sādhana* may be traced elsewhere in future.

Transcription

A. *Upper portion :*
1.   ja-
2.   ṭila nirjaṭa [5])
3.   bhūṣi [6]) pāṇḍura-
4.   ṅgabhasmaja
5.   bhasmeṣu bhasma-
6.   citta nirdoça [7])
7.   · .. [8]) virūpa

B. *Middle portion :*
  a (to the left of the head of the figure): *oṃ* [9])
  b. (to the right of the figure, from top to bottom): kuvera

C. *Under portion :*
  a (above the left hand concentric circles): *o* [10])
  b (below the latter): *sāvi* [11]).

---

[5]) The reading of these two words is not doubtful. In *nirjaṭa,* the little dash expressing the *r* preceding a consonant is attached to the middle horizontal stroke of the *ja,* as we find it more often in inscriptions from Java. The possibility that the little dash is meant to express a daṇḍa cannot be excluded, but *nijāṭa* does not seem probable.

[6]) The *ṣa* (at least if it is a *ṣa*) has a curious form ; the akṣara is almost completely closed at its upper side. In a similar way, we find *ṣu* in line 5. *Bhūṣi,* as a vocative of *bhūṣin,* „adorned with", would make sense if we consider *nirjaṭa* an error for *nirjaṭā* ; we then get the compound *nirjaṭābhūṣi,* „with ornaments but without *jaṭā*" (?).

[7]) For *nirdoṣa?* The wrong spelling makes some reservations necessary.

[8]) Probably, *deva* is written here, but the akṣaras are undistinct.

[9]) Conjectural reading. We distinguish the initial *u* preceded by a taling and followed by a daṇḍa.

[10]) The *o* is certain, but there might be an anusvāra over it.

[11]) Very uncertain.

c   (above the right hand concentric circles): *ai* [12])

d   (below the latter): .. *ççikha* [13])

VII. THE PRE-NĀGARI INSCRIPTION FROM TJANDI PLAOSAN

The origin of the stone fragment numbered D. 82 in the Djakarta Museum was considered unknown until in 1915, when Bosch succeeded in combining several data which made it probable that the fragment was discovered in the ruins of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan, Central Java [1]). There, the stone was already noticed by Crawfurd [2]). Later on, it was incorporated into the collection Kläring at Djogjakarta [3]), from where it was transferred to the Djakarta Museum by 1890 [4]). The inscription was briefly discussed by Bosch in the introduction to his publication about the Kĕlurak inscription in 1928 [5]). Recently, I examined a few passages in connection with other Çailendra inscriptions [6]).

The stone is in a fragmentary state. A large portion in the left hand corner is lost and, in addition, the whole upper part and a smaller portion

---

[12]) Or: *aiṃ*? Cf. note 10 above.

[13]) Between the two sets of concentric circles, there is another akṣara, which might be *thu*. The meaning of the akṣaras in the lower portion of the plate is obscure. They should probably be connected in some way or other; if we exclude the two akṣaras on the top of either set of concentric circles (probably *bījākṣaras*, especially if *aiṃ* should be read instead of *ai*) and connect the remaining ones, the result would be: *sāvithuççikhe*, which does not resemble anything known.

[1]) *Oudheidk. Versl.*, 1915, Bijl. X. pp. 89-91.

[2]) Bernet Kempers, *Crawfurd's beschrijving van Prambanan in 1816*, T.B.G., 83 (1949), pp. 177-193; cf. Crawfurd quoted p. 181: „About midway between the gates I discovered a slab of black stone with an inscription in the Deva Nagari character, much effaced and I fear illegible, except in one or two places. The stone is at least a foot thick, and as it bears no marks of the application of blows it seems somewhat difficult to account for its being broken as it is, unless we suppose that it was placed in an elevated situation and fractured in its fall".

[3]) Verbeek, *Oudheden* (1891), p. 164 (description of the Collection Kläring, No. 3); Hoepermans, *Hindoe-oudheden van Java*, Rapp. Oudh. Comm., 1912, p. 234, who stated that according to the informations he had obtained the stone originated from Plaosan. In addition, Hoepermans mentions the presence of another fragment of the same stone; if Hoepermans' statement is correct (the fact that Crawfurd, quoted in note 2, did not notice a smaller fragment necessitates some reservations), the latter fragment must have been lost in rather recent times.

[4]) Cf. *Notulen B.G.*, 28 (1890), p. 54 and p. 76. As Bosch, quoted in note 1, pointed out, the data about D. 82 had been lost during some time, because they were taken to apply to D. 76, a small inscribed stone fragment, which either is lost or, more probably, has never arrived at Djakarta.

[5]) *T.B.G.*, 68 (1928), pp. 8-13 (palaeographic discussion). A photograph of the stone is attached to this article.

[6]) *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 12-14, and pp. 103-105. The doubt as to the origin of the stone, expressed on p. 105, is not justified in view of the more detailed treatment which follows.

at the left hand side, extending over the entire height of the stone, are missing [7]). The part of the stone which is preserved is however considerable (undoubtedly, it amounts to far more than half of its size), but is unfortunately badly weather-beaten. Only in the right hand lower corner, the state of preservation is relatively good; there, the reading does not offer serious difficulties. More or less considerable portions of twenty-three lines of script are preserved. Although such a fragmentary transcription necessarily remains unsatisfactory, there is a still considerable portion of the text left the reading of which is sufficiently certain to justify its publication; this applies especially to the latter half of the inscription. The fact of its being composed in metrical Sanskrit is a great advantage since it makes some control of the transcription possible.

The type of script is a Pre-Nāgarī the essential features of which were discussed by Bosch [8]). Bosch pointed out that the four extant Pre-Nāgarī inscriptions from Central Java, viz. those of Kalasan, Ratubaka, Kělurak and Plaosan, represent two distinct types of script. That in which the Kalasan and Ratubaka charters are written shows a number of curious features not yet found together, at least in that very form, in any Pre-Nāgarī inscription from India [9]). The latter type, that in which the Kělurak and Plaosan inscriptions are written, exhibits no real differences from the script used by some of the Pāla kings in Bengal and Bihar. Whereas the Kalasan and Ratubaka charters are written in exactly the same type of script (no difference could be discovered), the Kělurak and Plaosan types do not appear to be identical, but it soon appears that the differences are not essential in the latter case: they are differences in execution rather than in the forms of the akṣaras themselves. Thus, the height and the breadth of the Plaosan akṣaras amount to about the double of those of the Kělurak ones [10]). In addition, the latter were executed without much care; as a matter of fact, a considerable number of irregularities may be noticed and there are even some obvious lapses [11]). Nothing of the kind could be noticed in the Plaosan

---

[7]) The gaps in the text of the inscription amount to about one fifth of the length of the entire lines as far as the part broken from the left hand side of the stone is concerned; the exact length may be calculated by means of the metre. The lacunae in the transcription are almost always considerably longer since, as a rule, only very faint traces of the akṣaras immediately following the break remained visible on the stone. As a matter of fact, it is curious that the state of preservation of the text gradually decreases the more one gets near the breaks at the upper and at the left hand side. Presumably, the stone was partly hidden in the soil with the left hand corner below and had remained in that position for centuries. The explanation given by Crawfurd in the last clause of the quotation in note 2 above might be the correct one.

[8]) Quoted in note 5 above.

[9]) Its most striking feature is the form of the ya after a consonant. Some other important details were summarized in Pras. Indon., I, pp. 13 sqq.

[10]) The average height of the akṣaras in the Plaosan inscription is about 1 cm. In the Kělurak inscription, there are considerable differences, but the average is considerably lower.

[11]) A clear example occurs in strophe 2, where the exact reading on the stone is either

inscription. Wherever the akṣara forms are well preserved, they prove to have been executed with the utmost care. This is an enormous advantage for the transcription, since even the smallest details may be relied upon : only a part of an akṣara, if it is clearly visible, often makes an unambiguous identification possible.

As we noted above, one is inclined to assign the Plaosan inscription to a considerably younger date than the Kĕlurak charter [12]. The more carefully written documents are often to be considered younger in date, but there are, of course, numerous exceptions. In this case, there are, however, several other data which would make us date the Plaosan inscription considerably later than the Kĕlurak charter. We shall see in the course of this introduction that the form of Buddhism appearing from this text belongs to a later stratum of ideas. A more important argument is the relation with Tjaṇḍi Plaosan, a complex rightly considered to belong to the younger group of Central Javanese temples on account of various, mainly technical, considerations. We now have some idea about the date of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan. Some of the short inscriptions in the small buildings of the complex mention the king Rakai Pikatan, who issued an edict in 850 (No. IX below), but ceased to reign in 856, as will appear from the introduction to No. XI below [13].

---

dhatu, or, more probably dhatta (the -u would be very similar to the second ta), whereas it is obvious that dhartum (or dharttum) was intended. In the Kĕlurak charter, there is much confusion between akṣaras which resemble each other such as pa, ma, sa and ya; there are many examples where a distinct sa was put down although the context requires ma. The stone-cutter may have copied an example which was not clear everywhere (cf. some typical mistakes of this kind in No. X below, the last line of b).

[12] Cf. Bosch, art. cit., pp. 7 sqq.

[13] Infra No. XI, strophe 9 ; cf. its transcription and translation, and the discussion of the data in the Introduction. Some notes about the short inscriptions of Plaosan, especially the mention of the king Rakai Pikatan (viz. the inscriptions dharmma çrī mahārāja rakai pikatan), were given in Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 116 sq. A more detailed discussion with the complete number of inscriptions hitherto discovered is published in the Report of the Archaeological Service of the Indonesian Republic for the years 1951-52. — We add that the Rakai Pikatan has the title Çrī Mahārāja in these inscriptions, whereas he is denoted by ratu in the Perot inscription dated 850 A.D. For the meaning of the latter term, cf. the discussion in the Introduction to No. IX below ; if the conclusion to which we arrive there is correct, we have a definite proof that the short Plaosan inscriptions must be dated after Āṣāḍha 850, whereas the terminus ad quem is Mārgaçīrṣa 856, the year in which the Rakai Pikatan is succeeded by the Rakai Kayuwaṅi. The Pre-Nāgarī inscription does not seem to contain a word about the small temples surrounding the main buildings of the Plaosan complex, which might be a, necessarily weak, argument in favour of the supposition that the small temples were constructed after the Pre-Nāgarī inscription. On the other hand, the wording of some passages in the Plaosan inscription to be examined in the course of this Introduction make it almost certain that our text does not refer to the original foundation. If the above is correct, we have to assume at least three different stages in the construction of the Plaosan complex: an old foundation presumably alluded to in the former part of the Pre-Nāgarī inscription, the erection of an image together with the construction of new buildings and the carving of relief

If the above data may be relied upon (none of the above arguments is really decisive), the most probable date of the Plaosan inscription would be before the middle of the 9th century A. D. Unfortunately, neither a definite date, nor even the name of the reigning king could be traced in the text of the inscription.

As far as this text is preserved, it is entirely composed in Sanskrit verse. The language is correct; no grammatical or orthographic errors could be noticed and one gets the impression that the author of the epigraph possessed a thorough knowledge of the language. The strophes run remarkably well and might even have some poetical merit.

The choice of the metres is remarkable. Most of the first part of the inscription (up to line 12) seems to be composed in Āryā metre, but uncertain reading makes it impossible to separate the strophes. The Āryā strophes seem to alternate with some strophes in the Mālinī metre in lines 6 and 7. From line 13 on, the reconstruction of the strophes is possible. We then have ten stanzas in the Anuṣṭubh metre (strophes 1 to 10), seven strophes in Drutavilambita (11 to 17) and the two last strophes (18 and 19) in the Praharṣaṇī (Praharṣiṇī) metre. The names of the metres are mentioned in the strophes, a custom well-known from handbooks on metrics and even from literature [14]. Thus, we read the word *anuṣṭubhi* at the end of strophe 10, *drutavilambita*° in 17 *d*. In the last strophe (19), one would have expected to read the word *praharṣa(i)ṇī*, which is not, however, the case [15]; the term probably occurred at the end of 18 *d* [16].

---

panels, which appears to be the main subject matter of this inscription, and, finally, the construction of the numerous small buildings between, presumably, 850 and 356. It is at least obvious that the history of the construction of the complex is a very complicated one. Architectural analysis and continued excavations, which are still going on, might perhaps give some precisions. With the materials at our disposal, the most probable date of the Plaosan inscription would be the first half of the 9th century A. D.

[14] A good example is Chapter CIV of the Bṛhatsaṃhitā, in which fifty-six different metres are mentioned.

[15] The reason probably is that the word *praharṣaṇī* (or *praharṣiṇī*) could be used at a single place in the pāda, viz. immediately before the end, so that there remains a single syllable left. Since there is only a limited choice of monosyllabics in Sanskrit, the difficulty is usually solved by putting the gerundive *praharṣaṇīya* at the end of the pāda; cf. *matipraharṣaṇīya*, Bṛhats., CIV, 22. The Old Javanese *Wrĕttisañcaya* uses the words *praharṣiṇī* (read: *praharṣiṇī*) *twas* at the end of strophe 67 (vide Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, IX, p. 89; cf. also p. 154), but in Old Javanese there are more possibilities for monosyllabics. Kern (*op. cit.*, p. 154) notes the difference as to the place of the caesura in the Sanskrit and Old Javanese strophes; Old Javanese poets seem to use different rules in this respect (there seems to be a facultative caesura after the 3rd and the 8th syllables); it is not without interest to note that our poet shows the same peculiarities as those stated by Kern (at least, 19 *b* and *c* have no caesura after the third syllables). It is well-known that Buddhist poetry knows different laws, but the Praharṣaṇī examples from Açvaghoṣa (quoted by Johnston in the Introduction to his translation of the Buddhacarita, p. lxiv) agree with the classical forms. The point deserves interest in view of the problem of the poetical tradition followed by the Old Javanese poets.

[16] One would have expected the term at the end of strophe 19, but the poet may have

The different metres correspond to different portions of the inscription. Thus, the Çlokas (with at least two *vipulās* in 1 *c* and 6 *a*) [17]) give a description of the erection of an image ; the Drutavilambita strophes, with their anapaestic cadence, lend themselves very well to the vivid descriptions of details of a temple in stanzas 11 to 17, and the Praharṣaṇī strophes (nomen est omen) are well adapted to the two benedictory strophes at the end of the text.

The poet makes a moderate use of the *alaṃkāras*. *Yamakas* are numerous; cf. *prati .. prati* (separated by one syllable) in 1 *d*, *çrānta .. çrānta* in 5 *a-b, kana .... kana* in 12 *a, vara .. vara-vāra-vārā* in 13 *b, pratima-pratimā* in 16 *d, rāja-rāja* in 19 *c*, and a few others. *Upamās* are common, but not very striking ; we note *çiçiraraçmirucāpravarānvayaḥ* in 12 *c*, and the more elaborate simile *sugatabhaktibharapraṇatai(r)* in 14 *b* ; in the latter case, the burden of *bhakti* is not of course the real cause why the persons are bowed ; the simile is an *utprekṣā* rather than an *upamā* [18]).

Some of the similes are typically Buddhistic. A good example is *viçvāvaraṇavāraṇaḥ* in 6 *b*. *Āvaraṇa*, „obstruction, fence, wall, screen", is a well-known technical Buddhist term to denote the obstacles of all kinds on the Path leading to Nirvāṇa or Buddha-hood. Its usual division is into two groups, viz. *kleça and jñeya* [19]): the former are especially the obstacles met on the Path leading to Nirvāṇa, the latter, which are of a far more subtle nature, are the obstructions which the Bodhisattva encounters on the Path leading to Buddha-hood. According to a more complicated division [20]), there is one obstacle, viz. the quality of being a Pṛthagjana (*pṛthagjanatvā-varaṇa*), which prevents most people from ascending the first Bhūmi of the Bodhisattvamārga ; then, there are ten other kinds of Āvaraṇa, viz. the sorts of obstructions to be met on each of the Bhūmis : those of the first

---

preferred not to end the text of a Buddhist inscription in such a display of feeling as is necessarily suggested by the word *praharṣaṇī;* cf. note 94 to the Transcription.

[17]) There are two *vipulās* against eight *pathyās,* but the numbers are too small to base any conclusions on this relation. The *vipulā* of 1 *c* is a very usual one, that of 6 *a* is unusual.

[18]) O. Böthlingk, *Daṇḍin's Poetik* (1890), p. 85.

[19]) *Dharmasaṃgraha,* CXV ; edition by Kasawara, Müller and Wenzel in *Anecd. Oxon.,* Vol. I, Part V (1885), p. 28, and *passim.* These two 'screens' correspond to the two kinds of *sambhāra* to be mentioned in note 98 below : *puṇyasambhāra* is the equipment necessary to 'leap over' the screen constituted by the *kleças* and *jñānasambhāra* is, as it were, the weapon by means of which the Bodhisattva overcomes the more subtle screen which is *jñeyāvaraṇa.* This symbolism may be noticed throughout the *bhūmi* conception of Mahāyāna. In the Barabuḍur, the great Javanese monument symbolizing these *bhūmis* by its different terraces, the lower *bhūmis* are separated one from the other by real walls, making the monument a „monde clos", to quote the term used by Paul Mus in his penetrating analysis of Barabuḍur symbolism (*B.E.F.E.O.,* 32, 1932, *Troisième Partie,* pp. 353 sqq.). On the other hand, it seems hardly doubtful that the weapons carried by many Bodhisattvas, such as Mañjuçrī's *khaḍga,* Vajrapāṇi's *vajra,* etc., symbolize the means to overcome the different screens.

[20]) Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *La Siddhi d'Hiuen Tsang,* II (1929), pp. 639 sqq.

Bhūmi must be vanquished to ascend the second Bhūmi and so on; those of the tenth Bhūmi must be eliminated to become a Buddha during *vajropamasamādhi*. The Bodhisattva who succeeds in destroying all kinds of obstructions may be compared with an elephant [21]. This is one of the manifold examples belonging to this group of similes; some other examples such as the Buddha (or Bodhisattva at the highest stage) being compared with a cloud from which the soft rain of the Dharma descends will be mentioned in the survey of the type of Buddhism below. Most of these cases, to be defined rather as *rūpakas* (metaphors) than as similes, have become technical terms in Buddhism, although their metaphorical nature is never forgotten; our poet makes a full use of the possibilities that offer themselves.

Since the text is badly damaged, it is not easy to determine its meaning. In the survey which follows we limit ourselves to those portions the reading and interpretation of which are sufficiently certain to permit conclusions.

As was briefly noted above, neither the date of the inscription nor the name of the reigning king is preserved. There could not, however, be any reasonable doubt that this text was issued by one of the Çailendra kings in Central Java. The use of the Pre-Nāgarī script is a strong argument in favour of such a surmise, since the only three other extant Pre-Nāgarī documents all belong to the dynasty mentioned. In addition, the text is clearly Mahāyānic. Finally, the last strophe of the inscription, which will be fully discussed below, seems to refer to the founder of the Çailendra dynasty.

The first portion of our text (up to line 12 inclusive) may have contained important historical data, as appears from the relatively small portions which could be deciphered [22]. It is hardly possible to make use of these isolated fragments, the meaning of which might be different if we knew their contexts. One would like to comment on *jamvulakṣmyāḥ* ..... *lolakīrttyā vilokinyāḥ*; the reading of *jamvu*° is certain and that of *lakṣmyāḥ* is clearly confirmed by the epithet; *jamvulakṣmī* cannot well be interpreted otherwise than as a queen originating from India (Jambudvīpa), but the loss of the context necessitates reservations. In line 6, a (third?) pāda of a Mālinī strophe [23] could be read except for the last syllable, which may be completed without difficulty [24]; it runs: *smaraharavaravarṣṣad=bhūjayottuṅgade(vaḥ)*. A royal name may be recognized in the portion after the caesura, viz. Bhūjayottuṅgadeva. Most of the Çailendra princes known to us, if not all, took *abhiṣeka* names in which the element *tuṅga* or *uttuṅga* constituted an important part [25]; the name here mentioned is unknown from other

---

[21] Cf. the note to the translation of this strophe (note 106).

[22] Since the metre cannot be reconstructed, we miss an important means of control.

[23] That it is a third pāda seems to follow from the single daṇḍa preceding it.

[24] The only point which is uncertain is whether the form is put in the nominative of the singular, but this is irrelevant for the discussion following here.

[25] The names known to us are Dharmatuṅgadeva (Ratubaka charter), Samaratuṅga

sources. There is no reason whatever why we should take it to be the name of the reigning king in the time in which the inscription was composed. On the contrary, there is a strong indication that this is not the case. The royal name is preceded by the epithet *smaraharavaravarṣad-,* meaning „causing the rains, which are the boons taking away passion, to descend" [26]). Normally, the effect of rains consists in refreshing those tortured by heat ; the latter is however a well-known metaphor for the heat of passion (*rāga, kāma*), which is cooled by that excellent rain which is the exposition of the Doctrine. Only Buddhas and Bodhisattvas abiding on the highest stage of perfection, which is therefore called Dharmameghā [27]), have acquired the complete possession of the forces necessary to that purpose. It is not probable that the compound should refer to a Buddha, to whom the simile of the Rain of Dharma might refer as well as to a Bodhisattva abiding on the 10th stage ; the use of °*deva* makes such an interpretation less likely [28]).

Karangtĕňah inscription), Māravijayottuṅgavarman and Saṅgrāmavijayottuṅgavarman (the Coḷa charters); cf. Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.,* 18 (1918), pp. 1-28; cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, pp. 20, 101, 106. The name Saṅgrāmadhanaṃjaya in the Kĕlurak inscription (*ibid.,* p. 102) is not necessarily an exception since the name is not probably complete in this form.

[26]) Tatpuruṣa compounds the latter part of which is a participle are not common. Whitney, *Grammar,* § 1273 *c,* gives a similar compound *prāsakārmukabibhrat.*

[27]) Obermiller, *Acta Orient.,* XI (1932), p. 57. Cf. also *Mahāvy.,* 31, 10 (p. 14), *Dharmas.* LXIV, No. 10 (p. 14); *Siddhi,* II, p. 618 : „La terre du nuage de Dharma. Le nuage qu'est le Mahādharmajñāna porte l'eau de tous les biens spirituels (*guṇa*); cache le *dauṣṭhulya* (les deux Āvaraṇas), comme un nuage cache l'espace; remplit ..... le Dharmakāya". A detailed description in *Daçabhūmika,* chapter X (ed. by Rahder, pp. 82-95). Further references in De la Vallée Foussin, *Siddhi, loc. cit.;* Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine,* pp. 64 sqq. The Dharmameghā stage implies a very elaborate symbolism. Thus, the Dharma emanating from the Bodhisattva abiding on that stage is compared with rain in as far as it extinguishes desire and suffering, the latter being symbolized by fire. Prajñākaramɛti, commenting upon *Bodhic. Av.,* IX, 167. notes with reference to *puṇyamegha* (edition by De la Vallée Poussin, p. 603, lines 10 sq.): *puṇyāny eva meghāḥ . sarvaduḥkhasaṃtāpārtiçamanasukhopakaraṇaçītalavṛṣṭipradānāni- dānatvāt,* with which cf. *ḍuḥkhaçamanaçāsanah* in strophe 7 *d* of our inscription. In the same strophe quoted from the *Bodhic. Av.,* the notion contrasted to *puṇyamegha* is *duḥkhāgni,* for which the commentator gives the sober explanation *duḥkhāny evāgnayaḥ.* The acts of the Bodhisattva abiding on the Dharmameghā bhūmi are explained as *jātyādiduḥkhānalatāpapraçamana.* The rain of the Doctrine does not only act as a destroyer of fire (viz. Desire, Tṛṣṇā, and *duḥkha,* which is narrowly associated): just as ordinary rain makes the plants grow, the rain of Dharma makes the development of the roots of virtue (*kuçalamūla*) possible ; cf. the important Gaṇḍavyūha quotation in *Çikṣās.,* p. 103, lines 1 sq.: *dharmameghayugapatpravarṣaṇaḥ sarvaçukladharmaphalaçasyavardhanaḥ.* The *dharmamegha* is not visible on the phenomenal sky, but exists in the transcendental *dharmadhātugagana (op. cit.,* p. 102, line 15). We think that these references make it possible to understand and connect the mutilated strophes in our text. It is well-known that one form of symbolism does not exclude another. Whereas here the Bodhisattva extinguishes the burning fire of suffering, the same Bodhisattva may be the fire that consumes the impurities that are the *kleças,* the simile suggested by other passages in our text.

[28]) On the other hand, the designation by *deva* is not unusual for Bodhisattvas abiding

The interpretation of the quoted passage is strongly confirmed by strophe 8 of our inscription, where the same metaphor is used in a more elaborate form. There, the image is compared with a twilight-cloud (*sāndhyābhra*) from which a soft rain (*mañjuçīkara*) descends, viz. the discourses (*vyāhāra*) aiming at saving the creatures [29]. The dark-grey cloud as seen during twilight suggests the monk's dress (*cīvara*) by its colour, as is expressed in the strophe.

The above question whether the description refers to a Buddha or a Bodhisattva is capable of being answered more definitely with the help of strophe 5. We there read °*vodhim* (*bodhim*) *eṣyati*, and the use of the future excludes the interpretation as a Buddha [30].

Another elaborate metaphor, interesting from several points of view, is contained in strophe 1. There, the image, probably the same as that dealt with in the other strophes, is stated to be provided with *dharmasambhāra*, the equipment of merits and wisdom necessary for the attainment of Buddhahood. Now, the wording of the first two pādas of the strophe suggests that there is a close relation between *dharmasambhārasamita*° and *naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāro* at the beginning of the strophe [31]. There is a pun on the meanings of *sambhāra* and *bhāra*, the former having the technical Buddhist connotation of merits and wisdom as the Bodhisattva's equipment by which he is able to proceed from one *bhūmi* to the next one and, finally, to become a Buddha. Such an 'accumulation of virtuous elements' (*dharmasambhāra*)

---

on the 10th bhūmi. Thus, in the Daçabhūmika, such Bodhisattvas are equalled with Mahādeva as far as the supernatural faculties are concerned. Among the most typical representatives of 10th *bhūmi* Bodhisattvas, Avalokiteçvara, Maitreya, Mañjuçrī and Samantabhadra, it is Avalokiteçvara who shows some vague Çaiva affinities, especially by his designation by a name ending in -*içvaia*.

[29] The exact wording of the beginning of the strophe is open to doubt. The use of °*pāra*° suggests a simile of crossing the Saṃsāra, which is often compared with an ocean, but it is obvious that this would imply quite a different simile than that based upon the rain of the good doctrine. Something which is compared with rain could however be used in a simile in which phenomenal existence is compared with fire or heat (e.g. the fire of the *kleças*, *kleçāgni*). Probably, our conjectural reading of the beginning of strophe 8 is not correct.

[30] In spite of the gaps in the transcript, it seems probable that all the strophes from 1 to 10 refer to the same image; it seems that the subject of these strophes, which are all in the same Anuṣṭubh metre, never changes. There is a far greater amount of uncertainty about the fragmentary passage in line 6; still, the fact of the same simile of the *dharmamegha* being used both with reference of Bhūjayottuṅgadeva in line 6 and in the elaborate simile of strophe 8 might be an indication that the same statue is meant. — On the other hand, we want to stress that the strophes 11 to 17 inclusive clearly refer to a Buddha whose good influence is shown in a number of small scenes; the use of the term *nirvṛta* in 16 c is conclusive since the term could never be used with reference to a Bodhisattva. This apparent contradiction might be interpreted in two ways. Either the poet considered a Bodhisattva abiding on the 10th stage perfectly equal to a Buddha, which does not seem probable, or the strophes 11-17 refer to another image, e.g. one of the twenty Jinas mentioned in strophe 5 c.

[31] For details and references, the reader is referred to note 98 to the Translation below.

is something difficult to be expressed in a statue, but it is possible to represent the superhuman qualities which are the result of this accumulation by adequate symbols, viz. by the dress, ornaments and other attributes and distinguishing marks of the image. If, therefore, a statue is stated to be provided with *dharmasambhāra,* this could only mean that the statue is provided with such ornaments etc. that may be considered symbols of the presence of the accumulated virtuous elements. Thus, the sword in the right hand of Mañjuçrī may be explained as the symbol pointing to the Bodhisattva's perfect mastership in removing all kinds of obstacles on the Path — obstacles usually represented as veils or screens (*āvaraṇa*) to be cut by the sword of transcendent knowledge (*prajñā* and *jñāna*). The „burden of kingship" (as we may render *naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāra*) is less difficult to be represented by visible symbols; such symbols as thrones and crowns have this very function. The elaborate metaphor in strophe 1 leaves no doubt that the relation between *dharmasambhāra* and *naranāthābhisaṃskāra* is an intimate one : the two notions are applied to one and the same statue. The only acceptable explanation seems to be that the statue is provided with manifest royal ornaments (tiara, bracelets, *nūpuras* etc.), which are, however, to be considered as many symbols of superior qualities acquired on the Mārga. It is well-known that Maitreya's kingship in Tuṣita heavens is not anything else but the retribution of merit and wisdom acquired during innumerable former states of existence. Especially Paul Mus pointed out the great importance of Maitreya's coronation ceremony for a correct understanding of Buddhist art [32]. We do not mean, of course, that the statue would certainly have been a Maitreya ; although the ceremony in Tuṣita heavens may have been the prototype, all the great Bodhisattvas abiding on the tenth *bhūmi* of the Mārga may be considered transcendent kings, at least in full-developed Mahāyāna [33]).

[32] Paul Mus, *Et. indiennes et indochinoises,* II *Le buddha paré, B.E.F.E.O.,* 28 (1928), pp. 153-278, especially pp. 267 sqq. Cf. also the same scholar in *Barabuḍur, Cinquième Partie, Chap. XIII, Çākyamuni et Maitreya dans le rituel royal,* in *B.E.F.E.O.,* 33 (1933), 1, pp. 830 sqq.

[33] In the most authoritative source on the Bodhisattvabhūmis, the Daçabhūmikasūtra, the tenth stage of the Mārga is called both Abhiṣekabhūmi and Dharmameghā Bhūmi. The inauguration ceremonies are described in detail in the fifth section (E) of the tenth Bhūmi, edition by Rahder, pp. 85 sq. As a consequence of this *abhiṣeka,* the Bodhisattva becomes a Cakravartin ; he only needs a further perfection of the ten forces (*daçabala*) to become a Perfect Buddha. By these royal ceremonies, the Bodhisattva is installed in the Dharmameghā Bhūmi ; cf. *op. cit.,* p. 86, lines 8 sq. : *sa evam abhiṣikto 'prameyaguṇajñānavivardhito dharmameghāyāṃ bodhisattvabhumau pratiṣṭhita ity ucyate.* As a rule, the combination of the Clouds of Dharma and royal inauguration is characteristic of most of the extant descriptions of the tenth Bhūmi. It is very clearly expressed in the Ratnāvali quoted in translation from Tibetan by Obermiller, *Acta Orient.,* IX (1931), p. 117, note 5 : „It is (called) so, because the rain of the Highest Truth descends upon the saints and the Bodhisattvas are consecrated in the light of the Buddha". These conceptions are undoubtedly very important for a correct understanding of Buddhist dynasties since they establish a direct link between kingship and the Mārga.

By combining the above arguments, one might arrive at a plausible conjecture as to the identification of the royal name mentioned in line 6 of our text. The combination of kingship with a Bodhisattva abiding on the tenth bhūmi completely agrees with what we may conclude about the founder of the Çailendra dynasty on account of other data[34]. It would therefore seem probable that Bhūjayottuṅgadeva is the abhiṣekanāma of that very founder — or, to be more precise, the name attributed to the latter by the later Çailendra generations in the ninth century A. D. The name has not been traced in other sources. As we have it, it would not disagree with the other names of Çailendra kings[35].

In this connection, we call again attention to the last strophe (19) of this inscription[36]. As a matter of fact, it is one of the very few strophes in this text that could be read from the beginning to the end; its reading is certain except for the three first syllables of pāda c[37]. This Praharṣiṇī strophe contains the wish, usual in the records of Mahāyāna foundations, that the puṇya acquired by the pious deed may serve for the liberation of all the creatures[38]. In this phase of Buddhism, however, one's own efforts are not sufficient to that purpose; the protection of a Buddha, or rather, of a Great Bodhisattva is necessary. Now we see that in the pādas c-d of strophe 19 there is an appeal for protection from those impurities (kleça) which are the Wrong Views (dṛṣṭi), but this appeal is addressed not to one of the well-known Great Bodhisattvas, but to the king of the supreme kings of Varanara[39] (varanarādhirājarāja). It may be concluded that this supreme

---

[34] Cf. Pras. Indon., I (1950), p. 174.

[35] Cf. note 25 above. It seems hardly likely to us that the name should be considered an authentic one. Revision of official names and titles of ancient kings on the base of the titles used in the revisor's times is only natural. For the artificial character of some dynasties, cf. Cœdès, Etudes Cambodgiennes, XXI, La tradition généalogique des premiers rois d'Angkor, in B.E.F.E.O., XXVIII (1928), pp. 124 sqq. Cf. Berg, Bijdr. 98 (1939), p. 57 (about anachronisms in the titles given in the Pararaton to older dignitaries) and De Graaf, ibid., 109 (1953), pp. 62-82.

[36] Op. cit., p. 104.

[37] For these three syllables, we shall here give a corrected reading, which is not absolutely certain but has the great advantage of accounting for the metre.

[38] In the Buddhist texts and inscriptions, we meet with all kinds of variations on this theme. Indian inscriptions often show the well-known formula deyadharmo 'yaṃ etc., which has not been met with in any Buddhist inscription from Indonesia. The Kalasan inscription ends in the curious wish that all people may get acquainted with the meaning of Pratītyasamutpāda (pratītyajātārthavibhāgavijñāḥ) as a consequence of the puṇya acquired by the foundation. Such passages have sometimes been interpreted as a gift of puṇya; this could hardly be called a sacrifice, since the puṇya acquired by the latter gift necessarily exceeds the amount of puṇya acquired before. The idea is however that the founder pronounces the wish that the foundation may be a bridge (setu) or a ladder (sopāna) towards the stronghold of liberation (muktipura).

[39] This Varanara should probably be identified with Naravaranagara, the Na-fu-na of the Chinese sources, which is the name of the capital of the Fu-nan empire after the kings had left Vyādhapura; cf. Cœdès, B.E.F.E.O., XLIII (1943-46), pp. 3 sq. and Pras.

king was endowed with powers characteristic of the Bodhisattvas abiding on the highest *bhūmi* [40]). Therefore, the last strophe of the inscription is very probably an invocation addressed to the same Bhūjayottuṅgadeva, conceived of as a Bodhisattva-Cakravartin. If these identifications are correct — the mutilated text necessitates some reservations — they supply us with

---

Indon., I (1950), pp. 191 sq. The last line of the Kĕlurak inscription has the compound *çrīsaṅgrāmadhanaṃjayanaravarasaṃskāralavdhagurunāmnaḥ*, in which the use of *naravara*, all but a usual term to denote a king in the only place in the text where the official name of the reigning monarch is mentioned, appears to be an unambiguous reference to the last Fu-nan capital. Cf. also the important article by Cœdès, *La tradition généalogique des premiers rois d'Angkor d'après les inscriptions de Yaçovarman et de Rājendravarman, Et. Camb.*, No. XXI, in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XXVIII (1928), pp. 124-140; Rājendravarman uses the title *adhirāja* to refer to the kings of Vyādhapura, the Fu-nan capital from where the kings retired to Naravara as a consequence of dynastic difficulties after the death of Rudravarman (presumably, in the second half of the sixth century A. D.; cf. Finot in *Mélanges Sylvain Lévi*, p. 211, quoted by Cœdès *art. cit.*, p. 130). Now it is curious that the same term *adhirāja*, unusual to denote kings in inscriptions from Indonesia, is also used in the last strophe of the Plaosan inscription to refer to the king of Varanara (= Naravara, as we presumed above); the title may therefore have been considered characteristic of the Fu-nan kings. It is not less striking that the much discussed inscription *B* of Ligor, which contains the oldest mention of the Çailendra dynasty, begins *yo 'sau rājādhirājas*, thereby using the same title *adhirāja* again. We think that these data make it very probable that Varanara, combined with the *adhirāja* title, do refer to Fu-nan, viz. to the last capital which may have been situated on the Gulf of Siam, possibly in the Northern part of the Peninsula, in any case to the South of Vyādhapura, which is probably the present Bà Phnom (Cœdès, *art. cit.*, p. 130). Already in 1924 (*Journ. Gr. Ind. Soc.*, I, pp. 66-70), Cœdès proposed to connect the Çailendra kings of Indonesia with the ancient Fu-nan on account of various data which have not lost their weight, although they necessarily remained vague. The loci in the Kelurak and Plaosan inscriptions give it a strong support. An inevitable consequence is that new problems arise as soon as one tries to arrive at further precisions. There remains a gap in our data between about the middle of the 6th century and the second half of the 8th century when the Çailendra dynasty suddenly appeared in the Ligor region and in Central Java. We have to conclude that Fu-nan, though no more than a shadow of what it was before, continued to exist during about two centuries in Naravaranagara. This would not, however, be in conflict with our data, especially in view of a statement by I-tsing about in the middle of the dark period. I-tsing (cf. Pelliot, *B.E.F.E.O.*, III, 1903, p. 284) mentions the country Pa-nan, formally called Fu-nan, which is situated on a month's sailing distance to the South-West of Campā. The fact of it being defined as not a separate island but the South-Eastern corner of Jambūdvīpa points to the Malay Peninsula. In the present state of research, it seems probable that a small state in the Northern half of the Peninsula claimed to continue the old empire of Fu-nan. It remained one of the numerous small states on the Peninsula until, in the eighth century, one of its petty kings made the best of the changed conditions and revived the old empire in narrow associations with Çrīvijaya, adopting the old but not yet forgotten titles of the kings of Naravara.

[40]) Cf. *Mahāvy.*, 30, 47: *nānādṛṣṭyanuçayaparyavasthānakleçapraçamanakuçalaḥ*. The title of this chapter is given as *Bodhisattvānāṃ sūtrāntanirgatāni kānicid guṇanāmāni*; it appears however from the first item *ekajātipratibaddhaḥ* that only Bodhisattvas abiding in the Dharmameghabhūmi are meant.

further materials about this mysterious king of Varanara, who became the founder of the Çailendra dynasty in Central Java.

The first twelve lines of the text must have contained many other data. At least a part of it makes the impression of being a vaṃçāvali, in which the excellent qualities of different Çailendra kings and queens are extolled [41]. Unfortunately, the text is too mutilated to make any conclusions possible.

· Much more is preserved of the ten Anuṣṭubh strophes (1 — 10) and the seven Drutavilambita stanzas (11 — 17). The former all deal with the principal image. The first strophe was already discussed above in connection with the identification of the statue. In the third, a very interesting explanation of its origin is given. It is stated there that the image had miraculously fallen down into the temple (prāsādādbhutasaṃbhraṣṭaḥ) owing to its attachment to the Four Sugatas, but in spite of its fall, it continued to be brilliant [42]. This probably means that the temple had been there since some time before the date of our inscription; we also learn that not only the temple buildings existed already, but there were images, too, viz. the Four Sugatas, for if we understand the meaning of the strophe correctly, the presence of these Four Sugatas was the immediate cause of the descent of the marvellous image. This interpretation is greatly confirmed by strophe 18 c, where we read the words itarakṛto 'pi pālanīyaḥ, applied to the foundation [43]. These words mean : „(which) is to be protected also after having been made different". As a matter of fact, the protection of a foundation should imply that the things are to be left in the condition in which they were before. The contrast made by these words could only be understood if we presume that the king had made considerable changes in the foundation, but added that this fact should not be an excuse for future generations of kings who might not be satisfied with the sanctuary. We should then expect some mention of the original foundation in the initial part of the text in connection with one of the members of the vaṃçāvali. It is therefore quite possible that the words priyatamam eva parikhayā pari . . . . . [44] bear upon this original foundation. Our poet can hardly state anything without pointing to some antithesis. Here, the point is that nobody likes priyaviraha as a rule, but in

[41] The impression of a vaṃçāvali is made especially by the words janayām = babhūva bhūpo bhūbhṛtam in line 10. In the lines 8 and 9, a queen (or queens) is (are) extolled.

[42] We analyze prāsādādbhutasambhraṣṭaḥ as prāsādam adbhutena sambhraṣṭaḥ ; cf. note 101 to the Translation. Normally, something would have lost its beauty by falling down from unfathomable height. Such kinds of antithesis are very frequent in this text; some other examples are treated below. A similar case of an image fallen from heaven and erected in a temple occurs in the Karangtĕñah inscription ; cf. Pras. Indon., I (1950), p. 39. Bosch (Bijdr. K.I., 108, 1952, p. 194) rejects the interpretation proposed there and refers the simile of the portion of the lunar disc fallen to earth not to the image, but to the mandira mentioned at the end of strophe 11 of the text; the simile would, however, seem very strange in that case.

[43] For the meaning of koṣa, the reader is referred to note 137 to the translation.

[44] Pari- is probably the beginning of one of the numerous words meaning „to surround" (paridadhāti, etc.).

this particular case the temples, though being *priyatama* are nevertheless surrounded by a ditch [45]. Then we may presume that the subject matter of the strophes 1 to 19 deals with the changes at the occasion of which this inscription was made. The most important change was undoubtedly the erection of the marvellous image. But there was more. We may interpret the compound *ratnatrayāçayopetaṃ* (strophe 10 *a*) „(the image) provided with a Triratna temple", in such a way that the image is erected in a temple dedicated to the Triratna, which had been constructed on its behalf [46]. Seven strophes (11 — 17) are devoted to sundry details of this [47] temple. These seven strophes belong to the most interesting portion of the text in its present form. Each of these gives a small but vivid picture of a separate detail. The Drutavilambita metre is well adapted to descriptions of this kind. Its lively form, which is mainly due to the shortness of the pādas and the preponderance of *breves*, suggests the impressions made upon the visitors by these details.

In the first of these strophes (11), we see a number of beautiful women before us, anointed with all kinds of scents. Since only the first pāda is preserved, we remain in the dark about what they are doing. Strophe 12 is very interesting. There, we may represent us a Buddha [48] who blinds others by the incomparable splendour emanating from the *çikhā* — a splendour due to a golden lotus hidden there. Here we have a clear allusion to one of the interior lotuses (*padma*) which play a very important role in both Brāhmaṇic and Buddhist Yoga. The lotus here mentioned is known as the Thousand-petalled one (*sahasrārapadma*) [49]. It is evident that a Buddha image cannot have a *çikhā*, at least if this term is taken in its proper meaning ; but this is just the place where the *uṣṇīṣa* is found in Buddha images. The splendour emanating from the *uṣṇīṣa* is often mentioned in the texts [50] The blinding splendour of the Buddha is in a striking contrast to his company, probably Bodhisattvas, characterized by the soft rays of the moon. The latter are blended by the light issuing from the Buddha ; they cannot see what

---

[45] The (poetic) reason why this was done is not clear owing to a lacuna in the text.

[46] Although there is no real proof for the latter statement, the use of °*upeta* suggests that the temple was built for the image. Cf. strophe 3 of the Kalasan inscription where it is stated that a (statue) of Tārādevī was made, and also a temple for her (*T.B.G.*, 68, 1928, p. 58 : *tārādevī kṛtāpi tadbhavanam*).

[47] The wording of strophe 10, in which the poet expresses his inability of giving an adequate description of the beauties of this image and this temple, is an excellent link with the strophes 11 sqq., in which an (inadequate) attempt to mention at least some of its *adbhutāni* is made.

[48] This cannot be the image described in strophes 1 to 9, which is not a Buddha image if our interpretation especially of strophe 5 is correct. One might presume that the Buddha of strophe 12 is sculptured in one of the reliefs of the temple.

[49] Cf. the detailed description by P. H. Pott, *Yoga en Yantra*, 1946, pp. 20 sqq. and p. 39, with numerous references.

[50] Cf. *Mahāvy.*, 244, 31-33 (p. 81): *uṣṇīṣavivarāntād raçmiṃ niçcarati / sa raçmiṃ niçcārya parisphuṭo 'bhūt.*

they are doing. In the fourth pāda, of which only the beginning *sakalakhādya-* is preserved, some accident must have been mentioned with the different kinds of food they were carrying; they probably let it drop. We can get some idea of the scene : there was probably a Buddha sitting on his throne with a number of Bodhisattvas intending to bring him food as a form of *pūjā*, but when the latter were suddenly in the presence of the Buddha, they were frightened by his divine appearance and were unable to keep the food in their hands.

A different scene is described in strophe 13, where however the entire first pāda is lost. The interpretation of the scene is therefore uncertain; we presume [51]) that the poet describes a number of lovers sporting with their beloved ones, who find themselves suddenly in the presence of a Buddha. This symbol of *vairāgya* makes the lovers unable to continue with what they were doing; all their energy is hence-forward devoted to the sublime ideal. The poet expresses this sudden change by stating that the Buddha takes their passions out of their heart-lotuses (*hṛdayanīraja*). Here, we have another unambiguous reference to one of the interior *padmas* ; it is the heart-lotus, which is known as the *ānandakandapadma* in Yoga [52]). Here, too, the description is strikingly 'plastic' : one is more or less able to reconstruct the scene which is represented. We have probably a Buddha to whom a number of youths pay homage while their beloved ones are on the background. If this interpretation is correct, the scene described in strophe 13 is closely related to that in strophe 12. In both cases, the super-natural power of the Buddha is stressed especially in connection with the interior mystical centres.

Strophe 14 is interesting from a historical point of view. Here, we represent us a Buddha temple (*jinamandira*) worshipped by a group of people, bowed by the burden of devotion to the Buddhas. who continuously arrived from the Gurjara country. We briefly mentioned this simile in a different context ; *bhakti* is represented here as a burden which makes these people humbly pay worship to the temple. It our reading *satkriyate* is correct, the passage refers to the typical forms of worship in later Mahāyāna, in-cluding *vandana*, „praising", the bringing of scents and ointments (*gandhānu-lepa*), the erection of Buddha images (*tathāgatapratimākaraṇa*), etc. [53]).

---

51) For the details of the interpretation, cf. the notes to the translation of strophe 13.

52) Cf. Pott, *op. cit.,* pp. 16 sqq. The term usual in Yoga is *hṛdayapuṇḍarīka*, one of the most important mystic centres.

53) These forms of worship, for which *satkāra* and *pūjā* are the most usual terms, are very well-known from Mahāyāna ; they probably constituted one of the most important features of living Buddhism. A systematic account with numerous quotations is given by Çāntideva in chapter XVII of the Çikṣāsamuccaya (under the title Vandanānuçaṃsa ; cf. the edition by Bendall in *Bibl. Buddh.,* I, 1902, pp. 297-315). For the term *satkāra*, cf. *ibidem*, p. 312, line 5 : *sarvasatkāraiḥ satkuryuḥ*. Cf. also Bodhicaryāvatāra, II, 10 to 30, where we find the bathing of Buddha images (*snāna*, 10-11), the gifts of clothing (*vastrāṇi*, especially *cīvarāṇi*, 12-13), of scents, ointments and flowers (*gandha, anulepa* and *puṣpāni*, 14-15), clouds of incense, foods and drinks (*dhūpameghāḥ*,

A very interesting point is the mention of people arriving from the Gurjara country. One would especially like to know what kind of people are meant here, whether *gurus* or merchants. We suggested the former alternative in a previous publication mainly on account of two considerations : the mention of a guru from Gaudīdvīpa (Bengal ?) in the Kēlurak inscription and the possibility of restoring *gurubhir* at the beginning of pāda c [54]. On the other hand, the use of *satata* at the beginning of the strophe would suggest a continuous coming and going from and to Gurjaradeça, which would agree better with commercial than with religious and cultural contacts [55]. In any case, this passage leaves no doubt of there having been some regular contact, at least during some years, between Java and Gurjaradeça. The latter term is unfortunately vague. If we consider the approximate date of our inscription (the first half or the middle of the ninth century A.D.), the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire of Kanauj, though not the only possibility, would seem the most probable conjecture [56].

The next strophe (15) gives a vivid picture related with that described in strophes 13 and 14. Some distinguished people bearing countless ornaments were just on the point of revealing their feelings to their beloved ones, but it was just in time that they saw a Buddha image ; the sublime majesty of the Perfect Being devoid of passion withheld them from ceding to that temptation [57]. The word *kvacid,* with which this strophe begins, underlines that a different scene is described in each of these strophes.

The two last strophes in the Drutavilambita metre (16 and 17) give an explanation of the wonderful influence of the Buddha image expressed in the little scenes which precede. The Buddha, although perfect, is not irritated at those who are not accomplished and adhere to different views ; He aims at rescuing the entire world. Since He is liberated from phenomenal existence (*nirvṛta*), He must use special means to that purpose, viz. images which are incomparable in destroying worldly existence [58]. At last, the wish is pronounced that by these means those obscured by the thick veil of ignorance may obtain Deliverance.

It thus appears that the meaning of the scenes is not obscure as a rule.

---

bhojyāni, khādyāni, peyāni, 16 ; this use of *khādya* confirms the interpretation of strophe 12 suggested above), etc.

[54] Cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I (1950), pp. 104 sq.

[55] At present, we are certain of the reading of these three short syllables which were left open in the survey mentioned in note 54.

[56] Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Dynasties et Histoire de l'Inde* in *Histoire du Monde,* Tome VI (1935), pp. 118 sqq. In this period, there are several Gurjara dynasties reigning in different parts of India, but it seems very doubtful whether in such cases the designation by Gurjaradeça could be used. The term might well have been used for designating the country irrespective of the reigning dynasty ; in that case, the present country of Gujerāt would be the most probable conjecture.

[57] The last pāda is mutilated, but the meaning of the strophe as a whole does not seem doubtful. There is something about the arrows of Love which do not attain their aim.

[58] The latter are therefore compared with *amṛta;* cf. the notes to the Translation.

It is however very difficult to arrive at any conclusion about the way in which they were represented. Was there a Buddha image in each of the reliefs representing these scenes ? This is possible, but not necessary at all. One could also suppose that the Buddha image was erected in the temple chamber, whereas the different scenes were represented on its walls in the form of reliefs. In that case, all the figures in these reliefs would be directed towards the image and depicted in various forms of devotion. It is well-known that a number of scenes is represented in relief in the two side chambers of each of the two central buildings of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan [59]. The place where these reliefs are found agrees with that we conjecturally concluded about the descriptions in our text, but this is almost as far as the correspondence goes, unless a further comparison might reveal further points of agreement [60].

Something more may be stated about the form of Buddhism appearing from the inscription. Already a superficial examination shows that the text belongs to a fully developed form of Buddhism, in which *bhakti* and differ-

[59]) Description by Krom, *Inleiding²*, II, pp. 11 sq. Photographs *Din. Purb.*, Nos. 2117-2123.

[60]) If the second interpretation of the way in which the sculptor may have represented the scenes described in the text is correct, we expect to find only the effect of the influence of the Buddha expressed there, i.e. different categories of people in attitudes of devotion. Then, the only other point which is essential is that the different groups should be clearly characterized as those mentioned in the inscription. If we look at the scenes from this point of view, we could note some points of agreement with the text. Thus, the relief representing two men bearing many ornaments and seated in *añjali* attitude, each with his servant (cf. Krom, *Inleiding²*, II, p. 11 ; it is one of the reliefs in the Southern chamber of the Southern Vihāra) could correspond to the description in strophe 15. The obvious point of disagreement, viz. only two princes in the relief, but a plural, not a dual, in the inscription, is hardly relevant : the sculptor who had to represent 'princes' leaving their worldly occupations to pay homage to the Buddha would have limited their number to two of them, each accompanied by an attendant to show their rank, because their was not sufficient room to represent more princes. — In the same chamber, there is a scene representing two high clerical dignitaries ; one of these is distinguished by a rather strange headgear for which Krom very conjecturally proposed that it denoted the official head of the Çaiva clergy (*op. cit.*, II, p. 13). There would, however, be another possible interpretation of the two dignitaries, viz. that one of the high monks is a high Buddhist dignitary at the Çailendra court, whereas the other, who is marked by the peculiar headdress, is a 'colleague' from abroad. In that case, one is inclined to connect the representation with the *gurus* from the Gurjara country in strophe 14. These *gurus* would have been the guests of the Javanese court ; when they went to the temple to pay homage, they would not go there by themselves but in the company of their hosts, viz. the Buddhist priests of the Çailendra court. Here again, the sculptor, who had only limited space at his disposal, and was, moreover, forced to express the high rank of the dignitaries by attributing them attendants, could represent only one Javanese and one Gurjara dignitary. Everything depends on whether the remarkable headdress could be brought into connection with Gujarāt. Special attention is drawn to this point since it might be the only case in which the correctness of our conjectural relation between the strophes 11-17 and the small scenes represented in Tjaṇḍi Plaosan could be controlled. In all the other cases, as far as we can see, either the strophes in the inscription or the representations in the temple are too mutilated to make any identification possible.

ent forms of *pūjā* are the outstanding features. A more peculiar feature is
the reference to at least one, and probably more, of the internal *padmas*,
which are characteristic of Yoga and of other systems which underwent
strong Yoga influences. It is very doubtful whether we could characterize this
type of Mahāyāna as Tāntric; it mainly depends on how one likes to define
Tāntrism. If one associates the latter with the preponderance of *vajra* and
mantra practices, together with the five *makāras*, and all of these elements
as an essential part of the Mārga, then it is obvious that the type of Mahāyāna
exhibited by the Plaosan inscription is not Tāntric ; on the other hand, it
cannot be denied that a broader use of the term is easily misleading. It is
not impossible to give a Tāntric explanation of at least one passage in our
inscription. Thus, the images which are incomparable in destroying worldly
existence (16 *d*) might easily suggest various Tāntric rites in which these
images are used to obtain Deliverance or the transcendent powers of the
Tathāgata. But this interpretation of the pāda is not confirmed by the context.
Its meaning probably is that the Buddha is in the unutterable (*anabhilāpya*)
state of Nirvāṇa (*nirvṛta*); in order to save mankind, he cannot act in this
incomprehensible state but has to use his power of Nirmāṇa. To deliver the
creatures from death and suffering, he has his own *upāyas* equal to *amṛta*.
These *upāyas* are the images in the temple(s); they reveal the perfect tran-
quillity of those liberated from the Saṃsāra and their influence makes itself
felt in all these different scenes. The effect of the image is expressed by a
metaphor of a type which is very common in all Mahāyāna [61]. These me-
taphors are based on a symbolism which probably was inherent in Buddhism
from its very origin, though only the Mahāyāna sources inform us about its
full extent. Quite a few metaphors have completely lost their original fresh-
ness and became *loci communes* or, even worse. technical terms. An inte-
resting aspect of the symbolism which is at their base is that transcendent
reality, which is not susceptible of being expressed by words, is described
by means of the same metaphors which are used to denote phenomenal
reality. If phenomenal existence is compared with a tree sprung from the
seed which is Defiled Consciousness and producing fruits the nature of which
is suffering, also trancendent existence is a tree, but a very different one :
its seed is Bodhicitta [62] and its fruits are the unexpressible joys of Nirvā-
ṇa [63]. Phenomenal existence is an ocean on which the ignorant creatures

---

[61] Cf. *Bodhic. Av.*, I, 10: *açucipratimām imām ġrhītvā jinaratnapratimāṃ karoty anarghāṃ*
with reference to the acquisition of Bodhicitta.

[62] The comparison between *citta (vijñāna)* and the seed *(bīja)* is a very common one;
cf. *supra*, No. III, *d*— A — 6 to 8. The Vijñānavādins (*Siddhi*, I, pp. 94 sqq.) distinguish
the concept of *ālayavijñāna*, which contains all the seeds (*sarvabīja*) from the six
streams of *pravṛttivijñāna* (cf. also *Siddhi*, II, pp. 433 sqq.) and the Manas. Bodhicitta
is the corresponding pure seed, often compared with a gem (e.g., *Bodhic. Av.*, I, 11);
it is the first simile in the Gaṇḍavyūha quotation, *Çikṣās.*, p. 5, line 20: *bodhicittaṃ
hi...... bījabhūtaṃ sarvabuddhadharmāṇām.*

[63] This simile is used e.g. the Kēlurak inscription, strophe 11, the first word of which
we read *bodhicittamūlaḥ.*

roam about without finding their way to the other shore [64]), but also transcendent existence is an ocean itself, the ocean of the immeasurable qualities *(guṇa)* of the Tathāgata [65]). The relations between phenomenal and transcendent existence are clearly expressed only in the Vijñānavādin system; in the process called *āçrayaparāvṛtti,* the mundane elements of existence develop into as many transcendent qualities of the Dharmakāya of the Buddha [66]).

In the transcription which follows only the first twelve lines (and the beginning of line 13; we already noted that the numbering of the lines is conjectural) have been rendered as if it were a prose text. From line 13 on, the form of the metres and the length of the lacunae could be determined with certainty. From there on, we start counting the strophes. Only these nineteen strophes are given in translation below (as far as the lacunae allow it) ; up to line 13, we inserted occasional interpretations of the passages capable of translation in the notes to the Transcription ; we are fully aware of the fact that such isolated interpretations necessarily remain conjectural.

Transcription[67])

[5] ......vijara*kāya*vibham=vibhāti guṇavibh*āmalapu*trajananaṃ [68]) yais= taruṇavala-

[6] ......svaparahitaguṇasya sva......ādvitīyaṃ / smaraharavaravarṣṣad= bhūjayottuṅgade- [69])

---

[64]) The simile of the *bhavārṇava* needs no comment. In that case, Bodhicitta is compared with a fish-hook *(baḍiça)* used to lift the drowning creatures. Cf. the Gaṇḍavyūha quotation mentioned in note 62, p. 6, lines 5 sq.: *baḍisabhūtaṃ saṃsārajalacarābhyud-dhāraṇatayā.*

[65]) Thus, one of the names of the Buddha is Guṇasāgara *(Mahāvy.,* I, 3C ; ed. by Minaiev-Mironov, p. 1). These transcendent qualities are acquired during the Mārga and the higher Bodhisattvas, too, are in the possession of a great number of them. Cf. the same epithet applied to Bodhisattvas in Bodhicarvyāvatāra, II, 1 d : *buddhātmajānāṃ ca guṇodadhīnāṃ.*

[66]) Cf. the Siddhi translation by De la Vallée Poussin, II, pp. 661-667 and 681-692. Thus, the four *(lokottara) jñānas* of the Buddhas are due to the *parāvṛtti* of the eight *vijñānas.* Detailed references are given by Friedmann in note 85 to p. 70 of his translation of the Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā (1937). Cf. also the very important analysis by Paul Mus, *Barabuḍur,* Sizième Partie, Chapitre VIII, *B.E.F.E.O.,* XXXIV (1934), pp. 260-276.

[67]) Up to line 13 of our transcription, the reading is too fragmentary and too uncertain to make the reconstitution of the metres possible. One has the clear impression that most of this portion is composed in the Āryā metre, or in one of the other metres belonging to this group, such as Gīti. In view of this uncertainty, the first portion of the text has been rendered as if it were prose in this transcription; only from line 13 on, transcription in strophes is possible. Above the first line given in transcription here, some definite traces of four lines of script are still visible on the stone ; therefore, the first line transcribed is numbered 5. The true number may have been higher.

[68]) The italics are very uncertain.

[69]) The transcribed portion of this line seems sufficiently certain. We take the metre to be Mālinī; this may also be the case with line 7. If this presumption is correct, there are a few Mālinī strophes between the Āryās. Line 6 has been briefly discussed in the Introduction.

[7] ....saṅgaṃ / ......ti [70]) kuçalarāge yaç=ca vṛddhim=*vibhartti* [71])
// çara-

[8] .... jamvulakṣmyāḥ [72]) / .... lolakīrttyā vilokinyāḥ [72]) // sa-

[9] .... satatārthakāriṇī varadā / ....bhāryyā [73]) tāreva
virājati // gatinā kuçala-

[10] ....ñjabhṛto ....ṣṭapādasatkāyaṃ [74]) // janayām=vabhūva
bhūyo [75]) bhūbhṛtam=adyāṣṭahastāṅçam //

[11] ....sajjanataḍitkuliçabhṛt=kuleçaçaraṇaç=ca......ḥ / valamālā [76])

---

[70]) The word preceding *kuçalarāge* might well be *jayati*, which would agree with the Mālinī metre.

[71]) The last word, which presumably represents a not unusual orthography for *bibharti*, is uncertain. We have no examples of the combination *vṛddhiṃ bibharti*, which could however be understood in view of usual combinations such as *phalaṃ bibharti*.

[72]) The words given in transcription seem certain and make sense. The uncertainty about the metre makes however some reservations necessary. If it is a Mālinī strophe, which seems to be the case, then there would be a syllable too much at the end of the strophe; this is not however the only possibility.

[73]) Only those words the reading of which appears to be beyond reasonable doubt have been given in the transcription of this line. Here, again, the metre gives the impression of being an Āryā, but an amphibrachys in the antepenultima cannot be correct. If this transcription may nevertheless be relied upon, it is probable that the epithets in line 9, presumably depending on *bhāryyā*, refer to the same queen (?) to whom the genitives in line 8 apply. Cf. the Introduction.

[74]) Here, the metre is undoubtedly Āryā. The meaning of this passage is completely obscure to us; *aṣṭapādasatkāyaṃ* does not make sense, unless it could mean something like *aṣṭāṅgasatkāyaṃ;* but even then, the compound would not be lucid. Presumably, there is a pun with *aṣṭahastāṅçam* at the end of the line 10, but this does not mean anything to us. Instead of °*ñçam*, *ñgam* is also possible, but we cannot see how that would render the text more satisfactory.

[75]) Instead of *bhuyo*, the possibility of *bhūpo* cannot be excluded; the latter reading might be more satisfactory for the meaning of the strophe, which could then be rendered by: „he, the protector of the earth, begot an Earth-bearer whose body (?) has at present eight arms (?)". If the reading may be relied upon, we are able to conclude that (a) the text gives a kind of *vaṃçāvaiī* of a dynasty of kings (a point which is hardly doubtful in view of the reading of *janayām babhūva* which is certain), and (b) the king mentioned in the genealogy is „at present" *(adya)* eight-armed. The choice among eight-armed divine powers in the Buddhist pantheon is limited; an eight-armed form of Mañjuçrī, called Vāgīçvara Dharmadhātu, is known from iconography (Bhattacharya, pp. 18 sq.). In view of the uncertain reading, this interpretation is however given with reservations.

[76]) The portion of this line capable of being rendered in the transcription appears to be a part of an Āryā. The words *sajjanataḍitkuliçabhṛt=kuleçaçaraṇaç=* are clear by themselves and could be translated: „holding the *vajra* which (emits) lightning to the good, being a refuge for the chief of his race". The text presumable suggests a Vajrapāṇi image, whose *vajra* is considered the symbol of the powerful fire that burns the impurities of those good men (*sajjana*) who have attained a high state of perfection. At the same time, the *vajra*-bearing Bodhisattva is represented as the protector of the *kuleça*, who could only be a Buddha. The conception of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas as a family (*gotra*) is a common one in Mahāyāna; the Buddha is then designated by epithets such as *pitā bodhisattvānām (Mahāvy.*, 19, 35, ed. by Minaiev-Mironov, p. 7), the Bodhisattvas as *buddhasuta* or a synonym. If this interpretation is correct, we re-

[12] ....takalolatphalotpalālabhṛtaḥ [77]) / priyatamam=eva parikhayā
pari- [78])
[13] ....jinasutaḥ // [79])

Naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāro vibhāti bhāsvaraḥ /
Dharmmasambhārasamitapratimāprati [14] __ ⌣ ⌣ // 1 // [80])

__ __ __ __ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ ⌣ ⌣ /

⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ nīrajān=varayānagān [81]) // 2 //

⌣ ⌣ ḥ sva ⌣ ⌣ yāvā ⌣ catussugatasaṅgataḥ / [82])
Prāsādādbhutasambhraṣṭaḥ kim=bhāti tādṛçaç=ciram // 3 //

Bhūbhṛd=iva vi [15] __ __ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ ⌣ ⌣ /

⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ ⌣ raṇaḥ pāpabhā ⌣ naḥ // 4 // [83])

Sambhavabhramaṇaçrāntaviçrāntavodhim=eṣyati /
Viṃçatīha virājante jinā jinasutānvitāḥ // 5 //
Analpajanmopajitya viçvāvaraṇavāraṇaḥ /
[16] ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ ⌣ ⌣ // 6 //

⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ ⌣ ⌣ /

⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ __ __ ⌣ duḥkhaçamanaçāsanaḥ // 7 // [84])

*Gahana*pāraçāsārthavyāhāramañjuçīkaraḥ / [85])
Cāracīvarasāndhyābhradhībhūridalayoja[17]<naḥ> // 8 //

---

present us a Buddha accompanied on one side by a Vajrapāṇi; in that case, one is
inclined to suppose that the second pāda, only the beginning of which could be de-
ciphered, refers to the Buddha's other divine companion, usually Lokeçvara.

[77]) Here, too, we have a part of an Āryā; we may translate : „the bees of the blue lotus(es)
with swinging fruits ......"; cf. the next note.

[78]) The second pāda deals with something very dear (*priyatama*) which for that very
reason (this might have been expressed by *eva*) was surrounded (*pari°* is probably the
beginning of one of the numerous words meaning „to surround", such as *pari-dhā*)
by a ditch (*parikhā*). If we try to establish a relation between the preceding part of
the strophe and these words, we might conclude that the bees (*alabhṛt*) are attracted
by the scent of the blue lotuses (*utpala*), probably those carried by Bodhisattvas such
as Mañjuçrī (?); the bees are not of course held back by the ditch protecting the
foundation where the Bodhisattvas are placed.

[79]) From here on, the metre is capable of being re-established. We therefore transcribe the
following portion in strophes; since the length of the lacunae is known, the interpre-
tation (and also the reading) becomes far less uncertain.

[80]) The preserved portion of this çloka is perfectly clear. For the three last syllables,
we propose -*modayaḥ*, which would be in keeping with the simile.

[81]) Although the third pāda is still preserved on the stone, its reading is very uncertain.

[82]) The reading seems to be certain, except for the first pāda, where some of the akṣaras
are badly mutilated. For a conjectural reading, cf. the notes to the translation.

[83]) The reading of the last syllables is very uncertain. The penultima might be a *dha*,
but then the preceding syllable cannot be *bhā*.

[84]) The reading of the third pāda, which is preserved on the stone, is too uncertain to
be given here.

[85]) The reading of the first three syllables of this çloka is uncertain. *Gahana* is not

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ _ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ _ ⏑ _ /

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ _ ⏑ _ kṣaṇārtham=vidīyate // 9 // [86])

Ratnatrayāçayopetaṃ samastaguṇaratnabhaṃ /
Kaçcin=na vaktuçakto vas=tatpuṇyāyām=anuṣṭubhi // 10 //

Vividhagandhasudigdhavarā[18]<ṅganāḥ> [87])

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _ /

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ yate [88]) // 11 //

Kanakakokanadodaravisphurad-
    ruciradīpaçikhākṛtatāmasaḥ /
Çiçiraraçmirucāpravarānvayaḥ
    sakalakhādya[19] ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _ [89]) // 12 //

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _

    pravarasamvaravāravarāṅganāḥ /
Hṛdayanīrajasāndrarasāntaraṃ
    harati kāmijanasya samantataḥ // 13 //

Satatagurjaradeçasamāgatais=
    sugatabhaktibharapraṇatai[20] ⏑ _ /

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ tkriyate [90]) jinamandiram // 14 //

Kvacid=asaṅkhyaçikhāmaṇibhūṣaṇāḥ
    praṇayinīprakaṭīkṛtamanmathāḥ /
Sugatavimvavilokananirjita-
    smaraçarākuçalāḥ ça[21] ⏑ _ _ // 15 //

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ ⏑ _ ⏑ _

    vigataroṣadṛço 'ntaradṛṣṭiṣu /
Sakalalokam=asāv=api nirvṛto
    bhavabhidapratimapratimāmṛtaiḥ // 16 //

---

satisfactory, since the context requires a word meaning 'fire' (Buddhist teaching is often compared with a soft rain, which calms the fire of passion). *Dahana* is impossible from a palaeographic point of view; in addition, we should rather expect some compound like *kleçāgni*.

86) The reading is rather uncertain.
87) The completion is uncertain, but a word meaning 'women' seems to be required by the context.
88) The preceding syllable might be *dī*.
89) For a conjectural reconstitution, cf. the translation.
90) If the ligature *tkri* is correctly transcribed, the preceding akṣara was probably a *sa (satkriyate)*. Then there still remain three short syllables at the beginning of pāda c, for which the adverb *sapadi* is suggested. The possibilities for reconstituting three short syllables preceding a verbal form are rather limited.

Vahulamohamahātimirāvṛto
    jinavad=astinirodha[22] ⏑ __ ⏑ __ [91]) /

⏑ ⏑ ⏑ __ ⏑ ⏑ __ ⏑ ⏑ __ ⏑ __

    drutavilambitasādhanavanditaḥ [92]) // 17 //
Saṃsārāvanicaratān=na dharmato 'nya-
    jantūnām=varaçaraṇaṃ triçarmmadhīraiḥ /
Koṣo 'sāv=itarakṛto 'pi pālanīya- [93])
    [23] __ __ __ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ __ <praharṣaṇīyaḥ> [94]) // 18 //
Kṛtvemaṃ çaçadharavimvaçuddham=āpam=
    yat=puṇyam=bhajatu jano jinakramasya /
Asmān=rakṣa varanarādhirājarāja [95])
    dṛṣṭikleçam=api janā na rāgabaddhāḥ // 19 //

---

[91]) Pāda *b* might be completed to *jinavad=astinirodha(m=avāpnuyāt)*. Here the context requires a verbal form, preferably in the optative, for the opposition between *timira* and *nirodha* makes it probable that a wish should have been expressed here.

[92]) The reading of pāda *d* would have been very doubtful, if on account of a comparison with pāda *d* of strophe 10 there was not a very strong reason to presume that the name of the metre of these strophes should have been mentioned here.

[93]) The reading of these three pādas is sufficiently certain. The line ends in *pālanīya;* the latter should not probably be reconstituted as *pālanīyaḥ;* for in that case the final visarga could have easily been placed on line 22. Presumably, this word ended in a consonant which could be combined into a ligature with the first consonant of pāda *d*, i.e. either a dental or a palatal sibilant (words beginning in a lingual are extremely rare). Pāda *d* ought then to begin with a *sa, ta, ca, tha* or *cha ;* the two cases last mentioned are however unlikely. This point is of interest for a conjectural restitution of pāda *d;* cf. the next note.

[94]) Since in this inscription the names of the metres appear to be mentioned at the end of one of the strophes composed in a particular metre, it is very probable that the word *praharṣiṇī* or *praharṣaṇī* occurred at the end of either strophe 18 or strophe 19. It soon appears that, if that name is mentioned, there is only one possible place, i.e. in strophe 18, pāda *d*, and in the pāda itself there is also a single place where the name can be fitted in into the metre, i.e. when ending at the penultima; (cf. the Old-Javanese Wṛtta-Sañcaya, published by H. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.* IX (1875, date of the original publication), pp. 69 — 189, strophe 67 (on p. 89), where also one syllable is following in the 1st *pāda* (*sasiṅ ramya mamuhara praharṣiṇī twas*). The feminine name of the metre cannot fit in with the context; in addition, a single syllable is required by the metre after the name and the parallelism of the strophe (*pālanīya*) suggests *praharṣaṇīyaḥ*. Since such feelings as joy do not properly flatter a Buddhist practising *vairāgya*, we need some explanation here. Probably, *praharṣaṇīya* was preceded by *api* again.

[95]) The reading of pada *c* proposed in *Pras. Indon.*, I, p. 104, is not correct; there was moreover a short syllable missing. The reading of the three first syllables of the pāda remains conjectural since the lettering is badly preserved here. *Kṣa* seems however certain; the preceding ligature, which was transcribed *ndra* before, proves to be *nra*. Thus, we have the imperative *rakṣa* preceded by an *n* which must be the final consonant of the preceding word, presumably the ending of the accusative plural of a disyllabic word. *Asmān* makes good sense and seems to agree with the traces still visible on the stone.

Translation [96])

1. Bearing the burden of consecration as the lord of men, he shineth forth, the Brilliant One, as the incomparable sunrise in the form of an image [97]) adorned with the equipment of Dharma [98]).

---

[96]) We made no attempt at translating the fragmentary readings in the first twelve lines of the inscription. The impossibility of reconstructing the metre prevents us from connecting the passages that could be deciphered. A few important terms are discussed in the Introduction.

[97]) The use of *bhāsvaraḥ* at the end of pāda *b* suggests the use of a simile with the sun. If, then, the statue is compared with the sun, we conclude that the three lost syllables at the end of pāda *d* contained a term capable of being applied to both the statue and the sun; the completion of *prati-* to *pratimodayaḥ* would satisfy this condition.

[98]) For the meaning of the strophe as a whole, cf. the Introduction. Here, we add some details and references. *Sambhāra* is the Bodhisattva's equipment on the Path and has the twofold aspect of being merits (*puṇya*) and wisdom (*jñāna*); cf. Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine* (1932) pp. 169 sqq.; *Siddhi*, II, pp. 572 sqq.; *Dharmasaṃgraha*, No. CXVII, edition in *Anecd. Oxon.*, Vol. I, Part V, p. 29. The *sambhāra* concept is also known from Hīnayāna, but the terminology seems less systematical. Cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, VII, p. 82, the compound *sarvaguṇajñānasambhārābhyāsa*, considered the first aspect of *hetusampad*, „perfection de causes". The explanation given by De la Vallée in a note and presumably translated from the Vyākhyā is interesting: „les qualités *(guṇas)* sont de leur nature cinq Pāramitās; les savoirs (Prajñā) sont la Prajñāpāramitā". This is exactly the well-known Mahāyāna view according to which the first five Pāramitās are *puṇyasambhāra*, the sixth is *jñānasambhāra*. Cf. also the Mahāvastu, edition by Senart, I, p. 239, line 5: *mahāsamudāgamanaṃ ca jñātvā kuçalamūlasambhāraṃ ca cetopraṇidhānaṃ jñātvā*, where *kuçalamūlasambhāra* comes very near to *puṇyasambhāra;* cf. also *op. cit.*, II, p. 286, lines 6 sq.: *balavāṃ bhavati samādhi sambhārato puṇyānām*, „the meditation becomes more powerful owing to the accumulation of good acts" (a very similar expression *ibid.*, II, p. 417, line 19: *balavāṃ bhoti samādhi sambhāravatāṃ sapuṇyavatāṃ*). The Abhidharmakoça states that all the Buddhas are equal in as far as they all have accumulated merits and wisdom (VII, pp. 80 sq.: *pūrvapuṇyajñāna-saṃbhārasamudāgamatas*). The paramount importance of the *sambhāra* concept in Mahāyāna appears, for instance, from the fact of it being almost the last word of such an authoritative text as the Bodhicaryāvatāra, viz. IX, 168 *d: puṇyasambhāram ādarāt* (ed. by De la Vallée Poussin in *Bibl. Ind.*, 1901-14, p. 603). The Pañjikā *(ibid.*, p. 604, lines 6 sq.) explains: *evam upacitaḥ puṇyasambhāro buddhatādhigamāya jāyate*, i e. „the provision of merits accumulated in such a way (viz. by realizing that neither the object given, nor the giver and receiver are real) becomes a means of reaching Buddha-hood". The idea is that the sage who fully understands the irreality of subject and object does not give in view of a later recompense, but just because it becomes natural: it is the highest degree of *puṇyasambhāra* based on the comprehension of the Çūnyatā, which is the essence of *jñānasambhāra*. The latter quotation is especially interesting because it proves that even in the highest summits of Buddhism the under-lying idea of accumulating *puṇya* (the term *upacita* used by Prajñākaramati to explain *sambhāra* leaves no doubt) is some kind of provision by means of which the adept is able to bring the long journey to the city of Buddha-hood to an end. In addition, in a similar way as a definite amount of good *karman* brings about re-birth and existence in a definite divine sphere and for a definite period — during which the fruit of the *puṇya* is enjoyed —, in the same way a sufficient quantity of *puṇya-* and *jñāna-sambhāra* brings about the superior qualities that constitute the *svasambhogakāya* of

2. ...... passionless, going on the best vehicle [99].

3. ...... from the contact with the Four Sugatas [100]; how is it possible that he continues to shine forth after having fallen into the temple by a miracle ? [101]

---

the Tathāgata; cf. *Siddhi*, II, p. 705 (in De la Vallée Poussin's translation): „*svasaṃ-bhogakāya*. — C'est d'infinies réelles *(bhūta)* qualités *(guṇa)*, créées *(nirvartita)* par l'accumulation d'un mérite et d'un savoir *(puṇyajñānasaṃbhāra)* cultivés pendant trois Asaṃkhyeyakalpas; un corps matériel *(rūpakāya)* parfait (muni des marques et sous-marques) ......". Cf. also *op. cit.*, II, 727, where De la Vallée Poussin mentions some forms of *saṃbhāra* occurring in the Abhisamayālaṃkāra. As a matter of fact, the Ālōka to the latter text, quoted by Obermiller, *Acta Orient.*, XI (1932), p. 87, note 3, mentions a list of different kinds of *saṃbhāras* beginning with *dayā* and ending in *dhāraṇī (dayām ārabhya dhāraṇīparyantena)*. Obermiller mentions these kinds in the Index, *art. cit.*, p. 111; there are fifteen *saṃbhāras* in all, but this high number includes the six Pāramitās from *dāna* to *prajñā*. *Dharmasaṃbhāra*, the term used in our text, is less usual; it is probably used to comprise both *puṇya* and *jñāna* into a single compound; our only reference is the Bodhisattvapiṭaka, quoted in the Çikṣāsamuccaya, edition by Bendall, pp. 190 sqq., especially p. 191, line 4, the term *dharmasaṃbhārayogaḥ (sa evāsya jñānasaṃbhāro bhavati)*; cf. the terms *dharmaprāg-bhāratā* and *dharmapravaṇyatā*. Finally, we refer the reader to *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 161, where the compound *bhūmisaṃbhāra*, presumably the original name of the Barabuḍur in Java (or rather, the beginning of that name), is discussed; the above references may be added to the there discussion. — The main reason why we quote the above data is to stress the almost concrete value of *saṃbhāra* as 'something' which is carried by the Bodhisattva on the Path towards Bodhi and which gives him the strength to continue. According to the Siddhi, this 'something' is not lost after the arrival, but in the *āçrayaparāvṛtti* it develops into the transcendent *guṇas* of the Saṃbhogakāya which manifest themselves in the Mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas.

99) Only the last pāda, *nīrajān varayānagān*, is legible. *Varayāna* is, of course, the Mahāyāna or Bodhisattvayāna, in contrast to the lesser *yānas* of Çrāvakas and Pratyeka-buddhas; sometimes, more *yānas* are mentioned, e.g. in the Mahāvyutpatti, edition by Minaiev and Mironov, p. 20, sub 59, 1-6: *mahāyānaṃ, pratyekabuddhayānaṃ, çrāva-kayānaṃ, hīnayānaṃ, prādeçikayānaṃ* and *ekayānaṃ* (for the latter term cf. Ober-miller quoting Haribhadra's Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka in *Acta Orient.*, XI, 1932, pp. 29 sq., note 1; *ekayāna* represents the three main *yānas* conceiveᵈ of as a unity); *varayānagān* means the same as *bodhisattvān*. *Nīrajān*, to be analyzed as *nī-rajān* (= *nīrajaskān*), not as *nīra-jān* (although there might be a pun), may well apply to Bodhisattvas who live in the world without being attached to it.

100) *Catuḥsugatasaṅgataḥ*, „from (owing to) the contact *(saṅga*, also: attachment) with the Four Sugatas (probably, the four Buddhas of the past ?)". The interpretation of this pāda is the more difficult because the first pāda is lost. *Saṅgataḥ* could also be interpreted as *saṃgataḥ*, „having joined", but this seems less likely: we expect a term which explains why the statue left the lofty realms to fall on earth; we understand that the Bodhisattva follows the example of Vipaçyin and the others, who obtained Bodhi on earth. We do not think it probable that *catuḥsugata* refers to the Four Jinas (why not Five in this case ?). If this is the correct interpretation, it would be a strong argument in favour of the suggestion made in the Introduction *(supra*, p. 183) that the image in strophe 1 is a Maitreya.

101) *Prāsādādbhutasaṃbhrastaḥ* is analyzed as *prāsādam adbhutena saṃbhrastaḥ*. Compounds of the type *adbhuta-saṃbhrastaḥ* are perfectly normal; cf. Speyer, *Syntax*, p. 160, § 217, sub 8, and Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, II, 1, p. 66, § 27 a. Also *prāsādasaṃbhrasta*,

4. Like a mountain (or : like a king) ...... [102].

5. He will obtain (that) Bodhi [103]) which is the ultimate rest for those tired with roaming through worldly existence [101]); twenty Jinas are shining forth here, accompanied by Bodhisattvas [105]).

as a tatpuruṣa composed of a nomen verbale preceded by an accusative of direction, is normal (Speyer, § 216, II *b*); a well-known similar compound, on which ours may have been inpired, is *garbhāvakrānta*. In the construction of larger compounds, we find certain freedoms in Buddhist Sanskrit; for our compound, cf., for instance, *dharma-meghayugapatpravarṣaṇaḥ* (quoted in note 27 to the Introduction; here, too, we find the adverbial form placed between the parts *dharmamegha-pravarṣaṇaḥ*). With a view to the latter compound, we prefer this analysis to another possibility, viz. of taking *prāsādādbhuta* as a unity („wonder of a temple", i.e. „a wonderful temple"). — This kind of miracles, based upon the identity of the statue and that which it represents, is very common in Mahāyāna; one of the best known examples is Prince Siddhārtha's visit to the temple, which makes the divine statues leave their pedestals to pay homage to the young Bodhisattva.

[102]) Only the words *bhūbhṛd=iva* are legible at the beginning of the strophe.

[103]) The words *vodhim=eṣyati* may be considered a definite proof that the statue described is that of a Bodhisattva, not of a Buddha. Since the strophes from 1 to 10, all composed in the same Anuṣṭubh metre, seem to give a continuous description of only one statue, we may conclude that also strophe 1 relates to a Bodhisattva image. The use of the future *eṣyati* does not only express the certainty of ultimate Buddha-hood, but seems also to suggest that the event will not probably take place within a short period, for the poet would have used the present tense to indicate something about to happen.

[104]) This passage gives a typical example of the close relationship of Bodhi and Nirvāṇa in this form of Buddhism. *Viçrānta* is a synonym of *çānta*, one of the common attributes of Nirvāṇa. As a matter of fact, *çānta* is considered one of the four aspects of Nirodhasatya; cf. *Abhidh. Koça*, De la Vallée Poussin's translation, VII, pp. 31 sqq. (where a number of explanations of the four *ākāras* of Nirodhasatya are given); *Mahāvyutp.*, 54, No. 11 on p. 19 of the edition by Minaiev-Mironov; *Dharmasaṃgraha*, edition by Kasawara, Mueller and Wenzel in *Anecd. Oxon.*, Ar. Ser., Vol. I, Pt. V, No. XCIX on p. 23). Nirvāṇa and Bodhi gradually become almost synonyms in the development of Mahāyāna. Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, *Siddhi*, II, p. 676 : „Le Nirvāṇa des Buddhas n'est pas distinct de la Bodhi; c'est la Tathatā plus les quatre savoirs; c'est dans la réalisation du Dharmakāya et par l'intelligence parfaite de la Tathatā, la paix absolue et l'éternelle activité : telles de Brahmā ou de Kṛṣṇa". The Nirvāṇa of Çrāvakas and Pratyekas is, of course, something very different. The simile suggested by *bhramaṇa* is a very common one; it is that of phenomenal existence (*bhava*) viewed as a jungle through which only the Bhagavat can show the path.

[105]) One wonders what the poet means to express by pādas c-d following a-b. Probably, we have to consider the statement about the twenty Jinas a kind of encouragement : the Jinas, too, have accomplished the entire Path before having arrived at the state of perfection; their presence proves the possibility of obtaining Bodhi to the Bodhisattva. With a view to our explanation of *eṣyati* in note 103, we may consider pādas c-d some kind of elucidation. The mention of twenty Jinas might be important for our knowledge of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan. Twenty is not, of course, a usual number for Jinas and this point makes it probable that the number relates to a definite detail of the foundation : the foundation included already twenty Jina images before the installation of the Bodhisattva. *Buddhasutānvitāḥ*, „accompanied by Buddha-sons, i.e. Bodhisattvas", probably means that each Jina would be accompanied by two Bodhisattvas. This would bring the original total of Jinas and Bodhisattvas to sixty. Now it is curious

6. After having vanquished numerous lifes as an elephant breaking through all kinds of obstacles ...... [106].

7. ......, whose doctrine appeases suffering [107].

8. Making the gentle rain of his discourses, which aim at teaching (the converts) how to cross the depths (of the ocean of Saṃsāra) [108], descend,

---

that the total number of small structures surrounding the two main buildings in the Plaosan complex amounts to 58 (i.e., excluding, of course, the Stūpa structures, which cannot contain any statues). If we add the two main buildings to this number, we arrive at a total of 60 buildings capable of containing images. This superficial comparison tends to show that there is at least some agreement, although it leaves a number of problems open. It is not, for instance, clear where the Bodhisattva statue, which is not included into the number, was placed. In addition, the two main buildings gave place to more than two images.

[106] *Analpajanmopajitya viçvāvaraṇavāraṇaḥ.* — The use of *upajitya,* „having vanquished". seems to be connected with the *bhūmi* conception of the Bodhisattva carreer; one of the current explanations of the term *bhūmi* is that the latter are „des étages qu'il faut conquérir" (De la Vallée Poussin, *Siddhi,* II, p. 619, *parigrāhya);* the Path leading to Buddha-hood is, in fact, a continuous struggle with the foes that are the *kieças (Bodhicaryāv.,* VI, 19 c: *saṃgrāmo hi saha kleçaiḥ)* and the Bodhisattvas are victorious heros *(op. cit.,* VI, 20 c : *te te vijayinaḥ çūrāḥ);* as a matter of fact, all those foes have to be overcome and the Bodhisattva may lose no battle (VII, 55 a-b: *mayā hi sarvaṃ jetavyam idaṃ jeyo na kena cit)* ; he strives after a victory over the triple world *(trailokyavijigīṣutvaṃ, Bodhicaryāv.,* VII, 54 c; *vijigīṣu* is the term used to denote the would-be world conqueror in handbooks on politics); two of the transcendent virtues of the Bodhisattva *(vīryapāramitā, Mahāvy.,* 34, No. 4, p. 15) and *balapāramitā (ibid.,* 34, No. 9) give him the superhuman courage and force to succeed. Only after having accomplished the entire Path the Bodhisattva will become a real Victor (Jina). A freer translation of *analpajanmopajitya* would be : „having victoriously passed through a large number of existences". In each life, the Bodhisattva struggles against the „walls" *(āvaraṇa)* which surround the „thronghold of Illumination" *(bodhipura),* viz. the thick walls of passion *(kleçāvaraṇa)* and the subtle veils of ignorance as to the real nature of everything *(jñeyāvaraṇa).* The latter are even more dangerous since the „eye of wisdom" *(prajñācakṣus),* unimpeded by *timira (infra,* strophe 17 a) is required to notice their existence. In order to be able to bring all these battles to a successful end, the Bodhisattva should have the „essence of an elephant" *(eṣo gajasatvasāro, Mahāvastu,* III, p. 256, line 4; the expression is used in an Avadāna in which the Bodhisattva sacrifices himself to save his fellow-sailors; cf. also *ibid.,* II, p. 13, line 19 : *prasūyate sā gajasatvasāraṃ,* "she (i.e. Māyā) will bring forth (a child) which has the essence of an elephant nature"). The elephant, which is also one of the Cakravartin's jewels, is able to „take away the impetus of the (weapons of the) army of Passion" *(madanabalavegāpanayanaṃ, Mahāvastu,* I, p. 210 line 6).

[107] Only pāda *d, duḥkhaçamanaçāsanaḥ,* is legible. With the compound, cf. *sarvaduḥkhapraçāntikṛt, Bodhicaryāv.,* III, 6 *d.* The epithet expresses the very essence of the doctrine; the Mārga, after all, is the *duḥkhanirodhagāminī pratipat,* to use the technical term *(Mahāvyutp.* 64, No. 6, and *passim).*

[108] *Gahanapāraçāsārthaṃ* is clearly based upon the well-known comparison of the Saṃsāra with the ocean with its unfathomable depths in which the helpless creatures risk to be drowned. These depths are the wrong views (cf. *dṛṣṭigahanam, Mahāvyutp.,* 205, 6). The compound itself does not, therefore, afford any difficulty. However, this conception, cannot well be combined with the simile of the „rain of the discourse" descending out of the „cloud of Dharma" (cf. note 27 to the Introduction above), for it is obvious

he is to be compared with a twilight cloud in his dark monk's dress [109]),
while he concentrates himself upon the manifold petals of his mind [110]).

9. ...... is distributed for protection (?) [111]).

10. Nobody could, in an adequate Çloka [112]), give a description (of this
statue) which is endowed with an abode for the Three Jewels [113]) and
shines forth owing to the presence of those jewels that are the complete
(trancendent) qualities [114]).

11. Beautiful women, well anointed with all kinds of scents, ... [115]).

12. Owing to the blinding splendour of the crest of his head, from which ra-
diant light glittering from a hidden lotus in its interior emanates [116]), his

---

that the cooling rain, however efficient it should be in appeasing the fire of passion,
could not help the poor creatures roaming about on the ocean of existence. Perhaps,
our poet combined the above conception with the common Hindu idea of a great fire
burning beneath the earth; one would inevitably arrive there if, losing one's way on
the ocean, one is taken by storm up to the limits of the ocean. The latter interpretation
is hardly likely, but seems to be the only choice if the reading of the beginning
of pāda a, which is not beyond doubt, is accepted.

[109]) Cf. supra, note 27 to the Introduction. The dark-grey colour of the monk's dress
(cīvara) recalls a twilight cloud from which rain, viz. the doctrine, descends.

[110]) The Buddha or Bodhisattva, expounding the doctrine, is represented in trance; the
mind upon which he concentrates himself is as a lotus the numerous petals of which
recall the Sahasrārapadma (cf. the Introduction).

[111]) Uncertain translation, which is based upon the completion of pāda d to: rakṣaṇārtham
vidīyate.

[112]) The word anuṣṭubhi is used to mark the strophes 1 to 10 as Anuṣṭubhs. Tatpuṇvāyāṃ,
here translated by „adequate", literally means „as propitious as that" (statue). The
poet wants to stress that the above strophes are only a poor attempt at describing
the marvellous statue.

[113]) Ratnatrayāçayopetaṃ, „provided with an abode of the Triratna", could mean that a
special temple is built or arranged on behalf of the statue whose origin was explained
by supernatural power in strophe 3. In this case, the new temple in which the statue
was erected would be dedicated to the Three Jewels. There is, however, another
possibility in as far as the statue itself might symbolize the Three Jewels; the latter
interpretation could be supported by strophe 14 of the Kelurak inscription (cf. Bosch
in T.B.G., 68, 1928, p. 19), where the Buddha, the Dharma and the Saṃgha are
stated to be present, though invisible, in a kīrtistambha (atra buddhaç=ca dharmaç=ca
saṅghaç=cāntargatah sthitaḥ). Bosch (art. cit., pp. 41 sq.) suggests this should be taken to
mean that formulae of the Triratna divinities were inclosed in a cavity within the Mañju-
çrī image. In this case, one would think of a small gold plate in which the çaraṇagamana
formula was inscribed. But Bosch does not exclude the possibility that the Mañjuçrī
was placed in a real sanctuary dedicated to the Triratna, viz. Tjaṇḍi Lumbung (art.
cit., p. 52). Our strophe 10 gives rise to similar considerations. After the 'discovery'
of the statue a new building had to be erected (is this the koça mentioned in strophe
18 a ?) to give it a worthy place, and this temple was dedicated to the three jewels.

[114]) There is a pun on the different meanings of ratna. The second time, it serves as a
tertium comparationis for the Tathāgataguṇas (cf. note 65 to the Introduction).

[115]) Strophe 11 is the first one of a series describing a number of small 'scenes' as we
might call them. It seems that in each of the strophes a separate description of a
distinct detail is given; cf. the Introduction.

[116]) The subject of this strophe is probably the compound ending in °anvayaḥ in pāda c,

excellent retinue, shining as the cool-rayed (Moon), ... all their
dishes [117]..

13. .... the excellent harem women belonging to his excellent retinue [118];
everywhere, he takes different feelings from the heart-lotuses of their
lovers (?) [119].

14. By (gurus ?) who continuously arrived from the Gurjara country [120],

to which the compound extending over the pādas a-b refers. The radiant light which
issues from the çikhā of the Buddha image must have a cause in the interior (udara)
of its head. It is due to the presence of a golden lotus there. The place of the çikhā
agrees with that where we find the uṣṇīṣa in the Buddha images; the lotus is
probably to be identified with the Sahasrārapadma (cf. the Introduction).

[117] The blinding splendour of the Buddha is contrasted to the soft moonlight emanating
from the Bodhisattvas. The simile is a common one. The meaning of the last pāda
is, however, difficult to be ascertained. Khādya is often used to denote food, also
in Buddhist texts; cf., for instance, Bodhicaryāvatāra, II, 16 c, where it is contrasted
with bhojya and peya. According to the Pañjikā (edition by De la Vallée Poussin,
p. 53, lines 17 sq.), bhojya food needs only be put into the mouth (yan mukham
āpūrya bhujyate), whereas khādya has first to be cut into pieces (kavadaçah chedya),
e.g. ghṛtapāra, a kind of sweetmeat. In the Bodhic. strophe quoted, the different
foods and drinks are considered excellent presents to be made to Buddhas. This
might well be the case here, too. It would seem that the scene represents a number
of Bodhisattvas carrying large dishes to offer them to a Buddha; owing to the
dazzling light, which emanated from the latter, they lose their controll and let their
presents drop. One might perhaps complete the last pāda to: sakalakhādya$<m=$
apātayad$=$bhūtale$>$ or something similar. If this is correct, we get an idea of the
scene represented. Each of these strophes tries to illustrate a special aspect of the
Buddha's activity.

[118] This second pāda is a very artful one (vara-vara-vārā-varā) and therefore not exactly
clear. Vārāṅganā usually denotes ganikās, but this is not necessarily the case. Anyhow,
we have some love scene here; cf. note 119.

[119] Kāmijana are probably those sporting with the women mentioned in pāda b. We
suppose that the subject of harati is the Buddha who takes the passions away. Instead
of passions, the text uses an elaborate compound in pāda c. The scene represents
a number of young lovers who express their feelings to young women, but the Buddha,
who always tries to save the creatures, prevents them from executing their intention.
He acts in the peculiar way expressed by the strophe, viz. he takes the rasāntara away
from their heart-lotuses. For the meaning of rasāntara, the reader is referred to the
excellent study by J. Gonda, Altind. anta-, antara-, usw., in Bijdr. K.I. XCVII (1939),
pp. 453-500, where an exhaustive treatment of such compounds is given; one might
translate „all kind of feelings" (viz. rāga, kāma, etc.); sāndra is somewhat pleonastically
used, which is not, however, rare in these kinds of compounds (cf. art. cit., p 486:
anyat sthānāntaram gatvā, and anyatamasya rājño viṣayāntaram upajagāma, „.....
reached the realm of some king", Speyer's translation of a Jātakamālā passage
quoted by Gonda). This pleonastic use might confirm our conjectural explanation
proposed for the difficult words di antara mārgga lai in the inscription of Talang
Tuwo, South Sumatra (cf. supra, p. 22); the words could correspond to Sanskrit
anyasmin mārgāntare. — It is obvious that rasāntara is used because it may refer
to both hṛdaya- and -nīraja; in the latter case, it denotes such qualities as colour,
smell, etc.

[120] The term Gurjaradeça is unfortunately rather vague; it does not necessarily denote
Gujarat, although there is at least a great chance that it does (cf. the Introduction).

bowed by the burden of devotion to the Buddhas [121), ... a Jina temple is worshipped [122).

15. Somewhere [123), a number of (young men) adorned with innumerable crown pearls [124) had just revealed their love to their beloved ones, (but) ...... [125) (from ?) the arrows of Love, which lost their power [126) when they saw a Jina image, they ...... [127).

16. ......, from whose eyes all anger about other, wrong views is gone [128) ; although in an incomprehensible state, he (rescues ?) the entire world by means of the amṛta which are the statues incomparable in breaking phenomenal existence.

17. (May mankind) blinded by the thick layer of infatuation, which is as a veil covering the eyes [129), obtain the cessation of (worldly) existence (and become) like a Jina [130); ...., praised by hymns which run

---

I should be inclined to bring this strophe into connection with one of the scenes represented in the main building of the Plaosan complex, where two high religious dignitaries are visible (Krom, Inleiding², II, p. 11 sq.). Krom conjecturally proposed to consider the two figures as the heads of the Buddhist and Çaiva clergy respectively. With a view to our text, one might also consider the possibility that we have two Buddhist dignitaries here, one from Java and one from the Gurjara country. Further research as to the question whether the strange headdress of one of these figures could be connected with his origin from abroad is required.

121) We already noted in the Introduction that this might be an example of utprekṣā; the gurus are represented as people slightly bowed by the burden of old age, but the poet attributes the bowedness to their bhakti.

122) For the forms of worship implied by satkāra, cf. note 53 to the Introduction.

123) The word kvacid probably occurred at the beginning of more strophes (perhaps 13 or 16). The term clearly suggests that the descriptions refer to a number of separate scenes. If one presumes that the word had already been used before, one might translate „elsewhere".

124) Çikhāmaṇi corresponds to the more usual cūḍāmaṇi in meaning; the young men are of a very high rank, probably princes.

125) In the lacuna, we expect something like „not influenced by"; cf. the notes which follow.

126) The conjectural reading smaraçarākuçalāḥ cannot be quite correct; the end of the compound is not clear on the stone. One might suggest to correct the compound to smaraçarāviçarāḥ, which would not be impossible from a palaeographic point of view ; aviçara could perhaps be interpreted as „not torn asunder" (from the root çṛ), although viçara only occurs in the active meaning of „tearing asunder" according to the dictionaries. The meaning of the strophe seems hardly doubtful. The words suggest a simile based on the struggle between Māra and the Buddha, where also the flowers of love do not reach the Saint.

127) The four missing syllables at the end of strophe 15 after ça- could be completed to ça<ranāgatāḥ>, „came to seek Refuge".

128) Dṛṣṭi, in Buddhism, always denotes the wrong views, usually analyzed into the pañca dṛṣṭayaḥ (mithyādṛṣṭi, etc.); here again, antara is pleonastically used, for the Buddha's views could not be denoted by dṛṣṭi.

129) For timira, cf. the Introduction. We gave a free translation of the strophe, especially by adding a few words between brackets. The words „may obtain" are based on the conjectural but very likely completion of the pāda proposed in note 91 above.

130) Astinirodha is a very positive acquisition in this phase of Buddhism; most Buddhists

sometimes fast, sometimes slow (or : composed in the Drutavilambita metre) [131].

18. May this foundation [132], an excellent refuge for the other creatures, who abide on this abode of misery [133] not living according to Dharma (?) [134], be protected by those firm in the Triple Refuge although it

---

even consider it some kind of fruit, viz. the fruit which is separation (from phenomenal existence, *visaṃyogaphala*); cf. especially *Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 276, where *nirodha* is considered the fruit of the Mārga. During the last part of the Mārga (termed *vimukti-mārga* in *Abhidh. Koça*, VI, p. 234), „l'ascète prend possession *(prāpti)* de la discon-nexion" *(Abhidh. Koça*, II, p. 276, note 2). This conception also supports our restitution proposed in note 91 above. The term *jinavat* was probably chosen because the term *jina* is always associated with the idea of a victory, viz. over phenomenal existence.

131) The words *drutavilambita°* are of course chosen to indicate the metre in which the strophes 11-17 are composed.

132) The orthography *koṣa*, although less common than *koça*, may be the correct one from an etymological point of view. In addition, the Amarakoça (2nd edition by Colebrooke, Loiseleur Deslongchamps, Thatte and Kielhorn, 1882), III, 4, 29, 223, gives it in an enumeration of words ending in -*ṣa*. For the different meanings of the word, cf. *Pet. Dict.*, II, p. 450; the fundamental meaning seems to be anything which envelops and protects something precious; the secundary meanings such as „treasury", „envelop of a *liṅga*", „womb", etc. are based upon the fundamental concept. Cf. the expressions such as *brahmakoça* (= *hṛdaya*) and *hṛdayaṃ jīvakoçaṃ pañcātmakam*, „the heart is the place where the principle of life, comprising the five *ātmans*, is hidden", *brāhmaṇaḥ / īçvaraḥ sarvabhūtānāṃ dharmakoṣasya guptaye*, „the Brāhmaṇa is the lord of all the creatures for the protection of that treasure which is Dharma". Cf. also such expressions as *guṇānāṃ koṣaṃ tvam (Mahāv.*, I, p. 210, 1. 8). Every sanctuary may be considered a *koṣa* since its function is essentially that of protecting the holy objects of worship. The use of just this term to denote the foundation in this inscripdon agrees particularly well with the interpretation that we suggested for strophe 3. The new foundation, on account of which the inscription was composed, implies the construction of a building to protect the miraculously descended statue. Cf. the notes which follow.

133) *Saṃsārāvanicaratāṃ*, lit. : „of those who live on the earth subject to the laws of transmigration". As a matter of fact, the foundation is as it were an oasis for those roaming about in the desert of phenomenal existence, where they pass from one form of existence into another while they are tortured with thirst.

134) *Na dharmato* corresponds in meaning with *adharmeṇa* and qualifies *°caratān*. For the use of the suffix, cf. *nyāyataç=çāsti rājyam* in the last strophe but one of the Tjaṅgal inscription (*vide* Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, VII, p. 120); cf. Speyer's *Syntax*, § 104 (p. 77). The adverbial use of the suffix sometimes corresponds better to that of the instrumental than to that of the ablative. — The special mention of people not living according to Dharma is interesting; with a view to the mention of the Triple Refuge in this same strophe, one is inclined to interpret Dharma in the special Buddhist meaning of the term, which may be rendered by „Doctrine", „the Good Faith". As a matter of fact, „taking the Triple Refuge" *(çaraṇagamana)* is almost identical with "becoming a Buddhist"; cf. De la Vallée Poussin in *Mélanges chin. et bouddh.*, I (1931-32), pp. 65-109. It appears from the 4th pāda of strophe 19, that the text is not devoid of some missionary tendency (cf. note 140 below). If this is correct, a double wish is expressed in strophe 18 : may the Buddhists be firm in their devotion to the Three Jewels in order to protect the foundation, and may the non-Buddhists find Refuge in the Good Faith.

was made different [135), ... [136).

[135) The words *itarakṛto 'pi pālanīya(ḥ)*, literally: „to be protected although it was made different", must contain an antithesis (indicated by (a)*pi*); *itarakṛto* could not therefore mean: „made by other people", but should be interpreted as „made different". This agrees with the meaning of *itara*, which always implies a comparison between two different things or persons; here, *itarakṛto* could refer only to the comparison of the complex before and after the events commemorated by the text. Then the opposition expressed in this strophe becomes clear: the idea implied by *pratipā* is always „to maintain, to protect", i.e. to maintain the foundation in the form in which it is. One may conclude from the wording of this pāda that the fact of changes having been made in the original temple complex is all but an excuse for future generations to do the same (or rather: to make arbitrary changes in the foundation). Only then, the words mean something. We insist on this point because it is of a decisive importance with a view to the interpretation of the entire text: if this interpretation of the pāda is certain, the Plaosan inscription does not deal with an entirely new foundation, but with the renewal of an older foundation. The text gives no evidence whatever that the original foundation would have been damaged; on the contrary, strophe 3 gives a clue as to the possible reason why a renewal was necessary. With a little imagination, we may represent us the following string of events. Since some time there had been a temple complex at Plaosan constructed by a former king (line 12 might refer to it), but owing, perhaps, to the fact that the people did not live according to Dharma, the complex showed signs of decay. It was, however, left in this state until, suddenly, somebody discovered a marvellous Buddha or Bodhisattva statue within the temple grounds. This supernatural event was interpreted by the Buddhist priests as a sign that the image wanted to be near the Four Sugatas (*catuḥsugatasaṅgataḥ* in strophe 3); is was therefore necessary to provide for a suitable sanctuary in which the image could find a place near the Four Buddhas (this would then be the *kośa* mentioned in strophe 18); numerous arrangements had to be made to that effect and the old foundation was really made a different one (*itarakṛta*). This is how we understand these words in connection with the preceding strophes. We probably have another example of a miraculous descent of an object of cult in one the Ratubaka inscriptions to be discussed below (*infra*, No. X, inscription *a*, the third pāda of the third strophe); there it is a *liṅga* the descent of which seems to be connected with an important dynastic change. Such miracles may have a political importance. Recently, Berg proposed to interpret the miraculous *disappearance* of an Akṣobhya image from Tjaṇḍi Djawi in 1331 as a supernatural sign to effect a profound change in Majapahit politics at the moment when Gajah Mada took the affairs of state in hand (*vide Indonesië*, V (1951-52), No. 3, pp. 200 sq.). Owing to lack of data, it is impossible to conclude whether also the descent of the Bodhisattva or Buddha image mentioned in our text is connected with political events; this could well be the case. — If the above interpretation is correct, we have a valuable indication that the Plaosan inscription does not refer to an original foundation.

[136) If our surmise that the name of the metre must occur in this pāda is correct, (cf. note 94 above), one could venture to reconstitute the pāda. *Praharṣanīyaḥ*, „to be enjoyed", is not a word which could be used near the end of a Buddhist inscription without some kind of excuse. We therefore expect some antithesis more or less parallel to that in pāda c. The supposed meaning of the pāda then is: „which must be a cause of joy even to those devoid of passion and the like." One could even try to reconstitute the entire pāda on this base. If it ends in *praharṣanīyaḥ*, one may be almost certain that this word was preceded by *api* and that the latter, again, was preceded by a compound meaning „by those devoid of passion" or something similar. Instrumentals ending in *-air* or *-dbhir* are impossible on account of the metre; we

). May man by the merit which I acquired by constructing (?) this (temple) [317]) pure as the disc of the moon, participate in the acts of a Jina [138]); protect us, king of the supreme kings of Varanara [139]), against the impurity of wrong views; may not the men be bound to passion [140]) !

---

need an instrumental ending in *-bhir* preceded by a short vowel. We then arrive at the following partial reconstruction:

— — — ⏑ ⏑ *-bhir=api praharṣaṇīyaḥ.*

Up to this point, we stand on a firm base. Further reconstruction could only be conjectural. Considering the terms possible on account of the metre and the meaning required by the context, one could complete the pāda as:

-s=tat=prajñāmatibhir=api praharṣaṇīyaḥ //, i.e.: „which should therefore be a cause of joy even to those whose mind is directed towards wisdom". The *-s* at the beginning constitutes the end of *pālanīya* in pāda *c* (cf. note 94 above). For the compound *prajñāmati* (= *yasya prajñāyaṃ matiḥ*), cf. such compounds as *prajñātman* and Prajñākaramati, the name of the well-known commentator on Çāntideva's Bodhicaryāvatāra. At least in Buddhist Sanskrit, compounds ending in *-mati* mean: „having the mind directed towards"; cf., e.g., *dhāraṇīmatir nāma samādhiḥ, Mahāvy.*, 21 No. 99 (edition by Minaiev and Mironov, p. 10); it denotes the state of concentration during which the mind is directed towards *dhāraṇīs* only. For the use of *mati*, cf. also *Çikṣās.*, kārikā No. 2, 3rd and 4th pādas: *çraddhāmūlaṃ dṛdhīkṛtya bodhau kāryā matir dṛdhā* (Bendall's edition, p. 2, line 14; his translation in the Introduction, p. XXXIX).

:) *Imaṃ*, viz. *koṣam*, the term used in the preceding strophe (18 *c*). The compound *çaçadharavimvaçuddham* (read: °*bimba*°), a karmadhāraya of the type *ūrṇāmṛdu*, „soft as wool" (Whitney, § 1291 *a*), may refer to either *imaṃ* or *puṇyam* in pāda *b*.

*) We construct: *yat puṇyam āpaṃ kṛtvemaṃ çaçadharabimbaçuddhaṃ (tena puṇyena) jano bhajatu jinakṣamasya*. No other examples of the 1st person aorist *āpam* are known to occur, but *āpaḥ, āpat* and *āpan* are known according to the Pet. Dict., s.v. *āp. Bhajati* (or: °*te*) with the genitive in the meaning „to partake of" is archaic but well attested.

') Cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 104 sq.; the translation is based on the corrected reading defended in note 95 above. Nevertheless, the construction *asmān rakṣa dṛṣṭikleçaṃ* is not completely satisfactory; °*kleçād* would have been the more regular construction. The interpretation may however be defended on account of the use of a double accusative in the examples quoted by Whitney in § 277; the double accusative is used with verbs meaning „to shake off, to take something from somebody (or: something else)" and occurs in the examples *vṛkṣaṃ pakvaṃ phalaṃ dhūnuhi*, „shake ripe fruit from the tree", and *jitvā rājyaṃ nalam*, „having won the kingdom from Nala", quoted there.

') The words *api janā na rāgabaddhāḥ* (viz. *bhaveyuḥ*) are loosely attached to the preceding words. Another interpretation, which might be preferable on account of the place of *api*, is to consider the latter an interrogative particle (cf. Speyer's *Syntax*, p. 323), „are not men bound to passion ?", i.e. „is not it natural that man is bound to passion ?". Then, the appeal for protection is based on the fact that man is naturally inclined to passion.

VIII. AN INSCRIBED PLATE FROM BUKATEDJA (PURBA-LINGGA, CENTRAL JAVA)

The gold plate to be discussed hereafter was discovered in the collection Tan Oen Dji at Bukatedja in the regency Purbalinga of the residency Banju-mas in Central Java. No precise data as to where the plate had been before are available. A photograph was made immediately after its discovery [1].

The measurements of the plate are 14,2 cm in height and 8,5 cm in breadth.

Most of the space on the plate is occupied by an engraved figure of a four-armed god in standing attitude. The god holds a *cāmara* in his front left hand, a *triçūla* in his front right hand, an *akṣamālā* in his back left hand and a *kuṇḍi* in his back right hand. These attributes are sufficient to define the figure as a Çiva Mahādeva. At the left hand side of the god, two objects are placed on the ground. The one nearest to the god's feet is an incense-burner, the other is a jar, which is lower and broader than the incense-burner. On the top of the jar, presumably on its lid, an ornament is visible which reminds one of the form of the three teeth of a *triçūla,* but is not quite identical with the latter. Immediately to the right of the *triçūla,* a short inscription is engraved the akṣaras of which run from top to bottom.

This short inscription is written in a rather archaic type of Old Javanese script. The virāma is expressed by a tiny curve over the akṣara, a peculiarity no examples of which are known from inscriptions dated later than 850 A.D.[2]. The initial *i* is expressed by two tiny curves with a third one of equal size below the two; from about the middle of the ninth century A.D., the initial *i* is always expressed by the akṣara *ga* (sometimes slightly modified) under which a small curve is added a little below the line. Forms of the initial *i* which are very much like that in the beginning of our inscription are found in the Karangtěñah (824 A.D.) and Gaṇḍasuli (832 A.D. ?) inscriptions.

Another interesting detail is the form of the *ña.* In the older type of Old Javanese script (from the Dinaya inscription on), the vertical part of the *ña* has a clear crack about in the middle; this feature distinguishes the *ña* from the *da,* with which it would be perfectly identical without the crack[3]. Ninth century inscriptions which give the same form of the *ña* are those from Kuburan Tjaṇḍi (821 A.D.), Nañgulan (822 A.D.) [4], Karangtěñah and

---

[1] No. 14323 in the collection of the Dinas Purbakala at Djakarta.

[2] The inscriptions from Tjaṇḍi Perot, dated 850 A. D., add the virāma to the right of the akṣara, and so do all the later inscriptions. In an inscription dated 842 A.D. (edited in *Pras. Indon.,* I, 1950, No. VI), various forms for the virāma occur; they evidently represent a transitional phase during which several forms were current. All inscriptions dated before 842 use a tiny curve above the akṣara.

[3] This is probably the reason why the *da* gets a crack in the lower horizontal part in later times, whereas the *ña* gets a similar crack in the upper horizontal part.

[4] *Pras. Indon.,* I (1950), pp. 126-130. The Kuburan Tjaṇḍi inscription was discussed in detail by Goris in *T.B.G.,* 70 (1930), pp. 157-170.

Gaṇḍasuli [5]). Already in inscriptions dated 842 [6]) and 850 A.D. [7]), the vertical part of the ña is perfectly straight.

The three details mentioned may be considered clear indications that the Bukatedja inscription is to be assigned to not later than about 840 A.D.

We read the inscription as follows :

// ini paḍehānda hawang payangñan //

The only akṣara which might not be beyond doubt is the ha in the second word. Its third vertical bends to the left at its lower end and touches the second vertical. Since, however, no other akṣara could be considered, the peculiar form of the ha would probably be a mere lapse by the engraver.

The most interesting feature is the language : the use of ini and of the suffix -nda makes it very probable that the language is Old Malay. It is curious that the suffix is spelt by dentals and not by linguals as one would have expected. The form paḍehānda is to be analyzed as ḍeha provided with the affixes pa- and -nda. Deha could hardly be anything else but Sanskrit deha, „body". The spelling by a lingual is not astonishing : presumably, the dentals and linguals were confounded [8]). The lengthening of the final a of ḍeha is normal before the suffix [9]), but we prefer a different explanation. Pa-ḍeha, followed by -nda, does not seem satisfactory. We prefer the interpretation of paḍehānda as paḍehān (i.e. ḍeha with the affixes pa- and -an), „the place

---

[5]) *Pras. Indon.*, I. pp. 73 sqq.

[6]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 50 sqq.

[7]) *Infra*, No. IX.

[8]) It is well-known that modern Malay and Indonesian have only a single series in contrast to modern Javanese. On the other hand, the Çrīvijaya inscriptions dated the end of the 7th century A. D. do distinguish dentals and linguals, although the latter are very rarely used. If we leave the words borrowed from Sanskrit out of the account (*kapaṭa, kalyānamitra, cintāmaṇi, jyeṣṭha, dṛḍha*, etc.; cf. the Index by Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.*, 30, 1930, pp. 66-80), there only remain the prefix ḍa (in ḍapunta) and the suffix -ṇḍa. In other cases where one would have expected a lingual a dental is used (*dang hyang*, cf. Old Javanese ḍang hyang; cf. also ḍaṃ in the fragment supra, No. I, inscription a, line 20, p. 6; dātaṃ, Old Javanese : ḍatang; kaḍatuan, Old Javanese : kaḍatuan or kaḍatwan). The latter examples would make it doubtful whether there existed two series in the Çrīvijaya dialect. The words borrowed from Sanskrit were, of course, correctly written according to their etymology and do not prove that linguals were pronounced (just as the spelling 'théologie' in French would not prove the existence of aspirates). The spellings ḍa- and -(ṇ)ḍa, the only real examples, could be due to other reasons than the pronounciation as linguals. The two affixes are honorific and this might be the very reason why a spelling, properly denoting sounds which did not exist in the language, was chosen. Modern Javanese gives close parallels; thus, the names of the Susuhunans of the Surakarta court in Java are spelt by consonants that would represent Phakhubhuwaṇa if the consonants had their etymological value. We therefore think that the linguals in the honorific affixes ḍa- and -(ṇ)ḍa are due to similar considerations. If our inscription writes -nda instead of -ṇḍa, this does not prove a difference in language, but rather a difference in spelling practice.

[9]) Cf. Cœdès, *art. cit.*, p. 62 ; the lengthening is due to the shift of the accent.

where the body is". May we interpret the latter to mean „embodiment" or „corporeal, material form" ? Since the words which follow *paḍehānda* contain a title and name to be examined below, one would conclude,.on the basis of the above interpretation, that the divine, four-armed, form corresponds to the title and name which follow — in other words, that the title and name belong to a dignitary after his apotheosis. We rather think that *paḍehān* means „the place where the material remains (especially *çarīra*, a synonym of *deha* is often used in the meaning of „relics") are", probably in the form of ashes. For the meaning of the inscription as a whole, the difference in translation is not essential. The gold plate is then narrowly associated with the corporeal remains and the divine figure engraved in the plate could hardly represent anything else but the person mentioned after *paḍehānda* in the form which he is presumed to have adopted after his apotheosis : it is the real form opposed to the poor material remains. *Ini*, referring to the latter, is,. as it were, the link which connects the divine figure with the deposit of ashes.

The exact value of *hawang* is difficult to be ascertained; in some inscriptions from Eastern Java it is used as a title belonging to, presumably, high dignitaries; it is always followed by a name [10]. On account of the above arguments, we translate the text by „These (presumably the deposit of *bhasma*) are the corporeal remains of Hawang (title) Payangñān (name)" [11].

---

[10] *O. J. O.* XXXI, A -33, where the correct reading is: *mamrati hawang wicakṣaṇa*; *O. J. O.* XXXVIII, B-4/5: *mamrāti hawang wicakṣaṇa* (the word *hawang* at the end of line 4 was omitted by Brandes); cf. also *O. J. O.* XXXVII, B-5 and XLVI, A-33. — It seems doubtful to us whether we should assume a connection with the word *(m)puhawang*, „captain of a commercial ship" ; a *puhawang* is the main person in Old Malay epigraph from Gaṇḍasuli (unfortunately lost; cf. Brandes' transcription as *O. J. O.* III; Krom, *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 151; Goris *T. B. G.*, 70, 1930, p. 160, who assigns the inscription to the year 787 A.D., which is unacceptable; Damais *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, 1, 1952, pp. 28 sq., dated it 827 A.D. especially on account of a calculation of the date); Goris, *loc. cit.*, gives some references to Dapu Hawang who has become a mythological figure in the Bandjarmasin Chronicle and elsewhere); in No. II above, *puhāvaṃ* is found in the list of state servants of Çrīvijaya (cf. *supra*, p. 20); finally, we note the occurrence of the term in the Old Javanese Harivañca (edition by A. Teeuw, 1950, Canto XXIII, str. 7, pāda *c*). A curious point in favour of a possible connection between the *hawang* in our text and the *puhawang* in the above references, is the fact that the oldest known examples of the occurrence of *puhawang* are both Old Malay ones, while, on the other hand, our *hawang* appears in an Old Malay context, too. There is not, however, the slightest indication that our *hawang* should have had any connection with navigation; his attributes on the plate, especially the incense burner, would rather suggest some sort of priest. The meaning of the title still remains obscure.

[11] We have no idea as to the meaning of the name Payangñān, which sounds, or rather, looks strange. This impression is mainly due to the spelling by a double *ñ* and a long *-ā*. Possibly, the name is a corruption from *parhyañan*, with which it seems rather similar in sound. In the inscription of Kuburan Tjaṇḍi (front part, line 18/19 ; cf. the edition by Goris, *T.B.G.*, 70, 1930, pp. 157 sqq., and a few notes in *Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, pp. 126-128) we read the village name Kayyañan which might represent the well-

The main point of interest of the inscriptions is not the above interpretation, which necessarily remains conjectural and furnishes no real proof of the existence of apotheosis rituals in the first half of the 9th century, but the use of the Old Malay language. In this respect, our text may be compared with the two Gaṇḍasuli inscriptions mentioned above. At present, only highly conjectural explanations of the occurrence of Old Malay texts in Central Java before the middle of the 9th century A.D. can be given [12]. Influence from Çrīvijaya cannot be excluded, but seems hardly probable in view of the pronounced Çaivism found in all these Old Malay texts from Central Java [13]. There is an inscription in Old Malay from Këbon Kopi (Western Java); there, the use of Old Malay is probably due to influence from Çrīvijaya [14], so that a connection would not be likely on the same grounds. A prisoners of war colony could hardly be considered even if such a thing would not be an anachronism [15]. The situation in the Malay Peninsula and the neighbouring island groups is not clear in this period; Çaiva centres may have remained there [16].

The mention of a merchant group having their own temple in the Perot inscription [17] might give a hint as to the direction in which a solution of the problem could be looked for. The presence of Indonesian, but non-Javanese, merchants on Javanese soil would hardly be astonishing; neither would non-Javanese soldiers be in view of what we see in many a period of Javanese history [18]. If the solution should be looked for in the direction suggested above, one is inclined to connect the occurrence of Old Malay texts in Central Java with the undoubtedly turbulent events which marked

---

known word *kahyañari*. The combination *hy* may have been pronounced *y* in common language from early times; cf. also the form *kayañau* in one of the Sukuh inscriptions, M. Muusses, *T.B.G.*, 62 (1923), pp. 509 sq. Doubling of a final consonant before the suffix *-an* is common; in Javanese writing, this custom is even preserved up to now.

[12] Cf. the conjectural explanations quoted or suggested by Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 155.

[13] As to the Gaṇḍasuli inscription published in *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), No. IV, Çaivism is beyond doubt and the same is true for this text. Also the Gaṇḍasuli inscription published by Brandes as O.J.O., III (cf. Goris, *art. cit.*, p. 160 with note 4 to that page; cf. also note 9 above) seems Çaiva, although there is no definite proof.

[14] Published by Bosch, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 100 (1941), pp. 41 sqq. The Këbon Kopi inscription is probably dated more than a century earlier than this text, so that therefore, too, a direct connection with the Old Malay texts discovered in Central Java is not probable. We note that the Këbon Kopi inscription, too, confounds dentals and linguals (*sabdakalānda, sunda*). — We have little information about the extent of Çrīvijaya power in Western Java; even Chau Ju-kua (writing in 1225) considers Sunda a dependency of Çrīvijaya (cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 308), but his informations about Çrīvijaya are based on sources before 1178, the date of the *Ling wai tai ta* by Chou K'ü-fei. Cf. Cœdès, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 83 (1927), p. 469.

[15] This was the explanation suggested by Rouffaer as one of the possibilities in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 74 (1918), p. 142, but refuted by Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 155.

[16] Cf. the important excavations by Quaritch Wales, *Archaeological Researches on Ancient Indian Colonization in Malaya*, in *J. M. Br. R. A. S.*, XVIII, Pt. 1 (1940), pp. 1-85 (89 Plates).

[17] Cf. *infra*, No. IX, the end of the Introduction.

the decline of Çailendra hegemony in Central Java about in the middle of the 9th century A.D. Our data about what happened in these times are still rather confused, but the inscriptions X and XI, to be discussed below, contain some important additional information.

IX. TWO INSCRIPTIONS FROM TJANDI PEROT (850)

The two inscriptions to be discussed hereafter are cut in large stones originating from Tjandi Perot (regency Temangung, residency Kedu); as early as 1819, the two stone inscriptions were transported to Magelang [1]. The stone here referred to as b was transported from there to Djakarta (in a year unknown, but presumably very long ago), where it was incorporated into the collection of inscribed stones (No. D. 7) [2]. The other stone (b) remained at Magelang at that time, but was likewise transported to Djakarta in 1890 and incorporated into the collection of inscribed stones in the Museum (No. D. 80) [3].

The dimensions of a are 58 cm in breadth and 110 cm in height, of b: 59 cm in breadth and 111 cm in height. As far as the dimensions are concerned, the two stones are therefore almost equal. For a, the number of lines with which it is inscribed, cannot be settled with certainty; this is due to the weathering especially of its lower portion. Probably, there are 26 lines of script, perhaps one or two more. The stone b is inscribed with 37 lines of script.

As was noted above, a is badly weathered and considerable portions of the text have become illegible; b is in a good state op preservation on the

---

[18] Settlements of foreign merchants keeping their own forms of organization have been a common feature in Indonesian society; cf. especially J. C. van Leur, *Eenige beschouwingen betreffende den ouden Aziatischen handel* (1934), *passim*, especially pp. 170 sqq. The picture there given is mainly based on 17th century materials, but seems capable of being applied to earlier centuries, at least as far as the main lines of this picture are concerned. In Barus (on the West coast of Northern Sumatra), there existed a corporation of Tamil merchants in the 11th century (Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 304; Nilakanta Sastri, *A Tamil merchant-guild in Sumatra*, T.B.G., 72, 1932, pp. 314-27; cf. also *infra*, No. IX, note 85 to the Introduction). As far as Java is concerned, we meet groups of all kinds of foreigners in inscriptions of Airlanga (first half of the 11th century; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, pp. 264 sq.) and later. For earlier times, cf. Stutterheim, *Epigraphica*, III, *Een Javaansche acte van uitspraak uit het jaar 922 A.D.*, T.B.G., 75 (1935), pp. 444-56, where the role of foreigners in the collection of the king's revenues is stressed. — Foreign (i.e. non-Javanese) troups were involved in 17th century Mataram (Madurese under Trunajaya, Macassarese under Kraëng Galesung, Balinese under Surapati); we have no data for Hindu-Javanese times, but the possibility of similar events could not be excluded. Cf., however, the introductions to Nos. X and XI.

[1] References are given in the Introductions to *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden* (abbreviated O. J. O.), V and VI.

[2] *Catalogus Groeneveldt* (1887), p. 374.

[3] Cf. *Notulen B. G.*, 1890, pp. 11 sq. and p. 52.

whole, but from line 23 on, the inscribed stone surface is damaged in several spots, owing to which there remain considerable lacunae in the middle of the lines.

Transcriptions of a and b, prepared by Brandes, were published in *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden*, Nos. V and VI, but Brandes' transcription of a is very uncomplete (it ends in the middle of line 5 of the stone); the transcription of b is complete, but not reliable in detail. A few, but important, corrections to Brandes' transcript were proposed by Damais[4]. The most important discoveries were that (1) the inscriptions a and b are identical apart from a few, but interesting, orthographic details, and (2) the inscriptions are dated 772 Çaka, corresponding to 850 A.D. In addition, Damais gave a correct interpretation of the meaning of the word *ratu* in line 5[5].

The new transcriptions to be given below contain numerous other corrections to the edition by Brandes-Krom. One has the clear impression that Brandes' transcript was not intended to be published in the form in which we have it now. Although these corrections hardly change the interpretation of the text as a whole, they are rather important for our knowledge of ancient Central Javanese topography and civil administration.

The script is of the usual Old Javanese type. Almost the only point worthy of note is the form of the virāma (patèn in Javanese), which is written below instead of above the akṣara in a few cases. The obvious explanation is that it was difficult to express the virāma in the usual way when the akṣara right above in the preceding line stretched far down. The unusual way of writing the virāma is therefore due to practical considerations only.

We note a few points about the orthography. The type of script used in the Old Javanese records was not originally adapted to the writing of charters in the Old Javanese language[6]. The phonemic system of Old Javanese differs considerably from that of the Sanskrit language. In the vowel system, the main difference is the frequent use of the pĕpĕt (ĕ, the so-called toneless vowel; a more correct term, which is used by Uhlenbeck in his treatise on the structure of the Javanese morpheme[7]), is 'undetermined') in Old Javanese. Gradually, a special vowel mark, which is probably derived from the *upadhmānīya* in South Indian script, came into common use, but

---

[4]) L. C. Damais, *Epigraphische Aantekeningen*, in *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 18 sq.

[5]) Brandes (*Catal. Groeneveldt*, p. 374) and Krom (*Geschiedenis²*, p. 156, who notes the absence of a royal title) considered *ratu* a part of the name of the village. The interpretation given by Damais is undoubtedly correct; it seems however doubtful to us whether *ratu* is completely equivalent to the Sanskrit title *Çrī Mahārāja* (cf. *infra*, p. 219 sqq.).

[6]) In spite of the uncertainty as to the exact origin of the so-called Old Javanese type of script (the older term is 'Kawi' script), we take it for granted that it originates from India.

[7]) E. M. Uhlenbeck, *De structuur van het Javaanse morpheem*, in *Verhand. B. G.*, LXXVIII (1949), pp. 30 sqq.; the opposition 'determined': 'undetermined' was introduced by Jacobson (*loc. cit.*, note 4). It is doubtful whether the ĕ should be considered an

till recent times it was not used in all the cases where ... should have ex-
pected to find it. As a rule, Old Javanese records use the special vowel
mark only if it is necessary to avoid misunderstanding [8]. Although the vowel
mark for the ĕ is known in our inscriptions, its use is limited to one single
case [9]. Everywhere else where one would have expected to find it, a number
of different modes of orthography are preferred.

If an ĕ occurs in the first syllable of a disyllabic base, no vowel mark is
expressed and the consonants at the beginning of the two syllables are com-
bined into a ligature (cf. wka for wĕka in a 6 and b. 5). This spelling is
difficult to be used if the second syllable begins with two consonants; in
such cases, the usual spelling is a (kambang or kamwang for kĕmbang),
but no certain example is found in these inscriptions. An ĕ in the last
syllable is usually written as an a; it is obvious that it would be impos-
sible to end the word in a consonantal ligature [10]. We therefore find forms
such as manapal (b 16), which probably represents manapĕl [11]. Very often,
the first and the third modes of orthography are used together in a single
word in the first and second syllables respectively. We then find forms
such as sḍang (b 18, probably representing sĕḍĕng); a similar combination

---

'undetermined' vowel in Old Javanese, too. The main arguments to consider the ĕ
an 'undetermined' vowel in modern Javanese — such as the impossibility of it being
followed by the 'undetermined' consonant h (op. cit., p. 54) or of constituting the
final vowel of a word or word-base and the absence of vowel variants — either do
not exist or cannot be controlled in Old Javanese; words ending in -ĕh are rather
common (Old Javanese sĕgĕh corresponding to suguh in Modern Javanese) and so are
those ending in -ĕ (with usual lengthening of the final vowel, i.e. -ö in our transcript-
ions); the ĕ may also occur as the first vowel in words of the scheme CVVC (Old
Javanese wĕas corresponding to wos in the modern language). We have, of course,
no means to ascertain whether the mechanism of vowel variants existed in Old
Javanese. The ĕ is written long (by the addition of a dauda) in the same cases in
which also the other vowels are. As far as a judgment based only upon written language
is permitted, we may conclude that the ĕ was equivalent to the other vowels in
Old Javanese. The non-expression of the vowel in many cases is fully explained by
the absence, originally, of a distinct vowel mark in a system of writing borrowed from
India. It is curious that it appears from inscription No. XI below that even such
artificial forms as mnang (for mĕnang) could be used in poetry in those very forms,
i.e. as monosyllabics. Cf. the Introduction to No. XI.

[8]) Such cases are not, however, rare (mĕnang: mĕnĕng, etc.). Presumably as a consequence
of normalizing tendencies in orthography, the use of the special vowel mark for ĕ
gradually increases in the course of centuries, but spellings such as tka instead of
tĕka are occasionally found in rather modern Javanese writing.

[9]) Viz., in manasö (b 9; in the corresponding place in inscription a, viz. a 9, the final
consonant is not lengthened). In cases like this one, the use of the ĕ cannot be avoided.

[10]) Neither in Sanskrit, nor in Old Javanese, a word may end in a consonant cluster;
writing down such a combination, even if it meant something completely different,
may have been too shocking to the eyes. Sanskrit and Old Javanese agree in this
respect. On the other hand, there was no objection against writing strange ligatures
due to the non-expression of the vowel mark for the ĕ; ligatures such as tga, impos-
sible in Sanskrit, frequently occur in Old Javanese inscriptions.

[11]) Possibly even mĕnapĕl. As a matter of fact, the first ĕ is not usually expressed in
writting neither in Old nor in Modern Javanese.

of the second and third modes of orthography occurs in *mapakan* (b 24, probably representing *mapĕkĕn*). If we see that these cases are easily explained by the difficulties arising from the expression of the *ĕ*, we have no reason whatever to assume that an *a* would have been pronounced in Old Javanese in these cases [12].

There is one more method of expressing an *ĕ* in the first syllable of a disyllabic base, viz. by writing an *a* and geminating the consonant which follows. Only a single example occurs in our texts, viz. *tangṅah* in b 25, which undoubtedly represents *tĕṅah* [13]. It is difficult to give a correct explanation of this spelling. Phonetically, there exists no consonantal gemination in Javanese and we have no reason to assume that Old Javanese would have been different in this respect [14]. Clusters, on the other hand, are rather frequent between the two vowels of a disyllabic base [15]. Now we see that in most of the cases where we find a cluster in this place of the word the vowel in the first syllable is preferably an *ĕ* [16]. From a historical point of view, we observe that the *a* of Sanskrit words usually developed into an *ĕ* in these cases; the Sanskrit words *bhakti, çakti, pakṣin, sākṣin, mārga, varṇu, satya* became *bĕkti, sĕkti, pĕksi, sĕksi, mĕrga, vĕrṇa, sĕtya*

---

[12]) We stress this point since most of the extant descriptions of Old Javanese suffer from a confusion between the language and its orthography. Thus, we learn from Kats, *Kusumavicitra* (1929), p. 4, that the 'long pĕpĕt' (represented by *ö* in transcription) is pronounced in Old Javanese as it is in Sundanese and that the long vowels are pronounced longer than the short ones. Such statements, even if they are given only to pupils in order that they know how to read the Old Javanese text, are easily misleading since they create an artificial difference from the modern language, a difference which probably existed only in writing and in reciting poetry. One cannot, of course, prove that Old Javanese *pkan*, as the word is spelt in the inscriptions, was really pronounced *pĕkĕn* as in the modern language, but it is at least true that orthographic considerations fully account for the spelling *pkan*; there is no reason to assume an evolution from Old Javanese *a* to Modern Javanese *ĕ* in these cases. For the long vowels in writing, a question which is far more complicated, cf. the discussion below.

[13]) The akṣara *ṅa* and the *anusvāra* were probably considered perfectly equivalent, but the former was reserved for the end, the latter for the beginning of a syllable. In words such as *saṅka*, often spelt *saṅgka*, either spelling occurs but the former is more frequent on the whole. Examples of a final guttural nasal expressed by *ṅa* with a *virāma* occur, mainly in the older period (cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I, p. 113 and p. 128), but they are very rare.

[14]) Cf. note 12 above. It seems a sound principle not to conclude to a phonemic difference from Modern Javanese, unless there should be real arguments in favour of such a difference. Spelling is, of course, no argument if it is capable of being explained in a different way; important cases are those in which the same word is written either *tṅah* or *tangṅah*; cf. also *infra*, note 47.

[15]) Cf. the description of these types in Modern Javanese by Uhlenbeck, *op. cit.*, chapter IV *sub* C, pp. 149-181.

[16]) Excluding, of course, the combinations of a mute preceded by a homorganic nasal, where no such preference is noted. The preference for *ĕ* is pronounced if the combination consists of a mute and *l* or *r* (Uhlenbeck, p. 157) or of a number of less common combinations (*op. cit.*, p. 161).

in Javanese [17]). If we assume that this tendency is an old one, although it is not expressed by writing as a rule, we could understand that the *ĕ* pronounciation of an *a* in the first syllable was unambiguously indicated by creating an artificial cluster which could not be misunderstood; writing a double consonant was an easy means to achieve this purpose since real gemination did not occur [18]).

In addition to the cases dealt with above, we find double consonants written in a small number of other cases. More often than not, a consonant following *r* is doubled; cf. *sarwwa* (b 6), *parwwuwus* (b 15). This is only the application of a Sanskrit rule of sandhi which needs no further comment. In addition, we often find the final consonant of a base doubled if it is followed by the suffix *-an;* cf. *ḍamiliḥhan,* b 11/12, *wlaḥhan,* b 12. The most likely explanation is that the gemination is a means to denote the shift of the accent from the first to the second syllable of the original word after the addition of a suffix; the expression of a double consonant in Old Javanese would then have about the same function as vowel lengthening has in Old and Classical Malay [19]).

The latter point naturally leads us towards the most awkward problem of this kind, viz. the expression of long vowels in Old Javanese. The cases in which long vowels are written in these inscriptions (which are, on the whole, in accordance with the common practice in Old Javanese records) are classifiable into three groups. First, we have the words borrowed from Sanskrit, spelt according to the rules known from Sanskrit [20]); cf. *çakawarṣātīta* (b 1), *tatkāla* (b 3/4 and b 5), etc. Second, we find vowels written long in Old Javanese words if grammatical analysis combined with the Sanskrit rules of vowel contraction tends to show that a vowel is the product of originally two vowels. The inscriptions therefore spell *tuhān* (b 15 and 16) since the word is analyzed into *tuha* and the suffix *-an* and the Sanskrit rules of sandhi prescribe a long vowel in such cases. We have no sufficient reason to conclude that this vowel lengthening corresponded to a living feature of the Old Javanese language. As a matter of fact, the inscriptions give numerous examples of the use of Sanskrit rules of sandhi in the Old Javanese text. Some examples in the Perot inscriptions are *ryy=umaḥnya* (b 3), *sy=ulihan*

---

[17]) Often, the forms with an *a* in the first syllable still occur in Javanese, but they are less common. Uhlenbeck *(op. cit.,* p. 169) rightly considers the forms with an *ĕ* the more adapted ones.

[18]) It is the same principle, *viz.* that of using means offered by the system of orthography to a new purpose when the original function was not needed, which we observe in other cases, too. A clear example is the use of the ancient aspirates and other akṣaras which were no longer needed (such as the *ṇa*) as the so-called *aksara ṇgeḍé* in Modern Javanese writing. The form of the *ṇa,* for instance, expressing a superfluous sound in the modern language, could be used as a polite equivalent of the *na.*

[19]) Cf. Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.,* XXX (1930), p. 62, who compares *jāhat* and *marjahāti, dātu* and *datūa.* In classical Malay, the accentuated syllable is denoted by the addition of an *alif, yā* or *wāw.*

[20]) It is hardly necessary to add that this is not always done correctly; some examples of mistakes in the spelling of Sanskrit words will be given below.

(b 16), and *manusuk=sema* (b 4); in the last example, we notice not only the change from the dental sibilant to the lingual after the *k* but also a curious mistake in spelling to be examined below.

In addition to the long vowels in either of the above groups, we find a number of words not classifiable as loan words or as those in which the long vowels could be explained by the rules of sandhi. Some examples are *manukū* (b 4), *tuṅgū* (b 5), *manū* (b 7), *wadwā* (b 10), *manūt* (b 24), and *rāma* (b 35). Properly speaking, these examples do not constitute a real group; the long vowels are difficult to be accounted for. We confine ourselves to some remarks.

The spelling *manū* may be due to the wrong opinion that the word should be spelt by a long vowel [21]. *Wadwā* gives the impression of a foreign origin [22]. As to *rāma*, it is noted that the word is spelt by a long vowel only if it means „village elder" [23]; it is, however, written *rama* in the meaning „father", although there is no doubt that we have the same word used in two meanings. It may, however, be very useful, sometimes even necessary, to distinguish these meanings in official documents in order to avoid a misunderstanding [24]. The normal form is reserved for the meaning „father", whereas the long *ā* in the first syllable gives the word a more official tinge, which makes it very suitable to denote a technical term. If this conclusion is correct, the spelling by a long vowel could be compared with our use of capitals in similar cases. Thus, we use the spelling „father" to denote the family relation, but we write „Father" as a religious title [25]. It is well-known that another, but re-

---

[21] At least if the word, used as a person's name in the text, is to be identified with the name of the great Manu. In that case, it is nothing but a wrong orthography to which no importance should be attached.

[22] As far as Modern Javanese is concerned, the majority of the words of the type CVCCV in which the second consonant of the cluster is a semi-vowel (*y* or *w*) are of a non-Indonesian origin (29 on a total of 52; cf. Uhlenbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 168).

[23] We prefer this translation to „village authorities" (dorpsautoriteiten in many a Dutch translation). The meaning of *rāma* seems to correspond to that of *grāmavṛddha* in some Sanskrit inscriptions. The *rāmas*, in Old Javanese records, are divided into two groups: (a) those „holding a command" *(maṅagam kon)*, i.e. charged with a definite function, e.g. with the supervision over the bridges in the village *(hulu wuatan)*, and (b) those „taking rest" *(maratā)*, i.e., probably, those who were formerly charged with a definite function, but retired afterwards. Cf. *infra*, notes 74 sqq. The *tuha wanua*, „the old ones in the village", constitute a separate group among the *rāmas* charged with a definite function; cf. *infra*, note 75.

[24] *Rama*, meaning „father" (apparently without the honorific tinge which the word has in Modern Javanese), frequently occurs in Old Javanese inscriptions in the combination *rama ni* „father of", followed by a name. Since identical names frequently occur within the same village, the persons are often distinguished not by adding their father's name, as we sometimes do, but by mentioning the name of their eldest son or daughter. Grown-up men without a regular family do not count in essentially agricultural societies. It is obvious that only a small number of the 'fathers' belonged to the group of village elders.

[25] As a matter of fact, written language, usually not provided with sufficient signs to denote all the phonemes and devoid of means of rendering the more subtle elements

lated, method is used in later Javanese to a similar purpose, viz. the replacement of the common akṣaras by those which originally denoted aspirates [26]. Now it is remarkable that the inscriptions of Tjaṇḍi Perot do not appear to make the distinction between *rama* and *rāma*, for the word is written *rama* in a number of cases where the meaning „village elder" is required (e.g., in b 19, 20, 21 etc.) [27].

The above refers to only a small part of the complicated problem of the „long" vowels in Old Javanese, but it seems sufficient to explain the orthography found in these inscriptions. We shall take the same problem up again in connection with the prosodic laws of Old Javanese poetry in the Introduction to No. XI below.

The spelling of Sanskrit words is rather careless. We note *āsādhamāsa* for *āṣāḍhamāsa* (b 2), *dwitīyā* for *dwitīyā* (ibid.), *suklapakṣa* for *çuklapakṣa* (b 3), *jiwaṇa* for *jīwana* (a 12), and many other examples may be added. A curious spelling, already noticed by Damais [28], is *manusuk=ṣema* in b 4, whereas the corresponding place a 5 gives the correct spelling *manusuk sīma* [29] as two words. In modern Javanese, the phonemes *i* and *e* are sometimes confounded, especially in dialects [30], and this may be an old feature [31], although the cases found in inscriptions could be explained in a different way [32].

---

of language such as intonation, needs its own means of expression. The use of capitals in writing often corresponds to a more emphatic expression in speech as is usual for proper names, titles and words associated with the Divine. Old Javanese has different means. Names of persons are introduced by an article (*si, pu, sang*), words associated with the Divine are preceded by *sang hyang* (*sang hyang dharma* may be rendered by „the Temple", *sang hyang haji praçasti* by „the Royal Edict").

[26] We mean the so-called *aksara gĕḍe* in Javanese writing, commonly denoted by „capitals"; cf. note 18 above. The comparison with capitals in European writing is not exact; their use is only honorific (which is one of the aspects of European capitals) and moreover, the *aksara gĕḍe* are not limited to the first sound of the words.

[27] Also some later inscriptions (e.g. O.J.O., XXIII) do not make this distinction regularly.

[28] Quoted in note 4 above.

[29] The completely correct spelling would, of course, have been *sīmā*, but the final a is usually written short in Old Javanese. There is a curious little problem whether the spelling *sīmā*, sometimes found in Old Javanese records, represents the etymologically correct spelling or the so-called 'conjunctive', i.e. *sīma* followed by the suffix *-a*. Often, the latter appears to be required by the context, but we do not want to make this an absolute rule.

[30] Cf., for instance, Uhlenbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[31] This is not, however, probable. We add that the vowel *e*, which has no particular position in Modern Javanese, only occurs in three definite groups of cases in Old Javanese, viz. (a) in words borrowed from Sanskrit (e.g., *dewa*), (b) as a product of the contraction of an *a* at the end of a prefix with an *i* at the beginning of a base (e.g., *mesi*, i.e. *isi* with the prefix *ma-*), and (c) in a number of cases in which *e* alternates with *ai* (*kwaih* — *kweh, waih* — *weh, dai* — *de, rarai* — *rare,* etc.; the spelling by *ai* is the more common one in inscriptions, but it may be an archaism since also Sanskrit words with *e* are often found spelt by *ai*; cf. Old Javanese *kaiwala* instead of *kewala* and the name *kaisava* instead of *keçava* mentioned above).

[32] As to our *manusuk=ṣema*, one might consider the possibility of a confusion between

The text of the inscriptions *a* and *b* is identical apart from a small number of minor differences mainly in spelling. The reason why the text was copied twice can only be guessed at. Perhaps, the territory to which it applied was very extensive so that it was considered preferable to place different copies at different spots. Another possibility is that inscription *a* soon became almost illegible, so that a new copy was made a few years afterwards [33]; then, the older stone would not have been destroyed (although it had become useless) because it had been properly inaugurated [34]. We have several examples of inscriptions which were copied more than once, sometimes one on stone and another [35]) or even two others [36]) on bronze. In two other cases, we have the same inscription on the stones, but then one of the copies is either abbreviated or incomplete [37]). Here, the two inscriptions appear to be complete, but there is no absolute certainty owing to the very difficult reading of *a*, especially of its lower portion [38]). The discussion which follows is based on inscription *b*.

The inscription is dated 850 A.D. It deals with the foundation of a freehold [39]) by a Rakai Patapān named Pu Manukū under the reign of the king Rakai Pikatan [40]). The king is denoted by *ratu*. There may be some doubt whether the latter term should be considered perfectly identical with the usual royal title in Old Javanese records, viz. Çrī Mahārāja. The curious point is that not only the title is short and simple, but the king is even

sīmā, „boundary" (the extended meaning „bounded ground" and, especially, „grounds separated from civil administration by the king and his servants", i.e. free-hold) and *kṣema*.

33) The stone may have been in a similar state from the very beginning; it is a very rough type of stone.

34) In that case, it would have been kept as the authentic original.

35) Cf. the inscription published by Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 65 (1925), p. 209.

36) *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 172 sqq.

37) Of the two inscriptions of Tjandi Argapura, the stone in the Djakarta Museum (D. 81) is an incomplete copy of another stone which remained *in loco*, but is probably lost by now; cf. Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 4 sq. The inscription published in *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), No. V, contains only the beginning of that published *op. cit.*, No. VI.

38) The length of inscription *a* might be about the same as that of *b*, but on the estampage of *a* only here and there some vague traces of akṣaras are visible after line 20. The size of the two stones is almost equal.

39) This is the translation of *sīma* which we have adopted; cf. note 32, above. These free grounds could be called free only with a view to civil administration; apart from a small number of uncertain cases, they appear to have always belonged to a religious foundation.

40) This important fact was first pointed out by Damais, *loc. cit.* In this connection, Damais examined a number of other cases in which the title *ratu* is used (*art. cit.*, pp. 18 sqq.). The data there mentioned are based on reliable readings, but do they prove that *ratu* (sometimes: *sang ratu*) is a full, but archaic, equivalent of Çrī *Mahārāja*? — In our opinion, the data do not necessarily point to such a conclusion as long as we do not know much about the real position of these *ratus*. It is curious that also in the inscriptions of Argapura and Pĕndĕm the *ratu* is mentioned after the founders or, as we could put it, at the head of a list of dignitaries.

mentioned as only the first person in an enumeration of dignitaries. An even more striking fact is that king Rakai Pikatan is not the first person mentioned in the text. It would be contrary to all we know about Old Java-nese hierarchy to presume that the supreme king should have been mentioned after the founder Rakai Patapān unless the latter was considered higher in rank [41]. Normally, it is stated that the king issues an order to the effect that a privilege is given, whereas the favoured one(s) is (are) mentioned afterwards [42]. An attempt at explaining the relation between the two autho-rities in the Perot inscription cannot be based on this text alone. Several explanations might be suggested, but there is one which is particularly attrac-tive although it is not capable of real proof. The title Rakai Patapān is known to have belonged to the king who preceded Rakai Pikatan [43]; could it be that the Rakai Patapān in the Perot inscription is nobody else but the pre-ceding king himself ? This would explain both the order in which the two authorities are mentioned and the modest title of the Rakai Pikatan. We do not want to suggest that the founder is a dead king, which seems absurd [44], but that he might be in life after having resigned the throne. Then, the way in which the foundation is mentioned in the inscription is not astonishing : the king-father, as we might term the position of the Rakai Patapān in that case, is still the highest authority in the country although he leaves the exertion of his power to the Rakai Pikatan, while withdrawing into a *pata-*

---

[41] The wording of the Perot inscriptions seems to indicate that the Rakai Patapān acts entirely on his own responsability, whereas the king, *patih* and the other dignitaries are only the executors of the former's intention. Krom (*Geschiedenis²*, p. 156, note 6), referring to the Perot inscription (the year 853 is based on Brandes' reading of the third cipher, viz. 775 Çaka), conjecturally concluded to a lower position of the Rakai Pikatan. We think that Krom's opinion may still be maintained, although it is, at least partially, based on Brandes' interpretation of *ratu* as the end of the village name (*Catal. Groeneveldt*, 1887, p. 374).

[42] The formulation in the initial parts of the inscriptions deserves full attention. The inscriptions from Eastern Java from the 10th century onwards begin with the (elaborate) date and state that at „this date" *(tatkāla)* or „on this day" *(irika diwasa)*, the „order" *(ājñā)* or the „favour" *(anugraha)* „descends" *(tumurun)* on a number of high dignitaries, from whom it „goes down" *(umingsor)* to a number of lower digni-taries until it reaches the favoured one(s). There are, however, numerous variations on this theme. In a few cases, all during the reign of the king Sinḍok, the formula is completely different; in these cases, a high authority whose name is mentioned first, requests the king for some favour. In *O.J.O.* XL, dated 929 A.D., the person who addresses the king in such a way is a spiritual teacher (with the title *ḍang ācārya*), and his mention before the king is probably honorific. We cannot give a full discussion of these problems, which would require a separate article, but we think that the way in which we formulated this difficult point is sufficiently flexible to account for some apparent exceptions.

[43] Cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 122-126.

[44] As a matter of principle, this possibility could not be completely excluded in view of the conclusions by Stutterheim on the identity of king Wāgīçwara (*T.B.G.*, 75, 1935, pp. 422 sqq.), but if something of this kind should be presumed for our text, it is certain that such a fact would not have been omitted.

pān [45]). At present, we could only state that such a solution would agree with the facts, whereas it would not be unlikely on more general grounds. More positive arguments cannot be given, but it will appear in the Introductions to Nos. X and XI below that our conjectural explanation would probably be confirmed by the situation to which we conclude only six years afterwards (in 856 A.D.). There, these problems will be examined with greater detail.

The Perot inscription is the oldest document known which gives a regular list of dignitaries (b 5 to 9) mentioned after the king. The first of these is the *patih*, who bears the title Rakai Wĕka and the name Pu Puluwatu. The titles of the other dignitaries are Sirikan, Tiruan, Manahuri, Hālaran, Palarhyang, Wĕlahan, Dalinan, Pangkur, Tawān, Tirip, Lampi, Wadihati and Makudur. All these titles are known from other inscriptions. Not only Wĕka, but also Sirikan, Manghūri [46]), Halaran, Palarhyang, Wĕlahan and Dalinan are usually preceded by *Rakai*, whereas Tiruan, Wadihati and Makudur are always preceded by the term Pamĕgĕt [47]); the three titles Pangkur, Tawān and Tirip almost always occur together [48]), whereas Lampi is rarely met

---

[45] The curious title Patapān (= Hermitage) might have been deliberately chosen with a view to a later retirement into a hermitage. If our surmise about the identity of the titles Garung and Patapān is correct (*Pras. Indon.*, I, pp. 125 sq.) the prince would have changed his original title Rakai Garung to Rakai Patapān. The reading 741 Çaka for the Pĕngging copper plate, which we hesitated to accept, is confirmed by Damais in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, fasc. 1 (1952), p. 26.

[46] We give the titles in their usual spelling here. Manghūri became the designation for the „court historian", as one might term it, at the court of the 17th century Gĕlgĕl (cf. Berg, *De Middeljavaansche historische traditie*, 1927, pp. 42 sqq.).

[47] Old Javanese charters spell this term in many different ways, viz. *pamgat*, *pamgĕt*, *pamagat*, *pamaggat* and the same forms with an initial *sa* (*samgat*, *samgĕt*, etc.). Van Naerssen, *Bijdr. K. I.*, 90, 1933, pp. 241-244, has discussed this term with its different spellings in detail; he has made it probable that the forms beginning with *sa* should be considered contractions of *sang pamgat* etc.; we follow his example (*art. cit.*, note 1 to p. 243) in reproducing the title in the form *sang pamĕgĕt* except, of course, in transcriptions. It is the easiest way to account for the different spellings, whereas it would be difficult to explain the occurrence of forms with an *ĕ* in the last syllable if this vowel was an *a*. Cf. the above discussion of the different spellings of the *ĕ*.

[48] In a few cases, the term *tawān* is replaced by *hadanan*; cf. *K.O.*, No. I, 1st plate, front part, line 17. The three terms are mentioned together already in the Sanskrit charter of Kalasan dated 778 A.D.; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 135; Van Naerssen, *India Antiqua*, 1947, p. 250; *Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, p. 15. In strophe 4 of the Kalasan inscription, they are called the *ādeçaçastrins* of the king (*pankuratavānatīripanāmabhir :ādeçaçastribhī rājñaḥ*), whereas they are denoted by *deçādhyakṣa* and *mahāpuruṣa* in strophe 7 (*sākṣinaḥ kṛtvā pankuratavānatīripadeçādhyakṣān mahāpuruṣān*). The exact meaning of these terms is open to doubt. Bosch (*T.B.G.*, 68, 1928, p. 61) translated *deçādhyakṣān mahāpuruṣān* by „de notabele dorpshoofden" (the notable village chiefs); the translation which was adopted by Vogel, *Aanteekeningen op de inscriptie van Tjanggal in Midden-Java*, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 100 (1941), note 2 to p. 444, and by van Naerssen, *art. cit.*, p. 250: „the Javanese *pankur*, *tawan* and *tirip* and the 'notable desa-heads' ...... the *ramas* of the Old Javanese deeds". It does not

with in this connection. As a matter of fact, the title Lampi occurs only in the Argapura inscriptions (a 11, b 7), where it is however placed after, instead of before, the titles Wadihati and Makudur[49]. A detailed comparison with the list given in the Argapura inscriptions (a 7 to 12, b 4 to 7) agrees in the essentials, but shows numerous differences in details. The most striking agreement is the number of dignitaries, which is perfectly identical; in addition, all the titles but one agree, but the order in which they are enumerated is rather different. The title which does not agree is Wĕlahan, not occurring in the Argapura inscriptions; on the other hand, the

seem likely that *deçādhyakṣa* should correspond to *rāma* in the Old Javanese texts; *adhyakṣa* sounds like a royal functionary; moreover, the term does denote a royal functionary, viz. a kind of sheriff, in later Javanese administration, and the same meaning is required in the old Çrīvijaya inscription (cf. *supra*, No. II, line 4), whereas the *rāmas* could not possibly be considered royal servants. Real desa-heads such as the *lurahs* and *pĕtinggis* in more recent times, appear to be unknown in Old Javanese times. We have some doubt whether *deça* has the meaning „village" (i.e. *desa* in Modern Javanese) in this context. In a passage where the meaning „village" is required beyond doubt, the Kalasan inscription uses *grāma* (strophe 7 : *grāmah kālasanāmā*), whereas Old Javanese inscriptions always use *wanua* (*wanwa, banua, banwa*) in this meaning. So we prefer to translate *deçādhyakṣān* by „inspectors (possibly surveyors or sheriffs) over the country" (which is ruled by the king). The fact of the *pankur, tawān* and *tirip* being regularly mentioned among the first of those forbidden to interfere with foundation grounds, which were free from royal taxation, seems to confirm this interpretation. We then translate *pankuratavānatiripadeçādhyakṣān* by „the inspectors over the country, viz. the Pankur, Tawān and Tirip". The meaning of *ādeçaçastrin*, a term which is not lucid, may be looked for in the same direction. The translation „those armed with orders" (cf. Bosch, *art. cit.*, p. 60) might not be satisfactory: could *ādeça*, in the compound, stand for *ā deçāt*, „over the country", so that *ādeça-çastrin* means: „whose weapons (or: knives, *çastra*) reach (all) over the country", whereas the dignitaries themselves abide in the capital as most dignitaries do ? Cf. such compounds as *ājānubāhu*, „one whose arms reach down to the knees" (Monier-Williams). *Mahāpuruṣa*, a term used to denote the Buddha or Viṣṇu, is rather a strong expression for a dignitary of some rank; the term undoubtedly has a weaker meaning here, presumably that of *orang bèsar* in Malay. Our final conclusion is that *pankun, tawān* and *tirip* are the titles of three court dignitaries whose main task was the supervision over forces to execute royal orders.

[49] Anticipating the publication of these two epigraphs, we quote the passage in which the authorities are mentioned according to the text of *a* (lines 6-12); for the relation between the two texts of the Argapura inscription, cf. Damais, *T. B. G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 4 sq., who gives the transcription of the initial portions from which the correspondence clearly appears. The second Argapura inscription (the original of which is, unfortunately, lost) is not, however, a real 'duplicate' (Damais, p. 4) of the first one (Mus. Djak., D. 81); its text is about twice as long as that of inscription a and has entire paragraphs which do not occur in a. Inscription a may, therefore, be styled an abbreviated copy of b. The text of a, important for a comparison with the Perot inscriptions, runs: [6] ..... ratu tatkāla rakarayān kayuwani [7] pu lokapāla. patih rakarayān wka pu manūt . sirika[8]n pu bahā . halaran pu wīryya . pangilhyang pu tarangal . tirua[9]n pu sapi . sikhalān pu lamuñjang . manuhuri pu agrih . dāli[10]nan pu gnang . pankur pu brahmā . tawān pūcung . tirip pu mamanu[11]k . wadihati pu manū . makudur pu manindit . lampi pu dhana[12]hu //. — We add that the reading *sikhalān*, uncertain in a, is confirmed by the estampage of b (line 5).

title Sikhalān is mentioned in the Argapura inscriptions, but not in our text [50]). A minor difference is the title Palarhyang, which is replaced by Pangilhyang in the Argapura inscriptions; the two terms are undoubtedly identical since not only the second parts of the names agree, but also the meaning of the former parts [51]). A more interesting point is the different order in which the titles are given in the two documents. In the following list, we give the order of the dignitaries in the Perot inscriptions at the left hand side and of those in the Argapura inscriptions at the right hand side :

1. Patih Rakai Wĕka;	Patih Rakai Wĕka;
2. Sirikan;	Sirikan;
3. Tiruan;	Halaran;
4. Manghūri;	Pangilhyang ;
5. Halaran;	Tiruan;
6. Palarhyang;	Sikhalān;
7. Wĕlahan;	Manghūri;
8. Dalinan;	Dalinan;
9. Pangkur;	Pangkur;
10. Tawān;	Tawān;
11. Tirip;	Tirip;
12. Lampi;	Wadihati;
13. Wadihati;	Makudur;
14. Makudur;	Lampi.

The numbers 1-2 and 8-11 remained unchanged. Tiruan went two, Manghūri went three places down so that Halaran and Palarhyang obtained the third and fourth places respectively. These changes make it clear that the hierarchy fixed by the titles was not absolutely rigid. The title Tiruan, for instance, was sometimes higher (as in the Perot inscriptions), sometimes lower (as in the Argapura inscriptions) than the title Halaran. The same applies to the title Lampi with reference to Wadihati and Makudur. These facts do not, of course, prove a sort of degradation of the titles Tiruan and Lampi (although this would not be impossible); they would rather suggest

---

[50]) Or rather : the title Sikhalān is not mentioned in the list of the fourteen dignitaries in the Perot inscription. As a matter of fact, we do find Sikhalan mentioned after the list in a 10 and b 9. The same strange name, spelt also by the aspirate *kha*, occurs in line 2 of the Pĕndĕm inscription; cf. Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), p. 19.

[51]) The meanings of *pangil* and *palar* are, at least, closely related, the former meaning „to call", the latter „to look for, to hope". *Pangil* (or *palar*) *hyang* could mean „calling the gods" or something similar (cf., perhaps, Vedic *devahū?*). We are not as certain as some scholars were, that all these Rakai and Pamĕgĕt titles are originally toponymics; their use as toponymics (but then, never, it seems, as names of villages, but always as those denoting groups of villages, which may or may not have constituted geographical units; it is well-known that later Javanese princes used to avoid that the territories belonging to one nobleman constituted a geographical unity) might be secondary in many cases. The origin of the Rakai titles, probably to be referred to a remote past, cannot be traced except, perhaps, in a few isolated cases. The title Rakai Halu will be discussed in the Introduction to No. XI below.

that the hierarchy expressed by the titles depended not exclusively on the titles themselves, but also on the age of those bearing the titles. The three titles Lampi, Wadihati and Makudur were equivalent in rank, but the dignitary bearing the Lampi title was older than those bearing the Wadihati and Makudur titles in 850, but when, in 863, three other persons had inherited these titles, the Lampi was younger than the two others. This seems the most probable conclusion based on the comparison between the two documents. It is, moreover, confirmed if more documents from Central Java are taken into consideration. The order of the dignitaries is fixed only up to a certain extent, but free — i.e. fixed by considerations other than the intrinsic value of the titles, considerations such as the age of the persons bearing the titles — for the remaining part, i.e. within certain groups. Two groups of three dignitaries could easily be isolated from the other names, viz. the numbers 9-11 and 12-14. Then, there remain eight titles (Nos. 1-8) headed by the *patih*. In either case, this group of eight begins with the Rakais Wĕka and Sirikan and ends in Dalinan. It is impossible to decide whether this is only due to chance or to the fact that Wĕka and Sirikan are always the highest titles of the eight whereas Dalinan is the lowest one. If other inscriptions are taken into account, we conclude to the former alternative. Thus, in the Kĕḍu inscription dated 907 A.D. [52], the Wĕka is mentioned after instead of before the Sirikan and the Dalinan precedes instead of follows the Manghūri. Only a very detailed comparison, which would constitute a separate study, could establish whether there are any intrinsic rules as to the order of some of the titles; we may, however, conclude on account of the above that, if there are such rules, they may be crossed by other considerations.

Even this limited material enables us to make some conclusions which appear beyond doubt. The high dignitaries following the founder and the *ratu* (respectively the Rakai Patapān and the Rakai Pikatan in the Perot inscriptions and the Rakai Pikatan and the Rakai Kayuwaṅi in the Argapura inscriptions), form three groups composed of eight, three and three dignitaries respectively. The group of eight is the highest one; it is headed by the *patih*. They probably surround the king as the eight Lokapālas do with reference to Çiva, a symbolism found in hinduized courts even up to rather recent times [53]. The two groups of three dignitaries each are on a lower level. The former seem to be especially connected with the perception of the king's revenue [54], the latter might be associated with the ceremonies by

[52] Published by Stutterheim in *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 172-215. The names mentioned here occur in the transcription, pp. 206 sq., A, lines 10-12.

[53] Cf. the excellent survey with further references by Sir Richard Winstedt, *Kingship and Enthronement in Malaya*, *J. R. A. S.*, 1945, pp. 139-149 (reprint in *J. Mal. Br. R.A.S.*, XX, 1947, Pt. 1, pp. 129-139).

[54] The fact of this trad being regularly mentioned at the beginning of the lists of those forbidden to tread on temple grounds (cf. *supra*, p. 220) would be a hint in that direction.

means of which territories belonging to the civil administration by the king and his servants are inaugurated to become temple grounds [55].

The list of these dignitaries is followed by another list of people all included in the term *wadwā* (a 9 to 14; b 9 to 14). The titles of these persons, which are all preceded by the honorific article *sang*, prove that *wadwā* does not denote ordinary servants. There is no doubt that the persons mentioned after the dignitaries are the representatives of the latter, their 'spokesmen' (*parwuwus*, the term used in the Argapura inscriptions to denote the corresponding group; *parujar* is a synonym). We may be certain that the dignitaries did not do the work themselves; they would not probably have assisted at the foundation ceremonies, often far away. It would not even be too audacious to assume that these dignitaries, whose main activities may have consisted in „eating the land", as the Arthaçastra puts it, were not able to perform the various duties connected with the transfer of grounds from civil to religious administration, implying, among other formalities, dressing up acts. The dignitaries were therefore represented by presumably learned Brāhmaṇas [56], who took an active part in the foundation. We see from those documents which give a more or less detailed description of the inauguration ceremonies that the authorities themselves were not present, but the representatives were [57]. As might have been expected, the number of representatives agrees with that of the dignitaries : it also amounts

---

[55] We limit ourselves to this provisional statement, anticipating a more detailed research.

[56] That they were Brāhmaṇas (or, officially, considered as such; the caste system existed at least in theory in hinduized Java, but the practice probably was rather different from what we observe in India) may perhaps be concluded from the use of the 'article' *sang*, which is in a striking contrast to the use of *pu* preceding the names of the dignitaries mentioned before. As long as no detailed study about the use of these 'articles' is available, it is not safe to base conclusions on their use. There are, however, other arguments in favour of our surmise. A number of inscriptions issued during the reign of Balitung (898 ?-910) give far more detailed and systematic lists of these spokesmen; cf., e.g., the inscription of Raṇḍusari I, dated 905 (published by Stutterheim in *Inscr. Ned.-Indië*, I, 1940, pp. 3-28), where very detailed lists of 'spokesmen' (*parujar*), clerks (*citralekha*) and lower administrative (?) personnel (*pañurang*) are given (Pl. 1b, line 11, to Pl. 2a, line 5). There, the spokesmen and the clerks each have two names, the former preceded by *sang*, the latter by *pu*. Cf., for instance, Pl. 1b, line 15 : *parujar=i sirikan sang hujunggaluh pu ayuddha anakwanua i truwanban watak tirurāṇu.* Now we know from an almost contemporary record, that there was indeed a monastery in Hujunggaluh; cf. F. H. van Naerssen, *Twee koperen oorkonden van Balitung*, in *Bijdr. K. I.*, 95 (1937), pp. 441-461 the transcription of No. I, A, line 10 : *wihāra i hujung galuh.* It is not probable that the *sang* name of the *parujar* in the Raṇḍusari inscription should be dissociated from that of the monastery in the same period. In some other cases, too, some control is possible; we hope to deal with these in another context.

[57] This point appears clearly from those records in which a description of the inauguration ceremonies is given (e.g., Van Naerssen, *art. cit.*, Inscription II, A, line 11, to B, line 1; cf. Bosch, *Oudheidk. Versl.*, 1925, pp. 41-49, especially pp. 48 sq.). At the time of the ceremonies, the different authorities present take in their places, one group at the eastern side, another at the southern side etc. The dignitaries, we mean those bearing titles such as Rakai or Pameget, are not mentioned in that context,

to fourteen. As we already noted above, all of them are denoted by *sang,* a honorific article, followed by a name. As to these names, there might be some doubt whether we have real personal names here or titles derived from the places (perhaps monasteries, hermitages and similar sorts of dwelling) where these spokesmen used to stay. It cannot be denied that some of these names give the impression rather of names of monasteries etc. than of persons, especially *sang* Kamalagyan (a 13/14, b 14), *sang* Katuwuhan (a 14, b 14) and a few others [58]).

In this list of fourteen representatives, there is a slight irregularity since the Wadihati is not represented,—whereas the Makudur has two representatives. Moreover, this list is preceded by two persons (a 9/10, b 10) whose status is not clear. As a matter of fact, it is indicated by the words *anung mañasö i patapān milu,* „those who go to (?) Patapān, joining (the authorities mentioned before"). The main difficulty is connected with the uncertainty as to the exact meaning of *mañasö.* Words in the meaning of „going to", such as *mañasö, umañsö, umara, makna, mapara* and a few others, do not necessarily imply a regular movement from one place to another, but may refer to some form of dependence — i.e., the revenues and compulsory labour go from one place to another. This is certainly the meaning if it is stated that grounds or villages „go to" some authority, some foundation, an expression frequently found in Old Javanese inscriptions [59]). Then, the

---

but the representatives are seated at one side, facing the South in the text published by Van Naerssen and facing the East in that published by Bosch.

[58]) *Kamalagyan,* derived from *lagi,* „a while", seems to denote a temporary hermitage Its designation by „temporary" may not refer to the *ācrama* itself, but rather to the period during which the hermits stayed there, i.e. a place of temporary retreat (cf. *kalagyan* in *Nāgarakrĕt.* 75, 2, and 78, 6; "9,1). *Katuwuhan,* derived from *tuwuh,* „to grow", may mean „place of prosperity"; *hrĕtan,* derived from *hĕrĕt,* „to retain", may mean „a place where one has to stop, to stay"; *damilihan,* from *pilih,* „to choose": „a chosen place". Other names occurring in our text, such as *īwana,* „life", *talaga,* „pond", *ḍakukap,* the name of a tree, a sort of Artocarpos, often planted at more or less sacred spots (cf. the Old-Javanese *Rāmāyana,* XVI, 44), are less characteristic, but, at least, not in conflict with our interpretation.

[59]) Cf. O.J.O., XXXVIII (929 A.D), front side, line 5, where a number of grounds, the (annual) revenue in gold of which is mentioned, become temple domains in the future, „to depend on the holy *kahyañan* (a kind of sanctuary) at Panawán" *(manasĕa i sang hyang kahyañan i pañawān).* The consequence is that the inhabitants of the grounds are liberated from royal taxes, but get duties towards the *kahyañan,* viz. the obligation to furnish a sheep and a fixed quantity of rice (?) at the times of the yearly sacrifices *(mapañasĕa wdus 1 pāda 1 ankĕn kapūjān bhatāra i pañawān ing pratiwarsa;* Brandes' reading *wdu* instead of *wdus* is probably only a printing mistake). Cf. also O.J.O., XXV (905 A.D.), Front part, lines 7/8 : *mañasö i lumku,* „dependent on Lumĕku". — Expressions such as *tan tumamā,* „do not enter" (grounds etc.) do not mean, literally, that the persons to whom the words apply are forbidden to touch the grounds. The expression is always used with reference to those „claiming the king's property" *(mañilala drawya haji)* who are forbidden to continue their activities in the villages situated within temple grounds. The meaning is that the various collectors of taxes, exercising their unpopular activities in the

words *anung manasö i patapān milu* mean : „those who are dependent on (act on behalf of) Patapān"; the two persons about whom this statement is made are then representatives of the Rakai Patapān, the founder of the free grounds. The reason why they are mentioned at the end of the list of dignitaries could be easily understood : they represent the favoured party. For after all, the Rakai Patapān is the favoured one; he separates the grounds needed for his foundation from civil administration. The word *milu,* placed after the words *anung manasö i patapān,* denotes that the two persons are only loosely connected with the authorities mentioned before.

The exact status of the two persons cannot be inferred from the text. They might have been younger sons or relatives of the Rakai Patapān. In any case, they are not the subordinates of this dignitary, for a separate list of the latter is given in the passage from a 14 to 17 (= b 14 to 16); it is the *wadwā rakarayān patapān,* consisting of at least seven persons (it is not absolutely clear where the list ends). The list of seven persons is made up of five people denoted as *tuhān* followed by *ni* and further definitions, one secretary (*mangtaṇḍa*) and one spokesman (*parwuwus*). These servants are of a considerably lower rank than all those mentioned before. This appears clearly from the use of the 'article' *si* before their names [60].

If we try to represent us the status which the Rakai Patapān must have had, it is obvious that he must have had a considerable number of personnel at his disposal. The titles *mangtaṇḍa* and *parwuwus* need no comment; the function of the five *tuhāns* is, however, less clear. The term *tuhān* frequently occurs in Old Javanese inscriptions. It is never applied to high dignitaries, although it is also clear that the people denoted by *tuhān* are not 'commoners' either. A hint as to the status of *tuhāns* is given by the expression *sang tuhān mamuat wuwus* used to denote 'spokesmen' in several inscriptions [61]. Some people denoted by *tuhān* are regularly mentioned after some Pamĕgĕts Wa-

---

name of the king (who probably ceded these rights in exchange for regular payments, a system which remained in use in Java until Raffles introduced the landrent system of perceiving taxes, a system which only gradually extended over Java), had to cease their business on the grounds which had become free, i.e. attached to some foundation. The words *tan tumamā* could be rendered by „have no competency over". The meaning of *manasö* appears very clearly from K.O., I, first plate, line 15 : *Parujar i tiruan sumuḍan anak wanua ing kabikuan ing siddhakāryya manasö i ḍihyang,* „the spokesman of (the Pamĕgĕt) Tiruan, Sumuḍan, resident in the monastery (called) Siddhakārya dependent on the Diëng", cf. a similar expression in O.J.O. XXXVI, B (back), line 6. The monastery was probably situated outside the temple plateau, but fell under the competency of the Diëng authorities. Many derivatives of the root *asö* (or : *ansö*) occur in the Old Javanese inscriptions. One of the most frequent forms is *manaseakan,* „to give (to a person of higher rank)" with the passive form *inansean (inasean),* „(a higher person) is given (something)".

[60] The article *si* is used with all the persons who have no particular title; not only ordinary villagers (*anak wanua*) have it before their names, but also village elders (*rāma*) and other people not of a low position.

[61] Cf. the Kĕmbang Arum inscription (dated 824 Çaka, here corresponding to 903 A.D.), Plate III *b,* line 5 (Bosch, *Oudh. Versl.,* 1925, p. 44; cf. also p. 48). Cf. also the same inscription, Plate I, line 16.

dihati and Makudur, whom they probably served as assistants or spokesmen[62].
It is in any case clear that *tuhān* does not denote the lords bearing titles such
as Rakai or Pamĕgĕt, but those working immediately under their orders;
they are themselves chiefs over groups of lower servants. The lords „eating
the land" needed not only secretaries to make up acts of all kinds (the *mang-
taṇḍa* in our text), but also administrators of different groups. The text men-
tions two *tuhān ning nayaka*. The meaning of Sanskrit *nāyaka*, from which
the word is undoubtedly derived, is too vague to make a definition of the
function possible. From the designation as a whole one may infer that there
were many *nāyakas* in the service of one lord, but working under one chief.
A more common designation for the same function is *tuhān ning kanayakān*
or *juru ning kanayakān*[63]. The most important hint as to the meaning of
nāyaka in Old Javanese might be the fact that the *nāyakas* are usually men-
tioned at the beginning of the lists cf *manilala drawya haji*[64]. They are

---

[62] Cf. the inscription mentioned in the preceding note, Plate I, line 13 : *sang tuhān
ni wadihati 2 sang miramirah si rayung mangrangkapi sang halaran si rahula.........
sang tuhān ni makudur 2* etc.; K.O., I, first plate, lines 10 sq. and *passim*. — A diffe-
rent use of *tuhān* is found with reference to crafts; then the term seems to indicate
the independent craftsmen having others working under their orders. We find this
use mainly in inscriptions from Eastern Java in which the rights of craftsmen exer-
cising their professions in free territories are defined. Cf. O.J.O., LI, front, line 30 :
*anung tan knāna de sang manilala drabya haji tlung tuhān i sang masambyawahāra
ing sasima* (Brandes, wrongly, *sasama*), i.e. „those who are not subject to those
claiming the king's property, are three 'bosses' for each kind of crafts and trade in the
whole freehold". The point is that crafts and trade were not subject to taxation
by the king in free territories. If this principle was, however, carried through without
restrictions, the consequence would be that craftsmen and traders would leave the
ordinary villages to establish themselves within the bounds of free territcries, where
they could exercise their occupations without duties. In order to avoid that this should
happen, the rights of craftsmen and traders are limited in several ways. The most
important restriction is the fixation of the numbers of craftsmen and traders allowed
to exercise their activities on the free territories (usually, three independent 'bosses'
of each craft being admitted within the boundaries). Another restriction is that the
duties are not completely abolished; the inscriptions from Eastern Java often mention
detailed regulations by adding, for instance, that the amount of taxes normally due to
the king's servants is divided into three portions and one third goes to „those claiming
the king's property", whereas the remaining amount goes to the temple and its guardians
(cf. especially Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 65, 1925, pp. 274 sqq.).

[63] *Tuhān* and *juru* seem to have exactly the same meaning in these lists. Also *tuhān*
and *tuha* occur side by side.

[64] To be more precise, the *nāyakas* (together with *pratyayas*, *patihs*, *wahutas* and some-
times others, too) are usually mentioned just before these lists. A common formula
is : *tan katamāna dening patih wahuta rāma nāyaka pratyaya samgat nuniwaih sa-
prakāra ning manilala drabya haji*, „not to be trod upon by the *patihs*, *wahutas*,
village elders, *nāyakas*, *pratyayas*, Pamĕgĕts, and, still less, by all kinds of people
claiming the king's property" (cf., e.g., O.J.O., XXXVIII, front part, lines 14 and
15 ; we corrected a few minor lapses in the transcription by Brandes) ; another ex-
pression is *tan parabyāpāra* „not to be interfered with" (cf. Stutterheim, *art. cit.*, p.
234, line 4 of plate I*b*).

especially forbidden to interfere with the affairs of free-holds [65]. Probably, they were some local chiefs managing the affairs of greater lords; they might then be compared with the *bĕkĕls* in later times [66]. At present, it would not, however, be possible to define the function of a *nāyaka* with greater detail; it is not known, for instance, what the difference between a *nāyaka* and a *pratyaya* is [67]; also the *patih*s and *wahuta*s may often have had similar functions. In spite of such uncertainty, there does not seem to be any reasonable doubt about the status of these people as a group : all the titles mentioned above appear to denote different kinds of administrators acting in behalf of high-class persons.

Of the three other *tuhān*s, those of the *wadwā rarai*, *kalula* and *manapal* respectively, only the last item presents no real difficulty. *Manapal*, probably an orthography for *manapĕl*, is a derivative from *tapĕl*, „image, mask"; *manapal* would therefore mean „those who make images etc." [68] and the *tuhān ning manapal* would probably be a chief or a surveyor of sculptors etc. The meaning of the other two terms, *wadwā rarai* and *kalula*, is obscure. The literal meanings „groups of children" and „servants" do not bring us very far; if the explanation suggested for *manapal* is correct, there are reasons to suppose that also *wadwā rarai* and *kalula* are connected with crafts. The former might be connected with some handicraft frequently exercised by children, whereas the latter might denote potters (?) [39].

---

[65] Perhaps the most interesting locus with reference to the function of *nayaka*s in Old Javanese society is the Barabudur copper-plate dated 906 A.D., published by Bosch, *Oüdh. Versl.*, 1917, p. 88; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 186. In more recent times, the plate was discussed and translated by H. Bh. Sarkar, *J.G.I.S.*, VI (1939), pp. 124-130. Sarkar's interpretation of the text as a whole is the correct one: „The inscription records a difference of opinion between the *rāmantas* of Palĕpangan and the *nayaka*, viz., *bhagawanta* Jyotisa" *(ibid.*, p. 124). The difference of opinion concerned the amount of taxes (of different kinds). The village elders, considering the amount too high, applied to the Rakryān Mapatih and by order of the latter, the grounds were re-estimated with the result that the taxes were lowered. From the high title of the *nāyaka* (Bhagawanta is derived from Sanskrit *bhagavant*), we may conclude that the *nāyaka*s were by no means always lower-class people; their position may have been in relation with the authorities in whose name they acted.

[66] Cf. Van Vollenhoven, *Het adatrecht van Nederlandsch-Indië*, II (reprint in 1925), pp. 660 and *passim*.

[67] In the formulae such as those quoted in note 64 above, the *nāyaka*s are almost always mentioned together with *pratyaya*s. We may render the latter term by „men of confidence", but that gives only a slight indication as to their function. We adopted the interpretation by Coedès in *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), p. 93, according to which the *pratyaya*s would be connected with the administration of property of deceased people (in behalf of minor heirs or of the king?); in that case, the principal difference between *nāyaka*s and *pratyaya*s would consist in the former administrating living people's property and the latter taking care of the not yet inherited dead persons' estates. In this function, they could claim taxes etc. in a similar way as the *nāyaka*s.

[68] Cf. the detailed references to be mentioned in note 171 below.

[69] Cf. note 170 below (*kalula*) and note 169 (*wadwā rarai*). The group of people denoted by *tuhān* (or *tuha* or *juru*) followed by a further definition will be discussed separately.

. After these authorities, representatives and lower servants, there begins a completely different portion of the text in b 16 (a 17); from here to the end, a great number of representatives are enumerated, but representatives not of authorities but of villages. The enumeration is archaic if it is compared with the lists given in later inscriptions from the reign of Kayuwani on. In the latter cases, we find more or less systematic accounts of the village elders in the village(s) which is (are) to become free and of the representatives of neighbouring villages who act as witnesses. Here, however, no such distinction is made; the foundation village, Tulang Air, is nothing but one of the villages represented, although its importance is clearly marked by the relatively very great number of witnesses.

Before the ordinary villages, some important centres, the residences of authorities designated by the terms *patih* and *wahuta* are mentioned (b 16 to 19), viz. Kayumwunan (a *patih* with his spokesman, *parwuwus*), Mantyasih *(idem)*, Lwapandak (a *patih*), Pětir [70]) (a *wahuta* with two clerks), and Pandakyan (a *wahuta* with two assistants). The toponymics here mentioned occur in other Kědu inscriptions, too; they should be considered important centres, although one could only have a vague idea about the reason of their importance [71]).

The village where the foundation takes place, Tulang Air, is represented by (probably) twenty people [72]); the latter are immediately followed by about thirty [72]) representatives of other villages. If the importance of the foundation is in some relation with the number of villages represented, it is obvious that the foundation was an important one — a point which is in a striking contrast to the smallness of the temple, Tjandi Perot, in the immediate neighbourhood of which the two inscriptions were discovered [73]).

Other titles such as *tuhān ning lampuran*, usually mentioned in these lists, do not occur here.

[70] Spelt *patir*. Since other texts spell the name *ptir* (cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, p. 154), the *a* in the first syllable probably represents an *ě*. A village named Pětir-rědjo still occurs in the immediate neighbourhood of Tjandi Perot; cf. the Topographical Map, No. 46/XL D.

[71] References to the occurrence of these names are given in *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 152-155. Mantyasih was probably situated at about a mile's distance to the North of the present village Kědu (*ibid.*, p. 158). — The importance of the centres mentioned might be connected with their geographical situation, which is of a considerable strategic interest. The present regency Těmangung dominates the communications between the fertile plains in the South of Central Java and both the coast and the Diëng plateau. Especially the great Kědu inscription of Balitung, dated 907 A.D., gives a hint to the importance of this region. There have certainly been other factors, too, but they are more difficult to be ascertained. We especially suggest the possibility of historical factors; there is some reason to suppose that there was a dynastic, Çaiva, centre in these regions during the Çailendra domination in Southern Central Java; the Gandasuli inscription (*Pras. Indon.*, I, No. IV) might give a hint in this direction.

[72] Owing to numerous small lacunae in the transcription, the exact numbers cannot be ascertained.

[73] Krom, *Inleiding* 2, I, pp. 208 sqq. Another small temple, Tjandi Pringapus is situated

The functions of the representatives are always added. Among the representatives of Tulang Air, we find well-known (or rather : often mentioned) indications such as *rāma* (village elder), *kalima* („fifth", but the function denoted by this expression is unknown) [74], *parwuwus* (spokesman), *wariga* (village astrologist), *tuha banua* (literally : village elder, but the term is always distinguished from *rāma ;* the *tuha banua* constitute a separate group among the *rāmas*) [75], *tuhālas* (surveyor of the woods) [76], and *mapěkan* (i.e. *mapěkěn,* surveyor of the market). Other functions are less frequently found in inscriptions. We here find *juru limus,* „surveyor of fine metal work" (?) [77]; *silijuru* seems to be a compound of *silih* and *juru ;* such compounds are unusual, but not without parallels [78]. The meaning would be „acting *juru*", i.e. somebody replacing the regular *juru. Jurukuñci* gives no difficulty ; it was undoubtedly a sort of guardian.

A few terms are connected with irrigation. *Hulair,* a contraction of *hulu air* was probably charged with the distribution of the water supply over the rice-fields [79]. *Matamwak* (b 23), derived from *tamwak* (*tambak*), „dam" (in a river), would denote the village elder charged with the supervision of a larger water work [80]. The meaning of *mula* (b 23) in this context is not clear.

Among the other terms occurring in the text, we note *hulu tangnah* (i.e. *těnah*) [81], „chief of the centre", whatever that means [82], and especially the *marhyang ing prasāda ing kabanyagān* (b 34 [83]), „the priest (?) [84] in the

---

at only a hundred meter's distance; Krom rightly considers the possibility that our text should be referred to the latter temple instead cf to Tjandi Perot (*op. cit.,* I, p. 210).

[74] One might, for instance, suppose that the original number of the *rāmas* was four, but that a fifth elder might be added to this number for a special purpose.

[75] These *tuha wanua* should probably be compared with the *marakaki* (synonyms: *měrkaki, pantjakaki, tuwa-tuwa, kamituwa, winituwa, pinituwa, wong tuwa, tuwa désa*) in the later Javanese village organization; cf. Van Vollenhoven, *op. cit.,* pp. 527 sqq. They are possessors of grounds in the village, who transferred their rights to their heirs but played an important role in the village, where they were consulted in difficult questions; having no more ground property, they could be considered disinterested.

[76] A contraction of *tuha alas;* cf. *infra, hulair,* a contraction of *hulu air.*

[77] Cf. Stutterheim, *T.B.G.,* LXV (1925), p. 248, and the references given there.

[78] Cf. the examples in Van der Tuuk's Dictionary, III p. 239, sv. *silih* III.

[79] For modern equivalents, cf. Van Vollenhoven, *op. cit.,* p. 534.

[80] For *tambak,* cf. the references *infra* No. XI.

[81] For this orthography, cf. *supra,* p. 214.

[82] We do not think a connection with *tanah rumah* (*supra,* p. 29, note 39 to the translation) likely. Some village functions were, however, distinguished into the centre and the four main directions; cf. such distinctions for *gusti,* among whom there is a *gusti těnah* in the second Randusari inscription, line 5, edition by Stutterheim in *Inscr. Ned.-Indië,* I (1940), p. 29 and p. 32.

[83] Read : *prāsāda ing kabanyāgān ;* the latter term is derived from Sanskrit *banyāga* with the affixes *ka-* and *-an.*

[84] The exact meaning of *marhyang* is doubtful, although its derivation from *hyang,*

temple of the merchant guild" ; one concludes that there must have been an establishment of merchants, who had their own temple, in the neighbourhood. The text does not make it clear whether these merchants were Javanese or foreign ; the use of the term *kabanyagān,* pointing to a separate group of merchants, suggests the latter possibility ; the term reminds one of the foreign merchants quarters known from rather ancient times [85].

A great number of villages are mentioned in the text. Quite a few of these are known from other inscriptions, viz. Parang, Kakalyan, Tulang Air, Kayumwuñan, Kaṇḍañan, Samalagi, Muṅgu, Muṅgu-antan, Wunha and Sulangkuning [86].

Transcription [87]

a

1. çrī [88]
2. swasti . çakawarṣātīta
3. 772 āṣāḍamāsa tithi dwitīyā .

„divinity", with the prefix *mar-* is clear; cf. also the term *parhyañan* to denote a sanctuary. In an inscription dated 842 A.D., published in *Pras. Indon.,* I (1950), pp. 79-95, somebody is denoted by *marhyang sthāpaka* (line 9/10); cf. *op. cit.,* p. 94, where it is noted that the *marhyangs* are sometimes connected with different directions (just as the *gustis* sometimes are; cf. note 82 above). In any case, the *marhyangs* have some temple functions, although their special activities are unknown.

[85]) A regular Tamil guild is known to have existed at Barus, Sumatra; cf. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, *A Tamil merchant-guild in Sumatra, T.B.G.,* 72 (1932), pp. 314-27. Another Tamil establishment existed in Takuapa on the West coast of the Malay peninsula in the 9th century A.D.; Nilakanta Sastri *(Journ. Mal. Br. R.A.S.,* XXII. 1949, Pt. 1, pp. 25-30) concludes *(art. cit.,* p. 30) that there must have been a good number of Tamils including soldiers and merchants in this time, the latter dependent on the Manikkiraman, a term derived from Sanskrit *vaṇiggrāma,* a merchant guild frequently mentioned in South Indian inscriptions.

[86]) E.g., Wunha in the inscription mentioned in note above (cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, 1950, p. 155); references to Kayumwuñan are given *ibid.,* pp. 152 sq.; Tulang Air, Samalagi and Sulangkuning occur in the Kĕḍu inscription *(ibid.,* p. 156); Kakalyan in the Gaṇḍasuli inscription *(ibid.,* p. 59). A village called Parang occurs in K.O., I, Plate 3, line 3. A Muṅgu-antan is mentioned in O.J.O., XVIII, lines 3 and 6; it might have been a „daughter village" [*antan* is undoubtedly a 'pseudo-krama' form of *ari,* „younger brother or sister"; cf. Poerbatjaraka in *T.B.G.,* 72 (1932), pp. 192 sqq.; it is curious that in O.J.O. XVIII the title of the founder is (Pamgat) Muṅgu]; Kaṇḍañan is mentioned in the Karangtĕñah inscription (line 50; cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, p. 41). Some of these villages could be localised (cf. the scheme, *op. cit.,* p. 159). A few names may be found back on modern maps, e.g. Kaṇḍañan to the north of Tĕmaṅgung (Top, map 47/XL C; cf. *Rapp. Oudh. Dienst,* 1914-15, p. 283, No. 921).

[87]) Although *a* and *b* are identical in their essentials, a complete transcription is preferable, especially in view of the numerous slight differences in spelling and other details.

[88]) This beginning does not occur in *b.* As a rule, the differences between the two recensions are referred to in the notes to the transcription of *b,* which gives the more complete text.

4. suklapakṣa [89]) . tu . pa · ā . wāra hana ryy=umaḥnya ta-
5. tkāla rakai patapān pu manukū manusuk sīma i tulang air. ra-
6. tu tatkāla rakai pikatan [90]). patiḥ rakai wka pu puluwatu . sirikan pu sarwwa .
7. tiruan pu mahantara . maṅuhuri pu landuta . halaran pu maddhawa . palarhyang pu
8. wairawa . wlaḥhan pu tugū . dalinan=pu manū . pangkur=pu agra . tawān=pu mulung . tirip=pu ga-
9. da . lampi pu manglakṣa . wadihati pu manawan · makudur=pu raja . anung maṅasĕ i patapā-
0. n milu sikhalān rua pu bhadra . pu tumak . ḍatar=pu arka wadwā rakarayān=mapatiḥ milu
1. sang ḍakalang . i sirikan sang garawuy . i tiruan sang talaga . i maṅuhuri sang katu-
2. ḍaing . i halaran sang jīwaṇa . i palarhyang sang ḍamiliḥhan . i wlaḥhan sang ḍakukap . i dali-
3. nan sang hrĕtan . i paṅkur sang ḍakampak . i tawān sang ḍawamlar . i tirip sang
4. kamalagyan . i lampi sang damalung . wahuta makudur sang ka- tuwuḥhan · sang ḍaragang wadwā raka-
5. rayān patapān tatkāla taṇḍa [91]) si maṇḍi tuhān=ning kanayakān rua si gandha si da-
6. *mo* . parwwuwus si mangdana . tuhān=ning wadwā rarai si çrīdhara . tuhān=ning kalula si jaha . tuhān=ning ma-
7. napal si uliḥhan . patiḥ wanua kayumwuṅan si jāntan [92]) mantyāsiḥ si jakkhāra parwuwus-
8. nya punta pramāna si gaṇḍaḥ punta sḍang si murana lwapaṇḍak si mandiha wahuta pati-
9. r si hayu . jurunya si saisa . rāmanya si rutung . paṇḍakyan si sanā . jurunya si maring
0. kalima si nihān [93]). i tulaṇg air juru limus si balubu rāma si tārawana kalima
1. . . . . . [94])

b

1. // swasti çakawarṣātīta
2. 772 āsādhamāsa [95]) tithi dwitīya

[') Read : çuklapakṣa.
[') For the word separation, cf. the Introduction.
[) Inscription b (line 15) reads mataṇḍa here.
[³) The reading does not seem doubtful; b, however, reads dhantan (line 17).
[') Inscription b (line 19) reads nahan here.
[') From iine 21 on, only some isolated words could be deciphered ; as far as these few fragments permit us to judge, the text seems to agree with that of inscription b.
[') Read : āṣādhamāsa; cf. also dwitīya instead of dwitīyā in this same line and, in line

3. suklapakṣa . tu . pa . ā . wāra hana ryy=umahnya [96]) tatkā-
4. la rakai patapān pu manukū manusuk=ṣema [97]) i tulang ai-
5. r ratu tatkāla rakai pikatan . patiḥ rakai wka pu puluwatu .
6. sirikan pu sarwwa . tiruan pu mantara . mañahuri [98]) pu manduta . halaran pu
7. madhāwa [99]). palarhyang pu wairawa . wlaḥhan pu tuṅgū . dalinan pu manū . pangkur pu a-
8. gra [100]). tawān pu mulung. tirip pu gadā . langpi pu manglakṣa [101]). wadihati pu manawan . maku-
9. dur pu gadā . anung mañasö i patapān milu sikhalān [102]) karua pu bhadra pu tuma-
10. k ḍatar pu aku wadwā rakarayān mapatiḥ milu sang ḍakalang [103]). i sirikan sang garawuy [104]) i <ti-> [105])
11. ruan sang talaga i mañuhuri sang katuḍaing i halaran sang jiwana i palarhyang sang ḍa-
12. miliḥhan i wlaḥhan sang ḍakukap i dalinan sang hrětan i pangkur sang ḍakampa-
13. k [106]) i tawān sang ḍawamlar [107]) i tirip sang kamalagyan i lampi sang damalung [108]) wahu-

---

3, *suklapakṣa* instead of *çuklapakṣa*. — The third figure of the date was read 5 by Brandes in *O. J. O.*, No. VI. The correct reading was, however, given by Damais in *T. B.G.*, 83 (1949), p. 18.

[96]) It is not at all certain whether there is an *r* above the *ya;* this seems, however, likely in view of the *ya* which was doubled.

[97]) Read *manusuk = ṣīma;* the *e* might be due to a confusion with *kṣema*.

[98]) In a 7: *mañuhuri;* cf. also the same spelling of the name in b 11. The spelling *mañahuri*, which we find in b 6, is probably due to a lapse. The word undoubtedly corresponds to *manghūri* in numerous other records.

[99]) Brandes: *manawang*. We see in the second akṣara of this line a *dha* to which a daṇḍa is attached; a detail which is conclusive in our opinion is the fact that the two first verticals are clearly closed at the bottom. The reading of a 7 is *maddhaṛa*, which is only an orthographic variant.

[100]) We see unambiguous traces of the initial *a*, omitted by Brandes, at the end of line 7.

[101]) Brandes : *lang pisumanglakṣa*. *Langpi* is only a different spelling of *lampi*, the name occurring in a 9, a 14 and b 13. We think that the anusvāra (expressed by ⁻ng in our transcript of Old Javanese records) is used to denote the homorganic nasal (as is usual in inscriptions from India), not the guttural. The comparison makes it clear that the word separation adopted by Brandes is not correct. In addition, the syllable which follows *pi* is undoubtedly *pu*, not *su*.

[102]) Brandes: *si lalān*. The *kha*, though resembling a *la*, seems perfectly clear. *Sikhaiān* is a title known from other inscriptions (cf. note 162 to the Translation).

[103]) Brandes: *sang pu kalang* (the second word printed in italics).

[104]) The patèn *(virāma)* is written below instead of above the *ya;* cf. the Introduction, *supra*, p. 212.

[105]) The syllable *ti* was already added by Brandes.

[106]) Brandes *-t*, which would not be impossible.

[107]) Brandes' reading *ḍagumlar* looks less strange than *ḍawamlar* in our transcript; the latter reading agrees, however, better with the traces visible in the stone.

[108]) Possibly : *ḍamulung;* Brandes had transcribed: *sang da ma(ng)yung*.

14. ta makudur sang katuwuhhan sang ḍaragang wadwā rakarayān patapān tatkā-

15. la maṅgtaṇḍa [109]) si maṇḍi tuhān=ning nayaka rua si bhantu si damo parwwuwus si mangdana tuhān=ning

16. wadwā rarai si çrīdhara tuhān=ning kalula si niha tuhān=niṅg manapal sy=ulihan . patiḥ [110]) wa-

17. nua kayumwuṅan si dhantan mantyasiḥ si jakkhara [111]) parwuwusnya punta pramāṇa si gandaḥ punta [112]).

18. sḍang [113]) si muranā [114]) lwapaṇḍak si mandiha wahuta patir si [115]) hayu jurunya si saisa

19. rama si rutuṅg paṇḍakyan si sana jurunya si maring [116]) kalima si nahan i tulang air ju-

20. ru limus si balubuṅg rama si tarawaṇa kalima si jana silijuru [117]) si rgga [118]) parwuwus si pasa-

21. t wariga si ñcung [119]) i tulang air juru kuñci si sayut rama si kesawa kalima si

22. bhānu [120]) silijuru si kala parwuwus si wuri wariga si dhasa tuha banua si bañcung si nana [121])

23. .... [122]) sang si warā si ḍaṇḍa ..ra [123]) si jantra hulair si layar matamwak si tamuy mula [124])

---

[109]) Perhaps Brandes' reading *mataṇḍa* should be preferred; the anusvāra is very undistinct.

[110]) The word *ṗatih*, cleary visible on the stone, was probably overlooked by Brandes.

[111]) Brandes: *mi rkkha (sic)*. The reading given in our transcript seems certain. The name, which is more often found in Javanese inscriptions, is neither Sanskrit nor Old Javanese. Both the spelling and the trisyllabic form make the impression of being non-Indonesian. It looks like Prakrit or Pāli (a corrupt form corresponding to a Sanskrit *bījākṣaṛa* or *vidyākṣara* with the loss of the first syllable?).

[112]) Brandes: *gandha*. Both the *pasaṅan ḍa* (not *dha*) and the visarga are clear.

[113]) Brandes: *sṭhang;* the *ḍa* seems clear.

[114]) Brandes: *muraba-* (without word separation from the following). The name *muranā* (written by a dental nasal) is strange again.

[115]) This word is omitted in the transcription by Brandes.

[116]) Brandes : *masi*, which is not correct.

[117]) Brandes adopted a different word separation and took the syllables *sili* to belong to the name which precedes. The term *silijuru* occurs again in line 22; as to its meaning, cf. note 179 below.

[118]) *Sic;* the strange orthography may represent *rĕga* in which the pĕpĕt was left out; since the consonant then followed the *r*, it was doubled.

[119]) This spelling may indicate *ĕñcuṅg*. There exists no akṣara to express an initial *ĕ* in Old Javanese.

[120]) Brandes: *ganung*, which is not exact. For *sili°*, cf. note 117 above.

[121]) This name is omitted in the transcription by Brandes.

[122]) Three, possibly four, akṣaras have completely disappeared from the stone. The only detail still visible is the anusvāra mark above the last akṣara in the lacuna. *Saṅg* cannot be the well-known article here, but is the end of a name (*....ṅgsang*).

[123]) There may be a vowel mark for *-u* under the *ra*. The preceding syllable, which is seriously damaged, might be *ju*. The correct reading is probably *juru*.

[124]) This word is omitted in the transcription by Brandes.

24. si taguḥ paḍahi manggala si manūt mapakan si mulyang tuhalas sy==
awit hulu

25. tangṅaḥ [125]) si dawa macaru [126]) si naraṇ [127]) jumput ing [128]) çrī
maṇḍaki [129]) si ṇiru [130]) ri kuñci si siga . ing

26. prasiñaṇg ing limus [131]) si krahu i parang [132]) si sanā ing paṇiṇg si
tawang ing kakalyan [133]) si mi-

27. liḥ ing tiwrus [134]) si haryyang [135]) anak ring sīma ing [136]) tulang air [137])
ing krodha [138]) si dhura ing air=pa-

28. pi si pagar si paña ing kakar si paḍar ing limus watu [139]) si sañjanā
ing talang ai-

29. r [140]) si malini ing ṃanāha si guwasang i kayu...u...n=si............... [141])
ing kaṇḍaṅan si mu-

---

[125]) The akṣara ṅa is usually doubled by putting an anusvāra on the top of the preceding
akṣara; one might therefore transcribe taṅṅah. The double consonant often serves to
indicate the pronunciation as a pĕpĕt of the a which precedes. Then, tangṅaḥ, which
looks rather strange, is nothing but a particular method of expressing the pĕpĕt sound
without making use of the separate vowel sign.

[126]) The ca, omitted by Brandes, is clear on the stone.

[127]) It is certain that there is another akṣara after the ra, to which a virāma is attached;
the akṣara itself is however undistinct; its lower part resembles that of the na.

[128]) Brandes: i; the anusvāra is certain.

[129]) Brandes: çrī maṇḍakini. The stone gives no trace of ni. Brandes probably recognized
the well-known name of the Gaṅgā, but it should have been spelt by dentals
(Mandākinī).

[130]) Brandes read juri, which he corrected to juru.

[131]) Brandes: limut. The last akṣara is clearly a sa with virāma. The anusvāra of prasiñaṇg
is very uncertain.

[132]) Brandes: saraṇg, which is not correct.

[133]) Brandes: wrongly transcribed kakabyan. The la is certain.

[134]) Brandes: tiwran. The suku below the wra is perfectly clear; the last akṣara is un-
doubtedly a sa with virāma.

[135]) Brandes: haysima, which is impossible. Probably, Brandes mistook the ya (with a
pasaṅan ya below and an r above, for the ligature ysi. No traces of a ma are visible.

[136]) Thsee words were left open by Brandes. Their reading is not doubtful.

[137]) The ai has almost disappeared from the stone; its lower part, however, enables us
to identify it.

[138]) The word krodha was left open by Brandes.

[139]) Here, again, Brandes transcribed limut instead of limus.

[140]) One would be inclined to correct tulang air, but this is uncertain. Cf. note 197 below.

[141]) In line 29-34, there are more or less considerable portions in the middle of the stone,
where hardly any traces of akṣaras are recognizable. The lacunae are however less great
than it would appear from the transcription by Brandes. The beginning and the end
of the lines are well preserved and sometimes a few akṣaras may be identified within
the damaged part. — In line 29, we may recognize the name Kayumwuṅan in the
damaged portion. The reading kayu is certain; of the next akṣara only the suku can
be identified; since its place is lower than usual, we conclude that there are two
akṣaras one above the other, which we indicated in the transcript by two points. The
following akṣara has completely disappeared, but the next one could be identified
as a na with virāma.

0. lya ...wus [142]) hyang tir̃u... [143]) ing prasāda si wanasi juru ....
    .... kalima si
1. siga parwuwus sang *hada* juru ing .. la .... *walahhan* si .... [144])
    juru ing samala-
2. gi si tala .... juru i muṅgu si
    pangsat
3. kalima si jati juru i*ng* wunha si .... rama si napal
    mapakan ing
4. muṅgu antan si laya .... hāt marhyaṅg [145]) ing prasāda ing
    kabanyagān si ka-
5. ṇḍi hulu wras [146]) si marowa*ng* juru ing air=pyal [147]) si huwus rāma
    si rutus [148]) juru ing ai-
6. r=hulu si milar rama si taṅguh juru i*ng* sulangkuning si [149]) bantal
    i *masa*lañcang [150])
7. .... kalang i lu.u... *si* .... // (*end*)

Translation[151])

[1] Hail! In the evolved Çaka year 772, [2] in the month Āṣāḍha, he second lunar day [3] of the bright half of the month, on the weekdays 'ungle, Paing and Sunday [152]), while the ..... (?) is in its home (?) [153]). On that

---

[42]) The first syllable of this word consists of a ligature; there might be a vowel mark to indicate -e before the ligature. We have no idea about the word which could have been here.

[43]) Possibly: *tiruan;* the last akṣara seems to be provided with a virāma

[44]) Possibly, the village name *tulang* *nir* was written after the words *juru ing.* We then expect a name followed by *ing;* then follows the word *walahhan* and, after that, again a name preceded by *si.* Such a restitution, though not unlikely, remains however conjectural.

[45]) Brandes: *matya.* The readin*g* *marhyang* is certain. The word *kabanyagān,* a little further in this line, is wrongly spelt by a dental *n.*

[46]) Brandes: ...*luwas.* Our reading is not doubtful.

[47]) Brandes: *aipyal.* The *layar* above *pya* is distinct.

[48]) Brandes: *nutus.* Since the suku, if attached to the akṣara *ra,* is not put right under the *ra* (presumably in order to avoid the syllable *ru* being expressed as a single long vertical), but a little to the right, it is easily confounded with *nu.*

[49]) Brandes: *salangkung ni.* The village name Sulangkuning, which is known from other inscriptions, too (cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, 1950, p. 159), is clearly visible here.

[50]) Perhaps: *mamalañcang,* which looks slightly more acceptable as a village name.

[51]) Only inscription *b,* which gives the more complete text, is translated here.

[52]) The date corresponds to the 15th of June, 850 A.D. (Damais, *B.E.F.E.O.,* XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, pp. 30 sq.). Tungle is the first day of the six days' week, Paing the first of the five days' week.

[53]) The expression *hana ryy=umahnya,* placed at the end of the date, certainly refers to an astronomical detail, perhaps to the place of the sun. The expression could be used for the solstices, where the sun is supposed to remain for some days before changing its course. Stutterheim *(T.B.G.,* 74, 1943, p. 86) also translates „(de zon) in zijn huis zijnde" (the sun being in its home), but adds no explanation as to the

date, [4] the Rakai Patapān (named) Pu Manukū founds a free-hold [154]) in (the village) Tulang Air [155]).

[5] The king at that time is the Rakai Pikatan: the *patih* [156]) is the Rakai Wĕka (named) Pu Puluwatu ; [6] the Sirikan : Pu Sarwa, the Tiruan : Pu Mantara [157]); the Mañahuri [158]): Pu Manduta ; the Halaran : Pu [7] Madhāwa [159]); the Palarhyang : Pu Wairawa ; the Wĕlahan : Pu Tuṅgū ; the Dalinan : Pu Manū [159]) ; the Pangkur : Pu [8] Agra ; the Tawān : Pu Mulung ; the Tirip : Pu Gada ; the Lampi : Pu Manglakṣa ; the Wadihati : Pu Manawan ; the Maku[9]dur : Pu Raja [160]).

Those who are dependent on Patapān, joining (the ceremonies ?) [161]),

---

meaning of these words. The date of the Perot inscription comes rather close to the date of the summer solstice. By means of the tables given by Van Wijk in *Acta Orient.*, II, (1942), pp. 247 sqq. (Tables VI and VII), the beginning of the Karkasaṃkrānti in the year K.Y. evolved 3951 is dated 50,574 + 123,838 = 174,412, i.e. the afternoon of June 23, i.e. slightly more than a week after the date of our text. For the Argapura inscription, where the same expression occurs, the distance is considerably greater. We have no certainty about the date of the inscription of Krapyak (Stutterheim, *loc. cit.*). The meaning of the words *hana ryy=umahnya* therefore still remains obscure.

[154]) Cf. note 39 above.

[155]) The name perhaps means „Bone Water".

[156]) It is evident that *patih* denotes a very high function here, probably the same as in later times. In that meaning, the older inscriptions almost always use *Rakarayān Mapatih (rakryān mapatih);* cf. the Introduction.

[157]) Inscription a reads Mahantara. Unless the akṣara *ha* was omitted in *b*, which does not seem probable, the comparison between the two versions suggests that the *h* became evanescent between two *as* as early as the 9th century A.D.

[158]) The title probably corresponds to Manghūri in later records.

[159]) For the orthographies of these names, cf. the Introduction.

[160]) For the dignitaries and their titles, cf. the Introduction.

[161]) We think that the meaning of *milu*, „joining", is not that the three people mentioned join the authorities, who are on too high a level to assist at the inauguration ceremonies, but that they join those executing these ceremonies. We mean that the people mentioned in the lists which follow are those who actually go to the village Tulang Air on the inauguration day to represent the Rakai Patapān. Bosch, *Oudh. Versl.* p. 48, called attention to the elaborate lists given in the Kĕmbang Arum inscription, from which it appears beyond doubt that only the representatives of the authorities were present at the ceremonies; the statement by Bosch implying that there is one exception to this rule, viz. the Makudur who would actually be present, is open to doubt; it is undoubtedly based upon the presumption that *sang wahuta hyang kudur* (mentioned in III-a-13) is the same person as the Makudur, named Pu Sambrada (mentioned in I-11/12). The *wahuta* is, however, a lower function, never mentioned in the lists of high authorities; he probably was one of the assistants of the Makudur mentioned in I-13 *(sang tuhān ni makudur).* The title *sang makudur* in III-a-14 is undoubtedly this same assistant who was mentioned in the preceding line, but with an abbreviated title; it appears clearly from III-*b*-5 (the words *sinusuk sang wahuta hyang kudur)* that it is the *wahuta hyang kudur* (and not the Pamĕgĕt mentioned in the list of authorities), who has a function during the ceremonies, probably that of pronouncing the *sumpah* or *çapatha.* — In view of the above considerations, we think that *milu* could be translated by „(those who) actually go". For the translation of *manasö*, cf. note 59 to the Introduction.

are: the two (representatives of) Sikhalān [162]), viz. Pu Bhadra and Pu Tuma[10]k and (the representative of) Ḍatar [163]): Pu Aku.

The servant of the Rakarayān [164]) Mapatih, joining (the ceremonies), is Sang Ḍakalang [165]), of the Sirikan: Sang Garawuy, of the Ti[11]ruan

---

[162]) Sikhalān occurs as a title in the Argapura inscriptions, too (inscription *b*, line 5: *tiruan pu sapi sikhalān pu lamuñjang)*; cf. also the beginning of the Pĕṇḍĕm inscription (transcribed by Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83, 1949, p. 19): *tatkāla rake sikhalān pu hāmā manusuk șī<ma>*. It is probably the name of a place or of an administrative unity dependent on Patapān.

[163]) A village Ḍatar is mentioned in K.O., No. I, Pl. 1. line 11: *anak banua i ḍatar watak ḍatar.* The same village name occurs in an unpublished inscription in the Djakarta Museum (No. D 35), viz. in line 2: *tatkāla rakarayān kalangwatu pu banā manusuk sīma i ḍatar.* On account of other place names mentioned in the latter text, the village should probably be localized in the Tĕmaṅgung region.

[162]) *Wadwā,* also spelt *waduā* in inscriptions, denotes the servants as a group and also the army. In this case, it appears from the context (especially from the use of the rather honorific *sang* before the names of the persons following) that those comprised by *wadwā* are persons of some rank, probably representatives *(parujar* or *parwuwus).* Each authority, to begin with the *patih,* is represented. The *rakarayān mapatih,* mentioned in line 10, is, of course, the same authority as the *patih* in line 5 above; the use of the more elaborate title in line 10 is easily explained by the fact that a number of lower *patihs* (whose names are preceded by the 'article' *si* only) are mentioned in lines 16 sqq.; in line 5, however, there would not be any chance of misunderstanding.

[163]) Some of the names have the honorific prefix *ḍa-;* for the latter and for these in general, cf. the Introduction.

[164]) The reading of this name is uncertain; cf. note 107 to the transcription.

[165]) It clearly appears from this list that these two *wahutas* are of the same rank as the representatives mentioned before; they are about in the same relation to the Makudur as the other representatives are to the other authorities. The Makudur has two such representatives, whereas the Wadihati has none. For *wahuta,* cf. the passage in the Kĕmbang Arum inscription quoted in note 181 above: the *wahutas* here mentioned seem to have the same function as the *sang wahuta hyang kudur* in the Kĕmbang Arum inscription. The latter is charged with the pronounciation of the imprecation formula (III-*a*-14: *mamangmang manumpah manapatai)* menacing any future violators of the rights of the free territory. The exact meaning of *wahuta,* a term very frequently found in inscriptions (cf. also *infra,* line 14), is obscure; they are subordinates of higher authorities, but not necessarily of low rank; just as for the *parujars,* their rank probably depended upon whom they served or represented. We note the same for the *patihs.* The original meaning of the term might be „executor of orders" (Stutterheim, *T.B.G.,* 74, 1934, note 3 to p. 290, and *Inscr. Ned.-Ind.,* I, 1940, p. 32); this might explain why not only the highest dignitary after the king, but also not very high functionaries such as those mentioned in lines 16 sqq. are denoted by *patih:* the former executes the king's orders, the latter those of local chiefs. *Patihs* and *wahutas* are very often mentioned together and their functions were, therefore, probably closely related. There existed several pairs of functions in Old Javanese society; other examples are *nāyaka* and *pratyaya, pañurang* and *kĕring, tapahaji* and *airhaji* (and numerous other examples especially in the lists of the *mañilala drawya haji).* We may consider both *patihs* and *wahutas* representatives of the king and the higher authorities such as Rakais and Pamĕgĕts, in whose name they possessed civil cr (and) military power; they must have been all over the coun-

Sang Talaga, of the Manahuri : Sang Katuḍaing, of the Halaran : Sang
Jīwana, of the Palarhyang : Sang Ḍa[12]milihan, of the Wĕlahan : Sang
Ḍakukap, of the Dalinan: Sang Hĕrĕtan, of the Pangkur: Sang Ḍakampa[13]k,
of the Tawān : Sang Ḍawamlar [164]), of the Tirip : Sang Kamalagyan, of
the Lampi : Sang Damalung ; the wahu[14]tas of Makudur [165]) are Sang
Katuwuhan and Sang Ḍaragang.

The servants of the Rakarayān Patapān at that time [15] are : the
secretary [166]): Si Maṇḍi, the two chiefs [167]) of the nayakas : si Bhantu and
si Damo, the representative [168]): si Mangdana, the chief of the youthful
servants (?) [169]): si Çrīdhara, the chief of the potters (?) [170]): Si Niha, the
chief of the sculptors (?) [171]): Si Ulihan.

---

try, especially in the more important centres. It seems impossible to go into further
details; as is the case with many other terms denoting functions in Old-Javanese re-
cords, any attempt at too great a precision is almost certainly doomed to failure.

[166]) Mangtaṇḍa, usually mataṇḍa, is derived from taṇḍa, „seal, banner". For the former
meaning, cf. the well-known expressions tinaṇḍa ġaruḍamukha, „sealed with the Ga-
ruḍa head" in edicts issued by the king Airlaṅga, tinaṇḍa narasiṅha, „sealed with
the man-lion" in edicts by Jayabhaya, etc. The mataṇḍa probably denotes the man
who seals the letters, orders, etc., and probably writes them, too, in this case, in the
name of the Rakarayān Patapān.

[167]) Tuhān=niṅ nayaka, — a more usual expression is tuhān (or: tuha, juru) niṅ
kanayakān. Cf. the notes 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66 and 67 to the Introduction.

[168]) Probably not the representative of the Rakai Patapān, for whom the article si would
not be fitting, but rather a clerk representing the two tuhāns or the mataṇḍa. The
direct representatives of the Rakarayān Patapān are probably those mentioned in
lines 9 sq. above.

[169]) The exact meaning of this function and the two next ones is obscure. For wadwā,
cf. note 162 above ; rarai, corresponding to lare in modern Javanese, means „child-
ren" so that the title as a whole would literally mean : „chief of the group of child-
ren", but this gives no idea of the real function. The term wadwā rarai is sometimes
replaced by wadwā ḍmit (e.g. O.J.O., XXII, line 19); terms such as rarai or ḍĕmit
need not necessarily refer to smallness in age; they may also be applied to their
social position (cf. wong ċjilik in modern Javanese). May we compare vālāġrah (or:
bālāġrah) in Sanskrit? For the latter, cf. Mahāvy., 245, No. 86 (edition by Miṇaiev-
Mironov, p. 84).

[170]) Since manapĕl, the next term, undoubtedly denotes a kind of craft (cf. note 171
below), we may consider the possibility that also kalula does. The meaning of the
latter is not lucid. In a number of loci quoted by Juynboll (Woordenlijst, s.v.) from
the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, the meaning appears to be „family"; Goris (in the
word index to the first volume of Old Balinese inscriptions, which is being printed,
s.v.) suggests that kalula is a derivative from Sanskrit kula, which might mean:
„a servant born in the house, house slave" (?). We might suggest the possibility of
a different interpretation by connecting the term kalula in the expression juru (tuhān)
niṅ kalula with Sanskrit kulāla, "potter". Trisyllabic words being uncommon in Old
Javanese, the Sanskrit word could have been deformed in Old Javanese by its being
adapted to a common word type, viz. a disyllabic base preceded by the prefix ka-.
As we noted above, the mention of some kind of craftsmen would well agree with the
next term.

[171]) Manapal, derived from tapĕl; the more common term in these lists is mangrakĕt,
sometimes spelt maṇḍakĕt, a derivative of rakĕt, which may mean image, but, more

The *patih* [172]) of the vil[17]lage Kayumwuñan [173]): Si Dhantan [174]), of Mantyasih Si Jakkhara ; their representatives (are): Punta Pramāṇa, Si Gandah and Punta [18] Sĕḍang, Si Murana [175]); (the patih of) Lwa Paṇḍak [176]): Si Mandiha ; the *wahuta* of Pĕtir [176]): Si Hayu ; his surveyor ; Si Saisa ; [19] the village elder : Si Rutung ; (the *wahuta* of) Paṇḍakyan :

---

frequently, some sort of mask. Cf. *karakĕtan* in the *Nāgarakrĕt.*, 27, 2, pāda c, mentioned among the feasts given by the king during his visit to Patukañan and translated „maskerspelen" (plays executed by masked persons) by Kern (Translation, 1905-14, p. 76). Such plays, perhaps to be compared with the *wayang wong* in more recent times, are known from the courts of Tjĕrbon (Hazeu, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Javaansche toneel*, 1897, p. 95) and Bandjermasin. They are frequently mentioned in the Hikayat Raja Bandjar dan Kotawaringin (Cense, *De Kroniek van Bandjarmasin*, 1928, pp. 20, 22, 52 and 154), where the word is, however, spelt *rakit;* the difference may be irrelevant since all MSS of the latter text are in Arabic script. A few more references are added by Cense, *op. cit.*, p. 154. In Nāgarakrĕt. 91, 4, the king himself is asked to *arakĕrakĕt*. In Arjuna-wiw., 30, 8, *rakĕt* seems to mean „image". — For *manapĕl* and *mangrakĕt*, one might hesitate between „those who make masks, images, etc." and „those who perform mask plays, etc.", i.e. between the artisans and the artists. As a matter of fact, the composition of the list of these *tuhān* is still obscure ; similar lists add other items such as *tuhān ning lampuran* and *mañasĕakan*, the latter probably denoting a servant who conveys (literally: „makes arrive") messages and orders. There may be some reason to connect all these *tuhan* with the collection of some special taxes on behalf of the Rakarayān. Just as the king has his 'army' of *mañilala drawya haji*, the Rakarayāns have a small group of personnel collecting special taxes such as those on the ground (the *nayakas*, cf. *supra*, notes 64, sqq.), and on some arts and crafts; these would be their main sources of income from their apanages, whereas all the other taxes are reserved for the king.

[172]) Cf. note 165 above.

[173]) For this place name and the other ones, cf. the Introduction. For the meaning of *patih* and *wahuta*, cf. *supra*, notes 161, 162 and 165.

[174]) The spelling by *dha* is strange; it would suggest a Sanskrit word. The name might be one of these „pseudo-krama" forms corresponding with Sanskrit *dhara*. Cf. *wihantan (wihantĕn)* for *vihāra* and a few other words.

[175])(Probably there are only two, not four, representatives, but with double names, the former preceded by *si*, the latter by *punta;* if there were four representatives, it would be difficult to account for the fact that the first and the third persons have names preceded by *si*, the second and fourth representatives those introduced by *punta*. Double names are not at all uncommon in Old Javanese; in this case, one could consider the possibility of the representatives being monks possessing a worldly name which they had already before entering religious life and a religious one adopted at the moment when they became monks. *Punta* and *ḍapunta*, also *punta hyang*, *ḍapunta hyang*, *ḍapu hyang*, *ḍaman*, *bhagawanta* and, probably, a few other terms, seem to be religious titles. A number of these occur in the Sukabumi inscription (published by Van Stein Callenfels in *Meded. Kon. Ak. Wet., Afd. Lett.*, LXXVIII, B, 1934 pp. 115-130); cf. also O.J.O., XIX, in which the titles *ḍapunta*, *ḍapu hyang*, *ḍaman* and *ḍapu* follow each other in this order and may express differences in rank or age. Cf. also the *ḍapunta i kabikuan i panuñgalan watak raja*, in K.O., IX, Pl. 1b, line 2.

[176]) For these important place names, occurring in several other inscriptions from the same region, cf. the Introduction.

Si Sana ; his surveyor : Si Maring ; the *kalima* [177]) : Si Nahan.

At Tulang Air (the following persons are represented): the surveyor [20] of the metal workers (?) [178]): Si Balubung ; the village elder : Si Tarawana ; the *kalima* : Si Jana, the acting surveyor (?) [179]): Si Rĕga ; the representative : Si Pasat; [21] the astrologist [180]): Si Ēñcung. (Also) at Tulang Air, the guardian [181]): Si Kesawa ; the *kalima* : Si [22] Bhanu, the acting suveyor : Si Kala ; the representative : Si Wuri ; the astrologist si Dhasa ; the village councillors : Si Bañcung, Si Nana ; [23] ...... [182]): Si Warā and Si Daṇḍa ; the ...... [183]): Si Jantra ; the surveyor of water supply [184]): Si Layar ; the surveyor of the dams [185]): Si Tamuy ; the *mula* [186]): [24] Si Taguh ; the drummer during the ceremonies [187]): Si Manūt ; the market

---

[177]) Literally: "the fifth"; the term denotes a rank or a function among the village elders (cf. the Introduction). — A comparison with the Kĕḍu inscription (dated 57 years later; cf. Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 67, 1927, pp. 172-215, especially the passage from A-16 to A-20) shows the continuity of administration in this region; there, too, Mantyasih and Kayumwuñan are the residences of *patihs*, whereas *wahutas* are established at Pĕtir and Paṇḍakyan.

[178]) For *limus*, cf. Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 65 (1925), p. 248, with references.

[179]) *Silijuru* is interpreted as *silih-juru*. The loss of the *h* is strange; we may perhaps compare the loss of the *h* in the former half of a word compound with that which regularly takes place in word gemination; cf., for instance, *pili-pilih* in Nāgarakrĕt., 30, 1, where the metre garanties the loss of the *h*.

[180]) The meaning of *wariga* is not doubtful; his main activities probably concerned the calculation of auspicious dates for the important actions in the village.

[181]) The term is still in use for the guardians of cementeries, temples and the like.

[182]) The word is illegible, possibly *juru* (cf. note 123 above).

[183]) Owing to the lacuna, we do not know whather the two persons who follow are still included in the list of *tuha banua* or have another function. In the latter case, the lacuna at the beginning of line 23 did not contain a name, but a term denoting a function.

[184]) For the meaning of *hulair*, of the *pañulu* *bañu* (with numerous synonyms in modern Javanese villages (*vide* Van Vollenhoven, *Javaansch Adatrecht*, 1923, p. 29). This village elder was charged with the upkeep or the new construction of small canals, tunnels etc. for the irrigation of rice fields, including perhaps the just distribution of water supply to the different rice fields.

[185]) *Tambak* (usually spelt *tamwak* in Old Javanese records) denotes a dam in a river. Such dams are usually constructed with the intention of forming an artificial lake in the river, a guarantee in view of water supply during the dry season. At the same time, such artificial lakes are a protection against dangerous *bandjirs* in the beginning of the rainy season. In Modern Javanese, *tambak* denotes rot only the dam itself, but also the artificial lake before the dam: the latter is often used also as a fish pond. In No. XI below, an undoubtedly similar work is used to change the course of a river. The dam itself required constant supervision, e.g. to regulate the outlet of the water, to repair it if necessary etc. The artificial lake, too, required constant care; from time to time it had to be deepened out. Pressumably, the *ma-tamwak* was charged with the supervision over these and related activities.

[186]) The meaning of *mula* (probably, Sanskrit *mūla*, „root" etc.) is obscure in this connection; probably he has also something to do with irrigation.

[187]) For the *padahi*, probably a conical drum, cf. J. Kunst, *Hindoe-Javaansche muziekinstrumenten* (1927), pp. 46 sqq. The exact meaning of *mangala* in this combination

inspector : Si Mulyang; the wood inspector : Si Awit; the chief [25] of the centre [188]): Si Dawa; the sacrificer [189]): Si Naran.

The witnesses (?) [190]) (are): from [191]) Çrī Maṇḍaki: Si Niru; from Kuñci : Si Siga; from [26] Prasiña ing Limus [192]): Si Krahu; from Parang : Si Sana; from Paṇing [193]): Si Tawang; from Kakalyan : Si Mi[27]lih; from Tiwrus : Si Haryang; the inhabitant [194]) of the free territory at Tulang Air ing Krodha [195]): Si Dhura; from Air Pa[28]pi : Si Pagar (and) Si Paña, from Kakar : Si Paḍar, from Limus Watu [196]): Si Sañjana, from Talang

is difficult to be settled. One might consider the possibility that the paḍahi mangala was one of the village elders who had to beat the drum at the beginning of the inauguration ceremonies and, probably, during several rites, too.

[188]) Cr. the Introduction, especially note 82.

[189]) Caru denotes especially the sacrifices of rice etc. strewn on the ground to satisfy the lower classes of demons lest they should interfere with the ceremonies. Cf. one of the Ngabean copper-plates (O.J.O., No. CVI), front part, lines 3-5 (pacarnan in line 3 of the transcript by Brandes is a printing mistake for pacaruan), where holders of rice fields in the free territory belonging to the prāsāda at Laṇḍa presumably have the duty of furnishing rice for the caru sacrifices. The expression pacaruan kyan mahala is interesting, mahala is a derivative from hala, „wicked", so that it is indeed probable that the caru was especially due to the wicked spirits.

[190]) We do not understand the meaning of jumput here. In modern Javanese, the word may denote a kind of pincers or nippers. Dijumput means: „(a small portion) is taken out (of something)". In Madurese (Kiliaan's Dictionary, II, p. 163), djhum-pòdhan denotes the part of a feast meal which the guests take home after having enveloped it in palm leaf. Since the long list preceding jumput is composed of village elders of Tulang Air (the village which is to become free as a consequence of this edict), whereas the list following jumput consists of people belonging to other villages, the meaning of jumput required by the context is sāksin, „witnesses". A number of witnesses from neighbouring villages are mentioned with every ground transaction; it was necessary to have such witnesses in view of possible litigations about the exact limits of the temple domains. On account of the above, we presume that jumput means· „those taken out" (of the neighbouring villages to act as witnesses).

[191]) Literally: „at"; the meaning is that these witnesses are established in the villages which are mentioned for each of them and which they represent.

[192]) For limus, cf. note 178 above. Prasiña is probably composed of pras, a kind of plate used during sacrifices, and iña, „nurse".

[193]) Or: Paṇi; the anusvāra is uncertain.

[194]) Anak ri sima; the expression is on a line with anak wanua, for the villagers enjoying full rights. One gets the impression that there was already another free territory at Tulang Air prior to the foundation of 850 A.D.

[195]) Tulang Air ing Krodha; the addition of ing krodha, „of the wrath" (?), might suggest that the village name is to be distinguished from the Tulang Air where the foundation in 850 takes place. It is, however, also possible (cf. the preceding note) that there had been a free territory within the désa grounds of Tulang Air belonging to an earlier foundation, possibly at a considerable distance from Tulang Air. Those living on this free territory were, of course, not dependent on the village elders of Tulang Air and could therefore represent something else.

[196]) For limus, cf. the notes 178 and 192 above. If the presumed meaning of limus is correct, one would get the impression that the industry of fine metal art was important in this region, giving its name to several villages.

Air [197]: [29] Si Malini, from Manāha (?) [198]: Si Guwasang (?), from Kayumwuṅan (?): Si ....., from Kaṇḍaṅan : Si Mu[30]lya ; the ..... (?) [199] in the temple (?) [200]: Si Wanasi, the surveyor ....., the *kalima* : Si [31] Siga, the representative : Sang Hada (?), the surveyor in the ....., Welahan : Si ....., the surveyor at Samala[32]gi : Si Tala, ... [201]), the surveyor at Muṅgu : Si Pangsat, [33] the *kalima* : Si Jati, the surveyor at Wunha [202]: Si ...., the village elder : Si Napal, the market inspector at [34] Muṅguantan [203]): Si Laya, ..., ... the priest [204]) in the temple of the merchant group : Si Ka[35]ṇḍi (?), the surveyor of the husked rice [205]): Si Marowang, the surveyor at Air Pyal : Si Huwus, the village elder : Si Rutus, the surveyor at Ai[36]r Hulu : Si Milar, the village elder : Si Taṅguh, the surveyor at Sulangkuning : Si Bantal, at Masalañcang (?): [37] ..... the *kalang* at ..... : Si ..... // [206]).

---

[197] Cf. note 140 above. *Talang Air* would mean „water pipe"; it is undoubtedly a village different from Tulang Air in spite of the striking resemblance. It would, moreover, have been strange if the foundation village should have been mentioned among the witness villages, usually situated in the neighbourhood.

[198] The reading is uncertain. The reconstitution of the names followed by (?) is doubtful; cf. the details in the notes to the transcription.

[199] We have no idea about the term preceding *hyang*. Well-known titles (or functions) are *guru hyang*, *pratyaya hyang*, *wahuta hyang* and, of course, *dang hyang*, but the traces visible on the stone exclude any of these terms. It is, however, probable (on account of *hyang*) that some sort of priest is mentioned here.

[200] *Prasāda* is probably a wrong spelling of *prāsāda; prasāda* and *prāsāda* are very often confounded in Old Javanese inscriptions. Cf. the preceding note.

[201] The lacuna is a lengthy one; cf. the Transcription.

[202] The village name Wunha, which looks suspect, proves to occur elsewhere, too ; cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), p. 155.

[203] For the village name, probably connected with Muṅgu mentioned before, cf. the Introduction.

[204] The exact meaning of *marhyang* is unknown, but it is certain that the term denotes some kind of priest, probably not a very distinguished one (cf. the use of the article *si*).

[205] The *hulu wras* is very often mentioned among the *rāmas*. The term probably denotes the village elder who was in charge of a provision of rice belonging to the village as a whole. Van Vollenhoven notices the presence of similar village elders in modern Javanese villages (*op. cit.*, p. 30), but considers the function an innovation of recent times; the latter conclusion might not be correct in view of what we see in Old Javanese inscriptions.

[206] Only a few scattered words have remained legible in line 37.

X. (A - C). THREE SANSKRIT INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE RATUBAKA PLATEAU

The Ratubaka plateau, situated at a few km's distance to the South of Prambanan, Central Java, has yielded one Sanskrit inscription in Pre-Nāgarī script [1]) and three other Sanskrit inscriptions in Old Javanese script, two of which were discovered in rather recent times. In view of the close relations between these three epigraphs, they may well be treated together. Only some individual details such as measurements, the kinds of stone in which the inscriptions are cut, will be mentioned in brief notes preceding the transcriptions. The three inscriptions are denoted by a, b, and c, according to the order of the dates of discovery.

The first of these inscriptions, a, has been in the Djakarta Museum since 1902; it is numbered D. 104 [2]). The second one (b) was discovered in 1935; it was briefly discussed by Stutterheim [3]) and by Damais [4]). Neither for a nor for b, the exact site of discovery on the Ratubaka plateau is known. The third inscription (c) was discovered in 1941 on the premises of a peasant house in the hamlet (padukuhan) Dawangsari in the immediate neighbourhood of the archaeological remains of the Ratubaka plateau [5]). Both b and c are at present in the office of the Dinas Purbakala at Prambanan.

Inscription c is in an excellent state of preservation ; a is rather weather-beaten and, in addition, the rough surface of the stone makes its reading uncertain at several spots; inscription b is by far the worst, especially in its middle part (lines 5 to 11). The lettering is badly weather-beaten there, so that the reading is not everywhere certain. Fortunately, the language and the metre are of a great help since they make a valuable check on the correctness of the transcription possible.

The three inscriptions are written in one and the same type of script, which is hardly different from that used in the numerous Central Javanese inscriptions dated the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century A.D. The u following a consonant shows a tiny curve to the right at its lower end, a feature which is regularly found in the older inscriptions, but oc-

---

[1]) *Mus. Djak.*, No. D. 50. Cf. Bosch, *T.B.G.*, 68 (1928), pp. 63 sq.; cf. also *Pras. Indon.* I (1950), pp. 11 sqq.

[2]) Rouffaer, *Notulen B.G.*, 1909, p. LXXXIV. Rouffaer adds that according to data supplied by Van Erp the stone was discovered in 1901 and sent to Djakarta in 1902, but no account was entered into the minutes of the Society. Its origin from the Ratubaka plateau, which might not be beyond doubt if based upon these data alone, is greatly confirmed by the text of the inscription, which shows close affinities with the inscriptions b and c.

[3]) *T.B.G.*, 75 (1935). p. 443, note. Stutterheim also gave a transcript of the first lines of the inscription and made a conjecture about the name Lokapāla.

[4]) *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), p. 3, with a small correction in Stutterheim's reading and a slightly different conjecture about the name Lokapāla. This point will be discussed in the course of this Introduction.

[5]) These data are based upon correspondence in the archives of the Dinas Purbakala at Djakarta.

casionally extant in 10th century texts [6]. A more characteristic feature is the form of the *gha*, two examples of which occur in these inscriptions (viz. in *hastakānghraye*, a 3, and, more distinct, in *ghṛṣṭa°*, c, line 2); the *gha* has only three verticals, but the left hand stroke begins with a slight curve to the left. In all the later inscriptions, this curve has grown into a fourth stroke [7].

The lettering is rather careless as a rule, especially in the inscriptions a and b. The differences in the size, in the degree of cursivity and even in the form of the same *akṣaras* are striking; on the other hand, some other *akṣaras* resembling each other (such as the *ga* and the *bha*, the *ma* and the *ṣa*, the *da* and the *ṅa*) are hardly or not distinguishable on the stones. The impression of carelessness is partly due to the rough kind of stone used for the inscriptions. It is a very hard and coarse-grained variety of limestone, the surface of which was not sufficiently smoothed before the *akṣaras* were cut into the stone.

All of the three inscriptions are composed in metrical Sanskrit. The strophes are devoid of poetical merit, although the poet appears to be well trained in the use of *alaṃkāras*. Also the language is not everywhere correct. If we exclude some obvious lapses made by the lapicide (these will be dealt with below), there remain some shortcomings which should be attributed to the poet. A case of incorrect sandhi is the change of the final -*s* to a visarga before the dental mutes in inscription b, line 4 (*namaḥ tryamvakāya*) and line 7 (*°dātuḥ tryamvakasya*). A more serious point is the construction of the second strophe of inscription c. There, the accusatives presumably depend on a verb which is not expressed [8]. The lengthy compound which fills up the former half of strophe c 2 is not quite lucid. The compound in the second pāda of c 4, viz. *varuçāstratalānvitaḥ*, is based upon an incorrect simile; instead of *anvitaḥ*, a word such as *upetaḥ* should have been used. Some other examples might be added, but they are either less striking or based upon a not completely certain reading (such as the use of *amita*, presumably in the meaning „innumerable", in the first pāda of a 1).

The metres are correct. The only remarkable point is the *vipulā* in the first pāda of c 4, no other examples of which are known to us (it ends in ⏑ ⏑ — —). The *vipulā* in c 5, first pāda, is, however, a regular one.

A few lapses by the lapicide are remarkable. In a 1, a syllable, presumably *'stu*, was omitted. Quite a number of mistakes occur in inscription b, line 12, where the text runs *praṇvāpitaṃ tryamvaliṅvam=ehat* instead of *prasthāpitaṃ tryambakaliṅgam=etat*. The four lapses, viz. *ṇvā* for *sthā*,

---

[6] This feature is very pronounced in Balitung's Kĕḍu inscription dated 907 A.D., but exceptional in other 10th century inscriptions.

[7] This change in the form of the *gha* may be explained by the necessity of clearly distinguishing the *gha* from the *ya*. The addition of a fourth stroke to the *gha* runs parallel to the development from a spiral to a vertical stroke in the left hand part of the *ya*. Of the two *akṣaras* the Ratubaka inscriptions show an intermediate form.

[8] Cf. the discussion of this passage, *infra* notes 151 sqq. to the Translation.

the omission of *ka*, *ñva* instead of *ñga* and *ha* instead of *ta*, are typical copyist's errors made by somebody who did not understand the text and mechanically reproduced what he saw. A somewhat negligently written *ta* might resemble a *ha*, a not distinctly written *ga* might be mistaken for a *va* and an akṣara might be overlooked. A very curious mistake, which might convey an idea about the manner in which the lapicide worked, is *ṇvā* instead of *sthā*. The akṣaras *va* and *tha* resemble one another, but *ṇa* and *sa* do not appear to have much in common. The mistake could be explained only if we presume that the lapicide worked on an example in which he mistook the single verticals of the *sa* for double ones. Now it it well-known that if one writes with a blunt piece of chalk on a rough surface, one may easily put down double lines instead of single ones. This example accounts satisfactorily for the mistake. We could suppose that the paṇḍit who had composed the text wrote it down on the inscription stone by means of a piece of chalk, so that the lapicide had only to follow the lines he saw. The result is that which we find on the stone.

In view of the above cases where the correction seems certain, we assume a similar mistake in the third gaṇa of the second Āryā half in c 1. There, the form *abhihapat*, clearly visible on the stone, does not make sense ; it is probably a mistake for *abhitapat* [9]). The above points are of an obvious importance for the interpretation of the texts. The possibility of similar errors should be considered in some other passages where the text visible on the stone does not seem to make sense. The beginning of the first pāda of strophe a 2 is a good example [10]).

We noted above that the three inscriptions are entirely written in verse. The metre is correct except for a slight irregularity in the *vipulā* c 4, which we already mentioned above. The following metres are used :

Indravajrā, — a 3 and b 4 ;
Mālinī, — b 1 and 2 ;
Rucirā, — a 1 and 2 ;
Āryā, — c 1 and 2 ;
Anuṣṭubh, — c 4 and 5 ;
Svāgata, — c 3 ;
Ṭoṭaka, — b 3.

We now proceed to a short examination of the meaning of the texts. The composition of the three texts is very similar in spite of some differences in details. They all begin with a strophe addressed to Çiva, followed by a strophe in the same metre as the first one and addressed to some form of Lakṣmī-Çrī. The third strophes of b and c deal with a prince who presumably arrived from foreign shores in ancient times ; such a strophe

---

[9]) In that case, we should have exactly the same mistake as in *ehat* instead of *etat* (the last line of *b*). The form *abhitapat* might not be completely satisfactory, but it is the easiest correction; cf. note 147. below.

[10]) Cf. note 120 below.

is, however, absent in *a*, which consists of three strophes only. The last strophe of *a* and *b* and the two last strophes of *c* relate that the king, a descendant of the mysterious prince mentioned above, erected a linga.

We find different names of Çiva in each of the three inscriptions. In *a*, the initial strophe is addressed to Kṛttivāsas, the god clad in a (tiger) skin. It is certainly not a haphazard synonym of the name of Çiva, for the name Kṛttivāsas (with the variant Kṛttikavāsas, probably chosen for metrical considerations, in a 3) is repeated in the two other strophes of *a*, but no other name of the supreme god is mentioned. In *b*, the initial strophe is addressed to Tryambaka (spelt Tryamvaka) and the same name is used in the other strophes. Finally, inscription *c* is addressed to Hara, the name which is repeated in strophes 2 and 5. We therefore conclude that the three Ratubaka inscriptions relate the erection of a Kṛttivāso-, a Tryambaka- and a Hara-linga respectively.

The analysis of the first strophes of the three texts makes it clear that the three different names denote as many different aspects of the supreme god. In *a*, the god is represented in a demonic form — clad in a tiger skin and crowned with bloody skulls while he dances in a cemetery. Inscription *b* evokes the image of the all-mighty god who is seated on his lotus-throne beset with jewels and surrounded by all the other gods and goddesses who obey his will. In *c*, the god is the divine warrior who leads the army of the gods in the fierce battle against the Asuras to destroy their fortress Tripura.

The three second strophes are addressed to the female counterparts. In *a*, the goddess assists the Divine Dancer in his terrific cemetery dance; in *b*, she is represented while embracing the god and fulfilling all his desires; in *c*, she accompanies the god in his battle against the Tripurāsuras [11].

It is curious that the goddess in the second strophes is nowhere denoted by one of the numerous common designations of Çiva's spouse, as we might have expected. The three texts mention her by the names of Çrī, Çūralakṣmī and Mahallakṣmī respectively. The first designation is a common one to denote Viṣṇu's spouse, at the same time the symbol of prosperity and royal majesty. Çūralakṣmī, the term used in *b*, suggests the same but with the special shade of success in battle, although the designation is unusual as a precise term [12]. Mahallakṣmī, undoubtedly a variant of Mahālakṣmī, again suggests Lakṣmī-Çrī, but the name is also used, in different texts, to denote the Devī in the age of thirteen years or in the conception of universal

---

[11] We already mentioned the difficulties in the interpretation of c 2. It is not therefore exactly clear what the goddess did in the battle. The wording of the first pāda, in which the goddess is covered with the pollen of Çiva's lotus-feet, which attracts such bees as Rāvaṇa, Bāṇa and Arjuna, might suggest that she accompanied the god-warrior in order to seduce the Asuras.

[12] The synonymous Vīralakṣmī is known as the name of the main queen of Sūryavarman I of Cambodia in the beginning of the 11th century A.D.; cf. the inscription of Sdok Kak Thom, strophe LXXIV, edition by Finot in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XV, 2 (1915) p. 66, and the references given by Coedès in *Les Etats hindouisés*, p. 228 and p. 233.

Çakti [13]). We therefore conclude that two of the three inscriptions address the *namaskāra* to the combination of a form of Çiva and a form of Lakṣmī-Çrī, whereas the initial strophes of the third text refer to the combination of Çiva and a rather ambiguous term to denote the goddess. These remarkable combinations pose a curious problem, which will be dealt with after a closer examination of the remaining parts of the three texts.

The *namaskāras* are followed by what might be styled historical portions. Inscriptions *a* and *b* are dated by the addition of the mere Çaka year 778 after the strophes. Since no further details are mentioned, the date could correspond to 856 or 857 A. D., to be more precise, between the 10th of March 856 and the 27th of February 857 [14]). The date may even be fixed within slightly narrower limits by comparing these texts with the inscription which will be dealt with in No. XI. It will appear that the events mentioned in No. XI are necessarily posterior to these liṅga foundations. This makes it very probable that our texts are dated before the 11th of the *çuklapakṣa* of Mārgaçīrṣa, i.e. between the 10th of March and the 12th of November 856.

The name of the reigning king is mentioned in each of the three inscriptions, *viz.* Çrī Kumbhaja in *a* and *b*, and *Kalaçodbhava* in *c*. These names are well-known paraphrases of the name of the *ṛṣi* Agastya, who was born in a jar according to tradition [15]). The names Kumbhayoni, Kalaçaja and Agastya occur in the Dinaya inscription dated 760 A. D. [16]) and also in the Pereng inscription dated 863 A. D. ; the latter was discovered in Central Java in the immediate neighbourhood of the Ratubaka plateau [17]). There Kumbhayoni is not exactly used to denote the ancient sage : it is the name of the founder of the Çiva temple Bhadrāloka by name.

We conclude from the Ratubaka inscriptions *a* and *b* that there was a

[13]) Gopinatha Rao, *Elements*, II, Pt. 2, p. 333. The second interpretation is based on the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa quoted *ibidem*, p. 337. — Monier Williams' *Dictionary* s.v., explains : „the great Lakṣmī (properly the çakti of Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu, but sometimes identified with Durgā or with Sarasvatī)". It would not be impossible that the poet substituted the term Mahālakṣmī just in order to avoid the interpretation as the Devī and to stress her Lakṣmī aspect. In this case, the way in which the goddess is denoted would better agree with the names Çrī and Çūralakṣmī mentioned in the two other texts.

[14]) Viz. the beginnings of the Çaka years elapsed 778 and 779. For the reduction of the dates, cf. Damais in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, Fasc. 1 (1952), pp. 30 sq., No. 21.

[15]) For these traditions and numerous other data about Agastya worship in Java, cf. the monograph by R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya in den Archipel* (1926), *passim;* cf. also Bosch in *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 462-502, and Nilakanta Sastri in *T.B.G.*, 76 (1936), p. 471-545.

[16]) First edition by Bosch in *T.B.G.*, 57 (1917), pp. 410-444; discussed in detail by the same scholar in *T.B.G.*, 64 (1924), pp. 227-291 (with a note by B. Schrieke) ; cf. also Poerbatjaraka, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-55; Nilakanta Sastri. *art. cit.*, pp. 512 sq.; J.G. de Casparis, *T.B.G.*, 81 (1941), pp. 499-513.

[17]) First edition by A.B. Cohen Stuart, *Kawi Oorkonden* (1875), No. XXIII. The Sanskrit portion was discussed by Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, VI (article dated 1917), pp. 277-286. Some other publications dealing with special details in this inscription are mentioned in the notes which follow.

king reigning in Central Java in 856 A. D., who had Agastya, or rather one of the numerous paraphrases meaning „Born in a Jar", as his personal name. The first point to be examined is whether there might be a close connection between the king in the three Ratubaka epigraphs and the distinguished founder of a Çiva temple, owner of a considerable number of villages, in the Pereng inscription. As a matter of fact, there are several points in favour of such a connection. The fact of both being denoted by common names of the ṛṣi Agastya is hardly an argument by itself, but it should not be forgotten that the fact is more relevant than it seems to be because the founder in the Pereng inscription, if not a reigning king, is at least a very high dignitary. In addition, the Pereng inscription, dated about seven years later than the Ratubaka inscriptions, belongs to the same period and, finally, the village Pereng is situated in the very neighbourhood of the Ratubaka plateau. It is however obvious that these points, interesting though they may be, could not prove that the royal erector of the liṅgas on the Ratubaka plateau should be identified with the distinguished founder of the Çiva temple in its neighbourhood.

It is well-known that the Pereng inscription, composed partly in Sanskrit verse, partly in Old Javanese prose, records the foundation of the Çiva temple Bhadrāloka by a Rakai Walaing Pu Kumbhayoni. The first scholar who made a detailed study of the Pereng inscription, H. Kern, suggested that the text mainly bears upon an astronomical event ; as a matter of fact, Agastya is not only the name of a sage, but also the common Indian designation of the star Canopus. Kern adopted the latter interpretation and proposed to explain the puzzling name Walaing, occurring in the Rakai title of Pu Kumbhayoni, as a Polynesian equivalent of the name of the star [18]). Some years afterwards, Krom reexamined the contents of the Pereng inscription and arrived at a completely different conclusion about the identity of the founder [19]). He refuted the astronomical explanation suggested by Kern and rightly concluded that the text refers to a historical person whose name agreed with htat of the great sage. As to Walaing, Krom interpreted the strange word as a title derived from a geographical name. A few years afterwards again, Poerbatjaraka dealt with the Pereng inscription [20]) and tried to arrive at a kind of compromise postulating both a historical and a mythical founder, the latter identical with the great sage. Bosch, discussing Poerbatjaraka's interpretation [21]), agreed with Krom on the whole, but tried to arrive at a further identification of the founder of the Çiva temple. He suggested that Kumbhayoni-Agastya might have been the king's *purohita* and supported this interpretation by a reference to a parallel in later Old Javanese history [22]). Finally, Krom summarized the state of research on the

---

[18]) Kern, *art. cit.*, p. 282.

[19]) *Bijdr. K.I.*, 75 (1919), pp. 14-19.

[20]) *Agastya*, pp. 45 sqq.

[21]) *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 470 sqq.

[22]) An interesting passage in the Old Javanese Hariwaṅça, dated in the reign of Jayabhaya of Kaḍiri (from about 1135 to 1157 A.D.), viz. Canto 53, strophes 2 sqq., mentions the incarnation of Viṣṇu as Jayabhaya and of Agastya as the official head

Pereng inscription in 1931 and mainly repeated his conclusions arrived at in 1919. Only with reference to the name Walaing, he no longer insisted on his geographic explanation [23]. As to the function performed by Pu Kumbhayoni, Krom did not mention the explanation given by Bosch and used the rather vague term of a 'high dignitary' [24].

Krom's last account of the Pereng inscription in the first of the clumsy volumes of Stapel's History [25] shows no further progress. It is a carefully worded extract of the discussion in Krom's History written seven years earlier. After an introductory note about the puzzling meaning of most of the text, Krom gives a survey of what he considers the most probable conclusions. The latter include Agastya worship [26] and homage to „him whose name is Walaing" [27]. Both conclusions seem rather doubtful [28]. It is curious to

of the clergy *(panditādhikāra)*, combining the function of a *rājaguru* and a 'prime minister' *(patih)*. These incarnations had taken place in a time when the island of Java was in a panic and had lost its beauty (?). The importance of this passage was pointed out by Poerbatjaraka (*op. cit.*, p. 36 sq.). Bosch (*art. cit.*, p. 470) discussed this passage again and concluded that Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription may have stood in the same relation to the king as was the case with the head of the clergy in Jayabhaya's time. Although the parallel is remarkable, the conclusion is not necessarily correct: the Pereng inscription does not state at all that Kumbhayoni should have been an incarnation of Agastya; even such names as Çiwa, Nārāyana etc. occurred as names of villagers. For the Hariwança, we now dispose of the excellent edition and translation by A. Teeuw, *Verhand. K.I.*, LI (1950), where the passage occurs in I, p. 84 (text) and II, p. 105 (translation).

[23] *Geschiedenis²*, pp. 165 sq.

[24] This vague term (i.e. „hoogwaardigheidsbekleder" in the Dutch text) was probably chosen to avoid the necessity of giving an interpretation of the difficult words *puyut sang ratu i halu pakwiannira i jangluan* (line 9), which follow the name Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription. Several different interpretations of these words were proposed; they will be discussed below.

[25] Krom, *Het Hindoe-tijdperk*, in Stapel, I, pp. 1o7 sq.

[26] Krom, *op. cit.*, p. 168, leaves the choice between two alternatives, viz. either a foundation attributed to the ancient sage himself, or a foundation by a dignitary connected with Agastya; in either case, we may obtain some data about Agastya. This seems too much value attached to the mere name of the founder.

[27] It is curious that the words *tāvad=bhaktir= valainnāmnah* were always interpreted in this way. The alternative „homage *of* (i.e. by) him whose name is Walaing" seems preferable. *Walaing* is the abbreviated expression of the founder's title Rakai Walaing in that case. The meaning of the third strophe would then imply that the cult associated with the foundation of the Çiva temple should be continued as long as the sun and moon are on the sky etc. Owing to its occurrence in these Ratubaka inscriptions, the word Walaing may be less obscure than it might appear on account of the Pereng inscription only.

[28] There are some more points in Krom's survey of the contents of the Pereng inscription which are subject to doubt. Krom states, for instance, that a passage near the end of the text implies the wish that Kumbhayoni's posterity may find a living in the foundation (i.e. in the fields attached to it). This is undoubtedly a paraphrase of the words *labdhestapadajīvāh*, translated by Kern „daarin een standplaats en levensonderhoud naar wensch mogen ontvangen". We prefer to consider *istapada*, „the desired place", a synonym of *paramapada, nirvānapada, Çivapada* (cf

note that Kern's subtle interpretation continued to exercise considerable influence, although it is based on an older stage of research.

After Krom's last account, Damais dealt with the Pereng inscription at two different occasions [29]. In his first note, he tried to establish the identity of the Ratu i Halu; the latter is brought into some connection with the founder Rakai Walaing Pu Kumbhayoni by the words *puyut sang ratu i halu pakwiannira i jangluran*. Several different interpretations of these difficult words have been proposed. Kern, the first editor of the Pereng inscription who discussed its meaning [30], chose an interpretation agreeing with his view that the Pereng inscription related an astronomical event [31]. Poerbatjaraka, critizising Kern's interpretation, rendered *puyut* by „great-grandfather" [32], whereas Bosch, comparing the meaning of *kabuyutan*, considered the word to mean „object of worship" [33]. The latter interpretation would not seem likely: „object of worship" could, at most, translate *kabuyutan*, but never *buyut* or *puyut* [34]. Poerbatjaraka's translation is based upon the most common meaning of *puyut*, but, although it is not completely impossible that somebody should be the great-grandfather of a living king, such a relation would not be likely [35]. The most probable solution is that proposed by Stutterheim. It is usual in Old Javanese inscriptions that a person who, for some reason or other, wants to stress his particular position does so by referring to some illustrious ancestor. Since terms such as *puyut* serve to indicate a definite genealogical distance, although it is not rare that they are used to denote both the ascendant and descendant

---

Zieseniss, *Studien zur Geschichte des Çivaismus*, I, in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 98, 1939, pp. 208 sqq.), and to interpret *jīva* in the meaning „soul, vital breath". The compound as a whole, has a *bahuvrīhi* meaning.

[29] *Epigrafische Aantekeningen, VII, Sang Ratu i Halu*, in *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 21 sq., and *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, Fasc. 1 (1952), note 1 to p. 34.

[30] The first editor of the inscription itself (Cohen Stuart) had only given a (very provisional) transcription; cf. note 17 above.

[31] It is needless to add that Kern's interpretation is mainly based upon the fact that Kumbhayoni is a synonym of Agastya, which is also the common name of the star Canopus. The latter's rising and setting are important moments for the regulation of agricultural activities; the date of the Pereng inscription would more or less agree with the period in which Canopus disappears from the sky. Kern's interpretation is based rather on general ideas about the dependence of mythology on the movements of planets and stars than on the text of the Pereng inscription. As far as *puyut* is concerned, Kern's translation is based exclusively on the above interpretation, which is not in the least supported by etymology.

[32] *Agastya in den Archipel*, p. 47.

[33] *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 470 sq. Bosch appears to accept Poerbatjaraka's comparison with *(pu)puṇḍen* in modern Javanese.

[34] This meaning of *kabuyutan* is easily derived from *buyut* in its usual meaning of „great-grandfather" and, by extension, „ancestor"; the combination of the affixes *ka-* and *-an* usually denotes the place. For the combination *sang hyang dharmma kabuyutan*, cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I, p. 172.

[35] The extreme minimum is about fifty years of difference in age, but this would not be completely impossible. A far more serious objection will be mentioned below.

line at the same time, it is far more probable that Kumbhayoni refers to an illustrious ancestor by the words *puyut sang ratu i halu* : he calls himself the great-grandson of the Prince of Halu or, at least, his descendant, if a less precise meaning could be attached to *puyut* [36]). Finally, Damais rightly accepted Stutterheim's interpretation of this passage, although he disapproved of the less precise meaning added by Stutterheim between brackets [37]). Damais' argument that the precise meaning of a definite grade of relationship should be required in a passage such as this one seems hardly relevant. Not only is a statement that somebody descends from king so-and-so in a straight line a rather definite one, but Damais' argument is directly refuted by our Ratubaka inscriptions *b* and *c* where the king's relationship with some famous ancestor is indicated by the words *tasyātmanas=santatijena*, „sprung from his own descendency", — an expression implying a direct descent but not a definite grade of relationship [38]). It seems, therefore, safe to maintain the meaning „descendant" for *puyut* as a possible alternative.

With a view to the above, I am hardly convinced by the calculation by Damais of when this Ratu i Halu may have lived and reigned. The average length of a generation cannot be relevant if only three or four generations are concerned. There is no reason to fix the difference between 80 and 100 years even if the precise meaning „great-grandfather" is attached to *puyut*. The only reasonable conclusion is that the number of years should be fixed somewhere between 0 and 160 [39]).

We therefore conclude that, if Stutterheim's interpretation is correct, which it has every chance to be, the founder Pu Kumbhayoni defines his status by (a) the title Rakai Walaing and (b) his descent from the Ratu i Halu, who presumably was a famous person.

Former editors of the Pereng inscription agreed at least on one point, viz. that the founder was not a reigning king. The absence of a royal title is conclusive [40]). It is, however, obvious that such a negative conclusion is hardly satisfactory; for it is not doubtful that the founder in the Pereng inscription certainly was a very distinguished authority. The foundation is an elaborate one, commemorated by a bilingual inscription; in addition,

---

[36]) Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 65 (1925), note 8 to p. 215.

[37]) Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 21 sq.

[38]) *Infra*, inscription *b*, strophe 4, pāda *a*. Inscription *c*, strophe 4, pāda *a*, uses the equivalent expression *tadanvayāt=prasuto 'yam*, which is not less vague.

[39]) The minimum is based on the theoretical possibility that the great-grandfather was still alive in 863, the maximum on the possibility that the generations of both great-grandfather and great-grandson should be included into the total. With a view to some arguments to be discussed below, there are strong reasons to suppose that Kumbhayoni was already aged at the time of the Pereng inscription, so that the true distance might be nearer the maximum than the minimum. The point will be further dealt with in the course of this Introduction.

[40]) It is a sound principle not to conclude to kingship unless there is an unambiguous royal title.

the end of the Pereng inscription (*tungang dawĕt, lankā sĕrĕh wulakan=ni wala walaing lodwāng wanwanirang dhīmān kumbhayoni narannira*) makes it clear that he is the possessor of at least seven villages (*wanwa*). *Dhīmān* might be a mere commonplace, but it is a rather strong term; in Buddhism, e.g., it is almost a synonym of Bodhisattva [41]), whereas it appears to be especially used as an epithet of ancient sages in Brāhmaṇism [42]).

After the above digression, the question about a possible identification of Pu Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription with the king Çrī Kumbhaja (Kalaçodbhava) in the Ratubaka inscriptions may be posed again. We think that an easy explanation of the absence of a royal title in the Pereng inscription may be given if we assume that the king in the Ratubaka inscriptions resigned the throne in the years preceding the Pereng epigraph. Before considering this point in detail, we want to stress that there is a small detail, *viz.* the title Rakai Walaing, which might be explained by the Ratubaka inscriptions to a certain degree. The name Walaing, occurring in this title, though not unknown from other inscriptions [43]), is peculiar. Kern considered it a „Polynesian equivalent" of the name of the star Canopus, i.e. Agastya in Sanskrit [44]), whereas Krom interpreted it as the mere name of a locality that required no further explanation [45]). Krom appears, however, to have changed his opinion on this point since about twenty years later he considered the name Walaing „puzzling" [46]).

Walaing occurs three times in the Pereng inscription. In the beginning of the Old Javanese portion, the founder, Pu Kumbhayoni, is denoted by Rakai Walaing. At the end of the third introductory Çloka, the genitive *valainnāmnah* occurs and, finally, Walaing is mentioned in the enumeration of villages (*wanwa*) of Kumbhayoni at the end of the text in a passage quoted above. As to its second occurrence, *viz.* in *valainnāmnah*, we already cincluded that it may easily be connected with the Rakai title in the first reference if we consider it an abbreviated expression, easily explained by the requirements of Sanskrit language and metre, of the founder's title [47]).

[41]) *Mahāvyutpatti*, edition by Minaïev and Mironov in *Bibl. Buddh.*, XIII (1911), p. 10, chapt. 22, No. 3. [42]) *St. Petersb. Diction.*, s.v. *dhīmant*.

[43]) A few references were given by Poerbatjaraka, *op. cit.*, p. 49. In Balitung's Kĕdu inscription dated 907 A.D., Walaing is the place where the scribe lived (B-23 : *likhita citrālekha i Walaing punta tarkka;* cf. Stutterheim *T.B.G.*, 67, 1927, p. 212).

[44]) *Verspr. Geschr.*, VI, p. 282.

[45]) *Bijdr. K.I.*, 75 (1919), pp. 17 sq.

[46]) Cf. *supra*, p. 250.

[47]) This *valainnāmnah* should therefore be compared with *kalaçajanāmnā* in the first of the two strophes at the end of the inscription. Both expressions undoubtedly refer to the founder. We do not understand why Krom concluded that it appears from the introductory strophes that Walaing is certainly the name of a being to be worshipped (p. 18). Neither do we understand what Krom considers mysterious in the last lines of the Pereng inscription where the names Walaing and Kumbhayoni are again connected with one another. Poerbatjaraka (*Agastya*, p. 49) rightly notes that the connection is not a very mysterious one : Walaing is nothing but one of the domains belonging to Kumbhayoni. Krom, however, rightly noticed that the two last

Then, there is no more reason to interpret Walaing as the name of some superhuman being: it is both a locality and a Rakai title, a combination which is frequently found in Old Javanese epigraphy [48].

Now it is very important to note that Walaing occurs twice in our Ratubaka inscriptions in the sanscritized form Valaṅga. We find it in inscription *b*, strophe 4, pāda *c* (*valaṅgajetrā*) and in inscription *a*, strophe 3, pāda c (*valaṅgagoptrā*) as epithets of king Kumbhayoni. In the former case, one should translate the „victor of Valaṅga" (or : of Walaing), in the latter, however, the „protector of Valaṅga". Since the two expressions must be more or less equivalent, Walaing could not be, for instance, the name of the enemy beaten by the king in the former expression; „victor of Valaṅga" should therefore be interpreted as either „conqueror of Valaṅga" or „victorious king of Valaṅga" [49]. So we conclude that Walaing is the name of some centre or territory dominated by the king, probably as a result of an important victory. It seems likely that this Walaing should be identified with the village *walaing watak walaing* mentioned in a copper plate inscription from Central Java [50]. An argument in favour of the identification is not only the rare occurrence of the name, but also the fact that the latter Walaing is not an ordinary village but the centre of an administrative unity (*watak*) [51]. It must therefore have been a place of some importance, a fact which could well be connected with the *loci* in our Ratubaka inscriptions. In addition, one might attach some importance to the fact that Balitung's Kĕḍu inscription dated 907 A.D., considered one of the most important documents not only by modern scholars but also in older times (it is the only inscription three copies of which are known) [52], was

---

lines of the Pereng inscription constitute a Kawi strophe, whereas Poerbatjaraka considered them prose : it is a regular Anuṣṭubh strophe with a not unusual Vipulā in its first pāda. This explains why the order of the words is slightly different from what it would have been in prose. One might agree with Krom that not everything in the Pereng inscription is clear to us, but even scepticism may be exaggerated.

[48] We do not mean that all of the Rakai and Pamĕgĕt titles should be derived from geographical names ; the contrary, i.e. geographical names, especially those of so-called "circumscriptions" (we mean the names preceded by *watĕk),* being derived from the Rakai titles of the lords, may also have happened. The essential point is that most of the names we find after *watĕk* in inscriptions also occur as parts of Rakai titles (Kayuwaṅi, Halaran, Hino, Halu, Pikatan, Patapān, etc.).

[49] Cf. note 145 below.

[50] *O.J.O.,* XXIX, B-1 to 2. Cf. Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya,* note 2 to p. 49.

[51] Cf. note 43 above. — It is hardly necessary to add that the form Walaing, which we use throughout unless quoting the text of the Ratubaka inscriptions themselves, is the original one. Valaṅga is the form used in the Sanskrit texts. Words ending in -ṅ occur only in a very few cases as a consequence of sandhi in Sanskrit (the stems in -añc in the nom. masc. singular). This kind of adaptation may well be understood ; some similar cases were discussed by Gonda, *Bhujaṅga, Bijdr. K.I.,* 89 (1932), pp. 253-260 *(lavaṅ* and *lavaṅga, kataṅ* and *kataṅga;* Gonda conjecturally explains Javanese *bujaṅga* as, originally, a learned form of *bujaṅ).*

[52] Stutterheim, *T.B.G.,* 67 (1927), pp. 172 sq.

written at Walaing [53]. Finally, it appears that the name Walaing also occurs in the title Sang Watu Walaing, frequently found in inscriptions [54].

There could be no doubt that Walaing was situated in Central Java [55], but are there data that would make it possible to locate the name at a more limited place ? We think that a positive reply may be given to the latter question if we take the above materials into account. We concluded from the end of the Pereng inscription that Walaing is mentioned among the domains belonging to Kumbhayoni. This point makes it probable, though not certain, that Walaing should be located at not too great a distance from Pereng. Now we see that a king who erected three *liṅgas* on the Ratubaka plateau calls himself protector and conqueror of Walaing in two of the three inscriptions dealing with these very *liṅga* erections. It is well-known that *liṅgas* are often erected as visible signs of a victory (*jayacihna*) [56]. Now we see from these inscriptions that a victory over Walaing by Kumbhayoni is mentioned in the texts themselves. One would naturally conclude that this very victory was the direct motive of the *liṅga* erections. It is also natural to conclude that the *liṅgas* were erected on or near the place of the victory. Since we know the *liṅgas* to have been erected on the Ratubaka plateau, the above arguments would lead us to the conclusion that that plateau itself was the scene of the victory. If, then, we see that the inscriptions themselves allude to a victory over Walaing, the final conclusion is that the name Walaing denoted the Ratubaka plateau in ancient times.

This conclusion agrees well with the Pereng inscription, which makes it probable that Walaing should be looked for in the neighbourhood; as a matter of fact, the Ratubaka plateau is situated in the immediate neighbourhood. The exact site of discovery of *O.J.O.*, XXIX is unknown; the copperplate was incorporated into the Collection Dieduksman at Djokjakarta, but the place names mentioned in the text make it very probable that it

---

[53] *Art. cit-*, p. 212, B, line 23 : *likhita citrālekha i walaing punta tarka.*

[54] The oldest reference is the Nangulan inscription dated 822 ; cf. *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), p. 129. We find it several times in the still unpublished inscriptions of the copper plates from Poleñan (cf. Damais, *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, pp. 36-41), viz. in inscription II, dated 875 A.D., A, lines 6 sq.: *tuhān 2 watuwalaing si mnang . pulung si jakhara;* in inscription III, dated 876 A.D., B, line 9 : *tuhān 2 rolū si manūt watuwalaing si mnang;* the title also occurs in inscriptions from Eastern Java, e.g. in *O.J.O.*, XXXVIII (from Singosari), B, line 7 ; *O.J.O.*, XLIII (also from Singosari). A, line 25,; *O.J.O.*, XLVII (from Kudjon Manis), D, lines 2 sq.

[55] That the title occurs in inscriptions from Eastern Java too, is not astonishing : the kings reigning in Eastern Java kept the old tradition of the Central Javanese kraton in most of the titles of dignitaries — titles which probably had their geographical basis in Central Java; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, pp. 206 sqq.

[56] Cf., for instance (one example out of many), an inscription from Cambodia quoted by Cœdès, *B E. F. E. O.*, 28 (1928), p. 129: *jitveman deçam akhilam ĝirīçasyeha bhūbhṛti liṅgan niveçayām āsa jayacihnam ivātmanah //.* Cœdès translates the last pāda: "comme le signe de sa victoire".

originated from the Prambanan region [57]). These references are rather vague, but a third one is very precise. A stone fragment, part of the cornice of a temple building, which was discovered during excavations at the Eastern side of the so-called *pĕndapa* terrace at the Ratubaka plateau, proves to be inscribed with the very word *walaing* [58]). Of course, one could never conclude from this inscription that Walaing is the old name of the Ratubaka plateau or a part of it, but after having arrived at such a conclusion on account of the arguments discussed above one may consider the short inscription an important confirmation.

On the above basis, one might try to reconstruct some of the events which took place about 856 A.D. A Prince, denoting himself by synonyms of the sage Agastya, succeeded in conquering the Ratubaka plateau on an unknown enemy in 856 A.D. and erected three *liṅgas* on the place of his victory. In the stone inscriptions recording the *liṅga* erections, he refers to this feat of arms by calling himself „Victor of Walaing (Valaiṅga)" or, less precisely, „Protector of Walaing". This was not just a deed of violence or revolt, for the victor stresses his rights to the throne by referring to his descent from a great king in old times in two strophes to be analyzed below. Some time afterwards, he may have resigned the throne to devote himself to a more contemplative state in which he continues to live during a couple of years. Six years after his victory, he inaugurates a Çiva temple commemorated by a bilingual inscription in which he again stresses his royal descent and denotes himself by a Rakai title in which the name of the place of the, presumably decisive, victory is preserved.

It is possible that the Pereng inscription contains an allusion to such a victory. In the third introductory Sanskrit strophe, we read the words *çiviravṛtāpy=atipūtā çilā yato janmibhiḥ pūjyā*, words which appear to have puzzled the editors. Kern [59]), not corrected by Poerbatjaraka [60]), considered the current meaning of *çivira* (*çibira*) [61]) unsatisfactory, for a royal camp

---

[57]) For the plate, cf. also Damais, *art. cit.*, pp. 50 sq. The inscription is a *çuddhapattra*, „document proving the repayment of a debt" (cf. No. XII below). The place where the two creditors live is Wurutuṅgal. The same village name occurs in the inscription of Raṇḍusari II (published by Stutterheim in *Inscr. Ned.-Indië*, I, 1940, pp. 29-32), in line 12 and as the name of a centre preceded by *watak* in line 2. In the inscription of Raṇḍusari I (also published by Stutterheim, *ibid.*, pp. 3-28), it occurs as the name of an administrative centre on plate 1 *b*, line 19, in the form *wurusiki* (*siki* and *tuṅgal* are synonyms). The name *walakas* (*watak walakas*), in line B-1 in O.J.O. XXIX, also occurs in Raṇḍusari I, Plate 2 *a*, line 10.

[58]) At present, the stone fragment is at the office of the Dinas Purbakala at Prambanan.

[59]) *Verspr. Geschr.*, VI pp. 281; cf. the note by Cohen Stuart, *ibid.*, p. 282, note 1.

[60]) *Agastya*, p. 46. — Poerbatjaraka transcribed, however, *çivara*, which is not correct.

[61]) *Çibira*, „a sort of grain", is mentioned in Indian Koças only. Even if we accept Kern's conjecture according to which the term would denote some wild herb (a conjecture for which there exists no reference but the Pereng inscription itself), the contrast with *atipūtā çilā* is not comprehensible.

(çibira) [62]) and an extremely pure rock (atipūtā çilā) [63]) are not such nat-
ural oppositions that the expression „this rock, though surrounded by a royal
camp, is extremely pure and therefore to be worshipped by the people" would
be comprehensible; in addition, nothing whatever about a royal camp in
the neighbourhood of Pereng was known, so that Kern presumed that
çibira would have some meaning sharply contrasted to the holy rock
and interpreted „wild herbs" or „dirt". After the preceding arguments
it is, however, clear that it is quite unnecessary to consider such a forced
interpretation. The contrast expressed in this strophe may well be understood
if we presume that the temple Bhadrāloka, whose foundation is recorded
in the Pereng inscription, was erected in a place where there had been royal
camps some years before. The place may have been the scene of fierce battles,
soiled with the blood of numerous victims. It is self-evident that such a place
is not the most suitable one for the erection of a temple; that this place was
nevertheless chosen to that purpose, is because it was naturally pure, not
susceptible of being influenced by defiling forces. It may be compared with
a grain of gold buried in mud or the Bodhisattva in Māyā's womb, to take
two similes famous from Buddhism [64]). If this interpretation of the second
introductory strophe is correct, the connection between the Ratubaka epi-
graphs and the Pereng inscription is a very close one, which is an additional
argument to consider these texts the work of the same king-sage [65]).

It might not be useless to make an attempt at determining what kind
of battles and victory made Kumbhayoni erect his lingas and resign the
throne to lead the life of a royal ascetic. The question is not completely

---

[62]) In spite of Cohen Stuart's note (cf. note 59 above), some of the loci clearly suggest
a military camp; cf., for instance, the Old Javanese Bhīṣmaparwa, edition by Gonda
in Bibl. Jav., No. 7 (1936), p. 86, lines 6 sq., where all the Kaurawas kapwâměgil iñ
çiwirāyatana when sunset made it necessary to cease fighting; cf. also, op. cit., p.
95, line 6 (mundur ta sakweh sañ Korawa, kapwa mulih riñ çiwira). Van der Tuuk,
referring to these loci in his dictionary (III, p. 209) correctly paraphrases „place
where one returns after the battle".

[63]) Poerbatjaraka's translation of this strophe is very different from that by Kern, but
it is due to a confusion between çilā and çila (cf. Bosch. T.B.G., 67, 1927, p. 470). It
is not clear what exactly is meant by çilā; it might be the stone in which the in-
scription was engraved, but this does not seem probable; one could also suppose
that çilā refers to the vibudhageha mentioned in line 17, but çūnyāpi (line 3) seems
strange in this case, unless we should interpret çūnya in its philosophical meaning,
well-known in Çaivasiddhānta as well as in Mahāyāna (cf. Zieseniss, Studien zur
Geschichte des Çivaismus, I, in Bijdr. K.I., 98, 1939, pp. 114 sqq.; p. 114: „Das
çūnya ist das Kennzeichen des Aṣṭaçiva"). This interpretation could more or less
account for the sophisticated contrast: the true nature of the supreme gods can only
be expressed by a paradox.

[64]) Cf., for instance, the numerous similes which aim at explaining the presence of the
pure germ of Buddha-hood in the defiled bodies in the Uttaratantra, Obermiller's
translation in Acta Orient., IX (1931), pp. 132 sqq.

[65]) One might add another, small, detail viz. the use of atipūtā çilā in the Pereng in-
cription and the words bhuvi pūtaṃ tadābhavat. Cf. the detailed discussion in note
160 below.

— 258 —

hopeless if we consider the time in which the above events would have taken place.

When Krom examined the problem of when the Çailendra kings had lost their power in Central Java, he concluded that the first unambiguous proof for the cessation of Çailendra hegemony is the Pereng inscription dated 863 A.D. [66]. Krom rightly argued that the Perot inscriptions dated 850 furnished no real proof [67]. Now, we pointed out that the new interpretation of the beginning of the Perot inscriptions suggested by Damais makes it clear that the Rakai Pikatan, mentioned in these inscriptions, is indeed the king to whom that very title is attributed in Balitung's list of the preceding kings who protected the kraton of Mĕdang [68]. It is, however, clear that the new interpretation hardly affects Krom's analysis : the Çailendras may have continued to reign in the plains of Southern Central Java when descendants of Sañjaya had already succeeded in liberating themselves from Çailendra supremacy. It appears that a prince belonging to the Sañjaya dynasty had made himself completely independent from the Çailendras as early as 832 A.D. or eighteen years before the Perot inscriptions [69]. From about 832 on, we have to presume the existence of a Çaiva centre, probably claiming descent from Sañjaya, in the Northern part of Central Java. We do not know how the relations between the two dynasties developed in the years following 832, but later on, at least since the reign of Kayuwañi, the Çailendra dynasty has disappeared from the Javanese soil and Balitung traces his dynasty back to Sañjaya in his famous Kĕḍu inscription. In order to explain what must have happened in the meantime, we suggested that a king belonging to the Sañjaya dynasty, probably the Rakai Pikatan, married a daughter of the Çailendra king Samaratuṅga, — a princess who is mentioned in the Karaṅgtĕñah inscription dated 824 and who appears to be identical with the queen who issued two charters in 842 A.D. [70]. In this way, one could fully account for what happened in Java, but one important detail is left unexplained, viz. the problem why and how a son of the Javanese Çailendra king Samaratuṅga could become a king in Sumatra; we know, however, that this happened. If we assume that Balaputra mounted the Çrīvijaya throne because he was entitled to the succession [71], we have still to explain why he renounced

66) Geschiedenis², p. 165.
67) Op. cit., p. 156. In this connection, Krom called attention to the stone inscription Mus. Djak. D 28, in which traces of a Pre-Nāgarī inscription are visible on its back. The stone is discussed as No. XI below.
68) Cf. the Introduction to No. IX above.
69) Pras. Indon., I, No. IV (the Gaṇḍasuli inscription issued by a Ḍang Karayān Partapān). The date 832 A.D. is not beyond doubt (cf. op. cit., pp. 56 sq.); it is not certain that the words at the beginning of the text do have a numerical value (cf. Damais, B.E.F.E.O., XLVI, Fasc. 1, note 1 to p. 28), but the not quite natural choice of the words in which the text begins makes this interpretation probable, especially since the result would agree with other data.
70) Pras. Indon., I, Nos. V and VI, pp. 116 sqq. and 131 sqq.
71) According to the Nālandā inscription (reverse, lines 52-62), Bālaputradeva, the king of Suvarṇadvīpa, is a son of Samarāgravīra and his principal spouse (agramahiṣī)

any claims to the Central Javanese throne. It seems probable that those circles in Central Java who had been attached to the Çailendra court during several generations were not satisfied with the events as a consequence of which they would lose their influence; if this line of argument is correct, we should expect them to support Bālaputra if he should make an attempt at obtaining the supreme power in Java.

With a little imagination, we could represent us two groups struggling for supremacy in Central Java about in the middle of the 9th century. If now, on the other hand, it is known that a king belonging to a Çaiva dynasty and denoting himself by the name of an ancient sage closely connected with the expansion of Brāhmaṇic culture erected liṅgas in 856 A.D. probably as the commemoration of an important victory and in any case at a place which had been associated with the Buddhist Çailendra dynasty in older times [72]), there are strong reasons to connect these facts with the struggle for supremacy which could be presumed on more general and, unfortunately, rather vague arguments. The two lines of arguments fit in with one another as well as could have been expected. Fortunately, we now dispose of a strong argument which confirms the otherwise weakest link in the chain of events

Tārā. Samarāgravīra is the son of the king of Java, ornament of the Çailendra dynasty (52), Tārā is the daughter of Çrī Dharmasetu (or: Varmasetu; in the most recent transcript of the Nālandā inscription by Hirananda Sastri in Mem. Arch. Surv. India, No. 66, 1942, p. 99, line 59, the name is rendered çrī-Dharmasetōḥ, but Dr. Chakravarti adds in note 3 to op. cit., p. 99, that „Majumdar reads Varmasetōḥ, which is correct") of the lunar dynasty. Stutterheim (A Javanese Period, 1929, pp. 10 sq.) had considered Dharmasetu a synonym of the Pāla king Dharmapāla, but without sufficient arguments; we accept Krom's conjecture (in Stapel, I, 1938. p. 162; cf. also Nilakanta Sastri in B.E.F.E.O., XL, 1940, p. 267, and Pras Indon., I, p. 110) according to which Dharmasetu or Varmasetu would have been a king of Çrīvijaya: in that case, he could have ascended the Çrīvijaya throne owing to, presumably, complicated dynastic relations in Çrīvijaya. Question: could Bālaputra have been made king in Çrīvijaya in preference to and favoured above other possible pretendents on account of claims to Central Java? If it is correct that Dharmasetu was a king of Çrīvijaya, we know that the reigning dynasty in Çrīvijaya was the Somavaṃça before Bālaputra, who probably started the line of Çailendra kings who continued to reign in Sumatra until, at least, the first half of the 11th century (cf. Cœdès, Les Etats hindouïsés, p. 185 and pp. 238 sqq.). Bālaputra calls himself Suvarṇadvīpādhipamahārāja (Nālandā inscription, obverse, line 37), but when he gives his vaṃçāvalī (reverse, lines 52 sqq.), he starts with a yavabhūmipāla, not with some Çrīvijaya king. One may assume that such an important document as this Nālandā inscription, dealing with the relations between the two great Mahāyānic powers, is very carefully worded. I am therefore inclined to attach some importance to this point: claims are an essential factor in political history of all countries and all times. Cf. also below.

[72]) This appears from the Pre-Nāgarī inscription dated about 778 A.D. and discussed lastly in Pras. Indon., I, No. II. Among the scarce Buddhist remains discovered on the Ratubaka plateau, there is a small gold plate with an inscription ye te svāha, undoubtedly the initial syllables of the two main parts of the Buddhist formula ye dharmā hetuprabhavā etc. The archaic script, especially the form of the -e, makes it probable that the inscription should be assigned to a considerably earlier period than our liṅga inscriptions.

reconstructed above. An Old Javanese inscription dated the same year as the Ratubaka inscriptions (856 A.D.) mentions the name Bālaputra (spelt *vāla-putra*) in connection with a struggle in the preceding period, after which the Çaiva king acquired complete sovereignty in Central Java [73].

The above is important for several reasons. It supplies us with an important date in Old Javanese history, something more precise than we knew before; it is also interesting for the history of Çrīvijaya and even for that of Bengal. Pāla chronology is still very uncertain; the date of the Nālandā inscription, i.e. the 39th year of Devapāla's reign, floats between 833 and 878. The above reconstruction gives us a fixed point. Since Bālaputradeva sends his ambassador as a king of Sumatra, the Nālandā inscription must be dated in or after 856 A.D. It is not unlikely that Bālaputra should have made haste to enter into relations with Devapāla: the events in which he had been involved in Java might have induced him to look for possible allies in the West. Is not it the same kind of policy as that which we vaguely distinguish in the beginning of the 11th century when the friendly relations between Çrīvijaya and the Coḷa king Rājarāja I, which are marked by the foundation of a Vihāra at Nāgīpaṭṭana, by the Çrīvijaya king Māravijayottuṅgavarman take place — only a few years after an attack by a Javanese fleet ? [74] If the presumed connection is correct, we have a strong argument to date the Nālandā inscription only a few years after 856 or about 860 A.D. [75].

Finally, one might ask again with Krom [76] whether the famous transposition of the Javanese court from Central to Eastern Java in the first half of the 10th century is not connected with a direct or indirect attempt by Çrīvijaya at executing the claims which we suggested above.

Krom's arguments, though based upon an explanation of the Çailendra period which is no more accepted in that form [77], have not lost their force;

---

[73] Strophe 7, pāda d, of No. XI below. The passage will be discussed in detail in the Introduction to No. XI.

[74] Cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 229 ; Cœdès, *Les Etats hindouïsés*, p. 224. Berg, *Indo-nesië*, IV, No. 6 (May 1951), p. 511, note 3, is very sceptical about this Javanese expedition since there would be too much chance for a misunderstanding by the Chinese. This scepticism seems exaggerated since the precise references to the movements of the ambassador from Çrīvijaya give the impression of being reliable ; it seems that the only reasonable chance for a misunderstanding could be in the name of the country that attacked Çrīvijaya. It should, however, been added that the explanation of the Çrīvijaya ambassador's delay is strongly confirmed by a Javanese embassy in 992 where the same events are alluded to ; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 229.

[75] Possibly later. Also if we assume that Bālaputra sent the embassy shortly after his accession to the throne, there still remains the undetermined period between his expulsion from Java and the accession to the throne.

[76] *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 208.

[77] Recently, three different attempts at defining the relations between Crīvijaya and Central Java in the period from about 775 to 850 A.D. have been made, viz. by Cœdès, *Le Çailendra „Tueur des Héros ennemis"* in *Bingkisan Budi* (1950), pp. 58-70, by myself, *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 99 sq., and by Bosch, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 108

the only difference is that the motive for an attack is slightly changed : the relation even becomes rather more explicit [78]).

Whatever one may think about the above suggestions, which seem to open new lines of research that may prove to permit more satisfactory interpretations of some of the most annoying problems of the older Indonesian history, the meaning of the year 856 begins to stand out against the background of this period. Before proceeding to give a transcription and translation of the three texts, we shall briefly discuss two other aspects of their meaning, viz. the two strophes dealing with the descent of king Kumbhayoni (b 3 and c 3) and the namaskāras, interesting for our knowledge of the history of Çaivism in Java.

Strophe b 3 is very difficult to be read ; its transcript is not everywhere certain. Fortunately, the metre (Ṭoṭaka) and the abuse of alliterations make some control possible. We understand that once there was a king who, driven by his great pity, settled down in some country to reign in an excellent town. The names of both the country and the town are uncertain. The name of the country seems to read Sargabhava, whereas the excellent town is probably called Yava (pāda d : yavākhyapure pravare) [79]. Also if this reading is not correct, there is no reasonable doubt that the town and the country are situated in Java : the strophe deals with a prince who settled down out of pity and to this prince Kumbhayoni traces his descent. Strophe c 3 deals with the same events, but describes them from a different point of view. There, the country in which our mysterious prince settled down is not men- tioned, but attention is drawn to the very marvellous city that he left or, to use the terms of the text, from where he descended like a moon from the pure sky. The most important point is the mention of a definite place of origin in this connection, viz. Akhaṇḍalapura. The supernatural plan upon which the 'descent' is placed leaves no doubt that the marvellous city is conceived of as some kind of other world ; the simile would be completely out of the place if it had reference to the movement from one place to another in the neighbourhood. Akhaṇḍalapura must have been far away from the Ratubaka hill, probably not in Java. The former half of the name strongly reminds one of Ākhaṇḍala, a well-known name of Indra. The spelling by a short initial a could not be explained as a scribal error, for the metre (it is the second syllable of a Svāgata pāda) requires a short syllable ; a

---

(1952), pp. 113-123. The three attempts, rather different in their details, agree in as far as they mark a partial withdrawal from the complete dissociation of the Çailendra kings from the rulers of Çrīvijaya. Cœdès, in this point followed by Bosch, considers the first Çailendra king a son of the king of Çrīvijaya and a princess descending from Fu-nan. The solution which I proposed differs in detail, but agrees in postulating dynastic relationship between the Çrīvijaya and the Çailendra kings from the end of the 8th century onwards.

[78]) Cf. the Introduction to No. XI below.

[79]) Cf. notes 131 and 143 below.

mistake by the poet is, however, plausible on account of the numerous other inaccuracies in these inscriptions [80]). If, then, the name is to be considered a mistake for Ākhaṇḍalapura, it would correspond to Indrapura, a very common name especially of a royal residence. This very fact, however, makes it impossible to identify it. The first capital of Jayavarman II in Cambodia was called Indrapura; it was probably founded at the very beginning of the actual reign of Jayavarman II, i.e. in 802 A. D. [81]). The well-known Cham dynasty of Indrapura (which was situated in the province Quang-nam) was in power from 875 A. D. on [82]). In the Malay Peninsula, Indrapura appears to have been a common designation for royal residences; it has remained the court name of Pahang [83]). Other examples may probably be added: the name is not uncommon in Sumatra [84]). These references do not bring us much further: even if the equivalency of Ākhaṇḍalapura and Indrapura is accepted, there are no materials to justify a choice between the numerous Indrapuras. One point, however, deserves notice: no examples of Indrapura (or a synonym of that name) have been known from Java, whereas the name frequently occurs in Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, to mention only the nearest-by regions. It seems therefore more probable that the mysterious god-king came from Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula than from another region in Java.

---

[80]) We already called attention to the strange construction of strophe c 2 with the accusatives not depending on any verb. Also the two compounds of which the strophe is composed are not completely lucid. A compound such as *varaçāstratalānvitaḥ* (the second pāda of c 4) is hardly correct: *anvita* is „followed by, accompanied by, provided with", whereas the poet undoubtedly intended to use a term meaning „penetrating, going to (the bottom of the excellent Çāstras)", such as *āgata*. The last pāda of strophe c 5, viz. *bhuvi pūtam tadabhavat*, is not lucid; *pūtam* is, presumably. used as a substantive in the meaning of *viçuddhi, viçodhana*, „purification". One might find fault with *kṛttikavāsa-liṅgam* (the 4th pāda of a 3) instead of *kṛtti(ka)vāso-liṅgam*, with *bhuvanāvakrāntam* (overwhelming the earth, unless the meaning should be *bhuvane vyavatīrṇam*); *prasthāpitam*, in the meaning of *pratiṣṭhāpitam* is more often found in Sanskrit inscriptions from Indonesia (4th pāda of b 4; cf. Vogel, *Aanteekeningen op de inscriptie van Tjanggal in Midden Java, Bijdr. K.I.*, 100, 1941, pp. 443-447, who notes *prātiṣṭhipat* instead of *pratyatiṣṭhipat* in the first strophe of the inscription; cf. also *prātiṣṭhipan* in the Karangtěṅah inscription, strophe 11 d, *Pras. Indon.*, I, p. 39). — These inaccuracies are not devoid of interest in view of the interpretation of our epigraphs. Sometimes, e.g. in the two first pādas of a 2, we can only guess at what the poet meant. Uncertain reading and copyist's lapses could be only partly responsible for these inaccuracies.

[81]) Cœdès, *Les capitales de Jayavarman II, B.E.F.E.O.*, XXVIII, (1928), pp. 117-119; *Etats hindouisés*, p. 169.

[82]) *Etats hindouisés*, p. 209 and pp. 212 sq.

[83]) R. O. Winstedt, *Kingship and Enthronement in Malaya*, J.R.A.S., 1945, pp. 135 sq.; reprint in the *J.M.B.R.A.S.*, XX (1947), Pt. 1, pp. 129-139 (with references).

[84]) The most striking example is Siak Sri Indrapura, the residence of the Sultans of Siak. Another Indrapura is situated near Seulimeum to the south-east of Kotaradja in Atjeh; a third one is found in the south of the Minangkabau at the foot of the so-called „Peak of Indrapura" (or= „Peak of Korintji"). Only in the first of these references, the association with a royal residence is evident.

About when may this mysterious king have lived ? — It is obvious that the words *tasyātmanas=santatijena* (b 4) and *tadanvayāt=prasuto 'yaṃ* (c 4), by which the relation between Kumbhayoni and his ancestor is expressed, do not imply a definite grade of relationship. The Sanskrit expressions suggest some distance : they could not have been used for the relation between a son and his father, but this might be almost all that can be concluded. Owing to the scarceness of the data, an identification of the prince who descended from Ākhaṇḍalapura is impossible ; if, however, the above reference to Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula may be relied upon, the descent of the god-king might be connected with some other data which point to the same regions, too. Probably in 832 A. D., an inscription in the Old Malay language is carved in a rock at Gaṇḍasuli in the heart of Central Java ; another Old Malay inscription, originating from the same village, is dated 827 A. D. [85]). In addition, there is the short inscription from Bukatedja which was discussed above (No. VIII). Is there any connection between all these data ? [86]).

When discussing the Gaṇḍasuli rock inscription in an earlier publication [87]), I made no attempt at suggesting an explanation of the use of Old Malay in this edict, but only briefly mentioned the possibility that the use of the Old Malay language should be considered a kind of demonstration manifesting the origin of the *vaṃça* to which the Rakarayān Partapan belonged [88]). Recently, E. B. Vogler made a very interesting attempt at explaining the differences in style between the architecture of the northern and the southern part of Central Java in about the same period :

---

[85]) According to the calculation by Damais in *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI. Pt. 1 (1952), pp. 28 sq., No. 11.

[86]) Also another inscription, viz. that of Kebonkopi near Pogor in Western Java, is composed in Old Malay (cf. the publication by Bosch in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 100, 1941, pp. 49-53). It is possible that there is some connection between the latter text and the documents quoted above, but this does not seem likely. Unless new data should prove the contrary, it seems preferable to attribute the use of Old Malay in the Kebonkopi inscription to influence from Çrīvijaya and to dissociate it from the Old Malay materials in Central Java. Even in the 12th century A.D., a part of Western Java seems still to have been under the influence of Çrīvijaya (Chou K'ü-Fei, whose lost report constituted one of the main sources of Chau Ju-kua ; cf. Cœdès, *A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrīvijaya* in *Bijdr. K.I.*. 83, 1927, pp. 468-472, and the survey by Krom, *Geschiedenis*, pp. 302-8).

[87]) *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 50-73. Cf. especially p. 200.

[88]) Bosch *(Bijdr. K.I.,* 108, 1952, p. 196) interpreted my suggestion as if I had wanted to attribute the use of Old Malay in the Gaṇḍasuli rock inscription to Sumatranese influence and to the Sañjayavaṃça. I wish to stress that I even excluded such an interpretation on account of various linguistic features, which seem to point to the Riau Archipelago and the Malay Peninsula *(op. cit.,* p. 55). As a matter of fact, I left the whole question open at that time, hoping to be able to deal with these problems in the light of new materials. The passage in the English Summary of *Pras. Indon.*, I (p. 200), which was quoted above, is based on general impressions given by the Gaṇḍasuli rock inscription in connection with the time and the place of the latter.

the difference in style exhibited by the buildings of the northern part (if compared with the Çailendra monuments) is attributed to a new influx of non-Javanese elements presumably connected with the Rakai Patapān (Raka-rayān Partapān) [89]. On account of the language used in the Gandasuli in-scriptions the origin of the Rakarayān Patapān should be looked for in the Malay-speaking regions, such as Sumatra or the Malay Peninsula. To be more precise, it is not necessary that the Rakarayān Patapān himself originated from these regions; it may have been his father or grandfather. As is sug-gested by Vogler, the Rakarayān Partapān and his descendants would not have acted as strangers; they would have legitimated their actions by asso-ciating themselves with descendants of the Sañjayavaṃça by marriage or otherwise [90].

Whatever still remains dark in the undoubtedly very complicated dynastic relations during the first half and the middle of the 9th century A. D., it seems at least probable that several lines of arguments relate to roughly the same string of events : the descent from Akhaṇḍalapura of king Kumbhayoni's ancestor, the occurrence of Old Malay documents in Central Java in the first half of the 9th century, the appearance of a new style of architecture in the northern part of Central Java in roughly the same period — all these arguments seem to indicate that the Sañjaya dynasty, pushed to the background by the Çailendra rulers, was brought to new power by being associated with the chief of a new group of presumably warlike set-tlers from the Malay-speaking regions [91].

Finally, the materials of the Pereng inscription as far as the descent of the founder Pu Kumbhayoni is concerned [92] would probably refer to

---

[89] *Bijdr. K.I.*, 109 (1953), pp. 256-265.

were only too willing to accept the help of such an Indonesian (though non-Javanese)

[90] It may be supposed that the presumably weak descendants of Sañjaya in this period group since this was the only means to arrive at power again. Parallels from later Javanese history are easy to be found. It is well-known, e.g., that Pangeran Pugěr (the later Susuhunan Pakubuwana I) associated himself with the Macassarese chief Namrud by taking him up into his family, when his elder brother Amangkurat II recuperated the throne with the help of the Dutch East India Company.

[91] Cf. especially No. VIII above. The text of No. VIII had already been printed when I received the important article by E.B. Vogler, *Ontwikkeling van de gewijde bouw-kunst in het Hindoeïstische Midden-Java*, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 109 (1953), pp. 249-272; especially pp. 258 sqq. are interesting for the problems connected with influences from the non-Javanese regions.

[92] Viz. the passage *puyut sang ratu i halu pakwianira i jangluran.* According to Stut-terheim's interpretation (T.B.G., 65, 1925, note 8 to p. 215), which the present author considers the correct one, the passage mentions two details of Kumbhayoni's descent: he was a great grandson of the „Prince of Halu" and his grandmother came from Jangluran. Stutterheim fixed the meaning of *kwi (kbi)* „grandmother", in a later study *(Epigraphica,* I-V, in *T.B.G.,* 75, 1935, pp. 420-467, especially No. III); *pakwian* therefore means „grandmother's place". Stutterheim's suggestion that Jangluran is a toponymic is confirmed by recent research; I hope to show in a later publication that a centre Jangluran was situated in the Purworedjo region.

the same events [93]). The main difficulty is that the few accounts seem to pick out different details. It does not seem likely that a reliable reconstruction should be possible without new data. A few new data, mainly about king Kumbhayoni himself, are contained in No. XI below and will be discussed in the Introduction to the latter document.

In the last part of this Introduction, a few details about the *liṅga* foundations, commemorated by the three Ratubaka inscriptions, should be briefly noted. We already briefly alluded to the curious problem whether each of the three texts commemorates a different *liṅga* foundation or only one *liṅga* foundation considered from three different points of view. When considering the wording of the texts, the former alternative seems preferable. The fact that inscription *a* relates the erection of a Kṛtti(ka)vāsoliṅga and uses only Kṛtti(ka)vāsas and no other name of Çiva throughout the text, whereas the inscriptions *b* and *c* mention only the names Tryambaka and Hara respectively [94]), is too striking to be attributed to just a haphazard choice between numerous synonyms. It may be supposed that a Tryambakaliṅga was considered something different from a Kṛttivāso- and a Hara-liṅga. The differences need not necessarily be referred to the liṅgas themselves ; it is more likely that the different aspects of the supreme god with whom each of the three liṅgas was associated appeared from various details of the temples in which the liṅgas may have stood.

Inscription *a* abounds in ambiguous terms in its first two strophes. The key to its correct understanding is implied in the name Kṛttivāsas itself. *Kṛtti*, "that which has been cut off", denotes not only an animal skin, but also the bark of a tree. In the former case, Kṛttivāsas is connected with the terrific god wrapped in a tiger skin ; in the latter, the same name denotes somebody dressed in tree bark (*valkala*), which is the usual dress of Çaiva ascetics. The *double entente* is undoubtedly intentional, for the epithets have been chosen in such a way that they may apply to both the terrific god and the austere ascetic. Thus, *phanīndra* is not only the Nāga king around the god's neck, but also a well-known synonym of the name of Patañjali, the traditional founder of Yoga as a Fath leading to Mokṣa ; the second pāda of strophe 2 suggests both a famous pose of the dancing god and a particularly tiring attitude of an ascetic [95]). Strophe 3 makes it clear what the poet intended by this *double entente*. There, king Kumbhayoni is called an „undifferentiated portion" (*advayāṃça*) [95]) of Çiva, so that the *namaskāra*

---

[93]) On the basis of the identity of the king in the Ratubaka inscriptions and the distinguished founder in the Pereng inscription, which was concluded to above (p. 253), it is very likely that Kumbhayoni traces his descent to the same ancestor in both cases. This means that „the god descended from Ākhaṇḍalapura" is identical with „the Prince of Halu". For the meaning of *halu*, the reader is referred to No. XI below, strophe 12 *d*.

[94]) Cf. p. 247 above.

[95]) The reader is referred to the notes to the Translation for the details.

addressed to the god is necessarily also a homage to the king practising austerities on the cemetery grounds. Inscription *a* is of a considerable importance for the history of religious cults in Java. The text makes it clear that even these bloody forms of Çaivism were well established in Java in the middle of the 9th century A. D. If the reading and interpretation of *çavodvahe* (1 c) are correct, there is also an interesting reference to the famous Vetāla rites [96]. We already briefly mentioned the fact that inscription b, strophe 2 shows us a most developed form of Çāktism, the Devī being represented in union with the god, while Çrī is hidden in the most private part of the Devī. It hardly seems doubtful that here, as in inscription *a*, the strophes addressed to the god indirectly refer to the king who is his *advayāṃça* and fully enjoys Çrī. The representation as a whole reminds one of the famous tale about Ken Arok and Ken Ḍĕḍĕs in the Pararaton [97]. With a view to these demonic and sensual aspects of Çaivism, it may not be superfluous to stress that it is now beyond doubt that they were known during the greater part of Hindu-Javanese history. It has recently been argued that these hardly attractive forms of worship should have been imported by Kĕrtanagara in the second half of the 13th century from China or Tibet to inaugurate an entirely new line of politics [98]. It is at least clear that all the elements necessary to such a development were present in Java more than four centuries earlier [99]. Inscription *c* shows us the god in the battle against Tripura, the three castles built by the Asura architect Maya. The representation of the battle does not exactly correspond to the descriptions known from literature [100]. The main difference is that Maya is represented as the Asura warrior who defends the castles against Çiva's attacks. It is possible that the text is based on a version unknown to us; a second possibility

---

[96] This is based on our interpretation of *çavodvahe* in inscription *a*, strophe 1 c. The *çava* is the Apasmārapuruṣa if applied to the dancing god, but probably a corpse possessed by a Vetāla if the term also applies to the king practising Yoga, as we suggested. Further details will be given in the notes to the Translation.

[97] Brandes, *Pararaton²*, *Verh. B.G.*, LXII (1920), p. 15, lines 7-12, p. 58 (translation) ; cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 313 sq. (with references).

[98] C.C. Berg, *De geschiedenis van pril Majapahit*, II, in *Indonesië*, V (1951). p. 194 ; cf. also note 3 (p. 225). Cf. *infra*, note 99.

[99] The lines of religious development in Java are still very obscure. One of Berg's arguments that Tāntrism may have been imported during the reign of Kĕrtanagara because there was a reason for such an 'importation' is a very weak one : there would not have been any reason to import it if Tāntrism had been in Java for centuries. The non-Tantric character of the complex Barabuḍur-Mĕndut-Pawon cannot serve as an argument; one could as well prove that there is no Çaivism in India because there is Vaiṣṇavism. All the material at our disposal seems to indicate a co-existence of many different forms of religion and worship during Old Javanese history. Political considerations, but also personal religious convictions (why should kings have been different from other human beings in this respect) may lead to combinations of different religious elements.

[100] Cf. the notes to the Translation.

is that our poet, whose account seems rather confused, had misunderstood Maya's role; finally, one could consider the possibility that the poet gave a slightly different version of the story in order to adapt it to historical circumstances. We saw that it was hardly doubtful that the inscriptions consider king Kumbhayoni a partial incarnation of the god, as appears especially from inscription a. Then we may conclude that a part of the praise addressed to the god is naturally referred to the king. To put it otherwise, the poet would have worded his praise in such a way that at least part of it might be applied to the king. In view of such an interpretation, one is inclined to suppose that the two first strophes of inscription c refer to a fierce struggle in which Kumbhayoni with his group succeeded in beating an enemy; since this struggle reminded the poet of Mahādewa's fight against Tripura, he addressed the first strophes of the text to Çiva Tripurāntaka but related the episode in a slightly different way in order to make it better agree with the historical struggle. If, then, Kumbhayoni's principal adversary not only had a number of strongholds built but also defended them himself, the poet would have been forced to represent the role played by Maya in a different way. Although such an explanation necessarily remains conjectural, it hardly seems doubtful that we should look for a solution along these lines.

If the three Ratubaka inscriptions do refer to historical episodes, one might conclude that the original order is somewhat different from that which is given in this edition [101]), viz. a (ascetism), c (struggle and victory), b (full exertion of royal power). This, of course, is only the order of the events to which the inscriptions seem to allude: the inscriptions themselves, as well as the liṅgas, should probably be attributed to the same date. There is little doubt that the three liṅgas and the three texts mark an important event in the old history of Central Java; in the light of the preceding arguments, it is justified to determine the event as a great victory over an unknown foe in or a little before 856 A.D., a victory which marks this date as the re-establishment of Çaiva power in Central Java [102]). In addition, there is some reason to suppose that these events are connected with the Ratubaka plateau in some way or other.

Finally, it may be useful to call attention to a few minor points.

We have already briefly called attention to the curious relation between the two first strophes in each of the three inscriptions. Whereas each of the three first strophes is addressed to one of the forms of Çiva (Kṛttivāsas,

---

[101]) The order adopted in this edition is based on the dates of discovery of the three inscriptions; cf. the beginning of this Introduction.

[102]) This interpretation is mainly based on (a) the very remarkable fact of the erection of three liṅgas probably at the same time, (b) the analysis of inscription c. It is not impossible to interpret these facts in a different way, but, as we shall see in the Introduction to No. XI, the interpretation here given is fully confirmed by other data.

Tryambaka and Hara, respectively), the three second strophes are addressed
to Lakṣmī-Çrī (expressed as Çrī, Çūralakṣmī and Mahallakṣmī respectively),
not to three forms of the Devī as one would have expected. There is some-
thing strange in this combination. It is possible that the poet denoted Çiva's
çakti by Lakṣmī-Çrī in order to stress the divine symbol of sovereignty ac-
quired by the god-king [103]). Although such an interpretation would fully
confirm the above surmise about the meaning of the liṅga erections, it could
hardly be considered satisfactory since one would have expected that the
king himself should have been represented as an avatāra of Viṣṇu in that
case [104]). In view of this difficulty, one might suggest an interpretation which
is in a line with that proposed for the two first strophes of inscription c. There,
I considered the possibility that the poet gave a slightly different version
of the Tripura episode in order to make it agree with a historical episode.
If, then, the relation between the king and the queen was an unusual one —
which would be the case if, for instance, the king and the queen belonged to
a different group or to a different dynasty —, it could be understood that the
poet expressed such an incongruity by transferring it, as it were, to the
divine plan. Such an interpretation, though far from being evident by itself,
would agree remarkably well with some data to be discussed in the Intro-
duction to No. XI below.

Secondly, I should like to lay some stress on the rather plastic descriptions
of the god and the goddess in the two first strophes of each of the three
inscriptions. This applies as much to the Naṭarāja in a, as to the āliṅganamūrti
in b and the Tripurāntakamūrti in c. Although the inscriptions deal only with
the erection of liṅgas, there is no reason to suppose that only liṅgas were
erected. The liṅgas would not probably have been erected in the open air
and, on the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the three liṅgas
should have been different in form because they were associated with different
aspects of the supreme god; but if this difference was not expressed in the
shape of the liṅgas, it is only natural to assume that the poet would not have
insisted on these different associations if the difference did not appear from
other details of the foundations. Presumably, the poet only mentioned the
liṅga foundations because he considered these the essence of the foundation
as a whole. By combining the above points one is inclined to conclude that
the inscriptions refer to the foundation of three temples, in which the main
objects of worship were liṅgas, whereas the different mūrtis with which each
liṅga was associated appeared from other temple details such as their reliefs
or their iconography. This presumption is strongly supported by other discov-

---

[103]) Cf. the excellent survey by Jatis Chandra De, *Sidelights on the Hindu Conception
of Sovereignty* in *The Cultural Heritage of India, Sri Ramakrishna Centenary Me-
morial*, III (1937), pp. 249-258.

[104]) It is curious that we have no definite proofs foi this conception in Indonesia before
the 11th century A.D. (Airlaṅga and the Kaḍiri period) ; in the Kaḍiri period it was
however very usual (cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 268 sqq.) ; thus, Jayabhaya is called
Madhusūdanāvatāra, Kāmeçwara is a Trivikramāvatāra (O.J.O., LXXII, A-3).

eries on the Ratubaka plateau. In 1816, Crawfurd visited the Ratubaka plateau and noticed an image there described by him as „a mutilated stone figure which I imagine to represent Mahādeva destroying Tripurāntaka" [105]. Unfortunately, no stone figure of that kind has been recovered, but there is no reason to doubt the correctness of Crawfurd's statement; one may assume that he saw a group which was familiar to him from Indian iconography [106]. As to the *āliṅganamūrti* suggested by inscription *b*, it is curious that an image of a god and a goddess embracing each other was also discovered on the Ratubaka plateau [107]. These references are the more striking because neither representation is common in Old Javanese iconography; they make it probable that the stone figures should be associated with the liṅga foundations in some way or other. Without further data, it is impossible to conclude how the statues were combined with the liṅgas. The archaeologic research on the Ratubaka plateau, which is being continued at present, might possibly furnish new materials.

---

a

The dimensions of this stone are 68 cm in height and 31 cm in breadth. The stone is inscribed on one side with 14 lines of Old Javanese script and is rather weather-beaten as a whole. The inscribed surface is very unequal, which is mainly due to the rough kind of stone. The akṣaras are of considerable size, the average height being about 2 cm. There are however striking differences between the akṣaras, both in the height and in the degree of cursivity.

Transcription

[1] // Saçoṇitā*mitanṛpamauli*[2]māline [108)
phaṇīndrabhūṣitagala[3]hastakāṅghraye [109) /

[105)] Cf. the quotations from Crawfurd's description by A.J. Bernet Kempers in *T.B.G*, LXXXIII, 1949, p. 186.

[106)] Cf. Gopinath Rao, *Elements*, II, 1, pp. 164 sqq. Cf. also C. Sivaramamurti, *Geographical and Chronological Factors in Indian Iconography*, in *Ancient India*, VI (Jan. 1950), pp. 58 sq.

[107)] J.W. IJzerman, *Beschrijving der Oudheden nabij de grens der residenties Soerakarta en Djogdjakarta* (1891), p. 112.

[108)] The latter half of the first line is difficult to be read and its transcription is not therefore completely certain. In *mauli*, the *la* is completely certain and traces of the *-i* are still visible; the first syllable is uncertain by itself, but the combination of the vowel signs does not seem doubtful. The reading *mauli* is acceptable on account of the meaning and of the alliteration with *māline* at the beginning of line 2. We are not certain about *(a)mita*, which, in addition, is hardly satisfactory; *(a)mṛta* might also be considered, but is hardly more satisfactory.

[109)] The first syllable of °*gala*° is uncertain. As a matter of fact, the akṣara seems closed on the bottom; *vala* does not however make sense. Possibly, the line at the bottom is only a scratch in the stone surface. Cf. also b 4 below, where the stone-cutter clearly put down *va* instead of *ga*.

pranṛtyate pi[4]tṛnilaye çavodvahe [110])

    namo <'stu> [111]) [5] te daçadiçi kṛttivāsase // 1 //

[6] Navodyajambhajaṭilakāntisa[7]nnibhāṃ [112])

    suvijvaladbhaṭamaṇikā[8]ntiçobhinīṃ [113]) /

purārcitāṃ çriyam=atha [9] kṛttivāsaso

    dadātu vo [10] varacaraṇāṅgulis=sadā // 2 //

[11] Çrīkumbhajākhyena nararṣabheṇa

    [12] harādvayāṃsāmalabhaktinā ca /

[13] valaiṅgagoptrā bhuvanāvakrā[14]ntaṃ

    saṃsthāpitaṃ kṛttikavāsaliṅgam // 3 // 778 çaka //

<div align="center">T r a n s l a t i o n</div>

1. Thou who art wrapped in a (tiger) skin [or: dressed in tree bark], bearing the blood-stained crowns of innumerable [114]) kings as a wreath while Thy neck [115]), arms and legs are adorned with the king of the hooded ones [or: distinguished by Patañjali]) [116]), dancing at the abode

---

[110]) In the last compound of this pāda, at least the second and fourth syllables are certain (vo and he, respectively); ça is however probable, though ga and bha could not be excluded. As to the third syllable, it is a ligature in any case, but its reading is completely conjectural; other possibilities are vva or gva and probably some other readings, too. Our transcription is mainly based on the ending -he; since a dative is required by the context, the term must be a noun ending in -h, a rather rare type: among these, compounds ending in -vah are not unfrequent (indravah, havyavah, apsuvah, etc.; cf. Whitney's Grammar, §§ 403 and 404; the weak cases ought however to have -uh (Pāṇini, Aṣṭādh., III, 2, kār. 64, and IV, 1, kār. 61), but those in udvah are not known to occur; cf. infra, note 117.

[111]) The short syllable required by the metre may be reconstituted as 'stu, which could not be missed in the context.

[112]) The three first syllables of the pāda are obscure, although their reading seems rather certain. Cf. note 120 below.

[113]) We are not certain about the correct reading of the fifth syllable of pāda b. The lower part of the ligature might be either a bha or a na. We consider the former a little more likely than the latter, because the right hand part of the akṣara begins above the middle of its height; this detail might not however be decisive in view of the striking irregularities in the script of the three Ratubaka inscriptions. On the other hand, the reading naṭa might be slightly more satisfactory with a view to the meaning of the pāda, although one might object that there is no special „dancer's jewel"; bhaṭa could be explained as a wrong orthography for bhaṭṭa, which is not unacceptable in view of the spelling bhaṭāra instead of bhaṭṭāra from the same root, which is the usual form met with in Old Javanese records.

[114]) Amita, if this is the correct reading (cf. note 108 above) is used in a rather strange way.   [115]) This translation is based on the reading ° gala °; cf. 109 above.

[116]) Phaṇīndrabhūṣita, — „adorned with the king of the Nāgas", used as an upavīta by the god, is perfectly clear. Since, however, it seems obvious that all the terms have a double meaning, referring not only to the dancing god but also to the king practising Yoga in the cemetery grounds, both conceptions being expressed by the same compound Kṛttivāsas, it is probable that Phaṇīndra has the second meaning of Patañjali, the traditional founder of the Yoga system. The limbs of the king practising austerities could be considered „distinguished by (the lore of) Patañjali". Cf. also the Introduction, supra, p. 266.

of the Fathers and carrying away a corpse (?) [117] — glory to Thee in the ten quarters.

2. May always the toe of the excellent foot of (the god) wrapped in a (tiger) skin [or : of him who is dressed in tree bark] grant you Prosperity [or : the royal dignity] besought in the empire [or : entreated in former times] [118]), (Prosperity) which resembles the charm of Çiva [or : of the ascetic] [119]) with .... (?), resplendent by the charm of the flaming jewel of the Lord [or : of the warrior] (?) [120]).

---

[117]) *Çavodvahe* could be only a dative of *çavodvah*, a compound which is not, however, quotable from other sources. The root form *vah* is often used as the last member of a compound (cf. the references in note 110 above), but the form given here is not quite correct from a grammarian's point of view (cf. *ibid.*). *Çavodvah* would mean : „carrying away, or lifting up, a corpse" (cf. *çavodvaha* for which the dictionaries give „remover of corpses" as a translation). In addition it is noted that *çava* is more often combined with a root in its radical form (cf. *çavabhṛt, çavaspṛç*). The Apasmārapuruṣa on whose back the god performs the dance is not represented as a dead body as a rule. One gets the impression that a slightly different version is given in order to imply a second meaning to the term which could be applied to the king-ascetic. The expression „carrying away a corpse" immediately suggests the famous Vetāla practices by which the Yogin may acquire the Vetālasiddhi; cf., e.g., Pott, *Yoga en Yantra* (1946), pp. 85 sq. and the references to Tāranātha mentioned there. Such practices could well be applied to the king-ascetic practising Yoga in the cemetery grounds in order to acquire the forces necessary for the victory. This interpretation agrees remarkably well with the words *purārcitāṃ çriyam* in the third pāda of the second strophe, if the former half of *purārcitāṃ* is to be interpreted as *purā;* cf. *infra*, note 85. — The word *pitṛnilaya* could denote any cemetery, but when the term is applied to the king-ascetic, *pitṛ* may refer to the king's ancestors : it is well-known that up to relatively recent times the kings of Mataram used to make a pilgrimage to their family graves on the eve of important decisions. Even such an innocent-looking term as *daçadiçi* was probably deliberately chosen because it stresses both the cosmic aspect of Çiva's dance and the king's aspiration to acquire 'universal' power.

[118]) It does not seem doubtful that also the words *purārcitāṃ çriyam* are used in a double meaning. *Çrī* denotes not only Çiva's partner in the dance, but is also the symbol of royal dignity and power (= Rājyaçrī, Rājyalakṣmī) and, finally, Prosperity in its divinized form. In the first and third meanings, *purārcitāṃ* is to be analyzed into *pura* and *arcitāṃ* „worshipped in the town (or : empire, if one may translate *pura* in this way; cf. the Introduction)". If the same compound is however based on the second meaning of Çrī, *purārcitāṃ* should be analyzed into *purā* and *arcitāṃ*, „worshipped, entreated, in former times". We have seen in the Introduction that there are strong reasons to suppose that Kumbhayoni was not always in the possession of royal power.

[119]) *Jaṭila*, literally : wearing a *jaṭā* (twisted hair), is a characteristic common to Çiva and to ascetics.

[120]) We do not understand the meaning of the beginning of pāda *a* and pāda *b* is not perfectly clear either; cf. *supra*, notes 79 and 80 to the Transcription. If the three first syllables are transcribed correctly which seems probable, one would suppose that the pāda begins with *navodyad-*, „just rising"; in that case, we have to read a *da* instead of a *ja* (*jambha*), which is not impossible since the small horizontal stroke in the middle of the akṣara might be a scratch in the stone. *Navodyad-* could

3. By the Bull among men, named Çrī Kumbhaja, whose devotion was immaculate since he was an inseparable portion of Hara [121]), the protector of Valaṅga, (this) *liṅga* of (the god) wrapped in a (tiger) skin was erected after having fallen on earth [122]).

(In the) Çaka (year) 778.

---

b

The dimensions are 58 cm in height and 49 cm in breadth. The stone is inscribed on one side with 12 lines of Old Javanese script and is badly

bo applied to the disc of the sun or of the moon; the term would then suggest the *ardhacandra* in Çiva's *jaṭāmukuṭa*. But then, the word *ambha* which would be following could not be correct; we then expect to find a word meaning 'moon' here, e.g. *indu*, which agrees with the metre. One might perhaps distinguish an *i*-vowel above the *da* or *ja* and *mbha* could possibly be explained as an error by the lapicide for the ligature *ndu* in his example. The inscriptions *b* and *c* do give a number of certain examples of mistakes made by the lapicide. We therefore conjecturally propose to read pāda a as *navodyadindujaṭilakāntisannibhām*, „in beauty resembling the (god) with twisted hair in which the just rising moon is visible". If applied to the king ascetic, *indu* could denote the drops (of sweat) due to the king's efforts in Yoga; these drops could be called *navodyad*, „just appearing" on his skin, while they are made brilliant by the splendour emanating from Çrī. — In pāda b, *bhaṭa*, if transcribed correctly (cf. note 80 above), could have a double meaning; it could be an orthographic variety for *bhaṭṭa* (originally a Prakritism for *bhartṛ*), an orthography which has an exact equivalent in the spelling *bhaṭāra* instead of *bhaṭṭāra* (cf. note 113 above) but it could also be Sanskrit *bhaṭa*, „soldier" (cf. the compound *cāthabhaṭa, supra*, p. 20), which is, originally, a Prakritism for *bhṛta*. It is obvious that the first two pādas of the second strophe could hardly be considered satisfactory in spite of the suggestions for their interpretation. The poet probably intended to express the complicated relations between the god-king and his *çakti* who is royal majesty and prosperity personified; in view of the antithesis usually observed in these cases, it would be natural to presume that the poet wanted to express that Çrī not only derives her beauty from the splendour of her Lord, but also manages to make her Lord brilliant by her presence.

[121]) *Harādvayāṃsāmalabhaktinā*, — *aṃsa* could only be the — very common — wrong spelling of *aṃça*, „portion"; then, *harādvayāṃsa* means: „an undifferentiated (i.e. unseparable; the use of the term is well-known from Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism, but not at all alien to Çaivism) portion of Hara". Then, Hara denotes not the god-destroyer (as is the case in inscription c), but rather the god in his universal aspect (Paramaçiva in Siddhānta thought). The compound, applied to Kumbhayoni then means: „with immaculate devotion to (Kṛttivāsas) who is an unseparable portion of Çiva". The compound is, however, capable of being interpreted in a different way viz. as: „possessing the immaculate devotion of (i.e. natural for) somebody who is an unseparable portion of Hara". Then, the use of *amala* is easily explained: his devotion is immaculate because he is an unseparable portion of Hara. The use of *advayāṃça* seems to indicate that unlike the other human beings, who are differentiated portions of Çiva, the king is considered an identical, though not complete, portion of the god. The use of *aṃça* reminds one of the term *aṃçāvatāra*, frequently used to denote the king as a partial *avatāra* of the god in Old Javanese. The two interpretations of the compound here suggested are probably both intended by the poet.

[122]) *Bhuvanāvakrāntam*, — cf. the use of *avakrānta* in compounds such as *garbhāvakrānta*, „descended into a womb", well-known from Buddhism (cf. the references

weather-beaten, especially lines 5 to 11. The average akṣara height is about 2 cm.

Transcription

[1] // 0 // svastir=bhavatu.

Maṇimakuṭavirājallokapālai[2]r=vṛto yaḥ [123])
parijanayutadevīvṛndakair=bhūṣita[3]ṅgaiḥ /
amitavihitaçaktī ratnapadmāsanastho
vivudha[4]gaṇanutāyāsmai namaḥ [124]) tryamvakāya // 1 //

Vikacakama[5]labhāsvat*tan*tramālāsarūpāṃ [125])
yamayatiyatacandraiçvar*ya*[6]mūrttīṣṭadātrīṃ [126])
caraṇayuganidheyaçrīmatīṃ [127]) çūralakṣmī[7]n=
tribhuvanahitadātuḥ [128]) tryamvakasyāçrayaddh<v>aṃ // 2 //

---

given in No. III above, note 54 to the Translation). The latter compound proves that *avakrānta* may be used at the end of a Tatpuruṣa compound in which the former half denotes the place of descent. We therefore have an example here of an object of worship supposed to have miraculously fallen from heaven (cf. the so-called „Moon of Pedjeng" (Bali), which is a kettle-drum, and strophe 12 of the Karangtëñah inscription in *Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, p. 39, where a statue is supposed to have fallen from heaven; cf., however, Bosch in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 108, 1952, p. 194, who refers the simile to a temple having fallen on earth, which does not seem acceptable).

[123]) This entire line has already been published in transcription by Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 75 (1935), p. 443, note. Some small corrections to Stutterheim's transcription were suggested by Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), p. 3. The transcription here given agrees with the latter one. Damais noted that the *ṭa* in °*makuṭa* seems strange; after the discovery of inscription *c*, where exactly the same form is found twice in line 2 (in °*makuṭakoṭi*°), there can be no doubt that it represents *ṭa*.

[124]) Read: *namas=*; the same sandhi is found in line 7 (°*dātuḥ*).

[125]) The first half of line 5 is not only badly weather-beaten, but it seems also to have been engraved in a very careless way; the transcription is uncertain. Especially the reading of °*tantra*° is open to doubt. Its first *ta* is written under a *ta* which is certain; the first one is, however, very doubtful. Instead of *ntra*, *ntu* would be possible; there may be other possibilities, too.

[126]) The reading of the second part of line 6 is much less uncertain than that of its first part. The passage *yamayatayati*° is perfectly clear, but the next akṣara would seem a *va* rather than a *ca*; since, however, the complicated ligature *ndrai* is beyond doubt, it seems certain that a *ca*, not a *va*, was meant. The very last ligature of line 5 is uncertain; the *ya* may still be recognized, but the layar over the akṣara is doubtful; probably there is another *ya* under that written on the line; the transcription would be *ryya* in that case; the latter detail is, however, irrelevant for the meaning.

[127]) The reading °*nidheya*° is given with some reservation. Its first akṣara seems *si* on the stone, but the second vertical might be only a scratch in the stone; also the -*e* of *dhe* is damaged.

[128]) For the sandhi, cf. note 124 above. — The *va* supposed to be written under the ligature *ddh* in the last syllable of line 2 is hardly visible: there is only a tiny circle engraved under the *dh*; nevertheless, it seems hardly doubtful that *ddhvaṃ* is meant.

Abhavad=*bha*[8]vapādabhavatkaruṇā-
   kṛtasarggavidhir=bhuvi sarggabhave [129]) /
[9]vibhavoddhṛtaviçvahito nṛpatiḥ
   kila çāsti [130]) *yavākhya*[10]pure [131]) pravare // 3 //

Tasyātmanas=santatijena tena
   çrīkumbhajā[11]khyena nararṣabheṇa /
valaiṅgajetrā varabhaktihetoḥ
   pra[12]*sth*āpitaṃ tryamva<ka>liṅgam=etat [132]) // 4 //
778 çakābde.

Translation

May there be Prosperity !

1. Glory to the Three Eyed (Çiva), who is surrounded by the Guardians
   of the World [133]) brilliant with their pearl crowns and their bodies
   adorned by (the presence of) multitudes of goddesses surrounded by
   their servants, (Çiva) whose energy is unlimited and (at the same time)

---

[129]) Most of strophe 3 is very badly weather-beaten, too, except for the middle portion
of the lines, which is fairly well preserved. The strophe is composed in the Toṭaka
metre, consisting of four pādas of four anapaests each. The monotony is usually com-
pensated by a preference for puns, especially those based upon the repetition of
identical or similar syllables or groups of syllables in a completely different meaning.
This is very striking in the few Old Javanese examples of this metre, too; cf. H. Kern,
Verspr. Geschr., IX. pp. 145 sqq. The abuse of syllable repetitions (*bha* followed
by *va* with various vowels occurs six times; *sargga* is used twice) makes the tran-
scription far less uncertain than it would have been without such puns. Thus, the
reading *sarggabhave* at the end of line 8, though uncertain by itself, is confirmed in
this way. Cf. the Translation.

[130]) The reading of çāsti is uncertain. Only the *ta* under, and the *-i* over the second
syllable are beyond doubt. Since, however, the form of a verb is required by the
context here, the possibilities are considerably limited. The reading çāsti satisfies
these conditions; it corresponds well to the akṣara forms which have remained visible
and makes good sense.

[131]) The reading of *yavākhya-* is conjectural except for the *ya* at the beginning of the
word and the pasaṅan *ya* in the third syllable. The conjectural reading given in the
text agrees well with the traces of the other akṣaras on the stone, but there might
be other possibilities, too. It seems therefore preferable not to base any conclusions
on this reading unless it should be confirmed.

[132]) The state of preservation of the last line of the epigraph is excellent, but the stone-
cutter made no less than four serious mistakes. The exact reading given on the stone
runs : praṇvāpitaṃ tryamvaliṅvamehat. Cf. pp. 245 sq. above.

[133]) *Lokapāla;* Damais, *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), p. 5, supposed that the use of this word
might be an allusion to the name of the Rakai Kayuwaṅi : Pu Lokapāla. He therefore
conjecturally referred this inscription to the reign of Kayuwaṅi. This assumption is
especially weak since the reigning king would not probably be alluded to as a second-
ary god. If it is an allusion, which might very well be the case, one would rather
conclude that Lokapāla (Kayuwaṅi) was not (yet) the reigning king — a conclusion
fully supported by the fourth strophe of this inscription, where the king is named
Kumbhaja.

well-apportioned, while he is seated on his lotus throne beset with jewels, and who is cheered by the groups of gods [134]).

2. Taketh thou refuge [185]) with the Heroic Lakṣmī [186]), whose beauty is equal to the garlands of .... (?) [137]) brilliant with fully open red lotuses, who grants the wishes of Him whose appearance is (marked) by the domination of the moon of the ascetics subdued by Yama [138]), and who bears Majesty necessarily hidden in the juncture of her legs [139]), —

---

134) Çiva is represented here as the Supreme God, omnipotent with his three eyes. His boundless çakti is well-directed there where it is needed (vihita), while the god is staying seated on His brilliant lotus throne. This image is seen reflected in the court ceremonies described in the Old Javanese poem the Nāgarakrētāgama, cere-monies which, in most of our translations, were wrongly interpreted as audiences in the modern sense of the word; cf. Stutterheim, de Kraton van Majapahit, Verhand. K.I., 7 (1948). pp. 30 sqq.

185) Translation of āçrayaddhvam; cf. also note 128 to the transcription. For the gemina-tion of the dha preceding va, which is frequently met with in manuscripts, cf. Whitney, Grammar⁵, § 232 a. The imperative is presumably addressed to the people in general; vandadhvam and praṇamata are often used in a similar context.

136) Çūralakṣmī. It is probably not a fixed compound to be left untranslated; we take it as Lakṣmī accompanying the god warrior and securing him success in the battles.

137) The meaning of tantramālā (possibly tantumālā, if the latter is to be considered the correct reading) is not lucid. The attribute vikacakamalabhāsvat seems to refer to a lake or to a river; the river especially associated with Çiva is the Gaṅgā, but we cannot see how Tantramālā (or a similar form, for the reading is uncertain) could be a name of Gaṅgā.

138) We consider candraiçvaryamūrti, „the form (of Çiva) which is marked by his lordship over the moon", a synonym of the term candraçekharamūrti in iconographic literature; cf. its description in Gopinath Rao, Elements II, 1 (1916), pp. 113 sqq. According to several sources (e.g., the Suprabhedāgama, quoted by Gopinatha Rao, loc. cit), the moon in Çiva's jatāmukuṭa was acquired by the god after a fierce battle with a number of ṛṣis. The initial portion of the compound, viz. the terms yamayatayati°, seems to allude to the latter story; as a matter of fact, the ascetics (yati) were killed (yamayata) by the god. The compound as a whole seems a little clumsy since one would have expected a term meaning „conquered from" to connect yamayatayati° with the following. — The last portion of the compound, viz. °iṣṭadātrīṃ, „granting the wishes" (of Çiva in his mūrti denoted by the preceding portion of the compound), probably represents the goddess (here Çūralakṣmī) while ceding to the male desires of Çiva. It appears from the description of the candraçekharamūrti given by Rao (loc. cit.) that this form of Çiva is usually accompanied by the Devī, who may be re-presented in an intimate union with the god (āliṅganamūrti). Our text (also pāda c; cf. note 140 below) seems to allude to such an image.

139) The translation is based on the reading caraṇayuganidheyaçrīmatīṃ, which may not be completely certain (cf. note 127 above), especially as far as nidheya° is concerned. If the latter is correct, it could mean only: „which should be hidden" or „supposed to be hidden" (cf. nidhi, a hidden treasure, etc.). Caraṇayuga usually means „a pair of feet or legs", but this does not seem to make sense here. We therefore suppose that yuga should be interpreted in the meaning „yoke", so that caraṇayuga could mean „the yoke (formed by) the legs". In that case, the compound would become clear. It would then point to a very developed form of Çāktism.

(the Heroic Lakṣmī) of the Three-Eyed (Çiva), who grants welfare to the three worlds [140]).

3. (Once) there was a king who, driven by the pity present in the feet of Çiva, had granting (boons) as his principle [141]) (while being) in the land Sargabhava (?) [142]) and, being good to all (people), who were raised by his majesty, ruled indeed in the excellent town .... (?) [143]).

4. By the bull among men named Çrī Kumbhaja, sprung from the very lineage of the afore-mentioned(king) [114]), the victor of

---

[140]) For the type of image suggested by the two first strophes of this text, probably an Umāmaheçvaramūrti of the ālingana type, cf. the Introduction. Çūralakṣmī is unusual as a precise term; it probably denotes Lakṣmī-Çrī in her çāktic aspect of conferring succes in battle. Cf. the synonymous Vīralakṣmī, the name of the first queen of Sūryavarman I (inscription of Sdok Kak Thom, published by Finot in B.E.F.E.O., XV, 1915, 2, pp. 53-106, especially strophe LXXIV on p. 66) ; Coedès conjecturally connects the name Vīralakṣmī with Jayavīravarman, whose spouse she seems to have been before.

[141]) This Toṭaka strophe appears to have many terms with a double meaning, which is a characteristic feature of this metre, capable of compensating its otherwise monotonous cadence. The partly uncertain reading makes it difficult to determine its exact meaning. The compound bhava-pāda-bhavat-karuṇā-kṛta-sarga-vidhir could mean: „having as a rule of life (vidhi) granting (sarga) due to (kṛta, literally: made by) (his) pity (karuṇā) which is present in (bhavat; the meaning probably is that, being present in the feet of the god, the compassion emanates to him who adores these feet) the feet (pāda) of Çiva (bhava)": owing to the king's intense devotion to Çiva, the king was able to feel the same compassion on behalf of his subjects as the god does with respect to all the living beings. The compound could, however, also be translated: „performing an act of creation (kṛta-sarga-vidhir) out of pity (karuṇā) for you (bhavat-; the term may refer to the subjects addressed by the second person plural in strophe 2 d) who are subject to (literally: having their feet in, °pāda) phenomenal existence (bhava)". The choice of the words makes it probable that these two (perhaps even more) interpretations are intended. The former is not much more than a common-place, but the latter would imply some act of creation on behalf of those subject to the laws of temporary existence, presumably a foundation which could liberate the creatures; the expression could also refer to the foundation of an empire by the mysterious king.

[142]) Bhuvi sargabhave, if this is the correct reading. Sargabhava is unknown as the name of a country; it is not necessarily a real name, but could as well be a paraphrase of another name. Such paraphrases of geographical names have been frequent both in India and in Java at all times. Recently, Poerbatjaraka recognized the name Kuñjarakuñja of the Tjangal inscription in the present name Sleman (derived from alas liman, which is an almost literal translation of kuñjara-kuñja; vide, Riwajat Indonesia, 1952, p. 56 sqq.).

[143]) If our conjectural reading (cf. note 131 above) may be relied upon, the name of the excellent town would be Yava (yavākhyapure).

[144]) Tasyātmanas=santatijena. We tried to render ātmanas by (the) very (lineage). The use of this term is probably based on that in ātmaja to denote a „son"; ātma is, however, replaced by ātmanas santati since the relation is not as close as that of a son with his father. The addition of ātmanas may not be arbitrary; it rather seems to stress that there is a direct family relation between the two kings mentioned

Valaiṅga[145]), this liṅga of the Three-Eyed (Çiva) was erected as a token of excellent devotion.
In the Çaka year 778.

————————

c

The dimensions of the third Ratubaka stone are 71 cm in length and 35 cm in breadth. This stone is in an excellent state of preservation; everywhere, the lettering is clear and unambiguous. The *akṣaras* are somewhat smaller than those of the two other stone inscriptions (average height about 1½ cm).

Transcription

[1] Namaç=çivāya [146])
Kamalabhavādisurava[2]rojjvalitamakuṭakoṭighṛṣṭacaraṇā[3] ya /
   mayakaravālābhihapattripurabhide [147]) [4] smai harāya namaḥ // 1 //
daçavadanabāṇapā[5]rthapramukhamadhukarātulābhinandakarīṃ /
hara[6]pādapaṅkajarajaḥkaṇikāvodanmahalla[7]kṣmīṃ // 2 //

Asty=akhaṇḍalapurād=atibhāsvad=
   bhū[8]ribhogabharitād=urukāntiḥ /
çarmado tha vivu[9]dho vyavatīrṇnaḥ
   khād=ivātivimalād=dhimakā[10]ntiḥ // 3 //

Tadanvayāt=prasūto yaṃ varaçāstratalānvi[11]taḥ /
   rarāja manujaçreṣṭ<h>aḥ kalaçodbhavasaṃjñataḥ [148]) // 4 //
[12] tenājapadakamalabhramarīkṛtamolinā [149]) /
   [13] sthāpitaṃ haraliṅgaṃ tad=bhuvi pūtaṃ tadābhavat // 5 //

————————

in the strophes 3 and 4; there probably were many others, too, who claimed descent from the mysterious king.

[145]) Probably to be interpreted as the victorious prince of Valaiṅga in a similar way as we may use expressions such as „the Victor of Trafalgar". It seems certain that this name is identical with Walaing, which occurs in the Rakai title of Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription. Cf. the Introduction (*supra*, pp. 253 sqq.).

[146]) Just above the punctuation mark, a rather strange symbol was carved on the stone. It does not resemble any of the symbols used for *oṃ*. Since just below the text of the inscription the ciphers 1941 were engraved in rather recent times, the possibility of the strange form having been recently added might be considered. The technique of engraving does not, however, make such a supposition probable. The strange symbol rather belongs to the original inscription.

[147]) The form *(a)bhihapat°*, perfectly clear on the stone, cannot be correct. Considering that in line 12 of inscription *b* the stone cutter carved a *ha* instead of a *ta* (*ehat* for *etat*), one may presume that the same error was committed here. In that case, *(a)bhihapat°* should be corrected to *(a)bhitapat°*. Although the latter term is not quite satisfactory (cf. note 150 to the translation), it seems to be the only obvious way of correcting the incomprehensible form. It is noted that the second strophe, too, shows some peculiarities as to its language.

[148]) Read: °*saṃjñitaḥ*.
[149]) Read: °*maulinā*.

Translation

Glory to Çiva !

1. Glory to that Hara, whose feet are rubbed by the tops of the flaming crowns of (Brahman) Born in a Lotus and the other principal gods, and who destroyed Tripura glittering with the sword of Maya [150]).

2. (Pay homage to) [151]) to the Great Lakṣmī [152]), who gives unequalled pleasure to (the heroes) with the ten-headed (Rāvaṇa) [153]), Bāṇa [154]) and Arjuna [155]), (adoring her lotus feet like) honey-making (bees), at their head [156]), and from Whose body the granules of pollen of the lotus

---

[150]) The story of Tripura, built by the Asura architect Maya, and destroyed by Çiva-Mahādeva with the help of many other gods, is well-known from Indian literature ; it is told, for instance in the Vanaparvan of the Mahābhārata ; numerous references are given by Gopinatha Rao, *Elements*, II, 1, pp. 164 sqq., who, in addition, discusses the iconography of this episod. Brahman, especially mentioned in this strophe, assists Mahādeva as his charioteer. According to all accounts we were able to trace, Maya is only the architect of the Asuras ; nowhere, he is conceived of as the leader in the defence by the Asuras, when the castles were attacked by Mahādeva and the other gods. In our inscription, however, it is Maya who is the principal defender. This may be concluded from the use of *karavāla*, which is not capable of being interpreted in another way. The translation 'glittering' renders *abhitapat*, corrected from the incomprehensible form *abhihapat* in the text (cf. note 147, above). The form *abhitapat* may not be quite normal ; one would rather have expected *abhitapyamāna ;* on the other hand, *tapati* in the meaning of „emitting heat or light" is usual enough to account for the form *abhitapat*.

[151]) No term on which the accusatives depend is expressed in the text. We suppose that a term like *vandadhvam, namadhvam, pranamata,* or possibly *vande* etc. must be supplied as to the meaning. Cf. the Introduction, *supra*, p. 245.

[152]) *Mahallakṣmī,* — for the translation, cf. note 7 to the Introduction.

[153]) The simile with Rāvaṇa may refer to the relation of the ten-headed monster with Sītā, often taken to be an incarnation of Lakṣmī. The allusion, however, is not very correct in that case, for *abhinanda* is just the thing Sītā did not give to Rāvaṇa, anyhow according to the Rāmāyaṇa version. Perhaps, we should not think here, and not in the two following references either, of a well-known incarnation of Lakṣmī, but rather of success in battle in general.

[154]) *Bāṇa,* — perhaps the name of the Asura, son of Bali, who fought with the gods from the Krauñca mountain, but was killed by Skanda (the Tārakādhyāya of the Çalyaparvan).

[155]) *Pārtha,* usually, but not always, a name of Arjuna („son of *Pṛthā"*).

[156]) The exact meaning of this compound is not lucid. We analyze : *daçavadana-bāṇa-pārtha-pramukhebhyo madhukarebhyo 'bhinandakarīm,* „giving pleasure to the bees having as their chiefs Rāvaṇa, Bāṇa and Pārtha" ; the bees coming to suck the honey from her lotus-feet are the usual simile for the heroes worshipping the feet of the goddess. The identity of two of the chiefs, Daçavadana and Pārtha is not open to doubt, but it is not clear who is meant by Bāṇa ; one of the ancestors of Rāma, great-grandchild of Ikṣvāku, the first king of Ayodhyā, bears that name (*Bālakāṇḍa,* 70), but a better-known Bāṇa is the son of the demon Bali, killed by Skanda in the Çalyaparvan of the Mahābhārata. If these mythologic heroes are only mentioned because they obtained boons from Lakṣmī, they are not the most characteristic examples. Probably, the compound has a double meaning, which is not however clear to us ; the compound seems clumsy.

feet of Hara trickle down like drops of water (do from the body of those
who have just taken a bath) [157].

3. Once, there was a very charming, propitious God, who descended from
the very brilliant Akhandalapura [158], rich in [159] manifold pleasures,
as a Moon with refreshing rays from the immaculate sky.

4. This prince, descended from the race of that God, well-acquainted with
the excellent Çāstras, reigned as the best of men, known by the name
Kalaçodbhava.

5. By him, whose diadem consisted of bees on the lotus-feet of Aja, this
liṅga of Hara was erected; then, there was a purification (?) on the
earth [160].

---

[157] *Avodan* is one of those bahuvrīhis the first part of which is an adverb. Cf. *avakeça*
(*Atharvav.*, VI, 30, 2, quoted by Monier-Williams): „having the hair hanging down"
and a few other examples; for this kind of compounds, cf. Wackernagel, II, 1, p. 282.
Pāṇini *(Aṣṭādhy. VI, 4, kār.* 29) mentions *avoda,* having become an *a*-stem, in the
same meaning. The *upamā* is clear: the pollen of Çiva's lotus-feet drops down from
Mahallakṣmī's body and is compared with the drops of water trickling down from
a woman who has just come out of the water. The simile expressed in the whole
strophe is a rather complex one: the bees, who are the heroes worshipping the god-
dess, are attracted by the pollen dripping down form her, but the pollen itself does
not belong to the goddess but is due to her worshipping the feet of Hara.

[158] As we noted in the Introduction, it is not yet possible to conclude anything on the
basis of this name. The name is completely unknown. If it is permitted to consider
Akhandala an incorrect spelling of Ākhandala (chosen for metrical reasons), the name
could be a synonym of Indrapura, but then the name is too common to permit iden-
tification. For a conjecture, cf. p. 262 above.

[159] *Bharita* is usual in the meaning „rich in, full of" in Buddhist Sanskrit; cf. the note
by Senart in his Mahāvastu edition, I, p. 453; it sometimes occurs in non-Buddhist
Sanskrit, too (Pet. Dict., s.v.).

[160] *Bhuvi pūtaṃ tadābhavat,* — the use of *pūta* as a substantive is strange. It is probable
that its use is more important than it seems to be; cf. *pūtikeçvarapāvitā* in the first
strophe of the Dinaya inscription, *atipūtā çilā* in the second strophe of the Pereng
inscription, and *pūteçwara* in line A — 6 of Balitung's Kĕdu inscription (T.B.G., 57,
1927, p. 206). Important references, which may throw some light upon the meaning
of Pūtikeçvara in the Dinaya inscription, were collected by Bosch in T.B.G., 64 (1924),
pp. 280 sqq. Although it is probably correct to interpret Pūtikeçvara as 'Lord of the
Stench', associated with the chthonic aspects of Çiva, it is not doubtful that at least
here and in the Pereng inscription *pūta* and *atipūta* are not connected with *pūti* etc.;
pūta derived from *pūyate* is known only from Indian dictionaries, whereas it is
very common as a derivative from *punāti;* moreover, the wording of the Pereng in-
scription leaves no doubt that the latter meaning is required. Similar considerations
apply to Pūteçwara in the Kĕdu inscription, which could hardly have another meaning
than the 'Lord of Purity' (cf. *pūtamati, pūtamūrti* and similar compounds). Now we
have the choice between two possibilities: *pūtikeçvara* should either be disconnected
from *Pūteçvara* and the other examples (all from Central Java), or its interpretation
should be revised; a point in favour of the latter view might be the fact that the
compound *pūtikeçvarapāvitā (purī)* remains strange if it should mean: „purified by

XI. A METRICAL OLD JAVANESE INSCRIPTION DATED 856 A.D.

The site of discovery of the stone inscription numbered No. D. 28 in the collection of the Djakarta Museum is completely unknown. No details whatever are available [1]).

The measurements of the stone are 112 cm in height and 51 cm in breadth [2]). The stone is inscribed on either side. Brandes noticed that there are traces of a lengthy inscription on its back [3]), no transcription of which can be given on account of its very bad state of preservation; the few traces still visible on the surface of the stone make it certain that the inscription was written in Pre-Nāgarī [4]). Some isolated akṣaras, which are relatively well preserved, might permit a vague conclusion based on the script. The inscription on the front of the stone is in a far better state of preservation, although it was damaged at several places. The text counts 48 lines in all [5]); lines 1—6 have almost disappeared from the stone except for a few akṣaras mainly at the beginning of the lines; in the lines 7—10, there are extensive lacunae in the middle portions; the lines 16—24 are mutilated owing to a large hole in the surface of the stone, bringing about lacunae of two to nine akṣaras in the different lines. Except for these lacunae, the text is well preserved.

---

the Lord of the Stench", especially since the Dinaya inscription is completely devoid of puns. Unfortunately, no data about the Pūtikeçvara-tīrtha, situated on the Narmadā, are available (cf. Bosch, art. cit., p. 279). In all these cases, it is hardly doubtful that liṅgas are meant; in our text, this is beyond doubt, and, as Bosch pointed out, it is very probable foi the Dinaya inscription, too. In the Pereng inscription, it is less certain; the whole pāda runs çiviravṛtāpy=atiputā çilā (note: Poerbatjaraka, Agastya, p. 45, reads çivara without further comment and introduces that word into Kern's translation) and we do not understand why Kern (Verspr. Geschr., VI, p. 282) considers the only usual meaning of çivira (i.e. çibira), viz. „royal camp'', impossible and prefers the meaning „a sort of grain", only known from Indian dictionaries, but interprets tne latter meaning as „weeds"; this seems arbitrary. The word çibira occurs in the Tugu inscription (in the compound çibirāvani; cf. Vogel, Publ. Oudh. Dienst, I, (1925), pp. 31 sq.), where it was explained as „camp, camping grounds" belonging to a rājarṣi. Is not the latter point a striking analogy with what we concluded about the identity of the founder in the Pereng inscription (cf. the Introduction)? It is well-known that in Old-Javanese society there was a very strict separation between the domains of the king and those of the gods. A divine stone surrounded by some sort of royal establishment is something very extraordinary and this would explain the opposition made by api in the text; on the other hand, it would be less strange if here, too, a liṅga is meant standing within a royal hermitage.

[1]) Cf. Brandes in Catalogus Groeneveldt (1887), p. 382.

[2]) More exact figures of the measurements of the stone inscription and its pedestal are mentioned by Brandes, loc. cit.

[3]) The terms 'front' and 'back' refer to the present position of the stone in the Djakarta Museum; they imply no conclusion as to the priority of one of the sides.

[4]) Although here and there a few akṣaras are sufficiently well preserved to make their identification possible, a complete word could nowhere be deciphered; except for some palaeographic remarks, we are forced to exclude the back of the stone from the discussion which follows.

[5]) Brandes, loc. cit., mentioned 50 lines of script.

feet of Hara trickle down like drops of water (do from the body of those who have just taken a bath) [157].

3. Once, there was a very charming, propitious God, who descended from the very brilliant Akhaṇḍalapura [158], rich in [159] manifold pleasures, as a Moon with refreshing rays from the immaculate sky.

4. This prince, descended from the race of that God, well-acquainted with the excellent Çāstras, reigned as the best of men, known by the name Kalaçodbhava.

5. By him, whose diadem consisted of bees on the lotus-feet of Aja, this liṅga of Hara was erected; then, there was a purification (?) on the earth [160].

---

[157]) *Avodan* is one of those bahuvrīhis the first part of which is an adverb. Cf. *avakeça* (*Atharvav.*, VI, 30, 2, quoted by Monier-Williams): „having the hair hanging down" and a few other examples; for this kind of compounds, cf. Wackernagel, II, 1, p. 282. Pāṇini (*Aṣṭādhy.* VI, 4, *kār.* 29) mentions *avoda*, having become an *a*-stem, in the same meaning. The *upamā* is clear: the pollen of Çiva's lotus-feet drops down from Mahallakṣmī's body and is compared with the drops of water trickling down from a woman who has just come out of the water. The simile expressed in the whole strophe is a rather complex one: the bees, who are the heroes worshipping the goddess, are attracted by the pollen dripping down form her, but the pollen itself does not belong to the goddess but is due to her worshipping the feet of Hara.

[158]) As we noted in the Introduction, it is not yet possible to conclude anything on the basis of this name. The name is completely unknown. If it is permitted to consider Akhaṇḍala an incorrect spelling of Ākhaṇḍala (chosen for metrical reasons), the name could be a synonym of Indrapura, but then the name is too common to permit identification. For a conjecture, cf. p. 262 above.

[159]) *Bharita* is usual in the meaning „rich in, full of" in Buddhist Sanskrit; cf. the note by Senart in his Mahāvastu edition, I, p. 453; it sometimes occurs in non-Buddhist Sanskrit, too (Pet. Dict., s.v.).

[160]) *Bhuvi pūtaṃ tadābhavat*, — the use of *pūta* as a substantive is strange. It is probable that its use is more important than it seems to be; cf. *pūtikeçvarapāvitā* in the first strophe of the Dinaya inscription, *atipūtā çilā* in the second strophe of the Pereng inscription, and *pūteçwara* in line A — 6 of Balitung's Kĕḍu inscription (T.B.G., 57, 1927, p. 206). Important references, which may throw some light upon the meaning of Pūtikeçvara in the Dinaya inscription, were collected by Bosch in T.B.G., 64 (1924), pp. 280 sqq. Although it is probably correct to interpret Pūtikeçvara as 'Lord of the Stench', associated with the chthonic aspects of Çiva, it is not doubtful that at least here and in the Pereng inscription *pūta* and *atipūta* are not connected with *pūti* etc.; *pūta* derived from *pūyate* is known only from Indian dictionaries, whereas it is very common as a derivative from *punāti*; moreover, the wording of the Pereng inscription leaves no doubt that the latter meaning is required. Similar considerations apply to Pūteçwara in the Kĕḍu inscription, which could hardly have another meaning than the 'Lord of Purity' (cf. *pūtamati, pūtamūrti* and similar compounds). Now we have the choice between two possibilities: *pūtikeçvara* should either be disconnected from *Pūteçvara* and the other examples (all from Central Java), or its interpretation should be revised; a point in favour of the latter view might be the fact that the compound *pūtikeçvarapāvitā (purī)* remains strange if it should mean: „purified by

XI. A METRICAL OLD JAVANESE INSCRIPTION DATED 856 A.D.

The site of discovery of the stone inscription numbered No. D. 28 in the collection of the Djakarta Museum is completely unknown. No details whatever are available [1]).

The measurements of the stone are 112 cm in height and 51 cm in breadth [2]). The stone is inscribed on either side. Brandes noticed that there are traces of a lengthy inscription on its back [3]), no transcription of which can be given on account of its very bad state of preservation; the few traces still visible on the surface of the stone make it certain that the inscription was written in Pre-Nāgarī [4]). Some isolated aksaras, which are relatively well preserved, might permit a vague conclusion based on the script. The inscription on the front of the stone is in a far better state of preservation, although it was damaged at several places. The text counts 48 lines in all [5]); lines 1—6 have almost disappeared from the stone except for a few aksaras mainly at the beginning of the lines; in the lines 7—10, there are extensive lacunae in the middle portions; the lines 16—24 are mutilated owing to a large hole in the surface of the stone, bringing about lacunae of two to nine aksaras in the different lines. Except for these lacunae, the text is well preserved.

---

the Lord of the Stench", especially since the Dinaya inscription is completely devoid of puns. Unfortunately, no data about the Pūtikeçvara-tīrtha, situated on the Narmadā, are available (cf. Bosch, *art. cit.*, p. 279). In all these cases, it is hardly doubtful that *lingas* are meant; in our text, this is beyond doubt, and, as Bosch pointed out, it is very probable for the Dinaya inscription, too. In the Pereng inscription, it is less certain; the whole pāda runs *çiviravṛtāpy=atipūtā çilā* (note: Poerbatjaraka, *Agastya*, p. 45, reads *çivara* without further comment and introduces that word into Kern's translation) and we do not understand why Kern *(Verspr. Geschr.*, VI, p. 282) considers the only usual meaning of *çivira* (i.e. *çibira*), viz. „royal camp", impossible and prefers the meaning „a sort of grain", only known from Indian dictionaries, but interprets the latter meaning as „weeds"; this seems arbitrary. The word *çibira* occurs in the Tugu inscription (in the compound *çibirāvani;* cf. Vogel, *Publ. Oudh. Dienst*, I, (1925), pp. 31 sq.), where it was explained as „camp, camping grounds" belonging to a *rājarṣi*. Is not the latter point a striking analogy with what we concluded about the identity of the founder in the Pereng inscription (cf. the Introduction) ? It is well-known that in Old-Javanese society there was a very strict separation between the domains of the king and those of the gods. A divine stone surrounded by some sort of royal establishment is something very extraordinary and this would explain the opposition made by *api* in the text; on the other hand, it would be less strange if here, too, a linga is meant standing within a royal hermitage.

[1]) Cf. Brandes in *Catalogus Groeneveldt* (1887), p. 382.

[2]) More exact figures of the measurements of the stone inscription and its pedestal are mentioned by Brandes, *loc. cit.*

[3]) The terms 'front' and 'back' refer to the present position of the stone in the Djakarta Museum; they imply no conclusion as to the priority of one of the sides.

[4]) Although here and there a few aksaras are sufficiently well preserved to make their identification possible, a complete word could nowhere be deciphered; except for some palaeographic remarks, we are forced to exclude the back of the stone from the discussion which follows.

[5]) Brandes, *loc. cit.*, mentioned 50 lines of script.

Curiously enough, the only scholar who took a real interest in the inscription was Brandes; his description of the stone in the *Catalogus Groeneveldt* bears a full testimony to this point. It appears from several remarks made there that he succeeded in reading considerable portions of the text; among other details, Brandes discovered its date expressed in the words *wualung gunung sang wiku,* which correspond with the ciphers 778 Çaka or 856 A.D. Krom presumably knew only Brandes' account, on which he based some provisional remarks in his *Hindu-Javanese History* [6]). Finally, the inscription was briefly discussed by Damais in his list of the main dated inscriptions of Indonesia [7]).

The text is important for several reasons. In the first place it gives us the oldest dated specimen of Old Javanese poetry and may therefore prove interesting for the history of Old Javanese literature. Secondly, it contains some valuable data about important historical events about in the middle of the 9th century A.D. Thirdly, part of the text contains a detailed description of an Old Javanese temple complex — something unique in Old Javanese epigraphy. On the other hand, the great difference between this inscription and the texts which one is used to in epigraphy (and epigraphy is the only source of our knowledge of the Old Javanese language prior to about the eleventh century A.D.) [8]) makes its interpretation extremely difficult. The detailed discussion which follows could only be termed an introduction to future studies.

The type of Pre-Nāgarī used at the back of the stone is rather different from that known from some Çailendra inscriptions [9]). The 'nail-heads' at the top of the akṣaras already became small horizontal strokes, which do not yet constitute a continuous line although some akṣaras almost have their typical Nāgarī forms. In a *ma* of (probably) line 12, there is a real horizontal line at the top of the akṣara; in addition, the akṣara is characterized by a little loop which is completely absent in the Çailendra inscriptions. Unfortunately, there are only four or five akṣaras which are sufficiently well preserved for a palaeographical analysis. They might permit the conclusion that the type of script represents a far more advanced stage in the development of Pre-Nāgarī script than that used in the Çailendra inscriptions; it is, however, impossible to base any more positive conclusions on the few akṣaras that have remained visible.

The Old Javanese script on the front of the stone is extremely regular; it must have been engraved by a firm and very experienced hand. The ak-

---

6) *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 138. As to the relation between the two sides of the stone, Krom suggests three possibilities. The final conclusion is only negative: the use of Pre-Nāgarī at the back of a stone with a Çaiva inscription in Old Javanese script does not prove that Pre-Nāgarī script could be used in non-Buddhist inscriptions in Java.

7) *Etudes d'épigraphie indonésienne,* III: *Liste des principales inscriptions datées de l'Indonésie,* in *B.E.F.E.O.,* XLVI, Fasc. 1 (1952), pp. 30 sq.

8) With one probable exception, *viz.* the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, the date of which will be discussed in the course of this Introduction.

9) Cf. the detailed discussion by Bosch in *T.B.G.,* 68 (1928), pp. 3-16.

ṣaras are rather small (the average height being about 0,5 cm) and slightly
sloping. The same akṣara is everywhere expressed in exactly the same manner
and this statement is even true for the smallest details. This regularity is a
great help in identifying partly mutilated akṣaras. A definite number of
akṣaras, viz. the *ka, ta, wa, bha, ga, ça, sa, ra* and a few others, always start
with a tiny, almost circular, hook at the left hand top ; a definite number of
other akṣaras such as the *pa, ha, la, na* and initial *a,* have nothing of this
kind. These little hooks are thus made to serve a definite purpose instead of
being mere ornaments : they have become a real secondary distinguishing
mark between forms that would otherwise be very similar. Thus, the *ra*
may be confounded with a simple daṇḍa in some of the older inscriptions,
but here the little hook gives it a certain individuality. As a matter of fact,
later Old Javanese script has not only preserved the hook of the *ra,* but has
even made it the most characteristic feature of that akṣara [10].

The *suku,* which still bends to the right at its lower end, has a typical
form when it is attached to the *ka;* instead of running right down, it is
expressed as a curve open to the right hand side. The evolution of the *ka*
during the history of Pallava script makes us understand the function of
this peculiarity. In the older phase, the middle vertical of the *ka* was continued
considerably beneath the line; although in later Pallava script, e.g. in the
seventh century Çrīvijaya inscriptions, the three verticals of the *ka* became
equal in height, the form of a *ka* with a mere vertical stroke for the expression
of the *-u* would agree with the older form of the akṣara without any vowel
mark attached to it and might therefore be misunderstood. It was therefore
considered necessary to express the *-u* in a somewhat different way. Although
this peculiar mode of expressing *ku* had lost its *raison d'être* in the second
half of the ninth century, it was kept as a sort of archaism in our inscription,
possibly because it was considered ornamental. The most interesting point
is that our inscription is evidently based upon a tradition different from that
of the contemporary Central Javanese inscriptions, in which *ku* is expressed
in the usual way. Exactly the same peculiar form of the *-u* is used with the
ra and there it is due to the same cause. These details are not only interesting
for the history of Old Javanese script, but they are also a help to the tran-
scription : the syllables *ku* and *ru* can be recognized even if the upper part
of the akṣaras is badly damaged. Finally, I note the frequent use of the vowel
mark for the *pĕpĕt,* although it is not found everywhere where one would
have expected it. It appears that a disyllabic word the first vowel of which
is an *ĕ* may be expressed either by using the vowel mark for the *ĕ,* or by
making the two consonants between which an *ĕ* is heard immediately follow

---

[10] In the eastern variety of Old Javanese script (in the tenth century and later), the
little hook of the *ra* developed into a rather elegant curve, which made the akṣara
almost as broad as the average akṣara. During the same period, the little hooks at
the top of most of the other akṣaras, in which they had no definite function, disap-
peared.

each other [11]). As will appear in the course of this Introduction, the choice concerning which of these modes of expression is preferred depends on metrical considerations.

The orthography used in our record is interesting. The poet had a large amount of freedom in expressing long vowels, in using double consonants in some definite cases, in expressing or omitting the pĕpĕt in any syllable except the *ultima* and in several other cases. He made full use of this freedom in order to meet his metrical needs, *i.e.* in a definite number of cases he could use a long vowel if he needed one, but he could also put down a short one if this was necessary for the metre. The orthography will therefore be discussed in close connection with the metre.

The choice of the metres is interesting. At least six different metres are used [12]) belonging to three distinct classes, viz. to the *samavṛtta, ardha-samavṛtta* and *ardhaviṣamavṛtta* groups [13]); the author shows a considerable amount of learning and practice in their use. The first group is represented by four types, viz. Vasantatilaka, Rajani (also called Narkuṭaka), Pṛthvī (sometimes called Pṛthvītala) and Çikhariṇī; the second and third groups are represented by the well-known Puṣpitāgra metre and a, presumably rare, variety of *ardhaviṣama* the exact name of which is unknown to us. The latter consists of two equal pādas of thirteen syllables each (the pādas b and d), whereas the pādas a and c are different, but consist of twelve syllables each [14]). The metres are quite regular and require only a few remarks. For Vasantatilaka, there is no fixed caesura, as might have been expected [15]); Çikhariṇī has a caesura after the sixth syllable of each pāda, as is usual, but the Pṛthvī, which usually has a break after the eighth syllable, does not appear to have any caesura here. In Puṣpitāgra, the last syllable of each pāda should be long, but this is not the case here [16]). The Rajani

---

[11]) A third possibility, viz. that of writing an *a* instead of a pĕpĕt, also occurs, but far less frequently than the two methods mentioned in the text. For further details, cf. the Introduction to No. IX, above.

[12]) In the first six lines of the text, the metre cannot be re-established; only a few isolated words could be deciphered.

[13]) The fourth great class of metres *(Jāti)* is not represented, unless one of the initial strophes was written in Āryā, which is not at all impossible. There might even be some reason to suppose that the poet wanted to show off his skill in handling all the four classes of metres and not only three of these. This is also the case in, for instance, the Ligor inscription (cf. B. Ch. Chhabra, *Expansion*, p. 21).

[14]) Its metrical scheme is:

    (a) ◡ ◡ ◡ — — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

    (b) ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

    (c) ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ — — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

    (d) ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡

[15]) The epic Vasantatilaka usually has a caesura at the fourth and again at the seventh syllable; the classical Vasantatilaka may have one at the eighth. However, Açvaghoṣa, the treatise of Piṅgala and most of the classical authors do not follow this rule; cf. the survey given by E. H. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita*, II (1936), pp. lxvi sq.

[16]) Açvaghoṣa always makes the pādas a and c of the Puṣpitāgra strophes end in a long syllable, but the last syllable of the pādas b and d may be either short or long.

metre is used in no less than eleven stanzas ; the preponderance of short syllables makes it very suitable for vivid descriptions and this might be the reason for its frequency in our text.

The prosody is still more remarkable than the choice of the metres. The use of quantitative metres is more natural in a language such as Sanskrit than in an Indonesian language in which there is no phonemic opposition between long and short syllables [17]. As far as we know, the prosody of the classical Old Javanese poetry was based on the Sanskrit rules. Thus, *o* and *e* are always considered long, also in words of Indonesian origin ; a vowel due to contraction of two vowels (such as *tĕkān*, analyzed as *tĕka* and -*an*) is long according to the Sanskrit rule of sandhi ; words borrowed from Sanskrit retain their original quantities in Old Javanese, etc. In most of the remaining cases, the vowels are reckoned short, unless they are followed by more than one consonant [18]. It cannot be denied that most of these rules have something artificial, or rather, traditional. Thus, the rule that *e* and *o* are always long, does not seem to correspond to any phonemic feature of Old Javanese [19]: these vowels are long because they were considered diphthongs in Sanskrit. It must necessarily have taken much time before such a traditional prosody, reposing on an elaborate *ars poetica*, was duly fixed and adhered to. The prosody of our text is particularly interesting because it shows us an early stage, in which there still was a great amount of freedom in applying the above rules. The treatment of Sanskrit vowel quantities depends almost exclusively on metrical exigencies ; consequently, the Sanskrit words are sometimes hardly recognizable. A few examples will be sufficient. In strophe 16, the poet, needing a number of short syllables succeeding each other, made the word *avatāra*, provided with the affixes *pa-* and -*an*, *panawataran* (instead of *pañawatārān*); the Sanskrit word *banyāga* is spelt correctly in strophe 27 *a*, but *baniyāga* in 22 *a*; in 10 *b*, Sanskrit *sandeha* (*saṃdeha*) is spelt *sandihā* by substituting *i* for the *e*, which was necessarily long. A very beautiful example is *duarapalā*, four short syllables and a long one, instead of *dvārapāla* in 14 *c* ; since two long syllables never follow each other in Rajani metre and the syllable preceding *dvārapāla* is necessarily long, the poet had to resort to drastic measures to

---

[17] It is necessary to summarize the conclusion of a rather complicated question, which would require a separate investigation. Nobody would doubt the correctness of this conclusion for the modern languages of Java and Sumatra, but there might be some doubt whether our statement holds good for Old Malay and Old Javanese, where quite a few cases of, at least apparent, opposition may be discovered. They might be divided into several categories. Sometimes, both words are borrowed from Sanskrit (such as *çīla: çĭlā, vara: vāra* and a few other cases occurring in Old Javanese).

[18] For the use of long vowels in Old Javanese epigraphy, cf. *supra*, pp. 215-217.

[19] The vowel system of the modern Javanese language was discussed in detail by Uhlenbeck, *De structuur van het Javaanse morpheem, Verh. B.G.*, LXXVIII (1949), pp. 30-41. One has the impression that the Old Javanese vowel system agreed with that of the modern language on the whole. The discrepancy between the vowel system of Old Javanese and the quantitative poetry in the *kĕkawin* literature was recently discussed by A. Teeuw, *Taal en Versbouw* (1952), pp. 4-6.

make the word (which he could neither avoid nor replace) agree with the metre. The Rajani metre had great advantages because it consists mainly of short syllables [20]), but a number of Sanskrit words could never have been used, unless they were considerably modified.

About the same considerations as for the spelling of long vowels apply to the poet's use of the rules of sandhi. In this respect, too, the poet enjoyed complete freedom, which he could use for metrical purposes. Whenever one long syllable was required, he combined the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next, but when two short vowels suited better his purpose, he left the *hiatus*. The latter point has a particular interest for our knowledge of the history of Old Javanese poetry, as will appear in the course of this Introduction. Examples may be found everywhere in the text.

The next point, which would however require a far more detailed treatment than can be given here, is the poet's use of the *alaṃkāras* known in Indian poetry. Even a superficial examination shows that he had a profound training in their use ; as a matter of fact, he seems to show off his skill and goes far beyond the discrete limits fixed by the classical poets in India. The most striking point is the lack of proportions between the different *alaṃkāras* used. The text is very poor in *upamās* and *rūpakas* : there is indeed nothing worthy of note that belongs to these categories; the poet is however very skilled in handling the different kinds of *yamaka* and various plays of words. Especially in the Rajani strophes, there is hardly any pāda without a repetition of at least two syllables. A few examples will be sufficient. In 17 *a*, *sama* occurs three times ; in 17 *b*, we have the repetition *bhakti ta bhaktita* ; 16 *b* : *apūrwwa ri pūrwwadiça* ; 16 *d* : *hyaṅa i hyañ=apa* ; 15 *d* : *ta pānti tinapān=tiruan* ; 18 *a* : *diwyatama diwyakĕnā* ; 19 *a* : *manona manojña.* In 19 *d*, a far more complicated type of *yamaka* is used ; there, the second half of the pāda is almost a reflected image of the first part, running : *atiçaya tang ñaranya tañaranya mahātisa ya*, the meaning of which is supposed to be : „extraordinary was their fame, a token that they would bring refreshment" [21]).

It is interesting to compare the poet's handling of the *yamaka* with the survey given by Daṇḍin in the third *pariccheda* of his Kāvyādarça [22]). As a matter of fact, most of the simpler kinds of *yamaka* occur in our text, although there is a definite preference for repetitions inside the same pāda. In most of the Rajani strophes they are found in each pāda. Sometimes the repeated syllables follow each other (e.g., in 21 *a*, 22 *a*), more often, they are separated by one, sometimes by more syllables ; a fourfold *yamaka* occurs in 14 *d* (*matakut maling ta kumaling*), whereas in the last strophe the repeti-

---

[20]) In ordinary Old Javanese prose (Ādiparvan), there are about three times as many short syllables as there are long ones; on pp. 24 sq. of Juynboll's edition, we counted 508 long syllables on a total of 2000 (calculated as if it were poetry). This is about the same relation as in the Rajani metre.

[21]) Cf. the notes to the translation of this strophe.

[22]) O. Böthlingk, *Daṇḍin's Poetik* (1890), pp. 85 sqq.

tion of *gawainya* in *b* and *d* constitutes a sort of refrain ; in the latter case, *gawai* is moreover used in two different meanings.

An *alaṃkāra* of a different kind occurs in 23 *c* (*wiku kumari kumāra kamarān mara*). Further we note in 9 *c* *lokapāla* in two different meanings and in strophe 8 : *rawiprakulastha* in *c*, on a line with *mamratipurastha*, the different meanings of *dharma* in 11 *d* and 12 *a*. A typical example of *utprekṣā* [23]) occurs in 14 *d*, where the presence of the *dvārapālas*, probably huge Rākṣasa images, serves to frighten the thieves ; a less characteristic example occurs in 18 *a*. Examples of *atiçayokti* are not rare, but they are hardly striking ; almost the only typical examples occur in the description of a tree in 16 *c* and *d*.

At least two different sorts of riddles occur in the text. Strophe 23 is introduced by the term *akṣaracyutaka*, which denotes a riddle in which a sentence or a strophe is pronounced with the omission of one or more *akṣaras* ; the other person, in this case, especially the editor, should guess what akṣara it is. Unfortunately, the editor did not find the solution ; he might partly be excused by the fact that some details in the reading are not certain. Strophe 24 shows another riddle called *winducyutaka*, more correctly *binducyutaka* ; here, it is easy to find the 'lost' anusvāra : it is of course the final sound of *gunung*. In addition, there are three strophes (from 19 to 21) which are complete riddles to us, although they are not denoted as such. In strophe 19, pāda *a* may be understood up to a certain degree, but the pādas *b — d* and the entire strophes 20 and 21 make the impression of being *abacadabra*. Strophe 20 is even strange from a phonetical point of view [24]) and not a single word could be recognized. The first impression is that some unknown language was used. Although this is not completely impossible [25]), it seems far more probable that here. too, a sort of riddle is given. It is possible that the akṣaras should be read in a different order, or even, that they should be replaced by other akṣaras. Strophe 21 is normal from a phonetical point of view, but, although a number of words may be recognized, it seems impossible to make any sense out of the strophe. It is not clear to us what the word *prākrĕtasanniveça* refers to; does this mean that, after the strange strophes, the poet goes back to a more 'normal' language ? This is not likely; I rather presume that the term refers to the immediately following strophe. *viz.* 22, and then it might mean : „transition to popular language". Strophe 22 does not give the strange impression of the immediately preceding one: considerable parts of it can even be understood, although it is far from being lucid as a whole; the strophe seems to

[23]) Cf. *ibidem*, p. 58, where the term is translated by „witzige deutung".

[24]) Cf. in pāda *a* the consonant doubling in *saggala muhojja* and *tulijju;* the consonant groups in *c (pum nwasāy ṅgua);* the succession *wi-i-ni-ji-di* in *d*, etc. The word separation adopted in the transcription is arbitrary.

[25]) In any case, the strophe does not make the impression of being composed in a regular, though unknown, language. It is also noted that strophe 21, though likewise incomprehensible, is 'normal' from a phonetical point of view. In sound, it resembles Sanskrit and some of the forms also do ; cf. the notes to the translation.

contain an invitation addressed first to birds and merchants, and then to village elders. Such a direct address would make the use of a more popular language understandable and this might be just the reason why it is difficult for us.

It appears from the above that our inscription is a unique document. It is especially striking that the oldest metrical text known in Old Javanese is at the same time one of the most sophisticated ones. This is, however, hardly astonishing in view of the fact that the Sanskrit literature of this period and the immediately preceding one is very complicated, too. These are about the beginnings of Old Javanese poetry and the smoother style, better adapted to the language, had still to be developed.

Still there is one Old Javanese *kāvya* with which the technique of our strophes (not, of course, their poetical merits) might well be compared, viz. the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa. About the date of the latter, different opinions were suggested. Its editor, H. Kern, assigned the work to the 13th century; Stutterheim, however, dated it in the first part of the Kaḍiri period [26]; Brandes thought the 10th century more likely [27]), whereas Poerbatjaraka assigned the Rāmāyaṇa to the Central-Javanese period about in the reign of Balitung (898 — 910) [28]). The arguments produced by Poerbatjaraka seem very strong; his conclusions are based on metrics (especially the use of the Āryā metre no examples of which are found in the Kekawins of the Kaḍiri period), on prosodic features (especially the frequent occurrence of the *hiatus*), a list of village authorities which agrees with the lists given in the inscriptions from the Central-Javanese period, but not with those of Eastern Java, a description of a temple complex, which agrees with the composition of Hindu-Javanese monuments belonging to the Central-Javanese period. In our opinion, these points constitute a rather complete argumentation, whereas none of the objections brought forward against such an early date seems decisive [29]). .

A comparison between the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa and the strophes of our inscription may furnish new arguments in favour of an early date of the former. The prosody of our text agrees in detail with that of the Rāmāyaṇa; I already noted the frequency of the hiatus in both cases; for vowel lengthening and shortening the Rāmāyaṇa gives similar examples as our text; final consonants, especially nasals, may be doubled before a word

[26]) H. Kern, *Rāmāyaṇa* (1900), Introductios, p. VI, where however important reservations were made ; Stutterheim, *Rāma-legenden* (1924), p. 233. Cf. also the same scholar in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 85 (1929), pp. 483 sqq.

[27]) Cf. Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 174, where a brief survey of the different opinions is given.

[28]) *Gedenkschr. K.I.* (1926), pp. 265 — 272, and, in detail, in T.B.G., 72 (1932), pp. 151 — 214.

[29]) An apparently strong objection was formulated by Berg, *Inleiding tot de studie van het Oud-Javaansch* (1928), pp. 51 sqq. : cf. also Stutterheim in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 85 (1929), pp. 483 — 487 and the survey by Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 174. The subject requires a detailed treatment.

beginning with a vowel. As to the *yamaka*, this *alaṃkāra* is frequently used in the Rāmāyaṇa, too, whereas Kaḍiri poets seem to have no special preference for it. In brief, it seems that in a considerable number of details, the technique of the strophes agrees. In the notes to the translation, we call attention to some striking passages in which the mode of expression in our text agrees with that of the Rāmāyaṇa. Future research might establish whether such correspondences constitute a sufficient basis for assigning the Rāmmāyaṇa to an early date, viz. in the Central-Javanese period.

Our text contains important materials for the Javanese history of the 9th century. The text is dated Mārgaçīrṣa 856 A.D., i.e. the same year in which also the three liṅga inscriptions dealt with in No. X above are dated. In the Introduction to No. X, it was pointed out that the liṅga erections by Kumbhayoni probably mark an important event, presumably a victory. Not much could be concluded neither about the details of this victory nor about the identity of Kumbhayoni. This text gives some valuable precisions.

In strophe 9 it is stated that king Jāti-ning-rat resigned the throne after some events mentioned in the preceding strophes (*tlas maṅkanā*). The term rendered by „resigned" is *uparata*, the literal meaning of which is „reposed, took a rest". It does not seem likely that this term should indicate the death of the king; it rather suggests a resignation by his life. This interpretation is confirmed by the form *tañanan*, which seems to imply that king Jāti-ning-rat himself handed the symbols of royal power to his successor. A further argument in favour of this interpretation will be mentioned in the course of this discussion.

The name of a king Jāti-ning-rat is still unknown in 9th century Java. This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the king himself is already known to us by a different name or a title; as a matter of fact, there are quite a few kings in the older history of Central Java who are known to us by their Rakai titles only. Some examples are the kings Rakai Panaṅkaran, Rakai Panuṅgalan, Rakai Warak, Rakai Garung, Rakai Pikatan and Rakai Watuhumalang, all mentioned in Balitung's great Kĕḍu charter dated 907 A.D. [30]). A very valuable detail is mentioned in strophe 9, pāda c, in which the name of the king to whom the symbols of royal majesty were handed is given as Dyah Lokapāla [31]). Fortunately, the latter name is well-known to us since a few years, when it was pointed out by Damais in one of his valuable epigraphical notes that Lokapāla is the real name of the king usually mentioned by his Rakai title Rakai Kayuwaṅi [32]). The oldest-known document issued by king Kayuwaṅi is the Argapura inscription dated 863

[30]) Published by Stutterheim in *T.B.G.*, 67 (1927), pp. 172-215. The list of preceding kings is found in the beginning of the imprecation formula on the second plate (B, lines 7-9; p. 210 of Stutterheim's publication).

[31]) The poet makes a pun on the name Lokapāla by adding that Prince Lokapāla was, as it were, a younger brother of the heavenly Lokapālas.

[32]) L.C. Damais, *Epigraphische Aantekeningen*, I, *Lokapāla-Kayuwangi*, in *T.B.G.*, 83 (1949), pp. 1-6.

A.D., *i.e.* seven years later [33]. Our text makes it certain that Kayuwani ascended the throne in 856 A.D. [34], when royal power was transferred to him by king Jāti-ning-rat. But then it is obvious that Jāti-ning-rat could be nobody else but the king immediately preceding Rakai Kayuwani in Balitung's list, *i.e.* Rakai Pikatan. This conclusion agrees as well with other data as could be expected, for Rakai Pikatan is known to have issued two charters in 850 A.D., *viz.* the two Perot inscriptions discussed in No. IX above [35]. Probably, Rakai Pikatan already reigned as early as 842 A.D., the year in which an influential queen, denoted by the title Çrī Kahulunnan, issued two charters pertaining to an important Buddhist foundation [36]. In an earlier publication, I concluded that this queen was the daughter of the Çailendra king Samaratunga and the spouse of king Rakai Pikatan [37]. Although there is no definite proof that Rakai Pikatan did occupy the throne by 842 A.D., the title and the position of Çrī Kahulunnan make it rather likely that this was indeed the case [38]. The regnal years of king Rakai Pikatan may then be fixed between 842 A.D. (possibly a few years earlier) and 856 A.D., those of Kayuwani between 856 and 882 A.D. (or, probably, a few years later) [39].

The next question which arises is the identity of king Kumbhayoni who erected three lingas on the Ratubaka plateau in this very year 856 A.D. [40] in which royal majesty passed from Rakai Pikatan to Rakai Kayuwani. Is he the former or the latter, or even a third king not mentioned in Balitung's

---

[33] The same scholar has made it very probable that Rakai Kayuwani was the reigning king in 863 A.D., although he is denoted by *ratu,* not by the usual royal title Çrī Mahārāja. A number of references to the use of *(sang) ratu* are given by Damais in *Epigraphische Aantekeningen,* VI, Sang Ratu — Çrī Mahārāja, in *T. B. G.,* 83 (1949), pp. 18 20. Finally, the reader is referred to *B.E.F.E.O.,* XLVI, Fasc. 1 (1952), pp. 30 sq. and pp. 34 sq., Nos. 17, 18, 27 and 28, where the principal results are briefly summarized by the same author.

[34] It is curious that Damais already suggested the same on account of the use of *lokapālair* in the second Ratubaka inscription, the first pāda of strophe 1, which might be an allusion to the name of Rakai Kayuwani; cf. *T.B.G.,* 83 (1949), p. 3. He therefore considered the possibility that Kayuwani reigned as early as 856 A.D. On account of the above discussion, the suggestion by Damais may be accepted with only a minor change: the form does allude to the name Lokapāla, but not as that of the reigning king at that time (Kumbhayoni) but as that of the heir-apparent. The simile is perfectly regular in that case, for the heir-apparent and the other princes surrounded the king as the Lokapālas do with respect to Çiva.

[35] Cf. *supra,* pp. 218-220.

[36] *Pras. Indon.,* I, Nos. V and VI.

[37] *Op. cit.,* pp. 107-109.

[38] It appears from the short inscriptions of Tjandi Plaosan (cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 116 sq.; a complete publication of these about sixty short texts is being printed) that the title Çrī Kahulunnan belonged to the king's consort, not to the crown princess.

[39] The last date might be changed to 887 A.D. if Gurunwani is to be considered a synonym of Gurunwani; cf. Krom in Stapel's *Geschiedenis,* I (1938), p. 168. Damais considers this identification at least doubtful *(T.B.G.,* 83, 1949, note 1 to p. 22), but the Plaosan inscriptions (cf. note 38 above) confirm it.

[40] More exactly, the Çaka year 778, i.e. from 10/3-856 to 27/2-857 A.D.

list ? The choice between these three possibilities is not so complicated. In the Introduction to No. X above, it was pointed out that the king who erected the liṅgas in 856 might well be identical with the distinguished founder of a Çiva temple in 863 A.D. In either case, the founder is denoted by a name meaning Agastya; in either case, the founder has some connection with Walaing, possibly the old name of the Ratubaka plateau; a few other points, not decisive by themselves, would confirm the identity [41]). There was, however, a serious objection which would invalidate the above arguments unless a satisfactory reply could be given to the question why Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription, though stressing his royal descent, is not a reigning king, whereas the founder of the liṅgas in 856 is. After the above discussion it has, however, become obvious that the absence of a royal title in the Pereng inscription is not only no objection against the identification, but even a strong confirmation. As a matter of fact, the absence of a royal title is exactly what we should have expected if the king in 856 had already resigned the throne before 863. And this is just the detail which is mentioned in this text. Unless it should be assumed that more than one king resigned the throne between 856 and 863 A.D., which is hardly likely, it is necessary to conclude that Jāti-ning-rat is identical with Kumbhayoni in the Ratubaka inscriptions and in the Pereng epigraph. Since it was concluded above that Jāti-ning-rat is identical with Rakai Pikatan in the Perot inscriptions, the short inscriptions from Tjaṇḍi Plaosan and Balitung's Kĕḍu charter, the final result is a triple identification: Kumbhayoni, Jāti-ning-rat and Rakai Pikatan denote the same king.

The next question which arises is the relation between these three names. Kings appear to have had three different types of names in the Central Javanese period, viz. a Rakai title [42]), a name preceded by *pu* or *dyah* and an *abhiṣeka* name; an example is Rakai Kayuwañi Pu Lokapāla Çrī Sajjanot-savatuṅgadeva, although the three elements have never been found together [43]). In a similar way, the names Kumbhayoni and Rakai Pikatan are easily combined to Rakai Pikatan Pu Kumbhayoni. It is, however, obvious that Jāti-ning-rat could not be the *abhiṣeka* name of the king [44]), but there is another possibility. It was concluded that the king resigned the throne in

---

[41]) Cf. the introduction to No. X above.

[42]) It is hardly necessary to add that a Rakai title is not exactly a kind of name; how-ever, it comes very near to it in the Central Javanese period: in many inscriptions (cf. for instance, No. X above) kings are denoted by the Rakai titles only; in Bali-tung's Kĕḍu charter all the preceding kings excepting Sañjaya are denoted in the same way. The Rakai title alone was sufficient to identify the king.

[43]) The only element which is never missing is the Rakai title Kayuwañi; it is found alone (the common case), in combination with the *pu* name Lokapāla (in the Argapura inscriptions), or, finally, in combination with the *abhiṣeka* name Çrī Sajjanotsawa-tuṅga (K.O., No. XV). One has the impression that the choice of the titles was rather arbitrary, even in such official documents.

[44]) As a matter of fact, the *abhiṣeka* names are always Sanskrit and usually, if not al-ways, preceded by Çrī.

856 A.D., but continued to live and even to acquire merits by foundations. The easiest explanation is that he retired to devote himself to spiritual life. A new status is often associated with a new name, at least for kings; Jāti-ning-rat might therefore be the spiritual name of the king as a rājarṣi.

This explanation of the name would have been very uncertain if there had not been a very close parallel in later Indonesian history. It is very striking that exactly the same name Jāti-ning-rat occurs once more and exactly as the spiritual name of a king who resigned the throne. From the Tjalon Arang it is known that the great Airlanga adopted the name Jāti-ning-rat after having retired to a hermitage [45]). The correspondence may be important. There is no doubt that tradition played a very great role in Indonesian history, so that it might not be impossible that Airlanga was inspired by an older example in history when he resigned the throne, adopted the name Jātiningrat and continued to live as a royal hermit. From the account which follows it will appear that the correspondence extends over a number of other details.

In the Introduction to No. X, it was concluded that the texts of the three liṅga inscriptions (a-c), if taken in the proposed order, show some sort of sequence which could be expressed by the terms asceticism, struggle and victory [46]). If this interpretation is correct, it seems likely that these three terms refer to just as many periods of the life of king Kumbhayoni : the period of „longing for Çrī" and practising all kinds of asceticism [47]) was followed by a period of fierce battles comparable with those of Mahādeva when fighting the Tripurāsuras and these again by a complete victory and the acquisition of absolute sovereignty. A fourth and last period may be added on account of this inscription, viz. resignation and spiritual life. It is well-known that the life of Airlanga might be divided into these very four periods [48]). It is not, however, sufficient to base this presumed parallel upon the above interpretation of the three liṅga inscriptions; the conclusions are too important to be accepted without further confirmations. Fortunately, this text not only confirms the lines sketched above, but also makes it possible to reconstruct some of the more important events.

The text gives little information about the presumed first period. This

---

[45]) Cf. the beginning of chapter X in the edition by Poerbatjaraka, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 82 (1926), p. 36 : *sang prabhu apuṣpata Jātiningrat, mahārāja Erlanggyabhiṣekanira.* Cf. also Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 271.

[46]) The 'natural' order of the three *liṅga* inscriptions is *a-c-b*; cf. *supra* pp. 267 sq. The order in which the inscriptions were published is the order of their discovery.

[47]) Cf. the notes to the translation of X a, especially note 118 *(purārcitāṃ çriyam)* and note 117 (Vetāla rites).

[48]) The first period begins almost immediately after the destruction of the Eastern Java *kĕraton*, when Airlanga retired to the woods with Narottama and others who had remained loyal; there, the king lived as an ascetic *(valkaladhara).* The second period consists of numerous battles against 'demons' *(hanitu).* In the third, Airlanga, having annihilated his foes, becomes a *cakravartin.* Finally, in the fourth and last period, Airlanga is the royal ascetic who has remained famous in legend rather than in history.

is hardly astonishing since the first six lines have almost disappeared from the stone. A period of asceticism is, however, more or less implied in the name of the great sage Agastya-Kumbhaja adopted by the king. Also this text seems to allude to the name of a ṛṣi in strophe 8, pāda c, viz. the words kālap kalāguṇarawiprakulasthanāma, „he adopted a name belonging to a family of honoured Brāhmaṇas" [49]), for it is well-known that all the Brāhmaṇic families trace their descent back to one of the great ṛṣis. This passage not only confirms the identification of Jātiningrat with Kumbhayoni in the Ratubaka epigraphs, but it also proves that the name Agastya-Kumbhaja was deliberately chosen by the king at a definite moment. The choice of the name may be understood if one considers the relations in Central Java about in the middle of the 9th century. After the Çailendra period, the new dynasty [50]) had to justify the reason of the struggle in order to establish a firm position in the Javanese country. Ancient states did not fight for democracy, but for the re-establishment of Dharma trodden upon by the preceding dynasty. A king struggling with a Buddhist power could consider himself a second Agastya who planted the roots of Hindu Law and Society in more southern regions. This idea is clearly expressed in strophe 9 d, where it is stated that (after his victory) „the subjects became independent, divided into the four āçramas [51]) headed by the Brāhmaṇas", and in 12 a, where the king is considered to be clever in distinguishing adharma from dharma. This zeal for Brāhmaṇism made him adopt the name of a ṛṣi connected with the expansion of Brāhmaṇism in older times [52]). Now it is difficult to announce oneself as a second Agastya without imitating at least some of the most characteristic features of such a sage. Agastya's famous feats such as subduing the Vindhya and drinking up the ocean were due to fierce asceticism, which gave him the powers to bring such acts to

---

[49]) „Honoured" translates the prefix of ra-wipra. One would have expected a term such as °upeta° to connect °kalāguṇa° with ° ra-wipra °. However, the poet, who did not mean to write correct Sanskrit but Old Javanese, took certain freedoms in the construction of his compounds. Note also the partial yamaka (with inversed vowel quantities) in °kālap kalā°. Wiprakulasthanāma are those names which are usual in Brāhmaṇic families. i.e. those traced back to one of the great ṛṣis. Instead of kula, gotra would have been more correct, but the poet probably considered the two terms synonyms.

[50]) It has been pointed out (cf. the Introduction to No. X above) that this 'new' dynasty may have been considered identical with the old Sañjayavaṃça which dates back from 717 A.D., the first year of the so-called Sañjaya era (cf. Damais, Etudes d'épigraphie indonésienne, II, Les dates en ère de Sañjaya, B.E.F.E.O., XLV, Fasc. 1, 1951, pp. 42-63). It is, however, very striking that none of the inscriptions dated 856 A.D., makes the least allusion to Sañjaya. The Sañjaya dynasty may have been some kind of dynastic myth developed during the reigns of Balitung and Dakṣa in the beginning of the 10th century.

[51]) Wipramukhya might be an indication that caturāçrama is used in the meaning of caturvarṇa, which is not uncommon in Old Javanese. Cf. note 20 to the Translation.

[52]) Especially of the Çaiva forms of Brāhmanism; this is also the case with king Kumbhayoni.

an end. The king acting as a second Agastya could not have acquired the force necessary to re-establish Dharma otherwise than by fierce asceticism, too. This line of argument leads to exactly the same conclusion which has already been drawn on account of the practices alluded to by inscription X *a*, strophes 1-2. It is therefore likely that the period of struggle was preceded by a period of asceticism, as was the case with Airlaṅga in the 11th century.

Something more definite may be concluded about the second period, that of struggle. Especially strophes 6 to 8, most of which has remained legible, contain important information. The most interesting detail is the mention of Bālaputra at the end of 7 *d*. In spite of a lacuna of one syllable at the end of line 9, the meaning of the pāda is not doubtful. I translate: „killing [53] as fast as (?) [54] the wind he attacked [55] Bālaputra". In pāda 7 *b*, the passages *tĕpat=tahun=ni lama ning* ....., „exactly a year was the time of the ..... (or: that he .....)", could be referred to the period in which the main (*i.e.* the last phase of the ?) struggle took place. If this inference is correct, the decisive battles continued for a year, *i.e.* in the period of one year between Caitra and Mārgaçīrṣa of the elapsed Çaka year 777 and the same date in the next year when the *liṅga* inscriptions were cut in [56]. Pāda *c* of the same strophe 7 mentions the term *ungsyan*, „(place of) refuge", probably to be connected with the words *watunn=inatus*, „stones (heaped up) by hundreds" [57]. By combining the above interpretations it may be concluded that Bālaputra, presumably after a defeat in the open country, retired to a place (this seems to be implied in *ungsyan*) which could be transformed into a stronghold by means of defence works built up with hundreds of stones. However, before having succeeded in establishing an almost unconquerable position, he was attacked and defeated by Kumbhayoni, who was as swift as the wind and wiped him off from there. Presumably, Bālaputra was not killed in battle, but being chased

---

[53] This use of *hantṛ* (Sanskrit -ṛ stems are adapted in their nominative forms in Old Javanese) may be compared with *jetṛ* (again in the nominative form) in 6*d* and with *waiaiṅgajetrā*, to be interpreted as the „victorious king of Walaing" in No. X, inscription *b*, strophe 4, pāda *c*. Another example, already mentioned in No. X above, is *dātṛ* in the passage *çrīmān=dātā kṛtajño* in the Djambu rock inscription (Vogel, *The Earliest Sanskrit Inscriptions of Java*, in *Publ. Oudh. Dienst*, I, 1925, p. 25).

[54] I have no exact parallel for this use of *āwali*, „string, series", etc. Cf. the Translation.

[55] The missing syllable may be conjecturally restored as *mri; amrihi*, „directed himself towards" (cf. *prih-prih* in 10 *d)* is the only term which makes sense and agrees with the metre. The subject of the sentence is probably the same as that of 7 *a*, viz. the king (*sira*).

[56] For the calculation of the limits within which No. X, *a-c* must be dated, cf. p. 248 in the Introduction to No. X. There is no reasonable doubt that the *liṅga* erections anticipate the foundation of a Çiva temple dealt with in No. XI (dated 11 çuklapakṣa Mārgaçīrṣa 778 Çaka) by a considerable lapse of time. The maximum is about nine months.

[57] Cf. note 10 to the Translation.

from his strong positions he managed to escape to Sumatra, where he became a king of Çrīvijaya in a manner still completely unknown [58]).

The above makes it possible to fill in some awkward gaps in our knowledge hitherto acquired. The groups between which the struggle took place were (a) a Çailendra group headed by Bālaputra and (b) a Javanese (?) group headed by Kumbhayoni, alias Rakai Pikatan [59]).The struggle ended in the defeat and flight of Bālaputra and the complete victory of Kumbhayoni. Now, it was suggested that the three lingas on the Ratubaka plateau were erected by Kumbhayoni as symbols of a great victory [60]). As a matter of fact, the texts of No. X clearly give this impression. But then, a new conclusion about the spot where the decisive battle took place seems possible. As a matter of fact, a „token of victory" is almost always erected on the spot where the victory was gained. The three linga inscriptions originate from the Ratubaka plateau ; therefore, the final victory should be located on the Ratubaka plateau.

This conclusion is nothing but a natural outcome of the arguments exposed above, but it may be considered from different points of view. The Ratubaka plateau is an excellent place for a fortification. Situated due south of Prambanan, it controls the fertile plains from Djogjakarta to Klatèn. From many a place on the border of the plateau one has a wide view and, if the atmosphere is clear, Djogjakarta and Klatèn are visible. No enemy could approach the plateau without being spotted a long time before. Its steep walls of granite make. it almost inaccessible except along a few paths cut into the rocks ; these tracks could, however, be easily defended. And even if an enemy had managed to ascend the plateau, there were still numerous opportunities for a successful defence.

---

[58]) Cf. *infra*, pp. 295 sqq.

[59]) In the present state of research it would not be wise to make an attempt at defining the background of this struggle. Religious factors should not be stressed. Religious fanaticism has been extremely rare in Java and when it occurred, it was limited to small groups of the population. In all the cases known, political and economic factors were the decisive ones, although religious factors were rarely completely absent. As a matter of fact, religious motives are often used for very materialistic ends by politicians of all countries. It is not hard to find possible economic motives behind the struggle mentioned in the text. The huge Çailendra foundations, such as Tjaṇḍi Sewu and Barabuḍur, must have constituted a tremendous burden on a population which, presumably, was much less dense than it is at present. Such constructions would not have made the Çailendra kings popular, so that other pretendents could be certain of support by the masses. B.J.O. Schrieke used similar arguments to explain the shift of the Javanese kraton from Central to Eastern Java in the beginning of the 10th century *(Het einde van de klassieke Hindoe-Javaanse cultuur op Midden-Java, 22ste kol. vac. curs. geogr.,* 1941. pp. 3-21) ; Schrieke's argumentation is doomed to fail as long as there is not a shadow of proof that the shift of the *kraton* would have been some kind of mass emigration ; in addition, the Çailendra foundations could hardly be considered responsible for such emigrations occurring three quarters of a century later. Political factors such as Sumatranese relations of Bālaputra will be considered in the course of this Introduction.

[60]) Cf. *supra*, p. 255.

Not only physical features, but also history made the plateau an ideal place for the last Javanese Çailendra. It is known from a Pre-Nāgarī inscription, to be dated in the latter half of the 8th century A.D. [61]), that there had been a Çailendra foundation on the plateau. The Pre-Nāgarī inscription is stated to have been discovered on the so-called *pĕṇḍapa* terrace on the plateau [62]), where not only some Buddhist statues (Dhyānibuddhas) but also a silver plate inscribed with the words *ye te svāhā, i.e.* the abbreviated form of the so-called Buddhist creed, were discovered [63]). The plateau was associated with the Çailendra dynasty since more than half a century. This may have been an additional reason for Bālaputra to select it as his last fortress in Central Java. This very association with the Çailendras made Kumbhayoni transform the Ratubaka plateau into a Çaiva centre by erecting *lingas* and probably other objects of cult, too ; then, the place could not easily become a new centre of resistance against his dynasty.

The period during which Bālaputra made the Ratubaka plateau his residence and his stronghold might well be the origin of the famous tradition about the „kraton of Ratubaka". It has been noticed that the Ratubaka plateau is all but a suitable place for a Javanese kraton [64]). This is perfectly true for a normal kraton, but the objections would not count for a temporary residence chosen for its strategically and morally strong position.

In the beginning of this Introduction, it was briefly mentioned that this text is indirectly important for the date of the Nālandā charter. Unless one should assume that Bālaputra interfered with Central Javanese affairs in a time when he was already a king of Çrīvijaya — which is extremely unlikely —, it is necessary to conclude that he became a king in Sumatra after 856 A.D. Without further materials, the questions how and why he arrived at such a lofty position after his defeat in Central Java cannot be answered ; it might, however, be suggested that Bālaputra could assert claims on the Çrīvijaya throne on account of family relations [65]) and it is

---

[61]) Probably about the same time as the Kalasan charter (778 A.D.) with which it has important passages in common (cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, 1950, p. 15).

[62]) Cf. A.J. Bernet Kempers, *Crawfurd's beschrijving van Prambanan in 1816,* in *T.B.G.,* 83 (1949), p. 186.

[63]) This silver plate was discovered in 1953 during excavations in the direct environs of the „pĕṇḍapa terrace". The script is no Pre-Nāgarī, but a very archaic type of Old Javanese script, which resembles the type used in the inscription *ye dharmmā hetu-prabhavā* etc. from Tjaṇḍi Mĕndut (at present No. D. 122 in the Djakarta Museum ; cf. Krom, *Inleiding²,* I, p. 317, and *Pras. Indon.* I, p. 112).

[64]) Cf. Krom, *Inleiding²,* I, p. 244 sqq., and, especially, Stutterheim in Djâwâ, VI (1926), pp. 129-135.

[65]) Cf. Krom in Stapel's *Geschiedenis,* I (1938), p. 162 ; *Pras. Indon.,* I (1950), p. 110 and note 7 to that page. Krom suggested that king Dharmasetu, mentioned as Bālaputra's maternal grandfather in the Nālandā charter, was a king of Çrīvijaya. Without refuting Krom's suggestion, I added another possibility by pointing out that the Ligor inscription(s) could be interpreted in such a way that it (they) suggest(s) a close relationship between the reigning dynasty of Çrīvijaya and the Çailendra kings of Central Java *(op. cit.,* pp. 99 sq.). In about the same time when I formulated the

not impossible that Bālaputra would have been preferred to possible other candidates because he alone could assert claims on Central Java [66].

This, of course, remains completely conjectural, but it has, at least, the advantage of enabling us to distinguish some vague but important lines in Indonesian history during a few centuries. Bālaputra, after being chased from Central Java, could assert definite claims to the fertile plains of Central Java. If he did not have forces to carry his plans into execution, his successors might be able to make use of his pretensions. The suggestion that Çrīvijaya was the main factor at the background of the shift of the Javanese capital from Central to Eastern Java in the beginning of the 10th century A.D. [67] and, again, that Çrīvijaya was the power essentially res-

above suggestion, Cœdès analyzed the four-lined Ligor inscription B again and concluded that not one, but two kings, father and son, are mentioned in this Sragdharā strophe; the former would have been identical with the Çrīvijayeçvarabhūpati of Ligor A, whereas the latter would have become the first Çailendra after having married a princess descending from the „Kings of the Mountain" of Fu-nan (Le Çailendra Tueur des Héros ennemis, in Bingkisan Budi, 1950, pp. 58-70). Finally, Bosch (Çrīvijaya, de Çailendra- en de Sañjaya-vaṃça, in Bijdr. K.I., 108, 1952, pp. 113-123), adopting the main conclusions arrived at by Cœdès, went much further by inserting also the Sañjaya dynasty into the genealogical tree. It is hardly necessary to add that these three interpretations, however different they may be in detail, are all based upon the assumptions that (a) there is a close relationship between Ligor A and B (although they are no more considered two parts of a single inscription) and (b) there is also a close relationship between the reigning dynasty of Çrīvijaya and the Javanese Çailendras. This consensus opinionum may be considered one of the principal results of post-war research as far as the Çrīvijaya-Çailendra relations are concerned. Cf also note 66.

[66] The family relations suggested in note 65 could hardly account for everything. The Ligor inscription is dated about eighty years before Bālaputra could have become a king. Being a Çrīvijaya king's grandson may have meant something more, but there is no reason to assume that Dharmasetu would not have had other grandsons with as many or more rights to the throne. It is necessary to assume the existence of other factors to arrive at a satisfactory explanation of the events. Without new materials, nothing certain may be concluded about the presumed factors, i.e. nothing but their very existence. One could suppose, for instance, that Bālaputra was married to the eldest daughter of the king who preceded him (which would have been a kind of cross-cousin marriage), not exactly because he was considered the most capable candidate to the throne, but because he brought in important territorial claims. It might be inferred from the Nālandā charter that these claims did mean something. Why else should Bālaputra have introduced himself as the son and grandson of a king of Java without giving any unambiguous reference to a former king of Çrīvijaya? The easiest explanation is that Bālaputra's position in Çrīvijaya was a fact which needed no further comment, whereas his references to kings of Java served a definite purpose as if he wanted to stress that he, king of Suvarṇadvīpa, had a father and a grandfather who were kings of Yavadvīpa. In international politics of those times this could mean: „if I am not a king of Java, too — although my father and grandfather were — it is because I was robbed of the throne". — Although one has to realize that the above is completely conjectural, it may nevertheless be useful to consider the possibilities in the light of our scarce data.

[67] Krom (Geschiedenis², p. 209), when discussing the different theories about the causes of the shift of the Javanese centre to Eastern Java, thinks influence (indirectly, as

ponsible for the destruction of the Eastern Javanese capital in 1016/17 [68]) might become less conjectural than it was before, though it is not, of course, capable of real proof.

The data about Bālaputra in this inscription make an important conclusion about the Nālandā inscription possible. Since Bālaputra was still in Java by 856 A.D. [69]), the Nālandā inscription cannot possibly be dated before 856. If it is assumed that Bālaputra did not become king of Çrīvijaya immediately after his defeat in Java, it is obvious that the Nālandā inscription could not be dated much earlier than about 860 A.D. On the other hand, there are reasons to suppose that Bālaputra would not have waited too long to send a „Cultural Mission" to the Pāla king. As a matter of fact, there might be a close relation between Bālaputra's defeat in Central Java and his desire to establish friendly relations with the greatest Buddhist power in the West at that time. With a hostile power in the East, which could become a real menace in the future, it was essential for a maritime power to have an ally in the West [70]). On account of these considerations, the most likely date for the Nālandā copper-plate would be between about 860 and 870 A.D.

After the above digression about Bālaputra and the Nālandā inscription it is necessary to consider Kumbhayoni and Central Java again. Kumbhayoni's battle against Bālaputra reminded the poet of inscription X c of Mahādeva's

---

a menace) from Çrīvijaya the most important factor. It is true that Krom based his explanation mainly upon his interpretation of the Çailendra period as years of Çrīvijaya domination in Central Java. After being liberated from Sumatranese supremacy, Central Java authorities still considered the possibility that the old rulers should return and therefore thought it safer to move to a place farther away. Although Krom's interpretations are based upon a conception of the Çailendra period which cannot be accepted in this form, the general account remains true; in the light of these new data, the reasons why an attack from Crīvijaya might have been expected become much clearer. Cf. also Moens in *T.B.G.*, 77 (1937), p. 411 and p. 442, and Cœdès, *Etats hindouisés*, pp. 217 sq.

[68]) This explanation was suggested by Van Stein Callenfels in *Oudh. Versl.*, 1919, pp. 156-163. Krom, *Geschiedenis*[2], p. 241 did not consider this explanation very likely, but mentions it as one of the possibilities. Cœdès, *Etats hindouisés*, p. 220, p. 224, appears to consider the explanation by Van Stein Callenfels very likely (p. 220 : „......... le résultat de cette agression javanaise fut probablement une contre-offensive du royaume sumatranais, que l'on a de sérieuses raisons de rendre responsable de l'expédition de 1006-1007, de la mort du roi javanais et de la destruction de sa résidence"). As to the year in which the expedition took place, it is added that Damais is certainly right in dating it ten years later, *i.e.* in 1016/1017 instead of in 1006/1007 (cf. *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, note 2 to p. 64).

[69]) I do not consider the possibility that Bālaputra would already have been king of Çrīvijaya when he took part in battles in Central Java.

[70]) This argument is considerably confirmed by a comparison with events in the end of the 10th and the beginning of the 11th century A.D. After the Javanese attack in 992 A.D., the king of Çrīvijaya got into contact with the Cola rulers and had a Buddhist temple constructed at Nāgīpaṭṭana in about 1005 A.D. Cf. the survey by Cœdès, *Etats hindouisés*, pp. 238 sq.

struggle against Tripura. With the help of the details supplied by this Old Javanese inscription it may be concluded that the mythic battle and the historical one show some striking points of agreement. The stronghold consisting of „stones (heaped up) by hundreds" [71]), to be identified with the Ratubaka plateau brought into the state of defence by Bālaputra, is the poet's Tripura constructed by Maya and his Asuras as a mighty stronghold against the Devas. It was, however, conquered by the Devas under the command of Mahādeva whose divine strength was essentially due to his fierce asceticism — just as the Ratubaka plateau was conquered by the armies commanded by Kumbhayoni, who, too, may have acquired the necessary forces by various forms of asceticism, if the above conclusions based upon (1) the analysis of inscription X a, (2) the name Kumbhayoni adopted by the king and (3) the comparison with Airlanga may be relied upon.

In that case it may be supposed that there have been some more analogies between the mythic Tripura battle and the historical struggle on the Ratubaka plateau. Tripura was built as a triple stronghold from where the Asuras threatened the Devas and prepared an attack on the Sumeru [72]). In a similar way, Bālaputra may have transformed the Ratubaka plateau into a fortress from where he threatened Kumbhayoni's palace which may have been situated in the plain not very far away. Then it is obvious that Kumbhayoni was already a regular king before 856 A.D., whereas Bālaputra's action may be considered a revolt. This agrees well with other data. The inscriptions of Tjaṇḍi Perot (No. IX a-b, above), are issued during the reign of king (ratu) Rakai Pikatan with whom I identified king Kumbhayoni of the Ratubaka epigraphs dated 856, i.e. six years later. Of course, the Perot inscriptions from the north-eastern slope of the Mount Sumbing would not necessary exclude an independent Çailendra centre under Bālaputra in the plain of Prambanan and environs, although this seems less likely. But also the Plaosan inscriptions mention king (çrī mahārāja) Rakai Pikatan [73]). Since it is known that Rakai Pikatan resigned the throne in or before Mārgaçīrṣa 856, the Plaosan inscriptions must have been cut in before the latter date. It could be suggested that these inscriptions were cut in between Caitra and Mārgaçīrṣa of the Çaka year 778, i.e. between the victory and the resignation [74]), but this is hardly possible. The latter suggestion would imply that most of the Plaosan complex was constructed in about eight month's time and in a period when Rakai Pikatan would have been busy with other things, not just a Buddhist foundation [75]). Unless such a forced

---

[71]) Cf. p. 293 above.

[72]) Cf. pp. 266 sq. above.

[73]) Cf. Pras. Indon., I, p. 117, and the Report on the Plaosan inscriptions (in print).

[74]) I.e. between 10-III-856 and 12-XI-856 A.D. (Damais, B.E.F.E.O., XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, pp. 30 sq.).

[75]) There remains the theoretical possibility that only the inscriptions were cut in within the eight months' period, whereas the buildings themselves were constructed in the years prior to 856, not by Kumbhayoni-alias Rakai Pikatan but by some other

and unlikely explanation should be adopted, it is necessary to assume that the Plaosan buildings were constructed and inscribed prior to the *liṅga* erections on the Ratubaka plateau. But then it follows that Rakai Pikatan dominated the Prambanan plain prior to 856 A.D., including the period in which Bālaputra settled down on the Ratubaka plateau to make it a stronghold [76] which could therefore be styled an act of revolt. Presumably, Bālaputra united chiefs and troops sympathizing with the Çailendras in order to attack the residence of Rakai Pikatan; after having suffered a defeat, which was not, however, decisive, Bālaputra withdrew to the Ratubaka plateau which he transformed into a stronghold from where he could attack Rakai Pikatan again, but before having succeeded in making it a very strong base, he was attacked by Rakai Pikatan and expelled from Java.

The presumed attack on Rakai Pikatan's residence is not only likely on account of the circumstances sketched above, but it is also confirmed by the text to a certain extent. In strophe 8 *d* it is mentioned that the king constructed a new residence (*kĕraton*) after his victory. It would not, of course, be impossible that the king's increase in power and prestige necessitated a new residence, but in most of the cases known from later Javanese history new residences are built after the destruction of or the occupation, even temporary, by an enemy. Thus, the residence of Plèrèd, occupied by Trunajaya in 1677 A.D., was not inhabited by Sunan Amangkurat II; after Trunajaya's defeat, the new residence of Kartasura was constructed. For a similar reason, the Kartasura residence was abandoned and replaced by Surakarta in 1745. Other examples, such as the different Djohor residences, may be added. The construction of a new residence by Kumbhayoni-Rakai Pikatan might therefore be a hint that the older *kĕraton* had been destroyed or occupied by Bālaputra. Although most of the details remain unknown, it is at least certain that the year 856 A.D. marks the end of a very fierce period of struggle between Bālaputra and Rakai Pikatan.

A few more words could be said about the new residence. It was constructed at *mamratipurastha maḍaṅg*, presumably : „Mĕḍang situated in (°*stha*) Mamratipura". This is the oldest mention of the famous Mĕḍang *kĕraton*, or rather, of one of the Mĕḍang *kĕratons*, for it is well-known that

---

king. Such a solution seems, however, rather far-fetched. — Another point is that a Buddhist foundation does not seem likely in the period between such pronounced Çaiva documents as inscriptions X, a-c and XI. As to the period prior to 856 A.D., the situation was completely different. Rakai Pikatan had to reckon with an undoubtedly powerful Çailendra group which might become hostile unless the king should support Buddhist foundations, too; his co-operation with the foundation of Tjaṇḍi Plaosan might have aimed at winning Buddhist sympathies with his rule. After Bālaputra's defeat, it was less necessary to reckon with the Buddhists' feelings.

[76] In later Javanese history, there are sufficient examples to show how easily things like this could happen in the very neighbourhood of the king. Thus, Kuṭi's revolt forced king Jayanagara to leave his Majapahit residence; Sunan Pakubuwana II had to flee to Panaraga when his residence at Kartasura was attacked by a Madurese prince with the help of a group of princes in the king's neighbourhood.

quite a number of Mĕḍang *kĕratons* survive in Javanese tradition. Three Mĕḍangs are mentioned in Old Javanese inscriptions, viz. Mĕḍang i bhūmi Mataram, Mĕḍang ri Pohpitu (in Balitung's Kĕḍu inscription dated 907 A.D.) and Mĕḍang in Mamrātipura (this text). Mamrati (without °*pura*) is frequently found as a title in inscriptions issued during the reigns of Tuloḍong, Wawa and Siṇḍok [77]). The name might be another example of a high title derived from the name of a royal residence, or rather, of the region in which a royal residence was situated. Other examples are Kanuruhan [78]) and possibly, Halu [79]).

The more historical part of this inscription serves as an introduction to the main portion of the text (strophes 11 to 29) dealing with a very extensive Çaiva foundation. The consolidation of the dynasty of Rakai Pikatan marked the beginning of a new period, which had to be inaugurated by the foundation of a great temple complex. This text gives by far the most detailed description of Hindu-Javanese temples known in epigraphy and the only examples known from Old Javanese literature are dated centuries later [80]). In addition, the text gives much more than mere descriptions; it also gives us some idea of how the complex was constructed and the frequent similes in the text might even give us some idea about the religious background. Unfortunately, this material is contained in hightly artful Old Javanese poetry, some of the characteristic features of which have been discussed in the preceding portion of this Introduction. As a consequence, the interpretation of the strophes poses tremendous difficulties which could not be solved in this first publication. Nevertheless, there still remain materials that seem sufficiently clear to constitute the basis of the survey to be given hereafter.

The part of the text dealing with the foundations may be roughly divided into two portions. The former (strophes 11 to 23) deals with the erection of buildings and other foundations; the main subject of the latter part (strophes 24 to 29) is the inauguration of the buildings and the grounds which will guarantee the autonomy of the temple complex.

The portion dealing with the construction of temples etc. is all but systematic. The poet limits his account to those details and those aspects of the foundation in which he is especially interested, or rather, which lend themselves well to a poetical description. It is, therefore, impossible to base any conclusions upon the absence of certain details in the description which

---

[77]) In addition, Mamrati occurs as the name of a dignitary (preceded by the honorific prefix *ra-*) in this text, too (strophe 10, pāda *b*).

[78]) The origin of the well-known title should probably be traced back to Kāñjuruhan, the name of the Eastern Java residence mentioned in the Dinaya inscription dated 760 A.D. (Cf. *T.B.G.*, 81, 1941, pp. 511-513).

[79]) For Halu, which is, for instance, the Rakai title of Airlaṅga, cf. *infra*, strophe 12, pāda *d*, the note to the translaton of this strophe, and *infra*, p. 342.

[80]) Such descriptions are found especially in the Nāgarakrĕtāgama, but also in other *kĕkawins*. As a rule, the poets describe the *adbhutāni*; cf. Stutterheim's important notes to Prapañca's description of the kĕraton of Majapahit in the Nāgarakrĕtāgama (*De kraton van Majapahit, Verh. K.I.*, VII, 1948).

is necessarily incomplete. The poet describes only what he thinks worthy of mention.

In strophe 11, it is stated that the king had a *dharma* constructed as soon as the circumstances made peaceful activities possible. *Dharma* probably denotes the foundation as a whole [81]), so that the descriptions thereafter should be referred to its various details. The precise meaning of *dharma* is difficult to be ascertained. It is generally accepted that the term usually applies to sanctuaries in which the main object of cult is the statue of a deified king, but there is no proof that this should be the case with all the foundations denoted by *dharma* in the texts. No more does this text furnish such a proof, but it seems hardly doubtful that the temple inaugurated in 856 A.D. was indeed a sanctuary of the type alluded to above. Thus, the term used to denote the main object of cult in 24 (pāda *d*) and in 28 (pāda *d*) is *bhaṭāra*, a term used for a deified king in at least the great majority of cases known [82]). In strophe 18, which is not, unfortunately, lucid, the term *diwyākěna*, „to be deified", applies to the temple complex as a whole, which is to be „deified", „made divine" by means of consecration ceremonies, but it is unlikely that such a term would have been used if the poet did not want to suggest that the principal aim of the construction was some kind of apotheosis [83]). Finally, perhaps the most convincing argument is the allusion to *patiha* ceremonies [84]) in 10a, a term denoting ceremonies connected with the cult of the dead, whatever its exact meaning is [85]).

---

[81]) There is an interesting pun on this meaning of *dharma* in connection with Dharma-Adharma in strophe 12 a; cf. notes 36 and 38 to the translation.

[82]) Cf. Stutterheim, *Prae-Hinduïstische Bijzettingsgebruiken*, in *Med. Kon. Acad. Wet.*, N.R., II (1939), p. 108 (= p. 4 of the separate edition).

[83]) Cf. *infra*, note 65 to the Translation.

[84]) Cf. Van der Tuuk's Dictionary, *s.v. tiwa* (II, p. 674): In the Tantu Paṅgělaran, edition by Pigeaud (1924), p. 112, *woṅ atitiwa* are stated to meet on cemetery grounds *(sma)*. Cf. also Stutterheim, *T.B.G.*, 75 (1935). p. 425, where the Dayak *tiwah* ceremonies are mentioned, interpreted as the ceremonies for the final redemption of the soul of the dead („het laatste verlossingsfeest der ziel'), and Berg, who discussed the term in his Kidung Sunda edition *(Bijdr. K.I.*, 83, 1927, p. 126). A very recent description of the Dayak *tiwah* ceremonies was given by Badar Sulaiman Usin, *Tiwah*, in *Mimbar Indonesia*, VII, No. 37 (12/9-1953): pp. 12-14 and p. 29.

[85]) From most of the references mentioned in note 84, it would appear that the *tiwa* ceremonies take place a long time after death. During the Dayak feast, *e.g.*, the bones are dug up, gathered and put into some kind of urn *(sandang)* to be buried again after the ceremonies. These details recall the *çrāddha* ceremonies known, *e.g.*, from Prapañca's description in the Nāgarakrětāgama (Cantos LXIII to LXIX); the *çrāddha* ceremonies for the Rājapatnī aim at complete purification in order that the Queen may return to her divine form of Prajñāpāramitā. I have the impression that the *patiha* mentioned in our text should be compared with the Rājapatnī ceremonies described in the Nāgarakrětāgama, although there is no proof. Further research about what exactly is meant by *tiwa* in the different texts might furnish precisions. There are a few *loci* which do not confirm the above interpretation. The Wirāṭaparwan (Old Javanese text published by Juynboll, 1912, p. 38, line 32, and p. 40, line 3) suggests ceremonies which take place immediately after the death of a prince (Kīcaka killed

The foundation as a whole is denoted by Çiwagrĕha (*i.e.* Çiwagrha) in 26*a* and by Çiwālaya in 25*a* ; there is not, therefore, any doubt that the *bhaṭāra* mentioned in 24*d* and in 28*d* was a Çiwa image. The date of its consecration (*sinangskāra* in 24 d) is given with great detail (24 *a-c*).

Strophe 13, unfortunately mutilated, might give some idea of how the complex as a whole was built. One gets the clear impression that only the main building(s) (probably denoted by *tĕas,* the 'heart' of the foundation, in 14*b*) were directly ordered to be built by the king, whereas the smaller buildings were constructed by others who had made solemn vows to that effect. The identity of these 'others' is less clear, but if the enumeration in 13 *a-b* refers to these, not only high dignitaries (*pramukha*), but also friends (*mitra*), servants (*bhṛtya*) and even low-caste people (*nijakula*) were included into their number. Probably, all these people have close relations with the king in common [86]; they may have been the people who accompanied the king during the difficult period of struggle [87] when they made solemn vows to be fulfilled after the final victory [88]. After this victory, everyone set himself cheerfully to this task. Strophe 17 pāda *a* makes it clear that the buildings to be constructed by those who made the vows are small temples in rows, stated to be all equal in height (*samaroha*) and equal in conception (*sārtha, samacitta*), though different in their details. As is

---

by Wṛhannalā=Arjuna in disguise), but these references may not, perhaps, be relied upon since they occur in Old Javanese paraphrases of Sanskrit strophes ; they prove, however, that *tiwa,* whatever its precise meaning is, could be used for different ceremonies connected with the cult of the dead. Cf. also note 22 to p. 319 below.

[86] Another example of an enumeration based upon similar principles is found in the Old Malay inscription dealt with in No. II, above ; cf. *supra,* pp. 18-21. Also the numerous inscriptions on the small temples of the Plaosan Lor complex seem to prove that not only very high dignitaries but even rather modest servants of the king contributed to the foundation as far as their limited resources reached (thus, one of the small buildings is stated to have been erected by the king in collaboration with no less than three, presumably, lower servants). It is well-known that class separations were often less strict in so-called feudal societies than in modern 'democracy' : in European medieval society it was not rare that servants dined at the lord's table (which still occurs in countries such as Italy or Spain, where feudalism has not completely disappeared), whereas a rich peasant family in Holland would not dream of allowing their lower servants at their table. This does not, of course, mean that feudalism should be regretted : the point is that social class distinctions (*i.e.* mainly 'money' distinctions in Western Society) tend to be stressed just because Constitution no more protects the Lords. Thus, the medieval servant would not have had the idea to abuse his close relations with his lord's family, just because the gap was considered natural.

[87] This, however, is completely conjectural. Unfortunately, strophe 13 is badly mutilated by a hole in the stone ; its interpretation, is, therefore, difficult, but the above is at least one of the ways in which the different parts of the strophe could be connected. For the details, cf. the notes to the translation of strophe 13.

[88] This is mainly based upon my interpretation of *anumoda,* the detailed discussion of which is given in the publication of the Plaosan inscriptions ; cf. also note 46 to p. 321 below.

well-known, rows of small temples surrounding the central building(s) are found in the great Central Javanese complexes such as Séwu, Plaosan and Lara Djongrang.

In strophes 14 and 15, numerous other important details are given. A *linga* is probably mentioned in 14 *a* [89]). Strophe 14, pāda *b* mentions the interesting detail that the central temples (the 'heart' of the foundation) had their own wall (*turus*), by which they were separated from the small constructions. Such a conception is not found everywhere ; it occurs, *e.g.*, in the Lara Djongrang complex, but not in Tjaṇḍi Séwu. In the same pāda the use of bricks is referred to ; it is stated that they were used for the construction of *tambak* [90]), presumably brick walls either in the interior of a temple building or between some groups of buildings [91]). The next pāda, 14*c*, mentions 'door-keepers' (*dvārapāla*), probably huge Rākṣasas protecting the gate-ways in the walls ; the explanation of their presence, given in 14 *d*, was already quoted above as a typical example of *utprekṣā* [92]). Near the gate-ways, pavilion-like buildings (*raṅkang* in 15 *b*) were erected ; there were only two of these buildings probably placed one opposite the other, *i.e.* either in the eastern and western walls respectively or in the northern and the southern walls. One gets the impression that the two *raṅkang* were situated within the innermost complex (that which is denoted by *tĕas* in 14 *b*), whereas the outer temples (*viz.* those outside the wall which presumably surrounded the *tĕas*) are mentioned only in strophe 17. If this is correct, the situation of the two *raṅkang* would correspond exactly with that the two so-called 'court-temples' in the inner complex of Lara Djongrang, where they are placed near the northern and southern entrances respectively [93]).

Rather a long passage (15 *c-d* and the entire strophe 16) deals with a very extraordinary tree. Owing to the God's neighbourhood, it had grown with a miraculous speed : though planted only a year before, it had come

---

[89]) Cf. *infra*, note 18 to the Transcription.

[90]) *Tamwaka* ...... *istaka*. The latter word is undoubtedly a wrong spelling of Sanskrit *iṣṭaka*, „brick" ; as to *tamwaka*, I consider this form a so-called 'form of irreality' (forms with the suffix -a, styled „irrealiteitsvorm" by Berg, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 95, 1937, p. 109 and *passim)*, the use of which is much freer in Old Javanese than it is in the modern language. I translate : „bricks to become *tamwak"*; exactly the same use of the derivative *tambak-a* (but in a different shade of meaning of the word *tambak* itself ; cf. note 91) is found in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa (Canto XV, strophe 4).

[91]) Cf. *infra*, note 49 to the Translation.

[92]) *Supra*, p. 286.

[93]) Cf. Krom, *Inleiding²*, I, pp. 456 sqq. and *Oudh. Versl. 1931-35* (1938), Plates 7 and 8 (after the reconstruction). The usual designation by 'court-temples' („hoftempeltjes" in Dutch) is based upon the numerous *ratna* ornaments and the impression made by the buildings to modern eyes. It is curious that most of what is known about the meaning of *raṅkang* in Old Javanese agrees more or less with the form of the Prambanan 'court temples', as also the situation of the two *raṅkang* in this text does. The usual translation of *raṅkang* is „pavilion" ; in Bhomakāwya, Canto XLIII, strophe

to considerable height. Although it was only a Tañjung tree (15 c), it was equal to the divine Pārijātaka [94]): this is why it would become the place where the God would descend when coming to Earth, using it both as a ladder and as a *payung* — it could really be called a God for the God [95]). It is added that the tree had been planted at the Eastern side (*ri pūrwwadiça=* Sanskrit *pūrvāyaṃ diçi*, — although it was *apūrva*, „unequalled", as the poet adds, unable to resist the opportunity for a pun). The simile suggests

24, pāda a, *rankang* designates the pavilion inside the *kĕraton* in which the princess ⁓Yajñavatī used to abide to wait for her lover (cf. also the references in note 53 to the Translation). The correspondence between the conception of the Kingdom of Heavens, symbolized in the great Javanese temple complexes, and the earthly abode of the king (who may be the „Shadow of God" even in Moslim terminology) is very striking; in addition to the references given in the Introduction to No. X above, I stress the correspondence between the Pārijātaka in heavens, the Tañjung tree in our temple complex (cf. the note which follows) and the special trees planted in Javanese kĕratons.

[94]) The Pārijāta (or Pārijātaka) is one of the five divine trees which originated at the time of the Churning of the Ocean; it is usually located in Indra's heaven and mentioned in most of the works on cosmology. An interesting and detailed description is found in Abhidharmakoça, III, p. 162 (of the translation by De la Vallée Poussin), where the distance up to which the scent of its flowers extends either with or against the wind is a point of controversy among theologists. The temple with its immediate surroundings is a replique of paradise (cf., e.g., the use of *diwyatama* in strophe 18 *a* of this text); owing to the similarity of the Tañjung with the divine Pārijātaka, the God recognizes the temple as His abode and may descend into the tree. In reality, the tree is a Tañjung (Mimusops Elengi), one of the trees which are commonly planted in temple courts (cf. the Old Javanese Rāmāyana, VIII, 53), but also in hermitages (Bhomakāwya, XV, 12) and in Javanese courts (e.g., in the kĕraton of Majapahit according to Prapañca's description in Nāgarakrĕtāgama, VIII, 5 D). The Pārijāta is considered a real wishing tree (*kalpadruma*) in the Old Javanese Rāmāyana, VIII, 53 *d*; cf. W. Aichele in *Djåwå*, VIII (1928), pp. 28 sqq., who determines the Pārijāta as a *warinin* especially on account of the (a) Pārijāta often being represented as a wishing tree and (b) the original meaning of *warinin* being „wishing" (= *bĕr-inin*). Neither argument is strong since there are several celestial trees that may be *kalpadrumas*. In India, the Pārijāta is considered to be a „coral tree" (Erythrina Indica), which is neither a Warinin nor a Tañjung; this is also the meaning of the word in Modern Javanese; its yellow, sour fruits are stated to be eaten by pregnant women to get children with a beautiful skin colour (Tjan Tjoe Siem, *Hoe Koeroepati zich een vrouw verwerft*, 1938, p. 224). Cf. also Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.*, VII. p. 60; Stutterheim, *Djåwå*, VI (1926), pp. 333-349 ; Rassers, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 88 (1932), p. 406; and, for the *kalpadruma* in one of the Kutai inscriptions, Vogel, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 76 (1920), pp. 431 sqq., and Blagden, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 74 (1918), pp. 615 sqq.

[95]) *Hyaṅa i hyaṅ=apa*, „would not it be a God for the God?" Not too much value should be given to these words, which may be due to the *yamaka*. It is also not certain what the poet meant by the words and other interpretations cannot be excluded; the words may not be more than an exaggerated expression (well-known as some kind of *alaṃkāra*, viz. *atyukti*: „is not it really wonderful"). *Ahyang* is often used by Prapañca in the meaning „wonderful, marvellous" applied to things which have no direct connection with the Divine.

that the marvellous tree was right before the main entrance of the main temple building [96]) which would have been at the eastern side.

Another interesting detail is the „innumerable, immovable women" mentioned in 17 *d*. They are in an obvious contrast to the artisans whose feverish speed is stressed by 17 *c*. There is no doubt that these 'women' are either images (such as careotids) or reliefs on the temple. The relief descriptions in the Plaosan inscription (No. VII above, strophes 11 to 17) are interesting for a comparison.

It seems that strophe 18 and the first pāda of 19 aim at describing the impression made by the temples upon the spectators. Such a subject offered a very favourable opportunity to display the poet's training in *alaṃkāras*. In strophes 19 *b-d*, 20 and 21, the emotions of the spectators could not even be described in a 'normal' language : the poet therefore expressed himself in a way which is not *prākṛta*, whatever that means [97]).

The last part of the text deals with the inauguration of the temples, of the temple grounds and similar subjects (strophes 22 to 29). Strophe 22 would certainly be very interesting if its meaning could be fully understood. It contains a double invocation, the former addressed to the rather remarkable group of three kinds of birds (herons, crows and *haṃsas*) and merchants, the latter to different kinds of village elders. If I understand the meaning of the strophe correctly, birds and merchants are supposed to go to a *tīrtha* within or in the immediate neighbourhood of the temple complex to take a bath (*diyus*) in order to acquire *siddhayātra*. As to the remarkable group of birds and merchants, it is noted that these heterogeneous visitors have travelling over great distances in common. On account of the numerous different interpretations which been suggested, the occurrence of this term in an Old Javanese text might not be without interest, although the context is not very clear. I think that the idea is that all kinds of travellers go to the *tīrtha*, which is clearly associated with the foundation as a whole, in order to acquire some sort of blessing which may guarantee good crossings and safe return for them. As a matter of fact, *siddhayātra* is usually associated

---

[96]) At least if one expects the God to enter by the main entrance, not, for instance, by the roof. The poetical description suggests the former alternative: the God descends out of the sky, as if by helicopter, and 'lands' just before the main entrance in the shade of the Tañjung, so that he would have a *payung*.

[97]) This appears from the words *prākrĕtasanniweça* between strophes 21 and 22, suggesting that the preceding strophes were not *prākrĕta*. It is well-known that *prākrĕta* does not denote the Indian dialects usually designated by the term in Old Javanese : it there designates Old Javanese (the 'natural' language opposed to learnt languages such as Sanskrit). This does not necessarily mean that the strophes are in a language other but Old Javanese; another possibility is that that the strophes are composed in what might be styled 'unnatural' language, *i.e.* some kind of riddle or code, the use of which is explained, *e.g.* in Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarça (III, 97-124), where many different kinds of riddles (*prahelikā*) are discussed. There is, however, none among the number, which would make our strophes understandable. The possibility that the strophes are riddles is confirmed by the occurrence of other riddles in our text (*akṣaracyutaka* and *binducyutaka*).

with voyages oversea [98]. It may then be understood why the poet also included migratory birds into the number of visitors to the *tīrtha*. If the *tīrtha* is a lake or a part of a river, one would regularly see herons, *haṃsas*, crows and other birds in its neighbourhood. The vulgar explanation is that the birds dive into the water to catch fish, but the poet's explanation, which is also some kind of *alaṃkāra*, is that the birds go there to be purified by the holy water and to acquire a blessing for their flight to far away regions [99]. Strophe 22 *a-b* suggests that the *tīrtha* is in the immediate neighbourhood of the temples. It is, however, obvious that it could not have been inside the two complexes already known, *viz.* the 'heart' of the foundation surrounded by its own wall and the *anumoda* buildings supposed to have been built in rows around the central part. The presence of a *tīrtha* within either of these complexes would be astonishing, if not impossible [100]. It seems far more likely that the *tīrtha* was outside these two groups of buildings. Now there are some other constructions mentioned in the text, which should be located outside these two groups of buildings, too. In 15 *d*, the poet mentions small buildings to be used as hermitages. Even when these hermitages were very beautiful (*mahayu* in 15 *d*), they could not be located in the central complex, nor between the rows of *anumoda* buildings [101]. Presumably, the poet does not always follow a systematic order (though he seems to do so as a rule), but allows himself digressions whenever poetical considerations or various associations give him a reason to take a side path. Although the considerable lacuna in 15 *c* makes it impossible to verify whether this should have been the case with the hermitages in 15 *d* [102], it is obvious that 15 *d* is no argument to suppose that the hermitages were within the central complex, which is very unlikely. They would rather have been situated outside the temple complex, but within the foundation as a whole, just as was concluded with reference to the situation of the *tīrtha*.

---

[98] Cf. the references given in No. I above, notes 6 to 12 to pp. 1 sq.

[99] A very similar example of *utprekṣā* is given by Daṇḍin in Kāvyādarça, II, 222 (Boehtlingk's edition, p. 58). There an elephant goes into a pond at noon-time in order to cut off the day-lotuses *(padma)* because they are the friends of the sun. The real reason is, of course, the elephant's desire to bathe and to drink, as Daṇḍin explains in II, 223.

[100] There might, however, be an important exception, *viz.* in one of the complexes of the Ratubaka plateau to the east of the so-called *pěṇḍapa*, where a number of water basins fed by sources were discovered (cf. the report by Soewarno in *Laporan Tahun* 1950 of the Dinas Purbakala, p. 18; one of these basins is slightly visible on the photograph No. 9 on p. 41). Much further research is necessary before something about the meaning of this part of Ratubaka may be concluded; thus, real temple buildings were not discovered there.

[101] Hermitages are never found between temple buildings, as far as is known. The immediate neighbourhood of the temples would, however, appear to be an excellent place for ascetics.

[102] Curiously enough, pāda 15 *d* is put between 15 *c* and the entire strophe 16, which all deal with the marvellous tree. It is therefore evident that 15 *d* about the hermi-

The above discussion is essential if one wants to get an idea of the situation of the different buildings etc. mentioned in the text. The form of the complex appears to show some vague analogies with the Lara Djongrang complex at Prambanan. There, too, there is a central complex surrounded by its own wall; within the central complex, there are two relatively small buildings (the so-called 'court-temples'), the place of which seems to agree with that of the two *raṅkang* buildings in this inscription (15 *b*). Outside the wall surrounding the central temple group, there are four rows of small temples the situation of which might well agree with that of the large number of small buildings — all similar, of the same height and having the same function [103]), but different in their details (*wicitra*) — mentioned in strophe 17 *a-b*. These might be the same buildings as those denoted by *anumoda* in 13 *d*. There is nothing very strange in the fact of their being mentioned in the very beginning of the description : strophe 13 aims at explaining how the construction of the little buildings is connected with the preceding events. The text does not mention a second wall which surrounded the *anumoda* buildings, but it is obvious that there should have been one since the small buildings still belong to the foundation. The poet describes those details which he thinks worthy of mention ; the central temples with their own wall (*tĕas saturusnya*) constituted a peculiar feature which deserved to be mentioned. It was, however, self-evident that the *anumoda* buildings would be surrounded by a wall again. But this is not all. It was noted above that it is very unlikely that the hermitages and the *tīrtha* should be located within either the 'heart' of the foundation or the space occupied by the *anumoda* buildings. As to the possibility of the latter alternative, it might be added that the homogeneity clearly suggested by *sama*, two compounds

---

tages is a digression in any case. There must have been something in the latter half of 15 c which made the digression possible, but I do not see the solution of this puzzle.

[103]) This is a free translation of *sārtha*. The usual Sanskrit meanings („having a commission" etc. and „successful, rich"; cf. *sārthavāha)* do not seem likely; I prefer to take *sa°* in the same meaning as in *sarūpa, sagotra* etc. and to translate „having the same aim or the same meaning", although *artha* is not included in the list of words given by Pāṇini, VI, 3, 85–89 (cf. Wackernagel, *Grammatik,* II, 1, pp. 76 sq., who adds that *sam-artha* is used in the meaning „von gleicher Bedeutung, zusammengehörig"). Presumably, our poet did not follow Pāṇini's rules exactly; the parallelism with *samaroha* and *samacitta* is, however, a strong argument to consider the interpretation of *sārtha* as *samartha* the more likely one. The meaning probably is that the small buildings were not only very similar to one another, but they also had the same function in the foundation as a whole. They were all *anumoda* buildings, erected to fulfil a vow.

[104]) Cf. Krom, *Inleiding²,* I, p. 449, and Stutterheim, *Djåwå,* XX (1940), note [2]) to pp. 225 sq., who gives a precise description of the situation, measurements, numbers of temples etc. of the Lara Djongrang complex. As far as the buildings within the space between the second and third walls are concerned, Stutterheim states that nothing is known about buildings in this part of the complex („Omtrent de bebouwing van A weten wij niets").

with *sama*° as their first parts and a compound with *sa-* would be seriously disturbed in that case. If, however, the hermitages and the *tīrtha* were outside the second wall, it is necessary to conclude that there was even a third wall to separate the foundation as a whole from the ordinary, profane grounds.

It is interesting to examine the last part of the foundation, presumably situated between the second and third walls, with greater detail. A brief description of the „buildings to be used as hermitages" (*pānti tinapān*) is given in strophe 15 *d*. They are beautiful (*mahayu*). In spite of the austerities of the ascetics, the charm of hermitages amidst trees and flowers is well-known from Indian poetry and dramas. Our poet thinks it, however, necessary to add a kind of excuse : the hermitages are made beautiful so that they would be an „example to be imitated" (*tiruan*), *i.e.* to make other people choose religious life ; it is almost some kind of propaganda. The meaning of this passage becomes very clear if one considers the above conclusion implying that the king himself had already given the good example by becoming an ascetic.

Most of the space between the second and third walls may have been occupied by these hermitages, almost hidden between trees and flowers. But where should the *tīrtha* be located ? A conjectural reply to this question may be given by comparing the composition of the Lara Djongrang complex. As a matter of fact, there is a third wall in the Lara Djongrang complex, too ; the latter does not run parallel to the two other walls and, curiously enough, no remains of buildings have been discovered between the second and third walls [104]. As far as I know, no conjectural explanation for these curious facts has been proposed. The most likely explanation for the latter peculiarity is that the space between the second and third walls was not just left empty but was occupied by buildings made of wood, bamboo or other materials which would not have left any distinct traces after so many centuries. On the other hand it is almost obvious that such buildings should have been closely associated with the sanctuaries, *i.e.* they should have been either dwellings for the priests charged with the temple cults or hermitages for ascetics who could be inspired by the neighbourhood of the divine buildings. The other peculiarity, the direction of the outer wall, is even more interesting. If the lines of the southern and western parts such as they may be sketched on account of the remains which have been discovered, are extended, it appears that they would converge almost exactly at the bank of a river, the Kali Opak. Now one might suggest the possibility, that the main reason for the construction of the outer wall in this way was due to the necessity of including a small part of the course of the river into the foundation. If this was indeed the intention of the architects, it is clear that the result could not have been attained in another way, for it would have been necessary that the first and second walls (which enclose the 'dwellings for the gods') were exactly orientated to the four main directions. For the third wall (separating only the dwellings of human beings from the rest of

the country), no exact orientation was considered necessary and the advantage of having part of the river inside the foundation as a whole or at its very border could have been a plausible reason to construct the outer wall in the form which could be traced [105]. The main advantage was that clean water for ablutions of priests, objects of cult etc. would be within the foundation. Unfortunately, the exact form of the southern and western outer walls near the south-western corner has not been settled, so that no verification is possible at this moment.

In this connection, I may call attention to an interesting passage in strophe 25, pāda *b* of this inscription. There, it is stated that the course of the river (*luaḥ* = *lwaḥ*) is changed (*inaliḥhakĕn*) in order that it might touch (*aniṭik*, derived from *ṭiṭik*) the grounds (*palmahan*). It is not exactly clear what grounds are meant by *palmahan*, the dry rice-fields (*huma*) mentioned in 25 *d* and 26 *a* or the grounds of the temple complex itself. The reference to the „completion of the divine Çiva temple" (*çiwālaya samāpta diwyottama*) in the pāda immediately preceding that in which the change of the course of the river is mentioned (25 *a*) would suggest the latter alternative. Presumably, a dam was constructed at some place of the river after the completion of a new bed which touched the limits of the foundation. Could this be connected with the *tīrtha* to which strophe 22, pāda *a-b*, alludes ? The unsystematical order in which the different parts of the foundation are mentioned in the text makes it impossible to answer this question in the affirmative, but it is clear that it would be difficult to account for the *tīrtha* in a different way [106]. The *tīrtha*, visited by birds, merchants and other travellers in order to acquire *siddhayātra* (?), might be the very part of the river which touched the foundation as a consequence of the measures mentioned in strophe 25 *a-b*. If this is correct, it follows that the form of the complex as a whole could more or less correspond to that of the Lara Djongrang temples. Among the details which show striking correspondence, I mention the two rankang in the inscription and the two ‚court temples' in the Lara Djongrang complex.

The above discussion might even suggest the question whether the text could be connected with the foundation of the Lara Djongrang complex. In spite of the curious correspondences, there is no sufficient reason to give a positive answer to this question, although it cannot be denied that the shape of the complex founded in 856 A.D. agrees with the Lara Djongrang temples in more than one respect and Çaiva complexes of such an enormous size have been rare. The main objection, however, is the date of Tjaṇḍi Lara Djongrang, considered to belong to the first decennia of the 10th century A.D. [107], *i.e.* at least half a century later than this inscription is. On the other hand,

---

[105] Another advantage is that more space for the hermitages became available.
[106] Unless the possibility mentioned in note 100 above should be considered.
[107] Cf. especially Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 192, and *Inleiding²*. I, pp. 441 sq., and Stutterheim, *De stichter der Prambanan-tempels*, in *Djåwå*, XX (1940), pp. 218-233. The association of the Prambanan temples with Dakṣa (from about 910 to 919 A.D.)

Krom considers Lara Djongrang contemporaneous with the northern complex of Tjandi Plaosan on account of apparently strong reasons [108]), implying that both temple groups should be assigned to the first decennia of the 10th century. For the northern complex of Plaosan this date can no more be accepted. Among the number of about sixty short inscriptions discovered after the publication of Krom's Introduction [109]), the name of the king (çrî mahārāja) Rakai Pikatan is found several times [110]). This very inscription informs us that Rakai Pikatan resigned the throne in 856 A.D. If it is assumed that cutting in the inscriptions would have been among the last activities preceding the inauguration, it becomes obvious that the temple complex could not be dated later than 856 A.D. [111]). Also in the Lara Djongrang temples a considerable number of inscriptions in red and white paint were discovered in recent times [112]). Not much may be concluded about *pikatan*, which occurs among the number, since there is no proof that it denotes the king

was first suggested by Rouffaer in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 74 (1918), pp. 151-163. The arguments given by Rouffaer, as well as those of Krom and Stutterheim, are necessarily vague. Thus, the argument considered the most convincing one by Rouffaer is the fact that one of Dakṣa's inscriptions probably originated from Gĕṭak in the neighbourhood of Prambanan! Krom stressed the use of marl, presumably from the Ratubaka plateau, a fact which would prove that Prambanan would have been built in a period when the royal residence on the plateau had already been abandoned; even if it is certain that the marl did come from the Ratubaka plateau and not from some other place, it is hardly possible to use the marl argument before there are some more data available about when there was a royal residence on the Ratubaka plateau; at another occasion *(Geschiedenis², p. 149)* Krom presumes that the royal residence on the plateau was that of the Çailendra rulers; since the last ' known document of a Çailendra ruler in Java is the Karangtĕñah inscription dated 824 A.D. the only conclusion to be based on the marl argument is that Plaosan and Lara Djongrang were built after about 824 A.D. — unless the Ratubaka *kĕraton* should have been used in the beginning of the Çailendra period only. The vagueness of the marl argument is even stressed by the uncertainty whether there ever was a *kĕraton* on the Ratubaka plateau; I noted in the beginning of this Introduction that the famous tradition about the royal residence should perhaps be traced back to the possibly short period in which Bālaputra had made the plateau his residence and his fortress. — Stutterheim's strongest argument is the *kanuruhan* inscription discovered on one of the minor temples of the Lara Djongrang complex *(Tjandi Lara Djonggrang en Oost-Java. Oudheidk. Aantek.* XXIX, in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 90, 1933, pp. 267-270), but here, too, there is the difficulty that it is by no means certain that there were no connections with Eastern Java before the beginning of the 10th century A.D. As a matter of fact, some typical Eastern Java titles are found in the Plaosan inscriptions, too.

[108]) *Inleiding²* (1923), II, pp. 1-16.

[109]) For full details, the reader is referred to the separate publication on the Plaosan inscriptions in *Berita Dinas Purbakala*, I (1955), Cf. also *Pras. Indon.*, I (1950), pp. 116 sq.

[111]) By combining a number of arguments based on the names in the Plaosan inscriptions, I concluded to the period between about 825 and 850 for the construction of the northern complex in the publication mentioned in note 109 above.

[112]) I collected about fifty inscriptions in all, most of which short and very difficult to be read (the paint does not resist the ages as well as the inscriptions cut into the

of that name [113]); the type of script in which these inscriptions are written seems identical with that of the Plaosan inscriptions, which is considerably more archaic than the script used in the inscriptions issued during the reigns of Balitung and Dakṣa [114]). It is therefore clear that the accepted date for the Lara Djongrang temples might not be as strong an objection as it seems at first. At present, the whole problem has to left undecided. Not only further study of this inscription (the interpretation of which still poses enormous difficulties) including the Pre-Nāgarī portion, but also further data are required before more satisfactory results may be arrived at.

Transcription

[1]   // swasti .... [1])
[2]   nyalaka ....
[3]   .. /,' saçrī ....
[4]   nang jetrakula ....
[5]   nyāpita // ....
[6]   wanti [2]) ....
[7]   ring kāla sang mnang makadhāraṇa lokadhātu // 5 // [3])
      Paryyantariṣṭa yuwanātha sarājya — — [4])
           mangrakṣa bhūmi ri jawārjawa jāta — — [5]) /
[8]   saçrī raṇautsawa ratejika lain prasiddha

---

stones). Contrary to the Plaosan inscriptions which give the titles and the names of the dignitaries, the Lara Djongrang inscriptions give the (Rakai or Pamĕgĕt) titles only (such as pikatan, kanuruhan, sirikan- etc.), which makes identification almost impossible. A separate publication about the Lara Djongrang inscriptions is in preparation.

[113]) On the other hand, the shortness of all the Lara Djongrang inscriptions makes it impossible to conclude that the absence of royal titles proves that pikatan would not denote the king Rakai Pikatan.

[114]) Among the most characteristic details of this script, I mention the form of the suku with a very distinct curve at its lower end. This feature is common to all the older inscriptions (such as the Perot and Ratubaka inscriptions including that which is discussed here), but is very exceptionally found in inscriptions of the 9th Çaka century.

[1]) In the first six lines of the stone, only some isolated akṣaras could be deciphered. These few syllables are not sufficient to determine the metre in which they were written. Only the few akṣaras at the head of the lines could be transcribed.

[2]) In line 6, something more than in the preceding lines may be recognized, but since its metre could not be fixed, its transcription is bound to be too uncertain to be given here.

[3]) Presumably, the fourth pāda of a Vasantatilaka strophe; the fifth syllable should however have been a brevis. The correct reading might be mnang atha dhāraṇa.

[4]) The two last syllables of the pāda might be lakṣmī; this reading would well agree with the traces still visible. The first compound paryyantariṣṭa is however difficult to be combined with sarājyalakṣmī, although the latter is satisfactory by itself; °riṣṭa, which is not beyond doubt, might be wrong.

[5]) The two last syllables of pāda b have completely disappeared from the stone.

jetã wïrãga maharãja warãnurãga // 6 // [6])

Mãheçwarã ta sira rïçwa[9]ri çūrapatnī

    těpat=tahun=ni lama ni*ng* — — — — — — /

— — ◡ —ṣṭala watunn=inatus=yat=ungsyan [7])

    hantãwali mwaṅ=anilã ◡ [10]hi wãlaputra // 7 //

Nãtha prasiddha ri jagat=ni ◡ — ◡ — ◡

    rakṣã ni rowaṅ=atha wïra waruḥ swaçïla /

kãlap kalãguṇarawi[11]prakulasthanãma

    ginlar ri mamratipurastha maḍang kaḍatwan // 8 //

Tlas maṅkanoparata sang prabhu jãti ning rat

    rãjya *k*a[12]ratwan=asiliḥ taṅanan inangsö [8])

dyaḥ lokapãla ranujãmata lokapãla

    swastha=ng prajã sacaturãçrama wipra*mu*[13]khya // 9 //

Rãjñe ta sang patiḥ=ayat=patihãkalaṅka

    tar=sandihã rakaki mamrati weḥ ri wantil /

merang ṅunin ṅuni-ṅunin *sa*[14]marãn=thanïwung

    priḥ-priḥ patoliha ni tan pasisiha denya // 10 //

Dewãnubhãwa sa*la*kas [9]) ni lawas=nira ṅke

    tapwan [15] hana=ng musuh=asiḥ pañaṅěnnaṅěnta [10]) /

pöngpöng haděp=ni hana ning wibhawãwyayãdi

    dharmã ta rakwa ginawainira sang wida[16]gdha // 11 //

Lãwan=ta durlabha wěruḥ niṅ=adharmmadharmma

    ndãtan wěruḥ hěněṅakan duwane ◡ — *k*wan [11]) /

mãntan=hale sira [17] ta p*u*tra [12]) h*u*r*i*p prahãtaḥ

    nã mūla ning halu daṅū ginawai tinonta // 12 //

---

[6])   The wrong spelling *mah₌rāja* is probably due to metrical considerations. It seems that the quantity of vowels in Sanskrit words could be changed at will if this was necessary for the metre. In any case, the stone-cutter is not responsible for the strange spelling. Cf. the section on metrics in the Introduction.

[7])   The transcription of this portion of pãda c, though apparently clearly visible on the stone, is not beyond doubt; cf. the Translation.

[8])   The final a of *rãjya* is scanded as a long syllable; although we have numerous examples of arbitrary lengthening of vowels in Sanskrit words for metrical reasons, it is remarkable that the length of the vowel is not expressed by a daṇḍa here. Although there might be doubt as to the correctness of the reading (the *ka*, which follows is uncertain and the preceding syllable would be long if there was a ligature there), the metrical anomaly is confirmed by *taṅanan*, the last syllable of which is scanded long, although the final -*n* was not doubled.

[9])   The word, if correctly transcribed, is to be considered an anomalous spelling for *salěkas*. A similar example occurs in strophe 8, pãda b *(waruḥ* instead of *wěruḥ)*, but in numerous other cases the *pěpět* is expressed in writing.

[10])   Perhaps we should separate *musuha siḥ* instead of *musuh=asiḥ*. Cf. the Translation.

[11])   If *kwan* is correct, the two missing syllables may have been *kala(kwan)*; it is however possible that instead of *kwan*, *twan* should be read (perhaps the end of *kaḍatwan)*.

[12])   The vowel marks of this word and the next one are very uncertain.

[13])   Read *aṅãry y)a*, there is no reason why the a should have been shortened here.

∪∪∪∪ — ∖ lang .sira sawargga anaryya [13]) ka[18]baiḥ

    nijakula mitra bhrĕtya manu*j*ān=.in*u*tān=pramukha [14]) /

prawa<ra> ∪ — ∪ — .∪ ∪ *j*ā magawai ya hayu

[19] syapa wihañā kaaum [15]) mañanumodanumoda [16]) gawai // 13 //

Nya [17]) sira hi — ∪ — ∪∪∪ — ∪∪ liṅgawayĕn [18])

    tĕasa[20]turusnya [19]) tamwaka ta istaka ista kariḥ /

duarapalā [20]) galak ∪, ∪∪ — .. ∪ — ∪∕ weḥ

    dadi matakut maling [21] ta kumaling waruheriṅ=alaṗ // 14 //

Griha hayu ning hyaṅ=ga*w*a ∪ — ∪ — liḥ=asiḥ [20])

    ri lawaṅ=ĕnaḥhi ra[22]ṅkaṅ=añaliḥ ta aliḥ pamawān /

hana sawuit=ta tañjuṅ=ati — ∪∪ — kalawān

    mahayu kuaiḥ [23] ta pānti tinapān=tiruan sawaluy // 15 //

---

[14]) The ita!ics are uncertain. The *pasañan* under the final *-n* of *manujān* seems to be either a *pa* or a *ṣa*. The vowel mark under the *na* which follows is uncertain; instead of *-u*, *-rĕ* (i.e. *-r̥*) is also possible. Finally, the *ta* which immediately follows may be open at the left upper side and should then be transcribed *ha*. In view of these possibilities, we suppose that *pinrĕhan* is the correct reading, which would also make sense.

[15]) The akṣara *au* after the *ka* seems certain. It is expressed by the well-known initial *o*, provided with a daṇḍa of the same form which is used with the akṣaras *pa*, *ṣa*, and some others.

[16]) This form is undoubtedly a contraction of *mañanumoda* and *anumoda;* this example proves that even an long *ā* due to a contraction of two short *as* could be shortened for metrical purposes.

[17]) This *nya* is undoubtedly the suffix attached to *gawai* at the end of stanza 13. It is a very audacious kind of *enjambement,* no examples of which are known from classical Old Javanese puetry, where, however, similar examples occur between two succeeding pādas of one strophe.

[18]) Probabiy to be separated as *liṅ=gawayĕn;* the objection against the separation *liṅga wayĕn* is that the latter word cannot be explained. Then, *liṅ* is the end of the preceding word. In view of the numerous puns towards the end of the pādas in most of the strophes, one would suppose that the word *liṅga* did occur in the pāda; this presumption is confirmed by the fact that it is evident that in this portion of the text all kinds of fcundations are enumerated. If the word *liṅga* did occur, the wording of the end of the pāda may be explained as a play of assonance on *liṅga*. On this presumption, most of the pāda may be reconstructed. The passive imperative *gawayĕn* must depend on a word meaning „to order", probably *makon* or *makonnakĕn,* the subject of which is *sira*. Since the latter is only used for high authorities, we expect the syllable *hi,* which follows *sira,* to be the beginning of *hino.* Then we may reconstruct: *nya sira hino makon* ∪ ∪∪ *liṅga* ∪ *liṅ=gawayĕn.*

[19]) The reading of this pāda seems absolutely certain; as to the word separation chosen in the transcription, cf. the notes to the translation.

[20]) This is the most striking example of how even Sanskrit words are changed for metrical exigencies, for there is no doubt that *duarapalā* is identical with Sanskrit *dvārapāla;* since the syllable preceding *dvārapāla* is necessarily long, and two long syllables can never follow each other in this metre, and, finally, this technical term could neither be avoided nor replaced by a synonym, the poet was forced to .change its prosodic form. Since in Old Javanese words he was allowed to use either- *kuaih* or *kwaih,* he took the freedom to change the Sanskrit *w* after a consonant to an *u*. In addition, he was forced to change the vowel quantities.

Kayu ki muhūr=ttakanya sa<tahun ru>muhun [21]) malawas

nikaṭa bhaṭāra [24] yan=tuwuḥ apūrwwa ri pūrwwadiça. /

atisaya [22]) pārijātakatarūpama rū<pa>niyān

pañawataran mahā[25]mayuña hyaña i hyañ=apa // 16 //

Sama samaroha sārtha samacitta wicitra kuaiḥ

syapa ta kasandi[26]hā ri sira bhakti ta bhaktita weḥ /

kṣuṇika samāpta deniñ=añutus=inatus [23]) magawai

sagupura parhyañan [27] agaṇitāṅgana tā pacalān // 17 //

Apa ta paḍanya diwyatama diwyakĕnā ya hanā

patahati [24]) sang tu[28]monya [25]) karasān rasa tann=uliha /

matataganā çatāgata [26]) ñ=amūja tamojar-ujar

atiçaya tang ñara[29]nya tañaranya mahātisa ya // 18 //

---

21) The last two words of pāda *a* were probably *silih=asih;* this appears to make good sense, especially in comparison with pāda *b*. The spelling *ɡriha* in 15 is interesting with reference to *ɡriya* in modern Javanese. The word is probably spelt according to its usual pronuncation; here, there is no metrical exigency whatever. In strophe 26, the same word is written correctly. Confusion between ṛ and *ri* is common in the less carefully composed Sanskrit records, too.

22) Read: *atiçaya.* — The reconstruction of *rūpa*, the first syllable of which has disappeared in the lowest portion of the hole that brought about the lacunae in the preceding strophes, is recommanded both by the *yamaka* and by its meaning. — *Pañawataran,* undoubtedly instead of *pañawatārān,* is another typical example of the poet's distortion of Sanskrit words for metrical needs.

2ᵃ) The last syllable of *añutus* should be metrically long; it is a similar case as that of final *-n* before a vowel, which is also not expressed in writing (an example occurs in pāda *d* of this same strophe, where the final syllable of *parhyañan* is considered long). The only differsnce is that the doubliᴨg of a finel *n* after a short vowel is a recognized Sanskrit rule cf sandhi, whereas no sandhi rule about the treatment of final *s* before a vowel exists, simply because such a case cannot occur in Sanskrit. — Pāda *d* gives examples of vowel shortening too, viz. *sagupuᴜa* instead of *saɡopura* (here, there is no reason to presume the existence of a form *ɡupura;* since *o*, again according to Sanskrit and not to Old Javanese principles, is necessarily and always long, there was no other choice for our poet needing a brevis but to abbreviate it (to *u)* and spell *aṅɡana* instead of *aṅɡanā.*

24) The word separation may be *pa ta hati;* then, *pa* should be explained as *apa* the first syllable of which constituted a long *ā* together with the final *a* of *hana* at the end of pāda *a.* Such an *enjambement* would be far less astonishing than that of *ɡawainya* separated into *ɡawai* at the end of strophe 13, and *nya* at the beginning of strophe 14. Such an explanation would also account for the long final vowel of *hanā,* which is difficult to be explained otherwise (there is no metrical necessity). The *pa* at the beginning of pāda *b* not being perfectly clear, one might consider the possibility of reading *ma.* Although not impossible from a palaeographic point of view, the meaning would not be satisfactory *(mata* and *hati* should have been connected in one way or another) and, in addition, it would leave the long *ā* of *hanā* unexplained.

25) The last akṣara of line 27 is not clear, except for the *u*-vowel attached to it; *ku* or *ɡu* might also be possible, but they do not yield a satisfactory meaning.

26) *Gatāgata,* „coming and going", would also be possible: the small curve which is visible within the akṣara (the only distinguishing mark between a *ɡa* and a *ça)* might not be original.

Syapa kari tan apūrwwa [27]) ta manona manojña dahat

    adakati yan=kinī ni ku[30]nu lāma kalāyu wuat [28]) /

tuaku dinuttakanya ḍagihāni mahānirutan

    ñya [29]) ajapahā warī měnulěḍö wu[31]lěḍěng pañawān // 19 //

Ja-ipuṇueha saggala muhojja tulijju khamu

    arěwěni colla māra ri ware ri waḍangěgulo /

[32] měhadahapum nwasāy ṅgua yaběk dalamök wrahaneḥ

    wi ini jidiñjaweçwaya mirātu rawān mikuni [30]) // 20 //

[33] Kwaramaya tatparam=parama sangguṇisangguṇitam

    hayuwa mahā manonna tatan=uttamanuttanatah /

nama [31]) tanu tang ha[34]ramyatama pāpa mapā ya haram

    gurumatatāpasa=ng samadanānalanāmarutam [32]) // 21 //

Prākrětasanniweça //

Kita ba[35]ka kāka haṅsa waṇiyāga niyāga wayat=

    ta diyus=aněmwaha trasiha [33]) siddha ta yātra siha /

kita ta kalang [34]) anakba[36]nua gusti wagus=tinajar

    ta muja kawittha yaḥ çuciharaḥ [35]) suraraḥ sakaki // 22 //

Akṣaracyutaka //

Ri diwasa ning wua[37]tthyang ñika [36]) manghyang uang pamatiḥ

    kuaih=asěsěk=masö saṅ=adimantri [37]) tama tritaya /

---

[27]) *Tan* is metrically long; cf. notes 8 and 23 above.

[28]) The word separation is uncertain; we do not understand the meaning of pāda *b* and still less that of the second half of the stanza. There, no importance whatever should be attached to the word separation given in the transcription, since the latter is almost arbitrary. Except for the word separation, the transcription is however certain.

[29]) *Sic.* We do not think that many examples of such a ligature could be quoted; it may be unisue. The three last pādas of strophe 19 and the strophes 20 and 21 are quite puzzling; as we noted in the Introduction, it seems more probable to suppose the use of some complicated 'trick' than of an unidentified language.

[30]) This is abacadabra to us. The word separation is arbitrary.

[31]) There is perhaps an *u*-vowel beneath the *ma*; more probably, however, it is only a scratch in the stone.

[32]) This stanza is normal again, although it is full of *yamaka* and therefore difficult to be understood; its meaning seems obscure. Here, too, the word separation is not everywhere beyond doubt.

[33]) This stanza is normal again, although it is full of *yamaka* and therefore difficult to understand. In pāda *b*, the word separation is not completely certain; cf. the Translation.

[34]) *Kalang* has its last syllable metrically long; similar cases occur for *n* and *s* (cf. notes 8, 23 and 27 to this transcription).

[35]) Owing to slight damage to the akṣaras, this word is not quite certain. Instead of *ci*, *wi* might also be possible; there might be an *u*-vowel attached to the *ha*.

[36]) Here, too, the akṣaras were slightly damaged; the vowel mark for -*i* is uncertain and instead of *ka*, *ta* would also be possible.

[37]) Presumably for *ādimantri*, the *ā* of which was however shortened for metrical considerations. *Ādimantri(n)* is not a usual title and the *da* is not very distinct on the stone; other possibilities might therefore also be considered.

wiku kumarī kumāra kamarā[38]n=mara yan=paguru

    garuti yatann=inūyana ḍaḍanya madaṇḍa kataḥ // 23 //

Winducyutaka //

Ri kāla nikanang sakā[39]bda wualung gunu<ng> [38]) sang wiku

    samārggaçiraçuklapakṣa sawēlas ya nā tang tithi /

wrēhaspati wagai lawan ma[40]wurukung ya nā wāra weḥ

    yatekana tēwēk bhaṭāra ginawai sinangskāra weḥ // 24 //

Huwus=nikana tang çiwā[41]laya samāpta diwyottama

    luaḥ ya inaliḥhakĕn [39]) apaniyāniḍik palmahan /

tatan=hana kasa[42]ndihe hala huwus dinānān kabeḥ

    sinīma ya *na* tang humet=trima harang [40]) humā sahiyang // 25 //

Aliḥ tampaḥ taikaing [43] huma tumama rīkeng çiwagrĕha /

    susuk samgat wantil saha nayaka lāwan sañ=apatiḥ [41]) /

patiḥ māran [44] si kling kalimanira māran rasi mrĕsi

    tiga ñ=wang gustīñke si jana rasi kaṇḍut rasi sanab // 26 //

Si baṇyāga=ng winka[45]s wahuta waraṇīyā tati wukul

    laḍuḥ si gnĕng yekā pinakaparujar=ny=akṣara waneḥ /

ka[46]buḥ mwang sang marsī sira makañaran rāma maratā

    yatekāweḥ sīmā saha matahunn=āran [42]) rasi kawit // 27 //

Ri kahuwusnyan=nikaing sawaḥ sinīma

    hana ta ya sīma puput waluy ya sīma /

patalēsan=ni ma[47]ṇḍĕr duṭī karamwa

    ya ikana sīma puput mare bhaṭāra // 28 //

Ya ta winaluyakĕn=kinon=mamūja

    pratidina tan=malupā rikang gawainya /

tan=imur=imura sang hiyang ri konya

    si khawali nityā a[48]jᵉnmahan gawainya // 29 //

Translation[1])

6. The young prince ..... [2]), in possession of royal majesty (?), protected

---

[35)] There is certainly no anusvāra written above *nu,* but it is evident that we should have *ǵunuṅǵ* here. As we suggested in the Introduction, the reconstitution of the anusvāra is probably the correct solution of the little riddle implied in *winducyutaka.* *Sakābda* is of course a mistake for *çakābda,* which is not justified by any metrical or other necessity.

[39)] Here, again, the syllable ending in a final *-n* preceding a word beginning with a vowel is considered long.

[40)] For the word separation, which is not completely certain, cf. the Translation.

[41)] There seems to be an anusvāra above the *sa;* it might however only be an occasional hole in the stone. In any case, it should be omitted for metrical reasons.

[42)] The final *-n* of *matahun* should of course have been written single; the metre (Pṛthvī) requires a short syllable.

[1)] No attempt at translation of the first five (?) strophes has been made; only a few isolated words could be made out.

[2)] I have accepted *yuwanātha* in the translation, although its reading is uncertain. *Pary-antariṣṭa,* which seems to be the reading of the stone, is not perfectly clear. If the

the country of Java, righteous and with ..... [3]), majestuous in battles and in feasts (?) [4]), full of fervour [5]) and perfect [6]), victorious but free from passion, a Great King of excellent devotion [7]).

7. He was a Çaiva in contrast to the queen, the spouse of the hero [8]); exactly a year was the time of the ..... [9]); ..... stones heaped up by hundreds [10]) for his refuge, a killer as fast as the wind ..... Bālaputra [11]).

8. A king, perfect in (this) world [12]), ..., a protection for his comrades, indeed a hero who knew the duties of his rank [13]); he adopted a name

---

first part of the compound is correct (it is relatively certain), we should rather expect something like honoured or recognized by the border regions. We translated the conjectural *sarājyalakṣmī* (note 4 to the transcription), which makes good sense.

[3]) *Ārjawa* may have been especially chosen for its pun on *Java*. „With" translates *jāta*...... One might suppose *jātarāga*: the king, though devoid of passion *(wirāga* in *d)*, had righteousness as a passion and owing to his *ārjawa*, he protected Java.

[4]) *Raṇautsawa*, mistake for *raṇotsawa* and to be interpreted as a dvandva? ? *Utsava*, in Sanskrit, usually refers to religious festivals; battles and religious festivals are indeed typical occasions where the royal *tejas* (cf. note 5) may become manifest. Another word separation, viz. as *raṇautsa waratejika*, is still less satisfactory.

[5]) *Ratejika*, — the poet makes often use of the prefix *ra-*; cf. *ranuja°* in 9 *c*; *rakaki*, 10 *b*; °*rawipra°*, 8 *c*; *rasi*, 26 *c* and *d*. But *tejika* is not Sanskrit; it might however be due to analogy and equivalent with *tejomaya*. For *tejas*, cf. Vogel's monograph in *Med. Kon. Ak. Wet., Afd. Lett*, 70, B (1930), pp. 83-125.

[6]) *Lain* occurs in the meaning „and, moreover" in the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*, I, strophe 13 *d*: *kanaka rajata len manik*.

[7]) *Jetā* is the nominative form, which was adopted in Old Javanese; cf. *hantā* in 7 *d*. *Warānurāga* is probably chosen for its contrast with *wirāga; anurāga* occurs in *abhiṣeka* names of later Javanese kings, e.g. in that of Tuloḍong (Krom, *Geschiedenis²*, p. 194).

[8]) Note the pun *māheçvarā* ...... *īçvari*, perhaps also with *çūra°*, which may have resembled *īçwara* in sound. For the meaning, cf. the Introduction.

[9]) One would suppose: „of the final struggle" or something similar, in the lacuna. Here, too, we refer the reader to the Introduction.

[10]) *Inatus* occurs in the same meaning in 17 *c*.

[11]) *Hantā* — cf. *jetā* in 6 *d*. — For our interpretation of *awali mwang*, „(on a) level with, as fast as", cf. the Introduction. The 8th syllable of the pada has almost completely disappeared from the stone. If it is supposed that the subject remains the same throughout strophe 7, i.e. the king who is also the subject of strophes 6 and 8, one expects a term meaning „attacked chased". Since *hi* is certain and *anilā* has a long final *a*, the word probably began with *a* or *a* and ended in *.hi*, it seems likely that the missing syllable read *mri*. *Amrihi* (or *amrih=i* as two words) would mean: „he strifed after, tried to catch, i.e. persecuted". Although this interpretation seems plausible on account of the meaning of *prih*, I have found no exact parallel.

[12]) The words *prasiddha ri jagat* contain an *ākṣepa* (*Kāvyādarça*, II, 120).

[13]) Note the alliterations *rakṣā* — *rowang* and *wīra* — *waruh*. *Waruh* probably corresponds to *wĕruh* (also in 14 *d*); but 12 *a* and *b* read *wĕruh*. *Swaçīla*, like *svadharma* in Sanskrit, probably refers to the duty prescribed for his caste, that is for the king, the duties of a Kṣatriya such as protecting his subjects. There obviously is a kind of *ākṣepa* with the next pāda, in which it is stated that in spite of his *kṣatriyatva* he took a name belonging to a Brāhmaṇa gotra.

proper to a family of honourable Brāhmaṇas (rich in) arts and virtues [14],
and established his *kĕraton* at Mĕḍang situated in the country (?) of
Mamrati [15].

9. After these (deeds) [16], the king Jātiningrat („Birth of the World")
resigned [17]; the kingship and the *kĕraton* were handed over to his
successor [18]: Dyah Lokapāla, who was equal to a younger brother of
the (divine) Lokapālas [19]; free were the subjects, divided into the
four *āçramas* with the Brāhmaṇas ahead [20].

---

[14] „Proper to" translates °*stha*°, which is used in the next pāda in a slightly different
meaning. The prefix *ra-* is rendered by „honourable"; cf. *ra-wiku, ra-kawi* etc.; the
Indonesian origin of the prefix is no objection for the poet to use it in a Sanskrit
compound. We supplied a word the words „rich in" (°*upeta*, °*samita)*, which in
Sanskrit would have been necessary for connecting *kalāguṇa* with the following.
As we pointed out in the Introduction, the name alluded to is undoubtedly that of
Agastya.

[15] The meaning of *pura* in Old Javanese seems rather vague. In any case, it is not a
kĕraton here, for the *kĕraton* is established (lit.: „spread out", *ginĕlar)* in it. For
Mamrati, cf. 10 *b*.

[16] *Tlas mankanā*, — the corresponding expression in prose would have been *i tĕlas
ning mankana*.

[17] For the meaning of *uparata*, cf. the Introduction.

[18] This is a free translation of *asilih tañanan inangsö*. The word *silih* belongs to the
group of predicate words which show the semantic peculiarity of being capable of
„double-sided" use (C.C. Berg, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 95, 1937, pp. 1 sqq., who used the term
'dubbelzijdig'): *asilih* does not refer to the grammatical subject of *inangsö*, but to
its 'logical' subject. We translated *tañanan inangsö*, lit.: „was handed, was given
to", by a single term. *Tañanan* is the passive of *manañani*, which may precede an-
other verb meaning „to give, to strike etc." to denote that the action which follows
was done by the own hands of the subject (cf. Gericke-Roorda. *Jav. Handw.*, I, p.
721). *Inangsö*, or usually *inangsēan* or *inangsēakan*, occurs innumerable times in Old
Javanese inscriptions in the meaning „was given", the polite equivalent of *wineh
(winaih)*. *Tañanan irangsö* could then be translated: „was given by his own hands".
This terminology is especially important because it proves that the old king himself
gave the royal dignity to his successor.

[19] *Ranujāmata* is a metrical liberty for *rānujamata*, i.e. *ra-anujamata*, „considered a
worthy *(ra-;* cf. note 5 above) younger brother of". It is, of course, a pun on the
name Lokapāla. Perhaps, the use of *anuja* might wel be a similar pun on the title
dyah, which seems characteristic of the younger members of the royal family. The
pun would then mean that Lokapāla used the title *dyah*, which is remarkable for
the king himself, because he considered himself not a real king if compared with
the divine Lokapālas. Of course, this is the 'poetical' reason (a kind of *utprekṣā* as
defined in the Indian Ars Poetica; cf. the Introduction); the historical reason pro-
bably is that the retired Kumbhayoni kept the royal dignity in name, though he
handed over the *rājya* and the *kĕraton*.

[20] This pāda is interesting since it proves that the Çaiva restauration was represented
as a national liberation (cf. the use of *swastha)*. The result of the restauration was
that also the Brāhmaṇic structure of the society was introduced (or re-introduced),
at least in theory. The word *wipramukhya* suggests that *caturāçrama* may have been
confused with *caturvarṇa*, as is more often found in Old-Javanese literature (cf. Van

10. A royal order [21]) went out to the Patih that hé should prepare immaculate funeral ceremonies [22]); without hesitation [23]), Rakaki Mamrati [24]) gave (grounds) to Wantil [25]): he was ashamed for the past [26]), especially for the fact that the village Iwung had been the battlefield (?) [27]), (and) took the utmost care not to be equalled by him (?) [28]).

11. All his actions during the time he was here [29]) were inspired by a divine majesty [30]); there were no enemies anymore [31]): love for his

der Tuuk, Dictionary, I, p. 619). This is not, however, necessary : the reference to the āçramas may be due to the fact that the king followed these rules by retiring from government.

[21]) *Rājñe* is not a Sanskrit dative, but *ra-ājñā* followed by *i* („to", rendered by „went to").

[22]) *Patihā* (note the *yamaka* with *patih=a-*, just before) is *pa-tihā; tiha* (usually spelt *tiwa)* is a „funeral ceremony" for a king (Van der Tuuk's Dictionary, II, p. 674), presumably for the immediately preceding king of this line (Rakai Garung or Patapān, reigning in 832, date of the Gandasuli inscription, and possibly still alive in 850, the Perot inscription, No. IX above, Introduction). These ceremonies were probably immediately connected with the foundation, which is alluded to in the next strophe (11 *d)* and described in detail in the following part of the text.

[23]) *Tar=sandihā;* for this curious form, metrically for *sandeha (samdeha),* cf. the Introduction.

[24]) Who is this Rakaki Mamrati? We saw in 8 *d* that Mamrati is the name of the country in which the new kĕraton was situated. *Rakaki* is *kaki,* „grandfather" with the prefix *ra-* (cf. note 5 above), but *kaki* (corresponding to Sanskrit *pitāmaha,* which is used as a title in the Diĕng inscriptions) should not be taken in its literal meaning, but is honorific here, an interpretation which is confirmed by *ra-.* I therefore think it very probable that Rakaki Mamrati is no other than the retired king himself : the honorific title preceding the name of the kĕraton could not well apply to any other person. It is, moreover, the only person whom we should have expected to give grounds.

[25]) As is confirmed by 26 *b* (*susuk samgat wantil),* Wantil (*i.e.* the Pamĕgĕt Wantil) is the person who receives the grounds as the king's donation. This donation is a recompense, but, as appears from strophe 29, the donee has also obligations in respect of the foundation.

[26]) *Nunin* is *ñuni* followed by n; *ñuni* (usually spelt *ñūni;* a derivative of *uni,* „sound", is impossible here) means „in the past" (contraction of *ing uni),* whereas the doubled form *ñuni-ñuni* means „how much more" (more often: *ñuniwaih, ñuniweh).* There obviously is a pun on *ñuni* alone and its doubled form which has rather a different meaning. The king made his donation in view of events in the past. It was a debt of honour.

[27]) Conjectural translation. Presumably, the village Iwung (*thanīwung* = *thani iwung)* had been destroyed by battle actions in the preceding years. After his victory, the king had the moral duty to give compensation. The village mentioned must have belonged to the Pamĕgĕt Wantil.

[28]) This probably means that the king did his utmost to make his gift more precious than the loss had been for the Pamĕgĕt.

[29]) *Salakas,* the reading of which is not certain, should be taken to correspond to *sa lĕkas.* There is a play on words with *lawas. Lawasnira ñke* refers to the king when he still was a king among his subjects.

[30]) *Dewānubhāwa* is translated as a Sanskrit bahuvrīhi.

[31]) Lit.: „*the* enemies (*i.e.* the enemies he had in the times of struggle) were not" (*tapwan*

subjects) was what he always strived after [32]). When [33]) he could at last dispose of power and riches etc. [34]), it was only natural [35]) that sanctuaries [36]) were built by him, the able one.

12. In addition [37]), he possessed the knowledge, difficult to acquire, of Dharma and Adharma [38]), but he was unable to conceal the lies of ..... [39]).

---

is an emphatic equivalent of *tan)*. Here, the article *ñ* before *musuh* may well be rendered by the addition of „anymore".

[32]) The enemies having disappeared, the king could love all his subjects. In *pañaññañénta*, *-ta* is the emphatic particle. The doubling is rendered by „always" in the translation.

[33]) *Pöngpöng*, like *dum* in Latin, means both „as long as" and „till" (conjunction), and here, probably the latter. As a 'noun', it means „occasion". The meaning is probably that the king did not erect *dharmas* till he had the means to do it. In view of his Attachment to Dharma, one would have expected the king to build sanctuaries long before, but he was not able to do it. During the years of battle, he had no occasion, but after his victory he devoted himself with a double energy to his religious duties. „When at last", seems a satisfactory translation for *pöngpöng*.

[34]) *Wibhawāwyayādi* for *wibhawawyayādi;* the final a of *wibhawa*, which is already long by position, should not have been lengthened. Sometimes there is something arbitrary in the writing of long vowels. *Wibhawa* might refer especially to the power of commanding people for corvée (to work on the construction of temples), *wyaya*, „expenses", to the funds necessary for the constructions.

[35]) A free translation of *rakwa*, which usually means „as you know", „as may be understood".

[36]) Here, *dharma* (the final a of which was lengthened for the metre) undoubtedly has the meaning it often has in Old Javanese, viz. a „temple" and especially, it seems, a temple which is a funeral monument at the same time. The latter is probably the case here; cf. especially the *patihā* in 10 *a*. There is an obvious pun on the different meanings of *dharma:* the king, in 12 *a*, knew very well the distinction between *dharma* and *adharma* and therefore constructed *dharmas*. There may be doubt whether *dharmā* in 11 *d* should oe rendered by the plural; the singular is perhaps preferable. It is possible that *dharma* here refers to a funeral monument which should have been built long before; then it is only natural *(rakwa)* that he performed his duty as soon as he had the occasion to.

[37]) *Lāwan* (here *metri causa* spelt by a long *ā* in the first syllable) probably means that in addition to the qualities mentioned before, the king possessed correct knowledge.

[38]) *Adharmadharma* obviously corresponds to *dharmādharma* in Sanskrit: it is every king's duty to protect Dharma and combat Adharma. The latter is the usual justification for kings enterprising campaigns, although they are attached to Ahiṃsā. This is probably the case here, too.

[39]) It is not exacty clear what the king did not know in spite of his profound knowledge. *Hénéñakan* is clear by itself, but *duwane*, which seems clear on the stone, is not. *Duwa* could correspond with *dwa*, „lie, falsehood". An example such as *duarapalā* for *dwārapāla* in 14 c shows that the poet took the liberty to make a complete syllable of a semivowel. The passage might refer to calumny about the king (other people might have had different notions about Dharma and Adharma), implying, for instance, that the deeds of the king were Adharma. Such lies need not, of course, be concealed: the king brought them to the light.

The wicked ones ceased to act against him [40), ... (?) [41);
this was the reason why the Halu, which you see now [42), was erected [43).

13. ..... he, with his servants, all simple people [44), low-born men, (but
also) friends, servants, and those placed in the foremost positions (?) [45);
excellent ..... made them beautiful : who would have been unwilling
to consent (?) in bringing their gifts (?) [46); (everybody) worked
cheerfully [46).

[40) *Māntan hale sira*, „the wicked ones *(hala)* ceased *(māntan = mantěn)* with reference
to *(i*, which is contained in *hale = hala i;* here it is used in the meaning „against,
acting against") him *(sira)*". There is a pun with *halu* in pāda *b:* the *hala* ceased,
but the *halu* was erected.

[41) We do not understand the second half of pāda *c,* the reading of which is uncertain.

[42) *Tinonta*, lit.: „seen by you".

[43) *Halu* is an important word. Its original meaning, preserved in many Indonesian
languages, is „pestle, pounder", which is a very important object for a population
mainly occupied in growing rice. Its form suggests a *liṅga* and it is probable that
the latter is meant here. The same is presumably the case with the *halu* erected
(pinratiṣṭha) by Airlaṅga (cf. *supra,* note 29 to the Introduction to No. XI) ; the
latter *halu* erection is brought into connection with the ceremonies of Airlaṅga's
consecration as a king. This might explain the frequent use of *halu* in titles (Rakai
Halu always denotes one of the highest dignitaries at the Old Javanese courts and
sometimes, as is the case with Airlaṅga, the king himself). If we correctly understand
the meaning of this strophe, the aim of the *halu* erection was the protection of the
empire against the wicked ones. But then the words *nā mūla niṅg* should be trans-
lated : „the reason (explanation) of it *(i.e.* of the cessation of the activities of the
enemies) is that" the Halu was erected, or more freely rendered: „this was due to
the erection of the Halu which may (still) be seen by you".

[44) Lit.: „not noble" *(anārya)*. The loss of the six first syllables of the pāda makes its
understanding difficult.

[45) This is a very strange list composed of the most different groups of people. The
enumeration presumably aims at giving the impression of a motley group. If *sira* in
13 a refers to the king, whicn is very probable, then we have all kinds of people
accompanying him or collaborating with him. The meaning of the last words of the
pāda is not certain ; we have translated *pinrěhan,* one of the possible readings (cf.
note 14 to the transcription); between *manuja (manujān* is *manuja + an)* and *pra-
mukha,* one presumes a term meaning „considered, placed".

[46) *Kaaum* is *aum (om)* preceded by the prefix *ka-,* the derivatives of which (such as
umom, umomakěn) usually mean „to confirm, approve" in Old Javanese (it is prob-
ably derived from *om* in the meaning „indeed, it be thus", when some service is
required). *Anumoda* is used twice in 13 *d,* and in such a case it may be considered
certain that it is used in two different meanings. Now we know that *anumoda* occurs
in Java in a meaning unknown from Sanskrit (at least, not yet traced in Sanskrit):
we find the word inscribed on temples in Java, where the term is always followed
by a title and (or) a name ; as such it occurs on many of the smaller temples of the
Tjaṇḍi Plaosan complex (cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, pp. 116 sq.). Its meaning probably is
„votive donation". Then, a number of these small buildings were built as *exvoto*
and those who had the small temples built to fulfil their vows had their names
engraved in the buildings concerned. Then the special meaning may be derived without
difficulty form the Sanskrit meaning of „joy": it is the expression of the joy due
to the fact that the vow was granted. If this explanation is correct, the meaning

14. ..... [47]), the heart (of the complex) with its own wall [48]) and bricks
to construct the dam (?), for thus it was desired [49]). Fierce door-
keepers [50]) ....., so that thieves would become afraid to ..... being
caught in taking away [51]).

---

of 13 *d* becomes clear ; the construction of the temples is a duty from which one can-
not withdraw. *Wihang* means „to be disobedient" and the idea that people would
be disobedient *(syapa wihanā)* to fulfil their vows is considered absurd. The use of
oṃ (aum) comfirms this interpretation ; „indeed, thus be it !" is the expression used
by the people who consent in executing what they had taken upon themselves. Of
course, they fulfil their vows with joy; otherwise, much of the effect would be lost.
The latter is expressed by *anumoda gawai*. We then may translate *mananumodanu-
moda gawai* by „they fulfilled their vows (by constructing the small temples) and
did it cheerfully".

[47]) *Nya* at the beginning of the strophe can only be the suffix of *gawai* at the end
of strophe 13. It is rather an extraordinary liberty to cut *gawainya* in this way. A
conjectural restitution of the beginning of strophe 14 (mainly based on the poet's
use of *yamaka)* is mentioned in note 18 to the transcription. If this restitution may
be relied upon, we may translate: „He, the Hino (a very high title) gave order that
a ...... *linga* ...... should be made'). The three short syllables preceding *linga* might
be *upala*, „a stone linga", but there are of course other possibilities.

[48]) *Tĕasaturusnya* interpreted as *tĕas saturusnya* with simple instead of double *s*, a
metrical licence for which there exist parallels. *Tĕas* is the archaic spelling of Old
Javanese *twas*, „heart", here probably used for the central building(s). The suffix
-nya of *saturusnya* proves that the centre was surrounded by its proper wall.

[49]) *Istaka* and *ista* are incorrect orthographies for *iṣṭaka* and *iṣṭa*. The play of words
cannot be expressed in the translation and then *ista karih* loses its force. The use of
tamwaka with the 'conjunctive' *-a* to denote the result might seem strange; *tamwaka*
is however used in exactly the same meaning in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, XV,
47 *d: manatĕra parwata len watu tamⴁaka*, „to carry mountains and rocks for thᵒ
dam". The translation of *tamwak* by „dam", which is the usual meaning of the
word, is not certain. One might defend it by referring to 22 *a-b*, dealing with a,
perhaps artificial, lake (?), and to 25 b, where it is stated that the course of a
river was changed and the building of a dam was necessary to that purpose. The
main objection against such an interpretation is that strophe 14 seems rather to deal
with temple buildings, or with constructions in immediate relation with the latter,
Tamwak may therefore have a different meaning here. In the Old Javanese Rāmā-
yaṇa, VIII, 43, the word seems to refer to ring-walls (cf. Poerbatjaraka, *T.B.G.*, 72,
1932, p. 164) ; Juynboll's *Glossarium* to the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, 1902, s.v. *tam-
bak*, where the Balinese gloss *tembok*, „wall", is quoted; cf. also Rām., VIII, 57 *a:
wwara teki tambaki yawā maruhur*, where there is no doubt that a high *(maruhur)*
wall is meant surrounding the entire complex. We therefore think that *tamwak* in
our text refers to walls made of brick to separate different parts of the complex
from each other.

[50]) These are probably the Rākṣasa statues mentioned in the Introduction.

[51]) We quoted pāda *d* in the Introduction as a typical example of *utprekṣā*. The idea is
that the Rākṣasas are so frightful that they would withhold thieves from taking away
objects from the temples. *Ta kumaling*, which we left untranslated, may be an in-
tercalated little sentence: *kumaling* should then be analyzed *k=umaling*, „in my
opinion", corresponding to Sanskrit *manye*. This interpretation is confirmed by the
fact that *manye* is usual in strophes containing an *utprekṣā;* it occurs in the first
example given by the Kāvyādarça (II, 222). We gave a free translation of *waruhe-*

15. A beautiful dwelling for the god [52] .....; at the gateways, two small buildings [53] were erected, different in construction [54]; there also was a Tañjung tree ...... together (?) [55]; beautiful were the number of small buildings [56] to be used as hermitages, which might, in their turn, be an example (?) [57].

16. Of the tree Ki Muhūr (?) [58], the stem was only one year old; the neighbourhood of the Lord was the reason of its matchless growth [59]

---

riñ=alap, interpreted as wĕruha iri ng alap, lit.: „that (they. the Rākṣasas) would see them when taking away".

[52]) The pādas a and b probably still belong to the order given in 14 a (the passive 'im-perative' gawayĕn there suggests makon or a synonym in the lacuna). Probably, gewa- in 16 a, is the beginning of the same word gawayĕn. We translated griha (i.e. gṛha) by the singular, although the plural would be preferred, especially if the completion silih=asih at the end of the pāda is correct: then, griha ning hyang would refer to a number of temples harmonizing with each other.

[53]) Rañkang usually means a pavilion inside the kĕraton; cf. the Old Jav. Rām., 20 79 (rañkañ ĕmas); Bhomakāwya, 43, 24 (the pavilion where the princess Yajñawatī stays). Here, it seems that small temple buildings are referred to, which resemble the pavilions just mentioned. There are two of these (añalih) and their pamawān was different; cf. the following note.

[54]) Pamawān, lit.: „the place where something is brought (wawa)"; cf. Bhomakāwya, 37, 7: prāgjyotiṣekang pamawān suputrī, „Prāgjyotiṣa was the place where the beau-tiful princess was brought". In view of these loci, we think that the difference be-tween the two rañkang refers to the place where they were constructed, not to the constructions themselves.

[55]) Owing to the lacuna, it is not clear to what kalawān, which may also mean „and, in addition", refers.

[56]) Pānti, probably pa + anti, „to wait", may mean a „place where a royal guest or a hermit may lodge" (cf. Van der Tuuk's Dictionary, IV, p. 31) and this certainly is the meaning required here. Tinapān may mean: considered a patapān, used as a hermitage.

[57]) The words tiruan sawaluy are difficult. We understand that these words are a kind of explanation of mahayu at the beginning of the pāda. In the temple complex, it is evident that everything is beautiful; but here the poet meets with a difficulty: why should the hermitages, intended for ascetics and their (sometimes) royal guests, be beautiful? Hermitages, should not be beautiful as a rule, so that the poet has to account for this fact. He therefore gives the explanation that these little buildings were made beautiful to make that others in their turn (sawaluy) would follow the example (tiruan) of the hermits they would see there. Technically, this is hetu used as an alamkāra; some similar examples are given in the Kāvyādarça (II, 242 sqq.), cf. Böhtlingk, Daṇḍin's Poetik (1890), pp. 62 sq.

[58]) We take kimuhūr to be the name of this very extraordinary tree. We then have to cut ki muhūr. Ki is probably an abbreviation of kaki; ki is used in modern Javanese before names of persons (rarely things) to be honoured. It is sometimes considered an abbreviation of kyai, „religious teacher". The name of the tree is explained by its miraculous growth; muhur may mean „suddenly, at once" in Sanskrit, but it should have been spelt by a short, not by a long u. As it is written in the text, one would rather have the name Muhūrtta, „hour" (of 48 minutes), for the long ū would then be correct. But in that case, the following words are incomprehensible. Takanya is interpreted as tĕkĕn-nya, „its stem" (lit.: „stick").

[59]) Yan corresponds to matangyan or matangnyan in prose.

at the Eastern side ; its beauty was extraordinary, equal to the (divine) Pārijātaka tree [60]); it was the place where the God would descend [61]) and (its branches) would be a parasol (for the God); was not it a God for the God ? [62]).

17. (The smaller buildings) were equal, of equal height, (served) the same purpose, (expressed) the same thoughts, (but) they were each different in their number [63]); who would hesitate in worshipping ? Out of worship (people) gave [64]). In a moment, the temples with the gateways and innumerable, immovable women [65]), were completed by the surveyors working by hundreds.

18. What would be comparable with this divine (building): it was there

---

[60]) For this comparison, cf. the Introduction.

[61]) *Pañawataran:* Sanskrit *avatāra* with the affixes *pa-* and *-an,* „the place for an *avatāra*", The word should have been spelt *pañawatārān,* but the long vowels were shortened for metrical considerations.

[62]) *Mahāmayuña* is derived from *payung,* „parasol", with the prefix *maha-* (spelt *mahā-* for metrical considerations, and also, perhaps, to associate it by a sort of *çleṣa,* with *mahā-,* „great"), after which the base was nasalized, and the suffix *-a.* For the prefix *maha-,* cf. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.,* VIII (article dated 1901), pp. 228 sq.; its meaning is related with *maka-,* but the nasal is irregular. *Rām.* 24, 136, is interesting because the prefix is used in a *yamaka* with *mahā-,* „great" *(mahaçuddhya citta nira sang mahājana).* *Hyaña i hyañ=apa* is a play on words which may more or less be rendered in the translation. *Apa* here simply introduces the question.

[63]) Strophe 17 presumably refers to the rows of small temples which in the Central Javanese complexes surround the main building(s). Usually, these small buildings resemble each other very much, although they are never exactly the same. They were probably built by high dignitaries (cf. *supra,* note 45), who were bound to conform to the general rules such as the dimensions, but were free in the execution of details. *Vicitra* refers to the differences in details (especially colours, but probably ornaments, too).

[64]) *Bhaktita weh.* The choice of the words may have been influenced by the desire for a *yamaka.* The only possibility I see is taking *bhaktita* as Sanskrit *bhaktitaḥ,* „out of devotion". The visitors in general probably are the subject of *weh:* the beauty of the temples made people give.

[65]) *Aganitāṅgana tā pacalān. Aganitāṅgana* is clear; the final *a* was shortened *metri causa.* As far as *tā pacalān* is concerned, there might be some doubt whether it should be derived from Sanskrit *cala* or from Sanskrit *chala.* In the latter case, the aspirate would have been neglected, but this would be a very small thing if compared with such spellings as *pañawataran* and *duarapalā.* If to be derived from *chala,* the meaning is „blameless, irreproachable" ; perhaps, the poet wanted the two interpretations at the same time as a kind of *çleṣa.* It is evident that this passage does not refer to women working on the temple; the passage is on a line with other details of the temples and probably refers to either caryotides or (more probably) to reliefs on the temple(s), as is the case in the Plaosan inscription (cf. the Introduction to No. VII above). Then, the 'immovable' women are the female figures in relief and images. The words *añutus inatus* may have been chosen on account of their similarity in sound. *Añutus* are those who give instructions *(utus);* with *inatus,* cf. *Rām.,* V, 26: *inatus-atus,* „by hundreds".

for a deification (?) [66]; was this the cause why the spectators were overwhelmed and the (normal) sensations did not come back (?) [67] ? The worshippers came in rows and in groups (?) [68], by hundreds [69], without saying a word : extraordinary were their names — a token that they (the images worshipped ?) would bring refreshment (?) [70].

---

[66] *Diwytama,* „most divine", is often used in the meaning „splendid, marvellous" in Old Javanese. I kept the more original meaning in the translation on account of *diwyakĕna. Diwyākĕn,* no other example of which is known in Old Javanese, could mean only „to make divine, i.e. to deify". The form is used without initial nasal here and should therefore be interpreted as a passive; in addition, it has the suffix -a (here written long on account of the metre), which usually denotes irreality or future. *Diwyakĕnā* therefore means: „in order to be deified, for being deified"; together with *ya hanā* (the final long a of which is strange ; cf. note 67 below), meaning „it *(i.e.* the temple complex?) was (there)", we could translate; „it was (there) for being deified"; in the translation, I gave a freer rendering of the text. During the time that the complex is in construction, there is nothing superhuman in it, although it may be *diwyatama,* „marvellous"; by the ceremony of consecration, the temples are brought on a higher, divine level, they are 'deified', as the poet appears to express it. I insist on this point in order to stress that this passage does not necessarily prove that the text refers to a deification of a king; on the other hand, it does not seem probable that the poet should have used terms such as this one if it was not his intention to imply such an idea.

[67] Cf. note 24 to the transcription. There obviously is a play on words between *karasān* and *rasa* and it is not, therefore, likely that the former should be considered a derivative of the latter. I therefore interpreted *karasān* as *kĕrasan,* a derivative of *kĕras,* „hard, strong" (or rather of *anĕrasi,* „to overpower somebody").

[68] *Matatāganā* is interpreted as *matatā,* „in regular order", compounded with *maganā* (for *magana),* „in groups"; owing to the word compound the prefix of the latter was omitted. Compounds with *tata* as their first part are common in modern Javanese (the best-known example is *tata-krama).*

[69] If *çatāgata* should be read. As was noted above (note 26 to the transcription), *gatā-gata* would also be possible („coming and going") but such a continuous *va-et-vient* would not probably be suggested.

[70] Conjectural translation of a very complicated *pāda,* in which the second half is the reflected image of the first; in such cases it is obvious that the form of the words is more important than their meaning, but they should mean something at least. The first half *atiçaya tang ñaranya,* „extra-ordinary were their names", probably means that the visitors to the temples included very distinguished people; then one may expect a kind of explanation in the second half. So I took *tañaranya* in the meaning of *tĕñĕranya* (the spelling of a instead of ĕ is rather frequent in our text; here, there is of course a special reason for doing so: the sound, or rather the writing, should agree with *tang ñaranya),* i.e. „it (the visit of the distinguished persons) was a token that", „it was because"; cf. the use of *cihna* (the Sanskrit equivalent of *tĕñĕran)* in the Old Jav. *Rām.,* IX, 45 d : *cihnāyan bhraṣṭā,* „as a token that (they) would be destroyed", „to indicate that, etc.". *Mahātisa* (for the prefix, cf. *mahāmayuña* in 16 d) is a derivative of *tis,* „cool(ness)": „that (they) would make cool". Coolness is an agreeable sensation to those tortured by the heat either of the sun or of passion, here, of course, of the latter: the temple with its images devoid of passion and helping to attain *mokṣa,* may thus be represented to give 'coolness' to the devout visitors.

.19. Who, then, would not be the very first to go and see ? [71]). It was very charming ..... [72]).

22. (transition to popular language) [73]):
You herons, crows, *haṃsas*, merchants, ... [74]); go and take a bath to find protection (?) [75]) ..... (?) pilgrimage (?) ..... [76]); and you, *kalang* [77]), village members [78]) and handsome *gusti* [79]), you are

---

[71]) *Tan apūrwwa*, — here, a- is of course the Sanskrit, not the Old Javanese prefix.

.[72]) For these enigmatic strophes, no translation of which can be given, cf. the Introduction.

[73]) *Prākrĕta (prākṛta)* may be used as the opposite of the artificial -(?) language of the preceding strophe. *Sanniveça* (Sanskrit *saṃniveça)* is not usual in the meaning which it seems to have here, but is hardly could be anything else. There is, however, another possibility. When we see that also strophes 23 and 24 are introduced by short indications, it is natural to suppose that also *prākrĕtasanniveça* is intended to state something more positive about strophe 22. One could translate „popular way of expression." In that case, we should have a unique example of popular Old Javanese of the 9th century A.D. The latter interpretation would agree better with the meaning of . *saṃniveça* in Sanskrit.

[74]) The words *niyāga wayat* are obscure to us; *niyāga* looks like a derivative of *ni-yaj*, which does not however appear to occur in Sanskrit; but then, it is also difficult to account for *wayat*. Another word separation, viz. *waṇiyāga-niyā gawaya=t* does not seem more satisfactory, although the words, if taken by themselves, would be clear.

[75]) Here, too, there may be doubt as to the correct separation of the words; *diyus* (i.e. *dyus) anĕmwaha*, „bathe to pay homage", would not be impossible, but what to do with *trasiha?* One could explain *tra* by Sanskrit *atra*, the initial a of which was combined with the final a of *anĕmwaha*, whereas the necessary lengthening of the vowel was omitted. Then, *siha* could mean „show your love" (?). One could, however, cut *diyus=anĕmwa hat=rasiha;* then, the first three words would make sense (cf. the translation), but *rasiha* (i.e. *ra-siha)* remains difficult. It might perhaps have the same meaning as *siha* translated above.

[76]) *Siddha ta -yātra*, — although it seems strange that a Sanskrit compound should be cut by an Old Javanese particle, there is no reasonable doubt that we have the famous word *siddhayātra* here, for which cf. the Introduction to No. I, above. The mention of water birds and of 'bathing' make it very probable that *siddhayātra* is acquired in a *tīrtha* as it seems more often to be the case; cf. Chhabra, *Expansion*, p. 19. But what is the meaning of *siha* then ? It seems rather meaningless to take it as the 'imperative' „adore !" again.

[77]). A *désa* functionary, frequently mentioned in Old Javanese records.

[78]) *Anak wanua* is the usual term in Old Javanese records to indicate those village inhabitants who enjoy full rights to act.

[79]) *Gusti* (as *kalang*, with whom it is frequently mentioned together in Old Javanese records) denotes a village functionary. There is nothing extraordinary in their being 'handsome', except that this qualification might be due to the pun *gusti wagus (ti)*. It is very striking that exactly the same pun on *gusti* is made in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, XXVI, 22 *b: gusti tātar wagus tikṣṇabuddhi;* the correspondence is not less striking because in the Rāmāyaṇa *locus* the *gustis* are stated to be. „not handsome". Especially in these last strophes of our text, there is much that reminds one of *Rām.* XXVI, 22 ; this strophe was fully discussed by Poerbatjaraka in *T.B.G.*, 72 (1932), pp. 153 sqq.

ordered (?) [80]) to worship with smelling salt (?) [81]) ..... (?) [82]) with old men.

23. (omission of an *akṣara*) [83]):
On the day (fixed for) compulsory work on behalf of the Gods [84]), the people in command [85]) performed the ceremonies ; crowds of people came in and the first surveyor [86]) came in the third place (?) [87]); monks, young man and women of rank [88]), ... (?) [89]); ..... (?) [90]); there were numerous guards (?).

---

[80]) We suppose that *tinajar* is *ta* (the particle) followed by *inajar*, but *te* was shortened to ti; a similar example is *kasandihā* in 17 b, derived from *sandeha* (cf. also *sagupura* instead of *sagopura*, in 17 *d*).

[81]) *Kawittha* also occurs in the Kěmbang Arum inscription, edited by Bosch, *Oudh. Versl.*, 1925, p. 43, III, line 11 : *pañcopacāra kamwang, kawittha, dīpa, dhūpa, gandhalepa.* Stutterheim *(Inscr. Ned.-Indië*, I, 1940, p. 23) connects it with Sanskrit *wiḍa*, but not only the *ttha* and the prefix *ka-*, but also the fact that smelling salt might already been implied in *gandhalepa*, „perfumes and unguents", does not make this interpretation probable; we do not however know any better one; *kawittha* makes the impression of being Prākrit.

[82]) We do not understand the meaning of *surarah*. It is moreover obvious that most of the strophe, though apparently written in a 'normal' language, remains obscure.

[83]) *I.e.*, a short riddle by which a 'lost' akṣara must be found back; cf. the Introduction.

[84]) *Wuatthyang* (a strange sandhi form for *wuat hyang;* obviously, *wuaddhyang* frightened even our author) denotes compulsory work by the villagers in behalf of temples etc.; cf. *wuat haji*, „compulsary work for the king".

[85]) *Uang (i.e. wwang*, often spelt *wuang* in Old Javanese inscriptions ; the latter spelling would however have made the preceding syllable long) *pamatih.* Cf. *mamatiha* in *Rām.*, XIV, 24, „in order to arrange"; *nanghyang* is „to address the gods" rather than „to pray". The combination of the two terms implies an *ākṣepa (Kāvyād.*, II 120 sqq.).

[86]) The form *ādimantri* is uncertain (cf. note 37 to the transcription); *ādimantri*, though unusual, may be understood (cf. such compounds as *ādideva, ādiçūra* etc.; the initial *a* may have been shortened for metrical considerations) ; one might also suggest *adhimantri*, which is however unusual, too. The meaning does not seem doubtful.

[87]) *Tritaya* is puzzling; in Sanskrit, it could only mean „a triad", but three *āaimantrins* (?) would seem strange. We rather suppose that it is used for *tṛtīya:* people entered in three groups, first the surveyors, then the crowds of workers, and as the third and last the *ādimantrin.* This is not very clearly expressed, but we should not forget that the pāda is very mannered (a three syllable *yamaka* not separated by another akṣara).

[88]) *Kumari* is probably used for *kumārī*.

[89]) We do not understand the second part of *c*, nor the pāda *d* except for the last words. *Kamaran* might be derived either from *mar*, „soft", of from *amĕr*, „to cherish"; *mara yan (marayan) paguru* would mean „so that they behaved like *gurus"* ; presumably, the clearness of expression was sacrificed to the complicated form of the pāda, and the meaning might therefore be rather far-fetched. Possibly, the pāda means that in addition to the people mentioned above, there came people of high rank, too, in order to give instructions. Then, *kamaran* could be supposed to mean that these high rank people were flattered in order that they should assume the task attributed to them.

[90]) *Garuti yatann=inūyana ḍaḍanya* could be made to agree with the conjectural ex-

24. (omission of an *anusvāra*) :

In the time of the Çaka year (denoted by) eight, mountains and monks [91]), in the bright half of the month Mārgaçīrṣa, the eleventh lunar day, on the week-days Thursday, Wagai (of the five days' week) and Wurukung (of the six days' week) ..... [92]) — that was the date at which the (statue of the) God was finished and inaugurated [93]).

25. After the Çiva sanctuary had been completed in its divine splendour, the (course of the) river was changed so that it rippled along the grounds [94]); there was no danger [95]) from the wicked ones, for they had all received their due [96]); then the grounds were inaugurated as temple grounds ..... [97]) with the gods.

26. Two *tampah* was the size of the rice-fields belonging to the Çiva

---

planation of pāda c which we proposed in the preceding note. It could then be translated; „their breasts were scratched (got scratch wounds) because they did not spare themselves" (?). The idea is then that these high-rank people were so enthu-siastic in fulfilling their tasks that they did not mind receiving scratch wounds by hurting against bamboos with their uncovered breasts.

[91]) Çaka 778 = 856 A.D.

[92]) *Weḥ* at the end of c and d has nothing to do with „to give", but is probably an adverb (also written *wiḥ*), meaning „also, in addition, then" etc. As such, it often occurs in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa; cf. I, 19 c: *maṅkana saṅ daçaratha weḥ,* „in a similar way, Daçaratha, too,......". The meaning is, then, that the date, which was already clearly defined by the indication of year, month, *pakṣa* and *tithi,* was also defined by the three week-days. The latter are never omitted in dating Old Javanese records: the choice of a favourable combination was essential.

[93]) *Weḥ,* at the end of pāda d, may have been added to stress that the completion of the last details (this is probably the meaning of *ginawai* here) was immediately followed by the inauguration of the image.

[94]) As we argued in the Introduction, it is probable that *palmahan (i.e. palĕmahan)* should refer to the temple grounds on which the complex was built, not to the rice-fields which are mentioned only in 25 d. The river course was changed so that it touched, rippled against (lit. 'ticked'; *aniṭik* is the nasalized form of *ṭiṭik)* the outer limit of the temple grounds; we conjectured that these measures were taken to include the *tīrtha* (strophe 22) in the temple complex.

[95]) We consider *kasandiha (kasandihe = kasandiha i)* a derivative of Sanskrit *saṃdeha* (cf. note 23 above, where the same spelling occurs).

[96]) There is no doubt that these words refer to the wicked spirits *(bhūtas* etc.), who might disturb the ceremonies if they were not satisfied. These 'gifts' include *caru,* for instance, rice strewn on the ground, and perhaps meat for the Rākṣasas etc.

[97]) I do not understand the words *humet=trima haraṅ,* if at least the words should be separated in this way. *Trima (= tarima)* makes good sense here; in 25 c, gifts to the low spirits were mentioned, so that the parallelism between the pādas would suggest that in 25 d gifts to the Gods were referred to. One might connect *trima haraṅ huma sahiyang,* „the rice-fields with the Gods received ......" *(haraṅ* in the meaning of *harĕṅ,* „charcoal" does not make sense). I have no idea about what *humet* could mean.

temple [98]); it was a freehold [99]) of the Paměgět Wantil [100]) with his *nayaka* and his *patih* [101]); the *patih* was called si Kling and his *kalima* [102]) was called *rasi* [103]) Mrěsi ; there were three *gustis* : si Jana, *rasi* Kaṇḍut and *rasi* Sanab.

27. The *winěkas* [104]) was si Baṇyāga ; the *wahutas* were Waranīyā, Tati and Wukul (?); the *laḍuh* [105]) was si Gěněng ; the following persons were representatives, speaking in the name of other people [106]), *viz.* Kabuh and sang Marsī, the latter representing the village elders without definite function [107]).

---

[98]) A *tampah* is an area measure frequently mentioned in Old Javanese records and is especially used to define the size of rice-fields.

[99]) *Susul (cf. manusuk, sumusuk, „to found a freehold")* seems to be a synonym of *sīma* here ; the meaning is that future kings will have no right to impose taxes etc. on the grounds.

[100]) *Samgat* is usual as a contraction of *sang pamgat* (cf. Van Naerssen, *Bijdr.* K.I., 90 (1933), p. 257). For Wantil, cf. 10 *b* above, where the king (Rakaki Mamrati, if correctly interpreted) made a gift to Wantil. By this act, the freehold was ceded to the Paměgět Wantil, of course with the stipulation that he (and his heirs) should supply the means to guarantee future conservation of the temples. Such gifts of grounds by kings imply that all the rights exercised by the sovereign on the territory (i.e. numerous kinds of taxes, the duty of work in the royal residence or in behalf of 'public works', *viz.* the construction of roads, bridges etc., by those who possessed grounds) are transferred to the freehold, so that the foundation gets complete autonomy.

[101]) *Nayaka* and *patih* denote functions frequently mentioned in the Old Javanese edicts, always as executors of orders issued by higher authorities such as the king and dignitaries with *rakai* and *paměgět* titles. The rank of *nayakas* and *patihs* therefore depends on whose orders they execute. Here, they assist the Paměgět Wantil.

[102]) *Kalimanira,* „his *kalima*", refers back to the Paměgět, not to the *patih;* this follows from the use of the suffix -*nira,* which is too high to be applied to the *patih* (the latter's name is introduced by the 'article' *si,* to which corresponds -*nya* as a suffix).

[103]) Rasi may be analyzed into the (honorific) prefix *ra-* (cf. note 5 above) and the 'article' *si;* it is rarely found in Old Javanese edicts. Considering that the three *gustis* mentioned in the end of the strophe have names preceded by *si, rasi* and *rasi* respectively, one gets the impression that the difference in rank could only be very small; perhaps *rasi* here refers to older men, but metrical considerations might also have had influence upon the choice.

[104]) *Winěkas,* grammatically a passive of *wěkas,* may be translated „he who receives orders"; but unlike the *patihs, nayakas, wahutas* who receive orders from court dignitaries and functionaries, the *winěkas* acts in the name of the village elders (*rāma*) as a group (to which he also belongs himself).

[105]) Unknown from other sources as the name of a function. It is also possible that *laḍuh* is a proper name, continuing the list of *wahutas*; in that case, there would be no less than five *wahutas* (since si Gěněng would be a *wahuta,* too), but this is only a minor objection. Another possible objection against the latter interpretation is that *laḍuh* is not preceded by *si* (or by another 'article'); it follows from Kabuh in pāda *d* that *si* could be omitted in poetry.

[106]) The words *ny=akṣara waneh* explain the meaning of *parujar;* a similar explanation of the same word occurs in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa (XXVI, 22), quoted by Poerbatjaraka in *T.B.G.,* 72 (1932), p. 154.

[107]) The former presumably represented the *rāmas* with a definite function (*rāma maṅagam*

28. After the inauguration of the wet rice fields [108]), the freehold existed, fized to remain a freehold (?) [109]), ... (?) [110]), this was the freehold that would belong to the god for ever (?) [111]).

29. Those (in charge) were sent back with the order to worship, every day, without forgetting their duties [112]) ; they should not be negligent in obeying the commands of the gods ; continuous re-birth in hell would be the result (if they were negligent) [112]).

XII. A JUDGMENT OF LAW DATED 860 A.D.

In 1935, Mr. E. W. van Orsoy de Flines discovered a fragment of an inscribed copper plate, brought to light during irrigation works on the Kali Putjanggading near the village Plumbangansari in the regency Děmak (Central Java). The measurements of the fragment are 22½ cm in length and 15½ cm in breadth ; the right hand portions of ten lines of script are preserved on one side of the plate, the other side being empty. Examination of the text shows that the plate is the last one of a set, giving only the end of an inscription. The fragment is only the right hand part of the plate. The text makes it possible to conclude that the lost portion is considerable, hardly smaller than the part which was recovered ¹). The fragment was incorporated into the private collection of Mr. van Orsoy de Flines at Ungaran (No. 246). There is an excellent photograph in the collection of the Dinas Purbakala at Djakarta.

---

kon, such as kalang, gusti, winěkas, tuhālas etc.), the latter those who gave advices to the village council after having transferred their possessions to their heirs (cf. supra, p. 230).

108) I.e. inauguration as a freehold (sīma). It is curious that the text here uses sawah, whereas the territories are probably the same as those denoted by huma in 26 a.

100) Conjectural translation. Puput means „finished"; in this context, this could only mean that there would be no more question about it, that its status was fixed for ever; the words waluy ya sīma are obscure to me.

110) Pāda c is incomprehensible; it may consist of an enumeration of villages which become sīma attached to the foundation. Patalěsan could well be the name of a village, but Nimaṇḍěr, Dutī and Karamwa seem strange as village names.

111) In this pāda, there is the same difficulty with puput (cf. note 109 above). For the metre of strophe and that of the next one, cf. p. 283 above.

112) Gawainya is used in two different meanings at the end of pāda b and that of pāda d. The repetition of the term is a kind of yamaka. Gawai undoubtedly has the two shades of meaning characteristic of karman in Sanskrit, viz. (a) act in general, (b) act considered the only 'thing' remaining after the end of an individual existence and capable of ripening (karmavipāka).

¹) At the end of line 1, the name of a village breaks off (air ha-), but in the beginning of line 2, one reads the beginning of a new date. The akṣara çi, followed by çuklapakṣa, is undoubtedly the end of the indication of the tithi, the shortest of which is dwādaçī (the spelling by a short -i is no objection since similar cases are very frequent in Old Javanese inscriptions). Before dwādaçī (or another ordinal number), one expects to find in the lacuna: (a) a mark of punctuation, probably a double daṇḍa, (b) çakawarṣātīta, followed by three ciphers, (c) the name of a

The script belongs to the older Central Javanese type. The akṣaras are relatively large and slightly sloping. Owing to considerable differences in size between the akṣaras, the writing gives the impression of carelessness or clumsiness. The most striking peculiarity of this script is the use of rather large hooks at the starting point of a number of akṣaras, especially of the ra. The left hand vertical of the ka bends considerably inwards at the foot of the akṣara. The -e after a consonant (taling in modern Javanese) starts at the normal height, but is not continued down to the botom of the akṣaras. Most of these features give the impression of being archaisms which gradually disappear during the development of Old Javanese script. Already the Perot inscriptions (850) are written in a less archaic type of script. Our plate is, however, dated 860 A. D. [2]), i.e. ten years after the Perot inscriptions, so that the apparent archaisms are to be considered peculiarities of a region where archaeological and epigraphic remains of the Hindu-Indonesian period are very scarce.

A few details of spelling and language are worthy of mention. Consonants are doubled before the suffixes -a and -akan (cf. misanna and kinonnaka$<n>$ in line 2). The spelling of Sanskrit words is correct excepting pātra instead of pattra, which is, however, very frequently found in Old Javanese texts.

A curious form is pinakakuannakan in line 2. Considering that kinonnaka$<n>$, a derivative of the same base kon, occurs in line 3, it cannot be doubted that the spelling kuan was an archaism already in the middle of the 9th century A.D. It should however be added that derivatives of kwan even occur in poetry dated centuries later [3]). The form pinakakuannakan is remarkable for another reason, too : it is the only case known of kon with the prefix maka- (pinaka-) [4]). The meaning of pinakakuannakan cannot be determined owing to the lacuna following this word almost immediately. The form is perhaps to be translated „was considered an order" [5]).

---

month (two to four akṣaras), (d) probably the word tithi. One should add the end of the village name; two village names known to occur in Old Javanese records are Airhaji and Airhaṅat, which makes one to two akṣaras. The total is: 1½ + 2 (the punctuation mark) + 6 + 3 + 3 (the average month) + 1½ (syllables preceding -çi) = 17 akṣaras. The preserved portion, calculated by the same method, shows an average of about 25 akṣaras. From this rough calculation it follows that the lost portion amounts to about two fifths of the entire lines.

[2) As will be examined below, 860 is the last date mentioned in the text; at least two earlier dates must have occurred in the inscription, but the date on which the copper plate was inscribed is, of course, the last one.

[3) Juynboll's Oudjavaansch-Nederlandsche Woordenlijst mentions examples from the Bhomakāwya and the Arjunawiwāha, but no references to Old Javanese prose works. It is therefore likely that metrical considerations are largely responsible for the use of such forms in later times.

[4) In addition, the combination of the prefix with the suffix -akan is very strange.

[5) I.e. some unknown other document was considered an order which had to be executed in spite of objections made by the other party. The word sang before the

. . Although the text is very badly mutilated, it is not impossible to understand something of the document.

A complete date is mentioned in line 5. According to the calculation by Damais, it corresponds to the 27th of March, 860 A.D. [6]). This is not, however, the only date found in the text; also in line 2, the final part of a date is still preserved. Since this date is not placed at the very beginning of the text, it is certain that at least one more date was mentioned in the original text. It may be concluded that an original edict was confirmed, modified or revised several times, at least twice, the last time in 860 A.D.

In line 9 the document is termed a *çuddhapātra*, an incorrect spelling for *çuddhapattra*. Another document of this kind is O. J. O. XXIX, dated 912 A.D. [7]), but hardly other examples are known. The meaning of *çuddhapattra* is „a receipt of discharge of a debt". It appears from line 1 that the debt was paid in the presence of witnesses. The rarity of such documents is certainly due to the fact they were ordinarily written on perishable materials such as *lontar*. The act inscribed on the copper-plate fragment relates, however, an extraordinary case in which there had arisen disagreement between parties concerning the payment of the debt. Owing to such dissensions, decisions had to be taken by competent authorities. It appears from the text that there has been some kind of law-suit after which one of the parties, Dapunta Angada, probably representing some monastery [8]), lost the case (*inalahakan* in line 8). The identity of the other party is not completely clear from the text; it probably was the village elders (*rāmanta*) of a *désa* the name of which begins with Air-ha (Airhaji or Air-hanat ?). It is mentioned in line 1 that an amount of gold and silver was in deposit with the above-mentioned village elders (*kinmit*, literally: „was guarded"). The point of controversy is not clear. The text mentions that it was the Dapunta's intention to *misanna ikanang mas*, the same expression which also occurs in the beginning of line 3. *Misan*, a derivative of *pisan*, „once", might mean „to do something once", here perhaps „to acquit (a large debt) all at the same time". The term may perhaps apply to a number of different financial obligations which the Dapunta wanted to finish by paying one (large) sum, presumably in order to recuperate the amount of gold and silver from the village elders. Probably, the latter did not agree with such a solution, perhaps because the amount offered by the Dapunta was considered too low. The latter point is, however, completely conjectural since nothing of the kind is alluded to in the fragmentary text. Considering

---

lacuna at the end of line 2 must have denoted the subject of *pinakakuannakan* and could not therefore have introduced the name of a person. I suppose *sang hyang ājñā haji* or something of this kind. The main difficulty is, however, the suffix *-akan* which seems superfluous.

[6]) *B.E.F.E.O.*, XLVI, Fasc. 1 (1952), pp. 50 sq.

[7]) There, too, the same term *çuddhapattra* is mentioned. A related document was published by Stutterheim in *Inscr. Ned-Indië*, I (1940), pp 29 sqq.

[8]) *Dapunta* seems to be a title of monks; cf. K.O. IX, line 1 (*dapunta i kawikuan i panungalan watĕk raja).* Cf. infra.

that the term *misanna* is especially stressed, it might be suggested that the point of controversy was not so much the sum itself, but the fact of the entire amount being acquitted all at once. If, for instance, the deposit exceded the amount of the debt by a considerable sum, it may be understood that the village elders would have preferred that the payment of the debt should be effected by smaller amounts extending over a considerable lapse of time. Something of the kind might have been specified in an earlier contract.

The first decision about this affair was made by a Rakarayān Wěka, who had died in the meantime and was buried at Bulai (*sang lumāḥ ing Bulai*, line 4). He had decided that the deposit of gold remained with the village elders (*tanmolaḥ*, line 4). It appears that this old decision was confirmed by the Rakarayān Mapatih of Wěka in 860. The latter listened to the statements of both parties. The village elders spoke first; afterwards the Dapunta repeated his intention (*maharap*) of acquitting himself of the debt all at once (line 6). He had, however, no more success than the first time. The new Rakarayān Mapatih [9]) considered the reasons upon which the former decision was based [10]), undoubtedly thought these convincing and therefore confirmed the sentence by his predecessor: Dapunta Aṅgada lost the case (*inalahakan*). The edict ends with the mention of witnesses — representatives of high dignitaries [11]) — and clerks [12]).

Considering the above, this document, though denoted by *çuddhapattra*, could also have been called a *jayapattra*, „document of victory", containing the final sentence to be preserved by the party who gained the process [13]). There is no doubt that the process was an important one : no less than two Rakarayāns Mapatih (which is the highest function after the king) are concerned with the affair. The reason for its importance may only be guessed at. First, it is noted that the amount of the debt is considerable ; if Stutterheim's calculation of Old Javanese weights is approximately correct [14]), the total amount would equal more than one and a half kg of gold and two and a half g of silver [15]). Although one cannot have an idea of how

[9]) The former Rakarayān Mapatih is designated by *rakarayān mapatiḥ sang rumuhun* (line 7) and by *rakarayān sang matuha*, the 'old' Rakarayān (line 8).

[10]) If the reading *sadon* in line 7 is correct, this might be formulated slightly differently. The point of controversy might not have been the sentence by the late Rakarayān itself, but its interpretation. In that case, the last decision aimed at establishing the exact meaning of the former decision, not so much its literal meaning as the intention which the late Rakarayān had in arriving at his decision. It is almost as in modern jurisdiction.

[11]) *Sang mamuat ujar*, lit.: „those who make the words", *i.e.*, „spokesmen"; cf. *tuhān mamuat wuwus* in the Kěmbang Arum inscription with the note by Bosch in *Oudh. Versl.*, 1925, p. 48. More common designations are *parujar* and *parwuwus*.

[12]) Or rather, those who dressed up the official act and had it written on the copper-plate. Cf. below.

[13]) It is obvious that the gaining party had more interest to keep the official act than the losing one.

[14]) *Inscr. Ned.-Indië*, I (1940), p. 17 and p. 31.

[15]) More exactly, 1,524786 kg of gold and 0,002412 kg of silver.

much this represented in Old Javanese society, it is obvious that it was sufficient to risk a process for it.

This document is the more interesting because it originates from a region where remains from the Pre-Islamic age are very scarce. Since the copper-plate fragment was discovered under the earth, it seems hardly doubtful that it originates from the region where it was discovered, the regency Dĕmak [16]). Since the plate is dated 860 A.D., it belongs to the reign of king Rakai Kayuwaṅi who ascended the throne in 856 A.D. [17]). Since the edict was issued by the Rakarayān Mapatih, it may further be concluded that the Dĕmak region belonged to Kayuwaṅi's empire [18]). In addition, the copper-plate fragment proves that a regular administration of state existed also in the more remote regions of the empire [19]). The procedure strongly reminds one of cases known from later times [20]).

Finally, it might be interesting to examine the background of this lawsuit in spite of the scarcity of the materials. It has already been noted that the dispute goes between the Ḍapunta Aṅgada and the village elders of a désa the name of which is only incompletely known. The precise value of the title ḍapunta is unknown. Grammatically the form may be analyzed into pu preceded by the honorific prefix ḍa and followed by the suffix -(n)ta, which is the possessive suffix corresponding to kita as an independent pronoun. The suffix, too, might be merely honorific as in rāma-nta, reṇanta, bhagawanta. An interesting reference is K. O. IX, dated 886 A.D., in which

---

[16]) Since half of the village name is lost, the text itself cannot confirm that the plate does originate from that place; copper-plates are easily transported. The only place name mentioned in the text is Bulai (line 4), probably to be identified with the Gunung Wule in the Brahol inscription as was concluded by Damais (B.E.F.E.O., XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, p. 32). This Gunung Wule was situated near the Diëng according to the same text. This Bulai in our text is, however, only the place where the former Rakarayān is buried (lumãh), so that nothing justifies the conclusion that it would have been situated in the neighbourhood of the place of origin of our record.

[17]) Cf. supra, p. 289.

[18]) All the other, numerous, inscriptions of Kayuwaṅi's reign were found either in the Kĕḍu, or in the Prambanan plain and its immediate neighbourhood. Although the king's title does not occur in the epigraph, the mention of two Rakarayāns Mapatih is a guarantee that the edict was issued by the Central Javanese court, which must therefore have dominated the northern coast. This entire region becomes especially important in the 16th century.

[19]) At least as far as the great majority of Hindu Javanese monuments and inscriptions are concerned, the Dĕmak region is relatively very poor. It is impossible to conclude whether this region was also remote from the seat of the central government in those times; as a matter of fact, Stutterheim considered it likely that the kĕraton of the old Central Javanese empire was situated in the north of Central Java, not in the south where most of the later kĕratons (Padjang, Pasargedé, Kerta, Plèrèd, Kartasura, Surakarta and Djogjakarta) were situated (Oudheidkundige Aanteekeningen, XXVI, in Bijdr. K.I., 89, 1932, pp. 278 — 282).

[20]) Cf., for instance, the so-called Jayapattra Dieduksman, published by Brandes in T.B.G., 32 (1889), pp. 98-149, and Stutterheim, Een Javaansche acte van uitspraak uit het jaar 922 A.D., in Epigraphica, III, T.B.G., 75 (1935), pp. 444 — 456.

a ḍapunta or ḍapuntas in the monastery of Panuṅgalan are granted privileges [21]). It might be concluded that ḍapuntas could represent monasteries; although there is no proof that this was always the case, there is not, on the other hand, anything which would oppose this conclusion. If this was the case with the Ḍapunta Aṅgada in our document, too, the decision might be important since it concerned a matter of principles : a conflict in rights between the village and a monastery, between worldly and spiritual power. Then it is not astonishable that no less than three decisions were needed before the affair was finally solved : in a case such as this one any decision is bound to be a precedent for similar cases.

Transcription

1.]lor [22]). mas kā 2 su 7 mā 8 pirak mā 1 kinmit rāmanta i airha-
2.]çi [23]) çuklapakṣa . wu po so . tatkāla muwaḥ pinakakuannakan sang
3.]<maha>rap misanna ikanang mas . ujar rakarayān=mapatiḥ i wka . kinonnaka<n>
4.]<raka>rayān=mapatiḥ sang lumāḥ ing bulai . tanmolaha tātaḥ kinmit rāma<nta>
5.]ta 782 waiçākhamāsa . dwitīya çuklapakṣa . pa ka bu . tatkāla mu<waḥ>
6.]<tumu>luy mojar ḍapuntāṅgada . maharap misanna ikanang mas ataḥ
7.]<u>laḥ-ulahan tātaḥ sadon [24]) rakarayān=mapatiḥ sang rumuhun
8.]wkas rakarayān sang matuha . inalahakan ḍapuntāṅgada . na-
9.]<i>kaing çuddhapātra ing tāmraçāsana . sākṣī sang mamuat ujar
10.]likhita halangmanuk dharmmasinta . [25])

Translation

[1] ..... [26]) North [27]): 2 kāṭi, 7 suvarṇa and 8 māṣa gold anu 1 māṣa silver [28]), kept by the village elders [29]) of Air Ha ..... [30]) [2] ..... ,

---

[21]) Plate I b, line 1: ḍapunta i kawikwan i panuṅgallan.
[22]) Only traces of the taliṅ before the la have remained visible.
[23]) Read : çī. The length of the final -ī of feminine adjectives is often neglected in Old Javanese.
[24]) The second syllable of this word looks rather like -dān, which does not, however, make sense. It seems that the tiny hook before the da is to be considered a taliṅ. As a matter of fact, this vowel mark is written remarkably small in some other words, too.
[25]) The mark of punctuation is uncertain. Since, however, the rest of the line was left open, there is no doubt that the inscription ended here.
[26]) For the length of the lacunae at the beginning of the lines, cf. note 1 above.
[27]) Probably the second part of the name of a village.
[28]) An attempt at calculating these weights is given in the Introduction (cf. note 15). Although the calculation is conjectural, it cannot be doubted that the amount was considerable.
[29]) Rāmanta might be slightly more honorific than rāma; cf. the Introduction.
[30]) The end of the village name is lost. For possible reconstructions of the name, cf. the Introduction.

the -teenth (lunar) day of the bright half of the month [31], on the days Wurukung (of the six days' week), Pon (of the five days' week) and Monday (of the seven days' week), — at this time ..... was again considered an order [32] [3] to acquit the amount of gold all at the same time [33]. Such were the words of the Rakarayān Mapatih of Wĕka [34]. ..... was ordered [4] ..... the Rakarayān Mapatih who is buried [35] at [36] Bulai. (The amount

---

31) Unfortunately, the greater part of this date is lost since neither the year, nor the month is preserved. The number of the lunar day is imperfectly known (11th, 12th, 13th, 14th or 15th of the bright half). A definite combination of three week davs is bound to repeat itself after 210 days. The chance that a -definite combination falls on one of the possible tithis is therefore: 5 × 210 or 1050, i.e. once in about 3 years.

82) Translation of the words muwah pinakakuannakan. In the Introduction it was pointed out that the combination of pinaka-(and maka-) with -akan is unusual, whereas kuan (for kon) is an archaism. There is no doubt that the meaning of the form is entirely different from that of kinonnakan in line 2. Since the most usual meaning of pinaka- is „considered to be (that which is indicated by the base)", the use of this form suggests that something else is again considered an order. Consequently, there have been some arguments to prove that an older decision in this question would not have to be considered an order, probably because there may have been some doubt whether it was valid or not. It may be concluded that the first decision was due to a Rakarayān Mapatih in former times, undoubtedly the same who is mentioned in line 4, was re-examined and confirmed twice, the last time in 860 A.D.

33) Maharap misanna ikanang mas, the same expression which occurs in line 6. It is, however, to be noted that misan cannot be used in this meaning in Modern Javanese where the form misani is used instead. The Javaansch-Nederlandsch Handwoorden-boek by Gericke and Roorda, II, p. 276, explains misani by ñuwisi, „to finish with something". The prevalent notion of pisan and its derivatives is that an act is completed in a single time without being delayed or split up into a number of separate acts; thus, kapisanan means „killed by one blow". If used with reference to a large amount of gold, the term would probably mean „acquitting it" instead of dividing it up into several payments. It has been suggested in the Introduction that there may be circumstances in which it is more advantageous for the debtor to pay an amount off in a single time rather than acquitting it by a number of payments.

34) I suppose that ujar rakarayān=mapatih i wka refers back to the preceding decision. The lacuna between lines 2 and 3 may be reconstituted as follows: tatkāla muwah pinakakuannakan sang ⟨hyang rājapraçasti. inalahakan dapuntāñgada maha⟩ rap misanna ikanang mas. Although the precise wording remains uncertain, the context requires words of about this meaning and the length of the added words would correspond with the supposed length of the lacuna, viz. about 20 syllables.

85) Lumāh, literally „lying", does not necessarily imply a burial in its usual meaning. The term may also be used for a deposit of ashes.

36) It was rightly noted by Damais (B.E.F.E.O., XLVI, Fasc. 1, notes 1 and 4 to p. 32) that Wulai might be identical with the Gunung Wule mentioned in the Bĕrahol inscription dated 861 A.D., since Wule and Bulai may be only orthographic variants. If this identification proves correct, the translation at Bulai should be changed to on the Bulai. This point is the more interesting because the Gunung Wule of the Bĕrahol inscription is stated to be situated on, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, the Diëng plateau As a matter of fact, there are several Diëng inscriptions dated in about the same period, inscriptions which will be examined in detail in the third volume of Prasasti Indonesia which is being prepared for print. We then learn the

of gold) would remain on deposit [37]) with the village elders [5] ...... [Hail.
Çaka years evolved] 782, in the month Vaiçākha, the 2nd (lunar) day of
the bright half of the month, on the weekdays Paniron (six days' week),
Kaliwon (five days' week) and Wednesday, — at this time again [6] .....
After that (?) [38]) Dapunta Aṅgada spoke, expressing his intention of
acquitting himself of the debt all at once [39]). [7] ..... the former Rakarayān
Mapatih's aim had been to avoid any trouble in the future [40]). [8] .....
the intention (?) of the former Rakarayān. Dapunta Aṅgada lost the case.
Thus (?) [41]) [9] ..... this act of acquitment engraved in a copper-plate.
The witnesses were : the representative of [10] ..... clerks from Halang-
manuk and Dharmasinta [42]).

---

interesting fact that the funeral temple of a Rakarayān Mapatih was situated on
(possibly: in the immediate neighbourhood of) the Diëng. One might even suggest
who this Rakarayān Mapatih was. The *patih* mentioned in the Pěrot inscriptions
(No. IX above) is a Rakai Wěka, named Pu Puluwatu *(supra* p. 233, line 5 of the
transcription). Since another *patih* is mentioned in the Argapura inscriptions dated
863 A.D., *viz.* the Rakarayān Wěka Pu Manūt (cf. the quotation by Damais in
T.B.G., 83, 1949, p. 5), it is certain that Pu Puluwatu resigned his office of a *patih*
between 850 and 863, probably by dying. It is therefore all but unlikely that the
Rakarayān Mapatih sang lumāh iṅ Bulai is this Pu Puluwatu of the Perot inscrip-
tions.

[37]) Literally: „guarded by" *(kinmit)*.

[38]) The translation is based on the completion of *luy* to *tumuluy*.

[39]) The last words are a free translation of *misanna ikanaṅ mas;* cf. the Introduction
and note 33 above.

[40]) *Ulah-uiahan* is one of the euphemistic terms used in inscriptions for violating royal
edicts or changing their text. The term is frequently found at the beginning of the
oath formula in Old Javanese inscriptions (cf., for instance, *O.J.O.* LVIII, back, line
29, and *passim)*.

[41]) *Na-* is probably the beginning of *nahan,* „thus".

[42]) The names Halaṅgmanuk and Dharmasinta are always associated with the Rakais
Wěka and Sirikan repectively. As to the former, cf., for instance, the Kěmbang
Arum inscription (published by Bosch in *Oudh. Versl.* 1925, pp. 41-49), second plate
(II), line 2/3: *citralekha halaṅgmanuk si govinda,* mentioned immediately after the
parujar i wka and just before the representative of Tiruan, the title which follows
Wěka immediately in this period. As to the relation between Sirikan and Dharma-
sinta, which is the same as that between Wěka and Halangmanuk, cf. the same
Kěmbang Arum inscription, second plate (II), line 2: *citralekha dharmmasinta si par-
bwata,* mentioned immediately after the *parujar i sirikan* and before the *parujar i
wka.* It is not without interest to call attention to the fact that Halangmanuk is
mentioned before Dharmasinta in this copper-plate inscription; it agrees with the fact
that Rakai Wěka is a higher title than Rakai Sirikan in the Perot and Argapura
inscriptions, since the former title is that of the *patih,* the dignitary mentioned im-
mediately after the king. During the reign of Balitung, however, the *patih* has the
title Rakai Hino, whereas the Rakai Sirikan is mentioned before the Rakai Wěka
and, therefore, considered higher in rank. The above agrees well with the conjecture
mentioned in note 36 above.

ADDENDA

I. One of the introductory strophes in No. III

During my visit to London in December 1954 I succeeded in tracing the strophe mentioned in No. III, c-A-1 (113), or rather, three of its four *pādas*, which are quoted by Pentti Aalto, *Prolegomena to an edition of the Pñcarakṣā*, ed. Soc. Orient. Fennica, XIX (1954), No. 12, pp. 48 sq. The strophe is found in the Mahāmāyūrī (d'Oldenburg, p. 222, lines 16 sqq.) in the following form:

Sarve sattvāḥ sarve prāṇāḥ sarve bhūtāç ca kevalāḥ //
Sarve vai sukhinaḥ santu *sarve santu nirāmayāḥ* /
Sarve bhadrāṇi paçyantu mā kaçcit pāpam āgamat //
Maitracittaṃ samāsthāya karomi viṣadūṣaṇaṃ /
Rakṣāṃ parigrahaṃ caiva tathaiva paripālanam //

It is obvious that the three *pādas* printed in italics agree with those of the çloka in No. III except for a few minor details. Instead of *nirāmanāḥ*, which is, of course, impossible, the Mahāmāyūrī reads *nirāmayāḥ*, which yields a satisfactory meaning. The correction to *nirāmaṇāḥ*, which I proposed in note 50 to p. 113, may be left out. My doubt about the correctness of *santu* proves unjustified.

It is, however, curious that the first pāda disagrees; in our text we have *rūpiṇas = sarvvasattvā hi*, whereas the Mahāmāyūrī reads *sarve vai sukhinaḥ santu*. On the other hand, *rūpiṇah* and *sukhinaḥ* resemble each other and an equivalent of *sarvasattvā hi*, viz. *sarve sattvāḥ*, occurs in the preceding line of the Mahāmāyūrī quotation. As a matter of fact, the reading *rūpiṇah* of our text is meaningless so that I am very much inclined to correct it to *sukhinaḥ*. Presumably, the copyist did not understand *sukhinaḥ* in this connection and replaced it by *rūpiṇah*, a term he knew well. If this is correct, the strophe may be reconstituted as follows:

Sukhinas = sarvasattvā hi sarve santu nirāmayāḥ /
Sarve bhadrāṇi paçyantu mā kaçcit = pāpam = āgamat //

I translate: „May all living beings be happy, may they all be in good health; may they all see what is good for them and may nobody commit evil !"

The disagreement of the first pāda proves that the Mahāmāyūrī could not have been the source from where the compilator of the text of No. III took the çloka. Presumably, both the Mahāmāyūrī and the compilator of

No. III took it from the same source ; as seems to be the case with the *ajñānāc* = *cīyate karma* formula (cf. *supra,* pp. 57 sq.), it may have been a well-known strophe which occurred with differences in detail.

There is no doubt that the strophe belongs to some kind of *praṇidhāna* for the well-being of all living beings. In the Mahāmāyūrī, the first chapter of the Pañcarakṣāsūtra (cf. also Jean Filliozat in L. Renou et J. Filliozat, *L'Inde Classique,* II (1853), § 2014, p. 374), the strophe is used as a charm against the disastrous effect of snake bites : by uttering the ardent wish for the health and happiness of all living beings, by practising the spirit of love towards the creatures (*maitracitta*) one creates a force which is an anti-dote against snake poison (*karomi viṣadūṣaṇaṃ* etc.). There is, however, no reason to assume that the strophe was originally and exclusively intended to be used as a snake charm ; as a matter of fact, it has a different, more general, purpose in the text of No. III : it refers to superior wisdom, especially knowledge of the causes of origination and decay, as a kind of antidote against the evil influences of ignorance and *karman.*

Although the occurrence of the greater part of the strophe in the Pañ-carakṣā does not establish from where the compiler of No. III took the çloka, the correspondence proves important for several reasons. First, it ena-bles us to determine the correct wording of the strophe with a reasonable degree of certainty ; second, it reveals the meaning of the çloka and its bearing upon the text of No. III ; and third, it may bring us a step nearer to the source from which the compiler of No. III took the çloka.

II. Some notes on Ullaṅgha's Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra

In the autumn of 1954 I had the occasion to visit some librariers in Europe and to consult some of the works I badly needed for the edition of No. III (cf. *supra,* note 195 to p. 107). L. de la Vallée Poussin, *Théorie des douze causes* (1913), did not supply important additional information, mainly because the author referred to his previous conclusions in his great Abhidharmakoça translation. On the other hand, the publication by Vasudev Gokhale, *Ullaṅgha's Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra,* Doctoral Thesis Bonn (1930), 31 pp., V Tafeln, prov-ed to be very useful. Ullaṅgha's Çāstra proves to give most of the divisions found in No. III, c-A-6 to e-B-7 (pp. 114-117) ; cf. especially pp. 8 sq., *Tabelle der Einteilungsarten der zwölfgliedrigen Kausalreihe nach Ullaṅgha's Lehr-buch.* As a matter of fact, seven different divisions are given there :

(a) the threefold (or sixfold) division into *kleça* (*aṅgas* 1 ; 8, 9), *karman* (2 ; 10) and *vipāka* or *duḥkha* (3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ; 11 and 12) in strophe 6.

(b) the threefold division into *pratīta, pratyutpanna* and *anāgata* in strophe 7.

(c) the two- or four-fold division into *hetu* (1, 2 ; 8-10) and *phala* (3-7 ; 11, 12) in strophe 10.

(d) a twofold division into *avidyāmūla* (1-7) and *tṛṣṇāmūla* (8-12).

(e) a division into four groupings, *saṃkṣepa* (1-2; 3-7; 8-10; 11-12) with three nodes, *saṃdhi* (between 2 and 3; 7 and 8; 10 and 11).

(f) a fivefold division into *pañca duḥkhasthityaḥ* denoted by terms which Gokhale translated from the Chinese text by „Agens", „Mutterschoss", „Sinnesbereich", „Auswirkung" and „Entstehen" corresponding to the *aṅgas* „zwei, zwei, drei, drei, zwei". It is obvious that this division is identical with that of No. III, d-A-1 to 2, which gives :

1. *kāraka* (*aṅgas* 1 and 2),
2. *garbha* (3 and 4),
3. *viṣayapravṛtti* (5, 6 and 7),
4. *prabhava* (8, 9 and 10),
5. *pravāha* (11 and 12).

For 1 and 2, Gokhale reconstituted the very terms *kāraka* and *garbha* on the basis of the Chinese terms. For 3, Gokhale reconstituted *viṣaya*, but *viṣayapravṛtti* seems more satisfactory. However, Nos. 4 and 5 do not agree ; it may be doubted whether the Chinese interpretation or, perhaps, the interpretation of the Chinese version is correct, for „Auswirkung" and „Entstehen" do not appear to make sense in this connection. The terms *prabhava* and *pravāha* do make sense, the former denoting existence (*bhava*) with its direct and indirect causes (*upādāna* and *tṛṣṇā*), the latter the ever-returning cycle of deaths and re-births.

The text published by Gokhale has the great advantage of yielding a more satisfactory interpretation of the fivefold division. It now seems clear that this division is based upon five stages of a disease in its complete form (Gokhale translates „die fünf Zustände während der Dauer des Leidens" from Chinese, which corresponds to *pañca duḥkhasthityaḥ* or *duḥkhāvasthāḥ*). The disease is, of course, existence ; the indirect cause is Ignorance, the more direct *kāraka* is *saṃskāra*, which is threefold (cf. the three *doṣas*). *Garbha* corresponds with the latent period, *viṣayapravṛtti* with the first symptoms announcing the ailment, *prabhava* is the outbreak of the disease followed by the ever-continuing series (*pravāha*) of births and deaths, like a recurrent fever.

(g) an eightfold division into eight „fruits" (Gokhale, strophes 15-17) corresponding with the division of No. III, d-A-9 to d-B-2 (p. 116). The eight terms used by Gokhale are : Betörung, Entfaltung, Vergeltung, natürliche Folgeerscheinung, Leidenschaft, Elend, Entwicklung, natürliche Folgeerscheinung. No. III has : *saṃmoha, ārambha, vipāka, niṣyanda, santāna, ...* (?), *nirvṛtti, aniṣṭa.* There is com-

plete agreement between the first, third and fourth fruits; the second fruit disagrees; the fifth fruit, *santāna* does not make sense in our text, but should be corrected to *santāpa* which is excellent for *tṛṣṇā* and *upādāna* and corresponds with „Leidenschaft"; the sixth fruit was erroneously omitted by the copyist of No. III; it could have been *kārpaṇya* or a synonym. For *nirvṛtti* I gave a wrong translation on p. 145; the Chinese interpreted it correctly in the meaning of *abhinirvṛtti* as it is used in III, b-B-2 (111) ; for the eighth and last fruit the Chinese version seems to repeat the fourth term, which is unsatisfactory, whereas No. III gives *aniṣṭaphala*. It follows from the above analysis that four of the eight fruits agree and a fifth may be made to agree by a small emendation (*santāpa*) ; of the three fruits which remain one is indecisive for a comparison because it was left out in No. III. Only for two fruits is there serious disagreement, for which I do not see a plausible explanation. In spite of this, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the fundamental identity of the eightfold division in Ullaṅgha's Çāstra and the text of No. III.

In addition, Ullaṅha's Çāstra throws an interesting light upon the importance attached to the above divisions in Mahāyāna. As is expressed in the third *kārikā* (Gokhale, p. 29) it is a means of arriving at an intuition of Çūnyatā — which is, by the way, an idea similar to that expressed in III, c-A-4/5 (114), if my interpretation in the Introduction to No. III is correct. On the whole, it seems to me that the correspondences with Ullaṅgha's Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra give an additional and strong argument in favour of my surmise (*supra*, pp. 99 sqq.) about the Mahāyānic and, more precisely, Mādhyamika character of the Upadeça of No. III above

---

c. Recent discoveries on the Ratubaka plateau

After the text of *Prasasti Indonesia II* had already been printed, four new inscriptions, three of which were fragmentary, were discovered on the Ratubaka Plateau in Central Java. One of the fragments is inscribed with Pre-Nāgarī, it proves to be the right hand part of the Buddhist inscription five other fragments of which were dealt with in *Prasasti Indonesia I* (1950). Considering the important new data contained in this fragment, I intend to publish the entire text again.

The other two fragmentary inscriptions and the complete text are Çaiva; they belong to the same group as the texts published above as No. X, a-c (pp. 244 to 279). At least two of the three new texts relate the erection of Çivaliṅgas by king Kumbhayoni; again two different names of the god are used, *viz.* Çambhu and Pinākin. Among the most important new data supplied by the complete inscription I mention the name of the kingdom over

which the mysterious god-king, ancestor of Kumbhayoni, ruled, given as *musalākhyarāṣṭra*. Since the Sanskrit word *musala* means „pestle", it is the exact equivalent of the Old Javanese name Halu, which is the name of the kingdom of Pu Kumbhayoni's ancestor according to the Pereng inscription [1]. So this new inscription gives a strong confirmation to my conclusion (*supra*, p. 253) that Pu Kumbhayoni in the Pereng epigraph is identical with the king Çī Kumbhaja or Kalaçodbhava in the Ratubaka inscriptions. Again it confirms that Halu, in the title *sang ratu i halu*, is not an abbreviation of the title Rakai Halu, but the name of the empire of the mysterious god-king. This, by the way, easily explains how the *halu* became a real symbol of royal power, as is reflected in the title Rakai Halu of one of the highest court dignitaries throughout the history of Java and, still more, in the symbolical erection of a rice pestle by king Airlanga at the beginning of his reign [2].

One of the fragmentary inscriptions [3] gives still further materials. There, a complete genealogy of Kumbhayoni is given in strophes 2 to 5; first we have the god-king (strophe 2), then his son (*tasmāt = prasūto* ......) about whom we learn the usual common-places in strophe 3 [4]. The third king (strophe 4) is again the son of the king mentioned in strophe 3 (*tasya sūnur* ......) ; his sphere of action seems to have been the sea, for it is stated that he was foremost in protecting the ocean, just as Varuṇa (*pāti pāçabhṛd = ivārṇṇavam = agryaḥ*). The fourth and last king is Çrī Kumbhayoni (strophe 5), whose knowledge of the Çāstras is praised as in the three texts of No. X above (strophe 5, pāda *d : çāstrārthanirmmalamatir*). Strophe 6 is particularly interesting since it mentions, in each of its pādas, four succeeding capitals of Kumbhayoni, viz. the lofty Dava (*tungam dawākhyam puram*), then Laṅkapura, further Nirjjhara and, finally, Walaing. The last strophe strongly confirms the interpretation of Walaing (Valainga) suggested on pp. 255 sq. At least it follows from the new discovery that Walaing was

---

[1] Cf. *supra*, pp. 251 sqq.

[2] Cf. line 14 of the Old Javanese part of the Calcutta inscription (*ikanang halu pinaka-kapratiṣṭhān çrī mahārāja . matangyan rake halu crī lokeçwara dharmmawangça airlangānantawikramottungadewa saṃjñā kāstwan çrī mahārāja de mpunku sogata māheçwara)*. Kern's translation in *Verspr. Geschr.* VII cannot be maintained; I fully agree with the interpretation suggested by Bosch in *Oudh. Versl. 1925*, p. 47. It seems that inscription No. XI above alludes to a similar ceremony in strophe 12; the text is unfortunately badly mutilated, but the interpretation does not seem doubtful in its essentials (cf. note 42 to p. 321). The possibility of Halu having been an ancient royal residence, as was suggested in the last sentence of the first alinea of p. 300 above, becomes at least a probability.

[3] The fragment is the left hand part of a beautifully inscribed stone, giving a little more than half of the text. The text contains nine Sanskrit strophes in nine different metres *(viz.* Anuṣṭubh, Āryā, Indravajra, Svāgata, Vasantatilaka, Çārdūlavikrīḍita, Bhramitākṣara, Praharṣiṇī and Drutavilambita).

[4] Thus, the king was a *pureça*, he tamed the multitude of his foes *(çamitāgharāçi)*, being a *rāçir-guṇānām* himself.

the last of the four residences of king Kumbhayoni, undoubtedly connected with his final victory. I hope to be able to deal with the location of Kumbhayoni's three other residences in the near future in a detailed publication about the new Ratubaka epigraphs. At present I confine myself to the remark that the king's four succeeding residences might well be connected with the struggles for supremacy discussed in the introductions to Nos. X and XI.

WORD INDEX

a. Old Malay [1])

-a — suffix, often spelt *-ā*, used to form abstract nouns (cf. C. 63) or, possibly, to express future or irreality; cf. *s. v. dātu, ruru, vuat.*

abhiprāya — *abhiprāyāña*, II-23 (35).

āçraya — *āçrayamāmu*, II-15 (34).

āda — II-7, 12, 16, 18 (33-35) ; cf. 24 and *Pras. Indon.,* I, 71,

addhyākṣī — II-4 (32) ; wrong spelling for *adhyakṣa* ?

adhikaraṇa — II-4 (32) ; 20.

āhāra (?) — II-13 (34) ; C. 66.

akan — II-20, 21, 22 (35), 25, 27 (36).

āku — II-5, 7 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15 (34), 17, 18, 20, 21, 23 (35), 25 (36) ; C. 66.

alit — *mañalit*, II-11 (33) ; 40.

amala — cf. *s.v. tantrāmala.*

amātya — cf. *s.v. kumārāmatya.*

amgap — *umamgap*, I, a-16 (5).

amithyā — I, a-18 (5).

an — II-2 (?), 4 (32), 9 (33).

anak — *anakda*, I, a-3 (5) ; *anakmāmu*, II-19 (35) ; *anakvinimāmu*, II-25 (36).

anucāra — *makānucāra*, II-6 (33) ; 38.

apa — I, a-18 (5).

ārambha — II-8 (33) ; 26, 39 ; cf. *s.v. sārambha.*

ārjava — cf. *s.v. sārjava.*

āsannakāla — 22 ; C. 66.

āsannaphala — *āsannaphalāña*, II-27 (37) ; 46.

āṣāḍha — I, e-6 (14) ; II-28 (36) ; 12, 18.

athavā — II-6, 8, 9, 10 (33) ; 14, 16 (34) ; 17 (?), 18 (35) ; 26, 27 (36).

avadya — II-27 (36) ; 46; cf. Index *c, s.v.*

āyu-āyu — *mi-āyu-āyu*, II-7 (33) ; 38.

bhakti — II-3 (32), 5 (33), 20, 24 (35), 25 (36) ; C. 74 ; the word is always used in the meaning „loyal, submissive" ; cf. 27, 38.

bharu — I, a-10 (5) ; *nibharu* (?), I, a-12 (5).

bhasma — in *marūpabhasmavaidimantraprayoga,* II-13 (34) ; 30.

bhūpati — II-3 (32) ; 37.

bhūpura — 30.

---

[1]) Numbers preceded by C. refer to the Word Index by G. Cœdès, *B.E.F.E.O.,* XXX (1930), pp. 63-80.

cakṣu — 17, 22 ; cf. *s.v. paracakṣu.*

cāthabhata — II-4 (32) ; 20 ; the correct spelling is *cāṭabhaṭa.*

cāri — *nicāri,* II-10 (33) ; owing to a lacuna in the transcription, the context is not clear; the word may be derived from Sanskrit *cārin,* „going around" etc. ; *tjari,* in modern Indonesian, means „to look for, to seek".

caru — *mañcaru,* II-11 (33) ; 41.

cihna — II-14 (34) ; 42.

corakāra (?) — *mañcorakāra,* II-8 (33), but the reading is not certain ; presumably Sanskrit *caurakāra,* but this compound is not known to occur.

cūrikā — *cūrikāṅku,* I, a-6 (5) ; undoubtedly Sanskrit *chūrikā.*

çānti — II-26 (36) ; 21, 25 ; C. 78.

çāsana — *çāsanāña,* II-22 (35).

çatru — *çatruṅku,* II-6, 10 (33), 12 (34), 20 (35).

cihna — II-14 (34) ; 42.

çrī — I, a-1 (4).

çrīyantra — *makaçrīyantra,* II-12 (34) ; 30, 34, 41.

-ḍa — suffix, 3 ; cf. *s.v. -ṇḍa.*

daṃ — I, a-20 (6) ; C. 70.

dañan — I, a-5 (5) ; II-12 (23) ; 3 ; C. 70 ; cf. *s.v. dñan.*

daṇḍa — II-18 (35) ; *nidaṇḍa,* II-18 (35) ; *daṇḍaṅku,* II-19 (35) ; *daṇḍakudaṇḍa,* II-15 (34) ; 27.

daṇḍanāyaka — II-3 (32) ; 27.

ḍapunta hiyaṃ — 9 sq. ; C. 68 sq., 73 sq. *(s.v. punta).*

daraḥ — II-12 (34).

dari — I, a-2 (4), a-6 (5) ; II-5, 6, 7, 8, 11 (33), 13, 16 (34), 22, 24 (35) ; C. 70.

ḍātaṃ — I, e-5, 6 (14) ; II-18 (35) ; C. 70.

dātu — II-6, 10 (33) ; *datūa,* II-15 (34), 20, 21 (35) ; *parddatvan,* I, a-1 (3) ; *parddatuan,* II-10 (33) ; *kadātuan,* II-8, 11 (33), 20 (35) ; 17 ; C. 70 *(dātu, datūa),* 67 *(kadātuan),* the new texts seem to establish that *kadātuan* has the meaning „royal residence" (kraton in Javanese), rather than „territoire sous l'autorité d'un *dātu"* (C. 67). As to *datūa,* one might hesitate between the interpretations of Kern *(Verspr. Geschr.,* VII, 213) and Cœdès *(art. cit.,* 63, 70).

ḍeha — *paḍehānda,* VIII-1 (208) ; the use of dentals and linguals is just the contrary of what would have been expected.

deça — II-14 (34).

dhava — II-24 (35) ; C. 71.

di — I, a-8 (5), e-5 (?), 8 (14) ; II-7, 9 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15 (34), 17, 18, 19, 20, 23 (35) ; 26 (36) ; C. 70 ; cf. *s.v. dia, dīya, dy-.*

dia — II-17 (35) ; cf. *s.v. dīya.*

dīri — II-14 (34) ; *dirīña,* II-?9 (33), 15 (34).

divasa — *divasāña,* II-26 (36).

dīya — II-15 (34), 28 (36) ; C. 71.

dñan — I, a-21 (6), II-17, ?19, 20, 22 (35), 25 (36) ; C. 71 ; cf. *s.v. dañan.*

doṣa — II-25 (36) ; C. 71.

dravya — II-9 (33).

drohaka — II-5, 7 (33), 24 (35) ; 17, 27, C. 71.

dua — I, a-14 (5), e-5 6 (14) ; C. 71.

dūruṃ — II-23 (35).

dy — instead of *di* before a vowel, II-5, 7 (33), 12, 13, 14 (34), 17, 18, 20, 23 (35) ; sometimes, however, we find *diy* in the same position : II-15 (34), 25 (36) ; C. 71.

galar — *nigalarku*, II-18 (35) ; *nigalarmāmu*, II-11 (33) ; 15; C. 71 ; cf. *s.v. saṃvarddhi*.

gīla — *makagīla*, II-14 (34) ; 38.

gītodyāna — perhaps I, e-7 (15).

gotra — *gotramāmu*, II-19, 22 (35) ; *kulagotramitrasantānamāmu*, II-21 (35) ; C. 68.

graṃ — II-22 (35), 25 (36). Here and at the two *loci* mentioned by C. 68, the word is found before *kadāci*. Although it is obvious that the word is connected with *gĕranan* in modern Indonesian (cf. Blagden, *J.S.B.R.A.S.*, 64, 1913, 70 ; 65, 1913, 37), its use seems slightly different. The meaning of *graṃ kadāci* appears to be : „if, on the contrary", „if, however". As a matter of fact, *kadāci* alone is used to formulate crimes with their sanctions, whereas *graṃ kadāci* is found towards the end of the texts when good acts with recompenses are mentioned.

gulas — II-27 (36) ; presumably identical with *gula* in Indonesian (Sanskrit and Prākrit *guḍa* or *gula*), but the final *-s* is strange.

hāji — *vini hāji*, II-9 (33) ; *hulun hāji*, II-5 (32) ; probably in the hybrid compound *haji-pratyaya*, II-3 (32) ; 20.

hanun — 26 ; inscription II gives *vānun* in the same context ; C. 79 („mot de sens inconnu") ; R.A. Kern, *Bijdr. K.I.*, 88 (1931), 512 sqq. ; cf. *s.v. vānun*.

havaṃ — VIII-1 (208 sq.), transribed *hawang*.

hīnamaddhyamottamajāti — II-8 (33).

hulu — II-6 (33).

hulun — II-5 (32) ; 20, 37; cf. *s.v. hāji*.

huluntuhāṅku — II-7, 9, 11 (33), 12, 14 (34), 17, 23 (35) ; 26.

ini — I, a-4, 13, 16 (5) ; e-8 (15) ; II-13, 14 (34), 21, 22, ?24 (35), 25, 26 (36) ; VIII-1 (208 sq.) ; C. 66.

iya — I, a-8 (5) ; II-25, 28 (36) ; C. 66.

jādi — I, a-6 (5) ; C. 68.

jāhat — II-14 (34) ; C. 68.

jana — II-9 (33), 21 (35) ; 44.

jānan — 25 ; C. 68.

jayasiddhayātra — 1 ; C. 68 ; cf. Index b, *s.v. siddhayātra*.

ka — II-6, 9, 10 (33), 22 (35) ; C. 67 ; cf. *s.v. kamāna.*

kadāci — II-5, 6, 7 (33), 13, 15 (34), 17, 18, 20, 22 (35), 25 (36) ; 16 ; C. 67.

kalvana — II-27 (36).

kāma — I, a-15 (5) ; 4.

kamāna — II-28 (36) ; cf. *s.v. māna.*

kāmu — II-3, ?5 (32), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 (34), 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 (35) ; 25 (36) ; 21-23 ; cf. *s.v. kita.* Curiously enough, the word does not occur in any other Çrīvijaya inscription.

karmma... (?) — II-4 (32).

kāryya — *makārryāña,* I, a-4 (5) ; *nikāryyākan,* I, a-19 ; *makāryya,* II-27 (36) ; perhaps *kāryya,* II-25 (36) ; cf. *s.v. kriyākarmmakāryyakarādi.*

kasīhan — II-13 (34) ; 22, 30 ; C. 67.

kāyastha — II-4 (32) ; 20.

kita — 21.

krama — I, a-18 (5).

kriyākarmmakāryyakarādi — II-16 (34) ; 42.

krodha — I, a-15 (5) ; 4.

-ku — suffix, in *kadatuanku,* II-8, 11 (33) ; *daṇḍaku,* II-15 (34) ; *nigalarku,* II-18, 19 (35) ; *nisamvarddhiku,* II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35), 26 (36).

kula — *kulamāmu,* II-6, 11 (33) ; *kulagotramitrasantānamāmu,* II-21 (35).

kumārāmātya — II-4 (32) ; 20.

kuṣṭa — Sanskrit *kuṣṭha,* II-13 (34) ; 22, 30, 41.

lābha — *lābhamāmu,* II-24 (35) ; 44.

lai — II-6, 7, 9, 10, 11 (33), 13, 14, 15 (34), 17, 18, 20 (35) ; 21-23 ; C. 77.

lañit — *mckalañit,* II-8 (33), 13, 14, 15 (34) ; C. 74. Kern, *Verspr. Geschr.,* VII, 212. I translated „making crazy", but „making impotent" might be preferable. *Lĕngit,* in modern Indonesian (especially at Djakarta), means „indolent, lazy", but then with the back-thought of making money by sly means without working. Thus, Poerwadarminta, *Kamus Umum* (1952), p. 409, adds „banjak akal buruk" between brackets.

larī — II-6, 7, 10 ; *mamlarī,* II-9 (33) ; *larīyakan,* II-9/10 (33) ; 40.

lavan — II-6 (33) ; C. 76.

lilu — I, a-19 (5), possibly a name.

lñit — *makalñit,* I, a-20 (6) ; 4 ; cf. *s.v. lañit.*

lobha — I, a-15 (5).

lpas — I, a-12 (5) ; 12 sq. ; C. 75, *s.v. marlapas.*

luar — II-9 (33), 12 (34), 19 (35).

luvī — II-5 (33) ; 11.

ma- — prefix, in *makāryya,* II-27 (36) ; *makāryyāña,* I, a-4 (5) ; *marūpabhasmavaidimantraprayoga,* II-13 (34) ; *ma-* followed by a base with initial nasal, cf. *s.v. mam-* ; cf. also *s.v. mar-* and *maka-.*

maka — *maka ya lñit,* a kind of tmesis (?), I, a-20 (6).

maka- — in *makalñit,* I, a-20 (6) ; *makamatai* (?), II-2 (32) ; *makānucāra,*
II-6 (33) ; *makatālu,* II-8 (33) ; *makaçrīyantra,* II-12 (34) ; *makagīla,*
II-14 (34) ; *makalañit,* II-14, 15 (34).

mākan — *nimākan,* II-25 (36) ; 45.

mālam — *samālam,* II-27 (36).

malūn — II-7, 9, 10, 11 (33) ; pp. 21, 24, 40.

mam- — prefix, with assimilation of the nasal before stems beginning with
velars, palatals and labials, in *mañujāri,* II-7, 9 (33) ; *mamlarī,* II-9 (33) ;
mamruruā, II-10, 11 (33) ; *mamrakṣa,* II-18 (35) ; *mamrakṣāña,* II-20
(35) ; *mañalit,* II-11 (33) ; *mamāva,* II-9 (33) ; *mañcaru,* II-11 (33) ; C. 63.

mammam — II-5, 7 (33) ; 38; C. 74.

-māmu — suffix, corresponding with *kāmu,* in *vañakmāmu,* II-5 (32) ; *kula-
māmu,* II-6, 11 (33) ; *mitramāmu,* II-6, ?19 (35) ; *vaduamāmu,* II-6 (33) ;
āçrayamāmu, II-15 (34) ; *katāhumāmu,* II-17 (35) ; *sthānamāmu,* II-18
(35) ; *vinimāmu,* II-19 (35) ; *anakmāmu,* II-19 (35) ; *anakvinimāmu,*
II-25 (36) ; *santānamāmu,* II-19, 22 (35) ; *gotramāmu,* II-19, 22 (35) ;
kulagotramitrasantānamāmu, II-21 (35) ; *pallavamāmu,* II-19 (35) ; *nimi-
numāmu,* II-21, 22 (35) ; 26, 27 (36) ; *samaryyādamāmu,* II-24 (35) ;
lābhamāmu, II-24 (35) ; *vuatmāmu,* II-24 (35).

māna — I, a-7 (5) ; cf. *s.v. kamāna.*

mañcak — *mamañcak,* I, a-13 (5) ; 4; C. 74

maṇḍala — 18; cf. *s.v. sakalamaṇḍala.*

mani — instead of *maṇi,* II-11 (33).

mantri (?) — II-23 (35), but the reading is uncertain.

mantrika — II-17 (34).

mar- — prefix, in *marsvastha,* I, a-8 (5), II-17 (35) ; *marvyūha* (?), I, a-10
(5) ; *marvuddhi,* II-5 (33), 20 (35) ; *marppādah,* II-7, 11 (33), 13 (34),
17 (35) ; *marcorakāra,* II-8 (33) ; *marvuat,* II-9. 10, 11 (33), 14 (34), 21
(35), 25 (36) ; *marvuddhisāraṇa,* II-11 (33), 14 (34) ; *marsamjñāvuddhi,*
II-11 (33) ; the prefix *ma-* (cf. *supra*) is probably *mar-* the final *-r* of
which disappeared as a consequence of dissimilation (cf. *makāryya* and
marūpa°), just as in modern Indonesian (cf. *bĕladjar*). For the use of
the prefix cf. Cœdès, 63, who states that „il donne aux verbes une valeur
analogue à celle du moyen" ; there are, however, exceptions such as
marvuat above and *marjahāti* in line 7 of the Kotakapur inscription.

marsī — *marsī haji,* II-5 (32) ; 20, 37.

muara — I, a-16 (5).

maryyāda — *maryyādaṇḍa,* I, a-2 (4) ; *samaryyādapatha,* II-13 ; *samaryyāda,*
II-26 (36) ; *samaryyādamāmu,* II-24 (35).

mas — II-9, 11 (33).

māti — II-10 (33) ; 40.

mi- — prefix, only in *mi-āyuāyu,* II-7 (33). The meaning is clearly causative
as in Old Javanese and in modern Javanese (cf. *misah).*

minum — II-24 (35), ?26 (36) ; *niminumāmu,* II-21, 22 (35), 25, 26, 27 (36) ; C. 72, *s.v. niminumnya.*

mitra — *mitramāmu,* II-6 (33), ?19 (35) ; *mitrāṅku* (?), I, a-21 (6) ; *kulagotramitrasantānamāmu,* II-21 (35).

muah — II-8 (33), 21, 22 (35), 26, 28 (36) ; *muahña,* II-26 (36) ; *nimuah,* II-26 (36) ; *nimuahña,* II-23/24 (36). Cf. 21, 24 sq., 46 ; C. 75 sq. Dr. Cœdès rightly noted that my explanation of *muah* in the Talang Tuwo inscription (p. 24) meets with the serious objection that *vuah* also occurs in the same text. It is true that the objection might not be decisive, but it is safe to wait till further materials are available.

mulam — II-7, 8 (33), 1?, 15, 16, 17 (34), 17, 21 (35) ; *nimulam,* II-22 (35) ; *kamulamña,* II-18 (35). Together with *muah* above, the meaning remains a *crux;* cf. the conjectural explanations, 25 sq., 42, 43, 44, 45 ; C. 76.

muara — I, a-16 (5).

-ña — suffix, in *pramirahña,* I, a-5 (5) ; *vañakña,* I, e-5 (14) *diriña* (?), II-9 (33) ; *tahuña,* II-11 (33), *sthānāña,* II-12 (34) ; *vuatña, prāṇāña,* II-14 (34) ; *diriña,* II-15 (34) ; *prakārāña,* II-16 (34), 17 (35) ; *sakalamaṇḍalāña,* II-20 (35) ; *çāsanāña,* II-22 (35) ; *abhiprāyāña,* II-23 (35) ; *pūrvvāña,* II-23 (35) ; *divasāña,* II-26 (36) ; *āsannaphalāña;* II-27 (36) ; *tamūña,* II-28 (36). Together with the suffix *-a* (*-ā*) in *vuatāña,* II-15 (34) ; with *ma-, makāryyāña,* I, a-4 (5) ; with *ka-, kamulamña,* II-18 (35) ; with *ni-, nipiṅanña* (?), II-12 (34) ; *nitamūña,* II-28 (36) ; with *mam-, mamrakṣāña* II-20 (35) ; with *sa-, savañakña,* II-16 (34) ; with *par-* and *-ā, parvuatāña,* II-17 (35) ; with *ka-, -an* and *-a, kavuatanāña,* II-26 (36).

nariyāt (?) — I, a-17 (5).

nāyaka — II-3 (32) ; 19, 27, 37 ; cf. also Index b, *s.v.*

ni- — prefix, in *nitāpik,* I, a-9, 11 (5) ; II-26 (36) ; *nivunuh,* II-5 (32), 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (34), 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 (35), 25 (36) ; *nicāri,* II-10 (33) ; *nisuruh,* II-21, 23 (35) ; *nimākan,* II-25 (36) ; *nivava,* II-26 (36) ; *nimuah,* II-26 (36) ; *nisamjñā,* II-27 (36) ; together with *-kan, nikāryyākan,* I, a-19 (5) ; with *-i, niujāri,* II-23 (35) ; with *-(n)ku, nirakṣāṅku,* II-8 (33) ; *nigalarku,* II-18, 19 (35) ; *nisamvarddhiku,* II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35) ; 26 (36) ; with *-māmu, niminumāmu,* II-21, 22 (35), 25, 26, 27, (36); *nigalarmāmu,* II-11 (33); with *-ña,* cf. *s.v. -ña ;* with *par-* and *-(a)kan, niparsumpahakan,* II-20 (35) ; cf. 3 ; C. 63.

nibharu — I, a-12 (5) ; with the prefix *ni-* ?

nijavarṇa — II-4 (32).

nirbhāra — I, a-11 (5).

om — II-1 (32)

pādah- — *marppādah,* II-7, 11 (33), 12, 13 (34), 17 (35), 23 (35) ; 38 ; C. 75.

pam- — in *pamvalyanku,* II-25 (36) ; cf. note 56 to p. 31.

paracakṣu — II-6, 10 (33) ; 22.

par- — with *-an, parddātvan* (?), I, a-1 (4), *parddatuan,* II-10 (33) ; with *ni-* and *-(a)kan, niparsumpahakan,* II-20 (35) ; with *-a* and *-ña, parvuatāña,* II-17 (35); with *-ṇḍa, parvvāṇḍa,* I, a-11 (5); II-15 (34), 26 (36); perhaps also in *paravis,* I, a-7 (5) ; 3, 18, 42, 46 ; C. 63 (*par-*), 73 (*parvāṇḍa*), 72 sq. (*parāvis*).

paracakṣu — II-6, 10 (33) ; 22.

parāvis — cf. s.v. *par-*.

pallava — *pallavamāmu,* II-19 (35).

pasaṃ — I, a-15 (5).

pātrc — II-12 (34).

pauravirakta — I, a-9 (5).

piṅan (?) — *nipiṅanña,* II-12 (34).

prajā — I, a-13, 16 (5) ; II-8 (33), 23 (35).

pradhāna — I, a-21 (6).

prakāra — II-16, 17 (35).

pramirah — *pramirahña,* I, a-5 (5).

prāna (sic) — II-13 (34) ; cf. s.v. *prāṇa.*

prāṇa — *prāṇāña,* II-14 (34) ; cf. s.v. *prāna* and *sarvvaprāṇa.*

pratisāra — II-4 (32) ; 20.

pratiyuvarāja — II-20, 21, 22 (35) ; 17.

pratyaya — II-4 (32) ; cf. 19, 27, 37 ; I add the following references in inscriptions from Cambodia, G. Cœdès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge,* I (1937), 180 ; II (1942), 56, 109 ; III (1951), 75 ; 168. Cœdès translates : „homme de confiance", „curateur" and „commis", the last term kept intentionally vague („volontairement vague").

prostāra (?) — II-3 (32), but the reading is uncertain.

puhāvaṃ — II-4 (32) ; 12 ; cf. Index *b,* s.v. *hawang.*

pūrvva — perhaps in II-8 (33) ; *pūrvvāña* II-21, 23 (35) ; as to the uncertain reading of II-8, I add that a recent re-examination of the stone convinced me that the correct reading is *pūrvvāña tālu muahña,* instead of *pūrvva katālu muahña* as printed on p. 33 above.

raijya — I, a-8 (5) ; presumably for *rājya.*

rājakumāra — II-20, 21, 22 (35) ; 17.

rakṣa — *maṃrakṣa,* II-18 (35) ; *maṃrakṣāña,* II-20 (35).

rumah — II-9 (33) ; cf. s.v. *tñah.*

rūpa — cf. the compound which follows.

rūpabhasmavaidimantraprayoga, preceded by *ma-* — II-13 (34) ; 30, 41.

ruru — *maṃruruā,* II-10, 11 (33) ; 40.

sa- — prefix, in *samaryyādapatha,* II-13 (34) ; *samaryyāda,* II-17 (35) ; *samaryyādamāmu,* II-24 (35); *sārambha,* II-24 ; *sārjjava,* II-24 (35), 25 (36); *savātu,* II-27 (36) ; *samālam,* II-27 (36). — In several cases there may be doubt whether *sa-* is the Indonesian, or the Sanskrit prefix. Only for *sārjjava,* it seems certain that the Sanskrit prefix with associative

meaning is used; cf. the examples given by Wackernagel, *Altind.
Gramm.*, II, 1 (1905), § 30, b, α (p. 74) ; Whitney, § 1305 (p. 509) ; espe-
cially for adverbs, Whitney, § 1313ƒ (p. 513). Unlike Cœdès (p. 79), I
take *sa-* in *sārambha* as the Indonesian prefix, translating all the enter-
prises (used as a euphemism; cf. note 16 to p. 38). The Indonesian
prefix *sa-* means either „one" (in *samālam* and *savātu*) or „all" (all the
other examples) ; cf. in modern Indonesian, *sĕhari sĕmalam,* „one day
and night" and *sĕtauku,* for all I know".

sakalamaṇḍala — *sakalamaṇḍalāña,* II-20 (35).

sākit — II-11 (33).

samaryyāda — cf. *s.v.* *sa-* and *maryyāda.*

samaya — *samayaṅku,* II-13 (34).

saṃjñā — *nisaṃjñā,* II-27 (36) ; cf. *s.v.* *saṃjñāvuddhi.*

saṃjñāvuddhi — *marsaṃjñāvuddhi,* II-11 (35) ; cf. *s.v.* *saṃjñā* and *s.v.*
vuddhi.

saṃkṣepa — I, a-14 (5) ; cf. Index b, *s.v.* *saṃkṣepataḥ.*

saṃsthāna — II-12 (34) ; 30.

samvarddhi — Sanskrit *samvṛddhi* („power, might"), in *nisamvarddhiku,*
II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35), 26 (36) ; 18, 46. Unlike *nigalarku* (cf. *s.v.* *galar*),
the term applies to honorary functions.

saṅkaṭe (?) — I, a-17 (5).

sanmata — II-23 (35).

santāna — *santānamāmu,* II-19 (35) ; *kulagotramitrasantānamāmu,* II-21 (35).

sanyāsa — Sanskrit *saṃnyāsa* (*sannyāsa*), I, a-14 (5) ; II-15 (34), 20 (35) ;
18, 41 ; C. 78.

sārambha — cf. *s.v.* *sa-* and *s v.* *ārambha;* C. 79.

sāraṇa — cf. *s.v.* *vuddhisāraṇa.*

sārjjava — II-24 (35), 25 (36) ; cf. *s.v.* *sa-* and C. 78.

sarvva — cf. *s.v.* *sarvvaprāṇa* and *sarvvasattva.*

sarvvaprāṇa — II-18 (35) ; cf. *s.v.* *prāṇa.*

sarvasattva — 1.

senāpati — II-3 (32).

savañakña — cf. *s.v.* *sa-,* *vañak* and *-ña.*

sida — I, a-19 (5) ; cf. *Pras. Indon.* I, 52, 70, where, however, the reference
to Sanskrit *siddha* cannot be maintained.

siddha — II-28 (36) ; 25; cf. *s.v.* *siddham.*

siddham — II-1 (32).

sidanayātra — 1 sq., 10, 15 ; cr. Index b, *s.v.*

sthāna — *sthānāña,* II-12 (34) ; *sthānamāmu,* II-18 (35).

sthāpaka — II-4 (32) ; 20, 37.

sumpaḥ — II-5 (32), 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 (34), 17
18, 19, 22, 23, 24 (35), 25, 26 (36) ; *niparsumpahakan,* II-20 (35) ; C. 79.

suruḥ — *nisuruḥ,* II-21, 22, 23 (35).

svāmi — I, a-20 (6) ; 4 sq.

svasthā — *marsvasthā,* I, a-8 (5) ; II-17 (35) ; cf. C. 79, who translates : „daus un état normal, en bonne santé". I translated „independent", which seems to make better sense in the passages of I and II, although it is not the normal meaning of *svastha* in Sanskrit.

ta — particle, I, a-18 (5) ; cf. Index *b, s.v.*

-ta — suffix, 21.

tāhu — I, a-10 (5) ; II-9 (33), 12 (34) ; *tahūña,* II-12 (33) ; C. 70.

tālu — II-8 (33), 19, 21, 22 (35) ; *makatālu,* II-8 ; the word is followed by *muah* in all of these cases ; cf. 24, 25, 26 and C. 70.

tāmu — *tamūña, nitamūña,* II-28 (36).

tāmva — II-8 (33) ; 38.

tāpik — *nitāpik,* I, a-9, 11 (5) ; II-26 (36) ; *manāpik,* II-26 (36). — Cf. C. 70, who quotes the explanation given by Ferrand, where it is compared with *tāfika* in Malagasi, meaning „army, military expedition". My translation is based on the above interpretation. Poerbatjaraka, *Riwajat Indonesia,* 1952, p. 41, translates the words *kaliwat manāpik* in line 10 of the Kotakapur epigraph by „sangat běrusaha měna'lukkan" (= made a vigorous attempt to submit), but adds in note 2 to p. 41 that the word might rather be compared with Minangkabau *manape,* which, according to Westenenk (quoted *ibidem*) means „to strife after". As a matter of fact, Poerbatjaraka combined the two interpretations. However, according to information kindly supplied by Mr. Muhammad Yamin, which was also confirmed by my Minangkabau students, the word is always used in the meaning „to defend oneself against, tot resist" in the Minangkabau language. If the latter meaning, which has the advantage of still being current in a part of Indonesia, is adopted, it follows that the action alluded to in the Kotakapur and Tělagabatu epigraphs is defensive rather than offensive.

tanḍa — I, a-14 (5).

tathāpi — II-12 (34) ; 16 ; C. 69.

tatkāla — 16.

tattva — II-25 (36).

tīda — I, a-10 (5) ; II-5, 7 (33), 11 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (34), 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24 (35), 25, 28 (36) ; C. 70 ; for *tīda bhakti,* cf. 27.

timira — I, a-7 (5), but the reading is conjectural.

tñah — *tñah rumah,* II-9 (33) ; 39.

tuha — II-4 (32) ; 37 ; cf. *s.v. huluntuhāñku.*

tuvi — II-5, 6, 7, 8, 11 (33), 12, 15, 17 (34), 17, 21, 23 (35) ; C. 70. The word is followed by *mulaṃ* in most of the cases.

ujar — *mañujāri,* II-7 (33), 33 (35) ; *niujāri,* II-23 (35) ; 26 ; C. 71, 74.

umaṃgap — I, a-16 (5) ; I translated „devour, swallow" (p. 4) ; a better translation might be „to seize" ; cf. *tangěp* in Javanese. The word must have existed in Old Javanese, as follows from *sāñgappan,* „nine", *i.e.* one taken off (*viz.* from ten).

upāya — cf. *s.v. varopāya.*

uraṃ — I, a-21 (6) ; II-5 (32), 8, 9, 11 (33), 13, 16 (34), 18, 24 (35) ; C. 67.

vā — *parvvāṇḍa,* cf. *s.v. par-.*

vaçīkaraṇa — II-13 (34) ; 22, 30 ; C. 77.

vaduā — *vaduāmāmu,* II-6 (33) ; cf. Index *b, s.v. wadwā.*

vaidi — cf. *s.v. rūpabhasmavaidimantraprayoga.*

vaidika — II-11 (33).

vala — II-28 (36).

valuṃ — I, a-3 (5) ; cf. Old Javanese *wwalung.*

vañak — *vañakmāmu,* II-5 (32) ; *savañakña,* II-16 (34).

vaṇiyāga — II-4 (32) ; 20 ; for Sanskrit *baṇyāga ;* cf. Index *b, s.v. waṇiyāga.*

vanua (vanuā) — I, e-8 (15) ; II-13 (34) ; cf. Index *b, s.v. wanua.*

vañun — II-5, 7 (33), 13 (34) ; 26, 38, 44.

varopāya — II-9 (33).

vaṣīkaraṇa — II-4 (32) ; 20 ; not to be confounded with *vaçīkaraṇa.*

vatak — II-5 (32) ; 37 ; cf. *Pras. Indon.,* I, 73.

vātu — *savātu,* II-27 (36) ; perhaps, II-7 (33).

vihāra — I, e-8 (15).

vini haji — II-9, 11 (33) ; 38. — As I was informed by Mr. Muhammad Yamin, the term is used for noble women in present Minangkabau language.

vṛddhi — 25.

vuat — II-14 (34) ; *vuatña,* II-14 (34) ; *vuatāña,* II-15 (34) ; cf. *s.v. -ā)* ; *marvuat,* II-9, 10, 11 (33), 14 (34), 25 (36) ; *kavuatanāña,* II-26 (36) ; C. 77 (*vuatāña, vuatku* and *vuatña*).

vuddhi — *marvuddhi,* II-5 (33) ; *marvuddhisāraṇa,* II-11 (33), 14 (34).

vukan — II-6, 11 (33) ; 38, 40 ; C. 78.

vulan — II-28 (36).

vunuḥ — *nivunuḥ,* II-5 (32). 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (33), 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 (34), 17; 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24 (35), 25 (36).

vuruḥ — II-5 (32) ; 37.

vyasta -- I, a-6 (5).

vyūha — *marvyūha,* I, a-10 (5).

---

b. Old Javanese. [1])

a- — prefix, in *asilih,* XI-9*b* (312) ; *?asih,* 11*b* (312), 15*a* (313) ; *?agalak,* XI-14*c* (313) ; *asěsěk,* 23*b* (315) ; *apatih,* 26*b* (316) ; *aweḥ,* 27*d* (316) ; *āran,* 27*d* (316) ; combined with the suffix *-an* (attached to the root with an *h* as connecting consonant) in *ajanmahan,* 29*d* (316). For *a-* prefixed to a nasalized or pre-nasalized root, cf. *s.v. aṅ-. A-* is clearly

---

[1]) Abbreviations: p.: name of a person; t.: title; v.: name of a village. After p., the article preceding the name is added between brackets (such as *si, pu, sang*).

far less frequent than *ma-*, and it is curious that, as far as the texts of this collection are concerned, it is found exclusively in the metrical inscription No. XI.

-a — suffix, not rarely spelt *-ā*, in *musuha*, XI-11*b* (312) ; *wihañā*, 13*d* (313) ; *tamwaka*, 14*b* (313) ; *?waruha*, 14*d* (313, for *wruha* ?) ; *uliha*, 18*b* (314) ; *hyaña*, 16*d* (314) ; *siha*, 22*b* (315) ; after a doubled root, *imur-imura*, 29*c* (316) ; combined with another affix, *patoliha*, 10*d* (312) ; *pasisiha*, 10*d* (312) ; *?kasandihā*, 17*b* (314) ; *manona*, 19*a* (315) ; *?matataganā*, 18*c* (314 ; uncertain, cf. *s.v. tatag*) ; *diwyakĕnā*, 18*a* (314) ; *mahātisa*, 18*d* (314) ; *?anĕmwaha*, 22*b* (315) ; *mahāmayuña*, 16*d* (314) ; *iñūyana*, 23*d* (316 ; presumably : *iñū* followed first by *-an*, with *y* as a connecting consonant, then by *-a*) ; *hyañā* XI-16*d* (314) cf. 322.

adharmadharma, XI-12*a* (312).

adimantri — XI-23*b* (315, for *ādimantrī* ?).

agam — *mañagam kon*, 216.

aganita — *aganitāñgana*, XI-17*d* (314) ; 324.

agra — p. (*pu*) of Pañkur in Perot inscriptions, IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).

air — *air pyal*, v., IX, b-35 (236) ; *air hulu*, v., IX, b-35/36 (236) ; *air papi*, v., IX, b-27/28 (235) ; *air ha (ji ?)*, v., XII-1 (235) ; *air haji*, t., 238 ; cf. *s.v. talang, tulang, hulu*.

ajar — *tinajar* (= *ajar* with prefix *t-* and infix *-in-*), XI-22*c* (315) ; 327.

akalañka — XI-10*a* (312).

akṣara — XI-27*b* (316) ; *akṣaracyutaka*, 23*a* (315) ; 305.

-akan (*-akĕn*) — *hĕnĕñakan*, XI-12*b* (312) ; combined with other affixes, *diwyakĕnā*, 18*a* (314) ; *inaliḥhakĕn*, 25*b* (316) ; *winaluyakĕn*, 29*a* (316) ; *pinakakuannakan*, XII-2 (335) ; 331.

aku — p. (*pu*) of the Datar in the Perot inscriptions, IX, b-10 (233) ; cf., however, *s.v. arka*.

alah — *inalahakan*, XII-8 (335) ; 332 sq.

alap — *riñ = alap*, XI-14*d* (313) ; *kālap*, XI-8*c* (312).

alas — cf. *s.v. tuha*.

alih — XI-15*b* (313) ; *añaliḥ*, XI-15*b* (313), 26*a* (316) ; *inaliḥhakan*, XI-25*b* (316) ; 309.

-an — suffix, in *pikatan*, IX, a-6 (232), b-5 (233) ; *sirikan*, IX, a-6 (232), b-6, 10 (233) ; *tiruan*, IX, a-11, 7 (232), b-6, 10/11 (233) ; *wlaḥhan*, IX, a-8, 12 (232) ; b-7, 12 (232), b-31 (236) ; *dalinan*, IX, a-8, 12/13 (232) ; b-7, 12 (233) ; *tawān*, IX, a-8/13 (232), b-8, 13 (233) ; *?sikhalān*, IX, a-10 (232), b 9 (233) ; *halaran*, IX, a-7 12 (232), b-6, 11 (233) ; *kandañan*, IX, b-29 (235) ; IX, b-29 (235) ; *tuhān*, IX, a-15, 16 (232), b-15, 16 (234) ; *ungsyan*, XI-17*c* (312) ; *?samarān*, XI-10*c* (312) ; *tañanan*, XI-9*b* (312) ; *tiruan*, XI-15*d* (313) ; combined with other affixes, *kamalagyan*, IX, a-14 (232), b-13 (233) ; *katuwuḥhan*, IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (233) ; *tinapān*, XI-15*d* (313) ; *parhyañan*, cf. *s.v. hyang* ; *pacalān*, cf. *s.v. cala* ; *dinānān*, cf. *s.v. dāna* ; *ajanmahan*, cf. *s.v. a-*.

anak — for *anak wanua,* 242 ; *anak wanua (banua),* XI-22c (315) ; 226, 326.

anaryya — for Sanskrit *anārya,* XI-12d (312) ; 321.

anila — XI-7d (312).

antan — *māntan,* XI-12c (312) ; 321 ; cf. *s.v. muṅgu.*

anti — cf. *s.v. pānti.*

anubhāwa — *dewānubhāwa,* XI-11a (312).

anuja — *ranujāmata,* XI-9c (312) ; 318.

anumoda — XI-13d (313) ; *mañanumoda, ibid.* ; cf. 302, 306, 321.

anung — IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (233).

anurāga — cf. *s.v. warānurāga.*

aṅ. — prefix *a-* before a nasalized base, *añaliḥ,* XI-15b (313) ; *cñutus,* XI-17c (314) ; *amūja,* XI-18c (314) ; *aniṭik,* XI-25b (316).

aṅĕn — *pañaṅĕnnañĕnta,* XI-11b (312) ; 320.

aṅgada — p. *(ḍapunta),* XII-8 (335).

aṅgana — for Sanskrit *aṅganā,* cf. *s.v. agaṇita.*

apa — XI-16d (314) ; *apaniya,* XI-25b (316) ; *?hanāpa,* XI-18a/b (314) ; cf. note 24 to p. 314.

apūrwa — XI-16b (314), 19a (315).

aran — *māran,* XI-26b (316) ; *āran,* XI-27d (316) ; *makañaran,* XI-27c (316) ; *ñaranya,* XI-18d (314).

arka — p. *(pu)* of the Ḍatar in Perot inscr., IX, a-10 (232) ; inscr. *b* reads, however, *aku.*

artha — *sārtha,* XI-17a (314) ; 307.

asö (asĕ), also *aṅsö* — *masö,* XI-23b (315) ; *inangsö,* XI-9b (312) ; *mañasö,* IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (233) ; *umaṅsö,* 225 sq. ; *mañasĕakan,* 240 ; cf. 318.

asih — XI-11b (312) ; *?siliḥ-asih,* XI-15a (313) ; cf. *s.v. sih.*

ataḥ — XII-6 (335) ; *tātaḥ* (= *tc ataḥ*), XII-4, 7 (335).

atha — XI-8b (312).

atisaya — for Sanskrit *atiçaya,* XI-16c (314), 18d (314).

atus — *inatus,* XI-7c (312), 17c (314) ; 293, 317, 324.

aum — for Sanskrit *oṃ* (?) *ka-aum,* XI-13d (313) ; 321.

awatāra — *pañawataran (sic),* XI-16d (314) ; 284, 324.

awit — p. *(si),* IX, b-24 (235).

ayat — XI-10a (312).

ā — abbreviation of *ādityawāra,* IX, a-4 (232) ; b-3 (233).

ācārya — t. *(ḍang),* 219.

āçrama — *sacaturāçrama,* XI-9d (312) ; 318 sq.

ādi — XI-11d (312).

ājñā — *rājñe* (= *ra-ājñā i* ?), XI-10a (312) ; 319.

ālaya — cf. *s.v. çiwālaya.*

ārjawa — XI-6b (311) ; 317.

āṣāḍhamāsa — IX, a-3 (231, spelt *aṣāḍa*), b-2 (232, spelt *āsādha*).

āwali (?) — XI-7d (312) ; 293, 317.

baka — XI-22*a* (315).

balubu(ng) — p. (*si*), IX, a-20 (232), b-19/20 (234).

bañcung — p. (*si*), IX, b-22 (234).

bantal — p. (*si*), IX, b-36 (236).

banyāga — *kabanyagān* (*sic*), IX, b-34 (236) ; 230 sq.

bu — abbreviation of *budhawāra*, XII-5 (335).

bulai — name of a mountain (?), XII-4 (335) ; 336.

buyut — 251 sq. ; cf. *s.v. puyut.*

bhadra — p. (*pu*), IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233).

bhagawanta — for Sanskrit *bhagavant*, 228.

bhakti — XI-17*b* (314) ; *bhaktita* (for Sanskrit *bhaktitah* ?), *ibid.*

bhānu — p. (*si*), IX, b-22 (234).

bhaṭāra — for Sanskrit *bhaṭṭāra*, XI-16*b* (314), 24*d* (316), 28*d* (316).

bhrĕtya — for Sanskrit *bhṛtya*, XI-13*b* (313).

bhūmi — XI-6*b* (311).

caru — *macaru*, IX, b-25 (235) ; 242.

caturāçrama — *sacaturāçrama*, cf. *s.v. āçrama.*

çīla — cf. *s.v. swaçīla.*

citta — *samacitta*, XI-17*a* (314).

çiwa — *çiwagrĕha*, XI-26*a* (316).

çiwālaya, — XI-25*a* (316).

çrī — *saçrī*, XI-6*c* (311) ; *çrī maṇḍaki*, v., IX, b-25 (235) ; *çrīdhara*, p. (*si*),
    IX, a-16 (232), b-16 (234).

çuciharah (?) — XI-22*d* (315).

çuklapakṣa — XII-2, 5 (335) ; *samārggaçiraçuklapakṣa*, XI-24*b* (316) ; spelt
    suklapakṣa, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233).

çūra — *çūrapatnī*, XI-7*a* (312). Cf. Index *c. s.v. çūralakṣmī.*

ḍa- — prefix, in *ḍakalang*, IX, a-11 (232), b-10 (233) ; *ḍakampak*, IX, a-13
    (232), b-12/13 (233) ; *ḍamiliḥhan*, IX, a-12 (232), b-11/12 (233) ; *ḍawain-
    lar*, IX, a-13 (232), b-13 (233) ; *ḍakukap*, IX, a-12 (232), b-12 (233) ;
    ḍaragang, IX, a-14 (232).

dadi — XI-14*d* (313).

dalinan — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-8, 12/13 (232), b-7, 12 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.

damalung — t. (p. ?), IX, a-14 (232), b-13 (233).

ḍaman — 240.

damo — p. (*si*), IX, a-15/16 (232), b-15 (234).

dana — *mangdana*, p. (*si*), IX, a-16 (232), b-15 (234).

dāna — *dinānān*, XI-25*c* (316).

daṇḍa — *madaṇḍa*, XI-23*d* (316) ; p. (*si*), IX, b-23 (234).

ḍang — *ḍang hyang*, 208, 243 ; cf. *s.v. ācārya.*

dañū — XI-12*d* (312).

ḍapu — *ḍapu hyang*, 240 ; *ḍapu hawang*, 209.

ḍapunta — XII-6, 8 (335) ; 240.

ḍatar — t., IX, a-10 (232), b-10 (233) ; 238.

dawa — p. (*si*), IX, b-25 (235).

de — *denya*, XI-10*d* (312) ; *dening*, XI-17*c* (314).

dewa — *dewānubhāwa*, cf. *s.v. anubhāwa*.

dhantan — p. (*si*), IX, b-17 (234) ; inscr. *a*, however, reads *jāntan*.

dharma — XI-11*d* (312, spelt *dharmā*) ; *dharmmasinta*, XII-10 (335) ; 337 ; cf. also 320.

dhasa — p. (*si*), IX, b-22 (234).

diça — for Sanskrit *diç*, in *pūrwwadiça*, XI-16*b* (314).

diwasa — XI-23*a* (315).

diwya — *diwyatama*, XI-18*a* (314) ; *diwyottama*, XI-25*a* (316) ; *diwyakěnā*, XI-18*a* (314).

diyus — (= *dyus*), XI-22*b* (315).

don (?) — *sadon*, XII-7 (335).

duarapalā — for Sanskrit *dvārapāla*, XI-14*c* (313) ; 284.

durlabha — XI-12*a* (312).

duwa (?) — *duwane* (?), XI-12*b* (312).

dwitīyā — for Sanskrit *dvitīyā* (*tithi*), IX, a-3 (231), b-2 (232) ; XII-5 (335).

dyah — XI-9*c* (312).

-ěn — suffix, in *gawyěn* (?), XI-14*a* (313).

ěnah — *ěnahhi*, XI-15*b* (313).

(*ě*)*ñcung* — p. (*si*, in combination with the name : *siñcung*), IX, b-21 (234).

gaṇḍah — p. (*si*) of *patih* of Mantyasih who has the title (or : religious name ?) *punta pramāṇa*, IX, a-18 (232), b-17 (234).

gandha — p. (*si*), IX, a-15 (232), b-15 (234).

gada — p. (*pu*), IX, a-8/9 (232), b-9 (233, spelt *gadā*).

galak — *agalak*, XI-14*c* (313).

gaṇita — cf. *s.v. agaṇita*.

garawuy — p. (t. ?), IX, a-11 (232), b-10 (233).

garung — t. (*rakai*) of a king, 220.

garuti (?) — XI-23*d* (316).

gatāgata (?) — XI-18*c* (314), but perhaps to be read *çatāgata* ; cf. 325.

gawai — XI-13*d* (313) ; *gawainya*, XI-29*b*, *d* (316) ; *ginawainira*, XI-12*d* (312) ; *magawai*, XI-13*c* (313) ; *gawayěn* (?), XI-14*a* (313), 15*a* (313) ; *ginawai*, XI-24*d* (316).

g(*ě*)*lar* — *ginlar*, XI-8*d* (312) ; cf. 318.

g(*ě*)*něng* — p. (*si*), XI-27*b* (316).

grěha — spelt *griha*, XI-15*a* (313) ; cf. *s.v. çiwa*.

guṇa — *kalāguṇarawiprakulasthanāma*, XI-8*c* (312).

gunu(*ng*) — to denote the number 7, XI-24*a* (316).

gupura — for Sanskrit *gopura*, in *sagupura*, XI-17*d* (314).

guru — *gurumatatāpasa*, XI-21*d* (315) ; *yan paguru*, XI-23*c* (316) ; *guru hyang*, 243.

gusti — XI-26*d* (316) ; *gusti wagus*, XI-22*c* (315) ; *gusti těnah*, 230.
guwasang (?) — p. (*si*), IX, b-29 (235).

hada — p. (*sang*), IX, b-31 (236).
haḍaṅan — t., 220, 222.
haděp — XI-11*c* (312).
haji — cf. *s.v. air*.
hala — XI-24*d* (316) ; *hale* (= *hala i*), XI-12*c* (312) ; cf. 328.
halangmanuk — t. (also v. ?), XII-10 (335) ; 337.
halaran — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-7 (232), b-6 (233) ; 220, 221.
halu — XI-12*d* (312) ; 251 sq., 312.
hāna — IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233); XI-11*b*, c (312), 15*c* (313), 18*a* (314), 28*b* (316).
haṅsa — Sanskrit *haṃsa*, XI-22*a* (315) ; 1, 74.
hantā — nom. of Sanskrit *hantṛ*, XI-7*d* (312) ; 317.
harang (?) — XI-25*d* (316).
harap — *maharap*, XII-3 (?), 6 (335).
hawang — *ḍapu hawang*, 209 ; cf. *s.v. puhawang*.
hayu — XI-13*c*, 15*a* (313) ; p. (*si*), IX, a-19 (232), b-18 (234) ; *mahayu*,
    XI-15*d* (313) ; *hayuwa* (= *hayu* with suffix *-a* ?), XI-21*c* (315).
hěněng —*hěněṅakan*, XI-12*b* (312).
hino — presumably, XI-14*a* (313) ; cf. note 18 to p. 313.
hiyang — cf. *s.v. hyang*.
hrětan — p. or t. (*sang*), IX, a-13 (232), b-12 (233).
hulu — *hulu tangṅah* (=*těnah*), IX, b-24/25 (235) ; *hulu wras*, IX, b-35 (236) ;
    hulu wuatan, 216 ; *hulair* (contraction of *hulu air*), IX, b-23 (234) ; cf.
    230, 241, 243.
huma (humā) — XI-25*d*, 26*a* (316).
humet (?) — XI-25*d* (316).
hurip (?) — XI-12*c* (312).
huwus — XI-25*a*, c (316) ; p. (*si*), IX, b-35 (236) ; *ri kahuwusnyan*, XI-28*a*
    (316).
hyang (also spelt *hiyang*) — XI, 16*d* (314) ; *sang hyang*, XI-29*c* (316) ; *wuat
    hyang* (*wuatthyang* with sandhi), XI-23*a* (315) ; *ḍang hyang*, 208, 243 ;
    ḍapu hyang, 240 ; *sahyang*, XI-25*d* (316) ; *marhyang*, IX, b-34 (236) ;
    parhyaṅan, XI-17*d* (314) ; *manghyang*, XI-23*a* (315) ; *hyaṅā*, XI-16*d*
    (314) ; cf. 209 sq. ; cf. also *s.v. guru, palar, pangil.*

-i — suffix, in *ěnahhi*, XI-15*b* (313) ; perhaps in *maṅuhuri*, IX, a-7 (232) ;
    maṅahuri, IX, b-6 (233) ; *garuti* (?), XI-23*d* (316).
ilu — *milu*, IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233) ; 237.
-in- — infix, in *inatus*, XI-7*c* (312), 17*c* (314) ; *ginlar*, 8*d* (312) ; *inangsö*, 9*b*
    (312) ; *ginawai*, 12*d* (312), 24*d* (316) ; *ginawainira*, 11*d* (312) ; *tinonta*,
    XI-12*d* (312) ; *tinapān*, 15*d* (313) ; *sinangskāra*, 24*d* (316) ; *inaliḥhakěn*,
    25*b* (316) ; *dinānān*, 25*c* (316) ; *sinīma*, 25*d* (316), 28*a* (316) ; *winkas*,
    27*a* (316) ; *pinakaparujar*, 27*b* (316) ; *winaluyakěn*, 29*a* (316) ; *kinon*,

29a (316) ; *kinonnakan,* XII-3 (335) ; *pinakakuannakan, kinmit,* XII-1, 4 (335) ; *inalahakan,* XII-8 (335).

ika (ikā) — *yekā* (= *ya ikā*), XI-27b (316) ; *yateka* (= *yata ika*), XI-27d (316).

ikana — *yatekana,* XI-24d (316), 28d (316) ; *ikanang,* XII-3, 6 (335).

ikeng (ikaing) — XI-26a (316) ; XII-9 (335).

imur — *tan imur-imura,* XI-29c (316).

iña — cf. s.v. *pras.*

iṅke — (= *i ṅke*), XI-26d (316).

iṅū — *iṅūyana,* XI-23d (316).

irang — *merang,* XI-10c (312).

iring — (= *i ring* ?), *waruheriṅ* = *alap,* XI-14d (313).

ista — wrong spelling of Sanskrit *iṣṭa,* XI-14b (313).

istaka — wrong spelling of Sanskrit *iṣṭaka,* XI-14b (313).

iwung — v. (?), XI-10c (312).

içwari — Sanskrit *içvarī,* XI-7a (312).

jagat — XI-8a (312).

jaha — p. (*si*), IX, a-16 (232), but inscr. *b* reads *niha.*

jakkhara — p. (*si*), IX, a-17 (232), b-17 (234).

jana — p. (*si*), IX, b-20 (234).

jangluran — v., 251.

janmah — *ajanmahan,* XI-29d (316) ; cf. s.v. *a-.*

jantan (?) — p. (*si*), IX, a-17 (232), but *b* reads *dhantan.*

jantra — p. (*si*), IX, b-23 (234).

jati — p. (*si*), IX, b-33 (236).

jāti — in *jāti ning rāt,* name of a king, XI-9a (312) ; 288-293.

jawa — *bhūmi ri jawa,* XI-6b (311).

jetā — nom. of Sanskrit *jetṛ,* XI-6d (312).

jīwana — p. or t. (*sang*), IX, a-12 (232), b-11 (233).

jumput — IX, b-25 (235) ; 242.

juru — IX, b-23 (234) ; b-31, 32, 33, 36 (236) ; *jurunya,* IX, a-19 (232), b-19/20 (234) ; *silijuru,* cf. s.v. *silih* ; *juru limus,* IX, a-19 (232), b-19/20 (234) ; *juru kuñci,* IX, b-21 (234) ; cf. 230, 241.

ka — abbreviation of *kaliwuan,* XII-5 (335).

ka- — prefix, in *kālap,* XI-8c (312) ; *ka-aum,* XI-13d (313) ; perhaps in *karih,* XI-14b (313), in *kalula,* IX, a-16 (232), b-16 (234) ; *kalima,* IX, a-20 (232), b-19, 20, 21 (234), 30, 33 (236) ; XI-26c ; together with *-i* in *kasandihe,* XI-25c (316) ; with *-nyan* in *kahuwusnyan,* XI-28a (316) ; with *-an* in *katuwuhhan,* IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (233) ; *kanayakān,* IX, a-15 (232) ; *kakalyan,* IX, b-26 (235) ; *kabanyagān,* IX, b-34 (236) ; *kadatwan,* XI-8d (312) ; *karatwan,* XI-9b (312) ; *?karasān,* XI-18b (314) ; *kamarān,* XI-23c (316).

kuan — *pinakakuannakan,* XII-2 (335) ; cf. 331.

kudur — *wahuta hyang kudur,* 237 ; *makudur,* t., IX, a-9 (232), b-8/9 (233) ; *wahuta makudur,* IX, a-14 (232), b-13/14 (233 sq.) ; cf. 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 227, 237, 238.

kukap — *ḍakukap,* t. or p., IX, a-12 (232), b-12 (233).

kula — *kalāguṇarawiprakulasthanāma,* XI-8c (312) ; *nijakula,* XI-13b (313).

kuma- — prefix (?), *kumaling,* XI-14d (313) ; more probably, however, the form is to be analyzed as the -*um*- form from *waling* with prefixed *k*- or rather *ku*- (without lengthening of the *u*) for the first person.

kumāra — XI-23c (316).

kumarī — for Sanskrit *kumārī,* XI-23c (316).

kuñci — v., IX, b-25 (235).

laḍuḥ — p., XI-27b (316).

lagi — *kamalagyan,* t. (*sang*), IX, a-13/14 (232), b-14 (234) ; 225.

lain — XI-6c (311).

lakas — *salakas* (for *salēkas* ?), XI-11a (312).

lama — XI-7b (312).

lampi (langpi) — t., IX, a-9, 14 (232), b-8. 13 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.

lampuran — 229, 240.

lawan — XI-12a (312), 24c (316), 26b (316) ; *kalawān* XI-15c (313).

lawang — XI-15b (313).

lawas — *malawas,* XI-16a (314) ; *lawasnira.* XI-11a (312).

laya — p. (*si*), IX, b-34 (236).

layar — p. (*si*), IX, b-23 (234).

l(ē)mah — *palmahan,* XI-25b (316).

likhita — XII-10 (335).

lima — *kalima,* IX, a-20 (232) ; b-19, 20, 23 (234), 32 (236) ; *kalimanira,* XI-26c (316) ; cf. 230, 241.

limus — *limus watu,* v., IX, b-28 (235) ; *juru limus,* IX, a-20 (232), b-19/20 (234) ; 241, 242.

liṅga — XI-14a ; cf. note 18 to p. 313 ; cf. also Index *c, s.v.*

loka — *lokadhātu,* XI-5d (311) ; *lokapāla,* XI-9c (312).

luaḥ — XI-25b (316).

lumāḥ — XII-4 (335) ; 336.

lupā — XI-29b (316).

lwapaṇḍak — IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234) ; 229.

ma- — prefix, in *madaṇḍa,* XI-23d (316), *mawurukung,* XI-24c (316) ; *māran,* XI-26c (316) ; *maratā,* XI-27c (316) ; *matahun,* XI-27d (316), *malupā,* XI-29b (316) ; *magawai,* XI-13c (313), 17c (314) ; *māntan,* XI-12c (312), *matakut,* XI-14d (313) ; *mahayu,* XI-15d (313) ; *malawas,* XI-16a (314) ; *matamwak,* IX, b-23 (234) ; *mapakan,* IX, b-24 (235) ; *macaru,* IX, b-25 (235) ; *marowang,* IX, b-35 (236) ; *merang,* XI-10c (312) ; *makudur,* cf. *s.v. kudur ; mapatih,* cf. *s.v. patih ; ma(ng)taṇḍa,* cf. *s.v. taṇḍa ;* together with negative particle, *tamojar-ujar,* XI-18c

(314) ; with suffixes, *matatagana* (= *tatag* with prefix *ma-* and suffixes *-an* and *-a* ?), XI-18c (314).

mā — abbreviation of *māsa*, XII-1 (335).

maddhawa — p. (*pu*), IX, a-7 (232) ; cf. *s.v. madhāwa*.

madhāwa — p. (*pu*), IX, b-7 (233) ; it is curious that the name occurs in two different forms in corresponding places ; it is still more curious that both *maddhawa* and *madhāwa* are wrong spellings, the correct form being *mādhawa*.

maha- (*mahā-*) — archaic prefix, exclusively and not frequently found in the older Old Javanese writings, in *mahāmayuṅa*, XI-16d (314), *mahātisa*, XI-18d (314) ; references, 324.

mahantara — p. (*pu*), IX, a-7 (232) ; 237; the corresponding place in *b* reads *mantara*.

māheçwarā — wrong spelling for Sanskrit *māheçwara*, XI-7a (312).

maka- (*pinaka*) — *makadhāraṇa*, XI-5d (311) ; *pinakaparujar*, XI-27b (316) ; *makaṅaran*, XI-27c (316) ; *pinakakuannakan*, XII-2 (335) ; 331.

maling — XI-14d (313).

malini — p. (*si*), IX, b-29 (235).

mamrati — *mamratipurastha*, XI-8d (312) ; *rakaki mamrati*, XI-10b (312).

manahā (?) — v., IX, b-29 (235).

manawan — p. (*pu*), IX, a-9 (232), b-8 (233).

maṇḍaki — cf. *s.v. çrī*.

mandĕr — p. (?), XI-28c (316).

maṇḍi — p. (*si*), IX, a-15 (232), b-15 (234).

mandiha — p. (*si*), IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234).

manduta — p. (*pu*), IX, a-7 (232), b-6 (233).

maṅgala — *paḍahi maṅgala*, IX, b-24 (235).

manghūri (spelt *manahuri* and *manuhuri*) — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-7, 11 (232), b-6, 11 (233) ; 220, 221.

mangkanā — *tlas maṅgkanā*, XI-9a (312).

manglakṣa — p. (*pu*), IX, a-9 (232), b-8 (233).

manojña — XI-19a (315).

mantara — p. (*pu*), IX, b-6 (233) ; 237; cf. *s.v. mahantara*.

mantyasiḥ — v., IX, a-17 (232), b-17 (234) ; 229, 241.

manū — wrong spelling of Sanskrit *manu*, p. (pu), IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).

manuja (?) — *manujān* (= *manuja* followed by *an* ?), XI-13b (313).

manuk — cf. *s.v. halangmanuk*.

manūt — p. (*si*), IX, b-24 (235).

mar (?) — (= *mĕr* ?), *kamarān*, XI-23c (316).

mārg(g)açira — *samārggaçraçuklapakṣa*, XI-24b (316).

maring — p. (*si*), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234).

mas — XII-1, 3, 6 (335).

masalañcang (?) — v., IX, b-36 (236).

mata — *ranujāmata*, XI-9c (312).

milar — p. (*si*), IX, b-35/36 (236).

mitra — XI-13*b* (313).

mrĕsi — p. (*rasi*), XI-26*c* (316).

muhūr (?) — XI-16*a* (314), where it is supposed to be the name of a tree (preceded by *ki*) ; cf. note 58 to p. 323.

mukhya — *wipramukhya,* XI-9*d* (312).

mula — IX, b-23 (234) ; 241.

mūla — XI-12*d* (312).

mulung — p. (*pu*), IX, a-8 (232), b-8 (233).

mulya — p. (*si*), IX, b-29/30 (235 sq.).

mulyang — p. (*si*), IX, b-24 (235).

muṅgu — v., IX, b-32 (236) ; cf. 231 ; *muṅguantan,* v., IX, b-34 (236) ; 231.

murana (*muranā*) — p. (*si*), IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234).

musuh — XI-11*b* (312).

mwang — XI-7*d* (312).

n — *watu* = *nn* = *inatus,* XI-7*c* (312) ; 293.

ṅ — XI-9*d,* 11*b* (312), 18*c* (314), 26*d,* 27*a* (316).

nā — XI-12*d* (312), 24*b,* c (316), ?25*d* (316).

nahan — p. (*si*), IX, b-19 (234), but the corresponding place in inscr. *a* reads *nihān.*

nana — p. (*si*), IX, b-22 (234).

naran (?) — p. (*si*), IX, b-25 (235).

ṅarᴖn — cf. s.v. *aran.*

nātha — XI-8*a* (313).

nayaka (*nāyaka*) — *tuhān ning nayaka rua,* IX, b-15 (234) ; *tuhān ning kanayakān,* IX, a-15 (232) ; 227, 228, 238, 239.

ndātan — XI-12*b* (312).

ni — *passim, e.g.,* XI-7*b,* 8*a,* 10*d,* 11*a,* c (312), 28*c* (316) ; *ny,* XI-27*b* (316).

niha (?) — p. (*si*), IX, b-16 (234), but inscr. *a* reads *jaha.*

nihan — p. (*si*), IX, a-20 (232), but inscr. *b* reads *nahan.*

nijakula — XI-13*b* (313).

nikaing — XI-28*a* (316).

nikana — XI-25*a* (315).

nikanang — XI-24*a* (316).

nikaṭa — XI-16*b* (314).

ning — *passim, e.g.* XI-9*a,* 11*c,* 12*a,* d (312).

nira — suffix, in *lawasnira,* XI-11*a* (312) ; *kalimanira,* XI-26*c* (316) ; *ginawainira,* XI-11*d* (312).

niru (?) — p. (*si*), IX, b-25 (235).

nitya — XI-29*d* (316).

niyāga (?) — XI-22*a* (315), but the word separation is not certain.

ṅke — cf. s.v. *iṅke.*

-(n)ta — *tinonta,* XI-12*d* (312) ; *pañaṅĕnnaṅĕnta,* XI-11*b* (312).

ṅuni — *ṅunin ṅuni-ṅunin,* XI-10*c* (312).

-nya — suffix, in *umaḥnya*, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233) ; *parwuwusnya*, IX, a-17/18 (232), b-17 (234) ; *jurunya*, IX, a-19 (232), b-18, 19 (234) ; *rāmanya*, IX, a-19 (232) ; *denya*, XI-10d (312) ; *gawainya*, XI-13d to 14a (313 ; presumably, the base at the end of strophe 13 and its suffix at the beginning of the next strophe) ; XI-29b, d (316) ; *takanya*, XI-16a (314) ; *paḍanya*, XI-18a (314) ; *tumonya*, XI-18b (314) ; *taṅaranya*, XI-18d (314) ; *ṅaranya*, XI-18d (314) ; *rūpaniyān* (= *rupāniya*, metrical license for *rūpanya*, followed by *an*). XI-16c (314) ; *ri kahuwusnyan*, XI-28a (316).

pa — abbreviation of Pahing, 1st day of the 5 days' week, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233) ; abbreviation of Paniruan, 4th day of the 6 days' week, XII-5 (335).

pa- — prefix, in *patihā*, XI-10a (312) ; *pānti*, XI-15d (313) ; *paguru*, XI-23c (316) ; before a nasalised base, *pamatiḥ*, XI-23a (315) ; together with a suffix, *patoliha*, XI-10d (312), *pañañ̆ennañ̆enta*, XI-11b (312) ; *pasisiha*, XI-10d ; *pamawān*, XI-15b (313) ; *pañawatarān*, XI-16d (314) ; *tan pacalān*, XI-17d (314) ; *palmahan*, XI-25b (316) ; *patal̆esan*, XI-28c (316) ; *patapān*, IX, a-5, 9/10, 15 (232), b-4, 9 (233), 14 (234).

paḍa — *paḍanya*, XI-18a (314).

paḍahi — *paḍahi maṅgala*, IX, b-24 (235) ; 241 sq.

paḍar — p. (*si*), IX, b-28 (235).

pagar — p. (*si*), IX, b-28 (235).

pakan (= *pĕkĕn*) — in *mapakan*, XI, b-24 (235), b-33 (236) ; 230.

palarhyang — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-7 (232), b-7 (233) ; 220, 222; cf. s.v. *paṅilhyang*.

pam̆egat (*pam̆egĕt*) — 220.

paña — p. (*si*), IX, b-28 (235).

paṇḍakyan — IX, b-19 (234) ; 229.

pangsat — p. (*si*), IX, b-32 (236).

paṅilhyang — t. (*rakai*), 221, 222.

paṇi (*paṇing* ?) — v., IX, b-2C (235).

paṅkur — t., IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233) ; 220, 221, 222.

pānti — etymologically, *anti* with prefix *pa-*, XI-15d (313).

pañurang — 238.

papi — cf. s.v. *air*.

par- — prefix, in *parw(w)uwus*, IX, a-16, 17 (232) ; b-15, 17, 20, 22 (234) ; b-31 (236) ; *parhyañan*, XI-16d (314) ; *pinakaparujar*, XI-27b (316).

para — *mare*, XI-28d (316).

parang — v., IX, b-26 (235).

pārijātaka — *pārijātakatarūpama*, XI-16c (314).

pasat — p. (*si*), IX, b-20/21 (234).

patapān — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-5, 9/10, 15 (232) ; b-4, 9 (233), b-14 (234) ; 218, 219, 220, 223, 225, 226, 237, 239.

patiḥ — IX, a-6, 17 (232), b-5 (233), b-16 (234); XI-26c (316); *saṅ=apatiḥ*, XI-26b (316) ; *sang patih*, XI-10a (312) ; *rakarayān mapatiḥ*, IX, a-10 (232),

b-10 (233) ; XII-3, 4, 7 (335) ; *mamatih*, XI-23a (315) ; 227, 228, 237, 238, 240, 241.

patnī — XI-7a (312, *çūrapatnī*).

payung — *mahāmayuṅa*, XI-16d (314) ; 324.

pětir (spelt *ptir*, *patir*) — v., IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234) ; 229, 241.

pikatan — t. (*rakai*) of a king, IX, a-6 (232), b-5 (233) ; cf. the Introductions to Nos. IX, X, XI, *passim*.

pilih — *damilihan*, p. or t. (*sang*), IX, a-12 (232), b-11/12 (233).

pirak — XII-1 (335).

pisan — *misanna*, XII-3, 6 (335) ; 336.

po — abbreviation of *pon*, 2nd day of the 5 days' week, XII-2 (335).

pöngpöng — XI-11c (312).

prabhu —*sang prabhu*, XI-9a (312).

prahātah (?) — XI-12c (312).

prajā — XI-9d (312).

prākrětasanniweça — XI-between strophes 21 & 22 (315) ; 286 sq., 326.

pramāṇa — t. (*punta*), IX, a-18 (232), b-17 (234).

pramukha — XI-13b (313).

pras — *pras* = *iña ing limus*, v., IX, b-26 (235) ; 242.

prasāda — for Sanskrit *prāsāda*, IX, b-34 (236) ; possibly, b-30 (236) ; 230.

prasiddha — XI-6c (311), 8a (312).

pratidina — XI-29b (316).

pratyaya — 227, 228, 238 ; *pratyaya hyang*, 243.

prawara — XI-13c (313).

prih-prih — XI-10d (312).

puhawang — 209 ; cf. s.v. *hawang*.

pūja — for Sanskrit *pūjā*, in *amūja*, XI-18c (314) ; *muja* (preceded by *ta*, so that the form might also be *amuja* with neglected lengthening of the *a ;* the length of the *u* is also neglected), XI-22d (315) ; *mamūja*, XI-29a (316) ; cf. Index c, s.v. *pūjā*.

puluwatu — p. (*pu*) of the *patih* Rakai Wěka in 850, IX, a-6 (232), b-5 (233) ; 220.

punta — IX, a-18 (232), b-17 (234) ; 240.

puput — XI-28, b, d (316).

pura — *mamratipurastha*, XI-8d (312).

pūrw(w)a — cf. s.v. *apūrwwa* and s.v. *diça*.

putra — XI-12c (312).

puyut — 251 sq. ; cf. s.v. *buyut*.

pwa — cf. s.v. *tapwan*.

pyal — cf. s.v. *air*.

ra- — prefix, in *rakarayān*, IX, a-10, 14/15 (232), b-10 (233) ; b-14 (234) ; *rakai*, IX, a-5, 6 (232), b-4, 5 (233) ; *ratejika*, XI-6c (311) ; *rawipra*, XI-8c (312) ; *ranujāmata*, XI-9c (312) ; *rājñe*, XI-10a (312) ; *rakaki*, XI-10b (312) ; cf. s.v. *rasi*; s.v. *rakarayān*.

ragang — *ḍaragang,* t. (*sang*), IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (234).

raja — p. (*pu*), IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (233)

rājya — XI-9*b* (312).

rakai — cf. *s.v. ra-.*

rakarayān — *rakarayān patāpān,* IX, a-14/15 (232), b-14 (234) ; *rakarayān mapatiḥ,* IX, a-10 (232), b-10 (233) ; XII-3, 4, 7 (335) ; *rakarayān sang matuha,* XII-8 (335) ; cf. *s.v. ra-.*

rakĕt — *mangrakĕt, maṇḍakĕt,* 239 sq.

rakṣa — XI-8*b* (312, spelt *rakṣā*) ; *mangrakṣa,* XI-6*b* (311).

rakwa — XI-11*d* (312) ; 320.

rama (*rāma*) — IX, b-33 (236), a-20 (232), b-20 (234) ; b-35 (236) ; b-36 (236) ; XI-22*c* (312) ; *rāmanya,* IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234) ; *rāmanta,* XII-1 (?), 4 (335) ; 216 sq., 220 sq., 230.

raṇautsawa — Sanskrit *raṇotsava* (?), XI-6*c* (311).

rankang — XI-15*b* (313).

ranujāmata — cf. *s.v. anuja.*

rarai — cf. *s.v. wadwā.*

rasi — composed of *ra-* and *si* (?), XI-26*c, d* (312) ; 27*d* (312).

rat — cf. *s.v. jāti.*

ratā — *rāma maratā,* XI-27*c* (316) ; 216.

ratejika — XI-6*c* (311).

ratu — IX, a-5/6 (232), b-5 (233) ; *karatwan,* XI-9*b* (312) ; 212, 218, 219.

rawipra — cf. *s.v. wipra.*

rgga — p. (*si*), IX, b-20 (234) ; the name is probably *rĕga* with non-writing of the *ĕ* and doubling of *ga* after *r*).

ri — XI-7*a* (312), 8*a, d* (312), 10*b* (312).

roha — *samaroha,* XI-17*a* (314).

rowang — XI-8*b* (312) ; *marowang,* p. (*si*), IX, b-35 (236).

rua — IX, a-10, 15 (232), b-15 (234) ; *karua,* b-9 (233).

ruhun - - *rumuhun,* XI-16*a* (314) ; XII-7 (335).

rūpa — *rūpaniyān* (= *rūpaniya,* for *rūpanya,* followed by *an*), XI-16*c* (314).

rutung — p. (*si*), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234).

rutus — p. (*si*), IX, b-35 (236).

sa- — prefix, in *saçrī,* XI-6*c* (311) ; *sacaturāçrama,* XI-9*d* (312) ; *sawargga,* XI-13*a* (313) ; *saturusnya,* XI-14*b* (313) ; *sawuit,* XI-15*c* (313) ; *sawaluy,* XI-15*d* (313) ; *satahun* (?), XI-16*a* (314) ; *sārtha,* XI-17*a* (314) ; *sagupura,* XI-17*d* (314) ; *sakaki,* XI-22*d* (315) ; *samārggaçiraçuklapakṣa,* XI-24*b* (316) ; *sawĕlas,* XI-24*b* (316) ; *sahiyang,* XI-25*d* (316).

saha — XI-26*b* (316) ; 27*d* (316).

saisa — p. (*si*), IX, a-19 (232), b-18 (234).

sakābda — incorrect spelling for Sanskrit *çakābda,* XI-24*a* (316).

sākṣī — XII-9 (335).

sama — XI-17*a* (314) ; *samaroha, samacitta,* XI-17*a* (314).

samalagi — v., IX, b-31/32 (236) ; 231.

samāpta — XI-17*c* (314) ; 25*a* (316).

samara — *samarān* (= *samara* followed by *an* ?), XI-10*c* (312).

samgat — XI-26*b* (316) ; cf. *s.v. pamĕgat.*

sana — p. (*si*), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234) ; p. (*si*), IX, b-26 (235).

sanab — p. (*rasi*), XI-26*d* (316).

sandiha — Sanskrit *saṃdeha,* XI-10*b* (312) ; *kasandihā,* XI-17*b* (314) ; *kasandihe* (= *kasandiha i*), XI-25*c* (316).

sang, — XI-9*a,* 10*a,* 11*d* (312), 18*b* (314), 22*b* (315), 26*b,* 27*c,* 29*c* (316) ; 217, 224, 225 ; cf. *s.v. hyang.*

sangskāra — Sanskrit *saṃskāra,* in *sinangskāra,* XI-24*d* (316).

sañjanā — p. (*si*), IX, b-28 (235).

sarw(w)a — p. (*pu*) of the Rakai Sirikan in 850, IX, a-6 (232), b-6 (233).

sawah — XI-28*a* (316).

sayut — p. (*si*), IX, b-21 (234).

s(ĕ)dang — t. (*punta*), IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234).

sĕmbah (?) — *anĕmwaha,* XI-22*b* (315), but word separation is uncertain.

sĕsĕk — in *asĕsĕk,* XI-23*b* (315).

si — *passim* before names of persons, *e.g.* XI-26*c, d* ; 27*a, b* ; 29*d* (316) ; cf. 217, 226, 243.

siddha — XI-22*b* (315) ; cf. *s.v. prasiddha* and Index *c, s.v. siddhayātra.*

siga — p. (*si*), IX, b-25 (235) ; b-31 (236).

sih — *asih,* XI-11*b* (312), 15*a* (313) ; *siha,* XI-22*b* (315).

sikhalān — t., IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233) ; 221, 222, 238.

silih — *asilih,* XI-9*b* (312), 15*a* (313) ; *silijuru,* presumably for *silih-juru,* IX, b-20, 22 (234) ; 230, 241.

sīma — IX, a-5 (232) ; spelt *sema,* which became *ṣema* after *k* at the end of the preceding word, IX, b-4 (232) ; *ŗnak ring sīma,* IX, b-27 (235) ; *sīma,* XI-28*b, d* (316) ; *sinīma,* XI-25*d,* 28*a* (316) ; *sīmā,* XI-27*d* (316) ; cf. 217, 218, 237.

sira — XI-7*a,* 12*c* (312) ; 13*a,* 14*a* (313) ; 17*b* (314) ; 27*c* (316) ; cf. *s.v. -nira.*

sirikan — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-6, 11 (232), b-6, 10 (233) ; 220, 221, 222.

sisih — *tan pasisiha,* XI-10*d* (312).

so — abbreviation of *somawāra,* XII-2 (335).

su — abbreviation of *suwarṇa,* XII-1 (335) ; 333.

suklapakṣa — cf. *s.v. çuklapakṣa.*

sulaṅkuning — v., IX, b-36 (236) ; 231.

surarah (?) — XI-22*d* (315).

susuk — XI-26*b* (316) ; *manusuk,* IX, a-5 (232), b-4 (233).

swaçīla — XI-8*b* (312).

syapa — XI-13*d* (313), 19*a* (315).

t- — prefix, in *tinajar* (so-called conjugated form, Dutch : 'vervoegde vorm' of the 2nd person plural; the meaning, presumably, is : „you should receive orders to", but I know no other example of *t-* used before a base with the infix *-in-*; cf., however, *tājarakěn, Nagarakṛt.* 89, 1*d*, ed. Kern-Krom, 1919, p. 196), XI-22*c* (315) ; probably, *ta dyus* (22*b*) and *ta muja* (22*d*) contain the same prefix and should rather have been cut *t = adyus* and *t = amuja* ; *trasiha* could be cut *t = rasiha* and *rasiha* could be considered a more respectful equivalent of *asiha*, to be translated : „you should acquit yourselves of the pilgrimage (*siddhayātra*) with respectful love" (?).

ta — particle, XI-7*a*, 10*a*, 11*d*, 12*a*, *c* (312) ; -17*b*, 18*a* (314) ; 19*a*, 22*b*, *c*, *d* (315), 28*b*, 29*a* (316).

-ta — suffix, in *pañaněnnaněnta,* XI-11*b* (312).

tā — *tā pacalān,* XI-17*d* (314) ; cf. Old Jav. *Rām.,* II-57.

taguḥ — p. (*si*), IX, b-24 (235).

tahun — XI-7*b* (312) ; *satahun,* XI-16*a* (314) ; *matahun,* XI-27*d* (316).

takan — *takanya* (archaic spelling for *těkěn-nya* ?), XI-16*a* (314).

takut — *matakut,* XI-14*d* (313).

tala — p. (*si*), IX, b-32 (236).

talaga — t. or p. (*sang*), IX, a-11 (232), b-11 (233).

talang — *talang air,* v., IX, b-28/29 (235) ; possibly, but not necessarily, to be corrected to *tulang air,* q.v.

talěs — *patalěsan,* p. (?), XI-28*c* (316).

tama — XI-23*b* (315) ; *tumama,* XI-26*a* (316) ; *tan tumama,* 225 sq.

tama — *tamojar-ujar,* XI-18*c* (314).

tampaḥ — XI-26*a* (316).

tāmraçāsana — XII-9 (335).

tamuy — p. (*si*), IX, b-23 (234).

tamwak — *tamwaka,* XI-14*b* (313) ; *matamwak,* IX, b-23 (234) ; 230, 241 ; note 49 to p. 322.

tan — XI-10*d* (312) ; 18*b* (314) ; 29*c, d* (316) ; cf. s.v. *tā* and *tama, tatan, tar, tanmolah.*

tanmolah — *tanmolaha,* XII-4 (335).

tañan — *tañanan inañsö,* XI-9*b* (312) ; 288.

tañar- — *tañaranya* (for *těněranya* ? cf. s.v. *takan*), XI-18*d* (314).

taṇḍa — IX, a-15 (232) ; *mangtaṇḍa,* IX, b-15 (234) ; 226, 239.

tang — XI-18*d* (314) ; 24*b*, 25*a, d* (316).

tanguḥ — p. (*si*), IX, b-36 (236).

tanjung — XI-15*c* (313).

tapa — *tinapān,* XI-15*d* (313) ; *tapa haji,* 238 ; cf. s.v. *patapān.*

tapal (*tapěl*) — *tuhān ning manapal,* IX, a-16/17 (232), b-16 (234) ; 228, 239 sq. ; *napal,* p. (*si*), IX, b-33 (236).

tapwan — XI-11*b* (312) ; 319 sq.

tar — XI-10*b* (312).

tarawaṇa — p. (*si*), IX, a-20 (232), b-20 (234).

taru — *pārijātakatarūpama*, XI-16c (314).

tatag (?) — *matataganā*, XI-18a (314).

tatan — XI-25c (316).

tati — p. ?, XI-27a (316).

tatkāla — IX, a-4/5, 6, 15 (232) ; b-3/4, 5 (233), 14/15 (234) ; XII-2, 5 (335).

tawān — t., IX, a-8, 13 (232), b-8 (232) ; b-13 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.

tawang — p. (*si*), IX, b-26 (235).

tĕas — XI-14b (313) ; 322.

t(ĕ)las — XI-9a (312).

tĕñah — cf. s.v. *hulu* and s.v. *gusti*.

tĕpat — XI-7b (312).

tĕwĕk — XI-24d (316).

thani — *thanīwung* (= *thani iwung* ?), XI-10c (312).

tiga — XI-26d (316).

tiha — *patihākalaṅka*, XI-10a (312) ; 319.

tirip — t., IX, a-8, 13 (232) ; b-8 (232), 13 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.

tiru — *tiruan*, XI-15d (313) ; 323 ; *tiruan*, t., IX, a-7, 11 (232), b-6, 10/11 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 224.

tithi — IX, a-3 (231) ; b-2 (232) ; XI-24b (316).

tiṭik — *aniṭik*, XI-25b (316).

tolih — *patoliha*, XI-10d (312).

ton — *tinonta*, XI-12d (312) ; *tumonya*, XI-18b (314) ; *manona*, XI-19a (315) ; *manonna* (?), XI-21b (315).

tritaya — XI-23b (315).

tu — abbreviation of Tunglai, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233) ; 236.

tugū — p. (*pu*), IX, a-8 (232) ; inscr. b, however, reads *tuṅgū*.

tuha — *matuha*, XII-8 (335) ; *tuhān*, 226-228, 237 ; *tuha wanua* (*banua*), IX, b-22 (234) ; 216, 230 ; *tuhalas* (*tuhālas*), IX, b-24 (235) ; 230 ; cf. s.v. *nayaka*, *wadwā*, *kalula*, *tapal*.

tuku — *manukū*, p. (*pu*) of Rakai Patapān in the Perot inscriptions, IX, a-5 (232), b-4 (233) ; 218, 237.

tulang — *tulang air*, v., IX, a-5, 20 (232), b-4/5 (233), 21 (234) ; 229, 231, 237 ; *tulang air ing krodha*, IX, b-27 (235) ; cf. s.v. *talang*.

tuluy (?) — *tumuluy* (?), XII-6 (335).

tumak — p. (*pu*), IX, a-10 (232), b-9/10 (233).

tuṅgū — p. (*pu*), IX, b-7 (233), but cf. s.v. *tugū*.

turus — *saturusnya*, XI-14b (313).

tuwuh — XI-16b (314) ; *katuwuhhan*, t. (*sang*), IX, a-14 (232) ; b-14 (234).

uang — XI-23a (315).

ujar — XII-3 (335) ; *mamuat ujar*, XII-9 (335) ; *mojar*, XII-6 (335) ; *tamojar-ujar*, XI-18c (314) ; *parujar*, 224 ; *pinaka-parujar*, XI-27b (316).

ulah — *ulah-ulahan*, XII-7 (335) ; 337.

ulih — *tann* = *uliha*, XI-18b (314) ; *ulihhan*, p. (*si*), IX, a-17 (232), b-16 (234).

-um- — infix, but prefix if the base begins with a vowel or a *w* (in that case *um-* is often changed to *m-* even in the oldest texts), in *milu*, IX. a-10 (232), b-10 (233) ; *mnang*, XI-5d (311) ; *rumuhun* (?), XI-16a (314) ; *tumonya*, XI-18b (314) ; *masö*, XI-23b (315) ; *humet* (?), XI-25d (316) ; *tumama*, XI-26a (316).

umah — *hana ryy = umahnya*, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233) ; 236 sq.

ungsi — *ungsyan*, XI-7c (312) ; 293.

upama — Sanskrit *upamā* at the end of a *bahuvrīhi*, XI-16c in *pārijātakata-rūpama*, XI 16c (314).

uparata — XI-9a (312) ; 288, 318.

utsawa (?) — cf. s.v. *ranautsawa*.

utus — *anutus*, XI-17c (314).

uwah — *muwah*, XII-2, 5 (?) (335).

wadihati — t. (*pamĕgat*), IX, a-9 (232), b-8 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 227, 238.

wadwā — IX, a-10, 14 (232) ; b-10 (233), 14 (234) ; 216, 224, 226, 238 ; *wadwā dĕmit*, 239 ; *tuhān ning wadwā rarai*, IX, a-6 (236), b-16 (234) ; 228, 239.

wagai — 3rd day of the five days' week, XI-24c (316).

wagus — *gusti wagus*, XI-22c (315).

wahuta — XI-27a (316) ; IX, b-13/14 (233 sq.) ; *wahuta ptir*, IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234) ; *wahuta makudur*, IX, a-14 (232), b-13/14 (233 sq.) ; *wahuta hyang*, 243 ; further references : 227, 228, 237, 238, 240, 241.

waiçākhamāsa — XII-5 (335).

wairawa — p. (*pu*), IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).

walahhan — v., IX, b-31 (236) : possibly another form for *wĕlahan*, which occurs as a title ; cf. s.v. *wĕlahan*.

walaing — t. (*rakai*), 254-256, 290, 293 ; *watu walaing*, 255 ; cf. Index c, s.v. *valainga*.

waluy — XI-28b (316) ; *sawaluy*, XI-15d (313) ; *winaluyakĕn*, XI-29a (316).

wamlar — *dawamlar*, t. or p. (*sang*), IX, a-13 (232), b-14 (233).

wanasi — p. (*si*), IX, b-30 (236).

waneh — XI-27b (316).

wang — XI-26d (316) ; cf. s.v. *uang* ; the usual spelling of the word in Old Javanese literature is *wwang*.

waniyāga — Sanskrit *banyāga*, XI-22a (315).

wantil — v. (?), XI-10b (312) ; t. (*samgat*), XI-26b (316).

wanua — *patih wanua kayumwunan*, IX, a-17 (232) ; b-16/17 (234).

wara — *warānuraga*, XI-6d (312).

warā — p. (*si*), IX, b-23 (234).

wāra — XI-24c (316).

waranīyā — p. (?), XI-27a (316).

warg(g)a — *sawargga*, XI-13a (313).

wariga — IX, b-21, 22 (234) ; 241.

waruh — XI-8b (312) ; 317.

watu — *watu = nn = inatus*, XI-7c (312) ; 293.

wawa — *pamawān*, XI-15b (313).

wayat (?) — XI-22a (315), but the word separation is uncertain.

weh — XI-10b (312) ; 24b, c (316) ; 17b (314).

w(ĕ)ka — t. (*rakai*) of the Rakarayān Mapatih in 850, IX, a-6 (233), b-5 (234).

w(ĕ)kas — *pawkas*, XII-8 (335) ; *winkas*, XI-27a (316).

w(ĕ)lahan — t. (*rakai*), IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233) ; 220, 222.

wĕlas — *sawĕlas*, XI-24b (316).

w(ĕ)nang — *mnang*, XI-7a (311).

w(ĕ)ruh — XI-12a, b (312) ; cf. s.v. *waruh*.

wibhawa — XI-11c (312).

wicitra — XI-17a (314).

widagdha — *sang widagdha*, XI-11d (312).

wihang — *wihanā*, XI-13d (313).

wiku — XI-23c, 24a (316) ; *kawikuan, kabikuan*, 335, 240.

wipra — *kalāguṇarawiprakulasthanāma*, XI-8c (312) ; *wipramukhya*, XI-9d (312).

wīra — XI-8b (312).

wirāga — XI-6d (312).

wras — cf. s.v. *hulu*.

wrĕhaspati (*wāra*) — XI-24c (316).

wu — abbreviation of *wurukung*, 3rd day of the six days' week, XII-2 (335) ; cf. s.v. *wurukung*.

wualung — XI-24a (316) ; 281.

wuat — *wuatthyang* (irregular *sandhi* for *wuat hyang*), XI-23a (315) ; *ma-muat*, XII-9 (335) ; *hulu wuatan* (*wwatan*), 216 ; cf. Index a, s.v. *vuat*.

wuit — *sawuit*, XI-15c (313).

wule — *gunung wule*, 336 ; cf. s.v. *bulai*.

wunha — v., IX, b-33 (236) ; 231, 243.

wuri — p. (*si*), IX, b-22 (234).

wurukung — *mawurukung*, XI-24c (316) ; cf. s.v. *wu*.

wuwus — *parwuwus* (*parwwuwus*), IX, a-16 (232), b-15, 20, 22 (234), 31 (236); *parwuwusnya*, IX, a-17/18 (232) ; b-17 (234) ; 226, 230 ; cf. s.v. *ujar*.

wyaya — *wibhawāwyayādi*, XI-11c (312).

ya — XI-13c (313) ; 18a, d (314) ; 24b, c ; 25b, d ; 28b, d ; 29a (316).

yan — XI-16b (314), 23c (316).

yat — XI-7c (312).

yatan(*n*) — XI-23d (316).

yateka — XI-27d (316).

yatekana — XI-24d (316).

yekā — XI-27b (316).

c. Sanskrit.

akuçala — *saṃskāra, karman,* III, a-A-9/10 (109) ; *trividham (viz. kāya-, vāk-* and *manas-karman),* III, f-B-2 to 3 (119) ; in a slightly different division, III, f-B-7 (119) ; probably VII-15d (195) ; cf. 71, 79, 93, 129, 156 ; cf. also *s.v. karman, saṃskāra, apuṇya, kuçala* and *kuçalākuçala.*

aṅkura — in *vījād aṅkuram, aṅkurāt pātram,* III, c-A-9/10 (114) ; cf. 82 sq., 97, 154.

aṅga — III, c-A-9 (114) ; cf. 77 ; *bhavāṅga,* 81.

ajñāna — in the *avidyā* definitions, III, a-A-7 to a-B-1 (109) ; f-A-1, 3 ; *ajñā-nāndhakāra* (?), III, c-A-4 (114) ; *ajñānasthānāni,* 65 ; *akliṣṭam ajñānam,* 152 ; cf. *s.v. ajñānāc cīyate karma* and *avidyā ;* cf. also 65, 67, 115, 128-130.

ajñānāc cīyate karma — first pāda of a çloka frequently quoted in Indonesia and Malaya, III, c-A-1 to 2 (113 sq.) ; i-A-1 to 2 (123) ; j-A-1 to 2 (123) ; cf. 57 sq., 140.

aṇḍajā (jātiḥ) — III, g-B-1 (120).

atitṛṣṇā (?) — III, e-B-6 (118) ; cf. 101, 151.

atidṛṣṭi (?) — III, g-A-1 (119) ; cf. 159 sq.

atīta — *pratītyasamutpāda,* III, c-B-6 (115) ; *bhava,* III, g-A-6 to 7 (120) ; cf. 143.

ataimirika — III, c-A-5 (114) ; cf. 87, 88, 89, 90, 141.

adarçana — 66.

aduḥkhāsukha (vedanā) — III, b-A-5 (111) ; e-B-5 (118) ; cf. 147 ; (sparça), III, e-B-3 (117) ; cf. 150.

advayāṃça — in *harādvayāṃsāmalabhaktinā* (sic), X-a-3b (279) ; cf. 266.

adhirāja — in *varṇarādhirājarāja,* VII-19c (196) ; cf. 184 sq., 206.

adhvan (tryadhvan) — 161; cf. *s.v. pratītyasamutpāda.*

anabhisamaya — III, a-B-1 (109) ; cf. 65 sq., 130.

anavadya — *(dharmas),* III, a-A-10 (109) ; also in *sāvadyānavadyeṣu (dharmeṣu),* III, a-A-10 (109) ; cf. 129.

anāgata — *pratītyasamutpāda,* III, c-B-7 (115) ; *bhava,* III, g-A-8 (120) ; *bheda,* III, d-B-5 (116).

anāsrava — 63.

anitya — 81.

aniṣṭa — *phala,* III, d-B-2 (116) ; cf. 145.

anu- — meaning of the prefix in Buddhist texts, 88.

anubhāvanā — *lakṣaṇa* of *vedanā,* III, e-B-4 (117).

anuloma — 58.

anuṣṭubh — *tatpuṇyāyām anuṣṭubhi,* VII-10d (195) ; cf. 201.

anta — *pūrvānta, madhyānta, aparānta,* 71.

antagrāha — *dṛṣṭi,* III, g-A-2 (120) ; h-A-8 (122) ; h-B-1 to 2 (122) ; cf. *s.v. dṛṣṭi.*

antara — *rasāntara,* VII-13c (195) ; 202 ; *antaradṛṣṭiṣu,* VII-16b (195) ; cf. 203.

andhakāra — cf. *s.v. ajñāna.*

andhatva (?) — III, b-B-5 (112) ; cf. 138.

anvita — not quite correctly used in *varaçāstratalānvita*, X-c-4b (277) ; cf. 262.

apacaya — *dharmāṇām*, 63.

api — 206.

apuṇya — *apuṇyamayāḥ saṃskārāḥ*, III, f-A-10 ; f-B-1, 2 (118 sq.) ; these *saṃskāras* are defined as threefold (*kāya, vāc, manas*) *akuçala ;* cf. 93, 156, 158 ; *apuṇyopaga*, 72.

aprāpti — 158, 161.

abhinirvṛtti — III, b-B-2 (111) ; *skandhābhinirvṛtti*, III, b-B-3 (111) ; cf. 83, 135, 136.

abhilāpatā — *lakṣaṇa* of *parideva*, III, g-B-3/4 (120).

abhiṣeka — 183, 184.

abhedena — cf. s.v. *bheda*.

abhisaṃskāra — in *naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāra*, VII-1a (194) ; cf. 182 ; cf. also s.v. *saṃskāra*.

abhisaṃkṣipya — in *aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya*, 66, 132, 149.

abhyantara — *pratītyasamutpāda*, III, c-A-9 (114) ; c-B-1, 4 (115) ; cf. 82, 142.

abhra — in *sāndhyābhra*, VII-8c (194) ; cf. 182.

amoghasiddhi — 169.

ayoniçamanasikāra — 73.

arūpa — 151 ; cf. s.v. *tṛṣṇā*.

arūpin — *catvāraḥ arūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ* (sic), III, a-A-5/6 (110) ; cf. III, e-A-9 (117), where the term was, however, erroneously omitted ; cf. also 130 sq., 149.

artha — *pratītyasamutpādārtha*, III, b-B-10 (113) ; *hetuphalārthena*, III, c-A-7 (114) ; *avitothārthena*, III, f-A-2 (118) ; *svārthakārin, pcrārthakārin*, III, f-A-7 (118) ; *pratītyajātārthavibhāgavijña*, 184 ; *paramārthasatya*, 91, 141, *nītārtha, neyārtha*, 140 ; cf. also 75, 139 sq., 153, 155. Cf. Index b, s.v.

ardhatrayodaça — 64.

arbuda — 146.

alabhṛt — *lolatphalotpalālabhṛtaḥ*, VII-1, 12 (194).

avakrānti — III, b-B-b (111) ; cf. 135; *vijñānāvakrānti*, 143, 146; cf. *bhuvanāvakrānta*, X-a-3c (270) ; cf. 272 sq.

avadya — *sāvadya*, III, a-A-10 (108) ; *sāvadyānavadya*, presumably, III, a-A-10 (109) ; cf. 129 ; cf. also s.v. *anavadya*.

avasthā — *pratītyasamutpāda* viewed as a number of successive states, cf. 73, 81, 127 ; cf. also s.v. *āvasthika*.

avijñapti — 132.

avitatha — *avitathārthena*, III, f-A-2 (118) ; cf. 153.

avidyā — first *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, cf. s.v. *avidyāpratyayāḥ saṃskārāḥ ;* explained as *ajñāna* with reference to a great number of notions, III, a-A-7 to a-B-1 (109) ; analyzed into one to five divisions, III, f-A-1 to 9 (118) ; considered *hetu*, c-A-7 (114), c-B-9 (115) ; *kleça*, III, c-B-5 (115) ; *kleçamūla*, d-B-7 (116) ; *kāraka*, III, d-A-1 (115) ;

bhūmi, d-A-6 (115) ; *mithyāndhakārabheda* III, d-B-3 (116) ; *svāmin,*
d-B-10 (116) ; belongs to the past portion of *pratītyasamutpāda,* c-B-6
(115) ; *sammohaphala,* d-A-9 (116) ; *pratyaya,* not *hetu,* of the *samskaras,*
f-A-6 to 9 (118) ; included into *kleçasamkleça,* 58, 62, 143 ; different
versions of the *avidyā* definition in the Vibhaṅga, 65 sq., 71 ; conditioned
by *ayoniçamanasikāra,* but considered an original cause, even an
asamskrtadharma by some sects, 62, 73 ; basis of *pratītyasamutpādā,* 92
sqq. ; relation with *samskāra,* cf. *s.v. avidyāpratyayāḥ samskārāḥ ;* with
the five *dṛṣṭis,* 93 sq. ; with *kāmopādāna,* 97-99, 161 ; with *ajñāna,* cf.
s.v. ajñāna ; various references, 125, 128-130, 145, 146, 148, 152-155 ;
avidyāndhakāra, a-B-1 (109) ; *tāvad-avidyā,* III, f-A-1 (118) ; *avidyā
kevalā,* 152 ; based on either causation or consciousness (?), III, f-A-1 to
2 (118) ; cf. 153 ; cf. also *s.v. ajñāna, āvaraṇa, kleça, pratītyasamutpāda*
etc.

avidyāpratyayāḥ samskārāḥ — first *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula,
always given in this form, not in the singular, in No. III, a-A-3 to 4 (108),
a-B-6 to 7 (108 sq.), a-B-1 to 2 (109), c-B-1 (115), e-A-4 (116) ; the
meaning of *avidyā* in this formula, cf. *s.v. avidyā ;* of *samskāra,* cf. *s.v.
samskāra ; pratyaya,* not *hetu,* of the *samskāras,* III, f-A-6 to 9 (118),
cf. 154 sqq. ; are all of the *samskāras* conditioned by *avidyā,* III, f-B-8
to g-A-6 (119 sq.) ; if the Bhagavat intended to explain why *karman* is
conditioned by *kleça,* why did he express this idea both by *avidyāpra-
tyayāḥ samskārāḥ* and by *upādānapratyayo bhavaḥ ?,* III, g-A-6 to 8
(120).

avijñapti — 132.

avīci — III, h-A-5 (122).

avodan — *harapādapaṅkajarajahkaṇikāvodan,* X-c-2b (277) ; cf. 279.

avyākṛta — applied to *karman. samskāra,* III, f-B-4, 5, 7 (119) ; cf. 71, 79,
93, 156 sqq.

açubhabhāvanā — 89.

açrutavant — *vālaḥ açrutavān pṛthagjanaḥ,* III, g-A-4 to (120) ; cf. 161.

aṣṭamahānarakaḥ — III, h-A-3/4 (122).

aṣṭavidha — *pratītyasamutpāda,* III, d-A-8 to d-B-3 (115 sq.).

asamskṛta — 62, 73, 136, 150.

asevitavya — III, a-A-11 (109) ; cf. 109 ; cf. also *s.v. sevitavya.*

asti — perhaps in the compound *astidṛṣṭi,* III, g-A-1 (109), but the text reads
atidṛṣṭi (cf. 160) ; *astinirodha,* VII-17b (196), cf. 203 sq. ; *astiduḥkha,*
III, h-B-3 (122) ; *a-astisamudaya* (?), III, h-B-3 (122) ; *astimārga* (?),
III, g-A-1 (119), cf. 119 sq. and 159. Cf. *s.v. ātman.*

asmin sati bhavatīdam — III, a-A 3 (108) ; cf. 61, 80, 124, 141.

ākāra — of the *āryasatyas,* 199.

ākāça — *ākāçavat,* III, e-A-10 (117) ; cf. 149 sq.

ācaya — the *samudaya* portion of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula defined as
dharmāṇām ācayaḥ, 63 ; cf. *s.v. upacaya.*

ātman — *ātmātmīya*, III, g-A-4 (120), cf. 161, 166 sq. ; *ātmadṛṣṭi*, perhaps to be read instead of *atidṛṣṭi*, III, g-A-1 (119), but cf. *s.v. asti ; ātmavādopādāna*, III, b-A-8 (111) ; e-B-7 (118), cf. 161, 166 sqq. ; *tasyātmanas santatijena*, X-b-4a (274), cf. 252, 276 ; *ātmarahita*, explanation of *kevala* in the *pratītyasamutpādasūtra*, 127 sqq. ; cf. *s.v. ādhyātmika, nirātmika, nairātmya. Ātman* in a spurious passage, III, h-B-2 (122).

ātmīya — cf. *s.v. ātman.*

ādi — of *pratītyasamutpāda*, III, a-A-2, 3 (108), 6 (108), b-B-10 (113) ; cf. 58, 61, 63, 73, 165 ; at the end of compounds, especially *jarādi, jarāmaraṇādi*, for *jarāmaraṇāṅga* including the *çokas*, III, c-A-8 (115) ; c-A-10 (115) ; d-A-2 (115) ; d-A-5 (115) ; d-B-9 (116) ; other *aṅgas* abbreviated by *ādi*, c-B-5 (115).

ādeçaçastrin — 220 sq.

ādhyātman — cf. 82, 91, 128 ; III, a-A-7 (109).

ādhyātmika — opposite of *bāhya* (applied to *āyatana*), III, b-A-1, 2 (111) ; cf. 72, 82, 146 ; cf. also *s.v. abhyantara.*

ānandakandapadma — 170.

ānejya — 72, 79, 93, 156.

āp — aor. *āpam*, VII-19a (196) ; cf. 206.

āptamanas — III, h-A-1 (121) ; cf. 165.

ābhiprāyika — interpretation of *pratītyasamutpāda*, 127.

ābhisaṃsārika — one of three divisions of *saṃskārāṅga*, III, f-B-9 (119) ; cf. 79, 93, 158.

āyatana — *āyatanapratilābha*, III, b-B-2/3 (111) ; *cakṣurāyatana, çrotrāyatana, ghrāṇāyatana, jihvāyatana, manaāyatana, kāyāyatana*, cf. *s.v. cakṣus* etc. ; *rūpāyatana*, 101, 150 ; *sparçāyatana*, III, a-A-11 (109). cf. 129 ; *bāhyāyatana*, 129 ; *naivasaṃjñānāsaṃjñāyatana*, 134 ; Buddhist etymology, 126 ; various references, 82, 133, 135, 136, 146, 150, 163 ; cf. *s.v. ṣaḍāyatana.*

āyus — *āyuḥsaṃskāra*, 138.

ārambha — *ārambhaphala*, III, d-A-9 (116) ; 145. Cf. Index a, *s.v.*

ārūpya — *ārūpyabhava*, III, b-A-9 (111), g-A-8, 9 (120) ; *rūpārūpyā (bhavāḥ)*, g-A-10 (120) ; *ārūpyadhātu*, 134 ; *ārūpyatṛṣṇā*, III, e-B-6 (118) ; cf. 67, 68, 69, 79, 101, 133, 151.

ārya — opposite of *pṛthagjana*, 161 ; *āryasatya*, 80 ; Ignorance with reference to each of the Four Truths, III, a-A-8 to 9 (109) ; the Four Truths as antidotes to four kinds of Ignorance, III, f-A-4 (118) ; *mithyādṛṣṭi* as the denial of the Four Truths, 160.

ālayavijñāna — 191.

āliṅganamūrti — suggested by X-b-2 (273) ; cf. 275 sq. and 268 sq.

āvaraṇa — *pāpāvaraṇaviçodhani*, V-1/2 (171 sq.) ; *karmāvaraṇa*, V-2 (172), cf. 171 ; *sarvakarmāvaraṇāni*, V-2/3 (172) ; *viçvāvaraṇavāraṇa*, VII-6b (179), cf. 179 ; *kleçāvaraṇa, jñeyāvaraṇa*, 90, 95, 125, 152, 153, 171, 179, 200 ; *pṛthagjanatvāvaraṇa*, 179. Further references, 71, 180, 181, 183.

upādānapratyayo bhavaḥ — ninth *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula,
III. a-A-5 (108), b-A-7/8 (111), c-B-3 (115), e-A-6 (117), g-A-6, 8 (120) ;
cf *s.v. upādāna, bhava.*

upādāya (rūpa) — III, a-B-6 (110) ; cf. 101, 131, 149.

upāya — 147 sq., 191.

upāyāsa — III, a-A-5/6 (108), e-A-7 (117) ; *daurmanasyapratyayo* (sic)
upāyāsaḥ, g-B-5 (121); *upāyāsahetujñatvād daurmanasyam*, g-B-6 (121) ;
cf. 61, 96, 164.

uṣṇīṣa — 187.

ekṣaṇa (?) — *ekṣaṇabheda*, III, d-B-4 (116) ; cf. 146.

ekadvitricatuṣpañca- etc. — çloka, III, c-A-3 (114) ; cf. 78 sq.

ekavidha — *(pratītyasamutpāda)*, III, c-A-6 (114) ; *(avidyā)*, III, f-A-2 (118).

ekādaçavidha — *(pratītyasamutpāda)*, III, d-B-10 to e-A-3 (116).

evam asya kevalasya mahato duḥkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati — III,
a-A-6 (108) ; e-A-7 (117) ; cf. 61, 127 sq.

evaṃ mayā çrutam — III, a-A-1 (107).

aikadhyam — *abhisaṃkṣipya*, 66, 132, 149.

aupapattyāṃçika (saṃskāra) — III, f-B-9 (119) ; cf. 79, 93, 158.

karman — *karmaṇy ajñānam*, III, a-A-8 (109) ; c-A-1 (113) ; c-A-2 (114) ;
i-A-1, 2 (123) ; j-A-1, 2 (123) ; a part of *pratītyasamutpāda (saṃskāra*
and *bhava)*, III, c-B-4 to 5 (115), d-A-3, 5 (115 : *karmakāṇḍa); karmavi-
pāka*, III, a-A-8 (109), cf. 128 ; *karmamūla*, d-B-7 (116) ; *kāya-, vāk-,
manas-karmakuçala*, f-B-1 (118 sq.) and the same combinations with
akuçala, f-B-2 to 3 (119) ; probably in *janmakarmabhava*, g-A-9 (120 ;
the text gives, however, *janmakāmabhava)*, cf. 127, 162 ; *karmāvaraṇa*,
cf. *s.v. āvaraṇa; karmasaṃkleça*, 143, 58 ; *pūrvokarman*, 143 ; *atītakar-
man*, 146. Various references, 58, 65, 71, 72, 81, 127, 128, 129, 134, 140,
142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 155, 156, 157, 159, 162, 171, 172 etc. Cf. also *s.v.
saṃskāra.*

kalala — *kalalamūla*, III, d-B-7 (116) ; cf. 125, 146.

kalaçodbhava — *kalaçodbhavasaṃjñataḥ* (read : *-jñitaḥ*), X-c-4d (277) ; cf.
248 ; cf. also s.v. *kumbhaja* and *Kumbhayoni*.

kāṇḍa — used to denote groups of *pratītyasamutpādāṅgas* comprised by
notions such as *hetu* opposed to *vipāka*, III, c-B-8 to 10 (115), or the
sequence of *kleça, karman* and *phala*, III, d-A-3 to 5 (115) ; in a simile,
III, c-A-10 (114).

kāpālika — 160.

kāma — *kāmabhava*, III, b-A-9 (111), g-A-8 (120) ; considered twentyfold,
g-A-9 (120) ; *janmakāmabhava*, cf. *s.v. karman; pañca kāmaguṇāḥ*,
e-A-1 (116) ; *kāmadhātu*, h-A-7 (122) ; *kāmopādāna*, b-A-7 (111), e-B-7
(118), e-B-7/8 (118), g-A-5 (120) ; considered twentyfold, h-A-7 (122) ;
cf. 95, 97, 102, *kāmatṛṣṇā*, b-A-6 (111), e-B-6 (118) ; cf. 67, 68, 69, 95,
97, 101, 102, 134, 147, 151, 152, 161, 162, 166.

kāya — *kāyavijñāna*, III, a-B-4 (109) ; *kāyasaṃskāra*, presumably a-B-2 (109), but omitted by the copyist; *ṣaḍ vijñānakāyāḥ*, a-B-3 (109), e-A-10/11 (117) ; *ṣaṭ sparçakāyāḥ*, b-A-3 (111), e-B-2 (117) ; *kāyasaṃsparça*, b-A-4 (111), e-B-2 (117) ; *kāyāyatana*, b-A-2 (111), e-B-1 (117) ; *kāya-karmakuçala*, f-B-1 (118) ; *kāyakarma-akuçala*, f-B-2/3 (119) ; *akuçala-kāyakarman*, f-B-3 (119) ; *dharmakāya*, 87 ; *kāyakarman*, 93 ; *svasaṃ-bhogakāya*, 198 ; cf. 129, 130, 155.

kāraka — referring to *avidyā* and *saṃskāra* in a simile, III, d-A-1 (115) ; some kind of soul, III, g-A-3 (120).

kāla — *kālakṣaya*, cf. *s.v. maraṇa ; kālakriyā*, 139.

kālasūtra, — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

kāsa — 137.

kiñci — in *yat kiñci*, III, a-B-7 (110).

kīrtistambha — 201.

kubjatā — III, b-B-4 (112) ; cf. 137.

kumbhaja — *çrī kumbhajākhyena*, X-a-3a (170) ; X-b-4b (274) ; cf. *s.v. kalaçodbhava ;* cf. also *s.v. Kumbhayoni*

kumbhayoni — 248 ; cf. *s.v. kumbhaja.*

kuliça — *sajjanataḍitkuliçabhṛt*, VII-line 11 (193).

kuvera — VI-B-b (174).

kuçala — *kuçaleṣv dharmeṣv ajñānam*, III, a-A-9 (109) ; *kuçaīasyopasampadā*, i-B-1/2 (123) ; *trividhaṃ kuçalam : kāyakarmakuçalaṃ vākkarmaku-çalaṃ manaskarmckuçalaṃ*, f-B-1 to 2 (118) ; *kuçalākuçala*, a-A-10 (109); *kuçalamūlasaṃbhāra*, 197 ; *kuçalasaṃskṛta*, 129 ; *kuçalāvyākṛta*, 66 ; *ku-çalasāsrava*, 129 ; *kuçalarāga*, VII-line 7 (193) ; various references : 71, 93, 94, 95, 129, 152, 156, 181

kṛttivāsas — name of Çiva, X-a-1d, 2c, 3d (270) ; cf. 247, 265, 266, 267.

kṛṣṇa — qualification of *karman*, 65, 66.

kevala — in *asya kevalasya mahato duḥkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati*, III, a-A-6 (108) ; cf. 61, 127 ; *avidyā kevalā*, 152.

kokanada — in *kanakakokanadodaravisphurat*, VII-12a (195) ; cf. *s.v. padma, nīraja.*

koṭi (koṭī) — 105, 158.

kotha — III, c-A-5 (114) ; 78, 87, 88, 89.

koṣa (koça) — VII-18c (196) ; cf. 186, 201, 204 ; *brahmakoça, dharmakoça*, 204.

kleça — a part of *pratītyasamutpāda*, viz. the *aṅgas avidyā, tṛṣṇā, upādāna*, III, c-B-4, 5 (115), which is therefore styled *kleçakāṇḍa*, d-A-3 (115) ; *sarvakleçāçrayatvāt*, III, c-A-6 (114) ; *kleçamūla*, d-B-7 (116) ; *sarva-kleçānām avitathārthena*, f-A-2 (118) ; *kleçāvaraṇa*, cf. *s.v. āvaraṇa ; dṛṣṭikleça*, VII-19d (196) ; *kleçasaṃkleça*, 58, 143 ; *pūrvakleça avidyā*, 143 ; *parīttakleça*, 152.

kvacid — VII-15a (195) ; cf. 189.

khalatatva (read : *khalatva* ?) — III, b-B-4 (111) ; cf. 71, 157.

khādya — VII-12d (195) ; cf. 189, 202.

jamvutakṣmī — VII-line 8 (193) ; cf. 180.

jarā — defined, III, b-B-4 (111) to b-B-7 (112) ; g-B-1 sq. (120) ; cf. 65, 71, 96, 136-138 ; cf. also *s.v. jarāmaraṇa.*

jarāmaraṇa — 12th link of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, cf. *s.v. jātipratya-yaṃ jarāmaraṇam* ; the Vibhaṅga definition in No. III consists of a definition of *jāra* followed by one of *maraṇa, q.v.* ; relation between the two parts of the compound, g-B-2 (120), g-B-8 (121) ; 'complex of suffering' included into the *aṅga,* cf. *s.v. duḥkha* ; sometimes abbreviated *jarādi,* c-A-8 (114), c-B-7 (115) ; considered *duḥkha,* c-B-5/6 (115), *phala,* c-A-8 (114), *phalakāṇḍa,* d-A-5 (115), *vipākakāṇḍa,* c-B-10 (115) ; *aniṣṭaphala,* d-B-2 (116) ; *anāgata,* c-B-7 (115) ; *pravāha,* d-A-2 (115) ; *punarbhavavṛkṣabīja,* d-A-7/8 (115) ; *punarāvartakamūla,* d-B-9 (116) ; *vināçabheda,* d-B-6 (116) ; *aiçvaryavipatti,* e-A-2 (116) ; included into *jāti-* or *phala-saṃkleça,* 58 ; into the *vastu-* part of *pratītyasamutpāda,* 81 ; further references : 61, 66, 80, 82, 96, 136-139, 145, 164.

jarāyu — *jarāyuja,* 162.

jarjarībhāva — one of the terms explaining *jarā,* III, b-B-6 (112) ; 139.

jāti — 11th *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, cf. *s.v. jātipratyayaṃ jarāmaraṇam* ; the Vibhaṅga definition, III, b-B-1 to 3 (111) ; four kinds of *jāti,* g-A-10 to g-B-1 (120) ; relations with the preceding and following *aṅgas, jarāhetukī jātiḥ,* g-B-8/9 (121), *jātihetuko bhavaḥ,* g-B-9 (121) ; considered *phala,* c-A-8 (114), d-A-5 (115) ; *duḥkha,* c-B-5/6 (115) ; *anāgata,* c-B-7 (115) ; *vipāka,* c-B-10 (115, where, however, the term was erroneously omitted) ; *pravāha,* d-A-2 (115) ; *punarbhava-vṛkṣabīja,* d-A-8 (115) ; *nirvṛttiphala,* d-B-2 (116) ; *vināçabheda,* d-B-6 (116) ; *punarāvartakamula,* d-B-9 (116) ; *aiçvaryasampatti,* e-A-2 (116) ; explanation of the Vibhaṅga definition with references, 134-136 ; other references, 127, 162 ; *jātisaṃkleça,* 58 ; *tiryagjāti,* III, h-A-6 (122).

jātipratyayā jarā — III, g-B-1 (120).

jātipratyayaṃ jarāmaraṇam — (with, usually, the enumeration of other aspects of suffering following *maraṇa*) III, a-A-5 (108) ; b-B-3/4 (111) ; c-B-3/4 (115) ; e-A-6 (117) ; cf. *s.v. jarā* and *maraṇa.*

jina — *jinā jinasutāvitāḥ,* VII-5d (194) ; *jinamandira,* VII-14d (195) ; *jinasuta,* VII-line 13 (194) ; *jinavat,* VII-17b (196) ; *jinakrama,* VII-19b (196) ; *jinaratnapratimā,* 191.

jihvā — *jihvāvijñāna,* III, a-B-4 (109) ; *jihvāsaṃsparça,* b-A-3 (111) ; e-B-2 (117) ; *jihvāyatana,* b-A-2 (111) ; e-A-11 (117).

jīrṇatā — in the definition of *jarā,* III, b-B-4 (112) ; 137.

jīva — 95, 160.

jīvitendriya — *jīvitendriyaprādurbhāva,* III, b-B-3 (111) ; *jīvitendriyani-rodha,* b-B-8 (112) ; cf. 139.

jñāna — 93, 183 ; *lokottara,* 192 ; *jñānasaṃbhāra,* 179, 197 sq. ; cf. *s.v. ajñāna, mithyā, saṃçaya.*

jñeya — III, f-A-6 (118) ; *jñeyāvaraṇa,* 90, 95, 152, 153, 171, 179.

ṭoṭaka (metre) — X-b-3 (274) ; cf. 276.

tathatā — 153, 199.

tadyathā — III, c-B-1 (115) ; e-A-11 (117) ; h-A-2 (121) ; h-A-4 (122) ; cf. 170 ; V-1 (171).

tapana — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

tamas — in the Vibhaṅga definition of *avidyā*, III, a-B-1 (109) ; cf. 65 ; cf. also *s.v. timira.*

tāvant — *tāvad-avidyā,* III, f-A-1 (118) ; cf. 152.

timira — *vahulamohamahātimirāvṛta,* VII-17a (196) ; 90, 200, 203 ; cf. *s.v. tamas, taimirika, ataimirika.*

tiryagjāti — III, h-A-6 (122).

tilaka — *tilakādikagātratā,* a *lakṣaṇa* of *jarā,* III, b-B-5 (112) ; cf. 138 ; *tilakācitagātratā,* 138.

tuṅga — 180 sq.

tuṣita — name of a paradise, III, h-A-5 (122).

tṛṣṇā — 8th *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, cf. *s.v. tṛṣṇāpratyayam upādānam ;* different kinds of *tṛṣṇā : kāma, bhava, vibhava,* III, b-A-6 (111) ; *kāma, ārūpa, ati* (*tṛṣṇā* ?), e-B-6 (118) ; *rūpa, arūpa, nirodha,* 151 ; *itibhava,* 151 ; *kāma, rūpa, ārūpya,* 151 ; *tṛṣṇāvivrddhi, tṛṣṇāvaipulya,* 68, 127 ; *sutṛptilakṣaṇā tṛṣṇā,* c-B-5/6 (118) ; considered a *hetu,* c-A-7 (114), c-B-9 (115) ; *duḥkha,* c-B-5 (115) ; belongs to the *vartamāna* part of *pratītyasamutpāda,* c-B-8 (115) ; *prabhava,* d-A-2 (115) ; *kleça,* d-A-4 (111) ; *phala,* d-A-7 (115) ; *santānaphala,* d-B-1 (116) ; *anāgatabheda,* d-B-5 (116) ; *hetumūla,* d-B-8 (116) ; *parasparajiyāṃsaḥ,* e-A-2 (116) ; various references : 65, 67-69, 79, 80, 81, 82, 101, 127, 133, 144, 147.

tṛṣṇāpratyayam upādānam — III, a-A-5 (108) ; c-B-3 (115) ; b-A-7 (111) ; e-A-5/6 (117) ; e-B-6 (118) ; cf. *s.v. tṛṣṇā* and *s.v. upādāna.*

tejas — 317.

taimirika — 81, 90, 97, 153 ; cf. *s.v. timira, ataimirika.*

trāyastriṃça — III, h-A-5 (122).

trika — with reference to the three elements implied in each act of *sparça, trikamūla,* III, d-B-8 (116) ; *trikasamavāya,* e-B-2 (117).

tripura — *mayakaravālābhitapattripurabhid,* X-c-1b (277) ; cf. 247, 267, 278.

triratna — cf. *ratnatraya,* VII-10a (195) ; cf. also 187, 201.

trividha — *pratītyasamutpāda,* III, c-B-4 to 8 (115) ; *avidyā,* f-A-3 (118) ; *saṃskāra,* f-A-10 (118) to f-B-9 (119).

triçaraṇa — cf. *triçarmadhīra,* VII-18b (196) ; *çaraṇatraya,* c-A-4 (114) ; 84, 86, 87, 90, 203, 204.

tryadhvan — 161.

tryambaka — name of Çiva, X-b-1d (273), 2d (273), 4d (274) ; 247, 265 sq., 268, 275.

daṇḍa — *daṇḍaviṣkambhanatā,* characteristic *of jarā,* III, b-B-5 (112) ; cf. 137 ; *ātmabhedadaṇḍāvapradāni* (?), III, e-A-2 (115), 147 ; cf. also 173.

darçana — *darçanamārga,* 154.

daçavidha — pratītyasamutpāda, III, d B-6 to 9 (116).

duḥkha — duḥkhaskandha, comprising çoka, parideva, duḥkha (in the nar-
rower meaning of physical pain), daurmanasya and upāyāsa, III, a-A-6
(108), e-A-9 (117) ; cf. 61 sq., 81, 128, 163 sq. ; paridevapratyayam duḥ-
kham, daurmanasyatvād duḥkham, duḥkhapratyayañ ca daurmanasyam,
III, g-B-4/5 (120 sq.) ; duḥkha for those aṅgas which are neither kleça
nor karman, c-B-5/6 (115) ; duḥkhasparça, e-B-3 (117) ; duḥkhavedanā,
b-A-5 (111), e-B-5 (118) ; duḥkhapraheya, f-A-4 (118), probably, f-A-5
(118), but omitted by the copyist ; astiduḥkha, h-B-3 (122) ; saṃskāra-
duḥkha, pariṇāmaduḥkha, duḥkhaduḥkha, 143 ; duḥkhavṛkṣa, 82, 83 ;
duḥkhasatya, 154 ; duḥkhaçamanaçāsana, VII-7d (194) ; sarvaduḥkha-
saṃtāpārticamana-, 181 ; duḥkhanirodhagāminī pratipad, 200 ; sarva-
duḥkhapraçāntikṛt, 200 ; various references : 61, 81, 82, 83, 96, 97, 128,
140, 142, 147, 164.

dṛṣṭi — pañca dṛṣṭayaḥ enumerated III, h-A-7 (122) ; dṛṣṭyupādāna, b-A-7/8
(111) ; e-B-7 (115) ; h-A-7 (122) ; dṛṣṭiparāmarça, g-A-1 (119) ; h-A-8
(122) ; atidṛṣṭi (presumably a lapse for astidṛṣṭi), cf. s.v. asti ; dṛṣṭikleça,
VII-19d (196) ; antagrahadṛṣṭi, III, g-A-2 (120) ; h-A-8 (122) ; h-B-1/2
(122) ; mithyādṛṣṭi, g-A-2 (120) ; h-A-8 (122) ; çīlavrataparāmarçadṛṣṭi,
g-A-2 (120) ; cf. çīlavrataparāmarça, h-A-8 (122) ; çuddhidṛṣṭi, g-A-3
(120) ; satkāyadṛṣṭi viṃçatividhā, h-A-9 to h-B-1 (120) ; antaradṛṣṭi,
VII-16b (195) ; çācvatadṛṣṭi, ucchedadṛṣṭi, 93 ; dṛṣṭigahana, 200 ; further
references : 93, 94, 95, 97, 158-161, 166 sq., 184, 203, 206.

deva — 181 sq.

deçādhyakṣa — 220 sq.

daurmanasya — III, a-A-5 (108) ; e-A-7 (117) ; hṛtparitāpaṃ daurmanasyam,
g-B-4/5 (120 sq.) ; daurmanasyapratyayo (sic) upāyāsaḥ, III, g-B-5 (121);
further references : 61, 96, 97, 163, 164 ; cf. also s.v. duḥkha.

daurvyāhāra — a lakṣaṇa of Old Age, III, g-B-1 (120) ; cf. 162.

drutavilambita — drutavilambitasādhanavanditaḥ, VII-17d (196).

drohaka — cf. Index a, s.v.

dvādaçavidha — pratītyasamutpāda, III, e-A-3 to 7 (116 sq.).

dvividha — pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-A-6 to c-B-4 (115 sq.) ; avidyā, f-A-2/3
(118).

dvīpa — catvāraḥ (sic) dvīpāḥ enumerated, III, h-A-2/3 (121 sq.).

dhandhatva — one of the lakṣaṇas of jarā, possibly mentioned III, b-B-5 (122),
although the text reads andhatva ; cf. 112, 138.

dhamanisantatagātra — 137.

dharma — No. III, passim ; cf. especially a-A-9 to 11 (109) ; c-A-2 (114) ;
V-1 (171) ; dharmakāya, 87, 100, 181, 199 ; na dharmataḥ, VII-18a (196) ;
dharmasambhāra, VII-1c (194) ; cf. 182 sq., 197 sq. ; dharmamegha, 181
sq., 183 ; dharmanairātmya, 90 ; āveṇikadharma, 105 ; çukladharma, 181 ;
dharmadhātugagana, 181 ; further referencec : 58, 65, 67, 77, 80, 88,
89, 90, 97, 103 sq., 129.

punarāvartakamūla — III, d-B-9 (116).

punarbhavavṛkṣabīja — III, d-A-8 (115).

purataḥ prāgbhārakāyatā — III, b-B-5 (112).

purāṇībhāva (saṃskārāṇām) — III, b-B-6 (112) ; 138.

purārcita, presumably in a double meaning — X-a-2c (270) ; 271.

puruṣa — 95.

puṣpa (as a masculine) — III, c-A-10 (115) ; 142.

pūjā (different forms of) — 188.

pūta — X-c-5d (277) ; *atipūta, Pūteçvara, Pūtikeçvara, pūtamati, pūtamūr-ti*, 279 ; cf. 257, 262.

pūrva — *pūrvakarman, pūrvakleça*, 143.

pṛthagjana — III, g-A-5 (120) ; cf. 89, 97, 161 *(pṛthagjanatva).*

peçin — 146.

poṣa — 95.

prakṛti — *mithyā-* and *samyak-prakṛti* used to indicate the *samudaya* and *nirodha* parts of *pratītyasamutpāda* respectively, 62.

prajñapti — *prajñaptim anupatitaḥ*, III g-A-5 (120) ; 97.

prajñā — 183, 197 ; *prajñācakṣus*, 200 ; *prajñāmati*, conjecturally restitued, VII-18d (196) ; cf. 206.

praṇīta (opposite of *hīna*, applied to *dharmas*) — 65, 66, 71.

prati — 158.

pratigha — *sapratigha*, 148, 151, 154.

pratilābha — *skandha-, dhātu-, āyatana-pratilābha*, III, III, b-B-2/3 (111) ; cf. 136.

pratiloma — 58.

prativijñapti — 89, 131.

prativibha — III, f-A-9 (118) ; 155.

pratisiddh (?) — *pratiçiddhaty avidyā*, III, f-A-1/2 (118) ; 152, sq.

pratīti (?) — *pratītyaḥ*, III, c-A-3, 5 (114) ; 141. Or have we to read *pratītyāḥ*, 1st plural of a substantivised *pratītya* ?

pratītya — *pratītyajātārthavibhāgavijñāḥ*, 184. Cf. *s.v. pratīti* and *s.v. pratī-tyasamutpāda.*

pratītyasamutpāda — No. III (47-167), *passim ;* some more important referen-ces : Sūtra, III, a-A-1 to 6 (107 sq.) ; its Vibhaṅga, a-A-6 to b-B-10 (108-113) ; translation of Sūtra and Vibhaṅga, 124-139 ; different versions of Sūtra, 60-63 ; of Vibhaṅga, 63-75 ; conjectural dating of versions, 75 ; Vasubandhu's commentary, 73-75 ; etymology of the term, 77 sq., 141 ; different version of a part of the Vibhaṅga, III, e-A-8 to e-B-8 (117 sq.), g-A-8 to g-B-9 (120 sq.) ; Upadeça, c-A-1 to g-B-9 (113-121) ; *aṅgas* clas-sifiable under different headings in numerical order, c-A-6 to e-A-7 (114-117 ; translation, 141-148 ; discussion, 78-83) ; Mahāyānic features of Upa-deça, 97-100 ; considered an *asaṃskṛta* by some schools, 62 ; more precise references to the numerical divisions, cf. *s.v. eka, dvividha, trividha* etc. ;

for the separate *aṅgas*, cf. *s.v. avidya,· saṃskāra* etc. ; references to one of the introductory çlokas and to Ullaṅgha's Çāstra, cf. the Add.

pratītyasamutpanna — 65.

pratyaya — to denote the relation between successive *aṅgas* of the *pratītya-samutpāda* formula, III, *passim ;* cf. especially, III, c-A-4 (114) ; f-A-7 to 9 (118) ; *pratyayopanibandha*, 82, 142, 154 ; various references : 61, 83, 92, 142, 152, 154, 155.

prabhava — to denote the *aṅgas tṛṣṇā, upādāna* and *bhava*, III, d-A-2 (115); cf. 144.

pravāha — III, d-A-2 (115) ; 144.

pravṛtti — viṣayapravṛtti, III, d-A-2 (115) ; 144 ; *pravṛttivijñāna*, 126, 146, 191.

praçākhā — 146.

praçvāsa — III, f-B-5 (119) ; 130.

praheya — *duḥkhapraheya*, IIII, f-A-4, 5 (?) (118) ; *samudayapraheya, niro-dha-, mārga-, bhāvanāpraheya*, f-A-4/5 (118) ; *apraheya* (?), f-A 5 (118).

prākarṣika — interpretation of *pratītyasamutpāda*, 81.

prāgbhārakāyatā — cf. *s.v. purataḥ.*

prātisattvika (saṃskāra) — III, f-B-7 (119) ; 79, 93, 158.

prādurbhāva — jīvitendriya, III, b-B-3 (111) ; *skandha*, g-A-10 (120) ; cf. 134, 135, 162.

prāpti — 136, 157 sq., 161.

pretaloka — III, h-A-6 (122).

phaṭ — 169.

phaṇīndra — X-a-1b (269) ; cf. 270.

phala — *hetuphalārthena*, III, c-A-7 (114) ; *phala* part of *pratītyasamutpāda*, c-A-8 (114) ; in a simile, c-A-10 (115) ; *phalasaṃkleça*, 56, 143 ; *saṃmo-haphala, ārambhaphala*, d-A-9 (116) ; *vipāka-, niṣyanda-, santāna-phala*, e-A-1 (116) ; *nirvṛtti-, aniṣṭa-phala*, e-B-2 (116) ; *visaṃyogaphala*, 204 ; various references : 80, 81, 141, 142, 143, 145.

bala — 105.; *daçabala*, 183 ; *balapāramitā*, 200.

bāla (written *vāla*) — III, g-A-4/5 (120) ; cf. 97, 161.

bāhya (written *vāhya*) — *pratītyasamutpāda*, III, c-A-9 (114) ; c-A-10 (115); *bāhyaçūnyatā*, 91 ; *bāhyāyatana*, 129 ; cf. also 82, 142.

bīja (written *vīja*) — III, c-A-9 (114) ; d-A-6 (115) ; *punarbhavavṛkṣabīja*, d-A-8 (115) ; *sarvabīja*, 191 ; *bījabhūta*, 191 ; various references : 82, 83, 125, 154, 169.

buddha (written *vuddha*) — III, a-A-8 (109) ; V-1 (171) ; 67 ; *buddhasuta*, 199 sq.

bodhicitta — 83, 191 ; *bodhicittamūla*, 191.

bhagavant — III, a-A-1 (107), 2 (108).

bhakti — *bhaktibharapraṇata*, VII-14b (195) ; 188.

bhaj (bhajati) — VII-19b (196) ; 206.

bhaṭa — *suvijvaladbhaṭamaṇikāntiçobhinī*, X-a-2b (270) ; 272.

bharita — bhūribhogabharita, X-c-3b (277) ; 279.

bhava — tenth *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula cf. *s.v. bhavapratyayā jatiḥ*; three forms of *bhava*, III, b-A-9 to b-B-1 (111) ; g-A-8 to 10 ; considered *hetu*, c-A-7 (114) ; c-A-9 (114) ; *karman*, c-B-5 (115) ; d-A-5 (115) ; *vartamāna*, c-B-8 (115) ; *prabhava*, d-A-2 (115) ; *phala*, d-A-7 (115) ; *nirvṛttiphala*, d-B-2 (116) ; *anāgatabheda*, d-B-5 (116) ; *punarā-vartakamūla*, d-B-9 (116) ; *aiçvaryasampatti*, e-A-2 (116) ; *anāgatabhava*, *atītabhava*, g-A-6/7 (120) ; *antarābhava*, 77, 127, 135, 136 ; *bhavacakra*, 82 ; *bhavaṅga*, 81 ; *tribhava*, 134 ; *punarbhava*, *karmabhava*, 127 ; *bha-vabhid-*, VII-16d (195) ; *bhavapāda-*, X-b-3a/b (274) ; *sargabhava*, X-b-3b (274) ; various references : 81, 95, 127, 134, 144, 145, 161, 276.

bhavapratyayā jātiḥ — tenth link of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, III, a-A-5 (108) ; b-B-1 (111) ; c-B-3 (115) ; e-A-6 (117) ; g-A-10 (120) ; cf. 134 ; cf. also *s.v. upādāna*.

bhasma — *pāṇḍuraṅgabhasmaja*, VI-A-3/4 (174) ; *bhasmeṣu bhasmacitta*, VI-A-5/6 (174).

bhāra — *naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāra*, VII-1a (194) ; 182.

bhāvanā — *bhāvanāpraheya*, III, f-A-5 (118) ; cf. 154.

bhugnatā — attribute of *jarā*, III, b-B-4 (112).

bhūjayottuṅgade (va) — VII-line 6 (192) ; cf. 180, 181, 182, 184 sq.

bhūmi — *avidyā* compared with, III, d-A-6 (115) ; *bhūmisaṃbhāra*, 198 ; cf. also 179 sq., 185, 200.

bheda — *cyavanatābheda*, III, b-B-7 (112) ; *mithyāndhabheda* (?), b-B-7 (112) ; *phalabheda*, d-B-2 (116) ; *kriyā-, santāna-bheda*, d-B-4 (116) ; *ekṣaṇabheda* (?), d-B-4 (116) ; *āçraya-, samavāya-, citta-, anāgata-bheda*, d-B-5 (116) ; *vināçabheda*, d-B-6 (116) ; *bhedena, abhedena*, 61 ; *ātma* ? *bhedadaṇḍāvapradāni*, e-A-2 (115) ; cf. 68, 126, 130, 140, 147.

bhojya — 202.

bhautika (rūpa) — 101, 131.

bhrānti — 92.

maṇḍa — III, e-A-8 (117).

mati (at the end of a compound) — 206.

manas — *manassaṃskāra*, III, a-B-2 (111) ; f-B-5 (119) ; *manassaṃsparça*, b-A-4 (111) ; e-B-2 (117) ; *manovijñāna*, a-B-4 (109) ; *mana-āyatana*, b-A-2 (111) ; e-B-1 (117) ; *manaskarmakuçala*, f-B-2 (119) ; *manaskarma-akuçala*, f-B-3 (119) ; *avyākṛtamanaskarman*, f-B-4 (119) ; *manasikuruta* (?), a-A-3 (108) ; *manaskarman*, 93 ; cf. 72, 73, 74, 131, 155.

mandatva — III, b-B-5 (112).

maya — *mayakaravālābhihapattripurabhid*, X-c-1b (277) ; cf. 266 sq., 278.

maraṇa — *jarāmaraṇa*, cf. *s.v. jarāmaraṇa* ; Vibhaṅga definition, III, b-B-7 (112) to b-B-9 (113) ; *jarāyāḥ samanataraṃ maraṇam, skandhabheda-tattvād* (read : *skandhabhedatvān* ?) *maraṇam*, g-B-2 (120) ; *maraṇakā-lakṣaya* (or : *kriyā* ?), b-B-8 (112) ; *çokahetuṃ maraṇaṃ, vyastaṃ maraṇaṃ, maraṇahetukā jarā*, g-B-8 (120) ; cf. also 65, 96, 139, 142.

maraṇapratyayaḥ çokaḥ — III, g-B-2 (120).

marīci — 90.

mahallakṣmī — *harapādapaṅkajarajaḥkaṇikāvodanmahallakṣmī*, X-c-2b (277) ; cf. 247.

mahabhūta — III, a-B-7 (110) ; 101, 163.

mātṛkā — 79.

māna — 154.

mārga — *mārgapraheya*, III, f-A-4 (118) ; *astimārga* (?), g-A-1 (119) ; *darçanamārga, bhāvanāmārga*, 154 ; cf. 119 sq., 159, 183 ; cf. also *s.v. nairyāṇika.*

mithyā — *na mitthyaivāvidyā*, III, f-A-1 (118) ; *mithyājñāna*, f-A-3 (118) ; *mitkyādṛṣti*, g-A-2 (120) ; h-A-8 (122) ; h-B-2 (122) ; *mithyāprakṛti*, 62 ; further references ; 5, 94, 103, 152 ; cf. also *s.v. bheda.*

muc- — *pratyamuñcat*, 8-10.

mūrti — *candraiçvarya*, X-b-2b (273) ; *āliṅgana-, tripurāntakacandraçekharamūrti*, 268 sq., 275, 276, 278.

mūla — *kleça-, karma- kalala-, skandha-mūla*, III, d-B-7 (116) ; *āçraya (phala)-, trika-, vipāka-, hetu-mūla*, d-B-8 (116) ; *grahaṇa-, punarāvartaka-mūla*, d-B-9 (116) ; *kuçalamūla*, 152, 181 ; *kuçalamūlasaṃbhāra*, 197 ; cf. also 146 sq.

megha — *puṇyamegha*, 181 ; cf. *s.v. dharma* and *abhra.*

maitreya — 183.

yamayatayati — X-b-2b (273) ; 275.

yaṣtiviṣaktahasta — 137.

yāma — a kind of gods, III, h-A-5 (122).

yathābhūtasaṃprativedha — 66, 63, 109.

yaḥ kaçcit samyag...... — beginning of a strophe, III, c-A-4 (114) ; conjectural restitution, 83-87.

yāna — 198.

ye dharmā hetuprabhavā — beginning of a strophe, III, c-A-2 to 3 (114) ; i-A-3 to i-B-1 (123) ; j-B-1 to 2 (123) ; cf. 58, 63, 80, 86, 140, 259. I here add the translation by Filliozat in Louis Renou et Jean Filliozat, *L'Inde Classique*, Tome II (1953), p. 538 : "Les choses qui naissent d'une cause, celui qui est arrivé à déclarer ce qui est en a dit la cause, et, leur arrêt, il est celui qui l'a dit tel qu'il est, le grand religieux".

yoni — 134, 162.

ratna — *ratnatraya*, V-1 (171) ; *ratnatrayāçayopeta*, VII-10a (195) ; *samastaguṇaratnabha*, VII-10b (195) ; cf. 201.

ratnasaṃbhava — 169.

rasa — *rasāntara*, VII-13c (195).

rāga — 154.

rūpa — in *nāmarūpa*, defined III, a-B-7 to 8 (110) ; considered twentyfold, e-A-8 to 10 (117) ; h-A-9 (122) ; *rūpavaivarṇatā*, g-B-2 (120) ; *rūpabhava*,

vaiyavadānika — 58, 129, 153.

vaiçāradya — 105.

vyañjana — 140.

vyavadāna — 62 sq.

vyavahāra — 91.

vyasta — III, g-B-7 to 9 (121 : eight times) ; 141, 164.

vyādhi — 61, 95.

vyāhāra — vyāhāramanjuçīkharah, VII-8b (194) ; 182.

vrata — 160.

çakta — vaktuçakta, VII-10c (195).

çakti — amitavihitaçakti, X-b-1c (273).

çabda — 120.

çaraṇa — çaraṇatraya, III, c-A-4 (114), cf 84 ; triçaraṇa, 84 ; kuleçaçaraṇa,
    VII-line 11 (193) ; varaçaraṇa, VII-18b (196) ; çaraṇagamana, 201, 204 ;
    cf. s.v. çarman.

çarman — triçarmadhīra, — VII-18b (196).

çava — çavodvah, X-a-1c (270) ; 266.

çāta — III, e-A-8 (117).

çāçvata — çāçvatātma (?), III, h-B-2 (122) ; çāçvatadṛṣṭi, 68, 159 sq. ; cf. 83,
    94, 167.

çikṣāprajñā — 11.

çikhā — ruciradīpaçikhākṛtatāmasah, VII-12b (195); asaṅkhyaçikhāmaṇibhū-
    ṣaṇāh, VII-15a (196).

çibira (çivira) — 256 sq. ; 280.

çīkara — vyāhāramañjuçīkarah, VII-8b (194).

çīla — 95, 133, 160 ; cf. s.v. çīlavrata.

çīlavrata — çīlavratopādāna, III, b-A-8 (111) ; e-B-7 (118) ; çīlavrataparā-
    marça, III, h-A-8 (122) ; çīlavrataparāmarçadṛṣṭi, g-A-2 (120) ; cf. 68,
    94, 95, 133, 160 ; cf. also s.v. çīla and vrata.

çuddhi — çuddhidṛṣṭi, III, g-A-3 (120).

çukla — (karman) 65, 66.

çūka — 142.

çūnya — çūnyendriyāvasthānadhātuçoka, III, g-B-3 (120) ; cf. 78, 83, 91, 99,
    163, 257.

çūralakṣmī — X-b-2c (273) ; 247, 276.

çoka — III, e-A-7 (117) ; g-B-2, 3 (120) ; 61, 96, 127, 163, 164 ; cf. s.v. çoka-
    pratyayah paridevah.

çokapratyayah paridevah — III, g-B-3 (120).

çrī — X-a-2c (270) ; 247, 271 sq.

çrotra — çrotravijñāna, III, a-B-3/4 (109) ; çrotrasaṃsparça, b-A-3 (111) ;
    e-B-2 (117) ; çrotrāyatana, b-A-1 (111), e-A-11 (117).

ṣaḍāyatana — 5th aṅga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. ṣaḍāyata-
    napratyayah sparçah ; defined as ṣaḍ ādhyātmikāny āyatanāni, III,

saṃghāta — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

saṃjāti — III, b-B-2 (111) ; 135, 162.

sañjīva — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

satkāya — *dṛṣṭi*, III, h-A-8 (122) ; twentyfold, h-B-1 (122) ; *aṣṭapādasatkāya-* (?), VII-line 10 (193) ; cf. 68, 94, 95, 97, 166, 171.

satkāra — 188.

satkārya — 82, 166.

sattvanikāya — III, b-B-1 (111) ; b-B-7 (112) ; 71, 134 sq.

satya — *saṃvṛti-, paramārtha-satya*, 91, 141, 153 sq., 167 ; cf. *s.v. duḥkha, samudaya, nirodha, mārga.*

santāna — 126, 136, 144, 153 ; *santānaphala*, cf. *s.v. santāpaphala.*

santāpaphala — presumbly the correct form for *santānaphala*, III, e-A-1 (116) ; cf. Add. II, sub g ; note 104 to p. 145 therefore loses its meaning.

samnyāsa — 5.

saptavidha — *pratītyasamutpāda*, III, d-A-5 to 8 (115) ; *çīla*, g-A-2 (120).

sabhāgatā — *nikāyasabhāgatā*, 135, 158.

sam- — meaning of the prefix, 88, 129, 135.

samanantara — *jarāyāḥ samanantaraṃ maraṇam*, IIII, g-B-2 (120) ; 163.

samavadhṛ — *samavadhārya* (?), 83 sq.

samavāya — *samavāyabheda*, III, d-B-5 (116) ; *trikasamavāya*, e-B-2 (117) ; *cakṣurādivijñānasamavāya*, e-B-3 (117) ; used in the meaning „total", h-A-6 (122) ; cf. 126.

samāsa — *samāsataḥ*, III, c-A-6 (114) ; 141, 152.

samudaya — III, a-A-6 (108) ; *samudayapraheyā (avidyā)*, III, f-A-4, 5 (?) (118) ; *samudayasatya*, 87 ; cf. 78, 128.

sampratāpaka — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

sambhava — *sambhavabhramaṇaçrāntaviçrantabodhim = eṣyati*, VII-5a (194).

sambhāra — *dharmasaṃbhāra*, VII-1c (194), cf. 182 sq., 197 sq. ; *puṇya-, jñānasaṃbhāra*, 179, 197 sq. ; *saṃbhārato (sic) puṇyānāṃ, saṃbhāravant, kuçalamūlasaṃbhāra*, 197 ; *dayāsaṃbhāra, dhāraṇisaṃbhāra, dharmasaṃbhārayoga*, 198 ; cf. *s.v. guṇa.*

sammoha — III, a-B-1 (109) ; *sammohaphala*, d-A-9 (116) ; *pūrvānta-, aparānta-, madhyānta-sammoha*, 128 ; cf. 65, 145, 162.

sarga — *bhavapādabhavatkaruṇākṛtasargavidhi*, presumably in different meanings, X-b-3a/b (274) ; cf. 276.

sarvapāpasyākaraṇaṃ — beginning of a Buddhist çloka, III, i-B-2 to 3 (123) ; in addition to the reference to the Mahāvastu in note 131 to p. 123, the reader is referred to the important publication by E. Lamotte, *La Grande Vertu de la Sagesse* (= Mahāprajñāpāramitāçāstra), II (1949), p. 1075, where the following translation is given : „Eviter tout péché, pratiquer le bien, purifier sa pensée : tel est l'enseignement des Buddha". Lamotte refers the reader also to *Dīgha*, II, p. 49 ; *Dhammapada*, V-183 ; *Nettipakaraṇa*, 43, 171, 186.

sahasrārapadma — not mentioned, but probably alluded to, VII-12*a/b* (195) ;
  cf. 187, 202.

sāṃkleçika — *dharmas*, 58, 153.

saṃjñā — III, h-A-8 (122) ; *saṃjñāskandha*, III, a-B-6 (110) ; *naivasaṃjñānā-
  saṃjñāyatana*, 134 ; cf. 97, 130, 131.

sādhana — *drutavilambitasādhanavanditaḥ*, VII-17*d* (196) ; 173.

sādhu ca susṭhu ca manasikuruta, III, a-A-3 (108) ; 73 sq., 77.

sāma — 147.

siddhayātra (*siddhiyātra*) — 1 sq. ; cf. XI-22*b* (315) ; *siddha ta yātra* (in Old
  Javanese) ; cf. also 326.⁻

sukha — *sukhavedanā*, III, b-A-5 (111) ; .e-B-5 (118) ; *sukhasparça*, e-B-3
  (117) ; cf. 147 ; cf. also *s.v. aduḥkhāsukha*.

sugata — *catussugatasaṃgataḥ*, VII-3*b* (194) ; *sugatabhaktibharapraṇataiḥ*,
  VII-14*b* (195) ; *sugatavimvavilokananirjita*, VII-15*c* (195).

sutṛpti — *sutṛptilakṣaṇā tṛṣṇā*, III, e-B-5/6 (118) ; 151.

susṭhu — cf. *s.v. sādhu*.

setu — 184.

sevitavya — *dharma*, III, a-A-11 (109) ; 71, 129.

skandha — *catvāraḥ arūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ* (*vedanā-, saṃskāra-, saṃjñā-,
  vijñāna-skandhāḥ*), III, a-B-5/6 (110) ; e-A-9 (117) ; *duḥkhaskandha*,
  a-A-6 (108) ; e-A-7 (117) ; *skandhapratilābha*, a stage of *jāti*, III, b-B-2
  (111) ; *skandhābhinirvṛtti*, b-B-3 (111) ; *skandhamūla*, d-B-7 (116) ;
  skandhaprādurbhāvāj jātiḥ, g-A-10 (120) ; *skandhabhedatattvāt* (*sic*)
  maraṇam, g-B-2 (120) ; *skandha-paripāka*, *-bheda*, 163. Further referen-
  ces : 82, 83, 95, 96, 97, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 144, 149.

stūpa — 87, 100.

sthāna — *sarvasthānagatāni* (*malāni ?*), V-3 (172).

sthāpanīya (*praçna*) — 158.

sparça — 6th *aṅga* of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, cf. *s.v. sparçapratyayā
  tṛṣṇā* ; defined as *ṣaṭ sparçakāyāḥ* (*viz. cakṣuḥ-, çrotra-, ghrāṇa-, jihvā-,
  kāya-, manaḥ-saṃsparça*), b-A-3/4 (111) and, in a very clumsy form,
  e-B-1 to 3 (117) ; *sukha-, duḥkha-* and (presumably, but omitted in the
  text) *aduḥkhasukhasparça*, e-B-3 (117) ; *pañcadaça sparçāni* (*sic*), e-B-4
  (117) ; considered *phala*, c-A-8 (114), d-A-4 (115) ; *niṣyandaphala*, d-B-1
  (116) ; *duḥkha*, c-B-5 (115, where *sparça* is not, however, mentioned,
  but implied in *-ādīnām*) ; *vipāka*, c-B-9 (115) ; *viṣayapravṛtti*, d-A-2
  (115) ; *puṣpa*, d-A-7 (115) ; *samavāyabheda*, d-B-5 (116) ; *trikamūla*,
  d-B-8 (116) ; *pañca kāmaguṇāni*, e-A-1 (116) ; further references : 97,
  126, 132, 147, 150 ; cf. also *s.v. sparçāyatana*.

sparçapratyayā vedanā — 6th link of the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula, III,
  a-A-4/5 (108), b-A-4 (111), c-B-2 (115), e-A-5 (117), e-B-4 (117) ; cf.
  s.v. sparça, vedanā and *pratyaya*.

sparçāyatana — III, a-A-11 (109) ; 129.

svacittaparyādāpana — 123 ; cf. also *s.v. sarvapāpasyākaraṇam*.

svabhāva — 78, 90, 104.
svārthakārin — III, f-A-7 (118) ; 115.
sveda — svedajā (jatiḥ), III, g-B-1 (120) ; 162.

hara — harādvayāṃsāmalabhaktinā, X-a-3b (270) ; harapādapaṅkajarajaḥ-,
   X-c-5c ; harāya namaḥ, X-c-1d (277) ; haraliṅga, X-c-5c (277) ; cf. 247,
   265 sq. 268.
hāni — III, b-B-5 (112) ; āyuṣo hāniḥ, antahāniḥ (?), b-B-8 (112) ; cf. 139·,
   cf. also s.v. parihāṇi.
hīna — of karman, 65, 66, 71, 94, 159.
hūṃ — 169.
hṛtparitāpa — hṛtparitāpaṃ daurmanasyam, III, g-B-5 (121).
hetu — III, c-A-2 (114, in the ye dharmā strophe); a number of pratītyasamut-
   pādāṅgas in opposition to phala, c-A-7 (114) ; its difference from pratyaya,
   f-A-6 to 9 (118) ; hetusamutpanneṣu dharmeṣv ajñānam, a-A-9 (109) ; to
   define the relation between elements of the duḥkhaskandha, g-B-5 to 9
   (121) ; hetukāṇḍa as a part of pratītyasamutpāda, c-B-9, 10 (115) ; hetu-
   prabhava, III, c-A-2 (114) ; hetumūla, d-B-8 (116) ; hetutayāçrayatvād
   (read : hetutvāçrayatvād ?), f-A-2/3 (118) ; hetūpanibandha, 82, 142 ;
   hetupratyaya, 92, 154 ; sahabhūhetu, 97, 163 ; sahetuka (pratītyasamutpā-
   da), 142 ; anyonyahetuka, 163 ; further references : 80, 81, 92, 129, 141,
   142, 154, 155, 163, 164.
heya — 92 ; cf. s.v. praheya.