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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 Coedès (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 ³ 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.
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INTRODUCTORY

In editing these texts I followed the same principles as in Prasasti Indonesia 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 reference 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, whereas 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 inscription No. III. Small Roman letters are also used for separate inscriptions going under the same number, whereas the italics from α to δ refer to the pādas of a strophe.

Italics in the transcription denote uncertain reading. Deletions are marked 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 contraction, 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 danda is rendered by /, a double danda 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 ñ. 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 īa 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 r is rendered by r in Sanskrit, but by ré 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 dharmāstraṣas).

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 conven­
tional 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 publ­
cation, 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, espe­
cially 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 Kêdukan 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 Telaga 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 Črivijaya.

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 sarvvasatvāh (D. 158) or by sarvvasatvau (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-Biéu, where the same meaning appears to be required by the context. The expression mahambil


²) Intra, No. II.


⁴) Intra, inscription a and most of the siddhayātra-stones.

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

siddhayātra, occurring in line 3 of the inscription of Kedukan 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 naalap bĕrkat 8). A different interpretation was proposed by Chhabra 9), but Nilakanta Sastri 10) and Krom 11) confirmed the view of Coedès. — 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 tirtha, 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 Kedukan 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 Ĉrīvijaya.

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 Sēnguntang, 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.

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 Sēnguntang, 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.

12) Infra, No. XI, strophe 22. — As to the strange combination of merchants, herons, crows and hamsas, 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 tirthakāka. The merchants, of course, are "migratory men". In the Kedai inscription, discussed by Chhabra, the term siddhayātra occurs in connection with the merchant (mahānāvika) Buddhagupta, and the tales of the Kathāśārītāgāra, 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 Tjāṅgal 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 Tjāṅgal inscription.
14) Oadh. Versl., 1928, p. 101. Cf. also Annual Bibl. I. A., 1931. p. 29. — According to local tradition, the low hill of Bukit Sēnguntang is closely connected with the empire of Ĉrīvijaya. In addition, the Malay annals Sējarah Malaya 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. Westenack, Uit het land van Bittertong (Zuid-Soenatra), Djīnde, I (1921), pp. 8—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 estamping 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 Tjāṅgal 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 bēr- (e.g. in mārsvanātha, line 8), and ni- instead of dī- (e.g. in nikāryyākan, line 19) 16). As possessive suffixes we find -nī and -(η)da, 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 -n, or -d. Finally, we note the occurrence of the word parāvis, meaning „all” 18), of daṇan, „companion”, but dīan, „with” 19), and of the remarkable orthography rājiya, presumably for rāiya (line 8).

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 bēr-) and dī-; cf. Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 54 sqq.
17) The form -ṇa is used after vowels, -ña 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. mārṇyāṇa (line 2) and mākāryyāṇa (line 4). As appears from these examples, Sanskrit words are not excepted.
19) As to the meaning of parāvis, cf. Cœdés, art. cit., pp. 72 sq.
20) Cf. daṇan (line 5) at the beginning of a new sentence (therefore it does not appear to be a preposition), but dīan (line 21), meaning „with”. It is, however, probable that this difference was not always made; cf. line 12 of inscription II (infra), where daṇian is used in the meaning of dīan. 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 maruyā(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), vaṅkā pramiraḥṇa, "much was their blood (shed)", may refer to the losses either of the enemy or of the army of Çrivijaya. The word pauravirakta, "red with (the blood of) the citizens", referring to either the soil or the big river (Sungai Musi) of Çrivijaya, might point to heavy losses of the Çrivijaya army, too. The words mamaṅcaṅk yaṁ praṅā ini (line 13) may refer to fighting itself or, more probably, to a victory dance [cf. modern Malay mēmēṅcaṅk for a kind of sword-dance with an imaginary opponent and the well-known Balinese pēṅcaṅk, a martial dance]. This word mamaṅcaṅk does not seem to be related to maṅcaṅk, which occurs twice in the inscription of Tālang 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 umaṅgap). 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 Tēlaga Batu 24). The end of the inscription might be a sort of epilogue warning any future insurgents.

Transcription

1. //  çrī yā... 25) // parddaṭva ........................................ 26)  
2. ū ṇa maruyāḍaṅḍa dari ................................................... 27)

21) In lines 5 and 12. — As Cœdès pointed out (act. cit., p. 74), the meaning required by the context and supported by etymology, is "full".
22) Makalaiti daṅ svāmi. — Svāni (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 makalaiti in the Kotakapur inscription, as compared to makalaiti of our text, offers a parallel to daṅsan and diṅsan, note 26).
24) Lines 8 and 13.
25) The aṅsara 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 pardāṭvan, "province of a dāṭu" (or: "office of a dāṭu")?. 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 dā.
3. dyata 28) jādi anakada valum uram ........................................
4. ... mā ini mākṣayāṇa ta ............................................................
5. vañak = pramārāñha. dañan ....................................................
6. cūrikāņku 29) jādi vyasta dara 30) ...........................................
7. mira mana 31) parāvis / 0 // da ...................................................
8. marsvastha di iya raijya 32) pra ..............................................
9. pauravrakta nītāpik ma ............................................................
10. tīda tāhu pira marvyū<ha> ....................................................
11. bhāru nīrbhāra 33) nītāpik parvā<nda> 34) .........................
12. risir = nibharu lpas 35) yam mati ...........................................
13. māmaṇcāk yam prajā ini .........................................................
14. samksepa dua tāṇḍa sanyā<sa> 36) ...........................................
15. kan pasām kāma krodha lo<ha> 37) ...........................................
16. <pra> jā ini muara ya umāṅgap 38) ...........................................
17. yan = tīda nariyāt = saṅkaṭe 39) ..............................................
18. hat 40) apa ta krama amithyā 41) ...........................................
19. nādā nikāryākan sida lilu 42) ....................................................

28) Other possibilities are nyāka or nyata.
29) Evidently for chūrikāņku, "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 Črīvijaya 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 bh-ru is archaic in this meaning. The text might refer to the tactics of Črīvijaya, which consisted in isolating the enemy commanders from their troops.
34) Nītāpik parvānda might mean: "(the commanders, isolated from their troops) were punished by the parvāndas"; the latter term seems to be the title of rather high officials in Črīvijaya, though lower in rank than a dāta; 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 sannyāsa) is rather often found in the Črīvijaya inscriptions, where it is used in the meaning "charged with"; cf. the Introduction to No. II. Does tāṇḍa 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 prai 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, mithyājañña etc.), but their opposites are almost always replaced by compounds with sanyag- (sanyagdṛṣṭi etc.).
42) Whereas nikāryākan is perfectly clear, the following words appear to be rather strange. Sīda occurs in the Gaṇḍasuli inscription as a particle used for introducing names of
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 aśkara 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 Têlaga Batu ("Stone Pond"), kampung Sabukiingking, 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 Črīvijaya. 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 Črīvijaya 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 praçaṣṭi issued on the occasion of a victory of the king of Črīvijaya over an army of revolting subjects (line 2: netā m̄ṇḍāsasenāyāh, "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 vyaṭarkyata mayā), concludes that the enemy army (śā, viz. senā) must be destroyed (varjanīya, 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 Črīvijaya, as we know it

---

20. makalṅit = dāṃ svāmi maka ya līñt dāṃ .........................................
21. trāṅku\[43\] dūan yaṃ uraṃ pradhāna .............................................

---

\[43\] Another possible interpretation of varjanīya 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.

\[44\] Possibly, őtrāṅku is the end of mitrāṅku, "my friends".

\[45\] *Jaarboek B. G.*, 3 (1936), p. 199.

\[46\] *Jaarboek B. G.*, 3 (1936), p. 52. Dr. Goris informed me that vida 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 Liù might be the title and name of the person by whom was made (nikāryākan) something which, owing to the lacuna, is unknown.

---

\[a\] apparently high-class people (*vide Pras. Inçìon.*, I, 1950, p. 53). Dr. Goris informed me that vida 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 Liù might be the title and name of the person by whom was made (nikāryākan) something which, owing to the lacuna, is unknown.

\[b\] Possibly, őtrāṅku is the end of mitrāṅku, "my friends".

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

\[d\] Agreeing in this respect, however, with the large stone inscription of Ligor and with the inscription fragments c and (probably) d below.
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 Kota-kapur, Karangbrahi and Télaga Batu (infra No. II) form together more than half of the epigraphical remains of Çrvijaya; 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=\langle p\rangle r\theta <i>/\rangle vyāḥ patibhiḥ pañca\textit{tvam}[^{47}]
2. \[\text{ri}ṣadaḥ netā maddāsasēyāḥ praty\textit{a}l...][^{48}]
3. \[\text{ru}v\text{a} iti \text{vyatarkyata} mayā sā varja\langle \text{nīyā}\rangle[^{47}]

[^{47}] The first line of this fragment suffered at several spots; the transcription seems however certain. In \textit{prthivyāḥ}, both the first consonant and the vowel sign of the \textit{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 \textit{patibhiḥ}. Vipulās of the metrical scheme \(\ldots \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu\) are by no means rare; they not only occur in the Epics, but also in the poems by Āyaghoṣa (cf. E. H. Johnston, \textit{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 \textit{patibhiḥ}. The next pāda, beginning with \textit{pañca\textit{tvam}}, is then a second or fourth one of the strophe, so that the missing portion of it consists of five syllables the metrical structure of which is known. We then get the following reconstruction of the two pādās:

\[
\text{m=}\text{prthivyāḥ patibhiḥ pañca\textit{tvam}} \equiv \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu \quad \varpiu
\]

This portion s\textit{hows} some peculiarities worthy of note. First of all, there is the use of \textit{pañca\textit{tvam}}, "fivefoldness", which is almost always used for denoting the dissolution of the individual into its five elements of earth, water, fire, wind and empty space (\textit{ākāṣa}, together the \textit{pañca mahābhūtāḥ}), i.e. death. The examples given in the \textit{P\textit{et. 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 \textit{p}, then there is some reason to suppose that the last word of the pāda was \textit{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 \textit{adharmena}), 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 Çrvijaya. Obviously, the menacing tone of the inscriptions of Kota-kapur and Télaga 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 \textit{pariṣadaḥ} ("of the assembly"); very probably, \textit{praty\textit{a}l...} should be completed to \textit{praty\textit{a}l\textit{adbha}} ("took, obtained"). As to the last line, cf. the Introduction and note 46 above.
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.

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 Cārdulavikrīḍita.

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” (maduval 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 danḍa 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 (saptamāṃ tīthau).

Now it is very striking that the same date saptamā is mentioned in line 3 of the Kēdukan 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 Kēdukan Bukit inscription. The meaning of (prā)tyamuñcat in our text corresponds rather

well with that of marlapas in line 4 of the Kêdukan Bukit stone 59), 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 Kêdukan 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 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 Kêdukan Bukit inscription, although the more than twenty thousand soldiers accompanying the ḍapunta hiyaṁ make it very probable that such action did take place 81).

If our presumption of a close correspondence of the first line of our fragment with the events at the second date of the Kêdukan Bukit inscription is correct, we might arrive at a conclusion, unfortunately only negative, about the identity of the ḍapunta hiyaṁ in the Kêdukan Bukit inscription. If maduole 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 Têlaga Batu (infra, No. II), where the king refers to himself by āku, „I". But then it follows that the third person (pra)tyamuṇīcat (alabīda may of course be either first or third person) could not refer to the king. Presumably, (pra)tyamuṇīcat refers to the person who is the subject of marlapas in the Kêdukan Bukit inscription, i.e. the ḍapunta hiyaṁ, but then it follows that the latter, whatever his identity was, cannot be the same as the king of Črivijaya 62).

---

59) G. Cœdès (art. cit., p. 35) translated marlapas by "se libéra de". As a matter of fact, the meaning of lēpas correspond as closely as possible to that of the Sanskrit root muk; kalēpasa is the exact equivalent of mokṣa. But how do the derivatives correspond? Pratyamuṇīcat would rather mean "liberated, set free", whereas marlapas 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 marvut. Although the exact meaning remains obscure, the equivalence of the two forms does not seem doubtful.

81) N. J. Krom (quoted note 1 above) combined a very doubtful reading at the end of line 7 of the Kêdukan Bukit epigraph with the well-known statement by I-tsing about the country of Malayu and therefore concluded that a part of the Kêdukan 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 Kêdukan 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 Kêdukan Bukit inscription (and our fragments c and d).

62) As to the meaning of the title of (da)punta hiyaṁ, 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 Têlaga Batu inscriptions), the term (da)punta hiyaṁ is not mentioned. As to the inscriptions of Kêdukan 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 aksaras. 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 23).

Transcription

1. ]tyamuñcat=tatsaptamyām=ala[
2. ]naripuṇagam=madval ye praviṣte [  
3. ] api ca // mā—sāratiraskṛtārkkakiranāḥ 54) [  
4. ] parokṣam=aksaravaraṅc=candrá 25) [  

The next fragment was described by Stutterheim as „a stone, carved into the form of a wedge with smoothed, triangular front side” 56). Its dimensions are: length 13 cm, height 6 cm. The fragment was bought at the Bukit Senguntang 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

---

23) 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 Çardūlavikṛīḍita strophe might be translated: "The rays of the sun, concealed by the quintescence of Illusion".
55) Possibly to be completed to: candrāṛṣṭṛtyam bhāvaram or something similar.
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 çikṣeyaprājña 59), 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 ja 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 aksara. 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 Srāgdrā (or possibly, Aryā or Anuṣṭubh) metre. Çikṣā and prajñā are two fundamental notions in Mahāyāna (and in some Hinayāna 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 Cūnya-tā. The two words together may have been used in an invocation to addressed to a perfect Buddha (or, possibly, to Māñjuṣrī or Avalokiteśvara). We can only hope that more fragments will be discovered.

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 ă-stroke, would be read as ha and na, respectively.
59) Cf. the photograph published in the article by Cædes, Le royaume de Çūrijāya, B. E. F. E. O. 18 (1918), Pl. 1, and by Chhabra, op. cit., Pl. 4.
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 \(āśāda\) 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
\(āśāda\) (\(Āsāḍha\)).

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 \(dapunta
hiyam\) in the expired Čaka-year 605. The result would be as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(a)] At 11 \(çuklapakṣa\) of Vaiṣākha: \(naïk\ di sāmvau\);
  \item[(b)] At 7 \(çuklapakṣa\) of Jyaistha: \(marlēpas dāri mināna\);
  \item[(c)] At 5 \(çuklapakṣa\) of Āśāḍha: \(laghu\ mudita\ dātāṃ.
\end{itemize}

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
\(adhimāsa\), 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 (\textit{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 \(aṅkaras\) 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.

\(^{62}\) \textit{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, \textit{Reduction of
Hindu Dates from the data of the Sūryasiddhānta} (1938), we find for the Julian
equivalent of True Minasaṃkrānti preceding the beginning of the Čaka year 605 the
number of 49,362 days and for the distance to the first New Moon 13,496 days.
The 11th \(tithi\) of Vaiṣākha 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 ḍapunta hiyam? — In view of these two periods, it is not probable that the inscription records a return journey from the capital of Črivijaya (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. Another point which is difficult to understand in the case of a return journey is that the ḍapunta hiyam would have taken his army (manāva 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; recently, Poerbatjaraka added new arguments to this conjecture. It seems however difficult to account for the fact that the ḍapunta hiyam 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 dātāma) followed by the „making“ (marvata) 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? 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 Tamvan (?) 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. Especially by V. Obdeyn, quoted in note 1 above.

66) Quoted in note 1 above. Poerbatjaraka explains (pp. 34 sq.) the name Mināña Tamvan as the place where two rivers meet. Tāmvān is explained as the equivalent of Old Javanese tāmvan, derived from the base tēmu, „to meet“. This etymology is however in direct conflict with the fact that the equivalent of Old Javanese tēmu occurs six times in the inscription of Talang Tuwo (lines 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, and 14), but spelt tēmu, thus pointing to an original pēpēt. 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 the 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.

67) 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 aksara, it seems certain that the second and third verticals are connected at the upper side, a feature which excludes ls. The aksara is either a ta (as Cœdès read), or, more probably to our opinion, a ke. 
Our fragment contains an additional passage, which is not found in the Kêdukan 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” \((\text{vihāra ini di wanua ini})\) is mentioned. The twofold use of ini makes it probable that the Vihāra was situated in the neighbourhood of Télagä 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 Kêdukan 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 Çrîvijâya, it gives us a few details which might prove interesting.

**Transcription** \(^{71}\)

3. ]ptami çuklapakṣa ruḷan .................
4. ]va \(^{72}\) yaṃ vala dua laicṣa .................
5. ] sapuluḥ dua vañakṣa dātaṃ di
6. ] āsādha \(^{73}\) laghu mudita dātaṃ .................

\(^{69}\) We read vaṛṣā at the end of the line. The two preceding aksaras, which are only very faintly visible, might well have been čaka. 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 Kêdukan 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 Kêdukan 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 mānāra occurring in line 5 of the Kêdukan Bukit inscription.

\(^{73}\) Read: āsādha. Only very few examples of the aksara ḍha are known from Indonesian inscriptions (the only examples known to us are found in the Karangtênah inscription; *cf. Pras. Indon.*, I, 1950, p. 29) ; in the name of the month āsādha, which seems to be the only Sanskrit word with ḍha adopted in Old-Javanese, it is always replaced by either da or ḍha.
II. THE OLD MALAY INSCRIPTION OF TELAGA BATU (SOUTH SUMATRA)

As was stated in the introduction to No. I above, the discoveries at the place called Têlaga Batu to the east of the town of Palembang (South Sumatra) include not only a large number of siddhayâtra stones and 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 7). 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 aksaras. 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 Çrîvîjaya, 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 aksaras preceding are very faint on the stone, but might well have been çaka. The reading of gi seems certain. Between the latter and the presumed ça, there are traces of three or four aksaras, possibly to be read todyâna followed by a mark of punctuation. Gitodyâna, if this conjectural reading may be relied upon, would appear to be the name of a park (?) ; as to the (presumably two) aksaras preceding raḥ, no identification is possible.

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

2) Ibid. The translation of the passage is as literal as possible.
ninth or tenth century A.D. 2). We do not know upon what details the above conclusion was founded. On the contrary, both form and style of the aksaras 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 Tēlaga 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, kimci 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 inappropiate, 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 tatkal 6).

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

---

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 in this case the more striking. In both cases we note the same style of the aksaras with their slender forms (in relation to their breadth, the aksaras are very high). The ra is double-stroked everywhere.
5) Also in the metrical parts of texts like the Siddharmapuṇḍarikā, 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, kētika 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 kadācit(t). Similar developments may be observed in present-day Indonesian; cf. A. A. Fokker, Indoensische 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 *cākṣu* in Indian political literature, and to that of *mata-mata* in modern Indonesian. The combination *paracākṣu* 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, *paracākṣu* should be explained as a Sanskrit compound, the first half of which means "enemy" (cf. *para*deça etc.); *paracākṣu* 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 Črīvijaya. In *cākṣu*, 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 Télaga 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 respective'y 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 *tapah*; Javanese *teja* from Sanskrit *tejah*, etc.). In Buddhist Sanskrit, however, the loss of the final visarga is frequent; it even leads to sandhi forms such as *tojva* for *teja iva*. Cf. *tama*, "nouveau thème primitif 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 empire10). 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: yuvārāja , pratiyuvārāja , rājakumāra yan nisamvardhiku akan datūa, "who are distinguished by me with the function of a dātu (lit. to be a dātu)". Nisamvardhiku, which occurs several times in this form, is a derivative from the base samvardhi by means of the affixed ni- and -ku. There might be some doubt whether the original Sanskrit form from which samvardhi is derived is sanvrdhī or sanvrdhīta. The meaning of the form found in the inscription is not doubtful. The expression nisamvardhikā is reserved for the princes; for the lower rank state servants performing the function of a dātu, the expression nīgalarku, "are charged by me with", is used (also in line 4 of the Kotakapur inscription).

10) Cf. line 20: manārakṣā́ta sakalamandalaśa kadatuanka. Kadatuanka cannot possibly mean "office of a dātu" (Cœdès, art. cit., p. 57) here, and the meaning of Javanese kēraton, "royal palace", is also out of the question. Here, at least, kadatuana has clearly the meaning of "empire" as a whole; the latter is divided into a large number (this seems implied in sakala) mandalaś. 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 vijakṣa, bhakti etc. do not occur in the Črivijaya inscriptions. Probably, the empire was divided into a considerable number of mandalaś, 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 parvānā; 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 parvānā dyākū, on a line with sanyāsa datūa). In line 26, where the same term occurs, the same appears to be the case (nisamvardhiku parvānā is to be compared to nisamvardhiku datūa).

11) Art. cit., p. 54, more precisely: "(le roi) nommait des dātu, qui devaient gérer chacun un kadatuana, et éventuellement diriger des expéditions militaires"; we learn from our inscription that the territory under command of a dātu was denoted by mandala, whereas kadatuana seems to refer to the empire as a whole; cf. note 10 above. We suppose that the relation between kadatuana 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 danadanāyaka, 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 tatpurusa 17). The whole could mean something like “royal sheriffs”.

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

--- 19 ---

12) In that case, however, these feudal chiefs would have come under the direct authority of the king of Črīvijaya. 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.

13) Cf. note 4 to the transcription.

14) We mean the so-called lists of manīlaśa 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 versamelingen (1941), the Introduction and passim.

15) The meaning of nāyaka in Sanskrit is rather vague ("leader" e.g. of an army), whereas in the modern Central Javanese courts the nayakās 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.

16) 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 vāsikaraṇa, „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 cāthabhaṭas 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 (puhāvara, one of the few Indonesian terms in this list), merchants (vānīyāga) 23), commanders (pratisāra), royal washermen (marśī hāji, 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) Tuśān vāsākṣa =vūrḥa, — cf. the note to the translation.
19) Adhyakṣa nicavaraṇa.
21) Art. cit., p. 199. — Ibid., p. 200, a copper-plate grant is mentioned, the seal of which bears the legend Kumārāmātyādikaraṇasaya. Some other officers, frequently mentioned in Indian inscriptions in this connection, such as Mahattaras and Rājasthānīyas, do not occur in our text.
Cāthabhaṭas are often mentioned in Indian inscriptions among the persons who are not allowed to enter temple grounds, just like, e.g., the nāyakas and pratyayes in the Old Javanese inscriptions. Cf. H. Kern, Verspr. Gesch., 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 vanyāga. 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 Çrivijaya.

For our knowledge of the Old Malay language, too, the inscription of Têlaga 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 kamù means „you” (plural). Here we find also the enclitic form -mâmu, „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 malefactors themselves.

The word malûn, which occurs several times in this text (e.g. in line 11), undoubtedly corresponds to modern Indonesian bêlum (or: bêlon). It seems that in a small number of words the Çrivijaya 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 bêr-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” 34). 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 lai 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

---

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 kasihaṇ vaṣīkaraṇa lai; the Kotakapur inscription, in the corresponding passage (line 6), reads kasihaṇ vaṣīkaraṇa . 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 kasihaṇ vaṣīkaraṇa lai were to be translated: "kuṣṭha (cf. note 51, below), philtres and other means to make people submit to their will". Vaṣīkaraṇa 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 paracaksu (lines 6 and 7). Caksus, in the meaning "spy", is a well-known term in the Arthaśāstras; 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 vījīṣu ; spying for the enemy was however something quite different and the passage in our text contains a sanction against it. If, then, lai means "other", its addition to paracaksu 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 Rāmāyana (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 āsana kāla. In that case, the statement makes sense, but the main objection is that it would constitute an anticipal 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 punya 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 caksu 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 Tēlaga 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 \textsuperscript{29}). In that case, of course, the latter are referred to by the third person (ya and \textit{-na} 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 Črīvijāya inscriptions, too, is \textit{muah}. H. Kern \textsuperscript{30} and Van Ronkel \textsuperscript{31} connected it with Old Javanese \textit{muawah}, „again”, whereas Cœdès took it as an equivalent of \textit{āda (ada)}, „to be” (presumably not occurring in the Črīvijāya inscriptions), indicating the mere presence of something and often used as an emphatic particle \textsuperscript{32}). It appears, however, that no argument can be based upon the absence of \textit{āda}, for the same word proves to be frequent in the Télaga 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 (\textit{tmu muah ya āhāra dhān air niminumna}). Here, it is difficult to account for any special reason why \textit{tmu} should have been stressed; if it had been the intention to stress the presence of food and water, one would have expected \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{mar-} in the Črīvijāya inscriptions corresponding to \textit{bēr-} in classical Malay and modern Indonesian, and \textit{mamāva} corresponding to \textit{mēmbawa}; in addition, we consider \textit{malān} corresponding to \textit{bēlon} hardly doubtful) we see that the initial \textit{m} of the Črīvijāya inscriptions corresponds to a \textit{b} in classical and modern Malay. \textit{Muah} could then be taken to correspond to the well-known word \textit{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” (\textit{phala}; cf. also terms like \textit{vipāka} and \textit{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

\textsuperscript{29} This passage will be discussed with greater detail towards the end of the Introduction.

\textsuperscript{30} Verspr. Geschr., VII, p. 211.

\textsuperscript{31} Art. cit., p. 16.

\textsuperscript{32} Art. cit., pp. 75 sq. According to this opinion, \textit{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 muah (Kotakapur, lines 5 and 7; our text, lines 8, where it occurs twice, 19, 21 and 22), vriddhi muah (Talang Tuwo, line 6), jānana muah ya siddha (Kotakapur, line 6), pulam ka iya muah yaṃ dosānaa vautoa jāhat inan (ibidem), cānti muah kavutānīa (ibidem, line 7), subhikṣa muah yaṃ vanuānaa parāvis (ibidem, line 9), cānti muah kavutānānaa yaṃ sumpah niminumāmu ini (our text, line 26), diya siddha muah (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 (jānana ........ 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 vriddhi (growth, prosperity), by subhikṣa (prosperity), by siddha (arriving at its perfect state, successful) and even by cānti (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 muah 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 nimuah 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 muah: „bears fruit”; here, too, the use of phalati in Sanskrit may be compared (cf. Buddhac, VII, 26: tasmād adharmā phalatīha dharmah, „then dharma in this world bears as its fruit what is contrary to dharma” (Johnston).

Another very awkward word is mulam which Kern and Blagden connected with Malay pulang, „to come back”, but Cœdès with Cham mulan, „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: pàrvvāna mulam kāmu tālu

32) We presume that cānti 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 Śamāra have come to complete rest; it has almost become a synonym of Nirvāṇa; cf. the definition of the latter by cāntyekalaksāntvāt, „car le Nirvāṇa a pour unique caractere la cessation des passions et de la souffrance de soi et d’autrui” (translation by L. de la Vallée Poussin, L’Abhidharma koça de Vasubandhu, IV, 1924, p. 78). To a Buddhist, there might be something strange in defining notions like cānti, niruddha, 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 visārṇyagaphala, „fruit de disconnexion” (Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 291).
muḥāḥ 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 Tēlāga Batu inscription might be of some importance will be briefly mentioned.

An interesting expression not yet known from the other Ćrivijaya inscriptions is huluntuhāṅku, apparently meaning "my empire" (lines 7, 11, 12, 14, 17 and 23); the literal meaning seems to be: "my slaves (hulun) and lords (rahāṅ)"; 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 haṅun 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 ḫan (from which also haṅun, "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 vāṅun instead of haṅun (cf. line 5: drohaka vāṅun, and line 7: drohaka vāṅun—dy—aṅku). One would even be inclined to consider the possibility of an error by the scribe in the case of haṅun in the Kotakapur inscription, since in this type of script va with a daṅda is very similar to ha. A small hint in this direction might be the fact that in haṅun 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 ārambah kadatuanku, "to organize, i.e. to attack, my kraton", negative

---

33) Art. cit., p. 79.
expressions like *tīda bhaṅkti*, „not worshipping, i.e. revolting against“, and several other expressions; probably, *drootaka*, 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 32). 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-kudāṇḍa* 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 *dvānda* of the type *jīvāmaraṇaṃ*, „life and death”. But *daṇḍa-kudāṇḍa* meaning „fines, bad fines“ (?) does not yield a suitable meaning 37). The occurrence of exactly the same expression in a Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya. 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 Črīvijaya 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

---

32) Such passages occur only in inscriptions originating from Eastern Java.  
37) In view of such an interpretation, our printed transcription of Old Javanese edicts usually separate *daṇḍa kudāṇḍa*. 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 Črīvijaya 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 *daṇḍam 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 *maṇḍihālādī*, also spelt *bhaṇḍihālādī*, 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 *nāyaṅa praryaya* (cf. supra p. 19) and perhaps also other terms.
perpetrators of all possible crimes against the king and the state of Çrivijaya. 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 28). The Têlaga 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 Coëdes 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

---

28) At the same time, the Kotakapur inscription contains an additional passage at the end referring to the much discussed expedition to javä. 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 Têlaga 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 Čāḍha 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.


41) This is, for instance, expressed in the explanation in the Museum.
imphecy 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 nimmumāmu\textsuperscript{42}, "which is drunk by you" \textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{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, Geschichtte der Indischen Literatur, 1907—22, III, p. 496.  
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. Ngan 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 dahān daraḥ). After that, mention is made of the use of the ċṛīyaṇtra by conspirators. This very complicated figure (sāṃsthāna, which is also mentioned in the text) consists of a large number of triangles overlapping each other, which are concentric circles with lotus petals and aksaras, 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 vaśikaraṇa 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, rūpā (images or drawings of the people to be bewitched), bhasma (ashes), vaidī (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 (ṛūpiṇāṅku). Also a special plant is mentioned, viz. kuṣṭha (Sanskrit kuṣṭha). We know that it was frequently used for magical purposes. It is mentioned in the Kauḍīkasūtra among the means used in order to win the love of a woman (which is also a kind of vaśikaraṇa) 51). It here occurs together with philters (kaṣṭhan) 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 vaśikaraṇa ceremonies, we refer the reader to Bhattacharjya 53) who states that „Kuruṇallā 54) is said to confer success in the Tāntric rite of vaśikaraṇa of the rite of subduing or bewitching men, women, ministers or even kings”.

51) Kauḍīkasūtra, 35, 12; cf. the translation by W. Caland, Verh. Kon. Acad. Wet., Afd. Lett., N. R., III, No. 2 (1900), p. 118: “Einen mit frischem Butter (unter Aussprechung des citierten Liedes) bestrichenen Costus Speciosus (kuṣṭha) waermt er dreimal taglich, 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 Leppa, composites)”. — 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. img. klasse, 88), passim, but cf. the World 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 Miniaev-Mironov, p. 76), but also in the list of diseases (284, No. 6; p. 116).
52) The term kaṣṭhan is also mentioned in line 6 of the Kotakapur inscription.
54) One of the ćaktis of Amitābha, especially worshipped in Nepal.
It is evident that all these Tāntric rites must have been very well-known in 7th century Črivijaya; 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 (Āśaṅha), 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 Črivijaya 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 pamvalyanuku; the latter form (cf. Modern Indonesian pāngĕmbalan) 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 Tëlaga Batu inscription does not supply us with any details as to the way in which the empire of Çrivijaya 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 luah makamatai tandrun luah an hakairu muah kāyet
3. ntem bhakti ni ulun haraki . unai tuhai ³) // kāmu vaṇak=māmu rājaputra , prośāra ⁴) . bhūpati . senāpati . nāyaka . pratyaya . hāji-
   pratyaya . daṇḍanāvaka .
4. .... mūrddhaka ⁵) . tuhā an vatak=nuṇuḥ . adhvākṣī nūjavarna ⁶) . vāṣikaraṇa . kumārāṇātya . cāthabhata . adhikaraṇa . karmma . . . ⁷) .
5. kāmu marsī hāji . hulun=hāji . vaṇak=māmu uraṇ 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 luah the words vinuna paithampaan. 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 caṭra, the combined vowel signs for -o and the last syllable as seems certain. Instead of stū, apparently the most probable reading, nṝṇa of mbhā would also be possible. We do not see any acceptable term which might satisfy these conditions.
⁵) Two aksaras at the beginning of the line are too vaguely visible for being identified.
⁶) Read: adhyakaṇa nīcavarna.
⁷) One, perhaps two, aksaras illegible.
⁸) Only the da is certain. At the end of the line, there is room for one more aksara. Dhan would be possible.
dari māṃmaṃ kāmu. kadāci kāmu tīda bhakti dy=āku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ. tuvi mūlaṃ kadāci kāmu drohaka vaṅun luvī yaṃ marvuddhi
6. lavan çatrunku. athavā lariya ⁹) ka dātu paracakṣu lai nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ. tuvi mūlaṃ kadāci kāmu makānuca rā dari çatrunku dari dātu paracakṣu lai. dari kulamāmu mitrāmāmu. dari vadaumāmu. dari hulu vukan paracakṣu
7. lai. mañujāri kāmu drohaka vaṅun=dy=āku malūna āda di kāmu. tīda ya māpādāḥ dy=āku di huluntuhāṅku. kadāci kāmu lai lāri nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ. tuvi mūlaṃ kadāci kāmu miyuāyu māṃmaṃ dari vātu ... ¹⁰)
8. athavā marcorakāra ¹¹) hinamadhyaamottamajāti. yadi ¹²) makalāñit= tāmva yaṃ prajā nirakāñku. athavā makatālu muaḥ uran kalpita pūrva katālu mūharñāma ¹³) uran āramba kadātuanku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ. tuvi mūlaṃ dari kāmu ...... ¹⁴)
9. kāmu marvuat vini hāji an tāhu an tīaḥ rumah mañujāri yaṃ māmāva mas dravya athavā mañujāri diriña ¹⁵) uran an tīaḥ rumah mālu. uran mānlāri yaṃ jana mamāva dravya di luar huluntuhāṅku lai varopāya ka kāmu laři-
10. yākan ka çatrunku ka dātu paracakṣu lai nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ // athavā kadāci kāmu māti malūn mānāruḍā athavā kāmu lariya mānlā-riya lai kāmu. nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ // athavā kāmu nīcāri lai marvuat=nīcāri parādātuan ¹⁶)
11. manalit mas mani ¹⁷) malūn maṇprurūḍā kadātuanku. marvuddhisārana ri lai kāmu. uran vukan vaidiaka tahūnā kāmu marvuat sākit. tīda kāmu māpādāḥ dari huluntuhāṅku. nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ. kāmu tuvi nīgallānāmu māṣasājāvuddhi kulamāmu maṇjaru ......... ¹⁸)

¹⁰) Or lari ya as two words.
¹¹) Or dariy=āku (?) .
¹²) The second akṣara is damaged. Other possibilities would be bhā and sa. Co seems however more palaeographic grounds. As to the meaning, marcorakāra, though not at all impossible, is not quite satisfactory.
¹³) The first akṣara is uncertain. It might be a ya the three verticals of which are placed very close to each other. Tati and kadi would also be possible. As to the meaning, none of the three possibilities seems satisfactory. (Sanscrit) yadi does not occur in any Cṛivijaya text. For if or when, these texts seem to use kadāci (sic).
¹⁴) 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 cillpita cannot be excluded. The reading cilpītamūrdhaka, though in part conjectural, would not be unsatisfactory.
¹⁵) Two or three akṣaras at the end of the line have become illegible.
¹⁶) Viniña would also be possible.
¹⁷) The last two syllables of the word are very vague. The reading is conjectural.
¹⁸) Except for the very end of the line, the whole of it is very clear. We suppose that mani is a wrong orthography for mañi. It is curious that this word is always given as manik in Old Javanese.

Two or three akṣaras at the end of the line have almost disappeared. Rūpinanktu, occurring also in line 13, might be in accordance with the traces, but remains conjectural.
12. नकु कामु अदा पत्रा दाना दारा निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . तुवी मुलां ताहु कामू दी सिवनादे ग्रत्रुण्कू लाई निपिनान्दा 19) मकारच्युन्त्रा दि 
काना 20) लुआर सांस्थाना तिडा कामू 21) मरन्पक्याद्य द्य=अकु 
दी हलुंतुहान्कू निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . ताहपी कामू 22) 
13. ............... दि 23) समार्यादापाडा दिसे वाणु=द्य=अकु . तिडा 
कामू मरन्पक्याद निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . ली मकारणीिन्त=प्राणा 23) 
उराम मरुपालहस्नावदामान्त्रप्रयोगा . तिडा अहारा 24) दरी सामा 
यांकू रुपिनान्कू कुस्ता कसित्ता वांकिराना लाइ . कादाकी कामू 25) 
मरवुद्धिसराना मा रान्यादा 26) . यथाि वांकिराना . तिडा मकाररी 
मकारणीिन्त प्राणा , अतहाव वृतमा ताहु कामू दी देा . तिडा याकुम द्य=अकु दी हलुंतुहान्कू , निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . अतहाव 
अहार दरी कामू दी मरवुत्र याम वृत ठाहत आहि . i.i द्राति ............. 27) 
15. ति दीना ............... 28) दि कामू . निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . अतहाव 
मुलां दरी कामू तालू दिया . तिडा अकु दान्धाकु दान्धा . तुवी कामू लाइ याम सांया दातुा . सांया लाइ न्दा 29) . सांया 
सार्ववंशा द्य=अकु . कादाकी कामू अचुरांमामु मकारणीिन्त वृतमा दसा 30) 
16. ताह निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . अतहाव मुलां अदा उराम दरी कामू 
................. 31) सावाफका िन्तुय्यकरमकािर्नासिरादि ............... I 32) 
निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब . अतहाव मुलां कादाकी अदा ............... 
प्राकिराना दिसे निवृत्तुह कामू सुम्राब ........................ 
17. कामू सुम्राब . तुवी मुलां कादाकी कामू मान्त्रिका 

19) Most of the middle part of this line is very difficult to be read. Nipiiनन्दा is not satis 
factory. Other possibilities such as niपि, दितानान्दा (?) cannot be excluded. 
20) One might suppose dikit=कालजुर. 
21) Possibly: (tida कामू) बहक्ति तिडा कामू (मरन्पक्याद). 
22) Of the four or five अक्षरास at the beginning of the line only vague traces remain. 
23) For प्राणा? — 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 Buddhist Sanskrit (this may be the case with कादाकी). 
There is however one, apparently certain, example of a replacement of the lingual 
by the dental nasal (मानि, I. 11). 
24) Except for the initial अ, the reading is uncertain. It seems, however, that none of 
the alternative possibilities (such as अक्श्व, अप्राश, अद्हारा etc.) is acceptable. The 
meaning required by the context is: "shrinking back from (the use of)" , or something 
similar. 
25) About eight अक्षरास have become illegible. 
26) Except for the first word of the line, uncertain. 
27) Five or six अक्षरास 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 अक्षरास of which no reliable reading can be obtained. 
29) Possibly: dvitigō, which, however, does not make sense. We should expect the name 
of a function to be mentioned here. 
30) The three last अक्षरास of the line are very uncertain. 
31) About ten अक्षरास illegible. Only about in the middle of the passage, the words 

d्य=ाकु can still be recognized. 
32) The end of the compound seems to be ष्ठिति, which, however, does not seem to make sense.
marswasthā samaryyāda athavā lai katāhumāmu ....... dia lai .........
.. prakārāna . tīda kāmu marppādaḥ dy=āku di huluntuhāṅku .
dāan=kāmu parvuatāṅa . nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ // tuvi mulam
kadāci ........

18. *mu* 23) niminumṇa nidanda kāmu tīda lai āda kāmu kadāci ...........
........ dy=āku tīda kanulaṁṇa sarvaprapaṇa nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ .
athavā ātaṁ kāmu di sthānamāmu tīda āku danda çānti yaṅ uraṅ
nigalarku manṛakṣa di kāmu .............. nivunuḥ 24)

19. ........ 25) dāan vinimāmu anakmāmu .............. 26) pallałamāmu
dandaṅku . tathāpi di luar .... uraṅ nigalarku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpaḥ .
tālu muah kāmu dāan anakmāmu vinimāmu santānamāmu gotramāmu
mitramāmu // tathāpi .............. 27)

20. dy=āku sanyāsa datuā kāmu manṛakṣāṅa sakalamaṇḍalāṅa kadātu-
anku . yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja . rājakumāra yaṅ nisamvarddhiku
akan=datuā niparsumpahakan=kāmu . kadāci kāmu tīda bhakti tīda
tattva dy=āku marvuddhi dīan çātrunku kāmu di yaṅ lai nivunuḥ kāmu

21. sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini . nisuruḥ tāpik=kāmu . pūrvvāṅa mulam kāmu
tālu muah kāmu //tuvi mulam jana vāṇun=kulagotramitrasantānamāmu
dy=āku . tīda yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja . rājakumāra yaṅ nisamvard-
dhiku akan=datuā . yaṅ marvuat=tiḍa kāmu nivunuḥ

22. sumpañ niminumāmu ini . nisuruḥ tāpik=kāmu dīan gotramāmu san-
tānamāmu tālu muah iva . ini graṃ kadāci ka yuvarāja . pratiyuvarāja .
rājakumāra yaṅ nisamvarddhiku akan=datuā lai kadāci akan=nimulaṇ
çāsanāṅa . akan=ḍari kāmu ni-

23. muahāṇa praṇā abhiprāyāṇa . niujārī kāmu pūrvvāṅa . uraṅ vukan
nisuruḥ ya maṇujārī kāmu saṃceta . kāmu tīda marppādaḥ cy=āku
di huluntuhāṅku nivunuḥ kāmu sumpañ . athavā tuvi vaṅak=māmu
mantri 28) dūruṇ vala yaṅ nisamva.ddhiku akan

24. ................. 29) luviḥ dari samaryyādamāmu . dari lābhamāmu .
nivunuḥ kāmu sumpañ . sārambhā dari uraṅ drohaka . tīda bhakti
tīda sārvajva . dhṛva vuatmāmu nivunuḥ kāmu sumpañ . ini vuatmāmu
minum sumpañ .............. 40)

---

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

24) After kāmu, there are faint traces of about ten aksaras. Nivunuḥ, at the end of line 18,
is however clear.


26) About ten aksaras 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.

27) The end of the line is illegible.

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

29) Some six aksaras at the beginning of the line are very difficult to be read. The last
word before the transcribed portion of it might well be vānum.

40) Our reading of the last eight or nine aksaras at the end of this line seems too
uncertain to be reproduced here.
25. .... kadāci kāmu mulaṃ kāryya 41) nivunuh kāmu sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini . ini gram kadāci kāmu bhakti tattva sārjjva diy=āku . tida marvuat kāmu doṣa ini tantrāmala pamvalyānku // tida iya akan= nimākān kāmu dhān anakvinimāmu . kadāci kāmu minuṃ sumpaḥ ....
26. vala yaṃ nivava di samaryyāda muah yaṃ muah niminumāmu . athavā kvāra 42) lai . cānti muah kavuyatnāna yaṃ sumpaḥ niminumāmu ini . nimuah di divasāna vala yaṃ nisamvardhiku parvvānda manāpik .
   tathāpi yaṃ nitāpik ................................
27. .... tida kāmu nisaṃjña kalpana akan ......... makāryya avadya āsannaphalāṇa savātu gulas=savātu ................................ samālam .
   athavā niminumāmu .................................... 43)
28. ....... maka tida tamāṇa diya siddha muah yaṃ kamāṇa iya nitaṃṇa vala ...................................... yaṃ kāmu vulan āṣādha ....................... 44)

Translation

[3] All of you, as many as you are, — sons of kings 2) ....... (? ) 5),

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, kva would also be possible. Neither reading is satisfactory. Or are we to read: athavākṣarai 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 Karangbahi. It is the patha in its narrow sense. — A partial and conjectural translation has been given by H. Kern (Veresp. Geschr., 7, pp. 210 sq.) and by V. Obdeyn (Tijdchr. 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.
5) The reading is uncertain; cf. the note to the transcription, where different possibilities were suggested.
chiefs 4), army commanders, nāyakas 5), pratyaya 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), adhikaran- nas 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 same meaning 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 Tatpurusa compound the first half of which is Indonsian is very strange, but we do not see another alternative.

8) Tuhā an vatak—vuruh, — vatak is probably the same word as Old Javanese watēk, "group", often used to confer a plural meaning on the term following [sang watēk dewarā = 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 trā¬tes and crafts (tuhā ning mangrakē, 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 Dīnaya, 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 (trīgībhīh vedavidbhīh ...... sthāpaṇādyaḥ ...... sthāpito agastyaḥ). — Sthāpakas are mentioned in later Old Javanese literature; they seem to play an important role during several ceremonies (cf. Nāgarakrītāgama, 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 hāji, — conjectural translation. The first word might well correspond to modern Indonesian bārīh, "clean". The correspondence mar- : bār- is regular. As to the loss of the visarga with compensatory vowel lengthening, this same line appears to give another example (tuvī : tuvīh). — 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 19); if you are not faithful to me, you will be killed by the curse.

Besides, — if you behave like a traitor, plotting with those (?) 19) who are in contact with my enemies, or if you [6] go over to Datus 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 Datus 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 watāk i dalām (or: watāk i jro), "groups of the interior (the part of the kératon 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 watāk i jro, the pamrēsi, a term which strongly reminds one of the marāi 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 pamrēsi with bērāh, "clean".

Mangunang, — undoubtedly the Old Javanese word mangunang, which is almost a synonym of sumpah. In the imprecations which are regularly found in the later Old Javanese inscriptions the three terms mangunang gapatha sumpah are often used together.

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 vānum ivi lāvan is not meant plotting in the narrow sense of the word, but rather the execution of plots. For vānum, cf. the Introduction; the tendency to use rather innocent-looking words for grave offences is seen in several terms in this context; besides vānum, we find also mañutjāri, "to speak to", i.e. "to plot with", marбудhi lāvan and, of course, negative expressions such as tīda bhakti and tīda marpēdah.

As noted in the Introduction, we take dātu paracā'gu lai to mean: "dātu [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.

Makānucaša, — 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 anucāra and anucārin do, both in the sense of "attendant, follower".

Hulu vukan paracā'gu 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 Črīvijaya 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 kératon, — 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) Miśayu mâpmam, — 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, Verzsp. Geschr., 8, pp. 224 sqq.). Mi-âyu-âyu 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“ (muâh siddha kâmu sumpâh).

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 tâmva has been read correctly, it might be connected with Old Javanese tamba, „medicine“.

24) Makâlila, — 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 tâlu 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) Vinî hasil, — 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, Geschiedenis", p. 214, and Stutterheim, T.B.G., 65 (1925), p. 212).

29) Tâlah rumah, — cf. (classical Malay) tâlah 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). Tâlah 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 tâlah rumah, the latter here probably means especially that interior part of the kératon 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 Çrîvîjaya 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 bēlon (often written bēlum). — 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 yan jana, if read correctly, are not clear. Manlārī could possibly mean: "to flee with something" (as an active form), though one would rather have expected manlārīyākān 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 Arthāpāstras 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) Mātī 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 nivruañh sumpah 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. — Mamrurūā is clearly causative. The final -ā must almost necessarily 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) Malaalit, — probably to be connected with Old Javanese (a)litt, "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). — Malaalit 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.


37) "To make sick" (marvuat sākit), so that they would offer no resistance to the rebels.
The king, who 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 aksaras 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.  

Rūpināṅku, — 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 rūpin is an incorrect adaptation of Sanskrit rūpin. The latter means: „provided with form, material“. So rūpināṅku 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 rūpināṅku 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 parvāṇḍa 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) Vaśiṅkarana, — presumably the general term referring to all those actions; cf. supra, p. 22.
48) Vaśitā, — „their actions”; the suffix -ā can refer to the groups addressed (which are always referred to as kāma); 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 turi 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 dyōāku di halamutuākā 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 an- 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) Cīhna, — lit.: „signs, indication”; we should have expected the use of a verb such as marvast before cīhna. 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 sanyāsa) parvāṇḍa a clear indication that parvāṇḍa 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 parvāṇḍa is obscure; the stone seems to give dvīlinda.
53) Keśyākarmakārya,—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 (aśīta) 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. Kāra 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 54), you will be punished, but no other, and if you ............ to me, ............... 55), 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, 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 (Ci:ap:er: „Crimes against the security of the state”).

54) Māntrika. — might also mean: „advisers, give advice”.

55) Dhan kē:p.a parvauatāna, „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 perpetrators.

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 sumpah, cf. infra, lines 21, 24 etc.

57) The words tīda kamulaṃño sarvapraṇā are obscure. As to kamulam cf. note 49, above. If the meaning of kamulam 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 uram niṣalarku, „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 yam 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 rājakumāras to the yuvāraja.
orders to punish you, (but) before your return (?) you will have expiated (your sins).

Moreover, — if others instigate 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, if you are guilty, you will not be killed 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 (resort) to 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, with the object that owing

63) Pūrwāna 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 -ā is strange, although it could be explained (cf. the corresponding term sēbēlamā in the modern language).

64) 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.

65) Vānum, — for this word cf. note 15 above. In this text, it has always a pejorative meaning.

66) Presumably, this is directed against those dātus who do not belong to the royal family. Because they are considered less dan, the sanction is lighter.

67) 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.

68) Ini probably refers to the first of the groups mentioned in note 66.

69) Only ka, „to”, is used here, obviously for „going to” or something similar. The inverse occurs, for instance, in modern Javanese mēhan and dātēnd, both meaning „to go”, but often used in the meaning „to, towards”.

Akan nimulam gāsmā. 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) 75) 25) 76) if you transfer (the execution of) the actions, you will be killed by this curse which is drunk by you 77). However, if you are submissive, faithful (and) straight to me and do not commit these crimes, an immaculate tantra will be my recompense 78). You will not be swallowed 79) with your children and wives. If you drink the curse 80) 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 Črīvijaya, 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) Mantri; 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) Lauhā dāri sansaryādāmānāu, dāri labhamācu. Maryāda seems to refer rather to delimited pieces of grounds than to the limits themselves; possibly, districts are meant. Labha then refers to territories obtained (legally or illegally). In Java, loyal civil and military servants were often rewarded pieces of ground.

74) Vustmānu minaṃ 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 mulanā (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) Nimākara — the use of this word is a change from the usual nivunah. 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 lauh 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 (?) ^84^ will undertake a punitive expedition. In addition, those who are punished .......... ^84^ [27] .................. [28] .................... (end).

^79^ Conjectural translation. The words muaḥ yaṃ muaḥ are difficult in combination with nimimānu. If we are allowed to read sumpah instead of the second muaḥ, the meaning of the words becomes completely lucid: „the fruits (consequences) of the curse which is drunk by you“. Although muaḥ 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, although these words would be clear by themselves, they would not seem to make sense in the context.

^80^ The meaning of cānti has been discussed in the Introduction.

^81^ The subject of nimimānu cannot be anything else than the sumpah ...... ini just before the punctuation mark. Presumably, the passive form ni-muaḥ corresponds to bārbūh 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 -rā is used to introduce a dependent clause. One could translate the sentence word for word into modern Indonesian as: „harinajarālantara jang dipērkuatku dengan prawira bārangkat“, although it would certainly be preferable to put the last word more in the beginning of the sentence (hari bārangkatnja balatēntara, etc.); obviously, manapik is put at the end of the sentence to lay particular stress on it.

^83^ Nisamvardhiku parvāṇḍa, — the use of parvāṇḍa 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 saṃvṛddhi parvāṇḍa in line 15. As to the etymology of parvāṇḍa, the explanation proposed by Cœdès (art. cit., p. ?^3^) is not necessarily correct; the root vā though known from related languages, does not actually occur in this form in Malay, and the Eñdukan Bukit inscription uses the double form (maṇāva, 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 p-va(ṃ) with the suffix (n)ra (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 saṃvyādhi or from Sanskrit saṃvardhita, 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 with which the word has in classical Sanskrit, and numerous other cases may be added (such as dromaka, paracakṣu, kadāci, marsamjñāvuddhi, (a)ārambhā). 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. Makārīya avadya (line 27) obviously means “doing mischief”; avadya is a well-known technical qualification of karman in Buddhism (cf. infra No. III, note 29 to the translation). Āsannapalāṇa is interesting in view of the interpretation of āsannakāśa 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 aksaras have nowhere been seriously affected 1); the difficult reading of the text is mainly due to the fact of the aksaras 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 aksaras 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 aksaras, 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 maesans, which occur on Moham medan 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 savatu (line 27), vatu might refer to a unity of weight; cf. the use of "stone" in English; one would then be inclined to consider guulas as a variant of Sanskrit goda; 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 Asaha; the words legible in the beginning of line 28 (especially nitaruna vals) 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 aksaras 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 triคāla and an aकuça. — 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 (pratityasamut-
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 maśan 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. \( \text{क} \). 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. \( \text{क} \).

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, \( \text{त} \), is larger than that of the na, \( \text{न} \), 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 Črīvijaya inscriptions dated the end of the 7th century A.D., the forms of the ta and of the na became \( \text{त} \) and \( \text{न} \), 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 \( \text{त} \) but na: \( \text{न} \).

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

---


\(^4\) 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 (bhūmīna, 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 \( \text{त}\) 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 अयस्तत्व 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 Çrivijaya 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. 7). 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 Pūṇavarman la (5th century A.D.) as from the Çrivijaya 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 lie 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

---


7) Krom, Not. Bat. Gen., 1910, p. 77, and (in abbreviated form) Gesch.5, 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 Verapr. 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 archaic 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 aksaras, 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. 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. 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. In any case, wrong sandhi is rare: it would not probably be more frequent than it is in the average Sanskrit inscription from India. 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 pause. 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: 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: bhagavāms tān and in a—A—1: bhagavān chrāvastīyām. In the latter case, the conversion of ृ to च 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.
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, aśā 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 Buddhism, gāthās, forms such as bodhiṣṭānam, samuddeccaye āyanam, buddhacanātra samuddeccaye, sarvanitrā bhajate atendritāh, yādṛṣṭo āya (example from the Gaṇḍavyūha ir. Ciśāśamuccaya, 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. Quercitich Wales, Archael. Researches, Journ. Mal. Br. R. A. S., 18 (1940), p. 7: nirodho āyanam. Also in the Indonesian examples of the formula, we often find prabhaṭvāḥ instead of prabhavā (before the h) and nirodhā or nirodho instead of nirodha (followed by āyanam). — 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 : sparce asati, (œuillet) r, V 5, śadāyatane asati, ibid., 3, etc. La chute de la initial râmālâm par le sandhi aurait effâché 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 Dināya 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 Pandits 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,


\(^{20}\) The question is however more complicated. There are some obvious exceptions, mainly enclitic words; cf. Javanese *mbohten*, derived from *tan wwan\(\)t\(\)en* in Old Javanese, and *tambeluh* from *tan wuruh*: 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 Rāmāyaṇa (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 Črīvijaya 22) and the Ĉailendra 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 21). 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; pūpa is used as a masculine in c — A — 10. A mistake of a different kind is the confusion between pātra 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 Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya, 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 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 Clōka 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 notices, the doctrine contained therein is not exclusively Buddhist: 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 Clōka 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 Clōka halves correspond

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 Sāmkhya 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 Pratityasamutpāda formula. There is also a close correspondence with the well-known Mahāyāna distinction of the twelve Nidānas as being either sāṃkleṣa, "favourable to the continuation of the Saṃsāra", or vaśyavāda-nīka, "favourable to ultimate Liberation". In the former case, the Āṅgas are classified into three groups, which are styled sāṃkleṣas, "great Impediments", viz. those of Kleça, Karman and Jāti 29).

It appears that our text attaches great importance to the Ajñānāc cytate 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

---

29) 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 Pousin in Indo-Européens etc. (1936). pp. 277 sqq. and pp. 310 sqq.

30) There is some doubt as to the exact term applied to the third saṃkleṣa. Th. Sticherbatskij, Buddhist Logic, I (1932), p. 137, notes: "In Mahāyāna, the 12 nidānas are called sāṃkleṣas, "great impediments" and are distinguished into three classes: the kleça-sāṃkleṣa — avidyā, āpyā, upādāna, etc. karman-sāṃkleṣa — sāṃskāra, bhava, — and the remaining members are styled jāti-sāṃkleṣa". 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 phala-sāṃkleṣa; cf. De la Vallée Pousin's translation, I, p. 215: "Par sāṃkleṣa, 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 Sticherbatskij is confirmed by the Madhyāntavibhāgañīkā, ed. by Yamaguchi, Tokyo, 1934, p. 35, reading kleça-karmanajammasāṃkleṣa, in the translation by D. Friedmann (1935), p. 46: "the defilesments 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 Čloka establishes the series Ajñāna, Karman, Janman, there is essential accordance with the Sāṃkleṣa classification.


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 Anuśṭubh strophe — this seems probable in view of the choice of the words and the rhythm — no less than thirteen syllables, almost 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 Dhammapada, 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 nirāmanāḥ in c. It is all but evident that the latter should be corrected to the former; one would rather correct it to nirāmanāḥ (i.e. the correction of the dental to the lingual nasāl), 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 nirāmanāḥ is clearly Mahāyānic. For the non-soul doctrine, a famous topic in Abhidharma literature, cf., for instance, Abbādhi. Koça, IX (Pudgalapratīṣedhaprakāraṇa).

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 sq.; Demieville, Les versions chinoises du Milindapaṇiha, B.E.F.E.O., 24 (1924), p. 159; ‘upasampadā, qui designe l’ordination comme thera à la fin du noviciat”; Mahāvyutpatti, ed. Minaev-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 translates ‘toe-treading”). 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 Dacasshasāsikā, published by Sten Konow, Avh. Norske Vid.-Ak., 1941, II, pp. 97 sq.: kṣatranāṁ catvāri dhvānāni? Yadvā vibhavāṁ kāṃsāṁ vibhavāṁ pāpākār śravānāṁ dharmāḥ ...... prathamaṁ dhvānam upasampadāya vihāratī. In a similar way, the derivatives of upasampad- are used to denote the arrival of the Bodhisattva on the different bhūmis (c. 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 38), from Buddhist Sanskrit literature 37), from Indian epigraphy both in Prākrit 39) 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 Pratītyasamutpādāsūtra 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 Črāvastī 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 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.

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 ab. ve), 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., Xiènca Série, XVI (191C), pp. 435-440.

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

39) The Gopalpur brick; cf. Proc. As. Soc. Bengal, 1896, p. 99; the Kasi copper-plate, Arch. Surv. India, Ann. Rep., 1910-11, pp. 76 sqq.; many examples have been found in Nālandā; cf. the survey by Hirandana 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 Épigr. 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, Épigr. Ind., 21 (1934), pp. 199 sqq.


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, Épigr. 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 Āṅgas. This is, as Vasubandhu explains, the Pratītyasamutpāda in its general form, in which the separate Āṅgas are not specified (abhedena); if the formula is given in the form Avidyāpratītyāh samskārāh etc., Pratītyasamutpāda is expressed bheda 43).

As a rule, the words asmin satīdam bhavati 44) are followed by asyot-pādād idam utpadaye, asya nirodhād idam nirudhyate. This is, however, not the case in our text: only the first clause is mentioned, immediately followed by the enumeration of the twelve Āṅgas. The formula is given in its usual form, each following notion being stated to have the preceding term as its pratītya. The very last link of the chain, Jarāmarana, is taken to imply a large 'complex' of different aspects of suffering, which consist of goka, parideva, duḥkhā, aaurmanasya 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 duḥkhahaksan-dhaya 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 analogous portion, in which it is stated that after the cessation (nirodha) of the first Āṅga, the second one also ceases to exist (or rather, is not produced at all); the third and following Āṅgas will not arise and the last Āṅga, Jarāmarana, 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 bhavatidam instead of idam bhavati.

45) Intra, a—A—S and e—A—6. The omission of goka 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 Daśasāhasrikā, 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 Nirodhasatyâ as the first portion to the Samudrayasatyâ.

The Nirodha portion of the Sūtra is not given on our plates, and the same is the case with the copper-plate from Kâśiâ and the two Nâlandâ 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 nirodha dham nirodhyate) is also omitted.

In a single case 48), we find at the end of the Samudya portion the words iyam mithyaprauktir samskṛtavartini, and at the end of the Nirodha portion iyam samyakprakṛtir asamskṛtaniyāmāvakkrantiḥ. There is something strange in the definition. of the two aspects of the Pratityasamutpāda formula as the wrong and the right prakṛti; the use of the latter term recalls the prakṛti conception of the Śaṅkhyaśins and suggests the interpretation of the twelve Aṅgas as a series of parināmas of the prakṛti either in the wrong (mithyā) or in the right (samya) 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 Mahāyānasakas, who considered Pratityasamutpāda a dharma and even asaṃskṛta, i.e. a transcendental conception beyond the Twelve Aṅgas which are asaṃskṛta 49).

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

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 Mahāyānasakas; as a matter of fact, Vasubandhu uses the expression nīkāyānāriyāā, "certaines écoles", but Yaśomitra (Vyākhya ad Bhā, 40, 21, in Cosmol. Boudha, p. 165, line 12) comments upon Vasubandhu's explanation by tā āryasaṃśaṅgakāh; the Vibhaṅga, however, attributed this opinion to the Vibhajyavādinâ. It is not however certain that the Vibhaṅga refers to a definite school by that expression; cf. the detailed notes by De la Vallée Poussin in Abhidh. Koça, Introduction etc. (1931), pp. iv — ivii, and pp. 133 sq. The interpretation of pratityasamutpāda as an asaṃskṛtadharma is based upon an interesting Nikāya passage quoted in the Vyākhya (loc. cit.); there, the well-known formula yo bhikkhave pratityasamutpādaṁ paścayati sa dharmam paścayati, yo dharmam paścayati sa buddhān paścayati is taken to refer to eśā dharmaṁ dharmaṁ, 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 saṃskṛtākāraṇās; how, then, could pratityasamutpāda 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 Hinayāna sources either. For samkleśa and vyavatāna, cf. Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 105, and III, p. 115; Mahāv., III, p. 321 line 6: samkleśa vyavaṭānāṁ yathābhūtaṁ praśānti. The division of the pratityasamutpādaṅgas into three samkleṣas seems to be confined to Mahāyāna (cf. Stcherbatskij, quoted in note 29 above).
also defined as sārava and anāsraṇa\(^{51}\). In addition, this same Nālandā text uses two other curious terms for these two aspects, viz. dharmāṇām ācayāḥ and dharmāṇām apacayāḥ, „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 Pratītyasamutpādāsūtra, 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 Pratītyasamutpādāsūtra 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 Nīrodha 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 Nīdānas are the only items explained in it; there is, for instance, no account of the notion of pratijaya 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,

---

\(^{51}\) Stschebatkij, Central Conception, pp. 1 sqq.; Sten Konow, Daçasahasrikā, 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 karma, as is expressed in the ajñānācīyate 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.


\(^{57}\) 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 69). 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 vāsion 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 Jarāmarana), 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 (ardhata-rayodaçabhī bhikṣuçataih) 63). In the Chinese version, this modest number of monks was increased to „innumerable”, and the audience is not limited

---

60) Published by N. P. Chakravarti in Epigr. Ind. 21 (1934), pp. 193 sqq.
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 °cataiḥ; 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 Huiian 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: hiṇa-praṇīta-krṣṇa-çukla-sapratibhāga-pratītyasamutpannesu dharmesu 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 hiṇa-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 Huiian Tsang used a slightly more elaborate version, and perhaps translated hiṇāçubha-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 reduction 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 Trṣṇa is divided into a very different set of categories.

In the definition of Avidyā, we referred to the compound beginning with hiṇa-praṇīta, which is absent in our version. These terms belong to the manifold classifications of Karvān; as a matter of fact, they can hardly be considered necessary, since they do not introduce any new elements i.e. 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 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 (śiṁhānakā); 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 (Vākyā in Čarit. Bouddhique, p. 164, line 21). Only at the end of the definition we find what we may designate by 'aspects', viz. the terms anabhisa-maya, tamsas and sammoha, 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 Huiian Tsang may have had phale 'jñānam; the Chinese pilgrim probably read the whole passage: hetāv ajñānam, phale ' parisams, hetupahalyor ajñānam. — It is curious that our text (a — A — 9) has in this connection: pratītyasamutpāde ajñānam, 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 Duhkhा and Samudaya Truths. Prañāna, on the contrary, is especially applied to the Nirodha and Mārga 67). Krṣṇa and ṇūkla are other terms which refer to Karman. Čukla is technically defined as kucañväyākṣta 68), the remaining Karman is krṣṇa.

Then, we have the term yathābhūtasamprativedha '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: aţñānam anabhisamayah tamas san摩hoh but the Nālandā text gives: yathābhūtasayajñānam adarçanam anabhisamayah tamah saṁmohah. Neither yathābhūta nor adarçana are limited to Mahāyāna 70), but both notions are certainly more developed there.

In the explanation of the other Āṅgas, the additions are less obvious, but they are not absent. The Āṅgas 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 Āṅgas, 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 τάd ubhayam, but the Nālandā text adds after these: aikadhyam abhisaṃkṣipya, literally: „throwing them together into a unity” 71).

[Note on page 66]
Among the characteristic features of Old Age, the Nālandā text adds the expressive compound *khuṣakhulapravāsakāyataḥ*, referring to difficult breathing, and among those of Death it gives the additional term *ūṣmaṇo hāṁthiḥ*, which refers to the coldness of a corpse.

It is evident that almost all the differences consist of additions in the Nālandā text 73). 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. 74). 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, Trṣṇā, Thirst, is taken to be of three kinds: kāmatṛṣṇā, rūpatṛṣṇā, and ārūpyatṛṣṇā (line 15). This is the only usual division in Mahāyāna sources. The Hinayāna 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 Hinayāna 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 Trṣṇā, 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 Trṣṇā and Bh. va do not follow exactly 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, Karnān is produced

73) For a single exception, cf. note 66 above. The addition of *pratītyasamutpāde ‘jñānaṁ* 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 ajñānaṁ dharmame ajñānaṁ saṅghe ajñānaṁ* by *vuddhadharmasamgheve ajñānaṁ* and may therefore be considered normalizing; nothing is omitted, but the text becomes much clearer. The Vyākhyā ad Abhiddh. Koça, 40, 5 (p. 164); cf. the quotation by De la Vallée Poussin, Abhiddh. 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.

74) This is the approximate date suggested by Chakravarti on account of the type of script used. Cf. Epiγr. Ind., 21 (1934) p. 194.

75) References will be given in note 137 to the Translation.

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 *dhṛṣṭyupādāna*:
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.

This, however, represents a later development. The Pāli sources, as a rule, take Trṣṇā 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 (saḍ viṣayāḥ: visible, audible etc. matter) which may become the objects of desire; in other words, they interpret Trṣṇā as kāma-trṣṇā. 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.

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, 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


cilavratopādana cannot be separated from cilavrataparāmarṣadṛṣṭi, and śītavādopādana is almost identical with satkāyadṛṣṭi.

[76] Upādāna is defined as trṣṇāvaiśalya (Cālistambhas. in Čikāsās, p. 222, and Bodhi- pañjī, p. 388) or as trṣṇāvivṛddhi (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 Viibhāṣā quotation in Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 29, note. The Saṃstāntīkas and Vasubandhu only recognize the triad of Kāma, Rūpa and Ārupya (Abhidh. Koça, III, pp. 85 sq.; Vyākhyā in Cosmol. Boudhh., p. 172, ad Bhāsyā 45, 2; cf. Vasubandhu's commentary to the Pratītyasamutpādasūtra, Tucci, art. cit., p. 616: tīraḥ <s> trṣṇā iti vistaritāḥ atāpi bhagavatā kāmarūpārūpyabhedena trṣṇāyāḥ prabheda ukto na tu svabhāvatā, "(in trṣṇāpratyayam upādānam), the three thirsts (are referred to); here, however, the Bhagavat explains (only) the variety of thirst by analyzing it into Kāma, Rūpa and Ārupya, not, however, its real nature; this division is considered intentional: vinayaviveśapākṣayeti, "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 Ārupya 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 śāhprāyika. 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 Mahāyāna, III, p. 448, where we have bhavadṛṣṭi = caiva gata dṛṣṭi, and vibhavadṛṣṭi = uccchedadṛṣṭi. Buddhist texts often use vibhava as the opposite of sambhava; cf. Daçabh., ed. Rahder, p. 47, sub VI B: mahākāraṅgāpīrśupārśtham lokasya sambhavaṁ ca vibhavaṁ ca vyavalokeyate.
extinction after death. Thus, the two latter kinds of Trṣṇā refer to the wrong views about the two extremes (antagṛhādṛṣṭā). The reason why Mahāyāna confined itself to the set of kāma, rūpa and ārūpya may be conjectured: it is difficult to see how vibhava-trṣṇā 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 bhavatrṣṇā as gāçvatabhavatrṣṇā 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 Trṣṇā, 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 Trṣṇā. 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 yathābhātatasam-prativedhe 'jñānam and yathābhātasyājñānam. 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 Hinayāna. 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.

Our case could be compared with that of the Lalitavistara.

Among the Hinayāna 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

---

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 Chō-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 Abhidharmakoṣa and quoted by the mere mention of its first term pūruvānte ‘jñānam in Vasubandhu’s Bhāṣya and with some greater detail (though also in a abbreviated form) in Yaḍomitra’s Vyākhyā 82). The Vibhaṅga definition of Avidyā known by Yaḍomitra seems to agree with that extant in the Chinese Śānyukta


81) Cf. Krom, Geschiedenis², p. 108; Condère, 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 89), 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 anāvadya 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 (hīnapraṇāta etc.). It is curious that
the Vyākhyā and the Chinese Sañyukta have madhyānte (jñānam) instead of
our purvāparānte (a — A — 7); the Sañyukta probably read avyākṛteṣu
(aññānam) instead of kuçalakuçalesu 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 (Bhāsyya) and quoted
by Yācomitra in an abbreviated form 85); more or less full versions occur
in Candrakīrī’s commentary to Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamakārikās (the
Prasannapadā) 86), the Bodhicaryāvatārāpañjikā 87) and the Čikṣāsamuccaya
(in all of the three cases based upon the Čālistambhūsūtra) 88). As was

p. 39, lines 17 sq., and Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 75; the Vyākhyā ad Bhāsyya, 40, 5, in

83) Sañyukta, 12, 21, and 16, 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 Sañyukta reads āvaraṇam
instead of saṃmohah at the end of the Avidyā explanation (our text, s — B — 1);

as we noted above, this translation was prepared by Gunabhadra 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.

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. Dīgha, II, p. 305 (Mañjhima, I, p. 49;
Rhys Davida-Stede, s.v. jarā): yā tesāṁ sattanamaṁ tesāṁ sattanukṣaye jarā jītaṁ
khaṇḍiccam pāllamaṁ vaḷitattavatā śyacu saṃphānti indriyāṁ pariṇāka. 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 Davida-Stede, Pāli Dictionary, s.v.) corresponds,
in the Sanskrit versions, khālītya, “baldness”. There is no doubt that the Pāli version
is more satisfactory here; the order in which the different laksanaḥ 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.


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

Here, it does not seem doubtful that 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 89). The division of Vijñāna into saññi vijñānakāyāḥ, of Śaḍāyatana into saññi adhikārakāyāḥ, and of Sparça into saññi sparçakāyāḥ, all occur in the Abhidharmakoṣa 91). Sāṃskāra, in the Viṃhaṅga, is divided into the sāṃskāras of body (kāya), speech (vāc) and mind (manas). This is one of the usual divisions for karman 92). Since the notions of sāṃskāra 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. Sāṃskāra has several different, though related, connotations, but here we are only concerned with the second link of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, technically, sāṃskārāṅga 94), i.e. those sāṃskāras which condition Vijñāna. In this connection, it is irrelevant whether the action has been accomplished by body, speech or mind; the essential point is the moral tenor of action. Therefore, the usual division of sāṃskārāṅga is into puṇya, apaṇya 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 Čālistambhasūtra, 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. rūpāyatanā). For reasons to be expounded at the end of this Introduction, we consider it a part of a clumsy interpolation.


92) Abhidh. Koṣa, IV, kārikā 1; cf. the references in the notes to the Translation.

93) Warren (Buddhism in Translations, p. 116) even ‘translated’ sāṃskāra in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula by karman. Most of the Hinayāna sects (Abhidh. Koṣa, III, kāri. 21 6): sāṃskārāṅga purvavakaranam) limited Sāṃskāraṅga to karman during past existence in as far as it ‘produced’ (abhissāṃskaroti) 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. Čālist. Sūtra quoted Cikṣāsanavuccaya, p. 223, and Bodhic. pañjikā, p. 479: puṇyopapāga apuṇyopapāga āniñjyopapāga cema ucyante ‘vidyāpratyayāḥ sāṃskārā hi’; — A combination of the two modes of division occurs in Abhidh. Koṣa, III, p. 84: “Il accomplit la triple action, corporelle, vocale, mentale ...... action non-méritoire (apuṇyag), ...... action méritoire (puṇya), ...... action “invariable” (āniñjya) ...... Ces actions sont les sāṃskāras 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 86; it is there attributed to the opinion of "others" (ānye punar āduh ......., 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 Nāmarūpāṇa). 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 Hsuan 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 87. 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 pratītyasamutpādasūtra 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 88, 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 uddeṣa preceding the nirdeṣa 89. — The words sādhu

---

86) Cf. the whole passage from g — A — 10 to g — B — 4. There, the division into kāy-a, vāc and manas is considered a subdivision of that into koṣa etc. A similar combination of the two modes of division of Saṃskārāṅga is given in the Madhyama-makavṛtti, p. 543.

87) Quoted in note 43, above. The original title of Vasubandhu's commentary may have been Pratītyasamutpādādivibhaṅgadīnirdeṣa, 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.

88) Cf. also Abhidh. Koṣa, III, kāsitkā 19 d; Bhāṣya, translation in Abhidh. Koṣa, III, pp. 70 sq. (about ayoniḥmanasakāra 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 (Vaśeṣika, Vedānta). The idea of an asamukṛtyadharma called Pratītyasamutpāda is attributed to various Buddhist schools (cf. supra, note 49).

89) Art. cit., p. 61: ādir uddeṣa nirdoṣasya tatpūrvavakṣāt; tena cādyāya yasmāt pratītya- samutpādaḥ, 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 suṣṭha 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.

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 bhikṣavah in a — A — 2 161) 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 Vasuṣandhu all over the world of Sanskrit Buddhism, it would not seem very probable that, at least in the great Buddhist centres,

160) 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.

161) Presumably, Vasubandhu read the sentence: prāśityasamutpādayudāni vo bhikṣavo vibhaṅgam cādoçayatiśyāmi. Our text of this passage has been badly copied [vo was omitted and instead of vibhaṅgam, *ādiṇi (written ādiṇ, with samādhi) is repeated]. The order of the words explained makes the reconstruction of the text, which was explained, possible, and it follows that bhikṣavah 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. 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. 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.

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 Āṅgas 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

---

103) 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 Pratītyasamutpāda-sūtra and vibhaṅga seems to give the same views as the Koça. There are no apparent Vājirņavāda influences, so that the commentary must be assigned to the earlier period of Vasubandhu's activity.

104) 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 Āṅgas 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, Madhyāntavibhāgañīkā (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 Áṅgas. Thus, this portion of the text may roughly be divided into two parts. In the first of these, the twelve sūdānas 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 upadiṣṭah pratītyasamutpādavidhiḥ; the use of upadiṣṭah there might show that the text was considered to be an Upadeça, „instruction“ \(^{105}\). Its complete title may have been: Pratītyasamutpādavidhāparaśānopadeça 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 substantively) is stated

\(^{105}\) On the exact meaning of upadeça, cf. Nalinaśa Dutt, Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism (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: “Après la disparition du Boudha, Ánanda, 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 Vibhāṣa, 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 Vibhāṣa) 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 Áṅgas is given in Mahāy. 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 ('ya) all of nine links (āniga) 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 Upadeç (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 pratiyaśamutpāda is given. 'Etymology' should be taken as 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\(^\text{107}\), including the term pratiyaśamutpāda\(^\text{108}\). 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 pratiṣṭya 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 pratiṣṭyaśamutpāda 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 pratiṣṭya as a gerundive; itya means "what must go"\(^\text{109}\), i.e. "perishable" "doomed to destruction"

\(^{107}\) Thus, dharma is derived from the root dhṛ "because it 'holds' (possesses) its own characteristic marks" (svalakṣaṇadhiścārṇāt, Abhidh. 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" (Abhidh. 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.


\(^{109}\) Cf. ibidem, III, p. 80, note 3; the Vyākhya in Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 168: itau gatau sādhaiva ityāḥ / tatra sādhur iti yatpratṣayayah / itau vināṣṭa sādhaivah / anvavasthāyina ity arthah / samupasargasah samavyārtham dyotayati, i.e. "things which are itya are 'good to it', 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, Aṣṭādhyāyī, III, 1, kār. 109 (eti-situ-ḥa-ye-dṛ-juṣah kyap), and the form
(vinaçvara); prati is distributive, utpāda means apparition. Therefore, pratiyasamutpāda 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 pratiy, prati is explained as āngaṃ prati, „with reference to each link” and is therefore interpreted viṣaṅrtham; 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 Mūlakāyamakakārikās, takes up the Sautrāntika interpretation and uses it to prove the voidness (gañyatā) 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” (avabhāva), 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 Upadeśa refers to the Čloka in which Dependent Origination is stated to be simple, twofold, etc., up to twelfefold. 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 Angas 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

---

\(^{110}\) In this way, the view of the Bhāṣya 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. samutpādās tām tām sāmaṅgirīṃ 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 (Suṣruta) 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: tṛṇakāṣṭhakothasāna pacayati satvarūpaṃ, „the (viz. the Bodhisattva) sees the body of a being as if it were rotting grass and wood”. Cf. note 149 below.

\(^{112}\) De la Vallée Poussin, Madhyamaka, Méλ. chin. et bouddh., II (1933), pp. 4 sqq. (with an extensive bibliography).

\(^{113}\) This line of argument is reproduced from a quotation from the Sāgaramati-paripṛcchā written on a clay tablet from Kēdah (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, aupp Gupta'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 Samgūṭīsuttānta in the Dīghanikāya and its Sanskrit version the Saṃgūtīparāśyāya, which is one of the seven 'feet' of the Abhidharma (op. cit., p. XXIII). — Similar numerical lists, but not in progressive arrangement, are well-known in Mahāyāna, too. Typical examples are: the entire Mahāyutpatti, 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 Daśaśāhasrikā, Avh. Norske Vid.-Ak., 1941, II, pp. 1-17 (where numerous accordances with other versions are also given).

The Ye-dhāraṇā 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 bhavatidam 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 Āṅgas. 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 Āṅga is a Cause (hetu) and a Fruit (phala) at the same time: a Cause of the next Āṅga and a Fruit of the preceding one 121). One of the special interpretations (c— A— 7 sq.), however, considers five Āṅgas as Cause, but the remaining seven ones as Fruit; the obvious reason is that for some Āṅgas the aspect of their being a Cause is more important, whereas the Fruit aspect dominates for some other Āṅgas. 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 Trṣṇā, Thirst; it is however far more important from a religious point of view that one should 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

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 Vākyāyā, III, 42, 25 sqq. in Cosm. Bouddh., pp. 169 sqq.
120) Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 67 (Bhāṣya).
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 Jarâmarâna, with the entire complex of suffering implied in it.\footnote{123}

Some of the other classifications are all variations on the \textit{hetu-phala} theme. The Cause comprises different aspects: the direct cause of re-birth is the existence of \textit{karman} leading to re-birth; but the existence of \textit{karman} itself is conditioned by Defilement (\textit{kleça}). Therefore, the Cause may be analyzed into either \textit{karman} or \textit{kleça}, and this leads to the important threefold division of the Āngas into \textit{kleça}, \textit{karman} and \textit{phala}. At the same time, the interpretation of \textit{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 \textit{karman} and is then called Ripening, Maturation (\textit{vipāka}). This result, in Buddhism, is always some kind of 'suffering': it is not suffering in its narrow meaning (which is the case with Jarâmarâna), but always suffering in a broader sense: the result produced by \textit{karman} is inevitably unstable (\textit{anitya}), since not only pleasant feelings in general (\textit{suḥkavedaṇīya}), but even heavenly existence comes to an end. Accordingly, the terms \textit{phala} and \textit{vipāka} may be substituted by \textit{duḥkha}.

In the fourth place, the same group of Āngas may be considered the object of Defilement and Karman, and therefore be termed \textit{vastu}. This last term, however, is not mentioned in our text, perhaps because it is too neutral\footnote{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 Āngas are often considered as many states (\textit{avasthā}) of \textit{Existence}, each of them corresponding to a definite period. Then, the Āngas become bhavāṅgas. This interpretation is accordingly termed 'static' (\textit{avasthāka}), or 'extended' (\textit{prakāraṇīka})\footnote{125}. As 'Existence' (\textit{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 Jarâmarâna 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.

\footnote{123} In our text (\textit{infra}, f—B—2 sqq.), the different compounds of the \textit{duḥkhahasthā} are analyzed and conceived in mutual interdependence, just like the \textit{pratītyasamutpādaṅgas}. This conception is unusual; as a rule, the whole complex (\textit{pokā} etc.) is taken to arise together (\textit{samsādbhavanti}) in dependence on Jarâmarâna.

\footnote{124} \textit{Abhidh. Koça}, III, p. 68, kārikā 26, a-b: \textit{kleças tried dvrayam karma sapta vastu phalam rathā}; so, the seven Āngas which are neither \textit{kleça} (\textit{avidiyā, trṣā, upādāna}), nor \textit{karman} (\textit{sāyaskāra, bhava}) are named \textit{vastu} or \textit{phala}. \textit{Vastu} is explained as \textit{açraya}, "point d'appui", in the Bhāsya. It is the chain interpreted as being partly subject (the forces of \textit{kleça} and \textit{karman}) and partly object; cf. the Vyākhyā ad Bhāsya, 35, 23 (\textit{Cosmol. Boudhd.}, p. 158): \textit{kleçakarmācayatrīd iti / viṣānādīni saptāngāni vastūni / adhiṣṭhānāni kleçakarmaṇāṁ ity arthaḥ. De la Vallée Poussin (op. cit., p. 68, note 3, and Théorie des dous causes, p. 34) notes that the term \textit{vastu} is not found elsewhere in that meaning.

\footnote{125} \textit{Abhidh. Koça}, III, p. 66. — Cf. \textit{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 Āṅgas would represent twelve stages of evolution or development (parināma); or rather, each of the twelve stages is named after the Āṅga which is prevalent in it. Thus, the period in which the passions begin to arise, early adolescence, is denoted by Trṣṇā; the period in which these passions are carried out, by Upādāna. The division of the Prātītyasamutpāda formula into twelve states is usually expressed by the simile of a tree, i.e. the Tree of Sorrow (duḥkhaṃvyṛkṣa). Then, the twelve Āṅgas 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’ Prātītyasamutpāda 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. 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 satkāra and parināma of Sāṃkhyā and other heretical systems. The term parināma is however used with reference to koça, pariṣeva, etc., considered to be ‘transformations’ of Jarāmaraṇa (and not separate Āṅgas); cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 83, note 5.

127 This is the opinion of De la Vallée Poussin, Bouddhisme, Histoire de la Doctrinale, p. 46, who makes, however, some reserves. It cannot be denied that the problems herewith connected are very complicated. Saṃghabhadrā, who was an orthodox Vaibhāṣika (cf. Abhidh. Koça, Introduction etc., 1931, p. LIII), ‘établit que la série causale soit intérieure, soit extérieure, — le kalusa, etc. d’auc part; la graine, etc., de l’autre — c’est ce qu’on nomme Prātītyasamutpāda’ (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 Yaṣomitra’s Vyākhyā (cf. Cosm. Bouddh., p. 133, line 11 and p. 163, line 12), but there is not the slightest indication that it should be considered the ‘interior’ interpretation of Prātītyasamutpāda. The distinction made by Saṃghabhadrā, on the other hand, uses the terms ‘interior’ and ‘exterior’ in a way quite different from our text, viz. as either paṅcakṣandaḥkā avasthāḥ, or bijāṅkurādi, i.e. in about the same way as the distinction is made for the āyatana 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 (hetuṇābandha). Schterbatskij (Buddh. Logic, I, p. 121, note) rightly concludes that Vasubandhu (Abhīdharma Koça) sharply distinguished the two interpretations (Koçasthāna II: the general theory in connection with the exposition of Hetu, Pratyaya and Phala; III: the special interpretations in connection with Lokani- debt), but the terms adhyātmika (abhyantara) and bāhya are not used in this connection. Some references to the Mahāyāna conception will be given in note 89 in 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 Madhyamika 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 kaṇcita samyaṅ<uddistān sam> avadhiyya prayāya /
<a>vācya<ṃ> parinirvṛt<t>e bhagavati caranaṃ yayau /

128) The ‘special’ interpretation (bījad sakuraṇa, sakuraṭ pattram, etc.) is very important in Madhyamika (Aṣṭasāhasrikā, Lalitavistara, Madhyamakavyutti, chapter Drṣṭipariṇāśa, Madhyamakāvetu, chapter VI), where it serves mainly to explain the conception of Buddhiṃ as madhyāṃ pratiṣṭap just as the sakura is neither identical with, nor different from the bija, in the same way two pratiyassamutpādaṃs successing one another are neither different nor identical; there is therefore no eternal matter (ṣaṭyatva), but also no annihilation (uccheda). The conception of Čunyatā avoided such an alternative. Cf. especially the analysis by De La Vallée Poussin 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 (dakkhyavṛkṣa), 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 “stool”. Another curious detail is the use of garbha, which represents the stage between nāla and puspa and therefore means “bud” here, i.e. the ‘womb’ of the flower. Bijā and sakura represent Viṃśaṇa and Nāmarūpa respectively (cf. Cālistambha in Bodhisarvavatārapaṇīkā, p. 481, lines 11 sq.: viṃśaṇabhiṣam tatra tatropapastī mātuh kuśaṃ nāmarūpaṃ sakuraṃ abhinirvṛtayati). 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 viṃśaṇa); the stem, skandaḥ, is karuṇa, etc.; this simile is well-known in Mahāyāna (Madhyamakāvatāra, VI) and is also referred to in the inscription of Kālarak (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”; uddīśān would be satisfactory, although it is not of course the only possibility (nirdīśān, 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 āvaya in vāya given in the plate; the loss of the initial vowel is obviously due to a breach of sandhi 129). The loss of the anusvāra and the spelling of parinirvṛtte by a single instead of a double t require no comment 131). At the end of the strophe, the text on the plate reads çaranaṭrayaṃ yaīyā (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); çaranaṭrayaṃ 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 tṛayam is easy to be accounted for since çaranaṭraya (= tṛcaṛayā) 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 pratyaḥ considered a brevis, but pādis also contains an inaudible 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 pratyaḥ āvayaḥ. 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 parinirvṛtte to parinirvṛtte might not be necessary, although a diacomb between an even pāda seems very strange. Spelling by a single t might well have been a attempt at correction.

132) The -su vowel must have been expressed by a double taling before, and a daṇḍa behind the second ya; the error made by the copyist was that he put the double taling before the first ya.
by Edgerton 135). 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 136). This seems to be the case with the fourth pāda of our Čloka, where bhagavatī counts as three syllables 137). 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 pronunciation of the Sanskrit words in Buddhist Gāthās (pratyayā in our text being pronounced paccaya, as in Pāli) 138). Further we note pratyayā used as an accusative 139) and, apparently, the gerund samava-

135) F. Edgerton, The Prakrit 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 Kuppuswami 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 Vasantaritākā are often replaced by two short ones. Cf. also Louis Finot, Rāṣṭrapālapariprōcā, 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 Tristubh and Jagati groups of metres, which really form a single class because in the Tristubh one syllable may be added, entire passages in which Indravajrā and Vançāṭha pādas are mixed up are very common (cf. Rāṣṭrī, pp. 35 sq., pp. 18 sq.; Bendall, Čikśāsamucaya, 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 Vançāṭha pādas are to be considered hypermetra. For the frequent hypermetra in the Čloka, 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 maccakatalagatā yathā, “(les damnés) s’agissent comme des poissons jetés sur la berge” (cf. the note by Senart to ibid., p. 382).

136) In this particular case, one might also consider the possibility that bhagavati was pronounced bhagavati 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, Čikśāsā, p. 45, line 1, where the vocative bhagavan is a disyllable (pāda a: vayam utahāmo bhagavan).

137) Edgerton, loc. cit.; cf. also Bendall, op. cit., p. XIX, on the prosody of the Gaudavyāśa quotation in Čikśāsā, 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.

138) The original reading probably was pratīṭayāḥ / svacyam. The use of nominative forms instead of accusatives is very common in the Gāthā dialect. It is not necessary to add the visarga after pratīṭayāḥ; 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 anāgātakalpa careyam (Dohaka 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* (?) 134).

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 135. 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 maṇḍān* 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* ..., *pratayāvācyam* (*h*), one could however substitute *uddiṣṭā(h)*. An argument in favour of the hypothesis that there was no visarga after *pratayāvācyam* is the fact that the copyist dropped the initial *a* of *avacīya*. It is easy to understand how somebody seeing *pratayāvācyam* (and being unaware of the metrical structure), presumed a mistake and put down *pratayāvacya* as a compound. The result would be less easy to be explained if the original read *pratayāvācyam*.

134 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 *saṃ-,* 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 proto-canonical Sanskrit, we frequently meet with forms ending in -i or -e, which are usually optatives (corresponding with -et in normal Sanskrit), but sometimes aorists (corresponding with -ī); cf. Edgerton, *art. cit.*, p. 515. In some texts (Ratnolākāhāraṇi in Čikṣāsamuccaya, pp. 2-5, and pp. 327-347; Bhadradcari) they are extremely common; we note from the Bhadracari (Watarabe's edition not being at our disposal, we quote from B-vsch. T.B.G., 97, 1938, pp. 255 sqq.): *pravatayi cakram dhārayi māram* (strophe 53, c-d), *dhārayi vācayi* (54 b), *pārayi* (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 not be 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.

135 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 (*janaṃmaraṇa-prabandha*), which does not depend on external causes; cf. Siddhi, II, p. 502.

140 We may understand this connection almost literally. The Mahāvagga explains how the wandering ascetics Sāriputta (Cāriputra) and Moggallāna (Maudgalyāyana) are converted by hearing the formula *ye dharmāḥ,* 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 Ācāyaghoṣa's Sūtrālaṃkāra, "où le brahmane Kauḍika 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 (samudayasañyāsa) and so suggests the possibility of bringing it to an end (nirodhasañyāsa) 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 āraṇya-amaṇa throughout the history of Buddhism 141). The earlier Buddhists did not, as a rule, pose that problem as pregnant, 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 Čloka, this or a related notion seems to be implied by the words parinirvṛtte bhagavati. As to parinirvṛtta, this term could well be rendered by „transcendent”. 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 Hinayāna 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 Hinayāna 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 unimitted 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: atairikā, caksūṣmān 143), pratītyasamutpāda, kotha and upādana. As these words contain twenty-one syllables in all, we need eleven more syllables


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-dharma 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) Caksūṣmān is certainly not a gloss on atairikā, for iti is placed after caksūṣmān, not after atairikā. Instead of the latter, the reading on the plate runs: atairikā, which could not, however, well represent anything else; cf. note 144.
to complete the Čloka. 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 Čloka. 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:

Ataimirikāc=cakṣuṣmān upādāṇāvivarjitaḥ /
Sa pratityasamutpādaṁ kotha iti vipaçyati // 144)

Instead of vivarjitaḥ there might have been a synonym, but the only word which is metrically possible, nirākSucaḥ, 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 ataimirikāc=cakṣuṣmān as two words, or ataimirikac=cakṣuṣmān as a single compound. From a metric 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 cæsura 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 diâmbos. Āçcāghoṣa, 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. 1 rv. The first pāda of Buddhac., XII, 49, viz. adhivāsāṣaṁ kānebhyaśa, 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 Vajrajñasūtra in Çāntideva’s Çiksāsamuccaya, Bendall’s edition, p. 30, line 13, viz. apratiññhacakṣuṣmantān (ca sarvajagaty utpādeyuh), “may they produce ‘the state of possessing unrestrained vision’ with reference to the entire world”. Apratiññhacakṣuṣmant comes very near to ataimirikacakṣuṣmant.


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.


148) For the meaning of vipaçyati, cf. the well-known expression dharmasāṁ 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, āhārmāṇām upacaya, etc.) really is a process of decay; we noted already above that this interpretation is supported by an etymology of ātya (= vipaçvāra) in the term pratītyasamutpāda.

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 reads 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)

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 Prthajana, 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 vipaçyāna (Mahāvastu, I, p. 120, line 10; Mahāvyutp., 90, 2 on p. 29; especially Siddhi, II, pp. 596 sq., note 2 with important quotations from the Bodhisattvabhūmi). This meaning of vi- is also assumed for vijñāna (skandha), explained by pratītyaśānti, "l'impression relative à chaque objet" (Abhidh. Koç, I, p. 30, kār. 16; Vyākyā in Bibl. Budh., 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 dominions of other skandhas.

149) Cf. supra, p. 77. For kotha, cf. note 111 above, where a passage is quoted from the Raṭṭarāpā. A particular state of mind is needed to see Dependent Origination as a process of decay; this may be the case with those practising açaubhāvāvanā and other kinds of concentration of the mind, for only samāhitacitto yathābhūtaṃ prajānāti (Abhidh. Koç VIII, p. 130, with numerous references by De la Vallée Poussin in note 5 to that page; Mahāv., 81, 6: Çikṣās., p. 119, etc.). Cf. De la Vallée Poussin, Mor. Boudh., p. 63: "La méditation de l'horrible est assurée quand l'ascète n'espère plus qu'un aventure sous les appâts féminins". During such practices, the ascetic may also see pratītyasamutpāda as it really is, i.e. as a process of patrañcikā (kotha); if this is correct, the latter term should be taken in its literal meaning. The mystical vision (vipaçvāsa) 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 dharma 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 dharma should be considered to be in the absolute state of rest (nirvṛttva): the Sāṃsāra, viewed sub specie aeternitatis, is Nirvāṇa; the ataimirika becomes an advaita. Although the latter conclusions are not expressed in our karikā, 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 tīmīrā 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 Prāthāgjāna whose vision is impeded by the screen of Ignorance may be cured from his naïve realism by the King of the Physicians, the Teacher of Gods and Men. Among the means used by the Buddha to that purpose, teaching of Pratītyasamutpāda 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 Čloka. 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 Čloka 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 and thus confirms our provisional conclusion based upon the preceding Čloka (parinirvṛtte bhagavati çaranam).

The fact that the two last Člokas on which the Upadcça is based belong to Mahāyāna is in an obvious contrast with the Sūtra-Vibhaṅga version, which gives the point of view of the 'orthodox' Sarvāstivādin (Vaibhashikas). 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 Cūnyaṭā is considered very dangerous for those who have not yet acquired a thorough knowledge about the Abhidharma.

--- 90 ---

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, Mèl. chin. et bouddh., II (1932-33), especially pp. 30 sq., p. 42 and p. 44. When taimirika is used to denote the Prāthāgjāna, cakṣusmānt remains its opposite and denotes the Buddhā Bhagavantaḥ who see things as they really (para-mārtfhah) are. These distinctions lead to three 'levels' of reality: (a) the imaginary truth (udakacandra, indrajā, marici, etc.), (b) relative (śāṃṛta) 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 parinippanna); cf. the literature mentioned by De la Vallée Poussin, Siddhi, II, pp. 514-533; Friedmann, Madhyāntavibhāgātikā (1937), p. 93.

152) In contrast to the pudgala-nairātmya in Hinayāna; cf. Siddhi, II, pp. 567 sq.: pudga-
lanairātmya is the antidote against klocāvaraṇa, dharmanairātmya against jñeyāvaraṇa.
theories, otherwise it might lead them to nihilistic views \(^{153}\): the sāmūrta Truth should be understood before the paramārthikasatyā could be explained \(^{154}\).

The entire final part of the Upadeça (from f — A — 1 to h — A — 2) is based upon the Člokas 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 indirect factor leading to re-existence, viz. fourfold Upādāna.

This is how our author understands the term upādānavivarjīta in the strophe: by becoming liberated from attachment to passions and wrong views, one becomes a caṇḍaśaman. 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 Āryatā itself is not the ultimate truth: in Mahāyāna, one of the forms of Āryatā is āryatācāryatā (Mahāvyutp., 37, 4 on p. 15: Dhammasagrāha, No. XII, p. 8 of the edition by Kasswara, Müller and Wenzel in *Anec. 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) respectively the Non-Substantiality of Non-Substantiality ... “: cf. also Obermüller, *A Study of the Twenty Aspects of Āryatā*, *Ind. Hist. Qu.*, IX (1933), pp. 170 sqq., and *Sublime Science, Acta Orient.*, IX (1931), pp. 161 sq (quotation from the Kācyāparavīrūcchāhā: „O Kācyapa, 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 Madhyamika, the doctrine of Āryatā is sometimes compared with a ship, necessary to cross the ocean cf. Samsāra, 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, _Buddh. -paññā_, p. 365, the strophe quoted from the Čaṭra (i.e. Mūlama­dyamakakārikās, XXIV, 10, as De la Vallée Poussin notes: _vyavahāram anāçritya paramārtha na deçyate_, „the highest truth cannot be explained unless one accepts the dialectic truth (vyavahāra, including the differentiation between ārya and āhaka, is almost a synonym of sāmṛti) 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 açakṣayatā). The same strophe considers _paramārtha_ in its turn as nothing but a means to reach Nirvāṇa (paramārthastham anāçganiya nirvāṇam nādhīganyate). 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 _samskritasya_ as a necessary introduction to the teaching of the _paramārthasatyā_ included in the Člokas upon which the Upadeça is based. Such a gradual instruction is typical of Mahāyāna with its interpretation of the successive dharmacaksapraparjanas; cf. the _Samdhinirmocanasūtra_ quoted by Obermüller, _The Doctrine of Prajñākramita, Acta Orient.*, XI (1932), pp. 93 sqq.; cf. also Stecherbatskii, *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 upādānavivajjita 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 Sāṃskāra 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 pratīya in avidyāpratīyāḥ sāṃskārāḥ, especially in connection with a possible question why avidyā is not called the hetu of the sāṃskāras. Here the rather strange reply is given that there is only one hetu, but there are many pratīyas; the meaning is obviously that not only Avidyā is required to produce the Sāṃskāras, 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 pratīyā. In fact, all hetus are comprised in one of the pratīyas, viz. the hetupratīyā 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 hetutāpyācrayatvāt and vijñānācrayatvāt, "since it is based either on causation (read: hetutāpyācrayatvāt?) 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 pratibhāsīkī bhṛānti, discussed by Stcherbatskij in Buddhist Logic, I, p. 154.


157) Īutra, 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 (*sāṃcīṣṭa*), but the *pratyaya* is detached (*viṣṭa*).

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) *punyamaya,* *apunyamaya* and *āneñjya* (?);

b) *kuçala,* *akuçala* and *avyākṣeta*;

c) *kāyakarman,* *vākkarman* and *manaskarman*;

d) *prātisattvika,* *aupapattyamçika* and *ābhisāmsārika*.

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 Jáñña, not to Avidyā, he gets into direct conflict with the text of the Pratītyasaṃputpāda; 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 *dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa:* 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 the 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 (antagráhadrṣṭi) 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 Satkāyadrṣṭi.

Up to this point there is nothing irregular in the connections, although they might not seem convincing to everybody. The connection between dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa and antagráha, for instance, is all but clear; it would be easier to explain how dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa leads to satkāyadrṣṭi. 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 efficacy of sundry rites of purification is an aspect of cilavrataparāmarṣa-dṛṣṭi; it may however also be called an aspect of dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa, since it implies the attachment to something hina which is wrongly conceived of being ucca; as a rule, the same belief would also imply antagráhadrṣṭi, 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 satkāyadrṣṭi 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 Satkāyadrṣṭi, 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), dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa is twofold, conceived of in the way formulated in the text. Our treatise, however, states that it is fivefold. Presumably, dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa is explained there as attachment to each of the five dṛṣṭis, including, of course, dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa with reference to dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa. 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 dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa and antagráhadrṣṭi are twofold, and this might be the main reason why the two were put together: those who are attached to the first aspect of dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa conceive of existence, which is always hina, 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 ucceda because they think that Nirvāna is hina.

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’ (*mahāduḥkkhakhandha*).

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 Śaṃskāras 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 Āṅgas of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula. The only difference between the Avidyā-Śaṃskāra and the Upādāna-Bhava

\(^{163}\) Cf. De ‘l.a Vallées Pousin, 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 (*kuśala*), but as long as they do not ‘break’ *jissayāvaran..* the road leading to Nirvāṇa is barred. Without scholastic subtleties, it is impossible to distinguish *satkāyadṛṣṭi* from *caṇḍatadṛṣṭi*, 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, pūṣa, puruṣa, ātman, pudgala*, etc.), attaches himself to something which is as imaginary as a flower growing at the sky (*khapsa*), 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, *dṛṣṭipāramāraṇa* is fivefold (g — A — 1) and *cīla* (in *cīlabrata*) 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 (gòla) 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 Jarāmarapānga. 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 prātiyamāna 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 dukhha 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 Āṅgas Vijñāna and Nārāyāna. 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 cañca-dharmas such as

166 A number of questions are connected with the points here mentioned. In the formula of causation, the group cokā etc. is almost always added to jarāmaranāṇa; cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, Théorie des douze causes (1916), p. 31: „quelques rédactions seulement mentionnent Visellesse-Mort, la plupart ajoutent chagrin etc.”. — It is remarkable that disease (vyāḍhi) is never mentioned in this context in our treatise, as is usually the case (e.g. Divya, pp. 314 and 676: jātījarāvyāḍhitmaranāṇacokaparidevadukkhasaurmanasyopāyāsa). Why jārā and maraṇa form only one Āṅga 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 Āṅga”. The same applies to vyāḍhi as well, but the latter is not even mentioned, because it is not only not necessary, but also not universal. This explains why vyāḍhi is often omitted. — In this passage, however, jārā is treated as if it were a real Āṅga. For the problem of accidental death (antarāmṛtyu), cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 176. For the internal structure of the dukhkhashandha, cf. op. cit., III, p. 83, note 5: „Les termes coka … upāyāsas sont compris (samgrhita) dans jarāmarana et ne sont pas des membres à part (nāgāntaram). Ils proviennent des divers transformations (parināma) des objets (viṣaya) et de la personne (ātmabhāva)”. The definitions of the constituents of the dukhkhashandha and their mutual relations are also explained in the Daśabhūmikasūtra, ed. Rahder, p. 49, and in the Madhyamakavṛtti, ed. L de la Vallée Poussin, p. 563.
Samjñā, 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 duhkha 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 mahāduhkhhaskandha, 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 upādānavivarjītaḥ, 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 Nālandā 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 Nirvāṇa and the reference to the taimirīka. 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 (satkāyadrṣṭi) and attachment to passions (kāmopādāna) is established by means of an unfortunately uncomplete quotation. Only the first words, vālah açrutavān prthagjanaḥ prajñāptim= anupatitah 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), açrutavān and prthagjana 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 Abhidharma koça dealing with the refutation of those Buddhists (the Vātsiputriyas and related sects) who believed in the existence of a pudgala (Pudgalapratishedhaparakarana), 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 Abhidharma koça. 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, pośa, 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 Abhidharma koça 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 Bhavasaṃkṛantisūtra (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 (abhāviniś) 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 Čāstras 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 Muséeon, 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 Čūnyatā 174; the Bhavasamkrāntisūtra, 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 Abhidharmakōṣa. 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 Upadeśa 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 Prasannapāda by Candrakīrti 176). This text begins with an analysis of the important notion of pratītya, 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 ĉūnyatā 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: Dvādaçāṅgaparīkṣā), and, finally, in

--- 99 ---

173) Quoted in the Çiksāsamuccaya, ed. C. Bendall, Bibli. Buddh., I (1902), pp. 244-256. Cf. especially p. 252, lines 3 sqq.: tucyathāpi nāma mahārāja puruṣāḥ svapnāntare janapadakalyānāḥ striyā sārdham paricaret; sa çavitavibuddho janapadalakalyānāṁ striyam anusmañcat; tati kim manyase mahārājāpi nu sa puruṣāḥ panditaśatiyo bhavet?

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 Prthagjana believing in the reality of the phenomenal world.


176) Edited by L. de la Vallée Poussin. Bibli. 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 Prasannapāda, Budhmica, 1-ièr 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: Drṣṭiparīkṣā). 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 saṃhī 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 pratītyasamutpādasūtras (c — A — 1 to e — A — 7), the second part of the Upadeça

177) Cf. the Vṛtti, p. 364: pratītyasamutpādasamjñayā hi decitavān saṃbhāṣṭiprahāṇārtatham 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 Āṅgas 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 Abhidharmakośa 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 was 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 Sparśa
are mentioned, followed by the conclusion that these are the pañcadaça sparçāni
(sic) 181). The set of three thirsts (kāma-, ārūpya- and ati-trṭṇā, 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 Nāmarūpānga; 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 Nāmarūpānga) comprises the five
sense organs (indriya), their five particular spheres of activity (visaya), 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 rūpam, bādhyata ity arthah, 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, Koça, I, p. 16).
179) Ibidem, I, pp. 23 sqq.
181) It seems that the three kinds of manaḥsamsarpīca (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 Upadeśa 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. 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 (kāmapāda). Presumably, the author intended to argue that the term kāmapāda means „Attachment to the Kāmadhātu in its twentyfold aspect” (i.e. vimśatīvidhakāmadhātu-pāda). According to the Buddhist point of view, this cannot be correct: attachment to some of the Kāmadhātu divisions, such as animal existence or Avicinaraka, is not easy to imagine. As a matter of fact, Kāmapāda is taken to refer to the five kinds of objects which may afford pleasure (pañca-kāmaguṇāḥ) in all our sources.

After this explanation of Kāmapāda, the author proceeds to a similar analysis of drṣṭyupāda; he there mentions, among other points, the famous twentyfold division of satkāyadṛṣṭi. Two other drṣtis are also analyzed (viz. antagrāha- and mithyā-dṛṣṭi), but the account is very confused. 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.

In spite of the clumsiness 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 Cūnyavādin, 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 Člokas, 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 Upadeśa 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 Mithyādṛṣṭi, 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 Mithyādṛṣṭi 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 Upadeśa. As we pointed out above, this 'Instruction' is based on three Člokas the reconstruction of which was attempted in the preceding page. 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 śānti-prakīrti, 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 Yogācārin 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 Mādhyaṃka ideas in the Indonesian world. Among the important discoveries in the neighbourhood of Kēdah (Malaya)\(^{188}\), there is a small clay tablet inscribed with three Çlokas which all have been traced in the Sāgaramatipariprēchā\(^{189}\). 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.” \(^{189}\). This date might be too early; the forms of most of the āksaras agree with those found in the Črīvijaya 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 āksara 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 Kēdah 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 Sarvāsśīva and Yogācarins lists of dharmas in Muséon, 6, 1905, pp. 178 sqq.) and important new notions (such as ālayavijñāna and other sorts of viṣṇa, also new divisions of the Pratityasamutpāda chain) were introduced; no traces of this development appear in our text.


\(^{189}\) The strophes were identified by Lin Li-kouang. Prof. Johnston (quoted *art. cit.*, p. 9) rightly took offence at svabhava in line 4, but this difficulty is probably due to a lapse in the transcription, for on the photograph (ibidem, plate 8) we read: \(^{13}\) svabhava na vidyante na tēśam sambhavah evacit, 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 Mādhyaṃka.

\(^{189}\) *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 Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya inscriptions is the more striking if one compares also the Pūrvavarman 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 Kēdah 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 Črīvijaya 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 Pūrvavarman inscriptions. For these reasons, we consider the first half of the 7th century the most probable conjecture
is 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 Kêdah.

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 Çlokā is a numerical one, referring to numbers of categories (in our text the divisions of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula; in the Kêdah tablet, the balas, vaiçāradyas and āvenuêkarharmas), whereas the second and, still more, the third Çlokas draw conclusions in view of the acquisition of perfect knowledge (atāmirika in our text, tasya kōṭim gatam iñānam in the Kêdah tablet). As we have noted above, the Kêdah strophes could be traced; now the curious point is that the three stromhs do not follow each other in the Sāgaramatipariprccchā 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 Čunyatā and perfect wisdom are touched upon. Such a reason might be discovered if we presume that also the Kêdah strophes were to be used as the basis of a Upadeṣa. 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 Upadeṣa, which was at his disposal. The latter was a prose text of considerable length, based on three (or more) Člokas treating of some special aspects of the deeper meaning of Dependent Origination. This Upadeṣa 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 Upadeṣa 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 Upadeṣa is certainly not clumsy, but it is rather scholastic; it was undoubtedly intended to be used by those „children, ignorant and ordinary 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 183). As we tried to point out above, the Upadeṣa probably belongs to (early) Mahāyāna and sometimes is in direct conflict with the Vibhaṅga text 184), 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 sufficiently authoritative

---

183) 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.

184) The most obvious detail is the different division of Jāti in the Vibhaṅga (b — A — 1 to 3) and in the Upadeṣa (g — A — 10 to B — 1); we also noted that the division of the Saṃskāras in the Vibhaṅga (a — B — 2) and in the Upadeṣa (f — B — 1 to 8) do not agree; the Vibhaṅga analysis is considered a subdivision of a different analysis in the Upadeṣa. 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 Upadeśa, 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.

Transcription

A. 1. // 1) evam=mayā črutam=ekasmin=sa[maye bhagavān=chravastyāṃ <vi>harati 2) &ma jetavane anāthapiṇḍa<da>syārame tatra bhaga-vāṃs=tān=āma<n>trayati 3) &ma bhikṣavo

198) 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; and V. Gokhale, Ullāṅgha's Pratītyasamutpāda-sūtra, Bonn, 1939.

1) Instead of the "double ñaṁ, C reads: siddham, G: namaḥ. — In the notes to the transcription, the following abbreviations are used:

C — the Nālandā brick's 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 bhikṣān, C, however, bhikṣūnām. The Sūtra text on which Vasubandhu wrote his commentary (cf. note 43 to the Introduction) appears to have read bhikṣān, 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 bhikṣān of his original. The latter possibility is not probable from a palaeographic point of view.
2. āmantrayati \(<ta>\) smin pratyācrausur 4) bhagavāṃś=ādīn=idam= avocat 5) prātiṣṭhitasamutpādasyādiṃ bhikṣavaḥ ādiñ=cādeçayisyey 6) çṛṇu-
3. ta 7) sādhu ca suñṭu 8) ca manasiku\(<rūta>\) 9) // bhāsīsy eva prātiṣṭhita-
   samutpādasyādiṃ katamaḥ yad=utāsmin=sati bhavatidam=ucyate yathāvat 10) avi-
4. dyāpṛṭayayaḥ=āṃṣkārāḥ āṃṣīkṣaṇapravṛttayaṃ vijñānayaṃ vijñānapra-
   vyayaṃ <nāmarupam nāmarūpapratyayaṃ> 11) saṃjñayatanam saḍā-
   yatana-pratvayayaḥ sparçāḥ sparçapratyayaḥ
5. vedanā vedanāpṛtyayaḥ tṛṣṇā tṛṣṇāpṛtyayaṃ=upādānām upādāna-
   pratyayo bhavaḥ bhavaprātyayo jātir=jātiprātyayo jārāmaṇapa-
   ridevaduḥkhasaduḥkhaupāyayaḥ-
6. sanm 12) sambhavati evam=asya ke\(<va>\) lasya 13) mahato duḥkha-
   skandhasya samudayo bhavati ayam=ucyate prātiṣṭhitasamutpādasyā-
   diḥ 14) vibhāgah 15) avidyāpṛtyayayaḥ

4) Read: pratyācrausur. The form given in our text may be due to analogy (association with adṛkkṣur?). — The words bhikṣava... pratyācrausur do not occur in the other versions known. The form bhikṣava is a breach of sandhi; it is however possible that the sandhi is correct, but that between bhikṣava and āmantrayati, a word was omitted.
5) Bhagavāṃś... avocat, omitted by C and G.
6) C reads: ādiñ vo dṛṣṭagṛṇi vibhaṅgaḥ ca; the repetition of ādi cannot be correct in our text. Since it is not probable that the copyist should have replaced vibhaṅgaḥ in his original by ādiṇca, one might consider the possibility that the original read arthaṇīca; from a palaeographic point of view, ādiṇca and arthaṇīca resemble each other very much.
7) C reads: taṣ=ucṛṇatu.
8) Read: suñṭu.
9) Manasikuruta occurs in all the versions. — In G, the following portion is introduced in a quite special way, i.e. as dharmāṇām ācayāḥ and apacayāḥ, referring to the Samudaya and to the Niruddha 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 Prātiṣṭhitasamutpāda formula in which all the Āṅgas are not enumerated do occur (in the Pāli canon; cf. Von Glasenapp, art. cfr.), there is no reason to consider the possibility of a Prātiṣṭhitasamutpāda version without nāmarūpaṭiṣṭha; everywhere else in our text, this link is mentioned regularly.
12) All texts read goka 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 goka is mentioned in its usual place.
   Usually, the whole compound is put in the plural (jātiprātyaya jārāmaṇaṇaçkaparideva-
   dvāduḥkhasaduḥkhaupāyayaḥ samuddbhavanti; cf. Vyākhyā quoted Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 84; Daçasāhasrikā §8, 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 ācayāḥ; cf. supra, note 9.
15) C: vibhaṅgaḥ katamaḥ; the second term is almost indispensable.
7. sanskārā iti avidyā katamā yattat=puurvānte ajñānaṁ aparānte ajñānaṁ pūrvvāparānte ajñānaṁ äddhyātmany=ajñānaṁ \( 16 \) vāhye
8. ajñānaṁ karmmanya=ajñānaṁ karmmavipāke ajñānaṁ \( 17 \) vuddhe ajñānaṁ dharmme ajñānaṁ saṃghe ajñānaṁ duḥkhasamudayaniryo-
9. dha<\( \text{mārggeṣv} \) \( 18 \) ajñānaṁ heto \( 19 \) ajñānaṁ hetusamutpanneṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ pratityasamutpāde ajñānaṁ \( 20 \) kuçaleṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ akуча-
10. leṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ kuçalākuçaleṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ \( 21 \) sävadyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ anavadyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ sävady<\( \text{āna} \)vadyeṣu> \( 22 \) dharmmeṣv=a-
11. ajñānaṁ asevitavyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ sevitavyeṣu dharmmeṣv=ajñānaṁ śatṣu vā sparçāyatanesu yat=tatra teṣu \( 23 \)

B. 1. ajñānaṁ=anabhisamayavah tamas=saṃmohav avidyāndhakāram=iyam =ucyate avidyā avidyāpratyayā bhikṣavah
2. sanskārā iti katame sanskārāḥ trayas=sanskārāḥ <kāyasaṃskārāḥ \( \) vāksam sanskārāḥ manassanskārāḥ \( 24 \) idam=ucyate sanskārāḥ
3. [sa] \( 25 \) sanskārapratyayāḥ bhikṣavo vijñānam=iti vijñānaṁ katamat svādviṣṇaṇakāyāḥ caṇṣurvijñānam cṛto-
4. vijñānaṁ ghrāṇavijñānaṁ jihvāvijñānaṁ kāvyavijñānaṁ manovijñānaṁ
ty=ucyate vijñānaṁ viṣṇāna-

\( 16 \) Read: \( \text{adhyātmany} \) ajñānaṁ. The vṛddhi of the form in our text is probably due to the confusion with \( \text{adhyātmikam} \). C, however, reads: \( \text{adhyātman} \). The latter version gives also \( \text{vahṛddhā} \) instead of vāhye. — In the portion which now follows, the text of C differs considerably from our version; instead of the continuous repetition of \( \text{ajñānaṁ} \) 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.

\( 17 \) This term is rather superfluous, since \( \text{vijñāna} \) is always \( \text{karmavipāke} \) in this context.

\( 18 \) It is obvious that the last term, \( \text{mārga} \), which is indispensable, was omitted by the copyist.

\( 19 \) Read: \( \text{hetā} \) or, with sandhi, \( \text{hetāv} \). In Sanskrit texts from Indonesia, \( \text{su} \) is almost always replaced by \( \text{o} \). In our text, however, \( \text{su} \) does occur in a few cases (I — B — 7 and \( \text{h} — A — 4 \)).

\( 20 \) In C, \( \text{pratityasamutpāde} \) ajñānaṁ 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 \( \text{kuçalesu} \) \( \ldots \) \( \text{akuçalesu} \) \( \ldots \) \( \text{kuçalākuçalesu} \), C mentions the last item only. The Madhyamāgama, quoted in the Vyākhyā to the Abhidharmakośa (vide \( \text{Abhidh. Koço} \), III, p. 92, note 1) mentions three terms, too, but replaces \( \text{kuçalākuçalesu} \) by \( \text{avvakṛtēsu} \).

\( 22 \) This correction seems obvious, since \( \text{avvadyeṣu} \) was already mentioned before.

\( 23 \) After \( \text{sparçāyatanesu} \), C adds: \( \text{yathābhūtasamprativedhe} \), 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 \( \text{samskāras} \) was evidently omitted by the copyist.

\( 25 \) In C the singular (\( \text{vah} \)) is used for each of the three groups.

\( 26 \) Probably due to diplography.
5. pratyayam bhikṣavo nāmarūpam=iti nāmarūpaṃ katamaṭ 26) catvāraḥ arūpinaḥ skandhaḥ vedanāskandhaḥ
6. saṃskāraskandhaḥ saṃjñāskandhaḥ vijñānaskandhaḥ idam=ucyate nāma rūpam=iti nāmarūpayor=iti 27)
7. yat=kiñci 28) rūpaḥ 29) sarvvan=tañ=catvāri mahābhūtani catvāri ca mahābhūtānai=upādāya ca rūpam=iti caī-
8. tac=ca rūpaṃ pūrvvakañ=ca rūpaṃ 30) tad=ubhayam nāmarūpam= ity=ucyate nāmarūpam=iti // <nāma>rūpapratyayam 31)

26) C reads: nāma katamaṭ, 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 pratītyasamutpāda formula. The Bhagavat then replies by first defining nāman and rūpa separately, and concluding with the statement that the two notions, as such as they were defined before, together constitute nāmarūpāṅga.

27) Nāmarūpayor=iti, omitted by C and the Chinese version. These words are not entirely superfluous, since Rūpa included in nāmarūpāṅga is not identical with the Rūpa implied, for instance, in Rūpāṅgana or in Dharmāṅgana, referring to visible matter and avijñānai respectively.

28) C reads: kiñcid, the correct Sanskrit form. In older Buddhist Sanskrit, the final dental is usually dropped in words like this one. In the Črīvijaya inscription discussed below, the form kadāci instead of kadācit occurs many times; cf. supra note 5 to the Introduction to No. II.

29) Read: rūpaḥ, the correct Sanskrit form. The form rūpaḥ cannot however be due to a mere lapse by the scribe, for the text continues with sarvvan=tac (catvāri). Confusion between the grammatical genders, especially between masculine and neuter, is very common in older Buddhist Sanskrit; cf. C. Bendall, Čikṣāsanamocaya, Bibl. Budh. XV; a number of examples were given in Aṣṭaṅga (cf. E. H. Johnston, The Buddhacarita, II, 1936, Introduction, p. lix). A strange example occurs in this text, infra e — B — 4, viz. the plural sparśāni instead of sparśāh; the latter example occurs in a rather suspect portion of our text and is perhaps a mistake only. Everywhere else in our text, sparśa has its usual gender. Cf. also puspha instead of puspaṃ, 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

1. bhikṣavaḥ śaḍāyatanam=iti śaḍāyatanam katamat śaḍ=ādhvāśmi-kāny=āyatanāni cakṣu<ḥ>çrotraghrāṇa-

2. jihvākāyamanāṃśya=ādhvāśmikāni idam=ucyate śaḍāyatanam [ka
tamat] 32) śaḍāyatanapratyayo

3. bhikṣavaḥ sparçā iti sparçā katamaḥ śaṭ=sparçakāyāḥ cakṣus-
saṃsparçāḥ çrotrasaṃsparçāḥ ghrāṇajihvā-

4. kāyamanassaṃsparcāḥ ayam=ucyate sparçā // sparçapratyayā
bhikṣavo vedanā iti vedanā katama

5. tisro vedanā<ḥ> sukhavedanā duḥkhaṇavedanā aduḥkhāsuṣkhaṇvedanā iyam=ucyate vedanā // vedanā-

6. pratiyā bhikṣavaḥ trṣṇā iti trṣṇā katamaḥ tisraḥ <trṣṇāḥ> kāma-trṣṇā bhavatṛṣṇā vibhavatṛṣṇā iyam=ucyate <trṣṇā> 32)

7. trṣṇāpratyayām bhikṣavaḥ upādānam=iti upādānam katamat ca-tvāry=upādānāni kāmopādānāṃ dṛṣṭyo-

8. pādānam 34) cilavratopādānam ātmavādopādānam=ity=ucyate upā-dānam // upādānapratyayo

9. bhikṣavo bhava iti bhavā katamaḥ trayo bhavāḥ kāmabhavāḥ rūpa-bhavāḥ ārūpyabhavāḥ ayam=ucya-

B. 1. te bhavāḥ bhavapratyayā bhikṣavo jātir=iti jātīḥ katamaḥ yattat
teṣāṃ satvānāṃ tasmin=tasmin satvanikāye

2. jātīḥ san[jīnā]jātīḥ 35) avakrāntīḥ abhinivṛttīḥ skandhapratīlabho
dhātupratīlabhāḥ āya<ta>nāpratīlabh-

3. bhāḥ skandhābhinnivṛttīḥ jivitendriyapradurbhāvāh iyam=ucyate
ejātīḥ // jātīpratyayām bhikṣavo jārāma-

4. raṇam=iti tatra jārā katamanā yat 36) khalatatvaṃ 37) valita-

---

32) This term may be due to the fact of the copyist looking at the line above, where śaḍāyatanam is followed by katamat.

33) The omissions of trṣṇā 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 : dṛṣṭyopādānam; the o is undoubtedly due to analogy with the other kinds of Upādāna.

35) C (and all the other comparable texts) : sanjñātīḥ, undoubtedly the correct form (sanjñā belongs to a later stage; it is included in skandhapratīlabho). Probably, the original used by the copyist read sanjñātīḥ, which was misunderstood and considered a mistake for sanjñājātīḥ, 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 khālatyaṃ, which seems to be the most probable form; a quotation from the Madhyamāgama in the Sputārtha, commentary to the Abhidharmakoṣa (Abhidhā. Koṣa, 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. khādicoṣa (=the state of being broken, of teeth'). Rhys Davids). We presume that our copyist, reading khālatyaṃ in his original, assumed a mistake in the ending ayam and substituted the well-known tatvam. — The other versions of this passage cannot well
tvaṁ⁵⁸) valipraca</tvaṁ><ra>tā jī</tvaṁ><rnatā>⁵⁹) bhugnātā kubjata⁶⁰) gopānasivāṅketa⁵
5. daṇḍavijabhanatā purataḥ prāgbhārakāyatā tilakādikagātrata⁶¹) mandatvaṃ andhatvaṃ hāniḥ pariḥā-
6. niḥ indriyaṇāṃ paripākaḥ paribhedaḥ saṃskāraṇāṃ purāṇibhāvāḥ jarjaribhāvāḥ ayam—ucyate
7. jara⁶²) maruṇaṃ katamat yat=teśān=teśām satvānāṃ tasmāt= tasmāt satvanikāyacuyūtiḥ cyavanatābhedaḥ⁶³)
8. antahāniḥ⁶⁴) āyuṣo hāniḥ⁶⁵) jīvitendriyanirodhāḥ saṃskāraṇāṃ nīkēpo maruṇākālakṣaya⁶⁶)

be compared. The Chinese version translated by Bagchi is difficult to be used because the order of the terms has been changed there. The Lālitavistara, describing the Bodhisattva’s encounter with an old man (edition Löffmann, 1902, p. 186), is clearly based on the Vīhaṅga terms, but is not literal enough for a comparison; cf. the notes to the translation of this passage.

⁵⁸) Valitvatvaṃ, though not completely impossible (it could be explained as vali, „wrinkles“ +atva, „truth, reality“), is not likely since it would be duplicated by the next term. We suppose pālitvatvaṃ, which is the reading of C and of the Madhyama quotation in the Abhidharma-kāvyākhyā mentioned in note 37.

⁵⁹) The correction of pracūtā to pracuratā is evident. — The correction of jī to jirnātā seems rather far-fetched; it is however not doubtful since all comparable versions (including the Pāli definition in Dīgha, II, p. 305, which has jirnātā) give the same term here. Besides, the omission of one or more ākāras is the most common mistake found in our text.

⁶⁰) In C, kubjata 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“; cor-responding to bhugnatā kubjata).

⁶¹) C reads; tilakālakācītigātata, probably the original word. Other texts give slightly different forms; cf. note 63 to the translation.

⁶²) 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. khulakulapracvāsa-kārātā, „shortness of breath” (a colourless translation if compared with the expressive Sanskrit compound). The latter term does not occur in the Chinese translation either.

⁶³) Cyavanatāḥ 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 cyavanatāḥ 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.

⁶⁴) C: antarabhāniḥ, „interior exhaustion”, presumably, exhaustion of the internal organs such as the heart; our reading antarbhāniḥ could however be maintained if this term may be interpreted as „ultimate (final, irreparable) exhaustion”; it would then be more characteristic of death than antarabhāni.

⁶⁵) C adds āyusno hāniḥ after āyuṣo hāniḥ.

⁶⁶) C reads: maruṇaṃ 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 marāṇaṁ [etad=] etac=ca  
   marāṇaṁ pūrvvikā ca  
   jaraḥ tad=ubhayaṁ=jarāmarāṇaṁ ity=ucyte prati-

10. tyasamutpādasayādīḥ vibhāgāḥ katamaḥ pratītyasamutpādasya vo 
   bhikṣavāḥ arthaṁ=cādeçayiṣye  

A. 1. rūpīnas=sarvvasattvā hi sarvve santu  
   sarvve bhadrāṇi paçyanti mā kaçcit=pāpam=āgamat  
   ajñānāc=ciyate karma janmanāḥ karma kāraṇāḥ.

 to the Chinese version is that it presumes the repetition of maraṇaṁ 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 jārāmarāṇam): syam=ucyate pratītyasamutpādasya vibhāgāḥ. pratītyasamutpādasya ādīn vo doçayaiśāmi vibhāgāni=ca iti vo yad=uçktaṁ=idad= 
   etat=pratyuktaṁ. idam=avocad=bhaçavāṁ=<ātta>manasaḥ [x]to bhikṣavo bhaçavato bhāṣidam=abhyanandam=iti.

   Most of the text of C occurs in our text at the very end of the treatise (h — A — 1/2). The Chinese 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: santī (?) ; 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 santī 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 čolka half is clearly nirāmanāḥ; this form cannot possibly be correct; the easiest correction is nirāmanāḥ, implying a confusion between the dental and lingual nasals. 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 nirāmanāḥ, which is the lectio difficultior. 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 nirāmanā, 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 ciyate karma karmābhāvāt na jāyante 51) // ye dharmāṃ hetuprabhāvā hetun =tathāgata uvāca teṣām =ca yo nirodhāh

3. evamvādi mahācramā<na>ḥ 52) // ekadvitricatuspañcaçat<ap>tañavāṅgajaḥ daçasākādaçhadhotpannaḥ pratityaḥ dvādaçah smṛtaḥ //

4. yaḥ kaçcit samyag =avadhāryya pratyayā vaçya <ma> parinirvṛte bhagavati caranatrayam yavau 53) upadāna iti ajñāndhakāre-

5. su bhavaty =asā<ma> =atai <ma> =rikaç =cakṣuṣmān =iti 54) kiñ = jānāti pratityasamutpādaṃ pratitya iti kothā angam = prati ya utpadyate sa pratye-

6. tityaḥ 55) pratitya sas = távat = katividhāh samāsataḥ ekavidhāh sarvvakleṣṣāgrayatvāt prthivivad =iti dvividhāh pratitya-

7. samutpādaḥ hetupalārthena avidyāțṛṣnopādānaśmākabhāvā iti pañcavidhā hetavāḥ vijnānanāmarūpa-

8. saḍāyanatasaṣparṣaçedanāt jātiyādiri =iti saptavidhām phalam =iti ayaṇ =dvividhāḥ pratityasamutpādaḥ ayaṇ = apary = aparāh pratitya-

9. samutpādaḥ dvividhāḥ pratityasamutpādaḥ vāyāḥ pratityasamutpādaḥ abhyantarācaḥ =ca [çca] 56) vāyhas = távad = vijād = ankuram

10. ankurati =pattrām 57) pattrāt = kāṇḍam kāṇḍān = nālam 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 former 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 cloka. 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 clokas and commentary 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 : parinirvṛte.

Instead of yavau the plate seems to give vaśyā. Presumably, the sign for -ai has been placed before the first of the two yas.

Ajiñāndhakāreṣu, — read : ajñānāndhakāreṣu, evidently a case of haplography.

54) Ataimirikaç — read : ataimirikaç. One aṣṭara has been omitted.
55) One would have expected here something like : sa pratityasamutpādaḥ. In any case, the text cannot be correct as given on the plate.
56) Obviously due to diplography.
57) Pattrām instead of pattraṃ is a confusion which is common in the Old Javanese inscriptions, too.
garbhāt=puṣpaḥ 56) puṣpāt=phalam=iti ayaṃ vāhyaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ

B. 1. katham abhyantaraḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ // tadyathā avidyāpratyayāḥ sanśkarāḥ sanśkārapratītyayāṃ <vijñānam vijñānapratītyayām>

2. nāmarūpaṃ nāmarūpaprathyayaḥ śādāyatanam śādāyatanaprathyayaḥ sparçāḥ sparçāpratyayaḥ vedana

3. vedanaṇapratītyayā tṛṣṇā tṛṣṇāprathyayaḥ upādānaṃ upādānapratītyayo bhavaḥ bhavaprathyayaḥ jātiḥ jātipratyaya

4. jātamarāṇam=iti // vistareṇa ayaṃ=abhyantaraḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ // katham trividhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ kleçakarma-

5. duḥkhādinaḥ avidyātṛṣṇopādānam=iti klecaḥ sanśkārabhava iti karmma vijñānanāmarūpaśādāyatanādinām=iti 59)

6. duḥkhaṃ ayaṃ trividhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ ayaṃ cāparas=trividhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ // avidyāsaṃskāra ity=atītah

7. prathamaṃ=ca jātijarādir=ity=ayam=anāgataḥ dvitiyaṃ=ca vijñānaṃ

8. neti viṣayapravṛttiḥ tṛṣṇopādānabhava iti prabhavaḥ jātijarādir=iti pravāhaḥ iti pañcavidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ

9. avidyāśāmśkarā iti hetukāṇḍāḥ vijñānanāmarūpaśādāyatanasparcavedanetī vipākakāṇḍāḥ tṛṣṇopāda-

10. nabhava iti hetukāṇḍāḥ jarādi iti vipākakāṇḍāḥ <kāṇḍa>bhedena 60) caturvidhaḥ pratītyasaṃputpādaḥ //

d

A. 1. katham pañcavidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ avidyāśāmśkarā iti kārakah vijñānanāmarūpa iti gaḥbhāḥ śādāyatanasparcaveda-

2. neti viṣayapravṛttiḥ tṛṣṇopādānabhava iti prabhavaḥ jātijarādir=iti pravāhaḥ iti pañcavidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ

3. tṛṣṇopādānabhava ity=ayaṃ varttamāṇāḥ tṛṣṇāḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ // katham caturvidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ

4. avidyāśāmśkarā iti hetukāṇḍāḥ vijñānanāmarūpaśādāyatanasparcavedanetī vipākakāṇḍāḥ tṛṣṇopāda-

5. bhava iti karmakāṇḍāḥ jātijarādir=iti phalakāṇḍāḥ tṛṣṇopādānam=iti karmakāṇḍāḥ

6. pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ avidyātṛṣṇopādānam=iti phalakāṇḍāḥ ayaṃ saḍvidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ katham saḍvidhaḥ

7. pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ avidyātṛṣṇopādānam=iti phalakāṇḍāḥ ayaṃ saḍvidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ katham saptaśvādh

8. pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ avidyātṛṣṇopādānam=iti phalakāṇḍāḥ ayaṃ saḍvidhaḥ pratītyasaṃutpādaḥ katham aṣṭaviḥ

---

56) 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) Kānda was obviously omitted by the copyist.

61) Cf. supra, note 52.
9. avidyeti saṃmohaphalaṃ saṃskārā iti ārambahphalaṃ vijñāna-
nāmarūpam=iti

B. 1. vipākaphalaṃ śadāyatanasparçavedaneti niṣyandaphalaṃ trṣnopāda-
nam=iti santānapahalāṃ <bhava>-  
2. jātir=iti nirvṛttiphalaṃ jarāmaranādādir=iti aniṣṭaphalaṃ phalabhedena 
yam=a-  
3. śtavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ kathām navavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ 
avidyeti mithyāndhabhedah 62) 
4. saṃskārā iti kriyābhedaḥ vijñānam=iti  
5. āçrayaphalaṃ 7adāyatanasparçavedaneti niṣyandaphalaṃ  
6. jātir=iti vināçabhedaḥ ayaṃ navavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ 
kathām daçavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti  
7. kleçamulaṃ saṃskārā iti karmamūlaṃ vijñānam=iti kalalamulaṃ 
nāmarūpam <iti> 63) skandhamulaṃ śadāyatanam=iti 
8. āçrayamulaṃ 64) sparça iti trikamulaṃ vedaneti vipākamulaṃ 
9. nam=iti grahaṇamulaṃ bhavajātijarādir=iti punarāvarttakamulaṃ 
// iti ayaṃ daçavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ  
10. katamā 65) ekādaçavidhaḥ prātītyasamutpādaḥ avidyeti svāmī saṃskārā 
iti valăddhyakṣāḥ vijñānam=iti

A. 1. āmātyā nāmarūpam=iti puṇaraṃ śadāyatanam=iti grhaṃ sparçā iti 
pañca kāmaguṇāni vedaneti mitraṁ jayati  
2. trṣṇetiparasparajyāvasah upadānam=iti ātmabhedaḥ jānadhāva-
prādāni 66) bhavajātādir=ity=āçvaryaṇapattir 
3. jārāmarañādir=ity=āçvaryaṇipattir=ity=ayam=ekādaçavidhaḥ 
prātītyasamutpādaḥ kathām dvādaçavidhaḥ prātītyasa-
4. nupādaḥ avidyāpratyayās=saṃskārā saṃskārāpratyayām vijñā-
naṃ vijñānapratyayām nāmarūpam nāmarūpapa-

62) Probably to be corrected to mithyāndhabhedah.
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 comprehensible 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 katamā, or rather to katamāḥ 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 sāmabhedaṇa-
dasampradānāni or something similar, for there is no doubt that the four upāyas are here referred to.
5. 
6. 
7. 
8. 
9. 
10. 
11. 
B. 1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
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67) Probably, not only *evam* but also some more words were omitted by the copyist. After the *pratyayam* ending in "ṭāḥ, one would have expected: *samāhavanti. 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) *Vimśatīvidhānam,* — the word itself is correct, since the twentieth division of Rūpa is regular; the contradiction is due to the fact that only the eight *sanathāna* 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: *caṅkṣurāyatanaṃ.*

75) Read: *manoāyatanaṃ.*

76) The plural, though perhaps not impossible, is at least unusual.

77) *Probelably a mistake for caṅkṣuṣa- or caṅkṣuṣa-samparçah.*

78) One would have expected something like *caṅkṣurāḍiṣaṁparçah.*

79) *The third category has evidently been omitted.*

80) Read: *sparçah, or with sandhi: sparçā.*

81) *Sukha* might have got into this line from the preceding one, where the word occurs almost at the same place.
5. sro vedaṇāḥ sukhaṃ sro vedaṇā duḥkhasaṃvedana duḥkhasaṃvedana vedaṇāpratayah śṛṇā sutṛpitilakṣa- 
6. nā śṛṇā tisaḥ śṛṇāḥ kāmaśṛṇā ārūpyaśṛṇā atitṛṇāḥ śṛṇā- 
   pratyayaṃ = upādaṇāṃ kim = upādaṇāṃ bhavati catvā- 
7. ryy = upādaṇāṃ bhavanti kāmaśṛṇāṃ dṛṣṭiupādaṇāṃ çilavratopādaṇāṃ atī mavadopādaṇāṃ kāmo- 
8. pādanaṃ vīçatividhāḥ

A. 1. vistareṇa evam = upadīṣṭaḥ evam avidyā tāvad = avidyā na mitthya avidyā tad = evājñānaṃ kim = anyad = 
a jñānaṃ vrṣcati prati- 
2. cīḍhaty = avidyā 86) avidyā tāvad kātividyā samāsataḥ ekavidhā sarvvaklecaṇām = avitathārthena dvividhā cávidyā hetutaya- 
3. çrayatvā <d> vijñānaṃcrayatvā = ca trividhā cávidyājñānaṃ saṃça- 
   yājñānaṃ mitthājñānaṃ = iti caturvidhā cávidyā 
4. duḥkhapraheyaś samudaya prahayā nirodhapraheyaś mārgapraheyaś pañcaridhā evi- 
5. dyā <duḥkhaḥ > prahayā 86) samudaya prahayā nirodhapraheyaḥ bhā- 
   vanapraheyaḥ evamādi 
6. yāvat pañcaridhā avidyā jñeyeti avidyāpratayah saṃskārā iti 
   kasmād = avidyā hetur = i- 
7. ti noktā eso hetuḥ vahavaḥ 87) pratayaḥ svārthakāri hetuḥ 
   parārthakāri hetuḥ 88) ya- 
8. s = saṃcīṣṭah hetuḥ viçliṣṭapratyayaḥ tasmād = avidyā pratyaḥ <ya i- > 
   tī nāvidyā hetuḥ 
9. lītu[h] pratayor pratyayaṃ prativikheṣu avidyāpratayāḥ saṃskārāḥ 
10. saṃskārā iti trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ punyamayāḥ saṃskārāḥ apu- 
   nyamayāḥ = saṃskārāḥ

B. 1. aṃpunyamayāḥ = saṃskārāḥ 89) punyamayāḥ saṃskārāḥ iti trividhāḥ 
   kuçalam käyakarmakuçalam

---

85) Undoubtedly not correct in this form; cf. the Translation.
86) Read: dṛṣṭy upādaṇāṃ. 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 ṣṭu, which would have ended far too much below the line.
87) Viñçatividham; — 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.
88) Sic. We suppose pratisiddhyate (or 'ti'); cf. the Translation.
89) Duḥkha was probably omitted by the copyist. In that case, fourfold Avidyā applies to the four āryasyāyāni, whereas it is fivefold if referred to the latter with the addition of bhāvānā. If we accept the reading given by our text, the first category would be aprahayā, which, though unknown from other sources, would not be completely out of place.
90) Obviously an error for pratayaḥ (*ya with sandhi).
91) Instead of the third category of saṃskāra (usually given āneñjya), the second one
2. vākkarmakuçaḷaṁ manaskarmakuçaḷaṁ apunyamayāḥ saṃskārā iti 
   trividhāṁ akuçaḷaṁ kāyakarma-
3. akuçaḷaṁ vākkarma-akuçaḷaṁ manaskarma<<akuçaḷa> 90) akuçaḷa-
   lamayaḥ saṃskārā iti trividhāḥ 91) akuçaḷalakāyakarma
4. kāyakarma [ma] avyākṛtamanskarma 92) avyākṛtamanskarma anye 
   punar=āhuh trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ kāya[s]saṃskārāḥ 93)
5. vāksaṃskārāḥ manassasaktāḥ iti kāya[s]saṃskāro dvividhāḥ 
   āçvāsapaçvāsah 94) vāksaṃskṛtya iti vitarkayitvā
6. vicārayitvā bhāṣate manassakāra iti cetanā anye punar=āhuh 
   trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ kuçaḷa-
7. akuçaḷa-avyākṛtç=ça anye punar=āhuh trividhāḥ saṃskārāḥ 
   prātisatvāḥ vikāraḥ <t>yañçikāḥ ābhisaṃsā-
8. rikāḥ kim=ime saṃskārā avidyāpratayāḥḥ> syuh iti 
   neti syuh saṃskārā avidyāpratayāḥ syuh saṃskārā vidyāpratya-
9. yāḥ syuh saṃskārā vidyāvidyāpratayāḥ syuh saṃskārā 
   naivyāvidyāpratayāḥ praçṇaḥ catuṣkotikāḥ 95)

A. 1. çāntiḥ 96) astimānena daivyāyāniko 97) iti drṣṭiparāmarçaḥ 
   pañcavidhaḥ yuktaiṣā atidṛṣṭir=iti yuktai-

90) The insertion of this term is necessary; its omission is 
   undoubtedly due to haplography. The 
   omission of sandhi in the compounds with akuçaḷa 
   is certainly due to the necessity 
   of avoiding misunderstanding with kuçaḷa.

91) As we noted in note 39 above, this whole passage is very 
   confounded. Instead of akuçaḷa-
   ma/saṃskārā iti, we have to read 
   aneñjyāḥ saṃskārā iti. The last word of this 
   line, akuçaḷalakāyakarma, cannot be correct; it should 
   have been avyākṛtākāyakarma. 
   There is one excuse for the copyist: the very numerous 
   repetitions in this portion of the text are very 
   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 avyākṛta-
   manaskarma should be omitted.

93) The double s here and in line 5 is probably due to analogy with 
   manassasakārā.

94) Read: āçvāsapaçvāsau (or possibly: āçvāsapaçvāso).

95) Before praçṇaḥ, some words must have been omitted, probably 
   syuṛ=iti.

96) This reading is very uncertain. The word which we should have 
   expected to find 
   here is iti. Although the first aṃshara, 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 
   aṃshiras 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 
   çānti 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)yāniko. 
   The word which 
   precedes, astimānena, is most certainly wrong; it does not make sense. We 
   suppose 
   that it is a copyist's error for āstī mārgo; from a palaeographic point of view such
2. śa antagrāhādṛṣṭir=iti yuktaiśā mithyādṛṣṭir=iti yuktaiśā cilavrata-parāmargadṛṣṭir=iti saptavidhena
3. cilena cūddhidṛṣṭir=iti anekavidhena bhavitena cūddhidṛṣṭir=iti asti pudgalāḥ kāraṇa itye-
4. vamādi yathāḥ atmātmiya iti bhiksāvāḥ vā- 98)
5. laḥ agratavān prthagajānaḥ prajñāptiṃ=anupatitāḥ kāmopādhānam 99) ukte mo 100) ca avidyāpratayayāḥ
6. saṃskāra iti upādānapratayayasya bhavasya ca tayoḥ kin=ānā-kāraṇām avidyāpratayayāḥ samśkāra iti a-
7. titam bhavaṃ pradiṣṭa[n]ityi 101) upādānapratayo bhava iti anāgataṃ bhavaṃ prakāṣayati ayaṃ tayor=vi-
8. cēsaḥ upādānapratayo bhava iti trayo bhavāḥ kāmabhavaḥ rūpa-bhavaḥ ārūpyabhavaḥ=ca kāmabha-
9. vaḥ vipchatīvidhaḥ rūpabhavaḥ sūdaçavidhaḥ ārūpyabhavaḥ caturvidhaḥ bhavo nāma janmakāmabhavaḥ 102) kāma-
10. bhavaḥ tathā rūpārūpyā iti bhavapratayayā jātiḥ skandhapra-durbhāvāj= jātiḥ jātī=caturvidhā

B. 1. garbhajā sopapattijā svedajā aññajāt jatipratayā jagnitā 103) paripā-kendriyadaurvyāhāra-
2. rūpavārṇapāṭa jara jaryāḥ samanantaram maraṇaṁ skandhabhedatattvāt maraṇam=iti maraṇapratayayaḥ cōkaḥ
3. cōkaḥ tae=chokaḥ cūnyendriyavasthāna[n]dhātuçokaḥ 104) cōka-pratayayaḥ paridevāḥ abhilāpaṭā-
4. lakṣaṇaḥ paridevaḥ paridevapratayāṃ duhkham daunmanasyatvāt duḥham=iti duḥkhapratayayaṇa=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 kīṭas 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 upādattā), 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) Pradiṣṭaṇi is very probably a mistake for pradiṣṭati; the plural is out of place here.
102) Read: janmakārnavabhavaḥ. As we saw above in note 97, the copyist probably knew many Buddhist lists by heart. Thinking of the well-known set of kāmabhava, rūpabhava, and ārūpyabhava, which also occurred just before (in line 8), he substituted the first of these three terms for kārnavabhava, 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 jāreti; 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 athāna 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 daurmanasyaprata-
yo 105) upāyāsah upāyāsa-
6. lakṣanam 106) upāyāsahetujñatvā<d> daurmanasyam=iti vyastān
 daurmanasyaṃ daurmanasyahetum duḥkham=iti
7. vyastān=duḥkham=iti vyastaduḥkham 107) duḥkhabhastum paridevam
 =iti vyastā paridevāḥ paridevahetum çokam=iti vyasta-
8. ç=çokah çokahetum maraṇām=iti vyastā mano maraṇahetukā
 jāti 108) vyastā jāra jārahetukī jāti-
9. r=iti vyastā jātiḥ jāthetuko bhava iti vyasto bhavah bhavahetukam=
 upādānam=iti 109)

t
A. 1. vibhaṅga iti me 110) yad=uktam=idam=etad 111) pratyuktam=iti
 idam=avocad=bhagavān=āptamanasas=te 112) bhikṣavo bha-
ga<va>- 113)
2. ddbhāṣitaṃ 113) anandyan 114) maunyam=bhagavato niti-kā=pra-
krāntāḥ // O // O // 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: jāreti. 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 jāreti is
less clear; he may have thought of jērjartī.
109) This line was not completely filled in; there would have been room for two or three
aksaras 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 stereotypical 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 bhāgavaṇḍ 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. jambhūdvīpaḥ 116) uttarakurukodvīpaḥ 117) pūrvvavidadvīpaḥ 118) ceti aṣṭāmāhā
darakaḥ tadyathā sañjı̄va-kālasūtra-samghāta-raurava-mahārauravatapana-sampratāpaka-
aviść= =ceti 119) sadjīvokasamālayāḥ 120) cāturmahārājika-trāyastriṃ-ça-yāma-tuṣita-nirmā-
7. viṇcattividhā 121) kāmadhātur idam ucyate kānopādānam dṛṣṭyu-pādānam iti pañcadṛṣṭa-
yāt satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ antagrāhadṛṣṭiḥ mithyādṛṣṭiḥ dṛṣṭiparāmarcaḥ cīlavrataparāmarcaḥ
satkāyadṛṣṭi viṇcattividhā 122) rūpe caturvidhā vedanāyāni caturvidhā 123) saṃjñāyāni caturvidhā
caturvidhā vijñāne saṃskāreṣu caturwidhā samavāyaḥ
caturwidhā sattām kāmopādānam kāmadhātur iti caturwidhā

B. 1. saṃskārēṣu caturvidhā vijñānē caturvidhā tesāṃ saṃavāyāḥ
viṇcattividhā satkāyadṛṣṭiḥ antagrāha-
dṛṣṭiḥ trividhā ucedētām cāçvatātmā asti vā nāsti veti mithyādṛṣṭiḥ dvividhā satptanācī 124) kim vipra-
tyāgamī kim nāstidannādīh 125) astidukhham kim na nityaṃ iti a-astisasumadya na hetuḥ astinīrodhā 126) !!!

116) Read either jambhūdvīpaḥ or jambūdvīpaḥ.
117) Read: uttarakurukodvīpaḥ.
118) Read: avaragohānīyadvīpaḥ.
119) Read: aviść= =ceti, since the plural is required in a copulative compound of this kind. Even then, the mode of expression remains clumcy; one would have expected separate terms instead of a compound (especially in view of the use of ca after the last term). Similar remarks apply to the enumeration of the heavens below.
120) Read: sadjīvokasamālayāḥ.
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 viṇcasti instead of vinçaṭi here, in line 7 above (?) and in h - B - 1.
123) The plate seems to read cīturvidhā.
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 (ṣaṭi), which is destroyed by ( "nāci) Mithyādṛṣṭi. The only term which resembles a little the reading of the plate is saṣṭhyāna, but this does not make sense.
125) The words nāstidannādīh 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 nīro-
dhaye), 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-samadya, "(there is) no (the prefix a-)
A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaṃ
   2. jñānā<\n> na cīyate karma karmmābhāvān=na jāyate
   3. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavāḥ hetun=teṣāṁ
   4. tathāgato avadat teṣāṁ=ca yo

B. 1. nirodha <\e>vamvādi mahācramaṇaḥ kuçalaṃ
   2. sarvapāpasya kāraṇaṃ kuçalasyopasaṃ-
   3. padā

A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaḥ jñānā=na
   2. [c]cīyate karma karmmābhāvān=na jāya[\n]te

B. 1. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavā hetun=teṣāṁ tathāgata uvāca teṣāṁ=
   ca yo niro-

--- 123 ---

i 127)

A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaṃ
   2. jñānā<\n> na cīyate karma karmmābhāvān=na jāyate
   3. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavāḥ hetun=teṣāṁ
   4. tathāgato avadat teṣāṁ=ca yo

B. 1. nirodha <\e>vamvādi mahācramaṇaḥ kuçalaṃ
   2. sarvapāpasya kāraṇaṃ kuçalasyopasaṃ-
   3. padā

A. 1. ajñānāc=cīyate karma janmanaḥ karma kāraṇaḥ jñānā=na
   2. [c]cīyate karma karmmābhāvān=na jāya[\n]te

B. 1. ye dharmmā hetuprabhavā hetun=teṣāṁ tathāgata uvāca teṣāṁ=
   ca yo niro-

arising of (new) existence (asti)", na hetub, "(because there is) no cause", so that
there will be astinirodha, "cessation from existence", i.e. astisamudayabhāvā dhetur
na vidyata ity astinirodhaḥ.

127) No translation of the texts on the plates i and j will be given; except for a single
čloka (?) to be discussed in note 130 below, all these strophes also occur in the begin-
ing of plate c · A.

128) Instead of jāyate, the Čloka reads jāyate in supra, c · A - 2 and infra, j · A - 2. The
latter is unmetrical, but the pui.al is easier to understand.

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 term: used; cf. note 133 below).

130) The initial e was obviously overlooked The whole strophe was very carelessly writ-
ten; 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 Čloka is meant
which is quoted in Mahāvastu, III, p. 420, lines 12 sq.:

Sarvapāpasya kāraṇaṃ kuçalasyopasaṃpadā /
svacittaparyādāpanam etad buddhāstuṣāsanam //, 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 ḫy = avadat.
2. dha evamvādi mahāçramaṇaḥ // rūpiṇas=sarvasattvā hi sarvva 134) santi 135) nirātmikāḥ  
3. sarve bhadrāṇi 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 Črāvasti 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, 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: āgaman.

1) The translation is based upon the corrections proposed in notes 1 to 4 to the transcription (bhikṣava āsmantrayati asmin pratyaçrausur). 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 Črāvāca, Bodhisattva, gods and men.

2) The translation is based on the corrected reading (pratītyasamutpādyādiḥ bhikṣavo 'rthañ = cādeçayissya). The reading of (a)rthañ, translated by "meaning", is however uncertain; it is possible that the original read vibhāgaṁ (¬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 satīdāṃ 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 Ratnāvati, 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" (dirgha hrasvam yathā sati). In Abhidh. Koṣa, III, p. 81, different interpretations of the formula are given; the notes by De la Vallée Poussin (lo.) give full references, including those to the many existing variants of this formula in Sanskrit and in Pāli.

4) Although the yathāvāt 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 Śamskārāṅga 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 heta of phenomenal existence, as the soil on which the passions grow, as the vijīṣṭa of the Arthaśāstras, and, if the twelve nīdānas 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, samṣayaajñāna and mithyajñāna).— 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 sarvakleçānāṁ avitathārthaḥ, f - A - 2, but its double aspect as kleçāvarana and jñeyāvarana, „mere, exclusive, Ignorance“ (probably: Ignorance which is not associated with kleças, thus corresponding with the avidyā āveñikī 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 (Śaṅkhya, Vedānta).

6) Śamskāra, as a link in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, does not comprise all the samskāras which constitute samskāraskandha (infra, a - B - 6). The latter is the „collection“ of all sorts of forces (their number varies in the different Buddhist sects; the Abhidharmaśaka mentions 58 samskāras), but samskārāṅga only refers to those forces which themselves conditioned by Avidyā, making the arising of the vijñānāṅga possible. As, in one of the most common interpretations of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, the arising of Vijaśā marks the beginning of actual life, Śamskārāṅga may refer to action during former existences (it is defined by nīśakarman in Abhidh. Koça, III, kārikā 21), and is conceived of as forces producing new existence (punarbhavaṃ abhisaṃskaroṭi, s. g. in the Madhavāntavibhāgaṭīkā; cf. the translation by D. Friedmann, 1937, p. 47, and notes, p. 125). In view of the latter definition, the best translation for samskārāṅga is „Formative Forces“ as Friedmann translated. Most of the similes in our text stress „activity“ as one of the main aspects of the Śamskāras (they are, for instance, the army commanders of the vijīṣṭa, 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 Vijaśā, too, we have to distinguish between vijñānāṅga and vijñānāṅcasandha (one of the five divisions of Nāmarūpāṅga; infra, a — B — 3). In the special interpretation of the chain, Vijaśā 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 (bijā) of the Tree of Life growing on the soil which is Ignorance and developing if the rains, sunshine etc., which are the Śamskāras, are also present (infra, d — A — 6). In another simile (d — B — 7), Vijaśā 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 (Śamskārāṅga).— In the „general“ interpretation, however, Vijaśā
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 Vijñānakandha) is conceived of as an uninterupted stream (saṃtāna, infra, d — B — 4) of moments of being conscious. Technically, these two aspects are distinguished by the terms bija- 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 Vedantic 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 viṣṇīga (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) Saññācatana is analyzed infra, e — B — 1 to 2 and (in the repetition with many mistakes) from e — A — 11 to e — B — I. Saññācatana is based upon the classification of all the dharmas (including the asaṅgkṛti) into the six senses (indriya) and their respective classes of objects (viṣaya). For details, cf. Stcherbatskij, Centr. Conc., pp. 7 seq. — The addition of saññ- is necessary, since in the Pratītyasamutpāda formula only the six 'internal' bases are referred to. — Āyatana is explained as āya-tana = āya-dvāra, "entrance door" (Abhidh. Koça, I. kār. 20: rāga-vāra-gotrārthāḥ skauḍāyatanadāññavāh), for they (i.e. the six abhyantarārā āya-nānā), 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 (ācāraya) of the mind and the mental functions (cittacaita). This explanation is suggested by its comparison with a house (grha, e — A — 1), with a kind of support (ācārayabha), d — 3 — 3, and, in the representations of the bhavacakra, Saññācata 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 Abhidharmakośa (III, p. 98) contains a discussion between a Sarvāstivādin and a Sautrāntika on this point, in which each of the parties quotes a Śūtra 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 saṃsarpaṇa, "mutual contact", thus explaining it as the contact itself. In d — B — 5, Sparça is considered "a special form of meeting, of coming together" (saṃsarvāyabheda).
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 Milinda-pañha, 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 Āṅgas Tṛṣṇā and Upādāna are very closely related, the latter being defined as tṛṣṇāvivṛddhi, "increasing of Thirst" (Daśabhūmika, p. 48), or as tṛṣṇāvaiśāyā (Cālistambhasūtra, quoted Cīkṣāsamuccaya, p. 222, where tṛṣṇāvaiśāyā was however erroneously printed as two words in Bendall's edition). Cf. also Bodhis-pañji, p. 480: aparitvāgo bhūyo bhūyaça ca prāçātānā idān tṛṣṇāvaiśāyām 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 Sanskāra as a whole, which is subject to the twelve-linked pratiṣṭhāsamutpāda. 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: sanskāra and bhava belong to the karman-portion of the pratiṣṭhāsamutpāda (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 upādānakāndhas (Abhidh. Koça, I, p. 14, cf. Stcherbatskij, Centr. Conc., p. 98). In the 'static' (āvasthikā) interpretation of the Pratītyasamutpāda formula, according to which the twelve Āṅgas represent as many states in the development of the five Skandhas (Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 66; cf. Vyākhya ad 33, 22, Cosm. Bouddh., p. 156: dvādeśa navāṅgasāṃjñā kāvasthāh), Bhava denotes the stage during which the living being accomplishes those acts which condition repeated existence (bhavisyabhavasphalam karman, Vyākhya ad 33, 7, op. cit., p. 155). Cf. infra, g — A — 7. Vasubandhu considers this interpretation intentional (ābhijñāya), 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) Čoka, 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 čoka —— upāyāsa, cf. infra, g — B — 2 to 6.
16) 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.
17) According to the Vyākhya (Cosm. Bouddh., p. 170), kevala denotes that the entire complex of suffering depends on Jāti only, not, for instance, on the existence of an Āṭman (jātyāṁ eva satyāṁ jāramaraṇadayaranāṁ sambhavanti nānyasmin āṭmanām). Kevalaya is therefore explained by ātmaraṇaṁ tāsya; 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

\(^{18}\) *Keva* as a term denoting that the result of Jāti is exclusively duḥkha without any sukha implied in it.


\(^{20}\) For the meaning of *ādi* (opposed to vibhaṅga), cf. notes 97 and 99 to the Introduction.

\(^{21}\) As to the relation between *aṭṭha* and *avidyā*, cf. *infra*, \(f — A — 3\), where Avidyā is stated to be threefold since it comprises *aṭṭha*, *mithyājñāna* and *samsvayājñāna*. Here, at least, *aṭṭha* is only the negative aspect of Avidyā, i.e. want of knowledge. It appears from \(a — B — 1\) that the definition of Avidyā as *aṭṭha* with regard to the essential notion is in Buddhism is only partial, since *tāmas* and *sannāma* must everywhere be understood in addition to *aṭṭha*. With the passage which 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 *pūrva* and *aparānte* probably refer to *hetu* and *phala* respectively. Then, *pūrva* and *aparānte* refers to that which is both *hetu* (of future existence) and *phala* (of past existence), i.e. present existence. Cf. Vykhya do Bhāṣya, 35, 1, in *Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 157: the first two Aḷgas (Avidyā-Saṃskāra) are taught to eliminate *pūrva* (past) and *aparānte* (future), the remaining eight (from Vijñāna to Bhava) to eliminate *medhyānta* (present). *Adhyāntika* and *bāhya* are applied to the chain of Dependent origination, *infra*, \(c — A — 9\) sqq. A similar distinction is also made for the twelve *āyatana*; cf. *infra* \(b — A — 1\) sqq.


\(^{24}\) In the Abhidharma, *duḥkha* has become a technical term denoting the unrest of the *dharmas* (cf. Scherbatskij, *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 sqq.
of knowledge concerning the Cause and the dharmas sprung from a Cause 29), 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

29) Hetusamutpānnesu dharmesu, 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 samskrładharmas (72 in all, according to the Abhidharma Schools, but 94 in the YOGÁÇA system, in which vijnāna was analyzed into a number of dharmas beginning with śayāvijnāna, and the number of samskārās greatly increased; cf. the comparative account given by De la Vallée Poussin, Suzuki and Cordier, Les Soixante-quinze et les Cent Dhrmanas, Muséon, N. Sér., 6, 1905, pp. 178 — 194).

27) As we stated in the Introduction, this term is not found in the other VIBHĀNA versions. Originally, it may have been a mere gloss on the preceding term.

28) Kuśīkūṣala, — the meaning is probably: kuśa with reference to one aim, but kuśala with reference to another; usually, we find avyākta, 'undefined as to moral consequences' as the third category: some of the samskāras, for instance, are always kuśala (the kuśalamahābhūmikas such as gruddhā, vīrya etc., vid. Mahāvyutp., 104, 12 — 22), other samskāras necessarily are akuśala (the klecamahābhūmikas such as moha etc.), whereas most of the dharmas not included in these lists are avyākta (such as the cittaviprayuktas). Cf. E. Lamotte, Traité de la démonstration de l'acte, Mêl. chin. et boudh., 4 (1936), p. 224; Stcherbatskij, Centr. Conc., pp. 29 sqq.; Siddhi, pp. 319 — 395, where the third category is Jotted by aniyata; Daçasāhasikā (quoted note 117 to the Introduction), pp. 111 sqq.; cf. also pp. 81 — 95. For the definiteness of kuśala, cf. Abbidh. Koça, IV, p. 106, where it is explained as īṣṭavipāka: "these acts which produce agreeable consequences (such as re-birth in heaven) and which, eventually, may lead to Nirvāṇa".

29) Sāvadhyāna and avyādhyāna 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 (klec; 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 (kuśalamāsrava, Abbidh. Koça, IV, p. 106): a Vedāntin, ignorant of the Buddhist Truth, may accumulate good karmas. It is not clear to us what dharmas may be considered sāvyādavavyādya: the two notions seem to exclude each other.

30) Savatavaya, 'to be practised', is defined as kuśalasamskṛta in Abbidh. Koça, IV, p. 225. It is not exactly the same as kuśalasāsrava. The example is given (loc. cit.) that the five skandhas of a Saint may be pure (veisyāvadānika), although they are always produced by causes.

31) Sparśāyatanesu is translated according to the Chinese version (Epigr. Ind., 5, 1932, p. 203), but the expression is not perfectly clear. In any case, sparśāyatanas does not refer to the external base, the object of bāhyāyathanas, which is its usual meaning; the use of the plural and the addition of šatav make such an interpretation impossible. Possibly, the expression should be taken to refer to the six bāhyāyatanas, 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. Rāṣṭrapāla, ed. Finot, Bibl. Buddh., II (1901), p. 48, lines 3-4: yathā sammoham cāvidyāndhakāram.

33) Sanskārāṅga does not comprise all the dharmas included in sanskārakṣandha (cf. note 6 above). Here, the forces referred to are those of body (such as āpyāsa and pravāsa), speech (vītarka and vicāra) and mind. The mental forces are essentially cetasā, „will“, since only willful action is included in sanskārāṅga (not, for instance, the cittaviśayatana sanskāra). Although this threefold division is natural enough, it is a little strange to find it mentioned at this very spot; it is irrelevant for sanskārāṅga 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, sanskārāṅga is analyzed into punyopaga etc. (infra, f — A — 9 sqq.; the Viññāga text c. C.; Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 84; Čālistambhasūtra, quoted Čikṣās., p. 223, and Bodhic-panj. p. 479).

34) The same definition is given in Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 70, note (quoted from the Vyākhya) 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 cī (notī), „to accumulate“ (cf. the use of the latter in the ajñāna cīyate karma formula); cf. Fugini, 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 aśubhaḥbhāvanā was considered an excellent exercise; cf. the Ratnamegha quotation in Čikṣāsām, 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, sanskāra, samjñā and viññāna, 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 saṃskāra, cf. note 33 above. For saṃkāraskandha, 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 kuśa-lanahābhāvikas) and those independent of the will (cittaviprayukta, such as jatā, prāpti, sabbhāgatā, the forces which make akṣaras, words and sentences have a definite meaning and/or function, etc.). A full analysis of saṃkāraskandha and the dharmas included in it is found in the article mentioned in note 26 above.

38) Sāmiṇī is the faculty of forming concepts capable of being expressed in speech. Whereas viññāna implies only being conscious of the mere presence of something within the field of perception, sāmiṇī 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 associée à un certain mental, nommé sāmiṇī, notion, which apprehends a 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: sāmiṇī nimittodgrahanātmikā, „la notion (sāmiṇī) 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, Madhyāntavibhāgī, p. 45: „sāmiṇī, Ideation, is the exact discernment (pariccheda) of that which has been felt”; Siddhi, I, p. 148: „La Sāmiṇī a pour nature de saisir les ‘caractères’ de l’objet. Elle a pour acte (quand elle est mentale) de produire les divers noms-et-pACES”; cf. also E. Lamotte, MÉl. chinois bouddh., 4 (1936), p. 209, and S. Lasagupta, Study of Patañjali (1920), pp. 192-201.

39) Viññānaskandha is not quite identical with viññānāṅga; c.f. note 7 above. As a skandha, „collection”, viññāna is defined by pratirūpātī 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) Nāmarūpa=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 nāmarūpaṅga, not, for instance, to the rūpa included in rūpāyataṇa. 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 rūpāyataṇa. Finally, it is noted that the Sarvāstivādins and the Yogācārins knew a third kind of rūpa to be included in mansāyataṇa, viz. the avijñāpti, for which they were attacked by most of the other Buddhist sects.

41) Upādāyārūpa, 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 [44], 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 avijñāipti (Abhidh. Koça, I, kär. 9; Mahāvy. 101, 17—27; Nos. 60—70 of the Vijnānavādin list = Nos. 48—58 of the Sarvāstivādin list in the comparative account mentioned in note 25 above.

45) The translation is based on the correction of rūpa to nāma, proposed in note 30 to the Transcription.

46) 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 abhīsāṃskāpya (Çīkṣāsāna, p. 222; Rodhicaryāvatāsāpaśijākā, p. 388; Madhyamakavyātī, p. 10; the text of C), but these words were wrongly copied in the second and third of these quotations; thus, in the Madhyamakavyātī, the MSS read skanadhyam instead of aikadhyam (cf. the note by De la Valée Poussin), whereas the Bodh. Paśijākā seems to have omitted a number of words (it reads: caubāri mahābhūtāni o.pādānānī rūpam aikadhyarūpam). The purpose of the addition aikadhyam abhīsāṃskāpya is evident: in Nāmarūpāgga, the five skandhas do not constitute a real unity (which might lead to the wrong conception of a real individ’al), 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.

47) For śaḍāyatana, cf. note 9 above.

48) Sparśa is defined as the ‘collection’ of innumerable moments of sparśa, classified into six groups. This sixfold division is common to the aṅgās Vijnāna, Śaḍāyatana and Sparśa, which represent three distinct stages in the process of cognition, the result of which is Vedanā.

49) „Mutual” translates the prefix in saṃsparśa; this prefix almost always has a pregnant meaning in the technical terms of Buddhism. In every moment of Sparśa, three elements are implied: an ‘internal’ āyatana, the corresponding ‘external’ āyatana, and Vijnāna.

50) Vedanā is defined by anubhāva in Abhidh. Koça, I, p. 14; Cf. our text, infra e — B — 4: anubhāvanālaksanā; the Vyākhyā ad Abhidh. Koça, I, p. 14, quoted in the Index Général, p. 85, gives a more detailed definition, viz. vattano bhādatipāta-adubhāva-vinirmuktavāpaśāpākātkaṇavavubbhāva, „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 49). 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-Buddhist) 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 Sūtrārtha in Bibl. Buddh. XXI (1931), p. 38, lines 6 sqq., where also a different definition is given.

49) 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 āyatana. The Nālandā bricks (C) give the usual triad of kāma, rūpa and ārupya, 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 = cāyvatabhava), (c) thirst for non-existence, i.e. for annihilation after death. The second and third thirsts are therefore directly connected with the two Extremes (antagrāhadrṣṭi).

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 Dharmaśastras 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 śīras, sacrifices and the like; vrata refers to all kind of vows, such as living naked, living as a dog, all kinds of tapas etc. Çīlavra is not only an upādāna by itself, but it is also included in dṛṣṭupādāna (çīlavrataparāmarçadṛṣṭi).

51) In ātmavādopādāna, „vāda may be translated by „doctrine”; thus, Buddhism is anātmavāda or caṅyavāda. 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, purusa, jīva, etc.; sixteen different items are enumerated in Mahāvyutpatti, 207, 1 to 16 (edition Minev-Mironov, p. 64). Most of these terms refer to definite doctrines. As çīlavra, ātmavāda also occurs more than once in the list: it cannot well be separated from satkhyādṛṣṭi.

52) For bhava, cf. infra, note 54 (antarābhava) and supra, note 14. The explanation here given is the usual one in the Pratityasamutpāda 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 Vallee Poussin in Cosmologie Bouddhique, Troisième chapitre de l’Abhidharma Koça, kārikā, bāhyya and vyākhyā, avec une analyse de la Lokaprajñāpiti et de la Kāraṇaprajñāpiti de Madgalyaiana, 1914 — 19; numerous additions in De la Vallee 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 23), (comprising in due order the following

Introduction to the latter (1931), Additions et Corrections, pp. 145 — 147; substantial survey in Hastings'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 Avici up to the highest sphere, in which there is neither notion nor non-notion (naivasaṃjñānaṃsaṃjñāyatana). 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 Ārupyadhātu: 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: ārupyadhātu asthāna upapattāt caturvidhāḥ: 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 Ārupyadhātu are given by De la Vallée Poussin, Abhidh. Koça, VIII, pp. 135 sq. notes.

23) 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, pāṭhārāvha, 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 above terms here given, the analysis is meant to provoke disgust, for it shows the continuous defilement during the process.

In the Prātīyasaṃputpāda formula, the link bhavapratyanā jātiḥ 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 Jarāmarāṇa, 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 Prātīyasaṃputpāda, 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 teṣāṁ (yeṣāṁ yeṣāṁ would have been clearer) satrāṇaṁ tasmān tasmān satvaniḥkāye jātiḥ. All living beings belong
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 nikāyasabhāgata, a force included in the cittaviprayukta-sanskāras 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) Samjāti, Pāli saṅjāti, 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 Vibhanga text; cf. Bagchi's translation: "there is becoming and production (if becoming corresponds to samjāti, production should be taken to comprise both avakṛānti 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 prāduḥbhāve in the Sanskrit text)". It seems certain that the Chinese translation reproces on essentially the same Vibhanga 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' seem to correspond to three different Sanskrit notions, viz. samjāti, abhinirvṛtti and prāduḥbhāve, which are by no means synonyms; 'production' rather corresponds to (sa)mūtpāda 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 samjāti, 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 (samkleça opp. kleça; sammoha in Abhidh. Koča, III, p. 67, kār. 25, c-č, which is less definite than moha; it seems that sam- is sometimes technically used by Buddhists to incluclude related notions into the original term; thus, samkleça means "all that is associated with kleça" (such as the whole Pratityasamutpāda formula if Avidyā is not eliminated). If samjāti is meant to be a vaguer equivalent of jāti, it can only denote the 'birth' of that which will descend into the womb, since samjāti precedes avakṛānti. If we consider that according to orthodox Buddhist opinion Karman is the only thing remaining after physical death and continuing the Samsāra, 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 samjāti 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) Avakṛānti is garbhāvakṛānti; cf. the Prākrit and Pāli forms ukṛanttī, okkanttī and avakakanttī; there is an inscription bhagavato okkantī on one of the Bharhut reliefs (Barus and Singha, Bharhut inscription, 1926, p. 52).
development 63), the grasping of the Groups (of dharmas) 64), grasping of the (eighteen) Constituents 65), grasping of the Bases of Cognition 66), [3] further development of the Groups (of dharmas), and apperception of the vital sense 67). 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 68): baldness, greyness 69), wrinkled skin,

---

63) Abhinirvṛtti, in Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 123, and VI, p. 126, refers to the antarābhava, which cannot be the case here. D. L. Friedmann, Madhyaśāntavibhāgaśīka (1937), note 127 to p. 52, translates it by „realization“; in op. cit., note 84 to p. 50, abhinirvṛtta (of the saññāyatana) is translated by „accomplished“. In Daśabhaṁuka, p. 49, abhinirvartate is used with reference to the growth of the duḥkhavṛkkṣa representing phenomenal existence in a symbolic form. There, each preceding link of the Pratityasamutpāda chain is also stated to bring about the cause for the abhinirvṛtti of the following link e.g. avidyā hetum ca dadiṇī saññakārābhinirvṛttyaye). Here, the term might refer to the further development of the result of sañjñāti into the different prenatal stages (kalala, arūpa etc.). We then consider the next terms, which are compounded with pratiśānta (or pratilambha) as a kind of explanation of abhinirvṛtti, so that one could translate: „further development by grasping skandhas, āyatana and dhātu“. 65) Pratilābhā 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 cittaviprayuktānāśākas 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, kā. 20); they are based on three different principles. For the five skandhas, cf. supra, note 36.

69) The dhātu classification is based on the incorporation of the saññākṛtadharmas into eighteen components of an individual stream of life (saññītā); cf. Stcherbatskij, Centr. Conc., pp. 9 sq. Dhātu is however also used for the five great elements with vīṣṇāra; cf. the important Pitṛputrasamāñāgama quotation in Čikāsā, p. 244, which explains the well-known words saññādhātuva āyup puruṣah (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 koça.

68) For āyatana, cf. note 9 above. It is based on the incorporation of all the dharmas (including the asaññākṛtas) into the six senses (the internal or subjective part) and the six kinds of objects particular to each of these senses (the external part).

61) Jivitendriyaprādusarbhāva 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 jivitendriyanirodha, mentioned below in the definition of Maraṇa.

60) As may be expected, the definition of Jarāmarana consists of two definite parts: first, Jarā is defined, then Maraṇa, followed by a statement that Jarāmarana comprehends both notions together: as Nāmarūpa (cf. note 43 above), Jarāmarana is composed of two notions, but constitutes a single Aṅgā. 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 Ācāryaśa’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 (?) 625), [5] (the necessity of) leaning on a stick, the body weight is undoubtedly based on it (cf. terms such as yaśtiṣṭikahasta corresponding with dandavivikhabhānatā in the Vibhaṅga, abhyupetaḥ koṇāḥ sitār with our pālīya, 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 Baraboḍuṭ, 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: kujāḥ, jīrṇatā, valiṣprucatā, pālīyaṃ, danda avastambhānatā, khālityam, kāśāḥ (the 'cough' is not mentioned in our definition, nor in the Lalitavistara passage; it may be a later addition), kharukhāryasaktakṣaṇthāḥ (not mentioned in our text, but C has khulakholaprajvāsakṣayātā, expressing difficult breathing), prāgbhāreṇa kāyena dandaṃ avastambhāḥ, dhanaṃsaṃtataśātṛāḥ (referring to the veins of the leg? The same expression occurs in the Lalitavistara in the passage quoted; it seems to replace the compound tilakalakṣaṭātṛatā in the Vibhaṅga; for the latter cf. note 63 below), jīrṇah, vṛddiḥ, mahallakatā, gatiṣavaranatā (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'), valiṣṭacātṛāḥ (a useless repetition of valiṣprucatā mentioned above), vibhaṅgatāḥ and ātṛāḥ. The Abhidh. Koḍha (III, p. 88, Bāṣaya) refers to the Vibhaṅga definition in general terms ("le jārāmarana tel qu'il est défini dans le Sūtra") and the Vyākhya (cf. loc. cit., note 2) quotes the text of the definition such as it is found in the Mahāyānagama. The latter definition does 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. jārā), revised.

of this definition represent a very old list (mātrkā), which was frequently The terms 625 It is a little strange to find 'greyness' of the hairs mentioned after 'baldness'. The Pāli versions have instead of khālityam: khoḍāḍiccha, explained as „the state of being broken (of teeth)“ in the Pāli Dictionary quoted above.

626 Gopānasivaṅkata occurs in most of the Buddhist descriptions of Old Aśo (in 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 gopānasivaṅkta, 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 etymology. 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 gopānasivaṅka and gopānasivaṅkra occur in the Mahāvastu and Senart in I, p. 450 of his edition considers vaṅka as a „forme précrite du sanscrit vakra dans le sens moral“ (the last words cannot apply to the compound gopānasivaṅkata, 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 gopānasī 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 varavaṅka, „they rolled", is quoted from the Rigveda. Then gopānasī (better: gopānasī) vaṅkata 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 reservations: it is not yet clear to 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.

\(^{64}\) Tilakālakāgātrā; C reads tilakālakācita-gātrā, the Chinese version corresponds to "the spread of black spots" (the end of the compound, gātrā, is not rendered there). The Mahāvastu gives a slightly different compound, viz. tilakāhātagātra, 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 (anuryajjanāni) of a Mahāpurusa; cf. Mahāvyutp., 18, 41 (p. 6): vyapagatātilakāgātrā; further references are given by Sten Konow, Avhandl. Norske 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 indriyānāṃ paripākāh pariḥbodah, 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 difficillior should be considered the correct one. The reverse substitution would not have been likely. Dhandha was often mistaken by copyists; cf. Ciñcāsamsuccaya, p. 7, line 9: sa tera [da]haṃvaprâjño bhavati so 'nuttaraṣṭānānāmātṛ pratyākṣiyate pratyudvāvartaye and prajñendraṃ prajñācakṣuḥ 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 dharma (c.q. dhanvi) should perhaps be corrected to dandha (dhandhi), as dha and va are hardly distinguishable in the only existing MS. As for dandha, Bendall refers the reader to Sanskrit dandhiya, "dullness", to Pāli danda, and to De la Vallée Poussin's Paścākrama edition, p. 53, where dadvra is an evident corruption of dandha. The term dandhabhijña occurs in the Abbhidh. Koça (VI, p. 280). In the "Additions et corrections" to the Abbhidh. Koça (in Introduction, e.e., 1731), n. 152, De la Vallée Poussin refers to Waghara's thesis about the Bodhisattva bhāmā (1908) and does not consider Leumann's interpretation of the term as dhya-antino, "verstandes blind", very probable ("ne s'impose pas"). The Chinese Vibhāṅga 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 parāraḥbhāvah of our text, which here agrees with C, is to be accepted. The meaning could be that the sanaskāras, 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, reassemble in old age the state which they had in the earliest years of life. But purāṇa is mostly used to denote a very remote past, ancient times. The Chinese version gives 'rotting of the sanaskāras', which might point to an original reading pūtibhāva. In any case, sanaskāra must be taken in a non-technical sense, i.e. as vital forces; cf. Abbhidh. Koça, II, pp. 122 sqq.: āyuḥsamaskāra and śrītasaṃskāra, not occurring in the lists of dharmas (Muséon, N. S., 6, 1905, pp. 178—194). Thus sanaskārasakandha includes forces the activity of which should be supposed to increase as age advances, such as jarā (No. 68 of the Sarvastivadin list and No. 79 of the Yogācāra list). It is obvious that sanaskāraśaṅga should be excluded here: the karmic forces cannot be destroyed na kalpakotiçatais 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: cyavanātāḥ 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 lakṣanas necessarily precede dissolution; as a matter of fact, dissolution is implied in the last term of the Maraṇa definition (at least, if our reading maraṇa-kālakṛṣaya is accepted). The Chinese version seems to be based on cyavanātāḥ bhedaḥ (lit. 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 nihkṣepsa in the meaning of nihkṣepsa: confusion between the two prefixes is not rare. The sāṃskāras (here: „vital forces“; cf. note 67 above) are co-ordinated during life-time (sāṃskāras 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) Maraṇa-kālakṛṣaya is the reading in our text; C reads maraṇaḥ kālakṛṣiṇāḥ; 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 (maraṇa) seems strange, especially if it is taken to correspond to kālakṛṣiṇī maranaṃ. 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 Jāra definition: jāra-jāraḥkāvah, also comprising the whole process.

74) Cf. note 19 above.

75) Katamah refers to vibhāga only. This quite agrees with the external form of the text. The ādī is expounded by the Bhagavat without there being any preceding question on the part of the monks; the Vibhaṅga however, consists of explanations given by the Bhagavat in reply to a number of questions about the meaning of the separate links of the Pratiṣṭhāṃsūtpāda formula.

76) Artha, „meaning“, is opposed to vibhāga (vibhaṅga), „explanation“ in the form of an
[1] (This meaning is expressed in the following strophes):
— „Material, indeed, all living beings are, they are all devoid of Soul 
They all see the Good Path (?)
— 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”.
„The Buddha has the causes told
Of all things springing from a cause, And also how things cease to be —
[3] “This is the Mighty Monk proclaims”.
„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 (nirāṭāra), the ‘letter’ (rvañjana) of the Law, or to the indirect meaning
(neyāṭha), which is always more or less ‘hidden’ (gūdha) in the word of the
Śūtras, 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 neyāṭha, 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
nirāmanāḥ 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 Čloka — 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.
Sarve bhadram na pacayanti, but plate j reads sarve bhadram vipacayanti. Neither
reading is satisfactory; it seems that the correct form of the Čloka 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 Pratityasamutpāda into kleça
(here called ajñāna), karman and duṣṭha („suffering”) or jāti (here called janman);
it is the pratityasamutpādas trikāṇḍakaḥ (Abhidh. Koça, III, kār. 19; Nāgārjuna’s
Pratityasamutpādaḥdaya; Bodhicaryavatārapāñjikā, p. 386); in the work last men-
tioned, p. 351, the same division is called trivartman instead of trikāṇḍaka, although
the former term is usually reserved for the division of the pratityasamutpādānegas
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 Nirvāṇed 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: [8] '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 twofold 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 (Pan., 6, 1, 15: pratet ca, „and of (the prefix) prat". But the use of dvādaçaḥ (for dvādaçavidhah?) is strange. In view of the etymology given below, we are inclined to correct to pratītyāḥ dvādaça saṃtāḥ, „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) Atāimirika=cakṣusmān; for this clear reference to the Mahāyāna doctrine of satyadvaya (saṃsvṛti and paramārtha), cf. the Introduction. Although the Pratītyasamutpāda theor. is usually considered to belong to the domain of saṃsvṛti, 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 atāimirika, i.e. by becoming upādānavivajjita.

85) This explanation is clearly based on the etymology of pratītya attributed to the Saṉñātikas in the Abhidharmakoṭa. References have been given in the Introduction.

86) Saṁśāsataḥ is opposed to vyāsataḥ, „considering the different Áṅgas 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 saṁśāsa aspect of Pratītyasamutpāda is explained by saṁśin sati etc., the vyāsā aspect by avidyā-pratītyāḥ saṁsākārāḥ 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 Saṁsāra, which is the base (ācārya) of all forms of Defilement (sarvākleṣa).

87) For the hetu-phala division, which is essential, cf. the Introduction. The strange order in which the Áṅgas 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. 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). This is 'exterior' Dependent Origination.

— [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.

— What is the three-fold Dependent Origination like?

— (It is its division into) Defilement, Act, [5] and Suffering.

The hetu itself may be analyzed into the indirect hetu (kleça) and the direct hetu (karman); cf. infra c — B — 4 to 6.

Etc. is of course Death (marana); the different concepts which constitute the dukkhashandha (śoka etc.) may also be included into 'ādi.

The distinction between an 'exterior' and an 'interior' chain is typical of Mahāyāna (cf. the Introduction): it is pratītyasamutpāda viewed either as 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 hetupanibandha or pratyasamapānā (Scherbatski, *Buddh. Logic*, I, p. 84, note); according to the Čālistambhāsūtra, which is one of the most authoritative texts on pratityasamutpāda in Mahāyāna, the simile in our text applies to the hetupanibandha (or: sathuksa) interpretation, whereas the pratyasamapānā (sapratityaya) interpretation considers the pratityasamutpāda as consecutive stages due to the contact with the six dhātus (earth, water etc.); cf. the lengthy Čālistambha quotation in the Bodhic., p. 575, 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 ādha (between garbha and puspe). 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*, Vṛ. ad Bhāṣ. III, 30, 29; *Cosm. Bouddh.*, p. 153, line 31, to p. 154, line 8. The comparison of Pratityasamutpāda with the development from seed to germ is probably very old; but the Hinayāna sources do not appear to have considered it an 'external' interpretation of Pratityasamutpāda.

Vistareṇa i.e. by enumerating the different Aṅgas; the 'internal' series could also briefly be explained by the formula samsrān sati etc.

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 fourfold 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 fivefold 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. Dubhka 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 smaksaradhukha (Jāti), parināmānadhukha (Jarā) and duhkhabhukha (Marāṇa). The division here given is usually referred to by the three smkBées, the two first of which are kieça 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 (jinya) comme futur, on le décrit dans les termes Naissance-Vieillesse-Mort, pour provoquer le dégât. Lorsqu'on l'envisage comme arrivé au présent, pour enseigner la naissance complexe (xiang cheng, 109, et 4, 100) de ses divers stades, on le décrit comme Vījñāna, etc.". The threefold division is discussed in detail in Siddhi, II, pp. 500 sq., where numerous references are given. As to dubhka, it has almost a technical meaning, which Sicherbatskij (Centr. Conc., passim) denotes by the 'unrest of the elements': the fruit of karman is anitya and therefore dubhka. Only the loci may consider it sukha if it is sukhaveddānya.

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 = pārvakleça; Saṃskāra = pārvakarman; cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, kär. 21 a-b); present existence begins with the descent of Vījñāna (vijnānāvākrañāti) 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 Yogācārin agrees with the Sauberāntikas 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, Tṛṣṇopādana-Bhava: causes of future existence).

93) The fourfold division of Pratityasamutpāda 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 niyyandaphala, 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 sixfold 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 sevenfold [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 Āṅgas 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 Śaḍāyatana etc. imply the development of the dharmas so that they are in mutual relations towards each other (indriya opposed to viṣaya in Śaḍāyatanaśāga; three groups in Saprāca, the result of which is Vedānā); the latter group of three therefore constitute viṣaya-pravṛtti.

95) Prabhava, "origination", i.e. of Karman; the three Āṅgas included into this group are Bhava, existence viewed as production of Karman leading to re-birth, with its direct (Upādāna) and indirect (Ṭṛṣṇā) causes. According to the āvasthika interpretation (Abhidh. Kośa, III, p. 64), Ṭṛṣṇā is explained as: "l'état de celui qui désire les jouissances 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 saṁtāna, 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 Āṅgas are the general conditioning factors of existence.
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What is eightfold Dependent Origination like?

Ignorance is the fruit of infatuation; the Formative Forces are the fruit of enterprise; Consciousness and Name and d — B Form are the fruit of retribution; the Six Bases of Cognition, Contact and Feeling are the fruit of efflux; Thirst and Attachment are the fruit of the ‘series’; Existence and Birth are the fruit of annihilation; Old Age and Death is the undesirable fruit. Thus, according to the different sorts of fruits, Dependent Origination is eightfold.

What is ninefold Dependent Origination like?

100) This eightfold division is difficult. Whereas the twelve Āṅgas 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 Āṅgas 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; Scheberbatski, Bud. Log., I, p. 224; Mahāvyutp., 116, 1-5). The other six fruits mentioned here are no technical terms. Āvidyā is called ‘infatuation fruit’; cf. the definition of Āvidyā in Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 71 (‘sammūhā a l’endroit des vérités’); although Āvidyā 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 Āvidyā, 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 abhisamakaro), passim; cf. Friedmann, Madhyantavibhāgātikā (1937), p. 47. Ārambhaphala could be translated freely as an ‘acting fruit’.

102) Vījñāna and Nāmarūpa, the first Āṅgas 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 Āṅgas mentioned.

103) Cf. note 99 above. If the two first Āṅgas of present life are considered retribution of former existence, the following three, which were defined viśayapravṛtti in the fivefold division, do not contain any new moral elements (i.e. except for those already contained in Vījñāna and Nāmarūpa); their relation with the two preceding Āṅgas 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) Nivṛttiphala, 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 nivṛttiphala? 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 Āṅgas have sometimes been forced rather violently into some of these classificatory categories.

106) Aniśṭaphala is perfectly clear. The fools may be attached to phenomenal existence, but naturally they do not care for its undesirable consequences (Jarāmaraṇa with all the gokas implied). For this division, cf. Īdra, pp. 340 sq.
Ignorance is a kind of false infatuation; [4] the Formative Forces are a kind of action; Consciousness is a kind of series; Name and Form is a kind of looking at something; the Six Bases of Cognition are [5] a kind of support; Contact is a kind of meeting; Feeling is a kind of thought; Thirst, Attachment and Existence are a kind of future; [6] Birth and Old Age etc. are a kind of annihilation. This is ninefold Dependent Origination.

What is the tenfold Dependent Origination like?

— Ignorance [7] is the root of Defilement; the Formative Forces are the root of Karman; Consciousness is the root of the embryo; 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 mithyāndhakārabhedah, cf. note 62 to the Transcription, where we proposed to correct this incomprehensible form to mithyāndhakārabhedah. 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. sammoha, infatuation, into the definition.

108) Since it represents atitakarman (cf. note 92 above).

109) This is the conception of Viśṇā as pravṛttivijñāna (cf. note 7 to this Translation).

110) Ekṣanabhedah. The word ekṣara is unknown from other sources and therefore suspect; its meaning, if applied to Nāmarūpaṅga, is obscure.

111) Āçraya agrees with the usual meanings of āyatana ('base, dwelling place, temple', etc.). The (internal) āyatana such as eyes etc. are conceived of as the bases of cittacaitta; cf. Stcherbatskij, Centr. Conc., p. 3; Saḍāyatana is compared with a house ( Ignā); 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 Spaça, usually interpreted as the triple contact between anādyātmikāyatana and bāhyāyatana and viṁśa. Cf. note 10 above.

113) Cittabheda is strange; Vedanā is a caittadharm, but this it has in common with many other dharmas, such as Spaça.

114) Obviously, the meaning is that these three Āṅgas 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 skandhāmūla: the most characteristic aspect to Nāmarūpānga is that it comprises the five Skandhas.

117) As in most of the classifications given here, the essential feature of Sampākārānga consists in its being karman.

118) Kalala is the very first stage of embryonic life, the four other stages being arbuda, pucīn, ghana and praçākkha (Mahāvy., 190, 1-5, and passim). The comparison with Viśṇā is probably suggested by the common Buddhist theory according to which life begins with the descent of Viśṇā into the womb (viśṇāvākarānti, Abhidh. Koça, 113, III, p. 88; cf. Čaliṣtamba quoted in Čikāṣā, pp. 224 sq.; p. 225, lines 2-4: ati ca mitāpiṣṭanayogād śrutasamavāyad sarvesiṃ ca pratrayānāṃ samavāyad āśvādaṇupraviddham viśṇānabijam mātūḥ 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 elevenfold 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 123; Contact is the five objects of sensual pleasure 125; Feeling is the friends, foes and neutrals etc. 124; [2] Thirst is, that they wish to gain the victory over each other; Attachment is negotiation, 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 vipākākamīla, which would be better suitting for the relation between, for instance, Bhava and Jāti.
121) Cf. Siddhi, p. 484: „Le Biṣa peut rester 80000 kalpes sans engendrer: pour engendrer il doit être mouillé par la śaṣā“ . 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' (ṭṛṣṇāvādiddhi, Duṣḥbh., p. 48; ṭṛṣṇāvāripatya, Čālist. quoted Čikīṣa, p. 222; the latter should b. considered a single compound, not two words as in Bendall's edition). Grahana is almost a synonym of upādāna in its etymological sense (upādāta = grāhītā).
122) Cf. notes 111 and 115 above. Śādāvatana is often represented as a house with six doors.
123) The pañca kāmagunāh are mentioned in Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 56; cf. Rhys Davids and Stede, s.v., and Mahāvastu, III, p. 109, line 15. The five kāmagunāh correspond to the five senses, although there are six sparças.
124) Corresponding to the three kinds of Feeling, viz. sukha, duḥkha and aduḥkha sukha.
125) The text reads ātmabhedaḥdaṇḍaḥvāsappradāni, which cannot be correct in this form. Bheda and daṇḍa are two of the four means which are recommended by the Arthasāstra 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 understand what word, changed it to the well-known term ārma. The end of the compound gives more difficulties; the word to be expected there is dānāni, „gifts“, or some synonym (sampradānāni ?). The repetition of tā in is probably due to digraphy. 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 viyūtāśu; just as these four means might lead him to sovereignty, the four upādānas may lead one to repeated existence.
126) These four 'means' (upāya) are frequently alluded to in literature and epigraphy; for the latter, cf. one of the Miśon inscriptions, R.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 (daṇḍa), la discorde (bheda)“.

The similres are interesting from several points of view; cf. the Introduction. Dependent
— 148 —


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 Arthaśāstra 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 manḍala, which is directed towards universal domination, just as the pratityāsa-nirvāṇa-saṅgāgas 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.


Rūpa comprises eight categories of shape (samsthāna), the four principal and the eight secondary colours (varna), 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 Nāmarūpāga, is characterized by impenetrability (sapratīgha). 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

(agra, 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 Yaśomitra's Sphutārtha, Čālīstambhasūtra (quoted in three different forms in the Madhyamakārytti, Čīkṣās. and Bodhiit-.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. Čīkṣās., p. 222: viññāṇasahajāc catvāra 'rūpina upādānakandhās tan nāma, catvāri ca mahābhūtān ca copādyāna upādyārūpam aikadhyam abhisamkṣippya 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 change needed is to supply the words catvāri mahābhūtānī after mahābhūtāni: „both the four Great Elements (themselves) and the secondary (upādāya) Form derived from (līt.: 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 mahābhūtānī copādānāsī nāmarūpam aikadhyārūpam; viññāṇasahajāc catvāra 'rūpina upādānakandhā nāma; tan nāmarūpam); the latter text is due to a complete confusion; the strange aikadhyārūpam is obviously due to the expression aikadhyam abhisamkṣippya, which was misunderstood; upādāya, too, was not understood and changed to upādānāni (owing to a kind of anticipation of upādānakandha?), 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 Prasannapaḍā is discussed by the same scholar in the note to p. 9 of his edition in Bibli. Buddh. XXI. We noted with reference to the Vibhaṅga definition of Nāmarūpa that: a relatively simple form of the definition was given there — without, for instance, the words aikadhyam abhisamkṣippya, 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 Upadeṣa. Obviously, it is not. This appears clearly from the words yaśa nāma tatra rūpaṃ 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 abhisamkṣippya: „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 yaśa nāma etc. represent the popular explanation given by the teacher to make the pupils understand the difficult expression aikadhyam abhisamkṣippya; the teacher's idea is that Nāmarūpa 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 Upadeṣa was different from the Vibhaṅga one; the former has the additions occurring in our Mādhyaṃikā sources. The next point is what our author meant by adding ākāśavat, „like the sky“ or „like empty space“; it is not quite clear what could have suggested the comparison between Nāmarūpa and Ākāśa. About the latter, there has been a famous controversy in the Abhidharma Schools (cf. Abhidh. Roṣa, II, p. 279), continued in Mahāyāna,
the six groups of Consciousness (?) 181), such as the bases of eyes, ears, nose, tongue, skin and mind.

— (As to) „the Six Bases of Cognition condition Contact”, there are six (groups of contact 182): eye-contact, 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 183); eye-contact is threefold: agreeable contact, disagreeable contact and neither-agreeable-nor-disagreeable contact 184). In this way, [4] there are, in all, fifteen kinds of Contact 185).

181) 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 Vijnānas.

182) Saṭ sparçāḥ, — read: saṭ sparçācāyāḥ; cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 95, and supra, b — A — 3. Sparçā is defined as the total of an innumerable number of separate moments of contact, classified into six groups.

183) This explanation is rather clumsy, since only two items are mentioned. The meaning is of course: contact of Consciousness with visible matter (rupāyatana) by means of the eyes, with audible ‘matter’ (gaṅda) by means of the ears, etc.; the internal āyatana always the dvāra in this process (cf. note 111 above).

184) This is the division which is usually given for Vedana, not for Sparçā. The point is that if Sparçā may be agreeable etc., it does not really differ from Vedana. 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 ca cittadharma by itself and its mention in the Pratyayasamutpāda 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: sparçā iti trikāmālam; cf. also d — B — 5: samavāyabhedah, 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 Viṣṇaṅga; unfortunately, the text of this interpolation is so very clumsy that it does not make the impression of being based on an authorized source.

185) 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 multiplication: 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-Buddhist) moral rules and vows, and attachment to the doctrine of (the existence of) an Atman. Attachment to pleasure is twentyfold 139.

It is evident that such contact could only be effected by means of preceding cakṣusampanna etc., so that in that case there would be four factors getting into contact (for the difference between the first five, pratiṣṭhā, Sparça and the sixth one without direct pratiṣṭhā, cf. Abhidh. Koça, III, kā. 30 c-d). The interpolator may have realized this difficulty and therefore concluded that the three kinds of manabhasampanna should be excluded from the total. This seems more probable than a mere mistake in multiplication.

136) Sutraptikanā trṣṇā, — usually, the characteristic element of Trṣṇā is āsvādana, „enjoying”; cf. Čaṭistambha in Čiksās, p. 223, lines 8 sq.: yas tām (viz. vedanāṁ) vedayati viçepenaśvādayati, abhinandyate adhyavasyate adhiṣṭhati, sā vedanāpratayā trṣṇeṣty ucyate. Sutrpti is strange since it denotes rather the aim than a characteristic feature of Thirst.

137) The three sorts of Trṣṇā 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 Mahāvibhūṣa; cf. Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 29, note). The usual Mahāyāna triad is kāra-pūpa-ārūpya, which occurs in the text of C, but also in Hinayāna sources (Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 85; Vasubandhu’s commentary on the Pratītyasamutpāda-sūtra, J.R.A.S., 1930, p. 616; references to Pāli sources in Rhys Davids-Stede, s.v. taṇrā). Six thirsts (corresponding to the six kinds of Sparça) are mentioned in the Chachaksatutta, Diṅgha, III, p. 243. Tīre Dīghanikāya also mentions the triad pūpa, arūpa, nirodna (cf. Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 29, note, from which most of these references are borrowed). As to the relation between these different divisions of Trṣṇā, 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-pūpa-ārūpya, but the second item was omitted and a new third item, viz. atīṣṭhaṇā, 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 kāmapādaṇa can be traced; it is undoubtedly due to the twentyfold division of kāmadhātu (Abhidh. Koça, III, kā. 1: kāmadhātus sa narakādvipabhedena vimśatibh; cf. also note 202 below). The interpolator therefore interpreted kāmapādaṇa as kāmadhātupādaṇa. 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 Āṅgas 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 Upadeśa (without, of course, the interpolation) may be considered an ‚extension' of the last but one introductory sloka (c — A — 3).

142) There may be a small lacuna in the text here; we should have expected something like: evam avidyā pratityasamutpādāditi naiçayaḥ, followed by a question avidyā katānā? 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 avivekā, ‚independent ignorance' (Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 84; „not polluted by kleças'', but more ignorance in its negative aspect; cf. also ibid., II, p. 167, note 3, where āveśika is explained by rāgaśiptahāstā; cf. also Siddhi, I, pp. 277 sqq.); it is the most subtle kind of Avidyā in its aspect of jiśyāvaraṇa. This akiṣṭam 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 which is not associated with kleças; the Abhidh. Koça (II, p. 165) therefore uses the term parittakleça, „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 vrčati pratīṣṭhāyati (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. Vṛčati, „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' (chhatati) the 'roots of salvation' (kuçāla-mūlānā; 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 vṛčati 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 which resembles it a little is badhnāti (which would have been written vadhhnāti, 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. 69, where also a number of other synonyms referring to the action of Avidyā are mentioned. Pratīṣṭhāyati could be corrected to pratīṣṭhāyati (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 \textsuperscript{145}), Ignorance is one, since it is identical with all the defilements \textsuperscript{146}). Ignorance is twofold, too, in as far as it is based either on causation, \textsuperscript{3} or on Consciousness \textsuperscript{147}). Ignorance is threefold, too, in as far as (it comprises) want of knowledge, uncertain knowledge and wrong knowledge \textsuperscript{148}). Ignorance is fourfold, too, \textsuperscript{4} in as far as it is to be abandoned by (a) Suffering, (b) the Origin (of Suffering), (c) the Cessation (of Suf-

\textsuperscript{145} Cf. \textit{supra}, c — A — 6, where essentially the same statement refers to the formula of Dependent Origination.

\textsuperscript{146} To explain the use of \textit{avītāṭhārthena}, we refer the reader to the \textit{Bodhisattvabhumi}, edition by Wogihara (1930-36), p. 292, and De la Vallée Pousin, \textit{Documents d'Abhidharma}, in \textit{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: \textit{„avītāṭhārthena tāvad ekam eva satyam na dvītyam asti . dvīvidhaṃ satyam samvrtti satayam paramārtha satayam ...“}: „In as far as the Truth means 'not differing from the '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 \textit{avītātha} (and \textit{anavātha}) and its relation with the \textit{Tathātā} in Mahāyāna, cf. the copious notes in \textit{Appendice II} to De la Vallée Pousin’s \textit{Siddhi} translation (II, pp. 743-qqq). Cf. Yaşomitra, Vyākhyā ad Bhāṣya 40, 22, in \textit{Cosmol. Bouddh.}, p. 165, where the term occurs in a quotation from a Yogācāra source (\textit{Maitreyavacanam}).

\textsuperscript{147} It is remarkable that the most common twofold division of Avidyā, viz. the two \textit{‘śreneśa’} (\textit{āvaraṇa}) of Kīcā and Īśvara, is not mentioned in this place (for this division, cf. \textit{Siddhi}, II, pp. 566-572, with numerous references by De la Vallée Pousin). 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 \textit{taimitrika} 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 \textit{īlaa mārgāna} that he sees). The first of these (a) might well be expressed by \textit{hetuttvaścaya}, „having (the laws of) Causation (fixed in the \textit{Pratītyasamutpāda} formula) as its 'point d'appui'“; the second form of Avidyā may well have been expressed by \textit{vijñānāścaya}, 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 \textit{mukhyā} and \textit{pratibhāśākī bhānti}, made by the Buddhist logicians (cf. note 153 to the Introduction).

\textsuperscript{148} Cf. \textit{supra}, a — B — 1, and note 32 to this Translation.
tering), and (d) the Path 149). Ignorance is fivefold, 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 dsṭṣīn, 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 duḥkhasatyā, what part by samudayanastya, 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 dārçanāmārga (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 dārçanāmārga is therefore followed by the bhāvanāmārga. It can hardly be doubted 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 heya; since the preceding vowel is a long ā, an ignorant reader might understand that the first category mentioned is aheya, but this would of course be in direct contradiction with the Mārgasātya.

151) Cf. the preceding note. In the Abhidh. Koça (V, pp. 11 sq.), the examples of kleças to be eliminated by bhāvanā are rāga, pratīgha, 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 dārçanāmārga 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 pratraya 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 hetupratrayāya, the first among the four kinds of pratrayas (Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 299; Siddhi, II, pp. 436 sq.). The meaning which is required here is hetu opposed to those pratrayas which are not hetu viz. the three other categories, and this leads to the opposition of pratyanypaṇibandha and hetuṇaṇibandha in the interpretation of the relation between the Pratītyasamutpāda links. This is the interpretation of the Čālistambhasūtra, rightly termed locus classicus by Bendall (Cīkaś, Instr. p. XXXVI). In the twelve-linked chain, each preceding Aṅga is not only the pratraya, 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 pratrayas, 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 raina, sun, earth etc. are required. Obviously, this is meant by our author when he states eko hetuḥ, bhavavah pratrayāḥ.
rent (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,
at 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 prayāya 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.: 'affecting its own object', such as the seed
during the germ, which may not be styled different from the seed; prayāya, 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 samākṣīpta,
the prayāya viṣīṣṭa, cannot be separated from the two other differences. This
distinction is important for a correct understanding of the relation between Avidyā
and Samskāra. Why did the Bhagavat designate the former as the prayāya, not as
hetu, of the latter? The explanation here proposed is that Avidyā does not
merely develop into the Samskāras, or at least, this need not be the case (properly
interpreting this is only the āvasthika interpretation of the chain, which is only one
of the special aspects); the point is rather that the existence of Avidyā is a necessary
condition for the origination of the Samskārāṇa, i.e. without Avidyā, the Samskārāṇa
would not possibly arise (cf. Cālistambha, quoted Čikākar, p. 220, line 2: avidyā con
naiva samskārāḥ prāṇaḥsyaṇaḥ; note: the last word, reproduced according
to Cundall's edition, should be considered a lapse for prāṇaḥsyaṇaḥ, due to the rare
occurrence of the conditional).

A literal translation of the words such as th.y are given in the text. Prativibhesū
is a derivative meaning „in the meaning of“ (common in the Indian Kośas: cf. Speyer,
pp., § 140, Rem. 2); prativibha would mean „shining forth (vibha) towards
vyāti“, but vyāti may also be interpreted in a distributive sense (cf. note 111 to
Introduction). The etymology implied by the term prativibhesu would therefore
be sāntavibhāti prayāyā. As a matter of fact, the activity of a prayāya may be
viewed 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,
which explains prayāya by some kind of etymology (especially the repetition
of the root in the explanation points to an etymology), but here is nothing in the second
portion -āya could only have suggested the root i (gatau); the
etymology of prayāya therefore is: (sūgasa) prayāya prayāyā. It is probable
something of this kind should be read in our text. One might propose to correct
prativibhesu to prativigēṣu; as a copyist's error, this hardly requires explanation:
ba and ga are very similar in this type of script, but the objection is that -vi-
remains unexplained.

The already noted in the Introduction that this division of the Samskāras does not
coincide with that given in the Vibhaṅga (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 purat aśubha, I — B — 4). The obvious conclusion is that the author
meritorious formative forces (constitute) the threefold 'good'\footnote{\textit{The Sāmkārās which are \textit{punyopaya} are explained as threefold \textit{kuçala}Karman. One concludes that \textit{puny}a and \textit{kuçala} (and also \textit{apunya} and \textit{akuçala}, \textit{āneñjya} and \textit{avayākṣra}) are considered synonyms, which is in a direct conflict with Abhidharma, where the two triads are sharply distinguished. Cf., for instance, \textit{Abhidh. Koça}, III, p. 84 (\textit{punya} are those actions retributed by agreeable sensations within the domain of the Kāmadhātu) with op. cit., IV, p. 106 \textit{(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, \textit{kuçala} includes both \textit{punya} and \textit{āneñjya}, and even a little more; \textit{akuçala} is essentially identical with \textit{apunya}, whereas there is nothing in the \textit{punya} etc. classification that agrees with \textit{avayākṣra} (cf. note 158).}':

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 bhikṣavah as an address
(wheres 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, \textit{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, \textit{āneñjya}, does not occur at all in the text;
it was not probably understood and therefore replaced by a clumsy repetition
Lamotte, \textit{Mél. chin. et bouddh.} IV (1935-36), \textit{passim} (translation of the Karmasiddhi-
prakaraṇa), etc. Properly speaking, the terms \textit{punya} etc. apply to Karman, not to
Sāmkārāṅga, but since the latter consists of action, the suffix \textit{-maya} is added; the
usual terms however are \textit{punyopaga} etc.; cf. Čālistambha quoted \textit{Çikṣāsā}, p. 223, and
\textit{Bodhicā}, p. 479. For \textit{āneñjya} (variants: \textit{āniñjya, āneñjya}; Pāli \textit{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 \textit{Bodhis-pani}, edition (1901),
p. 80, note 4: \textit{ānejya et āniñjya n'ont rien de commun, sauf le son, avec iñj-ing.....
Vous avez bien vu qu'il est à peu près synonyme de culha}". Whereas the two first
categories of Karman are retributed in the Kāmadhātu, the third is retributed in
the two higher Dhātus (\textit{Siddhi}, II, p. 474); the three categories are connected with
the three kinds of Vedānā in \textit{Abhidh. Koça}, III, p. 84 (\textit{āneñjyakarman} is produced to
obtain \textit{adukkhasukhavedanā}). 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
\textit{-maya} in this connection (although variants of \textit{-upa}ga do occur; cf. \textit{āniñjyaprapṛpta
cittena} in the Saddharmapundarikā quoted by Senart, \textit{loc. cit.}); a far more important
point is however the relation between the \textit{punya}–\textit{apunya}–\textit{āneñjya} and the \textit{kuçala}–
\textit{akuçala}–\textit{avayākṣra} classifications; cf. note 157.\footnote{The Sāmkārās which are \textit{punyopaya} are explained as threefold \textit{kuçala}Karman. One concludes that \textit{puny}a and \textit{kuçala} (and also \textit{apunya} and \textit{akuçala}, \textit{āneñjya} and \textit{avayākṣra}) are considered synonyms, which is in a direct conflict with Abhidharma, where the two triads are sharply distinguished. Cf., for instance, \textit{Abhidh. Koça}, III, p. 84 (\textit{punya} are those actions retributed by agreeable sensations within the domain of the Kāmadhātu) with op. cit., IV, p. 106 \textit{(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, \textit{kuçala} includes both \textit{punya} and \textit{āneñjya}, and even a little more; \textit{akuçala} is essentially identical with \textit{apunya}, whereas there is nothing in the \textit{punya} etc. classification that agrees with \textit{avayākṣra} (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.; Karmasiddhiprakarana (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 Śaṃskārāṅga, 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 Śaṃskārāṅga, which should comprise only that Karman which punarbhavam abhisamkaroti. The only reasonable explanation is that our author, trying to arrive at an ‘exhaustive’ treatment of the possible Śaṃskāra divisions, confused Śaṃskāra with Karman.
The division of the Śaṃskāras into kāya, vāc and manas is that of the Viḥāṅga (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 Śaṃskārāṅga, 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 those three categories equivalent; manaskarman (i.e. cetanā, „will“) is primary, and kāya- and vāk-karman depend on it (Abhidh. Koça, IV, kārikā 1, c-d: cetanā manasaṃ karma tajj vākāya-karman); ur-willful action, i.e. that which is either kāya- or vāk-karman without depending on manaskarman, is deliberately excluded. Schierbatskjøi (Buddh. Lég., 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 Karmasiddhiprakarana in Mél. chin. et boedd., 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 Upadeṣa is that the definition of Śaṃskārāṅga as kāya-, vāk- and manas-karman is only a subdivision of punya etc. We noted above that the opinion of ‘others’ is exactly the opinion given in the Viḥāṅga.

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 citraviprayuktasaṃskāras are irrelevant here, because they are not subject to the will (such as prāṇī, etc.).

161) In Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 174, the interpretation of vitarka and vicāra as vāk-saṃskāras is attributed to the Sautrāntikas, who quote as evidence the Śūtra 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 Samsāra 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

162) Cf. note 159 above.

163) I.e., these doctors consider this the primary classification instead of punya-apunya-śānti; as we noted above (note 158), action of the group avyākṛta should not be included into Samsārāṅga.

164) The division of the Samsākāras into prātisattvika, aupapattyāṅγika and abhisāmāṅγika is unknown to us. The three terms used make it probable that the division refers rather to Samsārakārakanda than to Samsārāṅga. Prātisattvika is a derivative from prātisattvam, in which prati probably has a distributive meaning (vipā; Pā. I, 4, 90; cf. Weckernagel, II, 1, pp. 257 sqq.; cf. also the etymology of prātítyasamśāṭpāda discussed in the Introduction): "belonging to each (separate) living being"; the exp. resolution might then refer to those forces which make one belong to a definite group of living beings (nīkāyaabhiḥgatā; cf. Abhidh. Koça, II, pp. 195-198), and associated forces (such as prāpti, aprāpti, jīvitiṇḍriya (op. cit., pp. 178 sqq.). The last samsāra should perhaps be included into the second category, whereas the third category comprises the karma forces. As a rule, only the forces last mentioned are included in Samsārāṅga, and therefore, this threefold division is strange. It seems as if this whole division does not apply to Samsāra, but to Viṣṇā, where it is far more natural; we actually find it as such in a passage from the Bhavasamkrantiśūtra (Mahāy., 65, 54; ed. Minev-Mironov, p. 22) quoted Madhyamakāvatāra, VI, 40; cf. the translation of De la Vallée Poussin, Muséon, XI (1910), p. 319, where the viṣṇā are analyzed in (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 Samsāra.

165) In Buddhism, the four kōṭis 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 (athāpaniya; cf. Abhidh. Koça, V, p. 48). But this does not
g — A [1] considerations 160), 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 cāryaratadṛṣṭi, the second ucchedadṛṣṭi, the third is impossible, and the fourth is absurd. The state of Nirvāṇa cannot be expressed by dialectic methods (anabhiṣiṣya). The important Pāli text about this subject is the Brahmajālasutta in the Dīghanikāya (cf. Keith, loc. cit.), where fourteen so-called ‘un-defined’ points (caturdāṇa avyākatastavāni) 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 catuskōśinirmukta (Laṅkāv., p. 96), which may be translated as ‘non-dialectical’; cf. Madhyamakavṛtti, p. 57: paramārtha hy āryayānā tūṣṭibhāvāḥ, „la réalité absolue, c’est le silence des Saints” (J.W. de Jong, Cinq chapitres de la Prasangapadā, Buddhaica, 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, Catuṣkāta, Ind. Hist. Qu., VIII (1932), p. 692 (= Acintyastava, 36): yan naikam nāpy anekam ca nārūdayam na cobbhayam, and Subhāṣītasaṃgraha, edition by Bendall, Muséeon, 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 Angas of the Pratityasamutpāda formula belongs to the group of avyākta stavāni, or, at least, that there are other possibilities than the first alternative. This is a grave misunderstanding of Pratityasamutpāda, and the consequences of such a wrong opinion may be very serious.

160) Cf. note 96 to the Transcription. The translation is based upon the correction of cāntih, 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 asminārgo nāryāṇika). For the meaning of nāryāṇika, cf. Abhidh. Koça, VII, pp. 32, where it is translated by: „sortie définitive, parce ou’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. cut of the Samsāra). This is also the case here. The ignorant, who do not understand the relation between Avidyā and Samsārā conclude that some of the Samsārās (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 Pratityasamutpāda is very dangerous since it leads to dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa (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) Dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa is „la dṛṣṭi qui consiste à considérer bon, ‘haut’ (succe), 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. Dṛṣṭiparāma-rṣa implies all the other dṛṣṭis and is therefore fivefold. How the four other dṛṣṭis are associated with dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa 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 dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa; since antagrāha-, mithyā- and cilavrata-dṛṣṭi are mentioned in the following passage,
about the Extremes 179) 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. Aatidṛṣṭi, which has the advantage of being the easiest correction, might be considered a synonym of satkāyadṛṣṭi (asti, “real existence”, interpreted as „real existence”), but this is unusual. It might therefore be preferable to correct atidṛṣṭi to ʻatmadṛṣṭi, „the wrong view about the existence of an (eternal) Ātman”.

170) Viz. Çāçvata and ucheda, in this case, the former: the belief in the existence of an Ātman leads directly towards conceiving of it as something eternal.

171) Mitthyadṛṣṭi 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, mitthāya, dyṣṭa-paṭānārca, cilavrata; cf. Mahāvīr, 104, 34-38) is due to an attempt at establishing a causal relation between them; this relation is expressed by yuktā, „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 Brahmanas or Jains; cf. note 173. Čīla 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’ ċīla here; it probably refers to a list of seven means by which non-Buddhists presumed to obtain purification (cuddhidṛṣṭi). These seven means may have belonged to seven different sects. Cf. the Vyākhya quoted in the Abhidh. Koça, II, 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 Pāçvatatas, the skulls of the Kāpālīkṣas, the triple ājāna of the Parīrājakas there. It is not however probable that the Vyākhya list is referred to here; two of the seven groups mentioned there are sorts of vrata, not of ċīla.

In the Vibhāṣā, cilavrata 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 Vyākhya quoted in note 173. There, the example of kukkuvavarta, “the vow of living like a dog”, and a few others are mentioned. Cosmol. Bouddh., p. 172 (Vyākhya 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 ċīla 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 Mahāvīr, 207, 1-16 (p. 64).

The conception of a pudgala was developed within Buddhism (Vaśśiputriyās, Sāṁmittiyās) and may have constituted the gravest conflict in the older phase of Buddhism. An entire book of the Abhidharmakoça (IX: Pudgalapratiśedhappakaraṇa) 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 Bhāsāraśāstra. 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 Abhidharmakoço, Introduction (1931), pp. XXXIV — XXXVI.
to 'me' and 'mine'\(^{170}\): "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-

\(^{170}\) Ātmāniya is the usual reference to satkāyadarśa, for which cf. infra, h — A — 9 to h — B — 1.

\(^{177}\) Bāla, acrutavant and pṛthagjana are technical terms. Bāla is explained as those devoid of 'natural' knowledge, acrutavant 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 Vyākhya, Cosm. Boudh., 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); pṛthagjanaṭā is conceived of as a separate dharma (one of the citravayuktasamkāras) in the Yogācāra system (No. 74 of the list published in Muséon, N.S., 6, 1905, pp. 178 sq.); the important sources with reference to the different opinions in Buddhist Schools are mentioned in Siddhī, pp. 639 sqq. — In many Buddhist texts, āha (āhuh) is used to quote an opponent's opinion (unlike ucye or referring to the words of the Bhagavat); this is indeed the use of āhuh in the passage about the Saṃskāras, supra, f — B — 4 to 7; cf. also Siddhī, 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. r.frute 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. Siddhī, 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 bija etc.). It is not however correct to state that the tryadhvan conception is characteristic of Hīnayāna only; it is even very important in Mādhyaṃānita treatises (last chapter of the Madhyamakavṛtti; cf. also Bodhic-paṇi, 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" (time) 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
tioned 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 \(^{183}\), existence in the Realm of Formlessness is fourfold \(^{187}\). '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 of desire, caused by and conditioned by the senses. Birth is fourfold: [1] born from a womb, born by sudden appearance, born from exsudation, and born from an egg \(^{169}\). The „Old Age conditioned by Birth'' is Old Age (characterized by) 'ripening' of the senses \(^{185}\), difficult speech and

their desires, — such acts are the avidyā-pratyayāḥ sanskārāḥ. For the line of thought, cf. also Friedmann, Madhyāntavibhāga, Transl., p. 47, and the notes on pp. 125 sq.

\(^{181}\) Is. 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 (saptadacasthāno rūpadhāthah) 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). Jamnakarmabhavaḥ, "the existence of karma leading to re-birth" is more satisfactory.

\(^{185}\) The usual explanation. Cf. Čikṣāsā, p. 222: skandha-prādurbhāvo 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 Viśeṣa (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 samavesadaḥ; the prefix might be used for making the notion a little less precise (cf. samjñāti, samkleśa, sammoha, in which sam- is not used samavāyārtham, but rather to include kindred notions into the simple; samkleśa is also that which is associated with kleśa; 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; agga may be called a garbha, too); instead of upapattiḥ, 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. Čālist. quoted Čikṣāsā, p. 222; Madhyam-vidyāti, p. 209; Daćabha, p. 49; Bodhič.-paśyā, p. 480 (abbreviated by peyālam); Vyākhyā quoted Abhidh. Koça, III, p. 83, note 5, where other references (to Pali
[2] decoloration of the matter (constituting the body) \(^{189}\). The immediate consequence \(^{190}\) 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

---

\(^{189}\) Rūpa, „matter”, is characterized by saṃsthāna and varna (cf. the definition of rūpyatana, note 129 above). During Old Age, Rūpa more and more becomes vivarna.


\(^{191}\) Conjectural translation. The term reads čaṇyendriyāvasthānaandhātuṣṭoka, which cannot be correct in this form. The easiest correction is the omission of the \(n\) preceding "dātu", as was proposed in note 104 to the Transcription. Then čaṇyendriyāvasthāna could be explained as a bahuvrīhi „being in the condition of empty indriya”; it is of course not the indriyas that become empty, but the organs (ācāraya, i.e. eyes etc.) that lose the facultis (indriya) of vision etc. Dātu refers to the eighteen saṃtāna compounds analysed into three groups: six internal āyatanas or indriyas, six external āyatanas or viṣayas and the six viṣānas (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 'v.ïd', and this is the cause of sorrow for the others.
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.

\(^{193}\) The \(\text{\textit{çokas}}\) are not real \(\text{\textit{Añgas}},\) but constitute a great complex (\(\text{\textit{mahāduḥkhasārandha}}\)) comprised in \(\text{\textit{Jarāmāramānāda}}\) (cf. supra, note 18; cf. also \(\text{\textit{Siddhi}}, II, pp. 485 sq.}\). \(\text{\textit{Çoka, parideva, duḥkha}},\) 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 \(\text{\textit{vyasta}}\) (opposite: \(\text{\textit{samasta}},\) 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 \(\text{\textit{iti}}\). These sentences are to be taken in the accusative (cf. in line \(7\): \(\text{\textit{duḥkhaśhetum \text{\textit{parideva}}}}\); the latter is a masculine noun), which must be considered to depend on a word like \(\text{\textit{jīvātvā}},\) „knowing that”, which is not expressed in the text, but suggested by \(\text{\textit{upāyāsāhāduḥkhaśhetu}}\) \(\text{\textit{jīvātvā}}\) (line \(6\)). It is even possible that the latter word, the final \(d\) of which is omitted on the plate should be corrected to \(\text{\textit{upāyāsāhāduḥkhaśhetu}}\) \(\text{\textit{jīvātvā}},\) which is more satisfactory; as \(\text{\textit{upāyāsa}},\) this word is treated as a masculine line (instead of \(\text{\textit{upāyāsas}},\) c.q. \(\text{\textit{upāyāsōha}}\) \(\text{\textit{hetu}}\) here and in line \(5\), but this is very common.

\(^{195}\) The addition of \(\text{\textit{vyastaduḥkhama}} \text{\textit{a}}\) \(\text{\textit{t}}\) \(\text{\textit{vyastam}} = \text{\textit{duḥkhama}}\) seems quite useless.

\(^{196}\) The formulation becomes different as soon as the text treats about real \(\text{\textit{Añgas}},\) in \(\text{\textit{marataḥhetukā jarā}},\) the relation is a very close one; it is accepted as a fact, whereas the causal relation between \(\text{\textit{çoka}}\) and \(\text{\textit{parideva}},\) e.g., is not necessary: it is rather one of the possible opinions about their relation and therefore subjective (cf. the use of \(\text{\textit{jīvātvā}}\) 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, \(\text{\textit{hetuka}}\) 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 Upadeśa 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 kṣaras 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 (\(\text{\textit{upādānabhetukā treṣā}}\) etc. up to \(\text{\textit{Avidyā}}\). That there was a definite reason to end with \(\text{\textit{Upādāna}},\) appears from the line of argument which precedes. This line begins in \(\text{\textit{g}}\) — \(\text{\textit{A}}\) — \(7\): \(\text{\textit{upādāņapratītya bhavah}}\) and after that, the \(\text{\textit{pratītya}}\) chain is continued up to \(\text{\textit{upāyāsa}}\). When we see that in the portion following the line is drawn back again, it is only natural that it should end at \(\text{\textit{Upādāna}}\). 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 \(\text{\textit{Upādāna}}\) again. But then, it becomes
h—A | [1] — (The above is the) Explanation \(^{185}\). (The first part is)
what has been enounced to you, (the second), what has been said
in reply (to your questions) \(^{189}\).

Thus spoke the Bhagavat; the monks, whose minds were en-
litened (?) \(^{200}\), [2] rejoiced at his discourse and silently withdrew
from his neighbourhood.

— There are four continents \(^{201}\), viz. [3] Jambudvīpa, Uttara-
kurudvīpa, Pūrvavidehadvīpa, Avaragodhanyadvīpa; eight great [4]
hells, viz. Sañjīva, Kālasūtra, Saṃghāta, Raurava, Māhāraurava,
Tapana, Saṃpratāpaka, and [5] Avici; six divine abodes, viz. (those
of the) Four Māhārājikas, Trāyastraṇças, Yāmas, Tūṣitas, Nirmāna-
ratīs, [6] and Parinirmītavaçavartins; (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.

\(^{185}\) It seems that this final formula was directly taken from the Sūtra-Viññāṇa text,
for no reference to the Upadeça is mentioned. As we saw above (notes 75 and 76)
the final formula begins already in b—E — 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-Viññāṇa
text was continued.

\(^{189}\) The entire text may be considered to consist of two portions, very unequal in length,
viz. (a) the principle (ādī = utdēca = the Sūtra), which is the nucleus of the
Pratītyasamutpāda theory, and (b) the explanation of the direct (Viññāṇa) and
indirect (Upadeça) meaning of the principle. The Viññāṇa and the Upadeça are not
exactly enounced by the Bhagavat as the Sūtra is, but consist cf lengthy replies to
the questions rising about the meaning of the Sūtra. The first portion (a) is therefore
uptam, the second (b) pratyuyuptam.

\(^{200}\) Āptamānasas 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 ts do not resemble each other at all. It seems that ātta (from
ādātā) 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 āptamānasas. Buddhist texts giving
this stereotyped formula at the end of the Sūtras often read āttmanās (cf. Sad-
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 āttamanas and to replace the mark of punctu-
tuation adopted in Lefmann's edition, but this seems very doubtful. Cf. also Mahe-
vastu, II, p. 34, line 19: tān dṛṣṭvā anāttamanā puraṇḍaro, ity abhavīt āttmano
svarṣevu. Anāttamanā is acc. plur. fem. (cf. Sēnart, 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

\[ h \rightarrow B \] \(^{1}\) 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:

Nārakapretatīryaṇco mãṇuṣāḥ saṁ divaukasaḥ
Kāmadhātuḥ sa narakadvipabhedena viṃçetih

Very detailed references are given in De la Vallée Poussin’s Abhidharmakoça translation, III, pp. 1 sqq. ('vingt-quatre', 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 Koçāsthāna 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, Manasal, I, Cosmology (1923), especially pp. 60 sqq. (comparison of the Theravāda, Sarvāstivāda and Yogācāra systems). — Although the enumeration here given agrees exactly with that of 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 mãṇuṣaloka.

\(^{203}\) This is a curious misunderstanding, for it is obvious that kāmapādāna does not mean kāmadhātipādāna, 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; drṣṭiparāmaṇa is not of course the same as drṣṭipādāna; cf. note 168 above.

\(^{205}\) The usual explanation of satkāyadṛṣṭi is ātmātmiyadṛṣṭi, ‘the Wrong View on the existence of an Ātmān or what belongs to an Ātmān’ (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, Buddha. 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 sqq., seems to accept Liebenthal’s arguments, though with some reservations. On the striking resemblance between the dharmas of Buddhism and the āyus 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 \(^{206}\)). 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. (ṛūpavant), 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, 1-26 (p. 64). Although the twentyfold division of Satkāyadṛṣṭi is the usual one (cf. *Divya*, p. 46: viṃṣati-cikharasamudgataṃ satkāyadṛṣṭiṣṭalāṃ, 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 Vibhāṣa, 8*, in *Mél. chin. et bouddh.*, I (1931-33), pp. 22 sq.

\(^{206}\) 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 Dṛṣṭi. *Antaṅgāhādṛṣṭi* is a fundamental concept of Buddhism, which was always considered the Middle Path (maddhyamā pratipad) between the two extremes of Čāṣyata and Uccheda, and 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.

\(^{207}\) 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.

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.

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 aṅkṣaras are visible outside the lotus contours, but still within the vajra.

The aṅkṣaras are written in a form of Nāgarī which gives the impression of being rather late. Since the line to which the aṅkṣaras 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 Kēlura: inscriptions from Central Java date: 778 and 782 A.D. respectively. The form of the aṅkṣaras 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 aṅkṣaras, 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 aṅkṣaras 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**

\[a\ (upper\ part)\ :\ hūṃ\ amoghasiddhi / \textit{om} \textit{om}^{3)}\]
\[b\ (centre)\ :\ hūṃ\ aksobhya\ \textit{om} \textit{om} \textit{om} \textit{phaṭ}\]
\[c\ (lower\ part)\ :\ hūṃ\ ratnasambhava / \textit{om}^{4)}\]

**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 Aksobhya 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 Ājñācakra, 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 Täntrism usually represent the चाक्ति Hākini and other mystical figures together with bijas. 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 bijas. 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 \textit{om}, the same \textit{aksara} was probably repeated twice and followed by a single \textit{phaṭ}; the forms have, however, become very undistinct.


\(^7\) \textit{Oudh. Versl.} 1930, p. 134.
Dhyānibuddhas in practically the same type of Nāgari 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\(^4\). 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 Tjandi Ploasan 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 ākṣaras 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 ākṣara forms with the means at his disposal. Technical reasons account for the strange forms of some of the ākṣaras; 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 Saṅgha, the text of the dhāraṇī proper is introduced by tadyathā, a word well-known from Buddhist Sanskrit\(^2\). The text ends in the akṣara pāṭa five times, followed by ṣīṣāḥ.

\(^{4}\) This yantra, too, has Akoṣbhya as its central figure. The transcript added by Braundes 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 hum, not hyang as Braundes 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 Ploasan inscription (infra, No. VII), viz. the Ānandakandapadma in strophe 13c (bṛḍayaniraja) and the Sahasrārapadma, the thousand-petalled mind-lotus in strophe 8d (dhiḥbhūridalayoja\(<nab\>\)). 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 ṣudh 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 pāpāvaraṇaviṣṭuddhāni (line 1/2 and karmmāvaraṇaviṣṭuddhāni (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 Sarvāvaraṇaviṣṭuddhāni-nāma-dhāraṇī or something very similar.

The text seems unknown from other sources. A text named Sarvakarmāvaraṇaviṣṭuddhāni-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 Sarvadurgatipariviṣṭuddhāna, shows a closer affinity with our text, but is not identical either 6).

Transcription

1 oṃ 7) nama vuddhāya 8) nama dharmāya namaḥ saṃghāya tadyathā ṣudhde viṣṭuddhe ṣodhāni viṣṭuddhāni gagaṇaviṣṭuddhāni 9) cītaviṣṭuddhāni pā-

2) The usual technical term for the former kind is kleśavarana, i.e. the kleśas viewed as factors which obstruct the Mārga. Karmavarana 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 aśīnām produces karman. Karmavarana, 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 jīneyāvarana. It is almost impossible to draw a clear line of separation between the two kinds of avarana: the dharmas which constitute jīneyāvarana (such as pudgalavṝgha and dharmagrāha) are a part of satkāyadṛṣṭi, which is a kleśa; cf. especially the references given by De la Vallée Poussin, Siddhi. II, pp. 566 sqq.

3) Marcelle Lalou, Catalogue du Fonds Tibetain de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Buddhica, 3ième série, No. IV (1931), No. 40 on p. 20.

4) After a Tibetan introduction, in which it is stated that the dhāraṇī is addressed to mi 'khrugs pa (Aṣṭobhya), it begins: // nama ratnastavyāya / oṃ kamkani / kamkani / rocani rocani / trotani trotani / trāsani trāsani / pratihana pratihana / sarvakarmaparamparāṇi me svāhā // .... Almost the same text as this quotation in the Bka' 'gyur. Regyd XVII. 1 (Bibl. Nat. tib. 454, fol. 1).

5) Bibl. Nat. sanskrit 59, fol. 6a 1. 3: oṃ ṣodhāni ṣodhāni viṣṭuddhāni viṣṭuddhāni sarvapāpaviṣṭuddhe sarvakarmāhavaranāni viṣṭuddhe svāhā; Bibl. Nat. sanskrit 62, no. 25, fol. 58a, 1. 3-4: oṃ ṣodhāni ṣodhāni sarvapāpaviṣṭuddhāni ṣudhde viṣṭuddhe sarvapāpaviṣṭuddhe sarvakarmāvaramaṇavāpaṭuddhe 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. \(<pā>vāraṇaviçōdhanī\) karmāvāraṇaviçōdhanī viçuddhe viçuddhe kṣīne sarvakṣīne puspe supuṣpe rajoharaṇe sarvapatpā-
3. viçōdhanī hare hare sarvāvaramanānī dha dha sarvakarmāvaranānī paca paca sarvasthānagatānī 11) padme padmākṣi padmaviçā-
4. le pha pha pha pha pha pha svāhā

Translation 12)

[1] Om! 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 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.

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 Brânjes, who gave a detailed description, together

comparison with other forms of the na in this plate, such as the fourth aksara from the left of line 3, and, more clearly, the fourteenth (the last aksara of sarvāvaraṇānī); there it appears that the engraver expressed the na by two distinct strokes, and then a misinformation as that which we have here could easily occur.
10) The omission of the second na is easily explained as a haplography.
11) The ga is not distinct on the plate. The lower side of the aksara seems almost closed. Although *gaṇāṇī 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) Puspe is of course the vocative of the feminine form puspā. The ending in -e is even found inhare hare (line 3), where it replaces the -a of the imperative.
14) The compound is not perfectly lucid. If the reading is correct, sarvāakhānagatāni should be considered to depend on a term such asmalāni (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): pāṇicasu sthānese kṛtāvi saṃvṛttah.
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 kham 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 om, 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 om, 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: sāvithucçikha, but this does not make sense. Possibly, the word represents a vocative of a compound (probably a bahuvrīhi) ending in -çikha \(^2\).

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 sādhanā 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 tabij 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, sāvī, do not seem doubtful on the plate, but they do not make sense. It is possible that the carelessly written uṭu 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.

Among the other epithets we note *jaṭīla*, 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. *ṭīla nirjaṭa* ⁵)
3. *bhūṣi* ⁶) *pāṇḍura-*
4. *ṅgabhasmaja*
5. *bhasmēṣu bhasma-
6. *citta nirdoça* ⁷)
7. *... ⁸) virūpa*

B. **Middle portion:**
   a. (to the left of the head of the figure): *om* 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 *danda* cannot be excluded, but *nijāta* does not seem probable.

⁶) The *ṣa* (at least if it is a *ṣa*) has a curious form; the *aksara* 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 *nirdoça*? The wrong spelling makes some reservations necessary.

⁸) Probably, *deva* is written here, but the *aksaras* are undistinct.

⁹) Conjectural reading. We distinguish the initial *u* preceded by a *tauling* and followed by a *danda*.

¹⁰) The *o* is certain, but there might be an *anusvāra* over it.

¹¹) Very uncertain.
c (above the right hand concentric circles): ai

d (below the latter): ... cṭikha

VII. THE PRE-NĀGARI INSCRIPTION FROM TJANJI 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 Tjandi Plaosan, Central Java. There, the stone was already noticed by Crawford. Later on, it was incorporated into the collection Kläring at Djogjakarta, from where it was transferred to the Djakarta Museum by 1890. The inscription was briefly discussed by Bosch in the introduction to his publication about the Kélurak inscription in 1928. Recently, I examined a few passages in connection with other Cailendra inscriptions.

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

13) Between the two sets of concentric circles, there is another aṅsra, which might be tha. The meaning of the aṅsras in the lower portion of the plate is obscure. They should probably be connected in some way or other; if we exclude the two aṅsras on the top of either set of concentric circles (probably bijāṅsras, especially if aṁ should be read instead of ai) and connect the remaining ones, the result would be: sāvithaṭikhe, which does not resemble anything known.

2) Bernet Kemaers, Crawford's beschrijving van Prambanan in 1816, T.B.G., 83 (1940), pp. 177-193; cf. Crawford 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 biows its 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); Hoeperrmans, 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, Hoeperrmans mentions the presence of another fragment of the same stone; if Hoeperrmans’ statement is correct (the fact that Crawford, 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-Nāgari the essential features of which were discussed by Bosch 8). Bosch pointed out that the four extant Pre-Nāgari inscriptions from Central Java, viz. those of Kalasan, Ratubaka, Kēlurak and Plaosa, 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-Nāgari inscription from India 9). The latter type, that in which the Kēlurak and Plaosa 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 Kēlurak and Plaosa 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 aksaras themselves. Thus, the height and the breadth of the Plaosa aksaras amount to about the double of those of the Kēlurak 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 Plaosa

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 aksaras 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 aksaras in the Plaosa inscription is about 1 cm. In the Kēlurak 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 Kēlurak charter. 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 Kēlurak 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 Tjāndī 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 Tjāndī 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.

\[\text{dhatu, or, more probably dhatta (the -u would be very similar to the second ta), whereas it is obvious that dhartum (or dharttum) was intended. In the Kēlurak charter, there is much confusion between akṣaras which resemble each other such as pa, ma, sa and ya; there are many examples where a distinct sa was put down although the context requires ma. The stone-cutter may have copied an example which was not clear everywhere (cf. some typical mistakes of this kind in No. X below, the last line of b).}\]

\[\text{12) Cf. Bosch, art. cit., np. 7 sqq.}\]

\[\text{13) Infra No. XI, strophe 9; cf. its transcription and translation, and the discussion of the data in the Introduction. Some note: about the short inscriptions of Plaosan, especially the mention of the king Rakai Pikatan (viz. the inscriptions dharmma cīr mahārājās rakai pikatan), were given in Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 116 sq. A more detailed discussion with the complete number of inscriptions hitherto discovered is published in the Report of the Archaeological Service of the Indonesian Republic for the years 1951-52. — We add that the Rakai Pikatan has the title Cīr Mahārāja in these inscriptions, whereas he is denoted by rata in the Perot inscription dated 850 A.D. For the meaning of the latter term, cf. the discussion in the Introduction to No. IX below; if the conclusion to which we arrive there is correct, we have a definite proof that the short Plaosan inscriptions must be dated after Aśāḍha 850, whereas the terminus ad quem is Mārgaçīrṣa 856, the year in which the Rakai Pikatan is succeeded by the Rakai Kayuwañi. The Pre-Nāgari inscription does not seem to contain a word about the small temples surrounding the main buildings of the Plaosan complex, which might be a, necessarily weak, argument in favour of the supposition that the small temples were constructed after the Pre-Nāgari inscription. On the other hand, the wording of some passages in the Plaosan inscription to be examined in the course of this Introduction make it almost certain that our text does not refer to the original foundation. If the above is correct, we have to assume at least three different stages in the construction of the Plaosan complex: an old foundation presumably alluded to in the former part of the Pre-Nāgari inscription, the erection of an image together with the construction of new buildings and the carving of relief}\]
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 Mālīni 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 Praharṣanī (Praharṣāṇi) 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 in the end of strophe 10, drutavilambita 15 in 17 d. In the last strophe (19), one would have expected to read the word praḥarṣaṇ(i)ṇī, which is not, however, the case 16); the term probably occurred at the end of 18 d 17).

14) A good example is Chapter CIV of the Bṛhatasmhitā, in which fifty-six different metres are mentioned.

15) The reason probably is that the word praḥarṣaṇi (or praḥarṣāṇi) 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 monosyllables in Sanskrit, the difficulty is usually solved by putting the gerundive praḥarṣaṇīya at the end of the pāda; cf. matipraḥarṣaṇīya, Bṛhatā, CIV, 22. The Old Javanese Wrĕttisaṅcaya uses the words praḥarṣaṇi (read: praḥarṣāṇi) twas at the end of strophe 57 (vide Kern, Veraspr. Gesch., IX, p. 89; cf. also p. 154), but in Old Javanese there are more possibilities for monosyllables. 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 Praharṣanī examples from Ācārya (quoted by Johnston in the Introduction to his translation of the Buddhacarita, p. 1xiv) agree with the classical forms.

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 Člokas (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 Praharṣaṇi strophes (omenest omen) are well adapted to the two beneficatory 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, śrānta...śrānta in 5 a-b, kana....kana in 12 a, vara...vara-vara-vara 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 cīciračmirucāpravārānvayaḥ in 12 c, and the more elaborate simile sugatabhaktibharaṇaṇaṭa(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 vīṇāvāranaṇāvāranā 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 jīneya\(^{19}\): 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 Prthagjana (prthagjanatvā-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
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\(^{17}\) There are two vipulās against eight parhyās, 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. Böhlings, Danjín's Poetik (1890), p. 85.

\(^{19}\) Dharmasamgraha, 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: punyasaṃbhāra is the equipment necessary to 'leap over' the screen constituted by the kleças and jīnasaṃbhāra is, as it were, the weapon by means of which the Bodhisattva overcomes the more subtle screen which is jīneyāvaraṇa. This symbolism may be noticed throughout the bhūmi conception of Mahāyāna. In the Barabudur, 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 Barabudur 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 Mañjuśrī's khadga, Vajrapāṇi's vajra, etc., symbolize the means to overcome the different screens.

\(^{20}\) Cf. De la Vallée Pousin, La Siddhi d'Huien Tsang, II (1929), pp. 639 sqq.
Bhûmi must be vanquished to ascend the second Bhûmi and so on; those of the tenth Bhûmi must be eliminated to become a Buddha during vajropamasamâdhî. 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 rûpakas (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-Nâgarî script is a strong argument in favour of such a surmise, since the only three other extant Pre-Nâgarî documents all belong to the dynasty mentioned. In addition, the text is clearly Mahâyânic. 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 jamvulakṣmyâḥ . . . . lolakirityâ vilokinâḥ; the reading of jamvû\(^{a}\) is certain and that of lakṣmyâḥ is clearly confirmed by the epithet; jamvulakṣmî cannot well be interpreted otherwise than as a queen originating from India (Jambudvîpa), but the loss of the context necessitates reservations. In line 6, a (third?) pâda of a Mâlinî strophe \(^{23}\) could be read except for the last syllable, which may be completed without difficulty \(^{24}\); it runs: \(\text{smaraha}s\text{urasaravartin}bhûjayottuṅgade(vah).\)

A royal name may be recognized in the portion after the caesura, viz. Bhûjayottungaideva. 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 pâda 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 smarākaravarsavarṣad-, 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 Buddhias and Bodhisattvas abiding on the highest stage of perfection, which is therefore called Dharmanemgha 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).
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 (sāndhyābhāra) from which a soft rain (mañjuçikara) 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 "vadhim (bodhim) esyatī, 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 2 and narañāthābhisamskārabhāra 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 Dañabhūmika, 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, Mañjuçri and Samantabhadra, it is Avalokiteçvara who shows some vague Çiva affinities, especially by his designation by a name ending in -ihāra.

29) The exact wording of the beginning of the strophe is open to doubt. The use of "pāra" suggests a simile of crossing the Sañśāra, 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, kleçagñi). Probably, our conjectural reading of the beginning of strophe 5 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 Anustubh 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 dharmasamgha being used both with reference of Bhūjyottungadeva 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 Mañjuśrī 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 nara nāthābhisāṃskārābhāva) 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 nara nāthābhisāṃskāra 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 Tusiṣa 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 23). We do not mean, of course, that the statue would certainly have been a Maitreya; although the ceremony in Tusiṣa 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 Mañjīyāna 25).


25) In the most authoritative source on the Bodhisattvabhūmis, the Daśabhūmisikāsūtra, the tenth stage of the Mārga is called both Abhisekabhūmi and Dharma meghā 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 (daśabala) to become a Perfect Buddha. By these royal ceremonies, the Bodhisattva is installed in the Dharma meghā Bhūmi; cf. op. cit., p. 86, lines 8 sq.: *evam abhiṣikto pramāṇeyagnajñānajñavirodhito dharmameghāyām bodhisattvabhūmuṣau pratīṣṭita 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 the Clouds 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 Čailendra dynasty on account of other data 34). It would therefore seem probable that Bhūjayasottungadeva is the abhiṣekanāma of that very founder — or, to be more precise, the name attributed to the latter by the later Čailendra 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 Čailendra 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 Praharṣini 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

---

35) Cf. note 25 above. It seems hardly likely to us that the name should be considered an authentic one. Revisc: of official names and titles of ancient kings c a the base of the titles used in the revisor’s times : only natural. For the artificial character of some dynasties, cf. Cœdès, Etudes Cambodgiennes, XXI, La tradition généalogique des premiers rois d’Ankgor, 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 Paratara to older dignitaries) and De Gras, ibid., 109 (1953), pp. 62-82.

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 deṣadharma yāṇam 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 (pratītyajñātāsthavibhāgavijñāh) 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 (muktiṣara).
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 bhūmi⁴⁹). Therefore, the last strophe of the inscription is very probably an invocation addressed to the same Bhūjayottungadeva, conceived of as a Bodhisattva-Cakravartin. If these identifications are correct — the mutilated text necessitates some reservations — they supply us with

---

⁴⁹) Cf. Mahāvy., 30, 47: nānādṛṣṭyanucayaparyavasthānakleṣapraçaṣamanakusalaḥ. The title of this chapter is given as Bodhisattvānāṃ sūtrāntanirgatāni kānicīd guṇanāmāni; it appears however from the first item ekajātiratibadācaḥ that only Bodhisattvas abiding in the Dharmameghabhūmi are meant.
further materials about this mysterious king of Varanara, who became the founder of the Cailendra 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 vamçāvali, in which the excellent qualities of different Cailendra kings and queens are extolled. Unfortunately, the text is too mutilated to make any conclusions possible.

Much more is preserved of the ten Anuśṭubh 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 (pṛṣādādbhutasamabhraṣṭah) owing to its attachment to the Four Sugatas, but in spite of its fall, it continued to be brilliant. 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 itaraṅkṛto 'pi pālanīyah, applied to the foundation. These words mean: orrh 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 sanctuaty. 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 vamçāvali. It is therefore quite possible that the words priyatamam eva parikhyā pari..... 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 vamçāvali is made especially by the words janayām = babhūva bhūpo bhābhratam in line 10. In the lines 8 and 9, a queen (or queens) is (are) extolled.

42) We analyze pṛṣādādbhutasamabhraṣṭah as pṛṣādam abhoutena samabhraṣṭah; 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 Karangśāhā inscription; cf. Pras. Indon., I (1950), p. 39. Bosch (Bjdr. 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 kośa, 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 43). 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 ratnatrayagayopaṣṭam (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 cikhā — 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 Brāhmānic and Buddhist Yoga. The lotus here mentioned is known as the Thousand-petalled one (sahasrārāpadma) 49). It is evident that a Buddha image cannot have a cikhā, at least if this term is taken in its proper meaning; but this is just the place where the uṣṇīsa is found in Buddha images. The splendour emanating from the uṣṇīsa 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

43) 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 this 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 Tārādevi was made, and also a temple for her (T.B.G., 68, 1928, p. 58: tārādevi kṛtāpi tadhavanam).
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 adbhatāni 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. Port, Yoga en Yantra, 1946, pp. 20 sqq. and p. 39, with numerous references.
50) Cf. Mahāvyu, 244, 31-33 (p. 81): uṣṇīsavivarāntād raṃṇiṃ niṣcarati / sa raṃṇiṃ niṣcārya paripuṣatu 'bhūt.
they are doing. In the fourth pāda, of which only the beginning sakalakhādyas 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 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 (hrdayaṇṭra). Here, we have another unambiguous reference to one of the interior padmas; it is the heart-lotus, which is known as the ānandakapadma in Yoga.

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 supernatural 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 (jñamandira) worshipped by a group of people, bowed by the burden of devotion to the Buddhas who continued to arrive 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. If our reading satkriyate is correct, the passage refers to the typical forms of worship in later Mahāyāna, including vandanam, „praising” the bringing of scents and ointments (gandhānapaṇa), the erection of Buddha images (tathāgatapratimākaraṇa), etc.

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 hrdayapuruṣārika, 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 Čāndideva in chapter XVII of the Cikṣāsamuccaya (under the title Vandanānuçṣaṇa; cf. the edition by Bendall in Bibl. Buddh., I, 1902, pp. 297-315). For the term satkāra, cf. ibidem, p. 312, line 5: sarvasatkkāraḥ satkuryuh. Cf. also Bodhisarvyavatāra, 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 puspaṇi, 14-15), clouds of incense, foods and drinks (dhūpameghāh),...
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 Gaudidvīpa (Bengal?) in the Kālurak inscription and the possibility of restoring gurubhīr 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 kaucid, 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.

---

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 Gujarāt 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 Tjäng Plaosan. 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.

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-


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, Inleiding, 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 headdress for which Krom very conjecturally proposed that it denoted the official head of the Čāla 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 Čaitendra 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 Čaitendra 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 Gurjara. 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 Tjäng 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 pājā 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 Palaśan 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 (anabhīdāpya) state of Nirvāṇa (nirvṛta); in order to save mankind, he cannot act in this incomprehensible state but has to use his power of Nirmanā. To deliver the creatures from death and suffering, he has his own upāyas equal to anāyita. These upāyas are the images in the temple(s); they reveal the perfect tranquillity 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 metaphors 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 freshness and became loci commune or, even worse, technical terms. An interesting 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 transcendent existence is a tree, but a very different one: its seed is Bodhicitta 62) and its fruits are the unexpressible joys of Nirvāṇa 63). Phenomenal existence is an ocean on which the ignorant creatures


62) The comparison between citta (vijñāna) and the seed (bijā) 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 (sarvabijā) from the six streams of ālayavijñāna (cf. also Siddhi, II, pp. 433 sqq.) and the Manas. Bodhicitta is the corresponding pure seed, often compared with a gem (e.g., Bodhic. Ar., I, 11); it is the first simile in the Gaṇḍavyuha quotation, Čiksā, p. 5, line 20: bodhicittāṃ hi...... bijabhūtāṃ sarvabuddhaḥdhammānām.

63) This simile is used e.g. the Kālurak 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 (\(guna\)) of the Tathāgata\(^{65}\). The relations between phenomenal and transcendent existence are clearly expressed only in the Viśānavādin system; in the process called \(ācārayaparāvṛtti\), 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] ......vijarakāyavibham=vibhāti guṇavibhāmalaputrajananam\(^{68}\) yais=tarunavala-

[ 6] ......svaparahitagunasya sva......ādvitiyam / smararavavaravarṣad= bhūjāyottungade-\(^{69}\)

\(^{64}\) The simile of the bhavārṇava needs no comment. In that case, Bodhicitta is compared with a fish-hook (\(badiça\)) used to lift the drowning creatures. Cf. the Gāṇḍavyūha quotation mentioned in note 62, p. 6, lines 5 sq.: \(badisabhūtam saṃsāralacarābhyyud-dhāraṇat\.)

\(^{65}\) Thus, one of the names of the Buddha is Guṇāgāra (\(Mahāvy.,\) I, 36; ed. by Minaiev-Mirnov, 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 Bodhicaryāvatāra, II, 1 d: \(buddhātra\) \(cājānam\) ca \(guposaddhānām\).

\(^{66}\) Cf. the Siddhi translation by De la Vallée Poussin, II, pp. 661-667 and 681-692. Thus, the four (lokottare) \(jñānas\) of the Buddhas are due to the \(parśvott\) of the eight \(vijñānas\). Detailed references are given by Friedmann in note 85 to p. 70 of his translation of the Mahāyānavibhāṣājīka (1937). Cf. also the very important analysis by Paul Mus, Rasabuddha, Sāshastra Partila, 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 Giti. 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.
The text preceding *kuçalarāge* might well be *jayati*, which would agree with the Mālinī metre.

The last word, which presumably represents a not unusual orthography for *bibharti*, is uncertain. We have no examples of the combination *vrddhiṃ bibharti*, which could however be understood in usual combinations such as *phalāṃ bibharti*.

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.

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.

Here, the metre is undoubtedly Āryā. The meaning of this passage is completely obscure to us; *ṣṭapādasatkāyāṃ* does not make sense, unless it could mean something like *ṣṭapādasatkāyāṃ* but even then, the compound would not be lucid. Presumably, there is a pun with *ṣṭapādasatkāyāṃ* at the end of the line 10, but this does not mean anything to us. Instead of *śam, igaṃ* is also possible, but we cannot see how that would render the text more satisfactory.

Instead of *bhūpo*, the possibility of *bhūyo* 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, is got 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 *vaṃcāvali* 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 Mañjuśrī, called Vaiśeṣika Dharmadhātu, is known from iconography (Bhattacharya, pp. 18 sq.). In view of the uncertain reading, this interpretation is however given with reservations.

The portion of this line capable of being rendered in the transcription appears to be a part of an Āryā. The words *sajjanataditkuliçabhṛt=kuleçaraṇaç=ca*... 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 presumably suggests a Vajra-pāṇi 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 *kuça*, 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* (*Mahāvīra*, 19, 35, ed. by Mināvei-Mironov, p. 7), the Bodhisattvas as *buddhasuta* or a synonym. If this interpretation is correct, we re-
[12] ..........takalotphalotpalaläabhrtah / priyatamam=eva parikhayā pari- 78)

Naranäthabhisamspñkarbáho viháthi bhäsvarah /
Dharmmasambhärarasamitapratimäprati [14] — ○ / 1 // 80)

= — ○ ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ — ○ /
— ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ = nirajän=varayänagän 81) // 2 //
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Vinçatiha virajante jinä jinasutänvitaḥ // 5 //
Analpajamopajitaya vícävarañavarārañah /

[16] — ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ // 6 //
— ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ // 7 // 84)
Gahanapäraçäśärthavyähäramañjuçikaráh / 85)
Cärasvārasändhyäbradhibhüridalayoja[17]<nah> // 8 //
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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 deciphered, 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 (priyatamana) which for that very reason (this might have been expressed by eva) was surrounded (pari2) as 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 Māñjugūrī (?); 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 interpretation (and also the reading) becomes far less uncertain.

80) The preserved portion of this cloka 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 penultimate 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 cloka is uncertain. Gahana is not
Ratnatrayāçayopetan samastagunaratnabham /
Kaçcin=na vaktuçakto vas=tatpuñyāyām=anuṣṭubhi / 10 //
Vividhagandhasudigdhavarā[18] <ṅganāḥ> / 87) //
Kṣaṇārtham=vidīyate / 9 // 85)

Kanakakokanadodaravishpurad-
ciradipacikhākṛtatāmasah /
Çiçiraraçmirucapavarānvayaḥ
sakalahādaya[19] / 89) //
pravarasamvaravarvarāṅganāḥ /

Harati kāmijanasya samantataḥ // 13 //
Satatagurjaradeçasamāgatais=
sugatabhaktibharapraṇataij[20] / 86)

Kvacid=asaṅkhyacikhāmaṇibhuṣaṇāḥ
praṇayinīprakaṭīkṛtamantathāḥ /
Sugatavimvavilokanānirjita-
smaraçcarākuçalāḥ ça[21] / 91) //

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.

85) The reading is rather uncertain.
87) The completion is uncertain, but a word meaning 'women' seems to be required by the context.
89) For a conjectural reconstitution, cf. the translation.
90) If the ligature tkri is correctly transcribed, the preceding aksara 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.
Vahunamahahātimirāvṛto
    jinavad=astinirodha[22]  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( ^{91} \)  \\
\( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \\
\( \text{dru} \text{tavilambisādhana} \text{vanditaḥ} \)  \( ^{92} \)  // 17 //
Samśārāvanicarataṁ=na dharma\( t \) 'nya-
    jantuṅāṁ=varačaraṇaṁ tričammadhīraṁ /
Koṣo 'śāv=itarakṛto 'pi pālanīya- \( ^{83} \)
    [23]  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( \sim \)  \( ^{<p} \text{praharṣaniyāḥ} > \)  \( ^{94} \)  // 18 //
Kṛtvemāṁ çaçadharavimvaçuddham=āpam=
    yat=puṇyam=bhajatu jano jinakramasya /
Asmān=raṅgā varanarādhirājarāja \( ^{85} \)
    ċṛṣṭikleḍām=api janā na rāgabaddhāḥ // 19 //

\( ^{91} \) Pāda \( b \) might be completed to jinavad=astinirodha\( (m=\text{avāpṇu}\text{yāt}) \). Here the context
requires a verbal form, preferably in the optative, for the opposition between tīmira
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 \( e \) of strophe 10 there would not be 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 pālanīya; 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 \( d \),
that is either a dental or a palatal sibilant (words beginning in a lingual are extremely
rare). Pāda \( d \) ought then to begin with a \( s \), \( t \), \( c \), \( t \), \( m \) or \( c \); 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 praharṣaṇi or praharṣaṇi 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 \( c \), 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; \( \text{cf. the Old-Javanese} \ Wtta-Saścaya, 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 (saesing ranrya mamuhara praharṣaṇi tvas). 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 praharṣaniyāḥ. Since such feelings as joy do not properly flatter a Buddhist
practising vairāgya, we need some explanation here. Probably, praharṣaniyā was pre-
ceded by apī 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.
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 adored with the equipment of Dharma.

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. Saṃbhāra 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.; Dharmasamgaha, No. CXVII, edition in Anecd. Oxon., Vol. I, Part V, p. 29. The sambhāra concept is also known from Hinayāna, but the terminology seems less systematic. Cf. Abhidh. Koça, VII, p. 82, the compound sarva-vajñānasambhārābhyāsa, 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 (gunas) 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: mahāsamudāgamanam ca jñātva kuḍalamūlasambhāraṃ ca cetopraṇidhānan jñātva, where kuḍalamūlasambhāra comes very near to puṇyasambhāra; cf. also op. cit., II, p. 286, lines 6 sq.: balavāṃ bhavati samādhi saṃbhārato puṇyānāṃ, „the meditation becomes more powerful owing to the accumulation of good acts” (a very similar expression ibid., II, p. 417, line 19: balavāṃ bhavati samādhi saṃbhāravatāṃ sapuṇyavatām). The Abhidharma-koṣa states that all the Buddhas are equal in as far as they all have accumulated merits and wisdom (VII, pp. 80 sq.: pūrvapuṇyasajñāna- saṃbhārasaṃudāgamenatas). 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 Bodhicaryavatāra, viz. IX, 168 d: puṇyasambhāram ādārit (ed. by De la Vallée Poussin in Bibl. Ind., 1901-14, p. 603). The Pañjikā (ibid., p. 604, lines 6 sq.) explains: evam upacitaḥ puṇyasaṃbhāro 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 puṇyasaṃbhāra based on the comprehension of the Čuṇyatā, which is the essence of jñānasambhāra. The latter quotation is especially interesting because it proves that even in the highest summits of Buddhism the underlying idea of accumulating puṇya (the term upacita used by Prajñākaramati to explain saṃbhāra 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 karmas 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 svasaṃbhogakāya of — 197 —

Translation

Translation
2. ...... passionless, going on the best vehicle\(^{99}\).

3. ...... from the contact with the Four Sugatas\(^{100}\); 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 Pousin’s translation): „svaṣam-
bhōgakāya. — C’est d’infinies réelles (bhūta) qualités (guna), créées (nirvartita) par l’accumulation d’un mérite et d’un savoir (puruṣajñānasaṃbhāra) cultivés pendant trois Assamkhyeyakalpas; un corps matériel (rūpakāya) parfait (muni des marques et sous-
marques) ......”. Cf. also op. cit., II, 727, where De la Vallée Pousin mentions some forms of saṃbhāra occurring in the Abhisamayālaṃkāra. As a matter of fact, the Āl-kā 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 deyā and ending in dhāraṇi (dayām āraṇhya dhāraṇiparyantena). 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. Dhammadharma, the term used in our text, is less usual; it is probably used to comprise both punya and jīvāna into a single compound; our only reference is the Bodhisattvapitaka, quoted in the Čikṣāsamuccaya, edition by Bendall, pp. 190 sqq., especially p. 191, line 4, the term dharmasamabhārayogaḥ (sa evāya jīvaṃsaṃbhārāḥ bhavati); cf. the terms dharmapāra-
bhārata and dharmaṃpravanyātā. Finally, we refer the reader to Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 161, where the compound bhūmisamabhāra, presumably the original name of the Barabuṭṭa 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 Bochi and which gives him the strength to continue. According to the Siddhi, this ‘something’ is not lost after the arrival, but in the āgṛaparājyātti it develops into the transcendent gunaś of the Saṃbhogaśākāya which manifest themselves in the Mahāyānaśaṇḍhas.

\(^{99}\) Only the last pāda, nīrajān. avarāṇagān, is legible. Varnyāna is, of course, the Mahāyāna or Bodhisattvayāna, in contrast to the lesser yānas of Črāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas; sometimes, more yānas are mentioned, e.g. in the Mahāvīryupatti, edition by Minayev and Mironov, p. 20, sub 59, 1-6: mahāyānam, pratyekabuddhayānam, črāva-
kayānam, nījayānam, prīdejīKayānam and ekayānam (for the latter term cf. Ober-
miller quoting Haribhadra’s Abhisamayālaṃkāroloka in Acta Orient., XI, 1932, pp. 29 sq., note 1; ekayāna represents the three main yānas conceived of as a unity); varnāyanagān means the same as bodhisattvan. Nīrajān, to be analyzed as nī-rajān (= nīrajāskān), not as nī-rajān (although there might be a pun), may well apply to Bodhisattvas who live in the world without being attached to it.

\(^{100}\) Catuḥṣaṅgaśaṅgataḥ, „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. Satāgataḥ could also be interpreted as saṃghataḥ, „having joined”, but this seems less likely: we expect a term which explains why the statue left the lofty realms on fall on earth; we understand that the Bodhisattva follows the example of Vipaṣyin and the others, who obtained Bodhi on earth. We do not think it probable that catuḥṣaṅga 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.

\(^{101}\) Prāśādabhusamabhṛṣṭaḥ is analyzed as prāśādam abhūtana saṃbhṛṣṭaḥ. Compounds of the type abhūta-saṃbhṛṣṭaḥ are perfectly normal; cf. Speyer, Syntax, p. 160, § 217, sub 8, and Wackernagel, Altind. Gramm., II, 1, p. 66, § 27 a. Also prāśādassambṛṣṭa,
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).

102) Only the words bhūbhṛd=iva are legible at the beginning of the strophe.
103) The words vodhim=esātī may be considered a definite proof that the strophe described is that of a Bodhisattva, not of a Buddha. Since the strophes from 1 to 10, all composed in the same Anuśṭubh metre, seem to give a description of only one statue, we may conclude that also strophe 1 relates to a Bodhisattva image. The use of the future esātī 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. Vīrāṇa is a synonym of cānta, one of the common attributes of Nirvāṇa. As a matter of fact, cānta is considered one of the four aspects of Nirodhasatvā; cf. Abhidh. Koça, De la Vallée Pousin's translation, VII, pp. 31 sqq. (where a number of explanations of the four ākāras of Nirodhasatvā are given); Mahāyānap., 54, No. 11 on p. 19 of the edition by M'naiev-Mironov; Dharmasatvāgama, edition by Kasawara, Mueller and Wenzel in *Ox., 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 Pousin, Siddhi, II, p. 676: „Le Nirvāṇa des Buddhás n'est pas distinct de la Boči; c'est la Tathatā plus les quatre savoirs; c'est dans la réalisation d': Dharmakāya et par l'intelligence parfaite de la Tathatā, la paix absolue et l'éternelle activité: telles de Brahma ou de Kṣāṇa". The Nirvāṇa of Črāvakas and Pratyekakas 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 esātī 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 Tjānḍi Plaośan. 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. Buddhautānvītāḥ, „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 Sāṃsāra) 108), descend,

---

106) Analpajarnnopajita vicyavaranavarananah. — The use of upajitya, "having vanquished", seems to be connected with the bhūmi conception of the Bodhisattva career; 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, parigāhyā); the Path leading to Buddha-hood is, in fact, a continuous struggle with the foes that are the kīcchas (Bodhicaryāv., VI, 19 c: sarvāraṃ hi saha kīcchāḥ) and the Bodhisattvas are victorious heroes (op. cit., VI, 20 c: tē te vijayireṇa cārīh); 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 jetaṃ yāyam idaṃ yey na kena cīt); he strives after a victory over the triple world (trailokyaviyijātavṛt, Bodhicaryāv., VII, 54 c; viṣājī 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 analpajarnnopajita would be: "having victoriously passed through a large number of existences". In each life, the Bodhisattva struggles against the "walls" (ārāma) which surround the "threshold of Illumination" (bodhipura), viz. the thick walls of passion (kīcchāvaraṇa) and the subtle veils of ignorance as to the real nature of everything (jīvayāvaraṇa). The latter are even more dangerous since the "eye of wisdom" (prajñācakṣu) uninformed 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" (eso gajasatrasāro, 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: prasīyate sa gajasatrasāram, "she (i.e. Māya) will bring forth (a child) which is 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" (madanabalavegāpanavanām, Mahāvastu, I, p. 210 line 6).

107) Only piḍa d, dhukhaçananaçasanah, is legible. With the compound, cf. sarvadukha-praçantikṛ, Bodhicaryāv., III, 6 d. The epithet expresses the very essence of the doctrine; the Mārga, after all, is the dhūkhānirdhahājāminī pratipat, to use the technical term (Mahāvyutt. 64, No. 6, and paśinī).

108) Gahanapāraçasārtham is clearly based upon the well-known comparison of the Sāṃsāra with the ocean with its unfathomable depths in which the helpless creatures risk to be drowned. These depths are the wrong views (cf. drṣṭigahanaṁ, Mahāvyutt., 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 Čloka \(^{112}\), 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 radiant 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 Sahasāra-padmā (cf. the Introduction).

\(^{111}\) Uncertain translation, which is based upon the completion of pāda d to: rakṣanārtham vidiyate.

\(^{112}\) The word anuṣṭubhi is used to mark the strophes 1 to 10 as Anuṣṭubha. Tātpurāvāṃ, here translated by „adequate“, literally means „as propitious as that“ (statue). The poet wants to stress that the above strophies are only a poor attempt at describing the marvellous statue.

\(^{113}\) Ratnatrayaśeyopetan, „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 Kāuraka 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 kirtitāmbha (atra buddhaḥ = ca dharmaḥ = ca saṅghaḥ = ca antaragatāḥ sāhitāḥ). Bosch (art. cit., pp. 41 sq.) suggests this should be taken to mean that formulae of the Triratna divinities were inscribed in a cavity within the Mañjuśrī image. In this case, one would think of a small gold plate in which the carana-gamana formula was inscribed. But Bosch does not exclude the possibility that the Mañjuśrī was placed in a real sanctuary dedicated to the Triratna, viz. T’jaṇḍi Lumbong (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 koṣa 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 Tathāgatatānavas (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 “anvayāḥ” 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 cīkhā 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 cīkhā 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. Khādyā is often used to denote food, also in Buddhist texts; cf., for instance, Bodhicsaryāvatāra, II, 16 c, where it is contrasted with bhojya and peya. According to the Pañjikā (edition by De la Valièse Poussin, p. 53, lines 17 sq.), bhojya food needs only be put into the mouth (yan mukham āpūrya bhājye), whereas khādyā has first to be cut into pieces (kavadaçag chedyā), e.g. ghetapāra, a kind of sweetmeat. In the Bodhis. 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 control and let their presents drop. One might perhaps complete the last pāda to: sakalakhādyā<..<m= apāstavad bhūtāle> 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-vāra-varā) and therefore not exactly clear. Vāraṅgaṇā usually denotes garunikās, but this is not necessarily the case. Anyhow, we have some love scene here; cf. note 119.

119) Kāmiṇās 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-, ustaw., 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 sthāṇāntaraṁ gātvā, and anyatamasya rājīvo vinayāntaram 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 mārga 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 -niraja; 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 Gujar, although there is at least a great chance that it does (cf. the Introduction).
bowed by the burden of devotion to the Buddhas\textsuperscript{121}, …… a Jina temple is worshipped\textsuperscript{122}).

15. Somewhere\textsuperscript{123}, a number of (young men) adorned with innumerable crown pearls\textsuperscript{124} had just revealed their love to their beloved ones, (but) ……\textsuperscript{125} (from ?) the arrows of Love, which lost their power\textsuperscript{126} when they saw a Jina image, they ……\textsuperscript{127}.

16. ……, from whose eyes all anger about other, wrong views is gone\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{129}, obtain the cessation of (worldly) existence (and become) like a Jina\textsuperscript{130}; ………, praised by hymns which run

\begin{flushright}
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, \textit{Inleiding\textsuperscript{,} II, p. 11 sq.). Krom conjecturally proposed to consider the two figures as the heads of the Buddhist and Čaiva 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.

\textsuperscript{121} We already noted in the Introduction that this might be an example of utprekṣa; the gurus are represented as people slightly bowed by the burden of old age, but the poet attributes the bowedness to their bhakti.

\textsuperscript{122} For the forms of worship implied by satkāra, cf. note 53 to the Introduction.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{124} If one presumes that the word had already been used before, one might translate "elsewhere".

\textsuperscript{125} Cākhāmāni corresponds to the more usual cūdāmāni in meaning; the young men are of a very high rank, probably princes.

\textsuperscript{126} In the lacuna, we expect something like "not influenced by"; cf. the notes which follow.

\textsuperscript{127} The conjectural reading smaraçārākkuçalāḥ cannot be quite correct; the end of the compound is not clear on the stone. One might suggest to correct the compound to smaraçārāvijñārīkē, which would not be impossible from a palaeographic point of view; avicāra could perhaps be interpreted as "not torn asunder" (from the root vr), although vijñāra 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.

\textsuperscript{128} The four missing syllables at the end of strophe 15 after ca- could be completed to ca-\textsuperscript{<renāgaśalāh>}, "came to seek Refuge".

\textsuperscript{129} Drṣṭī, in Buddhism, always denotes the wrong views, usually analyzed into the pañca dṛṣṭāyāh (mithyādṛṣṭī, etc.); here again, antara is pleonastically used, for the Buddha's views could not be denoted by dṛṣṭī.

\textsuperscript{130} 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.

\textsuperscript{130} Astinireodha 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, visamyoṣagāphala); cf. especially Abhidh. Koça, II, p. 276, where nirodha is considered the fruit of the Mārga. During the last part of the Mārga (termed viśuṣṭi-mārga in Abhidh. Koça, VI, p. 234), „l'ascète prend possession (prāpti) de la disconnexion” (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 koça, although less common than koṣa, 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 -sa. For the different meanings of the word, cf. Pet. Dext., II, p. 450; the fundamental meaning seems to be anything which envelops and protects something precious; the secondary meanings such as „treasury”, „envelope of a womb”, etc. are based upon the fundamental concept. Cf. the expressions such as brahmakoṣa (= hṛdaya) and hṛdayaṃ jivakoṣam pañcātmakam, „the heart is the place where the principle of life, comprising the five ātmas, is hidden”, brahmakoṣa, kṣitraḥ sarvabhūtānāṁ 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 gūrṇāṇāṁ koṣam 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 inscription 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) Sanskrāvāna-caratām, 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 adharmena and qualifies caratām. For the use of the suffix, cf. nyāyataḥ-cāasti rájyaṃ in the last strophe but one of the Tjāngal 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” (cāraṇāgamaṇa) 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.
The words _itarakṛto_ 'pi pālaniya(h)', 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 _koṣa_ 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 _hiṅga_ 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 Tjandi 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 Indonesia, 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.

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. _Prahaṛṣṇa-vah_ „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 _praḥaṛṣṇa-vah_, 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
The words in (195), corrected based on Pras. I. Prat. I. 1. 

We, inclined to the other interpretation preceding "Nala", occurring somewhere else and in examples is given by constructing the term by constructing. May the place be denoted. Of the use of the term in the introduction, of the device of the compound as a "cause of joy", even to those whose mind is directed towards wisdom". The phrase at the beginning constitutes the end of pálaṇiya in pāda c (cf. note 94 above). For the compound prajñāmati (= yasya prajñāyān matiḥ), cf. such compounds as prajñāmatan and Prājakarāmati, the name of the well-known commentator on Čāntideva’s Bodhicharyavatāra. At least in Buddhist Sanskrit, compounds ending in -mati mean: “having the mind directed towards”; cf., e.g., dhāraṇīmatār nāma samādhīn, Mahāvyut., 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 Čikṣās, kārikā No. 2, 3rd and 4th pādas: śraddhāmālaṃ dyāhikṛtya bodhaṃ kāryā matiḥ dyāhā (Bendall’s edition, p. 2, line 14; his translation in the Introduction, p. XXXIX).

Imāṃ, viz. Lośam, the term used in the preceding strophe (18 c). The compound caṇḍharaviṃcaṇdham (read: “bimba”), a karmadhāra of the type unānādru, “soft as wool” (Whitney, § 1291 a), may refer to either imāṃ or punyam in pāda b. We construct: yat punyam āpam kṛtvemaṇ caṇḍharabiṃcaṇḍham (tena punyena) janā bhajatu jinak āmasya. No other examples of the 1st person auriṣṭ āpam are known to occur, but āpaḥ, āpat and āpan are known according to the Pet. Dict., s.v. āpaḥ, Bhaṣjati (or: “te” with the genitive in the meaning „to partake of” is arcaic 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 ṛahṣa dyāṣṭikkleṣaṃ is not completely satisfactory; “kleṣad could have been the more regular construction. The interpretation may however be defended on account of the use of the 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 vyākṣam pakvaṃ phalaṃ dhāmuḥ, „shake ripe fruit from the tree”, and jītvā rājyaṃ nālaṃ, „having won the kingdom from Nala”, quoted there.

The words api janā na rāgahadhāḥ (viz. bhavayuh) 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 it not 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 (PURBALINGGA, CENTRAL JAVA)

The gold plate to be discussed hereafter was discovered in the collection Tan Oen Dji at Bukatedja in the regency Purbalingga of the residency Banjumas 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 cāmarā in his front left hand, a trīcūla in his front right hand, an ākṣamālā in his back left hand and a kuṇāḍi in his back right hand. These attributes are sufficient to define the figure as a Viṣṇu 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 trīcūla, but is not quite identical with the latter. Immediately to the right of the trīcūla, a short inscription is engraved the ākṣaras 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 ākṣara, 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 ākṣara 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 Karangtēṇah (824 A.D.) and Gaṅḍasuli (832 A.D.?) inscriptions.

Another interesting detail is the form of the ia. In the older type of Old Javanese script (from the Dinaya inscription on), the vertical part of the ia has a clear crack about in the middle; this feature distinguishes the ia from the da, with which it would be perfectly identical without the crack 3). Ninth century inscriptions which give the same form of the ia are those from Kuburan Tjaṇḍi (821 A.D.), Naingulan (822 A.D.) 4), Karangtēṇah 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 ākṣara, 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 ākṣara.
3) This is probably the reason why the da gets a crack in the lower horizontal part in later times, whereas the ia gets a similar crack in the upper horizontal part.
Gandāsuli 5). Already in inscriptions dated 842 6) and 850 A.D. 7), the vertical part of the ʰa 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 payangān //

The only aṅśa 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 aṅśa could be considered, the peculiar form of the ha would presumably 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 deha 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 deha is normal before the suffix 8), but we prefer a different explanation. Pa-ṭeha, followed by -nda, does not seem satisfactory. We prefer the interpretation of paḍehānda as paḍehān (i.e. deha with the affixes pa- and -an), "the place

5) Pras. Indon., I. pp. 73 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 Çrivijaya inscriptions dated the ʰod 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, kalvānanaṇita, cintāmnī, iyeṣṭha, dydha, etc.; cf. the Index by Čodēs, E.E.F.E.O., 30, 1930, pp. 66-80), there only remain the prefix da (in daṇpaṭa) and the suffix -nda. In other cases where one would have expected a lingual a dental is used daṇḍ hyang, cf. Old Javanese daṇḍ hyang; cf. also daṇ in the fragments: supra, No. I, inscription a, line 20, p. 6; daṭaṁ, Old Javanese: daṭan̄j; kaḍatuaṇ, Old Javanese: kaḍatuaṇ or kaḍatuaṇ). The latter examples would make it doubtful whether there existed two series in the Çrivijaya 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 'thologie' in French would not prove the existence of aspirates). The spellings de-a- and -(o)da, the only real examples, could be due to other reasons than the pronunciation 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 Susuhumans of the Surakarta court in Java are spelt by consonants that would represent Phakhubhuwuṇa if the consonants had their etymological value. We therefore think that the linguals in the honorific affixes da- and -(o)da are due to similar considerations. If our inscription writes -nda instead of -nda, this does not prove a difference in language, but rather a difference in spelling practice.

8) Cf. Čodēs, 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 pādehānda 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 pādehāna means "the place where the material remains (especially čarīra, a synonym of deka 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 pādehānda 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. On account of the above arguments, we translate the text by "These (presumably the deposit of bhasma) are the corporeal remains of Höwyang (title) Payangnān (name)".

---

10) O. J. O. XXXI, A -33, where the correct reading is: mamrāti hawang wicaksana; O. J. O. XXXVIII, B-4/5: mamrāti hawang wicaksana (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 Gandašuli (unfortunately lost; cf. Brandes' transcription as O. J. O. III; Krom, Geschiedenis, 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, puhawang is found in the list of state servants of Črīvijaya (cf. supra, p. 20); finally, we note the occurrence of the term in the Old Javanese Harivāna (edition by A. Tewu, 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 Payangnān, which sounds, or rather, looks strange. This impression is mainly due to the spelling by a double ṇ and a long ṇ. Possibly, the name is a corruption from pariṣvayāna, with which it seems rather similar in sound. In the inscription of Kuburan Tjaoṇi (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., 1, 1950, pp. 126-129) we read the village name Kayyānān 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 Gañḍasuli 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. Influence from Çrīvijaya cannot be excluded, but seems hardly probable in view of the pronounced Čaivism found in all these Old Malay texts from Central Java. There is an inscription in Old Malay from Kêbon Kopi (Western Java); there, the use of Old Malay is probably due to influence from Çrīvijaya, 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. The situation in the Malay Peninsula and the neighbouring island groups is not clear in this period; Çaiva centres may have remained there.

The mention of a merchant group having their own temple in the Perot inscription 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. 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 kahyānī. The combination y may have been pronounced y in common language from early times; cf. also the form kayaṇā in one of the Sukuh inscriptions, M. Jauuses, T.B.G., 62 (1923), pp. 599 sq. Doubling of a final consonant before the suffix -an is common; in Javanese writing, this custom is even preserved up to now.

17) Cf. the conjectural explanations quoted or suggested by Krom, Geschiedenis, p. 155.
18) As to the Gañḍasuli inscription published in Pras. Indon., I (1950), No. IV, Čaivism is beyond doubt and the same is true for this text. Also the Gañḍasuli 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 Čaiva, although there is no definite proof.

19) Published by Bosch, Bijdr. K.I., 100 (1941), pp. 41 sqq. The Kêbon 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 Kêbon 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, Geschiedenis, p. 308), but his informations about Çrīvijaya are based on sources before 1176, the date of the Ling wai tai ta by Chou K'u-t'ai. Cf. Coedes, Bijdr. K.I., 83 (1927), p. 469.

20) This was the explanation suggested by Rouffaer as one of the possibilities in Bijdr. K.I., 74 (1918), p. 142, but refuted by Krom, Geschiedenis, p. 155.
21) 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).
22) Cf. intra, No. IX, the end of the Introduction.
the decline of Çaileendra 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 Témaṅgung, residency Kédu); as early as 1819, the two stone inscriptions were transported to Magelang'). 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 of preservation on the

---

19) Settlements of foreign merchants keeping their own forms of organization have been a common feature in Indonesian society; cf. especially J. C. van Leur, Eeneige beschouwingen betreffende den ouden Aziatische 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, Geschiedenis 2, p. 304; Nilakanta Sastrı, 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 Airlahga (first half of the 11th century); cf. Krom, Geschiedenis, p. 264 sqq. 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) troops were involved in 17th century Mataram (Madurese under Trunajaya, Macassarese under Kraēng 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.


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 (patēn 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 pēpēt (ē, 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 upadhmāniya in South Indian script, came into common use, but

---

5) Brandes (Catal. Groeneweldt, p. 374) and Krom (Geschiedenis, 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 Čī 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 Javanees 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 ē should be considered an
till recent times it was not used in all the cases where \( \dot{e} \) should have expected 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 \( \dot{e} \) 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 \( \dot{e} \) 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 combined into a ligature (cf. \( \dot{w}l\)ka for \( \dot{w}\l\)ka in \( \dot{a} \) 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 \( a \) (\( k\)ambang or \( k\)amwang for \( k\)\(\dot{e}\)mbang), but no certain example is found in these inscriptions. An \( \dot{e} \) in the last syllable is usually written as an \( a \); it is obvious that it would be impossible to end the word in a consonantal ligature \(^{10}\). We therefore find forms such as \( m\)anap\(\dot{e} \)l (b 16), which probably represents \( m\)anap\(\dot{e} \)l. \(^{11}\) 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 \( s\)\(\dot{e}\)\(\dot{n}\)g (b 18, probably representing \( s\)\(\dot{e}\)\(\dot{d}\)\(\dot{e}\)\(n\)g); a similar combination

\( ^{10} \) 'undetermined' vowel in Old Javanese, too. The main arguments to consider the \( \dot{e} \) 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 \( \dot{e}\)\(h\) are rather common (Old Javanese \( s\)\(\dot{e}\)\(\dot{g}\)\(\dot{h}\) corresponding to \( s\)\(\dot{u}\)\(j\)\(\dot{a}\)h in Modern Javanese) and so are those ending in \( \dot{e} \) (with usual lengthening of the final vowel, i.e. \( \dot{e} \) in our transcriptions): the \( \dot{e} \) may also occur as the first vowel in words of the scheme CVVC (Old Javanese \( w\)\(\dot{e}\)\(s\) corresponding to \( w\)\(\dot{e}\) in the modern language). We have, of course, no means to ascertain whether the mechanism of vowel variants existed in Old Javanese. The \( \dot{e} \) is written long (by the adition of a \( d\)a\(d\)a) 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 \( \dot{e} \) 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 \( m\)\(n\)\(a\)\(\dot{e}\)ng (for \( m\)\(n\)\(a\)\(\dot{e}\)\(n\)g) 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 (\( m\)\(n\)\(a\)\(\dot{e}\)\(\dot{e}\)ng, etc.). Presumably as a consequence of normalizing tendencies in orthography, the use of the special vowel mark for \( \dot{e} \) gradually increases in the course of centuries, but spellings such as \( t\)\(k\)a instead of \( t\)\(\dot{a}\)ka are occasionally found in rather modern Javanese writing.

\( ^{9} \) Viz., in \( m\)\(a\)\(s\)\(a\) (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 \( \dot{e} \) 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 \( \dot{e} \); ligatures such as \( t\)\(\dot{a}\)\(s\), impossible in Sanskrit, frequently occur in Old Javanese inscriptions.

\( ^{11} \) Possibly even \( m\)\(n\)\(a\)\(\dot{e}\)\(\dot{e}\)l. As a matter of fact, the first \( \dot{e} \) is not usually expressed in writing neither in Old nor in Modern Javanese.
of the second and third modes of orthography occurs in mapakan (b 24, probably representing mapékén). If we see that these cases are easily explained by the difficulties arising from the expression of the ē, we have no reason whatever to assume that an a would have been pronounced in Old Javanese in these cases
d.

There is one more method of expressing an ē 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. tangṅaḥ in b 25, which undoubtedly represents tēṅaḥ. It is difficult to give a correct explanation of this spelling. Phonetically, there exists no consonantal gination in Javanese and we have no reason to assume that Old Javanese would have been different in this respect. Clusters, on the other hand, are rather frequent between the two vowels of a disyllabic base. 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 ē. From a historical point of view, we observe that the a of Sanskrit words usually developed into an ē in these cases; the Sanskrit words bhakti, čakti, pakṣin, sākṣin, mārga, varṇa, satya became bēkti, sēkti, pēksi, sēksi, mērga, vērna, sētya

---

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 Kaka, Kusumavicitra (1929), p. 4, that the 'long pēpēt' (represented by ō 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 pēšēn 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 ē in these cases. For the long vowels in writing, a question which is far more complicated, cf. the discussion below.

13) The aksara ṇa 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 satya, often spelt sangka, either spelling occurs but the former is more frequent on the whole. Examples of a final guttural nasal expressed by ṇa 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 tīnaḥ or tangṅaḥ; cf. also infra, note 47.

15) Cf. the description of these types in Modern Javanese by Uhlenbeck, op. cit., chapter IV sub C, pp. 140-181.

16) Excluding, of course, the combinations of a mute preceded by a homorganic nasal, where no such preference is noted. The preference for ē is pronounced if the combination consists of a mute and I or r (Uhlenbeck, p. 157) or of a number of less common combinations (op. cit., p. 161).
in Javanese\textsuperscript{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 è pronunciation 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\textsuperscript{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. saruwa (b 6), parwuwuwus (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. damilikhan, b 11/12, wlahkan, 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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{20}); cf. çakaward-sâtita (b 1), tatkâla (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 tuhán (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 ṛṛy=umāñnya (b 3), sy=ulihan

\textsuperscript{17}) Often, the forms with an a in the first syllable still occur in Javanese, but they are less common. Uhlenbeck \textit{(op. cit., p. 169)} rightly considers the forms with an è the more adapted ones.

\textsuperscript{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 na) as the so-called akṣara gedé in Modern Javanese writing. The form of the na, for instance, expressing a superfluous sound in the modern language, could be used as a polite equivalent of the na.

\textsuperscript{19}) Cf. Coedès, \textit{B.E.F.O.O.,} XXX (1930), p. 62, who compares jāhat and marjahâti, dātu and daṭhā. In classical Malay, the accentuated syllable is denoted by the addition of an alit, yâ or wâw.

\textsuperscript{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=şema (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 manukā (b 4), tuṅgū (b 5), manū (b 7), wadvā (b 10), manāt (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). Wadvā 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 (r 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“ (mahāgam khaṇ), i.e. charged with a definite function, e.g. with the supervision over the bridges in the village (hulu wulan), and (b) those „taking rest“ (amaratā), i.e., probably, those who were formerly charged with a definite function, but retired afterwards. Cf. infra, notes 74 sqq. The tuha wanan, „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 aksaras by those which originally denoted aspirates 26). Now it is remarkable that the inscriptions of Tjandi 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 āsāḍhamāsa for āśāṇḍhamāsa (b 2), dvitiyā for dvitiyā (ibid.), suklapakṣa for guklapakṣa (b 3), jūvana for jivana (a 12), and many other examples may be added. A curious spelling, already noticed by Damais 28), is manusūk=ṣema in b 4, whereas the corresponding place a 5 gives the correct spelling manusuk sima 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 (a, pui, sang), words associated with the Divine are preceded by sang hyaṅg (sang hyaṅ dharma may be rendered by „the Temple”, sang hyaṅ bajj praṇasti by „the Royal Edict”).

26) We mean the so-called aksara gōde in Javanese writing, commonly denoted by „capitals”; cf. note 18 above. The comparison with capita’s in European writing is not exact; their use is only honorific (which is one of the aspects of European capitals) and moreover, the aksara gōde 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 sima, but the final a is usually written short in Old Javanese. There is a curious little problem whether the spelling sima, sometimes found in Old Javanese records, represents the etymologically correct spelling or the so-called ‘conjunctive’, i.e. sima followed by the suffix -e. Often, the latter appears to be required by the context, but we do not want to make this an absolute rule.


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 (kwañ — kwañ, wañ — wañ, 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 kaiwala and the name kaisava instead of koçava mentioned above).

32) As to our manusuk=pensa, 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. Çri Mahārāja. The curious point is that not only the title is short and simple, but the king is even

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.
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 aksaras are visible after line 20. The size of the two stones is almost equal.
39) This is the translation of sīmā 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 Çri 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 Pędém 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 Javanesse hierarchy to presume that the supreme king should have been mentioned after the founder Rakai Patapān unless the latter was considered higher in rank\(^\text{41}\)). 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\(^\text{42}\)). An attempt at explaining the relation between the two authorities in the Perot inscription cannot be based on this text alone. Several explanations might be suggested, but there is one which is particularly attractive although it is not capable of real proof. The title Rakai Patapān is known to have belonged to the king who preceded Rakai Pikatan\(^\text{43}\)); could it be that the Rakai Patapān in the Perot inscription is nobody else but the preceding 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\(^\text{44}\), 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 para-

\(^\text{41}\) The wording of the Perot inscriptions seems to indicate that the Rakai Patapān acts entirely on his own responsibility, whereas the king, patih and the other dignitaries are only the executors of the former's intention. Krom (Geschiedenis\(^2\), p. 156, note 6), referring to the Perot inscription (the year 853 is based on Brandes' reading of the th.id 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 (Cat. Grozneveldt, 1887, p. 374).

\(^\text{42}\) 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 (tattāla) or on this day (iti diwasa), the "order" (kijā) or the "favour" (anugraha) "descends" (tumurun) on a number of high dignitaries, from whom it "goes down" (uminggor) to a number of lower dignitaries 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 Sinjōk, 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 dāng acārya), 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.


\(^\text{44}\) As a matter of principle, this possibility could not be completely excluded in view of the conclusions by Stutterheim on the identity of king Wagywar (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 pātiḥ, who bears the title Rakai Wēka and the name Pu Puluwatu. The titles of the other dignitaries are Sirikan, Tiruan, Maṅahvri, Halaran, Palarhyang, Wēlahan, Dalinan, Pangkur, Tawān, Tirip, Lampi, Wadihati and Makudur. All these titles are known from other inscriptions. Not only Wēka, but also Sirikan, Manghūri 46), Halaran, Palarhyang, Wēlahan and Dalinan are usually preceded by Rakai, whereas Tiruan, Wadihati and Makudur are always preceded by the term Pamegēt 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 Čaṅka for the Pāṇḍiṅga 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. Maṅahvri became the designation for the „court historian", as one might term it, at the court of the 17th century Gālāgāl (cf. Berg, De Middeljavaansche historische traditie, 1927, pp. 42 sqq.).

47) Old Javanese—charter—spells this term in many different ways, viz. pāngat, pāngāt, pāmāgat, pamāgat and the same forms with an initial sa (samāgat, samāglī, 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 paimāgat etc.; we follow his example (art. cit., note 1 to p. 243) in reproducing the title in the form sang pamegēt 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 ē in the last syllable if this vowel was an a. Cf. the above discussion of the different spellings of the ē.

48) In a few cases, the term tawān is replaced by hadānān; 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, Geschiedenis, p. 135; Van Naerssen, Indis Antiquis, 1947, p. 250; Pras. Indon., I, 1950, p. 15. In strope 4 of the Kalasan inscription, they are called ādecastraṇa of the king (paṅkurtavāṇaṣṭiripanāmabhir ādecastraṇih rājāh), whereas they are denoted by decaḍhyakṣa and maḥāpuruṣa in strope 7 (śākṣinaḥ kṛtvā paṅkurtavāṇaṣṭiripadecaḍhyakṣaḥ maḥāpuruṣaḥ). The exact meaning of these terms is open to doubt. Bosch (T.B.G., 68, 1928, p. 61) translated decaḍhyakṣaḥ maḥāpuruṣa by „de notabele dorpsheerden" (the notable village chiefs), the translation which was adopted by Vogel, Aanteekeningen op de inscriptie van Tjāntgāl in Midden-Java, Bijdr. K.I., 100 (1941), note 2 to p. 444, and by van Naerssen, art. cit., p. 250: „the Javanese pangkur, tawān and tirip and the 'notable desa-heads' ... the rājas 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 Makudur⁴⁹). 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 Welahan, not occurring in the Argapura inscriptions; on the other hand, the

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 (Ms. Dja., 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] ..... retu tavaha rakayayan kayaaway [7] pu lokapala. patih rakahayan wka pu manut. sirika[8]nu pu bahā. halaran pu wiwya. pāṅgilhyang pu tarangal. tiraus[9]nu pu sa̤pī. sikhailan pu lamuliang. maunhuri pu agrih. dali[10]nan pu gṅag. paṅkur pu brahmā. tawān pācung. tiri̧pu pu mamanu[11]k. wadihati pu manū. makudupu ma̤ṇi̤pti. lampi pu dhane[12]nu ///. — We add that the reading sikhailan, 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. A minor difference is the title Palarhyang, which is replaced by Paṅgilhyang 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. 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 Wēka; Patih Rakai Wēka;
2. Sirikan; Sirikan;
3. Tiruan; Halaran;
4. Manghūri; Paṅgilhyang;
5. Halaran; Tiruan;
6. Palarhyang; Sikhalān;
7. Wēlahan; 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

It is not a question of the title Patih Rakai Wēka being replaced by Patih Rakai Wēka; Sirikan; Halaran; Paṅgilhyang; Tiruan; Sikhalān; Manghūri; Dalinan; Pangkur; Tawān; Tirip; Wadihati; 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 ha, occurs in line 2 of the Pĕndĕm inscription; cf. Damais, T.B.G., 83 (1949), p. 19.

51) The meanings of paṅgil and palar are, at least, closely related, the former meaning "to call", the latter "to look for, to hope". Paṅgil (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 Pamēgĕt titles are originally toponyms; their use as toponyms (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 dig-
nitary 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 doc-
ments. 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 pathik. In either case, this group of eight begins with the Rakais
Wēka and Sirikan and ends in Dalinan. It is impossible to decide whether
this is only due to chance or to the fact that Wēka 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 Kēdu inscription dated 907 A.D. 52), the Wēka is mentioned
after instead of before the Sirikan and the Dalinan precedes instead of fol-
low the Manghūri. Only a very detailed comparison, which would consti-
tute 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 Kayuwañi in the Arghapura
inscriptions), form three groups composed of eight, three and three digni-
taries respectively. The group of eight is the highest one; it is headed by
the pathik. They probably surround the king as the eight Lokapālas do with
reference to Civa, a symbolism found in hinduistic 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
54) The fact of this trad being regularly mentioned at the beginning of the lists of those
forbidden to tread on temple grounds (cf. gupra, 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 56).

The list of these dignitaries is followed by another list of people all included in the term waduvā (a 9 to 14; b 9 to 14). The titles of these persons, which are all preceded by the honorific article sang, prove that waduvā does not denote ordinary servants. There is no doubt that the persons mentioned after the dignitaries are the representatives of the latter, their 'spokesmen' (paruvuwus, the term used in the Argapura inscriptions to denote the corresponding group; paruljar 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 57), 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 Insce. Ned.-Indiï, I, 1940, pp. 3-28), where very detailed lists of 'spokesmen' (paruljar), clerks (citrañaka) and lower administrative (? personnel (pañhurang) 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: paruljar=ī srikan sang hujunggaluh pu ayuddha anakwanusia truwangan watuk tirurānu. 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: wihera i hujung galuh. It is not probable that the sang name of the paruljar 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 Pamėgĕt, 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 68).

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 maṅsa 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 maṅsa. Words in the meaning of „going to”, such as maṅsa, umaṅsa, 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 69). Then, the

but the representatives are situated at one side, facing the South in the text published by Van Naerssen (and facing the East in that published by Bosch.

68) Kamalagyan, derived from laji, „a while”, seems to denote a temporary hermitage Its designation by „temporary” may not refer to the ācārasana itself, but „rather to the period during which the āryas stayed there, i.e. a place of temporary retreat (cf. kalagan in Nāgarakeśī. 75, 2, and 78, 6; „9,1). Katuwuhan, derived from tanah, „to grow”, may mean „place of prosperity”; hrētān, derived from hētā, „to retain”, may mean „a place where one has to stop, to stay”; damilihān, from pilih, „to choose”; „a chosen place”. Other names occurring in our text, such as iwana, „life”, talāga, „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.

69) 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 kahyaṇān (a kind of sanctuary) at Panawān” (maṁsa i sang kahyaṇān i panawān). The consequence is that the inhabitants of the grounds are liberated from royal taxes, but get duties towards the kahyaṇān, viz., the obligation to furnish a sheep and a fixed quantity of rice (?) at the times of the yearly sacrifices (mapanaśa wdu 1 pāda 1 arkan kapāiṇa bhastara i panawān ing pratiwarsa; Brandes’ reading wdu instead of wjus is probably only a printing mistake). Cf. also O.J.O., XXV (905 A.D.), Front part, lines 7/8: maṁsa i lumka, „dependent on Lumēku”. — Expressions such as tan tumanā, „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” (matilala drowya hai) 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 maṅaso 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 maṅaso 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 voaudū 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 (paruwusus). 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 paruwusus 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 tuhān is given by the expression sang tuhān manuat wuwus used to denote 'spokesmen' in several inscriptions 61). Some people denoted by tuhān are regularly mentioned after some Pamēgĕts Wa-

The article si' is used with all the persons who have no particular title; not only ordinary villagers (anak wana) have it before their names, but also village elders (rāma) and other people not of a low position.

60) The article si' is used with all the persons who have no particular title; not only ordinary villagers (anak wana) have it before their names, but also village elders (rāma) and other people not of a low position.

61) Cf. the Kambang Arum inscription (dated 824 Çakā, here corresponding to 903 A.D.), Plate III b, line 5 (Bosch, Oudh. Verh., 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\(a\). It is in any case clear that tuhān does not denote the lords bearing titles such as Rakai or Pamēgēt, 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-tanda in our text), but also administrators of different groups. The text mentions two tuhān ning nāyaka. 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 \(b\). The most important hint as to the meaning of nāyaka in Old Javanese might be the fact that the nāyakas are usually mentioned at the beginning of the lists cf ma-nilala drawya haji \(c\). They are

\(a\) Cf. the inscription mentioned in the preceding note, Plate I, line 13: sang tuhān ni wadhati 2 sang miramirah si rayung manγangkapi sang halaran si rahuла........ sang tuhān ni makudur 2 etc.; K.O., I, first plate, lines 10 sq. and passim. — A different 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 exercising their professions in free territories are defined. Cf. O.J.O., LI, front, line 30: amung tan krā́ma de sang ma-nilala drabya haji tlung tuhān i sang massambayawahāra ing asā́mana (Brandes, wrongly, asama), 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 restriction, the consequence would be that craftsmen and traders would leave the ordinary villages to establish themselves within the bounds of free territories, 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.).

\(b\) Tuhān and juru seem to have exactly the same meaning in these lists. Also tuhān and tuha occur side by side.

\(c\) To be more precise, the nāyakas (together with pratayaya, patihs, wahutas and sometimes others, too) are usually mentioned just before these lists. A common formula is: tan katamāna doing pati wahuta ráma nāyaka pratayaya sangat ūnīvali sa-prakāra nγ ma-nilala drabya haji, „not to be trod upon by the patihs, wahutas, village elders, nāyakas, pratayayas, Pamēgēts, 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 expression is tan parabyāpāra „not to be interfered with” (cf. Stutterheim, art. cit., p. 234, line 4 of plate Ia).
especially forbidden to interfere with the affairs of free-holds \(^{(6)}\). Probably, they were some local chiefs managing the affairs of greater lords; they might then be compared with the \(bēlēs\) in later times \(^{(6)}\). 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 \(patiks\) and \(vahutas\) 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 \(tuhāns\), those of the \(waduā raṇa\, kalula\) and \(manapal\) respectively, only the last item presents no real difficulty. \(Manapal\, probably\ an orthography for \(manapēl\), is a \(dērivative\ from \(tapēl\, ,,image, mask''\); \(manapāl\) 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, \(waduā raṇa\) 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 \(waduā raṇa\) and \(kalula\) are connected with crafts. The former might be connected with some handicraft frequently exercised by children, whereas the latter might denote potters (?) \(^{(68)}\).

\(^{(65)}\) Perhaps the most interesting locus with reference to the function of \(nayakas\) in Old Javanese society is the Barabudur copper-plate dated 906 A.D., published by Bosch, \(Oudh. Versl.,\ 1917, p. 88; cf. Krom, \(Geschiedenis\,\), p. 185. 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 \(waṇa\) is the correct one: ,,The inscription records a difference of opinion between the \(raṇantas\) of Palēpaneg and the \(nayaka\, viz., \(bhagwanta\ Jyotisa'' (\textit{ibid.}, p. 124). The difference of opinion concerned the amount of taxes (of different kinds). The village \(e\)'ders, considering the amount too high, applied to the Rakṛṇa Mapati on 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 \(bhagawant\), we may conclude that the \(nāyakas\ 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 siederecht van Nederlandsch-Indië, II (reprint in 1925), pp. 660 and \(passim.\)

\(^{(67)}\) In the formulae such as those quoted in note 64 above, the \(nāyakas\ are almost always mentioned together with \(pratyayas. 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 \(pratyayas\ 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 \(nāyakas\ and \(pratyayas\ 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 \(nāyakas.\)

\(^{(68)}\) Cf. the detailed references to be mentioned in note 171 below.

\(^{(69)}\) Cf. note 170 below (\(kalula\) and note 169 (\(waduā raṇa\). 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 Kayuwanī 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. Kayumwuwan (a patih with his spokesmen, paruvana), Mantyasih (idem), Lwapanḍak (a patih), Petir (19) (a wahuta with two clerks), and Paṇḍanjoya (a wahuta with two assistants). The toponymics here mentioned occur in other Kĕdu 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 (22); the latter are immediately followed by about thirty (23) 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 (19).

Other titles such as tuhān ning lampuran, usually mentioned in these lists, do not occur here.

(19) 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 é. A village named Pêtir-râẢjö 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 Kĕdu (ibíd., 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 Téñahung dominates the communications between the fertile plains in the South of Central Java and both the coast and the Dieng plateau. Especially the great Kĕdu 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 Gaṇdasa-li inscription (Pras. Indon., I, No. IV) might give a hint in this direction.

(22) Owing to numerous small lacunae in the transcription, the exact numbers cannot be ascertained.

(23) 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), paruwuwas (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 mapēkan (i.e. mapēkēn, surveyor of the market). Other functions are less frequently found in inscriptions. We here find juru limus, "surveyor of fine metal work" (?) 77); silifuru 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). Matamvoak (b 23), derived from tamvoak (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 tangañah (i.e. tēñah) 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

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: mērkakē, pantjakakē, tuwa-tuwa, lamitunu, winitunu, pinitunu, wontu, 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.


78) Cf. the examples in Van der Tuuk's Dictionary, III p. 239, sv. silih III.


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 tāñah 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 tēñah in the second Randusari inscription, line 5, edition by Stutterheim in Inscr. Néé.-Indië, I (1940), p. 29 and p. 32.

83) Read: prasāda ing kabanyagān; 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 kâbênyaGân, 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, Kayumwuân, Katañán, Samalagi, Munig, Munig-anntan, Wunha and Sulangkuning 86).

Description

1. Guthi
2. Swasti. çakawarsatita
3. 772 aṣādamāsa tithi dwityā .

"divinity", with the prefix mar- is clear; cf. also the term pârhyânañ to denote a sanctuary. In an inscription dated 842 A.D., published in Pras. Indon., I (1950), pp. 79-95, somebody is denoted by marhyâṅ sthâpaka (line 9/10); cf. op. cit., p. 94, where it is noted that the marhyâṅs are sometimes connected with different directions (just as the āgatis sometimes are; cf. note 82 above). In any case, the marhyâṅs 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 Takuupa 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. I, 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 Manikkiramam, a term derived from Sanskrit vanijjâma, a merchant guild frequently mentioned in South Indian inscription.

86) E.g., Wunha in the inscription mentioned in note above (ct. Pras. Indon., I, 1950, p. 155); references to Kayumwuân are given ibid., pp. 152 sq; Tulang Air, Samalagi and Sulfangkuning occur in the Keôâ inscription (ibid., p. 156); K-kâlayan in the Gaṇḍasuli inscription (ibid., p. 59). A village called Parang occurs in K.O., Plate 3, line 3. A Munig-anntan 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. Poerbatjara 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) Munig: Katañán is mentioned in the Karangtênah 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. Katañán to the north of Témañgung (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\(^9\) tu. pa - ā. wāra hana ryy=umāḥnya ta-
5. tākāla rakai patapān pu manukū manusuk śīma i tulang air. ra-
6. tu tākāla rakai pikatan\(^9\). patīḥ rakai wka pu puluwatu . sirikan
   pu sarwāa .
7. tiruan pu mahantara . maṇuhuri 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 maṇasē i patapā-
0. n milu sikhālān rua pu bhadra . pu tumak . ḍatar=pu arka wadwā
   rakarayān=maṇatiḥ milu
1. sang ḍakalong . i sirikan sang garawuy . i tiruan sang talaga . i maṇuhuri
   sang katu-
2. ḍaing . i halaran sang jīwāna . i palarhyang sang ḍamiliḥhan . i wlaḥhan
   sang ḍakukap . i dali-
3. nan sang hṛetan . i pāṅkur sang ḍakampāk . i tawān sang ḍawamlar .
   i tirip sang
4. kamalagyan . i lampi sang damalung . wahuta makudur sang ka-
   tuwuhān . sang ḍaragang wadwā raka-
5. rayān patapān tākāla ṭaṇḍa\(^9\)) si maṇḍi tuhān=ning kanayakān rua
   si gandha si ḍa-
6. mo . parwwuwus si mangdana . tuhān=ning wadwā rarai si ārikhāra .
   tuhān=ning kalula si jaha . tuhān=ning ma-
7. napal si uliḥhan . patiḥ wanua kayumwuṇan si jānta\(^9\)) mantyasēi
   si jākkhāra parwwuwus-
8. nyc. puna pramāṇa si ganḍah puna sḍang si murana lwapanḍak si
   maṇḍi wahuta pati-
9. r si hayu . jurunya si saisa . rāmanya si rutung . paṇḍakyan si sanā .
   jurunya si maring
0. kalima si nihān\(^9\). i tulang air juru limus si balubu rāma si tārawana
   kalima
1. .... 84)

b

1. // swasti ḍakawarsṭāṭīta
2. 772 āsādhamāsa\(^9\) tithi dwitiya

\(^{9}\) Read: āsādhamāsa.
\(^{9}\) For the word separation, cf. the Introduction.
\(^{9}\) Inscription b (line 15) reads maṇṭaṇḍa here.
\(^{9}\) The reading does not seem doubtful; b, however, reads dhantan (line 17).
\(^{9}\) Inscription b (line 19) reads naḥan here.
\(^{9}\) From line 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.
\(^{9}\) Read: āsādhamāsa; cf. also dwitiya instead of dwitiyā in this same line and, in line
3. suklapakṣa. tu. pa. ā. wāra hana ryy=umaḥnya ⁹⁶) tatkā-
4. la rakai patapān pu manukū manusuk=ṣema ⁹⁷) i tulang al-
5. r ratu tatkāla rakai pikatan. patiḥ rakai wka pu puluwatu.
6. sirikan pu sarwaw. tiruan pu mantara. maṇahuri ⁹⁸) pu manduta . halaran pu
7. madhāwa ⁹⁹) palarhyang pu wairawa. wlahan pu tuṅgū. dalinan pu manū. pangkur pu a-
8. gra ¹⁰⁰) tawan pu mulung. tirip pu gadā. langpi pu manglakṣa ¹⁰¹).
9. wadihati pu manawan. maṅu-
10. dur pu gadā. anung maṅasō i patapān milu sikhalān ¹⁰²) karua pu bhadra pu tuma-
11. k ātār pu aku wadwā rarkerayān mapatiḥ milu sang ḍakalang ¹⁰³).
12. i sirikan sang garawuy ¹⁰⁴) i <ti-> ¹⁰⁵)
13. ruan sang talaga i maṇuhuri sang katudaing i halaran sang jiwana i
14. palarhyang sang ḍa-
15. ḍakukap i wlahan sang ḍakukap i dalinan sang hrētan i pangkur sang ḍakampa-
16. k ¹⁰⁶) i tawan sang dawamlar ¹⁰⁷) i tirip sang kamalagyan i lampi sang damalung ¹⁰⁸) wahu-

³, suklapakṣa instead of ćuklapakṣa. — 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
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 = śima; the e might be due to a confusion with ṣema.
⁹⁸) In a 7: maṇihuri; cf. also the same spelling of the name in b 11. The spelling
maṇihuri, which we find in b 6, is probably due to a lapse. The word undoubt-
edly corresponds to manghūri in numerous other records.
⁹⁹) Brandes: manawang. We see in the second aṅkara of this line a dha to which a danda
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 maddha-wa, 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 pismanglakṣa. 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: sang pu kalang (the second word printed in italics).
¹⁰³) Brandes: sang pu kalang (the second word printed in italics).
¹⁰⁴) The patān (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 dagumlar looks less strange than dawamlar in our transcript; the
latter reading agrees, however, better with the traces visible in the stone.
¹⁰⁸) Possibly: damulung; Brandes had transcribed: sang da ma(n)gyung.
14. ta makudur sang katuwuhiyang sang đaragang wadwa rakarayán patapán
tatká-
15. la mangtanda 109) si maṇḍi tuññ=ning nayaka rua si bhantu si damo
parwuwuwis si mangdana tuññ=ning
16. wadwa rareai si grïdhara tuññ=ning kaluila ni niha tuññ=ning manapal
sy=uluhan , patiḥ 110) wa-
17. nua kamywuñan si dhanat mantyasiñ si jakkhara 111) parwuwuwnya
punta pramâña si gandañ punta 112).
18. ṣdang 113) si muraṇā 114) lwapanḍak si mandihi wahuta patir si 115)
hayu jurunya si saisa
19. rama si rutung pândakyan si sana jurunya si maring 116) kalima si
nahan i tulang air ju-
20. ru limu si balubun̄g rama si tarawaña kalima si jana silijuru 117) si
rgga 118) parwuwuwis si pasa-
21. t wariga si ſicung 119) i tulang air juru kuñci si sayut rama si kesawa
kalima si
22. bhānu 120) silijuru si kala parwuwuwis si wuri wariga si dhasa tuha banua
si baṇcung si nana 121)
23. . . . . . . . . . . . . 122) sang si warā si ṣanda . . ra 123) si jantra hulair si layar
matamwak si tamuy mula 124)

109) Perhaps Brandes' reading matsanda should be preferred; the anuvāra is very
undistinct.

110) The word p.ṣiḥ, clearly 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-l-Donesian. It looks like P.Akrit or Pāli (a corrupt form corresponding to
a Sanskrit bījāksaśa or vidyāksara with the loss of the first syllable ?).

112) Brandes: āṅciña. Both the passesian ḍa (not ḍha) and the visarga are clear.

113) Brandes: sňang; the ḍa seems clear.

114) Brandes: muraba- (without word separation from the following). The name muraṇā
(written by a dental nasal) is strange again.

115) This word is omitted in the transcription by Brandes.

116) Brandes: naśi, which is not correct.

117) Brandes adopted a different word separation and put 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 roga in which the pōpōt was left out;
since the consonant then followed the ṛ, it was doubled.

119) This spelling may indicate ſicung. There exists no akṣara to express an initial ḍ in
Old Javanese.

120) Brandes: gānun̄g, which is not exact. For sili\(^{16}\), 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 anuvāra mark above the last akṣara in the lacuna. Sang
cannot be the well-known article here, but is the end of a name (......ngsang).

123) There may be a vowel mark for -a 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 taguh paḍa hi manggala si manūt mapakan si mulyang tuhalas sy= awit hulu
25. tangiaḥ 125) si dawa macaru 126) si naran 127) jumput ing 128) çri manḍaki 129) si niru 130) ri kući si siga . ing
26. prasiṅaṅg ing limus 131) si krahu i parang 132) si sanā ing paṭing si tawang ing kakalyan 133) si mi-
27. liḥ ing twrus 134) si haryyang 135) anak ring sīma ing 136) tulang air 137) ing krodha 138) si dhura ing air=pa-
28. pi si paga ri paña ing kakar si paḍar ing limus watu 139) si saṅjanā ing talang ai-
29. r 140) si malini ing manāha si guwasang i kayu…u…n=si……………… 141) ing kaṇḍaṇān si mu-

125) The aksara ri is usually doubled by putting an anusvāra on the top of the preceding aksara; one might therefore transcribe tauniaḥ. The double consonant often serves to indicate the pronunciation as a pĕpĕ of the a which precedes. Then, tangiaḥ, which looks rather strange, is nothing but a particular method of expressing the pĕpĕ 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 aksara after the ra, to which a virāma is attached; the aksara itself is however undistinct; its lower part resembles that of the na.
128) Brandes: i; the anusvāra is certain.
129) Brandes: çri mandaṅini. The stone gives no trace of ni. Brandes probably recognized the well-known name of the Gangā, but it should have been spelt by dentals (Mandaṅini).
130) Brandes read juri, which he corrected to juru.
131) Brandes: limut. The last aksara is clearly a sa with virāma. The anusvāra of prasiṅaṅg is very uncertain.
132) Brandes: sarang, which is not correct.
133) Brandes: tiwrus. The suku below the wra is perfectly clear; the last aksara is undoubtly a sa with virāma.
134) Brandes: haysima, which is impossible. Probably, Brandes mistook the ya (with a pasājan ya below and an r above, for the licature ysi. No traces of a ma are visible.
135) Three words were left open by Brandes. Their reading is not doubtful.
136) The ai has almost disappeared from the stone; its lower part, however, enables us to identify it.
137) The word krodha was left open by Brandes.
138) Here, again, Brandes transcribed limut instead of limus.
139) One would be inclined to correct tulang air, but this is uncertain. Cf. note 197 below.
140) In line 29-34, there are more or less considerable portions in the middle of the stone, where hardly any traces of aksaras 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 aksaras may be identified within the damaged part. — In line 29, we may recognize the name Kayumwuṭaṇ in the damaged portion. The reading kau is certain; of the next aksara only the suku can be identified; since its place is lower than usual, we conclude that there are two aksaras one above the other, which we indicated in the transcript by two points. The following aksara has completely disappeared, but the next one could be identified as a na with virāma.
0. lya ....wus 142) hyang tiru... 143) ing prasāda si wanasi juru ............ kalima si
1. siga parwuwus sang hada juru ing ...la .......... walaḥhan si .......... 144) juru ing samala-
2. gi si tala ............................................. juru i muŋgu si pangsat
3. kalima si jati juru ing wunha si .......................... rama si napal mapakan ing
4. muŋgu antan si laya ....................... hāt marhyang 145) ing prasāda ing kabanyagān si ka-
5. aḍi hulu wras 146) si marowang juru ing air=pyal 147) si huwus rāma si rutos 148) juru ing a-
6. r=hulu si milar rama si taŋguh juru ing sulangkuning si 149) bantal i masalaṅcang 150)
7. ....... kalang i lu.u... si .. // (end)

Translation 151)

[1] Hail! In the evolved Caka year 772, [2] in the month Āṣādha, he second lunar day [3] of the bright half of the month, on the weekdays tungle, Paing and Sunday 152), while the ..... (?) is in its home (?) 123). On that

142) The first syllable of this word consists of a ligature; there might be a vowel mark to indicate -a before the ligature. We have no idea about the word which could have been here.
143) Possibly: tiruṇa; the last aksara seems to be provided with a virāma
144) Possibly, the village name tulang :ir was written after the words juru ing. We then expect a name followed by ing; then follows the word walaḥhan and, after that, again a name preceded by si. Such a restitution, though not unlikely, remains however conjectural.
145) Brandes: matya. The reading marhyang is certain. The word kabanyagān, a little further in this line, is wrongly spelt by a dental n.
146) Brandes: ....lunas. Our reading is not doubtful.
147) Brandes: aipyal. The layar above pya is distinct.
148) Brandes: natus. Since the suku, if attached to the aksara 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 ru.
149) Brandes: sulangkuning ni. The village name Sulangkuning, which is known from other inscriptions, too (cf. Pras. Indon., I, 1950, p. 159), is clearly visible here.
150) Perhaps: masalaṅcang, which looks slightly more acceptable as a village name.
151) Only inscription b, which gives the more complete text, is translated here.
152) The date corresponds to the 15th of June, 859 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.
153) The expression hana ryy=umabhyya, 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


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 Kartikāmāntrī 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 Arupura 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 ṛyy=umahya therefore still remains obscure.

154) Cf. note 39 above.
155) It is evident that pathī denotes a very high function here, probably the same as in later times. In that meaning, the older inscriptions almost always use Rakarayān Mapatīḥ (rakryān mapatīḥ); cf. the Introduction.
156) 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 early as the 9th century A.D.
157) The title probably corresponds to Manghūri in later records.
158) For the orthographies of these names, cf. the Introduction.
159) For the dignitaries and their titles, cf. the Introduction.
160) We think that the meaning of ml̄t̄, "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 we those who actually go to the village Tulang Air on the inauguration day to represent the Rakai Patapān. Bosch, Oudh. Vers., p. 48, called attention to the elaborate lists given in the Kēmbang 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 wahuṇt̄ hyaṅt̄ kud̄ur (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 tuḥān 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 sinunuk sang wahuta hyaṅt̄ kud̄ur) that it is the wahuta hyaṅt̄ kud̄ur (and not the Pamāṣī mentioned in the list of authorities), who has a function during the ceremonies, probably that of pronouncing the sunpah or çāpatha. — In view of the above considerations, we think that ml̄t̄ could be translated by "(those who) actually go". For the translation of māmaṇū, cf. note 59 to the Introduction.
are: the two (representatives of) Sikhalān \(^{163}\), viz. Pu Bhadra and Pu Tuma\([10]\)k and (the representative of) Datar \(^{164}\): 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

---

\(^{163}\) Sikhalān occurs as a title in the Argapura inscriptions, too (inscription b, line 5: tirnun pu sapi sikhalan pu lanuijang); cf. also the beginning of the Fēyḏem inscription (transcribed by Damais, T.B.G., 83, 1949, p. 19): tatkāla rāke sikhalan pu hānā manunuk śi<ma>. It is probably the name of a place or of an administrative unity dependent on Patapān.

\(^{162}\) 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 hānā manunuk sima i ḍatar. On account of other place names mentioned in the latter text, the village should probably be localized in the Tēmaüğung region.

\(^{164}\) Wadwā, also spelt wadwā 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 saŋg before the names of the persons following) that those comprised by wadwā are persons of some rank, probably representatives (parujar or parwurus). 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.

\(^{165}\) Some of the names have the honorific prefix da-; 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 Wadihatī has none. For wahuta, cf. the passage in the Kēmbang Arum inscription quoted in note 181 above: the wahutas here mentioned seem to have the same function as the saṅg wahuta hyang kudur in the Kēmbang Arum inscription. The latter is charged with the pronunciation of the impriication formula (III-a:14: manungmang manumpaṭ 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 intra, line 14), is obscure; they are subordinates of higher authorities, but not necessarily of low rank; just as for the parujārs, 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 Insuc. Ned.-Ind., I, 1940, p. 32); this might explain why not only the highest dignity 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. Patih 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, pahurāng and kēring, tapahāji and aśīhāji (and numerous other examples especially in the lists of the maḥśilā ḍrawya hāji). We may consider both patihs and wahutas representatives of the king and the higher authorities such as Rakais and Pamāgāts, in whose name they possessed civil cr (and) military power: they must have been all over the coun-

The servants of the Rakarayân Patapan at that time [15] are: the secretary 169): 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 Cridhara, 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 records, any attempt at too great a precision is almost certainly doomed to failure.

160) Mautanda, usually matanda, is derived from tanḍa, „seal, banner“. For the former meaning, cf. the well-known expressions tinanda gourdamukha, „sealed with the Garuda head“ in edicts issued by the king Airalang, tinanda narasiha, „sealed with the man-lion“ in edicts by Jayabhaya, etc. The matanda probably denotes the man who seals the letters, orders, etc., and probably writes them, too, in this case, in the name of the Rakarayân Patapan.

167) Tuhân—ring nayaka, — a more usual expression is tuhân (or: tuha, jaru) nîng kanayakan. Cf. the notes 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66 and 67 to the Introduction.

168) Probably not the representative of the Rakai Patapan, for whom the article is would not be fitting, but rather a clerk representing the two tuhâns or the matanda. The direct representatives of the Rakarayân Patapan are probably those mentioned in lines 9 sq. above.

169) The exact meaning of this function and the two next ones is obscure. For wadhâ, cf. note 162 above; rârai, corresponding to lare in modern Javanese, means „children“ so that the title as a whole would literally mean: „chief of this group of children“, but this gives no idea of the real function. The term wadhâ rârai is sometimes replaced by wadhâ dêmît (e.g. O.J.O., XXII, line 19); terms such as rârai or dêmît need not necessarily refer to smallness in age; they may also be applied to their social position (cf. wong jilik in modern Javanese). May we compare vâlâgraḥ (or: bâlâgraḥ) in Sanskrit? For the latter, cf. Mahârâya, 245, No. 86 (edition by Miîaïev-Mironov, p. 84).

170) Since manapâl, 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 Râmâyana, 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 jaru (tuhań) nîng kalula with Sanskrit kalâśa, „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) Manapâl, derived from tapâl; the more common term in these lists is mangrakâêt, sometimes spelt mandjakâêt, a derivative of rakâêt, which may mean image, but, more
frequently, some sort of mask. Cf. karakêta in the Nâgarâkrêtä, 27, 2, pâda c, mentioned among the feasts given by the king during his visit to Patuâkan and translated "maskerspele" (plays executed by masked persons) by Kern (Translation, 1905-14, p. 76). Such plays, perhaps to be compared with the wayâng wong in more recent times, are known from the courts of Tjârun (Hazeu, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Javaansche toneel, 1897, p. 95) and Bandjermasin. They are frequently mentioned in the Hikayat Raja Bandjar dan Kotaawaringin (Cense, De Kroniek van Bandjermasin, 1928, pp. 20, 22, 52 and 154), where the word is, however, spelt rakêt; 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 Nâgarâkrêtä, 91, 4, the king himself is asked to arakêrakêt. In Arjuna-wiw., 30, 8, rakêt seems to mean "image". — For mansepel and mangrakêt, 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 tuhân is still obscure; similar lists add other items such as tuhân ning lamputan and mahassakan, the latter probably denoting a servant who conveys (literally: "makes arrive") messages and orders. There may be some reason to connect all these tuhân with the collection of some special taxes on behalf of the Rakarâyân. Just as the king has his 'army' of mahilala drawya haji, the Rakarâyâns 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 some 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 names, 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. wihan anten (wichantèn) or vihara 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 dapunta, also punta hyang, dapunta hyang, dahu hyang, daman, 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 dapunta, dahu hyang, daman and dahu follow each other in this order and may express differences in rank or age. Cf. also the dapunta i kabikuwan i panuwélan wat as raja, in K.O., IX, Pl. 15, 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 (?): Si Balubung; the village elder: Si Tarawana; the kalima: Si Jana, the acting surveyor (?): Si Rēga; the representative: Si Pasat; [21] the astrologist: Si Eñcung. (Also) at Tulang Air, the guardian 181: Si Kesawa; the kalima: Si [22] Bhanu, the acting surveyor: Si Kala; the representative: Si Wuri; the astrologist is Dhasa; the village councilors: Si Bahcung, Si Nana; [23]..... 182: Si Warā and Si Dāndo; the...... 183: Si Jantra; the surveyor of water supply 183): Si Layar; the surveyor of the dams 183): Si Tamuy; the mula 183): [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 Kādu 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, Mantyashh and Kayumwuhan are the residences of patih, whereas wahutas are established at Pētir and Pāndjakyan.

178) For ilimun, 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 in the form of h in the former half of a word compound with that which regularly takes place in word gemination; cf., for instance, pili-pilih in Nāgarakrēt, 30, 1, where the metre guarantees the loss of the h.

180) The meaning of wariā is not doubtful; his main activities probably concerned the calculation of suspicious dates for the important actions in the village.

181) The term is still in use for the guardians of cemeteries, temples and the like.

182) The word is illegible, possibly juru (cf. note 123 above).

183) Owing to the lacuna, we do not know whether the two persons who follow are still included in the list of tua 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 paīnu baīnu (with numerous synonyms in modern Javanese villages (vide Van Vollenhoven, Javanisch 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 tamsak 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 banjirs in the beginning of the rainy season. In Modern Javanese, tambak denotes not 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. Presumably, the ma-tamsak was charged with the supervision over these and related activities.

186) The meaning of mula (probably, Sanskrit múla, "root" etc.) is obscure in this connection; probably he has also something to do with irrigation.

187) For the pedak, probably a conical drum, cf. J. Kunst, Hindoe-Javaansche muziek-instrumenten (1927), pp. 46 sqq. The exact meaning of mahgala in this combination
is difficult to be settled. One might consider the possibility that the *pāsahi maṅgala*
was one of the village elders who had to beat the drum at the beginning of the in-
auguration ceremonies and, probably, during several rites, too.

183) *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 (*pacaran*
in line 3 of the transcript by Brandes is a printing mistake for *pacaran*), where
holders of rice fields in the free territory belonging to the prāśāda at Lanḍa presum-
ably have the duty of furnishing rice for the caru sacrifices. The expression *pacar-
ran kyan maṅala* is interesting, *maṅala* 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. *Dijumpat* means: "(a small portion) is
taken out (of something)". In Madurese (Kiliarn's Dictionary, II, p. 163), *dijum-
putan* denotes the part of a feast meal which the guests take home after having
enveloped it in palm leaf. Since the long list preceding *jumpat* is composed of vil-
lage elders of Tulang Air (the village which is to become free as a consequence of
this edict), whereas the list following *jumpat* consists of people belonging to other
villages, the meaning of *jumpat* required by the context is sākur, "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 *jumpat* means: "those taken out" (of the neighbouring villages to act as wit-
nesses).

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 *śiṇa*, "nurse".

193) Or: Panji; the anusvāra is uncertain.

194) *Anak ri sīna*; the expression is on a line with *anak wanu*, 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 inī krodha*; the addition of *inī krodha*, "of the wrath" (?), might suggest
that the village name is to be distinguished from the Tulang Air where the foun-
dation in 850 takes place. It is, however, also possible (cf. the preceding note) that
there had been a free territory within the dēsā 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 im-
portant in this region, giving its name to several villages.
Air 197): [29] Si Malini, from Manâha (?), from Kayumwuñan (?): Si ....... from Kañḍañan: Si Mu[30]lya; the .... (? 198) in the temple (?) 200): Si Wanasi, the surveyor ......., the kalima: Si [31] Siga, the representative: Sang Hada (?), the surveyor in the ...., Wêlahan: Si ......., the surveyor at Samala[32]gi: Si Tala, ........... 201), the surveyor at Mûnğu : Si Pangsat, [33] the kalima: Si Tali, the surveyor at Wûnha 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]Ndî (?), 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 Mîlar, the village elder: Si Tânguh, 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 Talang 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, prayâya hyang, wahuta hyang and, of course, dâng 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) Prasâda is probably a wrong spelling of prâsâda; prasâda and prâsâda are very often confounded in Old Javanese inscriptions. Cf. the preceding note.

201) The lacuna is a lengthy one; cf. the Transcription.


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 â€œ.)

205) The hulu warn is very often mentioned among the râmas. 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 to­
gether. 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 neighbour­
hood 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 cor­
rectness 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-

Indian. I (1950), pp. 11 sq.
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 Ra-
tubaka 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 hastakāṅghraye, a 3, and, more distinct, in ghṛṣṭa 6, 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 ḍha, the ma and the sa, the da and the ni) 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 adhyakṣas. 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 (namah tryamvakāya) and line 7 ("dātuh 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. varuṅastratāśvavitah, is based upon an incorrect simile; instead of avīvitah, a word such as upēvī 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 amīta, 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 🅝—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 pranvāpitam tryamvalīvatam=etat instead of prastāpitam tryambakalingam=etat. The four lapses, viz. ṣvā for sthā,

6) This feature is very pronounced in Balitung's Kēḍu 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, ṣaṇa instead of ṣaṇa 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 ṣaṇa and an akṣara might be overlooked. A very curious mistake, which might convey an idea about the manner in which the lapicide worked, is ṣvā instead of sthā. The akṣaras ṣaṇa and tha resemble one another, but ṣaṇa 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 abhitapat, clearly visible on the stone, does not make sense; it is probably a mistake for abhitapata 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 vīpulā c 4, which we already mentioned above. The following metres are used:

Indravajrā, — a 3 and b 4;
Mālini, — b 1 and 2;
Rucirā, — a 1 and 2;
Āryā, — c 1 and 2;
Anuṣṭuhā, — c 4 and 5;
Śvāgata, — c 3;
Ṭotaka, — 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 Čiva, followed by a strophe in the same metre as the first one and addressed to some form of Lakṣmi-Čri. 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 etat instead of etat (the last line of b). The form abhitapata 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 Tripurāsvas 11).

It is curious that the goddess in the second strophe 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 Mahailakṣmī respectively. The first designation is a common one to denote Viṣṇu’s spouse, at the same time the symbol of prosperity and royal majesty. Čūralakṣmī, 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). Mahailakṣmī, undoubtedly a variant of Mahālakṣmī, again suggests Lākṣmī-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, Bāna 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 Kac 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 États 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 Lakṣmi-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 linga foundations. This makes it very probable that our texts are dated before the 11th of the Çuklapaṅka of Mārgaṅīra, 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 Kumbhayoni in a and b, and Kalaçodbhava in c. These names are well-known paraphrases of the name of the rṣi 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 Lakṣmi (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 Mahālakṣmi just in order to avoid the interpretation as the Devī and to stress her Lakṣmi aspect. In this case, the way in which the goddess is denoted would better agree with the names Çrī and Çūralakṣmi mentioned in the two other texts.


17) First edition by A.B. Cohen Stuart, Kawi Oorkanda (1875), No. XXIII. The Sanskrit portion was discussed by Kern, Verspr. Geschr., VI (article dated 1917), pp. 277-288. 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 Čiva 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 ārya 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 Čiva 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 Čiva 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 re-examined 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 that 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 Čiva 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

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).

of the clergy (paśūditādhikārī), combining the function of a rāja-guru 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 Poerbatjara (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 Jayabaya'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 Čiwa, Nārāyaṇa etc. occurred as names of villagers. For the Hariwañca, we now dispose of the excellent edition and translation by A. Teeuw, Verhand. K.I., I (1950), where the passage occurs in I, p. 84 (text) and II, p. 105 (translation).

23) Geschiedenis, pp. 165 sq.
24) This term (i.e. "hoogwaardigheidsbekleder" in the Dutch text) was probably chosen to avoid the necessity of giving an interpretation of the difficult wordus puyut sang ratu i halu pakwiamira i jangluan (line 9), which follow the name Kumbhayoni in the Pereng inscription. Several different interpretations of these were proposed; they will be discussed below.
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 tāved=bhaktir= vallaināṁmaṇṭ 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 Rañai Walaing in that case. The meaning of the third strophe would then imply that the cult associated with the foundation of the Čiwa temple should be continued as long as the sun and moon are on the sky etc. Owing to its occurrence in these Ratuwala 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 labdhasteṣṭapaṣṭavāh, translated by Kern "daarin een standplaats en levensonderhoud naar wensch mogen ontvangen". We prefer to consider iṣṭapada, "the desired place", a synonym of paramapada, nirvāṇapada, Čivapada (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 pakawiannira 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, criticizing 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

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)panjen 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 dharma 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*. Finally, Damais rightly accepted Stutterheim's interpretation of this passage, although he disapproved of the less precise meaning added by Stutterheim between brackets. 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 *tasāyāṁmanas=santijena*, „sprung from his own descendency”, — an expression implying a direct descent but not a definite grade of relationship. 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.

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. 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,
the end of the Pereng inscription (tuṅgang ḍawēt, lāṅkā sērēh wulakan—ni walaṅ walaing loduṅg wanaunirang dhīmān kumbhayoni Ṉaranirra) makes it clear that he is the possessor of at least seven villages (wauna). 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 Črī Kumbhaja (Kalaṣodbhava) 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. Agastyra 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 Čloka, the genitive valaiṅnāmnaḥ occurs and, finally, Walaing is mentioned in the enumeration of villages (wanaun) of Kumbhayoni at the end of the text in a passage quoted above. As to its second occurrence, viz. in valaiṅnāmnaḥ, we already concluded 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\(^{47}\).


\(^{42}\) St. Petersb. Diction., s.v. dhīmānaya.

\(^{43}\) A few references were given by Poerbatjaraka, op. cit., p. 49. In Balitung’s Kēdu inscription dated 907 A.D., Walaing is the place where the scribes lived (B-23: ikkita cītrālokiḥ i Walaing puna taṛkṣa; 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 valaiṅnāmnaḥ should therefore be compared with kalaṣajanāmna 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 49).

Now it is very important to note that Walaing occurs twice in our Ratubaka inscriptions in the sanscritized form Valaiṅga. We find it in inscription b, strophe 4, pāda c (valaiṅgajetra) and in inscription a, strophe 3, pāda c (valaiṅgagoptra) as epithets of king Kumbhayoni. In the former case, one should translate the „victor of Valaiṅga” (or: of Walaing), in the latter, however, the „protector of Valaiṅga”. 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 Valaiṅga” should therefore be interpreted as either „conqueror of Valaiṅga” or „victorious king of Valaiṅga” 50). 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 valaiṅg 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 Kēḍu 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

49) We do not mean that all of the Rakai and Pamėgėt 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 watak), 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 watak in inscriptions also occur as parts of Rakai titles (Kayuwaṇi, Halaran, Hino, Halu, Pikatan, Patapān, etc.).

50) 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. Valaiṅga is the form used in the Sanskrit texts. Words ending in -aṅ or -aṅa occur only in a very few cases as a consequence of sandhi in Sanskrit (the stems in -aṅ in the nom. masc. singular). This kind of adaptation may well be understood; some similar cases were discussed by Gonda, Bhujāṅga, Bijdr. K.I., 89 (1932), pp. 253-260 (lavaiṅga and lavaiṅga, kataṅ and kataṅga; Gonda conjecturally explains Javanese Bujaṅga as, originally, a learned form of bujaṅ).
written at Walaing \(^5\)). Finally, it appears that the name Walaing also occurs in the title Sang Watu Walaing, frequently found in inscriptions \(^6\).

There could be no doubt that Walaing was situated in Central Java \(^5\), 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 (jayachīna) \(^5\). 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

---

\(^5\) Art. cit., p. 212, B, line 23: likhiṣa citraśekha i walaing punta tarka.

\(^6\) The oldest reference is the Naṅgulan 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 Poleśan (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 watovalaing si mnnag. pulung si jakhara; in inscription III, dated 876 A.D., B, line 9: tuhān 2 rolũ si manūt watovalaing si mnnag; the title also occurs in inscriptions from Eastern Java, e.g. in O.J.O., XXXVIII (from Sinosari), B, line 7; O.J.O., XLIII (also from Sinosari), A, line 25; O.J.O., XLVII (from Kudjon Manis), D, lines 2 sq.

\(^5\) 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, Geschiedenis,², pp. 206 sqq.

\(^6\) Cf., for instance (one example out of many), an inscription from Cambodia quoted by Cœdès, B.E.F.E.O., 28 (1928), p. 129: jīveman dešam akhilam giriḍasyeḥa bhūbhṛti liṅgaṁ nīveśayāṁ āsā jayacīhṇam ivātmaneḥ //. Cœdès translates the last pāda: "comme le signe de sa victoire".
originated from the Prambanan region\(^7\)). 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 pèndapo terrace at the Ratubaka plateau, proves to be inscribed with the very word walaing\(^8\). 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 (Valainga)“ 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 Čiva 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 stupahe, we read the words čiviravṛtāpy=atipūṭā cilā yato jannibhiḥ pūjyā, words which appear to have puzzled the editors. Kern\(^9\), not corrected by Poerbatjaraka\(^6\), considered the current meaning of čivira (gibira)\(^1\) unsatisfactory, for a royal camp

---

\(^7\) For the plate, cf. also Ḍamais, *art. cit.*, pp. 50 sq. The inscription is a ĉuddhapattra, „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 *Inschr. Nederl.-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 (ski and tuṅgal are synonyms). The name walaṅkas (watak walaṅkas), in line B-1 in O.J.O. XXIX, also occurs in Raṇḍusari I, Plate 2 a, line 10.

\(^8\) At present, the stone fragment is at the office of the Dinas Purbakala at Prambanan.


\(^6\) Agastya, p. 46. — Poerbatjaraka transcribed, however, čivara, which is not correct.

\(^1\) Čibira, „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 atipūṭā cilā is not comprehensible.
(çûnīra) 63) and an extremely pure rock (atipūtā çīlā) 64) are not such natural 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 çûnīra 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 epigraphs 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 tiṅgas and resign the throne to lead the life of a royal ascetic. The question is not completely

63) 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 Bhūmaparwa, edition by Gonda in Bibl. Jav., No. 7 (1936), p. 86, lines 6 sq., where all the Kaurawas kapwanaṁgīl in ãiwiyâkatana when sunset made it necessary to cease fighting; cf. also, op. cit., p. 95, line 6 (mountur ta sakweh sah Kora wa, kapwa mutih tin ãiwi ra). Van der Tuuk, referring to these loci in his dictionary (III, p. 209) correctly paraphrases „place where one returns after the battle“.

64) Poerbatjaraka’s translation of this strophe is very different from that by Kern, but it is due to a confusion between çīlā and çīla (cf. Bosch. T.B.G., 67, 1927, p. 470). It is not clear what exactly is meant by çīlā; it might be the stone in which the inscription was engraved, but this does not seem probable; one could also suppose that çīla refers to the vibudhagaha mentioned in line 17, but çūnya (line 3) seems strange in this case, unless we should interpret çūnya in its philosophical meaning, well-known in Čāivāsiddhānta as well as in Mahāyāna (cf. Ziesenis, Studien zur Geschichte des Čāivasmus, I, in Bijd. 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 Uṭṭaraṭatāna, Obermiller’s translation in Acta Orient., IX (1931), pp. 132 sqq.

65) One might add another, small, detail viz. the use of atipūtā çīlā in the Pereng inscription and the words bhūvī pūtanu tadābhavat. Cf. the detailed discussion in note 160 below.
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 Mèdang \(^{(68)}\). 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 Këdu 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 Samaratuñga, — a princess who is mentioned in the Karagi-ğtêñah 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 Samaratuñga could become a king in Sumatra; we know, however, that this happened. If we assume that Balâputra mounted the Çrîvijaya throne because he was entitled to the succession \(^{(71)}\), we have still to explain why he renounced

\(^{(66)}\) *Geschiedenis*, 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-ñagâri 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 Gañâsulû inscription issued by a Dâng Karayân Partapâñ). 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. I, 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.


\(^{(71)}\) According to the Nâlandâ inscription (*reverse*, lines 52-62), Bâlâputrâdeva, the king of Suvañadvîpa, is a son of Samarâgrâvra and his principal spouse (*agramahiṣi*)
any claims to the Central Javanese throne. It seems probable that those circles in Central Java who had been attached to the Cailendra 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 Balauputra 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 Civa dynasty and denoting himself by the name of an ancient sage closely connected with the expansion of Brahmanic culture erected lingas 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 Cailendra dynasty in older times, 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.

Tara, Samaragrevisa is the son of the king of Java, ornament of the Cailendra dynasty (52), Tara is the daughter of Cri Dharmaseta (or: Varmanseta; in the most recent transcript of the Nalanda inscription by Hirananda Sastri in Mem. Arch. Surv. India, No. 66, 1942, p. 99, line 59, the name is rendered cri-Dharmasat, but Dr. Chakravarti adds in note 3 to op. cit., p. 99, that Majumdar reads Varmanseta, which is correct) of the lunar dynasty. Stutterheim (A Javanese Period, 1929, pp. 10 sq.) had considered Dharmasetu a synonym of the Pala king Dharmapala, 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 Prar Indon., I, p. 110) according to which Dharmasetu or Varmanseta would have been a king of Cripijaya: in that case, he could have ascended the Cripijaya throne owing to, presumably, complicated dynastic relations in Cripijaya. Question: could Balauputra have been made king in Cripijaya in preference to and favoured above other possible pretenders on account of claims to Central Java? If it is correct that Dharmasetu was a king of Cripijaya, we know that the reigning dynasty in Cripijaya was the Somavarna before Balauputra, who probably started the line of Cailendra kings who continued to reign in Sumatra until, at least, the first half of the 11th century (cf. Coedes, Les Etats hindouises, p. 185 and pp. 238 sqq.). Balauputra calls himself Swarnaadvipadaipamaharaja (Nalanda inscription, obverse, line 37), but when he gives his vananva (reverse, lines 52 sqq.), he starts with a yuvabhimipala, not with some Cripijaya king. One may assume that such an important document as this Nalanda inscription, dealing with the relations between the two great Mahayanic 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.

12) This appears from the Pre-Nagar inscription dated about 778 A.D. and discussed last in Prar. Indon., I, No. II. Among the scarce Buddhist remains discovered on the Rutabaka plateau, there is a small gold plate with an inscription ye te svaha, undoubtedly the initial syllables of the two main parts of the Buddhist formula ye dharmat hetuprabhavat etc. The archaic script, especially the form of the -a, makes it probable that the inscription should be assigned to a considerably earlier period than our linga inscriptions.
reconstructed above. An Old Javanese inscription dated the same year as the
Ratubaka inscriptions (856 A.D.) mentions the name Bālaputra (spelt vālaputra) in connection with a struggle in the preceding period, after which the Čaiva 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 Črīvijaya 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 Bālaputradēva 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 Črīvijaya and the Cojl king Rājarājā I, which are marked by the foundation of a Vihāra at Nāgīpaṭṭana, by the Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya at executing the claims which we suggested above.

Krom’s arguments, though based upon an explanation of the Čailendra 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.
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 Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya. It should, however, been added that the explanation of the Črīvijaya ambassador’s delay is strongly confirmed by a Javanese embassy in 992 where the same events are alluded to; cf. Krom, Geschiedenis 5, 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 5, p. 208.
77) Recently, three different attempts at defining the relations between Črīvijaya and Central Java in the period from about 775 to 850 A.D. have been made, viz., by Coës, Le Čailendra “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.\footnote{28}

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 Čaivism in Java.

Strophe b 3 is very difficult to be read; its transcript is not everywhere certain. Fortunately, the metre (Toṭaka) 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: āvacākhya upaśāvae).\footnote{29} 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 mentioned, 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. Ākhaṇḍalapura. 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. Ākhaṇḍalapura must have been far away from the Ratubaka hili, 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 s 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

\footnote{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 Čailendra kings from the rulers of Črīvijaya. Coës, in this point followed by Bosch, considers the first Čailendra king a son of the king of Črīvijaya and a princess descending from Fu-nan. The solution which I proposed differs in detail, but agrees in postulating dynastic relationship between the Črīvijaya and the Čailendra kings from the end of the 8th century onwards.

\footnote{28} Cf. the Introduction to No. XI below.

\footnote{29} 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 Akhaṇḍalalapura, 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 Akhaṇḍalalapura 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 Čāstras)“, such as āgata. The last pāda of strophe c 5, viz. bhavi pāṭiva tadābhavat, is not lucid; pāṭiva is, presumably, used as a substantive in the meaning of viçuddhi, viṣodhana, „purification“. One might find fault with kṛttikavāsavālikāgami (the 4th pāda of a 3) instead of kṛttikālvāsoliṅgām, with bhuvanāvākraṃtaḥ (overwhelming the earth, unless the meaning should be bhuvanā vyavatīrṇaḥ; prasthāpiṇaḥ, in the meaning of pratiṣṭhāpitam is more often found in Sanskrit inscriptions from Indonesia (4th. pāda of b 4; cf. Vogel, Aantekeningen op de inscriptie van Tjanggal in Midden Java, Bijdr. K.I., 100, 1941, pp. 443-447, who notes pratiṣṭhitap instead of pratyiṣṭhitap in the first strophe of the inscription; cf. also pratiṣṭhipan in the Karangtēkā inscription, strophe 11 d, Pras. Indon., 1, p. 39). — These inaccuracies are not devoid of interest in view of the interpretation of our epigraphs. Sometimes, e.g. in the two first padas 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.


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 *tasyātmānas=santatijena* (b 4) and *tadanavayāt=prasuto 'yāṃ* (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 Akhandalapura 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 Gândasuli in the heart of Central Java; another Old Malay inscription, originating from the same village, is dated 827 A.D. In addition, there is the short inscription from Bukatedja which was discussed above (No. VIII). Is there any connection between all these data?  

When discussing the Gândasuli 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 vāṃśa 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 Kékonkopi near Pᵉgor 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 Kékonkopi 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'i-Fei, whose lost report constituted one of the main sources of Chau Ju-kua; cf. Caës, *A propos de la châte du royaume de Çrīvijaya* in *Bijdr. K.I.*, 83, 1927, pp. 468-472, and the survey by Krom, *Geschiedenis*, pp. 302-8).
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 Gândasuli rock inscription to Sumatranese influence and to the Sañjayavāṇa. 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 Gândasuli 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 Câlendrâ monuments) is attributed to a new influx of
non-Javanese elements presumably connected with the Rakai Patapân (Raka-
rayân Partapân) 89). On account of the language used in the Gandasuli in-
scriptions the origin of the Rakarayân Patapân 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 Rakarayân Patapân himself originated
from these regions; it may have been his father or grandfather. As is sug-
gested by Vogler, the Rakarâyân Partapân and his descendants would not
have acted as strangers; they would have legitimated their actions by asso-
ciating themselves with descendants of the Sañjâyavarâṇça 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 Akhandalayura 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 Sañjayâ dynasty, pushed
to the background by the Câlendra 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

90) It may be supposed that the presumably weak descendants of Sañjaya in this period
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 Pangran Pugër
(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
reunited 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 (1955), 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 râtu i halu pakwiantra 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 Čiva 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 Kṛttivāsā- 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. Kṛttī, “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 (valaka), which is the usual dress of Čiva 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, phaṇinдра 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 Path 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“ (advayāṇga) 96) of Čiva, 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 Ākhandalapura“ is identical with „the Prince of Hala“. For the meaning of hala, 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 Čaivism were well established in Java in the middle of the 9th century A.D. If the reading and interpretation of āvodbha (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 Çaktism, the Devi being represented in union with the god, while Çri is hidden in the most private part of the Devi. It hardly seems doubtful that here, as in inscription a, the strophes addressed to the god indirectly refer to the king who is his adva-yāmca and fully enjoys Çri. The representation as a whole reminds one of the famous tale about Ken Arok and Ken Déğes 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 Kértanagara in the second half of the 13th century from China or Tibet to inaugurate an entirely new line of politics 96. It is at least clear that all the elements necessary to such a development were present in Java more than four centuries earlier 98. 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 āvodbha in inscription a, strophe 1 c. The Çava is the Apasmarāpurusā 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, Pararaton, Verh. B.G., LXII (1920), p. 15, lines 7-12, p. 58 (translation); cf. Krom, Geschiedenis, p. 313 sq. (with references).


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 Kértanagara 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 Bara-bu dar-Māndut-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 Mahādeva's fight against Tripura, he addressed the first strophes of the text to Čiva 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 this 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 Čiva power in Central Java 102). In edition, 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 Čiva (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 Lakṣmi-Çrī (expressed as Çrī, Çūralakṣmi and Mahallakṣmi respectively), not to three forms of the Devī as one would have expected. There is something strange in this combination. It is possible that the poet denoted Çiva’s ċākti by Lakṣmi-Çrī in order to stress the divine symbol of sovereignty acquired by the god-king

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. In view of this difficulty, one might suggest an interpretation which is in 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 Introduction 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 even much to the Naṭarāja in a, as to the āliṅganamūrti in b and the Tripūrantakamūrti 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-

---

108) Cf. the excellent survey by Jatis Chandra De, Sidelights on the Hindu Conception of Sovereignty in The Cultural Heritage of India, Sri Ramakrishna Centenary Memorial, III (1937), pp. 249-258.

104) It is curious that we have no definite proofs for this conception in Indonesia before the 11th century A.D. (Airāṅga and the Kađiri period); in the Kađiri 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". 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. As to the alīṅganamūrti 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. 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 liṅgas 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.

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**

phasisbrbhūstigala[3]hastakāṅghraye\(^{109}\) /


\(^{105}\) 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)mīta, 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; *vāla* 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*. 
namo <'stu> 111) [5] te daçadipā kṛttivāsase // 1 //
suviva'labhata'manikā[8]ntiçobhinām 113) /
purācitām cṛiyam=atha [9] kṛttivāsaso
dadātu vo [10] varacaranāṅgalis=sadā // 2 //
[12] harādvayāmsāmalabhaktinā ca /
samsthāpitam kṛttikavālsalingam // 3 // 778 çaka //

T r a n s l a t i o n

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

119) In the last compound of this pāda, at least the second and fourth syllables are certain
(vo and he, respectively); ca is however probable, though sa 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, hariyavah,
aparvah, etc. ; cf. Whitney's Grammar, §§ 403 and 404 ; the weak cases ought however
to have -ah (Pāñini, Astā'dh., 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 'etu, which could
not be rised in the context.

113) The three first syllables of the pāda are obscure, although their reading seems rather
certain. Cf. note 120 below.

115) 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 aksara bāgins
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 nāta 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
uneatable 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) Anāta, 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.

Phañindrabhūṣita, — „adorned with the king of the Nāgas", used as an aṭapita
by the god, is perfectly clear. Since, however, it seems obvious that all the terms have
double meaning, referring not only to the dancing god but also to the king prac-
tising Yoga in the cemetery grounds, both conceptions being expressed by the same
compound Kṛttīvāsas, it is probable that Phañindra has the second meaning of Pata-
njali, 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) Çavodvahæ 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, çavaspaç). The Apasmārāpurūsa 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 purārcitām is to be interpreted as purā, etc. 118) — The word pitrnilaya 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 Mātara used to make a pilgrimage to their family graves on the eve of important decisions. Even such an innocent-looking term as đaçadīci 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 the words purārcitām çriyam are used in a double meaning. Çri denotes not only Çiva's partner in the dance, but is also the symbol of royal dignity and power (= Rājaçri, Rājyalakṣmy) and, finally, Prosperity in its divinized form. In the first and third meanings, purārcitām is to be analyzed into purā and arcitām, „worshipped in the town (or: empire, if one may translate purā in this way; cf. the Introduction)”. If the same compound is however based on the second meaning of Çri, purārcitām should be analyzed into purā and arcitām, „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) Jatila, literally: wearing a jatā (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 (jaṃbha), 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 Črī Kumbhaja, whose devotion was immaculate since he was an inseparable portion of Hara\(^{121}\), the protector of Valaiṅga, (this) īṅga 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

---

\(^{121}\) Haradvayāṇasamalabhaktinā, — amasa could only be the — very common — wrong spelling of amasa, „portion”; then, haradvayānasa means: „an undifferentiated (i.e. inseparable); the use of the term is well-known from Vedānta and Mahāyāna Buddhism, but not at all alien to Čāiva (cf. note 130 above). Then, Hara denotes not the god-destroyer (as is the case in inscription b), but rather the god in his universal aspect (Paramāciva in Śiddhānta thought). The compound, applied to Kumbhayoni then means: „with immaculate devotion to (Kṛttivāsas) who is an inseparable portion of Čiva”. 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 inseparable portion of Hara”. Then, the use of amasa is easily explained: his devotion is immaculate because he is an inseparable portion of Hara. The use of advayāṅṣa seems to indicate that unlike the other human beings, who are differentiated portions of Čiva, the king is considered an identical, though not complete, portion of the god. The use of amasa reminds one of the term amśāvataṭa, 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.

---

\(^{122}\) Bhuvanaakrāntan, — cf. the use of avakrānta in compounds such as garbhāva-krānta, „descended into a womb”, well-known from Buddhism (cf. the references...
weather-beaten, especially lines 5 to 11. The average aksara height is about 2 cm.

Transcription

Maṇimakuṭavirājāllokapāla[2]r=vṛto yaḥ 123)
parijanayutadevīvṛndakair=bhūṣita[3]ūgaiḥ /
amitavihiṣṭaṃtī ratnapadmāsanastho
yamayatitacandraśvay[6]mūrtīśiṣṭadātrīṃ 126)
caranāyuganidheyaṣcramatīṃ 127) cūralakṣmil[7]n=tribhuvanahitadātuh 128) tryamvakasyācrayaddh<v>am // 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 Tatpurśa 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 Karangtēṅah 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 ta 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 ta.

124) Read: namasa=; 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, nti 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 yamayatitacandar means perfectly clear, but the next aksara 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 va may still be recognized, but the layer over the aksara 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 aksara seems si on the stone, but the second vertical might be only a scratch in the stone; also the e of dho 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]vapādabhavatkarunā- Kraṭasarggavidhir=bhuvi sarggabhava 129) /
[9]vibhavoddhṛtaviṣvahito nṛpatih
kila āṣṭī 130) yavākhya[10]puṇre 131) pravare // 3 //
Tasyātmānas=santatiṣena tena
valaiṅgajetrā varabhaktihetoh
pra[12]sthāpitaṃ tryamva<ka>liṅgam=etat 132) // 4 //
778 cakābde.

T r a n s l a t i o n

May there be Prosperity!

1. Glory to the Three Eyed (Civa), who is surrounded by the Guardians of the World 129) brilliant with their pearl crowns and their bodies adorned by (the presence of) multitudes of goddesses surrounded by their servants, (Civa) 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 anapasteṣa each. The monotony is usually compensated 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= used twice) makes the transcription far less uncertain than it would have been without such puns. Thus, the reading sarggabhava at the end of line 8, though uncertain by itself, is confirmed in this way. Cf. the Translation.

130) The reading of āṣṭī 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 āṣṭī satisfies these conditions; it corresponds well to the aṣṭarc 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 passian ya= in the third syllable. The conjectural reading given in the text agrees well with the traces of the other aṣṭaras 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 stonecutter made no less than four serious mistakes. The exact reading given on the stone runs: pravāpatīm tryamvaliṇvanehat. 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 Kayuwaṇī; Pu Lokapāla. He therefore conjecturally referred this inscription to the reign of Kayuwaṇī. This assumption is especially weak since the reigning king would not probably be alluded to as a secondary god. If it is an allusion, which might very well be the case, one would rather conclude that Lokapāla (Kayuwaṇī) 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 \(^\text{134}\).

2. Taketh thou refuge \(^\text{185}\) with the Heroic Lakṣmī \(^\text{186}\), whose beauty is equal to the garlands of .......... (?) \(^\text{137}\) 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 \(^\text{155}\), and who bears Majesty necessarily hidden in the juncture of her legs \(^\text{139}\), —

\(^\text{134}\) Čiva is represented here as the Supreme God, omnipotent with his three eyes. His boundless caṭṭi is well-directed there where it is needed (vibhita), 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 Nāgarakṛṣṭāgama, ceremonies 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.

\(^\text{135}\) Translation of ṛgayaddhvam; cf. also note 128 to the transcription. For the gemination of the dha preceding va, which is frequently met with in manuscripts, cf. Whitney, Grammatur, § 232 a. The imperative is presumably addressed to the people in general; vandadhvam and prapamata are often used in a similar context.

\(^\text{136}\) Čūraḷakṣmī. 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.

\(^\text{137}\) The meaning of tantramālā (possibly tantamālā, if the latter is to be considered the correct reading) is not lucid. The attribute vikacakamanalabhāvavat seems to refer to a lake or to a river; the river especially associated with Čiva is the Gaṅgā, but we cannot see how Tantramālā (or a similar form, for the reading is uncertain) could be a name of Gaṅgā.

\(^\text{185}\) We consider candraçvrayamārūti, „the form (of Čiva) which is marked by his lordship over the moon“, a synonym of the term candraçvekharāmārūti 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 Čiva's jaṭāmukuta was acquired by the god after a fierce battle with a number of āsuras. The initial portion of the compound, viz. the terms yaṃmayatayati", seems to allude to the latter story; as a matter of fact, the ascetics (yaṭī) were killed (yaṃmayata) 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. "iṣṭadātriṃ, „granting the wishes“ (of Čiva in his mūrti denoted by the preceding portion of the compound), probably represents the goddess (here Čūralakṣmī) while ceding to the male desires of Čiva. It appears from the description of the candraçvekharāmārūti given by Rao (loc. cit.) that this form of Čiva is usually accompanied by the Devi, who may be represented in an intimate union with the god (āṭiṅganamārūti). Our text (also pāda c; cf. note 140 below) seems to allude to such an image.

\(^\text{139}\) The translation is based on the reading caranavyuganidheyaścīramatī, which may not be completely certain (cf. note 127 above), especially as far as nidheya\(^a\) 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.). Caranavyugā 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 caranavyuga 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 Čākṣtism.
(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) 144), the victor of

---

140) For the type of image suggested by the two first strophes of this text, probably an Umāmaheçvara-varamūti of the śilāṅga type, cf. the Introduction. Çūralakṣmī is unusual as a precise term; it probably denotes Lakṣmī-Çrī in her cāktic aspect of conferring success in battle. Cf. the synonymous Viralakṣmī, the name of the first queen of Suryavaran I (inscription of Solok Ka`k Thom, published by Finot in B.E.F.E.O., XV, 1915, 2, pp. 53-106, especially strophas LXXIV on p. 66); Coedès conjecturally connects the name Viralakṣmī with Jayaviravarman, 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-pāsa-bhavat-karunā-kṛta-sarga-vidhir could mean: "having as a rule of life (vidhi) granting (sarga) due to (kṛta, literally: made by) (his) pity (karunā) 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 (karunā) 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 ɪs, "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) Bhūri sargabhava, 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, Poerbatjaraaka recognized the name Kuśjarakunija of the Tjaigal inscription in the present name Sleman (derived from alas liman, which is an almost literal translation of kuśjarakuṇija; 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 ātma 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
Valaṅga\(^{145}\)), this liṅga of the Three-Eyed (Civa) 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**

\[1\] Namaḥ=çivāya \(^{146}\)


mayakaravāḷābhīhapattraparabhide \(^{147}\) [4] smai herāya namah // 1 //
daśavadanabāṇapa[5]rhapramuhadhukarāṭubābhīnandakarīm /


Aṣṭya=akhaṇḍalapurāṇā=atiḥhāsvad=

bhī[8]riḥgobharatād=ūrūkāntīḥ /

caṃado tha vivu[9]dho vyavatrūnāb

khād=ivaṭivimalā=ḍhimakā[10]ntīḥ // 3 //


rūrāja manuṣaṛcṛṣṭ<\h>\=aḥ kalaṇḍabhavasāṃ JIT[148]ah // 4 //

[12] tenījaḍadakamalabhrarikṛtamolīnā \(^{149}\) /

[13] sthāpitam haraliṅgam tad= bhuvī pūtam tādābhavat // 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 Valaṅga in a similar way as we may use expressions such as "the Victor of Trafalgar". It seems certain that this name is identical with Valaṅga, which occurs in the Rakai title of Kumbhayon 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 om. 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\(^{\ast}\), 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 (shat for etat), one may presume that the same error was committed here. In that case, (a)bhihapat\(^{\ast}\) should be corrected to (a)bhitapat\(^{\ast}\). 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: *sāṃjitāḥ.

\(^{149}\) Read: *maulīnā.
Glory to Śiva!

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 Lakṣmi (152), who gives unequalled pleasure to (the heroes) with the ten-headed (Rāvana) (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 Śiva-Mahādeva with the help of many other gods, is well-known from Indian literature; it is told, for instance in the Vanapravn of the Mahābhārata; numerous references are given by Gopinatha Rao, *Elements*, II, 1, pp. 164 sqq., who, in addition, discusses the iconography of this episo. 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 abhitapati, corrected from the incomprehensible form abhitapat in the text (cf. note 147, above). The form abhitapat may not be quite normal; one would rather have expected abhitapyamana; 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 Rāvana may refer to the relation of the ten-headed monster with Sitā, often taken to be an incarnation of Lakṣmi. The allusion, however, is not very correct in that case, for abhinanda is just the thing Sitā did not give to Rāvana, 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 Lakṣmi, 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 Krauśika mountain, but was killed by Skanda (the Tārakādhyāya of the Čalyaparvan).

155) Pārtha, usually, but not always, a name of Arjuna („son of Prthū“).

156) The exact meaning of this compound is not lucid. We analyze: daṇḍavādana-bāṇa-pārtha-pramukhēbhyo madhukairoho bhinnadakarīm, „giving pleasure to the bees having as their chiefs Rāvana, 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, Daṇḍavāna 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 Ayodhya, bears that name (Bālakāṇḍa, 70), but a better-known Bāṇa is the son of the demon Bali, killed by Skanda in the Čalyaparvan of the Mahābhārata. If these mythologic heroes are only mentioned because they obtained boons from Lakṣmi, 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 Akhaṇḍalapura 158), rich in 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 Čāstras, reigned as the best of men, known by the name Kalaḍodbhava.

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 bahuvrithis the first part of which is an adverb. Cf. _avakeṣa_ (Atharvas., 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 (Aṣṭādhyāyī, VI, 4, kār. 29) mentions _avoda_, having become an a-stem, in the same meaning. The _upamāna_ is clear: the pollen of Čiva's lotus-feet drops down from Mahallakṣmi'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) _Bhuri 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. _pūtike ḫarapāvitā_ in the first strophe of the Dinaya inscription, _atipāta_ _cilā_ in the second strophe of the Peraṅg inscription, and _pūatricevarā_ in line A — 6 of Balitung's Kṛdū inscription (T.B.G., 57, 1927, p. 206). Important references, which may throw some light upon the meaning of Pūtike ḫara in the Dinaya inscription, were collected by Bosch in T.B.G., 64 (1924), pp. 280 sqq. Although it is probably correct to interpret Pūtike ḫara as 'Lord of the Stench', associated with the chthonic aspects of Čiva, it is not doubtful that at least here and in the Peraṅg inscription _pūta_ and _atipāta_ are not connected with _pūti_ etc.; _pūta_ derived from _pāyaṭe_ is known only from Indian dictionaries, whereas it is very common as a derivative from _pāyaṭi_; moreover, the wording of the Peraṅg inscription leaves no doubt that the latter meaning is required. Similar considerations apply to Pāṭe ḫvara in the Kṛdū inscription, which could hardly have another meaning than the 'Lord of Purity' (cf. _pāṭamati_, _pāṭamārti_ and similar compounds). Now we have the choice between two possibilities: _pūtike ḫvara_ should either be disconnected from _Pāṭe ḫvara_ 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 _pūtike ḫrarapāvitā_ (puri) 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 Pitikeçvara-tīrtha, situated on the Nar­madā, are available (cf. Bosch, art. cit., p. 279). In all these cases, it is hardly doubt­ful that ñāgas 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 çivirmrtāpy=ṣtīpūtā çīlā (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 interpret­ the latter meaning as "weeds"; this seems arbitrary. The word çibira occurs in the Tugu inscription (in the compound çibirvāni; cf. Vogel, Publ. Oudh. Diast., I, (1925), pp. 31 sq.), where it was explained as "camp, camping grounds" belonging to a rājaśti. 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 līga is meant standing within a royal hermitage.

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.
127) *Avodan* is one of those bahuvrhihis the first part of which is an adverb. Cf. *avakeça* (Aṣṭādhyāyī, 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 (Asādhyāyī, VI, 4, kā. 29) mentions *avoda* having become an a-stem, in the same meaning. The *upamā* is clear: the pollen of Īśva's lotus-feet drops down from Mahalakṣmī'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 from her, but the pollen itself does not belong to the goddess but is due to her worshipping the feet of Īśva.

128) 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 Akhaṇḍalā an incorrect spelling of Ākhaṇḍalā (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.

129) *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.).

130) *Bhūra pūtām tadābhavati* — the use of *pūta* as a substantive is strange. It is probable that its use is more important than it seems to be; cf. *pūṭikeyavasāpāvītā* in the first strophe of the Dinaya inscription, *atipitā cīlā* in the second strophe of the Pereng inscription, and *pūṭaevāra* in line A — 6 of Balitung's Kōdū inscription (T.B.G., 57, 1927, p. 206). Important references, which may throw some light upon the meaning of *Pūṭikevāra* in the Dinaya inscription, were collected by Bosch in T.B.G., 64 (1924), pp. 280 sqq. Although it is probably correct to interpret *Pūṭikevāra* as ‘Lord of the Stench’, associated with the ethnological aspects of Īśva, it is not doubtful that at least here and in the Pereng inscription *pūta* and *atipūtā* are not connected with *pūti* etc.; *pūta* derived from *pāyaite* is known only from Indian dictionaries, whereas it is very common as a derivative from *pūnāti*; moreover, the wording of the Pereng inscription leaves no doubt that the latter meaning is required. Similar considerations apply to *Pūṭečvāra* in the Kōdū inscription, which could hardly have another meaning than the ‘Lord of Purity’ (cf. *pāṭamati, pāṭamūrtī* and similar compounds). Now we have the choice between two possibilities: *Pūṭikevāra* should either be disconnected from *Pūṭečvāra* 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 *pūṭikeyavasāpāvītā* (*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.

1) The Lord of the Stench", especially since the Dinaya inscription is completely devoid of puns. Unfortunately, no data about the Pūtikeśvara-tirtha, situated on the Nar-madā, 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 for the Dinaya inscription, too. In the Pereng inscription, it is less certain; the whole pāda runs çīvaṛa-tāmāya=atipātā cilā (note: Poerbatjaraka, Aṅgārāya, p. 45, reads çīvara 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 çiśra (i.e. çišira), 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 çišira occurs in the Tugu inscription (in the compound çiširaṇa; cf. Vogel, Publ. Oudh. Diast., I, (1925), pp. 31 sq.), where it was explained as "camp, camping grounds" belonging to a rājari. 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.


3) More exact figures of the measurements of the stone inscription and its pedestal are mentioned by Brandes, loc. cit.

4) 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.

5) 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.

6) 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 Groenewaldt 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 wuwalung 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 Çaïlendra inscriptions 9). The ‘nail-heads’ at the top of the aksaras already became small horizontal strokes, which do not yet constitute a continuous line although some aksaras almost have their typical Nāgarī forms. In a ma of (probably) line 12, there is a real horizontal line at the top of the aksara; in addition, the aksara is characterized by a little loop which is completely absent in the Çaïlendra inscriptions. Unfortunately, there are only four or five aksaras 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 Çaïlendra inscriptions; it is, however, impossible to base any more positive conclusions on the few aksaras 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 aksaras have been manipulated in a manner that clearly bears the mark of a skilled hand. They have been made by a very fine tool that has been used with considerable care. The script is so regular that it is impossible to imagine how it could have been produced by a casual hand. The skilful selection of adverbs and conjunctions in the middle of the inscription is also a mark of a very well-informed hand.

6) Geschiedenis*, 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 Çaïva inscription in Old Javanese script does not prove that Pre-Nāgarī script could be used in non-Buddhist inscriptions in Java.


8) With one probable exception, viz. the Old Javanese Ramāyana, 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.
The aksaras are rather small (the average height being about 0.5 cm) and slightly sloping. The same aksara 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 aksaras. A definite number of aksaras, viz. the ka, ta, wa, bha, ga, qa, sa, ra and a few others, always start with a tiny, almost circular, hook at the left hand top; a definite number of other aksaras 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 dança 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 aksara 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 aksara 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 transcription: the syllables ku and ru can be recognized even if the upper part of the aksaras is badly damaged. Finally, I note the frequent use of the vowel mark for the pépét, 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 è may be expressed either by using the vowel mark for the è, or by making the two consonants between which an è 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 aksara almost as broad as the average aksara. During the same period, the little hooks at the top of most of the other aksaras, in which they had no definite function, disappeared.
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 pépēṭ 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, ardhamaṃśamavṛtta and ardhaṃśasamavṛtta 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), Prthvi (sometimes called Prthvītala) and Čikhariṇī; the second and third groups are represented by the well-known Puṣpitāgra metre and a, presumably rare, variety of ardhaṃśamaṃśa 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); Čikhariṇī has a caesura after the sixth syllable of each pāda, as is usual, but the Prthvī, 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 pépēṭ, 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, Ācāraghoṣa, the treatise of Pīṅgala 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) Ācāraghoṣa 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 téka, analyzed as tékā 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 poētica, 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 onmetrical 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, paḥavatāran (instead of paḥavatārān); the Sanskrit word bāṣyāna is spelt correctly in strophe 27 a, but bāṇiyāna 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 duarasalā, 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 ciśa: ciśi, vara: vāra and a few other cases occurring in Old Javanese).


19) The vowel system of the modern Javanese language was discussed in detail by Uhlenbeck, De structuur van het Javaanse morfeme, Verb. 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 hēkkawin 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 alamkāras 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 alamkāras 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 tābhaktita; 16 b: apāruwa ri pāruwadiça; 16 d: kyaña i kyañ=apa; 15 d: ta pānti tinapān=tiruan; 18 a: diwyatama diwyakēnā; 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: atiṣaya tang ńa ranyā tańaranya maḥātisa 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 (matakuṭ maling ta kunaling), 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 Juynholt'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 alamkāra of a different kind occurs in 23 c (wiku kumarī kumāra kamarān mara). Further we note in 9 c lokapāla in two different meanings and in strophe 8: raviyprakulastha in c, on a line with manrati purastha, the different meanings of dharma in 11 d and 12 a. A typical example of upreksā 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 atiçayoktī 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 vinducyutaka, more correctly binducyutaka; here, it is easy to find the 'lost' anusvāra: it is of course the final sound of gurung. 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 and not a single word could be recognized. The first impression is that some unknown language was used. Although this is not completely impossible, 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 prākṛtāsanuviveṣa 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 deutzung".
24) Cf. in pāda a the consonant doubling in saṅgha muhoja and tulijja; the consonant groups in c (pum mvasky āgusa); the succession wi-i-ni-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 kavya 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; Brandes thought the 10th century more likely, whereas Poerbatjaraka assigned the Rāmāyaṇa to the Central-Javanese period about in the reign of Balitung (889—910). 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 Kēkawins 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.

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), Introduction, 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, Geschiedenis', p. 174, where a brief survey of the different opinions is given.
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 Rāmāyaṇa 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 Mārgaṭhṛṣṭa 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 maṅkaṇā*). 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 *taṇanan*, 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 Panunuṅgalan, Rakai Panuṅgalan, Rakai Waram, Rakai Garung, Rakai Pikatan and Rakai Watuhumalang, all mentioned in Balitung’s great Kėdu 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 Kayuwani 32). The oldest-known document issued by king Kayuwani 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.
A.D., i.e. seven years later 23). Our text makes it certain that Kayuwañi ascended the throne in 856 A.D. 24), 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 Kayuwañi 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 25). 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 26). In an earlier publication, I concluded that this queen was the daughter of the Câllendra king Sama­ratañga and the spouse of king Rakai Pikatan 27). 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 28). 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 Kayuwañi between 856 and 882 A.D. (or, probably, a few years later) 29).

The next question which arises is the identity of king Kumbhayoni who erected three liñas on the Ratubaka plateau in this very year 856 A.D. 30) in which royal majesty passed from Rakai Pikatan to Rakai Kayuwañi. Is he the former or the latter, or even a third king not mentioned in Balitung’s

23) The same scholar has made it very probable that Rakai Kayuwañi was the reigning king in 853 A.D., although he is denoted by ratu, not by the usual royal title Çrī Mahârâja. A number of references to the use of (sang) ratu are given by Damais in Epigraphische Arentkeningen, VI, Sang Ratu — Çrī Mahârâja, 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.

24) It is curious that Damais already suggested the same on account of the use of loka­pālâsin in the second Ratubaka inscription, the first pâda of strophe I, which might be an allusion to the name of Rakai Kayuwañi; cf. T.B.G., 83 (1949), p. 3. He therefore considered the possibility that Kayuwañi reigned as early as 855 A.D. Or, account of the above discussion, the suggestion by Damais may be accepted with only a minor change: the form does allude to the name Lokapâla, 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 Lokâpas do with respect to Çiva.


26) Pras. Indon., I, Nos. V and VI.


28) It appears from the short inscriptions of Tjanđi 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.

29) The last date might be changed to 887 A.D. if Gurunwañi is to be considered a synonym of Gurunwañi; 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.

30) 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 Čiva 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 Keḍu 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 ṛjyaḥ and an abhiṣeka name; an example is Rakai Kayuwani Pu Lokapala Čri Sajjanota-savatuṅgadeva, although the three elements have never been found together 43). In a similar way, the names Kumbhayoni and Rakai Piṅkātan are easily combined to Rakai Pikata 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; however, 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 Balitung’s Keḍu charter all the preceding kings excepting Saṅjaya 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 Kayuwani; it is found alone (the common case), in combination with the pu name Lokapala (in the Argapura inscriptions), or, finally, in combination with the abhiṣeka name Čri Sajjanota-suṭaṅga (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 always, preceded by Čri.
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 rājasī.

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 Airlaṅga adopted the name Jāti-ning-rat after having retired to a hermitage 42). 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 Airlaṅga 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 43). 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 Črī” and practising all kinds of asceticism 44) 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 Airlaṅga might be divided into these very four periods 45). 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

43) 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.
44) Cf. the notes to the translation of X a, especially note 118 (purācitāṃ ārtham) and note 117 (Veśāla rites).
45) The first period begins almost immediately after the destruction of the Eastern Java kāratōn, when Airlaṅga retired to the woods with Narottama and others who had remained loyal; there, the king lived as an ascetic (vallkaladhara). The second period consists of numerous battles against 'demons' (hanitu). In the third, Airlaṅga, having annihilated his foes, becomes a cakravartin. Finally, in the fourth and last period, Airlaṅga 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 Agasty-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 kālēp kalāgunaṇaraviprakulasthanāma, „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 Agasty-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 Śailendra 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 Agasty 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 āśramas 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 Agasty without imitating at least some of the most characteristic features of such a sage. Agasty’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 “kalāguna” 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 “kālēp kalēp”. Wiprakulasthanāna 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 Saṅjayavaṃca which dates back from 717 A.D., the first year of the so-called Saṅjayava era (cf. Damais, Etudes d’épigraphe indonésienne, II, Les dates en ère de Saṅjayava, 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 Saṅjayava. The Saṅjayava dynasty may have been some kind of dynastic myth developed during the reigns of Balitung and Daksā in the beginning of the 10th century.

⁵¹) Wipramukhyya might be an indication that caturāśrama is used in the meaning of caturvarna, which is not uncommon in Old Javanese. Cf. note 20 to the Translation.

⁵²) Especially of the Čaiva forms of Brāhmaṇism; 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 Airlāṅga 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 tēpat=tahun=ni lama nging . . . . , "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 Čaka year 777 and the same date in the next year when the līṅga 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 waturn=ina tātus, "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 Kumbhayon, who was as swift as the wind and wiped him off from there. Presumably, Bālaputra was not killed in battle, but being chased
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53] This use of handṛ (Sanskrit -r stems are adapted in their nominative forms in Old Javanese) may be compared with jethr (again in the nominative form) in 6d and with waisainiṅgajetrā, to be interpreted as the "victorious king of Walsing" in No. X, inscription b, strophe 4, pāda c. Another example, already mentioned in No. X above, is dāṭr in the passage çrimāñ=dāṭa kṛtaṇa in the Djambe rock inscription (Vogel, The Earliest Sanskrit Inscriptions of Java, in Publ. Oudh. Dienc, I, 1925, p. 25).
54] I have no exact parallel for this use of āwati, "string, series", etc. Cf. the Translation.
55] The missing syllable may be conjecturally restored as mṛ; amṛthi, "directed himself towards" (cf. prṭh-prṭh 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 (śīra).
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 līṅga erections anticipate the foundation of a Čiva temple dealt with in No. XI (dated 11 čuklapakaṇa Mārgaçīrṣa 778 Čaka) 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 Ćrivijaya in a manner still completely unknown \(^5^9\).

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 Çaïlendra group headed by Bālaputra and (b) a Javanese (?) group headed by Kumbhayoni, *alias* Rakai Pikatan \(^5^9\). The struggle ended in the defeat and flight of Bālaputra and the complete victory of Kumbhayoni. Now, it was suggested that the three *liṅgas* on the Ratubaka plateau were erected by Kumbhayoni as symbols of a great victory \(^6^0\). 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 *liṅga* 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 Djogiakarta to Klätên. From many a place on the border of the plateau one has a wide view and, if the atmosphere is clear, Djogiakarta and Klätên 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.

\(^5^9\) Cf. *infra*, pp. 295 sqq.

\(^6^0\) *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 Çaïlendra foundations, such as Tjaṇḍi Sewu and Barabudur, 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 Çaïlendra kings popular, so that other pretenders 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 classieke 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 Çaïlendra 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.

\(^6^1\) 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 pëṇḍapa terrace on the plateau 63), where not only some Buddhist statues (Dhyāñibuddhas) 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 64). 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 liṅgas 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 65). 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 Çrivijaya — 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 Çrivijaya throne on account of family relations 66) 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).
63) This silver plate was discovered in 1953 during excavations in the direct environs of the „pëṇḍapa 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 Tjanḍi Mēndut (at present No. D. 122 in the Djakarta Museum; cf. Krom, Inleiding, I, p. 317, and Pras. Indon. I, p. 112).
64) Cf. Krom, Inleiding, I, p. 244 sqq., and, especially, Stutterheim in Djāwā, 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 Çrivijaya. Without refuting Krom’s suggestion, I added another possibility by pointing out that the Lāgor inscription(s) could be interpreted in such a way that it (they) suggest(s) a close relationship between the reigning dynasty of Çrivijaya 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 Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya was the power essentially res-

above suggestion, Coedès analyzed the four-lined Ligor inscription B again and concluded that not one, but two kings, father and son, are mentioned in this Srāghdrā strophe; the former would have been identical with the Črīvijayaçvarabhūpâti of Ligor A, whereas the latter would have become the first Čailenda after having married a princess descending from the „Kings of the Mountain” of Fu-nan (La Čailenda Tueur des Héros ennemis, in Bingkisan Budi, 1950, pp. 58-70). Finally, Bosch (Črīvijaya, de Čailenda- en de Sañjaya-vaŋça, in Bijdr. K.I., 108, 1952, pp. 113-123), adopting the main conclusions arrived at by Coedès, 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 Črīvijaya and the Javanese Čailendras. This consensus opinionum may be considered one of the principal results of post-war research as far as the Črīvijaya-Čailenda 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 Črīvijaya 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 Črīvijaya? The easiest explanation is that Bālaputra’s position in Črīvijaya 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 Suvarṇadvipa, had a father and a grandfather who were kings of Yavadvipa. 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 (Geschichte^2, 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

---

68 This explanation was suggested by Van Stein Callenfels in Oudh, Verl., 1919, pp. 155-163, Krom, Geschiedenis\(^2\), p. 241 did not consider this explanation very likely, but mentions it as one of the possibilities. Coddès, 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 Damai 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 Nāgipaṭṭana in about 1005 A.D. Cf. the survey by Coddès, Etats hindouisés, pp. 238 sq.
struggle against Tripura. With the help of the details supplied by this Old Javanesene 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 Cailendra centre under Bālaputra in the plain of Prambanan and environs, although this seems less likely. But also the Plaosan inscriptions mention king (ça 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 Cailtra 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.
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 Ploasan buildings were constructed and inscribed prior to the linga 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 Cailendras 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 (kēraton) 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 Plârèd, occupied by Trunajaya in 1677 A.D., was not inhabited by Sunan Amankurat 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 kēraton 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 māḍang, presumably: “Mēḍang situated in (“stha) Mamratipura”. This is the oldest mention of the famous Mēḍang kēraton, or rather, of one of the Mēḍang kēratons, for it is well-known that

---

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, Kūṭī’s revolt forced king Javanagara 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 Mēdang kēratons survive in Javanese tradition. Three Mēdangs are mentioned in Old Javanese inscriptions, viz. Mēdang i bhumi Mataram, Mēdang ri Pohpitu (in Balitung’s Kēdu inscription dated 907 A.D.) and Mēdang in Mamratipura (this text). Mamrati (without "pura") is frequently found as a title in inscriptions issued during the reigns of Tulodong, Wawa and Sinḍok 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 Čaiva 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 highly 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, pada h).
78) The origin of the well-known title should probably be traced back to Kāñjuruh, 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. intra, strophe 12, pada d, the note to the translation of this strophe, and infra, p. 342.
80) Such descriptions are found especially in the Nāgarakṛtāgama, but also in other kāśāwins. As a rule, the poets describe the adibhatāni; cf. Stutterheim’s important notes to Prapaṇa’s description of the kēraton of Majapahit in the Nāgarakṛtāgama (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, 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.

In strophe 18, which is not, unfortunately, lucid, the term divyākēṇa, "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. Finally, perhaps the most convincing argument is the allusion to patiha ceremonies in 10a, a term denoting ceremonies connected with the cult of the dead, whatever its exact meaning is.

---

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.
83) Cf. infra, note 65 to the Translation.
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 (sanḍang) to be buried again after the ceremonies. These details recall the çraḍḍha ceremonies known, e.g., from Prapaṇca's description in the Nāgarakṛātāgama (Cantos LXIII to LXIX); the çraḍḍha ceremonies for the Rājapatni 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 Rājapatni ceremonies described in the Nāgarakṛātāgama, 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 Wiratāparwan (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 (Kicaka killed
The foundation as a whole is denoted by Çiwagrēha (i.e. Çiwagrha) in 26a and by Çiwālaya in 25a; there is not, therefore, any doubt that the bhāṭāra mentioned in 24d and in 28d 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 tēṇa, the 'heart' of the foundation, in 14b) 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 pāḍa 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 Wṛhanalā—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 N. 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 Djoṅgrang.

In strophes 14 and 15, numerous other important details are given. A liṅga 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 (turusa), by which they were separated from the small constructions. Such a conception is not found everywhere; it occurs, e.g., in the Lara Djoṅgrang complex, but not in Tjaṅḍi Séwu. In the same pāda the use of bricks is referred to; it is stated that they were used for the construction of tambak \(^{89}\)), presumably brick walls either in the interior of a temple building or between some groups of buildings \(^{91}\). The next pāda, 14c, 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 upreksā \(^{82}\).

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 tēas in 14 b), whereas the outer temples (viz. those outside the wall which presumably surrounded the tēas) 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 Djoṅgrang, where they are placed near the northern and southern entrances respectively \(^{83}\).

Rather a long passage (15 e–d and the entire strophe 16) deals with a very extraordinary tree. Owing to the God's neighbourhood, it had grown with a miraculous speci dad though planted only a year before, it had come

\(^{89}\) Cf. infra, note 18 to the Transcription.

\(^{89}\) Tamwaka ------ išaka. The latter word is undoubtedly a wrong spelling of Sanskrit išaka, "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).

\(^{82}\) Cf. infra, note 49 to the Translation.

\(^{82}\) Supra, p. 286.

\(^{82}\) Cf. Krom, Inleiding, 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 rati 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 Bhomakäwyä, Canto XLIII, strophe
to considerable height. Although it was only a Taň jung tree (15 c), it was equal to the divine Pārijātaka: 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

It is added that the tree had been planted at the Eastern side (vi pāruvōadiña—Sanskrit pāruvāyaṇa dhī, — although it was apūrva, „unequalled”, as the poet adds, unable to resist the opportunity for a pun). The simile suggests

24, päda a, raṅkang designates the pavilion inside the kāraton in which the princess Yajñavati 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 Taň jung tree in our temple complex (cf. the note which follows) and the special trees planted in Javanese kāratons.

Pārijātaka (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 Abhidharmakosa, 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 diwatyana in strophe 18 a of this text); owing to the similarity of the Taň jung with the divine Pārijātaka, the God recognizes the temple as His abode and may descend into the tree. In reality, the tree is a Taň jung (Mirusops Elecni), one of the trees which are commonly planted in temple courts (cf. the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, VIII, 53), but also in hermitages (Bhomakawya, XV, 12) and in Javanese courts (e.g., in the kāraton of Majapahit according to Prappača’s description in Nāgarakretāgama, VIII, 5 o). The Pārijāṭa is considered a real wishing tree (kalpadruma) in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, VIII, 53 d; cf. W. Aichele in Djaw, VIII (1928), pp. 28 sqq., who determines the Pārijāṭa as a wariṇī especially on account of the (a) Pārijāṭa often being represented as a wishing tree and (b) the original meaning of warītiin being „wishing” (= bēr-tin). Neither argument is strong since there are several celestial trees that may be kalpadruma, In India, the Pārijāṭa is considered to be a „coral tree” (Erythrina Indica), which is neither a Wariṇī nor a Taň jung; 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 Tjo Siem, Hoe Koevreden zicht een vrouw verwerkt, 1938, p. 224). Cf. also Kern, Verspr. Geschr., VII, p. 60; Stutterheim, Djaw, 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. Hyaṇa i hyah-zapa, „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 alamkāra, viz. styykti: „is not it really wonderful”). Hyaṇa is often used by Prappača 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 \(^{\text{86}}\) 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 alāṅkāras. 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 prākrita, whatever that means \(^{\text{97}}\).

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 hamsas) 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 āṭṭha 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 āṭṭha, which is clearly associated with the foundation of 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

\(^{\text{86}}\) 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 Taniung, so that he would have a payung.

\(^{\text{97}}\) This appears from the words prākritasanniveśa between strophes 21 and 22, suggesting that the preceding strophes were not prākrita. It is well-known that prākrita 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 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 Daqšin'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 (akṣaraacyutaka and binducyutaka).
with voyages oversea \(^8\)). It may then be understood why the poet also included migratory birds into the number of visitors to the *tirtha*. If the *tirtha* is a lake or a part of a river, one would regularly see herons, *hanṣas*, 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 *ālāṅkāra*, 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 \(^9\)). Strophe 22 a-b suggests that the *tirtha* 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 *tirtha* within either of these complexes would be astonishing, if not impossible \(^10\)). It seems far more likely that the *tirtha* 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 \(^11\)). 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 \(^12\)), 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 *tirtha*.

---

\(^8\) Cf. the references given in No. I above, notes 6 to 12 to pp. 1 sq.

\(^9\) A very similar example of *utprekṣā* is given by Daṇḍin in Kāvyādarśa, 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.

\(^10\) There might, however, be an important exception, viz. in one of the complexes of the Ratubaka plateau to the east of the so-called *pāṇḍāpa*, where a number of water basins fed by sources were discovered (cf. the report by Soewarno in *Laporan Tabun* 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.

\(^11\) 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.

\(^12\) 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 Djoṅgrang 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 (vicitra) — 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 (tēas satuurusnya) 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 Pāñini, 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 Pāñini'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 fulfill a vow.

104) Cf. Krom, Inleiding², I, p. 449, and Stutterheim, Djoṅgrang, XX (1940), note 5) to pp. 225 sq., who gives a precise description of the situation, measurements, numbers of temples etc. of the Lara Djoṅgrang 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\textsuperscript{o} as their first parts and a compound with sa- would be seriously disturbed in that case. If, however, the hermitages and the tirtha 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" (p\text{"a}nti t\text{"i}n\text{\text{"a}}p\text{"a}n) 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" (t\text{\text{"i}}r\text{\text{"u}}n), 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 tirtha be located? A conjectural reply to this question may be given by comparing the composition of the Lara Djo\text{"i}grang complex. As a matter of fact, there is a third wall in the Lara Djo\text{"i}grang 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\textsuperscript{100). 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 verifi-
cation 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 (luah = luah) is changed (inaliḥhakēn) in order that it might
touch (anīṭik, derived from ṭīṭik) 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” (çivālaya samāpita
divottama) 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
Djoṅgrang temples. Among the details which show striking corresponden-
ces, I mention the two rankang in the inscription and the two ’court temples’
in the Lara Djoṅgrang complex.

The above discussion might even suggest the question whether the text
could be connected with the foundation of the Lara Djoṅgrang 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 Djoṅgrang 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 Djoṅgrang,
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, Geschiedenis\(^{4}\), p. 192, and Inleiding\(^{4}\), I, pp. 441 sq., and Stut-
terheim, De stichter der Prambanan-tempels, in Djawā, XX (1940), pp. 218-233. The
association of the Prambanan temples with Đakṣa (from about 910 to 919 A.D.)
Krom considers Lara Djoṅgrang 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 (ṛṣi 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 Daka'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 (*Geschiedenis*, p. 149) Krom presumes that the royal residence on the plateau was that of the Cailendra rulers; since the last known document of a Cailendra ruler in Java is the Karangtēnā inscription dated 824 A.D. the only conclusion to be based on the marl argument is that Plaosan and Lara Djoṅgrang were built after about 824 A.D. — unless the Ratubaka kĕraton should have been used in the beginning of the Cailendra 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 Djongrang en Oost-Java. Outheidk. 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.

\(^{108}\) *Inleiding* (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.

\(^{110}\) 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 \textsuperscript{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 Daṅka \textsuperscript{114}). It is therefore clear that the accepted date for the Lara Djōṅgrang 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-Nāgari portion, but also further data are required before more satisfactory results may be arrived at.

\begin{center}
Transcription
\end{center}

\begin{flushleft}
[1] // swasti .................................................. 1)
[2] nyalaka ...........................................................
[3] .. /' saçı ........................................................
[4] nang jetrakula ................................................
[5] nypita // ....................................................
[6] uanti 2) .........................................................
[7] ring kāla sang mnang makadhāraṇa lokadhātu // 5 // 2)
Paryantariṣṭa yuwanātha sarājya — — 4) 
mangraķṣa bhūmi ri jawārjawa jāta — — 5) /
[8] saçı ranautsawa ratejika lai prasiddha
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{113}) On the other hand, the shortness of all the Lara Djōṅgrang inscriptions makes it impossible to conclude that the absence of royal titles proves that pikatan would not denote the king Rakai Pikatan.

\textsuperscript{114}) Among the most characteristic details of this script, I mention the form of the sūkṛa 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 Čaka century.

1) In the first six lines of the stone, only some isolated aksaras could be deciphered. These few syllables are not sufficient to determine the metre in which they were written. Only the few aksaras 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 Vasantaśila kṣreph; 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 laksordinates; this reading would well agree with the traces still visible. The first compound paryantariṣṭa is however difficult to be combined with sarājyalaksordinates, 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.
jetā wirāga maharāja warānurāga // 6 //
Māheqwarā ta sira riçwa[9]ri çūrapatni
tēpat=tahun=ni lama ning — — — — — — /
— — ◊ — śala watunn=inatus=yat=ungsyān 7)
hantāwali mwan=anilā ◊ [10]hi wālaputra // 7 //
Nātha prasiddha ri jagat=ni ◊ — ◊ — ◊
rakṣā ni rowan=atha wīra waruḥ swaçīla /
ginlar ri mamratipurastha maḍang kādatwan // 8 //
Tлас maṅkanoparata sang prabhu jāti ning rat
rājya ka[12]ratwan=asiliḥ tañnan inangsā 9)
dyāḥ lokapāla ranujāmata lokapāla
swastha=ng prajā sacaturāçrama wipramu[13]khya // 9 //
Rājñē ta sang pathiḥ=ayat=patihākalaṇka
tar=sandihā rakaki mamrati weh ri wantil /
merang ŋunin ŋuni-ŋunin se[14]marān=thaniwung
priḥ-priḥ patoliha ni tan pasisiha denya // 10 //
Dewānubhāwa salakas 9) ni lawas=nira ŋike
tapwan [15] hana=ŋ musuh=asīḥ pañāñennanėnta 10) /
pōṅpōṅ hadēp=ni hana ning wibhāwāwyāḍī
dharmā ta rākwa ginawaiiṁra sang wīda[16]gdha // 11 //
Lāwan=ta durlabha wēruḥ niṁ=adharmmadharmma
ndātan wēruḥ hēnēnakan duwane ◊ — kwan 11) /
māntan=hale sira [17] ta putra 12) hurip prahāṭaḥ
nā mūla ning halu daṇū ginawai tīnonta // 12 //

6) The wrong spelling mah-raja 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 pāda c, though apparently clearly visible on the stone, is not beyond doubt; cf. the Translation.
8) The final a of rājya is scanned 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 tañnan, the last syllable of which is scanned long, although the final -n was not doubled.
9) The word, if correctly transcribed, is to be considered an anomalous spelling for salēkas. A similar example occurs in strophe 8, pāda b (waruḥ instead of wēruḥ), but in numerous other cases the pedēt is expressed in writing.
10) Perhaps we should separate musuh=siṁ instead of musuh=asīḥ. 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 kādatwan).
12) The vowel marks of this word and the next one are very uncertain.
13) Read arāry y)a, there is no reason why the a should have been shortened here.
The notes to the translation.

This is the most striking example of how even Sanskrit words are changed for metrical exigencies, for there is no doubt that duHarapala 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 word he was allowed to use either kusih or kwaith, 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>muhydro 21) malawas
nikaṭa bhaṭāra [24] yan=tuwuḥ apūrwwa ri pūrwadiça. /
atīsaya 22) pārijāṭakatarūpama rū<pa>niyān
paṇawatan mahā[25]mayuña hyanā i hyan=apa // 16 //
Sama samarohā sārthā samacittā wicitra kuaih
syāpa ta kasandi[26]hā ri sira bhaktī ta bhaktita weh /
kuṇika samāpta deniḥ=ānūtus=īnatus 23) magawai
sagupura parhyānān [27] aganitāṅgana tā pacalān // 17 //
Apa ta paṇḍana diwyatama diwyakānā ya hanā
patahati 24) sang tu[28]monyā 25) karasan rasa tann=uliha /
matataganā catāgata 26) n=amūja tamojar-ujar
atiṣaya tang ṇara[29]nya taṇaranya mahātisa ya // 18 //

21) The last two words of pāda a were probably siliḥ=asiḥ; this appears to make good
sense, especially in comparison with pāda b. The spelling griha in 15 is interesting with
reference to griyā in modern Javanese. The word is probably spelt according to its
usual pronunciation; here, there is no metrical exigency whatever. In strophe 26,
the same word is written correctly. Confusion between r and ri is common in the
less carefully composed Sanskrit records, too.

22) Read: atiṣaya. — The reconstruction of rūpa, the first syllable of which has disap­
ppeared in the lowest portion of the hole that brought about the lacunae in the
preceding strophes, is recommended both by the yamaka and by its meaning. —
Paṇawataraṇa, undoubtedly instead of paṇawatārana, is another typical example of the
poet's distortion of Sanskrit words for metrical needs.

23) The last syllable of anūtus 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 parhyānāna is considered
long). The only difference is that the doubling of a final n after a short vowel is a
recognized Sanskrit rule if the, whereas no sandhi rule about the treatment of the final
a before a vowel exists, simply because such a case cannot occur in Sanskrit.
— Pāda d gives examples of vowel shortening too, viz. saṅgopura instead of saṅgopura
(here, there is no reason to presume the existence of a form gopura; 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 a) and spell aṅgana instead of anāgāni.

24) The word separation may be pa tu hati; then, pa should be explained as apa the
first syllable of which constituted a long ā together with the final a of hanā at the
end of pāda a. Such an enjambement would be far less astonishing than that of
gawainya separated into gawai 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 con­
nected in one way or another) and, in addition, it would leave the long ā of hanā
unexplained.

25) The last aṅgāra of line 27 is not clear, except for the u-vowel attached to it; ku or
gu might also be possible, but they do not yield a satisfactory meaning.

26) Gaṭāgāta, „coming and going”, would also be possible: the small curve which is
visible within the aṅgāra (the only distinguishing mark between a ga and a ca)
might not be original.
Syapa kari tan āpūrwwa 27) ta manona manojña dahat
tuaku dinuttakanya dagihāni mahānirutan
ñya 29) ajapahā warī mānulēḍō wu[31]lēḍēng pañāwān // 19 //
Ja-ibuṇueha saggala mohonja tulijju khamu
arēwēni colla māra ri ware ri waḍangēgulo /

[32] mēhadahapum nwasāy ŋgua yabēk dalamōk wrahaneh
wi in jidiñjawaçwaya mirātu rawān mikuni 30) // 20 //
[33] Kwaramaya tatparam=parama sangguṇisangguṇītan
hayuwa mahā manonna tatan=uttamanuttanatah /
nama 31) tanu tang ha[34]ramyatama pāpa mapā ya haram
gurumatātāpasa=ng samadānānāmarutam 32) // 21 //
Prākrētasannīweça //
Kita ba[35]ka kāka hañsa waniyā gā niyā ga wayat=
ta diyuš=anëmwlaha trasila 33) siddha ta yātra siha /
kita ta kalang 34) anakba[36]nuu gusti waguś=tinajar
ta muja kawittha yah çuciharah 35) suraraḥ sakaki // 22 //
Aksāracyutaka //
Ri diwaśa ning wu[a33]thyang niša 36) manghyang uang pamatiḥ
kuaïh=asēsēk=masō sañ=ādimantri 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 unise. 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 sup-
pose the use of some complicated 'trick' than of an unidentified language.
30) This is abreadabra 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 Trans-
lation.
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 aksāras, 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 aksāras 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 con-
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.
6. The young prince . . . . .2), in possession of royal majesty (?), protected

25) There is certainly no anuvāra written above ra, but it is evident that we should have gunu here. As we suggested in the Introduction, the reconstitution of the anuvāra is probably the correct solution of the little riddle implied in winducyutaka. Sakābda is of course a mistake for ṇaṭābda, which is not justified by any metrical or other necessity.

26) Here, again, the syllable ending in a final -n preceding a word beginning with a vowel is considered long.

27) For the word separation, which is not completely certain, cf. the Translation.

28) There seems to be an anuvāra above the sa; it might however only be an occasional hole in the stone. In any case, it should be omitted for metrical reasons.

29) The final -n of matahun should of course have been written single; the metre (Prthvi) requires a short syllable.

30) No attempt at translation of the first five (?) strophes has been made; only a few isolated words could be made out.

31) I have accepted yuvanātha in the translation, although its reading is uncertain. Pary-antarīśa, which seems to be the reading of the stone, is not perfectly clear. If the
the country of Java, righteous and with .... ³), majestic 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 Caiva 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 sarājyalakṣṣṇi (note 4 to the transcription), which makes good sense.

³) Ārijava may have been especially chosen for its pun on Java. „With“ translates jāta...... One might suppose jātarāga: the king, though devoid of passion (vīrāga in d), had righteousness as a passion and owing to his ārijava, he protected Java.

⁴) Raṇautsava, mistake for raṇotsava 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 raṇautsava 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 tejjnaya. For tejas, cf. Vogel’s monograph in Med. Kon. Ak. Wet., Afst. 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 mānık.

⁷) Jetā is the nominative form, which was adopted in Old Javanese; cf. hantā in 7 d. Warānaraṛāga is probably chosen for its contrast with vīrāga; anurāga occurs in abhijeṇaka names of later Javanese kings, e.g. in that of Tuloḍong (Krom. Geschiedenis¹⁶, p. 194).

Note the pun māhavāra .... içvāri, perhaps also with cūra", which may have resembled içvāra 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 anil 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 mṛi. Amriti (or amrīh— as two words) would mean: „he stroked 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 (Kāvyādaṇca, II, 120).

¹³) Note the alliterations rakā — rowā — wira — waruḥ. Waruḥ probably corresponds to wēruḥ (also in 14 d); but 12 a and b read wēruḥ. Swačita, like avadharmā 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 pada, in which it is stated that in spite of his kṣatriyātya 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 kēraton at Mēdāng 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 kēraton 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, „samsita), which in Sanskrit would have been necessary for connecting kalāguna 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 kēraton here, for the kēraton is established (lit.: „spread out“, ginælar) in it. For Mamrati, cf. 10 b.

16) Tīs mahkān, — the corresponding expression in prose would have been i tēlas ning mahkān.

17) For the meaning of uparata, cf. the Introduction.

18) This is a free translation of asilē tiṇānan ināngē. The word asilē 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“): asilē does not refer to the grammatical subject of ināngē, but to its „logical“ subject. We translated tiṇānan ināngē, lit.: „was handed, was given to“, by a single term. Tiṇānan is the passive of manānani, which may precede another verb meaning „to give, to strike etc.“ to denote that the action which follows was done by the own hands of the subject (cf. Gercke-Roorda. Jav. Handw., I, p. 721). Ināngē, or usually ināngesān or ināngesakan, occurs innumerable times in Old Javanese inscriptions in the meaning „was given“, the polite equivalent of winaḥ (wināh). Tiṇānan ināngē 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 ranujamata, 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 well 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 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 probably is that the retired Kumbhayoni kept the royal dignity in name, though he handed over the rāja and the kēraton.

20) This pāda is interesting since it proves that the Čaiva restauraation was represented as a national liberation (cf. the use of swastha). The result of the restoration was that also the Brāhmaṇic structure of the society was introduced (or re-introduced), at least in theory. The word wipramukhyā suggests that caturāçramas 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 he 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

---

21) Rājñē 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-tilhā; tiha (usually spelt tiwa) is a „funeral ceremony“ for a king (Van der Tuuk: Dictionary, II, p. 674), presumably for the immediately preceding king of this line (Rakai Garung or Pa- tapān, 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 kēraṇa was situated. Rakaki is kaki, „grandfather“ with the prefix ra- (cf. note 5 above), but kaki (corresponding to Sanskrit pitāṁaha, which is used as a title in the Diēng 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 kēraṇa 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 samgeät wantil), Wantil (i.e. the Pamāgēt 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) Nuni is nuni followed by n; nuni (usually spelt ūni; a derivative of unī, „sound“, is impossible here) means „in the past“ (contraction of inū unī), whereas the doubled form ūnuni means „how much more“ (more often: ūnunaih, ūnuniwēh). There obviously is a pun on ūnuni 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 (thanirwung = 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 Pamāgēt Wantil.

28) This probably means that the king did his utmost to make his gift more precious than the loss had been for the Pamāgēt.

29) Salakas, the reading of which is not certain, should be taken to correspond to sa lēkas. There is a play on words with lawas. Lawasnira nīke refers to the king when he still was a king among his subjects.

30) Dewāns bhāwa is translated as a Sanskrit bahuvrihi.

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. When he could at last dispose of power and riches etc., it was only natural that sanctuaries were built by him, the able one.

12. In addition, he possessed the knowledge, difficult to acquire, of Dharma and Adharma, but he was unable to conceal the lies of ......

---

is an emphatic equivalent of tan. Here, the article ṅ before musuh may well be rendered by the addition of "anymore".

23) The enemies having disappeared, the king could love all his subjects. In pañahēn-rihēnta, -ta is the emphatic particle. The doubling is rendered by "always" in the translation.

24) Pūṅgōṅg, 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 pūṅgōṅg.

25) Wisbawāwyāṭi for wisbawāwyādi; the final a of wisbawa, which is already long by position, should not have been lengthened. Sometimes there is something arbitrary in the writing of long vowels. Wisbawa 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.

26) A free translation of rakwa, which usually means "as you know", "as may be understood".

27) Here, dharna (the final a of which was lengthened before 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 pañhā 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 be 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 so soon as he had the occasion to.

28) Lāwan (here meiri casua spel) by a long ā in the first syllable) probably means that in addition to the qualities mentioned before, the king possessed correct knowledge.

29) 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 Ahimsā. This is probably the case here, too.

30) It is not exactly clear what the king did not know in spite of his profound knowledge. Hēṁākān is clear by itself, but duvana, which seems clear on the stone, is not. Duwa could correspond with duwa, "lie, falsehood". An example such as duvarapā for dvārapāla 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 \(^{40}\), \(\ldots\) (? \(^{41}\); this was the reason why the Halu, which you see now \(^{42}\), was erected \(^{48}\).

13. \(\ldots\) he, with his servants, all simple people \(^{44}\), low-born men, (but also) friends, servants, and those placed in the foremost positions (?) \(^{45}\); excellent \(\ldots\) made them beautiful: who would have been unwilling to consent (?) in bringing their gifts (?) \(^{46}\); (everybody) worked cheerfully \(^{49}\).

\(^{40}\) Māntan hala sira, „the wicked ones (hala) ceased (māntan = mantēn) with reference to (i, which is contained in hala = hala i; here it is used in the meaning „against, acting against“) him (sira)“. There is a pun with hala in pāda b: the hala ceased, but the hala was erected.

\(^{41}\) We do not understand the second half of pāda a, the reading of which is uncertain.

\(^{42}\) Tīnonta, 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 (pinnatīsta) by Airāṅga (cf. supra, note 29 to the Introduction to No. XI); the latter halu erection is brought into connection with the ceremonies of Airāṅga’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 Airāṅga, 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 māla nirāg should be translated: „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, which 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 pinnēhan, one of the possible readings (cf. note 14 to the transcription); between manuja (manujañ = manuja + an) and pramanukha, one presumes a term meaning „considered, placed“. 

\(^{46}\) Kasum is sum (on) preceded by the prefix ka-, the derivatives of which (such as umom, umonakēn) usually mean „to confirm, approve“ in Old Javanese (it is probably derived from on 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 Tjapdi 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 doorkeepers 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 cannot withdraw. Wiḥaṅg means ,,to be disobedient“ and the idea that people would be disobedient (syapa wihaṅk) to fulfil their vows is considered absurd. The use of om (aum) confirms 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 maianamodanu-

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 gawainye 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 ..... liṅga ..... should be made‘. The three short syllables preceding liṅga might be upane, „a stone liṅga“, but there are of course other possibilities.

48) Tēsaturusnya interpreted as tēs saturasunya with simple instead of double s, a metrical licence for which there exist parallels. Tēs is the archaic spelling of Old Javanese twas, „heart“, here probably used for the central building(s). The suffix -nya of saturasunya 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; tasmwaka is however used in exactly the same meaning in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, XV, 47 d: maṇaṭikara paṇwata len watu tamāka, „to carry mountains and rocks for the dam“. The translation of tamwaka 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 Rāmāyaṇa, VIII, 43, the word seems to refer to ring-walls (cf. Poerbatjarka, T.B.G., 1932, p. 164); Juynboll’s Glossarium to the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, 1902, s.v. tambak, where the Balinese gloss tembok, „wall“, is quoted; cf. also Râm., VIII, 57 a: wawara teki tambaki yswā 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 utpreka. 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 intercalated 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 utpreka; it occurs in the first example given by the Kāvyādārca (II, 222). We gave a free translation of waruhe-
15. A beautiful dwelling for the god \(^{52}\) ......; at the gateways, two small
buildings \(^{26}\) were erected, different in construction \(^{54}\); there also was
a Taśṣṭ tree ...... together (?) \(^{55}\); beautiful were the number of
small buildings \(^{36}\) to be used as hermitages, which might, in their
turn, be an example (?) \(^{57}\).

16. Of the tree Ki Muhūr (?) \(^{54}\), the stem was only one year old; the
neighbourhood of the Lord was the reason of its matchless growth \(^{29}\)

\(^{52}\) The pādas a and b probably still belong to the order given in 14 a (the passive 'imperative'
gawayān there suggests makon or a synonym in the lacuna). Probably, gawayān 16 a, is the beginning of the same word gawayān. We translated gṛiha (i.e. gṛha)
by the singular, although the plural would be preferred, especially if the completion siliḥ=asiḥ at the end of the pāda is correct: then, gṛiha nīg hyāṅ would refer to a
number of temples harmonizing with each other.

\(^{53}\) Rakṣaṇa usually means a pavilion inside the kārton; cf. the Old Jav. Rām., 20
79 (tariṅaś ėmasa); Bhomakāwya, 43, 24 (the pavilion where the princess Yaśāwati
stays). Here, it seems that small temple buildings are referred to, which resemble
the pavilions just mentioned. There are two of these (aṇaliḥ) and their pamaṅwāṇ
was different; cf. the following note.

\(^{54}\) Pamaṅwāṇ, lit.: „the place where something is brought (wawa)“; cf. Bhomakāwya,
37, 7: prāgjyotiṣekang pamaṅwāṇ suputri, „Prāgjyotiṣa was the place where the
beautiful princess was brought“. In view of these loci, we think that the difference be-
tween the two rakṣaṇa refers to the place where they were constructed, not to the
constructions themselves.

\(^{55}\) Owing to the lacuna, it is not clear to what kalawāṇ, which may also mean „and, in
addition“, refers.

\(^{56}\) Fānti, probably pa + anti, „to wait“, may mean a „place where a „royal guest or a
hermit may locģe“ (cf. Van der Tuuk’s Dictionaury, IV, p. 31) and this certainly is
the meaning required here. Tinapān may mean: considered a pataṅpān, used as a
hermitage.

\(^{57}\) The words tiruan sawaloy 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 (sawaloy) would follow the
example (tiruan) of the hermits they would see there. Technically, this is hetu used as
an alaṃkāra; some similar examples are given in the Kāvyādarçā (II, 242 sqq.),

\(^{58}\) 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; muhūr 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 u would then
be correct. But in that case, the following words are incomprehensible. Takanya is
interpreted as tēkēn-nyā, „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 tree⁶⁹); 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

---

⁶⁹) For this comparison, cf. the Introduction.
⁶¹) *Pāñwatariṇa*: Sanskrit *avatāra* with the affixes *pa-* and *-an*, "the place for an avatāra". The word should have been spell *pāñwatārāṇ*, but the long vowels were shortened for metrical considerations.
⁶²) *Maḥāmyavana* is derived from *payun̄a*, "parasol", with the prefix *maha*- (spelt *maḥa-* for metrical considerations, and also, perhaps, to associate it by a sort of *cīsa*, with *maḥa-*, "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 *maḥa-*, "great" (*maḥaḥuddhya citta nir sang maḥājana*). *Hyaṇa i hyaṇa=apa* is a play on words which may more or less be rendered in the translation. *Apa* here simply introduces the question.
⁶³) Javanese 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) *Agaṇitāṅgana* tā *pacalān*. *Agaṇitāṅgana* 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 *pāñwatariṇa* and *duarapāla*. 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 *cīsa*. 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 Piasan inscription (cf. the Introduction to No. VII above). Then, the 'immovable' women are the female figures in relief and images. The words *ātus inatus* may have been chosen on account of their similarity in sound. *Ātus* 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) Diwyatama, „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 diwyakānas. Diwyakān, 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 irrelativity or future. Diwyakān therefore means: „in order to be deified, for being deified”; together with ya hanā (the final long e 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 kērasan, a derivative of kēras, „hard, strong” (or rather of anērasi, „to overpower somebody”).

68) Matatāgāna is interpreted as matatā, „in regular order”, compounded with maṅgaṇa (for maṅgaṇa), „in group”; owing to the word compound the prefix of the latter was omitted. Compounds with tāta as their first part are common in modern Javanese (the best-known example is tata-krama).

69) If catāgāna should be read. As was noted above (note 26 to the transcription), gatā-goesta would also be possible („coming and going”) but such a continuous vae-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 taṅaranya, „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 taṅaranya in the meaning of taṅeranya (the spelling of a instead of ē 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 taṅaranya), 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 tēhērana) in the Old Jav. Rām, IX, 45 d: cihna-yān bhrasṭā, „as a token that (they) would be destroyed”, „to indicate that, etc.”. Mahātīsa (for the prefix, cf. mahaṁayuṣa in 16 d) is a derivative of tiṣa, „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? They were very charming.

22. (transition to popular language):
You herons, crows, hamsas, merchants, .....
and go and take a bath to find protection (....) pilgrimage (....) and you, kalang, village members and handsome guasti, you are...

21) Tan apârwsa. — Here, a- is of course the Sanskrit, not the Old Javanese prefix.
22) For these enigmatic strophes, no translation of which can be given, cf. the Introduction.
23) Prâkrêti (prâkṛta) may be used as the opposite of the artificial (?) language of the preceding strophe. Sânnîvêga (Sanskrit sânnîveça) 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 prâkrêtassânnîveça 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 sânnîveça in Sanskrit.
24) The words niyâga wayat are obscure to us; niyâga 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. waniyâga-niyâ gamaya=t does not seem more satisfactory, although the words, if taken by themselves, would be clear.
25) Here, too, there may be doubt as to the correct separation of the words; diyus (i.e. dyus) anânwaha, "bathe to pay homage," would not be impossible, but what to do with trasâka? One could explain tra by Sanskrit atrâ, the initial a of which was combined with the final a of anânwaha, whereas the necessary lengthening of the vowel was omitted. Then, siha could mean "how your love" (?). One could, however, cut diyus=anânwaha hat=rasâha; then, the first three words would make sense (cf. the translation), but rasâha (i.e. ra-sâha) remains difficult. It might perhaps have the same meaning as siha translated above.
26) Siddha ta yâtra, — 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 siddhayâtra here, for which cf. the Introduction to No. I. above. The mention of water birds and of 'bathing' make it very probable that siddhayâtra is acquired in a fârsha as it seems more often to be the case; cf. Chhabra, Expansion, p. 19. But what is the meaning of sâha then? It seems rather meaningless to take it as the 'imperative' 'adore!' again.
27) A dâsa functionary, frequently mentioned in Old Javanese records.
28) Anak wana is the usual term in Old Javanese records to indicate those village inhabitants who enjoy full rights to act.
29) Guasti (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 guasti wagus (ti). It is very striking that exactly the same pun on guasti is made in the Old Javanese Râmâyana, XXVI, 22 b: guasti tâtar wagus tîkṣṇabuddhi; the correspondence is not less striking because in the Râmâyana locus the guasti are stated to be, "not handsome". Especially in these last strophes of our text, there is much that reminds one of Râm. XXVI, 22; this strophe was fully discussed by Poerbatjaraka in T.B.G., 72 (1932), pp. 153 sqq.
ordered (?) to worship with smelling salt (?) ..... (?) with old men.

23. (omission of an aksara) :
On the day (fixed for) compulsory work on behalf of the Gods, the people in command performed the ceremonies; crowds of people came in and the first surveyor came in the third place (?); monks, young man and women of rank, ..... (?) ; there were numerous guards (?).
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 enthusiastic in fulfilling their tasks that they did not mind receiving scratch wounds by hurting against bamboo with their uncovered breasts.

91) Çaka 778 = 856 A.D.
92) Weh at the end of c and d has nothing to do with „to give", but is probably an adverb (also written wih), meaning „also, in addition, then” etc. As such, it often occurs in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa; cf. I. 19 c: mankana sang daçaratha weh, „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) Weh, 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 pālmahān (i.e. palāmāhan) 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'; antīk is the nasalized form of tīṭik) the outer limit of the temple grounds; we conjectured that these measures were taken to include the tīṭha (strophe 22) in the temple complex.
95) We consider kасandiha (kасandiha = kасandiha i) a derivative of Sanskrit samdeha (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 strewed on the ground, and perhaps meat for the Rākṣasas etc.
97) I do not understand the words humet=trīma harang, if at least the words should be separated in this way. Trīma (= tarīma) 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 trīma harang huma sabiyang, „the rice-fields with the Gods received . . . . . . ” (harang in the meaning of harāṇa, „charcoal” does not make sense). I have no idea about what humet could mean.
A tampah is an area measure frequently mentioned in Old Javanese records and is especially used to define the size of rice-fields.

Samgat is usual as a contraction of sang pamgat (cf. Van Naerssen, Bijdr. X.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 Pamēgēt 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.

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 pamēgēt titles. The rank of nayakas and patihs therefore depends on whose orders they execute. Here, they assist the Parnēgēt Wantil.

Kaiiranira, 'his kalima', refers back to the Pamēgēt, not to the patih; this follows from the use of the suffix -nira, which is too high to be applied to the patih (i.e., the latter's name is introduced by the 'article' si, to which corresponds -nya as a suffix).

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 gusit 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.

Winēkas, grammatically a passive of wēkas, may be translated 'he who receives orders'; but unlike the patih, nayaka, wahutas who receive orders from court dignitaries and functionaries, the winēkas acts in the name of the village elders (rāmasa) as a group (to which he also belongs himself).

Unknown from other sources as the name of a function. It is also possible that laduh is a proper name, continuing the list of wahutas; in that case, there would be no less than five wahutas (since si Gēnēg would be a wahuta, too), but this is only a minor objection. Another possible objection against the latter interpretation is that laduh is not preceded by si (or by another 'article'); it follows from Kabuh in pāda d that si could be omitted in poetry.

The words nayaka waneh explain the meaning of parujar; a similar explanation of the same word occurs in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa (XXVI, 22), quoted by Poerbatjarka in T.B.G., 72 (1932), p. 154.

The former presumably represented the rāmas with a definite function (rāma maṇaśaṃ
28. After the inauguration of the wet rice fields, the freehold existed, fixed to remain a freehold, this was the freehold that would belong to the god for ever.

29. Those (in charge) were sent back with the order to worship, every day, without forgetting their duties; 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).

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 Démak (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.

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, gasti, winiásas, tuhálas etc.), the latter those who gave advices to the village council after having transferred their possessions to their heirs (cf. m-pwa, p. 230).

98) I.e. inauguration as a freehold (síma). It is curious that the text here uses swah, whereas the territories are probably the same as those denoted by hame in 26 a.

99) Conjectural translation. Puput means "finished"; in this context, this could only mean that there would be no more question about it, that its tatus was fixed for ever; the words wálav ya sime are obscure to me.

101) Páda a is in comprehensible; it may consist of an enumeration of villages which become sime attached to the foundation. Patalásu could well be the name of a village, but Nimañḍār, Duṭi and Karamwa seem strange as village names.

110) In this páda, 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 páda b and that of páda 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 .github, followed by 9uklapaṇa, is undoubtedly the end of the indication of the titi, the shortest of which is ṭvatā (the spelling by a short 7 is no objection since similar cases are very frequent in Old Javanese inscriptions). Before ṭvatā (or another ordinal number), one expects to find in the lacuna: (a) a mark of punctuation, probably a double danda, (b) 9akawartsārita, 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 (tailing in modern Javanese) starts at the normal height, but is not continued down to the bottom 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<na> 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<na>, 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 kuan 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 tīthi. One should add the end of the village name; two village names known to occur in Old Javanese records are Airhaji and Airhaṇat, which makes one to two akṣaras. The total is: 14 + 2 (the punctuation mark) + 6 + 3 + 3 (the average month) + 1 1/2 (syllables preceding <i>) = 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) Juyhōll's Oudjavaansch-Nederlandsche Woordenlijst mentions examples from the Bhomakāwy and the Arjunawiwā, 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 çuddhapatra, 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, Đapunta Aṅgada, probably representing some monastery 8), lost the case (imalahakan 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 (Airha'i or Air-ha'nat?). It is mentioned in line 1 that an amount of gold and silver was in deposit with the above-mentioned village elders (kimmit, literally: „was guarded”). The point of controversy is not clear. The text mentions that it was the Đapunta’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 Đapunta 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 Đapunta 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 pinakakuan makani and could not therefore have introduced the name of a person. I suppose sang hyang ajiñā haji or something of this kind. The main difficulty is, however, the suffix -akan which seems superfluous.

7) There, too, the same term çuddhapattra is mentioned. A related document was published by Stutterheim in Inscr. Nod-Indiā, I (1940), pp 29 sqq.
8) Đapunta seems to be a title of monks; cf. K.O. IX, line 1 (đapunta i kawiku i panahga'ana waiēk 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 exceeded 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 Rakarayân Wêka, who had died in the meantime and was buried at Bulai (sang lumâh ing Bulai, line 4). He had decided that the deposit of gold remained with the village elders (tanmolah, line 4). It appears that this old decision was confirmed by the Rakarayân Mapathi of Wêka 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 Rakarayân Mapathi 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 *cuddhapattra*, 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 Rakarayâns Mapathis (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 Stutheim'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

---

8) The former Rakarayân Mapathi is designated by rakarayân mapathi sang rumahun (line 7) and by rakarayân sang matuha, the 'old' Rakarayân (line 8).
9) 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 Rakarayân 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 Rakarayân had in arriving at his decision. It is almost as in modern jurisdiction.
10) Sang munuat ujar, lit.: „those who make the words”, i.e., „spokesmen”; cf. tuhân munuat wawus in the Kâmbang Arum inscription with the note by Bosch in Oudh. Veral., 1925, p. 48. More common designations are parujar and parwawus.
11) Or rather, those who dressed up the official act and had it written on the copper-plate. Cf. below.
12) It is obvious that the gaining party had more interest to keep the official act than the losing one.
14) 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 Dèmak 16. Since the plate is dated 860 A.D., it belongs to the reign of king Rakai Kayuwani who ascended the throne in 856 A.D. 17. Since the edict was issued by the Rakarayân Mapathī, it may further be concluded that the Dèmak region belonged to Kayuwani’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 Dapunta Angada and the village elders of a désa the name of which is only incompletely known. The precise value of the title dèpunta is unknown. Grammatically the form may be analyzed into pu preceded by the honorific prefix da 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, bhagavanta. 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 Brahal inscription as was concluded by Damaïs (B.E.F.E.O., XLVI, Fasc. 1, 1952, p. 32). This Gunung Wule was situated near the Dieng according to the same text. This Bulai in our text is, however, only the place where the former Rakarayân is buried (humaḥ), 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 Kayuwani’s reign were found either in the Kedu, or in the Prambanan plain and its immediate neighbourhood. Although the king’s title does not occur in the epigraph, the mention of two Rakarayâns Mapathi 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 Dèmak 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 kdratana of the old Central Javanese empire was situated in the north of Central Java, not in the south where most of the later kdratana (Padjang, Pasargedé, Kerta, Plèrod, Kartsura, Surakarta and Djogjakarta) were situated (Oudheidkundige Aanteekeningen, XXVI, in Bijdr. K.I., 89, 1932, pp. 278 — 282).

a *dapunta* or *dapuntas* in the monastery of Panuṅgalan are granted privileges \(^{21}\). It might be concluded that *dapuntas* 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 Dapunta 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. \[^{22}\] lor. \[^{22}\] mas kā 2 su 7 mā 8 pirak mā 1 kinmit rāmanta i airha-
2. \[^{22}\] čuklapakṣa . wu po so . tatāla muwaḥ pinakakuannakan sang
3. \[^{22}\] rap misanna ikanang mas . ujar rakarayān=mapatiḥ i wka . kinonnaka<nta>
4. \[^{22}\] rayān=mapatiḥ sang lumāḥ ing bulai . tanmolaha tātaḥ kinmit rāma<nta>
5. \[^{22}\] ta 782 waiçākhamāsa . dwitiya čuklapakṣa . pa ka bu . tatāla mu<nta>
6. \[^{22}\] tumu{luy mojar} dapuntāṅgada . maharaṇap misanna ikanang mas atah
7. \[^{22}\] uḥlah-ulaḥan tātaḥ sadon \[^{24}\] rakarayān=mapatiḥ sang rumuhun
8. \[^{22}\] wkas rakarayān sang matuha . inalahakan dapuntāṅgada . na-
9. \[^{22}\] i<nta> kaing čuddhapāṭra ing tāmrācāsana : sākṣi sang mamuat ujar
10. \[^{22}\] likhita halangmanuk dharmmasinta . \[^{25}\]

**Translation**


\[^{21}\] Plate I b, line 1: *dapunta i konikwan i panuṅgalan*.
\[^{22}\] Only traces of the *talāṅ* before the *sa* have remained visible.
\[^{23}\] Read : či. The length of the final *-i* 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 *talāṅ*. 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 Rakarayän Mapatih of Wëka 34). .... was ordered [4] .... the Rakarayän 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 days is bound to repeat itself after 210 days. The chance that a definite combination falls on one of the possible tithis is therefore: $5 \times 210$ or 1050, i.e. once in about 3 years.

32) 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 Rakarayän 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 misarnna 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 Handwoordenboek by Gerick and Roorda, II, p. 276, explains misani by inwis, „to finish with something“. The pre-alent 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, ka misan means „killed by one blow“. If used with reference to a large amount of gold, the term would probably mean „acquiring 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 rakarayän=mapatih i wka refers back to the preceding decision. The lacuna between lines 2 and 3 may be reconstituted as follows: ratkala muwah pinakakuannakan sang <hyang raja-praçaesti. inlahakan ċapunika-gada mahe>. Maharap misarnna 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.

35) Lurañ, 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 Bërahol 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 Bërahol inscription is stated to be situated on, or in the immediate neighbourhood of, the Dieng plateau. As a matter of fact, there are several Dieng 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 Vaiṣākha, 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) Đapunta Aṅgada spoke, expressing his intention of acquitting himself of the debt all at once 29). [7] ...... the former Rakarayān Mapatih’s aim had been to avoid any trouble in the future 40). [8] ...... the intention (?) of the former Rakarayān. Đapunta Aṅgada lost the case. Thus (?) 41) [9] ...... this act of acquittance engraved in a copper-plate. The witnesses were: the representative of [10] ...... clerks from Halangmanuk and Dharmasinta 42).

interesting fact that the funeral temple of a Rakarayān Mapatih was situated on (possibly: in the immediate neighbourhood of) the Diėng. One might even suggest who this Rakarayān Mapatih was. The *patih* mentioned in the Perot inscriptions (No. IX above) is a Rakai Weḵa, 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 Weḵa 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 lumaṅ ing Bulai* is this Pu Puluwatu of the Perot inscriptions.

37) Literally: „guarded by” (*kinmits*).
38) The translation is based on the completion of *luy* to *tumuluy*.
39) The last words are a free translation of *misanna ike-seṅg mas*; cf. the Introduction and note 33 above.
40) *Ulah-uahan* 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 Halangmanuk and Dharmasinta are always associated with the Rakai Weḵa and Sirikan respectively. As to the former, cf., for instance, the Kĕmbang Arum inscription (published by Bosch in Oudh. Veral. 1925, pp. 41-49), second plate (II), line 2/3: *citralokha halangmanuk si gowinda*, mentioned immediately after the *parujar i wka* and just before the representative of Tiruan, the title which follows Weḵa immediately in this period. As to the relation between Sirikan and Dharmasinta, which is the same as that between Weḵa and Halangmanuk, cf. the same Kĕmbang Arum inscription, second plate (II), line 2: *citralokha dharmasinta si parbwata*, 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 Weḵa 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 immediately 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 Weḵa 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-l (113), or rather, three of its four pādas, which are quoted by Pentti Aalto, *Prolegomena to an edition of the Pâcarakṣā*, 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sarve sattvāḥ} & \text{ sarve prāṇāḥ sarve bhūtāḥ ca kevalāḥ} // \\
\text{Sarve vai sukhitāḥ santu sarve santu nirāmayaḥ} & // \\
\text{Sarve bhadrāṇi paçyantu mā kaçcit pāpam āgamat} & // \\
\text{Maitracitamaṃ samāsthāya karomi viṣaduṣanam} & // \\
\text{Rakṣāṃ parigrhaṇāṃ caiva tathaiva paripālanam} & //
\end{align*}
\]

It is obvious that the three pādas printed in italics agree with those of the cloka in No. III except for a few minor details. Instead of nirāmanāḥ, which is, of course, impossible, the Mahāmāyūrī reads nirāmayaḥ, which yields a satisfactory meaning. The correction to nirāmanāḥ, 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 rūpīnas = sarvasattvā hi, whereas the Mahāmāyūrī reads sarve vai sukhitāḥ santu. On the other hand, rūpīnaḥ and sukhitāḥ 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 rūpīnaḥ of our text is meaningless so that I am very much inclined to correct it to sukhitāḥ. Presumably, the copyist did not understand sukhitāḥ in this connection and replaced it by rūpīnaḥ, a term he knew well. If this is correct, the strophe may be reconstituted as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sukhinas} & = \text{ sarvasattvā hi sarve santu nirāmayaḥ} // \\
\text{Sarve bhadrāṇi paçyantu mā kaçcit} & = \text{ pāpam } = \text{ āgamat} //
\end{align*}
\]

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 cloka. 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 = ciyate 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 *praṣidhāna* for the well-being of all living beings. In the Mahāmāyūri, the first chapter of the Pañcaraṅkasūtra (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 antidote against snake poison (*karomi viṣadāśaṇaḥ* 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 Pañcaraṅka does not establish from where the compiler of No. III took the *çloka*, the correspondence proves important for several reasons. First, it enables 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 Ullāṅgha's *Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra*

In the autumn of 1954 I had the occasion to visit some librarians 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 Abhidharma-koça translation. On the other hand, the publication by Vasudev Gokhale, *Ullāṅgha's Pratītyasamutpādaçāstra*, Doctoral Thesis Bonn (1930), 31 pp., V Tafeln, proved to be very useful. Ullāṅgha'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 Ullāṅgha's Lehrbuch*. 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 trṣnāmūla (8-12).

(e) a division into four groupings, saṃskēpa (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 duḥkhaśthityaḥ denoted by terms which Gokhale translated from the Chinese text by „Agens“, „Mutter­schoß“, „Sinnesbereich“, „Auszwirkung“ 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-l to 2, which gives:
1. kāraka (aṅgas 1 and 2),
2. garbha (3 and 4),
3. viṣayapraṇvrtti (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 garbhā on the basis of the Chinese terms. For 3, Gokhale reconstituted viṣaya, but viṣayapraṇvrtti 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 „Auszwirkung“ 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 trṣṇā), the latter the evrer­returning cycle of deaths and re­births.

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 duḥkhaśthityaḥ or duḥkhavasthāḥ). The disease is, of course, existence; the indirect cause is Ignorance, the more direct kāraka is saṃskāra, which is threefold (cf. the three doṣa). Garbha corresponds with the latent period, viṣayapraṇvrtti 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, ārambhā, vipāka, niṣyandā, santāna, .......... (?), nirvrṛtti, 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 ṭṛṣṇā and upādāna and corresponds with „Leidenschaft”; the sixth fruit was erroneously omitted by the copyist of No. III; it could have been kārpanya or a synonym. For nirvṛttī I gave a wrong translation on p. 145; the Chinese interpreted it correctly in the meaning of abhinirvṛttī 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 anīṣṭaphala. 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 Čāstra and the text of No. III.

In addition, Ullaṅgha's Čāstra 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 Čūnyatā — 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 Pratītyasamutpādaññāstra 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 Upadeśa 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 Čāiva; 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 Čīvaliṅgas by king Kumbhayoni; again two different names of the god are used, viz. Čambhu 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 musalākhyṣṭagrama. 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 Čī 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 symbolic erection of a rice pestle by king Airlan-ga 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 = prasūtā ......) 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 sūtur ......); 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 pāçabhya = ivāṃsavam = aghyāh). The fourth and last king is Čī Kumbhayoni (strophe 5), whose knowledge of the Čāstras is praised as in the three texts of No. X above (strophe 5, pāda d : cāstrārthanirnālamamātir). Strophe 6 is particularly interesting since it mentions, in each of its pādas, four succeeding capitals of Kumbhayoni, viz. the lofty Dava (tungam dauākhyam puram), then Lāṅkapura, further Nirjhora 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 sq.

²) Cf. line 14 of the Old Javanese part of the Calcutta inscription (ik-panhal pinaka-kapatiṣṭham ċī mahārajā .. matangyan rakha halu ċī lokāçyara dharmnavaṇga aircalāgānānta-vikramottugadewa samiṇā kāśtwa ċī mahārajā de mpuṇku soğata māheçvara). 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. Anushtubh, Āryā, Indrabajra, Svāgata, Vasantatilaka, Čārdulavikrīḍita, Bhramitākṣara, Prabhaṇjini and Drutavilambita).

⁴) Thus, the king was a pūreça, he named the multitude of his foes (caṃtāgahārācī), being a rāçir-gamānām 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 — abhiprāyaṇa, II-23 (35).
ācraṇa — ācramāmu, II-15 (34).
āda — II-7, 12, 16, 18 (33-35); cf. 24 and Pras. Indon., I, 71,
addhyākṣi — II-4 (32); wrong spelling for adhyāka?
adhikaraṇa — II-4 (32); 20.
ādhāra (?) — 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.
amagap — ujamgapi, I, n-16 (5).
amithyā — I, n-18 (5).
an — II-2 (?), 4 (32), 9 (33).
anak — anakad, I, n-3 (5); anakmāmu, II-19 (35); anakvinimāmu, II-25 (36).
anucaṇa — makānucaṇa, II-6 (33); 38.
apa — I, n-18 (5).
ārambhā — I-8 (33); 26, 39; cf. s. v. sārmbha.
ārjava — cf. s. v. sārjava.
āsannakāla — 22; C. 66.
āsannaphala — āsannaphalāṇa, II-27 (37); 46.
āśāṅka — I, e-6 (14); II-28 (36); 12, 18.
atavā — II-6, 8, 9, 10 (33); 14, 16 (34); 17 (?), 18 (35); 26, 27 (36).
avadāyā — II-27 (36); 46; cf. Index c, s. v.
āyū-āyū — mi-āyū-āyū, 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, n-10 (5); nibhāru (?), I, n-12 (5).
bhasma — in marūpabhasmaṇavidamantraprayoga, II-13 (34); 30.
bhāpati — II-3 (32); 37.
bhūpura — 30.

cakṣu — 17, 22; cf. s.v. paracakṣu.
cāṭahāṭa — II-4 (32); 20; the correct spelling is cāṭabāṭa.
cārī — nicārī, II-10 (33); owing to a lacuna in the transcription, the context
is not clear; the word may be derived from Sanskrit cārīn, „going
around” etc.; tjeri, in modern Indonesian, means „to look for, to seek”.
caru — maṅcaru, II-11 (33); 41.
cihna — II-14 (34); 42.
corakāra (?) — maṅcorakāra, II-8 (33), but the reading is not certain; pre-
sumably Sanskrit caurakāra, but this compound is not known to occur.
cārīka — cūrikāṅku, I, a-6 (5); undoubtedly Sanskrit chūrikā.
čānī — II-26 (36); 21, 25; C. 78.
čāsana — čāsanāṇa, II-22 (35).
čatru — čatruṅku, II-6, 10 (33), 12 (34), 20 (35).
cihna — II-14 (34); 42.
ci — I, a-1 (4).
čriyantra — makačriyantra, II-12 (34); 30, 34, 41.

-dā — suffix, 3; cf. s.v. -ṇḍa.
Ďam — I, a-20 (6); C. 70.
Ďaṇan — I, a-5 (5); II-12 (23); 3; C. 70; cf. s.v. ďaṇan.
Ďanda — II-18 (35); niĎaṇa, II-18 (35); ḍaṇaṇku, II-19 (35); ḍaṇaku-
ṇḍa, II-15 (34); 27.
Ďaṇaṇāyaκa — II-3 (32); 27.
Ďapunta hiyaṃ — 9 sq.; C. 68 sq., 73 sq. (s.v. punta).
Ďoraḥ — II-12 (34).
Ďari — I, a-2 (4), a-6 (5); II-5, 6, 7, 8, 11 (33), 13, 16 (34), 22, 24 (35); C. 70.
Ďātāṃ — I, e-5, 6 (14); II-18 (35); C. 70.
Ďātu — II-6, 10 (33); ḍatūa, II-15 (34), 20, 21 (35); paṛdātvaṇ, I, a-1 (3);
paṛdātaṇ, II-10 (33); kadāṭauṇ, II-8, 11 (33), 20 (35); 17; C. 70
(Ďātu, ḍaṭva), 61 (kaḍāṭauṇ), the new texts seem to establish that ka-
dāṭauṇ has the meaning „royal residence” (kraton in Javanese), rather
than „territoire sous l’autorité d’un ḍātu” (C. 67). As to ḍaṭva, one might
hesitate between the interpretations of Kern (Verspr. Geschr., VII, 213)
and Cœdès (art. cit., 63, 70).
Ďeḥa — paḍehāṇḍa, VIII-1 (208); the use of dentals and linguals is just the
contrary of what would have been expected.
Ďeca — II-14 (34).
Ďhava — II-24 (35); C. 71.
Ďi — 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. di, diya, dy-.
Ďia — II-17 (35); cf. s.v. diya.
Ďiri — II-14 (34); dirīṇa, II-79 (33), 15 (34).
Ďivosa — diivasāṇa, II-26 (36).
Ďiya — II-15 (34), 28 (36); C. 71.
Ďiṇaṇ — I, a-21 (6), II-17, ?19, 20, 22 (35), 25 (36); C. 71; cf. s.v. daṇan.
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.

dūrum — 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. samvedāhī.

gīla — mākagīla, II-14 (34) ; 38.

gītoḍyāna — perhaps I, e-7 (15).

gotra — gotramāmu, II-19, 22 (35) ; kulagotramitrasantānamāmu, II-21 (35) ; C. 68.

gram — 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 gēraṇā 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 gram 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 gram 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 hāji-pratiyaya, II-3 (32) ; 20.

hānu — 26 ; inscription II gives vānu in the same context ; C. 79 („mot de sens inconnu”) ; R.A. Kern, Bijdr. K.I., 88 (1931), 512 sqq. ; cf. s.v. vānu.

havam — VIII-1 (208 sq.), transcribed havang.

hinamaddhyamottamajāti — 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, 724 (35), 25, 26 (36) ; VIII-1 (208 sq.) ; C. 66.

hya — 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.

jānana — 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.
kaloana — 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 Črīvijaya inscription.
karma... (?) — II-4 (32).
kāryya — makāryya, I, a-4 (5); nikāryya, I, a-19; makāryya, II-27 (36); perhaps kāryya, II-25 (36); cf. s.v. kriyakarmmakāryyakarādi.
kāshka — II-13 (34); 22, 30; C. 67.
kāyastha — II-4 (32); 20.
kita — 21.
krāma — I, a-18 (5).
kriyākarmmakāryyakarādi — II-16 (34); 42.
kroḍha — I, a-15 (5); 4.
-ku — suffix, in kadatwanru, II-8, 11 (33); danjak, II-15 (34); nigalru, II-18, 19 (35); nisamvardhik, II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35), 26 (36).
kula — kulamamu, II-6, 11 (33); kulagotrnatramtrasanānamāmu, II-21 (35).
kumārāmātya — II-4 (32); 20.
kūṣṭha — Sanskrit kūṣṭha, II-13 (34); 22, 30, 41.

lābha — labhamamu, II-24 (35); 44.
lai — II-6, 7, 9, 10, 11 (33), 13, 14, 15 (34), 17, 18, 20 (35); 21-23; C. 77.
lāṅit — mālaklāṅit, II-8 (33), 13, 14, 15 (34); C. 74. Kern, Verspr. Geschr., VII, 212. I translated „making crazy”, but „making impotent” might be preferable. Lēngit, in modern Indonesian (especially at Djakarta), means „indolent, lazy”, but then with the back-thought of making money by sly means without working. Thus, Poerwadarninta, Kamus Umm (1952), p. 409, adds „banjak akal buruk” between brackets.
lari — II-6, 7, 10; maṇlari, II-9 (33); larīyakan, II-9/10 (33); 40.
lavan — II-6 (33); C. 76.
līlu — I, a-19 (5), possibly a name.
lāṅit — mālalṅit, I, a-20 (6); 4; cf. s.v. laṅit.
lāpaha — I, a-15 (5).
lāpas — I, a-12 (5); 12 sq.; C. 75, s.v. marlapas.
luar — II-9 (33), 12 (34), 19 (35).
lūvi — II-5 (33); 11.

ma- — prefix, in makāryya, II-27 (36); makāryyāna, I, a-4 (5); marūpabhasmavidmantraprayoga, II-13 (34); ma- followed by a base with initial nasal, cf. s.v. maṃ-; cf. also s.v. mar- and maka-.
maika — maka ya lāṅit, a kind of tmesis (?), I, a-20 (6).
maka- — in makalnit, I, a-20 (6); makamatai (?), II-2 (32); makānucāra, II-6 (33); makatālu, II-8 (33); makaçriyantra, II-12 (34); makagila, II-14 (34); makalānit, 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.
man- — prefix, with assimilation of the nasal before stems beginning with velars, palatals and labials, in mañujāri, II-7, 9 (33); mañlari, II-9 (33); mañruruā, II-10, 11 (33); mañrakṣa, II-18 (35); mañrakṣāna, II-20 (35); mañalit, II-11 (33); mamāva, II-9 (33); maṅcaru, II-11 (33); C. 63.
manmaṃ — II-5, 7 (33); 38; C. 74.
–māmu — suffix, corresponding with kāmu, in vānakmāmu, II-5 (32); kula–māmu, II-6, 11 (33); mitramāmu, II-6, ?19 (35); vadumāmu, II-6 (33); ēcayamāmu, II-15 (34); katāhumāmu, II-17 (35); sthānamāmu, II-18 (35); vinimāmu, II-19 (35); anakmāmu, II-19 (35); anakvinimāmu, II-25 (36); sāntānamāmu, II-19, 22 (35); gotramāmu, II-19, 22 (35); kulagotramitisantānamāmu, II-21 (35); pallavamāmu, II-19 (35); niminmāmu, II-21, 22 (35); 26, 27 (36); samaryyādamāmu, II-24 (35); lābhamāmu, II-24 (35); vuaṭmāmu, II-24 (35).
māna — I, a-7 (5); cf. s.v. kamāna.
mančak — manmāncak, I, a-13 (5); 4; C. 74
maṅḍala — 18; cf. s.v. sakalamaṅḍala.
mansi — instead of maṣi, II-11 (33).
mantri (?) — II-23 (35), but the reading is uncertain.
mentrika — II-17 (34).
mar- — prefix, in marasvastʰa, I, a-8 (5), II-17 (35); marvyāha (?), I, a-10 (5); maruvudhi, II-5 (33), 20 (35); marppāda, II-7, 11 (33), 13 (34), 17 (35); marcorakāra, II-8 (33); maruvat, II-9, 10, 11 (33), 14 (34), 21 (35), 25 (36); maruvuddhisātau, II-11 (33), 14 (34); marśaṃjūvudhi, II-11 (33); the prefix ma- (cf. supra) is probably mar- the final r of which disappeared as a consequence of dissimilation (cf. makārya and marūpa*), just as in modern Indonesian (cf. bēladyar). For the use of the prefix cf. Cédès, 63, who states that „il donne aux verbes une valeur analogue à celle du moyen“; there are, however, exceptions such as maruvat above and marjahāti in line 7 of the Kotakapur inscription.
marsi — marsi kaji, II-5 (32); 20, 37.
mūra — I, a-16 (5).
māryyāda — māryyādanḍa, 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. niminumāmu.

mitra — mitramāmu, II-6 (33), 719 (35); mitrānku (?), I, a-21 (6); kula-gotramitrāsanātānamāmu, II-21 (35).

muah — II-8 (33), 21, 22 (35), 26, 28 (36); muahāṇa, II-26 (36); nimuah, II-26 (36); nimuahāṇa, II-23, 24 (36). Cf. 21, 24 sq., 46; C. 75 sq. Dr. Cœdès rightly noted that my explanation of muah in the Talang Tuvo inscription (p. 24) meets with the serious objection that muah 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); kamulamāṇa, 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).

-ṇa — suffix, in pramiraṇha, I, a-5 (5); vaṇkāṇa, I, e-5 (14) diriṇa (?), II-9 (33); tahanāṇa, II-11 (33), sthanāṇa, II-12 (34); vutāṇa, prāṇāṇa, II-14 (34); diriṇa, II-15 (34); prakāraṇa, II-16 (34), 17 (35); sakalamaṇḍalaṇa, II-20 (35); āṣaṇaṇa, II-22 (35); abhiprāyāṇa, II-23 (35); pārvuvāṇa, II-23 (35); divasāṇa, II-26 (36); āsannapalāṇa; II-27 (36); tamāṇa, II-28 (36). Together with the suffix -a (ā) in vatāṇa, II-15 (34); with ma-, makāryāṇa, I, a-4 (5); with ka-, kamulamāṇa, II-18 (35); with ni-, nīpāṇaṇa (?), II-12 (34); nītāṇaṇa, II-28 (36); with maṇ-, maṇrakāṣaṇa, II-20 (35); with sa-, savaṇkaṇa, II-16 (24); with par- and -ā, parvutāṇa, II-17 (35); with ka-, -an and -a, kavutanāṇa, II-26 (36).

nariyāt (?) — I, a-17 (5).

nāyaka — II-3 (32); 19, 27, 37; cf. also Index b, s.v.

ni— prefix, in nītāpik, I, a-9, 11 (5); II-26 (36); nivunuk, 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); nisuru, II-21, 23 (35); nimākan, II-25 (36); nivavu, II-26 (36); nimua, II-26 (36); nisaṇiṇī, II-27 (36); together with -kan, nikāryākān, I, a-19 (5); with -i, niujāri, II-23 (35); with -(i)ku, niṛka-ṣāku, II-8 (33); nighalarku, II-18, 19 (35); nisamvartdhiiku, II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35); 26 (36); with -mān, niminumām, II-21, 22 (35), 25, 26, 27, 28 (36); nighalarmāmu, II-11 (33); with -ṇa, cf. s.v. -ṇa; with par- and -(a)kan, nipersumpahākan, II-20 (35); cf. 3; C. 63.

nibhru — I, a-12 (5); with the prefix ni-?

nivacarna — II-4 (32).

nirbhāra — I, a-11 (5).

om — II-1 (32).

pādaḥ — māppādaḥ, II-7, 11 (33), 12, 13 (34), 17 (35), 23 (35); 38; C. 75.

pam — in pamanvayanku, II-25 (36); cf. note 56 to p. 31.

paracaksu — II-6, 10 (33); 22.
par- — with -an, paraddtvan (?) 1, a-1 (4), paraddatuan, II-10 (33); with n- and -a-kan, nipparsumpakahakan, II-20 (35); with -a and -ā, paruuatuṣa, II-17 (35); with -nā, paruuviṣa, I, a-11 (5); II-15 (34), 26 (36); perhaps also in paraviṣa, I, a-7 (5); 3, 18, 42, 46; C. 63 (par-), 73 (paruuviṣa), 72 sq. (paruuviṣa).

paracalan — II-6, 10 (33); 22.

parāvisa — cf. s.v. par-

pallava — pallavamāmu, II-19 (35).

pasaṇ — I, a-15 (5).

pāṭc — II-12 (34).

pauravirakta — I, a-9 (5).

piśaṇ (?) — nipīshanā, II-12 (34).

prañā — I, a-13, 16 (5); II-8 (33), 23 (35).

pradhāna — I, a-21 (6).

prakāra — II-16, 17 (35).

pramiraḥ — pramiraḥṇa, I, a-5 (5).

prāṇa (sic) — II-13 (34); cf. s.v. prāṇa.

prāṇa — prāṇāṇa, II-14 (34); cf. s.v. prāṇa and saruvaprāṇa.

pratikṣaṇa — II-4 (32); 20.

pratiyuvvarāja — II-20, 21, 22 (35); 17.

pratigya — 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 „commiss“, the last term kept intentionally vague („volontairement vague“).

prōṣṭāra (?) — II-3 (32), but the reading is uncertain.

puhāvaṃ — II-4 (32); 12; cf. Index b, s.v. hau)ang.

pūrvava — perhaps in II-8 (33); pūrvavāna 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 pūrvavāna tālu muahāṇa, instead of pūrvva katālu muahāṇa as printed on p. 33 above.

raijya — I, a-8 (5); presumably for rājya.

rājakumāra — II-20, 21, 22 (35); 17.

rakeśa — maṃrakeśa, II-18 (35); maṃrakeśaṇa, II-20 (35).

rūmaka — II-9 (33); cf. s.v. tīrhis.

rūpa — cf. the compound which follows.

rūpabhāsaṃavaidinstrapraṣayoga, preceded by ma- — II-13 (34); 30, 41.

ruru — maṃrruruḍ, II-10, 11 (33); 40.

sa — prefix, in samaryamāpatha, II-13 (34); samaryāda, II-17 (35); samaryādamāmu, II-24 (35); saśraṃbha, II-24; sārjjava, II-24 (35), 25 (36); savātu, II-27 (36); simālam, 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); especially for adverbs, Whitney, § 1313f (p. 513). Unlike Coēdes (p. 79), I take *sa-* in *sārāmbha* as the Indonesian prefix, translating all the enterprises (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, *sēhari sēmalam*, „one day and night” and *sētauiku*, for all I know”.

sakaḷamaṇḍala — sakalamanḍalāṇa, II-20 (35).

sākit — II-11 (33).

samaryyāda — cf. s.v. *sa-* and maryyāda.

samaya — samayaṇika, 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. *saṃkṣepaṭaḥ*.

saṃsthāna — II-12 (34); 30.

samvārdhī — Sanskrit *samvārdhī* („power, might”), in nisamvārdhiku, II-20, 21, 22, 23 (35), 26 (36); 18, 46. Unlike nīgalarku (cf. s.v. galar), the term applies to honorary functions.

śaṅkaṭe (?) — I, a-17 (5).

sānmuta — II-23 (35).

santāṇa — santāṇamāmu, II-19 (35); kulagotramitraṃsantāṇamāmu, II-21 (35).

sanyāsa — Sanskrit *sanyāsa* (sannyāsa), I, a-14 (5); II-15 (24), 20 (35); 18, 41; C. 78.

sārāmbha — cf. s.v. *sa-* and s v. ārāmbha; C. 79.

sāraṇa — cf. s.v. vuddhīśāraṇa.

sājrjava — II-24 (35), 23 (36); cf. s.v. *sa-* and C. 78.

sārvva — cf. s.v. *sarvvaṛṣaṇa* and *sarvasaṭṭva*.

sārvvaṛṣaṇa — II-18 (35); cf. s.v. prāṇa.

sarvasaṭṭva — 1.

saṃśāpati — II-3 (32).

savāṭikāṇa — cf. s.v. *sa-* vaṇak and -ṇa.

sida — I, a-19 (5); cf. *Pras. Indon.* I, 52, 70, where, however, the reference to Sanskrit *siddha* cannot be maintained.

sīḍhā — II-28 (36); 25; cf. s.v. siddhaṃ.

sīḍham — II-1 (32).

sūnayātra — 1 q, 10, 15; cf. Index b, s.v.

sīṭhāna — sīṭhāṇaṇa, II-12 (34); sīṭhāṇamāmu, II-18 (35).

sīṭhāṇa — II-4 (32); 20, 37.

sūnapaḥ — 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); niparsūnapaḥakan, II-20 (35); C. 79.

sūruḥ — nisūruḥ, 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 : „dans 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) ; tahūna, II-12 (33) ; C. 70.

tālu — II-8 (33), 19, 21, 22 (35) ; makatālu, II-8 ; the word is followed by muāḥ in all of these cases ; cf. 24, 25, 26 and C. 70.

tāmu — tamūna, nitamūna, II-28 (36).

tāmuva — 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 tāpika in Malagasi, meaning „army, military expedition“ : My translation is based on the above interpretation. Poerbatjaraka, Rimajat Indonesia, 1952, p. 41, translates the words kaliwat manāpik in line 10 of the Kotakapur epigraph by „sangat bērusaha mēna‘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 strive 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, to 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 Telagabatu epigraphs is defensive rather than offensive.

tānda — I, a-14 (5).

tathāpi — II-12 (34) ; 16 ; C. 69.

tatkāla — 16.

tattva — II-25 (36).

tida — 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 tida bhakti, cf. 27.

timira — I, a-7 (5), but the reading is conjectural.

tiṇah — tiṇah rumāḥ, II-9 (33) ; 39.

tuha — II-4 (32) ; 37 ; cf. s.v. huluntuhāṅku.

tuvi — II-5, 6, 7, 8, 11 (33), 12, 15, 17 (34), 17, 21, 23 (35) ; C. 70. The word is followed by mulāṃ in most of the cases.

ujar — manujāri, II-7 (33), 33 (35) ; niujāri, II-23 (35) ; 26 ; C. 71, 74.

umāŋgap — I, a-16 (5) ; I translated „devour, swallow“ (p. 4) ; a better translation might be „to seize“ ; cf. taśgēp in Javanese. The word must have existed in Old Javanese, as follows from sāṅgappan, „nine“, i.e. one taken off (viz. from ten).
upta — cf. s.v. varopāya.
ura — I, a-21 (6); II-5 (32), 8, 9, 11 (33), 13, 16 (34), 18, 24 (35); C. 67.
va — paruvāṇḍa, cf. s.v. par-
nācikāraṇa — II-13 (34); 22, 30; C. 77.
vadū — vaduvāma, II-6 (33); cf. Index b, s.v. wadwā.
vaidi — cf. s.v. rūpabhasma, vaidimantraprayoga.
vaṅḍika — II-11 (33).
vala — II-28 (36).
valum — I, a-3 (5); cf. Old Javanese wvaalung.
vaṅk — vaṅkma, II-5 (32); savaṅka, II-16 (34).
vaṇiyāga — II-4 (32); 20; for Sanskrit banyāga; cf. Index b, s.v. waniyāga.
vanua — I, e-8 (15); II-13 (34); cf. Index b, s.v. wana.
vaṇun — II-5, 7 (33), 13 (34); 26, 38, 44.
varopāya — II-9 (33).
vaṣikaraṇa — II-4 (32); 20; not to be confounded with vaṣikaraṇa.
vaṭak — II-5 (32); 37; cf. Pras. Indon., I, 73.
vaṭū — savatū, II-27 (36); perhaps, II-7 (33).
vihāra — I, e-8 (15).
vinī 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.
vruat — II-14 (34); vruatā, II-14 (34); vruatāṇa, II-15 (34); cf. s.v. -ā); marvruat, II-9, 10, 11 (33), 14 (34), 25 (36); kavruatanāṇa, II-26 (36); C. 77 (vruatāṇa, vruatku and vruatā).
vruddhi — marvruddhi, II-5 (33); marvruddhisārana, II-11 (33), 14 (34).
vukan — II-6, 11 (33); 38, 40; C. 78.
vulan — II-28 (36).
vunuḥ — niunuṇuḥ, 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.
yāstu — I, a-6 (5).
yūḥa — marvīyūha, I, a-10 (5).

b. Old Javanese. 1)
a- — prefix, in asīlih, XI-9b (312); ?asīh, 11b (312), 15a (313); ?agalak, XI-14c (313); aśīsēk, 23b (315); apatiḥ, 26b (316); ayeḥ, 27d (316); ārūn, 27d (316); combined with the suffix -an (attached to the root with an h as connecting consonant) in ajanmahān, 29d (316). For a-
prefixed to a nasalized or pre-nasalized root, cf. s.v. aṁ-. 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.

-an — suffix, not rarely spelt -ā, in musuha, XI-11b (312); wihañā, 13d (313); tamvāka, 14b (313); ?uvruha, 14d (313, for uvruha?); uliha, 18b (314); hyañā, 16d (314); siha, 22b (315); after a doubled root, imur-imura, 29c (316); combined with another affix, patoliha, 10d (312); pasisiha, 10d (312); ?kasandihā, 17b (314); manona, 19a (315); ?matataganā, 18c (314); uncertain, cf. s.v. tatag); diwyakānā, 18a (314); mahātisa, 18d (314); ?anēmovāka, 22b (315); mahāmayuṇa, 16d (314); inūyana, 23d (316); presumably: śīta followed first by -an, with y as a connecting consonant, then by -a; hyañā XI-16d (314) cf. 322.

adharmanadharma, XI-12a (312).
adimantri — XI-23b (315, for adimantri?).
agam — maṅgam kon, 216.
agāṇita — aganitāṅgana, XI-17d (314); 324.
agra — p. (pu) of Paṅkur in Perot inscriptions, IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).
air — air ṅyāl, 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-22c (315); 327.
akalāṅka — XI-10a (312).
akṣara — XI-27b (316); akṣaracyutaka, 23a (315); 305.
-akan (-akēn) — hēnēṅkan, XI-12b (312); combined with other affixes, diwyakēnā, 18a (314); inaliṅhākēn, 25b (316); uinaluyakēn, 29a (316); pinakakuanākan, XII-2 (335); 331.
akua — p. (pu) of the Datar in the Perot inscriptions, IX, b-10 (233); cf., however, s.v. arka.
alah — inalāhakān, XII-8 (335); 332 sq.
alap — riṅ = alap, XI-14d (313); kālap, XI-8c (312).
alas — cf. s.v. tuhā.
alīḥ — XI-15b (313); ainalīḥ, XI-15b (313), 26a (316); inaliṅhākan, XI-25b (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); velahhañ, IX, a-8, 12 (232); b-7, 12 (232), b-31 (236); dalinān, IX, a-8, 12/13 (232); b-7, 12 (233); tavūn, 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); kaṇḍaṅān, IX, b-29 (235); IX, b-29 (235); tuḥān, IX, a-15, 16 (232), b-15, 16 (234); ungsyan, XI-17c (312); ?samarān, XI-10c (312); taṇanān, XI-9b (312); tiruan, XI-15d (313); combined with other affixes, kanalagyan, IX, a-14 (232), b-13 (233); katuwuṅhan, IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (233); tināpān, XI-15d (313); parhyānān, cf. s.v. hyaṅ; pacleān, cf. s.v. cala; dinānān, cf. s.v. dāna; ajanmaḥan, cf. s.v. a-.
anak — for anak wanua, 242; anak wanua (banua), XI-22e (315); 226, 326.
anāryya — for Sanskrit anārya, XI-12d (312); 321.
anila — XI-7d (312).
anta— mānta, XI-12c (312); 321; cf. s.v. munyu.
anti — cf. s.v. panti.
anubhāva — dewānubhāva, XI-11a (312).
anuja — ranujāmata, XI-9c (312); 318.
anumoda — XI-13d (313); maṇianumoda, ibid.; cf. 302, 306, 321.
anung — IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (233).
anurāga — cf. s.v. warānurāga.
añi — prefix a- before a nasalized base, añaliḥ, XI-15b (313); cñutus, XI-17c (314); amūja, XI-18c (314); anitik, XI-25b (316).
añen — pañanēnañēnta, XI-11b (312); 320.
añgada — p. (nipta), XII-8 (335).
añgana — for Sanskrit añgana, cf. s.v. agaṇita.
apa — XI-16d (314); apaniya, XI-25b (316); ?hanāpa, XI-18a/b (314); cf. note 24 to p. 314.
apārco — XI-16b (314), 19a (315).
arav — māraṇ, XI-26b (316); āran, XI-27d (316); maṇikanaran, XI-27c (316); nāranya, XI-18d (314).
arka — p. (pu) of the Datar in Perot inscr., IX, a-10 (232); inscr. b reads, however, aku.
arthā — sārtha, XI-17a (314); 307.
asū (asē), also aṁsō — maṣō, XI-23b (315); inangṣō, XI-9b (312); maṅsō, IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (235); umaṁsō, 225 sq.; maṁsākan, 240; cf. 318.
asē — XI-11b (312); ?sīh-asē, XI-15a (313); cf. s.v. sih.
ataḥ — XII-6 (335); tātaḥ (= te ataḥ), XII-4, 7 (335).
atha — XI-8b (312).
atīṣaya — for Sanskrit atiṣaya, XI-16c (314), 18d (314).
atu — inatus, XI-7c (312), 17c (314); 293, 317, 324.
aum — for Sanskrit om (?) ka-aum, XI-13d (313); 321.
awatāra — paṇawataran (sic), XI-16d (314); 284, 324.
awit — p. (si), IX, b-24 (235).
ayat — XI-10a (312).
ā — abbreviation of ādītyavāra, IX, a-4 (232); b-3 (233).
ācārya — t. (dang), 219.
āḍārama — sacaturācārama, XI-9d (312); 318 sq.
āḍi — XI-11d (312).
ājñā — rājñe (= ra-ājñā i ?), XI-10a (312); 319.
ālaya — cf. s.v. čivālaya.
ārvama — XI-6b (311); 317.
āśādhamāsa — IX, a-3 (231, spelt āśāda), b-2 (232, spelt āśādha).
āwali (?) — XI-7d (312); 293, 317.
baka — XI-22a (315).
balubu(ng) — p. (si), IX, a-20 (232), b-19/20 (234).
baṅcung — p. (si), IX, b-22 (234).
bantal — p. (si), IX, b-36 (236).
banyāga — kabanyāgān (sic), IX, b-34 (236); 230 sq.
Bu — abbreviation of budhāvāra, XII-5 (335).
bulai — name of a mountain (?), XII-4 (335); 336.
Buyut — 251 sq.; cf. s.v. puyut.
bhādra — p. (pu), IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233).
bhagavanta — for Sanskrit bhagavant, 228.
bhakti — XI-17b (314); bhaktita (for Sanskrit bhaktitāḥ?), ibid.
bhānu — p. (si), IX, b-22 (234).
bhātāra — for Sanskrit bhāṭāra, XI-16b (314), 24d (316), 28d (316).
bhṛtya — for Sanskrit bhṛtya, XI-13b (313).
bhūmi — XI-6b (311).
caru — macaru, IX, b-25 (235); 242.
caturāçrama — sacaturāçrama, cf. s.v. açrama.
čila — cf. s.v. suacila.
citta — samacitta, XI-17a (314).
čiwa — čiuvārā, XI-26a (316).
čiuvālaya, — XI-25a (316).
čri — sačri, XI-6c (311); čri maṇḍaki, v., IX, b-25 (235); črīdhara, p. (si), IX, a-16 (232), b-16 (234).
čucihrā (?) — XI-22d (315).
čuklapakṣa — XII-2, 5 (335); samārgacīračuklapakṣa, XI-24b (316); spelt suklapakṣa, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233).
čūra — čūrapati, XI-7a (312). Cf. Index c. s.v. čūralakṣmī.
ča — prefix, in čakalang, IX, a-11 (232), b-10 (233); čakampak, IX, a-13 (232), b-12/13 (233); čamalihān, IX, a-12 (232), b-11/12 (233); čawānlar, IX, a-13 (232), b-13 (233); čakukap, IX, a-12 (232), b-12 (233); čaragang, IX, a-14 (232).
čadi — XI-14d (313).
čalinan — t. (vakai), IX, a-8, 12/13 (232), b-7, 12 (233); 220, 221, 222, 223.
čamalung — t. (p. ?), IX, a-14 (232), b-13 (233).
čaman — 240.
čamo — p. (si), IX, a-15/16 (232), b-15 (234).
čana — manḍaṇa, p. (si), IX, a-16 (232), b-15 (234).
čara — dinānān, XI-25c (316).
čanā — maṇḍaṇa, XI-23d (316); p. (si), IX, b-23 (234).
čang — čang hyang, 208, 243; cf. s.v. ācārya.
čanū — XI-12d (312).
čapu — čapu hyang, 240; čapu hawang, 209.
čapunta — XII-6, 8 (335); 240.
daatar — t., IX, a-10 (232), b-10 (233); 238.
daωa — p. (si), IX, b-25 (235).
de — denya, XI-10d (312); dening, XI-17c (314).
dewa — dewānubhāva, cf. s.v. anubhāva.
dhantā — p. (si), IX, b-17 (234); inscr. a, however, reads jānta.
dharma — XI-11d (312, spelt dharmā); dharmmasinta, XII-10 (335); 337; cf. also 320.
dhasa — p. (si), IX, b-22 (234).
deqa — for Sanskrit dīc, in pūrnwadiča, XI-16b (314).
dīwasa — XI-23a (315).
dīvyā — dīvyatama, XI-18a (314); dīwyottama, XI-25a (316); dīwyakēnā, XI-18a (314).
diyus — (= dyus), XI-22b (315).
don (?) — sadon, XII-7 (335).
durarapalā — for Sanskrit dvārapāla, XI-14c (313); 284.
durlabhā — XI-12a (312).
duwa (?) — duwane (?), XI-12b (312).
dvitiyā — for Sanskrit dvitiyā (tithi), IX, a-3 (231), b-2 (232); XII-5 (335).
dyā — XI-9c (312).
-ēn — suffix, in gawyēn (?), XI-14a (313).
ēnah — ēnahhi, XI-15b (313).
(ē)nēng — p. (si, in combination with the name: siēncung), IX, b-21 (234).

gandaḥ — p. (si) of patih of Mantyasih who has the title (or: religious name?) punta pramāṇa, IX, a-18 (222), b-17 (234).
gada — p. (pu), IX, a-8/9 (232), b-9 (233, spelt gadā).
galak — agalak, XI-14c (313).
ganita — cf. s.v. aganita.
garavuy — p. (t. ?), IX, a-11 (232), b-10 (253).
garung — t. (rakai) of a king, 220.
garutī (?) — XI-23d (316).
gatāgata (?) — XI-18c (314), but perhaps to be read çatāgata; cf. 325.
gawai — XI-13d (313); gawainya, XI-29b, d (316); ginavainira, XI-12d (312); magawai, XI-13c (313); gawayēn (?), XI-14a (313), 15a (313); ginawai, XI-24d (316).
gelar — ginlar, XI-8d (312); cf. 318.
gṛēha — spelt griha, XI-15a (313); cf. s.v. ċiwa.
guna — kalāgūnāvāvaprakulasthanāma, XI-8c (312).
gunu(ng) — to denote the number 7, XI-24a (316).
gupura — for Sanskrit gopura, in sāgupura, XI-17d (314).
gur — gurumatatēpasa, XI-21d (315); yan paguru, XI-23c (316); guru hyang, 243.
gusti — XI-26d (316); gusti wagus, XI-22c (315); gusti teňah, 230.
gutoasang (?) — p. (si), IX, b-29 (235).

hada — p. (sang), IX, b-31 (236).
hadaňan — t., 220, 222.

dēp — XI-11c (312).
haji — cf. s.v. air.

hala — XI-24d (316); hale (= hala i), XI-12c (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-12d (312); 251 sq., 312.

hāna — IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233); XI-11b, c (312), 15c (313), 18a (314), 28b (316).

hańska — Sanskrit hańska, XI-22a (315); 1, 74.

hantā — nom. of Sanskrit hantr, XI-7d (312); 317.

harang (?) — XI-25d (316).

hareap — maharap, XII-3 (?), 6 (335).

havang — dāpu havang, 209; cf. s.v. puhavang.

hayu — XI-13c, 15a (313); p. (si), IX, a-19 (232), b-18 (234); mahayu, XI-15d (313); hayuwa (= hayu with suffix -a?), XI-21c (315).

hēnēng — hēnēnakan, XI-12b (312).

hino — presumably, XI-14a (313); cf. note 18 to p. 313.

hiyang — cf. s.v. hyang.

hrēčan — p. or t. (sang), IX, a-13 (232), b-12 (233).

hulu — hulu tangña (=teňah), 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.

humā (humā) — XI-25d, 26a (315).

humet (?) — XI-25d (316).

hurip (?) — XI-12c (312).

humws — XI-25a, c (316); p. (si), IX, b-35 (236); ri kahunosyan, XI-28a (316).

hiyang (also spelt hiyang) — XI, 16d (314); sang hyang, XI-29c (316); wuath hyang (wuathyang with sandhi), XI-23a (315); ġang hyang, 208, 243;
dāpu hyang, 240; sāhyang, XI-25d (316); marhyang, IX, b-34 (236);

parhyanash, XI-17d (314); manghyang, XI-23a (315); hyanā, XI-16d (314); cf. 209 sq.; cf. also s.v. guru, palar, pāngil.

-i — suffix, in ēnaḣhi, XI-15b (313); perhaps in manuhuri, IX, a-7 (232);

maňahuri, IX, b-6 (233); garuti (?), XI-23d (316).

iļu — milu, IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233); 237.

-in — infix, in inatus, XI-7c (312), 17c (314); ginlar, 8d (312); inangso, 9b (312); ginnawai, 12d (312), 24d (316); ginnawainir, 11d (312); tinonta,

XI-12d (312); tinapān, 15d (313); sinangskāra, 24d (316); inalihhakēn, 25b (316); dinānaṅ, 25c (316); sinīma, 25d (316), 28a (316); winkas,

27a (316); pinakaporujar, 27b (316); winaluyakēn, 29a (316); kinon,
29a (316); kinonkan, XII-3 (335); pinakakuannaikan, kinnmit, XII-1, 4 (335); inalakan, 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).

īnā — cf. s.v. pras.

īnta — (= i nīte), XI-26d (316).

īnā — inūyana, XI-23d (316).

irang — merang, XI-10c (312).

iring — (= i ring ?), waruheriṇī = alap, XI-14d (313).

ista — wrong spelling of Sanskrit īṣṭa, XI-14b (313).

istaka — wrong spelling of Sanskrit īṣṭaka, XI-14b (313).

iṅwang — v. (?), XI-10c (312).

iṅvari — Sanskrit īṅvari, XI-7a (312).

īṅga — XI-8a (312).

ja — 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).

janturan — v., 251.

janmah — ajanmahar, XI-29d (316); cf. s.v. a-.

jantana (?) — p. (si), IX, a-17 (232), but b reads dhantana.

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).

jiwana — 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); jurunja, IX, a-19 (232), b-19/20 (234); siličjuru, cf. s.v. silih; juru limus, IX, a-19 (232), b-19/20 (234); juru kuṇci, IX, b-21 (234); cf. 230, 241.

ka — abbreviation of kāluwuan, XII-5 (335).

ka- — prefix, in kālāp, XI-8c (312); ka-aum, XI-13d (313); perhaps in karī, 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 kasandīhe, XI-25c (316); with -yan in kahuvusyan, XI-28a (316); with -an in kahuvuḥhan, IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (233); kanayakān, IX, a-15 (232); kakalyan, IX, b-26 (235); kabanyagan, IX, b-34 (236); kadaṭuwan, XI-8d (312); karaṭuwan, XI-9b (312); ?karasān, XI-18b (314); kamarān, XI-23c (316).
kā — abbreviation of kāṭi, XII-1 (335); cf. 333.
kabaiḥ (kabaiḥ) — XI-13a (313), 25c (316).
kāka — XI-22a (335); cf. 1.
kakalyan — v., IX, b-26 (235); 231.
kakar — v., IX, b-28 (235).
kaki — rakaki, XI-10b (312); sakaki, XI-22d (315).
kala — p. (si), IX, b-20 (234).
kāla — XI-5d (311); 24a (316).
kalā — kalāguwaraviprakulasthanāma, XI-8c (312).
kalang — IX, b-37 (236); XI-22c (315); dakalang, t. or p. (sang), IX, a-11 (232), b-10 (233).
kali — cf. s.v. kakalyan.
kalima — cf. s.v. lima.
kaling (?) — kumaling, XI-14d (313), but cf. s.v. ling.
kalula — tuhān ning kalula, IX, a-16 (232), b-16 (233); 228.
kamalagyan — cf. s.v. lagi.
kampak — dakampak, t. or p. (sang), IX, a-13 (232), b-12/13 (233).
kanḍanān — v., IX. b-29 (235).
kanḍī — p. (si), IX, b-34/35 (234).
kanḍut — p. (rasi), XI-26d (316).
karamba — p., XI-28c (316).
karas — karasān, XI-18b (314); or a derivative of rasa, cf. 325.
kari — XI-19a (315); cf. s.v. karih.
kariḥ — XI-14b (313); cf. s.v. kari.
kataḥ — XI-23d (316).
katuḍaing — p. or t. (sang), IX, a-11/12 (232), b-11 (253).
katuwuḥhan — p. or t., cf. s.v. tuwuḥ.
kawithha — XI-22d (315); 327.
kuṇu — XI-16a (314).
kuṇumwuṅan — v., IX, a-17 (232), b-17 (234), ?29 (235).
k( domestically or place)
k( domestically or place) — p. (si), XI-26c (316).
k( domestically or place) — 238.
k( domestically or place) — from Sanskrit kecava, p. (si), IX, b-21 (234).
khawali — XI-29d (316, preceded by si).
ki — XI-16a (314).
kilala — manilala drēwya haji, 227, 238, 240.
kita — XI-22a, c (315).
kon — konya, XI-29c (316); kinon, XI-29a (316); kinonnakan, XII-3 (335); cf. s.v. kuan.
krahu — p. (si), IX, b-26 (235).
kuṣuṇika — XI-17c (314).
kuaith — XI-15d (313), 17a (314), 22b (315).
kuan — pinakakuannakan, XII-2 (335); cf. 331.
kudur — wohuta hyang kudur, 237; makudur, t., IX, a-9 (232), b-8/9 (233); wohuta makudur, IX, a-14 (232), b-13/14 (233 sq.); cf. 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 227, 233, 238.
kukap — dukukap, t. or p., IX, a-12 (232), b-12 (233).
kula — kalagurawiprakulasthanamā, 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).
kumari — for Sanskrit kumāri, XI-23c (316).
kusi — v., IX, b-25 (235).
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 (langsi) — t., IX, a-9, 14 (232), b-8. 13 (233); 220, 221, 222, 223.
lamvan — 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(e)mah — palmahan, XI-25b (316).
lkhita — XII-10 (335).
lima — kalima, IX, a-20 (232); b-19, 20, 23 (234), 23 (236); kalimanira, XI-26c (316); cf. 230, 241.
limus — limus watu, v., IX, b-28 (235); juru limus, IX, a-20 (232), b-19/29 (224); 241, 242.
līnga — XI-14a; cf. note 18 to p. 313; cf. also Index c, s.v.
lōka — lokadhātu, XI-5d (311); lokapāla, XI-9c (312).
lūh — 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), mawurukan, XI-24c (316); māran, XI-26c (316); maratā, XI-27c (316); matakun, XI-27d (316), malupā, XI-29b (316); magawai, XI-13c (313), 17c (314); māntan, XI-12c (312), matakut, XI-14d (313); māhyu, XI-15d (313); malawas, XI-16a (314); matamvak, 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; mapatiḥ, cf. s.v. patiḥ; ma(n)taṇḍa, cf. s.v. taṇḍa; together with negative particle, tamojar-ujar, XI-18c
(314); with suffixes, matataganā (= tatag with prefix ma- and suffixes -an and -a?), XI-18c (314).

mā — abbreviation of māyā, XII-1 (335).
maddhava — p. (pu), IX, a-7 (232); cf. s.v. maddhāva.
maddhāva — 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 maddhava and maddhāva are wrong spellings, the correct form being mādhava.

maha- (mahā-) — archaic prefix, exclusively and not frequently found in the older Old Javanese writings, in mahāmayuṇa, XI-16d (314), mahātisa, XI-18d (314); references, 324.

mahantara — p. (pu), IX, a-7 (232); 237; the corresponding place in b reads mantara.

māheçwara — wrong spelling for Sanskrit māheçvara, XI-7a (312).

maka- (pinaka) — mākadhārāya, XI-5d (311); pinakapuruṣar, XI-27b (316); makanārana, XI-27c (316); pinakakuannakan, XII-2 (335); 331.

mañling — XI-14d (313).

mañini — p. (si), IX, b-29 (235).

mañrati — mañratipuraṣṭha, XI-8d (312); rakaki mañrati, XI-10b (312).

mañhā (?) — v., IX, b-29 (235).

mañawan — p. (pu), IX, a-9 (232), b-8 (233).

maṇḍaki — cf. s.v. ārī.


maṇḍīha — p. (si), IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234).

maṇḍuta — p. (pu), IX, a-7 (232), b-6 (233).

maṇḍala — paḍahi maṇḍala, IX, b-24 (235).

maṇghhūri (spelt maṇghūri and maṇhūhuri) — t. (rakai), IX, a-7, 11 (232), b-6, 11 (233); 220, 221.

maṇgkana — tlas manékana, XI-9a (312).

maṇglakṣa — p. (pu), IX, a-9 (232), b-8 (233).

maṇojña — XI-19a (315).

maṇtara — p. (pu), IX, b-6 (233); 237; cf. s.v. mahantara.

maṇtvyasiḥ — v., IX, a-17 (232), b-17 (234); 229, 241.

maṇ — wrong spelling of Sanskrit maṇu, p. (pu), IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).

maṇuja (?) — maṇujān (= maṇuja followed by an ?), XI-13b (313).

maṇuk — cf. s.v. halamnanuk.

maṇūt — p. (si), IX, b-24 (235).

maṛ (?) — (= mēr ?), kamaṁ, XI-23c (316).

mārgaḥcitra — samārggaçrayukapakṣa, XI-24b (316).

maṃning — p. (si), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234).

mas — XII-1, 3, 6 (235).

maṣalāñcang (?) — v., IX, b-36 (236).

mata — ranjāṃata, XI-9c (312).

milar — p. (si), IX, b-35/36 (236).
mitra — XI-13b (313).
mṛēsi — p. (rasi), XI-26c (316).
muhūr (?) — XI-16a (314), where it is supposed to be the name of a tree (preceded by ki); cf. note 58 to p. 323.
mukhya — wipramukhya, XI-9d (312).
mula — IX, b-23 (234) ; 241.
mūla — XI-12d (312).
mulg — p. (pu), IX, a-8 (232), b-8 (233).
mulya — p. (si), IX, b-29/30 (235 sq.).
mulyang — p. (si), IX, a-8 (232), b-8 (233).
mungu — 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-11b (312).
mwah — XI-7d (312).

n — watu = nn = inatus, XI-7c (312) ; 293.
ń — XI-9d, 11b (312), 18c (314), 26d, 27a (316).
nā — XI-12d (312), 24b, c (316), ?25d (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).
nātha — XI-8a (313).
nayaka (nāyaka) — tuhān ning nayaka tua, IX, b-15 (234) ; tuhān ning kana-
nayakān, IX, a-15 (232) ; 227, 228, 238, 239.
nātan — XI-12b (312).
i — passim, e.g., XI-7b, 8a, 10d, 11a, c (312), 28c (316) ; ny, XI-27b (316).
iha (?) — p. (si), IX, b-16 (234), but inscr. a reads jaha.
nihān — p. (si), IX, a-20 (232), but inscr. b reads nahan.
njakula — XI-13b (313).
nikaing — XI-28a (316).
nikāna — XI-25a (315).
nikanang — XI-24a (316).
nikāta — XI-16b (314).
nīng — passim, e.g. XI-9a, 11c, 12a, d (312).
nīra — suffix, in lawasinira, XI-11a (312) ; kalimanira, XI-26c (316) ; gina-
wainira, XI-11d (312).
nīru (?) — p. (si), IX, b-25 (235).
nītya — XI-29d (316).
niyāga (?) — XI-22a (315), but the word separation is not certain.
īke — cf. s.v. ike.
-(n)ta — tinonta, XI-12d (312) ; paṇaṇāṇṇaṇēnta, XI-11b (312).
nuni — nuni nuni-nuni, XI-10c (312).
-nya — suffix, in umañya, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233); paruvusnya, 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); tumunya, XI-18b (314); tañaranya, XI-18d (314); rūpaniya (= rupāniya, metrical license for rūpanya, followed by an). XI-16c (314); ri kahuvusyan, 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 paṭihā, XI-10a (312); pānti, XI-15d (313); paguru, XI-23c (316); before a nasalised base, paṭatiḥ, XI-23a (315); together with a suffix, paṭoliḥa, XI-10d (312), pañaññanēnta, XI-11b (312); paṣiḥa, XI-10d; paṇavān, XI-15b (313); paṇavantarān, XI-16d (314); tan pacalān, XI-17d (314); palināna, XI-23b (316); pataleśan, XI-28c (316); paṭapān, IX, a-5, 9/10, 15 (232), b-4, 9 (233), 14 (234).

paḍa — paḍanya, XI-18a (314).

paḍahi — paḍahi māgala, IX, b-24 (235); 241 sq.

paḍar — p. (si), IX, b-28 (235).

paḍgar — p. (si), IX, b-28 (235).

paṅkan (= pekēn) — in mapakān, XI, b-24 (235), b-33 (236); 230.

paḷarhyang — t. (rakāi), IX, a-7 (232), b-7 (233); 220, 222; cf. s.v. paṅgilhyang.

paṃgat (panęgēt) — 220.

paṇa — p. (si), IX, b-28 (235).

paṇḍakyan — IX, b-19 (234); 229.

paṅgsat — p. (si), IX, b-32 (236).

paṅgilhyang — t. (rakāi), 221, 222.

paṇi (paṇing ?) — v., IX, b-2c (235).

paṇkur — t. IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233); 220, 221, 222.

paṇti — etymologically, anti with prefix pa-, XI-15d (313).

paṇurang — 238.

papi — cf. s.v. air.

par- — prefix, in paru(w)uṣus, IX, a-16, 17 (232); b-15, 17, 20, 22 (234); b-31 (236); parhiṇyan, XI-16d (314); pinakaparujan, XI-27b (316).

para — mare, XI-28d (316).

parang — v., IX, b-26 (235).

pārijātaka — pārijātakarūpama, XI-16c (314).

pasat — p. (si), IX, b-20/21 (234).

patapān — t. (rakāi), IX, a-3, 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); saṁ-spatiḥ, XI-26b (316); sang patiḥ, XI-10a (312): rakarayān mapatiḥ, IX, a-10 (232),
b-10 (233); XII-3, 4, 7 (335); mamatiḥ, XI-23a (315); 227, 228, 237, 238, 240, 241.

patni — XI-7a (312, ʧurpatni).
payung — mahāmayuṇa, XI-16d (314); 324.
pētir (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 — ʤamilikan, 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).
pönpöng — XI-11c (312).
prabhu —sang prabhu, XI-9a (312).
prahāṭaḥ (?) — XI-12c (312).
prajà — XI-9d (312).
prākrētasannīvēga — 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 = iśa āṅg limus, v., IX, b-26 (235); 242.
prāsāda — for Sanskrit prāśāda, IX, b-34 (236); possibly, b-30 (236); 230.
prāśiddha — XI-6c (311), 8a (312).
pratidina — XI-29b (316).
pratyaya — 227, 228, 238; pratyaya hyang, 243.
prawara — XI-13c (313).
priḥ-priḥ — XI-10d (312).
pukawang — 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 Ḳakai Wēka 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 — mamratiṇuṣṭha, XI-8d (312).
pūru(u)a — cf. s.v. apūruwa and s.v. diça.
putra — XI-12c (312).
puyut — 251 sq.; cf. s.v. buyut.
pua — cf. s.v. tapuwa.
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); ranuṣjāmata, XI-9c (312); rājīne, XI-10a (312); rakaki, XI-10b (312); cf. s.v. rasi; s.v. rakarayān.
ragang — doctrine, t. (sang), IX, a-14 (232), b-14 (234).
raja — p. (pu), IX, a-9 (232), b-9 (233).
rägya — XI-9b (312).
rakai — cf. s.v. ra-.
arakayān — rakhayān patatā, IX, a-14/15 (232), b-14 (234); rakhayān
mapatih, IX, a-10 (232), b-10 (233); XII-3, 4, 7 (335); rakhayān sang
matuha, XII-8 (335); cf. s.v. ra-.
rakēt — mangrakēt, maṇḍakēt, 239 sq.
rakṣa — XI-8b (312), spelt raksā; mangraka, XI-6b (311).
rakwa — XI-11d (312); 320.
rama (rāma) — IX, b-33 (236), a-20 (232), b-20 (234); b-35 (236); b-36
(236); XI-22c (312); rāmeya, IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234): rāmanta,
XII-1 (?), 4 (335); 216 sq., 220 sq., 230.
raṇautsava — Sanskrit ranautsava (?), XI-6c (311).
rāṅkang — XI-15b (313).
rānujāmata — cf. s.v. anujā.
rārva — cf. s.v. uadvā.
rasī — composed of ra- and si (?), XI-26c, d (312); 27d (312).
rat — cf. s.v. jāti.
ratā — rāma maratā, XI-27c (316); 216.
ratejika — XI-6c (311).
ratu — IX, a-5/6 (232), b-5 (233); karatwa, XI-9b (312); 212, 218, 219.
rāvapra — cf. s.v. vrāpā.
rgga — p. (si), IX, b-20 (234); the name is probably rēga with non-writing
of the ō and doubling of ga after r).
ri — XI-7a (312); 8a, d (312), 10b (312).
roha — samaroha, XI-17a (314).
rouvāng — XI-8b (312); marowang, p. (si), IX, b-35 (236).
rūla — IX, a-10, 15 (232), b-15 (234); karua, b-9 (233).
rūluu — rumulhu, XI-16a (314); XII-7 (335).
rūpa — rūpanijān (= rūpanija, for rūpanya, followed by an), XI-16c (314).
rutunga — p. (si), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234).
rutus — p. (si), IX, b-35 (236).

sa- — prefix, in sacrī, XI-6c (311); sacaturāgrama, XI-9d (312); sawargga,
XI-13a (313); saturwanyā, XI-14b (313); sawuit, XI-15c (313); sawaluy,
XI-15d (313); sataire (?), XI-16a (314); sārtha, XI-17a (314); sugu-
pura, XI-17d (314); sakaki, XI-22d (315); samārggaçitamkāpakṣa,
XI-24b (316); savēlas, XI-24b (316); sahiyang, XI-25d (316).
saha — XI-26b (316); 27d (316).
saiṣa — p. (si), IX, a-19 (232), b-18 (234).
sakābda — incorrect spelling for Sanskrit čakābda, XI-24a (316).
sāki — XII-9 (335).
sama — XI-13a (313); samāraḥ, samacīta, XI-17a (314).
samalagi — v., IX, b-31/32 (236); 231.
samāpta — XI-17c (314); 25a (316).
samarā — samaraṇ (= samara followed by an ?), XI-10c (312).
samgat — XI-26b (316); cf. s.v. pavēgat.
san — p. (śi), IX, a-19 (232), b-19 (234); p. (śi), IX, b-26 (235).
sanab — p. (rasi), XI-26d (316).
sandīha — Sanskrit sandēha, XI-10b (312); kasandihā, XI-17b (314); kasandīhe (= kasandihā i), XI-25c (316).
sang — XI-9a, 10a, 11d (312), 18b (314), 22b (315), 26b, 27c, 29c (316); 217, 224, 225; cf. s.v. hyang.
saṇjanā — p. (śi), IX, b-28 (235).
sar vec(u) a — p. (pu) of the Rakai Sirikan in 850, IX, a-6 (232), b-6 (233).
sawah — XI-28a (316).
sayut — p. (śi), IX, b-21 (234).
s(ś)īyāng — t. (punta), IX, a-18 (232), b-18 (234).
sēmbaḥ (?) — anēmuḥa, XI-22b (315), but word separation is uncertain.
sēsēk — in asēsēk, XI-23b (315).
si — passim before names of persons, e.g. XI-26c, d; 27a, b; 29d (316); cf. 217, 226, 243.
siddha — XI-22b (315); cf. s.v. prasiddha and Index c, s.v. siddhayātra.
siga — p. (śi), IX, b-25 (235); b-31 (236).
sīh — asih, XI-11b (312), 15a (313); siha, XI-22b (315).
sīkhālan — t. IX, a-10 (232), b-9 (233); 221, 222, 238.
sīsīh — asīśī, XI-9b (312), 15a (313); sīlijuru, presumably for sīlījuru, IX, b-20, 22 (234); 230, 241.
sīma — IX, a-5 (232); spelt sema, which became āsena after k at the end of the proceeding word, IX, b-4 (232); evam ring sīma, IX, b-27 (235); sīma, XI-28b, d (316); sīnīma, XI-25d, 28a (316); sīmā, XI-27d (316); cf. 217, 218, 237.
sīra — XI-7a, 12c (312); 13a, 14a (313); 17b (314); 27c (316); cf. s.v. -nīra.
sirikan — t. (rakai), IX, a-6, 11 (222), b-6, 10 (233); 220, 221, 222.
sisīh — tan pasisīha, XI-10d (312).
so — abbreviation of somavāra, XII-2 (335).
su — abbreviation of suvarṇa, XII-1 (335); 333.
suklapakṣa — cf. s.v. cuklapakṣa.
sulāṅkuning — v., IX, b-36 (236); 231.
surāraḥ (?) — XI-22d (315).
susuk — XI-26b (316); manusuk, IX, a-5 (232), b-4 (233).
swacīla — XI-8b (312).
syapa — XI-13d (313), 19a (315).
t- — prefix, in tinajär (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, tājārakēn, Nagarakrīt. 89, 1d, ed. Kern-Krom, 1919, p. 196), XI-22c (315); probably, ta dyus (22b) and ta muja (22d) contain the same prefix and should rather have been cut t = adyus and t = amuja; trasīha 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-7a, 10a, 11d, 12a, c (312); 17b, 18a (314); 19a, 22b, c, d (315), 28b, 29a (316).

ta- — suffix, in yanañēmnañēnta, XI-11b (312).

ta — tā paccāmēn, XI-17d (314); cf. Old Jav. Rām., II-57.

tagāḥ — p. (si), IX, b-24 (235).

tahān — XI-7b (312); satahān, XI-16a (314); matahān, XI-27d (316).

takān — takanya (archaic spelling for tēkēn-nya ?), XI-16a (314).

takut — matakut, XI-14d (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.


tama — XI-23b (315); tumama, XI-26a (316); tan tumama, 225 sq.

tama — tamojār-ujār, XI-18c (314).

tampāḥ — XI-26a (316).

tāmraçāsana — XII-9 (335).

tamuy — p. (si), IX, b-23 (234).

tamvaka — tamvaka, XI-14b (313); matamvaka, IX, b-23 (234); 230, 241; note 49 to p. 322.

tan — XI-10d (312); 18b (314); 29c, d (316); cf. s.v. tā and tama, tatan, tar, tanmolah.

tanmolah — tanmolaha, XII-4 (335).

tānān — tānānā inansā, XI-9b (312); 288.

tānār- — tānāranya (for tēnēranya ?; cf. s.v. takan), XI-18d (314).

tāṇḍa — IX, a-15 (232); mangtāṇḍa, IX, b-15 (234); 226, 239.

tang — XI-18d (314); 24b, 25a, d (316).

taṅguḥ — p. (si), IX, b-36 (236).

taṅjung — XI-15c (313).

tapa — tinappān, XI-15d (313); tapa haji, 238; cf. s.v. patapān.

tapal (tapēl) — tuhān ning manapal, IX, a-16/17 (232), b-16 (234); 228, 239 sq.; napal, p. (si), IX, b-33 (236).

tapuan — XI-11b (312); 319 sq.

tar — XI-10b (312).
tarawana — p. (si), IX, a-20 (232), b-20 (234).
taru — pārijātākata-rāpama, XI-16c (314).
tatag (?) — matataganā, XI-18a (314).
tatan — XI-25c (316).
tatkāla — IX, a-4/5, 6, 15 (232) ; b-3/4, 5 (233), 14/15 (234) ; XII-2, 5 (335).
tauvāna — t., IX, a-8, 13 (232), b-8 (232) ; b-13 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.
tauvāng — p. (si), IX, b-26 (235).
tēas — XI-14b (313) ; 322.
tēlas — XI-9a (312).
tēnā — cf. s.v. hulu and s.v. gusti.
tēpat — XI-7b (312).
tēwēk — XI-24d (316).
thāni — thanītwa (= thani twa ?), XI-10c (312).
tiga — XI-26d (316).
tīha — yatīhākalanka, XI-10a (312) ; 319.
tīrip — t., IX, a-8, 13 (232) ; b-8 (232), 13 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 223.
tīru — tīrūn, XI-15d (313) ; 323 ; tīrūn, t., IX, a-7, 11 (232), b-6, 10/11 (233) ; 220, 221, 222, 224.
tīthi — IX, a-3 (231) ; b-2 (232) ; XI-24b (316).
tītik — anītik, XI-25b (316).
tīlīh — patoliha, XI-10d (312).
tōn — 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.
tuṅgī — v. (pu), IX, a-8 (232) ; inscr. b, however, reads tuṅgū.
tuḥa — matuha, XII-8 (335) ; tukān, 226-228, 237 ; tuḥa wamua (banua), IX, b-22 (224) ; 216, 230 ; tuḥālas (tuhālas), IX, b-24 (235) ; 230 ; cf. s.v.
nayaka, wadwā, kalula, tapal.
tukū — 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.
tulūy (?) — tumulūy (?), XII-6 (335).
tuṅgū — p. (pu), IX, b-7 (233), but cf. s.v. tugū.
tūras — saturasnya, XI-14b (313).
tuwūh — XI-16b (314) ; katuwuḥhan. t. (sang), IX, a-14 (232) ; b-14 (234).

uṅg — 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).
ulāḥ — ulāḥ-ulahan, XII-7 (335) ; 337.
ulīḥ — tann = ulīha, XI-18b (314) ; ulīhan, 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 mīlu, IX. a-10 (232), b-10 (233); mnang, XI-5d (311); rumuhun (?) XI-16a (314); tumonya, XI-18b (314); masō, XI-23b (315); humet (?) XI-25d (316); tumama, XI-26a (316).

umāḥ — hanā ryy = umāhnya, IX, a-4 (232), b-3 (233); 236 sq.

ungsi — ungsyan, XI-7c (312); 293.

upama — Sanskrit upamā at the end of a bahuvrihi, XI-16c in pariṣṭakata-rūpama, XI 16c (314).

uparata — XI-9a (312); 288, 318.

utsava (?) — cf. s.v. raṇautsava.

utus — aṇutus, XI-17c (314).

uwah — muwah, XII-2, 5 (?) (335).

wadihati — t. (paṃgat), 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 dēmit, 239; tuhān ning wadwā rāraī, IX, a-6 (236), b-16 (234); 228, 239.

wogai — 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 pitṛ, 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.

waśākhamāśa — XII-5 (335).

waṅrāwā — p. (pu), IX, a-8 (232), b-7 (233).

waḷahān — v., IX, b-31 (236): possibly another form for wēlahān, which occurs as a title; cf. s.v. wēlahān.

waḷaing — t. (rakai), 254-256, 290, 293; ϖatu waḷaing, 255; cf. Index c, s.v. vaḷaṅga.

waḷuy — XI-28b (316); sawaluy, XI-15d (313); winaluyakēn, XI-29a (316).

waḷmār — davaṃlar, t. or p. (sang), IX, a-13 (232), b-14 (233).

waṇasi — p. (si), IX, b-30 (236).

waṇeh — XI-27b (316).

waṅ — XI-26d (316); cf. s.v. uṅg; the usual spelling of the word in Old Javanese literature is uwaṅ.

waṇiyāga — Sanskrit banyāga, XI-22a (315).

waṇtil — v. (?), XI-10b (312); t. (samgat), XI-26b (316).

waṇua — patih waṇua kayumwunan, IX, a-17 (232); b-16/17 (234).

waṇa — warānuraga, XI-6d (312).

waṇā — p. (si), IX, b-23 (234).

waṇā — XI-24c (316).


waṇy(a) — sawargga, XI-13a (313).

waṇiga — IX, b-21, 22 (234); 241.

warūḥ — XI-8b (312); 317.
watu — water, XI-7c (312); 293.
wau — pamawán, XI-15b (313).
wayat (?) — XI-22a (315), but the word separation is uncertain.
weh — XI-10b (312); 24b, c (316); 17b (314).
w(e)ka — t. (rakai) of the Rakarayān Mapatih in 850, IX, a-6 (233), b-5 (234).
w(e)kas — pawkas, XII-8 (335); winkas, XI-27a (316).
w(e)lahan — t. (rakai), IX, a-6 (232), b-7 (233); 220, 222.
wēlas — sawēlas, XI-24b (316).
w(e)nan — mnang, XI-7a (311).
w(e)ruh — XI-12a, b (312); cf. s.v. waruh.
widhawa — XI-11c (312).
widitra — XI-17a (314).
widodha — sang widodha, XI-11d (312).
whang — wihanā, XI-13d (313).
whu — XI-23c, 24a (316); kawikuan, kabikuan, 335, 240.
wipra — kalāguṇarāwiprakulasthanāma, XI-8c (312); wipramukhya, XI-9d (312).
wha — XI-8b (312).
wrīga — XI-6d (312).
wrā — cf. s.v. hulu.
wrēhaspati (warā) — 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); mawuat, XII-9 (335); hulu wuat (wuat), 216; cf. Index a, s.v. vuat.
wuit — sawuit, XI-15c (313).
vūle — gunung wule, 336; cf. s.v. bulai.
vunha — v., IX, b-33 (236); 231, 243.
vuri — p. (si), IX, b-22 (234).
wurukung — mawurukung, XI-24c (316); cf. s.v. wu.
wuwus — parwuwus (parāwuwus), 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 — wibhauvowyayādi, XI-11c (312).
wa — 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, āpuṇya, kuçala and kuçalākuçala.

āṅkura — in vijād āṅkuram, āṅkurāt pātram, III, c-A-9/10 (114); cf. 82 sq., 97, 154.

āṅga — III, c-A-9 (114); cf. 77; bhavānga, 81.

ājñāna — in the avidyā definitions, III, a-A-7 to a-B-1 (109); f-A-1, 3; ajñā- nāndhakāra (7), III, c-A-4 (114); ajñānāsthānāni, 65; aklīśām ajñānam, 152; cf. s.v. ajñānāc cīvite karma and avidyā; also 65, 67, 115, 128-130.

ajñānāc cīvite karma — first pāda of a āloka frequently quoted in Indonesia and Malay, 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 (jāṭih) — III, g-B-1 (120).

atityāna (?) — III, c-B-6 (118); cf. 101, 151.

atidṛṣṭi (?) — III, g-A-1 (119); cf. 159 sq.

atīta — pratiyāsamatpāda, 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.

adārcaṇa — 66.

adudhκhāṣukha (vedanā) — III, b-A-5 (111); e-B-5 (118); cf. 147; (sparça), III, e-B-3 (117); cf. 150.

advayānāca — in harādvayoṣaṁalabhaṅktā (sic), X-a-3b (279); cf. 266.

adhirējā — in varṇaraṇāhīrējarāja, VII-19c (136); cf. 184 sq., 206.

adhvāna (tryadhvan) — 161; cf. s.v. pratiyāsamatpāda.

anabhāsāmaya — III, a-B-1 (109); cf. 65 sq., 130.

anuvadya — (dharmaś), III, a-A-10 (109); also in sāvadyāṇavadyeṣu (dharmaś), III, a-A-10 (109); cf. 129.

anagata — pratiyāsamatpāda, III, c-B-7 (115); bhava, III, g-A-8 (120); bheda, III, d-B-5 (116).

anāsrava — 63.

anītya — 81.

anīṣṭa — phala, III, d-B-2 (116); cf. 145.

anu- — meaning of the prefix in Buddhist texts, 88.

anubhāvonā — lakṣaṇa of vedanā, III, e-B-4 (117).

anuloma — 58.

anuṣṭubh — tatpuruṣāyam anuṣṭubhi, VII-10d (195); cf. 201.

ānta — pārvāṇa, madhyānta, aparānta, 71.

antaragrāha — drṣṭi, III, g-A-2 (120); h-A-8 (122); h-B-1 to 2 (122); cf. s.v. drṣṭi.

antarā — 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.

avacaṣya — dharmanām, 63.

api — 206.

apuṇya — apunyamayāḥ sāṃskārāḥ, III, f-A-10 ; f-B-1, 2 (118 sq.) ; these sāṃskāras are defined as threefold (kāya, vāc, manas) akuḍala ; cf. 93, 156, 158 ; apunyopaga, 72.

aprāptī — 158, 161.

abhiniirvṛtti — III, b-B-2 (111) ; skandhābhiniirvṛtti, III, b-B-3 (111) ; cf. 83, 135, 136.

abhilāpatā — lakṣaṇa of parideva, III, g-B-3/4 (120).

abhiseka — 183, 184.

abhedena — cf. s.v. bheda.

abhisaṃskāra — in naranāthābhisaṃskārabhāra, VII-1a (194) ; cf. 182 ; cf. also s.v. sāṃskāra.

abhisaṃskṛtya — in aikadhyām abhisamśkṛtya, 66, 132, 149.

abhīyantarā — pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-A-9 (114) ; c-B-1, 4 (115) ; cf. 82, 142.

abhū — in sāndhyābhū, VII-8c (194) ; cf. 182.

amoghasiddhi — 169.

ayonīcaśamanasīkāra — 73.

arūpa — 151 ; cf. s.v. tṛṣṇā.

arūpin — catuśṛṇāḥ arūpināḥ 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.

arūpa — pratītyasamutpādārtha, III, b-B-10 (113) ; hetuphalārthena, III, c-A-7 (114) ; avitathārthena, III, f-A-2 (118) ; svārthakārin, prcārthakārin, III, f-A-7 (118) ; pratītyajātārvānibbāgavijñā, 184 ; paramārthasatyā, 91, 141, niṭārtha, neyārtha, 140 ; cf. also 75, 139 sq., 153, 155. Cf. Index b, s.v. ardhatrayodaca — 64.

arūpam — lolatphalotpalālabbhṛtah, 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.

avijñāpti — 132.


avidā — first aṅga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. avidyāpratyaṣyāḥ sāṃskārāḥ ; 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) ; kleca, III, c-B-5 (115) ; klecamāla, 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); saṃmohapahala, d-A-9 (116); pratītya, not hetu, of the saṃskāras, f-A-6 to 9 (118); included into kleṇasamkleṇa, 58, 62, 143; different versions of the avidyā definition in the Vibhaṅga, 65 sq., 71; conditioned by ayoniṣāmanasikāra, but considered an original cause, even an asaṃskṛtaḥharma by some sects, 62, 73; basis of pratītyasamutpāda, 92 sqq.; relation with saṃskāra, cf. s.v. avidyāpratyayaḥ saṃskārāḥ; with the five dṛśṭis, 93 sq.; with kāmopādāna, 97-99, 161; with ajñāna, cf. s.v. aṣṭavāna; 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, āvarana, kleṇa, pratītyasamutpāda etc.

avidyāpratyayaḥ saṃskārāḥ — 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 saṃskāra, cf. s.v. saṃskāra; pratītya, not hetu, of the saṃskāras, III, f-A-6 to 9 (118), cf. 154 sqq.; are all of the saṃskāras conditioned by avidyā, III, f-B-8 to g-A-6 (119 sq.); if the Bhagavat intended to explain why karman is conditioned by kleṇa, why did he express this idea both by avidyāpratyayaḥ saṃskārāḥ and by upādānapratītyayo bhavaḥ?, III, g-A-6 to 8 (120).

avājāpti — 132.

avodan — haretapadapāṇikājanakāṇīkāvodan, X-c-2b (277); cf. 279.
avyākṛta — applied to karman. saṃskāra, III, f-B-4, 5, 7 (119); cf. 71, 79, 93, 156 sqq.
açubhavabhāvanā — 89.

açrutavant — vālak açrutavān prthajjanaḥ, III, g-A-4 to (120); cf. 161.
açtavidhā — pratītyasamutpāda, III, d-A-8 to d-B-3 (115 sq.).
asanśyāta — 62, 73, 136, 150.
asewītavya — III, a-A-11 (109); cf. 109; cf. also s.v. sevītavya.
asti — perhaps in the compound astidṛṣṭi, III, g-A-1 (109), but the text reads astidṛṣṭi (cf. 160); astinirdha, VII-17b (196), cf. 203 sq.; astiduhkha, 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 bhavaṭidam — III, a-A-3 (108); cf. 61, 80, 124, 141.

ākāra — of the āryasatyas, 199.

ākāra — a-kāca, III, e-A-10 (117); cf. 149 sq.

ācayā — the samudaya portion of the pratītyasamutpāda formula defined as dharmāyām ācayāḥ, 63; cf. s.v. upacayā.
ātman — ātmātmiya, III, g-A-4 (120), cf. 161, 166 sq.; ātmadrṣṭi, perhaps to be read instead of atidṛṣṭi, III, g-A-1 (119), but cf. s.v. asti; ātma-vādopādāna, III, b-A-8 (111); e-B-7 (118), cf. 161, 166 sq.; tasyātmanas santatiṣṇa, X-b-4a (274), cf. 252, 276; ātmarakita, explanation of kevala in the pratītyasamutpādasūtra, 127 sqq.; cf. s.v. ādhyātmika, nirātmika, nairātmya. Ātman in a spurious passage, III, h-B-2 (122).

ātmiya — 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 jārādī, jārāmarādī, for jārāmarāpāga including the ṭokas, 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.

ādhāyātmikā — cf. 82, 91, 128; III, a-A-7 (109).

ādhāyātmika — opposite of bāhya (applied to āyatana), III, b-A-1, 2 (111); cf. 72, 82, 146; cf. also s.v. abhyantara.

āṇandakandapadma — 170.

āneñjya — 72, 79, 93, 156.

āp — aor. āpam, VII-I/a (196); cf. 206.

āptamanas — III, h-A-1 (121); cf. 165.

ābhisāṃśārika — interpretation of pratītyasamutpāda, 127.

ābhisāṃśārika — one of three divisions of saṃskāraṇa, III, f-B-9 (119); cf. 79, 93, 158.

āyatana — āyatana-pratiliṅga, III, b-B-2/3 (111); caṅsuraṅyatana, çroṭrāyatana, ghṛṇāyatana, jhavāyatana, maṇḍāyatana, kāyāyatana, s.v. caṅsuras etc.; rūpāyatana, 101, 130; sparṣāyatana, III, c-A-11 (109). cf. 126; bāhyāyatana, 129; naivasaṃjñānaṃjñāyatana, 134; Buddhist etymology, 226; various references, 82, 133, 135, 136, 146, 150, 163; cf. s.v. sañjñāyatana.

āyuḥ — āyuḥsāṃskāra, 138.

ārambha — ārambhāphala, III, d-A-9 (116); 145. Cf. Index a, s.v.

āṛṣṭyā — āṛṣṭyābhava, III, b-A-9 (111), g-A-8, 9 (120); riśāṛṣṭī (bhavaḥ). g-A-10 (120); riśāṛṣṭihatu, 134; āṛṛṣṭih, III, e-B-6 (118); cf. 67, 68, 69, 79, 101, 133. 151.

ārya — opposite of prthajana, 161; āryasātya, 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.

āśiṃgamārī — suggested by X-b-2 (273); cf. 275 sq. and 268 sq.

āvaraṇa — pāḍavaraṇavirodhāni, V-1/2 (171 sq.) ; karmanāvaraṇa, V-2 (172), cf. 171; sarvakarmacaraṇāṇi, V-2/3 (172); viśvāvaraṇavarāṇa, VII-6a (179), cf. 179; kleśavaraṇa, jñeyāvaraṇa, 90, 95, 125, 152, 153, 171, 179, 200; prthajananavoḥvaraṇa, 179. Further references, 71, 180, 181, 183.
āvasthika — interpretation of praśtyasamutpāda, 81, 82, 127, 144, 155.
āvena — dharmaś, 105; avidyā (āvenikī), 125, 152.
ācīraya — ācīrayabheda, d-B-5 (116), cf. 126, 146; parāvṛtti, 192, 198; sarva-kleśācīrayatvāt, III, c-A-6 (114); hetutayācīrayatvāt (read: hetuścīraya-
atvāt ?), III, f-A-2/3 (118), cf. 92, 153; viśīnācīrayatvāt, III, f-A-3 (118), cf. 92, 153; cf. also 81, 126, 141, 163.
ācīvāsa — III, f-B-5 (119); 130.
āśrava — sāśrava, anāśrava, 63.
āsvādana — 151.
āhā, āhuḥ — III, e-A-8 (117); f-B-4, 6, 7 (119).
itara — itarakaṭa, VII-18c (196); cf. 205.
ittibhava — kind of trṣṇā, 151.
itya — presumably, III, c-A-5; cf. 77, 78, 89, 141.
indrajāla — 90.
indriya — indriyānām paripākaḥ paribhedāḥ, III, b-B-6 (112); paripāken-
drīyadaurvyāhārārāpavaivāvātātī, III, g-B-1/2 (120); çūnyendrīyā-
sthānadhātukatu, III, g-B-3 (120); cf. 101, 126, 138, 144, 163; cf. also s.v. jīvita.
iṣṭa — iṣṭapada, 250 sq.; iṣṭadātri, X-b -2b (173); cf. 275; cf. also Word In-
dex b, s.v.
ucca — opposite of hiṅa in the explanation of dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa, 94, 159.
uccheda — ucchēdāṭana, III, h-B-2 (122); ucchedaṛṣṭi, 68, 159; ucchedavāḍa,
80; cf. 93, 94, 160, 167.
uttuṅga — 180 sq.
uptāñ — cf. s.v. aṅbhrī.
uḍūkacandra — 90.
udan — cf. s.v. aṭovan.
udṛṣṭa, uḍḍeca — 73, 76, 83, 84, 165.
upacēya, — 89.
upadiṣṭa, upadeṣa — III, f-A-1 (118); 76, 83, 156.
upanibandha — hetopanibandha, pratyayopanibandha, 82, 142.
upapatti — sopapattijā (jātiḥ), III, g-B-1 (120); 83, 134.
upapādūka — 162.
upasaṃpadā — III, i-B-2 3 (123); cf. 59 sq.
upādāna — ninth anīga of the praśtyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. trṣṇāpraty-
yam upādānam and upādānapratyayo bhavah; fourfold, III, b-A-7 to 8
(111); e-B-6 to 8 (118); considered hetu, III, c-A-7 (114), c-B-9/10
(115); kleśa, c-B-5 (115), d-A-4 (115); vartamāṇa portion of praśty-
asamutpāda, c-B-8 (115); prabhava, d-A-2 (115); phala, d-A-7 (115);
santānaphala, d-B-1 (116); anāgatabhedā, d-B-5 (116); grahanamāla,
d-B-9 (116); aṭmabhedadandāvajradāni (sic), e-A-2 (116); cf. 67, 68,
79, 80, 81, 82, 95, 97, 103, 127, 133, 144, 147, 161, 164, 165; upādānaparv-
ījita, III, c-A-4 (presumably, cf. 87, 88, 97); upādānaskandha, 127, 149;
cf. also s.v. kāma, ḍṛṣṭi, ātivrama, ātmavāda.
upādānapratyayō 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); daurmanasyapratyayō (sic) upāyāsaḥ, g-B-5 (121); upāyāsahetujñātvād daurmanasyam, g-B-6 (121); cf. 61, 96, 164.

uṇīsa — 187.

ekṣana (?) — ekṣenabheda, III, d-B-4 (116); cf. 146.

ekadviṣṭicatuṣṭaṇi-ca etc. — clōka, III, c-A-3 (114); cf. 78 sq.

ekavidha — (pratītyasamutpāda), III, c-A-6 (114); (avidyā), III, f-A-2 (118).

ekādaśavidha — (pratītyasamutpāda), III, d-B-10 to e-A-3 (116).

eṇam asya kevālaśya mahato dukkhaskandhasya samudayo bhavati — III, a-A-6 (108); e-A-7 (117); cf. 61, 127 sq.


ākādhyam — abhisamākṣipya, 66, 132, 149.

auṣpūtāṃṣinca (sāṃskāra) — III, f-B-9 (119); cf. 79, 93, 158.

karman — karmaye 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 (sāṃskāra and bhava), III, c-B-4 to 5 (115), d-A-3, 5 (115: karmakāṇḍa); karmāvijāña, III, a-A-8 (109), cf. 128; karmamūle, d-B-7 (116); kāya-, vāk-, manas-karmakuṣala, f-B-1 (118 sq.) and the same combinations with akuṣala, f-B-2 to 3 (119); probably in janmakarmabhava, g-A-9 (120); the text gives, however, janmekāṁabhava), cf. 127, 102; karmēvarana, cf. s.v. āvaraṇa; karmasaṃkleṣa, 143, 58; pūrvoka-man, 143; atītakarmam, 146. Various references, 58, 65, 71, 72, 81, 127, 128, 129, 134, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 154, 155, 156, 157, 159, 162, 171, 172 etc. Cf. also s.v. sāṃskāra.

kalala — kalalamūla, III, d-B-7 (116); cf. 125, 146.

kalaḥdaḥbhava — kalaḥdhāvhasamjñātāḥ (read: jaṣātāḥ), 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 kleśa, 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; paṇca kāmaguṇāḥ, e-A-1 (116); kāmadhūtu, h-A-7 (122); kāmopāna, 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); kāyasamśkāra, presumably a-B-2 (109), but omitted by the copyist; sa ś vi jñāna kāyāḥ, a-B-3 (109), e-A-10/11 (117); sa ś spāryakāyāḥ, b-A-3 (111), e-B-2 (117); kāyasamśparca, b-A-4 (111), e-B-2 (117); kāyāyatana, b-A-2 (111), e-B-1 (117); kāya-karmakuḍala, f-B-1 (118); kāyakarma-akuḍala, f-B-2/3 (119); akuḍala-kāya-karmacana, f-B-3 (119); dharmakāya, 87; kāyakarmacana, 93; svasaṃbhoga-kāya, 198; cf. 129, 130, 155.

kāraka — referring to avidyā and samśkāra 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.

kiści — in yat kiści, III, a-B-7 (110).

kṛittisambha — 201.

kubjatā — III, b-B-4 (112); cf. 137.

kumbhaja — cṛi kumbhajākhyena, X-a-3a (170); X-b-4b (274); cf. s.v. kalaṇḍābha; cf. also s.v. Kumbhayoni kumbhayoni — 248; cf. s.v. kumbhaja.

kūla — saijanatādikulīcabhṛt, VII-line 11 (193).

cusoera — VI-B-b (174).

kuḍala — kuḍalasūtra dharmacau ajñānam, III, a-A-9 (109); kuḍalasyopasampadā, i-B-1/2 (123); trividham kuṭalām: kāyakarmakuḍalaṃ vākārkuḍalaṃ manaśkārakuḍalāṃ, f-B-1 to 2 (118); kuṭalākuḍala, a-A-10 (109); kuṭalāmasambhāra, 197; kuṭalāmasāṃkṣerta, 129; kuṭalātvyākṛta, 66; kuṭalāsaśrava, 129; kuṭalārāgā, VII-line 7 (193); various references: 71, 93, 94, 95, 129, 152, 156, 181.

kṛtvāsas — name of Čiva, X-a-1d, 2c, 3d (270); cf. 247, 265, 266, 267.

kṛṣṇa — qualification of karman, 65, 66.

kevala — in asya kevalasya mahato duhkhasanādhasya samudayo bhavati, III, a-A-6 (108); cf. 61, 127; avidyā kevalā, 152.

kocanada — in kanakakocanadadaravishphurat, VII-12a (195); cf. s.v. padma, niraja.

koṭi (koṭi) — 105, 158.

kotha — III, c-A-5 (114); 78, 87, 88, 89.

koṣa (koṣa) — VII-18c (196); cf. 186, 201, 204; brahmakoṣa, dharmakoṣa, 204.

klega — a part of pratītyasamutpāda, viz. the aṅgas avidyā, tṛṣṇā, upādāna, III, c-B-4, 5 (115), which is therefore styled klegakāṇḍa, d-A-3 (115); sarvāklegācayatvatī, III, c-A-6 (114); klegamāla, d-B-7 (116); sarvāklegānām avitathārthena, f-A-2 (118); klegāvarāṇa, cf. s.v. avarāṇa; dṛṣṭiklega, VII-19d (196); klegasāṃklega, 58, 143; pūrvāklega avidyā, 143; parīttaklega, 152.

kvaśid — VII-15a (195); cf. 189.

khalatavata (read: khalatva?) — III, b-B-4 (111); cf. 71, 157.

khāliva — VII-12d (195); cf. 189, 202.
khulakhulapraṇavāsakāyatā — 67, 112, 137.
gatā — 142.
gatī — five or six, 134.
gandha — vividhagandhasudigdha, VII-11a (195) ; 188.
gandharva — 77.
garbha — in a simile to explain 'exterior' pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-A-10 (114 sq.) ; the aṅgas vijñāna and nāmarūpa compared with garbhā, d-A-1 (115) ; garbhajā (jātī), g-B-1 (120) ; garbhāvakrānti, 135 ; further references : 83, 142, 144, 162.
gahana — gahanapāraśāsārtham, VII-8a (194) ; cf. 200 ; gahanadṛṣṭi, 200.
guṇa — VII-line 5, 6 (192) ; panca kāmaguṇāni, III, e-A-1 (116) ; samasta-guṇaratatābha, VII-10b (195) ; tathāgataguna, 181, 185, 192, 197, 201 ; sarvaguṇajñānasamāmbhārābhyyāsa, 197.
gurjara — in satataqurjaraṇadeśāsamāgatais, VII-14a (195) ; 189, 202 sq.
gūḍha — 140.
gotra — concept in Mahāyāna, 193 sq.
gopānasivakatā — III, b-B-4 (112) ; 137.
grahaṇa — grahanamūla (upādāna), III, d-B-9 (116) ; 147.
grāha — pūdagalagrāha, dharmagrāha, 171.
ghana — 146.
cakṣus — cakṣuvijñāna, III, a-B-3 (109) ; cakṣuḥsamsparṣa, III, b-A-3 (111), e-B-1 (117) ; cakṣuvatana, b-A-1 (111), e-A-11 (117) ; prajñācakṣus, 200 ; cf. 151 ; cf. also s.v. caksuṃant.
cakṣuṃant — III, c-A-5 (114) ; cf. 87, 88, 90, 91, 141.
caturvidha — pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-B-8 to 10 (115) ; avidyā, f-A-3/4 (118) ; ārūpyabhava, g-A-9 (120) ; jātī, g-A-10 to g-B-1 (120) ; (sotkā-yaḍṛṣṭir) vinçatīvidhā : rūpe caturvidhā, vedanāyāṇī caturvidhā saṃjñāni caturvidhā, saṃskāreṇu caturvidhā, vijñāne caturvidhā, h-A-9 to h-B-1 (122).
catuṣkoṭika (praṇa) — III, f-B-9 (119) ; 158 sq. ; catuṣkoṭivinirmukta, 159.
candraçeṣekhamūrti — 275.
candraśvarayamūrti — candrāṣṭrayamūrtiṣṭadhātṛī, X-b-2b (273) ; 275.
citta — cītavṛddha, III, d-B-5 (116) ; cītavṛddhaṃsaṃskāra, 157, 161 ; cf. 83, 146, 191 ; cf. also s.v. bodhicitta.
cīvra — VII-8b (194) ; 182, 188, 201.
cetanā — III, f-B-6 (119) ; 130 ; 157.
cyavanatā — cyavanatābheda, III, b-B-7 (112) ; 139.
jatilā — VI-A-1/2 (174) ; navodyajambhajaṭilasannibha, X-a-2a (270) ; cf 271.
janmaṇ — III, c-A-1 (113) ; cf. s.v. jāti.
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. jarāmaṇa.

jarāmaṇa — 12th link of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. jātipratyaya-yaṃ jarāmaṇaṃ; the Vibhaṅga definition in No. III consists of a definition of jāra followed by one of maṇa, q.v.; relation between the two parts of the compound, g-B-2 (120), g-B-8 (121); 'complex of suffering' included into the anīga, 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), vipakakāṇḍa, c-B-10 (115); anīṣaphala, d-B-2 (116); anāgata, c-B-7 (115); pravāha, d-A-2 (115); punarbhavavṛkṣabija, d-A-7/8 (115); punarāvartakamāla, d-B-9 (116); vināçabheda, d-B-6 (116); aiçvaryasipatti, e-A-2 (116); included into jāti- or phala-samañklega, 58; into the vastu- part of pratītyasamutpāda, 81; further references: 61, 66, 80, 82, 96, 136-139, 145, 164.

jarāya — jarāyaṇa, 162.

jarājābhāva — one of the terms explaining jarā, III, b-B-6 (112); 139.

jāti — 11th anīga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. jātipratyaya-yaṃ jarāmaṇaṃ; 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 anīgas, jarāhetukī jātiḥ, g-B-8/9 (121), jātihetukī 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); punarbhavavṛkṣabija, d-A-8 (115); nirvytthaphala, d-B-2 (116); vināçabheda, d-B-6 (116); punarāvartakamāla, d-B-9 (116); aiçvaryasamapatti, e-A-2 (116); explanation of the Vibhaṅga definition with references, 134-136; other references, 127, 162; jātisañklega, 58; tiryagjāti, III, h-A-6 (122).

jātipratyaya-yaṃ jarā — III, g-B-1 (120).

jātipratyaya-yaṃ jarāmaṇaṃ — (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.

jīna — jīnā jinasutavāt, VII-5d (194); jinamandira, VII-14d (195); jinasuta, VII-line 13 (194); jīnavat, VII-17b (196); jīnakrama, VII-19b (196); jinaratnapratimā, 191.

jīhvā — jīhvāvīyāna, III, a-B-4 (109); jīhvāsaṁśparṣa, b-A-3 (111); e-B-2 (117); jīhvāyatana, b-A-2 (111); e-A-11 (117).

jīraṭā — in the definition of jarā, III, b-B-4 (112); 137.

jīva — 95, 160.

jīvitendriya — jīvitendriyapradūrdbhāva, III, b-B-3 (111); jīvitendriyaniruddha, b-B-8 (112); cf. 139.

jñāna — 93, 183; lokottara, 192; jñānasaṁbhāra, 179, 197 sq.; cf. s.v. ajñāna, mithyā, samṣaya.

jñeya — III, f-A-6 (118); jñeyavāraṇa, 90, 95, 152, 153, 171, 179.
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toṭaka (metre) — X-b-3 (274) ; cf. 276.
tathāta — 153, 199.
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.
timira — vahulamohamahātimirāvṛta, VII-17a (196) ; 90, 200, 203 ; cf. s.v. tamas, taimirika, ataimirika.
tiryagyātī — III, h-A-6 (122).
tilaka — tilakādikāgātratā, a lakṣaṇa of jarā, III, b-B-5 (112) ; cf. 138 ; tilakācītagātratā, 138.
tuṅga — 180 sq.
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, āruśpa, ati (tṛṣṇā ?), e-B-6 (118) ; rūpa, arūpa, nirūda, 151 ; itibhava, 151 ; kāma, rūpa, āruṇya, 151 ; tṛṣṇāvividṛddhi, tṛṣṇāvaipulya, 68, 127 ; sutrāphalatraya 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) ; kleśa, d-A-4 (111) ; phala, d-A-7 (115) ; santānapahala, d-B-1 (116) ; anāgatabheda, d-B-5 (116) ; hetumūla, d-B-8 (116) ; parasparajīyāṃsah, e-A-2 (116) ; various references : 65, 67-69, 79, 80, 81, 191, 127, 133, 144, 147.
tṛṣṇāpratyayam upādānam — III, e-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.
tetras — 317.
taimirika — 81, 90, 97, 153 ; cf. s.v. timira, ataimirika.
trikā — with reference to the three elements implied in each act of sparśa, trīkāmūla, III, d-B-8 (116) ; trīkasamāvāya, e-B-2 (117).
trīpura — mayakaravābhitappattiprīpurabhid, X-c-1b (277) ; cf. 247, 267, 278.
trīratra — cf. ratnatraya, VII-10a (195) ; cf. also 187, 201.
trīvidhā — pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-B-4 to 8 (115) ; avidyā, f-A-3 (118) ; saṃskāra, f-A-10 (118) to f-B-9 (119).
trīgaraṇa — cf. trīgārmanadihīra, VII-18b (196) ; čaraṇatraya, c-A-4 (114) ; 84, 86, 87, 90, 203, 204.
trīyadhvan — 161.
trīyambaka — name of Čiva, X-b-1d (273), 2d (273), 4d (274) ; 247, 265 sq., 268, 275.
danā — danāvāśikambhanatā, characteristic of jarā, III, b-B-5 (112) ; cf. 137 ; atmahedadanāvāsaprādāni (?), III, e-A-2 (115), 147 ; cf. also 173.
darṣaṇa — darṣaṇamārga, 154.
daçavidha — pratityasamutpāda, III, d-B-6 to 9 (116).

duḥkha — duḥkhaskandha, comprising çoka, parideva, duḥkha (in the narrower meaning of physical pain), daurmanasya and upāyasa, III, a-A-6 (108), e-A-9 (117); cf. 61 sq., 81, 128, 163 sq.; paridevapratahyaya duḥkha, daurmanasyatvād duḥkhaḥ, duḥkhapratītyaṛṣṇa ca daurmanasyam, III, g-B-4/5 (120 sq.); duḥkha for those aṅgas which are neither kleśa nor karman, c-B-5/6 (115); duḥkhasperṣa, e-B-3 (117); duḥkhavedanaḥ, b-A-5 (111), e-B-5 (118); duḥkhapraheya, f-A-4 (118), probably, f-A-5 (118), but omitted by the copyist; astīduḥkha, h-B-3 (122); saṃskāradauḥkha, parināmadauḥkha, duḥkhaduḥkha, 143; duḥkhavṛkṣa, 82, 83; duḥkhasatya, 154; duḥkhacamanacāsana, VII-16d (194); sarva-duḥkhha-śamāṭāpārtiḥcamaṇaḥ, 181; duḥkhanirodha-śaṇmīnī pratipadā, 200; sarva-duḥkhhpaprāṇṭikṛt, 200; various references: 61, 81, 82, 83, 96, 97, 128, 140, 142, 147, 164.

dṛṣṭi — paśca dṛṣṭayaḥ enumerated III, h-A-7 (122); dṛṣṭyupādāna, b-A-7/8 (111); e-B-7 (115); h-A-7 (122); dṛṣṭiparāmarṣa, g-A-1 (119); h-A-8 (122); atīdṛṣṭi (presumably a lapse for astīdṛṣṭi), cf. s.v. asti; dṛṣṭikṛteṇa, VII-19d (196); antagrahadvṛṣṭi, III, g-A-2 (120); h-A-8 (122); h-B-1/2 (122); mithyādṛṣṭi, g-A-2 (120); h-A-8 (122); cilavataparāmarṣa-ṛṣṭi, g-A-2 (120); cf. cilavataparāmarṣa, h-A-8 (122); ādāntadṛṣṭi, g-A-3 (120); satkāyadṛṣṭi vinçastividhā, h-A-9 to h-B-1 (120); antaradṛṣṭi, VII-16b (195); cilavatadṛṣṭi, ucchedadṛṣṭi, 93; dṛṣṭigahana, 200; further references: 93, 94, 95, 97, 158-161, 166 sq., 184, 203, 206.

deva — 181 sq.

dēcādhyaḥkṛtaḥ — 220 sq.

daurnmanasya — III, a-A-5 (108); e-A-7 (117); hṛtparītāgo duurnmanasyan, g-B-4/5 (120 sq.); daurnmanasyaprātyāyo (sic) upāyāsah, III, g-B-5 (121); further reference: 61, 96, 57, 163, 164; cf. also s.v. duḥkha.

daurnvyahāra — a laksana of Old Age, III, g-B-1 (120); cf. 162.

drunvatilambita — drutaviłambitasāhānahavanditaḥ, VII-17d (196).

drōhaka — cf. Index a, s.v.

duividada — pratityasamutpāda, III, e-A-3 to 7 (116 sq.).


dvīpa — catuvāraḥ (sic) dvīpāḥ enumerated, III, h-A-2/3 (121 sq.).

dhandaṭṭa — one of the lakṣaṇas of jāra, possibly mentioned III, b-B-5 (122), although the text reads andhaṭṭa; cf. 112, 138.

dharmā — No. III, passim; cf. especially a-A-9 to 11 (109); c-A-2 (114); V-1 (171); dharmakāya, 87, 100, 181, 199; na dharmatāḥ, VII-18a (196); dharmasambhāra, VII-1c (194); cf. 182 sq., 197 sq.; dharmamegha, 181 sq., 183; dharmaniśrātmya, 90; evānīkadharmā, 105; cūkladharmā, 181; dharmadātvagāna, 181; further references: 58, 65, 67, 77, 80, 88, 89, 90, 97, 103 sq., 129.
dhātu — dhātupratilābha, III, b-B-2 (111); çunyendriyāvasthānadhātucoka, g-B-3 (120); kāmadhātu, b-A-7 (122); dharmadhātugagana, cf. s.v. dharma; cf. also 67, 82, 134, 135, 136, 163, 166.
dhārāṇī — 170, 171; dhārāṇisambhāra, 198; dhārāṇimati, 206.
nāraka — aśa mahānārakāh, enumerated III, h-A-3 to 5 (122).
navavaridha — pratityasamutpāda, III, d-B-3 to 6 (116).
nānākaraṇa, III, g-A-6 (120).
nāman — in nāmarūpa, defined, III, a-B-5/6 (110), e-A-8 to 10 (117); cf. s.v. nāmarūpa.
nāmarūpa — 4th anga of the pratityasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. nāmarūpa-pratyayam śādāyatañam; the Vibhaṅga definition, a- III, a-B-5 to 8; e-A-8 to 10 (116); belongs to the phala part of pratityasamutpāda, c-A-7 (114); considered duḥkha, c-B-5 (115); vartmāna in the tryadhva division, e-B-7 (115); vipakakāṅḍa, c-B-9 (115); garbha, d-A-1 (115); phala-kāṅḍa, d-A-4 (115); pātra (i.e. pattra), d-A-7 (115); vipākapāla, d-A-9 to d-B-1 (116); ekṣaṇabheda, d-B-4 (? 116); skandhamūla, d-B-7 (116); compared with a yura, e-A-1 (116); various references: 66, 71 sq., 73, 101, 102, 126, 131, 132, 148-150; cf. also s.v. nāmaṇ, rūpa and skandha.
nāmarūpapratyayam śādāyatanam — 4th link of the pratityasamutpāda formula, III, a-A-4 (108); a-B-8/9 (100 sq.); c-B-2 (115); e-A-4/5 (116); cf. s.v. nāman and rūpa.
nāla — in a simile, III, c-B-10 (114); cf. 83, 142.
nikāya — sattvaniṅkāya, III, b-B-1 (111); b-B-7 (112); nikāyasabhāgatā, 135, 158.
nikṣeṇa — (perhaps for niḥkṣeṇa), III, b-B-8 (112); cf. 139.
nitya — 78.
nidheya — X-b-2c (273); cf. 275.
nirāmaṇa — (either for nirāmaṇa or for nirātman), III, c-A-I (113); cf. 59.
nirodha — III, a-A-8/9 (109); nirodhaprāheya, f-A-4 and 5 (118); jivitendriyanirōda, III, b-B-8 (112); nirodhārṣnā, 79; astinirōda, III, h-B-3 (122); VII-17b (196); nirodhasatya, 87, 199; the nirodha portion of pratitṛyasamutpāda, 61-63; cf. 136.
nirdeça — 63, 73, 76.
nirvāṇa — 191, 199.
nirvṛt(t)a — VII-16c (195); 182, 189, 191; cf. s.v. parinirvṛt(t)a.
nirvṛttī — nirvṛttipāla, III, d-B-2 (116); 145. Cf. Add.
nīyandha — nīyandaphala, III, e-A-1 (116); 145.
niraja — hṛdayanirajjasāndrasāntaram, VII-13c (195); cf. s.v. kokanada, padma; cf. also VII-2c (194) and 198.
netr — I, b-2 (?).
nairātmya — cf. s.v. dharma and s.v. pudgala.
nairyāṇika — attribute of the Mārga mentioned in III, g-A-1 (119), if the correction proposed in note 97 to p. 119 is accepted; 159.

naivasaṃjñānasaṃjñāyatana — 134.

pañcatva — 7.

pañcavidha — pratityasamutpāda, III, d-A-1 to 3 (115); avidyā, f-A-4 to 6 (118); dhṛṣṭiparāmarṣa, g-A-1 (119).

pada — itṣapada, paramapada, nirvāṇapada, cīvapada, 250.

padma — padme, padmākṣi, padmaviṇāle, V-3/4 (172); sahasrārapadma, 170, 187; ānandakandapadma, 170, 188; cf. 187 sq.; cf. also s.v. kokaṇada, niraja.

paracaksu — 16.

paramārtha — paramārthasatya, 153, 159.

parāmarṣa — dhṛṣṭiparāmarṣa, III, g-A-1 (119); cīlavrataparāmarṣaṛṣṭi, III, g-A-2 (120); cīlavrataparāmarṣa, III, h-A-8 (122); cf. 93, 94, 95, 159, 160.

parārthakārin — III, f-A-7 (118); 155.

parāṛṣṭtī — cf. s.v. ēṛṣṭya.

parikāh — VII-line 12 (194).

parīṇāma — 82, 128, 143.

parideva — considered to belong to the 'great' duḥkhaskandha, III, a-A-5 (108); e-A-7 (117); cokapratyayah paridevas, III, g-B-3 (120); abhīḍapatalakṣayanah paridevah, g-B-3/4 (120); duḥkhahetum paridevam, g-B-7 (121); evaṁ paridevaḥ, g-B-7 (121); paridevahetum cokam, g-B-7 (121); cf. 61, 96, 164.

paridevapratyayasya duḥkham, III, g-B-4 (120).

parinirmitavārṣavārṣin (or rather: parinirmita°) — a class of gods, III, h-A-6 (122).

parinirṣṭ(t)a — II, c-A-4 (114); 83, 84, 87; cf. s.v. nirvṛṣṭ(t)a.

paripāka — indriyānāḥ; paripākaḥ, III, b-B-6 (112); paripākendriyadurvyāhṛarupavai-varṇata, g-B-1 sq. (120); cf. 81, 162 sq.

paribheda, — cf. s.v. indriya.


parivrājakā — 160.

parīhāṇi — III, b-B-5/6 (112); cf. s.v. hāni.

paç — vipacayati, cf. 88 sq.


pātra — wrong spelling for pattra, III, d-A-7 (115).

pālitya — 137.

pāṇgupata — 160.

pitṛnilaya — X-a-1c (270); cf. 271.

punya — punyayamayāḥ, saṃskārāḥ, III, f-A-10 (118); f-B-1 (118); tatpunyā-yām anuṣṭubhī, VII-10d (195); punyasaṃbhāra, 179, 197 sq.; saṃbhārato punyānāṁ (sic), 197; punyamegha, 181; gift of punya (?), 184; punyopaga, 72, 130; further references: 72, 93, 156, 158, 201.

pudgala — III, g-A-3 (120); pudgalaśarātmya, 90; cf. 95, 98, 160.
punarāvartakamūla — III, d-B-9 (116).


purataḥ prāgbhārakāyatā — III, b-B-5 (112).

purāṇībhāva (saṃskārāṇām) — III, b-B-6 (112); 138.

purārīcita, presumably in a double meaning — X-a-2c (270); 271.

purāṣa — 95.

puspa (as a masculine) — III, c-A-10 (115); 142.

pijā (different forms of) — 188.

pūtā — X-c-5d (277); atipūta, Pūteçvara, Pūtikeçvara, pūtamañi, pūtamārti, 279; cf. 257, 262.

pūrva — pūrvakarman, pūrvakleça, 143.

prthagjana — III, g-A-5 (120); cf. 89, 97, 161 (prthagjanatva).

peçin — 146.

posa — 95.

prakṛti — mithyā- and saṃyak-prakṛti used to indicate the samudaya and nirodha parts of pratītyasamutpāda respectively, 62.

prajñāpiti — prajñāpiti anupatatīḥ, III g-A-5 (120); 97.

prajñā — 183, 197; prajñācakṣus, 200; prajñāmātī, conjecturally restituted, VII-18d (196); cf. 206.

pranita (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.

prativijñāpiti — 89, 131.

prativibha — III, f-A-9 (118); 155.

pratīciddh (?) — pratīciddhāty avidyā, III, f-A-1/2 (118); 152, sq.

prātiti (?) — pratītyāḥ, 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. pratītyasamutpāda.

pratītyasamutpāda — No. III (47-167), passim; some more important references: 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); anīgas classifiable under different headings in numerical order, c-A-6 to e-A-7 (114-117); translation, 141-148; discussion, 78-83); Mahāyānic features of Upadeça, 97-100; considered an asamskrtya 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 Ullāṅgha’s Častra, cf. the Add.

pratītyasamutpāna — 65.

pratīyā — 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); pratīyāpanibandha, 82, 142, 154; various references: 61, 83, 92, 142, 152, 154, 155.

prabhava — to denote the aṅgas trṣṇā, upādāna and bhava, III, d-A-2 (115); cf. 144.

pravāha — III, d-A-2 (115); 144.

pravṛtti — viṣayapraśīrti, III, d-A-2 (115); pravṛttivijñāna, 126, 146, 191.

prācīkhā — 146.

pravāsa — III, f-B-5 (119); 130.

prāheya — duḥkkhāpraheya, III, f-A-4, 5 (?) (118); samudaya-prāheya, niro-

dha-, mārga-, bhāvanā-prāheya, f-A-4/5 (118); aprāheya (?), f-A 5 (118).

prakāsa — interpretation of pratītyasamutpāda, 81.

prābhārakāya - cf. s.v. purataḥ.

pratīsattvika (saṃskāra) — III, f-B-7 (119); 79, 93, 158.

prādūrvbhāva — jīvitendriya, III, b-B-3 (111); śkaṇḍa, g-A-10 (120); cf. 134, 153, 162.


pretaloka — III, h-A-6 (122).

phāt — 169.

phunindra — X-a-1b (269); cf. 270.

phala — hetupalārtha, III, c-A-7 (114); phala part of pratītyasamutpāda,

c-A-8 (114); in a similar, c-A-10 (115); phalaṃkale, 55, 143; saṃmoh-
haphala, ārambha-phaphala, d-A-9 (116); vipāka-, niṣyanda-, santaṇa-phala, e-A-1 (116); nirvṛtti-, aniṣṭa-phala, e-B-2 (116); visamyo- 
gaphala, 204; various references: 80, 81, 141, 142, 143, 145.

bala — 105; daçabala, 183; balapāramitā, 200.

bālā (written vālā) — III, g-A-4/5 (120); cf. 97, 161.

bhāya (written vāhya) — pratītyasamutpāda, III, c-A-9 (114); c-A-10 (115);

bhāyaçīnyata, 91; bhāyaçyata, 129; cf. also 82, 142.

bīja (written vija) — III, c-A-9 (114); d-A-6 (115); punarbhaveykaśabija, d-A-8 (115); sarvabija, 191; bijabhūta, 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; bodhicitattamula, 191.


bhakti — bhaktabharapravata, VII-14b (195); 188.

bhaj (bhajati) — VII-19b (196); 206.

bhāta — suvejvaladbhata-mañiśāntiçöbhini, X-a-2b (270); 272.

bharita — bhūrhibogabhārita, X-c-3b (277); 279.
bhava — tenth aṅga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula cf. s.v. bhavapratyayā jātiḥ; 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); nirūttiphalā, d-B-2 (116); anāgatabheda, d-B-5 (116); punarāvartakamāla, d-B-9 (116); aśvayyasampatti, e-A-2 (116); anāgatabhava, attabhabha, g-A-6/7 (120); antarābhava, 77, 127, 135, 136; bhavacakra, 82; bhaveṇa, 81; tribhava, 134; punarbhava, karmabhava, 127; bhavabhid-, 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. upādana.


bhāra — nārāṇāthābhisamāṇskārabhāra, VII-1a (194); 182.


bhugmatā — attribute of jāra, III, b-B-4 (112).

bhūyottungade (va) — VII-line 6 (192); cf. 180, 181, 182, 184 sq.

bhūmi — avidyā compared with, III, d-A-6 (115); bhūmisambhāra, 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); ācara-, samavāya-, citta-, anāgata-bheda, d-B-5 (116); vinācabheda, d-B-6 (116); bhedera, abhedenā, 61; ātma? bhedadandaṭṭavardāṇi, e-A-2 (115); cf. 68, 126, 132, 143, 147.

bhōjuḥ — 202.

bhautika (rāpa) — 101, 131.

bhrānti — 92.


mati (at the end of a compound) — 206.

manas — manassamskāra, III, a-B-2 (111); f-B-5 (119); manassamsparṣa, b-A-4 (111); e-B-2 (117); manovijñāna, a-B-4 (109); mana-śayana, b-A-2 (111); e-B-1 (117); manaskarmakuṇḍala, f-B-2 (119); manaskarma-akuṇḍala, f-B-3 (119); avyākṛtamanaskarman, f-B-4 (119); manasiluruta (?), a-A-3 (108); manaskarman, 93; cf. 72, 73, 74, 131, 155.

mandatva — III, b-B-5 (112).

maya — mayakaravālādbhiḥkāṣṭipurabhādhi, 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: skandhabhedateṣāna?) maraṇam, g-B-2 (120); maraṇakālakṣayā (or: kriyā ?), b-B-8 (112); cokahetum maraṇam, vyastesam maraṇam, maraṇahetukā jarā, g-B-8 (120); cf. also 65, 96, 139, 142.
maranaprātaṇyaḥ cokaha — III, g-B-2 (120).
mārici — 90.
mahalakṣmi — harapādaṇkajaraḥjakāṇikāvadānamahalakṣmi, X-c-2b (277); cf. 247.
mahabhūta — III, a-B-7 (110); 101, 163.
mātyākā — 79.
māna — 154.
mārga — mārgapraheya, III, f-A-4 (118); astimārga (?), g-A-1 (119); dar-
canamārga, bhāvanāmārga, 154; cf. 119 sq., 159, 183; cf. also s.v.
nairjānikā.
mithyā — na mithyaiśvidyā, III, f-A-1 (118); mithyājñāna, f-A-3 (118);
mityādṛṣṭi, 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 — pratyamanuścat, 8-10.
mūrti — candraścaṇḍa, X-b-2b (273); aśīgana-, tripurāntacandraścekha-
mūrti, 268 sq., 275, 276, 278.
mūla — kleca-, karma- kalala-, skandha-mūla, III, d-B-7 (116); ṛcaya (phala)-, trika-, vipāka-, hetu-mūla, d-B-8 (116); grahaṇa-, punarāva-
taka-mūla, d-B-9 (116); kucaλamūla, 152, 181; kucaλamūlasambhāra,
197; cf. also 146 sq.
megha — punyamegha, 181; cf. s.v. dharma and abhra.
maitreya — 183.
yamayatayati — X-b-2b (273); 275.
yāstisvīṣaṭkāhastā — 137.
yah kaṣcit samyaḥ...... — beginning of a strophe, III, c-A-4 (114); conjec-
tural restitution, 83-87.
yāna — 198.
yeh dharmaḥ hetuprabhavaḥ — 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); ratnatrayaṣayopeta, VII-10a (195); samasta-
gunaratnabha, VII-10b (195); cf. 201.
ratnasambhava — 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); rūpavaiśarpatā, g-B-2 (120); rūpabhava,
lakṣaṇa — anubhāvaṃalakṣaṇaḥ vedanā, III, e-B-4 (117); sutṛptilakṣaṇaḥ triṇā, e-B-5/6 (118); abhilāpalakṣaṇaḥ paridevah, g-B-3/4 (120); upāyāsalakṣaṇam, g-B-5/6 (121).
lakṣmi — jamvulakṣmi (?), VII-line 8 (193).
linga — kṛṣṭikavāsaliṅga, — X-a-3d. (270); tryambakaliṅga, X-b-4d (274);
haraliṅga, X-c-5c (277); cf. 247, 255-257, 259, 267 sq., 280, 289 sq., 294.
lokapāla — X-b-1a (273); cf. 274.
vajra — vajropamasamādhi, 180; cf. s.v. kulīca.
vandana — 188.
varanara — varanarādhirājarāja, VII-19c (196); 184-186.
varjaniya — 7.
varna — 148, 163.
wartamāna (pratītyasamutpāda) — III, c-B-8 (115).
varsikah — samākārāṅga compared with, III, d-A-6 (115).
vali — valitattva, III, b-B-4 (111 sq.); valipracurate, b-B-4 (111 sq.); valinicitakāya, 137.
valaiṅga — valaiṅgagoptṛ, X-a-3c (270); valaiṅgainetṛ, X-b-4c (274); cf. 250-256.
valkala — 265.
vastu (to denote a number of pratītyasamutpādāṅgas) — 81.
vah — (at the end of a compound) 270, 271.
vāc — vācasaṃskārāḥ, III, a-B-2 (109); vākakarma-akucala, f-B-2 (119); vākkarma-akuçala, f-B-3 (119); vāksaṃskāra, vāksaṃskṛta, f-B-5 (119); vākkarman, 93; cf. 72, 73, 155.
vi- — 88, 89.
vinçatīvidha (also spelt viñçatīvidha) — kāmopādāna, III, e-B-8 (118); kāmabhava, g-A-8/9 (120); viñçatīvidhā (sic) kāmadhātuh, h-A-7 (122); satkāyaṇḍrś, h-A-9 to h-B-1 (122).
vicāra — vicārayitvā, III, f-B-6 (119); cf. 130, 157.
vigijīru — 147 sq.; 200.
vijñāna — 3rd aṅga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. vijñānapratītyaṃ samājātanam; explained by sad vijñānakāyāḥ (cakṣurādi), III, a-B-3/4 (109); cf. also the spurious passage with sad vijñānakāye, e-A-10/11 (117); instead of taking -kāye as a locative, one might consider the possibility of a nominative plural in -e, common in Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit; although this assumption would not make the meaning clear, it might suggest a reason why the copyist got entangled in his words; of course, we have to add a mark of punctuation after vijñānakāye in that case. Vijñānaskandha, III, a-B-6 (110); h-B-1 (122); vijñānācrayat-
vāt, III, f-A-3 (118); caksu-, ċrotra-, ghrāṇa-, jihvā-, kāya-, manovijñāna, III, a-B-3/4 (109); considered phāla, c-A-7 (114), d-A-3 (115); vipākaphala, d-B-1 (116); dukkha, c-B-5 (115); vartamāna, c-B-7 (115); vipāka, c-B-9 (115); garbha, d-A-1 (115); bija, d-A-6 (115); santānabheda, d-B-4 (116); kalalamūla, d-B-7 (116); compared with amātyāḥ, e-A-1 (116); vijñānābija, 83; bijavijñāna, 126; pravṛttivijñāna, 126, 146, 191; ālayaviṣaya, 191; vijñānāvakraṇti, 143; further references: 104, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 144, 145, 146, 153, 158. Finally, the reader is referred to Vittore Pisani, Kośaparīṣṭāni, in Vāk, II (Poona, 1952), p. 21.

vijñānapratyayam nāmarūpa — 3rd link of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, III, a-A-4 (108); a-B-4 (109); c-B-1/2 (115); e-A-4 (116); cf. s.v. vijñāna and nāmarūpa.

vipāc— 88.

vipāk— vipākaphala, III, d-B-1 (116); vipākakārya, c-B-9, 10 (115); vipākakāmūla, d-B-8 (116); cf. 81, 126, 147; cf. also s.v. karman.

vibhāga (vibhāga) — III, a-A-6 (108); b-B-10 (113); h-A-1 (121); cf. 63, 64, 75, 139, 156; pratītyajātārthavibhāgavijnāṇāḥ, 184.

vibhāja — 158.

vibhava — vibhavatṛṣṇā, III, b-A-6 (111); cf. 68, 69, 79.

vīrūpa — VI-A-7 (174); cf. 173.

vivarjita — presumably in upādānavivarjita, 88.


vīcoddhai — in pāpāvaraṇa-, karmāvaraṇa-, gagan-, sarvapāpa-viçodhani, V-1/2 (171 sq.); sarvakarmāvaraṇaviçodhanināma-dhāraṇi, 171.

vīgrānta — vīgrāntabodhir eṣyati, VII-5b (194); cf. 199.

vījñāta — pratītya, III, f-A-8 (118); 155.

vījñāvajra — 168.


vīṣamāyoga — vīṣamāyogaphala, 204.

vīṣṭara — vīṣṭareṇa, III, c-B-4 (115); f-A-1 (118); 142, 152.

vīrīya — vīrīyapāramitā, 200.

vṛc — vṛcata (?), III, f-A-1 (118); 152.

vṛtāla — 266, 271; vṛtālasiddhi, 271.

vedanā — 7th anīga of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, cf. s.v. vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā; division into suka, duḥkha and aduḥkhasuṇaka, III, b-A-4/5 (111); e-B-5 (118); vedanāskandha, a-B-5 (110); h-A-9 (122); considered phala, c-A-8 (114), d-A-4 (115); niṣyandaphala, d-B-1 (116); vipāka, c-B-9 (115); vartamāna, c-B-7 (115); viṣayapravṛtti, d-A-1/2 (115); pueṣa, d-A-7 (115); cittabheda, d-B-5 (116); vipākamūla, d-B-8 (116); mitrāmitrodāsinī, e-A-1 (116); anubhāvanālakṣaṇā vedanā, e-B-4 (117); further references: 97, 127, 130, 132, 147, 150.

vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā — 7th link of the pratītyasamutpāda formula, III, a-A-5 (108); b-A-5/6 (111); c-B-3 (115); e-A-5 (117); e-B-5 (118); cf. s.v. vedanā and tṛṣṇā.
vaiyavadānika — 58, 129, 153.
vaiṣāradya — 105.
vyaśājana — 140.
vyaśavadāna — 62 sq.
vyaśavāhāra — 91.
vyaśa — III, g-B-7 to 9 (121: eight times); 141, 164.
vyaśādhī — 61, 95.
vyaśāhāra — vyāhāramanjuśikharah, VII-8b (194); 182.
vrata — 160.
ṣakta — vaktuṣakta, VII-10c (195).
ṣakti — amitavihitāṣakti, X-b-1c (273).
ṣabda — 120.
caṇa — caṇapravṛtta, III, c-A-4 (114), cf 84; tricaṇa, 84; kulecaṇa, VII-line 11 (193); varačaṇa, VII-18b (196); caṇapagamana, 201, 204; cf. s.v. caṃman.
caṃman — tricaṃmadhīra, — VII-18b (196).
cava — cauḍavah, X-a-1c (270); 266.
caṇata — caṇvatātma (?), III, b-B-2 (122); caṇvadṛṣṭi, 68, 159 sq.; cf. 83, 94, 167.
cikṣaṣpajna — 11.
cikṣaḥ — ruciradipacīkhaṅkṛtatāsah, VII-12b (195); asankhyacakhaṁpanibha-saṁyakha, VII-15a (186).
cībhira (cīvira) — 256 sq.; 280.
cīkara — vyāhāramanjuśikaraha, VII-8b (194).
cīla — 95, 133, 160; cf. s.v. cilavṛata.
cilavṛata — cilavṛatopadāna, III, b-A-8 (111); e-B-7 (118); cilavṛataparā-marca, III, b-A-8 (122); cilavṛataparāmarçadṛṣṭi, g-A-2 (120); cf. 68, 94, 95, 133, 160; cf. also s.v. cīla and vrata.
cudghi — cudhīḍṛṣṭi, III, g-A-3 (120).
cukla — (karman) 65, 66.
cūka — 142.
cūnya — cūnyendriyāavasthānadhātuṣcoka, III, g-B-3 (120); cf. 78, 83, 91, 99, 163, 257.
cūralakṣṇī — X-b-2c (273); 247, 276.
cūka — III, e-A-7 (117); g-B-2, 3 (120); 61, 96, 127, 163, 164; cf. s.v. cūkapratyayaḥ paridevaḥ.
cūkapratyayaḥ paridevaḥ — III, g-B-3 (120).
cṛī — X-a-2c (270); 247, 271 sq.
cṛotrā — cṛotravicīnāna, III, a-B-3/4 (109); cṛotrasamsparca, b-A-3 (111); e-B-2 (117); cṛotrāyata, b-A-1 (111), e-A-11 (117).
ṣaḍāyatanā — 5th aṅga of the pratiyāsamantrāpa formula, cf. s.v. saḍāyatana-narpratyayaḥ sparcaḥ; defined as saḍ ādhyaṁikāṇy āyatanāṇi, III,
śaḍāyatana-pratyayam sparçāḥ — 5th link of the pratiṣṭhitasammutpāda, III, a-A-4 (108); b-A-2/3 (111); c-B-2 (115); e-A-5 (117); cf. s.v. āyatana and s.v. sparçā.


śaḍvidhā — pratiṣṭhitasammutpāda, III, d-A-3 to 5 (115).

śaṃyac — sāmyak, III, c-A-4 (114); cf. 83; sāmyakprakṛti.

śaṃvṛtī — sāṃvṛtisatyā, 91, 141.

śaṃcaya — sāṃcayajñāna, III, f-A-3 (118); 125.

śaṃcīṣṭa — sāṃṣcīṣṭahetu, III, f-A-8 (118); 155.

śaṃsāra — sāṃsārīvonicarātām, VII-18a (196); 191.

śaṃskāra — 2nd anīga of the pratiṣṭhitasammutpāda formula, cf. s.v. sāṃskāra-pratyayam vijñānam; divided into kāya-, vāk- and maṇah-sāṃskāra, III, a-A-2 (109); divided into pūnyamāyāḥ, apuṇyamāyāḥ and (presumably, but omitted in the text) ānēnyamāyāḥ (with the above division into kāya, vāc, maṇas) as sub-divisions of each of these three groups, f-A-10 to f-B-4 (118 sq.) divided into kāya, vāc and maṇas, the former subdivided into ācvāsa and prāṇoṣa, the second into vītarka and vicāra, the third explained by cetanā, f-B-4 to 6 (119); divided into kuṣṭala, akuṣṭala and aṣṭyākṛta, f-B-6/7 (119); divided into prātīsatvākṣa, aṣṭapattyāmcika and ābhūṣaṁśārika, f-B-7/8 (119); considered hetu, c-A-7 (114); c-B-9 (115); bāraka, d-A-1 (115); past, c-B-6 (115); karman, d-A-3 (115); varṣikāḥ, d-A-6 (115); arAMBhaphala, d-A-9 (116); kriyābhedā, d-B-4 (116); karmamāla, d-B-7 (116); valāddhyākṣa (i.e. bcālāddhyakṣa), d-B-10 (116); sāṃskāraskandha, a-B-6 (110); sāṃskārānām puṇāṇihāvāḥ, b-B-6 (112); sāṃskārānām viśeṣaḥ, b-B-8 (112); āyuḥ-spārśa-sāṃskāra, 113; cītāvyaprayuktasāṃskāra, 157; sāṃskāradhāvāḥ, 143; various references: 72 sq. 79, 95, 125, 130, 131, 138, 139, 143, 146, 155-158, 159, 161.; cf. s.v. abhisāṃskāra, sāṃskṛta, asāṃskṛta.

śaṃskārapratyayam vijñānam — III, a-A-4 (108); a-B-3 (109); c-B-1 (115); e-A-4 (116); cf. s.v. sāṃskāra, vijñāna.

śaṃskṛta (dharma) — 129.

śaṃstāna — 101, 148, 163.

śaṃsparṣa — III, b-A-3, 4 (111); e-B-2 (117); 126, 132, 151.

śaṃvedaṇa — kind of birth, 162.

śaṃkleṣa — three sāṃkleṣas, 58, 62 sq., 143, 162: (kleśa-, karma-, phala- or : jāti-, janma-, vīpāka-).


śaṃgha — III, a-A-8 (109); V-1 (171); 67.
**saṃghāta** — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

**saṃjñāti** — III, b-B-2 (111); 135, 162.

**saṃjñāta** — name of a hell, III, h-A-4 (122).

**satuṣṭa** — dṛṣṭi, III, h-A-8 (122); twentyfold, h-B-1 (122); aṣṭapādasatākāya- (?), VII-line 10 (193); cf. 68, 94, 95, 97, 166, 171.

**satkāra** — 188.

**satkāra** — 82, 166.

**sattvanikāya** — III, b-B-1 (111); b-B-7 (112); 71, 134 sq.

**satya** — saṃvisñī, paramārtha-satya, 91, 141, 153 sq., 167; cf. s.v. duḥkha, samudaya, nirodha, mārga.

**santāna** — 126, 136, 144, 153; santānapaṭa, cf. s.v. santānapaṭa.

**santānapaṭa** — presumably the correct form for santānapaṭa, III, e-A-1 (116); cf. Add. II, sub g; note 104 to p. 145 therefore loses its meaning.

**saṃnyāsa** — 5.

**saptavidha** — pratītyasamutpaḍa, III, d-A-5 to 8 (115); cilā, g-A-2 (120).

**sabbhāgatā** — nikāyasabhāgatā, 135, 158.

**sam** — meaning of the prefix, 88, 129, 135.

**samanantara** — járyāḥ samanantaramaṇam, III, g-B-2 (120); 163.

**samavādy** — samavādyā (?), 83 sq.

**samavāya** — samavāyabhedā, III, d-B-5 (116); trikasamavāya, e-B-2 (117); caksurādiviyānānasamavāya, 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); samudayapraheyyā (avidyā), III, f-A-4, 5 (? (118); samudayasatya, 87; cf. 78, 128.

**sampratāpaka** — name of a hell, III, h-A-1 (122).

**sambhava** — sambhavaḥrmanāgraṇṭavīraṇtabodhim = esyatī, VII-5c (194).

**sāṃbhāra** — dharmasaṃbhāra, VII-1c (194), cf. 182 sq., 197 sq.; puṇya-, jñānasambhāra, 179, 197 sq.; sambhārato (sic) puṇyānāṃ, sombhāravat, kuṭalamālasambhāra, 197; dayāsaṃbhāra, dhāraṇīsaṃbhāra, dharmasaṃbhārayoga, 198; cf. s.v. guṇa.

**saṃmohā** — III, a-B-1 (109); saṃmohapāta, d-A-9 (116); pūrvānta-, aparānta-, madhyānta-saṃmohā, 128; cf. 65, 145, 162.

**sarga** — bhavapādaḥbhavatkarunākṛtarasargavidhi, presumably in different meanings, X-b-3a/b (274); cf. 276.

**sarasvāpasyākaraṇaḥ** — 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 (= Mahāprajñapāramitācātra), II (1949), p. 1075, where the following translation is given: „Eviter tout péché, pratiquer le bien, purifier sa pensée: tel est l’enseignement des Bouddha“. Lamotte refers the reader also to Diṅgha, II, p. 49; Dhammapada, V-183; Nettipakaraṇa, 43, 171, 186.
sahasrārapadma — not mentioned, but probably alluded to, VII-12a/b (195); cf. 187, 202.
sāṃklecika — dharmas, 58, 153.
sānjī — III, b-A-8 (122); sānjīśkandha, III, a-B-6 (110); naivasāṃjīnānā-
sāṃjīyatanā, 134; cf. 97, 130, 131.
sādhana — drutavinilabitasādhananvānītaḥ, VII-17d (196); 173.
sādhuc suśthu ca manasikuruta, III, a-A-3 (108); 73 sq., 77.
sāma — 147.
siddhayātra (siddhiyātra) — 1 sq.; cf. XI-22b (315); siddha ta yātra (in Old Javanese); cf. also 326.
sukha — sukhave, III, b-A-5 (111); e-B-5 (118); sukhasparça, e-B-3 (117); cf. 147; cf. also s.v. adukkhāsukha.
sugata — catussugatasaṃgataḥ, VII-3b (194); sugatabhaktibharsprāñataiḥ,
VII-14b (195); sugatavimvavilokunanirajita, VII-15c (195).
sutṛtī — sutṛṭilakṣayā triṣṇā, III, e-B-5/6 (118); 151.
suṣṭha — cf. s.v. suṣṭha.
setu — 184.
sevitaṃya — dharna, III, s-A-11 (109); 71, 129.
skandha — catvāraḥ arūpiṇaḥ skandhāḥ (vedanā-, saṃskāra-, sāṃjīnā-,
vijñāna-skandhāḥ), III, a-B-5/6 (110); e-A-9 (117); dūkhaskandha,
a-A-6 (108); e-A-7 (117); skandhapratilāba, a stage of jāti, III, b-B-2 (111); skandhabhinirvṛtti, b-B-3 (111); skandhamūla, d-B-7 (116); skandhapradurbhāvāj jātiḥ, g-A-10 (120); skandhabhedatattvāt (sic)
maranam, g-B-2 (120); skandha-paripāka, bheda, 163. Further references:
82, 83, 95, 96, 97, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 144, 149.
stūpa — 87, 100.
sthāna — sarvasvasthānagatāni (malāni ?), V-3 (172).
sthāpaniya (praṇa) — 158.
sparṣa — 6th aṅga of the pratiṣṭyasaṃutpāda formula, cf. s.v. sparṣaprātyayā
triṣṇā; defined as sat sparṣaḥkāyāḥ (viz. caṅsah-, cṛotra-, ghrāṇa-, jihvā-,
kāya-, maṇaḥ-saṃsparṣa), b-A-3/4 (111) and, in a very clumsy form,
e-B-1 to 3 (117); sukhā-, dūkhā- and (presumably, but omitted in the
text) adutukhasukhaśparṣa, e-B-3 (117); pāñcadaśa sparṣāni (sic), e-B-4 (117); considered phala, c-A-8 (114), d-A-4 (115); nisvandaphala, d-B-1
(116); dūkha, c-B-5 (115, where sparṣa is not, however, mentioned,
but implied in -aśīnām); vipāka, c-B-9 (115); viṣayapravṛtti, d-A-2 (115); puṣpa, d-A-7 (115); samavāyabheda, d-B-5 (116); trikāmula,
d-B-8 (116); pāśca kāmagunānāi, e-A-1 (116); further references: 97,
126, 132, 147, 150; cf. also s.v. sparṣāyatana.
sparṣaprātyayā vedanā — 6th link of the pratiṣṭyasaṃutpāda formula, III,
sparṣāyatana — III, a-A-11 (109); 129.
svacittaparyādāpāna — 123; cf. also s.v. sarvaspāpasyaśākaranam.
svabhāva — 78, 90, 104.
svārthakārin — III, f-A-7 (118) ; 115.
sveda — svedajā (jatiḥ), III, g-B-1 (120) ; 162.

hara — harādvayāmsāmalabhaktinā, X-a-3b (270) ; harapāḍapaṅkajarajaḥ-, X-c-5c ; harāya namah, X-c-1d (277) ; haralīnga, X-c-5c (277) ; cf. 247, 265 sq. 268.
hāni — III, b-B-5 (112) ; ēyuṣo hāniḥ, antahāniḥ (?), b-B-8 (112) ; cf. 139, cf. also s.v. parihāṃi.
hīna — of karman, 65, 66, 71, 94, 159.
hūṃ — 169.
hṛtparitāpa — hṛtparitāpam 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 pratīyaya,
f-A-6 to 9 (118) ; hetasamutpanneṣu 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) ; hetumāla, d-B-8 (116) ; hetutāyāçrayatvād (read: hetutvāçrayatvād ?), f-A-2/3 (118) ; hetūpanibandha, 82, 142 ; hetupratiyaya, 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.