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Written traces of the Buddhist past: *Mantras* and *Dhāraṇīs* in Indonesian inscriptions

Arlo Griffiths*
École française d’Extrême-Orient, Jakarta Centre
arlo.griffiths@efeo.net

Abstract

This article examines a group of ten Indonesian inscriptions citing a range of *gāthās*, *mantras* and *dhāraṇīs*. The texts, contextualized and in some cases read and identified for the first time, underline the pan-Asian character of Buddhism and the integral place the Indonesian archipelago once held in the ancient Buddhist world. The identification of the sources of several of these texts in known Sanskrit scriptures raises the question whether some of these texts, none of which survives as such in the archipelago, were once transmitted there in manuscript form.
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That Indonesia was a vibrant part of the ancient Buddhist world is well known from foreign (mainly Chinese) written sources, and from the almost unanimously wordless testimony of Buddhist monuments and sculptures, found at many sites in Sumatra, Kalimantan (Borneo), Java and Bali. Of the written (Sanskrit) vectors of Buddhism – revealed texts, doctrinal works, commentaries, ritual manuals – that must once have existed, only an infinitesimally small fraction have been transmitted into the present in the form of very scarce texts, mainly in Old Javanese language, preserved on Bali.¹

Written sources that have hardly been exploited thus far to gain a greater understanding of some aspects of the history of Buddhism in Indonesia exist in the form of Buddhist texts inscribed on stone and metal surfaces, which were better able to withstand the ravages of time than the palm-leaf manuscripts

---

¹ For an excellent concise overview of the textual and archaeological sources for the history of Buddhism in Indonesia, and a detailed listing of the relevant secondary literature, see Hooykaas 1973: 8–14. Nihom (1994) is a fine study concerned only with non-epigraphical textual materials. One relevant paper, dealing with one of the two most important doctrinal texts preserved from ancient Java, the *Saṅh Hyañ Kamahāyāñan Mantranaya*, appeared too late for Nihom to be able to take it into account. See Ishii 1992, whose results were partly taken over in Lokesh Chandra 1995.
used by learned Buddhists in ancient times. The contents of these inscriptions are almost invariably taken from scriptural sources, that is, they are (citations from) texts that were considered to have been uttered by the historical Buddha Śākyamuni or other beings holding equal or almost equal authority, such as direct disciples of Śākyamuni, or other Buddhas and even Bodhisattvas. The majority of such inscriptions are constituted, as elsewhere in the Buddhist world, by specimens of the Pratītyasamutpādagāthā (i.e. the ye dharmāḥ formula). Other examples of such pithy verses (gāthās) are, however, also attested, and some of them are of interest for the history of Buddhist literature. There are also, besides these very common and less common gāthās, a substantial number of inscriptions belonging to the class of texts to which the names mantra and dhāranī apply.

The existence of these mantra and dhāranī inscriptions in Indonesia has not as yet played any role whatsoever in the study of Indian and pan-Asian Buddhism. One may consult any of the seminal studies on Indian dhāranīs that appeared in the 1980s and 1990s, and find plentiful references to dhāranīs transmitted in various parts of the Buddhist world at greater or smaller remove from the historical heartland of Buddhism in India – Sri Lanka, China, Korea, Japan, Afghanistan, and especially Tibet; but Indonesia is never mentioned. This seems to be a loss as much for the study of the history of pan-Asian Buddhism, as it is for the study of Indonesian cultural history.

I hope to show in this contribution that the Indonesian dhāranī inscriptions have much to offer as comparative material for the historian of Indian and pan-Asian Buddhism because the diversity of dhāranī texts attested in Indonesian inscriptions seems substantial, because the types of objects bearing these inscriptions often help our understanding of the contexts in which these texts were used, and because the information about archaeological context is in several cases sufficient to shed extra light on the texts and the artefacts on which they are inscribed. Simultaneously I hope to show that engagement

---

2 See Griffiths (2011, items 1, 9 and 12), for specimens from Sumatra. I take this opportunity to correct a few errors in that publication. With regard to item 1, the gold foil engraved with the ye dharmāḥ stanza that was excavated in 1928 on the Bukit Seguntang in Palembang has not, as I affirmed in 2011, “fallen through the nest of colonial period Dutch archaeologists”, but has been repeatedly referred to in Krom’s 1938 study that was unknown to me when I published this gold foil inscription. See Krom (1938: 399–400, 411–12, 416). With regard to item 12, I carelessly misidentified the metre of the verse cited in the Pulau Sawah inscription: it is not in anusṭubh, but in jagati meter. I also failed to note another possible source for this verse, namely the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra (ed. Skorupski, 146: 4–6, several emendations of the published edition are required). This last omission is particularly poignant in the light of some of the material to be discussed in the present study.

3 See Skilling (forthcoming) for a study of a Sanskrit gāthā attested in multiple specimens from a wide range of sites in maritime South-East Asia, but not traceable in any known canonical text.


5 See Gippert (2004 and forthcoming) for fascinating dhāranī material from the Maldives.

6 Based on the studies of Schopen and those who followed in his footsteps, I am tempted to say that the diversity is greater than it is in India, but since I have not undertaken a systematic search for such inscriptions in India, and the authors mentioned do not claim to have been exhaustive either, this impression may be misleading.
with Buddhist literature which has not been preserved in Indonesia, as well as with the scholarly study of Buddhist texts and artefacts found elsewhere in Asia, cannot be ignored if our aim is to understand the function and meaning of Buddhist artefacts found in Indonesia. This might seem to be a self-evident point, but in Indonesia epigraphy is the preserve of archaeologists, who tend to be sent into the field without serious training in Sanskrit, let alone Buddhist studies. The result is that none of the interesting dhāranī inscriptions unearthed in recent decades have been properly published, and that the significance of these artefacts has had very little impact on archaeological and historical research.

There are exceptions, which can usefully be mentioned here by way of introduction to the main study. The late Indonesian scholar Boechari has published transliterations of Buddhist mantra and dhāranī material, frequently with the modest admission that he did not feel competent to interpret the data, and had to defer to specialists in Buddhist studies for that task. The challenge posed by his 1982 publication (reprinted in Boechari 2012: 575–86) of a lengthy dhāranī inscription engraved on a lead-bronze strip excavated near Borobudur was more recently taken up by Hudaya Kandahjaya, who drew the following conclusions (2009: 2, with table 1 on p. 4):

Given Boechari’s readings, it appears that some of the lines in this inscription correspond with verses preserved in a Balinese stuti called the Nava-Kampa, or “The Nine-Fold Tremble”. So far, the origin of the Nava-Kampa verses is unknown. But some lines of this stuti can be found in a number of dhāranīs. Of particular interest, the Susiddhikara-sūtra, a text known from the Chinese translation of 726, includes phrases parallel to those at the beginning of the Nava-Kampa. Moreover, the Nava-Kampa seems to suggest that after recitation there would be brought about perfection in all actions (sarva-karma-siddhi-karam āvantayisyāmi), which is somewhat in line with the title and purpose of the Susiddhikara-sūtra. Thus, it looks that the kind of dhāranīs represented by the Nava-Kampa originated in the cycle or family of this sutra.

---

7 By this I mean in a published form including a reliable transliteration with an analysis of contents, which in most cases will require an integral translation. The few publications that do exist never satisfy these criteria. What is offered is at most a transliteration, normally without diacritical marks, and no attempt to analyse the meaning of the sequences of syllables that are read.

8 Sic. The Navakampa, edited by Goudriaan and Hooykaas (1971) as stuti nr. 510, is actually a prose text.

9 Based on photographs of the Borobudur lead-bronze inscription I have recently obtained, and the textual correspondence brilliantly observed by Hudaya Kandahjaya, I have re-edited the text of the inscription, and can state that the correspondences concern almost the whole of the inscription and the Navakampa. The link with the Susiddhikara, preserved only in Chinese and Tibetan, cannot be confirmed and I have thus far failed to find any scriptural identification (see Griffiths 2014).
A few years later, Boechari published an article on ritual deposits from Candi Gumpung (1985a = 2012: 453–65), a shrine in the temple complex of Muara Jambi in Sumatra. The names of mandala deities inscribed on numerous leaves of gold are not mantras, but nevertheless deserve to be mentioned here, for they are evidence of the spread to Indonesia of Mantranaya Buddhism10 with its focus on rituals involving mandalas, of which we will encounter other traces in the present study. The material attracted the attention of Max Nihom (1998), who elucidated it from the perspective of his knowledge of Indo-Tibetan Buddhist literature.

I will not enter here into the issue of a possible distinction between the terms mantra and dhāranī, and will use them with a considerable amount of overlap, as do the original Buddhist texts in which we encounter them. It is important, however, to make clear that together they represent a text type that is quite clearly different, in form and content, from the class here called gāthā. Unlike gāthās, which use metrical form and no bija syllables, perhaps the clearest marker of mantras and dhāranīs is the circumposition of om ... svāhā/phat. It is common in the Indonesian secondary literature for all Buddhist texts cited in inscriptions indiscriminately to be referred to as mantra.11 And it must be admitted that the boundaries between these categories were blurred even among ancient Indonesian Buddhists. The common conjunction of the Pratityasamutpādagāthā with texts that are clearly dhāranīs, and the existence of an abbreviated form of the famous gāthā as om ye te svāhā,12 are clear indications of this. As previous scholars have emphasized, this blurring of categories can be explained as resulting from the fact that these different categories of Buddhist literature could be put to use in the same way. It is because of this overlap between gāthās, on the one hand, and dhāranīs/mantras on the other, in the epigraphical record, that both categories are covered in the selection of material presented in this study.

This material comprises inscriptions recovered from Sambas in west Borneo, from a shipwreck on the bottom of the Java sea off the northern coast of Java, from the southern tip of Sumatra, from central Java, and from Bali, thus covering a substantial part of the textual and geographical depth and breadth of ancient Buddhism in the Indonesian archipelago (see map, Figure 1). While most of the material is published here for the first time, some has been published previously but without identification of source texts. Indeed, use of modern computerized text corpora in many cases allows pinpointing of the textual sources of such inscriptions. The proper identification of the source text (or at least of close parallels) is, in turn, often of considerable help in determining accurate readings of these documents, some of which have come to us in very poor physical condition.

The material presented here is the result of rather unsystematic data gathering on this type of inscriptions during the years 2008 to 2012. It does not pretend to offer anything like exhaustive coverage of all of the Indonesian scholarly literature on this subject, but it does attempt to provide a basis for further research in this area.

10 On this term, used here instead of the term Vajrayāna (or Tantryāṇa) more familiar to most Indonesian scholars, see Cruijsen, Griffiths and Klokke (forthcoming).
11 See e.g. Machi Suhadi 1989.
12 For a discussion of this abbreviated formula, and a list of known cases, see Cruijsen et al. forthcoming, n. 50.
inscriptions whose texts might be classified as Buddhist mantras or dhāranīs. I have omitted cases for which there is no specific reason to assume that they are Buddhist, cases for which I lack any reliable reading or reproductions allowing me to verify existing readings, and cases which have already been prepared for publication elsewhere.

1. Silver foil inscription from Sambas, West Kalimantan

In the annual report of the Archaeological Service in the Dutch East Indies (Oudheidkundig Verslag, OV) for the year 1948, in §6 dealing with “Discoveries”, we find an entry on Sambas (West Borneo, now West Kalimantan province), which reads (p. 13):

---

13 E.g. the interesting inscription presenting the Kawi alphabet arranged in small groups of aksaras enclosed within om ... svāhā (Brandes 1889), devoid of any indication of religious affiliation. [See addition on p. 187.]

14 E.g. the inscribed gold foil from Candi Bogang, which is almost certainly Buddhist but for which only an eye-copy is available (Djoko Dwiyanto 1985: 443 and facsimile on pp. 453–4). The eye-copy is clearly not faithful to the original since only fragments can be understood. Among the readable parts, it seems likely that the inscription ends with anena cāhaṇī kuśalena karmmanā bhaveya buddho na cireṇa loke deśeyā dharmmaṇaḥ jagato hitāya ||, i.e. the first three-quarters of the stanza identified in the Pulau Sawah inscription (see n. 2). Another probable dhāraṇī inscription is the one captured, not very legibly, on OD photo 17343 (see n. 49 on OD photos). See also n. 149 below for some East Javanese specimens not discussed here.

15 I have in mind the items included in the forthcoming publications by Cruijsen, Griffiths and Klokke (forthcoming); by Griffiths, Revire and Sanyal (2013); and by Griffiths (2014) alone.

16 I have translated into English all citations from Dutch and Indonesian sources made in this article.
In 1939 an earthenware jar was found, standing on a bronze leaf and covered by a bronze discus, in the ground on the bank of the eponymous river.\textsuperscript{17} The jar was damaged during excavation and contained 18 small statues, among which 8 in gold, the remaining ones in silver and bronze, of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and a censer in bronze, in the form of a house. Right after the report of the discovery these objects disappeared, but they resurfaced after the war, now in the possession of Mr. Tan Yeok Song, President of the South Seas Society at Singapore, who had bought them and secured them in the Oversea Chinese Bank. At this time only 7 golden and 2 silver statues, besides the censer, remain. Mr. Tan offered a provisional publication, accompanied by photos, of this collection (Preliminary Report on the Discovery of the Hoard of Hindu Religious Objects, near Sambas, West Borneo, Singapore 1948).\textsuperscript{18}

Subsequently, the September 1949 issue of the Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (vol. 22, pt. 4) was dedicated entirely to the Sambas finds, with papers contributed by Roland Bradell, Nilakanta Sastri, H.G. Quaritch Wales, Tom Harrisson and Tan Yeok Seong. No mention was made in this publication of any inscription as part of these finds. The collection was acquired by the British Museum in 1956, and the technical staff of the Museum then discovered that a rolled-up silver foil had been hidden in the base of the largest sculpture of the Sambas hoard (object 1, plates 1 and 2 in JMBRAS 22/4, 1949). At some moment after being unrolled, this foil broke into two fragments, currently kept at the British Museum under registration number 1956,0725.8.b.\textsuperscript{19} Putting the two fragments close together, we can determine that the original would have been about 16 cm in length and 2.35 cm in height.

As far as I know, the inscription on this silver foil, covering both sides, has only rarely been mentioned in the scholarly literature and remains unpublished.\textsuperscript{20} I will first present my reading of this document, then I will analyse its contents and discuss the importance of this artefact for the history of Buddhism and Buddhist art in Indonesia.

Text

The foil is extremely hard to capture in its entirety photographically. After repeated provisional attempts based on different photographs offered by

\textsuperscript{17} For more details on the provenance of the discoveries that concern us here, see now McKinnon 1994: 23.
\textsuperscript{18} Note 1: “Journal of the South Seas Society, vol. V, part 1, June 1948, p. 31–42. Also compare O.V. 1939, p. 6”.
\textsuperscript{19} There is unusually detailed information, with photographs made before and after the extraction process, available in the online British Museum database under the registration number 1956,0725.8.a, analysis reference number PR00742 (last accessed 26 July 2012).
\textsuperscript{20} A newspaper item in the Evening News, London, of which a clipping is found among the documents put online by the British Museum, announced a publication by D.E. Barrett and J.G. de Casparis scheduled to appear in the British Museum Quarterly. No such publication has ever seen the light of day. The inscription on silver foil is listed in Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977: 55), with the information that it “is in Sanskrit, according to Dr. J.G. de Casparis”.

\textbf{Text}
Michael Willis, and a tracing of the letters as observed by his research assistant Beatriz Cifuentes (without knowledge of the script), I was able to determine the reading from the original at the British Museum on 20 June 2012, using a microscope. As we will see on some other specimens of mantra/dhāranī inscriptions included in this article, the writing is sloppy, so that it often takes some goodwill to read a given akṣara in a way that makes sense. I subjoin photos of the original both with and without the mentioned tracing (Figures 2 and 3). While it does not seem necessary to point out all scribal errors, my notes anticipate some of the textual identifications made after the decipherment is presented.21

Obverse:

(1) // na[m] (ār)yyā(ṇa)x n]tabhādṛā // yāvāda kāci daśaddisi loke sarvavatriyādhvagana narasi(h)ṇa // tāhu(2)tān ahna // vanda[m]i (sa)[r]vva āsaśaṃ (k)āyatū vācamanena prasannah // yāś ca ēimāṃ pariṇāmanarā // narāda(m-·) x tvā // (sa)kṛj janayed adhimuki (vo)dhivaram anuprāthayamāno āgru visista bhā(4)[ve]d [i]([mu] p[u]ṇya(m-·) // rakṣoghna paramā hy eṣā pavitrā pāpānāsaṃ śīka(r)ī dhī-

Reverse:

(1) karī cāti sarvavuṇavivardhānī // ye dharmā hyetoprabhāvā hetun teśā(2)n ca yo [n]i-rādo hy evam-vādī mahāśramanaḥ // ye mām (ru)peṇa ādarākṣu (3) ye mām [g[o])r(ṇa) anavuṇṭḥ mathyyāprāhānprāṣṭā na mā drakṣyantī te

21 In this article, I use the following editorial conventions: graphic elements wholly lost or wholly unreadable on the inscribed object but restorable on the basis of philological considerations are placed in […]; graphic elements whose reading is visually uncertain but philologically probable, or vice versa, are placed in (…); readings that are merely mechanical renderings of what I think I see on the object are printed in italics; a letter x represents one totally illegible akṣara; a capital letter C indicates one illegible consonant; a raised circle ° precedes independent (akṣara) vowel signs; a median dot · represents the virāma sign.

22 (ār)yyā(ṇa)x n]tabhādṛā: it appears to be impossible to restore here āryasamantabhādṛā, or any other reading with samanta, for the na after ār̥yya is relatively certain, and there seems not to be sufficient space for two akṣaras sama between this and n]tabhādṛā. All in all, the opening of the inscription, with an apparent nama lacking the expected following oblique case form, remains unclear.

23 narasi(h)ṇa: presumably narasiṇhā is intended, but it seems impossible to read īn.

24 The beginning of this line repeats the beginning of the pūda tān ahu … that had been commenced, albeit in corrupt form, at the end of line 1. The hna is a mistake for hu, caused by misplacement of the top horizontal bar of what should have been a ja in line 3.

25 There are more akṣaras incised at the beginning of this line than one would have expected from comparison with the Bhadracarīpranidhanā. The ja has been miswritten as da by misplacement of its top horizontal bar across what should have been hu in line 2. It seems that narā is again a case of repetition at the transition between lines. The syllable before tvā should be śru, but cannot be recognized as such. I guess that there is m- just before this, as the scribe seems to have an inclination to use m- rather than m. See the next line, and verso line 2.

26 p[u]ṇya(m-·) //: the presence of m- between nyā and the punctuation is uncertain. There may not be any sign expressing the expected final consonant.

27 There is a sequence scratched out at the start of this line.

28 cāti: this can probably be understood as a misrepresentation of caiva in the exemplar.
Figure 2. The Sambas foil, obverse and reverse.
Figure 3. The Sambas foil, obverse and reverse, with tracing of the aksaras by Beatriz Cifuentes.
The text constituting lines 1–3 of the obverse can be identified with the following two disconnected verses in the *Bhadracarī or Bhadracaripraṇidhāna*, the famous Bodhisattva vow that once circulated independently but came to be transmitted as the last part of the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*. I cite the text from the edition of Watanabe (1912):

\[
yāvata keci daśaddiśī loke sarvāryadrhiṣṭā narasimhāḥ |
tān ahu vandami sarvi aśeṣāṃ kāyatū vācmanena prasannāḥ || 1 ||
yāś ca imaṁ pariṇāmanarājaṁ śrutva sakṛj janayed adhimuktīm |
bodhivarām anuprāthrayamāno agru viśiṣṭā bhaved imu punyam || 48 ||
\]

From the recent integral translation by Osto (2010):

Filled with faith, I honor with my body, speech and mind all the Lions among Men without exception who abide in all three times, in the world with its ten directions.

And whoever has heard this King of Spiritual Maturation, seeking after the blessing of enlightenment, may [that one] at once make the resolution [for enlightenment]. May the merit [from this] be the foremost and most excellent.

After these two verses follows a verse that is known to me elsewhere only in the *Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājī*, albeit with the difference that all the nominal forms are neuter in that version (Hidas 2012: 188 and 248):

\[
raksoghnāṁ paramāṁ hy etat pavitraṁ pāpanāśananam |
śrīkaraṁ dhīkaraṁ caiva sarvagunāvivardhanam ||
\]

This is the foremost demon-slayer, the pure one, the destroyer of misdeeds. It brings about prosperity and wisdom, and increases all sorts of virtues.

The feminine forms we see may be explained as implying a word such as *caryā* or *dhāranī*, neither of which is actually found in the preserved portion of the text.

Next we read a truncated version of the *ye dharmāḥ* formula. The sequence of scriptural extracts is then terminated by a verse that I have identified in the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, §26. In the widely used edition by Conze (1957), the verse runs as follows:31

---

29 There is space for one wide or two thin *aksaras* between *bhadra* and *nidhāna*. The most suitable restitution would seem to be *[pra]*.
30 Instead of twice *(na)*, one could read twice *(ru)* in the problematic final sequence of this line.
31 This verse is not preserved in the Schøyen manuscript, and hence does not appear in the edition of that manuscript recently published by Harrison and Watanabe (2006).
The same verse is also quoted, without attribution to this specific text, in Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā on Mālamādhyamikārikā 22.16 (de la Vallée Poussin, 1903–13: 448), with the reading ghoṣeṇa anvayuh that we also see in our inscription and is confirmed by the Gilgit manuscript edited by Schopen (1989b: 105, folio 10b6). I quote Harrison’s translation (2006: 156):

Whoever saw me through my physical form, Whoever followed me through the sound of my voice, Engaged in the wrong endeavours, Those people will not see me.

Unfortunately it is impossible to decipher all of the last line of the inscription, which comprises a prose portion apparently composed in Old Malay. In the sequence yam bhadrāpranidhāna ini candravarmma we may recognize the Malay words yang and ini, which could yield the meaning “this vow to do good of Candrarvanman”, but one cannot exclude the possibility that yam is intended as a Sanskrit word, and so even these readable parts of the line cannot, alas, be translated with certainty. But what seems evident is that this compilation of scriptural verses constitutes the vow (pranidhāna) of a figure named Candrarvanman.

There is no obvious connection between the verses. If the verse that I have identified in the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājī is indeed taken from there and not from another, unknown, source, then we have here a further piece of (indirect) evidence concerning the cult of Mahāpratisarā in maritime South-East Asia. More importantly, in the light of Schopen’s much-cited publication (1989a [2005]: 300) emphasizing the great historical importance of an Indian inscription from Nalanda that cites verse 46 of the Bhadracarī, not only because “it contains the only verse of the Bhadracaripranidhāna known to occur in an Indian epigraph”, but more specifically because “this verse is the only passage from a Mahāyāna text so far known to occur in an Indian inscription” (emphasis Schopen), with the exception of “several specifically identifiable dhāranī […] found at a number of sites”, the fact that we now find two other verses from it cited in this Indonesian inscription, alongside other verses from Mahāyāna scriptures, is certainly remarkable. However, Schopen himself also adduced evidence suggesting that “The Bhadracarī itself apparently came to be classified

---

32 The reference to the Prasannapadā is to be added to Harrison’s list of parallels (n. 114).
33 On the term pranidhāna in connection with Buddhist inscriptions from India and Indonesia, see Cœdes 1930: 43.
34 On this cult, see Cruïjsen et al. (forthcoming).
35 The fact that the Bhadracarī had been received in ancient Indonesia was thus far only known from the wordless testimony of relief panels at Borobudur (see Bosch 1938). Our inscription yields the first written evidence. More generally on the issue of citation of Mahāyāna-inspired verses occurring in inscriptions, I recall the one or two Indonesian inscriptions citing a verse that is identifiable, among other sources, in the Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra (see notes 2 and 14 above). See also the epigraphical citation of a passage possibly taken from the Bodhisattvabhūmi discussed below, p. 183.
as a ‘dhāraṇī text’ at some stage’, and that “if the Bhadracarī was so classified already in the tenth century, then the verse that occurs in our inscription may have to be considered only another instance of a ‘dhāraṇī in an Indian inscription” (1989a [2005]: 304 n. 12). The Sambas inscription seems to throw important new light on these problems.

Like the Nalanda inscription, ours lacks circumposed oṁ ... svāhā. This seems to be in conformity with the fact that the text appears to characterize itself as a pranidhāna, which is in principle not a category of scripture (buddhavacana “Buddha word”), and that it comprises two verses from the famous Bhadracaripranidhāna, which is a text uttered by the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra. The compilation also comprises the ye dharmā formula, which is not buddhavacana either, for this stanza was uttered by the disciple Aśvajit (see Boucher 1991: 5–6), although it is hard to imagine a stanza that would be more quintessentially scriptural. The text is concluded by a stanza that was explicitly uttered by the Buddha in the first person. The use to which this inscription was put, being inserted into a Buddha image, strongly suggests that this compilation served the same function as the proper dhāraṇīs presented in this study, the juxtaposition of its elements being occasioned by their shared sacredness, which makes them suitable as “dharma relics”.

Now we would like to know how to date the inscription. First, the sculpture into whose base it was inserted is stylistically dateable to about the eighth century, and belongs to an iconographic type not entirely foreign to Java, but apparently better represented in Sumatra and the Malay peninsula. But since the silver foil must have been inserted into the base at some point after the time of manufacture, the probable eighth-century dating and provenance outside of Java are not necessarily applicable to the inscription itself.

From a palaeographic point of view, I would prima facie estimate the inscription to date from the ninth century. It is written in Kawi script, and the only dated inscriptions in this form of writing from the eighth century – all from the island of Java – are the Plumpungan (Central Java, 750 CE), Dinaya (East Java, 760 CE) and Mañjuśrīgrha inscriptions (Central Java, 792 CE), while the

36 Cf. Bentor 1995: 250–52. It is pertinent (if my restitution is correct) that the final prose part uses precisely the term pranidhāna, which is in principle a different textual category, apparently denoting here the compilation as a whole. Unfortunately the damaged state of the text does not allow us to understand with certainty the author’s intent in using the term.

37 Cf. Lunsingh Scheurleer and Klokke (1988: item 55) for a bronze specimen from South Sumatra (cf. item 4, of unknown provenance, assigned to Java). Sastri (1949: 18–19) refers to two stone sculptures from Sumatra. For one of these, and a third Sumatran specimen, see Brinkgreve and Sulistianingsih 2009: figures 5.1, 5.5. For a systematic study of this iconographic type, with numerous examples from peninsular Thailand and Malaysia, see Griswold 1966. Our Buddha, with both hands held up and both shoulders covered, belongs to Griswold’s type “1/c”. For references to Indonesian specimens see p. 65, n. 72 and p. 68, n. 91; for the dating of two comparable Dvāravatī specimens to the eighth century, see p. 69.

38 According to archaeologists Véronique Degroot and Dominique Soutif, whom I have consulted on this matter, it seems technically impossible that the insertion would have taken place into the earthen core before the silver statue was cast. Nevertheless, the foil itself may of course have been produced at an earlier point in time.
ninth century is much more densely populated by dated inscriptions on that island. Moreover, the remarkable tilted shape of the aksara ma seen in the Sambas foil appears to be a characteristic of some Javanese inscriptions of the mid-ninth century,\(^{39}\) for instance the stone inscription of Wayuku dated 776 śaka = 856 CE depicted in pl. 3 of Brandes 1913,\(^{40}\) whose script seems identical to that on the Sambas inscription. The same feature is observed in the lead-bronze plate with a dhāranī inscription from Borobudur, mentioned above, which was dated by Boechari to the mid-ninth century on palaeographic grounds, and it is observed again on the Nan Han-Cirebon gold foil presented below in section 4; by contrast, this feature seems to be absent from the Dinaya inscription. On the other hand, our inscription does seem to show a more archaic shape of the virāma (see rev., l. 2 evam-vāddī), which is written above the consonant that it affects, than the partially turned variant that we see once in the Wayuku inscription.\(^{41}\)

All in all, it must be observed that there is very little difference between the Kawi script observed on the Wayuku inscription and that from Dinaya, which is nearly a hundred years older, and that the existence of three dated inscriptions from the second half of the eighth century makes it almost certain that the script was in use decades earlier. Louis-Charles Damais has attributed a substantial number of undated inscriptions using Kawi script, engraved on metalwork, to the second half of the eighth century, admitting that “pour ce groupe de documents de « 700–750 » Śaka, les marges d’erreur peuvent être assez grandes”, implying the possibility of a dating bracket 650–700 Śaka, which would place them in the second and third quarters of the eighth century CE.\(^{42}\)

So we cannot rule out that our Sambas foil, despite the features it seems to share with the Wayuku inscription, belongs to the eighth, and perhaps even to the first half of the eighth century and to go against the prima facie palaeographic estimate? The answer may be affirmative, if we choose to identify the Candravarman of our inscription with king Zhandabo 旃達鉢, known from a single Chinese source, the Xin Tang shu, which reports his embassy to the Tang court in

---

\(^{39}\) I do not know any discussion of this feature in the scholarly literature on Javanese palaeography. See Griffiths (2011: 155–6) for my argument defending the methodological permissibility of attempting to date non-Javanese inscriptions by comparison with dated Javanese ones.

\(^{40}\) This publication cites the millésime 779, based on an incorrect reading which was subsequently corrected by Damais (1951: 29–31 and 1952: 30–31).

\(^{41}\) In fact we see one archaic virāma in l. 3 sisair, and one more developed example, at the end of the same line: manusuk. It may be noted here that the shape of the virāma in the Borobudur lead-bronze plate is totally aberrant, being subscribed in the manner of the Nāgarī virāma, a feature that is not known to me from any other early Kawi inscription, although it reappears much later (no doubt based on independent developments) in West Javanese inscriptions and manuscripts from the fifteenth–sixteenth century.

\(^{42}\) See Damais 1970: 43–4: the citation is from n. 8, on p. 43. See also the (very short and somewhat outdated) discussion of the archaic phase of Kawi script in De Casparis’ handbook (1975: 28–30).
669 CE, and situates this king, whose name can plausibly be interpreted as a phonetic representation of Candrava(rma), in a country called Boluo 波羅. There has been a long debate about the identification of this country, some authors proposing Borneo, while Wolters (1967: 186) situates it in northern or north-eastern Sumatra. Admittedly one might argue that the connection with Borneo is immaterial, since Candravarman may have originated from elsewhere in the archipelago, and the Sambas hoard as a whole may have been buried in West Borneo after the metalwork had been brought there from across the sea. On the other hand, there is considerable evidence for relatively old Buddhist presence on the western and north-western coasts of Borneo, so a local Candravarman in the early eighth century CE would not be unexpected.

Whatever the date and original provenance of these artefacts, the Sambas silver foil is precious not only from a textual point of view, but also as an archaeological artefact. This is probably the only case of an Indonesian inscription engraved on metal foil such as this being found inside a sculpture, photographed in that state, then extracted and unrolled, finally leading to the decipherment of the text. As repeatedly stressed by Yael Bentor (1995), there is ample evidence from various Buddhist texts showing that the insertion of dharma-relics into images was a widespread practice, besides the practice of inserting them into stūpas. The examples of such a practice preserved in India are apparently not numerous. The practice was widespread in Indonesia (and other parts of South-East Asia), but no case is as richly documented as this one.

2. Stone inscription of Batu Bedil in Lampung

Let us move now to that great bastion of Buddhism in Indonesia, the island of Sumatra. In the far south of this island, in the province of Lampung, there is a complex of megalithic sites now known as Batu Bedil (Rifle Stone), after the most eye-catching megalith. It seems to have been the German ethnographer Friedrich W. Funke who first discovered this complex in 1953, and found...
there a large inscribed stone (Batu Surat) at about 40 m from a field marked by twenty-seven menhirs arranged in a square (originally probably 8 × 8 stones, arranged regularly over 40 × 40 m). In 1958, he published an extensive report of his findings (see especially pp. 20–22), including a ground plan of the field of menhirs in relation to the Batu Surat (pl. I), with a good photo of the inscription (fig. 8 on plate III). He assumed that the position of the inscribed stone in relation to the field of menhirs indicated a significant correlation; he also speculated (p. 21 n. 3) that the text of the inscription would be in Old Sundanese. Both of these speculations were rightly rejected by van der Hoop in a very critical review of Funke’s book (v.d. Straaten and v.d. Hoop 1960: 285).

The site was visited again, in 1954, by a team of Indonesian and foreign archaeologists during a voyage of exploration that has become famous thanks to the full reports published by the leader of the team, Soekmono, on two occasions (1955 and 1962), both with the inscription illustrated in the form of the OD photo 19576. In the 1955 report (pp. 49–50), we find much more reliable information on the inscription:

The measurements of this stone are 1.85 × 0.72 × 0.55 m. Its characters are ±5 cm in height, and there are 10 lines. Below this inscribed portion there is an attractive lotus flower, resembling the thrones of statues of deities. Although its characters are big, the middle portion of the stone is very worn, so that its decipherment is very difficult. From what it was possible to read on the spot, it is clear that the language that is used for the inscription is Sanskrit (in line 1 we read namo bhagavate and in line 10 svāhā). There is no year, but the shape of the characters points to the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century. Namo bhagavate as beginning and svāhā as end give reason to suspect that this text is some kind of mantra. Only it is difficult to determine whether the religion is Buddhist or Śaiva, most probably Buddhist. If this is the case, then there is hope that it will be possible to read the complete stone, for there are many Buddhist mantras (called dhāranīs) whose expressions are similar.

This complex of a field of menhirs and the inscribed stone is in turn about 60 m from the Batu Bedil. A specific relationship with the latter monolith has not been established.

A database comprising all of the more than 21,000 of these “OD” photos that arrived in public Dutch collections prior to the late 1950s, before contacts between Indonesian and Dutch institutions finally became too severely weakened after decolonization, is searchable at https://socrates.leidenuniv.nl (under the collection “Kern Institute”: use prefix “OD-” with hyphen for searches by OD number). A substantial number of photographs are already available in digital form, including the OD photos cited in this article, and can be viewed through the Leiden website.

On p. 35 of the same report, a few more details of the reading were given, so that the following readings can be inferred from pp. 35 and 50 together:

(1) namo bhagavate
(2) aparimyta -
(3) -- vini ( ) ita -
(10) ... svāhā

The report was carefully summarized in French by Damais 1963: 562. The voyage and
More or less the same facts were mentioned by Damais (1962: 283–4, n. 5), who had himself participated in the voyage. He announced that a publication by J.G. de Casparis was forthcoming, but this has never materialized. I visited the site myself in September 2011, and was able to make the estampage of which a photograph is included here (Figure 4). Although I still find three of the ten lines totally unreadable, I can publish a greater part of the inscription here because I am able to confirm the suspicion voiced by Soekmono that it is a known dhārāṇī, and have identified its source: the Aparimitāyuḥsūtra. With this source text in hand, I am able to read a number of aksaras (here printed in italic) that it would otherwise probably have been impossible to decipher.

(1) namo bhagavate
(2) aparimitāyuṛjñā-
(3) nasuviniścitate-

Figure 4. EFEO estampage n. 2043 of the Batu Bedil inscription.

the epigraphic discovery are mentioned only briefly in Soekmono 1962 (pp. 5 and 7; pl. 1 = OD 19576), again translated into French by Damais 1967: 686–7.

51 Thus Boechari (1979: 5 = 1981: 84, n. * = 2012: 565 n. 4) still reported the inscription as unpublished, “owing to its very weathered condition”.

152 ARLO GRIFFITHS
These elements are sufficient to exclude the possibility that we are dealing with any other known dhārāṇī. We may initially compare the reading with the text of the dhārāṇī in the Aparimitāyūhsūtra, edited on the basis of Nepalese manuscripts by Konow 1916: 301:

ōṁ namo bhagavate aparimitāyurjñānasuviniścitatéorjñāya tathāgatāyārhatे samyaksambuddhā | tadyathā, oṁ punyamahāpunyā aparimitāpunyā aparimitāyupunyā jñānasambhāropacite | oṁ sarvasaṁskāraparīṣuddhādharmate gaganasamudgaté svabhāvaparīṣuddhā mahānayaśparivāre svāhā ||

But comparison with the version of the dhārāṇī in the Khotanese manuscript (dating to about the middle of the tenth century CE)52 that was edited in parallel by Konow, on the facing page of his edition, immediately shows that the Nepalese manuscripts, which are approximately 700 years more recent, give an expanded text:53

namau bhagavate aparīmattāyujñānasuviniścitatēorjñāya tathāgataya rhitē samyatsabuddhā tadyathā aum sarvasaṁskāraparīṣuddhadharmate gagānasamudgatē svabhāvāviśuddhē mahānayaśparivāre svāhā

That this shorter text is older, and that the Nepalese manuscripts transmit an expanded version, is suggested by the fact that all three versions included in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon show variants of the same short version.54

52 See Duan Qing ([1992]: 12). This dating estimate was confirmed to me by Prods Oktor Skjaervø (email 11/09/2012).
53 See also the synoptic edition provided by Duan Qing ([1992]: 133), indicating clearly that parts are shared by the Khotanese and Nepalese transmission, and that parts are absent in the former.
54 Rolf Giebel (email 3/10/2011) and Iain Sinclair (email 1/10/2011) kindly furnished me the references to and citations of Taishō 936 Dacheng Wuliangshou jing 大乘無量壽経 “Mahāyāna Sūtra of Aparimitāyus” (19: 82a–84c, translated by Facheng in the nineteenth century), T. 937 Dacheng sheng Wuliangshou jueding guangming wang rulai tuoluoni jing 大乘聖無量決定光明王如來陀羅尼経 “Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Dhārāṇī of the Tathāgata Ancyaparimitasuviniścitatéorjñāya” (19: 85b, translated 988) and T. 1389 Wuliangshou dazhi tuoluoni 無量壽大智陀羅尼 “Dhārāṇī of the Great Knowledge of Aparimitāyus” (21: 907b, translated 996). T. 936 and 937 are both translations of the Aparimitāyūhsūtra, the latter being a shorter version; T. 936 gives the dhārāṇī 29 times in all, while T. 937 gives it only once. T. 1389 consists solely of the dhārāṇī. All three texts give the dhārāṇī in phonetic transcription, each showing nearly the same text, all omitting oṁ, with ṛtejoṅ being absent in T. 936, and T. 936–7 reading svabhāvāviśuddhē, while T. 1389 reads svabhāvāviśuddhe, to mention the principal variants; the few other variants are not significant for comparison with our inscription.
Although our inscription is totally worn in the middle of the dhāranī, we may deduce from the fact that the preserved lines show an average of seven aksaras per line that there would certainly not have been enough space for the sequence tadyathā om punyamahāpunya aparimitāpunya aparimitāyupunya jñānasambhāropacite. In other words, our inscription was engraved with a variant of the original shorter version of the dhāranī, and it must be noted that compared to the Khotanese and Chinese versions, ours may have been even shorter, for the number of syllables on lines 6–8 will have been about 21, whereas the number of syllables required to obtain the text of those other versions is 28. In this connection, it is a striking fact that the Sūtra itself repeatedly states that the dhāranī consists of 108 syllables, which it only does in the longer Nepalese recension. In the present context, I am unable to throw any light on this numerical problem.

In his recent article dedicated to the text, Richard K. Payne has drawn attention to the fact that the Aparimitāyuḥ-sūtra and dependent texts seem to have been among “the most popular bodies of literature in Nepal, in Dunhuang, and elsewhere throughout the Buddhist cosmopolis” (2007: 277). The entire scripture consists of little more than the advice that one should copy, or have others copy, the scripture consists of little more than the advice that one should copy, or have others copy, the sūtra, or the dhāranī, and promises diverse benefits for those who do, using i.a. the phrase (Konow 1916: 315–7):

yasmin prthivipradeśa idam aparimitāyuḥsūtraṃ likhiṣyanti likhāpayisyanti, sa prthivipradeśaḥ caityabhūto vandanīyaḥ ca bhaviṣyatī |

Translation adapted from Silk (2004: 427):

On whatever spot of earth they will write down or will have others write down this Aparimitāyuḥ-sūtra, that spot of earth will become a true shrine and worthy of veneration.
It seems reasonable to assume that the ancient local Buddhists who were involved in the manufacture of our inscription did so with precisely the motivation of founding a “true shrine”. More specifically, Soekmono’s observation (cited above) that the text is provided with a lotus cushion, just like a Buddha image would be, is an unmistakeable expression of the intent behind engraving this text, namely that its presence as dharmakāya would be equivalent to the presence of the Buddha, and would sacralize the site.58

It should be noted that there is considerable overlap in the terminology used by the Aparimitāyuḥsūtra to describe, on the one hand, the ways in which the text (or its dhāraṇī) can be used as well as the benefits that will result from such use and, on the other, the way we see use and benefits described in other scriptures that will be discussed further on in this article, notably the Amoghapāśahrdaya (section 10).59

Finally, regarding the date of our inscription (which Soekmono situated around 900 CE, see above), it should be noted that Damais (1967: 687 n. 1) was inclined to date it about a century older, without specifying the more archaic traits underlying this estimate. The text is in Kawi script that, frankly, seems less archaic to me than the script of the Sambas inscription (section 1).60

3. Gold foil from sector Segaran IIA at Batujaya, West Java

During excavations in 2005 at the Buddhist complex of Batujaya, home to the oldest Buddhist monuments identified in Indonesia so far, the team led by Pierre-Yves Manguin discovered in the sector called Segaran IIA a piece of gold foil, folded up into a small squarish lump. When it was unfolded, it turned out to bear an inscription.61 The existence of this inscription, besides that of other gold foils bearing the ajñānāc cīyate formula found at the same site, was mentioned by Hasan Djafar (2010: 93).62 But the inscription so far remains

58 In assimilating expressions of the dharma (dharmaparyāya) to the dharma itself, the authors of certain Buddhist texts, on the basis of the canonical adage yo dharmāṁ pas-sati so bhagavatāṁ passati “he who sees the dharma, sees the Lord”, ended up equating dharmaparyāya to Buddha (bhagavant). See Schopen 1976 [2005]: 50.
59 Schopen (1976 [2005]: 35) described these two texts as belonging “to that intriguing genre of Buddhist literature in which almost the whole of a given text is given over to describing its own great power and the great practical advantages to be gained by reciting or writing or worshiping it”.
60 Note the shape of ma at the end of line 9 and compare my discussion above. With regard to Damais’ remark (1962: 284) “Il s’agit ici encore d’une variété de l’écriture paléo-javanaise et non d’une variété paléo-sumatranais”, I am once again uncertain how Damais thought he could distinguish palaeo-javanese from palaeo-sumatran script in this period (cf. Griffiths 2011: 155–6). When in an earlier publication Damais introduced these terms (1955b: 376), he did not (yet) argue for an earlier dating: “A Soumatra, l’écriture pallawa s’est développée indépendamment et a donné naissance à un type d’écriture que l’on peut appeler paléosoumatranais car il présente des particularités inconnues ailleurs. Cependant le type d’écriture paléojavanais s’y retrouve aussi, en particulier dans un document découvert récemment, d’inspiration bouddhique et rédigé en sanskrit, non daté, mais qui ne saurait être, croyons-nous, postérieur au xᵉ siècle e.c.”. The inscription alluded to here is that of Batu Bedil.
61 See Manguin and Agustijanto Indradjaja 2011: 121, fig. 5.6.
62 See Skilling, forthcoming on the ajñānāc cīyate formula.
unpublished. Thanks to excellent visual materials furnished by Manguin (Figure 5), I am now able to propose the following reading:

°om °etana tan no bhadra(m) pracoda(yā) svāhā

The reading is rather tentative, for the word etana makes no sense, while the reading yā is also far from secure. I translate:

Om. Eṭana (?), may you impel to us that which is good! Svāhā.

Despite the problem posed by etana, it is clear enough that the dhāraṇī is an adaptation of some of the numerous variants of the final line of the Gāyatrī mantra, reading tan no nom pracodayāt, found in brahmanical literature (see Bloomfield 1906: 50–51). The word taking the place of nom is in each instance the nominative singular case form of the name of a deity. I am unable to trace this formula in any Buddhist source, but the idea that it is Buddhist finds support in the monumental context where the foil was discovered.

The palaeographic appearance of the inscription is inconsistent, and comprises both some archaic features of Southern Brāhmī (i.e. “Pallava”) and some more Kawi-like characteristics. The stratigraphic context in which the artefact was found is somewhat difficult to interpret, the only thing that is certain being that it must date from before 800 CE. There is a greater archaeological likelihood that it belongs to a level dateable to 330–550 than to the subsequent level of 550–700/750. From the epigraphist’s point of view, however, this early dating bracket seems hard to accept. The other gold foil inscriptions from the same site give a more archaic impression that would more easily be compatible with such an early dating, although I would still be reluctant even in their case to consider a date before the sixth century.

Figure 5. The foil found at Batujaya, Segaran IIA. Photo EFEO/P.-Y. Manguin.

63 The prima facie readings would rather be dhūtana or dhatana. If one accepts °etana, this can perhaps be explained as a magical word, comparable to “the enigmatic etata in the Ākāraṇamantra” of the Amoghapāśāhyadāhāraṇī (cf. Meisezahl 1962: 269 and 322). But such a magical word admittedly does seem rather out of place here.

64 I thank Pierre-Yves Manguin for detailed explanation by email of the stratigraphic situation.
4. Gold foil from the Nan Han period “Cirebon” shipwreck, coast of West Java

A sunken ship was discovered off the coast of West Java near the city of Cirebon in 2003. After the cargo had been salvaged, it could be determined that the shipwreck must date from about the last quarter of the tenth century, or later. Alongside large quantities of ceramics and a substantial number of bronze cult objects, the divers also recovered a piece of gold foil which is inscribed with a dhāranī of a total of six lines. It is very difficult to produce legible photographs of this small, irregularly shaped artefact (Figure 6), but Horst Liebner, who is writing his doctoral thesis about this shipwreck and has had extensive access to the cargo, has taken considerable effort to document the inscription. He helped me execute the tracing of the akṣaras that is shown here in Figure 6.65

Obverse:
(1) namo ratnatrayāya nama ॐ āryyāva(lo)-
(2) kiteśvarāya bodhisatvāya mahā(sa)-
(3) tvāyā mahākā(ṛ)uṇikāya tadya(thā)
(4) ॐ orī mārutākuha x kāmāvṛā x (mālya)

Reverse:
(1) (prabhā)devī ॐ(ada)lān driyase nam(u)
(2) (dha)man de(v)ī

Homage to the Triad of Jewels (Buddha, Dharma and Sāṅgha)! Homage to noble Avalokiteśvara, the Bodhisattva, the great being, of great compassion. [The mantra is] like this: Om, . . . of the wind . . ., goddess who have the lustre of . . ., you bear . . .

Despite the fact that the writing is very faint, and that the photographs available do not show all parts of the texts with equal focus, it is possible to read more than half with certainty, due to the fact that the opening (up to the beginning of line 4 on the obverse) is highly formulaic, being found in a number of Buddhist scriptures. But I am unfortunately unable to identify the mantra part

65 In an email of 24/08/2012, Liebner provided me with the following information. The shipwreck was “Discovered in 2003, officially, by fishermen, then reported to a number of salvage companies. In 2004 excavation license was issued and field campaign started; finished end 2005. Between early and end 2006 the cargo was virtually locked up; then only selected people were given access. Divided in two halves last year August. November 2011 or so the salvage company’s half was taken to Singapore. I do not know about the fate of the gold foil; it should be among the collection of the Indonesian side. The foil was given no. 148341 in the artefact database, officially surfaced on 10 Sept 2005, registered as having been found somewhere off starboard aft of the ship’s remains. This might be wrong: the photos (from two cameras) I have are all dated on 07 Sept. If this is the case, it should have been found off starboard midships. It was initially only accessible after having been surfaced, and then was stored in a bank safe. November 2006 it was taken out of the bank safe, and the reverse side was photographed”. As for the dating of the shipwreck, “There is a clear terminus post quem: An inscription on a bowl dated CE968”. See Liebner 2011.
that begins with om, and am (therefore) unable to reconstruct the parts that are not formulaic. Since we find here the words māruta, meaning “wind” and (if my reading is correct) driyase, meaning “you are borne”, it may be suspected that the dhāranī was intended to protect against the dangers of voyage at high sea, and that the object on which it is inscribed was worn as an amulet, while the text was addressed to the goddess personifying the spell.

For the structure of this dhāranī, I refer to the Ekādaśamukha – a text of the same genre as the Aparimitāyuḥsūtra and the Amoghapāśahṛdaya referred to in sections 2 and 10 of this article – of which a copy was found among the Gilgit manuscripts (seventh century). Here we find a sequence of six repetitively structured mantric sequences beginning with namo ratnatraya | namo vairocanāya tathāgatāya | nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunikāya | nama atiātānāgatapratyutpannebhyaḥ sarvatathāgatēbhyaḥ ‘rhadbhyaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhebhyaḥ | oṁ diṁ diṁ diṁ dhuru dhuru | itte viṭṭe | cale cale | pracale pracale | kusume kusumavare | ili mili viṭṭi svāhā | and ending with namo ratnatrayāya nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunikāya | tadyathā piṁ piṁ tīṁ tīṁ | viṁ viṁ gaccha gaccha bhagavan āryāvalokiteśvara svabhavanam svabhavanāṁ svāhā | […] āryāvalokiteśvara gaccha svabhavanam ||

The Śādhanamālā (eleventh century) furthermore contains three citations of a Sinhanādadhāraṇī “Lion’s Roar dhāraṇī”, that again shows the same structure (Bhattacharya 1968: 48, 52, 54, 63): namo ratnatrayāya nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunikāya tadyathā oṁ akate vikate nikate kataṁkate karotavīrye svāhā.

On the basis of these comparisons, we expect the word svāhā somewhere in the part that I have not been able to decipher. In any case, it is clear that we have here a variation on dhāraṇī material of the type seen in the Ekādaśamukha and

66 The text was originally edited by N. Dutt 1939: 35–40. I cite the text with emendations proposed by Somadeva Vasudeva in an unpublished edition that he kindly allowed me to use.
the Sādhanamālā. The palaeographic appearance of the script is consistent with a date in the ninth or tenth century.

5. Gold and silver foils from Candi Plaosan Lor, Central Java

In his Prasasti Indonesia II (1956: 170–2), J.G. de Casparis included as item no. V the edition of a “plate of gold leaf” which had been discovered during excavations at Candi Plaosan Lor in 1947. The discovery itself had been the subject of a brief discussion in O V 1948 (p. 30), where it was also mentioned that a little silver plate had been found near the plate of gold foil, bearing the same inscription. It seems to be this silver foil inscription that is captured on the photograph OD 17094. Unfortunately, the current whereabouts of neither of the two foil inscriptions appears to be known, and no archaeological photograph seems to have been taken of the gold foil inscription at the time of its discovery. From their archaeological context, the inscriptions, written in Kawi script, may be assigned to the ninth century. The published reading is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \text{om} & \text{namo buddh}āya namo dharmāya namaḥ saṅghāya tadyathā śuddhe viśuddhe śodhani viśodhani gaganaviśodhani pā(2)<p>-> \text{varaṇaviśodhani karmāvaranaviśodhani viśuddhe viśuddhe kṣīne sarva-kṣīne puspe supuspe rajoharane sarvapāpa(3)viśodhani hare hare sarvāvar-anāniaha dahahara sarvakarmāvaranāni paca paca sarvasthānagatāni padme padmākṣi padmaviśā(4)le pha pha pha pha svāhā
\end{align*}
\]

De Casparis indicated no substantial difficulty in reading the text of the gold foil, and there is no reason to doubt that his decipherment is correct. Indeed, several elements of this reading can also be recognized on the OD 17094 photo of a silver foil inscription. De Casparis correctly identified this text as a dhāraṇī, and he translated:

Om! Homage to the Buddha, Homage to the Dharma, Homage to the Sarīgha. Thus (is the text): – Thou who art pure, perfectly pure, a purifier, a perfect purifier, a purifier of the atmosphere, a purifier of the mind, a purifier from the obstructions of Karman – thou, perfectly pure, perfectly pure, lean, perfectly lean, flowerlike, perfectly flowerlike, a remover of passion, a purifier from all evil – take away, take away all obstructions; burn, burn all obstructions of Karman; consume, consume (the impurities)

67 O V 1948, p. 30: “During the course of these investigations an excavation was carried out in 1947 between the stūpas II 21 and 22 of the inner circuit north of the main shrines. This led to the discovery of a gold foil, 22 mm wide and 202 mm long, folded in nine parts and containing a Sanskrit inscription in Old-Javanese characters. […] A silver foil with the same inscription and remnants of similar inscriptions on silver foil were found in between other stūpas near the place where the gold foil was discovered”. See also p. 23 of the same O V (dealing with a period marked by hostilities between forces of the Republic of Indonesia and the Dutch colonialist aggressor): “As a consequence of the rise in the price of gold during wartime (because gold was considered as the most secure investment), there were almost no reports of gold finds. This was counteracted to some extent during the republican period by purchasing against black market prices those objects that revealed themselves as being of archaeological value.”
gone into all the organs (?) – thou who art a Lotus, lotus-eyed, powerful in the lotus. Pha pha pha pha pha Svāhā.68

This scholar was unable to identify a precise scriptural source for the dhāraṇī, but noted its affinity with the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanadhāraṇī. He knew the latter only from two manuscripts kept at the Bibliothèque nationale at Paris, and from the manner that he cites them it seems that he was not aware of the further contents of these manuscripts.69 The scriptural source for this dhāraṇī is the eponymous Tantra, from which I cite (Skorupski 1983: 127–8):

This mantra was very widespread in Buddhist Asia, and existed in many variants. A version with only slightly different readings is one of two dhāraṇīs included in Taishō 1395 Baji kunan tuoluoni jing 拔濟苦難陀羅尼經 “Sūtra of the Dhāraṇī for Salvation from Tribulations” (21: 912c), a short dhāraṇi-sūtra about which Rolf Giebel (1993) has published an article, where he cited all the versions he had managed to identify at the time (see p. 152 for the Taishō version). Now the Javanese dhāraṇī seems to comprise a combination, not known to me at this time from any other Buddhist tradition, of the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanadhāraṇī with another known dhāraṇī, pointed out to me by Rolf Giebel.70 It appears in another short dhāraṇi-sūtra, translated by Faxian in 1001: Taishō 1399 Miechu wu nizui da tuoluoni jing 滅除五逆罪大陀羅尼經 “Sūtra of the Great Dhāraṇī for Extinguishing the Five Heinous Sins” (pañcānāntaryāṇi)” (21: 915c–916a):

As Giebel points out to me, in this Chinese version ajñāle is uncertain, and jalo-harane is probably an error for rajoharane, as we read on the foils from Candi Plaosan. Although a precise scriptural source for the Javanese dhāraṇī may of course still be discovered, it seems adequate to say that it is built substantially on the same text as seen in Taishō 1399, with insertion of elements that are all known from the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanadhāraṇī, except the epithets

68 De Casparis forgets to translate pāpāvaranaviṣodhani: “purifier from the obstructions of evil”.
69 The manuscripts have the call numbers “Sanscrit 59” and “Sanscrit 62, no. 25”. The first is a ms. of the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra, the second is part of a compilation of dhāraṇīs, stotras and other types of texts. See the catalogue compiled by Jean Filliozat (1941: 29, and 31, 36).
70 Emails of 5 and 7 July 2012.
It has been reported that the same dhāraṇī has also been found engraved on silver and gold foils from Candi Sojiwan, which have not, to my knowledge, ever been published, but which were mentioned by Boechari (1976: 19 = 2012: 172, n. 21).

Subsequent restoration work at the site of Candi Plaosan Lor in 1993 has brought to light other gold, silver and bronze artefacts bearing Buddhist inscriptions of a similar type, but now in Siddhamārka script closely resembling that of the Kalasan, Kelurak, Plaosan and Ratu Baka stone inscriptions, so datable to the period between the late eighth and mid-ninth centuries. A provisional reading of two gold foils, without diacritics, was included in the report on these restorations (Gutomo and Niken Wirasanti 1998: 54 with photo no. 27 on p. 100) and later reproduced verbatim in Miksic et al. 2001: 323–4. Besides an evident ye dharmāḥ formula at the head of the second inscription cited by Miksic et al., it is hard to make any sense of these two inscriptions in this provisional reading. However, the Bureau of Conservation of Archaeological Remains (BPPP) for Central Java province obligingly assented in August 2012 to my request to put photographs of these artefacts at my disposal. Besides the two gold foils, the photos I received from the BPPP also included a third item, that appeared to be in silver, and of which I found no mention in the report by Gutomo and Niken Wirasanti, or the publication by Miksic et al. This third photograph showed an inscription in two long lines of Siddhamārka script identical to that on the two gold foils, but the photograph was not sufficiently focused for me to be able to read the whole. I was subsequently allowed to come and inspect the three foils and photograph them myself. On this basis, I am now able to publish the following readings and source identifications.

The taller gold foil was found in association with the reliquary in the SE corner below the floor level of the central chamber of the northern main temple at Candi Plaosan Lor. It measures 5.2–5.8 × 25.5 cm, weighing 7.9 g (Figure 7).

(1) [siddham] namo bhagavate śākkyamunaye tathāgatāyahrhate samyak-samvuddhāya tadyathā ॐ vodhi vodhi vodhi sarvatathāgata

gocare | dhara dhara hara hara prahara prahara mahāvodhīcittadhare

This epithet is known to me only from the first dhāraṇī of the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājī. See Hidas (2012: 115) and Cruijsen et al. (forthcoming). Most witnesses read gaganaviśodhane. This epithet is not known to me from any other dhāraṇī.

See De Casparis (1956: 176–7), on the palaeography of the Plaosan stone inscription. The aksara bha is almost indistinguishable from ha in the script that we are dealing with. This explains the excessive number of bhs in the published readings by Kusen.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Dra. Zaimul Azzah, M. Hum., who was at the time the acting head of BPPP Jawa Tengah, as well as her team, for their kind assistance.

At the back of his 1995 monograph, Soekmono added to his brief note on these finds some photos showing the context of discovery (1995: 121–2, with plates 7–8), and these help to gain an impression of the condition in which these inscriptions were discovered.

śākkyamunaye: read śākyamunaye.
tathāgatāyahrhate: correct tathāgatāyahrhate.
sarvatathāgata: correct sarvatathāgata.
Figure 7. Gold foil recovered from the North shrine at Candi Plaosan Lor. Photo Arlo Griffiths.
This inscription gives the text of the Bodhigarbhālāmākāralakṣadhāraṇī, a text which has drawn quite a bit of attention in Buddhist studies in the last three decades, and which was thus far not known to be attested in Indonesia. I refer for the most recent publication on this dhāraṇī to Strauch 2009. Admitting the emendations proposed above, the version from Candi Plaosan Lor may be translated as follows:

Homage to the Lord Śākyamuni, the Tathāgata, the Arhat who is completely awakened. [The dhāraṇī is] like this: Oṃ. Awake, awake, awake, you (female deity of this dhāraṇī) who belong to the domain of all Tathāgatas! Hold hold! Take take! Steal steal, you who hold the thought of great awakening! CULU CULU, you who are impelled by a hundred thousand rays, who have been uttered by all Tathāgatas O virtue, O you who possess virtue! You who possess the light of the virtues of a Buddha! MILI MILI, you who are established on the vault of the sky, you who are governed by all Tathāgatas, you sky-surface! Calm, calm! Appease, appease, you who appease all evil, you who purify all evil! HULU HULU, you who have set out on the path to great awakening, you who are established by all Tathāgatas, pure one, pure one, SVĀHĀ! Oṃ. You who are observed by all Tathāgatas, win, win, SVĀHĀ! Oṃ. HURU HURU, you who are the face of victory, SVĀHĀ!

The reason why this dhāraṇī was deposited in the foundations of the monument is very clear from the framing Sanskrit text in which it is embedded in several other versions from India and Tibet. Let me quote here only Schopen’s translation of the relevant passage (1989a [2005]: 329):

79 °rasmi°: read °raśmi°.
80 guṇa-guṇavatī: correct guṇa guṇavatī.
81 vuddha-guṇa-avabhāś: (e): emend vuddha-guṇāvabhāse.
82 gaganatalapratīṣṭhīte: correct gaganatalapratīṣṭhitē. For another error involving ma instead of na, see n. 84 below.
83 sarvatta-hāgatā-hāgatā-hiṣṭhīte: correct sarvattahāgatā-hāgatā-hiṣṭhīte.
84 mabhastale: correct mabhastale.
85 sama sama prasama prasama: read śama śama prāsama prāsama.
86 sarvapatāśamane: read sarvapatāpajāśamane.
87 sarvapatāpe visodhane: correct sarvapatāpaviṣodhane.
88 °vyalokite: correct °vyalokite.
89 Since culu can mean “a handful of water” in Sanskrit, the reading sarvattahāgatāhiṣṭikte “you who have been anointed by all Tathāgatas”, seen in other versions (Strauch 2009: 45) is more likely to be original.
Whatsoever monk or nun or lay man or woman, or whatsoever other devout son or daughter of good family, after having written this Dhāraṇī, after having deposited it inside, will make a caitya [shrine, AG], by that single caitya being made[,] a hundred thousand caityas of the Tathāgata are (in effect) made. And those caityas come to be worshipped with articles (of worship), with all perfumes and flowers and incense, aromatic powders, cloths, umbrellas, flags and banners. But it is not merely the caitya (that is worshipped) thus: the Jewel of the Buddha, the Jewel of the Dharma, and the Jewel of the Community are (in effect) also worshipped with articles of such kind.

Another rolled piece of gold foil was found west of the SE reliquary. It measures 39 × 3.7–4.0 cm, weighing 15.2 g. Its reading is as follows (Figure 8):

(1) [siddham] ye dharmmā hetuprabhavā hetun teśān tathāgato hy avadat teśām ca yo nirodha ॐ evamvādi mahāsramanāḥ || namaḥ saptānāṁ (2) samyakṣāṃvuddhakotīṇāṁ tadyathā cala cula90 cunde svāhā || nāmo bhagavate ratnasīkhine tathāgatayārhatā samyakṣāṃvuddhāya (3) tadyathā ॐ oṁ ratna ratna ratnasāṁbhavā svāhā || nāmo bhagavate maṃjuśrīye kumāra kumāra(bhū)ṭāya91 tadyathā amala amala amalame(4)trāya92 svā(hā)

We have here the ye dharmā formula, followed by a dhāraṇī called the Saptasaṃptatisamyaksambuddhakotibhiruktā “Proclaimed by seventy-seven crores of completely awakened ones”, and two further dhāraṇīs of which the first is attested in transliteration in the Chinese canon (Taishō 1383, 21: 904b),93 while the last remains unidentified. As for the Saptasaṃptatisamyaksambuddhakotibhiruktā, I take this title from the single South Asian Sanskrit text where I have found the dhāraṇī in this full form: it stands at the start of section 2.7 of the Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra, in the most

---

90 cala cula: correct cale cule.
91 kumāra kumāra(bhū)ṭāya: correct kumārabhūṭāya. The bhū is not readable as such, but restored here on the basis of the requirements of context.
92 amalameṭrāya: read amalāmaitrāya?
93 Sumingzhi tuoluoni jing 宿命智陀羅尼經 (“Sūtra of the Dhāraṇī of Knowledge of Former Lives”), a short text translated by Faxian in 996. The text there reads, a bit more extensively (but lacking bhagavate): nāmo ratnasīkhine tathāgatayārhatā samyakṣāṃbhavā, tath yathā oṁ ratne ratne ratnasāṁbhavā svāhā. I owe this information to Rolf Giebel.
commonly used edition, straight after the section where the Buddha’s pupil has been taught the famous six-syllabled formula om mani padme hūṃ (Vaidya 1961: 301):

atha bhagavān śākyamunis tathāgato ’rhan samyaksaṁbuddhas tam etad avocat: labdhalābhhas tvāṁ kulaputra? sa āha: yathā bhagavān jñānaṁ samājānte | tataḥ saptasaptatiḥ samyaksaṁbuddhakoṭayāḥ samnipatitāḥ | tāś ācāri tathāgatair iyaṁ dhāraṇī bhāṣītum ārabadhā namaḥ saptānīm samyaksaṁbuddhakoṭinām om cale cunde94 svāhā || iyaṁ saptasaptati-
samyaksaṁbuddhakoṭibhiruktā95 nāma dhāraṇī ||

I have made only the most evidently necessary emendations, in consultation of the facsimile edition of a Nepalese manuscript published by Lokesh Chandra (1981),96 but even then, it is hard to escape the impression that the passage is incoherent, and therefore probably corrupt. The following translation makes this clear:

Then the Lord Śākyamuni, the Tathāgata, the fully awakened Arhant spoke this to him: “Have you obtained benefit, son of good family?” He answered: “Just as the Lord has perfect knowledge”. Thereupon seventy-seven crores of completely awakened ones flocked together, and those Tathāgatas started to pronounce this dhāraṇī: “Homage to the seven crores of completely awakened ones. Om. CÅLE, O CUNDĀ SVĀHĀ!” This is the dhāraṇī called Saptasaptatisamyaksambuddhakoṭibhiruktā.

The passage is not only hard to understand by itself, but also seems to lack coherence with its context in the text as edited from Nepalese manuscripts. Moreover, it is unattested in the significantly older Gilgit manuscript, and this absence does not seem to be an accident that can be attributed to the very fragmentary condition of this witness (see Mette 1997: 122–3). One may therefore suspect that the passage is an interpolation in the Nepalese tradition of this text, but if this suspicion is justified, it begs the question from which source the passage might have been borrowed. Beyond noting that a variant dhāraṇī namaḥ reading saptānīm samyaksambuddhakoṭīnām, namaḥ cale cunde namaḥ is attested in Taishō 1169 (20:678c); that another variant namaḥ saptānīm samyaksambuddhakoṭinām [sic], om cale cule cunde is attested in the same text (20:686b); that the Javanese version of the dhāraṇī is found in precisely the same form among the Sanskrit texts brought to Japan by Kūkai in the early eighth century; and that this same collection of texts also includes a Cundāstotra which alludes to the same idea of the dhāraṇī being uttered by

94 c unde em.; c undye ed.
95 ṛotibhiruktā em.; ṛotibhirukkā ed.
96 This is the codex denoted by siglum N1 in Mette’s 1997 edition. I give the corresponding passage in diplomatic transliteration: [152:4] ṛatha bhagavān śākyamunis tathāgato ’rhan samyaksaṁbuddhas tam etad avocat || labdhalābhā s tvāṁ kulaputra || evaṁ yathā bhaga-
seven (instead of seventy-seven) crores of Buddhas,97 I must leave these textual problems open here, and return to the inscription that was my starting point. In the case of this apparently composite second inscription, the reason for its deposit is unfortunately not provided by the identification of the source texts. Nothing seems to be known with certainty about the exact provenance of the third foil, mentioned above, but we may safely assume that it too was found during the restoration process of the same monument. Its dimensions are 56.5 × 3.6 cm, its weight 15.2 g. I read as follows (Figure 9):

(1) [ye dharmā]ḥ hetuprabhāvā hetum teṣāṃ tathāgato hy avadat: teṣām ca yo nirodha ो evamvādi māhāśramaṇaḥ || namāḥ saptānāṁ samyakṣamvuddhakoṭināṁ tadyathā cale cunde svāhā || namo (2) [ta[(hāga)tāyāhate samyaksa(m)yuddhāya tadyathā ो akṣa 298 ो akṣa- yapunyājñānasamībhāropacite svāhā || namo bhagavate ratnaśīkhine tathāgatāyāhate samyakṣamvuddhāya (3) [ra][tnameya]ratnasambhāve svāhā

Here again we find the ye dharmāḥ formula followed by the Saptasaptatimasyaksambuddhakoṭibhiruktā. Then follows a variant of the mantra that, as we have seen above, forms part of the expanded recension of the dhāraṇī of the Aparimitāyusūtra: tadyathā oṁ puṇyamahāpuṇyā aparimitāpyupunṣa jñānasamībhāropacite. I am unable to trace this variant with akṣa akṣa akṣaya9 in any other text. Then follow the words namo bhagavate ratnaśīkhine tathāgatāyāhate samyakṣamvuddhāya which we saw previously on the second gold foil, but it is possible that they occur here with a termination that is slightly different from that we saw there (tadyathā oṁ ratna ratna ratnasambhāve svāhā). The silver foil is unfortunately damaged at the point of possible difference. As noted above (n. 93), a variant of this dhāraṇī addressed to the Buddha Ratnaśīkhin is attested in the Chinese canon.

6. Two maṇḍala stakes (kīla) from Central Java

A recent publication from the Bureau of Conservation of Archaeological Remains (BPPP) of the special region of Yogyakarta includes, among numerous other items

97 T. 1169 (Chimingzang yu qie da jia Zunna pus a daming chengj iu yigui jing 持明藏瑜伽大教尊那普萨大明成就仪轨经，“Sūtra of ritual rules for the accomplishment of the great spell of the Bodhisattva Cundā, a great yoga teaching from the Vidyādharapīṭaka”) is a manual for rituals associated with Cundā that was translated by Faxian in 994. I once again owe the Taishō references to Rolf Giebel, who has also pointed out to me that in the Qìjūzhí fomu suoshuo Zhunti tuoluoni jìng 七俱胝佛母所说准提陀罗尼经 (T. 1076, “Sūtra of Cundā’s dhāraṇī spoken by the Buddha-mother of seven crores”), a ritual manual for Cundā translated by Amoghavajra, it is specifically stated that this dhāraṇī was “spoken by seven crores of Buddhas of the past” (20:178c). Regarding the Sanskrit texts preserved in Japan, I refer to Giebel 2012: 201–6, and to Sakai 1991. See on Cundā in East Asia also Gimello 2004.

98 The occurrence of the numeral sign 2 to indicate repetition of akṣa furnishes a relatively early instance of this mode of notation, which is not yet encountered e.g. in the Gilgit mss. of the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājñī (Hidas 2012: 46). See also Cruijsen et al., forthcoming, n. 176.
of interest, an inscribed object in tuff stone, resembling in shape some of the numerous inscribed boundary marking stones whose inscriptions form a distinct category of Javanese epigraphy. The object is stated to have been found in 1975, but this cannot be correct. The very fact that an excellent set of photographs is preserved at Leiden University proves that the discovery must have taken place earlier, because photographs stopped being supplied to Leiden by 1959.

According to the Leiden website (see n. 49), the creation of the prints of these

99 See Herni Pramastuti et al. 2007: 56–7. On inscribed stone boundary markers (vatu sīma) from Java, see Titi Surti Nastiti forthcoming.
OD photos 21151–21160 kept in Leiden dates to 1958. The provenance there cited is Kali Tirto, Berbah, Sleman; this disagrees slightly with the information in the recent publication, which states Jragung, Berbah, Sleman. The stone is currently held at the site museum in the Prambanan complex (Taman Wisata Arsitektur). This means that we can be relatively sure that the provenance was in kecamatan Berbah of kabupaten Sleman in the province DIY, but uncertainty remains about the lower administrative divisions. According to current divisions, Jragung is a dusun in the desa Jogotirto; there is still, today, a desa Kalitirto, but it lies on the opposite bank of the Kali Opak. I do not have access to an old map that would allow me to determine whether Jragung fell administratively within the desa Kalitirto in the 1950s, but this seems a priori unlikely. If there is an error in either the Leiden database or the recent publication, I am unable to determine on which side the error lies.
Candi Prambanan) and bears the inventory number BG 37. One of the OD photos is reproduced here as Figure 10. The shape of the akṣaras points to a date in the ninth or tenth century. The published reading, virtually without diacritical marks, bears only a vague resemblance to the text that is actually engraved, which I read as follows:

(1) | °o(m) vajr(a)nala hana daha pa(ca) ma(th) a bhañja raña hūṁ (phaṭː) vajra[n]e[tri bandha]101 (2) sarvavayyikānāː svāhā, °ōm hulu hulu hūṁ phaṭː, °ōm druṁ vandha hāṁ h(vana)ḥ (3) bajrapāśe hūṁ.102 °ōm vajra-yakṣa hūṁ, °ōm vajraśi(kha)re ṛutː (maːtː), (4) (h)ū(m) vajra(k)a(r)mma hūṁ°ōm bājraṅīlā kīlaya hūṁ phaṭː, hum hum hum hum hum hum (5) hum hum hum, °ōm gha gha ghaṭaya ghaṭaya sarvavadyaṅ-phaṭː kīlaya (6) kīlaya sarvavāpānː phaṭː, hum hum hum bājraṅīlā bājaṅḍa(7)(ro) jñā-payati,103 sarvavadyaṅː kāyakācittamː (v)a(jra(8)ṃː kīlaya hūṁ phaṭː, //

I have presented the text in two paragraphs, for it appears that it is composed of two parts, identifiable in distinct Sanskrit texts preserved in manuscripts from Nepal. The first paragraph finds a remarkable parallel in the Sarvavajrodaya section (cf. Sarvavajra bandha sarvavighnānāː iti | mudrāyuktāya sarvavajra bandhaṁ kurya | vajraṅbandhaṁ baddhvaṅguṣṭhadvayāṁ prasārya sa-  man dhārayet | vajraṇetrimudrā | prasārita vajraṅbandhaṁ bhūmyaṁ pratisthāpyādḥobhāṃ kurya | oṁ vajra dṛḍho me bhava rakṣā sarvān svāhā | vajrabhairavanetreṇa mudrāsahitenordhvabandhaṁ kurya | oṁ hulu

101 Only vajraCe is legible. The lost syllables can safely be restored on the basis of the textual parallels presented below.

102 One might perhaps expect hṛih vajrapāśe hūṁ since the parallel adduced below has hūṁ vajrapāśe hṛih. Indeed, the presence of the syllable na tentatively read here is very doubtful, and it might at least be possible to read hṛaḥ at the start of the sequence. If ever there was an i-vocalization, no trace remains visible on the OD photos.

103 bājaṅḍa(ro) jñāpayati: damage to the stone prevents absolute certainty as to the intended reading, but it seems unlikely that the expected preverb ā (cf. ājñāpayati in the parallel texts identified below) was actually written.

104 I have emended Skorupski’s hum to hūṁ throughout. This section is taken over nearly verbatim in the eleventh-century ritual manual entitled Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā, chapter 6 (Devatāyoga). See Inui (1988: 103–101 = 1991: 176–174). See also below on the likelihood that this Devatāyoga section has been adapted from an older text, the Sarvavajraśodhana.

105 vajraṇetrimudrā em.; vajraṇetrimudrā ed.
Next he should burn the obstruction by applying the gesture of Vajrānala. He should exclaim: Om Vajrānala Kill, Blaze, Consume, Convulse, Break, Battle Hūṃ Phat. The gesture of Vajrānala is the vajra-thumb raised in the middle of blazing fingers comprised inside the vajra-bond.

Next he says: Om Vajranetri Bind All the Obstructions. He applies the gesture and binds all the obstructions. He makes the vajra-bond, stretches the thumbs and holds them evenly. This is the gesture of Vajranetri. Placing the outstretched vajra-bond on the ground he should bind beneath. He says: Om Vajra Be Firm for Me, Protect All Svāhā.

Applying the gesture of Vajrabhairavanutra he should bind above. He says: Om Hūṃ Hūṃ Hūṃ Phat. Binding the vajra-fists and waving them like a firebrand he should hold them above the head with the forefingers made into hooks. This is the gesture of Vajrabhairavanutra.

Once more by means of the gesture of Vajravyakṣa he should make a new bond beneath, saying: Om Vajravyakṣa Hūṃ. The gesture of Vajravyakṣa is a form of the vajra-anjali with the thumbs outstretched and the forefingers projecting like tusk.

With the gesture of Vajroṣṇīṣa he should bind the eastern quarter. He says either Om Drum Bind Ham or just Drum. He should place the vajra-fists on the crown of his bowed head with the little fingers linked together like a chain and the forefingers made into a point. This is the gesture of Vajroṣṇīṣa. Once more he should bind the same quarter by applying the gesture of Vajrapāśa. He says: Hūṃ Vajrapāśa Hrīḥ. He should make a knot with

106 vajrapāśamudrā em.; vajrapāśamudrā ed.
the arms by means of the vajra-fists. This is the gesture of Vajrapāśa. He should bind the western quarter by means of Vajrapatākā. He says: OM, FLYING VAJRAPATĀKĀ FLUTTER. The gesture of Vajrapatākā is the vajra-bond in which the thumbs are crossed. The forefingers are put together and then parted, and the little fingers are made like banners.

He should destroy the obstruction below and above, in the quarters and in the intermediate quarters.

He should bind the northern quarter by means of Vajrakāli. He says: OM VAJRAKALI RUT MAṬ. The gesture of Vajrakāli is the gesture of Vajrakāla firmly placed at the heart.

With Vajraśikharā he should bind the southern quarter. He says: OM VAJRAŚIKHARĀ RUT MAṬ. The gesture of Vajraśikharā is made with the vajra-fists shaped like an arched hillock. He binds the maṇḍala by means of the gesture of Vajrakarma. He makes thus the enclosing wall. He says: HUM VAJRAKARMA.

The inner enclosure is made by means of Vajrahumkāra, saying: HUM. He binds the vajra-fists and forms a vajra with his arms; the little fingers he makes into hooks and raises the forefingers into a point known as Trilokyavijaya (Victor over the Threefold World). This is the gesture of Vajrahumkāra.

It should be pointed out that this portion is found only in what Skorupski (1983: xvii) has called “version B” of the Tantra, and finds no correspondent in “version A”. Skorupski considered the Tibetan translation of “version A” to be as old as the eighth century, while the oldest evidence for the existence of “version B” would be a Tibetan translation from the thirteenth century. It is at first sight surprising to see our ninth–tenth-century Javanese inscription agreeing with the ostensibly “later” version, but in his review of Skorupski’s work, van der Kuijp (1992) has pointed out that the very ancient date attached to “version A” cannot be taken at face value, and that the transmission of this version is not at all reliable; conversely, Skorupski has himself pointed out that the parts of “version B” not represented in “version A” “certainly represent very early materials” (p. xxix). That the set of deities involved in this portion had been received in Bali was already known from their occurrence in a Buddhist hymn transmitted on that island in manuscripts. None of these, however, is earlier than the seventeenth century, although the presence of the set of deities must logically precede the oldest manuscript by some amount of time. It seems to me that our inscription now offers fairly strong evidence of the availability to Buddhist priests in ninth–tenth-century Java of a textual/ritual tradition very closely related to that preserved in the thirteenth-century Tibetan translation and still much later Nepalese manuscripts of the

107 The form vajrapāśe must be a vocative of the feminine Vajrapāśa, rather than Skorupski’s Vajrapāśa.

108 I have not adjusted the quotation of Skorupski’s translation in the light of the small emendations proposed in the text.

It would hence seem that we can confirm with entirely independent evidence the conclusions reached earlier by Nihom, using the Balinese manuscript material, “that a tradition reflecting the form and content of [chapter 1 of “version B” of this Tantra] was available at some time in classical Indonesia”.\textsuperscript{111} I will return to this issue below.

The second paragraph of the inscription is itself composed of three parts. The first runs from \textit{oṁ vajrakīla to phat}. Then we find tenfold repetition of \textit{hum} (i.e. the \textit{bīja HŪM}). I will return to these first two parts below. The third part comprises the remainder of the inscription. This last part is found almost verbatim in a number of texts. I have found it in the ritual manuals \textit{Piṇḍikramasādhana}\textsuperscript{112} and \textit{Sādhanamālā},\textsuperscript{113} but also in the scripture \textit{Guhyasamājatantra}, at 14.59 (Matsunaga 1978):

\begin{quote}
ataḥ bhagavān sarvatathāgata-kāṇḍayavākṣittanibandhanavajraṁ nāma samādhiṁ samāpadyedam sarvatraidhātukakāṇḍayavākṣittakīlāna-vajraṁ svakāya-vākṣittavajrabhya niścārayāṁ āsa | \textit{oṁ gha gha ghaṁ taya sarvaduṣṭā phat kīlaya kīlaya sarvapāṁ phat hūm hūm vajra kīlaya vajradhara ājñāpayati kāṇḍayavākṣittavajraṁ kīlaya hūm phat |}
\end{quote}

Then the Lord entered the meditation called “Binding Vajra of the bodies, speech and minds of all the Tathāgatas” and brought forth from the Vajras which are his own body, speech and mind this Vajra for pinning down the body, speech and mind of all the [Tathāgatas of the] three realms: “\textit{OM gha gha strike strike all ills phat! Pin down, pin down all evils phat! HŪM HŪM, Vajra, pin down – the Vajra-master commands the Vajra which is body, speech and mind – pin down HŪM phat!”.

However, in none of the mentioned texts is this mantra combined with \textit{oṁ vajrakīla kīlaya hūm phat}. It is only in another ritual manual, the \textit{Sarvavajrodaya} composed by the ninth-century author Ānandagarbha (and the later \textit{Kriyāsāṃgrahapāṇīkā} which seems to be based on it in this section), that I find this combination. In the edition based on a single eleventh-century

\textsuperscript{110} The fact that the deities Vajrapātākā and Vajrakālī are part of the Balinese list suggests that their omission from our inscription, that lists only eight mantras in the first paragraph, is not intentional.
\textsuperscript{111} Nihom (1994: 80): “Consequently, on the basis of the existence of these selections of Indo-Indonesian Sanskrit text fragments, it appears that a tradition reflecting the form and content of this chapter 1 of SDP-B was available at some time in classical Indonesia”. And p. 82: “Although the Tibetan translation of SDP-B dates from the thirteenth century and although all originally Indian commentaries on the Sarvadurgatipariśodhana which have survived are on recension A, SDP-B chapter 1 must have existed several centuries earlier than the thirteenth century, most probably before the composition of the Indian commentaries on SDP-A, the earliest of which is perhaps that of Buddhaguhya, that is, from the second half of the eighth century.”
\textsuperscript{112} De la Vallée Poussin (1896: 2, verses 10–13), plus the mantra between stanzas 13 and 14.
\textsuperscript{113} Bhattacharya 1968, nr. 267 \textit{Bhūtādāmarasādhana}, p. 525.
Nepalese manuscript established by a group of young Japanese scholars, we read as paragraph 37:114

tatah khadiravajrakīlalāḥ maṇḍalakөne catuṣṭaye vajreṇākotyāḥ |
oṃ vajrakīla kīlaya saravivghanam bandha hūṁ phat ||
ity anena ह्रदयन्नोष्टततरासातम परिजया | vāmavajramuṣṭyā vā paṅcasūcikārī vajrām ādāya tena hūṃkāram udīrayan maṇḍalakөne catuṣṭaye maṇḍalānabhau ca kīlakapaṇcakaṁ nispaḍya | daksιṣkareṇa trisūcīkavajrīkṛtenākotayed imam udīrayan |
oṃ gha gha ghaṭaya ghaṭaya sarvaduṣṭān phat ||
kīlaya kīlaya sarvapāpān phat ||
vajrakīlavajradhara ājñāpayati svāhā115 || iti ||

Then Vajra-stakes of khadira wood are to be driven into the four corners of the maṇḍala with a Vajra. He mutters around them one hundred and eight times with this heart-mantra: “Oṃ Vajra-stake, pin down all obstacles, bind हūṁ phat!” Or else he takes a five-pronged Vajra with the left [hand held in the form of the] Vajra-fist, and while he utters the syllable हūṁ should make the five stakes in the four corners of the maṇḍala and in its centre with that [Vajra]; with his right hand made into [the shape of] a three-pronged Vajra he should drive [them into the ground] while uttering this [mantra]: “Oṃ gha gha ghaṭaya ghaṭaya sarvaduṣṭān phat! Pin down, pin down all evils phat! The Vajra-master of the Vajra-stake commands [you], svāhā!116

Returning now to the first two parts of the second paragraph of our inscription, I presume that the tenfold repetition of the bīja हūṁ, for which I do not find a precise textual parallel, indicates destruction of obstacles in the ten directions (the four cardinal and intermediate quarters of space, above and

114 The Sanskrit text of the Sarvavajrodaya is known to be preserved only in a single, incomplete, manuscript dated 1059 ce. From this manuscript, the Sanskrit text was edited in two parts by a group of students (Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai 1986–87), with a Japanese translation; a supplement was later published by Takahashi 1988, who was a member of the group. Little seems to have been published in English on this text, its author and its date. On its date, see Tanemura (2004: 8 n. 22). On the text, its date and its author, see Sanderson (2009: 125), who speaks of “the ninth-century Indian authority Ānandagarbha” and calls the text an influential manual that sets out detailed practical guidance for the performance of the initiation ritual taught” in the Sarvatathāgatattvavasāngraha, 236 n. 514 (justification for the dating). See also Isaacson 2009: 95 (the author is called a “celebrated authority on Yogatantra”), 113. For the parts of the Sarvavajrodaya not preserved in the single Sanskrit manuscript, we can take recourse to its Tibetan translation (not accessible to me). I thank Ryugen Tanemura for his great help in giving me access to the Sarvavajrodaya and interpreting its pertinence to the Javanese inscriptions under discussion in this article.

115 The text of the Sarvavajrodaya as edited by the Japanese team here diverges from the text seen in our inscription and in several other transmitted versions of this mantra. As the editors note, the manuscript is damaged at this place. Is it possible that more syllables were lost than their decision (based on the Tibetan translation) to terminate the mantra with svāhā suggests?

below), it may be assumed that the *Sarvavajrodaya*’s instruction *hūṃkāram uḍīrāyan* indicates a very similar liturgical element, although the number of the stakes there seems to be only five. As for the first part, a slightly more extensive variant of this occurs in another Javanese inscription of the ninth or tenth century, engraved on a *linga*-shaped stone whose precise provenance is unknown, held in the National Museum at Jakarta, under number D. 140. This inscription was published first by Crucq (1929: 274), and subsequently drew attention again from other scholars, all misguided by the idea that the language of the inscription was Old Javanese. However, some decades later Boechari (1964: 123 = 2012: 66 n. 5) observed that the text is in Sanskrit and must undoubtedly be read as follows:

vajrakīla kīlaya sarvavighnān vandha hūṃ phat om

This is (with just two minor variants: the repetition of *vandha* and the displacement of *om* to the end) identical to the text of the *kīlanaḥṛdaya* “heart-mantra for placing a stake” found first in the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, and hence repeated in several later Buddhist tantric texts, including the *Sarvavajrodaya* and the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā*, but not the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*. The passage is as follows (Horiuchi 1983/I, p. 526, sections 1264–5):

manḍalasya tu madhye vai viddhvā khadirakīlakam |
tatas tu sūtraṁ dvīdanaṁ kṛtvā tena prasūtryet ||
tatredam kīlakahṛdayaṁ bhavati: |
ōṁ vajrakīla kīlaya sarvavighnān bandha hūṃ phat ||

He should pierce a stake of *khadira* wood into the centre of the *manḍala*. Then he should make a cord of two threads and draw the lines with it. For this purpose, there is the spell for placing the stake: “*Om. Vajra-stake, pin down all obstacles, bind [them] hūṃ phat!*”

It is now time to draw conclusions from these data. With regard to the textual correspondences between chapter 1 of “version B” of the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*, on the one hand, and Balinese Buddhist liturgical materials on the other, adduced by Nihom (1994: 78–80) in favour of his conclusion that this Tantra was disseminated to the Indonesian archipelago, we have to keep in mind that all of the same correspondences can be traced in the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā*. This text, dating from the eleventh century, would be old enough to have served as the source for the Balinese material, but is too late to have served as source for the two inscriptions under discussion here. However, all

---

117 Cf. *digvidīkṣaḥ ārddhvaḥ ca vighnanikṛntanaṁ kuryāt* in the long quotation from the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra* given above. See Tanemura (2004: 31 n. 70) on what may have been meant by “above” and “below” in the case of a two-dimensional ground plan.

118 See *Notulen van de algemeene en directievergaderingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 54 (1916), pp. 45, 190. I have not seen the stone myself, and take the information that it is shaped like a *linga* from the *Notulen*. 
of the relevant textual material is found in the Devatāyoga part of the sixth chapter of the text, and this is precisely the part which is considered to have been adapted from the significantly older Sarvavajrodaya. This last text, possibly composed in the ninth century, would probably be old enough to have served as source for our inscriptions. Unfortunately, the part corresponding to Kriyāśaṅgaraṇaṇīkā 6 Devatāyoga is not preserved in the sole Sanskrit manuscript known to exist for this text. Because I do not have access myself to the Tibetan version of the Sarvavajrodaya, I limit myself to pointing out the correspondences between the elements that drew Nihom’s attention in the Sarvadurgatiṇiparıṣodhanatantra and the corresponding parts of the Kriyāśaṅgaraṇaṇīkā (see Table 1).

Among these elements, it must first be recalled that items 3 and 4 concern precisely the passages of the Sarvadurgatiṇiparıṣodhanatantra (and Kriyāśaṅgaraṇaṇīkā) which I have cited as a possible source for the first paragraph of the first inscription. If we may assume, then, that these and all the other elements, whose place in the Kriyāśaṅgaraṇaṇīkā is indicated in the table, do indeed find their correspondent in the (Tibetan version of the) Sarvavajrodaya, this means that the first paragraph of our first inscription may have been quoted from that text rather than the Sarvadurgatiṇiparıṣodhanatantra. If we keep in mind, furthermore, that the Tibetan version of the Sarvavajrodaya presumably offers parallels for all the segments of this inscription, and that this text is the only one which does so while also being old enough to have been known in (late) ninth-century Java, whereas the Sarvadurgatiṇiparıṣodhanatantra does not provide a source for all elements of the first inscription, and does not offer anything corresponding to the part that is also represented in the second inscription, it seems that we must draw the conclusion that it is more likely that the Sarvavajrodaya (or a text closely related to it) than that the Sarvadurgatiṇiparıṣodhanatantra inspired the rituals during which or with a view to whose execution these inscriptions were produced.

Although none of the ritual texts cited here prescribes the use of “stakes” (kīla) made of stone, it nevertheless seems clear that these two stones served as stakes – possibly the central ones – during the ritual opening of the ground plan (maṇḍala) of Buddhist shrines. In this connection, given the physical resemblance of these stones to the rather numerous wholly or partly linga-shaped boundary markers preserved from Central Java, called “śīma stones” (vatu sīma) in contemporary inscriptions (cf. n. 99), it is significant that certain Indian inscriptions use precisely the word kīlaka to denote cadastral boundary markers. Obviously, the spheres of a ritual demarcation of agricultural land

120 I assume that Sundberg’s statement to the contrary (2003: 172 n. 17) was based on contradictory information about the date of the Sarvavajrodaya.
121 For the potential pertinence of the Sarvavajrodaya, I refer also to Table 2 in Ishii 1992, which shows that of the Sanskrit stanzas in the Javanese Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyān Mantranaya, there is one that this author has been able to identify exclusively in the Sarvavajrodaya.
122 I have intentionally chosen the word “stake” to translate kīla here, as our Javanese inscriptions seem to imply a rather large object such as the word “stake” denotes. In other contexts, a word like “peg” might be a more suitable translation.
123 For an example of the use of kīlaka to denote a cadastral boundary marker in an Indian inscription, see the seventh-century Panchrol (or Egra) copper-plate inscription of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pūjāmegha mantras</td>
<td>140: 14–21</td>
<td>6.2.2.5 (p. 164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “Anuttarā Pūjā” hymn</td>
<td>146: 9–25</td>
<td>6.2.2.7 (pp. 161–160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Divinities of the Balinese Pañcadaśavājradevatāstuti</td>
<td>134: 19–136: 26</td>
<td>6.2.1.6 (pp. 176–174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Vajra Fire mantra</td>
<td>134: 16</td>
<td>6.2.1.6 (p. 176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Self-generation as divinity</td>
<td>132: 23–27</td>
<td>6.2.1.2–3 (pp. 178–177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vajrajvālānalārka and subsequent meditative procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Correspondences between Balinese Buddhist liturgy, Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra “version B” and the Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā.
and the ritual demarcation of *maṇḍalas* were felt to be connected in ancient India and Indonesia, as is expressed by the use in these spheres of a partly overlapping set of terminological and material culture.

### 7. Inscriptions with the mantra ṭaki hūṃ jaḥ

Another case where the *Sarvavajrodaya* could be pertinent to Javanese data is furnished by a group of inscriptions containing *mantras* with the sequence ṭaki/ī hūṃ jaḥ. In an important study published in 2003, Jeff Sundberg drew attention to and elucidated a unique gold artefact excavated in the Ratu Baka complex near Prambanan, bearing the text *oṃ ṭakī hūṃ jaḥ svāhā*. He has done his best to find a scriptural source for this mantra. Unable to find a precise match, he pinned much of his argument on the attestation of admittedly very similar, although not identical, *mantras* in the *Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha*.\(^{124}\) However, *oṃ ṭakī hūṃ jaḥ* is attested as such in the *Guhyasamājatantra* (14.22), which Sundberg does not mention;\(^{125}\) perhaps more significantly, it is also found in the *Sarvavajrodaya*, whose ritual system is based on that of the *Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha*.\(^{126}\)

Sundberg has pointed out that there are a few other, similar and obviously related stone inscriptions from Central Java, but in my opinion he was wrong to maintain, with his predecessors, that these inscriptions read *paki* instead of ṭaki, on which basis he concluded that “their mantra is not that of the Ratu Baka gold plate”.\(^{127}\) It is safe to assume that ṭaki is intended throughout,\(^{128}\) and the evidence suggests that the formula ṭaki hūṃ jaḥ at the beginning of three of these four short stone inscriptions recording the erection of boundary

---

\(^{124}\) This is indeed probably the oldest source (or one of the oldest sources) for *mantras* using the element ṭaki. We find in this text the following *mantras* (section numbers after Horiuchi’s edition, which reads *hūṃ* for *hāṃ*: *hūṃ ṭakki jjaḥ* (662), ṭakki āḥ, ṭakki jjaḥ, ṭakki hūṃ (927), oṃ ṭakki jjaḥ (1229). Note that this text everywhere seems to give the *bījas* with *kk* and *jj*.

\(^{125}\) The absence of *svāhā* can be considered a trivial difference. Cf. other cases of variation between *mantras* involving the presence or absence of final *svāhā* presented above, n. 115.

\(^{126}\) The list of *mantras* occurring in the *Sarvavajrodaya*, compiled by Takahashi (1988: 96–81) both from the parts preserved in Sanskrit and from those preserved only in Tibetan. The *mantras* ṭaki hūṃ jaḥ and ṭakki jjaḥ hoḥ, numbered 116 and 117, are found in a part of the text not preserved in the single Sanskrit manuscript.

\(^{127}\) Sundberg 2004: 164 n. 3. The four inscriptions mentioned without further references in that footnote can all be found discussed in Damais (1955a: 29–30 n. 1, 236); see also Stutterheim (1932) on three of the four. Note that the inscription called “Vihāra” by Damais was found in Jagung, one of the two possible provenances indicated for the first inscription in the previous section.

\(^{128}\) Other examples of *t/p* misreadings by previous scholars unfamiliar with these kinds of mantric syllables have been pointed out in Cruijsen et al. (forthcoming, n. 46).
markers served the purpose of removing obstacles. For at Sarvavajrodaya section 56, we read (Mikkyō Seiten Kenyüikai 1986–87: 267):

ayantanirvighnam kartukāmena mṛttikayā pracchādanīyāḥ | evam api yadi vighnaṁ kurvantī | vajrāhūṁkārayogaṁ kṛtvā ṭakkirājenākṛṣyā vajrānkuśādibhir apy ākarsanādikām kṛtvā vajrāhūṁkāraṁ badhīvā vāmapādena vighnapratikṛtim ākramya HŪM VAM HŪM ityādivivardhanayoγat pragyālidhāpaḍāvasthitō ‘ntarāntarā ca meghāyabhimukhīm tāṁ mudrāṁ kṣipet | gaganodārashranadīptajvilākula-prabhena vajrāhūṁkārene pādaprāhārābhīghāṭena meghādikām bhasmikryamatāṁ | evam ghaṭītā bhavanti |

He who wishes to effect complete freedom from obstacles should cover them (i.e. the effigies of the directional deities who might cause trouble, pinned down in section 55) with mud. If in this condition (evam) they [still] make trouble, he should immerse himself in [the deity] Vajrāhūṁkāra and adduct them with the Ṭakkirāja; should also adduct them etc. with the Vajra-goads etc.; should bind the [seal of] Vajrāhūṁkāra; and should step on the effigy of the obstacle with his left foot. After the practice of [self-]expansion with HŪM VAM HŪM etc., he should stand in pratvālīdha stance, should throw that seal in the direction of the clouds etc., in between each of them, and should visualize that the clouds etc. are being burnt to ashes by Vajrāhūṁkāra who shines like dense blazing fire expanding high in the sky and strikes [the obstacles] with his foot. In this way they are struck down.130

From the evidence of Guhyasamājatantra 14.22, where the mantra om ṭakki hūṁ jaḥ is explicitly called sarvatathāgataṭakkrājamañḍakrodha “the great wrath of all Tathāgatas who is [named] Ṭakkirāja”, it seems that ṭakki-rājenākṛṣya can be interpreted as “having adducted by reciting the mantra named Ṭakkirāja”, and that the intended mantra is the one that concerns us here.131 The position of the mantra in the three stone inscriptions corresponds precisely to that of the more familiar expression avighnam astu “let there be no obstacles!” found in several Javanese inscriptions of the ninth century onwards; one of these even opens more elaborately with om avighnam astu ganapataye namah “Om, let there be no obstacles! Homage to Gaṅapati (the god who removes obstacles)”.132

129 Understand kriyamāṇam.
130 The translation proposed here is based on the idea, communicated to me by Ryugen Tanemura (email of 04/10/2012) that vivardhanayoga might mean that the practitioner, who is identical with Vajrāhūṁkāra, becomes gigantic by uttering hūṁ vam hūṁ, and in this condition is able to remove the obstacles symbolized by the clouds, etc.
131 As Sundberg (2003: 173) has noted, the context of the mantra hūṁ ṭakki jiaḥ in the Sarvatathāgatattvasaṁgṛaha (Horiuchi 1983: section 662) is likewise that of ākaraṇa “(violent) adduction”.
132 To mention just some of the oldest inscriptions: Balitavan (813 Śaka), Sugih Manek (837 Śaka), Kinar (849 Śaka); the longer formula is found in the Gulun-Guluń
The fourth stone inscription with taki jah hūm comprises only a mantra, and has been read paki hūm jah jah hūm waho paki hūm jah jah hūm waho (that is, twice paki hūm jah jah hūm waho) by Damais, from a plaster cast kept in Leiden, the whereabouts of the original inscription being unknown. In the Kriyāsangrahapañjikā (6.2.9, Inui 1992: 139), in a section on the consecration of the Tantric master, I find om tākki jah hūm vāṁ hōḥ, which is virtually the same mantra and allows us to predict how Damais’ reading may be improved.133 I have not yet found this in any scriptural source, and alas we have in this case neither context nor original artefact to help us understand the inscription (851 Śaka). The openings of three of these four inscriptions are conveniently transliterated in Damais (1955a: 39, 53, 104); for Sugih Manek, see Brandes (1913: 37).

133 Ryugen Tanemura has written to me in an email of 10/08/2012: “The equivalent part of the Sarvajrodaya, available only in Tibetan, reads tākki dzah ho (= tākki jah ho, with ho a corruption of hōḥ?). The sequence jah hūm vāṁ hōḥ is a very strong unit in Buddhist tantras. So it is highly likely that tākki jah hōḥ came to be ‘corrected’ or ‘revised’ to tākki jah hūṁ vāṁ hōḥ”. Unless we presume that the correspondence between the Javanese mantra inscription and the mantra in the Kriyāsangrahapañjikā is coincidental, this “correction” or “revision” must have taken place before the mantra came to be used in this form in ninth- or tenth-century Java.
function of this inscription. Finally, I must add to this record the mantric sequence $tāki hūṁ jah ḍah hūṁ kiṭa$ in the lead-bronze inscription from Borobudur already mentioned a few times above.\footnote{Side B, line 4, published as $paki hūṁ jah ḍah hūṁ hita$ by Boechari (1982: 94 = 2012: 586). My reading is based on photographs of the inscription by Sugeng Riyanto, kindly furnished by Titi Surti Nastiti. See now Griffiths 2014.}

8. Bronze image of Vairocana at the Metropolitan Museum of Art

A small bronze image of Vairocana in vajraparyaṅkāsana and displaying bodhyāgrīmudrā is held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, under number 1987.142.171 (Figure 11). To my knowledge, it is so far unpublished,\footnote{Even though it is part of the stupendous Eilenberg collection, and was donated in 1987, the piece is not included in Lerner and Kossak 1991.} no doubt because the iconography is very well known from other, better preserved specimens. But the inscription engraved on the figure’s base lends it importance from perspectives other than art history. The script is that of Central Java, i.e. Kawi, in the ninth or tenth century. Excellent photos are viewable online through the Museum’s website, and allow the following reading:

(1) $○$ praṃtya dharma pa(jā)(2)(ya)nte nāsti dharmah (svabhāvata)(3)ḥ | ye [pra]̣ (tyī)ṭya (pra)jāna(4)te te jānanti dharmatāṁ $○$

This is a surprisingly corrupt anuṣṭubh stanza, that I hesitantly restore as follows:\footnote{Note that $pāda$ a is hypermetrical, while $c$ shows substandard $ja$-vipulā.}

praṃtya dharman prajāyante nāsti dharmaḥ svabhāvataḥ |
ye praṃtya prajānate te te jānanti dharmanām ||

If the emendations are correct, then we may translate as follows:

Entities come into being dependently. There is no entity that derives from an independent existence. Those who understand dependent [origination], they know the true nature of reality.

This is a very basic expression of the core Buddhist doctrine of dependent origination ($praṃtyasamutpāda$). Although I am unable to trace this verse in any preserved scriptural text, it could very well have been put in the Buddha’s mouth in some Buddhist scripture now lost (or no longer available in Sanskrit), for a gāthā much like this one, and likewise untraceable in known scriptures, is found attributed to the Buddha in Candrakīrti’s Prasannapadā on kārikā 4.19 (de la Vallée Poussin 1903–13: 505):

uktaṁ ca bhagavatā |
praṃtyadharman adhigacchate vidū na cāntadṛśīya karoti niśrayam |
sahetu sapratyaya dharma jānati ahetu apratyaya nāsti dharmanā || iti
I quote the translation by Jacques May (1959: 240):


It seems reasonable to assume that this gāthā, engraved on the base of the image of Vairocana, served as dharma-relic, just like the stanzas engraved on a silver foil inserted into the base of the Sambas sculpture discussed above (section 1) or the texts on gold foil or clay tablets inserted into relic caskets and stūpas (sections 5, 9 and 10). And in this sense, this inscription is comparable to the other material presented in this paper.

9. Clay sealings from Bali

In Machi Suhadi’s article on “Buddhist mantras in the ASEAN states”, the author’s “mantra formula II” (1989: 117), a text originally published by Stutterheim (1929: 38), can be identified with a widespread Buddhist dhāraṇī. The text is found stamped in Siddhamātrigāthā script on small clay sealings found at Pejeng and (not far from Pejeng) at Blahbatuh,137 inserted into miniature stūpas of unbaked clay. The reading published by Stutterheim was as follows:138

\[ \text{namah traya(va) savatathāgata tadapagantam jvalajvaladhamadhā ālasam-} \]
\[ \text{harasamhara āyussaṁsādha āyussaṁsādha savasatvānām pāpaṁ sarvathā-} \]
\[ \text{gata samantāśrī(tha) vimalaśuddha svāhā} \]

This text can now be identified as the Vimalośṇiṣadhāraṇī. The following is the version of that dhāraṇī in a Dunhuang manuscript dating to about the ninth/tenth century published by Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (1994: 712):

\[ \text{tadyathā orī namas trayadhvikānāṁ sarvatathāgataḥ} \]
\[ \text{dharmadātutgarbhe jvala dharmadhātutar bhe jvala} \]
\[ \text{dharmadātutar bhe jvala dharmadhātutar bhe jvala} \]
\[ \text{samharaṇa āyuṁ saṁsodhaya pāpaṁ sarvathā-} \]
\[ \text{gatasamante uṣṇisvīmāvīśuddhe svāhā} \]

There are some differences between this version and the Balinese sealings, but it is in any case clear from Schopen’s (1985) study of this text that the transmission of this dhāraṇī throughout Buddhist Asia was not very stable.139 Moreover, it is only natural that Stutterheim’s ignorance of the identity of the text,
combined with the challenges of reading a text stamped in miniature size on this kind of material, has caused several misreadings. Luckily, a fairly good photograph showing two specimens of clay sealings stamped with the same matrix of this text was published by Putu Budiastra and Wayan Widia (1980–81: photo 9), which I reproduce here as Figure 12. On this basis, I am able to propose the following synthetic edition of the text as it was transmitted to Bali:

(1) nama(s tre)ya(dhva)sarvatathā-
(2) gatahrdayagarbhe jvala jvala dha-
(3) rmadhātugarbhe saṁhara saṁhara ā-
(4) yus sa(m)ṣodha (ā)yus saṁṣodha\textsuperscript{140}
(5) sarvasatvānāṁ pāpa(m) sarvata-
(6) thāga(ta)samantoḍṇīṣa(vi)-
(7) malaś(ū)ddhe svāhā\textsuperscript{141}

Finding myself somewhat in disagreement with the way Scherrer-Schaub has translated her reconstituted text for the Dunhuang manuscript (1994: 713), I propose here the following translation, starting from the Balinese text, which is not essentially different:

\textsuperscript{140} All other versions have twice or only once saṁṣodhaya, and I assume that this word form is intended here twice too, instead of saṁṣodha and saṁṣodha.

\textsuperscript{141} An anonymous reviewer has added the observation that this dhāraṇī was used as a personal protective spell by the Palola Sāhi Navasurendraśyānāndi during the seventh century (cf. von Hinüber 2004: 14 ff.), and that while in Bali it begins by namas treyadhva, in Gilgit it begins with oṁ strṛyadh. According to the reviewer, this shows that the first word originally was indeed namas, whose -s was preserved in the ligature strṛ, when namas was replaced by oṁ.
Homage! O you [female deity of this dhāranī] who bear as womb the essence of all Tathāgatas of the three ages (past, present and future): burn, burn the evil of all beings! O you [dhāranī-deity] who bear as womb the dharma-relic: destroy, destroy [the evil!] Purify life, purify life! O [you dhāranī-deity] who are immaculately pure like all the cranial protuberances of all Tathāgatas! Hail!

It is clear from the rich evidence adduced by Schopen (1985) that the practice of stamping this dhāranī on clay and installing it in a stūpa is precisely in agreement with the way this text was used in other parts of the Buddhist world. The dating of these specimens is very hard to estimate on the basis of palaeography, but a date between 800 and 1000 CE seems likely.

More exceptional is the case of “mantra formula III” on the other clay object mentioned by Machi Suhadi (1989: 117–8). It was originally read as follows by Stutterheim (1935: 88):

\[
\text{ity api sa bhagavān arhan sanyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasaṁpannaḥ sugata-}
\text{tālokavidyanuttaraḥ paruṣadasyumāravigāsuradevamanusyaṇāṁ niddho bhagava–}
\]

I do not have access to a photo of any sealing bearing this text, so I cannot verify Stutterheim’s decipherment, but the text must be very similar if not identical to one of the many variants of the list of ten epithets of the Buddha. A particularly close (if not identical) parallel is the phrase ity api sa bhagavāṁs tathāgato ्rhan sanyaksamibuddho vidyācaraṇasaṁpannah sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ śastā devamanusyaṇāṁ buddho bhagavān iti, found in the Bodhisattvabhūmi 1.7 (Wogihara 1930–36: 93). It means something like this: “Thus also the Lord is [known as] Tathāgata, fully awakened, Arhant, endowed with knowledge and [good] conduct, the Sugata, Supreme knower of the world, Coachman of men who need to be tamed, Teacher of gods and men, the Buddha, the Lord”. This formula is in any case not a mantra.

10. A gold foil from Pura Pagulingan on Bali

Finally, the last section of Machi Suhadi’s article (1989: 118–9) was dedicated to a number of inscribed artefacts recovered during the dismantling of the temple Pura Pagulingan in preparation for its reconstruction. It was discovered then that the foundations showed an octagonal groundplan. It was at this level that two pieces of gold foil were discovered, beside a terracotta tablet (bearing the ye dharmāḥ formula) and a silver foil bearing a few aksaras. The first gold foil, rectangular in shape, was inscribed with a repeated ye dharmāḥ formula. Machi Suhadi also gives the text of the second gold foil, oval in shape, with three lines of writing in circles,

---

142 I presume that the place of sarvasatvānāṁ pāpaṁ, removed from the verbs jvala jvala and sanhara sanhara that govern this object, is due to clumsy expansion of an originally shorter text. This would have to have happened prior to the archetype of all existing versions known to me.

143 On this list, see Lamotte 1944: 115–44.
referring in n. 31 to an unpublished report by Boechari (1985b). Having recently prepared the publication of this report from the author’s own typescript (Boechari 2012: 526–8), I am able now to cite the reading precisely as Boechari saw it, without the copying mistakes in Machi Suhadi’s publication:

(1) oṁ hariḥ oṁ jayāta svāhā oṁ ṣadavitā svāhā oṁ ṣuḥ hum jaya svāhā namāḥ

(2) trailokyavijayāmoghapāśapatihato hariḥ haḥ hiḥ hum

(3) oṁ phat kriḥ hariḥ svāhā ||

This comprises five *mantras*, each introduced by *oṁ*, of which the fourth and most extensive is clearly identifiable as that which is called the *upahrdayamantra* of the *Amoghapāśahṛdayadhārāṇī* in the edition by Kimura (1979: 245 [12]), where this *mantra* does not appear to hold a particularly important position. This edition, however, is based only on late Nepalese manuscripts, and is altogether much less useful for historical research than the two painstaking publications by Meisezahl (1962, 1965), which present witnesses conserving the text in a considerably more archaic state. Several witnesses – a Dunhuang manuscript containing an old Tibetan recension (possibly dating to the ninth century), a twelfth-century Sanskrit manuscript held at Cambridge University Library, and a Siddhamātrikā manuscript preserved in Japan, apparently representing an old transmission of the Sanskrit text independent from that in Nepal – do not show the labels *homamantra*, *ḥṛdayamantra*, *upahrdayamantra*, etc., identifying the ritual use of various constituent parts of the *dhāraṇī*. Furthermore, in both the Dunhuang and the Japanese manuscript, we find the *mantra* corresponding to this Balinese inscription precisely at the end of the *dhāraṇī*, without any of the added *mantras* that all (?) other manuscript witnesses show.145 In other words, in the oldest versions of the text, the *mantra* that we see in Bali was the climax of the *mantra* portion, and hence it is not surprising that it would be chosen to stand for the whole. Also, the various manuscript witnesses show substantial variants among themselves for this sequence of *mantras* at the end of the *dhāraṇī*, so it seems unproblematic that the Balinese version is not identical to any other known version. Anyhow, now that the identity of this *mantra* has been determined, it must be kept in mind that the readings of this gold foil inscription from Bali are liable to be improved if the original could be inspected or good reproductions be made available.

Even though we do not know the precise archaeological context in which this gold foil was found, the function of this artefact may again rather clearly be inferred from the frame text of the *dhāraṇī* (Meisezahl 1962: 313):

144 See Soekmono (1995: 119–20) for a brief report on the context of the excavations and finds at Pura Pagulingan, along with plate 5 at the back of the book. Alas, the gold foil that concerns us here is not explicitly mentioned.

145 The manner of editing chosen by Meisezahl for the Sanskrit text, taking the old Nepalese manuscript (Cambridge Or. Ms. 152, siglum “P”) as basic text, means that the reader must infer on p. 324 of Meisezahl 1962 that the intrusive *mantras* are indeed found in this witness. Photos kindly supplied by the Sanskrit Manuscripts Project, Cambridge, have allowed me to confirm that Meisezahl’s edition is reliable in this regard, as indeed it seems to be in general.
And again, O Blessed One, on which spot of earth this Amoghapāśahṛdaya would circulate, it is to be known that on that spot of earth, O Blessed One, 12 × 100,000 devaputras, headed by Īśvaras, Maheśvaras and the devas belonging to Brahma, will dwell for the purpose of protecting and shielding and guarding it. That spot of earth, O Blessed One, where this Amoghapāśahṛdaya will circulate will become a highly honored sacred place.

We may hence assume that our inscription represents the epitome of the dhāranī, and its production must have been motivated by a similar intent to the inscription of Batu Bedil presented in section 2. In contrast to the Aparimitāyuhṣūtra, which was the source text there, it must however be pointed out that there is not, in the Amoghapāśahṛdaya, any emphasis on “writing down” the text.

Conclusion

I have presented a fairly wide range of Indonesian inscriptions citing gāthās, mantras and dhāranīs, providing rather eloquent written testimony to the fact that the Indonesian archipelago was an integral part of the ancient Buddhist world. I hope to have shown that this epigraphical material, thus far very little known outside of Indonesia, deserves the attention of historians of Indian and pan-Asian Buddhism. I have simultaneously tried to contextualize the Indonesian data in the light of Buddhist texts not preserved in the archipelago, hoping to aid Indonesian scholars towards an appreciation of this material. Indeed, the primary source for interpreting why a given citation was produced in the form of an inscription will always be the textual frame from which the citation is extracted.

I have been able positively to identify the source texts for most of the gāthā, mantra and dhāranī inscriptions presented in this article. Despite the fact that we are mostly dealing with very short segments of text, there have been several instances where this material has offered readings that are of philological significance for the critical study of the source texts. These are, in Sanskrit alphabetical order (and limiting myself to source texts for which a Sanskrit recension is preserved), the Apramitāyuhṣūtra, the Bodhigärbhālakāralaksadhāraṇī, the Bhadracarpiraṇidhāna, the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, and the Vimaloṣṇīsadhāraṇī. More tentative identifications have involved the Kāraṇḍavyūha, the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājī, the Sarvadurgatiṣodhanatāntra and the Sarvavajrodaya. If we may assume that the citation of mantras and dhāraṇīs from such source texts implies the availability of manuscripts of these texts as
such, then I would seem to have made a big leap in determining which were the
written Sanskrit vectors of Buddhism in ancient Indonesia. For with the exception
of the Mahāpratisarāmahāvīryājñī, the dissemination of none of these
texts had thus far been proven on the basis of written evidence.

But is it really true that we may infer as much? Schopen has repeatedly
addressed this question in his work on Indian dhārāṇī inscriptions, and has
tended to answer in the affirmative. See e.g. Schopen’s discussion of inscriptions
with the Vimaloṣṇīṣadhārāṇī (1985 [2005]: 336):

The identification of the dhārāṇī on the seals and the “Schutzformel”
found at Gilgit proves again that either the Samantamukhapraveśa or the
Shes pas thams cad or both were known and actually used during the
sixth to the ninth centuries at Paharpur in Bengal, at Bodhgaya and
Nālandā in Bihar, and at Gilgit. It could, of course, be argued that only
the dhārāṇī itself was known and available in these places. But that is dif-
ficult to maintain since a knowledge of the dhārāṇī by itself cannot
account for the fact that the dhārāṇī is found in all four places in exactly
the same setting: pressed into lumps of clay or written on birchbark and
deposited in a stūpa. It is, in fact, only a knowledge of the texts that con-
tain this dhārāṇī and explain how it is to be used that can account for this
setting.

I am less confident about this matter than Schopen was thirty years ago. For
instance, the Balinese version of the Amoghapāśahdyaya mantra, engraved in
a circle on gold foil, does not conform to any instruction in that text. This
means that practice was not bound by text, and I find myself quite easily able
to imagine the transmission of mantras and dhārāṇīs by themselves, in specific
material and ritual contexts, outside of the frame of larger texts containing
instructions on their use. In this connection, it may also be pointed out that
none of the Indonesian inscriptions presented here comprises any part of the
prose that frames the mantras or dhārāṇīs in their respective source texts, differ-
ent from several of the Indian cases published by Schopen. In fact I know of just
one Indonesian mantra inscription where any of the framing prose is included in
the citation; it will be published elsewhere.146

In whichever way we have to imagine that these mantras and dhārāṇīs
reached the Indonesian archipelago, it has become clear that the range of such
texts that was used in this part of the Buddhist world must have been quite simi-
lar to the texts that were used in other Buddhist countries. As Schopen puts it
(1989a [2005]: 336): “It is this group of texts that begins to make sense out
of the picture of Buddhism that emerges from our archaeological sources”.146

Schopen has insisted on one other point, which it is important to repeat in the
context of Indonesian studies, where many ideas from the colonial period still
linger. There is nothing at all “Tantric” about most of the inscriptions and source
texts that have occupied me in this contribution, “if by ‘Tantric’ we mean that

146 It is the gold foil inscription from Aek Sangkilon (North Sumatra), dating to the thir-
teenth century, to be published in Griffiths forthcoming (§1.2). The source text there
is the Hevajratantra.
phase of Buddhist doctrinal development which is characterized by an emphasis on the central function of the *guru* as religious preceptor; by sets – usually graded – of specific initiations; by esotericism of doctrine, language and organization; and by a strong emphasis on the realization of the goal through highly structured ritual and meditative techniques” (1982 [2005]: 310). The material I have discussed largely comprises “texts dealing with ritual forms open to all and religious problems common to all – monks, nuns, lay men and women” (1989a [2005]: 337). However, a few of the inscriptions presented here may be labelled “Tantric”, in the sense that their source texts belong to “Tantric” Buddhist (Mantranaya) literature, such as the *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṅgraha*, the *Sarvadurgatiṃpiśodhanatātra*, and the *Sarvavajrodaya*.147

With the exception of one relatively restricted area, I have for this paper cast my net all over the Indonesian archipelago.148 I have not focused on any particular period, but unintentionally the material presented here has turned out all to belong, with a fair degree of certainty, to the period before the turn of the second millennium of our era. Even though we know that Buddhism still thrived during the eleventh to fourteenth centuries in East Java, which was politically dominant in that period, very few inscriptions of the kind presented here have so far come to my attention from that part of the island, and none that could be included here.149 It seems possible that we see here a reflection of changes in the practice of Buddhism on Java during the “East Javanese period”, but it would be imprudent to draw such a conclusion from the very limited and largely negative evidence available so far.
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