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

Arlo Griffiths*
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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.

Keywords: Mantra, Dhāraṇī, Indonesia, Sanskrit, Inscription, Ritual deposit, Dharma relic

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

* Being based in Indonesia, without access to a good library, let alone a library for Buddhist Studies, I have perforce depended heavily for this paper on the help of many kind colleagues. It is a pleasure to express my gratitude, for support by no means limited to bibliographical information, to Véronique Degroot, Rolf Giebel, Don Longuevan, Horst Liebner, Pauline Lunsingh Scheurleer, Pierre-Yves Manguin, Cristina Scherrer-Schaub, Jonathan Silk, Iain Sinclair, Ryugen Tanemura, Vincent Tournier, Geoff Wade and Michael Willis.

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 Saṅ Ĥyān Kamaḥāyāna 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 dharmāh formula). The 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 dharmāh 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 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 transcriptions 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 āvartayisyāmi), 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 Nava-kampa, 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 Nava-kampa. 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 Buddhism 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 dhāraṇī, 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 dhāraṇīs 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. 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 dhāraṇīs, 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 dhāraṇīs/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

---

10 On this term, used here instead of the term Vajrayāna (or Tantrayāna) 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 cāhaṁ kuśalena karmmanā bhaveya buddho na cireṇa loke deśeyā dharmmaṁ jagato hitāya ||, i.e. the first three-quarters of the stanza identified in the Pulau Sawah inscription (see n. 2). Another probable dhāranī 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. 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).

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. 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. 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

---

17 For more details on the provenance of the discoveries that concern us here, see now McKinnon 1994: 23.
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”.
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).
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”.

---
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 aksara 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[ma] (ā)rjjya(na)x n]tabhādra²² // yāvada kāci daśaddīśi loke sarvavatīyādvahaganara narasi(h)̣hā²³ tāhu(2)tān ahna²⁴ vanda[m] (ṣa)rvva əaṣešām (k)āyatu vācamanena prasannah // yāś ca əi mano pariṇāmanarā(3) narāda(m) x tvā²⁵ (sa)kṛj janayed adhimuki (vo)dīhavaram anuprāthayamāṇo əagru viṣista bha(4)[ve]ḍ[im]u p[u]ṇya(m) //²⁶ rakṣoghnā paramā hy esā pavitṛā pāpanāsāṇā śrīka(r)ī dhī-

Reverse:

(1)²⁷ karī cāti²⁸ sarvagunānivardhanī // ye dhammā hyetoprabhavā hetun teṣā(2)ṇ ca yo [n]jirodho hy evam-vādi mahāśramanāḥ // ye mām (rū)peṇa əadrākṣu (3) ye mām [gho]ṣeṇa əanavayuḥ mathyyāprahāṇapraṣṭā na mā drakṣyanti 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 aksara; a capital letter C indicates one illegible consonant; a raised circle ° precedes independent (aksara) vowel signs; a median dot · represents the virāma sign.

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

23 narasi(h)̣hā: presumably narasinhā is intended, but it seems impossible to read ň.

24 The beginning of this line repeats the beginning of the pāda 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 aksaras incised at the beginning of this line than one would have expected from comparison with the Bhadracariprāṇidhāna. 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 ṣya 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.
Analysis

The text constituting lines 1–3 of the obverse can be identified with the following two disconnected verses in the Bhadracari or Bhadracaripraṇīdhāna, 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):

\[
yāvata keci daśaddiśi loke sarvatriyadhvagatā naraśimhāḥ
\]
\[
tān ahu vandami sarvi aśeṣān kāyatu vācamanena prasannāḥ || 1 ||
\]
\[
yāś ca imaṁ pariṇāmanarājaṁ śrutva sakṛj janayed adhimuktim |
\]
\[
bodhvārāṁ anuprārthayamāno agru viśiṣṭa bhaved imu punyam || 48 ||
\]

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):

\[
raksoghnāṁ paramaṁ hy etat pavitraṁ pāpanāśanam |
\]
\[
śrīkaraṁ dhīkaraṁ caiva sarvagunāvivardhanam ||
\]

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 dhārani, 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).
ye māṁ rūpeṇa cādrākṣur ye māṁ ghoṣeṇa cānvayuḥ |
mithyāprahamānapraṣṭā na māṁ drakṣyantī te janāḥ ||

The same verse is also quoted, without attribution to this specific text, in Candrakirti’s Prasannapadā on Mūlamādiḥmyakārikā 22.16 (de la Vallée Poussin, 1903–13: 448), with the reading ghoṣaṇa anvayuḥ 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):32

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 yanm bhadrapranidhāna ini candravarmaṇa we may recognize the Malay words yang and ini, which could yield the meaning “this vow to do good of Candravarman”, but one cannot exclude the possibility that yanm 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 Candravarman.33

There is no obvious connection between the verses. If the verse that I have identified in the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājñī 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.34 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 Bhadracariprāṇidhāna 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 dhāraṇīs […] 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.35 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 Cœdès 1930: 43.
34 On this cult, see Cruijsen 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 Suvaṇṇabhāṣottamasūtra (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”.36

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.37 But since the silver foil must have been inserted into the base at some point after the time of manufacture,38 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, for instance the stone inscription of Wayuku dated 776 šaka = 856 CE depicted in pl. 3 of Brandes 1913, whose script seems identical to that on the Sambas inscription. The same feature is observed in the lead-bronze plate with a dhārāṇī 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-vāḍī), which is written above the consonant that it affects, than the partially turned variant that we see once in the Wayuku inscription.

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 » Šaka, les marges d’erreur peuvent être assez grandes”, implying the possibility of a dating bracket 650–700 Šaka, which would place them in the second and third quarters of the eighth century CE. 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. 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

43 Bradell (1949) gives a misprint: 699. The year is given as 669 by Luce (1924: 176) and Wolters (1967: 186).
44 Bradell (1949: 4) assumes that this may denote (a part of) Borneo. See also Wolters 1967, n. 94 on p. 326. For a recent exposition of the very tangled web of place names and geographical indications in which the toponym Boluo must be interpreted, see Ptak 1998: 120–26.
46 Bentor (1995: 254) cites just two archaeological examples from India.
47 I refer, for visual evidence, to the British Museum website cited in the notes above. For other Indonesian cases, without a systematic survey of the relevant publications, I may here refer at random to OV 1948, p. 30 (about Candi Plaosan Lor): “A small bronze statue of a two-armed Bodhisattva, presumably representing Padmapaṇī, was found during the excavation of the floor of the northern cela of the principal shrine on the South, with the folded silver foil with a dhāraṇī still visible in the bottom of its base”. Another interesting find is the fragment of silverfoil extracted from the silver Mañjuśrī statue from Ngemplan Semongan, discussed by Bosch 1929: 45. Quite a number of further references to finds of the colonial period are cited in the article by F.J. Domela Nieuwenhuis (1983). For some more recent finds, see also Nugrahani et al. (1998: 18 and photos 27–8); for some cases from Campā, not yet properly published, see John Guy 2011: 318–9.
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. Hoop1960: 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.

48 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.

49 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.

50 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) aparimitya -
(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.51 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 dhāraṇī, 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) ṣaṃparimitāyurjñā-
(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”.

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

om namau bhagavate aparimitāyurjñānasuviniścitajeṭorājāya tathāgatāyārhaṃ samyaksambuddhāya | tadyathā, om puṇyamahāpuṇya aparimitāpuṇya aparimitāyupuṇya jñānasambhāropacite | om sarvasamāskāraparīṣuddhaharmate gaganasamudgate svabhāvaparīṣuddhe mahānayaparīvāre svāhā ||

But comparison with the version of the dhāraṇī 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 aparimattāyujñānasuviniścitajeṭorajāya tathāgataṃ rīte samyatsabuddhāya tadyathā aum sarvasamāskāraparīṣuddhadharmaṃ gaganasamudgate svabhāvaviśuddhe mahānayaparīvāre 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 大乘無量壽經 “Mahāyāna Sūtra of Aparimitāyu” (19: 82a–84c, translated by Facheng in the ninth century), T. 937 Dacheng sheng Wuliangshou juing guangming wang rulai tuoluoni jing 大乘無量壽決定光明王如來陀羅尼經 “Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Dhāraṇī of the Tathāgata Arṇaparimitasuviniścitajorāja” (19: 85b, translated 988) and T. 1389 Wuliangshou dazhi tuoluoni 無量壽大智陀羅尼 “Dhāraṇī of the Great Knowledge of Aparimitāyu” (21: 907b, translated 996). T. 936 and 937 are both translations of the Aparimitāyuhūtra, the latter being a shorter version; T. 936 gives the dhāraṇī 29 times in all, while T. 937 gives it only once. T. 1389 consists solely of the dhāraṇī. All three texts give the dhāraṇī in phonetic transcription, each showing nearly the same text, all omitting oṁ, with ṝtejo being absent in T. 936, and T. 936–7 reading svabhāvaviśuddhe, while T. 1389 reads svabhāvāsvuđde, 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 dhāraṇī, 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 dhāraṇī, 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 dhāraṇī 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 Aparimitāyuhṣūtra 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 śūtra, or the dhāraṇī, and promises diverse benefits for those who do, using i.a. the phrase (Konow 1916: 315–7):

yasmin prthivīpradeśa idam aparimitāyuḥṣūtraṁ likhiṣyanti likhāpayisyanti, sa prthivīpradeśaḥ caityabhūto vandanīyaś ca bhaviṣyati

Translation adapted from Silk (2004: 427):

On whatever spot of earth they will write down or will have others write down this Aparimitāyuḥ-śūtra, that spot of earth will become a true shrine and worthy of veneration.

---

55 In 2007, the entire scripture 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.

56 One may wonder why none of these facts were mentioned in Payne’s discussion of “differing versions of the Aparimitāyuḥ Dhāraṇī” (2007: 287–8); this discussion indeed entirely neglects the existence of a short and a long recension of the same dhāraṇī. In addition, I may mention here that a very close relative of our dhāraṇī is found, split in two, in the Sarvadurgatiparisodhanatratra (Skorupski 1983: 27–30): om namo bhagavate sarvadurgatiparisodhanamāyāya tathāgatāyārhatate samyaksambuddhāya | tadyathā | om śodhane śodhane sarvapāvavīśodhani śuddhe viśuddhe sarvakarmāvaranavīśodhani svāhā | mūlavāyā | om sarvasaṁskāraparīśuddhe dharmate gaganasamudgate sva-bhāvavīśuddhe mahānaya-parivāre svāhā |. We will encounter below a variant of the sequence om śodhane śodhane, that is intrusive here.

57 A variant of this sequence seems to have autonomous status among other dhāraṇīs in the silver foil from Candi Plaosan Lor presented below, p. 167.

58 This observation and much else in Payne’s paper is in fact taken over – albeit with acknowledgement – from an unpublished lecture “The most important Buddhist scripture? The Aparimitāyurjñāna and medieval Buddhism”, presented by Jonathan Silk in 1999 at the twelfth conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies at Lausanne.

59 On the significance of this phrase yasmin prthivīpradeśa etc., see Schopen 1976 [2005]: 35, and the recent challenge to Schopen’s position in Drewes 2007.
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 Aparimitāyuhṣūtra to describe, on the one hand, the ways in which the text (or its dhāranī) 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 dhammaṁ pas-satti so bhagavantaṁ pasatti “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-sumatranaise”, 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:

\[ \text{Oṃ } \text{etana tan no bhadra(m) pracoda(yā) svāhā} \]

The reading is rather tentative, for the word \text{etana} makes no sense,\(^{63}\) while the reading \text{yā} is also far from secure. I translate:

\[ \text{Om. Etana (?)}, \text{may you impel to us that which is good! Svāhā.} \]

Despite the problem posed by \text{etana}, it is clear enough that the \text{dhāranī} is an adaptation of some of the numerous variants of the final line of the Gāyatrī \textit{mantra}, reading \text{tan no nom pracodayāt}, found in brahmanical literature (see Bloomfield 1906: 50–51). The word taking the place of \textit{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.\(^{64}\) 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.

\(^{63}\) The \textit{prima facie} readings would rather be \textit{dhūtana} or \textit{dhaṭana}. If one accepts \textit{etana}, this can perhaps be explained as a magical word, comparable to “the enigmatic \textit{eta}ta in the \textit{Ākaraṇa}mantra” of the \textit{Amoghapāsah}dayadhāraṇī (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 ratnāryāya nama  (;;ārīyāva(lo)-
(2) kītesvārayā bodhisatvāyā mahā(sa)-
(3) tvāyā mahākā(ś)uṇīkāyā tadya(thā)
(4) oṁ mārūtākha x kāmvra x (mālya)

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

Homage to the Triad of Jewels (Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha)! Homage to noble Avalokiteśvara, the Bodhisattva, the great being, of great compassion. [The mantra is] like this: Oṃ, . . . 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 ratnatrayā | namo vairocanā ya tathāgatāya | nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunicāya | nama atītātānāgatapratyutpannebhyo ’rvadhbhyaḥ sampyaksambuddhebhyaḥ | oṁ dīri dīru dhurum dhuru | ītte viṭte | cale cale | pracale pracale | kusume kusumavare | ili mili viṭte | and ending with namo ratnātāyā nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunicāya | tadyathā piṭi piṭi tiṭi tiṭi | vīṭi vīṭi gaccha gaccha bhagavan āryāvalokiteśvara svabhavanam svabhavanāṃ svāhā | /.../ āryāvalokiteśvara gaccha svabhavanam ||

66 The text was originally edited by N. Dutt1939:35–40. I cite the text with emendations proposed by Somadeva Vasudeva in an unpublished edition that he kindly allowed me to use.

The Sādhanaṃālā (eleventh century) furthermore contains three citations of a Sinhanādadhāraṇi “Lion’s Roar dhāraṇī”, that again shows the same structure (Bhattacharya 1968: 48, 52, 54, 63): namo ratnātāyā nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārunikāya tadyathā oṁ akate vikaṭe nikate katanikake karoṭavīrye 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

Figure 6. The foil recovered from the “Cirebon” shipwreck, obverse and reverse. Photo Horst Liebner, with tracing of the aksaras by the author.
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 *OV* 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.67 From their archaeological context, the inscriptions, written in Kawi script, may be assigned to the ninth century. The published reading is as follows:

(1) om namo buddhāya namo dharmāya namaḥ saṁghāya tadyathā śuddhe viśuddhe śodhanī viśodhanī gaganaviśodhanī cittiḥaviśodhanī pā(2)<pā-> varanaviśodhanī karmavaranaviśodhanī viśuddhe viśuddhe kṣīne sarva-kṣīne puspe supuspe rajoharaṇe sarvapāpa(3)viśodhanī hare hare sarvāvar-anāni dāhā dāhā sarvakarmāvaranānī paca paca sarvasthānagatāni padme padmākṣi padmaviśā(4)le pha pha pha pha svāhā

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 dhāranī, 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 *OV* 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 *OV* (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.  

This scholar was unable to identify a precise scriptural source for the dhāraṇī, but noted its affinity with the Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanadāraṇī. 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. The scriptural source for this dhāraṇī is the eponymous Tantra, from which I cite (Skorupski 1983: 127–8):

\[
\text{om namo bhagavate sarvadurgatiparīśodhanarājāya tathāgatāyāhate sam-
yaksaṁbuddhāya | tadyathā | om śodhane śodhane sarvapāpaviśodhāni śuddhe viśuddhe sarvakarmāvaranaviśodhāni svāhā |}
\]

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 dhāraṇī-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 Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanadāraṇī with another known dhāraṇī, pointed out to me by Rolf Giebel. It appears in another short dhāraṇī-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 FiveHeinous Sins” (pañcānantaryāṇī) (21: 915c–916a):

\[
\text{namo ratnatrayāya nama āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya mahāsattvāya mahākārūnīkāya tadyathā om śuddhe viśuddhe suviśuddhe kṣīne pariṣīne puspe supuspe jaloharane hara hara sarvāvaranāni paca paca sarvāpāyasthānāni padme padmākṣi padmaviśāle phale pha pha ha ha ha ha ajñāle ajñāle siddhajale svāhā.}
\]

As Giebel points out to me, in this Chinese version ajñāle is uncertain, and jaloharane 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 Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanadāraṇī, except the epithets of the Dhāraṇīs, stotras and other types of texts. See the catalogue compiled by Jean Filliozat (1941: 29, and 31, 36).

68 De Casparis forgets to translate pāpāvaranaviśodhāni: “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 Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanatantra, 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).
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gaganaviśodhani\textsuperscript{71} and cittaviśodhani.\textsuperscript{72} It has been reported that the same dhāraṇī has also been found engraved on silver and gold foils from Candi Sojwan, 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 Siddhamārākāś 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.\textsuperscript{73} 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 Siddhamārākāś 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.\textsuperscript{74} 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.\textsuperscript{75} It measures 5.2–5.8 × 25.5 cm, weighing 7.9 g (Figure 7).

(1) [siddham] namo bhagavate śākkyamunaye\textsuperscript{76} tathāgatāyahrhate\textsuperscript{77} samyak-samvuddhāya tadyathā “oṁ vodhi vodhi vodhi sarvatathāgata(2) gocare\textsuperscript{78} | dhara dhara hara hara prahara prahara mahāvodhicittadhare |

\textsuperscript{71} This epithet is known to me only from the first dhāraṇī of the Mahāpratisarāmahāvīdyārājñī. See Hidas (2012: 115) and Cruijse\textsuperscript{71} et al. (forthcoming). Most witnesses read gaganaviśodhane.

\textsuperscript{72} 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 bhās in the published readings by Kusen.

\textsuperscript{73} 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.

\textsuperscript{74} 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.

\textsuperscript{75} śākkyamunaye: read śākyamunaye.

\textsuperscript{76} tathāgatāyahrhate: correct tathāgatāyahrhate.

\textsuperscript{77} satvatathāgata: 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 *Bodhigarbhālakāralaksadārāṇī*, 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 *dhārāṇī* to Strauch 2009. Admitting the emendations proposed above, the version from Candi Plaosan Lor may be transcribed as follows:

Homage to the Lord Śākyamuni, the Tathāgata, the Arhat who is completely awakened. [The *dhārāṇī* is] like this: OM. Awaken awaken awaken, you (female deity of this dhārāṇī) 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 Tathāgatas89 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! OM. You who are observed by all Tathāgatas, win, win, SVĀHĀ! OM. HURU HURU, you who are the face of victory, SVĀHĀ!

The reason why this *dhārāṇī* 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 °rasmi°.
80 guṇa, guṇavati: correct guṇa guṇavati.
81 vuddhagunāa vabhāše: emend vuddhagunāvabhāse.
82 gagamatalapraṇiṣṭhite: correct gaganatalapraṇiṣṭhitte. For another error involving ma instead of na, see n. 84 below.
83 sarvatathāgatagaradāhiṣṭite: correct sarvatathāgatadaradhiṣṭite.
84 mabhastale: correct nabhastale.
85 sama sama prasama prasama: read şama şama prāsama prāsama.
86 sarvapāpasama: read sarvapāpal pāpasama.
87 sarvapāpe vāsadhani: correct sarvapāpaviśadhani.
88 °vyalokite: correct °vyavalokite.
89 Since *culu* can mean “a handful of water” in Sanskrit, the reading sarvatathāgatābhāṣīkte “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 Dhāranī, 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 dhammadhetuprabhāvahetuntēsāntātathāgato hy avadattēsamāyatattatathāgatahī\ Error! Reference source not found. || namah\ Error! Reference source not found. cundēsvāhā || nāmo bhagavate ratnaśikhine tathāgatāyāhate samyaksaṁvuddhānāṁ tadyathā cala cula\ Error! Reference source not found. cundēsvāhā || nāmo bhagavate manjuśriye kumāra kumāra (bhū) tātyā\ Error! Reference source not found. tadyathā amala amala amalame (4) trāya\ Error! Reference source not found. svāhā

We have here the ye dhammadh formula, followed by a dhāranī called the Saptasaptatisamyaksambuddhakotibhiruktā “Proclaimed by seventy-seven crores of completely awakened ones”, and two further dhāranīs of which the first is attested in transliteration in the Chinese canon (Taishō 1383, 21: 904b), while the last remains unidentified. As for the Saptasaptatisamyaksambuddhakotibhiruktā, I take this title from the single South Asian Sanskrit text where I have found the dhāranī 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)tātyā: correct kumārabhūtātyā. The bhū is not readable as such, but restored here on the basis of the requirements of context.
92 amalametrāya: read amalamaitrāya?
93 Sumingzhituoluonijing 宿命智陀羅尼經 (“Sūtra of the Dhāranī 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 ratnaśikhine tathāgatāya arhate samyaksambuddhāya, tad yathā oṁ ratna ratna ratnasamodbhave mahāratmakirāṇe ratnasambhavē 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 maṇi padme hūṃ (Vaidya 1961: 301):

atha bhagavān śākyamunis tathāgato ’rhan samyaksambuddhas tam etad avocat: labdhalābhhas tvāṁ kulaṇḍputra? sa āha: yathā bhagavān jñānaṁ saṁjānāte | tataḥ saptasaptatiḥ samyaksambuddhakotayaḥ saṁnipaṭitiḥ | taś cāpi tathāgatair iyaṁ dhārāṇī bhāṣāṁ āraṇḍhā nāmaḥ saptānāṁ samyaksambuddhakoṭināṁ || om cale cunde svāhā || iyaṁ saptasaptati-samyaksambuddhakoṭibhiruktā nāma dhārāṇī ||

I have made only the most evidently necessary emendations, in consultation of the facsimile edition of a Nepalese manuscript published by Lokesh Chandra (1981), 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 Ārhat 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 dhārāṇī: “Homage to the seven crores of completely awakened ones. Oṃ. CALE CULE, O Cunda SVĀHĀ!” This is the dhārāṇī 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 dhārāṇī reading saptānāṁ samyaksambuddhakoṭināṁ, nāmaḥ cale cunde nāmaḥ is attested in Taishō 1169 (20:678c); that another variant nāmaḥ saptānāṁ samyaksambuddhakoṭināṁ [sic], om cale cude cunde is attested in the same text (20:686b); that the Javanese version of the dhārāṇī 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 dhārāṇī being uttered by
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 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 dharmmāḥ] hetu-prabhavā hetun teṣān tathāgato hy avadat- teṣāṁ ca yo nirodha ोevamvādi mahāśramaṇaḥ || namah saptānām samyaksaṃvuddhakoṭinām tadyathā cale cunde svāhā || namo (2) [ta](thāga)tāyārhave samyakṣa(m)vuddhāya tadyathā ोakṣa 298 ोakṣasya-yapunyajñānasaṁbhāropacite svāhā || namo bhagavate ratnaśikhine tathā-gatāyārhave samyaksaṃvuddhāya (3) [ra](tnameyan)ratnasambhave svāhā

Here again we find the ye dharmāḥ formula followed by the Saṃpaṭatisamyaṃbudha-kōṭibhiruktā. Then follows a variant of the mantra that, as we have seen above, forms part of the expanded recension of the dhāraṇī of the Aparimitāyuḥsūtra: tadyathā oṁ puṇyamaḥāpūnya aparim- mitāpyunyā jñānasaṁbhāropacite. I am unable to trace this variant with akṣa akṣa akṣayav9 in any other text. Then follow the words nāmo bhagavate ratnaśikhine tathāgatāyārhave samyaksaṃvuddhāya 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 ratnasambhavā 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 Ratnaśikhin is attested in the Chinese canon.

6. Two mañḍala 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 yuqie dajiao Zunna pusa daming chengjiu yigui jing 持明藏瑜伽大教尊那菩提大明成就儀軌經, “Sūtra of ritual rules for the accomplishment of the great spell of the Bodhisattva Cundā, a great yoga teaching from the Vidyādhara-piṭaka”) 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 Qijuzhi fomu suoshuo Zhunti tuoluoni jing 七俱胝佛母所説准提陀羅尼經 (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 Mahāpratisarasāmakeśvīdayārājñī (Hidas 2012: 46). See also Cruyssen 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: 66–7. 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

Figure 10. Photo OD 21151. Courtesy of Leiden University Library.

100 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 aksaras 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(ā)nala hana daha pa(ca) ma(tha) bhaṇja raṇa hūṃ (phaṭ:)
vajra[n]a[tri bandha]101 (2) sarvavavighnā: svāhā, °oṃ hulu hulu hūṃ phaṭ, °oṃ druṃ vandha hāṃ h(vana)ḥ (3) bajrapāse hūṃ.102 °oṃ vajra-yakṣa hūṃ, °oṃ vajraśi(kha)re ṛt (maṭ:), (4) (h)ū(m) vajra(k)rmma hūṃ °oṃ bājraklī kīlaya hūṃ phaṭ, hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ (5) hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ, °oṃ gha gha ghātaya ghātaya sarvavaduṣṭan-phaṭ kīlaya (6) kīlaya sarvavāpān-phaṭ, hūṃ hūṃ hūṃ bājraklī bājradha(7)(ro) jñā-
payati,103 sarvavaduṣṭan- kāyāvāk-cittam (va)jra(8)m: kīlaya hūṃ phaṭ, //

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 Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra. In the context of the ritual eradication by the tantric adept (yogin) of obstructions to his practice, we read a section intermingling ritual instruction with virtually the same mantras that we find on the stone. This section must be quoted here in full along with the editor’s translation (Skorupski 1983: 134–6; trans.: 12–3).104 The mantras corresponding to those in the first paragraph of our inscription are indicated in bold type:

tato vajrānaleṇa mudrāśahitena vighnadahanādiṃkāṃ kuryāt | oṃ vajrānale
hana daha paca matha bhaṇja raṇa hūṃ phaṭ ity udārayet | abhyanta-
ravajrābandhe ’ṅugulivālāgarbe ’ṅuṣṭhavajrām utthitam īyāṃ vajrānalamudrā|
tad anu | vajraṇeti bandha sarvaṃvīghnāṇ iti | mūḍrayuktyā sarvāvignha-
bandhāṃ kuryāt | vajrābandhāṃ baddhvāṅguṣṭhadvayaṃ prāsārya sa-
maṃ dhārayet | vajraṇetrimudrā105 | prāsārītavajrabandhāṃ bhūmyāṃ
pratiśṭhāpyādḥobandhāṃ kuryāt | oṃ vajra ṛḍho me bhava rakṣa sarvān
svāhā | vajrabhairavanatrenā mudrāśahitenordhvabandhāṃ kuryāt | oṃ hulu

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

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

103 bajradha(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 hūṃ to hūṃ throughout. This section is taken over nearly verbatim in the eleventh-century ritual manual entitled Kriyāsangrahapāñjikā, 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 Sarvavajrodaya.

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-band.

Next he says: **Om Vajranetri bind all the obstructions.** He applies the gesture and binds all the obstructions. He makes the vajra-band, stretches the thumbs and holds them evenly. This is the gesture of *Vajranetri*. Placing the outstretched vajra-band on the ground he should bind beneath. He says: **Om Vajra be firm for me, protect all svāhā.**

Applying the gesture of *Vajrabhairavanetra* he should bind above. He says: **Om hulu hulu 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 *Vajrabhairavanetra*. Once more by means of the gesture of *Vajrayakṣa* he should make a new bond beneath, saying: **Om Vajrayakṣa hūṃ.** The gesture of *Vajrayakṣa* is a form of the vajra-āṇja-li with the thumbs outstretched and the forefingers projecting like tusks.

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...
the arms by means of the vajra-fists. This is the gesture of Vajrapāśa.\(^{107}\) 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 Vajraśikharā. He says: OM VAJRAŚIKHARĀ RUT MAṬ. The gesture of Vajraśikharā is the gesture of Vajrayaksā 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 Trilokya-vijaya (Victor over the Threefold World). This is the gesture of Vajrahumkāra.\(^{108}\)

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.\(^{109}\) 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 Vajrapāśā, rather than Skorupski’s Vajrapāśā.

\(^{108}\) 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”.

The second paragraph of the inscription is itself composed of three parts. The first runs from oṁ vajrakīla to phat. Then we find tenfold repetition of huṁ (i.e. the 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 Piṇḍikramasādhana and Sādhanaṃālā, but also in the scripture Guhyasamājatantra, at 14.59 (Matsunaga 1978):

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: “Oṁ gha gha ghātaya sarvaduṣṭān phat kīlaya kīlaya sarvapāpān phat hūm hūm vajra kīlaya vajradhara ājñāpayati kāyavākcittavajraṁ kīlaya hūm phat”. However, in none of the mentioned texts is this mantra combined with oṁ vajrakīla kīlaya hūm phat. It is only in another ritual manual, the Sarvavajrodaya composed by the ninth-century author Ānandagarbha (and the later Kriyāsāṃgrahapāñjikā which seems to be based on it in this section), that I find this combination. In the edition based on a single eleventh-century

110 The fact that the deities Vajrapatākā 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.

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 Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatraya 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 Buddhaghābhya, that is, from the second half of the eighth century.”

112 De la Vallée Poussin (1896: 2, verses 10–13), plus the mantra between stanzas 13 and 14.

113 Bhattacharya 1968, nr. 267 Bhūtaḍāmarasādhana, p. 525.
Nepalese manuscript established by a group of young Japanese scholars, we read as paragraph 37:114

tataḥ khadiravajrakīlakāḥ maṇḍalakone catuṣṭayē vajreṇākotyāḥ |
oṁ vajrakīlā kīlaya sarvavighnam bandha hūm phat ||
ity anena ṭrdayenāśottottaraśatam pariṣayā | vāmavajramuṣṭyā vā pañcasūcikām vajrām ādāyā tēna hūṃkāram udiśrayan maṇḍalakone catuṣṭayē maṇḍalanābhau ca kīlaya sarvāpān 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: “OM Vajra-stake, pin down all obstacles, bind hūṃ 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 hūṃ 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]: “OM GHA GHA strike all ills 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 hūṃ, 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 Anandagarbha” and calls the text “an influential manual that sets out detailed practical guidance for the performance of the initiation ritual taught” in the Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, 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 udirayan** 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 sarvvavighnān vandha hūṃ phāt oṃ

This is (with just two minor variants: the repetition of **vandha** and the displacement of **oṃ** to the end) identical to the text of the **kīlanahṛdaya** “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 *Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā*, 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 dvigunaṁ kṛtvā tena prasūtrayet ||**
**tatredam kīlakahṛdayaṁ bhavati:**
**oṁ vajrakīla kīlaya sarvvavighnān bandha hūṃ phāt ||**

He should pierce a stake of khadira wood into the centre of the maṇḍala. 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: “**Oṃ. Vajra-stake, pin down all obstacles, bind [them] HŪṂ PHĀṬ!”**

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 *Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā*. 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. *digvidikṣav adha ārdhvaṁ 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 algemene en directievergaderingen van het Bataviasch 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.119 This last text, possibly composed in the
ninth century, would probably be old enough to have served as source for our inscrip-
tions.120 Unfortunately, the part corresponding to Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā 6 Deva-
tāyoga 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 Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra and the corresponding
parts of the Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā (see Table 1).
Among these elements, it must first be recalled that items 3 and 4 concern precisely
the passages of the Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra (and Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā)
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
Kriyāsaṅgrahapāñjikā 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
Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra. 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
Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra 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 Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra inspired the rituals during which or with a
view to whose execution these inscriptions were produced.121
Although none of the ritual texts cited here prescribes the use of “stakes”
(kīla) made of stone,122 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 śīma) in contemporary inscriptions (cf. n. 99), it is significant that certain
Indian inscriptions use precisely the word kīlaka to denote cadastral boundary
markers.123 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
Kamahāyānan 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 1. Correspondences between Balinese Buddhist liturgy, *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra “version B”* and the *Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā*

<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 <em>Pañcadaśavajrādevatāstuti</em></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 Vajrajvālānalārka and subsequent meditative procedures</td>
<td>132: 23–27</td>
<td>6.2.1.2–3 (pp. 178–177)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 ṭaκi āhūṁ jaḥ

Another case where the Sarvavajrodaya could be pertinent to Javanese data is furnished by a group of inscriptions containing mantras with the sequence ṭaκi/ī hūṁ 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 oṁ ṭaκi āhūṁ 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 Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṅgraha. However, oṁ ṭaκi āhūṁ jaḥ is attested as such in the Guhyasamājatantra (14.22), which Sundberg does not mention; perhaps more significantly, it is also found in the Sarvavajrodaya, whose ritual system is based on that of the Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṅgraha.

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 ṭaκi, on which basis he concluded that “their mantra is not that of the Ratu Baka gold plate”. It is safe to assume that ṭaκi is intended throughout, and the evidence suggests that the formula ṭaκi āhūṁ jaḥ at the beginning of three of these four short stone inscriptions recording the erection of boundary

time of Śaśāṅka, from West Bengal (Furui 2011: 124, 127); for another Indian example, again from West Bengal, but from the sixth century, using kīlaka next to the term sīmā, see the Mallasārul copper-plate inscription of Vijayasena, ll. 14–16 (Sircar 1965: 375–6; Mukherjee and Maity 1967: 89 and 93). I thank Ryosuke Furui for the reference to the Mallasārul inscription.

124 This is indeed probably the oldest source (or one of the oldest sources) for mantras using the element ṭaκi. We find in this text the following mantras (section numbers after Horiuchi’s edition, which reads huṁ for hūṁy: āhūṁ ṭaκki jjaḥ (662), ṭaκki ah, ṭaκki jjaḥ, ṭaκki āhūṁ (927), oṁ ṭaκki jjaḥ (1229). Note that this text everywhere seems to give the bijas 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 See 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 ṭaκki āhūṁ jaḥ and ṭaκki jjaḥ hoh, 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 Cruïjsen et al. (forthcoming, n. 46).
markers served the purpose of removing obstacles. For at Sarvavajrodaya section 56, we read (Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai 1986–87: 267):

atyanantirvighnam kartukāmena mṛttikayā pracchādanīyāh | evam api
yadi vighnaṁ kurvantī | vajraḥuṁkārayogam kṛtvā ṭakkirājenākṛṣya
vajraṁkūsādhibhir apy ākarsanādikam kṛtvā vajraḥuṁkāram baddhīvā
vānapādena vighnapratikṛtim ākramya HŪM VAM HŪM ityādivivarḍhanayogat
pratyālīḍhāpādāvasthitō “nṛtarāntā ca meghādyabhimukhām tām mudrām
kṣīpet | gaganodāraspharaṇapāḍaṭvālakulaprabhena vajraḥuṁkāreṇa
pādapahārābhīghāṭena meghādikām bhasmikṛyamāṇam129 cintayet |
evam ghātītā 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] Vajraḥuṁkāra and adduct them with the Ṭakkirāja; should also adduct them etc. with the Vajra-goads etc.; should bind the [seal of] Vajraḥuṁkāra; 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 pratyālīḍha 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 Vajraḥuṁkāra 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 ōm ōm jahi is explicitly called sarvatathāgatāṭakkirājamahākrodha “the great wrath of all Tathāgatas who is [named] Ṭakkirāja”, it seems that ṭakkirājenākṛṣya 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 Gaṇapati (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 Vajraḥuṁkāra, becomes gigantic by uttering hūṃ vam hūṃ, 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 hūṃ taki jahi in the Sarvatathāgatāṭattvasaṁygrahe (Horiuchi 1983: section 662) is likewise that of ākaraṣaṇa “(violent) addiction”.
132 To mention just some of the oldest inscriptions: Balitavan (813 Śaka), Sugih Manek (837 Śaka), Kinarī (849 Śaka); the longer formula is found in the Guluṅ-Guluṇ̇
The fourth stone inscription with $\text{taki jah hūm}$ comprises only a mantra, and has been read $\text{paki hūm jah jah hūm waho}$ $\text{paki hūm jah jah hūm waho}$ (that is, twice $\text{paki hūm jah jah hūm waho}$) by Damais, from a plaster cast kept in Leiden, the whereabouts of the original inscription being unknown. In the Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā (6.2.9, Inui 1992: 139), in a section on the consecration of the Tantric master, I find $\text{om ťakki jah hūm vaṁ hho}$, 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

---

133 Ryugen Tanemura has written to me in an email of 10/08/2012: “The equivalent part of the Sarvavajrodaya, available only in Tibetan, reads $\text{takki dzah ho}$ (= $\text{takki jah ho}$, with $\text{ho}$ a corruption of $\text{hho}$?). The sequence $\text{jah hūm vaṁ hho}$ is a very strong unit in Buddhist tantras. So it is highly likely that $\text{takki jah ho}$ came to be ‘corrected’ or ‘revised’ to $\text{takki jah hūm vaṁ hho}$. Unless we presume that the correspondence between the Javanese mantra inscription and the mantra in the Kriyāsamgrahapañjikā 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  tats  jāh  daḥ  hūṁ  kiṭa  in the lead-bronze inscription from Borobudur already mentioned a few times above.134

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

A small bronze image of Vairocana in vajraparyaṅkāsana and displaying bodhyagrīmudrā 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,135 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) ○ pratiṣṭha dharma pa(jā)(2)yaṁte nāsti dharmah (svabhāvata)(3)ḥ | ye [pra] (tyī)tya (pra)jāna(4)te te jānant(i) dharmanāṁ ○
This is a surprisingly corrupt anuṣṭubh stanza, that I hesitantly restore as follows:136

pratiṣṭha dharmaḥ prajāyante nāsti dharmah svabhāvataḥ | ye pratiṣṭha prajānate te te jānanti dharmanāṁ ||

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 (pratītyasamutpāda). 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 |
pratītyadharmān adhigacchate vidū na cāntadṛṣṭīya karoti niśrayam |
sahetu sapatrayaya dharma jānati ahetu apratrayaya nāsti dharmanā | iti

135 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.
136 Note that pāda a is hypermetrical, while c shows substandard ja-vipulā.
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 dhāranī. The text is found stamped in Siddhamātrākā script on small clay sealings found at Pejeng and (not far from Pejeng) at Blahbatuh, inserted into miniature stūpas of unbaked clay. The reading published by Stutterheim was as follows:138

\[ \text{namah traya(va) savatathāgata tadagantamaṃ jvalajvaladhamadhā ālasam-} \]
\[ \text{harasamhara āyussamsādha āyussamsādha savasatvānāṃ pāpaṃ sarvathā-} \]
\[ \text{gata samantāsṛ̥th)a vimalasuddha svāhā} \]

This text can now be identified as the Vimaloṣṇīṣadhāraṇī. 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):

\[ \text{tadyathā oṁ nāmas traṇyaḥvikānām sarvathāgatāhṛdayagarbhe jvala} \]
\[ \text{dharmanām sarvātmanāṃ pāpaṃ sarvātmanāṃ vimalasuddha svāhā} \]

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,

137 From Stutterheim’s wording in 1929, it is unclear whether he knew only one or more than one specimen. It becomes clear from Stutterheim’s 1931 contribution that multiple small stūpas have been found containing seals with this text, sometimes together with a seal showing the ve dharmāh formula.

138 It was repeated verbatim by Machi Suhadi as well as Putu Budiastra and Wayan Widia (1980–81: 56).

139 Several specimens, often with significant variant readings, are found on pp. 332–4 of the 2005 reprint of this study; see p. 339 for addenda mentioning a specimen from Ratnagiri.
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) madhātugarbhe saṁhara saṁhara ā-
(4) yus sa(m̄)sodha (ā)yus saṁsodha140
(5) sarvasatvānāṁ pāpa(m) sarvata-
(6) thāga(ta)samantoṣṇīṣa(vi)-
(7) malaś(u)ddhe śvāhā141

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:

(1) nama(s tre)ya(dhva)sarvatathā-
(2) gatahrdayagarbhe jvala jvala dha-
(3) madhātugarbhe saṁhara saṁhara ā-
(4) yus sa(m̄)sodha (ā)yus saṁsodha140
(5) sarvasatvānāṁ pāpa(m) sarvata-
(6) thāga(ta)samantoṣṇīṣa(vi)-
(7) malaś(u)ddhe śvāhā141

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:

140 All other versions have twice or only once saṁsodhaya, and I assume that this word form is intended here twice too, instead of saṁsodha and saṁsodha.
141 An anonymous reviewer has added the observation that this dhāraṇī was used as a personal protective spell by the Palola Sāhi Navasurendrāyanandī 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 strṛyadhe. 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 dhāraṇī] 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 [dhāraṇī-deity] who bear as womb the dharma-relic: destroy, destroy [the evil]! Purify life, purify life! O [you dhāraṇī-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 dhāraṇī 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):

\[\text{ity api sa bhagavān arhan samyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasāmpannaḥ sugatālokovavidyanuttaraḥ paruşadasyumāraśuradevamanusyāṇāṁ niddho bhagava–}\]

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 bhagavāṁ tathāgato 'rhan sanyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasāmpannaḥ sugatālokovāntataraḥ paruṣadamyaśāratiḥ śāstā devamanusyāṇāṁ 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,
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 hriḥ oṁ jayāta svāhā oṁ ṣadavitā svāhā oṁ dhū hum jaya svāhā namaḥ
(2) trailokyāvijayāmoghapāsāpratihato hriḥ haḥ ḫī ḫūm
(3) oṁ phat kriḥ hriḥ 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 upahṛdayamantra of the Amoghapāśahṛdayadhāraṇī 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, hṛdayamantra, upahṛdayamantra, 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. 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 Amoghapāsahṛdaya would circulate, it is to be known that on that spot of earth, O Blessed One, 12 × 100,000 devaputras, headed byĪśvaras, Mahēśvaras 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 Amoghapāsahṛdaya will circulate will become a highly honored sacred place.

We may hence assume that our inscription represents the epitome of the dhāraṇī, 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 Amoghapāsahṛdaya, any emphasis on “writing down” the text.

Conclusion

I have presented a fairly wide range of Indonesian inscriptions citing gāthās, mantras and dhāraṇīs, 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 dhāraṇī 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 Aparamitāyuhṣūtra, the Bodhigarbhalamkāralaksadhāraṇī, the Bhadracarīpranidhāna, the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, and the Vimaloṣṭhādhāraṇī. More tentative identifications have involved the Kārandaṭavyāha, the Mahāpratisarāmahāvidyārājīni, the Sarvadurgatipariṣodhanatantra 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 Mahāpratisarāmahāvīrājñī, 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 dhāraṇī inscriptions, and has tended to answer in the affirmative. See e.g. Schopen’s discussion of inscriptions with the Vimaloṣṇīṣadhāraṇī (1985 [2005]: 336):

The identification of the dhāraṇī 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 Bodhgayā and Nālandā in Bihar, and at Gilgit. It could, of course, be argued that only the dhāraṇī itself was known and available in these places. But that is difficult to maintain since a knowledge of the dhāraṇī by itself cannot account for the fact that the dhāraṇī 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 contain this dhāraṇī 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 Amoghapāśahydāya 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 dhāraṇīs 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 dhāraṇīs in their respective source texts, different 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 dhāraṇīs 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 similar 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”.

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 thirteenth century, to be published in Griffiths forthcoming (§1.2). The source text there is the Hevajraṭaṇtra.
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 *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*, 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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