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Volume One

This volume is devoted to an introduction to my edition of the poem of the Sutasoma.

Taking as a point of departure Rassers' theory of the origin of the wayang, and without going any deeper into this question, I have attempted to solve the problem of the relationship between the kakawin Sutasoma and the wayang, and suggest that the Sutasoma is a pakem (wayang handbook for a puppeteer) intended to be performed as a shadow-play to give instruction to Buddhist devotees in their search for salvation.

Further, I have sought a relationship between the form of the kakawin which comprises jatakas etc., and that of the reliefs of stories about Buddha on the walls of the Borobudur. I have endeavoured to prove a close relationship, and ventured the hypothesis that the stories on the walls of the Borobudur constitute a frame-story, a form which is very popular in Buddhist narrative art in Java as well as in other countries, and suggested that Mpu Tantular might have taken this as a model for his kakawin. I have then gone further into the question of the Javanese Mahayana Buddhism, especially the Wajrayana sect, basing my discussion on the relationship between Ciwa and Buddha.

Kern, who first put forward the theory of the blending of Ciwa - Buddha, says that both in a higher sense are One. Though as will be seen I do not accept this theory of the blending of Ciwa - Buddha, I would
fully support his view if it is understood in the sense that it applies not only to Qiwaism and Buddha, but also to the Supreme God of Muslims and Christians and other religions, as after all Truth is One and Mankind if One. However, subsequent scholars have continued to support Kern's theory on the basis of the observation that the Balinese today see no difference between Qiwa and Buddha. This prompted me to look more closely at this matter, and I have attempted to trace the development of the relationship between them from the time of the Borobudur down to present day Bali. In so doing, I have established that:

a) from the time of the Borobudur (± eighth century A.D.) till the end of the fourteenth century (Sutasoma), Qiwa was still contrasted to Buddha, but the latter subsequently lost ground due to lack of royal patronage.

b) In the Tantu Panggélaran (end of the Majapahit- era) we see the emergence of a new religious concept, namely that of Qiwa and Buddha as emanations of the Supreme God - Bhatāra Guru, which in all probability derives from the merging of the Javanese Guru and the Indian classical Qiwa. Adwaya Buddhism was no longer studied, and gradually became unknown. Even though today its doctrines can be found in mss, the survival of these mss is due merely to the accident of inheritance. An indication of Wisnuism gaining influence can also be seen.

c) In the Korawāgrāma religious beliefs deviated even further away from Wajrayana Buddhism and classical Qiwaism. Although the notion of the Supreme God remains the same, the name of this Deity changes from Bhatāra Guru to Sang Hyang Sukṣma Eka, and Guru is given a
lower rank. The concept of Ciwa - Buddha as emanations of the Supreme God (Sang Hyang Suksma Eka) is maintained, but Wajrayana Buddhism had become almost extinct. The re-emergence of Wisnuism and the merging of Ciwa or Guru or Mahâdeva with Buddha, resulted in a contrast of Buddha and Wisnu in Java and eventually the present relationship of Ciwa - Buddha in Bali. Therefore it is not surprising that the Balinese of today see no difference between Ciwaism and Buddhism. The interpretation of Bubuksah, as a Buddhist Bhairava supports the theory that the understanding of Buddhism in Bali differs from the Wajrayana doctrine as known in Java up to the end of the fourteenth century.

Volume Two

This volume consists of a critical edition of text A of the kakawin Sutasoma with the variae lectiones and an index of proper names occurring in the text.

Volume Three

This volume contains appendices including an English translation of the kakawin and notes on it. Some of the note on it. Some of the notes are rather elaborate and could be better called commentaries. I would like to mention one example, that is the note on boddhyagrimudrâ. Moens asserts that this boddhyagrimudrâ is perhaps the mudrâ of the Buddhist monk referred to by Brandes, however, I have discovered that the hand movements of the boddhyagrimudrâ are in all probability those of the boddhyagrimudra (chi-ken-in) combined with those known as the goshin-in in Japan, whereas the mudrâ of the Buddhist monk is the mudrâ of the Six Elements in
Tibet. But since the chi-ken-in is identical to the 
mudrā of the Six Elements, it only highlights the fact 
that Buddhism came to Japan through two routes, namely 
Tibet-China-Japan and Korea-Japan.
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For the Indonesian people of today, the phrase bhinneka tunggal ika (unity in diversity) is a magic one of great significance and it embraces the sincere hope of the whole nation in its struggle to become great, united in the framework of an Indonesian Pañcasilaist community. And those who know the origin of those words will not be surprised when I say that they have filled my heart with indescribable feelings given me a sincere desire to attempt to convey their full significance to my people.

These words are to be found in the poem Sutasoma upon which my thesis is based. This poem is still widely used among the Balinese people for their example and guidance, and is not less important than the wedas and other epics such as Râmâyana, Bhâratayuddha, Arjunawîhâha and so on. It is hoped that my research will form a useful contribution to its study and a clearer understanding of its teaching.

I feel I should mention here some of my old teachers, in the full sense of the word guru, who have patiently dedicated themselves to the task of planting and nurturing love and dedication towards knowledge within me. Indeed my main wish is to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation to the following:

I cannot find words to describe the deep relationship that exists between me and Prof. Dr Tjan Tjoe Siem. Perhaps the Suluk Wudjil¹ could provide

¹ Poerbatjaraka, Geh., p.4, st. 9-10.
some idea, inadequate as it may be. However I will not attempt a quotation or a translation into English for fear that some of the meaning may subsequently be lost or misunderstood.

This Suluk Wudjil was published by Prof. Dr Poerbatjaraka, known to his students as Pak Poerba. In choosing this work to find words of tribute to Prof. Tjan Tjoem Siem, I wish also to express my reverence to Pak Poerba, but words such as devotion, tribute and so on can never fully express the meaning of the Javanese word sungkem, which alone express my feelings towards Pak Poerba. It was he who encouraged my decision to persevere in the field of Oldjavanese philology.

During the few years that I have had the honour of associating with Prof. Dr A.H. Johns, my admiration for him has grown day by day, and in my gratitude to him for all his kindness and assistance I can only say simply matur nuwun, as it is impossible to find other words to express my feelings.

Dr Sutjipto Wirjosuparto has a special claim on my gratitude, because he was one of my teachers at grammar school, and is once again guiding me on the last stages of this thesis.

To Prof. Dr P.J. Zoetmulder I owe the greatest debt of gratitude for his constant encouragement and patient attention towards my work. It was an unforgettable honour to have access to his library whenever I wished.

It would take far too long to mention all the people for whom I have a great regard and owe a debt of gratitude, and I feel too that no list could ever be sufficiently adequate. Yet I want to express my thanks to Mrs N. Young and her staff and Mrs D. Smith for their share in this undertaking.
Finally - although it may seem ludicrous - I would like to express my thanks to the Indonesian National Revolution, as it is only due to its outbreak and success that I had the opportunity to study at the University. And accordingly I express my reverence to the heroes of the struggle for independence in general, particularly to my colleagues from the Students Army (Det. II, Be. 17) who fell in battle. May Allah the Merciful and Compensionate give them mercy and peace! Amīn! Amīn! Yâ Rabbu'l-'ālamin...
CHAPTER I

A DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS OF THE SUTASOMA-KAKAWIN
AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE EDITION OF TEXT A

1) The text:

A This text was originally edited by I Bagus Sugriwa and published in stencil by Penerbit Pustaka Bali Mas, Denpasar - Bali, in 22 volumes, each consisting of approximately one hundred pages. This edition is written in Balinese characters with a Roman transcription in accordance with Balinese tradition. It is accompanied by translation into modern Balinese and Bahasa Indonesia.

B 1) This is codex or.3716 according to Sup., p.140. I obtained two photographic copies of this version, each consisting of five microfiches. The first copy is clear at the sides but very often too dark in the middle. The second copy is clear in the middle but too light at the sides. The arrangement of the pages in microfiche No.3 is erratic. Each microfiche contains three rows of lontars. The first four contain 54 lontar-leaves each, on each of which in turn are four lines of script. The fifth only has fifteen lontars of four lines each. Although the script is extremely clear as in the case of C, in general this version is in a poor condition and very hard to read. In many places it is extremely dirty and where holes have been repaired its general condition has not been

1 Prof. Zoetmulder of Jogjakarta kindly loaned me mss B to J.
I - The text

improved, in fact in some parts it has become even more illegible. Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written in the Javanese style.
b) the lajar is still written above the following letter.
c) no numbers are given for the songs.
d) the page numbers are in Balinese.
e) there is no interlinear translation in Balinese.
f) there are no signs of examination or correction by Dutch scholars.
g) there is no colophon.

Codex or. 2211 according to Cat., p. 393. It consists of five microfiches. The first four contain 54 lontars of four lines each, while the fifth contains only forty lontars of four lines and one (on the last page) only one and a half lines. It is in Balinese script which is, for the most part quite clear. However, in some places it is hardly legible. Certain parts have been omitted; in all probability, the copyist found the original he was copying from unclear. Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written as usual in Balinese.
b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned, but very often it is written with the letter $\hat{\eta}$, especially at the end of the line or sentence, for example:

$$\text{dulur - dulur} : \text{the first } r \text{ is written with a lajar, whereas the second } r \text{ is written with a } \hat{\eta}. $$
c) there are no signs of examination by Van der Tuuk.
d) the cantos are not numbered.
The text

e) there is no interlinear translation in Balinese.
f) the metres are not named.
g) the colophon is very short, being merely:
   Ithi Sutasomakathå, telås sinurat.

D Codex or. 4525 according to Sup., p.142.
   It is a 35 mm. microfilm about 455 cm. long. Juynboll states that it has 197 pages. On studying it however, I discovered that it has 201 pages and is in fact a copy of codex 3716 (B). It is written in large clear Balinese script on a lined notebook. In general each page consists of 25 lines, the last page having 17 lines.

Other characteristics:
   a) the pangkon is written as usual in Balinese.
   b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
   c) the numbers of the cantos and names of the metres are not always given.
   d) the stanza-numbers are given according to their position in the canto.
   e) there is no colophon.
   f) there are signs of corrections made in the text and some marginal notes have been added.

E Codex or. 4522 according to Sup., p.141.
   It is a 35 mm. microfilm, about 450 cm. long. It is copied from a manuscript from Mengwi and written in the year 1780. Çaka and consists of 193 pages foolscap. The story covers about 191 pages and the last two pages contain a very elaborate but incomplete colophon; the last sentence ends with a comma. On the left hand side of the last page is written in Dutch Origineel uit Mengwi, but on the right
side kadi sa ...... and so on is unreadable. This ms. is in Balinese script. Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written as usual in Balinese.
b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
c) there is no interlinear translation.
d) there are signs of corrections made in the text and many marginal notes.

Codex or. 4523 according to Sup., p.141.

It is a 35 mm. microfilm, 530 cm. long; consisting of 137 pages, with approximately 30 lines on each page. A marginal note indicates that it should consist of only 130 pages, but the repetition of some parts has increased the number of pages. It was copied by Dr Van der Tuuk himself in Roman script. I find the handwriting of Van der Tuuk more difficult to read than the Balinese script. Other characteristics:

a) the dots of s, n, t, etc., which are usually placed under the letter concerned in transcription, are placed above them by Van der Tuuk, e.g.,

s, n, t.

b) the ç is written ş.
c) canto and stanza numbers are given.
d) in some cases, the name and the guru-laghu of the metre are given.
e) there is no interlinear translation.

Codex or. 4526. It is a 35 mm. microfilm, 440 cm. long consisting of 197 folio pages. The first page contains 40 lines, while the other pages contain only 39 lines each. The story is incomplete and ends rather abruptly, as follows: kumēlab tê ...... Other characteristics:
a) it is written in very legible Balinese script, even better than D.
b) the pangkon is written as usual in Balinese.
c) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
d) marginal notes have been added by a later hand.
e) there is an interlinear translation in Balinese.

Codex or. 4524. It is also a 35mm. microfilm and 445 cm. long, consisting of 202 folio pages, with 24 lines on each.

It is very legible, almost as good as J.

Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written in Balinese style.
b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
c) the canto and stanza numbers are written in Arabic numerals.
d) there is no interlinear translation.
e) a large number of the metre names are given.
f) corrections and marginal notes have been added.
g) it is unfinished.

Codex or. 4527. It is a 35 mm. microfilm, about 80 cm. long, consisting of 34 folio pages, with 34 lines on each page, except the last page which has only 18 lines.

It is in a readable Balinese script, though not such a good style as the others. Juynboll says that the ms. is from Karangasém, but at the end there is a note in Dutch stating that the ms. is copied from one originating from Manguryyan. Manguryyan is another form of Mengwi. So it could be that this ms. has been copied from E.

Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written in Balinese style.
b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
I - Principles

c) cantos and stanzas are already numbered.
d) corrections have been added in the form of marginal notes.
e) there is an interlinear translation in Balinese.
f) in some cases the name of the metre is given.

J

Codex or. 4528. It is a 35 mm. microfilm, about 200 cm. long, consisting of 87 folio pages with 33 lines on each, except the last page which has only one line. The catalogue of Juynboll states, that this ms. dates from 1788 A.D. It seems that this ms. is the continuation of G, because a) it begins exactly at the point where G ends, i.e., G ends on the words kumelab té .... while J begins with - ngran ...... So the first syllable of the word téngran is in G, while the second one is in J. It joins perfectly; and b) the script is very similar. Other characteristics:

a) the pangkon is written in Balinese style.
b) the lajar is placed over the letter concerned.
c) there is an interlinear translation in Balinese.
d) there is a colophon.

2) Principles:

My decision to use text A as the basis of my edition is based on the following considerations:

a) text A is the most complete ms. Only four stanzas are missing and this can be easily remedied with the aid of other mss.

b) on the whole, A is far and away the most accurate version, except in a few cases where only F has a sound reading although very often misspelt.

c) If we study the relationship between the mss it becomes evident that A, G, and J belong to a
group in which the year 1788 Çaka occurs in the
colophon (J), whereas the remainder, among which is ms.
E, give the year 1780 Çaka in the colophon.

d) A has indeed already been published in
stencilled form by I Bagus Sugriwa and this means that
it is quite widely known, although it has not been
subjected to a detailed comparison with other versions.
A critical edition of A therefore, will be of use to
quite a large public.

In this day and age, editing an Oldjavanese
manuscript cannot be classed as pioneering work, for
there are a few examples already in existence that one
can use as a guide. However, this does not mean that
it is an easy job, as the work of the pioneers lacks
uniformity. It therefore falls upon a present day
editor to organise the numerous signals and landmarks
provided by his predecessors into a clear system of
signposts. After a deep consideration, I have
formulated the following principles:

a) in transcription from the Balinese syllabary I
have laid greater emphasis upon clarity in meaning than
on preservation of the outer form of the metre, e.g.,
since in the expression pupusing gedang ing is a
preposition rather than an affix, I separate ing from
pupus and write it pupus ing gedang. The meaning is
clearer, although the metre is obscured. Another
example is the word narendrātmaja when it occurs at the
end of a line. If, according to the context, it means
princess, even though the manuscript shows a short final
a, I render it ā in the transcription. In this case the
metre is unaffected.

b) inconsistency in spelling is weeded out, except
in a few cases where the metre is involved, such as
Hawangga and Awangga. For cases of this sort, if the preceding word ends in a consonant, before Hawangga it is guru (long) and before Awangga it is laghu (short). Porusāda and Purusāda are likewise not normalised for the same reason. Porusāda occurs where a guru in the first syllable is needed, while Purusāda occurs where laghu is needed.

c) erratic spelling of Sanskrit words is corrected in accordance with the spelling in J and KBW, because of the possibility that these words may not be directly derived from classical Sanskrit forms, as changes may have already occurred in the meantime.

d) words such as: ni(ng), nira, ira, nika, ikâ etc., are separated from the preceding words.

e) i(ng). If it functions as a preposition it is separated from, but if it is an affix it is connected to the preceding word.

f) -nta, -ngku, etc., are treated as affixes.

g) although ང is retained for nj, for reasons of practicality ང is represented as ng.

h) variae lectiones follow the text in transcription. Where A has been amended, or a reading from a different ms. has been chosen, this is marked by an asterisk and the reference or explanation footnoted. As there are virtually no unfamiliar technical terms in the text, a list is not provided. On the other hand, an index of proper names is provided to serve the reader from possible confusion in some places.

i) the translation follows the text as closely as possible without doing violence to the norms of English

---

d.e.f.g. were decided after a study of the spelling of more than 30 publications of Oldjavanese works.
grammar and idiom. Notes are provided in cases where my understanding of a word deviates from the general meaning as it is found in the standard dictionaries and other sources.
CHAPTER II

SUTASOMA AND THE WAYANG

For a long time scholars believed that the wayang (shadow-play), an important part of the Javanese theatre was autochtonic Indonesian,¹ until some decades ago certain articles appeared which threw some doubt on it. These articles were based only on the existence of a form of Indian drama called chayanataka (literally 'shadow performance').² This aroused opposition on the part of the defenders of the older hypothesis. A. Rentse says:

the shadow play theatre is found in many places in Asia from China to Turkey, but nowhere has it been found developed to such a high cultural standard as in the Malay Archipelago. Perhaps it did not originate in Java, in which case we shall probably have to follow the traces of Animism and Shamanism back into Central Asia to find the place where the shadow play originated.³

C. Holt goes even further. After studying the data concerning the dating etc., of a shadow theatre in various countries, e.g., Thailand as early as 1458 A.D.; China as early as the eleventh century, she concludes as follows:

wherever its technique may have originated, the Indonesian wayang kulit also is a uniquely Javanese and Balinese creation - in the form and contents of its plays, in the style of its extraordinary puppets and in the manner of presentation by the story teller, the 'Venerable Dalang'.⁴

---

¹ Rassers, Jav., p.98.
² Ibid., p.104. See also A Rentse, Ori., p.12.
³ A. Rentse, Ori., p.15.
⁴ C. Holt, Art., p.131.
I wish to raise two questions, the first being: if the shadow theatre originated in India, why is it completely extinct there now,\(^1\) whereas it is flourishing in Indonesia? 'Flourish' is the operative word here, as the wayang is also still popular in parts of Kalimantan and Sumatra, and even in the Malay peninsula, not withstanding Rassers statement in an article written in 1931 that it was found exclusively in Java and Bali.\(^2\) In an article on the wayang kulit in Kelantan, A. Rentse says, that the Wayang Kelantan originated from Java and Siam, the latter in turn also originated from Java. It was brought from Java to Kelantan only about one hundred years ago, but it is dying now, killed by Western ideas and especially, by the cinemas.\(^3\) The answer in the case of India, as in that of Kelantan is may be because its roots were not strong enough, whereas in Indonesia, still possibly the land of its origin, in general it has been able to withstand the assault of the western culture.

The second question concerns the lakons or dramas for which this theatre was the medium. Notwithstanding the existence of a kind of wayang theatre in ancient India, the nature of the lakons supports the theory of an autochthonous origin to the Javanese wayang. Even Rassers remains of the opinion that from a structural point of view they are, undoubtedly purely native to Java. He points out in this connection that all lakons, although they differ widely from each other in content, have fundamentally a similar structure, as it were, one

1 Rassers, Jav., p.104.
2 Ibid., p.105.
3 Rentse, Kel., p.300.
type. They were apparently constructed to a definite plan, their form being determined by an ancient tradition, which in Hazeu's opinion was certainly Pre-Hindu.\(^1\) In this matter Rassers had no disagreement with Hazeu's findings and used them to support his own argument - which they do quite well - that the lakons constitute a single literary type which has its source in a classification system.\(^2\)

Before discussing further the nature of this structure, it is useful to look at their themes, so that it will become clear how the lakon came to be cast into the form it has. Poerbatjaraka has already written as follows about the theme of a lakon:

> the fear of the good party of an apparent or temporary victory of the bad party. The good or right party has recourse to a Higher Power; the right party then assisted by the Higher Power wages a fight against the bad or evil party which concludes in the defeat of the evil party and the victory of the right one.\(^3\)

From this opposition of right against evil, arises the use of the term right as synonymous with good and left as synonymous with evil which is expressed further in the arrangement of the wayang-puppets right and left of the dalang, although the distinction of good and evil becomes obscured by the fact that some of the good or noble figures (mostly the ones small in size such as the women-puppets) are situated on the left or at least regarded as belonging to the left. The reason for these disturbing facts is, according to most dalangs I interviewed on the matter, simply that there are too many small figures on the ksatriya (right) - side, while there are too few on the demonic (left) - side.
So the main theme of the wayang-lakon (the night-long staged story of the shadow theatre) is the confrontation of good and evil. In the first phase, the good seems in danger of defeat because it faces an enemy greater than itself or powerful enemies allied together. But the moral of the story is that good always defeats evil.

This main theme is the basic reason for the form the wayang-lakon takes. Each performance is divided into three parts and this division is also expressed in the lara and the patet of the accompanying music.

The first stage is between 9 p.m. - 12 midnight, and the patet is six. The second stage is between 12 midnight - 3 a.m., and the patet is nine. The third stage is between 3 a.m. - 6 a.m., and the patet is manjura.

For the first stage the performance consists of:

a) 1. an audience with the king of the good party. The matter discussed is for example: the disappearance of a prince or princess; the wedding of a daughter which involves a competition or the proposal of an unacceptable suitor; an advancing enemy or bad news from a friendly country. This scene is followed by a scene of the king returning to the palace, stopping at the gate and being welcomed by his queen(s) etc. The following scene is then related by the dalang.

2. the scene at the royal square, where the commander briefs his subordinates and orders them to carry out the commands of the king.

3. the marching out of the army.

b) 1. an audience with a king from abroad, usually representing the hostile party, with the first party mentioned in a. As a matter of fact the king
intends to attain the object mentioned in a, or intends to attack the first kingdom (e.g., he desires the hand of the daughter of the king mentioned in a, or intends to marry the same princess etc.).

2. the scene at the royal square as above and the marching out of the army to carry out the commands of the king. This party need only consist of one enemy, but to make the plot more complicated there are sometimes two, three or even more. If this happens, scene b.1. and b.2. are performed one after the other.

3. the army of party a. meets the army of party b. They do battle. The result is always indecisive, so this battle is called the perang gagal (indecisive battle). There are no fatalities but often a few wounded, because at this stage the time of killing has not yet come. It is now midnight, a crucial time of the night, just as middle age is a crucial time of life. This is the moment when the first stage ends.

The second stage of the performance consists of:

a) 1. the appearance of the hero of the story, very often accompanied by his attendants. Usually he is in a sad mood, in the wood or at a hermitage asking the advice of an ascetic.

2. leaving the hermitage, or in the wood while praying or contemplating, the hero is disturbed by demons of the hostile party. A fight breaks out and the demons are destroyed. Only their attendants survive and they run back to their home country to report the failure of their mission. Victims now fall in battle. To ease the tension, the dalang alternates fighting scenes with those presenting humourous actions and clowning on the part of the hero's attendants. The battle between a
ksatriya and demons which can be performed beautifully by a skilled dalang, is called the perang kembang (decorative battle). Very often the skill of a dalang can be judged by the spectators merely by his presentation of this perang kembang.

These acts (c.1. and c.2.) may last for two or three hours, depending on the development of the fight, e.g., the hero (say Abimanju) faces very many enemies, so Gatotkatja (the nephew of Abimanju) comes to his aid. It ends with the defeat of the evil party and the hero proceeds on his intended journey to the city. There the story develops towards it denouement which takes place in the third stage.

The third stage of the performance consists of the continuation and complication of the plot which culminates in the decisive battle between the good and evil party, with the final victory on the side of the good party, because all means and conditions needed for the conclusion have already been revealed in the first and second stages. *1)

In conclusion, the arrangement of a lakon can be outlined as follows:

Act one   : a.1. and a.2.
Act two   : b.1., b.2. and b.3.
Act three : c.1. and c.2.
Act four  : consists of scenes, alternating of audiences in the palace of the first king or one of the kings of the good party, and battles.

*1 Further variations see Kats, Jav.
2) Kakawin Sutasoma

This general outline of the structure of a lakon has suggested to me the strong possibility that the kakawin Sutasoma originated as a lakon was designed for performance. This is for the following reasons:

a) the composition of the story. If Poerbatjaraka felt justified in saying that the Arjunawiwaha was a wayang-lakon\(^1\) merely because the plot corresponds with the main theme of the wayang, the kakawin Sutasoma has a far stronger claim. It can be easily cast into the mould described above. The first part (the disappearance of Sutasoma up to his return to Hastina) has a great similarity to the Arjunawiwaha,\(^2\) and the second part to the Bratayuda wayang-lakon. I mean that the first part may be performed as a complete wayang-lakon during one night, and the second part likewise or, just as the Bratayuda, may be divided into several lakons and performed separately and successively. To test this point, I arranged the kakawin into two wayang-lakons and asked Mr Blassius Hardjowardojo of Malang (east-Java), a famous dalang in his younger years, and experienced in composing wayang-lakons to be performed by himself,\(^3\) whether or not he could perform them, since the wayang-lakons usually consists of the

---

1 Poerbatjaraka, Arj., p.4.
2 See Sutasoma-wiwaha, act. VI, 1.
3 He has composed and performed many wayang-lakons, including some derived from the Old Testament. It is unfortunate that his pioneering work was never published. His son - Reverend Hardjawardaja - later introduced the use of gamelan-music in Catholic churches in Semarang diocese.
main theme only (the balungans) without the djanturan, tjarita etc.\(^1\)

After studying them he declared that any dalang could perform them and complement the djanturan, tjarita etc., which are stereotyped.

b) some parts or motifs of the story are very similar to episodes of wayang-stories, e.g.:

1. the temptation of Sutasoma is analogous to that of Arjuna in the Arjunawiwaha. Poerbatjaraka says that Mpu Tantular took over this part of the Arjunawiwaha\(^2\) in toto.

2. the disappearance of a hero, just as prince Sutasoma disappears is a very common wayang-episode.\(^3\)

3. the battle between king Daçabâhu and the king-brothers of Magadha and Awângga is very similar to that between Bima and king Bomawikata and Wikataboma in the Bratayuda. And in the presentation of the battle there are striking similarities with the struggle of Hanuman against Indrajit and the demons of Lëngka.

\(^1\) djanturan: parts of the wayang-lakon which are recited by the puppeteer and without a musical accompaniament e.g., the dialogue between host and guest, lamentations.

\(^2\) Poerbatjaraka, Kap., p.43.

\(^3\) See e.g., 'lakon Narasoma, Bambang Kumbajana' and others.
4. the wedding of prince Sutasoma and Citrawati is very similar to that of Arjuna and Subadra.

c. the description of the personalities of the characters is very vivid, as though the author were drawing on the characters of the Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa or the combination of several characters in one, to create his own heroes. It is well known that some figures in the Mahābhārata are regarded as identical to certain of those in the Rāmāyaṇa, so for example:

Krīṣṇa is identical to Rāma
Arjuna is identical to Laksmana
Bima is identical to Hanuman etc.

Thus Tantular's action need not be regarded as unusual. We may note further for example that:

1. Prince Sutasoma appears to be a combination of Yudhisthira and Arjuna, or more striking, like Pāṇdu or Rāma.

2. King Daçabāhu is very similar to king Balarama (Baladewa); the story reveals that king Daçabāhu is actually the son of Brahmā, so that he is called Brahmāja, Dhātratanaya etc. Balarama is likewise regarded as the spiritual son and pupil of god Brahmā.

3. King Pōrusāda is described as the demon king of Lēṅka, that is the notorious king Rāwana of the Rāmāyaṇa. In the Mahābhārata, the figure of Boma (Narakasura) fits this description. One exceptional point should be mentioned which bears no resemblance to the Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, or other Hindu
epics, this is that Prince Sutasoma never kills an enemy. This is a strong indication that the author was a learned and devout Buddhist.

A. Sutasomawāha (canto I - canto XCIII)

Below, I have set out the Sutasoma kakawin in the form of two lakons, so that the nature of the structure is quite clear.

Act One+1)

1. The audience of Hastina

King Mahaketu is waited upon by the minister Jayendra and the priest Mahosadi. The king discusses with them the disappearance of the crown prince - Raden Sutasoma - during the night, presumably because he is undesirous of marriage and being crowned king. The reverend Mahosadi consoles the king by reciting teachings from the wedas, and he regains his composure. Then it is decided that a search-party should be sent out under the leadership of the minister Jayendra and that a message be sent to the king of Kaqi, a nephew of king Mahaketu, requesting aid in the search. On the dismissal of his audience, the king returns to his inner quarters.

2. In the royal square

The minister makes preparations, and afterwards set out with the search-party.

1 The term act and scene are introduced here to indicate the difference between djedjeran (act) and adegan (scene). There is still confusion in the use of these terms as djedjer can in fact only mean the first scene. See the story of the marriage of Angkavi jaya, included in the Religion of Java, pp.265-6, see C. Geertz, Rel.
Act Two

1. The audience of Awângga

King Dewantaka is seated in the audience hall with his younger brother king Koçapati of Magadha, waited upon by the entire army. King Koçapati informs his brother that his proposal for the hand of princess Citrawatî of Kaçî has been refused, and so he is compelled to ask the assistance of his brother to take the princess by force. King Dewantaka agrees and says that in the event of failure, they can still rely on the assistance from king Porusâda of Râtnakanda.¹)

2. In the royal square

The army of Awângga and Magadha makes preparations, then sets out for Kaçîpura.

3. The perang gagal (indecisive battle)

The army of Hastina en route to Kaçî meets with the army of Awângga. Both refuse to let the other pass and so a battle ensues. The army of Awângga is dispersed and takes refuge in the forest. The army of Hastina proceeds on its way.

Act Three

1. In the forest

Raden Sutasoma is in meditation. Batari Durgga (Widyutkaralî) the goddess of the forest appears before him and advises him to meditate in a cave in the Himalaya-mountains where god Guru used to meditate in former times. Raden Sutasoma accepts her advice and departs.

¹) This is a deviation from the text made to introduce the alliance between the two kings and king Porusâda at a later stage.
Act Four

1. In the hermitage of the sage Keçawa

The sage Keçawa is waited upon by his pupils and disciples. He orders one of his disciples to make preparations for the arrival of an important guest. The disciple informs him that all is prepared. Soon Raden Sutasoma arrives.

After a warm welcome, the sage asks the prince the reason for his departure from the city, when his duty is in Hastina to give shelter and protection to the world. The prince replies that he wishes to do penance in the Himalayas. He asks the sage to lead him there. The sage consents and departs with the prince, accompanied by some disciples.

Act Five

1. In the hermitage of the seer Sumitra

The seer is waited upon by his disciples, when Raden Sutasoma and his retinue arrived. After it is known that Raden Sutasoma is the crown-prince of Hastina, the sage Sumitra reveals the fact that he is his maternal grandfather. At the request of the prince the sage Sumitra relates:

a) the origin of Raden Sutasoma who is a reincarnation of prince Agrakumara.

b) the origin of king Daçabâhu of Kaçi.

1 In the kakawin the hermitage has no name, in the lakon a name such as Argabelah, Saptarga etc., can be easily improvised.

2 Though other characters may be used, the number of the retinue can be maintained (namely three or four) as in other lakons (Semar and his sons).

3 I suggest Sogatalaja as the name of the priest Sumitra, as he is a Buddhist.
c) the origin of king Porusāda, who is in fact an incarnation of the demon Quciloma who was defeated in battle by prince Agrakumara.

In view of which he argues that Raden Sutasoma should agree to become king of Hastina, so that he can protect the world by killing the demon Porusāda, otherwise the world will perish.

Thus concludes the sage Sumitra, but the prince refuses to be deterred, and the following morning they proceed on their journey to the Himalayas.

2. The journey of Raden Sutasoma

a) the encounter with the demon Gajahwaktra

On his journey Raden Sutasoma encounters an elephant-headed demon, called Gajahwaktra who is a menace to all priests and other beings in the vicinity. The prince advises him to abandon his life of sin, so that he may eventually go to heaven. The demon becomes angry and wishes to devour the prince. Raden Sutasoma defeats Gajahwaktra who finally becomes his disciple. They then proceed on their course.

b) the encounter with the dragon

They meet a huge dragon which intends to swallow the prince. The demon Gajahwaktra in defence of the prince fights ferociously with the dragon. On the advice of the prince, Gajahwaktra applies a certain formula which weakens the power of the dragon. Finally the dragon becomes another disciple of the prince. Again they proceed on their course.
c) the encounter with the lioness

Raden Sutasoma and his retinue stumble upon a cave where an old lioness dwells with her cub. Because of her hunger the old lioness is about to devour her cub. The prince restrains her, because this is a very sinful act, more sinful in fact than a brahmin-murder. The lioness retorts that in time of need, even a child is good food for a mother. The prince asks the lioness to replace the cub with him, a proposal which the lioness welcomes, as the prince is in the prime of life. The lioness quickly attacks the prince and sucks his blood until he dies. After drinking the blood of prince Sutasoma, the lioness becomes calm and very much regrets her act. She feels very sinful and asks Sutasoma's companions to kill her but none of them are willing to do so. Finally she decides to commit suicide.

God Indra appears before the lioness and promises to revive the prince. In a moment it is done. The prince at first reproaches the king of the gods because he is not afraid to die, and therefore not very happy to be revived. God Indra replies that it is not his intention to obstruct the prince in his attempt to reach salvation, but to perfect his merciful aims to the world. For if the prince remains dead, the lioness will commit suicide and there will be no one to care for her cub, which will certainly perish, so that the self-sacrifice of the prince will be to no avail. The prince is reassured by this explanation. God Indra takes his leave and the lioness becomes a disciple of the prince. After being educated in the knowledge of meditation and salvation the three disciples are ordered to do penance separately.
Act Six

1. In the hermitage on the mountain Himalaya

The prince is in meditation and no temptation can distract him, so that the mission of the nymphs is a complete failure. God Indra transforms himself into a nymph, beautiful, beyond description, and tries to disturb his meditation, but all his attempts fail. Finally he attempts to embrace the prince, who disappears and then re-appears in the form of God Wairocana. God Indra together with other deities come to pay homage and ask his favour and mercy for the world, because the intention of the Buddha has been not merely to achieve bliss, but to pacify the demon Porusâda. God Wairocana transforms himself back into prince Sutasoma. The gods take leave and the prince prepares to return to Hastina accompanied by the sage Keçawa.

Act Seven

1. In the forest in the vicinity of Hastina

A demon, called Sudahana, an attendant of king Porusâda has taken refuge with prince Sutasoma, as he is pursued by king Daçabâhu. They have been fighting for three days, but Sudahana is wounded and has fled to save his life. The prince promises shelter. Soon king Daçabâhu arrives, very angry, and surprised to find a ksatriya sheltering his foe, attacks the prince with all his might, but none of his weapons can harm him. The sage Keçawa explains to the king that the prince is really prince Sutasoma of Hastina. King Daçabâhu rejoices and invites the prince to call at his capital.

1 This is Indra in his female form.

2 Note the term used here, namely to pacify, not to kill as the sage Sumitra expressed it.
as he wants him to marry his younger sister Citrawati.

At first the prince is reluctant to go, but the sage Keçawa advises him to accept the offer in exchange for the life of the demon. The demon is ordered to do penance. The two ksatriyas head for Kaçi, while the sage Keçawa returns to his hermitage.

2. The wedding

In the golden pavillion of Râtnâlaya the wedding of prince Sutasoma and princess Citrawati takes place. Within two days the newly wedds return to Hastina accompanied by king Daçabâhu with his queen and all his vassals.

On arrival in Hastina, the prince is crowned king and the entire kingdom celebrates the occasion. But the festivities are interrupted by the arrival of the enemy from Magadha and Awângga. King Daçabâhu meets the two monarchs in battle and defeats them, but fails to kill them, so they flee. Then order is restored.

B. Purusâdaçañta (canto XCIV - the end)

Act One

1. The audience of Hastina

King Sutasoma is seated with king Daçabâhu, and waited upon by the minister Jayendra, the priest Mahosadi and numerous attendants. The king discusses the news that king Porusâda is searching for one hundred kings to be sacrificed to god Kâlarûdra for it was certain that the demon-king will invade Hastina. King Sutasoma out of mercy for the world and to avoid unnecessary suffering proposes to the Council that he should
surrender himself to the titan, whose intentions are directed solely against the king. No harm will then befall the kingdom or the people.

The proposal of the king, does not meet with the approval of king Daçabåhu, the minister of the numerous vasal-kings. The minister Jayendra says that it is in order to oppose the command of the king if this is done to protect him. Therefore, he pledges that no one will harm the king before he falls in battle. King Daçabåhu gives full approval to the minister's words and it is decided that they will march to Kurukṣetra-field to await the enemy.

2. In the royal square

King Daçabåhu, minister Jayendra and all the vasal-kings prepare for war and depart.

Act Two

1. The audience of Rātnakanda

King Porusåda, the demon-king is waited upon by the minister Wimona, king Dewantåka of AwåNGga and king Koçapati of Magadha. It is related that the king had not always been a demon but that this transformation was brought about by a cook who served him with human flesh and subsequently, because of a brahmin's curse, he later became a man-eater. The king relates to his audience his misfortunes in the forest and his oath to offer one hundred kings to god Kålarûdra if he were cured at once, and how his injury was healed. He has already captured ninety-nine kings, so that his promise is almost fulfilled. Then it is decided to invade the kingdom of Singhêla and to reinforce the borderline with the kingdoms Widarbba and Hastina.
2. In the royal square

The minister Wimona and the vasal-kings make preparations and then set out to perform their respective duties.

3. The perang gagal (indecisive battle)

The army of Hastina clashes with the army of Rātnakanda. After a while the army of Rātnakanda withdraw into the forest.

Act Three

1. The audience of Singhēla

King Jayawikrama is waited upon by the minister Pramoda and his numerous attendants. The king learns that king Porusāda has already arrived on the mountain Suparṣwa and is on the brink of invading Singhēla. Therefore he gives the order to prepare for battle. The minister advises the king to take refuge in Hastina, as he apparently does not have the strength to resist the demon-king. But the advice is too late and the king decided to defend his kingdom to the bitter end. Orders to prepare for departure are given.

2. In the royal square

The army of Singhēla makes preparations for the battle which soon takes place, as the invaders come swarming in a moment. Finally all attempts to capture king Jayawikrama fail and he is slain by king Porusāda.

3. In the camp of king Porusāda

King Porusāda holds a meeting with his commanders. A decision is reached to capture the king of Widarbba by trickery. King Porusāda transforms himself into a brahmin and departs for Widarbba.
4. The capture of the king of Widarbbha

While the king of Widarbbha is waited upon by his attendants and numerous brahmins and priests, king Porusāḍa arrives, disguised as a brahmin. The king is then abducted by king Porusāḍa. The number of one hundred kings has been reached and so king Porusāḍa heads for the forest to make his offering to god Kālarūdra. But the deity refuses to accept the offering, claiming that it consists only of inferior and minor kings. The deity desires the king of Hastina as an offering. Again king Porusāḍa prepares for war and departs for the Kuruksetra field.

Act Four

1. The audience of king Daṇḍabahu in Kuruksetra

King Daṇḍabahu has already learned that king Porusāḍa has arrived at the Kuruksetra-field and he orders the battle to commence.

2. The battle-scene

A fierce battle is joined which lasts for two days. The demons are eliminated by the princes and kings of the Hastina army. But then king Porusāḍa assumes his triwikrama-form and defeats the army of Hastina. Even the powerful king Daṇḍabahu falls in battle. Prince Sucitra withdraws from the battle ground to convey the news to the king.

Act Five

1. The audience of Hastina

The king discusses the course of the battle with the priest Mahosadi. Suddenly prince Sucitra arrives and conveys the news that the army of Hastina has been smashed. The king decides to meet king Porusāḍa himself.
II - Sutasoma and The Wayang

2. The battle between king Sutasoma and king Porusāda

The appearance of king Sutasoma on the battle-field is like nectar and revives all the dead kings and soldiers. The weapons of king Porusāda are poured down upon him but have no power to harm him. On the contrary, they are transformed into flowers, pools and streams.

Finally god Kāla by whom the king of Rātnakanda is possessed, departs after regaining consciousness because of the hymns and prayers of gods and seers and also as a result of the weapon of king Sutasoma. Porusāda faints.

As he recovers, king Sutasoma tells him that he is still willing to be sacrificed to god Kālarūdra. Influenced by the patience and courage of the king of Hastina, king Porusāda admits his guilt and is reluctant to carry out the offering.

Act Six

1. Conclusion

King Sutasoma asks the favour of god Kālarūdra to release the one hundred kings, a request which is approved. After preaching to the kings, king Sutasoma surrenders himself to god Kālarūdra, who transforms himself into a dragon. He intends to swallow the king, but after tasting his beneficent blood, he obtains peace of mind and desires nothing other than to become the disciple of king Sutasoma. King Sutasoma preaches to him and the other kings and princes, then returns to Hastina. A feast which lasts for ten days is held to celebrate the victory of Compassion over Violence.
In the past, it was common to seek the origins of various expressions of Old Javanese culture in India. And faced by evidence of sophistication, that is to say within the field of religion, literature and art, scholars looked at once for Indian prototypes. Sometimes spectacular discoveries were made, but very often the result of this method were not as fruitful as had been anticipated, and served as nothing further than a first step towards better knowledge. Quite often, unfortunately, the second step was a very long time coming, and in the meantime the first lay quietly under the dust of history, forgotten. It is salutary to review some of these first steps in the study of Old Javanese literature. R. Friedrich was one of the earliest pioneers with his Preliminary report on the island Bali. In this report he discussed amply the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa; a treatise on cosmogony, mythology, and mythic chronology very highly esteemed by the Balinese panditas, and expressed the wish that it be published in its entirety without delay. His wish was fulfilled over eighty years later, when Gonda published the text in 1932; in 1933 he provided a tentative translation in the hope that it might be of service to others as a basis for a better one. After more than another thirty years, this hope still remains very remote of fulfilment.

---

1 VBG, 22-3 (1849-50).
2 Gonda, Bra., p.i.
Friedrich himself published the Oldjavanese Arjunawaïha in Javanese characters in 1850. But a transcription into Roman script and a Dutch translation had to wait another seventy-six years. He also published the Bhomakâwya in 1852. Teeuw provided a Dutch translation in 1946, almost a hundred years later.

Another example is the Gandhawûha sûtra. It has long been known that this work is very important for the study of Buddhism. In 1920, Krom was maintaining that the story bearing this name depicted on the walls of the Borobudur could not be compared with the Sanskrit version, because no text of the Gandhawûha had yet been published. Yet Suzuki had been contemplating publication of this work since 1908, and finally did in 1940. However, nobody can tell when a translation will appear.

Notwithstanding the great contribution a study of ancient Indian civilization makes towards an understanding of the nature and origin of many elements in Oldjavanese culture, it is by no means the whole story, and there is a limit to its usefulness. This limit was often compounded by unwearied assumptions on the part of these pioneers, concerning the relationship of expressions of Indian culture to their Indian prototypes. This is clearly illustrated in the various attitudes scholars have taken to the Oldjavanese Râmâyana. In 1900 Kern

1 VBG, 23.
2 Poerbatjaraka, Arj.
3 Krom, Bor., vol.3, p.481.
4 Suzuki, Gan.
stated that the Oldjavanese author could not have derived his material from an Indian version of the Râmâyana, because he had no knowledge of Sanskrit.\(^1\)

Twenty-five years later Stutterheim stated that the Oldjavanese Râmâyana was an independent adaptation of the Râmâyana of Walmiki.\(^2\) Poerbatjara\(k\)aka then reported that an Indian scholar, Manomohan Gosh had been able to prove that the Oldjavanese Râmâyana was based on Bhatti's work called Rawana\(\wedge\)adha.\(^3\) Finally Hooykaas, after making a deep study both of the Oldjavanese Râmâyana and the Bhattik\(\wedge\)awya, announced that he estimated there was only about a sixty per cent correspondence between them.\(^4\)

In the field of Buddhist pictoral art, such as the jatakas, the awadanas, the life of the historical Buddha, depicted on the walls of the Borobudur, M\(\ddot{\text{e}}\)ndut and others and Buddhist writings, such as Sang Hyang Kamah\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)y\(\acute{\text{n}}\)ikan, Kuñ\(\ddot{\text{a}}\)jarakar\(\grave{\text{n}}\)a, Sutasoma, results are still unpromising. It has been said, for example, that the study of the jatakas has not yielded positive results,\(^5\) and that of the Lal\(\ddot{\text{l}}\)tawistara is not so far very encouraging.\(^6\) As the premise that all expressions of

\(^1\) Kern, Ram., p.vii.
\(^2\) Stutterheim, Ram., p.120.
\(^3\) Poerbatjara\(k\)aka, Kap., p.3. See also his article, Oud, TBG, 72, p.168, 1932.
\(^4\) Hooykaas, Fro., BKI, 114, p.360. See also, Old., VKI, 16, 1955.
\(^5\) Krom, Bor., vol.3, p.213.
\(^6\) Ibid., p.133. Krom points out that the sculptors of the Borobudur had not followed in its entirety the Lal\(\ddot{\text{l}}\)tawistara text, such as we have at the present time, but that they had in their possession a sutra which in substance was identical to it.
the Hindu-Indonesian culture should be assessed in terms of their Indian origin is doubtful validity, it is perhaps this faulty premise that has prevented earlier scholars from progressing as far as they might towards an understanding of Java's past. Certainly a majority of them presupposed that the Indonesian artist (writer, builder of temples or engraver of reliefs) was working according to an Indian model, and therefore that the result of his work should be a replica of that model. Thus any deviation from the original were attributed either to an imperfect understanding of that original or inadequate craftsmanship. This presupposition derived from the assumption that the Indonesian culture of this time was at a lower level of development than that of India, and that acculturation therefore, was necessarily a one way affair. Later students of the East Javanese period of Oldjavanese culture have acknowledged that in this period, there was a revival of the autochthonic cultural elements of Indonesia which by this time had strongly modified and even superseded some of those of Indian origin. This acknowledgement implied an admission of an active rôle of the Indonesian people in the process of Hinduisation which had not been fully recognized in previous periods of scholarship. Emphasis therefore needs to be placed on the active rôle of the Indonesian people in this process of acculturation. This in itself is nothing surprising. It has been known for a long time that Brandes expressed the view that pre-Indian Indonesian culture was already comparatively advanced, because the Indonesians already had knowledge of wet rice-cultivation, a metric system, and astronomy. And if this level of culture was low compared with that of the Indian migrants when they first reached Indonesian
shores (± 78 A.D.), this would not be the case some 300-400 years later when the first Hindu - Indonesian kingdoms were established. There is even a very strong surmise, that the rulers of those kingdoms were not Indians, but Indonesians.\(^1\) Therefore it is perfectly reasonable to assume that the differences between the manifestation of Hindu - Indonesian culture and their Indian prototypes are the result of conscious selections on the part of the Indonesians and Indian migrants or their descendants who envisaged a flourishing culture of Indian origin on Indonesian soil, nurtured with Indonesian elements, for the well-being and prosperity of the Hindu - Indonesian community.

Thus the matter of primary concern to these peoples was not the preservation of the original forms of Indian cultural elements, but the manner in which these elements could be used for the benefit of their community. This is clearly indicated in the order of the jatakas on the walls of the Borobudur. The engraver has clearly not followed the order of the stories in the Jatakamāla, yet it need not be assumed either that he took them at random, or that he did not know the Indian work. Rather, more important to him than an exact copy were the stories themselves, and whether they lent themselves directly to instruction in the Buddhist religion.

The episodes from the Lalītawistara depicted on the walls of the Borobudur constitute a problem, because they go no further than the Buddha's first sermon which started the rotation of the wheel of the Dharma. This should not be regarded as accidental. Rather, it should be understood as a carefully chosen device to synchronise

---

\(^1\) Poerbatjaraka, Riw., p.12.
the story of the life of the prince Siddhartha upto his enlightenment and Buddhahood, with the form and contents of his teachings. It is not the parinirwāna (complete extinction) of the Buddha which was important to the architects of the Borobudur, but his life as the Supreme Teacher and the Saviour of the threefold world and his teachings\textsuperscript{+1} presented in the form of jatakas, awadanas and sūtras - as for example the story of Sudhana which is called the story of Enlightenment\textsuperscript{+2} and Badhracari - because they represent the three most important themes that occur in narrative works.\textsuperscript{+3} Kern had more or less the same explanation, but did not go so far as to attempt to organise all the stories into a single frame-work. This solution did not occur to him even though he repeatedly expressed his puzzlement at the lack of an ending to the stories.

The Lalitawistara, the jataka and the Gandhavyūha for instance individually considered are indeed incomplete, as is likewise the Badhracari; and Brandes in fact searched for the end of the story on the walls of the circular corridor.\textsuperscript{+4} If this were done deliberately (although we have suggested otherwise), it could perhaps be interpreted as follows: The conclusion is an emptiness, The Void, or in Buddhist terminology ānyatā, which is the ultimate goal for every Buddhist. This goal must be given a formal expression, because all Buddhists are not of the same

\textsuperscript{1} Krom, Inl. K., p.388.
\textsuperscript{2} Suzuki, Mah., p.96.
\textsuperscript{4} Krom, Inl. K., p.387.
level of competence. Sarma\textsuperscript{1)} says of this kind of instruction - though he is speaking of Hinduism - his words are still applicable:

'This religious hospitality is shown by two characteristic Hindu doctrines called the doctrine of the chosen deity (\textit{ishta dewata}). The doctrine of spiritual competence requires that the religious discipline prescribed for a man should correspond to his spiritual competence. It is worse than useless to teach abstract metaphysics to a man whose heart hungers for concrete gods. A labourer requires a different type of religion from a scholar - so instruction should be carefully graded.' Carefully graded. What a marvellous and fitting expression! What then is the most appropriate form by which Emptiness, Nothingness, Çūnyyata may be expressed for those whose hearts hunger for concrete things, or at the very least for a symbolic representation of the Absolute?

This is a point of no return, a point of great subtlety that requires most careful treatment. First it must be determined whether the ultimate goal of the Borobudur Buddhism is Çūnyyata, and if so, how Çūnyyata should be understood. Here, fortunately we are on firmer ground, thanks to the elaborate work of many outstanding scholars such as Krom, Stutterheim, Gonda, Bosch, Moens and others. Krom clearly says that the Borobudur is the doctrine of Çūnyyata epitomized in stone.\textsuperscript{2)}

\textsuperscript{1)\textsuperscript{1}} Sarma, \textit{Nat.}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{2)\textsuperscript{2}} Krom, \textit{Inl. K.}, p. 397.
Of ċūṇyata, Gonda quotes Nagarjuna as follows:1)

'All can happen by ċūṇyata (being ċūnya = void); all dharmmas are based on ċūṇyata; ċūṇyata is synonymous with that which has no cause, that which stands beyond idea and conception, that which is not born and is without dimension'. Furthermore Gonda says: 'So metaphysically ċūṇyata is the Absolute Reality, in the empirical world "being empty, being nothing", the eternal changeableness and instability. As to how the Absolute became manifest in the empirical world, the Madhyamikas remain in the dark. For all later schools however, samsara is only another form of nirwāna, the empirical world is only a real semblance but not in an univocal sense of the word real, by which the Absolute manifests itself to the limited mind of the common people (and this doctrine) later became a fundamental conviction which excluded substantial differences between them. But the world is precisely this, in the sense that it is the place whereupon the paramitas and the Universal compassion of the bodhisattvas may be applied, so that it therefore serves as a preparation for the realisation of the Absolute.'

If the Borobudur is the doctrine of ċūṇyata epitomized in stone and if the Borobudur is a symbol of the Macrocosmos2) and hence of the empirical world understood as a preparation for the realisation of the Absolute, then in itself it supports my theory that the purpose of the major frame story of the Buddha to which

2 Stutterheim, Stu., p.39. But it should be noted, that Borobudur is also a symbol of the microcosmos, as a stūpa is the symbol of microcosmos, and because a stūpa is the symbol of nirwāna. (See Seckel, Art., pp.103 and 132).
the Lalitawistara, the Jataka, the Gandhavyūha etc., all contribute a part in the visual instruction in the search for perfection and bliss. Yet we have not yet discovered a symbol for the Void, for Absolute Reality, for Āṇyata which according to Nagarjuna is the base of all dharma. This was a problem of not only the Buddhists, but also of the Hindus, and we know that they solved it by inventing such a symbol, namely the number nil, written in the shape of a circle. This perhaps is the reason for the mysterious existence of the number nil which has no definite value, yet is called nothing. Is it possible to apply this symbol of the Void, namely the empty circle to the Borobudur?

Is it in fact far fetched to suggest that we become aware of this Void when we reach the walls of the highest square terrace which is regarded as the upper limit of the rūpadhatu, because here we leave behind the square terraces of rūpadhatu and come to the circular terraces of arūpadhatu? What is the significance of this change in the design? I venture the reason to be that the circle is the symbol of nothingness. If this is true, what then is the significance of the chief dagob? The dagob is a particular form of a stūpa, and the form of the stūpa originated from the form of the folded robe of the Buddha as the base with his overturned bowl on top of it. The form of the bowl is round or a half-sphere, and the fact that it is overturned, signifies that it is empty. The half-sphere is round, and this too is a symbol of nothingness. It must be admitted

1 Stutterheim, Stu., p.50.
2 This theory is not intended to replace the traditional theories, but to complement them. See also Seckel, Art., pp.131-2.
that the symbolization of nothingness in this way is not eyecatching; thus it needs to be repeated five times. (three round terraces, one round base of the dagob and the form of the overturned half-sphere). But why five times?

As the number five appears to have particularly close relationship with Wairocana or Wajrasattwa in the Borobudur, perhaps it refers to the appearance of Wajrasattwa with four faces, or with five bodies. Seckel writes as follows: 'The Absolute Buddha Wairocana also appears in Wajrayana art in the guise of a Bodhisattwa; as Wajrasattwa who under Hindu influence is occasionally represented with four faces. He is also depicted with five bodies. The latter form represents the five Buddhas which form a group in the centre of the mandala, and these in turn are manifested in the crowns of the five Bodhisattwa heads. This shows the interrelationship, indeed the ultimate unity, between appearance and essence, between cause and fruit, conveyed by the reciprocal representation of all these symbolic figures. +1)

In literary terms, perhaps, the Lalitawistara may be understood as the frame of a frame story, whereas the jatakas etc., are the stories within the frame. Thus the whole story-collection depicted on the walls of the Borobudur may be regarded as one long story of enlightenment, with the purpose of giving the humble Buddhist adherent visual instruction in his search for perfection and bliss. +2) Another possibility is that we regard the whole story-collection as an extended

1 See further Seckel, Art., p.232.
Lalitawistara, because in the life-story of the historical Buddha it is known that on one night full knowledge of all his previous existences \( ^1 \) was revealed to him. Later the stories of Buddha's former birth became increasingly important, as the Buddha frequently referred to his former lives as an example for his disciples and Buddhist laymen, and eventually they were compiled into a huge collection. This observation serves to illustrate a general characteristic of a frame story, namely that the stories within the frame may increase or decrease in number, or be removed entirely from one frame and put into another. The resulting flexibility is one of the major reasons why this form of story-telling or story-composition became so popular in India in olden times and spread to other parts of Asia. \( ^2 \) This genre of story was certainly known to both Buddhists and Hindus in India as well as Indonesia, at least at the time of the establishment of the Borobudur - stūpa in the eighth century A.D.

The frame-story by definition then, allows people a free hand to make alterations and improvisations; yet elements such as tradition and pietism of the adaptor can have some restraining power, so that a frame story such as the Lalitawistara has been to some extent able to maintain its original form in the Buddhist world, and indeed became a model, a fixed pattern for generations to come. \( ^3 \) It is indeed unfortunate that we have few Oldjavanese Buddhist literary works surviving. The most studied ones are Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan, Kuṇjarakarṇa.

---

1 Zurcher, Bud., p.20.
2 Hooykaas, Ove., p.136. See also, Per., p.95.
Sutasoma and the Nāgarakirtagama if it can be considered so, for it was at least written by a Buddhist. (see below in The case of Čiwa - Buddha).

Among these works, Sutasoma alone constitutes the life-story of a Buddha, and the bas-reliefs of the Borobudur may be used to investigate whether this is a frame story of this type or not. Kern suggested that Mpu Tantular, the author of the Oldjavanese Sutasoma took an old Buddhist poem as an example, based on the world boddhakawya occurring in the fourth stanza of this poem, which he translates as 'het Bauddhakavya' in a manner which suggests that it was the name of the poem in question. I cannot entirely concur with this suggestion for the following reasons:

1) it is based on the premise that the Oldjavanese author was lacking in originality. This animus against Mpu Tantular is quite evident throughout the article.

2) there is no necessity to understand the word boddhakawya as the title of a poem. It can also be rendered as the story or stories of a Buddha or Buddhas or the Buddha or Buddhist stories. (see further note).

3) I agree that Mpu Tantular to a certain degree follows a model as far as the form of the story is concerned (i.e., a frame story consisting of the frame of a story of the Buddha, with jatakas and sūtras within that frame) as found on the walls of the Borobudur. But the composition and

Kern, VG., vol. 4, p. 166.
the choice of the stories within the frame were entirely the work of Mpu Tantular, an author who in my opinion is well versed in the teachings of Buddhism.

As we saw above, the components of the frame story of the Borobudur are as follows:

1) the Lalitawistara as the frame.
2) jatakas, awadanas, and sutras as the stories within the frame.

The components of the Sutasoma kakawin are as follows:

1) the Sutasoma-jataka as a frame.
2) jatakas and motifs from the Mahabhârata, Râmâyana and other stories as the stories within the frame.

It may seem contradictory that we should find in a Buddhist epic motifs or patterns derived from sources which are known to be Čiwaitic or Hinduistic. But in East Java at that time this was not a peculiarity. We know that in East Java on the walls of temples known to be Hinduistic, Buddhist stories occur alongside Hinduistic ones. Up to the present this has been explained as illustrating syncretism or as proof of a good relationship between adherents of Buddhism and Hinduism.¹ And evidence of this compatibility dates back to the Middle Javanese era, for there we find Hinduistic decorative elements on Buddhist temples. It may well be that for the Indonesian (people or artists) at that time, these motifs were merely ornamentation and could be used either on Buddhist or Hinduistic

¹ See further in The case of Čiwa-Buddha.
temples. As for the stories, perhaps they too were regarded as ornaments or were simply held in high esteem in both communities as stories.

Where motives and patterns are derived from Hinduistic stories in the Sutasoma kakawin, one question needs clarification, namely: Did Mpu Tantular—as a Mahayanist—regard them as Hinduistic? If the answer to this question is Yes, then a further problem arises as to why this should be so. If Mpu Tantular regarded them as Hinduistic, there are several possible reasons:

1) as mentioned above.
2) those motifs have reference to the shadow-play, so that it can be supposed that Mpu Tantular made use of these scenes because the kakawin is a pakem.
3) they were taken from Hinduistic sources to make the development of the story easier for the audience to understand.

If Mpu Tantular regarded them as Buddhist and not Hinduistic, then two reasons may be considered:

1) these motifs, patterns, names etc., are also known in Buddhism.
2) Motifs like the temptation of Arjuna or Sutasoma are not unlike that of the daughters of Mara who struggled with Gautama. The changing of

---

1 Kern, Kal., VG, vol.3.
2 Suzuki, Lañ.
weapons into flowers, ponds etc., occurs
in the Lalitawistara as well as in the
Ramayana.

2) If Čiwa is identical to Buddha (as
asserted by Kern), based on the Sutasoma,
there is no reason why Mpu Tantular should
not have used them.¹

However, as this question can be set aside without
prejudice to the development of my argument, it is more
relevant to proceed directly to a comparison between the
frame story of the Borobudur and that of the Sutasoma
kakawin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borobudur</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life of prince Suddhartha</td>
<td>1. Life of prince Sutasoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) his descent from heaven.</td>
<td>a) his descent from heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) his childhood in the palace.</td>
<td>b) his childhood in the palace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) his escape to the forest.</td>
<td>c) his escape to the forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) his wanderings and visits to ascetics.</td>
<td>d) his wanderings and visits to ascetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) his asceticism.</td>
<td>e) his asceticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) his first sermon.</td>
<td>f) his sermons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. jatakas:</td>
<td>2. jatakas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Agastyajataka, Indra asks the Bodhisattwa to ask him for a reward.</td>
<td>a) see canto CXLVI, 7-8 Indra asks Sutasoma to ask him for a reward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This does not imply that I entirely agree with the view of Kern.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borobudur</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Maitribalajataka, The Bodhisattva surrenders himself to be devoured by five yaksas, who finally ask him to save them.</td>
<td>b) see canto, 8 - canto CXLIV, 7. Sutasoma is about to be devoured by Kālarudra in a dragon form, who finally asks Sutasoma to save his soul. The same situation occurs with Porusāda. In fact there are five creatures in the story, who wish to devour Sutasoma, e.g., Gajawaktra, the dragon-king and the lioness in addition to Kālarudra and Porusāda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Sutasomajataka,</td>
<td>c) The Sutasomajataka is used as the frame here, but the abduction of the king of Widarbbha is a combination of a scene involving (continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) A yogrha jataka.
 Prince Ayogrha wishes to renounce the world but is opposed by his father and the people.

e) Surupajataka:
 A yakṣa wishes to devour king Surupa who is eager for knowledge.

f) the story of the lioness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borobudur</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prince Sutasona in the Sutasomajataka and that of Sītā in the Rāmāyana.</td>
<td>d) see canto IV, l. - canto VI, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Sutasona wishes to renounce the world, but is opposed by his father and the people.</td>
<td>e) see 2b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The story of the lioness.</td>
<td>f) the story of the lioness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are of course differences, but they are attributable to adaptations of the story for performance as a shadow-play: e.g., the abduction of the king of Widarba, the battle between Porusāda and Daqabahu; or to remove discrepancies, as in the story of the lioness. In the Borobudur version, the Bodhisattwa dies forever, but in the kakawin, Cakra brings prince Sutasoma back to life.

The conclusion to be drawn from this comparison then, may be summarized as follows: The form and content
of the Sutasoma kakawin has as its model the particular frame story depicted on the Borobudur or one similar, perhaps modified by the oral tradition, but in all probability neither are taken directly from a foreign source.
Almost a century ago, Kern launched a violent attack on Brian Houghton Hodgson for his criticism of Crawfurd's work on the nature of syncretism between Buddhism and \( Q^\text{iwa} \text{ism} \).\(^2\) Apparently Hodgson's criticism, based on his own research and interviews with educated and well informed Buddhists had been so spirited as to provoke the wrath of Indologists of Kern's generation. In place of Crawfurd's conclusion that true Buddhism is nothing more than \( Q^\text{iwa} \text{ism} \), based on what appeared to be unmistakable evidence of the primacy of the Hindu God of Destruction in every large Buddhist temple, Hodgson put forward the view that this evidence was not relevant to \( Q^\text{iwa} \text{ism} \) and did not in fact indicate a blending of the two religions.

In defence of Crawfurd, Kern replied that the influence of \( Q^\text{iwa} \text{ism} \) upon Mah\(\text{y}^\text{a} \text{n}a \) Buddhism had been grudgingly admitted in Buddhist circles as early as the seventh century. He further stated that according to Histoire de la vie de Hiouen - Thsang\(^3\) the monks of Orissa, all adherents of the Hinay\(\text{a} \text{n}a \), did not believe

\(^{1}\) I like to regard the relationship between \( Q^\text{iwa} \text{ism} \) and Buddhism as a case in a court of law, in which the Buddhism of Java is the defendant, accused of an illicit association with Hinduism. The scholars who have studied this field are to be called as witnesses, and Javanese Buddhist texts constitute the evidence. We shall thus see whether the verdict is to be guilty or not guilty.

\(^{2}\) Kern, Ove., VG., vol.4, p.149.

\(^{3}\) P.220.
in the sublimity of the Mahāyāna, regarding the doctrines of this school as derived from heretics not from the Buddha; and further that the monks of the well known monastery of Nalanda, the seminary for Mahayanism, were indistinguishable from Ćiwaitic Kapalikas.¹ Concerning the well-educated Buddhist informant referred to by Hodgson, Kern claimed that he appeared not to be worthy of the epithet well-educated, for if he had known the history of his doctrine and that of his land, then he would not have made so foolish a remark.² Kern went on to assert that as far as the history of Buddhism was concerned, there was no period when the so-called Brahmanic deities had not been worshipped. To support this view he wrote an essay based on the kakawin Sutasoma, in which he claimed that Javanese Buddhists in the most unambiguous terms admitted, that there was a certain identity between their own Mahayanist doctrine and that of Ćiwaism. He concluded by claiming that the ties between Mahayanism and Ćiwaism in Java had become so strong that it could well be asked whether one should talk of blending (syncretism) or whether it would be better to speak of a confluence between the two religions. He asked rhetorically: If someone should pose such a question, then we should reply: 'Although according to the notions of well informed people, Ćiwa and Buddha in a higher sense are One, there has been no confluence between them, they remain distinct, though their adherents live together in a most friendly manner. Their objects of worship are somewhat alike, if not in appearance, certainly in reality.'³

¹ Kern, Ove., p.156.
² Ibid., p.155.
³ Ibid., p.177.
Since that time, this conclusion concerning Javanese Buddhism has been accepted as an established fact. Rassers for instance, used it as a point of departure in his article on Čiwa and Buddha in the East Indian Archipelago.\(^1\)

Scholars have often noted that the Javanese Mahayanism is similar to that of Northern Buddhism, particularly in its tantric form; it is therefore surprising that two authorities, one in the field of Northern Buddhism and the other in that of Javanese Buddhism, can stand so diametrically against each other.\(^2\) After studying Kern's article more closely it seems to me that the reason for this divergence of views lies in the different standpoints of the two authorities. Hodgson obviously approached the problem through the eyes of a Mahayanist Buddhist, whereas Kern looked at it through the eyes of a European scholar of the nineteenth century, or at the best, of a Theravada monk.\(^3\)

It is clear that the principal issue is the interpretation to be given to the presence of what appears to be Brahmanistic deities in the Mahāyāna pantheon, with the resulting suggestion of a special relationship. Can they be regarded as evidence of syncretism or blending?

In order to discuss this problem more fully we need to give careful attention to the manifestation of

\(^1\) Rassers, Siw., p. 62.
\(^2\) L.A. Waddel in The Buddhism of Tibet, p.xii, refers to Hodgson as the father of modern critical study of Buddhist doctrine, whereas Kern was an authority in this field among Dutch scholars.
\(^3\) Kern, Ove, p.156.
Buddhism in both areas, in particular the expression of the Wajrayana in Northern Buddhism and in Java, where several works in Oldjavanese testify to its status.\textsuperscript{1}

However, before proceeding I feel it would be useful to investigate whether in Hindu doctrine Buddha is regarded as identical to any Hindu deity. For example, in the jatakas mention is made of the rebirth of the Bodhisattwa as Brahmá, but this is not admitted in Hinduism. The only fact admitted in Hinduism is the birth of Buddha as a reincarnation of Wisnu, but in the rôle of a deceiver.

Of this Monier Williams says as follows:\textsuperscript{2}

'The adoption of Buddha as one of the ten incarnations of Vishnu appears to have been the result of a wise compromise with Buddhism; the Brahmans asserting that Vishnu, in his compassion for animals, descended as the sceptical Buddha that he might bring discredit on Vedic sacrifices; or according to another theory, that wicked men might bring destruction on themselves by accepting Buddhism and denying the supremacy of the gods.'

Jitendra Nath Bannerjea gives a slightly different explanation:\textsuperscript{3}

'Buddha, the founder of a religious order which is heterodox from the Brahmanical Hindu point of view, is given a place in the ten incarnations. In the Puranas, Vishnu is said to have been born as the Deluder in the Sakya race in order to delude the demons with false doctrines and thus work for their undoing. They accepted his teachings, gave up Vedic rites and practices, and as consequence were defeated by the gods.'

\textsuperscript{1} See below.

\textsuperscript{2} Monier Williams, Bra., p.114, see also Krom, Inl. K., p.98.

\textsuperscript{3} Jitendra Nath Bannerjea, Hin., p.57.
Thus it is clear that the view that Qiwa (or any other Hindu deity) may be regarded as Buddha is not held by the adherents of Hinduism. And in so far as Kern has claimed that Qiwa is identified with Buddha, it can only be said that at times Qiwa, like Brahmā, has appeared as a Bodhisattva. It is self-evident then, that had there been any attempt to bring about a unification of the two deities (which we do not concede) the initiative would come from the Buddhist and not from the Hindus.

We have already noted in Northern Buddhism, i.e., that of Tibet that the Wajrayāna sect obviously compares a great deal with that of Indonesia (Java). For the purposes of our investigation it is useful here to set out the principal features of the Wajrayāna as they concern:

1. the existence and mutual relationships of Brahmanic or Hindu deities.

L.A. Waddel\(^1\) observes that there are seven classes of divinities in the Lamaist Pantheon, arranged from the Highest to the lowest rank.

These are:

1. Buddhas
2. Bodhisats
3. Tutelaries
4. Defenders of the Faith and Witches
5. Indian Brahmanical gods
6. Country gods
7. Personal gods

Furthermore concerning the fifth class, he says: \(^2\)

\(^1\) Waddel, Bud., p.327. The distinction between Brahmanic and Hindu deities is actually not necessary as Brahmanism and Hinduism - according to M. Williams - are the same in the eyes of the Hindus themselves.

\(^2\) Ibid., p.366.
'These Dii minores are the gods and lesser divinities of Aryan and Hindu mythology, degraded to this low rank on account of their inclusion within the wheel of metempsychosis, and from their leading lives only partially devoted to Buddhist duties'.

D. Seckel writes\(^1\) as follows:

'Deities (dewa) are one rank below the categories discussed so far (namely the Buddhas, the Bodhisattwas etc.). The latter rank very high in the hierarchy since they belong to the sphere of nirwāna and in one way or another are closely related to the Buddha (or the Buddhas in plural). But with the dewa an important border-line has been crossed: for they already form a part of the samsara, cycle of rebirth, of the six realms of existence.... Although the dewas are far superior to men with regard to their life-span, their state of bliss and their freedom from earthly remains, they are not immortal and do not rule the world; still less have they entered nirwāna....

Ancient Indian deities were taken over by Buddhists, who entrusted them with various functions: to bring good fortune and aid in times of distress, to promote good and ward off evil, to ensure due order in the natural and moral world and above all to protect and worship the Buddha, his doctrine and the Buddhist community. The cult of gods was regarded by the earliest Buddhist as something tinged with a low form of popular religiosity. It was not, however, on that account despised or combated.'

Kern in the article referred to above says:

\(^1\) D. Seckel, Art., pp.242-8.
'As far as the history of Buddhism can be studied, there is no period in which the so-called Brahmanic deities are not worshipped. We have already recalled how important is the rôle of Indra, Çakra and Brahmâ in the holy life of the Lion of the Çakyas. Now it would be idle punning to claim, for example that the Çakra of the Buddhist holy scripture is radically another being than the common Hindu Çakra. The being indicated with that name is and remains one, although the rank ascribed to him may be higher or lower as the case may be.'

It is clear then that the so-called Brahmanic or Hindu deities exist in Buddhism, and that their rank is subordinated to that of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattwas. Kern however has asserted that whatever the respective ranks of the deities in the two religions, they were and are one and the same. It might be justly asked whether the Hindus themselves accept this view, whether they accept Brahmâ, the attendent or worshipper of Buddha Gautama, as identical with Brahmâ the Creator of the Universe? And conversely, whether Buddhists accept Brahmâ as the Creator of the Universe, including their Âdi-Buddha, or admit that Buddha Gautama is an incarnation of Wisnu, just to delude them. If the Hindus do not recognise so-called Brahmanic deities in Buddhism and the Buddhists likewise do not accept the Brahmanic deities as understood by the Hindus, then it should be concluded that the deities - despite an identity of name, but differing in function and rank - are in fact different to adherents of both religions. To speak of the similarities between them should be regarded as mere quibbling.

1 Kern, Ove, p.157.
2. the question of syncretism or blending

If this line of argument is correct, then the question of syncretism or blending becomes of minor importance, at least in the eyes of the Hindus or Buddhists themselves. Seckel, in his discussion of this point used the expression 'taken over' to explain the presence of these so-called Brahmanic deities in Buddhism; and perhaps it should be emphasised here that this 'taking over' was limited to outward appearances, including names.\(^1\) In the Oldjavanese Brahmandapurāṇa\(^2\), for example, mention is made of the son of Buddhi who is called Buddha, without any suggestion at all that he is to be connected with the Buddha of the Buddhists. May it be concluded then that similarity in name or form does not imply identity? In this case, the hypothesis that the Mahāyāna Buddhists created their own deities according to their requirements gains plausibility. In so doing it must never be forgotten that the early Mahayanaists were Indians born in a Hindu cultural environment and that the deities they formulated are coloured by the Hindu tradition. This is probably the reason why Hodgson's informant declared the so-called Brahmanic or Hindu deities as Buddhist, because for him and his fellow-believers there was no syncretism or blending of Hinduism and Buddhism. Their religion in their view was pure and uncontaminated.

\(^1\) For names, recall Shakespear, Romeo and Juliet, 2,2. Bernard R. Wize has noted that although Britons and Australians are apparently speakers of English, yet their ideas move on different planes and while each uses the same words, they speak in different languages. I suggest that the same holds true of Hindus and Buddhists.

\(^2\) Gonda, Bra., p.59. See also Gonda, Aga., pp.348-9.
To elaborate the fact that the early Mahāyāna Buddhists were in fact also Indians, it is well to recall the words of Monier Williams:  

"How, then, can the intelligent and well-educated Hindu - trained by us to think accurately, and instructed by us in the facts, phenomena, and laws of European science - acquiesce in these extravagances? "There is but one God by whatever form. He is worshipped in Asia or in Europe. He (the one God) is in His essence impersonal and formless, though He delights in manifesting Himself in infinite evolutions and personalities and though He chooses to ignore Himself in the distinct individualities created by Himself. Hence the separate existence of you, and of me, and of the world around us, is a mere illusion. When through protracted self-discipline, the illusion is made to vanish, we are absorbed into the one God."  

This attitude of tolerance and mutual understanding is perhaps the main reason why there have not been prolonged periods of conflict between Hinduism and Buddhism. Earlier we described attempts to draw conclusions from the similarity of name in Buddhist and Hindu deities as quibbling. Now M. Williams has given us the last word: illusion.  

So much then for the relationship between the Brahmanical and Buddhist deities in Northern Buddhism. We may now turn our attention to Buddhist works in Oldjavanese, giving an outline and interpretation of the relationship between Qiwa and Buddha as it is presented in them.

1 M. Williams, Bra., p.x. When we come to the question of the Indonesian Vajrayana, Mahāyāna Buddhist should be understood as Hindu-Javanese people or their descendants.
Concerning the existence and rank of the so-called Brahmanic deities, the San. has the following to say:

"Mijil tang dewata sarwakaryya kartta sake
kasarwwajñanan bhatara Wairocana, lpirnya Íçwara,
Brahmā, Wisnu, sira ta kinon mamaripurn(n)akna ng
tribhuwana mwang isyanya de bhatara Wairocana, donanya
pagawayana kapararthan mwang sthana Bhatara pinuja
irikang kala, dadi tang sthawara janggamadi. Swargga
hibēkan dewatadi marttyapada hibēkan manusadi, patala
hibēkan nagadi de bhataraçvara Brahmā Wisnu, nora tan
kahanan ira, ndan dinadyaken de ni kasarwwajñanan
bhatara Wairocana,"

Those almighty deities originated from the omniscience of god Wairocana, they were Íçwara, Brahmā and Wisnu who were ordered by god Wairocana to develop the three worlds along with their contents into perfection, so that they might be beneficial to men and serve as a place where the Lord should be worshipped at [all] times [by the people] etc. So the animals and plants and so on came into being. Heaven was filled with deities, the world of the mortal beings was filled with human beings and so on, the underworld was filled with dragons etc., all as the result of the work of god Íçwara, Brahmā and Wisnu. Therefore they were almighty but not by virtue of their own selves, for they came into being only as a result of the omniscience of god Wairocana.

1 J. Kats, San.
2 Ibid., pp. 60-1. See also Seckel, Art., pp. 242-4.
From this passage it is obvious that Īśwara, Brahmā
and Wisnu are only an emanation of Wairocana and that
their achievement in creating all the universe was
merely the fulfillment of the order of Wairocana,
accomplished through his power.\textsuperscript{+1} There is a similar
passage in a different context which goes as follows:

Sīra ta dēwa viṣesa ri boddha, bhatara Paramāçūṇya
ngaran iva; sīra ta bhatara Paramaçıwa ngaran iva,
bhatara Purusa ngaran iva de sang wadiqisya bhagawan
Kapila, sang hyang Atma ngaran iva de sang wadi
Kanabhakṣyaqisya, bhatara Nirguna ngaran iva de sang
wadi Wesnawa, ..., sīra matemah bhatara Rātnatraya
mwang bhatara pañca Tathagatha de dang Acaryya Sakara.\textsuperscript{+2}

'He is a paramount deity to the Buddhist, called
Paramāçūṇya (the Perfect Void). He is god Paramaçıwa
[or] god Purusa to the masters and students [of the
sect] of Kapila, god Atma to the masters and students
[of the sect] of Kanabhakṣya, god Nirguna to the masters
of the followers of Wisnuism..., he became the Holy
Rātnatraya and the five Holy Tathagata to the religious
teacher Sakara....

This passage is reminiscent of the manggala to the
Nāgarakērtāgama:

1. om nathaya namostu te stuti ning atpada
   ri pada bhatara nityaça,
sang suksmeng teléng ing samadi qiwa
   buddha sīra sakala niskalātmaka,
sang qi ri parwatanatha natha ning anatha
   sīra ta pati ning jagadpati.

\textsuperscript{1} In other works such as Kuñjarańkara and Sutasoma, the
existence of the Brahmanic deities is likewise evident,
also the fact that they are much lower than the Buddhist
bodhisattwas.
\textsuperscript{2} J. Kats, San., p.50.
sang hyang ning hyang inisty acintya ning
acintya hana waya tēmah nireng jagat,

2. byapi byapaka sarwwatawagata niguna sira
   ring apaksa wesanawa,
   ring yogiçwara poruseng kapila jambhala
   sakala siran hyang ning dana,
   çri wagindra siran hyang ing sakalaçåstra
   manasija siren smaragama,
   ring wighnotsarañ prñyoga yamaraja sira
   makaphala ng jagaddhita. 1)

1. 'Oh! Homage (should be paid) at Your Feet,
o, Protector and Eternal Lord,
the Suksma in the depths of samâdhi, Çiwa
and Buddha alike to all visible and
invisible beings;
He is çri Parvatanatha, the king of all
kings, Lord of (all) worldly rulers,
God of all adored gods, the Supreme among
all that is beyond thought, (but) whose
existence is demonstrated by His presence
in the world, which

2. pervades, penetrates and saturates all
   things. He is Niguna to the followers of
   Wisnuism,
   to the Yogis Ñçwara, Poruṣa to Kapila. He
   is Jambhala, the god of wealth in visible
   form.
   He is Wagindra, the god of all knowledge;
   (He is) god Manasija in the doctrine of love.

1 My translation differs from those of previous scholars
and may be regarded as a possible alternative to them.
I have only noted the reasons from this divergence where
it is relevant to my argument.
He is the excellent Yamaraja, the remover of troubles, who brings about the welfare of the world.

Notes: I regard Çiwa Buddha as a dwandwa compound.
Sire would be a better reading than sira, (1,b) but in that case the metre would be faulty.
I see in ring yogiçvara a better reading than the San.'s sira ta bhatara Paramaçiwa ngaran ira which is a little unusual in the context and general structure of the sentence. Perhaps sira ta bhatara Paramaçiwa ngaran ira de sang yogiçvara is more appropriate for San.

In my view, there is no indication in the foregoing passages of an identification of Çiwa with Buddha or vice versa. Both however are treated as equals in the sense that each deity is the highest or supreme goal of worship for its own adherents. Indeed it is hard to credit that Īçwara should be identified with Jambhala or Manasija\(^1\) or Yama or even Buddha.

b) Kuñjarakarna\(^2\)

The Brahmanical deities in this work are described as the pupils of Wairocana which naturally implies that their status is much lower than that of their teacher. Furthermore it should be noted that in this story the demon Kuñjarakarna - the most important character and from whom the story has its name - gained his salvation

---

1 Bosch in the 'Inscription of Kêlurak' mentions that Smara (Manasija) is the enemy of Çiwa.
2 Kern, Kuñ.
through the instruction of Wairocana. Another important feature of this story is the career of Pūrṇawījaya, a close friend to Kuñjārakarna. He was a great sinner for whom the attendants of Yama prepared a special hell, but who was able to overcome the torments of this hell as a result of his studies with Wairocana. In this way it is proved that Wairocana's Buddhist doctrine is better, higher and more efficacious than the laws of karmma in the teachings of Hinduism or ṇiwaism.

Just as in the works referred to above, the traditional view has been to identify ṇiwa with Buddha, here too Kern has attempted to find an identification of the two gods. The passage on which Kern bases his argument is as follows:

Buddha kami ling sang ṇwagatapaksa, apan bhatara
hyang Buddha pinakadidewa mami; tan angga tunggal lawan ṇewapaksa, apan bhatara ṇiwah pinakadidewa nika, apan padudu ta nikang paksa. Ya ta dumeh sira sang wiku ri madyapada tan hana mwakta, apan marwa tunggal, hangrujит wlu, sang durung wruh ring kalingan ika. Glang ling sang ṇwagata, pańcakusika ling sang ṇewapaksa. Ikang Kusika tunggalawan Swabhya; sang Garga tunggalawan Ratnasambhawa; sang Mestri tunggalawan sirumitabha; sang Kurusya tunggalawan Mwagasiddhi; sang Pratajala sira tunggalawan ści Wirwacana. Ndah parantanaku!

1 We are adherents of Buddhism, say the Sogatas, because god Buddha is our Supreme God; we do not wish to

1 Kern, Kuñ., p.36.
2 Ibid., p.68.
associate with adherents of Çiwaism, as god Çiwa is their Supreme God, and so their sect is different [to ours]. The reason that [certain] priests in this world do not achieve salvation, is because they regard the One as two; not understanding the true doctrine, they divide the circle. The Sogatas speak of a circle, the Çaiwaites speak of the five kusikas. Kusika corresponds to Aksobhya, sang Garga corresponds to Ratnasambhawa, sang Mestri corresponds to Amoghasiddhi, sang Pratañjala corresponds to Wairocana. Well, what about that, my son! They all correspond to each other. And 'we are Çiwa' [corresponds to] 'we are Buddha'. We believe in Them both, do we not? Now your instruction is finished. An excellent achievement is yours, my son.

Notes:
The manner in which Kern has made his emendations and skipped words in his renderings, frequently creates the impression that he did not have time to do the necessary groundwork for this article. e.g.:

paduduta nikang pakṣa

Such is Kern's reading of the text. In a note he amended this to padudwan tikang pakṣa. In my view the original reading is correct, the only modification necessary in the transcription is the separation of ta from padudu. This indicates why my translation here does not agree with that of Kern.

glang rira

Kern has omitted these words from his translation without indicating any reason. In my view glang rira sang cwagata is incorrect. Perhaps a better reading would be glang ling sang cwagata, so that the sentence then runs:
Glang, apparently, made no sense to Kern and his rendering of the line therefore is distorted, for he felt the need to amend wlu into wulu, despite the fact that wlu or wêlu (circle) make good sense, and it is in fact wêlu that gives the key to the meaning of glang or gêlang (ring, circle).

Kern's comma after Yamabala, and emendation of hanatiki to anakiti and marengantanalara to marengantanalara, have led him to translate this passage as:

'Thump, thump! Continuously they were beaten with an iron club. Thud! Smash! Everywhere one saw emerging spearpoints. Thus acted the attendants of Yama, while tormenting all the sinful people who moaned painfully'.

However, if a fullstop is placed after Yamabala and hanatiki is left as written, with the sense of hanateki (hana ta iki) and marengantanalara is read mareng anta n alara, then the translation is very different, e.g.: Thump! Thump! [This is the sound of] beating with an iron club. Such were the actions of Yama's attendants. Since those people were all sinful, they had to suffer in the hereafter. (Since is implied in the words hana ta, as this expression indicates emphasis).+2)

Several lines further on, the text reads:


Zoetmulder, Taa., pp.24-5.
Uduh siddhabagya ta kita yayi yan datêng, ndanarayyantini nghulun. +1) Kern amended ndanarayyantini into ndan arah or aray antên i, and translated the sentence: Well, how happy I am that you come here. Well my dear younger brother, ...etc. I would prefer a full stop after datêng and read ndanarayyantini as ndan arayyantên i from ndan arayyan antên i, so that the translation should be: Well, how happy I am that you are here. So take a rest, my brother! Or to be more eloquent: Well, how happy I am that you are here. So relax, my brother!

A final example is mijil ta kita mungup ri gaga nindungta+2) Kern takes the view that gaga is a misspelling for ganggang which means spleet (split) which he translated into opening (aperture) so that the full translation reads: Then the crown of your head appeared in the aperture of your mother.

I would amend gaga into baga from bhaga which means the female genital, as the Balinese letter ga is very similar to ba. The translation is then: Then the crown of your head appears in the genital of your mother.

It might be argued that my emendation of irikwa to irika in the sentence: kami ta mangandêl irika which I translate into we believe in Them both, [do we not]? In most cases kwa usually has the same sense as ko but kwa does also occur as a variant form of ka, e.g., kwama warâhê ko emended by Kern into kamy awaraha ko on the basis of the Balinese ms. which has kami hawaraha or kamu warâhê ko. In both emendations Kern has regarded kwa as equivalent to ka.

---

2 Text on p. 66, translation on p. 34, notes on p. 50.
IVb - Kuñjarakarna

However I amended _irikwa_ into _irika_ (in Them both) because I believe this gives us the clue to the understanding of the sentence: _Tunggal ika kabaih_. Kami Sivah, kami Buddha. In other words if one believes (with all one's heart) that A for instance is the Supreme God, then all will be well, that belief is true. A or Çiwa or Buddha or whatever or whoever it may be is simply a manifestation of the Only Supreme God. Kṛṣṇa in his discourse to Arjuna in the Bhagavadgītā explained the nature of the Supreme God, the Eternal and Ultimate One very clearly. It is useful to quote the concluding stanza of the poem:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{na 'nto 'sti mama divyanam } \\
vibhutinam paramtapa \\
esa tu 'ddeqatah prokto \\
vibhuter vistarо maya
\end{align*}
\]

which Radhakrishan renders:

'There is no end to My divine manifestations, o. Conqueror of the foe (Arjuna). What has been declared by Me is only illustrative of My infinite glory!'

But though Kṛṣṇa declared that all that has been compared by Himself to Himself is only illustrative of His infinite glory, it does not follow that those things, beings or gods are of the same quality, of the same status, rank, stature in relation to each other. It does not mean for example, that Wasudeva has in every respect the same characteristic traits as Arjuna, though they are the Supreme ones in their respective race. It does not mean that Ucchāिरावā is in every respect of the same degree of excellence as Airawata, though they are the Supreme ones among their own kind. Neither

\[1\]

does it mean that Arjuna is of the same quality as Airawata. So the sentence Kami Siwah, kami Buddha does not mean that Çiwa is Buddha or that Çiwa has the same qualification as Buddha. Their equivalence is restricted to their group, race, or kind as the case may be.

Pigeaud in his thesis\(^1\) in accordance with Kern's findings says, that the denomination of Çiwa and Buddha as Guru, the teacher of the doctrine of Salvation, made the identity of Çiwa and Buddha more intelligible. But this is not the case. It is true that Çiwa is a teacher of a Salvation doctrine; it is true that Buddha is a teacher of a Salvation doctrine, but this by no means implies that the Salvation doctrine taught by Çiwa is the same as that taught by Buddha or that Çiwa and Buddha are one and the same. Even if Çiwaitic and Buddhist tantrism were identical (which I do not concede), it would not necessary follow that Çiwa is identical to Buddha. Pigeaud himself admits as much: \(^2\)

'Toch kan men niet zeggen dat alle namen en attributen van d' een ook aan de ander toegekend worden, 'n zekere scheiding wat betreft benaming heeft men altijd gehandhaafd. Opmerkelijk is in dit opzicht de tegenwoordige toestand op Bali, waar men beide riten nog steeds naast elkaar ziet bestaan. Ook op Java zal dit vroeger zoo geweest zijn, de Nāgarakertāgama maakt steeds onderscheid tussen heiligdommen van verschillende richting enz!'

'Nevertheless one can not say that all names and attributes of the one can be ascribed to the other;
a certain distinction between the denominations has always been maintained; in this case the present conditions in Bali, where one can still see the existence of both rites side by side, is noteworthy. In Java it would have been the same; the Nāgarakértāgama makes a distinction between sanctuaries of various sects etc.

Of great interest in this connection is the passage of the Caturpakṣopadeṣa, quoted by Pigeaud on pp. 42-4, wherein he concludes (p. 46) that the five sects are in fact one. In his own words it is as follows:

'Al worden in dit stuk ook geen ċaiwas en saugatas genoemd, 't betoog voor de eenheid in wezen van de vijf richtingen en de verklaring van hun verscheidenheid, die nu slechts in uiterlijkheden bestaat, door 't verloren gaan van de verschillende leerstellingen, toegelicht met vergelijkingen, waarschijnlijk van Indische oorsprong, zijn opmerkelijk op zichzelf en geven 'n niet oneigenaardig voorbeeld van de trant van oudere Javaansche godsdienstige geschreven.'

'Though in this passage the ċaiwas and the saugatas are not mentioned, the argumentation for the unity of the five sects and the explanation of their diversity as exists only in outward appearances, and occasioned by the loss of various teachings, explained with comparisons probably of Indian origin, are in themselves quite remarkable and give a not uncharacteristic example of the style of the older Javanese religious writings.'
In order to render an objective judgement possible I quote some of the most important parts: 1)

Kadyangganing manandang wastra, makweh rupa ning wastra sinandang ing janma, yan pinga, bang, kuning,

hirêng, wawannan kunir, sakarésëpya pangangge; haywa cinacad ya de sang pandita ikang hinganggonya, apan tunggal panandang.

Han mangkana ta Bhatara hiko dadi kabe; bhedda rupaning wlang lawan buddhinya, kunang uripnya Sira juga kewala haneriya. Iwa kadyangganikang ghata samuha, pada mesi wwe, yata swakna ri sanghyang Aditya; yan pirang ayuta kweha nikang ghata, tathapi ya silwakên ikang ghata, pada mesi haditya ri satunggal satunggal. Kunang ikang ghata hana rahayu rupa warmnanya, hana hala rupa warmnanya, tuhun pada kinahanan wimba ning arkka. Pratyaksan tatënga sanghyang Suryya ikang ana sapradeça, pira ta wilangnira? Anghing tunggal juga sira.

'As in the case of wearing clothes, there are many sorts of dresses worn by people, there are ivory, red, yellow, black, curcuma-coloured, according to one's taste. The learned man should not find fault with the wearer [for his choice of garment], because they are all clothes. Bhaṭara is like that, He becomes them all. People differ in form and mind [to each other], as for their lives He only is in them. It is just like jars which all contain water; if they are put in the sun,

1 The spelling is the same as in Pigeaud's book, but I have endeavoured to make it clearer and made other changes in reading, see notes.
though there are tens of thousands of jars, if one takes a look in the jars, they each contain a sun. As for the jars, there are beautiful and ugly ones, but all have the reflection of the sun. Observe carefully, look up at the sun which is everywhere, how many is he? One alone.

On the basis of this passage Pigeaud claimed to discern the unity of the Çaiwas and the Saugatas, apparently on the grounds that since the Bhatara is in them both, Çiwa and Buddha must be identical. In fact the reverse is the case. If we examine the passage in detail we see that:

a) a red dress and a yellow dress are both dresses, but it does not follow that a red dress is identical to a yellow dress. Though both are dresses, each exists in its own right.

b) a beautiful jar with water contains a reflection of a sun. An ugly jar with water also contains a reflection of a sun. Though this is the case, a beautiful jar is not an ugly jar. They remain different, though they each contain water reflecting one and the same sun.

c) Bhatara is in a big clever man.

Bhatara is in a small stupid man.

It does not follow that a big clever man is a small stupid man, though the same Bhatara is in them both. They remain different, only the Bhatara is the same. ¹

I see in the above passage not the teaching of the identity of Buddha and Çiwa, but only an instruction to devotees to be humble and tolerant towards the adherents.

¹ Compare Johns, Mal., p.103 and Dak, part II, p.139.
of other sects. This expression is seen for instance in the following:

haywa cinacad ya de sang pandita ikang hinang

  gonya, apan tunggal panandang!

'The learned man should not find fault with the wearer [for his choice of garments], because they are all clothes.

c) Nāgarakērtāgama+1)

In addition to the foregoing, the Nāgarakērtāgama also contains much data concerning the relationship between Ĉiwaism and Buddhism in general. As it is a work written by a Buddhist scholar and court poet, it is to be expected that we should find in it information more or less of the same quality as in previously discussed works. To present this material clearly, I have divided it into three sections:

Section 1: data concerning double shrines, double statues and double heavens.

Section 2: differences in dwelling and offering places in the kraton-area, different places for religious domains and different areas for religious instruction in rural areas, and specifications of duties.

Section 3: development of the concept that Buddha is superior to Ĉiwa.

Section One:

Canto 40, stanza 5 describes a king who was enshrined in two dharmas, one Ĉiwaitic the other

+1 Pigeaud, Jav., vols 1-5.
Buddhist. The problem as to whether they are in the same place or in two different places has not yet been conclusively solved.

The relevant passage in the text is as follows:

mangkin wrrdyâmêvêh tang prabhawa wîbhawa

ring qri girîndrâtmasûnu,

enak tândêl nikang yâwadarani sumiwî jöng nirân

catra ning rât,

rî çâkyàsyabdi rudra krama kalahan irân

mantuk swarggaloka,

kyâtîng rât sang dinarmma dwaya ri kâgênângan qçewaboddeng usânà.

'The power and wealth of qê Girîndrâtmasûnu increased steadily, with pleasure the leaders of the land of Java waited upon the king, the protector of the world.

In the year 1149 Çaka was his downfall+1) returning to heaven, wellknown to the people in olden times as the one who was enshrined in two temples, one Çiwaitic and another Buddhist, in Kâgênângan.'

Notes:

While Kern and apparently Krom, Pigeaud and others took the view that both temples were located in Kâgênângan (or kagênângan according to the text), Poerbatjaraka understood the word usânà as indicating

1 I translate kalahan with downfall as it refers to the assassination of Ken Arok by the servant of Anusapati which resulted in the king's return to heaven.
the name of a place where the Buddhist shrine mentioned in the text was located. As ing usāna can mean at Usāna (as Poerbatjaraka suggested) as well as in olden times, I use the latter translation with the understanding that I do not completely dismiss the possibility of Poerbatjaraka’s suggestion. However all scholars have agreed that there are two temples, distinct from one another. Perhaps the situation is analogous to the two padmāsanas in a temple of Pinatih about six miles from Denpasar. +1) Hooykaas says that these padmāsanas are identical, each on one side of the bale pasamuan, the meeting-place of the gods during temple-festivals. Hooykaas further states that the villagers explained without any hesitation that these seats were for the Lord Buddha and the Lord Īcvara (Ciwa).

If Poerbatjaraka’s suggestion is in fact correct then the separation of the two temples is quite clear cut and the word dwaya certainly can not imply a hypostasis between Ciwa and Buddha. Perhaps in suggesting that Usāna was a place-name, Poerbatjaraka was influenced by canto 41, stanza 4, which reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{çakābda kanawawāniksithi bhatāra wiśnu wulih} \\
\text{ing qūrālaya pējah,} \\
\text{dinarmma ta sire walēri qiwawimbha len} \\
\text{sugatawimbha munggwing jajaghu,} \\
\text{samāntara muwah bhatāra narasinghāmūrtti sira} \\
\text{mantuk ing surāpada,} \\
\text{hañar sira dinarmma de haji ri wəŋkerja īttama} \\
\text{qiwārcca munggwi kumitir.}
\end{align*}
\]

'In the year 1190, Çaka, king Wisnu died and returned to the abode of the gods.

He was enshrined in Walēri in the form of a Čiwa statue and in Jajaghu in the form of a Buddha statue.

After a while king Narasinghamūrtti returned to the abode of the gods.

Recently he was enshrined by the king of Wēngkēr in Kumitir, in the form of an excellent Čiwa statue.'

In this stanza it is clearly evident that the statues of Čiwa and Buddha are distinct and located in different places though resembling the same king. That one and the same person may be enshrined as Buddha as well as Čiwa is certainly no proof that Buddhism and Čiwaism have fused into a single religion.

Canto 43, stanza 5 goes even further by stating that the king Wisnu in question obtained salvation in the abode of Čiwa-buddha. Whether the words Čiwa and Buddha denote a blending or not remains to be seen, as the compound can be regarded either as dwandwa or karmadarāya. The text runs as follows:

\[ \text{ring c̣ākābdī jakāryyama npati mantuk ring} \]
\[ \text{jina-indrālaya,} \]
\[ \text{sangka i wruh nira ring kriyāntara lawan} \]
\[ \text{sarwopadeçađikā,} \]
\[ \text{sang mokteng ċiwa-buddaloka talahan ċrī nātha} \]
\[ \text{ling ning sarāt,} \]
\[ \text{ri ngke sthāna nirān dinarma ċiwa-buddārcca} \]
\[ \text{halēp nyottama.} \]

'In the year 1214 Çaka the king returned to the abode of the Jinendras.
Because of his knowledge of the other rites and all kinds of excellent doctrines, people said that the name of the king was "the one who obtained salvation in the abode of Ciwa and Buddha".

Here was his place, enshrined in the form of extremely marvellous statues, one a Ciwa and another a Buddha. Poerbatjaraka and Pigeaud are apparently of the opinion that Ciwabuddaloka and Ciwabuddarcca are singular; Kern however still had his doubts and preferred not to hazard a guess. In a footnote he referred to canto 56 where he gave an alternative translation, in which the statues of Ciwa and Buddha were regarded as distinct. If Ciwabuddarcca then may be regarded as indicating two statues, then Ciwabuddaloka may be understood as referring to two distinct places. And the explanation for this is that the achievements of the king were brought about by his expertise in Buddhist as well as Ciwaitic rites. So it is not surprising the people felt that because the king excelled in Buddhism he should return to the abode of the Jinendras and as he was highly versed in Ciwaism he should return to the abode of Ciwa. There is material relevant to this topic to be found in the Sutasoma also.

It seems that the solution to this problem of dual representation is to be sought not in the concept of syncretism, but in the pre-Hindu religion involving ancestor worship. Clearly, the deceased kings were not enshrined for their own benefit, but for that of their descendants, the people still living. As these were adherents either of Ciwaism or Buddhism, and still felt the urge to worship their ancestors, the Ciwaite created
their image in his own way and the Buddhist in his. Indeed de Casparis\(^1\) has noted that Mahāyāna doctrines are interpreted by the Hindu Javanese people as but one aspect of royal ancestor worship.

**Section Two:**

I propose to use the data adduced here to demonstrate that Buddhists are separated from Çiwaïtes in all aspects of life, and that they are always kept apart in order to prevent any blending. In fact I hope to show that the preservation and the distinction between Çiwaïsm and Buddhism is as fundamental as that within the triwangga; in other words that a blending of Çiwaïsm and Buddhism will be as disastrous to the community as the fusion of the castes. And I might point out in passing that the Çiwaïte Hayam Wuruk quite subtly gave preferment to Çiwaïsm over Buddhism, although Buddhism was for Prapañca and his fellow Buddhists the superior creed.

Canto 12, stanza 1 and 5, presents the different dwelling-places of the Çiwaïtic and Buddhist clergy indicating that although distinct both are treated equally. The text runs as follows:

1) warnnan tingkah ikang pikandél atathātūt

kanta ning nāgara,

weten sang dwija çiwa mukya sira dang hyang

brāhmārajādikā,

ngkāneng daksīna bodda mukyaŋ anawung

sangkā karngkannadi,

'Let us describe the benteng \(^{1}\) which was set out according to the plan of the government,

to the east lived the Čiwaitic dwija, eminent among them the excellent Brāhmaṇa.

There to the south lived the Buddhist ones, eminent among them Candraprabha of Rngkannadi.

To the west [lived] the ksatriyas, mantris, officials and family of the king.

Then to the south of the palace were the very attractive dwelling-places of the darmmādhyakṣas.

The east one was that of the outstanding Čiwaitic darmmādhyakṣa, the west one was the well arranged one of the Buddhist darmmādhyakṣa.

Not described are the dwelling-places of the prime minister and those of the ksatriyas, because of their great number and their

---

\(^{1}\) See Stutterheim, Kra., VKI, vol.7.
differences from one another, the city appeared beautiful.

Notes:

nāgara is translated by Pigeaud and Kern as town. I prefer to render it as government, a meaning which it often has in Javanese from the Moslem period onwards and later in the Bahasa Indonesia. The form and shape of the town of Majapahit, which in many respects still has to be determined, and the question as to whether it was built according to an established plan which still needs an answer, also has a bearing on my choice of term, which at the same time high-lights the important rôle of the government in the decision of granting dwelling places to officials and clergy in Majapahit.

anawung sangkā karngkannadi is amended by Pigeaud to anawang sang kākī pūngwing nadi, and both he and Sutterheim reject Poerbatajaka's guess çangkapâni. Pigeaud's emendation seems to me very far-fetched, particularly as the verse in question in my view does not appear corrupt: \(^1\) the metre is correct and the character clearly written. \(^2\) Moreover Brandes in his edition saw no need for any emendation. \(^3\).

Whatever modifications are necessary therefore, should be only in points of detail. I suggest one of the following alternatives:

1. anawung sanggaha with Kern, but in the sense of controller of the sanggha - the master of the

---

1 Pigeaud, Jav., vol.2, p.28.
2 I have a copy of a photocopy of the lontar, now the property of Prof. van Naerssen of Sydney.
3 VBG, vol.54.
2. anawung sasangka Rngkannadi. As it is already established that Prapañca often made use of wangsalan I see in anawung sasangka\textsuperscript{1} (the holder of the moon) the name of the bodhisattwa Candraprabha.

Bhattacharyya\textsuperscript{2} gives the following description of Candraprabha:

'In the Manjuvajra Mandala he is described as: Candraprabha is of white colour like the moon. He holds in his left hand the disc of the moon on a lotus, and displays the Varada mudrá in his right.'

Furthermore Bhattacharyya concludes:

'Thus the recognition symbol of Candraprabha is the moon on the lotus.'

If my assumption is correct then we have here the name of the revered Buddhist priest of Nadi, a view to which Krom also subscribes. Proceeding from Krom's suggestion, we face the problem of Rngkannadi, which it is now clear is not the name of the priest, but of his dwelling-place. It may be that Rngkannadi is the full name which abbreviated in Canto 64, stanza 3 of the Nāgarakṛta-gama into Nadi. Another possibility is that Rngkan is derived from ṛṛṅga (cracked) so that Rngkannadi could mean the confluence of the river. In New Javanese the word for a confluence is tempuran and villages in the vicinity of a confluence are sometimes

\textsuperscript{1} It is possible that the word sasangka has been abbreviated into sangka and that the name of the place is Karnkannadi, which is the same as Rngkannadi (see below).

\textsuperscript{2} B. Bhattacharyya, Ind., p.89.
called the village of Tempur or Tempuran. As the Honourable priest of Rngkannadi (Tempur) was held in such high esteem, I do not think it unreasonable that he should have such an august name.

It might be objected that to introduce Brâhmarâja the author used the honorific dang hyang while for Candraprabha only the article ng. This point however has already been answered by Stutterheim, who attributed it to the humble character of Prapañca. That we have a wangsalan may well be another reason for the simple ng. So the passage should read:

ngkâñeng daksina bodda mukyang anawung sasangka
Rngkannadi, with its translation there in the south part (lived) the Buddhist (dwijas), eminent among them Candraprabha of Rngkannadi.

Stutterheim disagreed with Kern and Pigeaud regarding the word daksina. He felt the word ngkana contained an indication that daksina should be regarded as meaning to the south of the dwelling-place of the Çiwaitic priest. This point is outside the scope of my argument. My only concern is to show that a regulation exists concerning the dwelling-places of the priests of both religions, namely that they were forbidden to associate.

1 Stutterheim, Kra., p.104.
2 In the Jaya-song (Pigeaud's Jav., vol.1, pp.106-7) plate 5 verso, there is reference to a person called pun apanjyanawung harsa. This name Anawung Hariṣa is repeated four times and apparently there is no alternative in the reading, so that it may be that Anawung sangka is not a wangsalan at all, but the real name of the Buddhist priest of Tempur (an). Though this kind of name is rare in Javanese, it is not impossible. Other names in this group may be noted: Anrangkusuma (Babad Tanah Djawi), Among Raga (Cêntini) Anglingdarmo (Serat Kanda) etc.
In stanza 5 mention is made of the location of the dwelling-places of the darmadhyaksas. Both were located to the south of the king's palace, but that of the Quraitic darmadhyaksa is to the east and that of the Buddhist to the west. Recalling Sutterheim's remark concerning this matter, namely that the east is regarded as superior to the west, it is clear that the grants of land for residential purposes were made with the utmost care and consideration.

From the dwelling-places of the clergy we move to the offering-places. Stutterheim in his criticism of Kern's comments on the above mentioned sanggha, remarked that to understand the nature of the identity between the two religions one had only to consider the Balinese pedanda siwa and boda, and to see that both are officials of one cult. It seems certain that he made this comparison because he had already accepted the view that Qurais and Buddhism had merged together. This however has not been proved beyond doubt, and in fact the data contained in some places in the Nāgaraṅgātāgama is so ambiguous that once this view has been accepted, it is easy to find support for it. The relevant passage consists in canto 8, stanza 3 and 4. The text runs as follows:

3) alwagimbar ikang wanguntur anhaturddi'  
watangan ikā witāna ri tēngah,  
lor tėng wećma panangkilan para bhujangga  
kimuta para mantryalinggih apupul,  
westan nggwan para caiwaboda mawiwāda

1 Sutterheim, Kra., pp.105-6.  
2 Ibid., p.96.
The courtyard is wide and spacious, the watangans are on the four sides while the witâna is in the centre, the north building is the place of assembly of the bhujanggas, together with the mantris; the eastern [building] is the place where the Ćiwaitic and Buddhist clergy loudly recite their ajis, fully supplied with whatever is necessary, that is, for the prâyaçcitta (appeasement-offering) at the eclipse in the month Phâlguna for the well-being of the people.

Located east [of it] there are offering-places in three rows of three, the middle of which are tall Ćiwaitic ones, the offering-places of the wipras are in the south, very attractive with storeys; at the west [corner] of the yard is a platform for tawur-offerings. The offering-places
of the Buddhists are in the north in three tiers, the roof being beautifully carved, their flower (motif) - ornaments are everywhere. Regularly the princes came in groups to give offerings.

Notes:

mawiwāda. Stutterheim translates this as disputerend (disputing), while Pigeaud explains it as competition, apparently derived from the word wiwāda (as a noun) which means dispute, quarrel, contest between. But in my opinion the mawiwāda should not be classified as a noun, but as a verb. So I looked it up under vi-√vād and obtained another meaning, namely: to raise the voice; to sing.+1) In my opinion this meaning is more fitting than to dispute or to contest as it is unlikely that a dispute about religion would be held while officiating at an offering. I imagine that the Buddhist and the Čiwaitic priest were pronouncing their mantras loudly, while officiating at the prayaçcitta-offerings amid dishes of offerings (upakaras).

grahana Here the characters are very clear, so that one needs to look no further than the word itself for a solution. Even were grahana replaced by çrawana+2) in canto 63, stanza 4 and the Phālguna refers to the religious Phālguna - festival in canto 83 and 84, there is still, on Pigeaud's own admission, something missing. The word prayaçcitta occurs in neither of these cantos. Yet the explanation

1 MW, p. 986.
2 Pigeaud, Jay., vol.2, pp.21-3.
is simple. These two annual religious festivals are simply not pārayācittā, propitiatory-offerings. The story of the origin of the eclipse on the other hand, in the Ḍiparwa for instance, is very popular and has been cited more than once in other works, so that it might well be that Prapañca actually intended the word grahāna to mean eclipse. Up to the present time, when an eclipse occurs, Javanese villagers make a tumultuous noise by beating all kinds of sound-producing things so as to ward off its evil effects. This is an indication of their fear of Rahu who wishes to devour the moon and the sun bringing destruction to the world. So it is understandable that a pārayācittā should be made to propitiate the horrible Rahu. That is why makaphala haywa ning sabhūwana occurs in the text as the result of the pārayācittā.

Kern⁴ remarks that in the Brhat-Samhita, mention is made of the calamities signalled by eclipses, because Rahu is said to have gained a boon from the Creator - during the period of an eclipse he could feed upon a portion of the offerings to the gods. Concerning an eclipse in the month of Phālguna the following is stated:⁵

'An eclipse in the month of Phālguna causes distress to the Vangas, Aṃmakas, Avantis, Mekalas, dancers, grains, noble ladies, bowyers, Kṣatriyas and ascetics.'

Though described very briefly the disasters augured an eclipse of Phālguna are great, grain (foodstuffs and the result of the Waiṣya's work), Kṣatriyas (including the king), as well as the ascetics (Caiwa, Sogata, rṣi)

² Ibid., p.199.
and others all will be destroyed. On the other hand, no mention is made of the good things which might come from an eclipse, e.g., an eclipse in the Vaiśākhā:¹

'By an eclipse in the month of Vaiśākhā, cotton, sesam, and beans will be lost; the Ikṣvakuśas, Yaudheyas, Scythians and Kalingas will meet with calamity, but food will be plentiful.'

So, an eclipse in the month of Phālguna is a source of great danger which will befall the triṃgāṇa, without any compensatory promise of good to the Sudras, and this means total disaster. Therefore it is understandable that a prāyaçcittā be performed to appease the demon Rahu and to ward off the bad influence of the eclipse.

It would be a great help to historians, if astronomical scholars could discover whether there was an eclipse in the month of Phālguna in the period of Hayam Wuruk's reign. Then many points could be settled beyond doubt, e.g., the data of the composition of the Nāgarakērtāgama and the historical status of certain events recorded.

ążajar ttiga-tiga. Kern translates this as in rijen drie aan drie : in het midden een hooge Ğiwaitische tempel. (in rows of three : in the centre a tall Ğiwaitic temple). Stutterheim² though agreeing to the correctness of Kern's translation still feels that in this case it is unlikely and, influenced by a remark made by Goris, asserts that the translation should be three in a row. Pigeaud translates it in a row three by three - perhaps meaning the same as

¹ VG, vol.1, p.48.
² Kra., p.48.
Kern - so the number is nine,\(^1\) whereas the \textit{wipras} are considered to be \textit{Wisnuitic priests}. Thus these three scholars have different findings in regard to the number of the offering-places: Kern, nine or ten if the \textit{Qiwaitic} temple in the centre is not included in the rows; Pigeaud, nine; Stutterheim, three.

I however, see in this stanza reference to three groups of priests, namely: a) \textit{Qiwaitic}; b) Buddhist; and c) the \textit{wipras}. In other places these three groups are: \textit{Qiwaitic}, Buddhist and \textit{rsis}. So it is possible that the \textit{wipras} are the \textit{rsis} who were neither Buddhist or Brahmin. According to Hooykaas\(^2\) there are three kinds of non-Brahmin \textit{rsis} in Bali - \textit{rsi dukuh}, \textit{rsi pinatih} and \textit{rsi sengguhu}. Stutterheim states that the \textit{sengguhu} is closely related with the \textit{banti ni sor} or \textit{patawur}. The only difference is that he considers the \textit{sengguhu} to be \textit{Wisnuitic}. Apparently Pigeaud is influenced by Stutterheim's finding and concludes that the \textit{wipras} are \textit{Wisnuitic priests}.

The literal translation of \textit{ajajar ttiga-tiga} is in rows of three. So the number of the offering-places is uncertain, and could be \(2 \times 3; 3 \times 3; 4 \times 3\) etc. What is certain, in my opinion, is that each of the three kinds of priests had its own row. So the middle row was for the \textit{Qiwaitic} offering-places, that to the south of it, was for the \textit{wipras}, and that to the north side, was for the Buddhists. If this is true then the number given by Kern (ten) is incorrect and that of Pigeaud and Kern (nine) a mere possibility. Stutterheim could be still partly correct.

\(^1\) Jay., vol.III, p.10 and vol.IV, p.15.
\(^2\) Wed., p.236.
I feel that the middle row of the Çiwaitic offering-places consisted of at least three — namely that of Brahmā, Çīwa and Wisnu, exactly in the pattern of the 
candi Lorosjongrang in Middle Java, or the Balinese Tripurusa temple.\(^1\) The Buddhist ones were in all probability built according to the plan of candi 
Plaosan or candi Sari in Middle Java, as it is mentioned that the building had three storeys and a roof with fine carvings. Candi Plaosan or candi Sari were also built in storeys (two) consisting of three parts and the roof was also beautifully decorated. Probably the three chambers contained the statues of Buddha in the centre, and Maitreya and Wajrāpani in the other chambers arranged in a way similar to that of the statues in the candi Mendut, or Buddha, Lokeśvara and Bajrāpani, because they are regarded as the ratnatraya.\(^2\) The arrangement of the offering-places of the wipras is the most difficult to work out. Probably it had a groundplan similar to that of the Balinese temples or some East Javanese temples of the candi Panataran type, that is to say the entire compound was divided into three parts. The first part was lower than the second which, in turn, was lower than the third.\(^3\) This is perhaps what is meant by the words padottama susun (excellently graded).

Stutterheim remarks that Borobudur has nine stages, although in this context he is referring to the tiers in the roof. I think the term excellently graded refers to the grading of the three parts of the yard.

\(^1\) J.C. van Eerde, Hin., p.15.
\(^2\) Junyboll, Nie., p.59, see also Kats, San., pp.60; 64.
\(^3\) Bosch, Ins., p.48.

L.J.F.M. Pannenborg-Stutterheim, Tre., p.17.
In Bali, the Balinese always have small offering-places in their back-yard at which they worship their ancestors.\(^1\) Assuming this custom already existed during the Majapahit-era, then these offering places - though having distinctive characteristics - may be regarded as analogous to those offering-places in the back-yard of the Balinese.\(^2\) This would explain why ancestral offering-places were put together in one place within the Royal compound even though the descendants did not consist of followers of only one sect. Again it is obvious that there is no question of blending, and that adherents of Buddhism went to the special offering-places provided for them, not just to any one at random. Certainly on special days perhaps the followers of the three sects performed the same offerings (for instance the odalan of the king or other events of the Balinese), but they performed the ceremony in their own way and at their own offering-places.

The location of the offering-places, namely with the Çiwaitic ones in the middle, implied that Çiwaism was favoured by the ruling king, as suggested by Stutterheim. In this case the ruling king and his fellow believers regarded Çiwaism as the most fulfilling religion. But it by no means follows that the Buddhists shared that opinion. Prapañca's own view is to be discussed later.

From offering-places which are located in one place, yet kept distinct, we come to religious domains. In many places in the Nāgarakērtāgama one finds that

1 J.C. van Eerde, Hin., p.15. See also M. Covarrubias, Isl., pp 90-1.
2 Ibid., pp.92-3.
the Çiwaitic and Buddhist domains were kept separate, but it was also very common to find religious domains of both religions in one place.\textsuperscript{1} In the latter case, the probability is that in those districts there were adherents of both religions, perhaps distributed according to the rigid rules mentioned above, so that blending simply could not take place. As an example I recall the villages in the Tênggêrese districts in East Java. Even today the people still maintain this kind of division, for instance: villages A and B and C are Buddhist, while villages E and D are Islamic and so on. Nevertheless, on many occasions I have seen the Moslem villages commemorate the kesodo-festival along with the Buddhist ones, though this rite is not regarded as having any relation with Islam. Here it should be borne in mind that the Tênggêrese Muslims should not be regarded as orthodox Muslims, but rather as the great number of other ethnic Javanese or Kalang-Muslims.\textsuperscript{2}

In cant. 82 mention is made of the king's establishment of religious domains in order to give an example of his relatives. It is apparent that one king or prince would build only a Çiwaitic domain or domains, whereas another would build only Buddhist ones. The text in cant. 82, stanza 2, runs as follows:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{1} Pigaud, Jav., vol. 4, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{2} E. Ketjen, Kal., p. 424.
\end{quote}
locanapurā,
qṛī nāthe watsarīkāng tigawangi magawe
tusteng para jana.

'The king of Singhasari founded in Sagadā a beautiful dharmma,
the king of Wengkēr in Çurabhana and Pasuruhan and that [king of] Pajang,
founded these Buddhist domains of Rawa, Kapulungan and Locanapurā,
the king of Watsari [founded that of]
Tigawangi bringing about happiness to the world.'

Notes:

buddādistāna. Pigeaud\(^1\) sees in this stanza reference to the four princes of the Royal family reigning at Singhasari, Wengkēr, Paguhan and Matahun respectively. But he is puzzled by the fact that the prince of Paguhan is not mentioned. Krom\(^2\) suggests that his name should be sought in the third line, as he himself - and Pigeaud - had done, and in particular in the word buddādistāna. Krom explains buddādistāna as referring to the king's brother-in-law reigning at Paguhan, whereas Pigeaud says that this word does not make good sense in this verse, and in place of it he reads shri nāthe Sthāna, Sthāna standing for Paguhan, again finding fault with the text.

I see in this verse the establishment of distinct Ćiwaitic and Buddhist domains, as Kern remarks that buddādistāna and locanapurā were clearly Buddhist domains.

1 Jay., vol.4, p.263.
2 Näg., p.301.
As it is unlikely that one man established both Çiwaitic and Buddhist ones. The solution to the problem of a reference to the prince of Paguhan may well be sought in the second line. Hence my translation of lâwan tang i Pajang as and that [king of] Pajang, which refers to the king of Paguhan as he was married to the princess of Pajang.*1) If my assumption is correct then it strengthens the view that a Çiwaitie was not permitted to found a Buddhist domain or vice versa, (see further Arjunawijaya, canto XXX, stanza 1 and 2).

From domains we move on to a discussion of the various areas or districts where instruction in the two religions was permitted. There is reference to these in canto 16, stanza 1 and 2, which run as follows:

1) krama nika sang bhûjanggan umareng
digantara dangû,
hinila-hilân swakaryya jag adona tan swang
alahâ,
wênang ika yan pakon nrpati sing parâna
kunang,
mağêhakna çiwagama phalanya tan panasara.

2) Kunang ika sang bhûjangga sugatabrateki
carengê,
apituwin ajûa hajya tan asing paranän tikâ,
hinila-hila sakulwan ikanâng tanâh jawa
kabeh,
taya ring usâna bodda mara rakwa sambhawa
tinût.

---

*1 Berg has the same finding. See Rij., p.299.
1) The rules for bhūjaggas when they wished to go to other districts in olden times (were as follows):
   It was forbidden to travel around at will as it might be dangerous,
   on the other hand - if with the permission of the king - it was allowed to travel anywhere to establish Čiwaism, so that no confusion should arise.

2) As for the Buddhist bhūjaggas, it was heard that there was even an order of the king that they could not go anywhere, all districts west of Java were forbidden to them, for in olden times no Buddhist went there.
   Such is the story according to tradition.

Notes:

swakaryya jag adone Kern translates swakaryya by eigen zaken (own business), while Pigeaud translates it by of their own accord. I choose at will which seems to fit closely to the literal meaning.

jagadona Kern translates it by waardoor het belang der wereld (by which the interest of the world), while Pigeaud reads it jaga don (a) and translates it to fix one's eye on a goal. In this case Pigeaud assumes that the ecclesiastical officers of canto 16 were traders under a Royal patent.1

Further he says that a close relation of religion and
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economy is nothing to be wondered at; history is full of such instances.

I do not think this could be so in Hinduism which divides society into four castes, namely Brahmin, Ksatriya, Waiṣya and Cudra, and therefore I think it most unlikely that the clergy (bhūjangga) of Majapahit who were certainly brahmins would be merchants, since merchants normally belonged to the Waiṣya caste. It is probably true that clergymen accompanied convoys of merchants whenever they travelled, but they were not merchants themselves, only religious teachers. I think the regulations issued by the king were meant to prevent confusion among the people if religious teachers of both Civaism and Buddhism were allowed to wander (and preach) at will (swakaryya jag adon). The Javanese word jag or jag-jagan means to trample around, while in Oldjavanese texts, such as Tantu Panggélaran and Kuñjarakārṇa, jag or jag lēs is an onomatopoeic word which is closely related with the meaning to go, to leave and the like. The word andon or andon lelanā means to wander around.2)

tan swang alaha Kern translates it ten zeerste zou lijden (would suffer very much). Pigeaud translates it without fail they would perish. Juynboll (J., p.647) gives as translation of tan swang amongst others onbevreesd (without fear); alaha from alah has, amongst others, the meaning of defeat. I suppose harm fits better, as I do not think the brahmins were on the war-path, but only that it might happen that they preach their religion at the same place as a Buddhist priest with the result that the people

1 See J., p.302, don l.
would fall into confusion referred to in the fourth line, and that they might get hurt in any ensuing turmoil. In short there might be danger, if the bhūjanggas were allowed to travel around at will; hence my translation. However, this kind of danger could be prevented if there was a special order or permission given by the king, as mentioned in the third line, which would ensure there could be no confrontation between preachers of the two religions.

karēngō Kern renders it luidt het verhaal (the story goes), while Pigeaud renders it one hears that. I am of the opinion that Kern gives a better rendering, because it refers back to the word dangū (in olden times), so that it is probable that Prapañcā knew it from hearsay. Because Kern is puzzled by the word he has read as atana and Pigeaud is influenced by his own understanding of karēngō, both have produced an untenable translation of the second line. Since that of Kern derived from a misreading of the text, it can be ignored. Pigeaud's translation runs as follows:

even though there should be an order of our Lord, it would not be any travel, wheresoever, to be sure.

The incredible feature of this translation is that a Buddhist priest, even by orders of the king (Hayam Wuruk) should be barred from travelling. Who would dare to oppose the order of Hayam Wuruk at that time without the risk of being branded as a rebel and having to face Gajah-Mada's retaliation? In Pigeaud's own words without fail they would perish. The only possibility is that Prapañcā knew from hearsay that there was even

1 Pigeaud, Jav., vol.2, p.33.
in olden times an order of the king that forbade Buddhist priests to go west of the island of Java. Perhaps here in olden times refers to the time of Kertanagara or even Airlanggha who were known not to be on good terms with the western part of Indonesia (i.e., Criwijaya). It might be that this regulation arose from defensive consideration too, as Criwijaya was known as a centre of Buddhism, and Buddhist adherents of Majapahit or Singhasari might take the side of Criwijaya if they were allowed to go there and then return. The fact that Mpu Bharada and Kuturan are mentioned in the next stanza in fact indicates, that in all probability the olden times refers to the reign of Airlanggha. If this is true, then the regulation is just as in stanza 1, a protection for the clergy, who are thus not exposed to a temptation to disloyalty.

As Prapanca did not know whether or not this particular regulation was still in force, he put the word rakwa before tinut. Hence my translation tradition, i.e., something that people inherited from their ancestors and had to observe. I translate the word sambhawa by tradition, because it could mean origin, cause.\(^1\) Kern did not translate this part of the sentence and this prompted Berg to consider an emendation\(^2\) into wara Ratnasambhawa. Though very ingenious, I am not inclined to follow in his steps as I feel that it is unnecessary. Pigeaud rejected Berg's emendation by indicating that the Jina, who is sometimes identified with Wisnu is Amoghasiddha and not

\(^1\) J., p.58, see also MW, p.119.
\(^2\) Berg, Rij., p.267.
Ratnasambhava.1) I should add that also the word hila-hila supports the view that those regulations existed in the past.

From this passage it can be deduced that in the Majapahit-era there was a tradition in vogue, whereby certain parts of the country were taboo for the preaching and establishment of a particular religion by the ecclesiastical officers. The following stanzas however suggest that this tradition originated from the time of Airlanggha and in all probability was not rigidly observed at Hayam Wuruk's time.

As the last item in this second section I take canto 75, stanza 2 to illustrate the regulations concerning the administration of clergy in Majapahit. The text is as follows:

len tang dharma lepas padekana rinaksadeg nya

de ciri narendra,

ciwa dyaksa sira winha rumaksa parhyangan

mwang kalagyan,

boddadyaksa sireki raksaka ri sakweh ning kuti

mwang wihara,

mantri her haji tang karsyan iniwö nyän rakseka

sang tapaswi.

'The free religious domains were different, their existence was protected by the king, the Ciwaitic dyaksa had orders to protect the parhyangans and the kalagyan, the Buddhist dyaksa was the protector of all kutis and wiharas, the mantri her-haji looked after the karsyans, he had to protect the hermits.

---

1 Pigeaud, Jav., vol.5, p.437.
In this passage four protectors are mentioned, in the first place the king who takes direct responsibility for the free domains in the rural districts, and if this royal power has any bearing on the afore-mentioned story then it is very likely that the king made those travel-regulations for Čīwaitic and Buddhist priests so as to confine their movements solely within their respective areas. The other three (naturally under the kings supervision) are protectors of the three sects, namely the Čīwaitic, the Buddhist and the rsi, as already described, (see canto 8, stanzas 3 and 4). Again it is clearly described that the officials of the three sects are distinct from each other with specifications of their duties, which can be regarded as an indication that their fields are separate. (see also Arjunawijaya, canto XXX, stanzas 1 and 2 below).

Section Three

If in the first and second section I attempt to show that Čīwaitism and Buddhism retained their distinct individuality, in this part I would like to put forward some evidence that Prapañca, as a Buddhist author, endeavoured to express his own Buddhist view concerning the relationship of Čīwaitism and Buddhism, i.e., that Čīwaitism is inferior to Buddhism. This view is persistently maintained in Buddhist works or in texts written by Buddhist authors.

In canto 84, stanza 3, there is a description of Hayam Wuruk who is compared with Siddhârtha Gautama, flanked with minor kings around him in the form of Hindu deities. The text runs as follows:

sâmpun nrpati manek ring manimaya singhâsana

suminâbhra.
The king had already mounted the brilliant shining bejewelled lion-throne, he looked like the son of king Čuddodana [in visible form] just appearing from the wonderful abode of a jina, clearly the three divine kings of the gods stood close at his sides paying homage attentively; because their clothes were excellent, people said: "How great, how magnificent!"

Notes:

Čuddodani Kern translates this as Čuddodana's son, whereas Pigeaud regards the word Čuddodani as a proper name and explains it as Siddharta Buddha. Poerbatjaraka apparently accepts Kern's translation, but connects the episode with the descent of Buddha from the Trayastrimās heaven blended with the descent of the Buddha from the Tusita heaven. In short, all these prominent scholars refer to the son of Čuddodana as the Buddha. I find it more appropriate to understand Čuddodani as Prince Siddhartha Gautama before his enlightenment.

trisura surendra Kern translates this the three gods and Indra. Poerbatjaraka

emends it to tripura surendra and translates it Çiwa and Indra. Pigcaud goes further and makes a more dazzling emendation into tripura harendă, the name of a goddess. I prefer the text as it stands trisura surendra and to regard this phrase as a compound. The meaning of trisura is the three gods and surendra from sura-indra is the king of the gods. So the whole should mean the three divine kings of the gods which refers to Brahmā, Wisnu and Çiwa. It seems unfortunate that we should be misled by the idea that Prapañca was referring to minor kings such as the rulers of Wengkēr, Singhasari, Paguahan and Matahun. This is not the case. Prapañca was not referring to these princelings, but to an episode in the Lalítawistara, and perhaps even to the reliefs of Borobudur, when prince Siddhārtha Gautama was taken to the temple to receive his first consecration. As he stood in the temple yard, flanked by his father and other kings and highranking officials, the three kings of the gods paid homage to him. Krom says: +1)

"Zumo kwam koning Çuddodana onder groot koninklijk ceremonieel, groote koninklijke pracht en groote koninklijke heerlijkheid met den prins den tempel binnen. Zoodra de Bodhisattwa zijn rechtersoetzaal in dien tempel op de grond geplaatst had, toen stonden die levenlooze godenbeelden, te weten Çiwa, Skanda, Kuwera, Candra, Sūrya, Waiçrawana, Çakra, Brahmā, de wereldhoeders en nog andere beelden, allen elk van zijn voetsstuk op en vielen neder aan de voeten van den Bodhisattwa. En de goden, van welke die beelden waren, toonden allen hun eigen gedaante en spraken deze versen."

1 Krom, Lev., p.44.
So king Cuddodana and the prince entered the temple with great royal ceremonial, great royal magnificence and great royal splendour. As soon as the Bodhisattwa put the sole of his right foot on the ground in the temple, the lifeless statues of the deities, i.e., Çiva, Skanda, Nãrâyana, Kuwera, Candra, Sûrya, Waiçrawana, Çakra, Brahmâ, the world-guardians, and other statues, all of them stood up from their bases and prostrated themselves at the feet of the Bodhisattwa. And the deities, represented by those statues, appeared in their own forms and pronounced these verses.'

As Krom noted, the scene in the Lalítawistara occurs in the temple, while at the Borobudur it takes places in the open. Concerning the deities, Krom comments:

'Uit de vensters kijken twee menschenfiguren, waarschijnlijk goden; een derde komt reeds buiten den tempel; drie knielen, een staat, allen maken een eerbiedige sembah voor den van rechts naderenden Bodhisattwa. Onder die goden is de staande, welke niet den gewoone hoog hoofdtoo draagt, doch eenvoudig een naar boven opgebonden haar-massa, waarschijnlijk Brahmâ, die immers ook elders als Çikhin wordt voorgesteld.'

'Two human figures look out of the window, probably deities; a third comes (already) out of the temple; three kneel down, one stands by, all of them make a respectful sembah to the Boddhisattwa approaching them from the right. Among the deities is one standing who does not wear the usual high head-dress, but simply a hairknot on top of his head, probably Brahmâ who elsewhere is represented also as Çikhin.'
As we know, Prapañca's description of the scene is closer to its presentation on the reliefs of the Borobudur than in the Sanskrit Lalitawistara-text. This suggests that in all probability Prapañca did not know the Sanskrit version of the story, but only the Borobudur one, which at the same time adds support to the theory concerning popular knowledge of and respect for the temple of Borobudur, amongst Buddhist community of Majapahit. And as the scene in the Lalitawistara and also on the Borobudur is intended to suggest the superiority of Buddha to Čiwa and other Hindu deities, it is beyond doubt that Prapañca secretly had the same intention. Perhaps this last point requires further elaboration. In the Majapahit-era, or to be more precise, during Hayam Wuruk's reign, Čiwaism was clearly the favourite of the king though he did not neglect the other sects. So the Buddhist who wished to uphold his religion had to work cautiously so as to avoid offending the king or the government in power. In the verse quoted above, the king was compared with prince Siddhārtha Gautama, the Buddha to be, even though he was a Čiwaite. This was a very clever device.

Poerbatjaraka accuses Prapañca of being a great chauvinist,\(^1\) which is quite untrue. Was prince Siddhārtha already a Buddha at this stage in his career? No, for then he was still a Hindu, if not a Čiwaite. He was even preparing to go to his first consecration in a Hindu temple. So the comparison is perfect, the king would not be offended and Prapañca's secret goal would be achieved.

---

1\(\) Poerbatjaraka, Aan, p.277.
To give further proof that this kind of procedure was applied in other fields, I will take Prapañca's description of Candi Jawi in canto 56, stanzas 1 and 2 as an example. The text is as follows:

1) "Then in olden times there was a story about the excellent dharmma that was the kārtti of king Kērtanāgara, the great grandfather of the king. Furthermore it is said that he founded it himself, no one else.

That was the reason that formerly both Čiwaites and Buddhists paid homage there regularly."
2) Evidently the temple below was Ćiwaiteic, on top of which a Buddhist one was built, [and] inside it there was a Ćiwa statue limitless in beauty and lustre, and above it in the 'crown' [of the temple] there was a statue of Aksobhya without equal [in quality]. It disappeared by its own supernatural power; in truth this was release into the eminent Void.'

Notes:

sirângadistita çârîra. I render this he founded it himself, Pigeaud adds to his similar translation and quite alone.\(^1\) I think that king Kērtanâgara founded the kîrtti not by himself alone, but by virtue of the fact that the kîrtti was erected on his orders, according to his express wishes and was financed by him.

i ruhur mmakuta I think the mmakuta (crown, top, roof) is not the makuta of the Ćiawimba, but the makuta of the kîrtti as the first line implies, namely that the lower part of the candi, i.e., the base and the body, is Ćiwaiteic and the top or roof is Buddhistic, because inside the chamber there is a statue of Ćiwa and above in the roof there is a statue of Aksobhya. This is why the Candi Jawi is so high and is called a kîrtti.\(^2\) Therefore there could be two statues in the candi. Let us suppose that the statue of Aksobhya is in the makuta of the Ćiwa statue, then the sthâpaka mentioned in stanza 2

\(^1\) See Pigeaud, Jav., vol.4, p.152 and other commentaries and also Berg., Rij., pp.240-2.

\(^2\) Bosch, Ins., p.31.
above would not be perplexed to see a Buddhist monk paying homage there. +1)

\(\text{\textit{qa\text{-}iwa\text{-}boddha}}\) I prefer the translation of Piglaud to that of Berg, as it confirms the theory that the candi is supposed to be a holy building for both \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\) (as in the temple there is a \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\) statue) and Buddhists (as in the roof of the temple there is the Aksobhya statue, whom they came to worship).

It may be understood however, that this does not imply any blending between the religions, as suggested by Berg's translation (daar elke aanbidder \(\text{\textit{en Qiwa}}, \text{\textit{en}}\) \(\text{\textit{Buddha vereerd}}\)). The worshippers came there in fact to pay homage to Kêrtanâgara, the \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\)ites in his appearance as \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\); the Buddhists in his appearance as Aksobhya. If every worshipper paid homage to both \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\) and Buddha, in this way, the \(\text{\textit{sth\text{-}apaka}}\) would not be puzzled when he saw a Buddhist monk worshipping before the \(\text{\textit{Qiwa}}\) statue.

\(\text{\textit{q\text{-}unyatatwaparam\text{\text{-}}}}}\) I think Prapañca changed the order of the words in order to get a suitable \(\text{\textit{guru\text{-}laghu}}\). The actual order should be \(\text{\textit{parama\text{-}qunyatatwa}}\) which I translate in truth this was release into the eminent Void, to refer to the disappearance of Aksobhya with fire and thunder (as it is often described in the \(\text{\textit{wayang}}\), e.g., Resi Padmanaba whose disappearance was brought about by Kresna in the \(\text{\textit{lakon Kangsa adu djago}}\) and that of Resi Bagaspati by Narasoma in the \(\text{\textit{lakon Narasoma}}\) both of which are reminiscent of the \(\text{\textit{parinirw\text{-}wana}}\) of the Buddha Himself.

Another possible translation of \(\text{\textit{tuhu q\text{-}unyatatwaparam\text{\text{-}}}}}\)

\[1\]

Krom, \(\text{\textit{N\text{\text{-}}g}}\), p.285.
or tuhu paramaçûnyatatwa is in truth (he is) the eminent Void. The expression in the Sutasoma (canto XLI, 2, d.) is sirâñ nirbbâna nirllaksana, (he is Bliss without qualities).

The setting up of the Aksobhya statue in the Candi Jawi above that of Çiwa can have only one meaning, that Aksobhya is regarded by the founder of the temple as superior to Çiwa. But why then is the statue of Aksobhya hidden and not visible to the worshippers, because in Kërtanâagara's reign, Buddhists did not need to be as tactful in the expression of their religious views as in Prapañca's times? It should be realized, however that the arrangement of the statues in particular and the whole kîrtti in general was in accordance with the wishes of king Kërtanâagara, and the Subhûti tantra embraced by the king was a secret society known only to a privileged few. In recent years however the problem as to whether or not there was in fact an Aksobhya statue inside the main dagob of the Borobudur has risen again and indications are that there was. In this case, the existence of the Aksobhya statue hidden in the makuṭa of Candi Jawi, invisible to people, has a striking similarity to the one in the main dagob of Borobudur also hidden from public view. If this is correct then what is the explanation of the notion that the main dagob should be a symbol of çûnyāta. Prapañca's answer is that Aksobhya was supposed to be the symbol of çûnyāta or paramaçûnyatatwa itself. As I mentioned before, the Borobudur is a visual instruction to Buddhists. So to visualize Void or Emptiness, the unfinished Buddha (see below) is used, as it is the Void itself. It should be understood however, that this does not contradict my previous theory that the
dagob as an overturned bowl suggests emptiness, because emptiness does not only mean not to contain anything, but can be expressed in another way such as to contain nothing. But because it is very hard to grasp the significance of nothing being something, the existence of the Void is not displayed, but hidden from view. That is the reason why the main dagob has no holes and does not look like the other dagobs with holes on the circular base and why the Akṣobhya of Candi Jawi is said to be atisuksmre ruhur (well hidden in the roof, canto 57, 3).

If Berg's theory concerning the removal of the Akṣobhya statue is correct+1 then it only confirms the opinion that some people in the Hayam Wuruk government felt offended by this fact and made Prapañca's cautious attitude understandable. Again if Berg's theory about the Jaka Dolog statue (namely the Akṣobhya statue of Sim pang = the Akṣobhya of Candi Jawi) is true, then it would boost the theory that the setting of an unfinished statue in the main dagob of Borobudur was intentional. In this case one should remember that the phrase tan hanolyan tikâ (literally there was no match to it or it had no equal in quality) does not only mean ostensibly perfect or beautiful or outstanding quality in appearance and form, but literally that the deity has no equal to created things, as stated in the Qur'an, for instance:+2

wa lam yakun lahu kufîwan ahadun
(and equal to Him is not anyone)

---

1 Berg, Rij., p.245.
2 Sûra Al Ikhlâs, 4.
In the Sutasoma\textsuperscript{41} the expression is as follows:

\begin{quote}
ichā nora kasangayāganal-alit tan mātra
matreng sarāt. (He is tranquil, fears nothing, is neither coarse nor fine, and nothing in creation is like unto Him).
\end{quote}

d) \textit{Arjunawijaya}\textsuperscript{42}

The Arjunawijaya like the Sutasoma, is the work of Mpu Tantular. Therefore we would not expect the general concepts he expresses in this poem to differ from those we have already noted in the \textit{Sutasoma kakawin}. It goes without saying that since Mpu Tantular lived in the Majapahit-era, he is as much a representative of the living Buddhist tradition as Prapanca. But in the Arjunawijaya, there are only a few passages which can throw light on the problem with which we are concerned. Nevertheless, a preliminary look at this poem may yield important results. The most frequently quoted passages from this work ostensibly indicate the Unity of \textit{Çiva} and Buddha; some discussion is therefore required if what seems to me a mistaken view, is to be set in a proper perspective. The poem opens with canto 1, stanza 1:

\begin{quote}
ong sang çri parwatarājadewa hurip ing
sarwaprāmaṇeng jagat,
sang sāksāt paramārtha buddha kinēñep sang siddha
yogićwara,
sang lwir tirtha kiteng maharddhika wisāmbēkteng
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1} Canto XLI, 3, d.

\textsuperscript{2} My colleague Mr Supomo Surjohudojo is working on this text as the basis of his thesis. So some details, e.g., the establishment of authorship and details of his career will be included in his work. Therefore I have made little mention of such matters.
mahādurjana,
nirvighnopama surya wimba tumameng wway sānta ring
rāt kabeḥ.

'Om! Çri Parwatarajadewa, the life of all
creatures in the world is virtually an image of
the Supreme Buddha,
and who is kept in the mind of the perfect
Çiwaitic yogins:
You are nectar to the great souls (but) poison
to the great sinners,
clear as the reflection of the sun in water,
beneficent to all the worlds.'

Notes:

yogīwarā I understand this as meaning
Çiwaitic yogins as in Rāmāyana
I, 7, +1) which runs as follows: maheśwara ta sira lanā,
because it makes more sense that Parwatarajadewa rather
than Buddha is kept in the mind of Çiwaitic yogins. In
this case the only explanation of sang sāksāt paramārtha
buddha is, that it is used to indicate a comparison
with Parwatarajadewa ( = Çiwa).

sang īwir tīrtha etc..... mahādurjana

This line is of reminiscent of a passage in the
Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan+2) which is as follows:
wisāmrta ikeng bajrodaka, wwaḥ sahingga tinika, pilih
duhka kapangguha. Yat pramāda kita pamanggu duhka,
kunang yat prayatna, awās ikang suka hayu kasiddhyan
kapangguha useṇ, nguniweh dlaha.

1 Kern, Rām., p.l.
In the Nitiçåstra¹ a similar passage also occurs, e.g., in canto 1, 3, as follows:

ring widyå wisa tulya de nikang anabhyåsålasang

sampåneåh,
yan tan jîrna tikång bhinojana hatur wisyatèmah

wyådha ya,
ring hinårtha daridra tulya wisa gostinyåtèmah

manglare,
ring kanyå wisa tulya ring jada pikun tan pårmtångde
wingit.

'Knowledge is like poison for one who is not akin to it, lazy and inert, if food is indigestible it becomes poison and causes illness.

[Social] gatherings are like poison for poor people who do not have wealth, [they] bring about unhappiness.

A foolish old man is like poison for a young maiden, [he] has no nectar (= attractiveness) and causes only anger.'

hurip ing sarwa pråmana I translate the life of all beings. Such a phrase occurs very frequently, e.g., Någarakårtågama, I, 1 and 2, Caturpakåspadeçå (kunang uripnya Sira juga kewala haneriya,²) Arjunawîwaha (utpatti sthiti lina ning dadi kitåta karåna nika, sang sangkan paran ing sarååt sakala niskalåtmaka kita).³)

¹ Poerbatjaraka, Nåt, p. 22. The Nitiçåstra is regarded as contemporary with the Nirårthapåkråta. Poerbatjaraka places it in the last years of Majåpåhit.
² Pigeaud, Tan., p. 42.
In the Sutasoma, canto CXIX, stanza 13, it occurs in the following form:

Mwang yan paråtreka kabeth nya rakwa,
katon hurip nyan ri hurip narendra,
jiwanta jiwa nya mahåwiçesa,
kabeth pramånan kita jîwa ning råt.

From a brief glance at this stanza, we may well get the impression that Parwataråjadewa is in fact Buddha. But if we study it more closely, and without preconceptions, it becomes clear that this is not the case. The author merely wishes to state that Parwataråjadewa is the Life (Soul) of all beings in the world for the yogiçwaras, and Buddha is the Life of all beings in the world for the Buddhists. In the Kuñjarakarna we find the following:

Yeka sinangguh Bhatara Widdhi ngaranya, apan

Sira hâmiddhi ning hâjñana ..................

'It is this that is regarded as Bhatara Widdhi because It decrees [those] who may obtain knowledge.'

Here Buddha is regarded as Bhatara Widdhi because He has this nature. Çiwa is regarded as Bhatara Widdhi because He too has this nature. But the essential sense of the passage remains the same, namely that Buddha is the Bhatara Widdhi for the Buddhist and Çiwa is the Bhatara Widdhi for the Çiwaite.

Nevertheless, we cannot claim to have an open and shut case, for there are ambiguities, and even apparent

1 See my translation in vol.3.
contradictions in the text. Any definitive statement must wait until it has received detailed study, for example in the verse quoted below (canto XXVI, 4), we find the converse of stanza 1 above:

\begin{verbatim}

bhoh bhoh sang wipra ling sang prabhu mapa kariking dharmaparimita,
om om om boddhadharmâkuçala sahur ire sang
çrí narapati,
sang hyang wairocanâtyanta jinapati winimbârcâgêng i têngah,
lîlâboddhyâgrimudrânupama sira katon sâksât
siwasasâ.

"Now then, honorable priest", said the king.
"What temple is this outstanding dharma?"
"Om, om, om, a Buddhist dharma-building", was his answer to the king.
"The outstanding king of the Jinas, the honorable Wairocana is represented in a great statue in the centre, tranquil he is holding a boddhyâgri hand position, looking precisely like Siwasadâ."

Notes:

The king referred to is king Arjunawijaya, who is on a royal progress through his kingdom. This description is reminiscent of various passages in the Nâgarakârtâgâma of Prapañca, a work which the author in fact called a Deçawarnana.

In this stanza Wairocana is compared with Siwasadâ, while in canto I, stanza 1, Parwatarâjadewa is compared

\end{verbatim}

See note in vol.3.
with Buddha. This is the reason why I called it a converse view. However in this case too, the explanation remains the same, that is Wairocana to the Buddhist is comparable to what Siwasadâ is to the Cîwaite.

The following stanzas (canto XXVI, 1-2) have likewise been called into court:

1) Aksobhya pûrwa sira teki bhaṭāra Rudra,
   hyang Ratnasambhawa ri daksina Dhâtrdewa,
   sang çrî Amitâbha sira paçcima Dewamâhâ
   sang çrî Amoghasiddhi sira lor Harimûrttidewa.

2) ndah kantëna nya haji tan hana bheda sang hyang,
   hyang buddha rakwa kalawan siwarâjadewa,
   kâlih sameka sira sang pinakesti dharma,
   ring dharma sîma tuwi yan lêpasâdwitiya.

1) 'Aksobhya [is in the] East, He is god Rudra,
   hyang Ratnasambhawa is in the South and is god Dhâtr,
   sang çrî Amitabha is in the West and is Mahâdewa,
   çrî Amoghasiddhi is in the North and is god Harimûrtti.

2) Well, Sire, in fact there is no difference within Sang Hyang,
   [whether] It is called Buddha or Siwarâjadewa, both are the same, they are the goal of [all] religions,
   in the dharma sîma or dharma lêpas It is second to none.'
Notes:

Stanza 1 is very deceptive, as from a cursory reading one would be inclined to believe that Aksobhya etc., are identical with the Čiwaitic deities. But it must always be remembered that the author is still making a comparison, not stating that they are one and the same. In stanza 2 likewise, the comparison ends with Sang Hyang. This Sang Hyang is the same for Buddhist, Čiwaites, adherents of dharma sima and dharma lōpas. Buddha and Siwarājadeva are merely manifestations of the Sang Hyang, but it does not necessarily follow that Buddha and Siwarajadeva are one and the same.

kālih sameka ādwaitiya. This is taken from the last two lines of stanza 2. With the words in this order it bears a striking similarity to the most well-known phrase in the Sutasoma, canto CXXXIX, 5, d.: bhinneka tunggal ika. Though slightly different in expression, the sense is strikingly similar. The first means these two are of the same kind and second to none, while the second means they are different but they are of the same kind. The Balinese religious creed reads as follows: Ekam iwa adwaitiyam (One only, second to none) is in all probability still very closely related to this phrase.

If the Kuñjarakarna refers to the Supreme God as Bhatara Widdhi, the Caturpaksockopadeśa merely uses the term Bhatara, whereas the Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma use the terms Sang Hyang or Bhatara or Widdhi for the Supreme God, the ultimate goal of all dharmas. So only at this stage is the Supreme God of all dharmas one and the same.

Nevertheless, if there appears to be some ambiguity in these passages, and it is possible to explain them in
a way that suggests the Unity of Çiwa and Buddha, the
following (canto XXX, 1-2) appears to exclude this view
completely:

1) nda haywa juga mangkaneki kaharēpkwiri
   kita pinakesti ning hati,
   ndatan panuka dharma kewala tikang huwus
   iki pahajōng nareqwara,
   kitâmriha ri denya tan kaparahe para talēra
   subhuktya sang wiku,
   kaboddhan ika bodha sang sungana dharma
   kutikuti lépas kasatpadan.

2) Kaľaiwan ika čaiwa sang sungana tasyan
   angalapa kalagyan uttama,
   karsyan ika walkalika sirā sang sungana
   saphala ring wanācrama,
   apan hila-hileki rakwa yadiyan salaha para
   tēkap nareqwara,
   pitowi datēngeng mahåbala taha prabhu
   niyata tēkeng upadrawa.

1) 'So then, I hope you will not act and think
   in such a manner,
   do not merely establish dharmas, for it is
   the king's duty also to beautify existing
   ones, and so, if you wish to be unsurpassed
   (in good works) by others, continue to
   provide a good living for the priests.
   As for what concerns Buddhism the Buddhists
   should be given employment in dharmas and
   free kutis;
2) as for what concerns Çiwaism, the Çiwaites should be given the task of collecting the alms for the excellent kalagyans; as for what concerns the rsis, it is the walkalikas (the treebark-wearers) who should be given [alms] in accordance with the needs of forest-dwellers. This is because it is said to be taboo for the king down to all attendants to do otherwise, because if you do so, suffering will surely come.

In this passage the king is urged to attempt or to do the proper thing as concerns the living of the priests, namely that the Buddhist priests should be looked after by Buddhists, the Çiwaitic priests by Çiwaites, while the rsis should be cared for in the manner prescribed. In my discussion of canto 82, 2 and canto 75, 2 of the Nāgarakértagama I referred to this stanza. Perhaps Tantular was indicating the current regulations in Majapahit, namely that the king himself directly supervised the care of the rsis, while the Boddhadyākṣa and the Çaiwadyākṣa respectively cared for the Buddhist and Çiwaitic domains, including the priests attending them.

The third and forth line of stanza 2 contain a warning to the king and all his attendants not to err, e.g., not to allow Çiwaites, to care for Buddhists or vice-versa, because otherwise suffering will befall them. At the same time these lines appear to remove the ambiguity of the passages analysed earlier by making clear that it is hila-hila (taboo) to confound Çiwaism and Buddhism and rsi-religion.
e) Sutasoma

It is self-evident that the kakawin Sutasoma is a work written from a particular standpoint. This is likewise the case with other literary works in Oldjavanese. If this factor were overlooked, it could be misleading, but if taken into account and used with care, it can contribute much to our understanding of the text. Mpu Tantular, the author, lived in the Majapahit-era and was perhaps a contemporary of Mpu Prapañca. Both were Buddhists and, in all probability were learned men. This at least is the view generally held among scholars concerning Prapañca, for otherwise he could not have produced a poem containing such a wealth of material relevant for the study of his time. This is so, even though his work bristles with problems, and scholars of the calibre of Pigaud, Berg, Krom, Kern and others have attempted to elucidate many of its difficulties. Mpu Tantular on the other hand is not as well-known as Prapañca; he is not a court-poet; but two works of his have come down to us, very much larger than that of Prapañca. In these two works he proves to be a connaisseur of at least the Oldjavanese literature of his time still surviving today. I hesitate to claim that he was versed in Sanskrit literature as Kern has expressed certain doubts as to his knowledge of this language. Nevertheless, just as Manomohan Gosh has shown that the author of Râmâyana had a sound knowledge of

1 Slamet Muljono attributes Nirārthaprakṛēta and Kuṭijarakaṁa to Prapañca, but I think there are many matters to be solved before his theory can be regarded as established. (See Men., pp.22-7).

2 Kern, Ove., p.165.
Sanskrit, despite Kern's views to the contrary, further study may show that Tantular too, had a significant mastery of that language.\(^1\)

In the first part of his poem, Mpu Tantular merely alludes to a poet in the capital for whom he has great respect, but not mentioning his name, because he did not wish to cause him any embarrassment. Perhaps this was Prapañca himself who was also a Buddhist poet, or perhaps even a contemporary poet mentioned in the Nāgarakṛtāgama - sang Brahmārāja - though this is somewhat unlikely since he was a Čiwaite.

So far, most scholars have been of the opinion that in the Majapahit-era the most obvious and important religions were Čiwaism and Buddhism which were so close together that in Kern's view, had in the course of history grown so close together, that he felt justified in speaking of a confluence. Berg on the other hand, has elaborated the theory that the two foci of worship were not Čiwa and Buddha, but Wisnu and Buddha.\(^3\) In my view both are correct in the sense that they draw a contrast between Buddhism and Čiwaism (which includes Wisnuism and Brahmanism). Nevertheless, alongside the rivalry between Buddhism and Čiwaism, within the Hindu tradition there has often been rivalry between Čiwaites and Wisnuites and perhaps also between each of them with the followers of Brahmanism. These rivalries can be descerned in the description of wars between the principal deities in various literary works, even though the basic tensions are carefully camouflaged.

\(^1\) Poerbatjaraka, Kap., p.3.
\(^2\) Canto 12, 1, b, and canto 83, 3, a.
\(^3\) Berg, Rij., pp.196-7.
In the *kakawin* Sutasoma, Mpu Tantular vividly describes a series of such battles, culminating in the combat between Sutasoma and Porusâda. Without doubt, the author intended to show his readers who the real victor was. Tantular probably saw the whole situation as follows:

There are four prominent deities, Brahmâ, Wisnu, Çiwa (together with his son Gana) and Buddha. These deities descended to earth in the forms of Daçabâhu, Jayawikrama, Porusâda (and Gajawaktra) and Sutasoma. The author made Brahmâ an assistant to Buddha, because he is well-known in the *jataka*-stories and other traditions in this capacity. Wisnu who is supposed on one occasion to have been incarnated as Buddha according to Hinduism, was put on his own. Çiwa and Gana are put into one camp as the opponents of Buddha assisted by Brahmâ. Though this is the situation, the author did not let Brahmâ conquer Gana, but let Gana be defeated by the BodhisÂtuwa (the Buddha to be). There is evidence here that Tantular knew his job well. He did not want to oppose Brahmâ to Gana, because Gana was of a lower rank. So he let the three Super-deities do battle amongst themselves and in so doing perhaps revealed the true situation in Majapahit seen through Buddhist eyes, namely that Brahmanism and Wisnuism had lost ground to Çiwaism. This is described by the battle of Porusâda with Jayawikrama (canto XCVI - XCIX) and the battle of Porusâda against Daçabâhu (canto CXXXII - CXXXVII) in which both Jayawikrama (incarnation of Wisnu) and Daçabâhu (incarnation of Brahmâ) are killed. Porusâda's might, which reaches its apogee with his victory over Daçabâhu comes to an end when he meets Sutasoma face to face. All the dead are revived, all
damage and destruction are rehabilitated, and the mighty Porusāda is helpless to harm king Sutasoma. The might and superiority of Sutasoma over Porusāda is successfully displayed. Now follows a manifestation of the superiority of Buddha over Ćiwa, of the superiority of compassion and Love (the greatest characteristics of Buddhism) over Violence (the most distinct characteristic of Mahākāla or Bhairava), namely in the readiness of Sutasoma to sacrifice himself to Ćiwa resulting in the conversion of Ćiwa himself to Buddhism. Here again Tantular reveals his Buddhist spirit, for while Ćiwa always slays his opponents, Sutasoma never kills a living being. In fact when Sutasoma uses a weapon in his battle, e.g., with Gajawaktra (see cantos XXXII - XXXIII) Tantular explains that it is not Sutasoma's weapon which causes pain to the enemy, but Gajawaktra's own karmma.

If this is a true statement of Tantular's view, then the theory that there is any blending of Ćiwaism and Buddhism (at least to the extent that it is based on the Sutasoma) is scarcely tenable. We should therefore re-examine the stages of Kern's argument, and see if any further evidence can be found to clarify the relation between Ćiwa and Buddha. In following this course I have taken material from the kakawin Sutasoma and arranged it in three sections, namely:

1: that used by Kern to establish his theory of 'confluence' between the two religious traditions, considering the possibility of other interpretations.

2: material additional to that quoted by Kern which can be interpreted as supporting
Kern's thesis, but which is open to other interpretations.

material which can be used to support the alternatives suggested in 1 and 2.

Section One

It is unfortunate that in an article destined to be of such importance, and the foundation for much later research, Kern allows the Sutasoma little chance to speak for itself. Indeed he bases his argument exclusively on canto I, stanza 4, and canto CXXXIX, stanza 4, d and stanzas 5 and 6, a total of only thirteen lines. To make it complete in itself, I add the three (a, b, c,) previous lines of stanza 4 and the following stanza 7. The text is as follows:

Canto I, stanza 4:

Purwwa prastawa ning parwwa racana ginēlar sangka ring boddhakawyaya, ngūni dwāpāra ring treta krtayuga sirang sarwwadhammānggakāra, tan len Brāhma Wisnūṛqvara sira matēmah bhūpatī mrttyaloka, mangke prāptanq kali ṛī Jinapati manurun mātyanang kālamurkka.

First of all the story I compose is derived from the stories of the Enlightened One. In previous times, in the third, second and first ages the embodiment of all forms of

1 Kern, Ove., p.168.
2 Ibid., pp.172, 174.
Dharmma were none other than the gods Brahmā, Wisnu, and Ḥīmāra. They became kings in the world of mortal men. But now, in the kali-age, ḍhī Ḫiṇapati descends here to eliminate the evil and the wicked.

Canto CXXXIX

4. Yadyan sahācra juga rakwa dhiranta ring rāt, dhīroḍhāṭāṅgalaḥalā prabhū Hastinendra, dūran wenangta juga pan ratu Buddhajanma, hyang Buddha tan pahi lawan Čiwa rājadewa.

5. Rwāneka dhāṭu winuwus wara Buddha Wiṣwa, bhīnekī rakwa ring apan kēna parwanosēn, mangkāṅg Ḫiṇatwa kalawan Čiwaṭwa tunggal, bhīneka tunggal ika tan hana Dharmma mangrwa.

6. Akṣobhya tatwa kitang Ḫīwarā dewa dibya, hyang Rātñasāmbhawa sireki bhatāra Dāṭta, sang hyang Mahāmeru sirāstam ikāmithāba, ṛy Āmoghasiddhi sirekī Wiṣnu mahādikāra.


4. 'Even though your courage in the world is multiplied a thousand fold, as you frantically persist in attempting to disturb the king of Hastina, it is impossible for you to succeed because [though] he is a king, he is an incarnation of Buddha.
And there is no difference between god Buddha and god Ciwa, the king of gods.

5. It is said that the well-known Buddha and Ciwa are two different substances. They are indeed different, yet how is it possible to recognize their difference in a glance, since the Truth of Jina and [the Truth of] Ciwa is One. They are indeed different, but they are of the same kind, as there are no division in Truth.


7. So, therefore we request you, my Lord, now to be peaceful and to remember the Truth of Ciwa and Buddha. We beg you, abandon that dreadful and horrible form! It is not by violence that king Sutasoma can be sacrificed.

Notes and analysis:

Kern says: 'Derhalve, Buddha is voor Tantular identisch de Drie - eenheid, Brahmâ, Visnu en Íçvara, de Hindoesche Trimûrti, of, zoals hij zich uitdrukt: Tripûrûsa ...' (Consequently, for Tantular, Buddha is
identical to the Triad Brahmā, Wisnu and Iqwa, the Hindu Trimūrti, or, to use his own term; Tripurusa ...

However, it seems that Kern overlooked that the krta, tetra, dwapara and kali-yuga are not the same, because the circumstances in which the Dharma opposes the kālamurkkas is different. The following passage from the Nītiqāstra which Tantular cites on several occasions is relevant in this connection:

Canto IV, stanza 14:

'sLife in the Krta-yuga was constant, its place was in the marrow of the bones, in the Treta-yuga the life of all the world was settled, its place was in the bones, in the Dwāpara-yuga life was steady, its place was in the flesh, sinews and blood, in the Kāli-yuga it is in the skin, body-hair and food.'

The Nitiqāstra itself speaks of the Kāli-yuga in the following terms:

1 Concerning the correspondence of Brahmā, Wisnu, Qiwa with Krta, Treta, Dwapara-yuga, see J. Gonda, Asp., p.24.
2 See e.g., J. Gonda, Bra., pp.71-4, and Poerbatajaraka, Nīt., pp.44-8.
3 See e.g., Sutasoma, XXVI, 3-5. See also Korawāçrama, pp.52, 54, 56, 58, 60.
In consequence of the influence of the Kāli-age, people became obsessed with greed and rejected all guides to conduct, [they] quarreled and fought for high positions. They disregarded their proper responsibilities, struggled with their brothers and relatives, made alliances with their enemies and took revenge on their relatives. Holy domains were destroyed, temples broken down, hermitages were not safe-guarded by any religious law, so that they became deserted. Curses were useless against them, and the good praṇāstis were violated by the base and evil people of the world.'

As the conditions of life from Kṛta to Dwāpara-yuga gradually worsened, in the Kāli-yuga the evil and the wicked people gained the upper hand and became uncontrollable. The Dharmma was trampled on, religion and holy places were neglected. To remedy the situation, the rebuilding of the Dharmma became the responsibility of a Dharmmaṭāgakkara, a role which is a very heavy burden. Compared to the burden of the
Dharmmânggakara of the Kâli-yuga, the job of the Dharmmângkaras in former times was child's play. In many places the kakawin Sutamsa refers to this heavy and difficult task as a burden unbearable even to Brahmâ, Wisnu or Qiwa. I cite below two very clear examples:

Canto XXIII, stanza 3:

Ya tang umaranaput para sabhûmi Bhârata musuh
yayah nrpasuta,

ndi karika yan wênang têlasa de watêk ratu
makâdi Dhâtratanaya,
pituwi bhatâra Wisnu parananta tan wênang ikang
durâtmakaripu,
ri hana nikang narendra Naramangsa pâwak i

titah nikang Kâli-yuga.

'These are the enemies of your father who have come and dominated the people of the entire Bhârata-country. How is it possible for the companies of king headed by the son of Dhâttra to eliminate them? Even if you ask aid from god Wisnu, these evil-hearted enemies cannot be defeated, as long as king Naramangsa (man-eater) is still an incarnation of the age of Kâli.'

Canto LIV, stanza 3:

Apan taya ng bhûpati dewasangghya ya,
Indrâdi gandarwwapati kadewatan,
Içâdi Dhâträdbhuta Wisnwâgong takut,

jrih kumyus osah têkap ing mahâsura.

Translation:

'Because there are no companies of kings or gods [who can resist him].
Indra, king of gandarwās, and so on at the abode of the gods, the excellent Čiwa, the amazing Dhātra and Wisnu are in great fear, sweating and moaning because they fear the great demon.

In the first verse Naramangsa is said to be the personification of the evil of the Kāli-yuga and it is absolutely clear in the second that the Trimūrti can do nothing but perspire out of fear of him. Thus Tantular's aim is not to portray the Buddha as equal to Brahmā, Wisnu or Čiwa, but rather to express his conviction that the Kāli-yuga is so dreadful that even Brahmā, Wisnu or Čiwa are in terror of it, and that the Buddha in facing it is superior to the Hindu trinity.

stanza 4, d. Kern's grouping of the last line of stanza 4 with stanza 5, is evidence that he was of the opinion that its relationship to stanza 5 is closer than that to the preceding three lines of the same stanza. This is dangerous because it can mislead readers who take this interpretation for granted and either do not bother or have not the opportunity to refer to the original text. Not to put too fine a point upon it, I think that Kern himself has misunderstood the location of this line. His rendering of line 5, a runs 'Beiden heeten veel elementen te bevatten; de verhevene Buddha is het Al.' But in the original there is no equivalent to his term bevatten (to contain). Without this interpolation into the translation, it is quite clear that line 4, d belongs to stanza 4, and that this stanza is a sense unit in its own right.
In any case this line 'hyang Buddha tan pahi lawan Čiwa rājadewa = and there is no difference between god Buddha and god Čiwa, the king of the gods' cannot be taken as an identification of Čiwa with Buddha or vice versa, because earlier in the first and second lines of the stanza it is stated that even if Čiwa's courage is multiplied a thousand times, still he will not be able to harm the king. In other words, if Čiwa's strength is not multiplied by at least a thousand, he is no match for Buddha. Although the statement is somewhat rhetorical, it still has to be admitted that the fundamental idea is that Buddha is stronger than Čiwa.

stanza 5

Kern regards rwa as the subject of the sentence; however it seems obvious that rwa is an adjective qualifying Buddha and Wičwa (Čiwa)+1 so that in plain prose the word order would be as follows: 'wara Buddha Wičwa winuwus rwāneka dhātu.' A full stop should follow this sentence. Another key problem is the question introduced with ring apan (why). The second line of stanza 5 goes logically with the words 'tan hana dharmma mangrwa' literally 'there is no Truth divides into two.' I rendered it above as 'there are no divisions in Truth.'

It must be admitted that the explanation of this stanza is difficult. At first glance, it appears to indicate an identification of Čiwa and Buddha, although the contrary has already been stated three times. The Truth represented by Čiwa and Buddha is indeed One,

---

1 I am of the opinion that the ċrī Jñānačīwabajra in the Krtanāgara-hymn (see Rij., p.49)is in fact črī Jñānavigwabajra, as wicwabajra (cross-thunderbolt) makes better sense. The substitution was made as čiwa is a synonym of wičwa.
because Truth is only One and indivisible. However it is not stated that the Truth represented by Čiwa is the whole Truth, nor that the Truth represented by Buddha is the whole Truth, but only that the Truth which Čiwa represents and that which Buddha represents is One and indivisible. Our text does not indicate whether the Čiwa aspect of the Truth is of the same quality and quantity as the Buddha aspect of the Truth, but they are represented as different so that in my view the possibility of homogeneity is excluded; at least no conclusion can be reached based on this passage. It can only be ascertained that Čiwa and Buddha are just manifestations of the Truth. This kind of Two in Oneness can also be found in the wayang namely the relationship of Kresna and Ardjuna. The dalang says that they are 'kaja suruh, lumah lan kurebe; ditonton beda rupane, digeget pada rasane' (like a betel-leaf, the upper and lower side are different in appearance, but when bitten taste the same). Sometimes the above phrase is followed by another which is as follows: 'kaja gula lan legine' (like sugar with its sweetness). Perhaps this comparison does not take us any further, but in general it is adequate for the lay devotee, because here we have to do with the ultimate nature of God, which cannot be explained by any religion or fully understood by man, except a nisqreyasa or an insan kamil, and even they can give no explanation regarding ITS appearance, as it is said in the Sutasoma:  

'sirānēmu-nēmu nda tan pangaku yan katēmu rusit i sandhi ning hidēp.' (He has found, but

---

1 Canto XXIX, 2, b.
he does not claim that [he has] solved the problem of the mystery of life).

Canto CXXXIX, 6 In my view this stanza should be regarded as presenting a comparison between the pantheon of Buddhism and Qiwaism. To some extent there are similarities between the deities, e.g., all are manifestations of the Truth or, according to the passage from the Caturpkasopadeça quoted previously, the Bhatâra is in them, from which it does not follow that they are identical with each other.

Canto CXXXIX, 7 This stanza teaches that violence (the nature of Mahâkâla or Bhairawa) so far from offering a sure means to success, but leads only to failure.

Thus by approaching to the text in a broader frame of reference, we find evidence that does not support the identification of Qiwa with Buddha. Therefore it is even more advantageous to turn to other passages which may well help us further.

Section Two

In this section I have assembled ambiguous passages which may be interpreted in various ways. I will go through them in sequence.

Canto XXVI, stanza 7

Tuwin meh prâptângekjalaâdhi tēmah ning tribhubwana,
winââgang rât norang daçadići mâmōng tan
patuduhan,
bhatâra hyang çrî Buddha - Qiwa winayâcintya
Moreover it is almost time that the three worlds become one ocean. The earth will be shattered, the ten directions vanish, there will be darkness without any guidance. The laws of the gods Buddha and Çiwa will be inconceivable such will be the result of the amazing ferocity of the demons'.

This stanza is uttered by the goddess of the Earth pleading her cause before prince Sutasona, begging him to have mercy on the world. It is ambiguous because the phrase ÇRī Buddha-Çiwa winaya can be understood in two ways: as a dwandwa or a karmadhāraya compound. If it is understood as the former, then the sense is as I have translated it, but if the latter - which I regard as untenable - then the general sense suggests the unity of Buddha and Çiwa.

Canto XLII

1. Sangsipta teki bapa sang Gajawaktrarupa,
   mwang nāgarāja karuhun wara satwanātha,
   prih haywa tan duga-duge wuwus ing kadi
   ngwang,
   Buddhopadeça tēka ring Çiwatatwa yoga.

2. Āpan tiwas juga sirang muni boddhapâksa,
   yan tan wruh ring paramatatwa Çiwatwamârgga,

1. 'In brief Gajawaktra, my son,
you too, o, king of dragons and in particular
you, lioness,
do not hesitate to put into practice
what I have said,
from the teachings of Buddha to the teachings
of Ćiwaism.

2. For a Buddhist monk will fall short of his
goal
if he does not know the excellent path
of Ćiwaism.
It is the same with the Ćiwaitic monk,
if he does not know the highest Truth
of Buddhism, then he is weak.'

These two verses are part of Sutasoma's teaching to Gajawaktra, the lioness and the dragon who formerly had wanted to kill him, but later whose minds became peaceful and longed for the instruction which would lead them to the path of Bliss. In this sermon, though still a Bodhisattwa, the prince explains Ćiwaism as well as Buddhism. In verse one this might lead to the impression that Ćiwaism was to Sutasoma identical with Buddhism. Verse two might likewise lead to some misunderstanding, namely that Sutasoma teaches that both Ćiwaitic as well as Buddhist monks should understand Ćiwaism as well as Buddhism, because without knowledge of both, the monks will certainly not attain Bliss. The solution is perhaps that at a higher level Ćiwaism and Buddhism are merely aspects of the Supreme Truth, as explained
before. But in all probability Sutasoma merely wanted
to give his three students the free choice of observing
one of the two paths to Bliss, without urging on them
one or the other.

Canto LIII

2. Singgih yan Parameśwarādhika kiteng
    tripورसपति,
    yapwan paṇcapitamahādiśiwa donta ngūni
    karēngō,
    ring râṇatrayayoga Çakyamuni tāpa nēngga
    i kita,
    çrī Wairocana ring Tathāgata makādi
    Paṅcasugata.

3. Hyang Prtañjala rakwa ring prawara
    paṇcaraśyanupama,
    çrī Wāgīçwaramūrtti wījña kita ring
    kawindra winuwus,
    ring rāga Smaratatwa rakwa kita musti ning
    saturida,
    yan ring dlaha bhatāra Nāthagiri nātha ning
    sabhuwana.

6. Sangsiptan juga tan haneki ya muwah wīcesa
    kahidēp,
    anghing rakwa bhatāra sang winuwus ing
    trilokaçarana,
    hyang ning hyang pada bhakti tan hana wēnang
    lumangghyana kita,
    icchāntā Çiwa - Buddhāpākṣa paramārtha
dharmma kita.
2. 'You are indeed the supreme Paramēśvara among the three kings of gods. In the ranks of the five pitāmahās, it has already been said you are the Supreme Ādi; in the asceticism of the threefold jewel you are the ascetic Čakyaṃuni; among the tathāgatas you are Wairocana, the leader of the five Sugatas.

3. Among the five unequalled and distinguished sages you are Prtañjala, you are the incarnation of ādi Wāgiśvara, a pandita famous among the great poets; in the [science] of love you are in truth the god of Love, ruler of all passion; in time to come you are god Nathagiri, the protector of the entire world.

6. In brief, in my view, there is nothing higher than the god who is known as the protector of the three worlds. The gods of gods are devoted [to you] and no one dares to resist you. It is your wish that there are the Ājñatītic and Buddhist sects as you are the highest Dharmma.'

This passage was pronounced by Indra when he saw prince Sutasoma's metamorphosis into god Wairocana. He pleaded with the god not to leave the world and return to Heaven, as the world was in fear of the incarnation of Kāli.

In his prayer Indra praises Wairocana as Paramēśvara etc. Yet even if stanza 2 and 3 are not to be regarded merely as comparisons between Buddha and
other deities, sages etc., nevertheless they are not said to be identical. Stanza 6 can be advanced as proof of this, for in line c and d, the supremacy of Buddha Wairocana is affirmed beyond all doubt. The hyang ning hyang (gods of gods) is in my opinion the same sang hyang ning hyang found in the Nāgarakērtāgama, I, 1, d, that is Čiwa, or if plural the trimūrtti. In line d, Wairocana is praised as the Highest Dharmma, i.e., the Supreme God who desires the continued existence of both the Čiwaitic and Buddhist sects. It was perhaps a hint to the rulers at that time that Buddhism should not be suppressed in favour of Čiwaism.

It will be seen in this section that the passages cited are more ambiguous than those in the previous one. In 1 the unity of Čiwa and Buddha is emphatically denied whereas in this there are no categorical denials but only a very subtle indication of the superiority of Buddhism over Čiwaism.

Section Three

This group of passages contains statements unequivocally at variance to the theory of the Unity of Čiwa and Buddha, and offers clear indications regarding the Superiority of Buddha over Čiwa. They are likewise arranged in sequence.

Canto XLI

1. Nahan tingkah ikang Čiwatwa ri sirang Čewa

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{swapâksådhika,} \\
\text{bhedå mwång Jïnatñawa teki ri sirang} \\
\text{boddhåpreamyeñ jagat,} \\
\text{sång hyång Adwañya yoga sandhi pinakestî} \\
\text{dwåra sång bhïkṣuka,}
\end{align*}
\]
am - ah çabda nikang swabayu ri dalém
kanta prasiddhang hayu.

2. Rēp prāptang rawi soma de nya sumaput ring
deha çuddhakrti,
mwang tang adwayacitta diwya mapageh
ngkāne manah nirbhaya,
pūh ning rwānupamātiçighra ri wijil hyang
Buddha tan kāwaran,
çûnyākāra dewānγga nirmmala sirān nirbbāna
nirllaksana.

3. Āpan tan Čiwa tan Maheçwara sirān tan Brāhma
tan Keçawa,
tan sang hyang Paramesti Rudra tuduhēn
dūrān kawastwerika,
singgih yan Paramārthabuddha tēmahan sang
siddha yogiçwara,
icchā nora kasāngçayaganal alit tan mātra
matreng sarāt.

4. Nāhan hetu bhāṭāra Buddha kahidep
putrāprameyeng jagat,
sang hyang Adwaya rāma tatwa nira de sang
panditāṅghaywani,
Prajñāparamitebu tan sah i sēdēng ning
yoga sānusmrти,
tan rāgodaya bhīna rakwa kalawān hyang
Durmukeng ātmāja.

5. Mangka āila nireng Mahāyana wōkas ning
buddhisattwān laku,
wet ning tatwa viṣesa tan hininga ring
astέqwarάnindita,
yawat proksaka rakwa tawat ikanang
niçcreyaçeweh pinet,
nahan hetu nirang Ħiwatwa makađat
mungsyāmriheng Ħunyata.

1. 'Thus is the way of Ħiwaism for the major
sect of the Ħiwaites.
It differs from that of Buddhism, unequalled
in the world for its own adherents.
It is the Adwaya (non-two-fold) secret
asceticism which should be the means of
access [to Bliss] for Buddhist monks,
am-ah is the voice of their breath in the
pharynx;
the happiness [obtained] then is perfect.

2. Moon and sun rise up and cover the pure
body and the adwayacitta (non two-fold mind)
and the diwya are firm, [residing] there in
the heart without fear.
The result of these two unthinkables is
very immediate [namely] the revelation of
god Buddha, unveiled [and] in the appearance
of the Void with a body of pure light. He
is salvation without characteristics.

3. Because He is not Ħiwa, not Maheqbara, not
Brahmā, not Keqwa, not Parameşti Rudra,
say, they are far from him,
Truly He is the Supreme Buddha, the
metamorphosis of the perfect and great
ascetic,
tranquil, fearing nothing, neither coarse nor fine, unlike anything in the entire world.

4. That is why god Buddha is considered as the unequalled son in the world. The god Adwaya is in reality the father, according to the concensus of the ascetics. Prājñāparamita is the mother, inseparable [from her spouse] at the time of the concentration of the mind.

No passion emerges, differing from the birth of god Durmuka.

5. Such are the commandments to be put into practice by the prominent bodhisattwas of the Mahāyāna sect.

Because (IT is) the Supreme Truth, IT pays no heed to the eight faultless world protectors.

But as long as the concentration is scattered, then the perfect state is hard to find.

That is the reason why Čiwaism is slower in obtaining Salvation.1

This sermon - if it can be called that - is spoken by prince Sutasoma himself and is a very clear indication of the close relationship between the doctrine of Tantular's kakawin and that of the Mahayanism of the Sang Hyang Kamahayānick.1 The passage in the latter text is as follows:

1 Kats, San., text on pp.47-50, trsl. on pp.98-100.
Ikang am - ah mwang adwaya-jōāna ya adwaya

ngaran ya.

Am ngaran ya : pasuk ning bāyu, am çabdanya,

lumṛa

ring çāri, ngũniweh ring nawadwāra,
sūryarūpa

ikang çāri hibēkan de nya, smrti-sūryya

ngaran ikā.

Ah ngaran ya: wijil ning bāyu sangke çāri, ah

cabdanya,

muksa ring çāri, candra-rūpa ikang çāri

ri muksa ning

bāyu ring çāri, somya lilang ahēning

ikang çāri wēkasan, çānta candra ngaran ikā,

smrti ngaran ya waneh. Ri hana ning smrti-
sūryya

çānta-candra dadi tang adwaya-jōāna, patēmu

ning adwaya

mwang adwaya-jōāna, ya tāngdadyakēn diwarūpa,

awā sadākāla,

ahēning nirāwarana kadi teja ning manik,

apadang rahina

sadā, sugandha tan gawai-gawai,
surūpa tan gawai-gawai, surasa tan gawai-gawai,
sira katon
denta. Ikang am - ah yatikā sinangguh sang

hyang adwaya

ngaran ira, +1) bapa sira de bhatāra hyang

I put the comma.
buddha. Ikang
jñāna wruh tan wikalpa humidēng nirākāra, yatikā

sinanggah
sang hyang adwaya-jñāna ngaran ira. Sang hyang
adwaya-jñāna
sira ta devī bharālī Prajñā-Paramita ngaran
ira, sira ta
ibu de bhatāra hyang buddha. Sang hyang
dewārūpa sira ta
bhatāra hyang buddha ngaran ira.

Sangsipta ning am-ah mwang adwaya-jñāna ya
rasa ning adwaya ikā. Ikang aji adwaya sari
ning aji
tarkka wyākaraṇa.

Uli(h)an ing angaji tarkka : wruha ring adwaya
jñāna,
āpan bharālī Prajñā-Paramitā wekas ning jñāna
pinet
ing+1) mangaji tarkka, hetu nyan prakaraṇa
kāraṇa
ning+2) kapangguha+3) bhatāra hyang buddha.

p. 49:
Phala ning mangaji wyakaraṇa wruha ri sang
hyang
adwaya, apan am-ah wekas ning aji wyakaraṇa,
hetunyan

1 I prefer ing to ning.
2 I prefer ning to ri.
3 I prefer kapangguha to kapanggihan.
wyâkarana karana nirân katêwa\(^1\) sang hyang

adwaya-jñâna.

Patêmu ning wyâkarana mwang prakarana yatikâ

mijilakên

aji tantra, pinakâvak bhatâra hyang buddha.

Sangsipta nya : tang jñâna awak bhatâra hyang

buddha,

apan pêh ning jñâna matêmu lâwan bâyu

humênêng inandêlakên

ing çabda am-ah, ikang sinan_gguh sang hyang

diwarûpa

ngaran ira. Sangksepanya : artha ning

adwayaçâstra ya ta

hudin ta pêgatakna,\(^2\) gësêngananta ri

sadâbhyâsa, sådhanantât

manggihakna ng kahyangbuddhân.

Mapa de ning lumêkasa makasâdhana sang hyang

adwaya?\(^3\) Tan kari ikang bâyu am mangkana

lingnya,

ya ta isêp i tutuk, andêlakên i gurung-gurungan.

ya ta

lumrâ humibêki çarîranta kabe, atêmah sûrrya

rakta warnna.

Muwah dadyakna tang bâyu ah, mangkana lingya:

andêlakên i gurung-gurungan, muksa ring çarîra,

1. I prefer nirân katêma to nira ri katêmwana.
2. I prefer hudin ta pêgatakna to udik pêgatakna.
3. I prefer to put the question here rather than after lumêkasa.
atēmah çânta candra, somya lîla, saprânâyâma

ngaran ikâ, nityasâ kita mangkana, hilang sarwakle-
çânta, ri huwus nikâ, andêlakën tang

buddhânusmarana.

Buddhânusmarana ngaranya : sang hyang adwaya-
unjâna sâksât+1) kṛta ni tan hana ning hidēp,
len

p. 50:
tang hidēp mwang manghidēpi tingkahnya : ikang

bâyu
tan masuk mētu ri tutuk, ring irung kunang,
muksa :

mwang ikang ṇarira de ni kaçaktin sang hyang

adwaya

mwang kaçaktin sang hyang adwaya-jûâna, ri

wēkasan

awâliâlâhêning awâs ikang ćarîra, mwang tan
panghidēp, tan hinidēp, kewala lilang ahêning

nirawaraña ikang ćarîra, nirâkâra apadang rahina

sadâkâla ćarîranta, kadi mînâk inandêlaken mînâk.

'This am-ah and adwaya-jûâna are called the

adwaya.

Am is namely the inhalation, am is its sound,

spreading through the body, especially the nine

apertures, the body filled with it becoming

brilliant

1

I prefer Saksât to Kasâksât.
like the sun; this is called smṛti suryā (recalling the sun). Ah is namely: the exhalation, ah is its sound, disappearing from the body, at that moment the body is finally shining like the moon, peaceable and diaphanous; this is called cânta candra (the peaceable moon) or its other name is cântasmṛti (recalling peaceableness). From the existence of smṛti suryā and cânta candra arises adwaya-jñāna (the non twofold consciousness), the combination of adwaya and adwaya-jñāna brings about diwarūpa (brilliant form) [always shining, clear and radiant]

like the radiance of a jewel, always brilliant like daylight, fragrant without pretension, resplendent without pretension, tasteful without pretension, is he to you]. Am-ah is also regarded as sang hyang adwaya, the father of bhatāra hyang buddha. The consciousness which knows doubtlessly and sticks to formlessness, that is called the adwaya-jñāna. Sang hyang adwaya-jñāna is also called dewi bharalī Prajñā-Pāramitā; she is the mother of bhatāra hyang buddha. Sang hyang diwarūpa is also called bhatāra hyang buddha.

In short, am-ah and adwaya-jñāna are the essence of the knowledge of adwaya. The knowledge of adwaya is the essence of the knowledge of tarkka vyākaraṇa.

1 Here Kats did not translate the main text, but then follows text C, (see p. 48) until Am-ah etc.

2 Literally, without veil.
The result of studying tarkka is to know the adwaya jñāna, because bharali Prajñā-Pāramitā is the end of knowledge sought by those studying tarkka; therefore prakaraṇa is the means to discover bḥataṭa hyang buddha.

The result of studying wyākaraṇa is to know sang hyang adwaya, because am-ah is the end of the knowledge of wyākaraṇa; therefore wyākaraṇa is the means to discover sang hyang adwaya-jñāna.

The combination of wyākaraṇa and prakaraṇa brings forth the knowledge of tantra, the embodiment of bḥataṭa hyang buddha.

In short: that knowledge which is the embodiment of bḥataṭa hyang buddha is indeed the essence of knowledge merging together with the breath, held and kept in the sound am-ah, which is called sang hyang diwarūpa. In short: seek for the meaning of the adwaya-çāstra (science of adwaya), do not let it part from yourself or be burnt down through becoming a matter of habit, [it is] your means to obtain buddhahood.

How [do you] begin to do [that] by means of adwaya? Do not [forget] the breath am-so it is said - inhale it through the mouth, check it in the pharynx, do not be negligent of the breath entering and coming out through the nose; [the breath] checked in the pharynx will spread throughout your body which becomes a red-colored sun. Then produce the breath ah - so it is said - check it in the pharynx,
let it disappear into the body, which becomes cānta candra (peaceable moon), peaceable and diaphanous; this is called one prāṇāyāma (breath). If you do so regularly all your sins will disappear, afterwards concentrate on buddhānusmarana (the contemplation of the Buddha).

Buddhānusmarana is namely sang hyang adwaya-jñāna, precisely at the moment that the front [and rear] cease to exist, and likewise the one who is faced (i.e., Creator) and the one who faces (i.e., Creature); what happens is that breath does not enter through the mouth and does not come out through the nose, but disappears together with the body by the power of sang hyang adwaya and sang hyang adwaya-jñāna, the body then has become Light, brilliant, pure and clear, also without facing anything or being faced, it is only unveiled pure radiance, your body is formless and always shining like daylight, like oil upon oil.'

Before we continue with our analysis of Sutasoma's sermon, it is to our advantage to look for a while at this passage, as it throws much light on the former. First of all, differences in translation must be taken into account.

The literal meaning is holding of the breath, but it is really a unit consisting of one inhalation and one exhalation, which is done in this particular way. I adopt the translation of Pott in Yoga and Yantra (p.5) for the translation of this word in canto XLI, 4, a.
udik pēgatakna and hudin ta pēgatakna.

Because of the difference in choice of reading, there is also a difference in the translation. But by his choice of reading udik (beproeven = to endeavour, to test) Kats could not make sense of the following words. However, if he had chosen hudinta (from C) but read it hudin ta pēgatakna gēsēnganta ri sadābhāyaśa, in which hudin is derived from hudi + ēn (attempt; seek) and ta is the negator of the following two words, then he would probably have made the same translation as I propose. The meaning of pēgatakna from pēgat (to cut; to separate) refers to the am-ah, that the in- and exhalation should be done continuously and regularly. However this regularity could render the practice too mechanical.

haywa ta wawarēngō.

Here Kats misses ta as a negator, so that he translates the sentence into heb geen bewustzijn van ( = let niet op) 'not to be aware of or not to pay attention to', while haywa and ta form a double negator, so that the translation should be do not be unaware or pay heed to. In other words while performing the whole action, one should inhale while pronouncing the syllable am. While the breath is held in the pharynx, one should take care that no breath enters through the nose to mix with the am-breath in the pharynx, or that the am-breath in the pharynx should not escape through the nose. The intention is that the am-breath should no longer be able to pass either in or out, but rather should penetrate

1 In the Âdi., p.17 we find the phrase tan wawarēngōn. In Uttarakaṇḍa (see Zoetmulder's Sek., p.15) we find the phrase ndatan wawa-rēngō.
the whole body. To perform the exhalation one should withdraw the breath from the body, gather it in the pharynx and after a while let it escape through the nose. So the circulation of air is as follows:

in → mouth → pharynx → body → pharynx → nose → out

This is the first stage of the concentration. Then the performer of the concentration should try to control this circulation until it is motionless. Then he goes on to the second stage, that is the buddhānusmarāṇa. At this stage, the air does not enter through the mouth or pass out through the nose as before, so that there is no in- and out- movement, all comes to a rest or to a stand still; there is no front or rear. The body disappears and turns into Light and is called dīvarūpa (in the form of Light). This is described as oil upon oil, because oil has a glittering effect, so that the phrase merely means very bright.

Prajñā-Pāramitebu etc.

The meaning of the third line is quite clear, because the dīvarūpa is the result of the merging together of Prajñā-Pāramitā as adwaya-jñāna (the mother) with adwaya (the father), but this is no sex-act, though in Tibet, China it is sometimes represented in the form of yab-yum-statues, except in a figurative sense. Therefore no passion is aroused as stated in line XLI, 4, d, and the birth of the dīvarūpa, the incarnation of Buddha is different from that of god Durmukha, who was born as the result of the yoga of Ćiwa being foiled by god Smara and his passion and love towards Umā.

1 See the reading of text C on p.50, no.9.
3 See Poerbatjaraka, Sma., canto VIII-XXVII. Because of its vividness in describing the passion of God Ćiwa, Poerbatjaraka did not have the heart to translate it.
So, if we interpret this passage of the Sutasoma keeping the passage of Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan in the back of our minds, then we can see that the Mahāyanist doctrine is the same in both texts. This Mahayanism then is set by Tantular in opposition to the Ciwaism with the emphasis on the point of distinction between Buddhism and Ciwaism or between Buddha and Ciwa, by stating that Buddha is not Ciwa, nor Maheśwara etc., because Buddha is the Supreme Truth. Even the existence of Ciwaism is said to be the result of Buddha's wish. In another place, the life of Purusāda - the incarnation of Ciwa - is at Sutasoma's mercy. That passage is in Sutasoma, canto CXIX, 14:

Yadin hurip ning Purusādanātha,
kitān wiçeśā sahana nya rakwa,
ndātan sake çakti nikā ya jiwān,
jiwa nya sihteng dadi hetuka nya.

[and everyone knows that you are the soul of all beings in the world],
'even of the life of king Purusāda.
It is said that you are more excellent than his entire existence.
It is not because of his power that he stays alive;
he lives because of Your mercy'.

Canto LXIX

3. Bhaṭārendra mwang hyang Tripurusa sirān
tan katuduhan,
praçāsteng nūsa ngkā sira mahas alilāmēng-
amēngan.
ndatan manggeh rakwarés awédi kumél hila-
hila, apan udyāna ṇri Jinapati katatwa nya
karengö.

6. Tuhankwindung singgih tuhu niki wuwuste
nghulun ibu, Çiwādi Brāhma Wisnu katiga sirān tan kēna
mara, nda nista nyān tan dewa nrpasuta himpēr
pwa wēnanga, apan saksāt niçreyaça sira tēmah ṇri Jinapati.

3. 'The gods Indra and Tripurusa are not
allowed to wander and
take pleasure amusing themselves there on
the famous island,
[and they] do not wish to do so out of
fear and great
respect for the prohibition,
because it is said that it is the garden of
the king of the Jinas.'

6. 'My mistress, my daughter, your words are
indeed true.
The three excellent gods, Çiwa, Brahma and
Wisnu are not allowed to go there,
for even the gods are no match for the prince,
as he is exactly the perfect one, an
incarnation of the king of the Jinas.'

This passage is a part of the conversation between
dewī Candrawati and dewī Surāgā who are speaking of the
island Ratnālaya where the wedding of prince Sutasoma and
dewī Candrawati is to take place. I feel it needs no
further clarification, as the superiority of Jina over Tripurusa is expressed so clearly. Thus we can proceed to the next passage:

Canto CXLIV

4. Na wuwus narendra cumarik ri hati nira
Bhatāra rāksasa,
nda wawang sirāsalahi jōng Jinakula tumuluy
mangañjali,
nrpa Hastinendra matulak sira ri gati
Bhatāra mangkana,
kita dewa mānusa matāku mawōdi ring ulah
kapataka.

5. Sira Kāla teki mawuwus tumulusakēn ikang
prayojana,
ring uçanaparwwa Barunāmara sira karēngō
mangañjali,
ri narendra Rāma Harimūrtti karana nira
bhakti tan salah,
iwa mangkaneki gati ni nghulun atutur i
jōng Mahājina.

6. Kalawan ta hetu ning angarddhana ri datēnga
sang nareçwara,
kadi tuhwa ghora pakamangsa ri haji makarūpa
taksaka,
ndan agurwa donta kaharēpku lumukata ri pāpa
ni nghulun,
kita rakwa wās karana ning kaluputa ring
adharmmapātaka.
4. 'Thus spoke the king, touching the heart of the God in demon form, and quickly he placed the feet of Jinakula on the ground and paid him homage. The king of Hastina refused such honour from the God: "You are a god, I am a human being. I fear to be sinful."

5. God Kāla replied, continuing with his purpose: "In former times, Baruna, a god is known to have paid homage to king Rāma, the incarnation of Hari, [because of his devotion]. This was why he did not do wrong. I am in the same position, paying homage at the feet of Mahājina.

6. Moreover the reason why I summoned Your Majesty [here] and pretended to devour Your Majesty violently in my dragon form, was to study with You to gain release from my sins. You are surely able to free a bad criminal from his evil'.

This passage is a part of the conversation of king Sutasmā (the embodiment of Buddha) with Kāla. King Sutasmā surrenders himself to be devoured by Kāla. But every time the sword of Kāla nears the neck of the king it is repelled by a magical force-field. Then Kāla takes the form of a dragon and attempts to swallow him.
Meanwhile he asks the king many questions concerning morality. As the blood of the king penetrates Kāla's body transforming his violent nature into a compassionate one, the words of Dharma overpower his mind. So here, Mpu Tantular masterfully displays the conquest of Kāla by Buddha, and the surrender of Kāla who admits himself to be an evil criminal and recognizes Buddha as the irresistible Saviour.

Kern, though taking note of Tantular's purpose, does not give much attention to Buddha's meerderheid (Buddha's superiority) which he himself admitted.1 The reason is that he was too preoccupied with his conception of the Unity of Čiwa and Buddha. Considered against the background of Tantular's theme, this passage forms an irrevocable proof of Buddha's superiority. But the climax has still to come, namely in:

Canto CXLVII, 6:

Byātītan ri hhuws nirāmarahakēn wara-warah
ira sang munićwara,

māntuk çrī naranātha kāri ta Bhatāra sira
wiku Mahāyāna brata,

ndan sang çrī Purusāda rakwa kalawan para
ratu mangiring narećwara,

mwang sakweh para rājaputra sama manghulun
i sira mareng Gajahwaya.

'After instructing them in the teachings of the great monks, the king returned [while] the God stayed behind to become

1 Kern, Ove., p.172.
a Mahāyāna monk. But king Puruṣāda— it is said—with all the other kings accompanied the king, and all the princes too escorted him to Gajahwaya.'

This is the final climax, the complete submission of Čiwa to Buddha, that is the conversion of the Supreme God of Čiwaism to Buddhism. In the shadow-play, it will be almost tantjep kajon, and the puppeteer takes out his golek (puppet) and while performing the dance of the golek, he announced that the wayang-performance has now ended, and that the spectators should look (golek) for the significance of the lakon (story) which has been performed.

In conclusion, some comments should be made on an article of J.C. van Eerde written in connection with the Sutasoma. I do not know whether van Eerde owned or had seen or read a version of the story of prince Sutasoma or whether he just learned of the story from some informant. This latter is a possibility, because the story is very well known among the Balinese people of Lombok. If he had seen and read a version of the kakawin Sutasoma, then his version must definitely differ from the texts I have used for this edition. Van Eerde refers a.o. to two episodes which he claims occur in the kakawin, in one of which prince Sutasoma persuades a lioness not to devour her cub and in the other prince Sutasoma has an encounter with a dog. At the end of the first episode van Eerde concludes as follows:

1 The word golek can have the meaning of puppet as well as to look for. The puppeteer uses the puppet as an indication that the spectators should look for something.

Toen sloeg de tijgerin met haar klauw naar Sang Sutasoma, die zwaar gewond werd, maar ziet .... er liep wit bloed uit zijne wonden, hetgeen de tijgerin zoó verschrikte dat zij haastig vluchtte. (Then the tigress pounced on Sang Sutasoma who was seriously wounded, but behold... white blood came out from his wounds which frightened the lioness, so that she hastily ran away).

In the texts I have studied, the lioness does not flee, but becomes a disciple of the prince in Buddhism.

The encounter with the dog does not exist in the versions of Sutasoma that I know. Perhaps van Eerde's version had been influenced by a Kalang-story. However, if van Eerde's story is based only on hearsay, then his conclusions, which supports Kern's theory of the Unity of Çiwa and Buddha, should at the very least be considered doubtful.

f) Tantu Panggelaran

So far we have been examining texts which we know to be of a Buddhist nature or written by Buddhist devotees. With the Tantu Panggelaran however, we come to a text in the first place very much younger than those we have been discussing, which can be classified as Çiwaitic in nature. For the purposes of this discussion I propose to group with the Tantu Panggelaran the Korawâcrama and the Bubuksah.

In his thesis, Pigeaud stresses that the Tantu Panggelaran is a glorification of the Mahâmeru or the cosmic mountain. There are grounds however, I would venture, for regarding it as a glorification of Çiwa as Guru or Parameqwarâ, since it is he who instigates

1 Pigeaud, Tan.
the transfer of the Mahâmeru from India to Java. It may be the case that this transfer of the cosmic mountain to Java is an allegorical statement of the transfer of elements of Hindu culture to Java, which indicates that the author was explicitly aware of the Indian origin of certain elements of his culture; at the same time however, it contains a statement that Čiwa should be understood as Bhaṭāra Guru, the indigenous Javanese Supreme God.\footnote{1} In other words the Hindu Čiwa is for the Javanese (author) Bhaṭāra Guru. This is the form in which Čiwa is presented as the Supreme God. But elsewhere Pigeaud states: 'however there is no reason to assume that Kāla, Īcvara, Brahmā and Wisnu are just masks (disguise) for the names of old indigenous deities....' Apparently this opinion derives from his previous view on p.23 which I cite in full:

'God and Godennamen

Prof. Kern schreef in the inleiding tot zijn verhandeling Eene Oudjavaansche Cosmogonie: "Let men alleen op de eigennamen van goden, godinnen en andere hemelsche wezens, dan zou men wagen in de Indische godenwereld te verkeeren, maar wat er van die goden enz. verteld wordt wijkt in veel opzichten, niet alleen feitelijk, maar ook in aard, ten eenenmale af van de Indische voorstellingen." Opvallend is 't inderdaad dat bijvoorbeeld Īcvara, Paramecvara, Čiwa en Mahâdeva naast elkaar voorkomen als namen van verschillende personen; men moet wel aannemen dat de schrijver van de Tantu of de geschriften waar hij uitputte weinig op

\footnote{1} Guru is actually a name attributed to the Supreme Being for a limited period only.
de hoogte waren van de klassieke Indische opvattingen aangaande de namen der goden en hun verwantschap. Of de voorstellingen die de Tantu ervan geeft echter alleen te verklaren zijn door aan te nemen dat de Javaanse schrijvers de Indische verhalen uit eigen overlevering mee versmolten hebben, is nog de vraag; de mogelijkheid is niet uitgesloten dat sommige legenden op populaire opvattingen over de goden berusten die ook in Indie gangbaar waren of misschien nog zijn. Alle drie, misverstand, eigen overlevering en ons nog onbekende Indische bronnen zullen wel samengewerkt hebben om de voorstellingen in de Tantu hun eigennaardigheid te verleenen.

Prof. Kern wrote in the introduction to his essay An Oldjavanese Cosmogony: "If one regards only to the proper names of deities, goddesses and other divine beings, then one would imagine oneself to be in the world of the Indian deities, but what is said of these deities etc., frequently deviates from Indian notions of them in many respects, not only in fact, but also in nature." Indeed it is remarkable that for example Êwara, Parameñwara, Čiwa and Mahâdewa should occur side by side as names of different people; one must accept that the author of the Tantu or the writings from which he obtained his information, had very little idea of the classical Indian notions concerning the names of these deities and their relationships. Whether the notions presented by the Tantu can only be explained by accepting (the theory) that the Javanese writers misunderstood the Indian stories known in their own tradition, still remains to be seen; it might be that some of the legends were based on popular views.
concerning the deities which were also in vogue in India or perhaps still exist. All three of them, misunderstanding, native tradition, and Indian sources which are still unknown to us may have combined to give the concepts presented in the Tantu their distinctive nature."

Unfortunately, this passage leaves us little wiser. We can only gather from it Pigeaud's view that the Javanese author was not altogether well informed, and that from his ignorance derived incorrect and strange notions concerning the Indian deities and their relationship to each other; this notwithstanding his admission that the author obviously knew very well matters relating to the mandalas he described, and that he was in fact a wikus. This can only confirm the theory that at the time the Tantu was written, the wikus, the people most concerned with the religion, had deviated quite considerably from the classical Indian religious ideas.

However, if we glance back at the history of all religions, we see that misunderstandings, due in part to the ignorance of their adherents, have had a rôle in their development. In Buddhism for example, the Mahâyâna came into being as a result of misunderstandings despite the precept that anyone responsible for a schism was a great sinner. The threat of the most severe punishment could not prevent the schism. The development of Protestantism follows a similar course. Numerous examples can be adduced. But do these phenomena indicate decline? It is difficult to answer this question. In the period immediately following the schism, Mahayanism flourished, and the Protestant Reformation inaugurated a period of creative
and reformist activity. Perhaps we can say that schism often indicates the birth of a new idea. In this case, we have to assume a positive rôle on the part of people who had misunderstood, or had an inadequate knowledge of the traditional doctrine.\(^1\) Could this be true of the Javanese towards the end of the Majapahit era. Pigeaud's vague conclusions are insufficient to go on. Thus we must look to other sources.

I recall Goris: \(^2\)

'We also find priests of both religions mentioned in the old edicts as advisers to the king, and members of the royal court of justice. We may take it that these court clerics were summoned by the rulers themselves. The rulers had heard tales from traders and pilgrims (many Chinese pilgrims travelled to the Holy Land of Buddhism) of the great learning and magic power of the priest in Hindustan. Thus the rulers sent for these priests to give them a method of administration of their dominion, and for the magical sacred legitimization of their dynastic pretensions.

What did these priests bring to the ruler and to the land? In the first place a (magic) consecration for the ruler himself. Well known cases in Java and elsewhere lead us to assume that they also provide a Hindu mythological pedigree for him. Also when the ruler acquired the throne by force of arms, he considered it expedient to have his kingship made sacredly legitimate. We frequently see that for the maintenance and prosperity of his realms, a prince desired priestly consecration and above all a special sanctuary.

\(^1\) Cf. Zoetmulder, Pan.., pp.18-9.

\(^2\) R. Goris, Bal., pp.80-1.
So an already existing ancestral temple must be consecrated to become Hindu or a new one must be built, often a chandi or prasada for the later internment of the prince is erected. . . . New groups were added, or new methods of building, carved, painting etc., were applied. . . . The artistic Balinese learned new types of musical instruments and new genres of the theatre and the dance. Old styles were partly remodelled, while on the other hand imported styles were modified to a Balinese manner. . . .

From this passage - especially the parts underlined - we can draw the conclusion that the Indonesian people of all classes, kings, priests, or commoners, took an active part in the development or transplantation of Hindu or Buddhist culture. In the process, they often treated the elements of their own culture as a nucleus to which they added foreign elements as a means to enrich and revive their own culture. These foreign culture-elements might be techniques, forms or names. It is thus very probable that the names and relationships of the classical Indian deities were taken over by the Old Indonesians and applied to their own divinities, by so doing giving them a new lease of life in the minds of the people. Certainly there is much evidence that the influence of Indian culture was not as superficial as the above description might seem to suggest, but there is evidence that this foreign influence decreased in the course of history and that as time went on, foreign authorities received less respect; and in the Tantu Panggélaran mention is made of a Javanese Brahmin, superior to those from India.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Pigeaud, Tan., p.115. Older works as the Nâg., already had indications to this directions.
Van Akkeren\textsuperscript{1)} says virtually the same in his thesis on the lingga-cult in Java: "Het komt ons voor, dat hier evenals elders in India en Zuid Oost Azie dezelfde gedachten de voedingsbodem waren van menige godsdienstige overtuiging. Wij steunen voor onze opvatting op de studies van P. Mus, betreffende de liṅga en stūpa. Deze maakt het zeer aannemelijk, dat deze liṅga en stūpa beide in wezen wortelen in heel oude, voor India en voor Zuid Oost Azie geldende, gemeenschappelijk overtuigingen en gebruiken. Beiden waren in wezen een nieuw lichaam, dat men in de plaats stelde van de overleden voorvader, vorst of leeraar. Zij dienden als middel om weer met de overledene en diens kosmische heilbrengende krachten, diens vorstelijk gezag en dharma in contact te komen. In dit plaatsvervangende lichaam zijn godheid en afgestorvene een geworden. In de liṅga en in de stūpa bezit men dus een concentratiepunt van bovennatuurlijke krachten, waarvan het heil van het land afhankelijk is."

'It appears to us that here as elsewhere in India and South East Asia, the same ideas were the matrix of many religious convictions. We base our view on the studies of P. Mus concerning the lingga and the stūpa. He makes it very acceptable that this lingga and stūpa in nature are rooted in very old convictions and traditions, commonly held in India and South East Asia. Both are in nature a new body which people took as a substitute for a dead ancestor, king or teacher. They were used as a means to come into contact again with the deceased and his cosmic beneficial powers, his royal authority and dharma. In this substitute body the

\textsuperscript{1} Mon., p.13.
deity and the deceased become one. In the lingga and in the stūpa people have a focal point of supernatural power, on which the prosperity of the country depends.

In brief if this is so, it can be said that the lingga and the stūpa, both cultural product of the Indian people, became substitute bodies for indigenous local culture products according to the concepts in vogue in that particular locality, with the implication that the significance of the lingga or the stūpa could be adjusted to suit local concepts. Although the activity of the Indonesian people in this way can be established, we have still to face the question as to whether the Tantu Panggèlaran is such a product and whether the author of the Tantu belonged to a class which could be regarded as potentially capable of yielding such a cultural product. Pigeaud states that the author must have belonged to a wiku group and in all probability held the title of wiku, since he was so well acquainted with the particularities of the mandalas of which he wrote. Such being the case, he was a man well versed in the religious life and ritual of his time. But we can go further than thus. Since the Tantu Panggèlaran was held in high esteem by the Javanese people at that time, as many stories e.g., the rice myth in all probability originated from it, it may be concluded that the author was probably a wiku of high esteem who was regarded as a representative of the religious life and ideas existing during that period or, not to overstate the case, he may even have been a major exponent of the local genius. If this

1 Pigeaud, Tan., p.22. Even the Kalang-stories in all probability have their origin in the Tantu, (see text on pp.122-8).
2 Bosch, Pro., pp.13-5.
view of him is acceptable then a new question looms before us, that is, whether the society at that time was in a state of tension or even on the point of 'revolt'. Berg is of the opinion that this atmosphere of revolt within the minds of the people did in fact exist. In his thesis Berg states that in Majapahit a process of myth-forming took place and as a result of this political-mythology the statue of Aksobhya of Candi Jawi was removed to another place. Such a political mythology would be bound to have implications for religious life. And in this connection, in his discussion of the Calon Arang story Berg states that by the middle of the fourteenth century, people no longer had any understanding of the true origin of the bhairawa-cult. In terms of my theory, Berg's statement should be understood to mean that in the middle of the fourteenth century new notions of the bhairawa-cult, strikingly different from those in Indian tantrism were emerging. And if in the fourteenth century such notions were already formed, then in the late Majapahit era, approximately a century later, they could have become well established in the community, so that it can be said that what we find in the Tantu Panggêlaran are notions with a broad popular acceptance. How are these notions to be defined?

The removal of the Aksobhya-statue from Candi Jawi as a result of political-mythology indicates, at the very least, that life for the Buddhist community was not a bed of roses during these years, and that Buddhism if not suppressed, was receiving no significant degree of

1 Berg, Her., pp.147-8.
2 Ibid., p.138.
patronage from the Čiwaitic government; thus that its influence was on the wane despite the vigorous efforts of outstanding Buddhists such as Prapañca, Tantular and others. It can be said that these two authors did their utmost to propagate Buddhism in Java, but since there had been no influential Buddhist king since Kertanagara to revive its fortunes, Buddhism lost more and more ground. Nevertheless we must bear in mind that the people still had great respect for their cultural heritage and in particular the Buddhist scriptures. In fact even in present Bali, on Saraswati-day (odalan Saraswati), all kinds of books (cāstra) are taken out to be cleaned and worshipped. However, nothing may be read or written on those occasions. In general they are recited only occasionally these days, so that people's knowledge of the contents and language of these cāstras is declining. Such a decline was certainly underway in the Majapahit era, and it is perhaps this which gave rise to misunderstanding which prepared the way for new conceptions.

So far we have only spoken about a decline in Buddhism. Are there any indications of a similar decline in Čiwaism? Previously we saw in the Čiwaitic camp that Čiwa, Wisnu and Brahmā struggled for hegemony, and that Čiwa succeeded, while Brahmā and Wisnu fell into obscurity. On the other hand, the element of local genius meantime had done its work. Čiwa, who became the Supreme God (Parameswara) was by this time identified with the Javanese Bhatāra Guru. In other words, the indigenous nucleus which was clad in Čiwaitic terms had re-asserted itself and dominated its foreign

1 Goris, Bal., p.194.
trappings with the result that Bhaṭāra Guru became Čiwa for the Javanese, creating a Čiwa figure rather different from that known in India. By this I mean that in Bhaṭāra Guru or the Javanese Čiwa, the characteristics of both deities have merged to form a new focus of energy, more powerful than the original Bhaṭāra Guru or the original Indian Čiwa. This is perhaps the reason why Mpu Bharang, a Čiwaitic priest originating from Mpu Mahāpalyat who was a personification of Bhaṭāra Guru\(^1\) was regarded as more powerful than the deity Haricandana who was worshipped by one thousand brahmins of Jambudīpa. The extent of the decline in Buddhism and the modification of Čiwaism by Javanism is to be discussed further after a discussion of the text itself. I arrange the material in two sections, as follows:

1. passages containing evidence of Čiwa's (Paramecwara's or Bhaṭāra' Guru's) rôle and his superiority over Brahmā, Wisnu, Īcwara.

2. passages containing materials relating to Buddha.

Section One
Chapter I,\(^2\)

p.57

ndah ndah pahenak tangdenta mangrēngē ring kacaritanikā nusa Jawa ring açitkala. Ika manusa tanana, nguniweh sang hyang Mahâmeru

---

2 If I choose a different reading to that of Pigeaud's, I put the origin directly after the word or phrase concerned. Nevertheless I limit this to principal differences which are reflected in the translation.
tan hana ring nusa Jawa; kunang kahananira

tang hyang Mandalagiri, sira ta gunung magong

aluhur pinakalinggâning bhuwana (mungguh ring
bhûmi Jambudipa). Yata matangnyân henggang -
henggung hikang nusa Jawa, sadakâla molah

marayêgan, hapan tanana sang hyang
Mandararparwata, nguniweh janma - manusa.

Yata matangnyan mangadêg bhatâra Jagatpramanâ,

rep mayugha ta sira ring nusa Yawadipa lawan

bhatârî Parameçwari, ....

Malawas ta bhatâra manganakên yugha,

motus ta sira ri sang hyang Brahma Wísnu

magawe manusâ ....

p. 58 Ndah tanpa humah taya lanang wadwan mawuda -
wuda haneng alas, manikêl - nikêl (DE)
hanggas, apan tanana pagawe ulahnya, tanana
tinirû - tirûnya....

Yata matangnyan mapupul mapulungrahi sang
waték dewatâ kabeh, manangkilri bhatâra Guru.

Tuwan bhatâra Jagatnátha manuduh waték
dewata gumawayakna katatwapratista ring

Yawadipántara ....

Chapter II,
p. 62 Rêp kahucapa ta sang waték dewata sama

sumambah ri bhatâra Guru, sakweh ning dewata

kabeh, rsigana, çûranggana, widyadara,
gandarwwa, pada ngimpunakên lebuni pâdadwaya

bhatâra Mahâkarana. Uwusnira mawat sëmbah,
pada macilâ matarap tap manangkil ri bhatâra

Guru:

"Udoh kamu kita hyang dewata kahêh,
rsigana, çfrânggana, widyadara, gandarwwa,
laku pareng Jambudipa, tanayangku kita kahêh,
alihakna sang hyang Mahameru, parakna ring
nuwa Jawa, (makatitindih pâknanya) marapwan
apâgeh mari enggang - enggang ikang nusa Jawa,
lamun tka ngke sang hyang Mandaragiri. Laku,
tanayangku kahêh!"

Now, then, listen (at your ease) to the story
of the island of Java in olden times. There
were no people [yet], also the mountain
Mahâmeru was not in the island of Java, but
the place of the mountain of Mandala, a big
and high mountain regarded as the linggâ of
the world, was in the land of Jambudipa.
This was why the island of Java was unstable,
always moving and jolting, because the mountain
of Mandara was not [there] nor were there
inhabitants. Therefore god Jagatpramanâ
stood up and contemplated the island of Java
together with the goddess Parameçwarî....
The God contemplated for a long time, [then]
ordered god Brahmâ and Wisnu to create human
beings....'

'But they had no homes, men and women were
naked in the forest, destroying the plants,
because there was no purpose in their lives,
there was nothing [or nobody] to be taken as
an example.... That was the reason why the
deities came together to negotiate with and to wait upon God Guru. Lord Jagatnātha ordered the deities to found settlements on the distant island of Java....'

Chapter II, p. 62

'Let us tell of the groups of deities in attendance on god Guru. [They consisted of] all deities, groups of rṣis, cūrāṅggaṇas, widyādāras and gandārwās, all were sweeping up the dust at both the feet god Mahākāraṇa. After they had paid homage with folded hands, they sat in an orderly manner before god Guru:

"Well, all you deities, rṣis, cūrāṅggaṇas, widyādāras, gandārwās, go to Jambudīpa, all of you my sons, and move the mountain Mahāmeru to the island of Java to become a burden, so that the island of Java will become settled, for it will cease to move, if the mount of Mandara is placed there. Depart, all of you, my sons! ...."'

In this passage we see that it is god Guru who takes the initiative to populate the island of Java, to bring culture to its inhabitants and to move the Mahāmeru to Java to make the island stable and the life of the people more pleasant. This is why I am of the opinion that the purpose of the Tantu is to glorify god Guru or god Čiwa or, in fact the most appropriate god, Mahākāraṇa (The Great Cause). The view that the Tantu glorifies the cosmic mountain Mahāmeru can still be maintained, but in the sense that the Mahāmeru is the lingga of the world, and the lingga in turn is the symbol of the Deity, as explained by van Akkeren.¹) Although in this passage

¹) Mon., p.15. See also Dharmaçūnya, cod. or. 4185.
we can already see that Bhatāra Guru is the most powerful among the deities, there are other passages in which the superiority of Bhatāra Guru over Brahmā, Wisnu and perhaps even Buddha can be proved irrefutably.

Chapter V,

p. 92

Muwaḥ bhatāra Nandiguru manghanaken ta sīrā
yuga, pinalih ta hajūnananira, migil ta bhatāra Darmmarāja. Kinahanan sangaskara,
siniramning Tatwāmrtha cīwamba, inaranan
sang rsi Siddawangsitadewa....

Sdēng rumēgēp samaddi nirmmala sang rsi Siddawangsitadewa, tuminghal ta bhatāra
Īçwara, Brahmā, Wisnu ri polahira sang rsi Siddawangsitadewa, ri sdēng rumēgēp samaddi
nirmmala. "Sumadya syuhaning bhūwana", mangkana idēp bhatāra trisamaya....

p. 93

Matangnyan pada lumampah bhatāra trisamaya
humjahana sang rsi prayanya. Jag rēp mawak
agni sang hyang Brahmā, gumsēṅghana sang rsi
prayanya; ndātan wikara sang rsi. Mapa
nimittaning tan pjah de sang hyang Brahmā?
Apan sang hyang Darmma tan gsēng dening apuy;
yata matangnyan kawēs matakut sang hyang Brahmā. Tumandang ta bhatāra Wisnu, māwak
ta Wisnu - kroda sīrā, atēndas (s)ewu,
atangan rong iwu, sarwasaṅjeta rinēgēpnira.
Sang rsi pinarajayanya, dinaṅṅnira ring
cakra Sudarsana, pinupuh ring gada Mandiki,
'God Nandiguru contemplated once more, he separated his perception [from him]; so god Darmmarâja came into being. He was consecrated and sprinkled with the Čiwaitic holy-water\(^1\) and was given the name priest Siddawangsitadewa....

While priest Siddawangsitadewa was performing his flawless contemplation, the gods Ìçwara, Brahmâ and Wisnu saw everything that was conducted by priest Siddawangsitadewa at the moment of his flawless contemplation.

"He wants to destroy the world," such was the thought of the three gods....

---

\(^{1}\) Čiwâmba < čiwa + ambah = Čiwaitic water. I regard tatwâmrtâ as a synonym of čiwâmba. Perhaps this is an indication of the use of holy-water in religious ceremonies which later becomes more and more important, so that the Balinese people call their religion the Agama Tirtha.
Therefore the three gods formed the intention of killing the priest. In an instant god Brahma transformed himself into fire, intending to burn the priest. Why was it that God Brahma could not destroy him? Because god Dharma cannot be burnt by fire; and so god Brahma was frightened to death. God Wisnu began to attack in the form of Wisnu – kroda with a thousand heads, two thousand arms, each carrying all kinds of weapons. He attacked the priest, hit him with the Sudarsana – disc, beat him with the Mandiki – club, stabbed him with the Nandaka – sword, confused him with the Pańcajanya – horn, but priest Siddawangsitadewa remained unharmed. . . . God Darmmarāja cannot be defeated by violence; god Wisnu was defeated and frightened to death. Then god Īśwara transformed himself into Rudra and fiercely attacked the ascetic priest; but priest Siddawangsitadewa was performing his flawless concentration, he remained unperturbed. . . . Therefore god Brahma, Wisnu and Īśwara were afraid after seeing the perfection of the ascetic priest.'

This passage shows us that Nandiguru, in his form of the ascetic Siddawangsitadewa is clearly superior to Brahma, Wisnu and Īśwara. From this fact it can be seen that the theory of Pigeaud and Kern that Īśwara is not Īśwa but another deity may not be tenable. In my view Īśwara is still to be identified with the Indian Īśwa;
what is different is Guru or Bhatâra Guru or Nandiguru who is sometimes called Çiwa or Paramçwara; or in other words the Çiwa of the Tantu Panggelaran differs from the classical Indian Çiwa or perhaps it can be said that the Çiwa based on Javanese conceptions, and represents the blending of the classical Indian Çiwa and the original Javanese Guru. The Javanese Çiwa or the new Bhatâra Guru then is more powerful than the classical Indian Çiwa as well as the original Javanese bhatâra Guru. Likewise it is evident that Brahmâ, Wisnu and Içwara in the Tantu are portrayed as belonging to a younger generation of gods than the Javanese Çiwa - perhaps in the sense that the trimurtti were late arrivals in Java in comparison with the indigenous deities - in order to show his seniority and his superiority, so that theoretically speaking Brahmanism, Wisnuism, and Çiwaism according to the old conception only existed as religious sects in the framework of the Javanese Çiwaism - or may I suggest the term Guruism? That this annexation was established after a period of struggle is also evident, namely in the following episodes:

a) When Bhatâra Guru created Darmmarâja Brahmâ, Wisnu and Içwara opposed him by creating three demons to fight Darmmarâja. When Guru asked them to eliminate the three demons, they put forward a counter-demand, namely that Darmmarâja be exterminated, to which Bhatâra Guru agreed. 1)

b) When Bhatâra Guru wanted Wisnu to succeed him as deva-guru of Sukayajña, Wisnu was very reluctant, and though he finally consented, he did not wish to give consecration to anyone requesting it.

1 Pigeaud, Tan., pp.92-4.
other than a halfman. Bhatâra Guru transformed himself to such a man, and so forced Wisnu to give his consecration.\(^1\)

But finally Ícwara, Brahmâ and Wisnu agreed to help Bhatâra Guru in his religious work. The text is as follows:\(^2\)

**Chapter IV, p.89**

'Kunang Bhatâra Guru sdang haneng

Çûnyagirimandala, umawasakên sang hyang hastitijati. Datang hyang Ícwara, Brahmâ, Wisnu, sumambah ri Bhatâra Guru, mwajar tta

Bhatâra Paramêqwara:

"Uduh, bhahagyâ tanayangu sang trisamaya, rowanganaku gawe tantu praçista ri sang hyang Mahameru. Tanpasrehan yang bhuwana; kita katrini humilangakna lkañkaning bhuwana, glar tawur sërhanyu. Kunang sang hyang Ícwara, Brâhma, Wisnu, masêhana, wruha ri sisiku sung kita dewata. Den padâgawe kahyangan tanayangku katiga..." Kahucapa ta sira bhatâra trisamaya magawe mandala....'

**Chapter IV, p.89**

'But god Guru was at the mandala of Çûnyagiri, contemplating the nature of existence. Ícwara, Brahmâ and Wisnu came and paid homage before god Guru. God Parameqwara said: "Well, welcome my three

\(^1\) Pigeaud, Tan., pp.82-4.

\(^2\) Ibid., pp.89-90.
sons, help me to establish order and firmness at Mahāmeru. The world is without rule, the three of you must eradicate the impurities of the world, your task is to teach how to make offerings. As for you Īśvara, Brahmā and Wisnu, purify (the world) because you know the punishment from us gods. Make for yourself a mandala, my sons ...." It is related that the three deities made their mandalas....'

As we establish the relationship between Bhatāra Guru and the three deities, we must take note of the relationship between Bhatāra Guru and Buddha, which leads us to the second part of this discussion.

Section Two

Here we consider passages referring to the origin of the Buddha and indicating his place in the whole scheme. In chapter III there is an account of the origin of the rsi-, sewa-, sogata-sects:

p.78 Kahucapa ta Bhatārī Humā, mabōh mpumpu ning sukunira kiwa; mara ripuh ta sira (B); pinijētira, mtu rahnya, mtu pilapilunya, mtu kawahkawahnya; pinijētira muwah, mtu tang raray tigang siki kwehnya, mtu ariarinya. Yata matangnyan kroda bhatārī Humā; rēp ringēp tang sañjata ning para watēk dewata.

1 sisiku sung kita < sisiku (punishment which befall people as the result of their wrong behaviour) + sung < sun (I); the ng comes into being by the influence of k in kita.
yeki (p. 79) mangke bhawanira; sumyuhakna ikang raray paryyanira. Rep tikang raray katrini sumambah ri bhaññāri Paramēcwarī; mwajar tang raray: "Apa deya ranak bhaññāri yan pjahana de Paramēcwarī; prasiðanēn tanayan bhaññāri, pwangkulun."

Mangkana ling ning raray katrini: rep, mari krođa bhaññāri Humā, yata matangnyan pinratisthanira tang raray wkasan: "Uduh tanayanka kita raray katrini, kita pwa mijil sakeng mpumpune sukukiwa, matangnyan mpungku (B) na ngaranta katrini. Kunang kita sang matuhā, dak sangaskarani (DE) kita, dak raray pusāne romanta (B); tinhēr mpu Kumāragimbal ngaranta, wiku ḍsyangarēmban ta ngaranta mangke. Mangkana ta panganugrahangkwiri kita: sañjata sang hyang Trikurungan ta; kaytnakēn ta panganugrahangku."


"Kunang kita raray pamungcu, dak sangaskara kita mangke, mpu Kumara-raray ta ngaranta; tiñjo ta rahāsyangku yan samahita; wiku bodda ta ngaranta ring rāt, pamipda kita ring bhaññāra Budḍa dlahā. Ćo ngaraning hyang, gata ngaraning rēm; tinhēr ta čogata ngaranata ring rāt. Mah panganugrahangku; sañjata sang hyang Guduhā ngaranya. Kaytnakēn ta panganugrahāngku."

"We now tell of Bhaṭārī Humā. Her left big toe became swollen and she was in great pain; she squeezed it, blood came out; slime came out and then loinwater; she squeezed it again, and three children came out. Because of this she became very angry; she took the weapons of the gods in her hand, (this is how she now was), intending to pulverize her children. But the three of them paid homage to the goddess Parameqwarī, saying: "Why should you, Parameqwarī kill us, your sons? (It is better) that your ladyship perfect us."

Thus said the three children. The anger of the goddess Humā thereupon abated; and she then gave names to the children: "Well my three sons, you are born from my left big toe (mpu), thereupon your title will be mpungku (your lordship). As for you the eldest, I will give you consecration, I will tie up your hair, child, then your name will be Mpu Kumāra - gimbal; your name now is Rsyangarēmban. Here is my grant to you: a weapon called sang hyang Trikurungan, guard it carefully!"

"As for you, my second son, I give you your consecration, kneel down, then your name will be Kumāra - siddi. Study with god Gana, therefore you will be known by people

---

The phrase ta suhun wulune rahāsyangku has the same meaning as the Dutch phrase 'het hoofd in de schoot leggen'. I give the phrase tiŋjo rahāsyangku the same meaning as tiŋjo can also mean to go to, to approach.
as a qiwaitic priest. Teach the people the meaning of the alphabet, you will be the body and the arms of the world. Bhûja means arms, angga means body, therefore your name will be Mpu Bhûjânga. Here is my gift to you: the weapon of god Mrsa. Take care of it!"

"As for my youngest son, I will give you your consecration, your name is Mpu Kumâra-raray; if you feel devotion, kneel down; you will be known by the world as a buddhist priest, you will follow the example of god Buddha in the future. Go means god, gata means tranquility; then your name will be çogata. Here is my gift: a weapon called sang hyang Guduhâ. Take care of it!"

It is apparent from the above passage that the sogatas did not derive from Buddha Gautama, but from the son of the goddess Humâ by Bhatâra Guru, as was the case with the rsis and the qiwaites. This means that the sogatas of the Tantu are in fact a sogata-sect based on a Guruistic conception very different in nature from the sogata-sect based on the adwaya conception. In support of this theory I quote another passage:

Chapter VII,

p.104 Kahucapana Bhatâra Guru, tumulusakna magawe tantu ri Yawadipa.... Marûpa ta sira wiku, bhujangga çewapaksa ta sira, sira bhatâra mahâmpu Palyat ngaran ira....

p.109 Kahucapa tâmpu Mahâpalyat, mantuk ta sira maring nûsa Jawa, Pinalihnirâ ta çarîra nira matmahan ta çaiwa sogata, mangaran
Chapter VII

p.104 Let us relate the story of Bhatara Guru, who continued to found settlements on the island of Java. He took on the appearance of a ājīvaitic priest called the great priest Palyat....

p.109 Let us relate the story of the great priest Palyat. He returned to the island of Java. He divided himself into ājīvaitic and buddhist parts, calling them Mpu Bārang and Mpu Waluh-bang. Mpu Bārang was of the ājīvaitic sect and Mpu Waluh-bang of the buddhist sect.

It becomes more and more obvious that the sogatas of the Tantu are Guruistic in origin. If this theory is acceptable, then it is appropriate to seek for the place of Buddha or to be more accurate the Buddhist community (boddhapakṣa) in the framework of Guruism.

For this purpose we take:

Chapter IV,

p.82 Akweh manuṣa harēp wikuwa, yata sinangāskaran de bhatāra Guru. Tambehaning mangaskarani bhagawan Wṛhaspati, kapeng kalin bhagawan Soma, kapeng tiga bhagawan Budḍa, kapeng pat bhagawan Čukra, kapeng lima bhagawan Raditya, kapening ēnēm bhagawan Saneqcara, kapeng pitu bhagawan Hanggara. Samangkana kweh ning ājīva (DE) bhatāra Guru duk ing Sukāyajñā.
'Many people wished to become priests, and so were consecrated by god Guru. First was the consecration of the priest Wṛhaspati, second - priest Soma, third - priest Buddha, fourth priest Čukra, fifth - priest Raditya, sixth - priest Sandeṣa, seventh - priest Hanggara. This was the number of the pupils of god Guru when he was in Sukāyajñā.'

Here the position of Buddha is clear. He is presented as one of the pupils of Bhatāra Guru which means that the teachings he gave to his followers - those of Buddhism - actually originated from Guruism; in other words that the Buddhism of the Tantu is founded on Guruistic principles. So here we have the figure of Buddha as a priest and pupil of Bhatāra Guru, whereas the sogatapaksa, according to other passages, originated from Kumāra-raray, the son of Humā. Does this involve any contradiction? Not at all, because Humā ordered Kumāra-raray to take hyang Buddha as example, for apparently she was referring to Buddha, the priest and pupil of her husband, not to Buddha Gautama. So I feel it may be concluded, that the religious sects from India together with the rsi-sect in the Tantz may be regarded as originating from one source with a Javanese nucleus element, namely Guruism.

Finally, as a final remark on the Tantu, it should be noted that there is an indication of further development of this form of religion. I refer to what later emerged in East Java and is referred to as 'Buda-Wisnu'. The following passage perhaps will help to confirm this indication.
Chapter VII,

p.115

Ri sāmpunirāhurup bhasma, datang sang prabhū

ring Jambudipa, qri mahārāja Cakrawartti

nagaranira. Umēndēk

p.116

manambah ri sirāmpu Bharang, mangaturakēn
dodot malit, mās mirah hintēn rājayogya. Nda
tan tinanggap denirāmpu Bharang, pinintanira
kang kinabhaktan ing Jambidipa. Yata
winehakning sirāmpu Bharang, ndatan inalap
sireka, tuhun tiniru rūpanya; yata
pinakahantuk-antuk nira maring Jawa.

Lumampah sirāmpu Bharang samering lawan
sirāmpu Tapawangkēng mwang Tapapalet,
padāhāmbaramārgga sira, prapta ring Yawadipa

.... Kunang sirāmpu Bharang magawe ta sira
kańcana, dinadekēn pratimma hmās winimba rūpa
bhatāra Wisnu; inukirnira de mpu Tapapalet

Tapawangkēng. Tahatahaning mangukir
sumamburat lwir huddaka, matmahan

kṛṣṇā, katamapi katkaning mangke.

Sāmpun paripūrṇa sang hyang pratima
hmās, pinucakanira ta ring gunung Sundawini.

Mangrēṅgō ta sang prabhū ring Dāhā, qri
mahārāja Taki, yan hana sang hyang pratima
hmās ring gunung Sundawini; yata hutusan

sang Prabhū mangundanga sirāmpu Bharang
nguniweh sirāmpu Tapawangkēng Tapapalet. Tan
wihang sang inutus, lumampah siģhra prāpta
sumambah ri sirāmpu Bharang; mojar ta ya:
"Ranak sang pândita hinutus de sang aji ring Daha, hangundang ri sang yatiwara datngeng nâgara ta, pwangkulun."

"Um," ling nirâmpu Bharang, "tan wihang kami." Lumampah sirâmpu Bharang samering lawan sirâmpu Tapawangkông, cîghra prâpting Dahâ sira katrini dumunung ring aji Taki. Pininta nir a tang pratima hmâs de sang prabhû; tan tinngêt ta ya, winehaknira denirâmpu Bharang. Yata matangnyan sang hyang pratima hmâs kinabhaktenira de sang prabhu ring Dahâ, katamapi katkating mangke.

Chapter VII,

p.115

\textit{After they exchanged bhasma [with each other],}\n
the king of Jambudipa - king Cakrawartti - arrived. He bowed and paid homage to Mpu Bharang, offering fine clothes, and royal fineries. But Mpu Bharang refused them all, he asked for something that was worshipped in Jambudipa. That was approved and given to Mpu Bharang, though he did not take it, (he) merely copied it and brought it to Java.

Mpu Bharang departed, accompanied by Mpu Tapawangkông and Tapapalet. They went by air and arrived in Java... Then Mpu Bharang used gold to make a golden statue in the form of god Wisnu, engraved by Mpu Tapapalet and Tapawangkông. The gold left over after the carving spread around like water and became black, up to the present.
When the golden statue was ready, it was placed on the top of the mountain Sundawini. The king of Dahâ, çrî mahâraja Taki, heard of the golden statue on the mountain Sundawini. So he sent for Mpu Bharang and Tapawangkêng and Tapapalet. The messenger set out and soon arrived before Mpu Bharang. Making a sembah he said:

"I am ordered by the king of Dahâ to invite you to come to the city, my lord."

"Well," said Mpu Bharang. "I am willing."

Mpu Bharang departed, accompanied by Mpu Tapawangkêng and Mpu Tapapalet; the three of them came to Dahâ soon and were presented to king Taki. The golden statue was demanded by the king and he was not disappointed. Mpu Bharang gave it to him. This is why the golden statue has been worshipped by the king of Dahâ up to the present.

It is indeed very strange that Mpu Bharang (a personification of god Guru) together with Mpu Tapawangkêng (a personification of god Brahmâ) and Mpu Tapapalet (a personification of god Wisnu) should bring a copy of a statue of Wisnu from India to Java; made a golden statue in accordance with it and then give it to the king of Dahâ as an object of worship, because this is tantamount to replace himself with Wisnu. But perhaps the author wished to say that Bhatâra Guru consented to the worship of Wisnu in Java from that time. Perhaps it indicated an increase in the popularity of Wisnu-worship. This Wisnu-worshipping
community together with other religious sects in Java, in all probability continued to develop until they were overwhelmed by Islam, except those which fled to Bali. The people of Java were converted Islam, but the former beliefs remained latent, waiting for their chance to burst forth. An indication of this is the existence of a 'Buda Djawí' or 'Buda Wiśnu' religious sect in East Java, founded by Resi Kusumadewa in 1925 which has spread its influence in most parts of East Java and is apparently still spreading to other districts.\(^1\)

\(g)\) Korawācrama\(^2\)

Swellengrebel who is an authority on this text came to the following conclusions, namely that the stories it contains are set in Java, though it is still uncertain whether the prototypes of these stories are Javanese or Indian, and that in certain significant respects there are quite striking similarities in structure and content between it and the Tantu, so that one can accept that the views put forward in both texts might originate from a very similar original, and that the terminus ante quem of the Tantu Penggelaran, namely 1557 or 1635 A.D., might serve as the date of the Korawācrama.\(^3\)

These findings suggest quite clearly the implication that the Oldjavanese Korawācrama is the product of a Javanese author with perhaps a slight possibility of it being based on an Indian original, and it has very much in common with the Tantu as far

---

2. Swellengrebel, Kor.
3. Ibid., pp.40-2.
as ideas and dates are concerned. It is nevertheless noteworthy that although younger than the Tantu, its author still appears to have a fairly good knowledge of the relationships between the classical Indian deities, at least more so than the author of the Tantu, assuming we accept the view that where the doctrine of the Tantu and relationships of the gods it presents differs from that of classical Hinduism, this is due to ignorance on its author's part.+1)

In my view, the reason that there are certain differences between these two works - for example although in the Korawârama and in the Indian tradition Īśwara, Ćiwa, Umâpati, Tripurârî, Mahâdewa and Maheçwara are synonymous, in the Tantu, Īśwara, Ćiwa, Umâpati and Tripurârî are indeed synonymous, but Mahâdewa and Maheçwara are names for a quite distinct divine being+2) is because they belong to different genres. To me, it appears that the author of the Korawârama was in a dilemma. Although he had perhaps a keener interest in the formulations of the orthodox Hindu tradition than the author of the Tantu, he had to take into account ideas in vogue at the time he was writing. Thus to the extent that he wished to link the Korawârama with the Mahâbhârata, he had to make Ćiwa equivalent to Īśwara; but to the extent that he wished to strike a responsive chord among the common people, he had to present Ćiwa not as Īśwara but Guru.

The author of the Tantu, however, was in no such dilemma; he was responsible to no master, and could write in such terms as were meaningful to him. The

1 Pigeaud, Tan., p.23.
2 Ibid., p.31.
two works, therefore, despite their similarity had best be considered as belonging to different genres. The position of the authors of the two works may also be different, e.g., if the author of the Tantu is a priest in the sense of a dewaguru, then perhaps the author of the Korawâçrama is a priest more concerned with the wayang-theatre, a kind of dalang (puppeteer). This would explain his ability to draw on various sources to compile his stories, an ability still possessed by the dalang today, so that people say that a dalang never lacks a story (dalang mangsa kuranga lakon). The motifs of the Korawâçrama, namely of people seeking instruction from Brahmins in the mountains is not uncommon in the wayang. A very classical example of this motif is the lakon 'Kangsa adu djago' in which Kakrasana and Narajana seek instruction at hermitages. Modern lakons with the same motif are the Makutarama, Wahju Purba Sedjati, Bimapaksa and others. The position of bhatâra Guru in the Korawâçrama is also suggestive of the wayang, because in both cases bhatâra Guru is not the Supreme God; this is in fact Sang Hyang Tunggal (see further below).

As for the relative position of the religious sects themselves, it is Buddhism or Buddhists or Wisnuism or Wisnuites which have pride of place in this text, Cîwaism hardly gets a mention. In which case it is evident that the reference in the Tantu to Mpu Palyat's consent of the king of Dahâ worshipping Wisnu is true. In the Korawâçrama then, the two most important sects are Boddapaksa and Waisnawapaksa. What are the implications of these facts? That in the hundred years or so between the composition of the Sutasoma and the Tantu, the boddapaksa as understood in the Guruistic
sense as deriving from Humā's toe, has completely merged with the Čaiwapakṣa to become a new sect, although preserving the name boddapakṣa. I suggest this because in the Korawāgrama the guruistic conception of Buddha is on several occasions confused with Mahādewa. In other words, the term 'Buddha' is the container for Čiwaism, whereas in the Tantu, Buddha - Čiwa are both components of Guru. This is why, in the later text, Guru is demoted to a lower rank, and his paramount position now occupied by Sang Hyang Suksma-Eka or Sang Hyang Tunggal or Sang Hyang Ekawiṣesa who is in fact the original Javanese Supreme Deity.⁴¹
Thus the Guru of the Tantu is not the Guru of the Korawāgrama and later, but is rather the Guru of the wayang-stories, the Guru of the Tantu in the meantime having become Sang Hyang Suksma-Eka.

In case it might appear that I have deviated too far from the text, I adduce supporting citations in the first place to establish the merging of Buddha and Mahādewa and in the second to indicate the contrast between Buddha and Wisnu.

Section One⁴²

Of the four passages cited, it will be seen that two appear to support the view that Buddha is not Mahādewa and two that he is.

p.⁴ Tan kaïndran pwa sira, pan Rāditya, tan Wisnu pwa sira, pan Soma, tan Rudra pwa sira, pan Anggāra, tan Mahādewa pwa sira, pan Buddha...

¹ Poerbatjaraka, Kap., p.125.
² The text is drawn from Swellengrebel's edition, so that the number of the pages refer to the pages in that book.
'He is not Indra, because [he is] Rāditya, he is not Wisnu, because [he is] Soma, he is not Rudra, because [he is] Anggāra, he is not Mahādeva because [he is] Buddha....'

Dak warah pwa kitātmajā ni nghulun, sira bhagawān Trikālajñā ngaranya, yayah de bhattara Dharmarāja, bapa de sang hyang Yama, ya ta pinakabhiksu de wang Giri pita... ana pwa paomanya bhagawān Trikālajñā, Paoman mantēn unggwanira maweh sewā ring tanayanira, tatkalanira bhattara Dharmma, bhattara Yama, bhattara Mahādeva, bhattara Buddha, aminta aji warah ring sira bapa, pada umañjing ring dalem paoman mantēn....'

'I will tell you, my son. He is priest Trikālajñā, the father of bhatāra Dharmarāja, father of God Yama; he is regarded as the priest of the people of Giripita, .... Priest Trikālajñā has an offering-house, an offering-house of jewels.... where he gives audience to his sons, when bhatāra Dharmarāja, bhatāra Yama, bhatāra Mahādeva, bhatāra Buddha, ask for instruction in knowledge from their father; they come to the offering-house of jewels....'

om hyang jam hyang jam Čikhiraktam, ya ta pangastuti bhattāra Brahmā, om hyang jam hyang jam Buddhamañte, ya ta pangastuti hyang Mahādeva, om hyang jam hyang jam Narayanañte, ya ta pangastuti bhattāra Wisnu,
p.144

'om hyang jam hyang jam Çikhiraktam
is the eulogy of god Brahmã,

om hyang jam hyang jam Buddhambaste
is the eulogy of god Mahâdewa,

om hyang jam hyang Narayanamaste
is the eulogy of god Wisnu,'

p.164

Mawuwus pwa bhattara Buddha: "E kita sang Çakuni, apa denta palaku, mami maweha mas pisis sarwabharana," mangkana ling bhattâra Mahâdewa.

p.164

'Bhattara Buddha said: "Well, you, sang Çakuni, what do you want, I will give you all kinds of gold, jewels and money," so said bhattâra Mahâdewa.'

Of these passages, the first and second state that Buddha is not Mahâdewa, but the third and fourth state beyond doubt that Buddha is Mahâdewa. If such passages had occurred in older texts such as Sang Hyang Kamahâyânikan and Kuñjarakarna, I would be inclined to suggest that there was something wrong with the text and the unity of Buddha and Mahâdewa should be regarded as doubtful. But since we already know from the Tantu of the birth of a Guruistic Buddha (not to be confused with Gautama), there is no reason to believe that the Buddha in the Korawâgrama is not the same Guruistic figure.

Swellengrebel+1) argued that since Trikâlajña, the father of Buddha in the Korawâgrama, is an epithet frequently applied to the Buddha, it is evident that

1 Kor., pp.291-2.
the Buddha of the Korawâgrama is to be identified with Buddha Gautama, the founder of Buddhism. In my view his conclusion is based on a misunderstanding of the Oldjavanese Amaramâlã.\(^1\) It is clear to me that the expression bhagawân Trikâljña in this work means merely a buddhist priest and is not a synonym of Siddharta Gautama. As proof the word samantabhadrah which is also found together with the word Trikâljña may be mentioned, for we also know it as the name of a bodhisattwa and not an epithet of Gautama. Likewise Dharmmarâja should be regarded as meaning the lord of the dharma and not as specifically referring to Buddha Gautama. In the Nâgarakârtâgama\(^2\) we see that Mpu Bharadah is also called a buddhist priest who knew the three ages i.e., past, present and to come (kyâting hyang Mpu Bharada woda ri hatîtâdi trikâlâpagêh).

So, perhaps the relationship of Buddha and Mahâdewa in the Korawâgrama can be compared to that of Mpu Waluhbang and Mpu Bharang in the Tantu Panggêlaran, the only difference being that in the Tantu, Mpu Waluhbang finally left the bodâpaksa to become united again with Mpu Bharang, whereas in the Korawâgrama the name Buddha was preserved and put in contrast to Wisnu, with the understanding that the contrast does not mean confrontation but perhaps a kind of partnership which paves the way for a confluence in later periods. And with this matter we come to the next stage in our argument.

\(^1\) Kern, VG, vol.9, p.278.  
\(^2\) Pigeaud, Jav., vol.1, p.52.
Section Two

In the following passages I attempt to depict the parallelism between the boddapaksa and the waisnavapaksa.

p.14
Mamintuhu ta sang Pândawa kalima wuwus ning kaki, mangarcana sang Pândawa ring bhagawán Byása, padangastuti ongkara. "Warah i ujar kaboddhan kawaisnawan warahakeneng uwanta sang Dhrtarstra, kitamumpunaneng Hastinápura, nghulun mareng cawane putungku sang Korawa," mangkana wuwus bhagawán Byása.

p.14
'The five Pandawas agreed with the words of their grandfather; they paid homage and praised bhagawan Byasa while pronouncing the word "Om!"

“You should pass the teachings of the Boddhas and the Waisnawas on to your uncle Dhrtarastra. Rule the country of Hastina, I will visit the corpses of my grandsons the Korawas," so said the priest Byása.'

p.34 and p.36
Mangkana pwa kita putungku, sukhá mabalik duhka, tanggal mabalik panglong, pati puhara urip, urip puhara pati, mangkana pwa kita, duhka mangke tinémunta, sang Pândawa mangke mamanggih sukhá, duhka tёмbe sang Pândawa, dukha tёмbe kita mun wus manangsàra ràganta ring patapan, kalingane putu, lakoni ambèk kaboddhan kawaisnawan, kawiratin, kavélas - arèp nastapa, kastyabratan, ta satyèng sipta, satyèng samādhi, pet patintâmungpung aurip,
p. 34 and p. 36

So it is with you, my grandchildren, happiness turns into unhappiness, a waxing moon turns into a waning one, death is the cause of life, life is the cause of death; so it is with you, you are unhappy now, the Pandawas are in happiness, in the future the Pandawas will have hardships, and you will gain happiness, after you torment yourself in the hermitage. It means, my grandchildren, that you must observe the teachings of Buddhists and Wisnuites, and practise self restraint, be merciful, care for others, be true in faith, words and meditation. Look for the death while you are alive, do not delay it; do not postpone it, do not shelve it....'

On page 14 Byâsa, the grandfather of the Korawas and the Pandawas, orders Dharmâtma (the eldest among the Pandawas) to instruct king Dhrtarâstra in the teachings of Buddhism and Wisnuism. I have translated kaboddhan kawaisnawan as a dwandwa-compound, so that it implies that Dharmâtma has knowledge of both religions and that he is ordered to pass on his knowledge to one man (Dhrtarâstra) who is supposed to receive instruction in both religions. On pages 34 and 36 Byâsa orders the Korawas to observe the teachings of both religions. In the Sutasoma it is different. Sutasoma gives instruction in Çivaism and Buddhism, but allows his pupils to make the choice themselves, to observe one of them and to have knowledge of the other. This is clear,
because Sutasoma also explained that one can obtain salvation, either with Čiwaism or with Buddhism. 'Only', he said 'the path of Čiwaism is slower.' Sutasoma is not concerned whether people take the path of Čiwaism or Buddhism. Although Buddhism is the faster means to salvation, people may prefer to take the longer road because it is more suited to them; Sutasoma has no objection to this.

But in the above passages Byāsa orders instruction in both Wisnuism and Buddhism and the performance of both. It would be very strange if both religions were in opposition to each other in the manner of Čiwaism and Buddhism as described in the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan, Sutasoma and Kuñjarakarna, but not at all surprising if the relationship of Buddhism and Wisnuism is understood as being within the framework of Guruism.

With this discussion of the Korawāçrama, my study of the developing relationship between Čiwa and Buddha is complete. However a side glance is still necessary to clarify related questions which may arise from a study of the Bubuksah and the inscription of Kēlurak.

h) Bubuksah

On the basis of the fact that in the Bubuksah Bhaṭāra Guru is the Supreme Deity, it seems to me that the Bubuksah should be regarded as about the same age as the Tantu Panggélaran and older than the Korawāçrama, though the two texts in my possession seem very young. It therefore follows that Gagangaking and Bubuksah, who figure as representatives of the Čewa - Sogata pđ tandas.

1 I got two mss of the Bubuksah story from the Library of Leiden University, namely cod. or. 3918 and cod. or. 4164. Though both are incomplete, they serve well for my purpose.
should be regarded as manifestations of Bhaṭāra Guru.
The Tantu relates the story of two hermits, the sons of
Mpu Siddhayogi, a holy man who came from Jambudīpa and
married the princess Kasingi of Wawu-langit. Now Mpu
Siddhayogi was a student of Iśwara, so that his religion
would probably have been Ćiwaism. So if we compare the
story of Bhaṭāra Guru manifesting himself into Mpu
Bharang and Waluhbang to that of Mpu Siddhayogi who had
two sons Gagangaking and Bubuksah, it becomes obvious
from where the story of the two hermits representing the
Ćewa - Sogata was derived. The problem is whether
Bubuksah who was said to be a Bherawa, was in fact a
Buddhist Bherawa according to Wajrayana notions, or a
Buddhist Bherawa according to Guruistic notions.

In fact the contrast between Ćiwaitic Bherawas and
Buddhist Bherawas are well established, though in the
past the traditional interpretation of the figure of
Bubuksah has obscured this contrast. In fact I would
put forward the view that these two types of Bherawas
are dearly distinguished in the Calon-Arang,1) Sutasoma
and Bubuksah. According to Pigeaud, the Bhairawapakṣa
in the Tantu observed the ćmaçāṇamānā (doing penance
and samādhi in a charnel ground) and he compares its
followers to the Kāpālikas or Kalamukhas.2)
Concerning the Kāpālikas, Luniya writes as follows:3)

"The Kāpālikas and Kalamukhas followed very
unhealthy and revolting practices, like eating food in
a skull, keeping a pot of wine, and worshipping god
Maheshwar as seated therein, holding a trisula in hand,

1 Poerbatjaraka, Cal.
2 Pigeaud, Tan, p.38, note no.3.
3 Luniya, Evo., p.401.
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should be regarded as manifestations of Bhaṭārā Guru.

The Tantu relates the story of two hermits, the sons of Mpu Siddhayogi, a holy man who came from Jambudīpā and married the princess Kasingi of Wawu-langit. Now Mpu Siddhayogi was a student of Īcārā, so that his religion would probably have been Čiwaism. So if we compare the story of Bhaṭārā Guru manifesting himself into Mpu Bharang and Waluhbang to that of Mpu Siddhayogi who had two sons Gagangaking and Bubuksah, it becomes obvious from where the story of the two hermits representing the Čewā - Sogāta was derived. The problem is whether Bubuksah who was said to be a Bherawa, was in fact a Buddhist Bherawa according to Wajrayana notions, or a Buddhist Bherawa according to Guruistic notions.

In fact the contrast between Čiwaitic Bherawas and Buddhist Bherawas are well established, though in the past the traditional interpretation of the figure of Bubuksah has obscured this contrast. In fact I would put forward the view that these two types of Bherawas are clearly distinguished in the Calon-Arang,\(^1\) Sutasoma and Bubuksah. According to Pigeaud, the Bhairawapakṣa in the Tantu observed the qmačānagamana (doing penance and samādhi in a charnel ground) and he compares its followers to the Kāpālikas or Kalamukhas.\(^2\)

Concerning the Kāpālikas, Luniya writes as follows: \(^3\)

'The Kāpālikas and Kalamukhas followed very unhealthy and revolting practices, like eating food in a skull, keeping a pot of wine, and worshipping god Maheshwar as seated therein, holding a trisula in hand,

\(^1\) Poerbatjaraka, Cal.
\(^2\) Pigeaud, Tan, p.38, note no.3.
\(^3\) Luniya, Evo., p.401.
besmearing the body with the ashes of a dead body etc. They conceived their personal god Rudra or Siwa in a very horrible form.

From this description, it is clear that in the Calon Arang story, Calon Arang represents the Çiwaitic Bhairawa, while Mpu Bharadah represents the Buddhist one. Their distinguishing characteristics are that Calon Arang kills and makes offerings of human beings, whereas Mpu Bharadah restores the dead to life. In the Sutasoma we see clearly the same distinction between the dead-reviving Sutasoma and the man-eating Porusâda. The question is whether we can classify Sutasoma as a Bhairawa.

One of the distinguishing marks of a Bhairawa is that he performs his samâdhi in a charnel ground. The Sutasoma-kakawin informs us that Sutasoma in fact did this, namely in canto IX, 5 - XII, 4 and particularly canto XII, 2, which is as follows:

Tuwin ri sêdênganta dhîra mahaseng smaçanâlaya,
niragraha malinggheng kunapa lot madewâcraya,
samangkana kitân pamûrsitaknang mahânugraha,
awás ri têka ning prayojana sasâdhya sang sâdhaka.

'Furthermore while you were bravely entering this charnel yard, attached to nothing, sitting on corpses and continuously praying to the gods, at that moment you deserved a great reward. It is clear that [such a] sage will gain his objective and all his intentions will be fulfilled.'

This passage is part of the praise uttered by the goddess Widyutkarâli to Sutasoma, when he was performing samâdhi at the charnel yard. Thus it is clear that
Sutasa is a ācyānagamana or a Bhairawa. But what kind of Bhairawa? Since we know already that he is a bodhisattva, it is appropriate to look for a description of a Buddhist Bhairawa, and one is to be found in canto CXXV, stanzas 8 and 9:

8) ngkâ sang sadhaka mundirupa pakapâjaran irika malinggih ing cawa,
len tekang sinamadhi mungguh i harēp nira dadi mahurip mangañjali,
kapwahyun muliheng swaweçma sahajenurunaken
ira muwah wawang pējah,
mangka tingkah ireng rana prawala manglagi-
lagi ri kadibyan ing manah.

9) yeka hetu ni sang mahâyâna sirâtaki-taki
makabuddhi sadhaka,
tan sangkeng naramangsa tan saka ring ambēk
anuwukana bhoga bhojana,
jñânekâtwa ginông nirân wêñanga ring pati hurip ika don irân laku,
sâmangkâna sireki rakwa kahidēp Jinapati
wêkas ing nirâçraya.

8) 'There a bald-headed ascetic who owned the hermitage took his seat on a corpse, with the objects of his meditation laid before him; they returned to life, and paid homage, and wished to return to their own homes, but dropped dead again instantly. Thus was the scene on the battlefield, as though designed to give courage.
9) This is why the Mahāyāna ascetic desires very much to have the power of a magician, not because he wishes to devour human flesh, not because he wishes to satisfy himself with food and drink, [but] because his greatest concern is true knowledge, the power over death and life. This is the goal of his penance, that thuswise he will be regarded as Jinapati, the apotheosis of those who are "nirāgraya".

This passage is taken from the description of the battlefield at night, after the first day of the battle. The clear description of the Mahayana ascetic proves that he is a Bhairawa but that his goal is not to eat human flesh, but to obtain power over life and death. This goal is congruent with that of prince Siddhartha Gautama after his encounter with the aged, the sick, the dead man and the priest. It is evident that the Mahayanist Bhairawa is in fact, still observing the main principle of Buddha's teaching.

Concerning Porusāda, the kakawin Sutasoma characterises him as a Bhairawa (mabhairawa) in the following terms in canto XXII, 9:

Ya kārana nikān mareng wana ri lambung ing acala Sumeru parwwata,
makin ta ya mabhairawan mangan ikang nara makaratu ning mahāsura,
ares sahana ning watēk ratu kabeh sakaparēk i paminggir ing wana,
tēnuh twas ika yan rinampas inames i bala nikang Jayāntaka.
'This was why he went to the forest on the slopes of the mountain Sumeru.
He grew more and more a Bhairawa as he devoured human beings and became king of the great demons.
All the kings close to the forest were terror struck, their spirit broke when they were attacked and [their forces] cut to pieces by the army of Jayântaka.'

This passage describes the behaviour of Poruṣâda after being driven out of his country. Even Tantular's description of the Ćiwaitic Bhairawa could not be more unequivocal.

Looking back to the Bubuksah story, we see that Bubuksah as a Bhairawa did not hesitate to eat human flesh when necessary, because he believed that in fact he was helping miserable beings to attain a better life in their next rebirth. The text reads as follows:+1)

'Sang Bubuksah ling nya muwus: "Sing katon hënti de ning sun nadyan sawong hingsun bukti tēkang sato sambawi yen mañjing ring papasangan sun prassiddhakeṇeng tinggal didine lukat dadi wong sun prasiddha ri tēkeng don. Dadi haryya, dadi dëmung, dadi ranggâ lawan wirun, dadi tumënggung, apatih, ana dadi tanda mantri dadi bujangga satrya manusa mantri sapada hingsun dadeken wong ana dadi jro gedong."'

1 Codex. or. 3918, pp.9-10.
"Sang Bubuksah said: "I eat all that is visible, even human beings and animals falling in my traps. I perfect them with the intention of making them human beings, becoming nobles démungs, ranggas and wiruns, regents, prime-ministers, high-ranking officials, bhujanggas, ksatriyas, chiefs etc. All of them are what they are because of me, and some of them have become jro gedongs."

Let us consider the passage in the Tantu Panggélaran relating Mpu Mahâpalyat's return home to Nusa Kambangan accompanied by Mpu Kalotan and Mpu Wajukuning:

Prâpta ta sira ri nusa Kambangan, sinungsung de ning ðisya nira, wwang ayuhayu saha bhûsana, satus wwalung puluh kwehnya.

Umarek padànëmbah; matakwan tâmpu Kalotan (lawan mpu Wajukuning):

"Wong ðapeki, pwangkulun, ayuhayu saha bhûsana?"

"Ah, dadining wwang pinangan mami duk ing nusa Jawa."

"Mangkana kapwa, (pwa) ngkuluw."

'They arrived at Nusa Kambangan, and were met by his pupils, well-dressed and goodlooking folk, numbering one hundred and eighty. They waited upon him to pay him homage; mpu Kalotan and mpu Wajukuning asked him:

"My Lord, who are these well-dressed and goodlooking people?"
"0, they are people originating from those eaten by me in Java."
"Is it so, my Lord?"

From these descriptions Bubuksah cannot be classified as a Buddhist Bhairawa in the same sense as Mpu Bharadah and Sutasoma. He is in fact closer to the Čiwaitic Mpu Mahāpalīyat, Calon-Arang and Porusāda. However, if the Balinese maintain their belief that Bubuksah represents the Buddhist pēdanda, it can only be concluded that there must be a different concept of Buddhism than that of the Wajrayana, namely a concept deriving from Guruistic sources. And this can be regarded as offering additional support for my general theory that till the end of the fourteenth century Čiwa and Buddha are still distinct one from the other.

i) The inscription of Kēlurak

The inscription of Kēlurak is the only inscription to which I give detailed examination because it has a very special bearing on the Čiwa - Buddha problem. The reason is because Bosch in his article on this inscription makes an emendation which leads him to conclude that Mañjuśrī and the Trīmūrti are one and the same. ¹) We have already observed that an emendation, based on a preconception can lead to far-reaching conclusions. I would not venture to oppose Bosch's theory on the basis of his understanding of the text, but I rather suggest another course, based on the assumption that the text does not need any emendation.

¹) Bosch, Ins., pp.21, 42, 50.
It may well be that this attempt will lead to nothing, but in my opinion it is worth the effort as, on the other hand it might produce an interesting alternative.

In his article, Bosch emphatically refutes the definition of the word kirtistambha given by Coomaraswamy, namely 'een hoog, torenvormig, in verdiepingen opgetrokken bouwwerk in den trant van een Chineesche pagode' (a tall, building like a tower in tiers in the same way as a Chinese pagods), and gave as its meaning - een hooge, vrijstaande kolom of zuil (lât), die bij een heiligdom of op een heilige plek stond opgericht, (a tall, free-standing column (lât) which belongs to a holy building or is built on a holy place). He also rejects the theory of Brandes that the candi Lumbung is the Triratna-temple mentioned in the inscription, though later - assuming for the sake of argument that Brandes' theory might be true - he bases a theory of his own on it. In this connection the definition of kirtistambha by Coomaraswamy might prove to be a worthy alternative. In my view Coomaraswamy, receives support in various texts, i.e., Nâgarakértâgama wherein mention is made of a kirtti of king Krtanâgara. From this passage we understand that king Krtanâgara had built a kirtti (candi) consisting of two tiers with a Čiva statue within the lower part and an Aksobhya-statue well-hidden in the upper-part. This kirtti is now known as Candi Jawi and is in ruins with only

1 Bosch, Ins., p.31.
2 Ibid., pp.31-2.
3 Ibid., p.52.
4 Ibid., p.54 etc.
5 Pigeaud, Jaï., vol.1, pp.41-2, canto 56, stanzas 1 and 2.
6 Krom, Inl.K., vol.2, pp.139-40.
the base remaining intact. Even today, archaeologists are still not sure how to reconstruct it. It dates from sometime between the late Singhasari and early Majapahit-eras.

However, Krom's conclusion\(^1\) is of great interest and importance to the course of our investigation, i.e.,:

\(^{1}\)De belangrijke gevolgtrekkings, die we uit een en ander kunnen maken, is deze, dat de tempel duidelijk niet voorzien was van een trap of toegang naar de boven verdieping; het is eenvoudig een zoogenaamde torentempel geweest, waarvan slechts het onderste gedeelte door de geloovigen betreden kon worden, om hun vereering te brengen aan het Ciwa-beeld, terwijl daarboven een tweede onbereikbaar vertrek was uitgespaard, van welks inhoud de gewone bezoeker geen vermoeden had. Wij herinneren ons, dat een dergelijk vertrek (zelfs twee) ook bij Tjandi Singasari aanwezig was, waar deze bouwwijze op architectonische gronden verklaard werd, om de bovenbouw te ontlasten. Het voorbeeld van Tjandi Djawi leert ons, dat er toch nog een andere bedoeling bijgekomen kan zijn en men zulke bovenkamers ook kan hebben benut, door er nog een godenbeeld in te plaatsen.'

'The important conclusion which we can discover from one thing and another is this, that the temple obviously was not provided

\(^1\) Krom, Inl.K., vol.2, pp.140-1.
The inscriptions of Kélurak

The inscription of Kélurak, with stairs or any other means of access to the upper-floor; it was simply a so-called tower-temple, and the devotees could enter only the lower part to worship the Čiwa-statue, while a second inaccessible chamber was set aside above it, the contents of which the common visitor had no idea at all. We recall that a similar room (even two) was also found at the Candi Singasari, where this manner of building was explained on architectonic basis (that it was done) to relieve (the burden of) the superstructure. The example of Candi Jawi teaches us that there may be yet another purpose, and that one might utilize such an upper chamber by placing in it another statue of a deity.

We can elicit three facts from Krom's above conclusions, they are:

a) that the Candi Jawi was a tower-temple (see the definition of Coomaraswamy).

b) that the superstructure has a chamber without stairs or any other means of access.

c) that the chamber was a suitable site for a statue of a deity.

If we apply these conclusions to the kirtistambha mentioned in the inscription of Kélurak, perhaps we can hazard a guess as to its form, namely that it was a tower-temple with at least two parts, the upper-part of which is inaccessible and might contain a statue of a deity. But what deity?
Bosch in translating verses 13-15 of the inscription makes the emendation I have already mentioned. Now I would like to attempt a translation without emendation.

13) 'This unequalled tower-temple, an unmatched Protector of the Dharma has an image of Mañjuṣrī for the protection of all beings.'

14) Here in the interior, the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha are present, manifesting themselves, and are visible in this jewel of the slayer of the enemy of Smara.

15) He, the glorious Wajrabeearer is the Lord praised as Mañjuwāg containing Brahmā Viṣṇu Maheśvara and all deities.'

Notes:

ratne and smararatinisudane are in the same case (loc. sing.) so that I translate them: this jewel of the slayer (conqueror) of the enemy of Smara which means a jewel of a Buddha which in turn refers to
the statue of Mañjuśrī. De Visser\(^1\) says that in Japan we have a krodha-form of Aksobhya which is called Trilokya-vijaya Vajra (Gōzanze Kongô) which he describes as follows:

'Trilokya-vijaya Vajra has four heads and eight arms. He is the angry looking, doctrinal shape of the Eastern Buddha Aksobhya. He emits a blue lustre and suppresses the armies of Mahēśvara (Śiwa), the demons who violate and damage the Saddharma and hurt living beings.'

In this passage Aksobhya can be called Smarārātiniśūdana and as Mañjuśrī is also called as such, this identification can be confirmed, (see further below). In the Sutasoma, I, 4d, we have a similar expression, namely:

\[
\text{mangke prāptang kali śrī Jina-pati manunrun}
\]

\[
\text{mātyanang kālamurkka.}
\]

but now in the kali-age, śrī Jina-pati descends here to eliminate the wicked Kāla.

My translation of kālamurkka here differs to that in my translation (see vol. 3) that is 'the evil and the wicked', but this is merely another alternative. Probably Tantular had both senses in mind. As Ğiwa would have been in a krodha-form when he burnt Smara, the sense is quite clear.

The words brahmā viśnu maheśvarah sarvadevamayaḥ, in my opinion belong together, as they are all in the same case (nom. sing.). So I render them containing Brahma, Viśṇu, Maheśvara, and all deities, understanding Mañjuśrī here as the Supreme God in the same way as

\(^1\) De Visser, Anc., p.153.
Wisnu in the Bhagawādgīta. In my opinion this translation is more appropriate than that of Bosch: 'Hij, de Vajradrager, de doorluchtige, is Brahmana, Visnu en Mahecvara; hij is de Heer, bestaande uit alle goden en wordt bezongen als Manjuvac.'

However, Bosch came to the conclusion that the Trimūrti-shrine was subordinated to a Buddhist manifestation of the Supreme Deity. I fully accept Bosch's view of Mañjuṣrī as the Buddha Triçārana comprising the Triratna, and the Trimūrti, and the Mañjuṣrī here occupies the place of Aksobhya as the Ādibuddha. Thus the deities we now have in the kirtistambha are Mañjuṣrī Triçārana as a substitute for Aksobhya, and Trimūrti who in Java is mainly regarded as a manifestation of Čiwa. Now the nature of the kirtistambha with the deities within it can be reconstructed as follows:

The kirtistambha is a form of a tower-temple, perhaps in the style of Candi Jawi, with the statue of Mañjuṣrī - Aksobhya in the inaccessible upper-room and the statue of Trimūrti as a manifestation of Čiwa in the lower-room.

If this theory is accepted then we have three known cases of a buddha-statue (twice an Aksobhya in Borobudur and Jawi and once a Mañjuṣrī) placed in an inaccessible room. Does this have any significance? I leave this question to other scholars with more experience in this field, but may I be permitted to assert that the relation of Čiwa and Buddha in the

1 Bosch, Ins., p.56.
2 Ibid., p.48.
3 Krom, Inl.K., vol.1, p.100.
inscription of Kelurak is the same as in the Sutasoma, in other words that Buddha is superior to Qiwa, and they have not become united.

j) Conclusion

It should be clear from the above survey that the relationship between the figures of Qiwa and Buddha in your account of history is very complex.
inscription of Kelurak is the same as in the Sutasoma, in other words that Buddha is superior to Čiwa, and they have not become united.

j) Conclusion

It should be clear from the above survey that the relationship between the figures of Čiwa and Buddha in Java along the course of history is very complex, abounding in many twists and turns, and may be likened to the meandering course of a river.

From the Borobudur-era (± eighth century) to the end of the fourteenth century (Sutasoma-kakawin), the contrast between Čiwa and Buddha was quite clearly maintained.

During the time of the Tantu Panggèlaran, i.e., the end of the Majapahit-era, it appears that a new concept evolved, according to which the Supreme God was called Bhatàra Guru instead of Čiwa or Brahmà or Wisnu of Hinduism. It is possible that this resulted from a merging of the Indian classical Čiwa with the indigenous Guru of the Javanese. It is during this period also that Wajrayana Buddhism lost its influence and vitality. Yet at the same time a new Buddhism emerged as Bhatàra Guru manifesting himself in two forms, a Čiwaitic monk and a Buddhist one.

The Korawāçrama provides evidence of the influence of both classical Čiwaism and Buddhism being gradually extinguished. Javanese cultural elements and beliefs became increasingly popular as they were represented by the emergence of a new Supreme God - Sang Hyang Suksma Eka, as Bhatàra Guru in turn was demoted to a lower rank. The emanations of this Supreme God were Čiwa or Guru, and Buddha, who was occasionally confused
with Mahâdewa in a way which paved the way for the merging of Čiwa - Buddha in Bali. The re-emergence of Wisnuism, evident since the Tantu, was a lasting phenomenon and a new contrast of Wisnu - Buddha (Mahâdewa) comes into being in Java.

The interpolation of Bubuksah as a Buddhist Bhairawa confirms the theory that this new concept of Buddhism is quite distinct from that of the Wajrayana. And this enables us to put forward the view that the Buddhism of Bali is based on Guruismit blended with traces of old traditional Wajrayana rites which are almost forgotten.
### ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ccat</td>
<td>Catalogus etc. (see Vreede, A.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djawa</td>
<td>Tijdschrift van het Java - Instituut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>The Concise Oxford Dictionary. (see Fowler, H.W. and F.G.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Javaansch - Nederlandsch Handwoordenboek. (see Gericke, J.F.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Oud-Javaansch - Nederlandsche Woordenlijst. (see Juynboll, H.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMBRAS</td>
<td>Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Nieuw Maleisch - Nederlandsch Woordenboek met Arabische Karakter. (see Klinkert, H.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBW</td>
<td>Kawi Balineesch - Nederlandsch Woordenboek. (see Tuuk, N. van der)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Sanskrit dictionary. (see Macdonnel, A.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>A Sanscrit - English dictionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Pali - English dictionary. (see Rhys Davids, T.W.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kamus Basa Sunda. (see Satjadibrata, R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>Supplement etc. (see Juynboll, H.H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBG</td>
<td>Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, uitgegeven door het (Koninklijk) Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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