THE SANSKRIT-OLD JAVANESE TUTUR LITERATURE FROM BALI. THE TEXTUAL BASIS OF ŚAIVISM IN ANCIENT INDONESIA

ANDREA ACRI

The essay is a survey of the scriptural basis of the Śaiva religion in the ancient Indonesian Archipelago, consisting of texts (Tutur) that represent a corpus of didactic literature contextualising materials of South Asian provenance into a Javano-Balinese linguistic and doctrinal framework. Some among the many hitherto untraced Sanskrit ślokas embedded in the Old Javanese commentary of Tuturs are here shown to have parallels in early Sanskrit Siddhāntatantras. Through the comparison of doctrinal features found in sources of both areas, I argue that the form of Śaivism widespread in the Archipelago seems to be based on an ancient Saiddhāntika scriptural core reflecting an early phase of Śaivism in the Subcontinent.

WHY STUDY TUTUR TEXTS?

It is a well-known fact that a large number of palm-leaf manuscripts (lontar) from Bali have survived up to today in the libraries of Indonesia, the Netherlands and a few others scattered over the world, despite the corrupting activity of time and the humid tropical climate. A significant part of these manuscripts, written in beautiful script and sometimes illustrated, consists in works locally called Tuturs or Tattwas, being religious manuals of either Śaiva or Buddhist orientation, which have been handed down mainly by priests (pĕdanda) or religious masters for their private use. Tutur

* I wish to thank Peter Bisschop, Arlo Griffiths and Thomas Hunter for their comments on an early draft of this paper. Any mistake, of course, is mine alone.

1. On the meaning of the term Tutur (‘memory, recollection, consciousness’), translating the Sanskrit smṛti, see Soebadio (1971, 3-4).
texts are most frequently referred to as Javano-Balinese since they have been preserved mainly on the island of Bali, having been brought there from Java after the fall of Majapahit at the hands of the Muslims around the end of the 15th century.

As early as 1967 Brunner, commenting on the Old Javanese sources describing the Balinese ritual of sūryasewana translated by Hooykaas (1966), wrote: “Ces textes sont d’un intérêt extrême, et l’indianisme se doit de les prendre en considération et d’aider, si possible, à les élucider” (Brunner 1967, 422). Notwithstanding this declaration of interest, the Sanskrit-Old Javanese Śaiva Tuturs from the Archipelago have unfortunately remained a neglected branch of study. Even the specialists in Old Javanese admit to having largely ignored such texts, as they have mainly focused on the study of other genres like for example the belles-lettres, see Creese (2001, 14-15), Stephen (2005, 104). In the very few works that have been produced hitherto on the subject, mostly consisting in textual editions and translations of Tuturs, the Sanskrit primary sources as well as the secondary scholarly literature used for the comparison were poor and now inevitably outdated. This lack of interest seems primarily to be due to the difficulties connected with this kind of literature: first and foremost, since it is written in Sanskrit and Old

2. The first series of pioneering studies was produced by Goris (1926), Lévi (1933) and Zieseniss (1939; 1956), followed by the commented textual editions and translations of the International Academy of Indian Culture (Sudarshana Devi 1957, 1958, 1962; Sharada Rani 1961). After the articles by Gonda (1970, 1975), Goudriaan (1976, 1981) and Schoterman (1979), the interest in this field has virtually disappeared. More than two decades later, Nihom has applied once again the comparative standpoint, highlighting the Indic reflexes in some Old Javanese Tuturs (1995a, 1995b), although his research has regrettably been too soon discontinued. Recently, Hunter (2005a, 2005b) has written on certain aspects of Tuturs, while Sanderson (2003-04, 373-377) has discussed some features of Javano-Balinese Śaivism. A survey of doctrines laid down in some Balinese Tuturs in comparison with Indic Tantrism can be found in Stephen (2005, 73-98).

3. As pointed out by Goudriaan (1976) in his review of the edited Jñānasiddhānta, while Soebadio (1971) worked conscientiously, handling with care the corrupt ślokas of the manuscripts and finding their parallels in other Old Javanese texts, the Sanskrit materials used for the comparison were limited (the only Śaiva scripture referred to was the Rauravāgama). The earlier editions of Tuturs published by the International Academy of Indian Culture have been critically reviewed by Hooykaas (1962). It is worth pointing out that in the past decade many texts of the Tutur kind have been published in Bali along with their Indonesian translation for the sake of the general readers. While these publications are proof of the new interest of Balinese people in “Hinduism”, the use that can be made of them for scholarly purposes is limited because of the poor quality of the edited text and of the translation.
Javanese, scholars should command both languages; furthermore, the technical and esoteric nature of their content, in order to be understood, requires to be analysed by specialists acquainted with both Śaiva Tantras from the Subcontinent and ancient Javano-Balinese religious background. It is also true that their practice-oriented content and repetitive style can hardly be called appealing from the literary or philosophical point of view.

In addition to those reasons, I might mention on the one hand the relative lack of interest among Sanskrit scholars to broaden the horizons of their field by taking up the Indic materials of Southeast Asia as a rewarding object of study, on the other the rising of Javanese studies to the status of a highly specialised discipline. The loss of the once popular “Greater India” perspective among specialists in both areas has been recently challenged by Nihom, who has taken up the study of the Old Javanese sources from the Indological standpoint. Even though my purpose in this paper is not to engage with this debate, I cannot but approve of Nihom’s view that Archipelago texts, if analysed from the interdisciplinary standpoint, prove to be more interesting and meaningful than previously supposed and therefore “an Indological approach to the ‘high culture’ of the classical period in the Archipelago is an academic *sine qua non*:

[...] these works of literature are so pervaded by Indic culture, both linguistically — through the medium of Sanskrit loan words — and ideologically — in the sense of notions pertaining to religion, governance and the like — that an approach which is not fundamentally Indological runs the risk of being unproductive and misleading. (Nihom 1994, 14)

However, given still more recent developments concerning the theoretical aspects of the study of the trans-regional cultures of ancient South and Southeast Asia, to maintain an approach that is not focused on a trans-cultural dimension may be equally misleading.

The spread of the Indic cul-

---

4. An approach putting emphasis on the transcultural dynamics which occurred in the cultural exchanges between South and Southeast Asia has been advanced by Wolters (1999, 21-24; 46-48), according to whom the civilizations of Southeast Asia constituted “a broadly based communality of outlook” sharing Indic cultural elements, used by them to bring local beliefs and institutions into sharper focus. Kulke (1990, 28-32) introduced the concept of cultural convergence, pointing out that the two areas may have already shared important cultural and political features before the contacts. This greatly facilitated the mutual process of cultural exchange, which occurred through a complicated network of relations rather than a mono-directional ‘transplantation’.
ture in peripheral areas of the Subcontinent like Central and Southeast Asia has produced an original cultural identity that has been defined by Pollock as “Sanskrit Cosmopolis” or “Sanskrit Ecumene”, a phenomenon that may be “the most complicated — and as a totality least studied — transregional cultural formation in the pre-modern world” (1996, 197).

While this is not the appropriate place to discuss at length the long-debated issue of the Sanskritization of Java and the rest of Southeast Asia, it may suffice to say that scholars are increasingly aware of the fact that civilizations are not closed and self-contained but are often the result of trans-cultural dynamics. On the basis of this realization, I believe that the textual documents from the Archipelago, both those containing Sanskrit and those, originating at a later date, composed in Old Javanese only, deserve to enter the sphere of interest of Sanskrit studies.

Following an approach which is inspired by what Sanderson (2003-04) has recently done with regard to the study of the Śaiva religion in ancient Cambodia, I shall argue that research on the scriptural corpus from the Archipelago may throw important light on Indological dilemmas, just as much as the knowledge of the Indic forms of Śaivism may be of great help in order to establish the lines of transmission and the development of the religion in the Archipelago. As a matter of fact, important advancements in the understanding of the development of this religion in the Subcontinent have been achieved in the last two decades, with the discovery of a previously unknown corpus of Siddhāntatantras preserved in Nepalese and South Indian manuscripts. Given these recent developments, I believe that the corpus of Tuturs needs to be translated (or re-translated) and interpreted with the help of the newly available Sanskrit sources. As I shall argue further on in this article, the comparison between Tuturs and the body of Siddhāntatantras from South Asia may yield interesting results, adding new

5. The wealth of newly-coined terms such as “Self-Indianization”, “Self-Hinduization”, “Sanskritization”, “Indicization”, etc. reflect the attempt to describe the problem in a more balanced way according to the different contexts, since terms like Indianization have been taken too lightly in the past; the last in particular can be misleading, for in the ancient period there did not exist any homogeneous political, let alone cultural, entity called “India” or “Indonesia”.

6. To this respect, little has changed since when in 1971 Soebadio remarked that “we do not know yet which Indian traditions have in fact influenced Indonesia and in what form”, a statement passed also by Goudriaan (1976), who pointed out that “we are quite simply insufficiently informed about the development of Śaiva theory in India and Indonesia — and about the lines of communication between these two countries”.


perspectives to the ongoing research. Indeed, early features scantily attested in the Subcontinent are retained in texts from the Archipelago, where later doctrinal developments do not seem to have penetrated.

EXTENSION OF THE CORPUS

The sources falling into the category of Tuturs can be characterized as a (heterogeneous) corpus, consisting of hundreds of scriptures. It is evident that these texts, often fragmentary, have undergone various interpolations and accretions in the course of the centuries: most of the Tuturs are in fact of a composite nature, being the result of collations made by priests out of various sources and fragments of different provenance. Because of the fragmentariness of the tradition one cannot study a text without knowledge of the others. A striking feature is that the same series of *ślokas* can often be found in different texts in the whole corpus: these fragments should probably be regarded as the survivors of the catastrophic events following the fall of Majapahit, when manuscripts were hastily brought to Bali from Java. The manuscript tradition is corrupt, and has suffered major losses: only a small fraction has survived of what was once available in written form, while many teachings were probably never written down — the oral tradition available in the past is now lost.7

The corpus of Tuturs, for the most part unpublished,8 consists of a few hundreds of texts, available in palm-leaf manuscripts or romanized transcriptions. The standard and most complete sources for reference are the catalogues by Pigeaud (1967, 1968, 1970, 1980), listing the manuscripts stored in the library of Leiden University (LO). These mostly consist of copies (romanized transliterations) of manuscripts from the Gedong Kirtya (K) in Singaraja, Bali, which has the largest Indonesian collection of Tuturs. Another important collection of transliterations is stored in the Pusat Dokumentasi in Denpasar, Bali.9 Several Tuturs are also found in collections in Jakarta,10

7. See the remarks by Soebadio (1971, 58), according to whom this kind of texts was addressed to initiates already possessing some knowledge on a wide range of subjects, orally imparted by a master.
8. For the published Tuturs, see infra, fn. 15.
9. A number of the texts stored at the Pusat Dokumentasi are typewritten copies made from private collections, and as such they are particularly valuable. Unfortunately, a printed catalogue of the manuscripts of the Pusat Dokumentasi is not yet available.
10. See the catalogue of the Balinese manuscripts of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Indonesia (Behrend and Pudjiastuti 1997, 3-26); the catalogue of manuscripts of the National Library of Indonesia (Behrend 1998, 477-484 and 503-551).
and in a few European libraries. The denomination of ‘Tutur’ is a particularly broad one, for the scriptures that can be listed into this category differ widely in style, contents and persuasion. The texts taken into account in this article are those of speculative nature, mostly of Śaiva background (but a few Buddhist texts are also known). The main preoccupation of their authors seems to have been the production of practical manuals, intended as guides for initiates, focusing on speculations inserted in a context of practice, i.e. a body-centred form of yoga. These Tuturs most frequently deal with Śaiva soteriology, cosmology, micro-macrocosmic classifications, theorization of yoga and supernatural powers, mantras, speculations on the nature of the absolute reality and the various aspects of Śiva, etc. Besides this, there are also other categories of texts, namely: Tuturs dealing with the rules of conduct of various categories of ascetics (e.g. Wratiśāsana, Yama Niyama Brata, Śiwaśāsana); Tuturs on erotology and the practice of sexual yoga, see Creese and Bellows (2002); and Tuturs on ritual, see Hooykaas (1966).

**Chronology of Tuturs**

Most of the Sanskrit-Old Javanese Tuturs, like the majority of the extant Old Javanese literature, are believed to go back to the Majapahit period (13th-15th century CE), when compilations based on much earlier materials, including those of South Asian provenance, were produced. It is not yet known with certainty to which period this earlier scriptural core goes back, though for the most part it is likely to have been written during the reign of king Dharmawaṅsa of East Java from the end of the 10th to the beginning of the 11th century, whose court witnessed an intense literary activity, see Supomo (1996, 18). However, some strands may be pushed further back to the heyday of the Central Javanese kingdoms (8th-9th century CE) or perhaps even before. According to Hunter (2005b), it is possible that


12. E.g. the Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānikan (Kats 1910); other unpublished texts in Pigeaud (1967, 52-53). It is interesting to note that, as it was the case with Tantras in the Subcontinent, see Sanderson (2001), a great deal of mutual plagiarism occurred between Buddhist and Śaiva Tuturs in the Archipelago, see Soebadio (1971, 12-15).

13. This on the grounds of the accounts provided by the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims travelling to Java, the first of whom was Fa-Hsien (5th century CE), who reported having seen “Brahmans and infidels”, including the Pāśupatas, and a few Buddhist enclaves on the island.
the rhetorical structure of the sources belonging to this corpus may derive from the translational and commentarial tradition, mainly composed in Old Malay, of the Sumatran kingdom of Śrīwijaya. As the accounts of the Chinese travellers who visited Sumatra reported, as early as the 7th century this area was a renowned centre for the learning of Sanskrit grammar and Buddhist philosophy. One may therefore suppose that a similar activity of translation and composition of texts was going on, though on a smaller scale, in the nearby Java, which was prevalently Śaiva.

**Typology of Sources**

The findings presented in this article are mainly based on a narrow body of scriptures within the whole available corpus, which I have divided into three classes according to the layout and linguistic features of the sources. The texts I have perused most carefully fall into the first category of Tuturs listed below, i.e. those containing both Sanskrit and Old Javanese.

*Tuturs arranged in the form of Sanskrit/Old Javanese translation dyads*

The most remarkable feature of these texts, which are comparatively less in number than those belonging to the other categories, is their unique linguistic layout, embedding Sanskrit ślokas in an Old Javanese frame. This typical rhetorical structure has been referred to as consisting of “transla-

---

14. Yi-Jing (ca. 7th century CE) noted that “[m]any kings and chieftains in the islands of the Southern Ocean admire and believe (Buddhism), and their hearths are set on accumulating good actions. In the fortified city of Bhoga Buddhist priests number more than 1000, whose minds are bent on learning and good practices. They investigate and study all the subjects that exist just as in the Middle Kingdom (Madhya-desa, India). The rules and ceremonies are not at all different. If a Chinese priest wishes to go to the West in order to hear (lectures) and read (the original), he had better to stay here one or two years and practise the proper rules and then proceed to Central India” (Takakusu 1966, xxxiv).

15. Several of such Tuturs are listed in Pigeaud (1967, 51-53; 55-59 and 1980, 8); a useful index of all the texts mentioned here can be found in Pigeaud (1970), while brief descriptions of the contents are in Pigeaud (1968). The Tuturs I have taken into account are: Bhuwanakośa (L0: 5022/Mirsha 1994), Bhuwanasaṅśepa (L0: 9375), Brahmokta Widhi Śāstra (L0: 14.763), Cadhu Śakti (111.b.4718, Pusat Dokumentasi, Denpasar) Ganapatitattwa, see Sudarshana Devi (1958), Jñānasiddhânta, see Soebadio (1971), Kumāratattwa (L0: 10.249), Saṅ Hyaṅ Mahājñāna, see Sudarshana Devi (1962), Śiwāgama (no number, Pusat Dokumentasi), Śiwaśāsana (L0: 9127), Tutur Adhyātmika (L0: 10.286), Tutur Kamokṣan (L0: 10.258), Wṛhaspatitattwa, see Sudarshana Devi (1957).
tion dyads” (Hunter 2005a; 2005b), since the texts contain a core consisting of just a few up to hundreds of Sanskrit ślokas, each one followed by an Old Javanese paraphrase or commentary. These texts are usually arranged in the form of a dialogue between the Lord (Śiva, Bhaṭāra, etc.) and another interlocutor, usually gods such as Brhaspati, the Lord’s son Kumāra or the Goddess (Devī, Śakti). The texts falling into this category are likely to be the oldest ones for, as a rule of thumb, the more Sanskrit ślokas a text contains, the older it may be, probably reflecting a situation going back to a period when Sanskrit texts were still circulating in the Archipelago and the language was still actively used and well-understood. Indeed the Sanskrit contained in such works, albeit heavily corrupt, is still quite reasonable and capable of being successfully restored in most cases. Here the ślokas are still the main focus of interest, as they were given a high status and looked to as a source of authoritativeness, especially in matters of religious and speculative nature. To this original core longer prose extensions such as introductions or doctrinal expansions entirely in old Javanese were sometimes added at a later stage, probably during the Majapahit period or even after the arrival in Bali of the texts containing the Sanskrit ślokas.

*Old Javanese Tuturs with traces of ślokas*¹⁶

This type of arrangement, although not as a rule, may be taken as evidence of relative lateness, for works of this kind were probably composed at a time when Sanskrit scholarship was already fading away and the Old Javanese language, beside being the preferred language for literature, acquired a higher status also in the religious sphere. Although the arrangement is not dyadic anymore, a small number of Sanskrit verses, often incomplete, are interspersed within the Old Javanese prose. The Sanskrit seems to be quoted as a proof of authoritativeness, sometimes in a corrupted or Javanised form which makes them scarcely distinguishable from Old Javanese.¹⁷

¹⁶. To this category belongs *Saṅ Hyaṅ Tattwajñāna* (Sudarshana Devi 1962), as well as the first three chapters of *Jñānasiddhānta*, mainly written in Old Javanese prose occasionally interspersed with ślokas or half-ślokas; these chapters are evidently a later addition since they do not appear in the original core-text constituted by *Tutur Kamokṣan*, see Hooykaas (1962), Soebadio (1971, 4-7).

¹⁷. The kind of Old Javanese-influenced Sanskrit composed in Java and Bali was usually referred to as Archipelago Sanskrit. Recently, Goudriaan (1996a, 26) has suggested to use the term Indonesianized Sanskrit (which better distinguishes it from the kind of [non-contaminated, although corrupt] Sanskrit composed in the Archipelago).
These treatises in origin were probably shaped in the form of ślokas with paraphrases, which in the course of time underwent various enlargements until they acquired the status of longer chapters or even short independent treatises. It is not excluded that these compilations were directly inspired to some kind of Sanskrit sources, now lost or still untraced.

*Works entirely in Old Javanese*¹⁸

In this class of sources the composers used Old Javanese, which sometimes bears an influence from local languages such as Balinese or Middle Javanese, without feeling the need to make use of ślokas. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit influence is still present in the form of countless loan words and technical terms with which Old Javanese is replete. Even though themes of Indic origin are still present, doctrinal localisation becomes more and more widespread, a feature which may be taken as reliable evidence of lateness.

**ON THE SANSKRIT FEATURED IN TUTURS**

The kind of Sanskrit featured in these sources gives rise to a series of problems. Its corrupt and dilapidated state seems to be attributable to poor, late (probably 19ᵗʰ-20ᵗʰ century) scribal transmission, aggravated by the fact that, in order to ensure their survival, *lontars* had to be copied with great frequency. On closer inspection, we note that the ancient compilers of Tuturs were able to understand Sanskrit quite well, as the Old Javanese translation is intelligent and faithful to the original in most cases; nevertheless, instances of misunderstanding of Sanskrit words by the commentators are by no means unknown.¹⁹

One remarkable feature is their sensitivity to metrical issues, which enabled them to compose regular ślokas: cases of verses *contra metrum*

---

¹⁸ Several of which are listed in Pigeaud (1967, 55-59).
¹⁹ On the long-debated issue whether the ancient Javanese and Balinese were able to understand well Sanskrit, see Lévi (1933, 10), Hooykaas (1962, 320), Pigeaud (1967, 16), Schoterman (1979), Hunter (2005a, 2005b).
are relatively uncommon, and often already corrupt beyond recognition. Unfortunately, the same skilfulness cannot be attributed to the composers with regard to their mastery of grammar: the verses mostly lack complex syntactical constructions, and there are several instances of non-standard sandhi and other morphological inconsistencies. However, in dealing with this kind of highly corrupt and “incorrect” Sanskrit, it is worth considering its own characteristics and idiosyncrasies more carefully, as it has too often been wrongly defined as simply “bad Sanskrit”. As remarked by Schoterman (1979), these features should not be viewed as mere errors but rather as a hybrid kind of Sanskrit, which has parallels in many of the ancient Tantric scriptures from the Subcontinent, featuring a kind of non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit following rules of its own, which can, therefore, be defined as a kind of Tantric grammar.

From the foregoing it follows that a large part of the aberrations could have already originated in the Subcontinent.

**Characteristics of the commentary**

According to Hunter (2005a), even if we are dealing with a certain case of direct translation from Sanskrit into Old Javanese, it is also true that the rendition of the paraphrases and commentary, clearly focusing the attention on the audience, is to be located in a context of teaching and initiation, which contextualizes the concepts contained in the Sanskrit verses into an “indigenous pedagogic and theological praxis”. Indeed, the majority of the texts seem to be clearly didactic in nature as they are frequently oriented towards a student/initiate. The primary aim of these Old Javanese portions is to provide a literal translation and explanation of the verses for the sake of the initiates in such religious circles, whose mastery of Sanskrit was in all probability rather poor. However, these often appear to be more than mere paraphrases, not only focusing on the explanation of technical terms, compounds and so on, but also adding several new particulars and further discussions to the Sanskrit verses.

When commenting on the ślokas the composers employed mainly two methods: writing one or more ślokas and then the Old Javanese paraphrases and comment, or reporting, interspersed within the main piece of prose, the four pādas of a śloka one by one, each one followed by an almost literal translation, after which further digressions are sometimes inserted. This

---

suggests that, already in ancient times, there existed a rather developed interpretative tradition within the Archipelago. Yet, the extant Tuturs do not represent a genre of Old Javanese writing comparable in status and literary achievement to any degree with the commentarial writing in the Subcontinent. Moreover, their specific form does not seem to have any counterpart in Sanskrit commentarial literature either. Unfortunately, we do not have any certain evidence to determine whether the refined Sanskrit commentarial tradition along with its techniques were actively studied and put into practice in ancient Indonesia, although the reports of the Chinese travellers in Śrīwijaya and Java make us believe they were.\textsuperscript{21} The fact that we possess neither a single fragment or translation of a Sanskrit commentary nor any work of śāstra, let alone any indigenous commentary which may be defined to be really “śāstric” in character and style, does not provide evidence that it was not the case.

Beside the irreversible loss of the greatest part of the palm-leaf manuscripts that were available in the Archipelago due to the ravages of time, there seem to be other reasons that could account for this situation. For example, we have to keep in mind that, because the Javanese and Balinese probably had no direct access to South Asian manuscript sources for a long period of time, there was a general decline in proper understanding of Sanskrit and consequently a marked preference to copy texts in the form of brief Sanskrit-Old Javanese dyads, easy to memorise in a context of teaching or ritual. As Hunter (2005a) pointed out, this was so also on account of the “particular problems posed by a commentary composed in a language different from that of the text being commented upon”. It is clear that the nature of the texts under examination, the milieu in which they were handed-down, their audience and the composers themselves have all contributed since early times to shaping a local didactic and pedagogical tradition. What really mattered in the eyes of those ancient masters and composers of Tuturs, who are probably to be considered proficient practitioners rather than learned

\textsuperscript{21} It is indeed probable that, along with old Theravāda and Mahāyāna works, their Sanskrit commentaries were also translated into different languages. The Chinese accounts speak of the pilgrim Hui-Ning going to Ho-ling in Central Java in 664 CE and translating Indian Theravāda texts into Chinese, under the Javanese monk Jñānabhadra (Supomo 1996, 13). Furthermore, since we know that ancient Javanese authors mastered difficult Sanskrit texts, such as Bhaṭṭi’s Rāvaṇavadha (known as Bhaṭṭikāvya, prototype of the first half of the Old Javanese Rāmāyana) and works by Kumāradāsa and probably Kālidāsa (Hunter 2005a, 2005b), it is unlikely that they could do so without making use of commentaries, which are now lost.
scholars, was the edification of the disciples through the elucidation of the Sanskrit verses and the transposition of the contents into an indigenous doctrinal framework familiar to a local audience.

**PARALLELS TO SANSKRIT ŚAIVA SOURCES**

One of the most challenging reasons for Sanskrit scholars to study such kind of Archipelago sources is the presence of parallels to Śaiva scriptures from the Subcontinent. The tracing of such parallels might be useful in order to attempt to sketch a literary history of Sanskrit texts in the Archipelago, trying to establish the doctrinal links between these texts and their South Asian prototypes—mostly early Siddhāntatantras. Furthermore, notwithstanding the many chronological problems occurring on both sides, these parallels are in most cases the only elements that give us an idea about the date of Ttuturs. This kind of research may also help us to understand how well-supplied the libraries of the Javanese authors were, and what texts were considered authoritative. It is in fact likely that the quoted sources were already widespread and important in the Subcontinent if they travelled all the way to Southeast Asia.22

The evidence of the availability of Sanskrit Tantras in mainland Southeast Asia has already been found in epigraphic materials from Cambodia.23 As for the Indonesian Archipelago, the first piece of evidence suggesting the presence of full-fledged Tantric texts was found by Goudriaan

22. As Pollock (1996, 168) nicely put it, the spread of Indic culture in Southeast Asia was most probably due to the migration of “traditional intellectuals and religious professionals, often following the train of scattered groups of traders and adventurers, and carrying with them disparate and decidedly uncanonized texts of a wide variety of competing religious orders”.

23. Among the titles of scriptures mentioned by ancient Sanskrit-Old Khmer inscriptions which have been identified with Sanskrit texts from the Subcontinent stand the Sarvajñānottara, the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā and the Parameśvara, see Sanderson (2001, 7-8; 22-23). The famous inscription of Sdok Kak Thom, dated 974 of the Śaka era (1050 CE) but reporting events dating back to at least two centuries earlier, tells us about some śāstras called Śirascheda, Vināśikha, Saṁmohana and Nayottara, whose essence (sāra) was extracted by the learned Brahmin Hiranyadāman and recited to the King; only one of them, the Vināśikha, has been so far identified by Sanderson (2003-04, 356-7) as referring to the Vināśikhatantra, a scripture that has survived in only one Nepalese manuscript (Goudriaan 1985). This is a text belonging to the now almost completely lost Vāmasrotas division of the Tantras, which was one of the earliest traditions, going back to at least the 8th century and dealing mainly with rituals of magic.
(1981), who detected two ślokas belonging to the Vīṇāśikhatantra in the Māyātattva hymn among the Tantric fragments of Bali. Unfortunately, no further steps in this direction have been taken: to my knowledge, no parallels with Sanskrit Śaiva scriptures have been pointed out in previous publications.

The parallels which I have detected so far consist of sparse fragments, mostly spanning from a single up to a few ślokas, inserted within the usual Sanskrit-Old Javanese framework common to the older Tutur texts. These ślokas seem to have been extrapolated from their original context and collated together in order to form new texts, sometimes in quite a logical and organic way, such as in the Wṛhaspatitattva, but often more randomly. It is evident that the Javanese, to build their manuals, drew from the sources only what interested them, leaving the rest aside. Since the presence of such parallels strongly supports the hypothesis that the entirety of the Sanskrit verses preserved in Tuturs were composed in the Subcontinent, the significant number of Tuturs at our disposal need a thorough investigation of the linkages with South Asian counterparts.

I shall list below some of the parallels that I have detected so far, beginning with one from the Kiraṇatāntra, a source figuring among the early scriptures of the Siddhānta, see Goodall (1998), Vivanti (1975). This śloka appears, with minor variants, in at least three different Tuturs, viz. Jñānasiddhānta, Gaṇapatitattva, and Tutur Kamokṣan. The two versions run:

24. See stuti n. 450, (Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971, 274-281). There is no doubt that the Vīṇāśikhatantra was known in the Archipelago, for the form of Śiva called Tumburu and his four sisters (Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā and Aparajitā) worshiped in it are mentioned in various Old Javanese sources, see Jñānasiddhānta ch. 3, Goudriaan and Hooykaas (1971, 352-354), Hooykaas (1966, 118).

25. With the exception of Vasudeva (2005, 388), who points out a parallel śloka of Wṛtiśāsana (21) and various Sanskrit sources. Cf. also infra, fn. 45.

26. A step in the right direction has been taken in the field of Buddhist Tuturs. A number of quotations from various Buddhist Sanskrit sources, including those belonging to the yogatantra class, have begun to show up in the Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānikan and Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānan Mantrānaya, see de Jong (1974). Cf. also Nihom’s remark (1994, 67, note 176) “In addition to the references mentioned by de Jong, reflexes of these verses may be retrieved by the hundreds in Sanskrit and Tibetan”.

27. Hooykaas (1962) has shown that Gaṇapatitattwa is a later compilation based on Tutur Kamokṣan, which is also part of Tutur Adhyātmika/Jñānasiddhānta, see Soebadio (1971, 4).
sakalah kevalah śuddhaḥ tryavasthah puṇaḥāḥ sīrtaḥ
malinatvācittamokṣaḥ kalpyate nirmalaḥ śivaḥ

kevalah sakalah śuddhaḥ tryavasthah puṇaḥāḥ sīrtaḥ
malinatvācit mokṣaḥ prāpyate nirmalāc chivāt

It is interesting to note that in the version given by the Archipelago texts all the ablative grammatical constructions are missing, the first three words of the second hemistich being transformed into a compound. Remarkably enough, this second half-verse is not found in all the ancient Nepalese manuscripts and also in Rāmakanṭha’s commentary, cf. Goodall (1998, 221, note 188), but it appears in the later South Indian redactions, such as the Devakoṭṭai edition (cf. Vivanti 1975, 8). Since some of these redactions may have been compiled even after the 12th century, we may assume that this verse was borrowed in that form either from a South Indian recension of the Kiraṇa or from another version posterior to Rāmakanṭha.

Another parallel is found in Wṛhaspatitattwa, stanzas 7-10, which also appear in the Svāyaṁbhuvasūtrasaṁgraha, an early text of the Siddhānta stream. The portion of its vidyāpāda in which the ślokas appear (4.3-6) was commented upon by Sadyojyotiḥ, one of the most ancient figures of the Śaiva Siddhānta; its being mentioned in the Śivadṛṣṭi (3.13-14) by the

28. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakantha II, who flourished in Kashmir between c. 950 and 1000 CE, was a prominent Saiddhāntika exegete of Śaiva texts, see Goodall (1998, ix-xviii).

29. Dominic Goodall (e-mail dated 24-05-04) kindly pointed out to me that: “[…] in most cases where the South Indian text of the Kiraṇa deviates from both the Nepalese sources and what Rāmakanṭha appears to expound, I have the impression that the South Indian version is secondary and late (occasionally one can even demonstrate that it was not known in South India in the twelfth-century: see Kiraṇatantra 6.20). Nevertheless it is conceivable that some such deviations go back some way. In this case the undated commentary of Tryambakaśambhu was probably the earliest testimony for some version of the missing second half […]”. Yet this piece of evidence is not conclusive for, on the other hand, there is the possibility that the half-verse had already dropped in the Nepalese redactions after the complete śloka made its way to South India; in this case, the version preserved in the Jñānasiddhānta might be even earlier of the Nepalese one.

30. It is indeed preserved not only in South Indian manuscripts but also in Nepalese ones; for this and other criteria useful for dating Siddhantatāntras, see Goodall (1998, xxxix). Things are more complicated, however, for the Svāyaṁbhuvasūtrasaṁgraha seems to be a condensation of a much longer text, and the South Indian recensions present many discrepancies from the northern ones. On all this, see Goodall (1998, xlviii-xlxi, n. 110 and 111).
Kashmirian Somānanda (900–950 CE) provides a *terminus ante quem* for this text, which might be even a few centuries older. All the four stanzas are discussed as a unit by Sadyojyotī, according to whom the last three are the explanation of the first one (Filliozat 1991, 91); the same arrangement is also found in the *Wṛhaspatitattwa*:

```
aprameyam anirdeśyam anapamyam anāmayam
sūkṣmaṁ sarvagatāṁ nityāṁ dhruvam avayayam iśvaram || 7 ||
aprameyam anantatvād anirdeśyam alaksanam
anaupamyam anādrśyaṁ vimalatvād anāmayam || 8 ||
sūkṣmaṁ cānupalabhyatvād vyāpakatvāc ca sarvagam
nityākāreṇa sūnyatvam32 acalatvāc ca tad dhruvam || 9 ||
avayayam paripūrṇatvāt saumyabhāvaṁ tathaiva ca
śivatattvam idam uktam sarvataḥ parisaṁsthitah || 10 || WfT
```

```
aprameyam anirdeśyam anapamyam anāmayam
sūkṣmaṁ sarvagatāṁ nityāṁ dhruvam avayayam iśvaram || 3 ||
aprameyam anantatvād anirdeśyam alaksyataḥ
anaupamyam asādṛśyaṁ vimalatvād anāmayam || 4 ||
sūkṣmaṁ cānupalabhyatvād vyāpakatvāc ca sarvagam
nityam kāraṇaśūnyatvād acalatvāc ca tad dhruvam || 5 ||
avayayam paripūrṇatvāt svāmibhāvāt tatheśvaram
śivatattvam idam proktam sarvādhivopari sanisthitam || 6 || SBSS
```

I draw attention on one point where the two versions deviate, namely the last half-verse. The term *adhvan* (‘path’) appearing in *Śvāyaṁbhuvasūtrasaṁgraha* 6d as a reference to the division of the cosmos into six paths (*bhuvana, kalā*, etc.; see below, p. 136) according to Śaiva sources is replaced in *Wṛhaspatitattwa* 10d by the more general *sarvataḥ*, which is not mentioned in the Old Javanese paraphrase either. Assuming that the passage was originally contained in some lost common source, if we consider the reading in *Wṛhaspatitattwa* to be the earlier, it follows that the shift from *sarvataḥ* to

---

31. Furthermore, a *śloka* belonging to the *Śvāyaṁbhuvasūtrasaṁgraha* (*vidyāpāda 3.1cd-2ab*) is tacitly incorporated in the *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* (v. 190) of the Kashmirian Śrīkaṇṭha, an early Siddhāntin commentator (prob. 9–10th century CE).

32. The half-line is probably corrupt, for the Old Javanese commentary is closer to the Sanskrit version of the *Śvāyaṁbhuvasūtrasaṁgraha* maintaining the causal function of the ablative “*ṣūnyatvād* (‘devoid of’): *nityomideṇ Sadākala ri kadaṇḍaṇa n tan pasaṅkan* (He is eternal, i.e. continuously existing in creation, without an origin).
sarvādhva° took place in the Subcontinent. Although we cannot rule out the possibility that we are just dealing with a mere corruption attributable to scribal transmission, it is also possible that the shift was due to either a misunderstanding or an intentional change by the Old Javanese redactor, who was not familiar with the doctrine of the adhvans; in this case, it is likely that Wṛhaspatitattwa 7-10 was taken from Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṁgraha.

Another longer parallel has been found in Wṛhaspatitattwa 37-46, which agrees with a passage on nāḍicakra in Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama 10.3cd-13ef, which is in turn part of a larger parallel in Agnipurāṇa 2.214, 3cd-14ab.33

It is interesting to point out that the discovery of the above parallels might be of some importance for the issue of the antiquity of the Wṛhaspatitattwa. Zieseniss (1958, 14) regarded this text as a precursor of the Śaiva Āgamas,34 an opinion supported also by Nihom (1995a). The scholar, having compared Wṛhaspatitattwa vv. 60-61 to parallel passages found in the Sāṁkhya-vṛtti (p. 36, lines 4-17) and in Kauṇḍinya’s commentary on the Pāśupatasūtras (Paścārthabhāṣya, 1.9: 38-39), went on to argue that the treatment of the doctrine of yamas and niyamas as a single set of ten items called daśaśīla in the Old Javanese commentary stands midway between the view held in the Śaṁkhya text and in the Paścārthabhāṣya, therefore constituting evidence of Pāśupata influence: for the consideration of both the yamas and niyamas as a unique set of ten yamas is precisely what distinguishes the Pāśupata from the Śaṁkhya view. Since the Sāṁkhya-vṛtti has been dated around the first quarter of the 5th century CE at the latest, see Solomon (1974, 111, 149, 179), while the Paścārthabhāṣya is not later than the 7th century,35 Nihom (1995, 218) maintained that “the Sanskrit verses of the VT [i.e. Wṛhaspatitattwa] are substantially older than the PABh [i.e. Paścārthabhāṣya]”. However, the fact that the Sanskrit verses of the Wṛhaspatitattwa have parallels in Śaṅkhāyana’s Siddhāntatantras such as the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṁgraha and the Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama, which are in all probability later than the Paścārthabhāṣya,36 implies that Nihom’s

33. This parallel has been discovered by Peter Bisschop, whom I thank for having pointed it out to me.
34. It seems that also Brunner (1992, 45, note 50) viewed this text as a particularly early one.
35. This text may be dated back to the 4-6th century CE, also on account of the fact that the description of Pāśupata doctrines given by the Vedāntin Śaṅkara (8th century CE) in his commentary ad Brahma-sūtra 2.2.37 was probably based on it.
36. Although problems of dating occur also for the majority of Sanskrit Śaṅkhāyana’s Siddhāntatantras, see Goodall (1998, xxxvi-lxxiii).
conclusion needs to be reconsidered, also because of the composite nature of the Old Javanese text. Of course, one cannot exclude that the verses shared by the above-mentioned scriptures were borrowed from a common, older source — but this remains pure speculation at this stage.

The Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama has another parallel in Jñānasiddhānta 8.3. Verse 1.8, dealing with the well-known doctrine of the levels of the word, is substantially similar to its counterpart from the Archipelago text. The most remarkable deviation is that in the Javanese version of the śloka a new level — śūnya — was added to the standard three:

\[
\text{sthūlaṁ śabdamayaṁ proktaṁ sūkṣmaṁ cittamayaṁ bhavet |}
\text{paraṁ cittavirahitāṁ | cittayaktātiśūnyatā || 8.3 || JS}
\]

\[
\text{sthūlaṁ śabda iti proktaṁ sūkṣmaṁ cintāmayaṁ bhavet |}
\text{cintayā rahitam yat tu tat param parikiritam || 1.8 || STK}
\]

As appears from the Old Javanese commentary, śūnyatā is interpreted as a fourth level and not, as it might have been in origin, as a bahuvrīhi com-

37. As a matter of fact, the doctrinal outlook of Wṛhaspatitattwa is clearly Saiddhāntika, even though presenting archaic features in textual strata which may go back in some way to an earlier strand of Śaivism. For example, it mentions the three sects of the Śaivas, Pāśupatas and Alepakas instead of the more common tripakṣa formed by the Śaiva, Rēsi (probably the descendants of the Pāśupatas, see Sanderson 2002-03, 376) and Sogata (i.e. Buddhists) of the Majapahit period. Zieseniss (1956, 18-20) suggested a linkage between these Alepakas and the Indian Vaimalas on the basis of the reference in Tantrāloka 13.305. On the ground of additional textual evidence found in the Old Javanese literature, I have supported this identification, see Acri (*2006).

38. According to Torella (2001, 860), “this verse must have had a widespread renown if we even find it incorporated into a work of Tantric Buddhism, such as the Adhyātmasādhanā, ascribed to Kambala”. Hence it might be possible that the śloka was borrowed from some other source.

39. The third pāda is metrically irregular, having five shorts syllables in a row after the 3rd one. If we emend it to paraṁ cittavirahitāṁ we obtain a regular variant of anuṣṭubh. The Old Javanese commentary reads, however, cittavirahita.

40. The Old Javanese sentence introducing the śloka runs: “Fourfold means that His characteristics are: Gross, Subtle, Supreme and Void (aneka īśāna kahidēpan Bhāṭṭāra makalakaśaṇa caturdhā. Caturdhā īśāna, lakṣaṇanirān sthūla, sūkṣma, para, śūnya).”. Further, the commentary defines the four levels as follows: “gross is made of sound (śabdamaya); subtle is made of mind (cittamaya); supreme is devoid of mind (cittavirahita); void is [the stage] beyond the [state] devoid of mind (cittarahitāntya)”. Cf. also Jñānasiddhānta 8.1: sthūlaṁ sūkṣmaṁ param sūnyaṁ caturdhā praṇavaḥ smṛṭah | dvipānaś caiva brahmāṅgāṁ śivāṅgāṁ cāmṛtaṁ tathā.
pound ending in °śūnya[ka]m (confusion between -ka and -ta is common in Balinese mss.) or a construction in °śūnyatvāt referred to the third level, para. Śūnya[tā], i.e. the voidness, is a frequently used term in Śaiva sources from the Archipelago, denoting the highest principle.

I shall conclude with a parallel between a verse of the Jñānasiddhānta and the Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā, a remarkably ancient Siddhāntatantra preserved in a Nepalese manuscript going back to the 8-9th century CE, which must have been prominent in the Subcontinent and also in Cambodia in antiquity, but then lost its popularity, since later commentators seldom refer to it, see Sanderson (2001, 22). Verse 8 of the 6th chapter of the section of the text called mūlasūtra, also appearing in similar form in the Sārdhatri-śatikālottarāgama, runs:41

svayaṁ niṣkramate devo dehaṁ tyaktvā samārutaḥ |
niṣkala--- vijāniyāt ṣaḍvarṇarahitaḥ śivaḥ42 || 6.8 || NTS, mūlasūtra

svayaṁ niṣkramate devaḥ dehaṁ tyaktvā samārutaḥ |
niṣkalan tad43 vijāniyāt ṣaḍvargarahitaḥ śivaḥ44 || 25.6 || JS

There are other parallels consisting of Tantric fragments that, judging from their contents, must have been fairly widespread.45 Echoes of the Pāśupatasūtras are contained in the lists of siddhis outlined in Jñānasiddhānta ch. 11, where ślokas 5, 11 and 18 are a paraphrase of Pāśupatasūtras 1.21-37.46


42. The Nepalese apograph (ms. 5-2406, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project A 159/18) in pāda c reads: niṣkalena vijāniyāt ṣaḍvārṇarahitaḥ śivaḥ.

43. So the mss. The edited text of Jñānasiddhānta reads niṣkalāntād (emend.).

44. The lectio ṣaḍvarga° instead of ṣaḍvarṇa° is confirmed by the Old Javanese gloss.

45. Cf., for instance, the verse listing the supernatural powers or siddhis in Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā, guhyasūtra 7:204 (which is also quoted in the Svacchandatantra, 11.149cd-150ab and 10.1072cd-1073ab, with a variant in the last line) and Whhasapatiitatta 66. Cf. also the verse listing the six aṅgas of the Šaivyoga, which appears in Whhasapatiitatta 53, Jñānasiddhānta 15.1/Gaṇapatitattwa 3 and has parallels in several Siddhāntatantras, see Vasudeva (2005, 376)

46. The similarity with the Pāśupatasūtras was not recognised by the previous editor Soebadio (1971, 156), who in the notes to the text expressed her perplexity about the last series of 8 elements and conjecturally emended the sequence, inserting interrogative marks.
It has long since been noted that Old Javanese religious sources are characterized by a synthesis of Indic and autochthonous elements. As Ensink (1978, 178) put it with a nice metaphor:

One might say that, though they had nearly all Indian building materials at their disposal, they never erected an Indian building. While this is almost literally true of architecture, the metaphor also applies to religion. Javanese-Balinese tradition includes many teachings and cults that are composed completely of Indian elements, yet anything exactly corresponding is hard to find in India.

An insightful explanation of why this is so has been advanced by Wolters (1999, 55) in his assessment of the Indic cultural elements adopted by Southeast Asian civilizations:

[...] Indian materials tended to be fractured and restated and therefore drained of their original significance by a process which I shall refer to as ‘localization’. The materials, be they words, sounds of words, books, or artefacts, had to be localized in different ways before they could fit into various local complexes of religious, social, and political systems and belong to new cultural ‘wholes’. Only when this had happened would the fragments make sense in their new ambiences [...] 

It is true that, because they originated in a local religious and didactic tradition, Tutur texts should be understood against the background of this common corpus of knowledge. Yet, it may be pointed out that many Indic elements appear to be more faithful to their original canon than has been previously supposed. Even if many of the doctrines contained in Tuturs cannot be traced in India in exactly the same form — indeed the style and persuasion of these texts are unmistakably Javanese, so that many elements may certainly sound awkward to most Sanskrit scholars — we never find anything that cannot, somehow, be linked to ideas already present in the Subcontinent. Their general outlook is characterised by an unquestionably Tantric way of thinking.

This parallel was certainly noticed by Nihom (1995b); however, apart from the abstract, his paper was not accessible to me.
containing features which must sound familiar to the student of South Asian Tantric traditions. As recent research has shown, an accurate reading of Old Javanese Tuturs reveals the presence of detailed doctrinal points which are ultimately based on Sanskrit sources, see Nihom (1995a, 1995b).

Goris (1926), the first pioneer of the study of Indonesian Śaivism, stressed the similarity between the kind of Śaivism put forward by the Archipelago sources and Sanskrit Purāṇas. Zieseniss (1939; 1956, 14-15) compared the doctrines outlined in Bhuwanakośa, Bhuwanasaṁkṣepa and Wyhaspatitattwa with those of the Śaiva Upaniṣads, pointing out that Tutur texts are characterized by a somewhat archaic doctrinal outlook that qualifies them as the precursors of the Śaiva Āgamas. On the basis of Zieseniss’ findings, Gonda (1970, 1975, 16) also expressed the view that Indo-Javanese Śaivism should be regarded as a sort of “missing link” between the kind of system put forward in the Śaiva Purāṇas/Upaniṣads and the Āgamas, standing closer to Sāṁkhya teachings than to the fully developed Śaiva Siddhānta.

While this holds true as far as matters of doctrine are concerned, the parallels which have now been traced in various Sanskrit Siddhāntatantras constitute a piece of evidence suggesting that this view needs to be at least partially reformulated. Even though the dating problems occurring from all sides still prevent us from establishing with any certainty what influenced what, it is likely that most of this kind of literature was effectively based on a core of Siddhāntatantras, without the need to posit any “missing link”. Judging from the general doctrinal features found in the Sanskrit ślokas survived in the Archipelago texts, it seems that the Siddhāntatantras they drew upon were still in their ancient redactions, i.e. devoid of the doctrines added at a later stage in South India. The typical doctrinal outlook shared by South Asian and Archipelago sources can in fact be described as a form of mainstream Śaiva Siddhānta as we know it from its early scriptural core, i.e. before the sources were subjected to a massive activity of interpolation carried on by later compilers and/or commentators. In other words, it may be that the fragments which have been preserved in Tuturs, like literary fossils which were cut off from the doctrinal background in which they were composed, “photograph” an early situation, when the Sanskrit Siddhāntatantras were still circulating in the form they had before the 10th century CE. Indeed the form of Śaivism widespread in different areas of ancient Southeast Asia shows features that are the result of the independent developments undergone by a common early scriptural core which was probably separated from the mainstream tradition.47

47. Cf. the remarks by Sanderson (2001, 22-23, note 28) on the hypothesis that “the
This implies that these Sanskrit sources were introduced to Southeast Asia at an early date, even though it is likely that further influences found their way to the area also in later historical times. The stimulus to favour the diffusion of scriptures in the Archipelago probably came from the ruling elites of Central Java, who from the 9th century onwards strongly patronized Śaiva cults and maintained commercial contacts with South Asian kingdoms. It is therefore arguable that the majority of the Sanskrit materials for which parallels in the early Siddhāntatantras exist were introduced in the Archipelago from the Subcontinent in various waves already before the 10th century CE. To shed more light on the issue, further textual research will have to examine the different doctrinal strata contained in the sources available to us, and try to answer to the question as to whether this kind of sources from the Archipelago can be considered reliable materials for reconstructing ancient forms of Śaivism in the Subcontinent.48

I shall present here some of my findings, which add further elements to the above-mentioned hypothesis advanced by previous scholars.

Influence by Sāṁkhya and Pāśupata doctrines

The antiquity of the tradition is indirectly suggested by the Sāṁkhya and Pāśupata elements which have been found scattered over the whole corpus of Old Javanese literature and especially in Tuturs. To the examples mentioned above (e.g. the list of siddhis in Jñānasiddhānta ch. 11 and the treatment of yamas and niyamas in Wṛhaspatitattwa 60-61) may be added the widespread doctrine concerning the powers of Śiva, organized in a fourfold pattern as in the Pañcārthabhāṣya49 instead of the standard threefold one which is proper to the developed Siddhānta

Saiddhāntikas of Cambodia remained cut off from the mainstream once their tradition had taken root [...]”. See also Sanderson (2003-04, 361).

48. It is interesting to note that similar conclusions with regard to the form of Tantric Buddhism found in the Archipelago have been drawn by Nihom (1994, 189). Having pointed at textual evidence documenting the virtual absence of the vajradhātumāṇḍala in the Old Javanese sources from the Archipelago, he has argued that the theological framework of Indonesian Tantric Buddhism appears to go back to an earlier period, i.e. before the codification that took place in the Subcontinent at a later stage of its history. Therefore, it is likely that the introduction of Buddhist materials from the Subcontinent into the Archipelago took place before the codification of the Tattvasamgraha at the beginning of the 8th century CE.

49. Cf. the commentary on pati (the Lord) in Pañcārthabhāṣya 1.1.42, and also 1.26.7-8, 1.29.6.
(viz. jñāna, kriyā and icchā), consisting in the dyads of wibhu-prabhū along with jnāna-kriyā, collectively called cadhuśakti/caduśśakti (cf. Wṛhaspatitattwa 11-14; Tutur Cadhu Sakti, p. 3). Furthermore, I may point out that the basic dichotomy cetana/acetana (‘the conscious’ and ‘the unconscious’) which is at the basis of a number of Old Javanese Tuturs seems to have originated from the kind of dualism peculiar to Śāṁkhya, which has influenced the Śaiva cosmology. The Wṛhaspatitattwa (14) encompasses the tattvas in this twofold division, which in a way is reminiscent of the śuddha- and aśuddhādhvan partition of the cosmos according to mainstream Siddhānta Śaivism. 50

Archaic form of yoga

Tutur texts usually describe a form of yoga that is in many respects remarkably close to the one preserved in ancient Śaiddhāntika sources. Instead of a developed system of cakras we find enumerations of subtle centres within the body, such as maṇḍalas (agni/vahni, sūrya, somacandra) and sthānas/ādhāras51 which are identical with those commonly found in the Upaniṣads and early Siddhāntatantras.52 Furthermore, no trace is found of the variety of yogic postures (āsanas) taught in the later Haṭhayogic texts, while the few postures mentioned in Tuturs are those common to early Siddhāntatantras.53

Number of tattvas

The number of principles (tattva) in which the Śaiva cosmos is organised can be used as an effective criterion in the dating of a Tantra, for usually the lower their number the older the text.54 Although a really systematic

50. This dualistic structure was further re-elaborated in the Wṛhaspatitattwa in a theistic fashion: Śiva (compared to puruṣa, cetana, prakāśa) unite himself with māyātattwa (acetana, prakṛti, sakti), giving rise to Sadāśiva and the entire creation.
51. Cf. Jñānasiddhānta ch. 5: nābhir hṛt kaṇṭhaḥ taluś ca nāsaś caiva tu pañcamah | sthānāny etāny etāni yathā brāhmaṁ vyataśhitam (contra metrum).
52. As a matter of fact, early Siddhāntatantras almost never speak of cakras but constantly use sthānas or ādhāras, which usually are five in number, see Brunner (1994, 438).
53. Cf. Vasudeva (2005, 401, note 91), who refers to Saṅ Hyāṇ Tattwajñāna, verse 44.
54. On the consideration of the number of tattvas as a reliable criterion for determining the antiquity of a Siddhāntatantra, see Goodall (1998, liii and liv), where texts listing thirty-six, thirty and even fewer tattvas are mentioned.
exposition of the *tattvas* constituting the Śaiva cosmos is not to be found in any of the texts in question, the few extant lists describe a cosmology standing closer to the early Śaiva tradition than to the developed Siddhānta. For instance, the Old Javanese commentary ad *ślokas* 6, 14 and 33 of the *Wṛhaspatitattwa*, instead of the “standard” thirty-six (see Goodall 1998, li-lii), mentions the following tattvas: *śiva*, *sadāśiva*, *māyāśiras*, *māyā*, *pradhāna*, *triguṇa* (i.e. *sattva*, *rajaḥ*, *tamaḥ*), *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra*, *manaḥ*, plus the twenty lower categories of the Śāmkhya tradition.

The above passage can be compared to a verse appearing in a Balinese *stuti* (n. 133.3, *Bhūtarājastava*/*Yamastava*, Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971, 86):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iśaḥ puruṣo vidyā ca kālo rāgo rajas tamaḥ} \\
\text{sattvaṁ buddhir ahaṁkāro manaś caikādaśānanah} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here the eleven upper *tattvas* are enumerated, while the other twenty are passed over in silence. The first three remind of the so called *tritattva* (*śiva*, *vidyā*, *ātmā*); however, *vidyā*, along with *kāla* and *rāga*, is also one of the five or six standard “cuirasses” (*kañcuka*) standing between the pure and impure paths, see Torella (1998). A similar listing of *tattvas* is given in *Śivastava* (n. 751, Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971, 450-451), verse 11, where thirty-one items are listed, viz. the twenty-four *tattvas* of the Śāmkhya (including *pradhāna*), plus *puruṣa*, *iśvara* and the three *kañcukas* — *rāga*, *kalā* and *vidyā* — up to the highest principle, Śiva:

\[
\begin{align*}
caturviṁśatitattvān ca śivāṅgaṇ ca pradhānakam \\
puruṣaṁ cēsvaro rāgaḥ \text{56} \text{ kalā vidyā śivas tathā} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In support of the thesis advanced above, I may draw attention to an evidence *ex silentio*, i.e. the general absence in Sanskrit-Old Javanese Tuturs of fundamental doctrinal tenets, which are mostly found in demonstrably late Siddhāntatantras.

---

55. These three *kañcukas* are the most frequent ones in a list usually constituted by five items, viz. the former three plus *kāla* and *niyati*. The sources, however, are by no means in agreement, see Torella (1998).

56. The lectio given in ms. PPO 4673, see Goudriaan and Hooykaas (1971, 451), seems to me better than the one chosen by the editors (*puruṣaṁ cāmaro yagah*), which does not make sense.
Sixfold division of the cosmos (i.e. the six paths or adhvans)

No mention is made anywhere of the sixfold division of the cosmos. It is worth mentioning that this doctrine is not found in early Siddhāntatantras either, which might be evidence of relative lateness.\(^57\)

Threefold division of stain (āṇava, kārma, māyiya)

This is one of the fundamental tenets of the Śaiva Siddhānta theology. Though the concept of maculation and the term mala itself are attested, speculations concerning its threefold nature are nowhere found in Sanskrit-Old Javanese Tuturs. It is noteworthy that a certain ambiguity does exist in the Sanskrit sources as well, see Sanderson (1992, 285-286; 2003-04, 430-431), where in ancient times various terms, such as tamah, stood for mala (cf. Kiranatana, vidyāpāda 2.19c-20b), the threefold division being a rather late re-elaboration.

Division of beings into six classes (i.e. pralayākalas, vijñānākalas, etc.)

This systematization is strictly connected to the doctrine of a threefold mala, according to which all beings can be divided into classes according to the type of maculation they are affected by. Again, this division is unknown to most of the early Siddhāntatantras as well, whereas it is widespread in later exegetical works and seminal non-Saiddhāntika scriptures, e.g. in the Mālinīvijayottaratantra.\(^58\)

*\(^\)

I am aware that this argument can not be conclusive: indeed there could have been several reasons for the absence of doctrines, all the more so in the case of the concise, unsystematic collations of verses which form Tutur texts, mainly intended for the edification of a narrow circle of initiates who were probably not interested in the subtle doctrinal points elaborated by

\(^{57}\) Cf. Brunner’s (1992, 14) remarks on the Rauravagama: “It is clear that the Raurava in its ancient (we dare not to say: ‘original’) form knew nothing of the kalās. Nor did it know anything in general of what is called ‘the sextuple path’ (kalās, tattvas, bhuvanas, varṇas, pads and mantras), described in the same chapter on dikṣā”.

\(^{58}\) According to Goodall (2001, 331), the earliest instance of the term pralayākala in a Siddhāntatantra may be Parākhyanatana 4:20, “one of the very latest demonstrably early listed Siddhāntas”. On this categorization, see also Vasudeva (2005, 165-167).
the Sanskrit sources. Another point to be considered is that a significant gap may have occurred between the doctrinal picture we may gather from the extant sources and the ancient situation, probably maintaining alongside the written sources also some kind of oral tradition, which is now irretrievably lost. As a matter of fact, when traditions migrate from one place to another, travelling for thousands of miles across oceans and mountains, omissions easily occur.

Given the above-mentioned reasons, the kind of theology which was transmitted from South Asia apparently underwent various degrees of change in the Archipelago; therefore, this line of enquiry should be considered as preliminary, yet worthwhile of further research.  

59. It might be interesting to separate the doctrines described in the Sanskrit verses of Tuturs from those outlined in the Old Javanese parts. For example, the Old Javanese extensions which were in all probability added to Tutur texts during the Majapahit period occasionally contain a technical terminology that is not used in the original Sanskrit-Old Javanese dyadic core. In several cases such discrepancies cannot be ascribed only to a process of localisation, being rather the result of direct influence from Sanskrit sources introduced at a later time in the Archipelago.
ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>Gaṇapatitattwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Jñānasiddhānta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Gedong Kirtya manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kir</td>
<td>Kiranātanastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOr</td>
<td>Leiden Oriental manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGmPP</td>
<td>Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBSS</td>
<td>Svāyaṁbhuvātrasaṁgraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STK</td>
<td>Sārdhaṭrīśatikālottarāgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WṛT</td>
<td>Wṛhaspatitattwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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