



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Dharma Pātañjala. A Śaiva scripture from ancient Java studied in the light of related old Javanese and Sanskrit texts

Acri, A.

Citation

Acri, A. (2011, February 3). *Dharma Pātañjala. A Śaiva scripture from ancient Java studied in the light of related old Javanese and Sanskrit texts*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16438>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16438>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

DHARMA PĀTAÑJALA

A Śaiva Scripture from Ancient Java
Studied in the Light of Related Old Javanese
and Sanskrit Texts

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus Prof. Mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 3 februari 2011
klokke 16.15 uur

door
Andrea Acri
geboren te Parma (Italië)
in 1981

Promotor: Prof. Dr. A. Griffiths

Overige Leden van de Promotiecommissie:

Prof. Dr. B. Arps

Prof. Dr. P. Bisschop

Prof. Dr. M.J. Klokke

Prof. A.G.J.S. Sanderson (Oxford University)

Typeset by the author in 'Adobe Minion Pro' using $\text{X}_{\text{L}}\text{A}_{\text{T}}\text{E}_{\text{X}}$ and LEDMAC.

Cover photo: Īśāna (Lokapāla of the North-Western direction), Caṅḍi Loro Jonggrang, Prambanan (photo Andrea Acri 2004).

Ai miei genitori

Wahrscheinlich darf man ganz allgemein sagen, daß sich in der Geschichte des menschlichen Denkens oft die fruchtbarsten Entwicklungen dort ergeben haben, wo zwei verschiedene Arten des Denkens sich getroffen haben. Diese verschiedenen Arten des Denkens mögen ihre Wurzeln in verschiedenen Gebieten der menschlichen Kultur haben, oder in verschiedenen Zeiten, in verschiedenen kulturellen Umgebungen oder verschiedenen religiösen Traditionen. Wenn sie sich nur wirklich treffen, das heißt, wenn sie wenigstens soweit zueinander in Beziehung treten, daß eine echte Wechselwirkung stattfindet, dann kann man darauf hoffen, daß neue und interessante Entwicklungen folgen.

Werner Heisenberg, *Physik und Philosophie* (1959), p. 181.

PREFACE

I BECAME AWARE of the existence of the *Dharma Pātañjala* when, as a beginning graduate student of Śaivism with an interest in its Javano-Balinese developments, I read ENSINK's article 'Sutasoma's Teachings to Gajavakra, the Snake and the Tigress' (1974). In presenting the Śaiva Ṣaḍaṅgayoga found in Old Javanese sources, the author makes the following remark (p. 198):

We may note, as Mrs. Soebadio (1971:30) has done, that the yoga course of eight stages (*aṣṭāṅga-yoga*) as taught in Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*'s (YS 2.29–3.5) is hardly known in Javano-Balinese literature. So far only one text discussing it is known. This is the *Dharma Pātañjala* (Dh.Pāt. 68R–76v, where the order of *prāṇāyāma* and *pratyāhāra* has been inverted). It has been handed down only in Java.

This short remark by ENSINK aroused my interest in the text; however, given the Dutch scholar's silence as to the details and whereabouts of his source, I had to wait some time before I could satisfy my curiosity. That time arrived when, going through *Cosmogony and Creation in Balinese Tradition* by HOOYKAAS (1974), I came across the two folios of the *Dharma Pātañjala* edited and translated by the author, who included them in his book on account of their interesting account of the incarnation of the Lord as Pātañjala, the eldest among the five Kuśika-siblings. The section was introduced and concluded by the following considerations (pp. 166 and 170):

Though I do not as a rule believe in work with a single MS because of the possibility of errors, when one particular single MS promises to be the plum in the pudding of one's book, one may be excused for causing one's readers the inconvenience of having to put up with the imperfections of such a MS. [p. 170:] As is so often the case when one has only a single MS at one's disposal, some words and sentences remain obscure. However, as far as I know there is no other source available from which we can draw any more definite conclusions, on the basis of more direct evidence, as to the existence of the terrifying ash-smearing Pāsupatas in Java. [...] Again as far as I remember there is no other Javanese source available, moreover, that informs us so directly about the existence of old of different methods of care for the dead in that island; [...] I would once more like to urge my friend and younger colleague Ensink, who generously placed his transliteration at my disposal,

to try and complete his work on the *Dharma Pātañjala*; my comments are meant to act only as an appetiser. In conclusion I might direct the attention of those who are in search of a suitable subject for a Ph.D. thesis to the possibilities offered by an investigation of the other 399 volumes entrusted to the care of Dr. R. Friederich and his successors by an inspection of the wealth of MSS present in the Musium & Perpustakaan Pusat, Jakarta.

Tantalized by the contents of the two folios and by these remarks, I made further investigations about the manuscript of the text and its whereabouts. I soon found out that the codex, formerly belonging to the SCHOEMANN collection, was now to be found in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek, and also realized that ENSINK's work had never been committed to the print, while none seemed to have worked on the text after him. This was sufficient reason to take up HOOYKAAS' challenge to undertake serious philological work on the text, however corrupt it might be, in the form of a PhD dissertation. With the crucial intermediation of ENSINK's former pupil and successor in Groningen, Prof. HANS BAKKER, I was most kindly entrusted by the widow of the late scholar—whom I never had the pleasure to meet as he had just died a few months before—with his hand-written annotated transliteration of the codex.¹ These materials constituted for me an invaluable guide to the text in the early stages of my research. As I proceeded with the study of its contents, my initial impressions about the importance of the *Dharma Pātañjala* were confirmed beyond my expectations. It became clear to me that the text documented an hitherto unknown commentarial tradition to the Sanskrit *Yogasūtra* that is related, albeit by no means identical, to that of the *Bhāṣya*; and that it yielded precious data that not only filled a gap in our knowledge of Śaiva theology and philosophy in pre-Islamic Indonesia, but also cast light on the origin and development of Śaivism in the Indian Subcontinent.

* * *

This work is the result of four tremendously educative years spent between the Netherlands, Indonesia, India and Australia, during which I have had the opportunity to learn at the feet of many remarkable gurus of different backgrounds, whose teachings have constituted a constant example to be striven after.

1. These original materials, including an unpublished annotated edition of the Buddhist Kakavin *Sutasoma*, are now deposited at the Leiden University Library.

First and foremost, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Arlo Griffiths, who has been the best Promotor and academic supervisor I could ever have hoped for. His continuous and untiring moral support, scholarly rigor and intellectual stimulus, not to speak about his contagious enthusiasm, have positively influenced anything good that may be found in this book.

I thank Dr. Willem van der Molen, my former teacher of Old Javanese as well as Co-Promotor and supervisor during the two years prior to his departure from Leiden University following a 're-organization', with whom I went through the first draft of my edition and translation of the *Dharma Pātañjala*. Other scholars who were involved, to varying degrees, in the preparation and revision of the same part of my dissertation are the Balinese man of letters Ida Dewa Gede Catra (Amlapura, Karangasem), Dr. I. Kuntara Wiryamartana (Giri Sonta, Central Java), Dr. Suryo Supomo (ANU, Canberra). I am deeply grateful to them all for their valuable help as well as for the wonderful time they have allowed me to enjoy while in their company.

I express my gratitude to Prof. Alexis Sanderson (All Souls College, Oxford) and Dr. Dominic Goodall (EFEO, Pondicherry), with whom I greatly enjoyed reading Śaiva scriptures during my stay of five months in Pondicherry and during the international workshops on early Tantric texts that were held there and in Kathmandu. Without their magisterial works on Śaivism this book could never have been written in the first place. Dr. Goodall is also to be credited for having kindly shared with me his unpublished editions in progress of (parts of) the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* and of the *Sarvajñānottara* (with Aghoraśiva's commentary).

I am indebted to Prof. Dr. Hans Bakker (University of Groningen), who helped me to retrieve the transliteration of the *Dharma Pātañjala* made by Prof. Ensink; and to Prof. Dr. Peter Bisschop (Leiden University), who was never short of useful suggestions to improve my writings, which have found in him a most diligent and attentive reader.

Thanks are due to the following mentors: Drs. Undang A. Darsa (Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung), who introduced me to Old Sundanese codicology and joined me in a project involving the photographing of the palm-leaf manuscripts of the Ciburuy scriptorium; Prof. Raffaele Torella (Università di Roma 'Sapienza'), under whom I studied Sanskrit and became interested in Śaivism; and Dr. Thomas M. Hunter (CSA Bali, Denpasar), who has supported me since I was an undergraduate student.

Very special thanks are due to Prof. Em. Andries Teeuw and Dr. Roy

Jordaan, whose friendship I have cherished during my stay in Leiden, and who have entertained me respectively with reading sessions of Old Javanese texts and stimulating discussions about ancient Javanese cultural matters. The latter scholar is also to be credited for the proofreading of this book.

Last but not least, I wish to express my gratitude to my parents for their love and support. It is to them that I dedicate this book.

Notes on Conventions

Transliteration No consensus has been reached yet among scholars about the adoption of a standard orthographic system for the roman transliteration of the varieties of in origin Indic scripts in which Old Javanese texts are written. Previous generations of editors have used different systems, either adopting the conventions used by early Dutch scholars, by ZOETMULDER'S monumental *Old Javanese-English Dictionary* (OJED), or introducing their own codifications—often with little or no success in drawing further followers.² The majority of those systems, and notably those implemented in OJED and in several post-OJED philological works, are to a large extent based on the transliteration conventions used by Sanskritists, but with a few relevant differences. One finds no less than three renderings for the velar nasal grapheme, viz. *ṅ*, *ng* and *ŋ*, and two for the multipurpose nasal *anusvāra*, viz. *ṅ* and *ng*; the *visarga* is almost universally represented as *h*, just like the fricative *h*; the grapheme representing the phoneme /w/ is represented either as *w* or, less frequently, as *v*; the vocalic *r* and *l* are rendered by their Old Javanese phonetic counterparts, viz. the clusters *rě* (*r* + neutral vowel *pepet*) and *lě* (*l* + neutral vowel *pepet*).

In editions of Old Javanese texts which also contain Sanskrit verses, such as Parvas or Tuturs, there has been the tendency to transliterate the two languages with different systems. Whereas this convention conceals the important fact that the script used in the manuscripts does not make any distinc-

2. Think, for example, of the system used by VAN DER MOLEN (1983) to transliterate the three Javanese codices of the prose *Kuñjarakarṇa*, which was subsequently used only by WIRYAMARTANA (1990:490–492) and by SEDYAWATI, WIRYAMARTANA and VAN DER MOLEN (2002). In spite of being by far the most analytic one—to the extent of introducing specific diacritics in order to avoid the use of more than one Roman grapheme to transliterate, for example, the single aspirated grapheme *bh* of the Old Javanese—it has the drawback of being of not immediate intelligibility even to the specialist in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese, requiring instead a significant amount of familiarization.

tion as to their orthography, I have chosen to adopt this convention in the critical edition and throughout the book;³ that is, whenever the attention was on words as abstract entities constituting a language (\approx *langue*) rather than on words as time-and-place-bound phenomena (\approx *parole*). Thus, I have rendered *anusvāras* in Sanskrit words ‘quoted’ within the Old Javanese prose or appearing in the ślokas with *ṃ*, while I have standardized those appearing in Old Javanese words to *ṅ*, without differentiating the *anusvāra* in this context from the *akṣara* rendering the velar nasal.⁴ Similarly, I have maintained the *visarga* (*ḥ*), the vocalic *ṛ* and *ḷ* in the Sanskrit while in the Old Javanese I have collapsed them, respectively, into the fricative *h* and the clusters *rě* and *lě*. Contrarily to this principle, and in opposition to the dominant convention, I have maintained the transliteration for the Indic *v* (instead of *w*) for both languages.⁵ The two signs that are not represented in the Sanskrit syllabary, i.e. the short and long *pepet*, I have rendered as *ə* and *ē* (instead of *ĕ* and *ö*), thus appropriating the (never widely adopted) convention advocated by DAMAIS (1958:10, 1970:11–19).

The aspect of words as time-and-place-bound phenomena being the focus of the diplomatic edition, there—as well as in other parts of this work dealing with palaeographic aspects of the codex—I have implemented a unified system of transliteration that aims at rendering the (one) script of the document with a 1:1 correspondence between original and representation. Thus I have consistently respected the manuscript’s use of the *anusvāra* (*ṃ*)

3. Thus, also the Old Javanese passages I quote from printed editions as well as from secondary sources have been standardized according to my policy.

4. Thus in harmony with the convention implemented in OJED (xiv–xv), except that OJED collapses the two into *ṅ*. It is likely that the two graphemes represented in Old Javanese one and the same (velar nasal) phoneme, a fact that can be inferred from the ‘re-inforcement’ of the *ṃ* into *ṃṅ* in intervocalic position, and also from the outcome of *ṃ* as *ṅ* in intervocalic position (e.g. *saṃ hyaṃ bhaṭāra* vs. *saṃ hyaṅ ātmā*). Furthermore, even though the general tendency to write *anusvāras* at word boundaries is observed, not only do different manuscripts implement different policies, but even within the same manuscript the distribution of *ṃ* and *ṅ* may be quite arbitrary.

5. Indeed the two signs conventionally represent the same grapheme in the script. To defend my choice I point out that a separation between the level of transliteration and phonological transcription is methodologically desirable, and that no claim of preference of *w* over *v* can be made on ground of the argument that the former *grapheme* of the Roman alphabet corresponds more closely to the *sound* of the Old Javanese language it has *conventionally* come to represent. An exhaustive discussion of this transliteration problem may be found in DAMAIS (1958:10 n. 3 and 1970:19 n. 1).

vs. the nasal guttural (*ṅ*), the *visarga* (*ḥ*) vs. the fricative (*h*), and the vocalic *r̥* and *l̥* vs. the clusters *rə* and *lə*. I have also reproduced *virāmas*, rendering them with the raised dot (*·*).⁶

The adherence to the Indic (i.e. Sanskrit) system of transliteration implemented in this book does not aim at ‘Sanskritizing’ the Old Javanese but rather to rationalize and simplify the present situation by favouring a system that both Sanskritists and Old Javanists are acquainted with. The Sanskrit system has also the obvious advantages of being fully standardized and internationally established, and of being in use to transliterate a variety of Indic (languages and) scripts.⁷

Grammatical terminology In harmony with the adherence to the international and interdisciplinary system in matters of transliteration, I employ throughout the book a metalinguistic and metagraphic terminology—especially to refer to graphemes of the Old Javanese syllabary—that is in part Sanskrit-derived, and in part of Western origin. In doing so I go against the established practice in philological works of using the terminology commonly employed in the later Javanese tradition, which make use of the Javanese or Balinese terms employed up to modern times. Thus, I refer to graphemes as *akṣaras* either to indicate a consonant or a vowel written as a self-standing grapheme (and not in ligature); to ligatures or clusters (either CC, CCC or CV, CCV, CCCV) rather than to *pasangan* (CC, CCC) or *sandhangan* (CV, CCV); to *anusvāra*, *repha*, *ā-*, (superscript) *i-*, (subscript) *u-*, *e-* vocalization instead of *cĕcak*, *layar*, *tarung*, *ulu*, *suku* and *taling*; to *virāma* rather than *pangkon/paten*. Whenever specific Sanskrit terminology is lacking I use local denominations, e.g. in the case of the neutral vowels *ə* and *ɐ* (=

6. Adopted from GRIFFITHS (2005) and following publications in Southeast Asian epigraphy.

7. I am aware of only one editor who has previously called for a reconsideration of the Old Javanese spelling system in a way that more closely conforms to the Sanskrit standard, i.e. SOEBADIO (1971:67). Regrettably (and curiously) enough, SOEBADIO’s attempt remained a mere declaration of intents without materializing into real practice, for, in spite of her claim to ‘have chosen to transliterate the Old Javanese according to the Sanskrit system’ in her edition of the Tuteur *Jñānasiddhānta*, no real correspondence is found apart from the rendering of *w* as *v*. On the other hand, a completely consistent Sanskrit spelling (including the rendering of *anusvāra* as *ṁ*) was adopted by SUKANDA-TESSIER (1977) to render (Old) Sundanese and (Old/Modern) Javanese words throughout her book (even including the modern place-names, the titles of texts, etc.); the author however, disappointingly enough, discusses or justifies her choice nowhere in her book.

short and long *pepet*), and for punctuation (*pada lungsi* instead of the Sanskrit *daṇḍa*). Rather than seeing the issue in terms of an opposition between ‘indigenous’ and ‘Sanskritic’, I have implemented this set of conventions in order to be historically more accurate and escape, if only partially, the risk of being anachronistic. It is in fact apparent that the majority of the Javanese and Balinese terminology is not attested in OJED, unlike its Sanskritic counterpart. The latter terminology is also generally attested in such (rare) Old Javanese grammatical texts treating matters of spelling as the *Svaravyaṅjana* (cf. RUBINSTEIN 2000:257–262).

Referencing For the references to Old Javanese texts the following principles apply: portions of edited Tuturs and Tattvas are indicated by means of verse, chapter or paragraph number followed, whenever required, by the line number of the corresponding portion of text in either the romanized edition (e.g. in the case of the *Vṛhaspatitattva*) or the Balinese edition when a romanized one is not available (e.g. *Tattvajñāna*, *Vraṭisāsana*, etc.); in the case of all the other edited Old Javanese texts, the references may be either to *sarga*/canto numbers (in the case of Kakavins) or page numbers of the edition, followed by line numbers if the case requires it. The latter convention has also been followed to refer to passages of the *Dharma Pātañjala* itself, which does not present any obvious original subdivisions into sections.⁸ Edited Sanskrit sources follow both principles according to the different natures of the texts (i.e. their prose or verse form) and the published editions.

Portions of text in manuscript sources are referred to by means of folio ‘f(f)’ numbers, followed by the sigla *r* (recto) or *v* (verso) and line numbers. The same principle has been applied to both typed romanized / Devanāgarī transliterations and palm-leaf manuscripts. Whenever the division into folios could not be arrived at, the reference is to page numbers and, depending on the case, verse numbers or line numbers.

Symbols Besides the specific series of brackets and signs appearing in the Diplomatic and Critical Edition,⁹ I have made use of the following symbols throughout the book:

8. In order to further facilitate and simplify referencing, I have also numbered each of Kumāra’s thirty-nine questions to the Lord.

9. Explained respectively on pp. 86–87 and pp. 93–94.

=	‘equivalent to’; in the Introduction: ‘orthographically equivalent to’
≈	‘almost equivalent to’; in the Introduction: ‘orthographically almost equivalent to’
>	‘standardized to’
→	‘emended to’
<	‘from’
« »	enclose Sanskrit portions of text embedded in Old Javanese passages quoted in footnotes in Part III.
† †	the enclosed text is corrupted and/or lacunous.
▷	in Part III, indicates a parallel passage in the critical apparatus appended to quoted original sources
•	in Part III, precedes an emendation or variant reading annotated within quoted original sources (whenever the verse/line number is not indicated)
$x \leftarrow y$	‘ x originates from y ’
$x \rightarrow y$	‘ x gives rise to y ’
x^*	indicates an unattested word

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
Notes on Conventions	X

I INTRODUCTION

The Text and its Place in the Tuttur/Tattva Genre	3
<i>The West Javanese Tuttur Tradition</i>	3
<i>Tuturs vis-à-vis Tattvas</i>	8
<i>Relative Chronology of Tuturs and Tattvas</i>	10
<i>Tuturs and Tattvas vis-à-vis Sanskrit Siddhāntatantras</i>	11
<i>Title of the Text</i>	16
<i>Structure</i>	17
<i>Dialogic Framework</i>	20
<i>Śāstric Style</i>	23
Résumé	29
Manuscript	43
<i>History</i>	44
<i>Script</i>	47
<i>Colophon</i>	50
Language	53
<i>Spelling</i>	53
<i>Non-standard Old Javanese forms</i>	61
<i>Non-standard Sanskrit tadbhavas</i>	62
Scribal Errors	65
<i>Omission</i>	65
<i>Addition</i>	69
<i>Substitution</i>	72
<i>Transposition</i>	79
<i>Other Sources of Corruption</i>	79
Editorial Policies	81
<i>Why Two Editions?</i>	81
<i>Diplomatic Edition</i>	83
<i>Critical Edition</i>	88
<i>Treatment of Sanskrit</i>	95
<i>Notes on the Translation</i>	97

II TEXT & TRANSLATION

Facsimile Reproductions & Parallel Diplomatic Edition	101
Critical Edition & Parallel Translation	193

III DOCTRINE

<i>The Lord</i>	343
<i>As the Absolute</i>	343
<i>As Personal God</i>	355
<i>As an Incarnated Being</i>	365
<i>As the Same as or Different from His Creation</i>	378
<i>As the Material or Instrumental Cause of the Universe</i>	387
<i>The Soul</i>	391
<i>Vis-à-vis the Lord</i>	392
<i>Losing its Divine Status</i>	398
<i>At Liberation</i>	410
<i>Obtaining the Lord's Powers during Life</i>	418
<i>Cosmos</i>	421
<i>Lord, Soul, Māyā</i>	422
<i>The Thirty Principles of the Universe</i>	424
<i>Cosmography and Geography</i>	429
<i>Man</i>	437
<i>Citta and Buddhi</i>	437
<i>Bhāvas and Pratyayas</i>	441
<i>Ahaṅkāra, Manas and the Lower Constituents</i>	450
<i>Physiology</i>	458
<i>Subtle Body</i>	462
<i>Karma</i>	465
<i>Yoga</i>	477
<i>Samādhi and the stages of Yoga</i>	481

CONTENTS

XVII

<i>The Eight Ancillaries</i>	510
<i>The Yogic Powers</i>	528
<i>Prayogasandhi</i>	544
<i>Right Knowledge</i>	551
<i>As Salvific Knowledge</i>	551
<i>As the Three Valid Means of Knowledge</i>	552
<i>Wrong Knowledge</i>	557
<i>The Materialist Doctrine</i>	559
<i>Admitting only Direct Perception</i>	564
<i>Denying the Lord and Summum Bonum</i>	570
<i>Upholding Non-Existence as Origin and End of the Universe</i>	584
<i>Denying Causation</i>	592
<i>Denying Karma</i>	595
<i>Denying Heaven and Hell</i>	599
<i>Denying Soul and Liberation</i>	602
<i>Upholding Hedonism</i>	612
APPENDICES	617
A: Parallel Synopses of Three Tattvas	619
B: Parallel Synopses of the Yogapāda of the DhPāt and the YS[Bh]	633
C: Transliteration Tables	637
SIGLA	639
BIBLIOGRAPHY	643
INDEX OF SELECTED WORDS	669
SAMENVATTING	676
SUMMARY	677
CURRICULUM VITAE	678

