

Zeitschrift:	Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie
Herausgeber:	Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft
Band:	50 (1996)
Heft:	3
Artikel:	Old Javanese Rmyana 25.25 and 24.117ab : a study in literature and Pupata aivism
Autor:	Nihom, Max
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147273

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 25.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

OLD JAVANESE RĀMĀYĀNA 25.25 AND 24.117ab: A STUDY IN LITERATURE AND PĀŚUPATA ŚAIVISM

Max Nihom, Vienna

In the early thirties the Indian scholar Himansu SARKAR noted that a verse of the Old Javanese Rāmāyāna bore some uncanny resemblance to the Sanskrit Bhaṭṭikāvya. The implication, that the model for the Javanese poem was not the Sanskrit epic but rather this *mahākāvya*, was later taken up by Manomohan GOSH and subsequently convincingly demonstrated by HOOYKAAS. It was also noted that after canto 17 the Javanese appears to go its own way.¹

Of the final third of this poem held to be the oldest example of Old Javanese literature,² undoubtedly the most challenging portions are canto 24, which describes Lēṇka after the defeat of Rāvaṇa, and canto 25,³ which contains an account of the hermitage of Bharadvāja observed from the chariot Puṣpaka. It has been noted that these chapters contains many verses written in an exceedingly difficult and obscure style. In particular, verses 25.12-71 describe the inhabitants of the hermitage as animals in an idiom highly symbolic, allusive and exacting. The object of this study is to take one of these verses, 25.25, and to try to make sense of it. Having done so, we shall apply these insights to the half-verse 24.117ab which, containing no less than three hapaxes, has to date been resistent to understanding. It will be proposed that these two verses contain in highflown poetic metaphor and allegory some basic tenets of Pāśupata Śaivism. The methodological point to

- 1 A history of the identification of the Indian antecedent of the Javanese Rāmāyāna may be found in ZOETMULDER 1974: 226-230.
- 2 For a conspectus of the literature dealing with the date of the poem, generally now considered to derive from the Central Javanese period sometime before 930 A.D., see ZOETMULDER 1974: 230-233.
- 3 “The entire *sarga* is devoted to a description of the country which they [Rāma and Sītā] pass across on their flight, as given by Rāma in a most artificial kind of language full of literary embellishments” and “... the relative simplicity and lucidity of most of the earlier *sargas* have given way to an artificiality and obscurity which often present the translator with insurmountable difficulties” (ZOETMULDER 1974: 226, 230). Canto 25 has been translated by HOOYKAAS 1958a.

be advanced is that these cantos of the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, despite their indubitable Javanese nature, are not likely to be understood without consideration of the beliefs of various schools of Indian religious sects.

There are two English translations of this chapter 25 which must be taken into account.⁴ The first, by HOOYKAAS (1958b), is fairly literal. However, one has the impression that a certain dearth of Indological knowledge has impeded understanding of the Javanese, even as rightly the author take pains to acknowledge the existence of puns and ambiguities in the text. The second, by SANTOSO (1980), is much smoother. Nevertheless, here one has the feeling that this suavity has on occasion gone so far as to skate over many of the linguistic and semantic difficulties.

The verse to be examined reads as follows in SANTOSO's edition, with the caveat that the first quarter is given as printed by Z 608 ad *hayan*.

*mari yan hayar vēla hayan pahavū*⁵
*mapulañ milu n̄ brata ya pāśupata*⁶
makaśisya sesi nikanañ talaga
*riñ ikētt-ikēt t ikētakēn karuñā*⁷

HOOYKAAS, understandably as we shall see, evidently so despaired of this verse that his attempt at translation is utterly cursory:

... ashes ...
 ... take part in the vow of Śiva Paśupati;
 all the animals in the lake are his pupils
 ... compassion ...

Although printed as prose, I represent the translation of SANTOSO (1980: 682) in verse so as to facilitate discussion.

4 JUYNBOLL (1936) regards most of this chapter 25, inclusive verse 25, as an interpolation and therefore provides no Dutch translation.

5 Compare, however, this as cited by Z 607 ad *mahawu*, "to smear os. with ash ?": *mari yan hayar vēlaha (?) yan pahavu*.

6 For printed *paśupata*.

7 SANTOSO, by putting the second *t* of *ikētt-ikēt* and the first *t* of *t ikētakēn* in brackets, evidently would like to delete them. This is a mistake. Both are necessary on account of the metre; the second makes semantic sense. The doubling of consonants for reasons of the metre, although rare in *kakavins* of the East Javanese period – that is, all of them, save the Rāmāyaṇa itself – is not uncommon in this poem (ZOETMULDER 1974: 117).

The water-hen stops swimming and emits a loud cry,
to assemble [the devotees] of the Pāśupata-order,
which has as adherents all the inhabitants of the lake,
and whose hymns express the sentiments of compassion.

The first line of the verse is rendered so as to conform to the reading *mari yan hayam vēlaha yan pahavū*. Here, SANTOSO's emendation *hayam*, "water-hen", is troublesome.⁸ Firstly, although most of SANTOSO's manuscripts read *hayan*, which is incomprehensible, one source does have *hayar*, in turn the reading occasionally adopted by ZOETMULDER.⁹ *ayam* itself means 'fowl, cock, hen' (Z 175). The terminus *ayam alas* does mean 'wood fowl, jungle fowl', but the entries in Z do not provide loci which would induce one to suppose that *ayam* itself could be a water fowl.

Presumably, SANTOSO has this meaning from Modern Javanese *ayam-ayaman*, "a kind of water hen".¹⁰ In fact, *hayam-hayaman* is attested at Rāmāyaṇa 25.57a (*kuya n̄ hayam-hayaman sahajān mibēr*), where SANTOSO does indeed translate: "There are water-hens which simultaneously fly up".¹¹

However, there is a problem here. Although admittedly in Old Javanese the plural may be expressed by a zero morpheme, whence *hayam-hayaman* could be considered singular or plural, not only do the environs contain only singulars,¹² but the reduplication of *hayam* would rather tend to lessen the

8 Cf. SANTOSO 1980: 812.

9 See *supra*.

10 Cf. PIGEAUD (1982: 4): [een] s[oort] v[an] waterhoen.

11 SANTOSO 1980: 680 in fact reads *n̄ hayam-hayam an....* This does not effect the argument. HOOYKAAS (1958: 373): "There the moor-hens – it is their nature to fly". Z 176 ad *ayam* I reads *kayu hayam-hayaman sahajān ibēr* and, referring to the Modern Javanese dictionary of J. F. Gericke and T. Roorda (Javaansch-Nederlands Handwoordenboek, Amsterdam/Leiden, 1901), for *kayu hayam-hayaman* suggests "a part[icular] kind of tree". This makes no sense: even if one reads *ibēr* rather than *mibēr* (SANTOSO mss. BCDEF), both words mean 'fly', although the former is a substantive and the latter a verb. Moreover, there are no other plants in the vicinity of this Rāmāyaṇa passage. True, the third syllable should be short, but this may be done by deleting the *n̄* (found in mss. BCDEF), and has no effect on *kuya* (found in Kern's edition) as a deictic particle. All in all, interchange of *a* and *u* is not unlikely. The reading of SANTOSO, which is evidently also the one silently adopted by HOOYKAAS, makes good sense here and independently confirms the interpretation of 25.25 offered below.

12 If memory serves, water-hens tend to be rather solitary.

possibility that it be seen as a plural.¹³ As noted by GONDA (1950: 173, 190), reduplicated items in Indonesian languages often are names of animals and may also express similarity or likeness (p. 190). Thus *hayam-hayaman* would rather mean ‘an animal resembling a *hayam*’. Because Modern Javanese *ayam-ayaman* does mean water-hen, it is therefore probable that Old Javanese *hayam-hayaman* may do as well, even as *hayam* does not. This then is yet another reason not to accept the emendation from *hayan/hayar* to *hayam*.

However, having proposed this, SANTOSO at 25.25 is now constrained to read *vēlaha yan* rather than *vēla hayan*. *vēlah* means ‘paddle, oar’ (Z 2237). Not only is *vēlah* evidently a nominal rather than a verbal form – this is *avēlah* – but a) it is not clear that (a)*vēlah* is said of animals swimming, as opposed to men rowing, and b) the function of the irrealis *-a* would remain opaque in any case. Further, *pahavū* is taken as the prefix *paha* + *vū*. Although *avū/avuh* as ‘make a loud noise’ is common in *kakavins*,¹⁴ the form *pahavū* is not attested elsewhere. Moreover, the prefix *paha* is used with roots “which indicate a quality, so as to make them predicates with a causal meaning”.¹⁵ In this sense, *paha* is probably not suitable for use with **vū*, although, the bare root not being attested, this is not certain. Lastly, I do not understand how one might reasonably construe the second *yan* of ... *yan* ... *yan* ... as the co-ordinating conjunction ‘and’.

In line b SANTOSO inexplicably has not rendered *milu*, ‘join in’, nor *brata*, ‘observance’. Further, even if one grants that *pāśupata* in *ṅ brata ya pāśupata* refers to the ‘order of Pāśupatas’, then, because of the item *milu*, it is more likely that *pāśupata* refers the members of the order than that has reference to the order or sect itself. However, the term *brata* should not be rendered as ‘vow’ as is done by HOOYKAAS:¹⁶ ‘observances’ is better. The

13 Cf. ZOETMULDER 1950: 91 for reduplication as expressing plurality in the Ādiparvan. However, Gonda (1950: 177ff.), undoubtedly correctly, prefers to emphasize the reiterative, distributive and collective functions. In fact, this fits the examples cited by ZOETMULDER as well.

14 Z 2319.

15 ZOETMULDER (1950: 45): “*Paha-* dient om van stammen, die een eigenschap aanduiden, toevoegingswoorden met causatieve betekenis te maken.” Otherwise put, *paha* makes verbs from adjectives (UHLENBECK in *op.cit.*: V).

16 The “vow of Śiva Pāśupati” is also incorrect, insofar as it could be seen to imply the *paśupativrata* of the Śiva Purāṇa.

term *vrata* is a terminus technicus in the Pāśupatasūtra commentary named Pañcārthabhāṣya and authored by Kaṇḍinya, where it refers to practises such as the thrice daily ash-bath (*bhasmasnāna*), the lying in ashes (*bhasmasayana*), and so on.¹⁷

Line c, however, has been better understood by HOOYKAAS insofar as *makaśīṣya*, ‘act as disciple’, is preferable to ‘have as adherent’.

The last line is the most difficult. The root *ikēt* means ‘tie, band’. On the other hand, the verbal forms *añikēt*, *añiket-ikēt*, *umikēt* etc., do not only mean ‘to tie, bind’, but are also used in the sense of ‘to compose’ a poem, a song and the like. This last meaning, ‘to compose, arrange’, is also that of *umikētakēn*, of which *t ikētakēn* is an imperative or hortative¹⁸ Therefore, while SANTOSO’s translation lacks this modality, rendering *ikētt-ikēt* as “hymns” is not unfeasible, although one might also translate ‘ties’, which makes sense in terms of the ties, bonds, between a guru and his disciples (*śīṣya*). Lastly, the Javanese does not, as far as I can determine, allow for the translation “express”.

Having criticized SANTOSO on many points, it is incumbent upon us to advance a new translation. In fact, I shall advance two, both of which, I should like to hold, are feasible,¹⁹ and both of which, in the end, imply the same, although superficially directly opposed to each other. For the sake of

17 On the *vratas* of the Pāśupatas, see OBERHAMMER 1984: 169-177. The *vratas* are the *niyamas* peculiar to this school. Together with the five *yamas*, the more usual five *niyamas* of *yoga* (in Indonesia known as the *daśāśīla*) are considered to be *yamas* by Kaṇḍinya. This perspective is substantially shared by the Vṛhaspatitattva (cf. NIHOM 1995a). The term *daśāśīla* is to be found at Rāmāyāna 17.40. While in the Vṛhaspatitattva it functions both as the prerequisite and result of *yoga*, at this locus, where Śitā laments the apparent death of Rāma, it appears to precede *yoga*:

*śīla tan hana gunanya rinākṣa
tan wēnān ya tumuluṇ lara niṇ wan
saṇ narendra daśāśīla rinākṣa
krodha tan hana jitendriya śānta*

Good conduct being guarded is of no use.
It is not capable of succoring the sorrow of the people.
The king guarded the ten percepts.
Anger was not. He had subdued his senses [and] was tranquil.

18 Ad *umikētakēn*, Z 671 distinguishes between 1) “to use st. to bind or to compose” and 2) “= *umikēt*”. The present locus is arrogated to 1), which I believe is a mistake.

19 It should be noted that double translations are possible elsewhere in chapter 25. Another example is 25.20, which I hope to discuss on another occasion.

clarity this will be done in sequence, rather than trying to advance the arguments for both simultaneously.

The key to understanding this verse is in fact SANTOSO's notion that the subject of line a is the "water hen". Although, as per above, I cannot agree that this is the meaning of *ayam*, nor can I concur with his emendation of *hayan* or *hayar* to *hayam*, reading line a as *mari yan hayar vēla hayan pahavū*, one may propose with Z 608 that *vēla hayan* be understood as equivalent to *vēla haya-hayan*, which is attested at Rāmāyaṇa 24.117.²⁰ For *vēla haya-hayan* Z 2237 hazards: "a kind of bird?". It is here that SANTOSO's idea of "water-hen" shows itself as inspired. According to Webster's Dictionary this bird, of the family Rallidae, in English is also called a "coot", which is defined (p. 502) as: "any certain sluggish slow-flying slaty-black birds that somewhat resemble ducks, have lobbed toes and the upper mandible prolonged on the forehead as a horny frontal shield..." Now clearly the horny frontal shield in the present context would be the 'third eye' of Śiva and the fact that the bird is slaty-black accords nicely with *pahavū* (*pa-havū*) as 'that which is a smear of ash'. Taking *hayar* as equivalent to **ayar*, 'to unfold, spread out (to dry)',²¹ it follows that what the coot would have to unfold are its wings, the smears of ash. This obviously alludes to the bath of ashes (*bhasmasnāna*).²²

Now if the coot is Śiva or, what amounts to the same thing, a Pāśupata Śaivite *guru* or *ācārya*, it follows that the "all inhabitants of the lake" of 25.25c are his disciples (*makaśīṣya*) and that *ikētt-ikēt* refers to the *guru*/*śīṣya* relationship, the "ties" between the coot and all the other residents of the lake. These ties then enjoin (*t*) the coot/*guru* to forsake his abdication (*mari*) of the observances (*brata*) of a *pāśupata*, to wit, the ash-bath.

The coot, that had been unfolding its wings (the ash-smear) (that is, who had been acting), stopped [doing so]
(Whereupon,) coming together, the [other] *pāśupatas* joined in the

20 See *infra*.

21 Z 176, which also refers to Modern Javanese. This must be *diayar*, *ajaran* in meaning 3) of PIGEAUD (1982: 4): "[in (kleine) bosjes, uit elkaar gehaald] te drogen gezet (geoogste rijst op erf)". For completeness's sake, it should be noted that, orthographically, the equivalence of *ayar* and *hayar* is not a problem in Old Javanese.

22 See O'FLAHERTY 1971.

observance (of the coot. That is, they also ceased performing the *pāśupata vrata* consisting of *bhasmasnāna*)

They, all that inhabited the lake, (thereby) acted as disciples (to the coot),
Which, with reference to [their] ties [to him], induced/forced [him] to compose
compassion (for them and recommence acting).

This translation requires that one understand the action of the coot as a Pāśupata *vrata*. This, because of the word *pahavū*, is surely implied. Nevertheless, it also necessitates that *vrata* of line b be understood in the more general sense of an observance, namely, that of emulating the *guru*, of following or heeding the *guru*. This, however, is not really a Pāśupata Śaiva *vrata* but, as *guruśuśrūṣā*, is one of the ten²³ *yamas*.²⁴ Consequently, if we put the emphasis on the coot's remaining in the world and interpret the unfolding (*hayar*) of the ash-smear (wings) not as the *bhasmasnāna* per se, but as an action which precedes flying, that is, release from the world/lake, the inchoate transcendence of the coot (as Paśupati) vis à vis the world – we may recall 25.57a (*supra*) where it is said that “There the coot who of its nature (*sahaja*) flies” –, then the *vrata* of the Pāśupatas of line b may be seen as a statement of the necessity of a continuation of an specific kind of engagement in *samsāra*, namely, action in accordance with the will of the Lord, even while one strives to obtain release.

This last theme is specifically treated in the Nakulīśa Pāśupata section of Mādhava's Sarvadarśanasamgraha (65.4-16) during the discussion of whether the Lord is a cause (*parameśvarakāraṇa*).²⁵ The *pūrvapakṣin* says that if He were, then deeds by men would be without result (*karmavaiphalyam*). The *uttarapakṣin* retorts that this is not so: an action, graced by the will of the Lord, eventuates in a result (*iśvarecchānugṛhītasya karmaṇah saphalatvopapatteḥ*).²⁶

23 In the Pāśupata Śaivism of Kauṇdinya, the *yamas*, which include the traditional five *niyamas*, are considered as ten, rather than five in number (cf. HARA 1984-86: 147; 1984: 237). This also holds for Śaivism in the Indonesian Archipelago, where these ten *yamas* are known as the *daśāśīla* (cf. NIHOM 1995a)

24 See Pañcārthabhāṣya 27.7-28.21. Note that *gurubhakti* is the first of the five *bala* of Gaṇakārikā 3 (cf. Ratnaṭīkā 5.21-6.12) and that the Pañcārthabhāṣya 3.10-11 (*infra*) observes that the disciple should serve (*upasadana*) the teacher.

25 On the sources available to Mādhava, namely, the Pañcārthabhāṣya and the Ratnaṭīkā, cf. HARA 1958: 9.

26 For a translation of this section, see HARA 1958.

These notions are fundamental to Pāśupata thought. Thus, precisely in the Pañcārthabhāṣya ad *sūtra* I.3 which prescribes lying in ashes (*bhasmani śayīta*) we find (10.3-4):²⁷

*yathā mrgā mrtyubhayasya bhītā udvignavāsā na labhanti nidrām /
evam yatir dhyānaparo mahātmā samsārabhīto na labheta nidrām //*

As deer, afraid of the terror of death, dwelling in agitation, do not obtain sleep,
So a great-souled ascetic, intent on meditation, afraid of samsāra, would not
obtain sleep.

In other words, a *yoga* of pure introversion alone is not sufficient: the disciple must not be afraid of the hazards of the world, but must engage them in a particular way.²⁸ In Pāśupata Śaivism the notions of *vrata* and *vidhi* are two terms which cover the modes of such an engagement.

Moreover, SANTOSO's understanding of "whose hymns express the sentiments of compassion" in line d, while surely not a literal translation, does have some merit. The expression *ikētt-ikētakēn* may indeed refer to the composition of utterances, stories etc. (cf. Z 671). Understanding these "hymns" as teaching, Pañcārthabhāṣya 3.10-11 is apposite:

*anugrahārthā cācāryasya pravacanavaktrte pravṛtti / tathā bhajana-
codanaprasādaśivatvalipsopadeśād duḥkhāntārthinaḥ śisyasyehopa-
sadanapravṛttih*

The perceptor's²⁹ inclination to be a speaker of an utterance has as object
sustaining grace [for the disciples].³⁰ Likewise, on account of the instruction of

27 Compare Liṅga Purāṇa 1.86.42 (cited by HARA 1966: 175):

*yathā mrgā mrtyubhayasya bhīta ucchinnavāsā na labheta nidrām
evam yatir dhyānaparo mahātmā samsārabhīto na labheta nidrām.*

28 The Pāśupatasūtras, and Kauṇḍinya, discuss the proper manner of engagement in the world at 2.12-2.17. See also HARA 1982.

29 On the distinction in India between an *ācārya* and a *guru*, cf. HARA 1979. HARA (p. 103) notes with reference to the Ratnātīkā that: "In this text the *guru* is often called *angrahakārin* (he who favours the pupil with instruction). This epithet is never applied to the *ācārya*. On the other hand, the *ācārya* is often called *apavargagantr* (he who goes to final liberation), but this never said of the *guru*." Clearly, either HARA's interpretation of the Ratnātīkā passus is incorrect, or Bhāsarvajñā, its putative author, palpably is of a different opinion than Kauṇḍinya in his Pañcārthabhāṣya.

30 In the Pañcārthabhāṣya, *anugraha* must be distinguished from *prasāda*. I have the impression that the former appears to supplant what in other Śaivite schools is called

worship (*bhajana*),³¹ instigation (*codana*),³² grace (*prasāda*),³³ and strongly desiring Śivahood³⁴, for the disciple who has as object the end of misery, the inclination to go to [the teacher] (must) obtain.

Hence, the teaching is an instrumentality, via the perceptor, of the grace of the Lord, and the receptivity of the disciples, their willingness to accede to the teaching, is necessary. Adding to this the necessity of the disciples' acting within *samsāra* in accordance with the teaching, verse 25.25 may now be translated somewhat differently, although the upshot is substantially the same.

The coot who had been unfolding his (ashen-grey) wings (preparatory to flying, so as to escape the world/lake), stopped (remained in the lake, the world).

Coming together, the Pāśupatas (the followers of the coot), joined in [his] observance (remained engaged in the world).

They, all that inhabited the lake, acted as disciples (to the coot),
Which, with reference to [their] ties [to him], induced/forced [him] to compose [utterances which are] compassion.

From the perspective of this translation, the meaning of the verse would seem to be that Paśupati, because of his ties to the inhabitants of the lake, the

sthiti and that the term *tirobhāva* substitutes for *samhāra*. Cf. Pañcarthabhāṣya 7.6-11; 14.21-23; 54.2-18; 55.6-8; 56.8-13; 60.4-6; 60.20-61.4; 147.14-17. The set of three – *utpādakānugrāhakatirobhāvakatva* – are among the *kāraṇaguṇas* (cf. 62.12-15).

31 Cf. *sūtra* 1.43 (*bhajasva mām*). HARA (1966: 156) refers to 2.43, which is a misprint.

32 Hara (1992: 213), on Pañcarthabhāṣya 6.8-10, renders “God’s propulsion”. The *codaka* is indeed the Lord, *bhagavat* (cf. 7.20; 91.1). *codana* is defined at 108.16 (ad 4.24, *tan no rudraḥ pracodayāt*) at the close of the fourth *adhyāya*: *codanam nāma jñānakriyāśaktisamyoγaḥ/ ... uktam hi “rudrasyecchāpūrvako yo yogo jñānakriyāśaktibhyām paśvādiṣu sambhavah, tac codanam āhur ācāryāḥ” //*. See also Pañcarthabhāṣya 3.11,14; 5.13; 7.7,10; 60.5; 137.21. On *saṃyoga*, cf. HARA (1992: 212-214); SCHULTZ (1958: 138-140).

33 For *prasāda*, cf. *sūtra* 5.40 (*apramādī gacched duḥkhānām antam iśaprasādāt*) and Pañcarthabhāṣya 5.21; 6.1; 46.3,9; 86.2; 118.12, 23; 130.2,11; 140.15; 143.15,17,20-22; 144.1.

34 *śivatva* is the sumnum of the system. On *sivatvalipsā*, cf. *sūtra* 5.45 (*śivo me astu*) and especially the explanation of *astu* (*astv iti kāṅkṣāyām/kāṅkṣati lipsati mṛgayatīty arthaḥ*). HARA (1966: 156) refers to 5.40 (*apramādī gacched duḥkhānām antam iśaprasādāt*), which is less appropriate. On *śivatva*, compare Pañcarthabhāṣya 14.20 (*sadāśivatva*); 118.13 (*asīvatva*); 143.15 (*asīvatva*); 146.4-5 (*asīvatva*).

paśus, does not completely absent himself from the world. As we shall see, this does indeed not mean that the Lord's being a cause itself causes the effect which is the disciples' liberation in the absence of action.

Before proceeding to an examination of verse 24.117ab, it should be noted that the 'meaning' of the verse as ascertained is somewhat separate from the allusions implied by the vocabulary. That is, we have heuristically emphasized the 'verbs' – flying as a would-be escape from the world and 'stopping' as an act of cessation – and have thereby been forced, by the exigencies of English, not to render the sectarian implications of the 'ash-smear' (*pahavū* as *bhasmasnāna*) or observances (*vrata*) as referring to specifically Pāśupata Śaiva practises. In the highflown, one might even say, exaulted, poetry of chapter 25 such appears to be difficult to circumvent, even though hereby one loses much of the poetic effect.

If Rāmāyaṇa 25.25 may be said to be difficult, 24.117ab is, in the opinion of the present writer, next to impossible. Even so, if our understanding of 25.25 as representing the Pāśupata sect and its practises is defensible, then, given the occurrence of *vēla haya-hayan* at 24.117a and given the fact that these two loci are the only ones where this term appears in Old Javanese, as well as that both contain forms of *ikēt*, it follows that the assumption that one (24.117ab) might be approached in terms of the other (25.25) may have merit.

There is, moreover, an extrinsic, structural motivation for proposing that 24.117 and 25.25 may treat of similar matters. Namely, it has apparently escaped notice that 24.116-117 and 25.57-62, as well as 25.25, share several items of vocabulary. Verse 24.116 mentions three animals: the *jaṅkūn* (a type of heron), the *kuntul* (another kind of heron) and the *si bēsi* (an unknown kind of bird). Just so verses 25.58-60:³⁵ 25.58 reports on the *jaṅkūn*, 25.59 on the *si manuk bēsi*, and 25.60 again on *si kuntul*. Verse 25.57, as noted above, mentions the coot (*hayam-hayaman*) in connection with flying, even as 25.62 records the expression *adas-das* which together with *adas* of 24.117 evidently constitute the only loci in Old Javanese for this root. Therefore, it appears, at least based on this superficial analysis, that chapters 24 and 25 have some structural relationships with each other.

35 As noted by HOOYKAAS (1958b: 373) and affirmed by SANTOSO (1980: 815), these three verses recall the story of the heron and the crayfish, also known from the Indian Pañcatantra, as well as Southeast Asian versions. See KLOKKE 1993: 139, 185-186, 211-212, 224-225, 242-243.

Rāmāyaṇa 24.117ab:

*tan n olēg tan vutah dēh si vēla haya-hayān doyan n itēk-itēk
kekēt cittanya yan ton kuḍuk adēpa ḍuḍuk nkāne puḍak adas*³⁶

HOOYKAAS (1958: 282):

The *vēla*-bird has no dislikes and does not vomit, fie! it is unsuitable to be fond of mud.

His thoughts are captivated at seeing the squatting (?) frogs, sitting there in numbers on the puḍak-flowers.

SANTOSO (1980: 642):

The crow took no aversion to, nor did he become nauseated from eating the blenny, on the contrary, he was very fond of it. He was mystified when he saw a frog in front of him sitting on a pandanus flower staring at him.

It is not unfair to state that neither of these translations convey much meaning. Nevertheless, since this half-verse has no less than three hapexes – *itēk-itēk*, *kuḍuk*, and *adas* – and two items which only occur twice – **ulēg* and *vēla (haya-)hayān* – any attempt at a trenchant blow-by-blow critique of the two translations above is useless. Consequently, we proceed directly to venture to understand the verse from the perspective of 25.25.

a) I presume, after Z 608 ad *hayān*, that *vēla hayān* of 25.25a and *vēla haya-hayān* are identical.

b) The term *olēg* is traced back by Z 2110 to **ulēg*. The only other recorded occurrence is the form *kolēg* at Kiduṇ Harṣavijaya 4.48b.³⁷ ZOETMULDER hazards that the root may be equivalent to **ulug* and for *olug* proposes “lacking in, short of, failing in” etc. (Z 2114). The first meaning in particular may fit. Recalling that we have proposed that 25.25 and this half-verse are related, *tan n olēg* might be rendered “not lacking in [action]”. That is, just as the coot of 25.25 ceased from his desistence from observances (*vrata*) or from his removal from the world, so I see the *vēla haya-hayān* as not refraining from action. In other words, ‘not lacking [in action]’, the coot does not abide solely in absolute transcendence.

c) *vutah* means “gushing out, spewed forth, poured out” (Z 2337). ‘vomit’ appears restricted to *amutahakēn* etc. In any event, *vutah* may be

36 SANTOSO’s ms. B reads *adas*.

37 Kiduṇ Harṣavijaya 4.48b: *linira śri narapati riñ sañ abagus (s)aśringāra marum sipi gavokisun mulat i vongira kaki pantēs yan tameñ pupuh patañkise aluhuñ sama kasor mantrinisun kolēg patañkisipun ndan sañ inujaran asēn smita anēmbah matur.*

used not only with liquids but also, after Arjunavivāha 16.12ab, is said of the consequences of meritorious deeds (*yaśa*).³⁸ Consequently, the coot not refraining from causal action, I understand *tan vutah* to specify that, even though not not acting (that is, not not being a cause), for the disciples (the frogs) consequences of the acting of the coot do not gush forth in the absence of action on their part.³⁹ That is, although the Lord is the cause, the result obtains via the action of the disciples in the world in accordance with His wishes.

d) Firstly, we should note that *itēk-itēk* is a metathesis of *ikēt-ikēt*. *itēk-itēk* is a hapex which ZOETMULDER (707) defines as “to live (play, wallow) in the mud”. As ‘is fond of mud’, this is also the translation adopted by HOOYKAAS. Neither scholar motivates their respective translations: perhaps their reasoning was somewhat like this. vdT I.184b ad *itēk*, which is undefined, refers to *untēk* (I.61a). Ad *untēk-untēk*, VAN DER TUUK refers us to the entry of *tēmbiluk* (II.785b), “a kind of small aquatic worm (een soort waterwormpje)”, which is held to be equivalent to Malay and Javanese *ugēd-ugēd*.⁴⁰ ZOETMULDER himself (Z 2123) ad *untēk* states: “a certain aquatic creature (perhaps ModJ *ugēd-ugēd*, ‘a tiny waterworm, mosquito larvae’. sas. *untēk-untēk*)”.⁴¹ Therefore, if *itēk-itēk* is taken as parallel to *untēk-untēk*, then, if *untēk* or *untēk-untēk* is a waterworm or the like, *itēk-itēk* may be taken as ‘to act like a waterworm, mosquito larvae’, that is, ‘to live in (stagnant) water’. Similarly, SANTOSO’s evident understanding of *itēk-itēk* as a “blenny”,⁴² is clearly secured from the same considerations as the renderings of HOOYKAAS and ZOETMULDER.

38 Arjunavivāha 16.12ab (Arjuna speaking):

*saphala yaśanta yan vutaha denya mavarah i rahasya niñ hati
kavēnang ikāri yan kadi lēkasta riñ acala rikāna riñ gihā*

39 In Sanskrit the explicit use of the notion of ‘outflow’ for the results of action appears to be limited to the Jains (!), who use the term *āsrava*. However, the Buddhists often use the item *sāsrava*, or *sāśrava*, to refer to bad, or black, *karma* resulting from action. EDGERTON (1970: 111) renders this “evil influence, depravity...”, but perhaps Lévi’s rendering “écoulement” is better.

40 Cf. WILKINSON n.d.: 626a. *ugēd-ugēd* is not found in PIGEAUD.

41 See *infra*.

42 A kind of fish.

This reasoning, insofar as it could represent those of the scholars mentioned, is ingenuous but, I believe, may be besides the point. Let us start again: Ad *itēk*, vdT I.184b refers to *untēk* (I.61a). There, in addition to the references noted above, one finds *untēk* associated with Modern Javanese *utēk*. Ad *utek* (sic) (*oetek*), PIGEAUD 427 distinguishes between *utek* I, with the meanings ‘brains’ which are edible and understanding, comprehension, and *utēk-utek* I and II. The first means ‘to whine (treuzelen, zeuren)’; the second is ‘to keep touching unnecessarily with one’s fingers (men komt (onnodig) telkens m[et] d[e] vingers aan), to fiddle with (men knoeit aan)’ and also refers to *utak-utēk*. In turn, as a substantive *utak-utēk* he defines as ‘hanging around at home (thuis blijven rondhangen)’, while as verb, we again find ‘one touches with one’s fingers.’ These two definitions for *utak-utēk* would seem to share the meaning ‘to pudder about/around (with)’. Now, if *itēk-itēk* may indeed be associated with Modern Javanese *utēk-utēk* and *utak-utēk*, which does not seem unreasonable, it follows that *itēk-itēk* might mean to hang around a place and to be active while there. For *itēk-itēk* I therefore propose the translation “to pudder about/around in, to mess around in.”. This notion fits well with the idea that Paśupati (the coot), by his teaching, is still engaged in the world.

Therefore, if our interpretations of b) and c) are correct, it now follows that although superior to the world (the lake of 25.25) in that it does not touch him – for him there are no karmic outflows resultant upon his actions –⁴³ the coot has yet consented to involve himself in the material, the world/lake. Hence, “he is eager (*doyan*) to pudder about in [the world].”

e) I should further like to hold that the occurrence of *kekēt* ... *puḍak* ... may be significant. Not only is the root *ikēt* hereby shared with 25.25, but since *ikēt* is used in connection with composing stories etc., and because we have proposed above that the coot involves himself in the world via the Pāśupata teaching, *puḍak* here might be an indirect reference to the *pandanus* flower as material on which one writes.⁴⁴ I hasten to add, however, that this is purely conjecture.

f) The hapex *kuḍuk* is held to be a frog by ZOETMULDER (Z 909), HOOYKAAS, and SANTOSO, although more usual words for this are *vilan* and

43 Cf. Sarvadarśanasamgraha 64.11-12: *parameśvarasya paryāptakāmatvena karma-sādhyaprayojanāpeksāyā abhāvāt*.

44 Cf. ZOETMULDER 1974: 135-137. The *puḍak* is especially mentioned with reference to writing of love letter/poems, which may have been intended not to be conserved.

manduka.⁴⁵ The frogs are the equivalent of the inhabitants of the lake of 25.25 who are disciples of the coot.

g) The term *adas* is again rare. Z 375 does not provide a definition. However, we may note that that this line has many words with *d*. Of these, *adēpa* is from the root *dēpa* (Z 390) which Zoetmulder relates to *rēpa*. In analogy, I suggest that *adas* be understood as from *ras*, “deeply moved, disturbingly effected” (Z 1514). Interestingly, Van der Tuuk (I.161a) records only *adas*, said to be Sasak, and glosses it by *nuṅgañ adas*: “be impure as a result of menses or coitus”,⁴⁶ insofar as purification has not yet taken place”.⁴⁷ The alteration of *d* and *ɖ* is not particularly significant, so we may propose that *adas* refers to turbidity, taken as the opposite of clarity or purity, of mind or body. This is supported by Rāmāyaṇa 25.62 where we find both a mention of *adas-das* (evidently referring to the *manuk tambēñ*⁴⁸ in line b) and, in contrast (in line d), the mention of the *manuk śoca*, ‘the pure bird(s)’.⁴⁹

Not lacking in [causal action] nor gushing forth [effects], surprise!, the coot is [still] eager to pudder about in [the world].

His intentions (to teach) have been composed seeing the frogs (disciples) deeply troubled huddled on the *pudak* flower.

Given the difficulty of these chapters of the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, it would be presumptuous to submit that the problems of language and

If this allusion is implied by the poem, it must refer to the ‘love’ between the disciple and God. See the commentary of the Pañcarthabhāṣya on Pāśupatasūtra I.5 (*nirmālyam*) where the garland is worn *bhaktivivṛddhyartham*. However, Z 1428 ad *pudak* I observes that “in R[āmā]y[ā]na *pudak* not as writing material”.

45 vdT II.139b ad *kuduk* supplies a question mark and no further information, save “**nduduk*”.

46 *tuṅgañ*, as in *tugañ-tuṅgañ*, is attested at Rāmāyaṇa 24.103d (*tugañ-tugañ nya maṅgañ maṅgagai gigirēn saktin kahañētan*) and means “mating, covering (animals)” (Z 2070).

47 vdT I.161a: *onrein zijn* ten gevolge van de stonden of de coitus, daar de reiniging nog niet heeft plaats gehad.

48 “name of a bird” (Z 1918).

49 Rāmāyaṇa 25.62, as provided by SANTOSO:

*kuya ta vihaga maṅkuk kapva loglog baño bāp
madulu-dulur adas-das na n manuk tambēñ akveh
manēpi-nēpi yapan sor nā ri soso(r) svari sor
mañariñ-ariñ arinriñ riñ manuk śoca kāriñ*

interpretation adduced here have been definitively solved. For that, these two verses contain far too many hapaxes and rare and difficult words. Nevertheless, the proposed translations do perhaps have the merit of suggesting that the author of the Rāmāyaṇa had a detailed knowledge of the tenets of Pāśupata Śaivism.

There is no doubt that the Pāśupatasūtras themselves were known in classical Indonesia.⁵⁰ Collaterally, the understanding of the *daśaśīla* in the Vṛhaspatitattva – *daśaśīla* here being the equivalent of ten *yamas* of the Pañcarthabhāṣya – is intermediate between the treatment of the five *yamas* and five *niyamas* in commentaries to the Sāṅkhyakārikās and the treatment

HOOYKAAS (1958b: 369):

There are numbers of birds squatting down; the numerous *baño*-herons stride along;
those numerous birds that are mute, peep about, and keep each other company;
frequently they go to the banks for beneath there are water insects to outwit;
they are amused by the caresses of the clean birds who are stroking
themselves (?).

SANTOSO (1980: 691):

An owl is hopping along with a lot of storks, followed by the *tambēn*-birds
which run along. They swing aside when they see the casuaries-birds,
because they are always beaten when fighting them. So they join the *śoca*-
birds and stay with them in harmony.

Strangely, Z does not record this passus ad *adas*. See, however, Z 127 ad *kāriṇ*,
where it is questioned whether one should read *manuk śoca kāriṇ* or *manuk śocakāriṇ*. Z also suggests that this bird could be equivalent to the *cukcak* (“a part.
kind of bird”, said to be “a small bird with blue feathers, *Turdus analis*”, Z 336), but
adduces no reason for this identification. The manuscripts disagree about whether to
read *soso* or *sosor*. In either case, this is a hapex not defined by Z. The verse is again
very difficult: the following is provisional, to say the least.

Here the birds that squat, while the *baño*-herons vehemently move (their
upper bodies) to and fro.

So the many *tambēn*-birds that accompany [them] and that are very deeply
troubled (= not pure, *adas-das*)

Go close to the banks (of the river), for beneath (*i sor*) are females (*nāri*)
with a low (*sor*) sighing sound (*sososvari* < ? *svasa usvari* (=?? Skt.
**utsvari*)).

That relax, with soothing words to the *manuk śoca* who are quieted.

50 Cf. “The Pāśupatasūtras on Bali”. The material contained in this study – which was presented as a paper at the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies, Cracow, Sept. 23-26, 1993 (cf. the abstract NIHOM 1995b: 293) – will constitute a chapter in a volume provisionally entitled Studies in Indian and Indo-Indonesian Śaivism. For a mention of the Pāśupata school in Cambodia, see BHATTACARYA 1955.

of the ten *yamas* by Kaundinya.⁵¹ Consequently, we may hold that at least two, rather early, varieties, or sub-varieties, of Pāśupata Śaivism were available in classical Indonesia.

This is particularly interesting from a strictly Indological perspective since hereby it may be proposed that not only does Indological material directly assist us in understanding details and purport of Old Javanese literary texts as diverse as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Kuñjarakarnadharmaṅkathana*, and the *Śivarātrikalpa*, but that material found in the Archipelago, in addition to clarifying problems associated with the textual history of Buddhist tantra,⁵² will also help one towards understanding Pāśupata Śaivism in India itself.⁵³

51 Cf. NIHOM 1995a.

52 Cf. “*Dīksā, Kalā* and the *Stuti* of *Śivarātrikalpa* 31.1-2”, to appear in *Bijdragen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*; NIHOM 1994: 23-115.

53 To date, very little work has been done on this promising approach. The pioneering work of ZIESENISS (1939, 1958) was undertaken before the publication of the Pāśupatasūtras and the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* and must, unfortunately, be regarded as largely antiquated.

Abbreviations & Bibliography

Arjunavivāha see POERBATJARAKA 1926

BERG 1931 C. C. BERG, "Kidung Harṣa-Wijaya: Middel Javaansche historische roman", *BKI* 88 (1931), pp. 1-238.

BHATTACHARYA 1955 Kamaleswar BHATTACHARYA, "La Secte des Pāśupata dans l'Ancien Cambodge", in *Journal Asiatique* CCXLIII (1955), pp. 479-490.

BKI Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië.

EDGERTON 1970 F. EDGERTON, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. New Delhi 1970.

Gaṇakārikā C. D. DALAL (ed.), *Gaṇakārikā of Ācārya Bhāsarvajñā*, Baroda, 1920 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series XV).

GONDA 1950 Jan GONDA, "The Functions of Word Duplication in Indonesian Languages", *Lingua* 2 (1950), pp. 171-197.

GONDA 1972 —, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, 2nd edition, New Delhi, 1973.

HARA 1958 Minoru HARA, "Nakulīśa-Pāśupata-Darśanam", in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, 1958, pp. 8-32.

HARA 1964-66 —, "Pāśupata and Sāṃkhya-Yoga", in *Journal of Oriental Research* 34/35 (1964-66), pp. 76-87.

HARA 1966 —, *Materials for the study of Pāśupata Śaivism*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Sept. 1966.

HARA 1979 —, "Hindu Concepts of Teacher: Sanskrit Guru and Ācārya", in M. NAGATOMI et al. (eds.), *Sanskrit and Indian Studies: Essays in Honour of Daniel H. H. Ingalls*, Dordrecht, 1979, pp. 93-118.

HARA 1982 —, "Atidāna, Atiyajana and Atitapas", in *Abhinandana-Bhārati: Professor Krishna Kanta Handiqui Felicitation Volume*, Kāmarūpa Anusandhāna Samiti (Assam Research Society), Gauhati, 1982, pp. 34-43.

HARA 1984 —, "A Note on the Pāśupata Concept of Purity (Śauca)", in K.V. Ramesh, Agam Prasad and S.P. Tewari (eds.), *Svasti Śrī: Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, 1984, pp. 237-244.

HARA 1984-86 —, "A Note on the Pāśupata Concept of Ahimsā", in *R̥tam*, vols. xvi-xviii, January 1984-July 1986, pp. 145-153.

HARA 1992 —, "Pāśupata Studies (I)", in TEUN GOUDRIAAN (ed.), *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux*, Albany, 1992, pp. 209-226.

HARA 1994 Minoru HARA, “Pāśupata Studies II”, in *WKZS* 38 (1994), pp. 323-337.

HOOYKAAS 1958a C. HOOYKAAS, “The Paradise on Earth in Lēnkā (*OJR* XXIV.87-126)”, *BKI* 114 (1958), pp. 264-291.

HOOYKAAS 1958b — , “From Lēnkā to Ayodhyā by Puṣpaka, being the Oldjavanese Rāmāyaṇa sarga XXV Mainly”, *BKI* 114 (1958), pp. 358-383.

JUYNBOLL 1936 H. H. JUYNBOLL, “Vertaling van Sarga XXIV, XXV, en XXVI (Slot) van het Oudjavaansche Ramayana”, *BKI* 94 (1936), pp. 409-447.

Kiduṇ Harṣavijaya see BERG 1931.

KLOKKE 1993 Marijke J. KLOKKE, *Tantri Reliefs on Javanese Candi, Leiden*, 1993 (Verhandelingen van het koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 153).

NIHOM 1994 Max NIHOM, *Studies in Indian and Indo-Indonesian Tantrism: The Kuñjarakarnadharmaṭhāna and the Yogatantra*, Vienna, 1994 (Publications of the DeNobili Research Library, no. xxi).

NIHOM 1995a — , “Sāṅkhya and Pāśupata Reflexes in the Indo-Indonesian Vṛhaspatitattva”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 39 (1995), pp. 203-220.

NIHOM 1995b — , “Pāśupatasūtras on Bali”, in CEZARY GALEWICZ (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies*, September 23-26, 1993, Cracow, Poland (Cracow Indological Studies vol.1), p. 293.

NIHOM n.d. “The Pāśupatasūtras on Bali”, manuscript.

O'FLAHERTY 1971 Wendy DONIGER O'FLAHERTY, “The Symbolism of Ashes in the Mythology of Śiva”, in *Purāṇa* 13 (1971), pp. 26-35.

OBERHAMMER 1984 Gerhard OBERHAMMER, *Wahrheit und Transzendenz*, Wien, 1984 (Öst. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 424. Band; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 18).

Pañcārthabhāṣya See Pāśupatasūtra

Pāśupatasūtra R. A. SHASTRI (ed.), *Pāśupatasūtra with Pañcārthabhāṣya of Kaṇṭeya*, Travancore, 1940 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. 143);

PIGEAUD 1982 Th. PIGEAUD, *Javaans-Nederlands Woordenboek*, Leiden (reprint of 1938 edition).

POERBATJARAKA 1926 R. Ng. POERBATJARAKA, “Arjunawiwāha: Tekst en Vertaling”, *BKI* 82 (1926), pp. 181-305.

Rāmāyaṇa see SANTOSO 1980.

Ratnaṭīkā see Gaṇakārikā.

SANTOSO 1980 Soewito SANTOSO (ed. and transl.), *Ramayana Kakawin*, 3 vols., Delhi, 1980 (Śata-Piṭaka Series volume 251).

SCHULTZ 1958 F.A. SCHULTZ, *Die philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata Systems*, 1958.

SUDARSHANA DEVI 1957 *Wrhaspatitattva: An Old Javanese Philosophical Text*, edited and annotated by SUDARSHANA DEVI, Delhi, 1957.

vdT H. N. VAN DER TUUK, *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, 4 vols., Batavia, 189 -1910.

Vṛhaspatitattva see SUDARSHANA DEVI 1957.

WILKINSON n.d. R. J. WILKINSON, *A Malay-English Dictionary*, n.d., (reprint Daitōa Syuppan Kabusiki Kaisya, Tokyo).

Z See ZOETMULDER 1982.

ZIESENISS 1939 A. ZIESENISS, "Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus: die Śivaitischen Systeme in der Altjavanischen Literatur", in *BKI* 98 (1939), pp. 75-224.

ZIESENISS 1958 —, *Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus*, Delhi, 1958 (Śata Piṭaka no. 4).

ZOETMULDER 1950 P. J. ZOETMULDER, *De Taal van het Ādiparwa*.

ZOETMULDER 1974 —, *Kalangwan: A Survey of Old Javanese Literature*, The Hague, 1974 (Translation Series no. 16, KITLV).

ZOETMULDER 1982 —, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*, 2 vols., The Hague.

