

## KĀMALOKA: A RARE PĀLI LOAN WORD IN OLD JAVANESE ?

In a note to “Śiva-Buddhism in Java and Bali”, J. Ensink (1978: p. 178 note 8) observed that: “There is little evidence of Pāli, Pāli literature and Theravāda Buddhism in the whole of the Indo-Javanese and Indo-Balinese culture”. Indeed, this scholar adduces only four items: 1) Old Javanese *wiku* as a very early loan and a development from Pāli *bhikkhu*,<sup>1</sup> 2) Old Javanese *palangka*, “throne, seat for a priest” and Balinese *pelangka*, the term for the seat of the brahmin priest, from Pāli *pallangka*, 3) Balinese *pataraṇa*, the square cushion of a Balinese Buddhist priest from Pāli *pattharaṇa*, and 4) the seeming preference of the spelling *Poruṣāda* over *Puruṣāda* in the Old Javanese *Sutasoma*,<sup>2</sup> a poem which may have been inspired by the *Mahāsutasoma Jātaka*.

The text passage which may possibly furnish a fifth borrowing from Pāli is to be found in a late fourteenth or early fifteenth century Old Javanese Buddhist didactic poem, entitled *Kuñjarakarnadharmakathana* and written by *mpu* Ḍusun. This text has been edited and translated by Teeuw and Robson (1981). The context of the passage in question is as follows: Pūrṇawijaya, the king of the gods named *widyādharas* (*ratu niṅ dewa widyādharākhya*, 13.4b), together with his wife Kusumagandhawatī and attendants who were “not different from the host of Manmatha” (= *Kāma*), has departed (32.5a) from his residence in the heaven of Indra (*kendran*), to pay their respects to the Buddha Wairocana. Arriving at His abode (32.6a), the *wihāra* named Bodhicitta, Pūrṇawijaya, accompanied by the hosts of gods, performs the worship (*amūjā*). Music follows (33.1), to which dance (33.2) and songs (*kidun*)

---

<sup>1</sup> Gonda (1973: pp. 158, 274) says that Old Javanese *wiku* derives from Middle Indic *bhikkhu*. Pāli is, of course, also Middle Indic.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Soewito Santoso, *Sutasoma: A Study in Javanese Wajrayana*, Delhi, 1975 (Śata-Piṭaka Series no. 213).

which are hymns of praise in the divine worship (*prastuti dewapūjā*) are added (33.4). After describing how the sashes (*sasampur*) of the dancers slipped down, as if to display their slim waists, Kuñjarakarna 33.6 states:

*sañ atēlasan anṛttāninditānwam tuwuhnya  
iniriñ i wuri len tañ cārakākweh ri wuntat  
pilih amēnañ ataṇḍiñ rūm sakeñ kāmaloka  
hayu nika tuwin aṅsal yan tēkeñ rūmnya dewī*

Teeuw and Robson (1981: 147) translate:

Those who had finished dancing were in the prime of youth;  
They were let to the back, together with the many attendants behind.  
Probably they would win a contest with the beauties of Kāma's  
realm —  
Their beauty might even be successful against the charms of a  
goddess !

Before offering a slightly different translation, we may note a few details. The rendering of *amēnañ ataṇḍiñ rūm* and *tuwin aṅsal* by conditionals is perhaps unfortunate, since neither *amēnañ* nor *aṅsal* includes an irrealis (the suffix *a*). True, one could read *amēnaña*, but this would force one to read *taṇḍiñ rūm*, which, as the verbal phrase 'to compare/measure in/with respect to beauty', is not likely.

Secondly, and much more important, the translation "Kāma's realm" for *kāmaloka*, where *kāma* is taken, as it here is, as the proper name of the god of love, is questionable. The reasons are: 1) the term *kāmaloka* is not otherwise attested in Old Javanese,<sup>1</sup> 2) the compound *kāmaloka* is completely absent from all standard Sanskrit dictionaries,<sup>2</sup> and 3) Kāma,

<sup>1</sup> That is, there is no entry under *kāmaloka* in Zoetmulder's Old Javanese dictionary (1982) at all.

<sup>2</sup> That is, from Böhtlingk and Roth (St. Petersburg), Schmidt, Monier-Williams,

being generally a secondary or attendant rather than a presiding or central divinity in Hinduism or Buddhism,<sup>1</sup> does not have a world (scil. heaven, *loka*) of his own, unlike, for example, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Brahmā or Indra. Words for each of these worlds (*viṣṇuloka*, *śivaloka*, *brahmaloka*, *indraloka*) are attested in Sanskrit as well as in Old Javanese.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, instead of the "the world of [the god] Kāma",<sup>3</sup> *kāmaloka* must mean "the world of desire", that is, the world(s) in which desire is operative. In Buddhist Sanskrit cosmographic terminology this is called the *kāmadhātu*, the sphere of existence below the worlds of form (*rūpadhātu*) and the worlds of non-form (*arūpadhātu*). Hence, when the poem notes that the dancers are superior in beauty to those of the worlds of desire, this makes much sense insofar as, having left the heaven of Indra and having arrived at the *wihāra* Bodhicitta, the residence of the Buddha, the performers are as such no longer part of the sensual sphere and therefore must be superior to its inhabitants.

Apte, Mylius, Edgerton (Buddhist Hybrid), Conze (Prajñāpāramitā literature), and Sircar (epigraphic). Das (1985: p. 691) supplies both *kāmadhātu* and *kāmaloka* for Tibetan 'dod khams but does not supply text-references. Given that this dictionary reference is the only one furnished by Chandra (1976: p. 1261) in his Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary and in the light of the absent of *kāmaloka* in all the above dictionaries, one may be inclined to consider this as a 'ghost translation', the more because *kāmaloka* is also absent from the Mahāvvyutpatti, as well as from the index on the Abhidharmakośa (la Vallée Poussin) and its *bhāṣya* (Hirakawa).

<sup>1</sup> See, however, Stuti and Stava no. 405, the Smarastava, (Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971: p. 253), a hymn used in Śaivite circles, where Kāmadeva is said to prevail over Īśvara, Brahmā, Mahādeva and Viṣṇu (verse 6) and to be worshipped by the triple world (*trailokyasevitas*, verse 7d).

<sup>2</sup> Nor do hypothetical synonyms such as *\*kāmahuvana*, *\*kāmahūmi* or *\*kāmapada* appear to be attested in either language.

<sup>3</sup> Kāma and Ratih, moreover, are the patrons of poets and the *dalang*, the performer of the *wayang* plays, on Bali (Gonda 1975: p. 46. see C. Hooykaas, "The Function of the *dalang*", in *Akten des 24. intern. Orientalisten-Kongresses*, München, 1957). However, the context of the Kuñjarakarna does not appear to permit an understanding of 'the world of Kāma', that is, as the *wayang*.

As for the dancers being superior in beauty to a “goddess” (*dewī*), this would amount to the same thing, since, in Buddhist cosmology, the worlds of the gods (*devaloka*)<sup>1</sup> are superordinate to the worlds of demons, men, animals, ghosts and hell-beings, but still within the realm of desire. Nevertheless, we ought to consider if *dewī* could be a proper name, for “in her Sundanese (West Javanese) form as *Devī Śrī* she is a divine princess, able to descend from heaven and closely related to the *vidyādhārīs*, a class of kindly fairies who in part of the Archipelago are believed to preside over love and in Java to revive the deceased. They are in all probability a body of indigenous deities who have assumed an Indian name, taking over the role played, in India, by the *apsaras*” (Gonda 1975: p. 30).<sup>2</sup> The *Kuñjarakaṇṇa* identifies the dancers as *Apsaras* and divine women (*apsara mwañ surastrī*, 33.2a). In itself this is not a problem for identifying *dewī*, since the poem does not seem rigorously to distinguish between *apsaras* and *widyādhārīs*. Moreover, since Pūrṇawijaya, king of the *widyādhāras* and lord of the *apsaras* (26.4a, 31.7c, 37.2a, etc.) has returned from a spell in the *aweci* (sic) hell where he had been boiled in the hell-cauldron while his body lay in bed at home as if dead (25.2a, 29.1), only to engage in love with his wife (31.7), the identification of *dewī* as *Devī* would appear to be a reasonable possibility.

With the above considerations in mind, we may now retranslate the verse from the *Kuñjarakaṇṇa*.

They who had finished dancing were flawless, youthful in age.  
They were escorted to the back together with the many female  
attendants who were behind [them].

<sup>1</sup> These worlds, of which there are generally six, are also known as the *kāmāvacarāḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> Gonda refers here to K.A.H. Hidding, *Nji Pohatji Sangjang Sri*, Leiden, 1929, which is not available to me.

Certainly they are victorious measured in beauty compared to those  
in the world[s] of desire.  
Their loveliness also obtains when compared to the beauty of a  
goddess (or: *Devī*).

The difficulty therefore is: if *kāmaloḥka* is truly not available in Sanskrit, has the author of the *Kuñjarakaṇṇa* forged the compound by himself combining the very common items *kāma* and *loka* ? The answer to this would seem to be in the negative, since 1) the parallel termini *arūpaloka* and *rūpaloka* are also not attested in Sanskrit or Old Javanese, and 2) the expected Sanskrit terms *kāmadhātu*, *rūpadhātu* and *arūpadhātu* are attested in the Old Javanese *Saṅ Hyañ Kamahāyānikan*.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, because the words *kāmadhātu*, etc., are attested in Old Javanese, it does not seem plausible that the poet would have assumed the interchangeability of *loka* and *dhātu* unless he knew that *loka* in this Buddhist cosmological sense existed. Consequently, it is likely that the term *kāmaloḥka*, meaning the world(s) subject to desire, is borrowed from Pāli, where we find *kāma-*, *rūpa-* and *arūpaloka* as precise cosmological equivalents to *kāma-*, *rūpa-* and *arūpadhātu* in Sanskrit.

Beyond the merely linguistic interest of an addition to the trifling number of Pāli loan words in Old Javanese, the import of this conclusion is that there must have existed, at some time or another and at some place or another in the Archipelago, a Pāli text from which this word could have been borrowed.<sup>2</sup> As for which text, where and when, it is impossible to say with any certainty. Given that the Ratu Baka inscription of 792/3 A.D. mentions the foundation of the monastery *Abhayagiri* for the Sinhalese (*abhayagirivihāraḥ kāritaḥ sinhalānām*)<sup>3</sup> and given the

<sup>1</sup> Kats 1910: 55.4, 10, 13 respectively.

<sup>2</sup> As a cosmological term *kāmaloḥka* also may be distinguished from the material items cushion (*pataraṇa*) and throne (*palaṅka*) furnished by Ensink (supra).

<sup>3</sup> cf. de Casparis 1961. Sarkar (1971: p. 48) translates “The people of Ceylon

mention of Sinhalese as foreigners resident on Java in inscriptions of king Airlāṅga in the eleventh century,<sup>1</sup> we may opine that this may have been many centuries before the composition of the Kuñjarakarmadharmakathana. Indeed, it is conceivable that this could have been as early as the seventh century, since I Ching observes that *āgama* texts on Buddha's *nirvāṇa* were translated in Java and since, according to Gonda (1975: p. 7), these texts belonged to the "Hīnayāna". Further, we may refer to the work of Lokesh Chandra (1986) who makes a reasonable case for the existence of Abhayagirivāsins hailing from Ceylon on Java. Accordingly, one may conjecture that *kāmaloka* as a Pāli loan word in Old Javanese might ultimately have been borrowed from one or other text brought to Java by these monks sometime prior to 792/3, the date of the Ratu Baka inscription.

Lastly, an observation: even if one should prefer to hold, when all is said and done, that *kāmaloka* in the Old Javanese Kuñjarakarmadharmakathana was minted in Java itself, it is, from an anthropological perspective, not insignificant that \**kāmaloka* is seemingly absent in the enormous literature available in Sanskrit. Given the multifaceted compass of this literature, its lack is all the more piquant. One can only wonder why the term is not available, for, after all, given that the god Kāma also has the name Anaṅga, 'he without a body', one is inclined to suspect that some adroit Sanskrit poet would have found occasion to make a word-play on these two terms. That, somewhere, sometime, no one did make such a palpably obvious pun must mean something, if only that this would seem to presuppose the omnipresence — sensate and religious — of the realm of desire.

Vienna

Max Nihom

have erected the monastery called Abhayagiri". See also Chandra 1986, who discusses this inscription with reference to its bearing on the Barabudur.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Ensink, *loc. cit.*

## Bibliography

- Apte 1975 Vaman Shivam Apte, *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 4th rev. ed., Delhi, 1975.
- Lokesh Chandra 1976 Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, 2 vols., Kyoto, 1976 (reprint of 12 volume 1959 edition).
- Chandra 1986 id., "Cultural Contacts of Indonesia and Sri Lanka in the Eighth Century and Their Bearing on the Barabudur", *Journal of the Asiatic Society* 28 (1986), pp. 38–54.
- Childers 1875 Robert Caesar Childers, *A Dictionary of the Pāli Language*, London, 1875.
- Conze 1967 Edward Conze, *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, Tokyo, 1967.
- de Casparis 1961 J.G. de Casparis, "New Evidence on Cultural Relations between Java and Ceylon in Ancient Times", *Artibus Asiae* 24 (1961), pp. 241–48.
- Das 1985 Sarat Chandra Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Kyoto, 1985 (reprint of 1902 edition).
- Edgerton 1970 F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Delhi, 1970.
- Ensink 1978 J. Ensink, "Śiva-Buddhism in Java and Bali", pp. 178–198 in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, edited by Heinz Bechert (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, I, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, nr. 108), Göttingen, 1978.
- Gonda 1975 J. Gonda, "The Indian Religions in Pre-Islamic Indonesia and Their Survival in Bali", *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, III. Abteilung, II. Band, Abschnitt 1, Leiden, 1975, pp. 1–54.

- Gonda 1973 J. Gonda, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, 2nd. ed., Delhi, 1973 (ŚataPīṭaka Series vol. 99).
- Goudriaan and Hooykaas  
1971 T. Goudriaan and C. Hooykaas, *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava) of Balinese Brahmin Priests*, Amsterdam, 1971.
- Hirakawa 1973 Akira Hirakawa, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Tokyo, 1973.
- Kats 1910 J. Kats, *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan*, 's-Gravenhage, 1910.
- Monier-Williams  
1899 Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899.
- Mylius 1980 Klaus Mylius, *Wörterbuch Sanskrit-Deutsch*, Leipzig, 1980.
- Rhys Davids  
1925 T.W. Rhys Davids, The Pāli Text Society's *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Chipstead, 1925.
- Sara and Thakar  
1962 B.J. Sandhi Sara and J.P. Thakar, *Lexicographic Studies in 'Jaina Sanskrit'*, Baroda, 1962.
- Sarkar 1971 Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, vol. 1 (of 2), Calcutta, 1971.
- Sircar 1966 D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphic Glossary*, Delhi, 1966.
- Schmidt 1928 Richard Schmidt, *Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1928.
- Teeuw and Robson  
1981 A. Teeuw and S. Robson, *Kuñjarakarna Dharmakathana*, The Hague, 1981 (Bibliotheca Indonesica 21).
- Zoetmulder  
1982 P.J. Zoetmulder, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*, 2 vols, Leiden, 1982.

## VIMUTTIMAGGA AND ABHAYAGIRI: THE FORM-AGGREGATE ACCORDING TO THE SAMSKRĪTĀSAMSKRĪTA-VINIŚCAYA

### A. Introduction

The *Vimuttimaggā* is a comprehensive manual of the Theravādin school; lost in the original Pāli (or, less probably, Sanskrit),<sup>1</sup> it is preserved in a complete Chinese translation, made by a *bhikṣu* of Funan in the early 6th century.<sup>2</sup> This version has been translated into English in full under the title *The Path of Freedom*.<sup>3</sup>

While both Chinese and Pāli sources agree that the name of the author is Upatissa (Skt Upaṭiṣya),<sup>4</sup> there is some confusion about the Sanskrit form of the translator's name. In 1883 Bunyiu Nanjio gave the name Saṃghapāla, with the alternative Saṃghavarman.<sup>5</sup> In 1915 Sylvain Lévi rejected the form Saṃghapāla as erroneous, and suggested

<sup>1</sup> cf. Bechert 1992, pp. 95–96, and Skilling 1993A, p. 167. See, however, Louis Renou and Jean Filliozat (edd.), *L'Inde classique II* (Hanoi, 1953) § 2147: “à en juger par les noms ou termes transcrits, la version chinoise du *Chemin de la Libération* ne semble pas être faite sur un original de langue pāli; on n'y trouve aucun nom singhalais ... tout indique, pour cet original, une origine indienne et non singhalaise”. Sylvain Lévi (1915, p. 26) notes, with reference to the *Mahāmāyūrī*, that \*Saṃghabhara “paraît être un sanscritiste et un indianiste médiocre”.

<sup>2</sup> T 1648 (Vol. XXXII), KBC 968, *Chieh t'o tao lun*.

<sup>3</sup> See Bibliography: the English translation is hereafter referred to as *Path*.

<sup>4</sup> The name, prefaced by “arhat”, is transcribed at the head of the Chinese version; in the *Visuddhimagga* Commentary the author is described as *thera* (*Paramatthamañjusā*, cited at *Path* xxxvi, *ekacce ti upatissatheraṃ sandhāyāha, tena hi vimuttimagge tathā vuttam*).

<sup>5</sup> Bunyiu Nanjio, *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka, the Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan*, [Oxford, 1883] San Francisco, 1975, § 1293 “Saṃghapāla”; Appendix II § 102, “Saṃghapāla or Saṃghavarman”.