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When I published the first part of the present paper a few years ago, the Maldives were witnessing slow but steady progress in opening the country for scholarly investigations concerning their prehistory, i.e., the time before the twelfth century C.E. when the islands were converted to Islam; the fruitful cooperation with Maldivian scholars in the publication of the Buddhist Prakrit inscription that was the object of my study then is a good example of this. With the first democratic elections of a president and the establishment of a liberal government in 2008, interest in the remnants of the pre-Islamic times grew even stronger, and news about successful excavations of Buddhist artefacts were reported here and there. This progress came to a sudden end in the first months of 2012 when the democratic government was overthrown in a coup d’état, with Islamicists playing a considerable role. One side effect of this was the deliberate destruction of nearly all Buddhist (or Buddhist-looking) artefacts in the National Museum of Male by a group of masked bandits on Feb. 7, 2012. It is not yet clear whether the Prakrit dhāraṇī inscription from Landhoo I treated in Gippert 2004a was among the artefacts concerned; what is clear, however, is that this inexcusable act of vandalism did annhilate, in a strange way.

1 For the first part of this paper cf. Gippert 2004a. — My thanks are due to Chlodwig H. Werba, Arlo Griffiths, Martin Delhey, Anne MacDonald, and anonymous reviewers who read a previous version of the present paper and made extremely valuable comments. All remaining errors are mine, of course.
3 This is at least suggested by the report on http://tinyurl.com/glimpse2-3.
resumption of twelfth century practices, the most intriguing monuments of written Buddhist Sanskrit on the Maldives, viz., two multi-faced statues with obvious Vajrayāna features and lengthy inscriptions on their surfaces, which were unearthed in the Islands’ capital, Māle, in the 1960s and which are generally assumed to date back to the ninth to tenth centuries. For the present investigation, which had planned to provide the first thorough analysis of these artefacts, the loss is indeed disastrous as the available photographs, albeit numerous and of high resolution, do not suffice for the reestablishment of the wording of the inscriptions in every detail. This is due in part to earlier damage to the statues; in some cases, however, a visual inspection of the original artefacts might have supplied decisive additional insights. As the plan to undertake such an inspection in situ has now become obsolete, the present paper must confine itself to summarizing what has been accomplished from afar since 2003, which means that some aspects must remain hypothetical or doubtful.

At first glance, the two inscribed statues, which were assigned the shelfmarks IC 009 and IC 010 when I last visited the National Museum of Male in 2003, seem not to share many details, except for the fact that they are both made from coral stone, which is the only material available on the Maldives for producing lithic epigraphs, and the fact that several faces are carved on their sides (cf. Fig. 1 and 2). One of the statues, IC 010, is shaped like an inverted cone (ca. 80 × 50 × 40 cm) with rounded edges and a level top; it presents two faces with large earlobes, one above the other, on what is likely to have been its foreside, and one face each on its left, right, and backside and its top. The major part of the inscrip-

4. The destruction of Buddhist artefacts (statues) and institutions (monasteries) as well as the killing of Buddhist monks not willing to be converted to the new faith is mentioned in extenso in the Maldivian copper-plate grants (so-called rōmaiyanus); cf., e.g., the Isdu grant of ca. A.D. 1194 ("12", translated by Maniku – Wijayawardhana 1986: 2): “In the third year of his reign His Majesty (the great king Gadanaadheethiya), having destroyed the monastery erected previously on Isdho by the infidel kings, uprooted the image and destroyed it and having brought the ordained priests of the community of monks belonging to this monastery all together to Maale and [sic!] beheaded them.” For the name of the king which should rather be read gaganādhiya – skt. gaganādhiya “sun of the sky”, cf. Gippert 2003: 34, n. 13.

5. Cf. Gippert 2005 for a preliminary account of these inscriptions.


7. My thanks are due to Naseema Mohamed and the staff of the National Centre for Linguistic and Historical Research, Male, who supported me from 1993 to 2003 in taking the photographs underlying the present paper.


tation on it runs in a spiral around the four sides of its upper part and continues, in spiral shape again, on the top; minor parts are written on the sinistral (proper left) side and between the two faces on the foreside. In contrast to this statue, IC 009 is shaped like a rectangular block (ca. 60 × 40 × 30 cm). It has six faces as well, with a similar distribution (the face on the top is heavily worn); all are adorned with thick lips and moustaches, and the big face on the foreside also has large earlobes. Its inscription is located on the foreside, distributed into four parts, with an additional two-line fragment on the dextral (proper right) side. Both inscriptions are written in an archaic variant of the Insular Brāhmī cursive script that is sometimes styled evēla akuru, i.e., script (Maldivian akuru < skt. aksara) of yore (e vēla “that time”), which bears much more similarity with the script of the early Islamic period (used, e.g., in the Islamic copperplate grants of the twelfth century) than with that of the Landhoo inscription.10

Considering the differences in the outer appearance of the two statues, it may seem astonishing that the text of the inscriptions they bear reveals itself to be virtually the same. Its beginning is missing on IC 009 where it must have comprised two lines above the text visible today, split into two halves on the upper part of the foreside, left and right of the remnants of the lower part of the face on the top (cf. Fig. 2 and 4); these lines were presumably washed off because the top of the statue was not buried in the ground and thus remained exposed to erosion by water and sand. The visible part of the inscription continues with the two lines on the dextral angle, then in the dextral and sinistral areas below the ears of the main face on the foreside. On IC 010, the inscription starts right above the top of the nose of the upper face on the foreside and runs upward spirally, then continues on the top (in inward direction); its end is added on the lower part of the sinistral and back side. The two text lines between the two faces on the foreside have no counterpart on IC 009 and can therefore be regarded as an explanatory addition; an assumption which is supported by the decipherment of the texts under discussion and their identification. To visualize the complex arrangement of the texts, the inscriptions are redrawn in colours in Fig. 3ff., with identical colours indicating identical content on both statues. It has been suggested for IC 009 that it may have represented a vighnāntaka serving the function of a dvārapāla or doorkeeper in a sanctuary.11 On the basis

---

10 Cf. Gippert 2013: Table 1 for a paleographical synopsis of the scripts used on the Maldives in historical times.

of the evidence now available, we may safely posit that the statues represent
the head of the “Kings of Wrath” of Tantric Buddhism, specifically Yamāntaka,
for it is this kroḍhatājan that is addressed in the “additional” text on IC 010,
and the parallel text of the two inscriptions is a mantra pertaining to his invo-
cation. The mantra in its turn is nearly identical with the versions appearing in
the Guhyasamājatantra12 (GST, within ch. 14)13 and in the Mahājusrīmālakalpa14
(MMK, within ch. 115 and, with only slight differences, ch. 52,16 one of the
chapters devoted to Yamāntaka).17
All in all, the common text of the two inscriptions can be divided into thirty-
five meaningful units (not necessarily sentences but rather phrases or syntagms,
including vocative formulae and interjections).18 In Table 1, the proposed read-

---

12 The Sanskrit text of the Tantra is available in five editions which exhibit only slight differ-
ences in the concerned passages: the editio princeps of 1931 in Devanāgarī script by B. Bhat-
tacharya (here: GST), two further Indian editions in Devanāgarī (Bagchi 1965 and Dwarikadas
1984, the latter obviously a mere reproduction of the former), and two editions in Latin transcrip-
tion (Fremantle 1971 and Matsunaga 1978). An English translation is provided in Fremantle
1971, which, however, skips the mantras. In addition, Fremantle 1971 contains a full transcript of
the Tibetan version of the text. A Chinese version is available in text no. 855 of the Taishō canon
(T. 18, p. 469c–511b).
13 GST p. 79, l. 20 – p. 80, l. 10; Bagchi 1965 – Dwarikadas 1984: 65,13-20; Fremantle 1971:
298,10-300,3; Matsunaga 1978: 61,8-25; Tibetan in Fremantle 1971: 299,16-27; Chinese in T.
18, p. 489a,l-23.
14 The full Sanskrit text of the Kalpa (here: MMK) is represented in a single manuscript from
India first edited by T. Ganapati Śāstrī in three volumes between 1920 and 1925; the second edi-
tion by Vaidya 1965 exhibits no noteworthy differences in the passages consulted for the present
article (except for a more extensive use of duṇḍas for the delimitation of textual units). An Eng-
lish translation of several mantras of the text is given in Wallis 2002; a French translation mostly
of chapter 2 can be found in Macdonald 1962.
15 MMK I/15,23-16,6 – Vaidya 1965: 10,31-11,7. Chapter 1 of the MMK is contained in text
no. 1191 of the Chinese Taishō canon (including the mantra in question: T. 20, p. 843b18-844a3).
16 MMK II/577,17-26 – Vaidya 1965: 449,31-450,6. The second part of text no. 1216 of the
Chinese Taishō Canon (T. 21, p. 79b-81a) is regarded as a parallel of ch. 52 of the MMK (cf.
Matsunaga 1985: 884 with n. 13; Wallis 2002: 172; Macdonald 1962: 16); it does not contain the
mantra, however. Instead, the mantra is found again (in a slightly distorted version) in Taishō text
no. 1218 (T. 21, p. 95a29-b23).
17 Cf. Limrothe 1999: 63-83 for a comprehensive account of the iconography of Yamāntaka in
the period in question here. — I am heavily indebted to Arlo Griffiths and an anonymous reviewer
of the present article who – independently – drew my attention to these two texts and the striking
parallels they represent. My thanks are also due to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft which
funded my sojourn as a Petra Kappert Fellow at the Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures,
University of Hamburg, in the summer of 2013, thus providing an excellent basis for research
into these texts.
18 Similar – though not necessarily identical – divisions are found in several of the editions of
the Sanskrit and Chinese texts mentioned above. They will only be dealt with when they provide
crucial evidence.
ings are contrasted, unit by unit, with each other and with a tentative reconstruction of the underlying text and its translation; all items are treated in detail in the commentary below, with reference to the parallels available. It must be stated beforehand that the orthographical representation of the Sanskrit text is odd in both inscriptions, features of spoken (Old) Maldivian interfering throughout. This is true, e.g., for the missing distinction of sibilants, the disregard of h and aspiration, and the overall confusion of long and short vowels and single and geminate consonants. In addition, the grammatical rules of Sanskrit, including sandhi rules, are often transgressed, and additional signs such as anusvāras or visargas are often missing.

Table 1: Synoptical Arrangement of the Two Inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>IC 010</th>
<th>IC 009</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8a-b</td>
<td>(a1)</td>
<td>na-ma-s</td>
<td>sa-ma-n-ta-[a-v]&lt;ā-kṣi-ta-va-dra-(nā)m</td>
<td>namas</td>
<td>*samantakāyavākittavajrāṇām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homage to the Vajras (of) body, speech and mind all around!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>8b</th>
<th>'ōm</th>
<th>**</th>
<th></th>
<th>18</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'ōm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oṃ!

|------|------|------------|------|------------|------------|------|

kha kha kha khāhi khāhi

Eat, eat, eat, devour, devour!

---

19 Cf. Gippert 2004b and 2013 on the background of these effects.

20 Continuing the practice introduced in Gippert 2004a, in the transliteration of the inscriptions, angle brackets (< >) denote aksaras restored in lacunae; square brackets ([ ]), uncertain readings; (round) parentheses, less certain readings; and curled braces ( { }, gaps that were probably caused by primate damage of the surface and not filled with aksaras (with dash, —, indicating their length). The underscore (_) indicates word boundaries within aksaras; the hyphen, aksara boundaries within words. The backslash indicates line breaks; the slash, the split of longer horizontal lines across the face of IC 009. In order to facilitate paleographic analyses, ū (with a circumflex) stands for the (short) u vowel written with a closed loop, ȷ for the virāma-shaped ū; ṛ denotes the consonantal r indicated by a hook above the following aksara. Consonantless aksaras are introduced by ’ (in order to distinguish them from the consonantless aksaras emerging from the va-series; cf. 1 and 5 below), virānas by ’. Double asterisks (***) indicate un-restored aksaras. — In the lines containing the reconstructed text, only the most uncertain cases are marked with an asterisk, the restitution of missing anusvāras etc. remaining unmarked, and sandhi is not regularized. Elements that are only attested in one of the two inscriptions are indicated by (round) parentheses in the reconstructed text and the translation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>IC 010</th>
<th>IC 009</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8c–d</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa-[r]va-du-sṭa-tā-nā</td>
<td>sarvaduṣṭatānāṃ damaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>da-ma-ka</td>
<td>Tamer of all evil beings!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>(a2)</td>
<td>ya-si-m(ū)-(sa)-la-pa-ra- Śū-pā-(sā)-sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asimusalamaprāśapāsahasta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(You who have a) sword, pestle, axe and snare in (your) hands!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa-ḍmū-ka sa-<a href="s">d</a>a-ra</td>
<td>saḍmukha *ṣaṭcarana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>-;&lt;/(dmū)-[ka s</em>-**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Six-faced (one), six-legged (one)!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8b–c</td>
<td></td>
<td>ga-sa</td>
<td>gaccha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*<em>-</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8b–c</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa-ṝva-du-sṭi-pr[i]-na-ba-ri-ne</td>
<td>sarvaduṣṭapraṇabhārīne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*<em>-</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remover of the breath (of life) of all evil (beings)!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8c–d</td>
<td></td>
<td>mā-vi-gna</td>
<td>*mahāvighnagāta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*-](g)nā-ga-ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great destroyer of obstacles!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8c–d</td>
<td></td>
<td>vi-kra-ta-nya-na</td>
<td>*vikṛtānana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[i]-na-yā-na/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ugly-faced (one)!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8a–b</td>
<td>(a3)</td>
<td>sa-ṝva-bu-ṭa-baṃ-ku(ā)-ra</td>
<td>sarvabhūtabhayamkara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*<em>-</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Causer of fear to all beings!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8a–b</td>
<td>(a3)</td>
<td>‘a-ṭṭā-ṭṭā-sa-na</td>
<td>*attāṭṭahasānādine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*<em>-</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(You) who roar with loud laughter!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vyāghracarmanivāsa
(You) who are clad in a tiger's skin!

kuru (kuru) *sarvakarmān
Perform, (perform) all deeds!

chinda chinda sarvaparamantram
Break, break all mantra(s) of opponents!

bhinda bhinda paramantram
Split, split the mantras of opponents!

ākarsaya (ākarsaya) sarvabhūtaṃ
Attract, (attract) all living being(s)!

nirmāthaya (nirmāthaya) *sarvaduṣṭān
Grind, (grind) all evil beings!

praveśaya maṇḍalamadhye
Let (them) enter into the (middle of the) maṇḍala!

*vaivasvatāṃgaghātine
Destroyer of the limb(s) of the Vivasvatid!
Unit | Fig. | Line | IC 010 | IC 009 | Line | Fig.
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
21 | 10 | (b2) ka-ra ka-ra | <ka>-ra ka-ra | 22 | | 

kara kara
Doer, doer!

22 | 10 | (b2) kuru [kuru] ma-ma ku-ru ku-ru ma-ma ka-[iðha]-n | | 22 | | 

kuru kuru mama kāryaṁ
Do, do the work for me!

23 | 10 | [da-ya da-ya] da-ya (da-ya) \ | | 22 | | 

daha daha
Burn, burn!

24 | 10 | <pa-cha> [pa-ch]a | [b2] | 22 | | 
*paca paca
Cook, cook!

25 | 10 | ma-[hā vi-la-m]ba ma-hā ma-hā vi-la-mba vi-la-[m]ba ma-[hā]-(b)ā v(i)-la-mba | | [c1] | 22-24 | 

mā vilamba, mā vilamba
Do not tarry, do not tarry!

26 | 10 | sa-ma-ya-m_a-nu-sama-ra sa-(ma-) | | [c2] | 24 | 

samayam anusmara
Remember the convention!

27 | 10 | (b3) huṇh huṇh huṇh huṇh \ huṇh huṇh | | [c3] | 24 | 

Huṃ huṃ huṃ!

28 | 10 | (b4) pa-ṭ' \ pa-ṭ' \ pa-ṭ' \ pa-tú pa-ṭ' \ | | [c4] | 24 | 

phaṭ phaṭ (phaṭ)
Phaṭ phaṭ (phaṭ)!

29 | 12 | (c1-3) vi-ṣ[po]-{—}[(a][a] \ vi-sū-[ṣa]-[y]a \ vi-spo-<ṣa>-[y][a] sa- \ | | [d1-2] | 24-26 | 

visphoṭaya visphoṭaya *sarvavighnān
Shatter, shatter all obstacles!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>IC 010</th>
<th>IC 009</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(c4)</td>
<td>*sa ri-pu-[n]</td>
<td>*sa-[ya ri-pu-n_</td>
<td>[d3]</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *nāśaya ripān*

Destroy the enemies!

| 31   | 12   | (c4-5) | ka-ra ka                | _ka-ra ka^[1]: ra               | [d3-4] | 26   |

kara *kara

Doer, doer!

| 32   | 12-14| (c5-d1) | (‘ē) [ba]-ga-vā-{-}-(n’) | (‘ē ba)-ga-(va-n’ va)-dra va-dra | [d4-5] | 26   |

*he bhagavan vajra*

O Lord Vajra!

| 33   | 14   | (d1)  | ki-n_sī-ra-ya           | ki_n_sī-ra-ya                   | [d5]  | 26   |

kim *cirāyasī*

Why do you delay?

| 34   | 14   | (d2-3)| ma-ma sa-ivyavya-[i]ṭṭha | ma-ima sa-bba-[ya]-[It]          | [d6-8] | 26   |

mama sarva-arthaṃ sādhaya

Let all my purpose(s) succeed!

| 35   | 14   | (d4)  | sva-ha                  | sva-[h]a                        | [e1]  | 26   |

svāhā

Hail!

| 36   | 16   | (e1-2)| ‘oṁ [y]ya-ma-[nta]-ka   | [hun]                            | —     | —    |

‘oṁ Yamāntaka huṃ

Oṃ Yamāntaka huṃ!

---

1. *namas *samantakāyavācittavajrānām “Homage to the Vajras (of) body, speech and mind all around!” The reconstruction is based on the greeting formula introducing the mantra in all versions of GST (including the Chinese and the Tibetan) but not in MMK, where other deities are addressed by Mañjuśrī. The text of IC 010 is defective as the first syllable of kāya “body” is missing; as in other subsequent cases, this may be due to a quasi-haplography, here

---

caused by the similarity of the ta- and ka-akṣaras in evēla akuru.\(^{22}\) The rest of the spelling peculiarities can be regarded as typical for the Old Maldive writing tradition. This is first of all true for the rendering of ya (of käya) by way of the plain vowel akṣara, 'a, which is the natural consequence of the functional merger of the ya-akṣaras with the consonantless series we consistently observe in the documents of the early Islamic period.\(^{23}\) It is further true for the rendering of c (in cītta) by s, as Maldive no longer differentiated between Sanskrit’s sibilants (including c) and the rare cluster \(^{24}\) could thus easily be substituted by more common \(^{24}\) Third, it is true for the replacement of short i in cītta by long ī, which may be regarded as a “hyper-sanskritism” caused by the loss of length distinction in vowels in the prehistory of Maldive.\(^{25}\) And fourth, it is true for the replacement of skt. j (in vajra) by “Maldive” ð which is met with regularly in written records.\(^{26}\) The assumption that we have a compound a-rakṣita-vajra “unguarded Vajra!” here as proposed earlier\(^{27}\) must be given up on the basis of the evidence provided by the parallel in GST. — The spelling of the retroflex nasal in the genitive plural ending, -ṇām,\(^{28}\) is noteworthy as the akṣara in the given form might be mistaken for īm; however, the assumption of a bija syllable ām (following a vocative -vajra) can be ruled out in the given context.

2. oī. In the two inscriptions, the spelling with candrabindu occurs regularly in oī (here and in 36 below) and in huī (three times in 27). Given the frequent neglect of anusvāras, this is remarkable indeed as an indication of the eruditeness of the scribes. It may be noted here again that the text of IC 010 is closer to that of GST as MMK 1 has uī instead according to the editions (vs. oī in MMK 52).

3. kakkakka kai kai clearly matches the sequence of bija syllables reflecting imperatives of the meaning “eat”, “devour”\(^{29}\) we find at the given position of the mantra in GST and MMK (in both ch. 1 and 52) in the form kha kha khāhi

\(^{22}\) Cf. the paleographic table in Gippert 2013.

\(^{23}\) Cf. Gippert 2013: 91 on this phenomenon.

\(^{24}\) Cf. Gippert 2004b: 189 (note that evēla akuru did not possess a special ligature for ks as almost all other Indic scripts do).

\(^{25}\) Cf. Gippert 2004a: 99 and unit 35 below on this phenomenon.

\(^{26}\) The same is true for (later) Arabic loans; cf. Gippert 2003: 41.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Gippert 2005: 216.

\(^{28}\) In the MMK, the genitive is used instead of the dative in the majority of cases when a plural is addressed in the greeting formula.

khāhi. Different from these texts, IC 010 seems to provide a double repetition of the first element, a phenomenon which occurs later on, too (cf. 27 and 28). The rendering of kh by k as well as the neglect of skt. h in kai (for khāhi) is unproblematic as consonantal aspiration and the h consonant proper were lost early in the history of Maldivean. 

4. sarvaduṣṭaṭānām damaka “Tamer of all evil beings!” The vocative formula slightly deviates from GST and MMK which have compounds throughout instead of the genitive syntagm assumed here (the missing anusvāra in the ending notwithstanding), and the text of IC 010 is the only one to provide a formation in -tā derived from duṣṭa “evil” (lit. “evilness”), here probably used in a collective sense. Nevertheless, the text form is again closer to GST than to MMK, which has duṣṭasattvadamaka with sarva- “all” missing but -sattva- “being” added (in both chapters 1 and 52); in the witnesses of GST, we find sarvaduṣṭadamaka (in the critical text of all editions) alongside sarva-duṣṭasattvadamaka (in the Chinese and Tibetan versions as well as a few Sanskrit manuscripts).

5. asinisalaparāṣupāśahasta “(You who have a) sword, pestle, axe and snare (in your) hands!” Except for marginal spelling differences concerning musala “pestle”, the same bahuvrīhi compound is found in GST and in the first chapter of MMK. The spelling present in IC 010, with ya instead of ‘a, s instead of ś, and -ā- instead of -a-, may again be regarded as unproblematic (cf. 1 and 3 above).

30 With but a minor variant reported by Matsunaga 1978: 61 n. 9 for the Tibetan version of GST (“T”: khākhāhi); Fremantle 1971: 299,16 has regular “KHĀHI KHĀHI” for the Tibetan.

31 A similar sequence is found in the Taishō canon (vbīṣṭaḥ-paddhati); no. 963: T. 19, p. 338a2-3; no. 964: T. 19, p. 338b25, as well as even longer repetitions (vbīṣṭaḥ-paddhati) kakākakākaka kākaikaiākāikākāka; no. 997: T. 19, p. 568c11-12). The version of the Yamāntaka mantra appearing in no. 1218 has distorted kha kha kha kha hi hi (vbīṣṭaḥ-paddhati [T. 21, p. 95b5-6]).


33 Chinese 薬王頂恥世吒伽那摩迦 (T. 18, p. 489a2-3); Tibetan “SARBADUṢṬATVADAMAKA” (Fremantle 1971: 299,17), sarvaduṣṭastattvadamaka mss. A and T; (Matsunaga 1978: 61, n. 10). sarvaduṣṭadamaka is well attested in other Tantric texts such as the STTS, too (e.g., ahum bhogavadbhiḥ sarvatahāgataḥ sarvaduṣṭadamaka 11 in 2,6: 182,2; similarly 2,11: 253,6).

34 The edīto princeps of GST has the remarkable form -mūsala- (p. 79,21), taken over without any comment by Matsunaga 1978: 61,12. The latter author quotes “BG” for the spelling -musā-, which the work in question (Bagchi 1965: 65,14) does not show. The spelling -mukha- reported by Matsunaga for three Tokyo manuscripts (Tt, Tl, Tr) is noteworthy, though worthless.

35 In MMK 52, the sequence of paraśu and pāśa is inverted in the compound (cf. MMK III/577,20 – Vaidya 1965: 450,1).
6. ṡadmukha *sātcaraṇa “Six-faced (one), six-legged (one)!” This is the first unit that is attested, at least in parts, in both inscriptions, the ligature *-dmu- being discernible as the first element of the preserved text of IC 009. Leaving aside the confusion of sibilants, the less usual internal sandhi that we find in both inscriptions (*-dm- instead of *-nm-), as well as the missing internal sandhi and the omission of the final syllable of *sātcaraṇa in IC 010, we here have a major deviation from both GST and MMK where the latter word is preceded by caturbhuya “four-armed” and caturmukha “four-faced” instead of “six-faced.” The text restitution proposed here is nevertheless strongly supported by the fact that the statues themselves bear (or once bore) six faces; in addition, there is clear evidence for Yamāntaka being imagined with six faces elsewhere in the Tantric tradition, especially in another mantra in MMK (ch. 2) which contains the phrase sanmukha sadbhuya sātcaraṇa (cf. also 13 below).

7. gaccha “Go!” With this imperative formula, the text of IC 010 is closer to that of MMK which has reduplicated gaccha in both chapters 1 and 52, while GST provides double āgaccha “Come!” in most of its witnesses; however, we cannot exclude that an initial ā- was omitted, either as an individual aksara or in a sandhi combination, together with the final syllable of *sātcaraṇa preceding it. The rendering of *-cch- by *-ss- is unproblematic (cf. unit 1 above) though the retention of the gemination remains noteworthy.

8. sarvaduṣṭaprāṇahārīne “Remover of the breath (of life) of all evil (beings)!" The restitution of the compound is based upon the text of GST again which contains the form sarvaduṣṭaprāṇahārīne at the same position. The meaning assumed here (“remover” instead of more neutral “carrier”) is suggested by the

---

38 In this order in MMK (ch. 1 and 52) as well as the Chinese and the Tibetan versions of GST (*sātcaraṇa* sātcaraṇa) in T. 18, p. 489a4-5; “TSATURBHHUDZA TSATURMUKHA SATTSAVARANA” in Fremantle 1971: 299,17-18 and in the version appearing in text no. 1218 in the Taishō canon (sātcaraṇa sātcaraṇa sātcaraṇa in T. 21, p. 215b7-8). The editions of the Sanskrit text of GST have caturmukha caturbhuya instead.

37 The translation in Macdonald 1962: 25, “Toi qui as six têtes, toi qui as quatre têtes”, is obviously due to a lapsus calami (but nevertheless further rendered into English by Linrothe 1999: 64).

36 In this order in MMK (ch. 1 and 52) as well as the Chinese and the Tibetan versions of GST (*sātcaraṇa* sātcaraṇa) in T. 18, p. 489a4-5; “TSATURBHHUDZA TSATURMUKHA SATTSAVARANA” in Fremantle 1971: 299,17-18 and in the version appearing in text no. 1218 in the Taishō canon (sātcaraṇa sātcaraṇa sātcaraṇa in T. 21, p. 215b7-8). The editions of the Sanskrit text of GST have caturmukha caturbhuya instead.


40 The mantra version in the Taishō text no. 1218 has distorted gagagachacha (伽伽伽伽) in T. 21, p. 95b8-9).

41 gaccha gaccha is met with in mss. A and T of GST.
Chinese and Tibetan versions of GST which have more explicit -apahārīne; the replacement of -hārīne by -bhārīne remains remarkable, however, as does the vocative form in -e (but cf. 12 and 20 below). In MMK, the unit is missing throughout, as well as in the Yamāntaka mantra of text no. 1218 of the Chinese Taishō canon. In IC 010, we seem to read -duṣṭi- instead of -duṣṭa- which, however, would not alter the meaning.

9. *mahāvīghnahāta “Great destroyer of obstacles!” The restitution of the defective text of the two inscriptions is again supported by the Chinese and Tibetan versions of GST which, in accordance with MMK (ch. 1 and 52), have mahāvīghnahātaka, while the Sanskrit text of GST provides mahāvīghnātaka instead. The last compound member is missing in IC 010, possibly by quasi-haplography after -gma, but clearly discernible in IC 009. The spelling of skt. mahā- as mā- is unproblematic (cf. 5 above), even less so since the inverse effect of the loss of h (skt. mā “hypercorrectly” spelt mahā) occurs elsewhere (cf. 25 below).

10. *vikṛtānana “Ugly-faced (one)!” Different from the restitutions we have undertaken so far, the present one is anything but certain. It is clearly suggested by all versions of the mantra in GST and MMK, however, IC 010 and IC 009 seem to agree in reading vi-kra-ta-nya-na-ya-ya, which would suggest something like *vikrta-nyānayana, a compound unattested otherwise. As Yamāntaka is assigned an ugly face or shape in other expressions, too, a meaning like “Restorer of ugly (things)!” remains unlikely.

42 哨毘僧惹吒銘釋僧銘賀哩尼 (T. 18, p. 489a6-7); “SARBADUŚṬAPĀNĀPAHĀRĪNE” (Fremantle 1971: 299,18-19). According to Matsunaga 1978: 61, n. 13, sarvaduṣṭaprāṇapahārīne is also found in the Tokyo ms. T1.

43 Vocatives in -e of stems in -in- seem to be a characteristic feature of the Tantric texts under consideration; cf. also the vocatives mentioned in n. 47 below.

44 摩利迦近師多伽 (T. 18, p. 489a7-8); “MAHĀVĪGHNAHĀTAKA” (Fremantle 1971: 299,19). The Chinese version of MMK (ch. 1) has महाविग्नहातक (T. 20, p. 843b28), the mantra in Taishō no. 1218, 摩利迦近伽摩迦 (T. 21, p. 95b9).

45 According to the editions, a variant vighnahātaka is found in mss. A and T; it remains unclear whether mahā- is missing in these cases. The formations vighnahātaka and -āntaka are synonymous.

46 Matsunaga 1978: 61 n. 15 claims -ne for the Tibetan text of GST (“T”) but this is not confirmed by Fremantle 1971: 299,19 who transcribes “BIKRITĀNANA” vikṛtānana is also found in Taishō no. 1218 (尾訶哩迦那陀 in T. 21, p. 95b9); cf. 尾訶哩伽那陀 in the Chinese version of MMK ch. 1 (T. 20, p. 843b28-29) and 尾訶哩伽那陀 in the Chinese version of GST (T. 18, p. 489a8).

11. *sarvabhūtabhayāṇkara* “Causer of fear to all beings!” The compound is again attested in all versions of the mantra in GST and MMK\(^{48}\) so that the restitution of -bauṣ (in IC 010) to -b(h)ayauṣ - is justified.

12. *aṭṭāṭṭahāsanādine* “(You) who roar with loud laughter!” Even though the last two syllables are missing in IC 010 again, this restitution is beyond doubt as well, being supported by all versions of the mantra available.\(^{49}\) On the vocative in -e, cf. 8 above; on the missing reflex of h in IC 010, cf. 5 above.

13. *vyāghracarmanivāsa* “(You) who are clad in a tiger’s skin!” The restitution proposed here on the basis of both inscriptions deviates from the texts of both GST and MMK which show a different formation in the last compound member, viz. -nivasana, either in the vocative case (in MMK including its Chinese version as well as the Chinese and Tibetan texts of GST)\(^{50}\) or in the locative (or vocative?) case ending in -e (in the editions of the Sanskrit text of GST).\(^{51}\) The question as to which reading is better is related to the decision one makes regarding which root vas is to be assumed here, i.e., whether the reference is to “clothing” or “dwelling, residing”. The latter interpretation seems to be supported by the variant -nivesane occurring in ms. C of GST, which renders the same concept of “settling” or “dwelling”. However, contradictory evidence can be gained from another MMK passage, in the metric part of ch. 51, where *vyāghracarmanivasana* occurs alongside the bahuvihiṣṇu *ṣaṃmuṇha* “six-faced”, *ṣaṭcarana* “six-legged” (cf. 6 above), *keśavarna* “black-coloured”, and *vrkodara* “wolf-bellied” in describing Yamānta(ka) (MMK 51,10). That -nivasana must be understood as “wearing” the tiger’s skin wrapped around the hips here, is indicated by the Chinese version which explicitly paraprases

\(^{48}\) Also in Taishō text no. 1218: 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆 (T. 21, p. 95b10); cf. 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆 in the Chinese version of GST (T. 18, p. 489a8-9) and 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆 in the Chinese version of MMK (T. 20, p. 843b29).

\(^{49}\) Including Taishō no. 1218: 阿呹呹記呹呹呹呹 in the Chinese version of GST (T. 18, p. 489a9) and 阿呹呹記呹呹呹 in that of MMK (T. 20, p. 843b29).

\(^{50}\) 也伽婆左哩摩裡側薩義 in (T. 20, p. 843c1-2); 咚伽婆裡摩裡側薩義 in (T. 18, p. 489a9-10); “BYĀGHRAKTARMANIBASANA” (Fremantle 1971: 299,20). -nivasana seems also to be intended in the mantra version of Taishō no. 1218, which reads 昆耶迦羅摩裡摩裡摩裡摩裡摩 in that, but with a strange reduplication of -ma- in the middle (-mama- instead of -carma-) and an otherwise unmotivated -bhūta (?) added at the end. Cf. also the dative form clearly referring to a person (vyāghracarmanivasanāya svāha) in the Taishō dhāranīs no. 1111 (T. 20, p. 490a20-22; 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆, T. 10, p. 112c21-23: 晚夜併婆折弄伽婆伽婆 聖婆菩婆, and 1113A (T. 20, p. 498b7-8: 聖婆菩婆婆婆伽婆 聖婆菩婆).

\(^{51}\) Matsunaga 1978: 61, n. 16 adduces an accusative variant (“-nam”) from the Tokyo ms. T\(_{c}\).
“making (himself) a skirt with a tiger skin”.

The assumption that vyāghraracar-manivāsa denotes the “wearer” of a tiger’s skin rather than someone “dwelling” upon it thus has a good deal in its favour even though -nivāsa as a compound member seems to be more often attested in the sense of “abiding” or “residing” elsewhere.

14. kuru (kuru) *sarvakarmān “Perform, (perform) all deeds!” The restitution proposed presupposes gaps in both inscriptions, IC 010 omitting -rvaka- and showing but faint traces of the second kuru, and IC 009 leaving room for not more than two syllables before -karmān either. However, it seems well enough justified by the MMK parallel which has kuru kuru sarvakarmān in both chapters 1 and 52, thus opposing itself to the more regular kuru kuru sarvakarmāni of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of GST. This is the first of a series of sentences which commence with (reduplicated) imperative verb forms; the common structure also speaks in favour of the restitution.

15. chinda chinda sarvaparamantraṇ “Break, break all mantra(s) of opponents!” With sarvaparamantraṇ “all mantra(s) of opponents”, here obviously in an accusative singular form (but with no trace of the anusvāra) as the object of the reduplicated imperative, the text of the two inscriptions opposes itself to both GST and MMK which have sarvamantrān “all mantras” throughout. The insertion of -para- “opponent(s)” may have been triggered by the following sentence; this is all the more likely given the rhyming contrast with the

---

52 Taishō no. 1216 (T. 21, p. 77c14): 虎皮以為裙; cf. the translation of the complete passage (77c10-14) by Linrothe (1999: 66): “As for painting this image / The likeness of Yamantaka / Six faces, six arms and feet / Black in color, with a big belly / Bearing a skull, his hair flaring out in anger / A tiger skin wrapped around the hips”.

53 Cf. Wallis 2002: 82 who translates “wearer of tiger skins” in the given passage of MMK.

54 From the dictionaries we may quote, e.g., vṛksanivāsa “dwelling or living in a tree” (MW 1008b), kumanivāsa “where dwelling?” (MW 324b), or satapatramivāsa “abiding in a lotus” (MW 1049b).

55 Cf. BHSG 99 on the change of n-stems to a-stems and ib. 58 on “irregular” plural forms of the latter in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit.

56 The Chinese version of GST seems to read -karmān, thus matching the Sanskrit text of MMK and the Maldavian inscriptions.  

57 Including the Chinese and Tibetan versions as well as the mantra in Taishō no. 1218 (題陀薩婆蜜多彌 in T. 21, p. 95b12-13; cf. 視那覩那薩婆蜜多彌 in GST, T. 18, p. 489a11-12, and 順那覩那薩婆蜜多彌 in MMK, T. 20, p. 843c2-3).
16. bhinda bhinda paramantrān “Split, split the mantras of opponents!” Here again, the text of the two inscriptions differs from that of GST and MMK which have paramudrām “the seal of opponents” instead of -mantrān; the latter element may well have perseverated into the present sentence from the preceding one. The same effect is also visible in ms. A of GST, which has paramantrān, too.90 The addition of sarva- in IC 009 may be due to analogy with the surrounding units.

17. ākārṣaya (ākārṣaya) sarvabhūtām “Attract, (attract) all living being(s)!” Except for the accusative singular case form assumed here, the sentence agrees with GST again, which has -bhūtān in the Sanskrit and Chinese texts and -bhūtāni in the Tibetan version.91In MMK, the matching formula (ākārṣākārṣaya sarvabhūtām) is present in ch. 52, while ch. 1 has sarvamudrām in the Sanskrit text, obviously by perseveration from the preceding sentence. This is not confirmed by the Chinese version which has sarvabhūtān, though with single ākārṣaya.92 Single ākārṣaya must also be assumed for IC 009 as there is not enough room for both a second ākārṣaya and sarvabhū-.93

18. nirmāthaya (nirmāthaya) *sarvaduṣṭān “Grind, (grind) all evil beings!” The restitution is again suggested by both GST and MMK, which have nirmātha nirmatha sarvaduṣṭān throughout.94 The causative forms presupposed for the inscriptions, clearly indicated by the double -ya in IC 010, may have resulted from an adaptation to the preceding imperatives (ākārṣaya), with no seman-

---

91 PW IV/488a, MVF 587a and BHSD 319a note paramantra only as a variant of paramātra “a high number”, which does not fit here. The interpretation of paramantra as denoting a “mantra of opponents” is matched by the STTS (2.6: 178,14), where the word (acc. pl. masc. paramantrān) depends on the imperatives bhaṭīja “break”, mardā “squeeze”, and khāka “devour”, each of them repeated like bhinda in the inscriptions.  
92 “SARBABHŪṬĀNĪ” (Fremantle 1971: 299,22); 薬師頭部倉 (T. 18, p. 489a14).  
93 In the Tibetan version treated by Fremantle (1971: 299,22) as well as the Sanskrit text provided by the same author (p. 298,20), the imperatives are preceded by “MATHA MATHA”, i.e., the corresponding forms of the same verb without preverb. The mantra version in Taishō no. 1218 offers the “normal” text again (阿迦哩摩他阿迦哩摩他薩婆菩提呪咒 in T. 21, p. 95b16; cf. 偶摩吼他偶摩吼他薩婆菩提呪咒 in MMK, T. 20, p. 843c5-6). “chasyām in Vaidya 1965: 450,3 must be a misprint.
tic causativity implied. A mutual influence of units 17 and 18 also seems apparent in IC 009 where *nirmåtha* is preceded by a superfluous *a* and *ākaryaya*, by a superfluous *ya*. Note that there is hardly room enough in IC 009 for -thaya plus sarvaduṣṭā-, indicating that this inscription may have had a different verbal form, possibly *nirmitha* (with persevered -i-?), as suggested by the clearly distinguishable -mi-.

19. praveśaya maṇḍalamadhye “Let (them) enter into the (middle of the) maṇḍala!” Except for the single imperative form, here exhibited by both inscriptions, this sentence matches the texts of both GST and MMK again, which have praveśaya praveśaya maṇḍalamadhye throughout.63 As there is no overt (accusative) object in the given context, we might take the verb form to be devoid of causative semantics as in the preceding sentence;64 this, however, is less likely as there are clear parallels of evil beings being caused to enter the maṇḍala elsewhere in MMK.65

20. *vaivasvatāṅgaghātīne “Destroyer of the limb(s) of the Vivasvatid!” This restitution is very uncertain, given that only IC 010 provides sufficient material for it. It is modelled after the compound vaivasvataṅgivītiṇakara, lit. “end-maker of the life of the Vivasvati”, which we find at the same position in GST (including its Chinese and Tibetan versions), ch. 52 of MMK, the Chinese text of MMK 1 and the mantra transcript of Taishō no. 1218,66 only the Sanskrit text of MMK 1 having shorter vaivasvatāṅgakara instead. -gātin in the sense of “destroyer, killer” occurs several times elsewhere in MMK (e.g., sarvadākinīghātinī in 2,5d or vighnagātinī in 2,9d) so that its assumption seems justified even though the -t- is anything but certain. vaivasvata obviously refers to Yama, who has been regarded as a descendant of Vivasvat since Indo-Iranian times,67 the vocative thus carrying the same meaning as Yamāntaka it-

---

63 Single praveśaya occurs, with the same local object, in the mantra of ch. 2 of the MMK (1/29,6 ~ Vaidya 1965: 19,23) including its Chinese version (雙鼻羅末他伊詣噓呌呌音野 in T. 20, p. 851a1).

64 Cf. Wallis 2002: 82 and 38-39, where one finds the translation “enter into the (center of the) maṇḍala”. A similar (plain-active) usage is attested, e.g., in the STTS (om vajrapāṇi maṇḍaś-<maṇḍaś> praveśaya [2,6: 186,1]), in addition to the true causative kāye sarvabuddhān praveśayat in 1,1: 81.5. The causative of praviś has been attested since Vedic times; cf., e.g., sārvāṇa vācya *gnām kāmān praveśayati* in TB 3,7,1,1.

65 Cf. MMK 2 (Vaidya 1965: 17,22-24); krodharājānaṃ bhūmaśvītā kṣipati sma ... tam mahāparasamandalam sūddhāvāsahavanam praveśayati sma (parallel kindly provided by Martin Delhey, personal communication).

66 以缚娑払呁尾旦呁羯呁 (T. 21, p. 95b17-18); cf. 呈鳴婆旦ergy旦劫迦呁 in GST (T. 18, p. 489a16-17) and 呈鳴娑呁呁娑呁尾旦劫迦呁 in MMK (T. 18, p. 843c7; -ka- is missing here).

67 Cf., e.g., RV 10,14,1; 10,58,1 etc. for Old Indic, Y. 9,4 for Avestan.
The notation of the ai diphthong of vai by the double e-mark in IC 009 is remarkable; this spelling rarely occurs in the later documents of Dhivehi (the lōmāfanu copper plate grants), but cf. 32 below. On the other hand, the text of IC 009 is obviously defective, with the second va-aksara missing by haplography.

21. kara kara “Doer, doer!” This formula has no equivalent in either GST or MMK. It might be tempting to take it as a remainder of the compound vaivasvat(a)jīvitāntakara provided in the preceding unit by these two texts; however, its reappearance later on in the inscriptions (cf. 31 below) speaks in favour of regarding it as an unit in its own right, with kara representing the vocative of the agent noun of kr. On the other hand, the co-occurrence of kara kara with the subsequent unit strongly reminds one of the beginning of the second mantra concerning Yamāntaka in MMK (ch. 2), which reads kara kara kuru kuru mama kāryam as well, thus suggesting that kara might also be taken to be a secondary imperative form of the same verb, reinforced by kuru in the way dehi “give!” can be reinforced by dadāpaya (lit. “let give!”) in Tantric mantras. This would not alter the meaning very much though.

22. kuru kuru mama kāryam “Do, do the work for me!” Different from the double kara preceding it, this unit appears again at the same place in GST and MMK, with only a slight digression in the Tibetan version of the former which has mama sarvākāryam kuru kuru instead. Together with the parallel

---

Note: The page contains numerous references to specific texts and inscriptions, highlighting the complex nature of the study of ancient Indian inscriptions and their comparative analysis. The text references a variety of sources, including inscriptions, commentaries, and translations, to elucidate specific points of discussion. The use of citations and annotations indicates a detailed and scholarly approach to the interpretation of these historical artifacts.
from the mantra in MMK 2 (cf. 21), this seems to be enough evidence to accept the unexpected but apparent spelling kardh án for kāryam in both inscriptions; this may be taken as indicating the pronunciation karjam (with affrication after r?), with skt. j rendered by Maldivian d(h) as in vadra ~ vajra (cf. 1 above).

23. dāha dāha “Burn, burn!” In both inscriptions, the unit is written dāya dāya, thus rather suggesting jaya jaya “Be victorious, be victorious!” (with d representing j; cf. unit 1).75 however, the unanimous evidence of all versions of GST and MMK76 forces us to prefer dāha dāha here. This implies the otherwise unattested rendering of ha by way of ya, which must be seen in the light of the merger of ya- and consonantless aksaras (yielding dāya ~ da’ā; cf. 1 above).

24. *paca paca “Cook, cook!” This unit is only attested in IC 009, and that only partially; what is more, its last syllable seems to be represented by an otherwise unknown aksara, here tentatively transliterated as cha, which might be taken to represent geminated tta at first glance. That this is not an instance of phat as in 28 below is suggested by GST and MMK which, unanimously again, show paca paca.

25. mā vilamba, mā vilamba “Do not tarry, do not tarry!” The formula is attested in the same form in both GST and MMK77 as well as in many other Buddhist Sanskrit texts,78 so that the emendation of mahā, which appears in both inscriptions, to the prohibitive particle mā is well justified, mahā representing a hypersanskritized spelling of the latter triggered by the regular equivalence of skt. mahā and Insular Pkt. mā “big”.79 The duplication of the second hā in IC 009 is due to the arrangement of the unit across two distant parts of the statue.

26. samayam anusmara “Remember the convention!” This formula is again matched by all versions of the mantra in GST and MMK and appears in many

73 An example of jaya jaya is found in the STTS (om jaya jaya hum phat [2,13: 294,9]) or in sarva-vighnā(h) jaya jaya “overcome, overcome all obstacles” in the Taishō text no. 1153 (T. 20, p. 619a23-24 and 629b20-21; 薩埵毘盧遮那佛善思野野); cf. also no. 1005A (T. 19, p. 633b24) without an object: 唵誦迦瑜里低惹耶惹耶吽 om rokaṇālīṁ jaya jaya hum.

74 The printed editions of the Sanskrit text of GST (including Matsunaga 1978: 61,17) have mā vilamba vilamba, which is contradictory in itself and obviously due to a misprint in the editio princeps (p. 80,7), given that both the Chinese and the Tibetan versions have the “regular” text (摩尼盤陀摩尼盤陀 in T. 18, p. 489a18-19; “MĀ BILAMBA MĀ BILAMBA” in Fremantle 1971: 299,24-25).

75 Cf., e.g., Laṅk. p. 14,18, Hay. p. 44,1 and Sarv. p. 58,5 & 74,13, or the periphrastic formation mā vilamban kuṇu in story 31 of the Jaina recension of the Vikramarācita (Edgerton 1926: II/259,32f).

76 Cf. Gippert 2005: 218-219 for this proposal.
similar texts, among them the second mantra concerning Yamāntaka in MMK (ch. 2). The spelling with -sm- in both Maldivian inscriptions is remarkable but cannot be taken to prove an authentic pronunciation.

27. huṃ huṃ huṃ “Huṃ huṃ huṃ!” Different from all versions of GST and MMK, the two inscriptions repeat huṃ twice, not once. An even longer sequence is found in the second mantra concerning Yamāntaka in MMK (ch. 2) which has sixfold huṃ.

28. phat phat (phat) “Phat phat (phat)!” Here it is only IC 009 which repeats the syllable two times, IC 010 agreeing with all versions of the mantra in GST and MMK.

29. viṣphoṭaya viṣphoṭaya *sarvavighnān “Shatter, shatter all obstacles!” This and the following two units pose the biggest problems in establishing the text covered by the two inscriptions. First, the corresponding formula in GST and MMK shows (reduplicated) phoṭaya without preverb in nearly all its witnesses; only the Tibetan version of the former has viṣphoṭaya, thus supporting the Maldivian text. It has to be noted, however, that in all versions of GST, viṣphoṭaya occurs in another mantra following immediately after the present one so that there may be some mutual influence here. This is further suggested by the fact that the same mantra (addressing Vajrakrodha) continues with sarvavighna-viṇāyakān, which is fairly close to (though not identical with) the text of the inscriptions. Different from this, GST and MMK continue with a wording that begins with sarva-, too, but which raises doubts about its integrity. For the sake of convenience, the available variants are listed in tabular form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MMK</th>
<th>sarvāsāparipūraka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GST Chin. (+ T. 1218)</td>
<td>sarvāsāparipūraka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST Skt.</td>
<td>sarvāsāparipūraka sarvān nāśaya ripūn kara kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GST Tib.</td>
<td>sarvān nāśaya ripūn kara sarvāsāparipūraka kara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

80 Cf. Gippert 2005: 215 for this observation.
81 MMK I/29.6 – Vaidya 1965: 19,23 – T. 20, p. 851a1-2; correspondingly in Taishō no. 1214 (T. 21, p. 73b5-6).
82 MMK I/29.6 – Vaidya 1965: 19,23 – T. 20, p. 851a2; correspondingly in Taishō no. 1214 (T. 21, p. 73b6).
83 Including the version in Taishō no. 1218 (壘普呁耶壘普呁耶 in T. 21, p. 95b21; cf. 喑普呁野壘普呁野 in GST, T. 18, p. 489a20-21, and MMK, T. 20, p. 843c10-11).
84 “BISPHOṬAYA BISPHOṬAYA” (Fremantle 1971: 299,25).
The picture is further complicated by the fact that according to the editions of the Sanskrit text of GST, ms. A adds (a second?) sarvāśāparipūraka after kara kara (cf. 31 below), and ms. T₁, sarvāśāparipūraka he he after the he he following (cf. 32 below).\(^6\) All this strongly suggests that the versions combining sarvān nāsaya ripūn kara kara “Destroy all enemies, doer, doer!” with sarvāśāparipūraka “Fulfiller of all desires!” are the result of a contamination of two divergent traditions, one having the five-word phrase and the other one, the compound. This is all the more probable as both variants are similar enough to have derived from one underlying formula, given that nearly all sounds contained in sarvāśāparipūraka are also present, in the same order, in sarvān nāsaya ripūn kara kara. There is one more peculiarity about this, viz. the fact that sarvān and ripūn are separated by the imperative form in the sentence, a stylistic element that does not occur elsewhere in the present texts. All this leads to the assumption that a) sarvāśāparipūraka emerged from a secondary distortion of sarvān nāsaya ripūn kara kara (later inserted into the text as an interlinear gloss or the like), and b) sarvān did not originally belong to ripūn. The Maldivian inscriptions are likely to bear witness to this, suggesting that sarvān is the remainder of an independent object (here, sarvāvighnān) and that nāsaya ripūn and kara kara were two units in their own right as established below.

30. *nāsaya ripūn “Destroy the enemies!” It is true that neither of the two inscriptions exhibits the full text assumed here, *nāsaya being reduced to saya in IC 009 and to mere sa in IC 010. Nevertheless, the loss of *nā can be easily explained if we assume a total assimilation with the preceding accusative plural ending (*-ān nā- > *-ānā-) or, even more, a contamination (via haplography) with the last syllable of -vighnān (*-nān nā- > *-nān).

31. kara kara “Doer, doer!” This unit is spelt defectively in IC 010, too, where the last syllable seems to be missing, thus reminding of the reduction of ripūn kara kara to -ripūraka as assumed in 29 above. However, the text of IC 009 is clear enough to warrant the wording, which repeats unit 21 above.

32. he bhagavan vajra “O Lord Vajra!” By adding vajra after bhagavan, the vocative formula of the inscriptions deviates once more from what we find in GST and MMK. A second deviation consists in the fact that the inscriptions seem to indicate only one interjection, thus contrasting with the he he we find in nearly all variants of the mantra in the two texts;\(^7\) only ch. 52 of MMK has

---

\(^6\) Matsunaga 1978: 61, n. 19 and 20.

\(^7\) Including the mantra version in Taishō no. 1218 (槃嘗啣諦 in T. 21, p. 95b22; cf. 嘗嘗 in GST and MMK [T. 18, p. 489a22 and T. 20, p. 844a2]).
simple he bhagavan. The spelling of the Maldivian interjection is peculiar, too, as it obviously consists of the aksara for consonantless e ('e) with an additional e vowel mark; in accordance with the spelling of vai- (with twofold e-mark) in IC 009 (cf. 20 above), this may be taken to indicate either the ai diphthong or a long e (as assumed here in analogy with the historical development observable in Maldivian).  

33. kim *cira\={y}asi “Why do you delay?” Here again, the two inscriptions are defective, the second person verbal ending missing in both of them. This ending, however, must clearly be postulated, given that an imperative form makes no sense in an interrogative sentence introduced by kim “why”, lit. “what”, and kim cira\={y}asi is exactly what we find in all versions of the mantra in GST and MMK.\textsuperscript{38} A close parallel to this formula can be found in Hay. p. 43,18 where we read varavajradas\=t\=ra kim cira\={y}ayasi, the latter form representing the causative of the plain denominative stem cira\=ya- “be late.”\textsuperscript{39} kim cira\={y}asi is also attested outside Buddhist Sanskrit, for instance in a R\=am\=ay\=ana verse (kim cira\={y}asi me putra, p\=ani\=yam ksipram \=anaya // “What are you late for, son, bring me water quickly!”; R. 2,58,5cd).\textsuperscript{40} The omission of the second-person ending can be explained by assuming an influence of the surrounding imperative forms.

34. mama sarva-arth\=am s\=ad\=haya “Let all my purpose(s) succeed!” This formula matches the texts of GST and MMK, too, except for the fact that the Sanskrit text of GST has reduplicated s\=ad\=haya according to the editions.\textsuperscript{42} The omission of the word-internal sandhi (*sarv\=arth\=am) we see in the inscriptions finds its parallel in the Tibetan version of GST, which has mama sarva-arth\=an s\=ad\=haya \textsuperscript{39} (for the Maldivian spelling with the ya-aksara, cf. 5 above). A peculiar trait is the replacement of sar\=va- in IC 010 by sab\=ba-, a “Prakritizing” spelling which occurs frequently in forms like p\=urbba- (for p\=ur\=ba-; “east[ern], former”) in the twelfth-century copperplate grants but nowhere else in pre-Islamic texts from the Maldives.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{38} Cf., e.g., Maldivian t\=o “oil” < Insular Prakrit t\=o < skt. t\=aila (Gippert 2013: 88).

\textsuperscript{39} Including the mantra version in Taish\=o no. 1218 (稽其香油杜 in T. 21, p. 95b22-23; cf. 嬰㊶㊶㊶ in GST, T. 18, p. 489a23, and 嬰㊶㊶㊶ in MMK, T. 20, p. 844k2).

\textsuperscript{40} Cf. Gippert 2005: 218 for a first account of this parallel.

\textsuperscript{41} Cf. also Pacific. I, p. 44,25 where we read kim cir\={y}ayasi. — A similar expression is the analytic construction kim cir\=am kr as occurring in Mbh. 1,3,165 (kram) and 6,99,43d (kuru\=tha).

\textsuperscript{42} With the exception of the Tokyo mss. T\=3 and T\=c; cf. Matsunaga 1978: 61, n. 21.

\textsuperscript{43} “MAMA SARVA ARTH\=AN S\=AD\=HAYA” in Fremantle 1971: 299,27.

\textsuperscript{44} But cf. Maldivian farub\=ada “mountain”, which must be a borrowing from skt. parv\=ata (cf. Gippert 2004a: 94).
35. svāhā “Hail!” In spite of the spelling with short a in both inscriptions, this is the same closing formula as in the corresponding GST and MMK mantras. An early Maldivian example of the same interjection is provided by the Brāhma inscription from Landhoo.95

36. oṁ yamāṇṭaka huṁ “Oṃ Yamāṇṭaka huṁ!” This unit is only attested on IC 010, arranged between the two faces on what must have been the frontside of the statue. As the parallel texts show, it does not pertain to the mantra itself but indicates, as an explanatory addition, its “owner”. The spelling is peculiar again because the initial aksara of the word following oṁ seems to be written as a ligature consisting of two variants of y (cf. Fig. 16). As syllable-initial y- is likely to have been lost in Maldivian pronunciation by the end of the first millennium, with ya-aksaras thus giving rise to the second series of “plain-vowel” aksaras we met with several times above,96 the “geminate” spelling might have served the purpose of warranting the pronunciation of the glide required by the Sanskrit name here.97

Summary

The two inscribed statues, now destroyed, of the Māle Museum preserved the mantra used for the invocation of Yamāṇṭaka, the head of the “Kings of Wrath” (krodharājan) of Tantric Buddhism. The text represented by the inscriptions is by and large the same as the one contained in the Guhyasamājatantra and the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, with a slightly closer affinity to the former where the versions diverge. In several cases, the text of the inscriptions deviates considerably from both the GST and the MMK; these deviations deserve to be taken seriously if we consider the fact that the inscriptions are likely to represent, together with the Chinese transcripts contained in the Taishō canon, the oldest available witnesses of the mantra. Whether the deviating text passages can be regarded as being more authentic than those of the manuscript traditions cannot be decided off-hand. It is probable for the passage comprising units 29-31 in

---

96 The “double” series of consonantless aksaras is also met with in all written texts in evāla and divek akṣaru from the earliest copperplate grants on; cf. Gippert 2013: 91.
97 Given the clear correlation between Yamāṇṭaka and his mantra, other readings can be ruled out. This is true for syamantaka, the name “of a celebrated jewel (worn by Kṛiṣṇa on his wrist [cf. kaustubha], described as yielding daily eight loads of gold and preserving from all dangers” (MW 1273b with references to Viṣṇupurīna, Harivamśa and other texts, explicitly named in PW VII/1397) as well as śamāntaka, a name of the god of love (“destroyer of tranquillity” [MW 1054a referring to “L.” = lexicographers; cf. PW VII/78 naming Trikāṇḍāsa 1.1.37).
the transcription provided above, which speaks in favour of a major distortion of the text in the other versions. It is not so clear in the case of Yamāntaka being addressed as the “six-faced one” (vs. “four-faced and four-armed”) in unit 6, however. Further investigation into the mantra and its relationship to other sources will be needed in order to determine whether this represents an older tradition or just a local alternative. Be that as it may, the statues, together with the Landhoo inscription dealt with earlier, bear clear witness to Tantric Buddhism prevailing on the Maldives before the introduction of Islamic faith to the islands.

References

Bagchi 1965

BHSD

BHSG

CBETA

Duquenne 1983

Dwarikadas 1984

Edgerton 1926

Fremantle 1971
A Glimpse into the Buddhist Past of the Maldives. II. Two Sanskrit Inscriptions

Gippert 2003

Gippert 2004a

Gippert 2004b

Gippert 2005

Gippert 2013

GM I

GST

Hay.

Lānk.

Linrothe 1999

Macdonald 1962

Mackintosh-Smith 2010

Maniku – Wijayawardhana 1986

Matsunaga 1978

Matsunaga 1985

Mbh.
Mahābhārata

MMK I-III
Jost Gippert

MW

Naseema 1999

Pañc. I

PW I-VII

R.
Rāmāyaṇa

Romero-Frias 2003

RV
Rgveda Samhitā

Sarv.

STTS
Sarvatathāgata-tattvavasamgraha, ed. Isshi Yamada, *Sarva-Tathāga

T.
Taishō canon, quoted after CBETA 2002.

TB
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa

Tholal 2002

Vaidya 1964

Wallis 2002

Y.
Yasna
Fig. 1: IC 010

Fig. 2: IC 009

Fig. 3: same, with inscription redrawn

Fig. 4: same, with inscription redrawn
Fig. 9: IC 010, top

Fig. 10: same, with inscription redrawn
Fig. 11: IC 010, lower part (beginning)

Fig. 12: same, with inscription redrawn

Fig. 13: IC 010, lower part (end)

Fig. 14: same, with inscription redrawn
Fig. 15: IC 010, final part
Fig. 16: same, with inscriptions redrawn

Fig. 17: IC 009, beginning (dextral part)
Fig. 18: same, with inscriptions redrawn
Fig. 19: IC 009, beginning (sinistral part)

Fig. 20: same, with inscription redrawn

Fig. 21: IC 009, continuation

Fig. 22: same, with inscription redrawn
Fig. 23: IC 009, end (dextral part)

Fig. 24: same, with inscription redrawn

Fig. 25: IC 009, end (sinistral part)

Fig. 26: same, with inscription redrawn