

Translation as Commentary in the Sanskrit-Old Javanese Didactic and Religious Literature from Java and Bali

Andrea Acri and Thomas M. Hunter*

This article discusses the dynamics of translation and exegesis documented in the body of Sanskrit-Old Javanese Śaiva and Buddhist technical literature of the *tutur/tattva* genre, composed in Java and Bali in the period from c. the ninth to the sixteenth century. The texts belonging to this genre, mainly preserved on palm-leaf manuscripts from Bali, are concerned with the reconfiguration of Indic metaphysics, philosophy, and soteriology along localized lines. Here we focus on the texts that are built in the form of Sanskrit verses provided with Old Javanese prose exegesis – each unit forming a »translation dyad«. The Old Javanese prose parts document cases of linguistic and cultural »localization« that could be regarded as broadly corresponding to the Western categories of translation, paraphrase, and commentary, but which often do not fit neatly into any one category.

Having introduced the »*vyākhyā*-style« form of commentary through examples drawn from the early inscriptional and didactic literature in Old Javanese, we present key instances of »cultural translations« as attested in texts composed at different times and in different geographical and religio-cultural milieus, and describe their formal features. Our aim is to document how local agents (re-)interpreted, fractured, and restated the messages conveyed by the Sanskrit verses in the light of their contingent contexts, agendas, and prevalent exegetical practices. Our hypothesis is that local milieus of textual production underwent a progressive »drift« from the Indic-derived scholastic traditions that inspired – and entered into a conversation with – the earliest sources, composed in Central Java in the early medieval period, and progressively shifted towards a more embedded mode of production in East Java and Bali from the eleventh to the sixteenth century and beyond.

Keywords: Old Javanese; Sanskrit; tutur; tattva; commentarial literature; Śaivism; Buddhism

* **Correspondence details:** Andrea Acri, Section des Sciences religieuses, École Pratique des Hautes Études (EPHE, PSL University), Les Patios Saint-Jacques, 4-14 rue Ferrus, 75014 Paris, France; email: andrea.acri@ephe.psl.eu. Thomas M. Hunter, Department of Asian Studies, The University of British Columbia, 607-1871 West Mall, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 0C2; email: thomas.hunter@ubc.ca.

Introduction

A significant body of literature in Old Javanese, composed mainly in the period from c. the ninth to the fifteenth century, has come down to us from Java, Bali, and the nearby island of Lombok through palm-leaf manuscripts. This body of literature may be regarded as a relic of the region's Indic past, testifying to the process of appropriation and hybridization by local milieus of linguistic, cultural, and religious material derived from the Sanskritic world that mainly unfolded during the »post-Gupta« South Asian medieval period – a process that largely coincides with the global Middle Ages, of which Indonesia was an integral part.¹ During that period, the pedagogical institutions of urban centres and religious complexes of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago were part of the translocal culture first described by Pollock² under the terms »Sanskrit cosmopolis« and »Sanskrit ecumene«. Indic forms of writing and textual organization had arrived in the archipelago along with the Buddhist monks, Śaiva masters, and other religious wanderers who depended on textual means to preserve the continuity of religious doctrine.

In what follows we review the history of didactic and prose composition in the Old Javanese language as reflecting a tradition of translation that adheres to the norms of standard Indian Sanskritic models of the commentary, but uses Old Javanese rather than Sanskrit as the language of exegesis. The resulting form of text-building in Old Javanese has had a long life in the archipelago, extending from its original domain in theological and didactic works into prose works like the *parva* literature translating several books of the *Mahābhārata* and later prose works like the *Tantri Kāmandaka* – a collection of animal tales embedded in a Scheherazade-like framing tale – as well as the numerically significant genre of Śaiva (and, to a much lesser extent, Buddhist) technical texts called *tutur* or *tattva* concerned with the reconfiguration of Sanskrit-derived metaphysics, philosophy, and soteriology along localized lines.³ In this article we will focus on this body of Sanskrit-Old Javanese didactic literature, many important specimens of which are arranged in the form of a Sanskrit verse or a series of verses (whether quoted in their entirety or separated into their discrete units/*pāda*) provided with an Old Javanese prose translation and/or exegesis – each unit forming a so-called »translation dyad«.

-
- 1 One of the unifying factors of the Middle Ages across Maritime Asia was the multi-centric spread and circulation of (Sanskritic) Buddhism as well as Śaivism; on the former, see Acri, *Esoteric Buddhism*.
 - 2 Pollock, Sanskrit cosmopolis.
 - 3 In fact, this tradition would appear to have continued beyond the premodern »Hindu-Buddhist« period, for contemporary evidence for the continuing effects of a »śāstra model« of composition may be found in the »Yellow Books« explicating passages of the Qur'an or Hadith into Indonesian or Javanese and in the practice of the *sekaha mabasan* clubs of modern Bali. These clubs are characterized by »extemporaneous glossing« using hermeneutical strategies that do not (primarily) involve analytical means, drawn from a systematic knowledge of morphology and grammar, or try to establish historical derivations and etymologies; they are mainly based on contemporary/popular lexical know-how, »folk etymology«, and associative thinking effected through homology, metaphor, and assonance. These techniques are akin to the Sanskrit *nirvacana*, which unpack meanings from words rather than reduce them to their bare essentials.

Earlier work by Hunter⁴ traced some of the defining features of this literature in a study of the question of »translation« into Old Malay and Old Javanese. He suggested that for premodern insular Southeast Asia processes of translation are best understood in terms of a »culture of diglossia« that has its roots in the parallelism of Sanskrit and Prakrit in the inscriptions and dramatic forms of South Asia, and that features of textual diglossia – which are most prominent in the Old Javanese didactic tradition – must certainly be linked to pedagogical institutions. In these institutions the transmission of theological and philosophical ideas, and the formulation of literary practices, depended on an ongoing practice of translation that we find embodied in a number of characteristic modes of textual organization. The Old Javanese prose parts reflect dynamics of linguistic and cultural »localization« that could be regarded as broadly corresponding to the Western categories of translation, paraphrase, and commentary, but which often do not fit neatly into any one category, for they include multiple intents and agendas at once. Indeed, we could regard the kind of intellectual operation carried out by ancient Javanese and Balinese authors as a »translation as commentary« involving multiple processes simultaneously: first, the translation from an Indo-European language into a Western Malayo-Polynesian (WMP) idiom, and second, the exegesis (or reconfiguration) of Indic material and its refitting into a familiar/known cultural context, within the »horizon of expectations« of both the producers and consumers of literature.

In this article we present key instances of such »cultural translations« as attested in texts composed at different times and in different geographical and religio-cultural milieus, and try to sketch a preliminary taxonomy of their formal features. Our aim is to document how local agents (re-)interpreted, fractured, and re-stated the message conveyed by the Sanskrit verses in the light of their contingent socio-cultural contexts, agendas, horizons of expectations, and prevalent exegetical practices. Our underlying hypothesis is that local milieus of textual production underwent a progressive »drift« from the Indic-derived scholastic traditions that inspired – and entered into a conversation with – the earliest sources, composed in Central Java in the Early Medieval period, and progressively shifted towards a more embedded mode of production in East Java and Bali from the eleventh to the fifteenth century and beyond.⁵ While these two poles in the discourse can be situated within the theoretical and chronological parameters of the socio-linguistic phenomena of the »Sanskrit Cosmopolis« and »Vernacular Millennium« formulated by Pollock,⁶ some fine-tuning is needed to do full justice to the dynamics of cultural-religious and linguistic transfer at play, in particular by engaging with the textual genre of *tutur/tattva*, which was completely passed over in silence by Pollock, and which has received remarkably little scholarly attention thus far.⁷

4 Hunter, *Impact of Indian Forms*.

5 In the later *tuturs*, and even more so in the *parvas*, one often has the impression that the Sanskrit text is a mere »pretext« to authorize statements that are local in character, i.e. can be situated within a local context of understanding and practice.

6 Pollock, *Language of the Gods*.

7 On this class of texts, see Aciri, Sanskrit-Old Javanese *tutur* literature, and *Dharma Pātāñjala*.

*Old Malay and Old Javanese in a Comparative Perspective:
From »Connecting« to »Zone-shaping« Forms of Literature*

During the medieval period, the Malay-Indonesian archipelago was an active player among the transcultural societies of the Sanskrit Cosmopolis. One of the first visible products of the interaction of South Asian and indigenous linguistic and cultural practices is the languages of inscriptions that were developed through combining Sanskrit figures, tropes, metres and vocabulary with an underlying base in a language of the WMP group. Three of these – Old Malay, Old Javanese, and Old Balinese – left a significant inscriptional record and one – Old Javanese – developed very early into a literary language active for over a millennium that even today has its practitioners among Balinese students of the language they call *Kawi*, the language of poets.

The inscriptional record and premodern literature in Old Javanese show us that we must always take into account the language order of the premodern archipelago in our assessments of textual and inscriptional evidence. This means observing the formal differences in structure and diction between texts of the theological, didactic and prose traditions on the one hand, and the poetic traditions of the *kakavin* and *kiduñ* literatures on the other.⁸

In the prose traditions we will find an approach to text-building that harks back to Sanskrit models of the commentary, but adapted to the needs of translation within a pedagogy that in its first phase of development depended on bilingual preceptors capable of translation from Sanskrit into a local idiom in the process of development as a literary idiom, a Prakrit to the Sanskrit sources. At this stage Old Javanese served as the idiom of what Braginsky⁹ has called a »connecting literature,« a literature couched in a local idiom that provides a link to an authoritative source located elsewhere. Both Old Malay and Old Javanese were ideally suited to formulation as higher-order Prakrit languages, since both make use of similar morphology and morpho-syntactic processes that allow for the easy incorporation of »foreign« lexical elements into their WMP-based structures of meaning. As Braginsky has proposed for an »invisible« early literature in Malay, it may be that we should look to the religious institutions of the Sumatran/Śrīvijayan branch of the Śailendra dynasty as the crucible for a »connecting literature« centred on the canon of Sanskrit or Sanskrit-inspired Buddhist works. In this view what we see as a characteristic form of structuring texts in the Old Javanese theological literature was first developed in the Buddhist religious institutions of Sumatra and the Thai-Malay peninsula as a literature that connected the emerging literary awareness of the archipelago with distant centres of cultural production.

8 See further in Hunter, Translation, for the claim of a basic distinction in Old Javanese letters between »poetic« and »commentarial« forms of translation. The term »poetic« might be better understood as »transcreational«.

9 Braginsky, *System*.

By contrast, in the belletristic (*kakavin*) tradition in Old Javanese there appears to be no clear trace of the influence of Sanskrit models of the commentary. We find rather a consciously fashioned literary language, an Old Javanese Prakrit if you will, that was developed to suit the needs of what Braginsky¹⁰ has termed a »zone-shaping literature«, a fully self-conscious literature produced as an integral part of a major cultural formation. The earliest phase of the development of Old Javanese as a language of literature is represented by the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* and by the *kakavin* verses of the Śivagr̥ha inscription of 856 CE, which Aichele¹¹ has shown was very likely produced »in the same workshop« as the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*.¹²

In what follows we will be examining several case studies from the early theological and philosophical literature of Java that share a text-building strategy based on Indian models of the commentary. These strategies are used both to structure the text, and to link the text at hand to authoritative originals in the Indian tradition. They are thus kept in view throughout the process of composition. The creative enterprise of *kakavin* composition, on the other hand, follows Sanskrit standards of creativity that put a high value on innovative language, figures and tropes. The traces to Sanskrit originals are thus largely effaced, even when an Old Javanese work takes one of them as a model.

Morphological Incorporation in the Inscriptional Languages

The three languages of insular Southeast Asia known for their early inscriptions – Old Balinese, Old Malay and Old Javanese – all share similar morphosyntactic features that allow for the easy incorporation of new, non-native terms into a WMP base. This is still the case in modern Indonesian, where a quick check on the translation of »socialize« yields *men-sosialisasi-kan*, a perfect illustration of the process of morphological incorporation that makes a stronger bond between loan words and the local base than is ordinarily the case, something closer to the interweaving of Sanskrit and local elements developed in the »jewel and coral« (*maṇipravalam*) languages of Kerala and Tamilnadu.

As the case studies in this chapter will show, processes of morphological incorporation and juxtaposition of imported and local lexemes prominent in the inscriptional languages are also basic to the mode of composition found in the early theological literature in Old Javanese. It will thus be useful to review two examples of the intermingling of Sanskrit and local elements as found in an Old Javanese inscription dated 860 CE.¹³ This will serve as a prelude to the first level of analysis of the case studies from the Old Javanese doctrinal and soteriological literature.

Ya ta susukən *dharmasīma* ləpas denira pāduka mpuṅku iṅ *Bodhimimba* sīma kaliliranani vkanira Dyaḥ Imbaṅi Dyaḥ *Anārgha sambandha* sira pāduka mpuṅku iṅ *Boddhimimba mahāpuruṣa kṣatriyakula boddhalakṣaṇa prasiddha Vairocanātmake guru* paṅajyannira pāduka *Śri Mahārāja* sira [...] sira pāduka mpuṅku i *Bodhimimba* sarisaryy akāyakāya makarahinaṅvīi *ayoga amūjāsamādhi ajapāmṛrthanakən* ri *kajayaśatrvan Śri Mahārāja*.

10 Braginsky, *System*.

11 Aichele, *Vergessene Metaphoren*.

12 See also Acri, *On birds*.

13 Copper plates of Kañcana, dated 782 Śaka (860 CE). From the plates of 1295 Śaka (1367 CE) republishing two earlier charters. See Sarkar, *Corpus* 1, 133 for an alternative date of the original as 794 Śaka (872 CE).

These (rice-lands) then should be marked out as a free *dharma-freehold* by the reverend gentleman of Bodhimimba. The freehold is to be inherited by his children Dyaḥ Imbaṇi and Dyaḥ *Anārgha* the *occasion* being that the reverend gentleman of Bodhimimba is a *great soul, born of a noble lineage, having the characteristics of a follower of Buddha, successful* [in attaining] *self-identification with Vairocana*, and the *teacher* of holy knowledge to *his majesty the king*. He, the reverend gentleman of Bodhimimba each day makes every effort, day and night, to perform *yoga*, to make *offering-prayers*, to engage in *spiritual concentration*, to *recite mantras* [and] to *pray earnestly* for the *victory of his majesty the king over his enemies*.

This text has clearly been drafted by a learned hand, moreover one who is Buddhist and very likely a follower of an esoteric school based on the mandala of the transcendental Buddha Vairocana. In this excerpt, as is the case throughout the later history of Old Javanese, cases of incorporation into the Old Javanese morphosyntactic base are not uncommon. The most prominent examples are the verbal derivation *amrārthanakən*, »to pray for«, based on Sanskrit *prārthana*, »prayer, supplication« with the addition of Old Javanese verbal affixes *aN-* and *-akən* and the following nominal derivation *ka-jaya-śatrv-an*, »the state of victory over enemies« based on Sanskrit *jaya-śatru*, victorious over enemies.

Here we see a common pattern of accommodation across two linguistic systems, one contributing new lexical material and meanings drawn from a higher-status, cosmopolitan language, the other an indigenous linguistic base that provides a matrix for the development of what are essentially new, literized languages with a special role to play in the religious and political life of their speech communities.

Vyākhyā: Methodology and Aims

In this section we begin to examine representative texts from the didactic and narrative traditions of Old Javanese from the point of view of their possible relationship with »forms of the commentary« as known from Indian sources. This is not to suggest that Old Javanese sources are simply translations or mirror images of South Asian textual sources, or to imply that Old Javanese materials might stand in a secondary relationship to Sanskrit sources. It is rather to suggest that there may be formal correspondences between the structuring of didactic and narrative materials in the Old Javanese and Sanskrit traditions, and, if this is the case, similar correspondences may be found in the sphere of pedagogy and the organization of curricula in the religious institutions central to cultures with a long exposure to Indian religious ideas and practices.

Noting some initial similarities between works of the Old Javanese didactic tradition and commentaries like those of Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha, we propose that the term *vyākhyā*, »exposition, commentary«, might be adopted as a device for measuring the degree to which Old Javanese textual sources recapitulate the form taken by Indian commentaries in the transmission of knowledge and organization of a pedagogy. Here, *vyākhyā* is used as a term to mean an expository reading of a parent text that takes the form of a phrase-by-phrase glossing of the text, with the addition, where needed, of grammatical materials based on Pāṇinian analysis.

An Old Javanese Commentary on the Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa

When initiating a study of the role of Indian forms of the commentary in the Old Javanese tradition we are faced immediately with many difficulties. The first is that precious few documents have been preserved that bear traces of a tradition of teaching Sanskrit in the context of a *guru-śiṣya* transmission and with the use of a commentary. Fortunately, at least one fragmentary text has surfaced that has provided material evidence for just this mode of transmission. This is a fragment of what appears to be a student's »class notes« on a rendition of Kumāradāsa's classic *Jānakīharaṇa*.¹⁴ This fragment shows Old Javanese being used to provide a phrase-by-phrase gloss of the original, with at least one point where a lexeme from a commentary on the *Jānakīharaṇa* has been included in the text, thus suggesting that the Sanskrit original was taught along with expository materials in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese. In the Old Javanese gloss on *Jānakīharaṇa* I.2c we can observe the process of »classroom study« that is recorded in the textual artefact:¹⁵

akhaṇḍamāno manujeśvarāṇām mānyo manojñaiḥ guṇajaiḥ guṇajñahakhaṇḍa ṅa.
tan apiyak *māno* ṅa. kāhānkāranira *manujeśvarāṇām* ṅa. saṅ ratu *mānyo* ṅa. pinū-
janira *manojñaiḥ* ṅa. konaṅunaṅ *guṇajaiḥ* ṅa. kaśaktyan, *guṇajñah* ṅa. vruh iṅ *guṇa*.
sambah-niṅ hulun maṅgalani majarakna mahāmaramālā prakṛta // 1.1

akhaṇḍa means »not taking sides, not split«, *māno* means »his sense of self«, *manujeśvarāṇām* means »the lord king«, *mānyo* means »his being praised«, *manojñaiḥ* means »to be longed for«, *guṇajaiḥ* means »the state of being powerful«, *guṇajñah* means »he understands good qualities.«

Fragmentary though it may be, the text recording lessons in the *Jānakīharaṇa* with Old Javanese glosses gives us positive evidence for a pedagogy based on transmission of root texts along with a commentary and the phrase-by-phrase glossing of the original typical of the Indian *vyākhyā*.

14 See Lokesh Chandra, *Sanskrit studies*, 1-9.

15 Lokesh Chandra (*Sanskrit studies*, 1) notes a verse from the *Jānakīharaṇa* that is found in the »eclectic [Old Javanese] collection« *Svarasamhitā*. This led to his search of *Kṛtabhāṣā lontars*, which resulted in finding that manuscript Leiden Cod. Or. 5089 in that collection contains what can best be described as classroom notes for the study of the *Jānakīharaṇa*, a *kāvya* of the sixth-century poet Kumāradāsa.

Case Study I: The Old Javanese Lexicographical Work *Amaramālā*

We begin the review of case studies in this article with the Old Javanese lexicographical work *Amaramālā*.¹⁶ There are several reasons for choosing this as the first work to be examined. First, if Krom¹⁷ is correct in assigning this work to the mid-eighth century CE based on its dedication to the Śailendra monarch named Jitendra, then it is among the first works that give evidence of literary activity in Old Javanese. Indeed, since the Sukabumi inscription of Śaka 726 (804 CE) has to date been considered the oldest evidence for the existence of Old Javanese, it could predate even that inscription.¹⁸

In making an assessment of the nature of the *Amaramālā* we should clearly not discount its opening verses, which are quite explicit in referring to Jitendra as »the bull of the Śailendra dynasty« (*śailendrānvayapuṅgava*). While the question of whether or not the Śailendras were of Malay origin is still controversial, there are many reasons to suppose that at the very least the Buddhist »preceptors of the Śailendra kings« (*śailendrarājagurubhiḥ*) noted in the Kalasan inscription can be understood in terms of a close relationship between Buddhist institutions of Sumatra and Central Java during the period c. 700-850 CE.¹⁹

The Old Javanese *Amaramālā* is characterized in its opening passages as a »Prakritization« of a Sanskrit work, which we can surmise must have been a lexicographical work like the *Amarakośa* of Amarasiṃha. Such works were intended to serve as tools in the composition of *kāvya*, and by the time of Amarasiṃha (c. 600 CE) had become an indispensable part of a writer's toolkit.²⁰ The opening line of the *Amaramālā* thus stands at the beginning of a long tradition of referring to works in Old Javanese literary form with the term *prākṛta*, in this referring to works composed in a literary language fashioned on the order of Sanskrit:

sambahnīḥ hulun maṅgalani majarakna mahāmaramālā prākṛta // 1.1 //

»My offering with a bow of homage is an auspicious benediction for making an exposition of the great *Amaramālā* in Prakrit form.«²¹

16 The *Amaramālā* is part of the larger and composite text entitled *Candrakiraṇa*, edited as *Chandakaraṇa* by Lokesh Chandra (Chanda-Karaṇa). Here we have followed the text reconstructed by Lokesh Chandra in his edition, without systematically reporting deviations (whether in the main text or in the apparatus) from the original West Javanese *gebang* manuscript L631, except when we have proposed new emendations on the basis of the actual readings of the manuscript.

17 Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 145-146.

18 See Zoetmulder (*Kalangwan*, 3) on the Sukabumi inscription.

19 See Sarkar (*Corpus*, 36-40) for a text and translation of the Kalasan inscription. See Jordaan and Colless, *Mahārājas*, for a recent review of the long controversy surrounding the origins and nature of the Śailendra dynasty. Nihom's noting (*Studies*, 114) the verifiable presence of the mandala systems of the *Jagadvinaya*, *Trailokyavijaya* and *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana* in Old Javanese textual sources supports a close relationship of Śrīvijaya and the Śailendras of Java. As he points out, the presence of these mandala systems suggests that »the initial importation of *yogatantra* systems into the Archipelago most likely took place no later than the end of the seventh century [...] This would seem to put us in Śrī Vijaya.« Since the Sumatran branch of the Śailendra line of kings is believed to have »retreated« from Java by c. 856 CE, this would give us a *terminus pro quem* for at least the core sections of the *Amaramālā*.

20 Lokesh Chandra (Chanda-Karaṇa, 144) surmises that the Old Javanese *Amaramālā* is based on a section of a now-lost Indian work by that name, supporting his claim by citing references to a text by that name in Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary on the *Amarakośa* and Hemacandra's commentary on another lexicographical work, the *Abhidāna-cintāmaṇi*. See Raj Pant, *Jaṭarūpa's Commentary*, for an authoritative work on the *Amarakośa* that focuses on Jaṭarūpa's commentary, the *Amarakośatilaka*, likely composed in the second half of the tenth century CE.

21 »My offering with a bow of homage«: it was a common trope in Old Javanese to refer metonymously to what one offers up to a superior as one's *sambah*, or »bow of respect«.

We turn now to the form taken by the opening passage of the *Amaramālā*. This section of the text is crucial to this study in that it may represent the earliest stage of a »translational« form of composition and pedagogy for which we have written records, and because it bears the unmistakable imprint of a commentarial form of rhetorical organization. The development of Old Javanese into a literary language during the eighth and ninth centuries CE follows upon similar processes that are observable for Old Malay in five inscriptions of seventh-century Sumatra issued by Śrī Jayanāśa/Jayanāga. In the *Amaramālā* we begin to see evidence for a »commentarial« form of composition that appears to be the textual record of pedagogical practices that were initiated in the Buddhist institutions of the western Malay-Indonesian archipelago and made their way to Java by way of a close relationship of the »Javanese branch« of the Śailendra dynasty with a Buddhist polity of the western archipelago known to history as Śrīvijaya. From this perspective the precise political form that may have been taken by this relationship may not be as important as the question of the emergence of a commentarial form of text-building that from the time of the *Amaramālā* onward was developed in parallel fashion in both Hindu and Buddhist streams of Javano-Balinese religious and philosophical literature.

The evidence of the *Amaramālā* is critical to this study because it introduces two modes of text-building that have had a lasting impact on the prose traditions of Java and Bali. The first of these is a »dyadic technique.« In this form of composition the text is built up in paired Sanskrit verses and their Old Javanese exegeses, with the logic of the didactic narrative following the order of verses in the Sanskrit original, but with a great deal of flexibility in terms of the content of the exegeses. The initial dedicatory stanza of the *Amaramālā* is a good example of this type of composition:

Sanskrit *śloka*:

*śivam sarvagatam śāntam / sarvajñam sarvadam gurum²² /
praṇamyāmaramāleyam / nāmaliṅgam nigadyate //*

»Having bowed down to Śiva – the all-pervading, peaceful, omniscient, all-bestowing teacher – I will recite the *Amaramālā*, [and expound] nouns and [their] genders.«

Old Javanese glosses:

bhaṭāreśvara sira sambahiṅ hulun / lvirnira:²³

»My bow of homage is to the god Īsvara. His form is:«

sarvagatam vyāpaka riṅ bha / *śāntam* jitendriya ta sira / riṅ *sarvajña*²⁴ amratyakṣākən
ta sirātītānāgatavartamāna mvaṅ sūkṣma [h]atisūkṣma / *sarvadam*²⁵ aveh anugraha ri
bhakti ri sira / sira *gurunīṅ* sarvadevatā /

22 Em.; *sarvatiḡurum* ms.; *sarvādhigurum* ed.

23 While this phrase occurs without overt reference to a Sanskrit lexeme in the original, there is no doubt that it responds to *śivam* in the Sanskrit *śloka*.

24 Em.; *sarvajñana* ms.; *sarvajñāna* ed.

25 Em.; *sarvādi* ed.; *sarvādhi* / ms. Our proposed reconstruction is supported by the fact that most of the forms ending in *-am* in the verse have been restored from *-i* (these endings, as well as *-am*, are often confused in the Sanskrit portions found in Javanese manuscripts), as well as the Old Javanese gloss.

»*sarvagatam* [means] pervading space; *sāntam* [means] he has mastered the senses; in regard to *sarvajña*, he sees clearly the past, future and present and the subtlety of the most subtle; *sarvadam* [means] that he gives favour to all those who are devoted to him; he is the *guru* of all the gods.«

uvus pva ñhulun sumambah ri sira / ajaraknaniñ hulun tikiñ mahāmaramālā²⁶ pintonaknañ abhidhāna mvañ liṅga //

»Having completed my homage to Him, I will expound this *Mahāmaramālā*, [and] demonstrate the nouns and their genders.«

In the Old Javanese glosses there is a shifting back and forth here between Sanskrit lexemes or phrases and their glosses that follows the classical *vyākhyā* form to the letter, except that the explanatory phrases are given in Old Javanese, which is often enriched with Sanskrit lexemes. And it is clear that the composer of the *Amaramālā* has made an effort to account for the full content of the original, for example explaining the Sanskrit passive form *nigadyate* with the Old Javanese *ajaraknaniñ hulun*, and *nāmaliṅgam*, »nouns and their genders,« with Old Javanese *pintonaknañ abhidhāna mvañ liṅga*, »appellations (i.e., nouns) and their genders will be demonstrated«, thereby supplying another Old Javanese passive verbal form for the sake of clarity.²⁷

In a longer section following the introductory verse we find a panegyric to the royal patron of the work that is composed in the fashion of a commentary in *vyākhyā* form, with a series of Sanskrit phrases introduced that are followed by Old Javanese glosses. These passages need not expand on a particular verse in the work but can introduce new material directly.

hana sira ratu pinakacūḍāmaṇi deniñ sāmantajagatpālaka²⁸ /

»There is a king taken as the crest-jewel of all the guardians of the world.«

suragaṇair iṣṭaḥ prajāraḥṣaṇe²⁹ inarəmbha deniñ vatək devatā / rumakṣa prajāmaṇḍala /

»*suragaṇair iṣṭaḥ prajāraḥṣaṇe*: prepared by the company of gods to protect the realm and its subjects,«

26 Em.; *mamaramālā* ms.; *amaramālā* ed.

27 It should be mentioned here that another title under which Amarasimha's *Amarakośa* – a Sanskrit lexicon probably related to the *Amaramālā* – was known is *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, »The teaching about the gender of nouns«.

28 Lokesh Chandra emends *samantajagatphalaka* into *sāmantajagatpālakaḥ*, but we find the insertion of the *visarga* of the Sanskrit nominative unnecessary here as the compound has been embedded directly into the Old Javanese (prefixed by *deniñ*, which would render the Sanskrit instrumental case) and does not represent, strictly speaking, a direct quotation. Cf. the analogous case in fn. 30 below (and contrast the other Sanskrit forms in the passage, such as *vidyāvādātottamaḥ*, *sādhujanapriyaḥ*, *kulasyāntakaḥ*, etc., which do have *visargas* in the original and are enclosed between punctuation marks).

29 The ms. actually reads *prajāraḥṣaṇeḥ*, therefore *prajāraḥṣaṇe* in the edition represents an emendation by Lokesh Chandra.

apayan *yogadhyānasamādhikarmakuśala*³⁰ sira / vidagdha ri kagavayaniṅ *yoga dhyāna samādhi* /

»For *yogadhyānasamādhikarmakuśala*: he is wise in the performance of *yoga*, *dhyāna* and *samādhi*.«

vidyāvādātottamaḥ / sira ta viśeṣaniṅ mahāpuruṣa śāstrajña / niṣṭhāniran samañkana kottamanira / ndan tah upaśama ta sira /

»*vidyāvādātottamaḥ*: He is exceptional among the great men who are knowers of the Śāstras. His lowest ebb is at once his highest, and yet he is self-controlled.«

sādhujanapriyaḥ / anurāga ta sira / ri sakveh sañ sādhujana /

»*sādhujanapriyaḥ*: He is beloved by all good men.«

śatrūṇāṃ kulasyāntakaḥ / mañkana sakvehnikañ śatru bāhyābhyantara / sampun in-ariṣṭakənira /

»*śatrūṇāṃ kulasyāntakaḥ*: Likewise, all of his enemies, whether internal or external, have been completely annihilated by him.«³¹

śailendrānvayapuṅgavaḥ / sira ta pinakatuṅganiṅ śailendravanśa /

»*śailendrānvayapuṅgavaḥ*: He is regarded as the bull of the Śailendra dynasty.«

jayati [h]amnən ta sira /

»*jayati*: He is victorious.«

śrīmahārāja samañkanātīśayanira / sira ta śrī mahārāja jitendra samjñanira // 1

»His being an illustrious Mahārāja is the reason for his present renown. He is the great King Jitendra by name.«

In the *Amaramālā* we find a good illustration of the appropriation of the *vyākhyā* form of Indian commentaries for the needs of translation in a pedagogy and connecting literature that linked Śailendra Buddhist institutions to the wider Asian Buddhist world through the trading, diplomatic, and religious networks of the western Malay-Indonesian archipelago. As we will see in examples from the early theological literature, the textual use of the *vyākhyā* technique appears to reflect a pedagogical practice that was further refined in the textual tradition following the *Amaramālā*.

30 Lokesh Chandra emends °*kuśala* into °*kuśalaḥ*.

31 There has been an interesting shift in meaning here: Sanskrit *śatrūṇāṃ kulasyāntakaḥ* means »he who is the destroyer of the families of his enemies.« But the Old Javanese gloss turns its attention to beliefs well known in the Javano-Balinese tradition that conquering one's »internal enemies« is the key to success in the struggle for political survival.

Case Study II: The Sañ Hyañ Kamahāyānan Mantranaya

If we look now at an early work from the Mahāyāna Buddhist literature, the *Mantra System of the Great Mahāyāna Path (Sañ Hyañ Kamahāyānan Mantranaya*, henceforth SHKM), we find the same use of the *vyākhyā* form of glossing that is prominent in the *Amaramālā*. And we find the same use of a dyadic technique based on the juxtaposition of Sanskrit verses with blocks of Old Javanese glosses. The difference is that the dyadic form of composition was only occasionally used in the *Amaramālā*, but has become standard practice in the SHKM.

There has been some debate about the dating of this work. Goris³² proposed that it be dated to the tenth century, for Version »C« of the text, as per Kats' identification, contains a colophon mentioning the name Mpu Siṅḍok of the Īśāna dynasty (r. 929-947 CE). However, this is apparently a Śaivized text that might have been composed later than the other two purely Buddhist texts in the same manuscript. In 1974 de Jong summarized the findings of the Japanese scholars Wogihara Unrai and Sakai Shiro, who had shown that the Sanskrit portions of the SHKM can be traced to the Chinese version of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* and to Chinese and Tibetan versions of the *Adhyardhaśatikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*.³³ More recent scholarly work has also identified such Sanskrit sources as the commentarial literature on the *Guhyasamāja*,³⁴ as well as other esoteric manuals such as the *Sarvavajrodāya*.³⁵ These considerations suggest that the doctrinal basis of the SHKM was well known in Java by at least the ninth century, and that the composition of the text could easily have taken place in that period or not long afterward.

In an example of this form of dyadic composition, SHKM verse 31, we are witness to an exposition of a practical perspective on the practice of austerities that suggests a long history of initiatory practices in both Hindu and Buddhist circles in the archipelago:

32 Goris, *Bijdragen*, 151.

33 Two versions of the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* were brought to China by Wu-hsing and Śubhakarā and translated into Chinese between 724-725 C.E. by Śubhakarā and Yijing (de Jong, Notes, 633-635). Archaeologist John Miksic (*Borobudur*, 23) in turn notes that the *Mahāvairocanasūtra* »was probably found in most monastic libraries in Java and Sumatra during the ninth century«.

34 Kandahjaya, *Sañ Hyañ Kamahāyānikan*, 70, 72.

35 Ishii, Correlation, Table 2.

*svam ātmānam parityajya tapobhir na ca pīḍayet*³⁶ /
*yathāsukham sukham dhāryam*³⁷ *sambuddho*³⁸ *'yam anāgataḥ* // 31

ka: / *pativar ikāvakta*³⁹ / *svakāyanirapekṣataḥ* kita hayva tṛṣṇa riñ avak / *tapobhir na ca pīḍayet*⁴⁰ / hayva pinirsakitan⁴¹ riñ tapa / hayva vineh gumavayakən kavənañnya / *yathāsukham sukham dhāryam* / *yathāsukhātāḥ*⁴² lvirantat gavayaknañ bodhimārga / *sambuddho 'yam anāgataḥ* / hayva gyā hyañ buddha kita dlāha /

Having given up one's own Self, one should not oppress [oneself] with acts of penance. One should follow pleasure, comfortably, for he is a future Awakened one.

»The meaning is: you should abandon your body to its fate; you are *svakāyanirapekṣa*, you should have no attachment to the body; *tapobhir na ca pīḍayet*: don't torture it with austerities; don't allow them to take power over you; *yathāsukham sukham dhāryam*: as you carry forward the way to enlightenment the path you take should be one of ease; *sambuddho 'yam anāgataḥ*: don't rush; you [will become] the Lord Buddha in the future.«⁴³

An analysis of the Old Javanese passage shows that, in common with the initial stanzas of the *Amaramālā*, the *vyākhyā* form of commentary has had a shaping effect on how »translation« was conceived of in the production of the SHKM. The Old Javanese commentary does not directly render the Sanskrit into Old Javanese following the *vyākhyā* form, but instead repeats each of the four Sanskrit *pādas* and glosses them into Old Javanese.

First, the Old Javanese phrases that translate *pāda* (a) of SHKM verse 37 begin with an imperative form (*pativar ikāvakta*, »abandon your body to its fate«). This suggests that the text was used as an active guide for imparting the particular steps of an initiation, a fact that is not always brought out explicitly in the Sanskrit verses of the SHKM.⁴⁴ The translation then moves on to a paired Sanskrit-Old Javanese phrase that expands on this theme by introducing a Sanskrit synonym and its gloss. Here the Sanskrit synonym introduced by the composer of the Old Javanese commentary (*svakāyanirapekṣa*, »one who takes no notice of one's own body«) suggests an easy familiarity with the essentials of the technique of

36 Em.; *ṇnaḥ tha pīḍayet* ms., *nātipīḍayet* em. Kats, Wulff. The text has been reconstructed on the basis of the numerous Sanskrit parallels (viz. Dīpaṅkarabhadra, *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, ed. Klein-Schwind, 384b; *Hevajrasakraprakriyā*, ed. Finot, 27; *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, ed. Negī, 6.64b, *Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā*, ed. Tanemura, 6-6-6-2, verse 22, etc.).

37 Em. Kats (silent); *dhāryya* ms.

38 *sambuddho 'yam* ms., Speyer, *sambuddheyam* Kats.

39 Thus the ms.; *prativārikāvakta* em. Kats, *paṭavarikāvakta* em. Wulff.

40 Cf. above, fn. 36.

41 *Pini[r]sakitan* Kats, *pinrisakitan* em. Wulff.

42 *yathāsukhātāḥ* em., *yathāsukatāḥ* Kats.

43 This excerpt from the SHKM has previously been published as an example of a passage on the practice of yoga in a short study of the Old Javanese *Bhīṣmaparva* by Hunter, *Bhagavad-Gītā* sections, 192-193.

44 Based on his study of Sakai's work, de Jong (Notes, 621-622) proposed that the textual antecedents of the SHKM related to »four kinds of consecration (*abhiṣeka*) associated with the *anuttarayoga* texts«, thus underlining the initiatory aspect of works like the SHKM and *Saṅ Hyañ Kamahāyānikan*.

creating well-formed Sanskrit nominal compounds (*samāsa*).⁴⁵ Second, the introduction of certain explanatory phrases in the SHKM suggests the development of an indigenous school of thought that has been brought to bear in glossing Sanskrit originals.

In the second *pāda*, it may not be accidental that an Old Javanese verb phrase (*pinirsakitan* »be made to be in pain«) has been chosen in that its morphosyntactic form to some degree mirrors the complexity of the Sanskrit optative *pīḍayet*.

In *vyākhyā* form, the third *pāda* of the Sanskrit *śloka* is repeated, along with an Old Javanese gloss that to our mind is more clearly worded than the somewhat elusive phrasing of the Sanskrit. The syntax of the Old Javanese is quite alien to Indo-European forms of construction: *lvir-a-nta*, »your form should be« is an irrealis form based on a nominal root, with the addition of a second person pronominal clitic (*-nta*), while *t'gavayakna* is an irrealis form, here with optative force.⁴⁶

Once we consider the details of Old Javanese syntax, the phrasing of the gloss reads with a precision that suggests principles of brevity and clarity well known from the South Asian *śāstrīya* tradition, and may indicate an inclination among Javanese composers to seek a similar form of precision in their own idiom. It is clear that in formal terms there is a great deal of similarity with the »*vyākhyā* style« of the *Amaramālā*: for instance, we can see a similar tendency to combine the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *vyākhyā* style with direct translation of parts of the *śloka*, either in mixed Sanskrit-Old Javanese or in Old Javanese. Note that the SHKM pattern follows that of the *Amaramālā*, but is, if anything, more conservative in that it retains the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *vyākhyā* format for all of the four *pādas* (b-d), where the *Amaramālā* switches to direct translation in (c-d). In conclusion, it can be said that the SHKM takes up the commentarial style of Prakritization proposed in the *Amaramālā*, and carries it forward in the service of the didactic needs of the Buddhist institutions of ancient Java, apparently in terms of practices of initiation.

Case Study III: The *Vṛhaspatitattva*

Like many other works from the Old Javanese didactic tradition, the Śaiva speculative and soteriological text *Vṛhaspatitattva* provides us with no firm internal evidence that could be used to establish its date of composition. In cases like these we have to rely on the more circumstantial evidence of the contents of the text, their possible relationship with other texts in the corpus, and with antecedent textual materials from South Asia – namely, the body of early Śaiva Siddhāntatantras, alongside Sāṅkhya and Pāśupata sources. A number of scholars have previously sketched some of the doctrinal characteristics of the *Vṛhaspatitattva*, and argued that this text, along with a handful of other texts of the *tattva* genre, may be regarded as precursors of the (mature) Sanskrit Śaiva Saiddhāntika scriptures, which started to develop in India from the sixth century onwards.⁴⁷ Acri⁴⁸ has advanced a solution to the problem of the identification of the term *Alepaka* found among three terms referring to sectarian orientations in *Vṛhaspatitattva* 2.3-4 and 3.37, viz. *Śaiva*, *Pāśupata*, *Alepaka*. This reference

45 A recent contribution by Radicchi (More on the *Kāraṅgamaṅgraha*) has demonstrated the emphasis found in the Javano-Balinese tradition on the correct formation of *samāsa*. Important passages on this subject can be found in Old Javanese works like the *Kāraṅgamaṅkṣepa* and the *Kāraṅgamaṅgraha*.

46 See Oglobin, *Irrealis*, 3 for a brief review of the use of the second person proclitic form *t'* in the formation of one type of imperative construction. See also Hunter, Yati, 11.

47 Ziesenis, *Studien*, 4.

48 Acri, Vaimala sect.

had previously been assumed to parallel later references to the three major religious sects of East Java, the well-known *Śaiva-Sogata-Ṛṣi*. While the *Vṛhaspatitattva* term *Pāśupata* can be linked to the term *Ṛṣi*, efforts to link the *Alepaka* with some form of Buddhism have fallen far short of being satisfactory. Drawing on Sanskrit sources, Aciri has noted that the term *Alepaka* is synonymous with Vaimala, an early Atimārga sect within Śaivism, which may have broken off from the Pāśupatas at an early date.

The reference to the *Alepaka* sect represents a crucial point in the history of religion in premodern Java. The triad *Śaiva-Pāśupata-Alepaka* suggests that the *Vṛhaspatitattva* may have been composed at a time when Buddhist institutions of East Java had yet to gain enough importance to be accepted as a major sectarian division within the larger grouping of religious institutions. We know that Buddhist institutions were supported by the Kaḍiri kings beginning with Airlaṅga and gained greater prominence during the Singhasari dynasty (1222-1293 CE). Their presence as a major element in the configuration of religious domains was formalized, and listed with precise detail, in fourteenth century works of the Majapahit dynasty like the *Deśavarṇana*. But the evidence of the *Vṛhaspatitattva* suggests that at the time of its composition the author(s) recognized two currents representing the Atimārga forms of Śaivism, as opposed to a third – and possibly predominant current – representing a Javanese mainstream form of Mantramārga Śaivism akin to the Indian Śaivasiddhānta.

When we look closely at the *Vṛhaspatitattva* we find that the dyadic presentation of Sanskrit verses and Old Javanese glosses is very much in evidence. However, among the glosses we find both simpler exegeses that follow the phrase-by-phrase presentation of the *vyākhyā* model, and more complex cases that often represent fully developed doctrinal presentations:

*bhagavan deva devānām anādīpameśvara /
samākhyāhi tattvaṁ sarvaṁ ramayan⁴⁹ sacarācaram // 2*

sājñā bhaṭāra / kasihana rānak bhaṭāra / varahən ika sañ hyañ aji kabeh / matañnyan akveh prabhedanira de bhaṭāra / an pavarah ri sañ vatək devatā kabeh / hana Śaiva nāranya / hana Pāśupata nāranya / hana Alepaka nāranya / ika ta kabeh / kapva dudū / pavarah bhaṭāra sovañsovañ / lavan ikañ śāstra viḥ akveh ata prakāranya / ndya ta kaliñanika / matañnyan vineh makveha / ikananā mārگا kalavan aji de bhaṭāra / mañkana liñ bhagavān Vṛhaspati //

Oh Lord, God of Gods, Supreme Lord without beginning, may you relate to me (the truth about) all the elements of existence, both moving and unmoving.

»O Lord, please be kind to your son, teach me the reverend sacred lore in its entirety, [and] the reason why there are many different forms of it, as it is taught to the assembly of the gods. There is what is called Śaiva, there is what is called Pāśupata, there is what is called Alepaka. All of them, they are equally different teachings of the Lord, one by one. And also, there are many classes of scriptures. What is the meaning of this, [and] the reason why so many religious paths and scriptures have been allowed by the Lord?«

49 Sudarshana Devi (*Vṛhaspati-tattva* »Text with notes« section, 11) has noted the difficulties of the reading of the fourth hemistich from the various mss. and that her emendation to *ramayan* may not be entirely apposite.

The analysis of the Old Javanese passage reveals a text-building strategy that does not depend on a *vyākhyā* form of composition, but rather represents the »pure dyadic« form. The passage forms a loosely structured unit with the opening *śloka*, but in terms of meaning does not necessarily relate to it on a one-to-one basis.

In the opening clause (*sājñā bhaṭāra / kasihana rānak bhaṭāra*), the phrasing corresponds roughly to the string of vocatives filling the first two hemistiches of the Sanskrit verse (*bhagavan deva devānām anādiparameśvara*), but does not represent so much a translation or gloss on the Sanskrit as a paralleling of the Sanskrit vocatives with phrasing that is well-known from the entire tradition of prose works in Old Javanese, and is, indeed, retained in the special Old Javanese-derived language of the Balinese shadow theatre (*wayang*).

The clause *varahān ika sañ hyañ aji kabeh* glosses the Sanskrit *samākhyāhi tattvaṃ sarvaṃ*, but replaces the *tattva* »principles of reality« of the Sanskrit passage with the Old Javanese phrase *sañ hyañ aji kabeh*, »the reverend sacred lore in its entirety.« This could be due to the fact that *tattva* in Old Javanese could signify a »sacred text on metaphysics«.

In the lines that follow thereupon, there is still some link with the Sanskrit *śloka* in that the phrase *akveh prabhedanira*, »there are many different forms of them«, can be said to be related to the element of contrastive plurality in the phrase *sacarācaram*, »those that are ambulatory, and those that are not« (i.e., animate and inanimate entities); the Old Javanese cannot be considered a direct gloss on the Sanskrit, but rather continues the line of development that was initiated in verse 2. In the clause starting with *hana śaiva* [...], there is no longer any direct connection between the *śloka* and the Old Javanese. Instead the composer has introduced a discussion of three sectarian divisions within Śaivism that appear to be an entirely Śaivite form of the »three denominations« (*tripakṣa*) known from East Javanese textual sources from as early as the composition of the *kakavin Bhāratayuddha* (c. 1135-1157 CE). The discussion is continued, with a final appeal to the deity that recalls the imperative phrase of the Sanskrit (*samākhyāhi tattvaṃ sarvaṃ*). The closing statement, *mañkana liñ bhagavān Vṛhaspati*, has no parallel in the Sanskrit. The *śloka* and its »dyadic« counterpart in the Old Javanese are thus set into the framework of a *tantra*- or *purāṇa*-like narrative that reproduces a doctrinal discussion in the form of a conversation between a sage and the deity.

Verse 15 of the *Vṛhaspatitattva* gives us a good example of the continuing use of the *vyākhyā* form of glossing in this early work of Javanese Śaivism:

laghu prakāśakam sattvaṃ cañcalam tu rajaḥ sthitam /
tamo guru varaṇakam ity etac cittalakṣaṇam // 15 //
ikañ citta mahañan māva / yeka sattva ñaranya / ikañ madərəs molah / yeka rajah
ñaranya / ikañ abvat pətən / yeka tamah ñaranya //

Sattva is light and brilliant, while rajas is dynamic. Tamas is heavy and concealing. Such are the characteristics of the intellect.

»The intellect that is light and brightly shining, that is called *sattva*. That which moves in a rushing flow, that is called *rajah*. That which is heavy and dark, that is called *tamah*«.

The *Vṛhaspatitattva* thus documents two exegetical strategies, both in a Sanskrit-Old Javanese dyadic form: one that considerably expands on the themes of the Sanskrit verses (such as verse 35), and one that follows more closely the *vyākhyā* style encountered in the *Amaramālā* and SHKM.

Case Study IV: The Jñānasiddhānta

The *Jñānasiddhānta* is a *tutur* organized in the form of Sanskrit-Old Javanese translation dyads, consisting in a core – also preserved independently as *Tutur Kamokṣan* – complemented by Old Javanese prose opening chapters. This text, of a composite and heterogeneous nature, reveals a later period of compilation and an East Javanese Majapahit milieu and/or its continuation in Bali from the late fifteenth century.⁵⁰ In this context, older material coming from (possibly Central and/or East) Java was assembled and redacted so as to meet the demands of the local audiences.

Jñānasiddhānta chapter 19, bearing the caption *Saṅ Hyaṅ Bhedajñāna* »The Holy Gnosis of Difference«, is made up of seven Sanskrit *ślokas* followed by an Old Javanese paraphrase and/or exegesis. This short chapter is a telling example of the reconfiguration of Indic elements into a local context of doctrine and yogic praxis. Its doctrinal background is thoroughly Śaiva, yet a few passages (either Sanskrit *ślokas* or their Old Javanese exegesis) contain echoes of Sāṅkhya-Yoga views that may be traced to the Sanskrit *Yogasūtras* and its annexed commentary *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (*Pātañjalayogaśāstra*). The presence of certain technical terms indeed points at a different philosophical and yogic tradition than the Śaiva yoga of the six ancillaries (*ṣaḍaṅgayoga*) commonly encountered in the *tutur/tattva* corpus, and reflects an attempt to reconcile Śaiva theistic yoga with Pātañjala yoga.

A dyadic style featuring a word-by-word commentary – much like those in the Sanskrit tradition – that elaborates on the text in an original way is epitomized in dyad 5. Having been introduced at the end of the Old Javanese exegesis to Sanskrit verse 4 as providing a definition of the gnosis labelled *Saṅ Hyaṅ Bhedajñāna*, this dyad describes the Lord Śiva, the individual soul, and the state of liberation:

*sakalaḥ kevalaḥ śuddhaḥ tryavasthaḥ puruṣaḥ smṛtaḥ /
malinatvacittamokṣaḥ kalpyate nirmalaḥ śivaḥ || 5 ||*

Tiga *avasthā* ya *saṅ puruṣa* riṅ *kaləpasan*: hanān *sakala*, hanān *kevala*, hanān *śuddha*. Katuturakəna sirān maṅkana: *sakala* ṅaranya makāvaka triguṅa sira. *Kevala* ṅaranya atiṅgal pamukti sira. *Malinatva* ṅaranya papāsanira⁵¹ mvaṅ triguṅa. Manovijñānāvakanira. *Śuddha* ṅaranya patiniṅ manovijñāna. Sakeṅ sira māri mamikalpa, śūnyākāra, kaivalya, tan hana gələhgələhnirān pamukti. Sira sinaṅguh *nirmalaśiva*.

The soul is taught to have three conditions: the one visible in material form, the isolated, and the pure; the freedom of the mind from the condition of impurity is conceived to be the Spotless Śiva.

50 Hooykaas, Śaiva Siddhānta, has discussed in detail the textual relationship between the *Tutur Ādhyātmika* (edited by Soebadio as *Jñānasiddhānta*), the *Tutur Kamokṣan*, and the *Gaṇapatitattva*. This chapter is found, with only slight variations, in *Tutur Kamokṣan* and *Gaṇapatitattva* (40-45). Some of its *ślokas* have parallels in chapter 5 of the *Bhuvanakośa*.

51 The reading *papasah*, from the base *sah* »depart, be separated, come loose« (*papasah* = to be separated, split, be broken; see OJED, 1592), makes no sense in this context, and requires emendation. What the text implies here is clearly that the stained soul is ensnared by the three *guṇas*. Soebadio (*Jñānasiddhānta*, 211) translated the clause *papasahnira mvaṅ triguṅa* as »its connection with the three constituents«, yet she did not justify her translation. Thus, the reading *papasah* may be a corruption of either *papāśa* or *mapāśa*, from the Sanskrit *pāśa* (»fetter«), which would fit well into the Śaiva doctrinal context, but have the disadvantage of not being attested in Old Javanese texts (on the other hand, we would expect the attested forms *kapāśa* and *kapāśan* to be followed by *deniṅ* rather than *mvaṅ*: see OJED, 1309).

Three are the conditions of the soul in the state of liberation: there is the one in which he is visible in material form; there is the one in which he is isolated; there is the one in which he is pure. That [souls] being in such [conditions] will [now] be taught: *Visible in material form* means that it assumes the form of the three constituents. *Isolated* means that it has left behind the [condition of] enjoyer. *The condition of impurity* means that it is fettered by the three constituents. Its body is mental knowledge (*manovijñāna*). *Pure* means the end of mental knowledge. Because of that it ceases to produce dualizing thought, [its] appearance is void, [it is] isolated; it has no stain when it is in the state of liberation. It is called the *Spotless Śiva*.

As Acri has pointed out elsewhere,⁵² *śloka* 5 has a parallel in the Sanskrit *Kiraṇatantra* (Vidyāpāda 1.23ab),⁵³ an early scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta:

kevalaḥ sakalaḥ śuddhaś tryavasthaḥ puruṣaḥ smṛtaḥ /
malinatvāc ceter mokṣaḥ prāpyate nirmalāc chivāt //

The soul is taught to have three conditions; [that of] the one without [at least one of the bonds] (*kevala*), the one with [all three bonds] (*sakala*), and the pure soul (*śuddha*).⁵⁴ The liberation of the mind from stain is obtained because of [the will of] the spotless Śiva.

The version of the *śloka* preserved in the *Jñānasiddhānta*, as well as the parallels found in other *tuturs*, all read *kalpyate* »is conceived« instead of *prāpyate* »is obtained«.⁵⁵ Furthermore, all the ablative endings found in the *Kiraṇa* version are missing in the versions documented in the Archipelago texts, the third quarter being formed by a single compound and the last one substituting the ablative endings (*nirmalāc chivāt*) with nominatives. The meaning conveyed in the two versions of the *śloka* is at variance insofar as the Javano-Balinese one equates the mind freed from stain to the Spotless Śiva, whereas the South Asian one implies that liberation of the mind from stain is obtained because of the Spotless Śiva – thus alluding to the idea of divine grace that played a role in the process of liberation according to the early Śaivasiddhānta, and which was of even greater importance to the theologians of the of non-dualist Tamil Śaivasiddhānta.⁵⁶

The Sanskrit verse appears to hint at a fundamental doctrinal tenet of the Śaiva Siddhānta, according to which the three conditions of the soul (viz. *sakala*, *kevala*, *śuddha*) depend on the kind of stain it is affected by, e.g. *māyā*, *karma*, and *āṇava*. With regard to this matter there are different views within the Siddhānta, as different scriptures and commentaries

52 Acri, Sanskrit-Old Javanese *tutur* literature, 119-120.

53 Intriguingly, the second hemistich is not found in all the ancient Nepalese manuscripts nor in Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary (see Goodall, *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary*, 221, n. 188), but it appears in the later South Indian redactions, such as the Devakoṭṭai edition, and in the version commented upon by Tryambakaśambhu (who places it after 1.23d, see Goodall, *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary*, 29). Since some of these redactions may have been compiled even after the twelfth century, we may assume that this verse was borrowed in that form either from a South Indian recension of the *Kiraṇa* or from another version posterior, or in any event unknown to, Rāmakaṇṭha.

54 The translation of this hemistich is by Goodall, *Hindu Scriptures*, 345.

55 But some (apparently corrupt) Indian mss. read *procyate* »is declared« (see Goodall, *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary*, 29).

56 For a discussion of the doctrinal contents of this *śloka* in the *Kiraṇa*, see Brunner, *Analyse du Kiraṇāgama*, 313.

present distinct systematizations.⁵⁷ However, the Old Javanese commentary does not refer to any of these systematizations, and does not mention the different kinds of stain or the categories of beings known as *pralayakevala*, *vijñānakevala*, etc., either.⁵⁸ On the other hand, the *sakala* state is defined as the embodiment of the soul in the three constituents (*guṇa*). The condition of impurity means that the soul is not separated from the three *guṇas*. This viewpoint may reflect an either archaic or »local« doctrinal status quo, in which the Saiddhāntika ideas around stain (*mala*) had not yet been codified, and a Sāṅkhya-Yoga doctrinal matrix was predominant.

The Old Javanese form *pamukti*, deriving from the Sanskrit base *bhukti* (see OJED, p. 269), refers to the condition of enjoyer – in the sense of »experiencer« – of the fruits of actions. According to the Śaivasiddhānta, liberation consists in the freedom of the soul from the condition, caused by stain, of *bhokṛtva* – i.e. of being the experiencer of *karman* and its fruits. The concepts of *bhokṛtva* and *kevalatva* also feature prominently in the seminal scriptures of Pātañjala Yoga. The afflictions, being present in the mind (*manas*), are ascribed to the soul (*puruṣa*), because it is the enjoyer (*bhokṛ*) of their fruits. *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* 2.27 and 4.34 define the *puruṣa* as being in the *kevala* state when it transcends the three *guṇas* through the *buddhi*. The condition in which the mind is freed is called *cittavimukti*. According to Sāṅkhya-Yoga philosophy, *śuddha* is the state of the *puruṣa* when it does not assume the form of mind (*citta*), although it knows the mind. This view seems to be echoed in the Old Javanese commentary to *śloka* 5, which explains the word *śuddha* as a psychological condition involving the end of dualizing thought intended as mental knowledge (*manovijñāna*). This results in the isolation of the mind. The appearance of *manovijñāna* in this context is quite intriguing, for it is typically found as a technical term in Buddhist sources, meaning »mind-consciousness«. ⁵⁹ Our text thus appears to present a mixture of Śaiva, Sāṅkhya-Yoga, and Buddhist doctrinal elements, which also feature in the following dyad 6.⁶⁰

The dyads discussed above, and, indeed, the whole chapter 5 of the *Jñānasiddhānta*, present examples of the *vyakhyā* style. At the same time, they suggest that the commentator was aware of different streams of Indic religions and philosophies and their scriptural canons, and document his attempt to reconfigure those originally »Indian« elements into a local theology and praxis. The resulting doctrinal and soteriological system may be regarded as a synthesis of theologemes and yogic practices belonging to what were perceived in South Asian Sanskrit sources as distinct orientations, i.e. Śaivism and Sāṅkhya/Yoga.

57 See the discussion in Brunner, *Analyse du Suprabhedāgama*, 53: »quand il [i.e. the *ātman*] pénètre dans le ventre de la *māyā* et en même temps rencontre (mais comment?) *karman*, on le qualifie de *sakala* [...]; *śuddha*, il devient ce qu'il a toujours été en essence, pur et semblable à Śiva: c'est l'état de pureté totale, *śuddha avasthā*.« See also the scheme in Davis, *Ritual*, 26.

58 Goodall, *Hindu Scriptures*, 345 fn. 15.

59 *Manovijñāna* is not listed in OJED, which, on the other hand, lists *manovijñā* (1105) and hesitantly glosses it as »knowing the mind, versed in spiritual things?«

60 See Aciri, Re-configuration.

Case Study V: The Bhuvanakośa

The *Bhuvanakośa* (*The Storehouse of Worlds*) is a Śaiva text of the *tutur* genre. This textual source of uncertain dating, probably compiled in different stages, has come down to us through Balinese palm-leaf manuscripts. Comprising about five hundred Sanskrit *ślokas* accompanied by translations, paraphrases, and/or commentaries in Old Javanese, the *Bhuvanakośa* is the longest scripture of the *tutur* class. A common opinion among Balinese and early Western scholars is that the *Bhuvanakośa* is an early text – probably one of the earliest of the *tutur* genre. While its formal organization in Sanskrit-Old Javanese translation dyads instead of Old Javanese prose (whether interspersed with Sanskrit *ślokas* or not) would suggest that this is the case, one can never be sure: witness, for instance, the bulky *tutur Śivāgama*, which is organized in just the same way, and yet was composed by Ida Pedanda Made Sidemen in the first half of the twentieth century. What is important to stress here is that the *Bhuvanakośa* is a heterogeneous and conglomerative source, formed by at least two textual units that might have been at some point in time (parts of) distinct texts, namely the *Brahmarahasya(śāstra)* (chapters 1-5), and the *Jñānasaṅkṣepa/Siddhāntaśāstra/Jñānasiddhānta* (chapters 6 to 11). The latter chapters are characterized by a remarkable intertextuality with the *Jñānasiddhānta* discussed in the previous section, which has also been preserved uniquely in Balinese manuscripts, and which shares several Sanskrit verses and similar – yet not identical – paraphrases.

Although the *Bhuvanakośa* documents a form of Śaivism that seems to be related to that of texts of the *tattva* genre transmitted in Java and or Bali, such as the *Dharma Pātāñjala*, the *Vṛhaspatitattva*, and the *Tattvajñāna*, the text focuses more on yoga and mantric mysticism than metaphysics, and would seem to betray a derivation (or influence) from a different South Asian prototypical tradition.⁶¹ The Śaiva doctrine shares with the *Bhuvanakośa* several archaic elements, but some sections of the text present Vedāntic analogies that are found in the Upaniṣads, as well as in Vedānta-influenced non-dualistic South Indian Saiddhāntika texts. Just in the case of the *Jñānasiddhānta*, this suggests that the text may be the product of a relatively late Javano-Balinese milieu that appropriated and restated earlier Sanskrit(ic) material, or even composed the Sanskrit verses locally.⁶² Below we quote and analyse two passages that illustrate the different forms of *vyākhyā* textual organization employed by this text.

61 In this respect, one also notes a non-dualistic flavour of many of its theologemes and the use of a Vedāntic terminology, which is a trait of relatively late (post tenth-century) Śaiva texts composed or transmitted in South India. The text may have preserved ancient doctrines that seem to me to be derived by the Sanskrit Upaniṣadic corpus, in particular the *Śvetāśvatara* – the earliest theistic/Śaiva Upaniṣad (whose most recent textual strand might go back to the second or third century CE). But the »philosophical« section of the text, from Chapter 2 to Chapter 4, shares several doctrinal elements in common with the systematic writings of the *tattva* genre.

62 Indeed, it is entirely possible that the majority of the *ślokas* of the text were actually composed in Java or Bali, for they are characterized by remarkably non-standard features, metrical oddities, and (very rarely) even contaminations from Old Javanese. Furthermore, virtually none of them has been traced back to Indian texts so far.

Chapter 7.23:

*sakāro bhagavān viṣṇuḥ / makāro bhagavān śivaḥ /
bhakāro bhagavān brahmā / ekatattvaṃ⁶³ trayībhavet⁶⁴ // 7.23*

nāhan matañyan viśeṣa sañ hyañ śivabhasma / sañ hyañ trisamaya hana riñ bhasma /
bhaṭāra viṣṇu sira sakāra / bhaṭāra śiva sira makāra / bhaṭāra brahmā sira bhakāra / nā
ta lvirnirān tiga dadi eka //

*The Lord Viṣṇu is the SA, Lord Śiva is the MA, Lord Brahmā is the BHA. One reality
becomes threefold.*

Such is the reason why the holy ashes of Śiva are special. The reverend Trisamaya⁶⁵
is in the ashes. The Lord Viṣṇu, he is the SA. The Lord Śiva, he is the MA. The Lord
Brahmā, he is the BHA. Thus is their nature as the three become one.

In this translation dyad, the Old Javanese glosses all the elements of the Sanskrit verse,
and at the same time re-contextualizes them into a Balinese framework of speculation re-
volving around the concept of *trisamaya* («the Union of the Three [Gods]»), whereby the
three syllables of the word *bhasma* are connected with the deities of the Trisamaya/Trimūrti,
and a ritual praxis called *śivabhasma* («The Ashes of Śiva»), which is the main topic of the
chapter. The Sanskrit *cvi*-verbal compound *trayī-bhavet* is analysed by the commentator as
two separate words, *trayī* being the subject (as if it were *trayaḥ*, »triad«) and *ekatattvaṃ*
the object, resulting in an inverted sequence (i.e. three becoming one rather than one reality
becoming threefold, as in the Sanskrit).⁶⁶

63 Em.; *ekatattva* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

64 Em.; *trayībhavet* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

65 OJED, 2040: «(the meeting of three?) name of the trinity Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva».

66 Alternatively, *trayi* could be a corruption of *trayaṃ* (however, cf. the similar construction *eko eva trayībhavet* in *Bhuvanakośa* 3.74d).

Chapter 8.25:

*devadaityyamanuṣyāṇām / mudrārccaṇavidhikramāt / kunaṅ ikaṅ mudrā / mvaṅ arc-
caṇa / saha vidhikrama / deva / daitya /⁶⁷ manuṣya / ya ta phalanya / homabhasman
tathā moham / kunaṅ ikaṅ vvaṅ mahoma / mabhasma / yan tar vruh riṅ śaivasiddhān-
tajñāna⁶⁸ / niyata moha / ṅa / hūmḍhrūt-kāram idam mantram / ikaṅ mantra hūmḍhrūt-
kāra / sakale na tu niṣkalam / riṅ sakala ikā / kunaṅ ikaṅ niṣkala / tan maṅkana /
etat sarvvaṅ mahādevi⁶⁹ / ikā ta kabeh bhaṭārī / yo jñātvā svarggaḍam mohāt / yan
saṅ sādḥaka karaktaniṅ mudrārccaṇa / mvaṅ mantravidhikrama / ya ta tuməmuṅ
svarggaphala sira / makahīnaniṅ svargga sira / saka ri puṅguṅnira riṅ niṣkalajñāna
ikā / mama māyāvimoḥitaḥ⁷⁰ / ikā taṅ vvaṅ maṅkana / kna deniṅ baṅcanaṅku ikā /
mudrārccaṇavidhiṅ kuryāt / kunaṅ kagavayanikaṅ mudrārccaṇa / mvaṅ vidhikrama⁷¹
/ argaḍaḥ⁷² mokṣakāṅkṣiṅaḥ⁷³ / yekā vaṅklaṅ saṅ mahyun iṅ kamokṣaṅ //*

*By [following] the right order of the prescribed regimen, worship, and gestures [one will
be reincarnated] among gods, demons, and human beings. The fruit of gestures and
worship, together with the right order of the prescribed regimen (vidhikrama), is [re-
incarnation as] gods, demons, and human beings. Similarly, the fire-ritual and ashes
[lead] to delusion. The man who performs the fire-ritual and uses ashes, if he does not
know the doctrine of the Śaivasiddhānta, is called a »deluded one« indeed. This man-
tra hūmḍhrūt-kāram. The mantra hūmḍhrūt-kāram. [Is] in the realm of form, but not the
formless. It is within the realm of form. However, the formless is not so.*

*All this, o Great Goddess. All this, o Goddess. Which bestows heaven, he who knows it
because of delusion. If the practitioner is engrossed in gestures and worship, as well as
mantras and the right order of the prescribed regimen, he obtains the fruit of heaven.
He has heaven as his limit because of his ignorance about the formless gnosis. He is
beguiled by my magical power. This kind of man, he is struck by my beguilement. To
perform gestures, worship, and the prescribed regimen – The performance of gestures,
worship, and the right order of the prescribed regimen – is an impediment for one
desiring deliverance.⁷⁴ That would be an impediment for he who desires deliverance.⁷⁵*

This passage documents a case of *vyākhyā* style inserting the Sanskrit directly within the Old Javanese exegesis. The text advances a critique, from a gnostic (Mantramārga) point of view, to the outer-oriented forms of worship associated with Atimārga Śaivism. *Hūmḍhrūt-kāram* may represent either a local development or a »corruption« of the sound *huḍḍuṅ/huḍḍuk* (*huḍḍukkāra*) proffered by the Pāśupatas in the course of their ascetic practice. Also remarkable is the usage of the Sanskrit *argala* (= *argaḍa*) in the sense of »impediment«. One

67 Em.; *vidhikrama / daitya /* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

68 Em.; *śivasiddhāntajñāna* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

69 Leiden Cod. Or. 5022; *mahādevi* IDGC.

70 Em.; *māyāvimoḥitaḥ* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

71 Em.; *vidhikarmma* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

72 Em.; *argaḍa* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

73 Em.; *mokṣakāṅkṣiṅaḥ* Leiden Cod. Or. 5022, IDGC.

74 MW glosses *argala* (= *argaḍa*) as »a wooden bolt or pin for fastening a door or the cover of a vessel; a bar, check, impediment«; compare *sārgala* »obstructed, impeded, prevented«.

75 We accept OJED's (p. 2197) unattested/reconstructed root *vaṅkəl** as the basis of *amaṅkəl* (1) »to get stuck (in the throat, etc.);« (2) »unwilling, recalcitrant, savage (elephant).« Thus, the substantive (+ irrealis) *vaṅkəla* seems compatible with the meaning of the Sanskrit *argaḍa*.

could be tempted to take *argaḍa* not as a separate word but as a compound that would end with *mokṣakāṅkṣiṇaḥ* (understood as an irregular *-a* stem in the nominative instead of an *-in* stem in the genitive), therefore *argaḍamokṣakāṅkṣiṇaḥ* might have been intended as meaning »one who desires to be free from an impediment«. But *mokṣakāṅkṣin* is a cliché in tantric literature, meaning »one desiring release«, and the internal doctrinal and logical coherence of the passage requires the interpretation of *argaḍa* as an »impediment« (i.e., gestures, etc.) holding back the practitioner desiring release. This suggests that the Sanskrit is either a de-contextualized quotation from a South Asian text, or the product of a Javano-Balinese milieu.

Conclusion

In examples from the *Amaramālā*, SHKM, *Vṛhaspatitattva*, *Jñānasiddhānta*, and *Bhuvanakośa* we have observed the use of a *vyākhyā* model in translation and a »dyadic« mode of composition based on the juxtaposition of Sanskrit verses and their Old Javanese glosses. We have further seen that in the dyadic pattern there is a development from an earlier phase when the glosses align closely with the original to one that allows for an increasingly more flexible approach to the contents of the glosses. In the *Vṛhaspatitattva* this tendency is so pronounced that the Sanskrit verses in many cases do no more than launch an extended doctrinal passage.

Further studies of the dyadic form have shown that it was used as a text-building strategy in the Old Javanese *parva* literature, but was not limited to it: later texts in the *tutur* traditions once popular in Sunda, Java, and Bali (and still popular in Bali) show us that the structuring of larger stretches of discourse in terms of »translation dyads« continued to play a major role in text-building, while the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *vyākhyā* format for glossing at the phrase and clause levels lost none of its usefulness in the field of doctrinal exposition. Metaphysical texts from the *tutur* tradition like the *Gaṇapatitattva*, (parts of) which bear clear signs of late composition, as well as works devoted to ethics and the art of polity (*Nītisāra*, *Ślokāntara*, *Vratīśāsana*, etc.) are among the many texts organized along these familiar lines.

One contribution that this study may have to make is the elaboration of a taxonomy, and perhaps even the opening up of the possibility of a rough chronology for the development of the prose traditions in Old Javanese based on several stages in the use of text-building elements, which we believe ultimately owe their origin to the bilingual pedagogy of religious institutions of Central Java, c. 732-928 CE. While a methodology that pays close attention to formal features of text-building may never be able to provide us with a means for making a completely accurate analysis of the textual chronology of the Javano-Balinese tradition, it may provide us with a metric that can be used alongside other methods of textual analysis to give us a clearer picture of the development of Old Javanese letters. Given that caveat, we will propose here four modes or stages (not necessarily occurring in strictly chronological order) in the development of Old Javanese text-building strategies that appear to align with textual sources from the didactic and prose traditions focused on in this study:

- A first mode – probably the earliest – where the *vyākhyā* model of translation and a dyadic form of text-building prevails. This stage, represented by the *Amaramālā*, bespeaks a pedagogy that recapitulates the basic style of glossing known from Indian forms of the commentary, but combined with the element of translation that facilitated a »connecting literature«.
- A second mode, illustrated by the SHKM, where *vyākhyā* translations and a dyadic form of text-building are dominant, but Old Javanese passages elaborating on the *śloka* include expansions that bring in materials from local perspectives, at the same time demonstrating the ability of the composers to fashion well-formed Sanskrit compounds.
- A third mode where dyadic composition and the *vyākhyā* format of translation are still prominent, but Old Javanese glosses on Sanskrit verses often develop lengthy doctrinal expositions that move far beyond an exegesis on the meaning of the *śloka*. While simpler translation dyads are found in the *Vṛhaspatitattva*, many run to extraordinary length.
- A fourth mode, not examined in this chapter, where the *śloka-vyākhyā* format and »translation dyads« have been adopted for the needs of prose works like the *parva* literature and *Tantri Kāmandaka*.

From this study we can conclude that the apparent lack in the archipelago of commentarial tradition parallel to that of South Asia reveals to us not the absence of a tradition of commentary, but exactly the opposite: the norms of the South Asian commentary were so deeply embedded in the pedagogy of religious institutions that they left indelible traces on all that was to follow.

We would like to conclude this essay with some theoretical reflections on the nature of the texts discussed here in the cadre of Western ideas of translation, paraphrase, and commentary, as well as the methodology of philological research. Recent philological work on Sanskrit and vernacular languages of South and Southeast Asia has shown an increasing interest in the reception of texts. Indic texts were historically malleable and were reinterpreted by their audiences in different geographical contexts and epochs, all the more so in Java and Bali, where the textual tradition was considerably open to creative reuse rather than faithful reproduction of a canonical prototype. In the case of the Old Javanese textual tradition and its continuation in Bali, one may say that local authors and copyists were not moved by the intent to faithfully translate the Sanskrit sources and interpret them in a manner that is coherent with those elaborated within the prototypical religio-philosophical traditions they stem from; rather, Sanskrit materials – often fragmentary, and perhaps composed centuries before – in the Indian subcontinent were de-contextualized and interpreted in the light of local beliefs and practices. That is to say, an Indic textual tradition transmitted to Southeast Asia was transformed and adapted into contextually appropriate and meaningful styles and genres.

Thus, Old Javanese texts can be regarded as reflecting a conversation between »Indic« and »vernacular« elements. Old Javanese literature was far from being a derivative, translation-oriented endeavour, but from its very inception showed the traits of originality and synthesis, implying a conscious selection of essential elements that resonated within the local culture and the creation of a new whole that met the demands of the local audiences. These »wholes« inevitably varied across time, local contexts characterized by different histories of reception, socio-cultural factors, and religious contingencies, as well as individual agents, although one notes a remarkable resilience of the pedagogical and formal features

characterizing the genres discussed in this article. Texts composed (or recompiled) in Bali after the fifteenth century carried meanings that were quite different from those they had in their original milieu, possibly in pre-tenth-century Central Java, and Sanskrit materials were understood, appropriated, and restated in Old Javanese in ways that would often be at odds with both a Western philological and a South Asian »traditional«/śāstric understanding. Inevitably, this local »restating« of Sanskritic religious texts and traditions involves a certain amount of »falsification« to create new meanings in context. While this is a totally legitimate process, philology should not shy away from identifying and explaining any textual errors, contaminations or variants alongside the local interpretations and restatements, which will, all together, contribute to our better understanding of Balinese linguistic, orthographic, lexical, grammatical, narrative, and conceptual understandings (and misunderstandings) and practices in their historical dimension.⁷⁶

Acknowledgements

Andrea Acri would like to acknowledge that research represented in parts of this work was conducted within the programme »Scripta-PSL. Histoire et pratiques de l'écrit« (principal investigators: Andrea Acri, EPHE, PSL and Arlo Griffiths, EFEO, PSL), »Investissements d'Avenir« launched by the French Government and implemented by ANR (ANR-10-IDEX-0001-02 PSL).

76 While making a case in favour of a philology that is more concerned with reception and variance than establishing »original« texts, Pollock (*Philology*, 406) still advocates for »a scale of judgment in reading tradition«, according to which »not all interpretations are worthy of philological attention to the same degree. People in a tradition inherit bad textual variants, or make simple grammatical mistakes, and these misunderstandings, unless they are productive of interpretation, carry a dimension of historical consciousness lower on the philological scale of value than others. In other words, not all errors [...] are equal: some falsehoods (or what appear to be falsehoods) carry deeper truths than others, especially in their historical effectivity«.

References

Abbreviations

MW = Monier Williams' Sanskrit-English Dictionary (Monier-Williams, 1899)

OJED = Old Javanese-English Dictionary (Zoetmulder and Robson, 1982)

SHKM = *Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānan Mantranaya*

WMP = Western Malayo-Polynesian

Manuscript sources

Amaramālā (within the *Candrakiraṇa*), palm-leaf ms. (*gebang*) L631, Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia.

Bhuvanakośa, (1) palm-leaf ms. (*lontar*) Cod. Or. 5022, Leiden University Library; (2) palm-leaf ms. (*lontar*) IDGC, private collection of Ida Dewa Gede Catra, Amlapura, Karangasem, Bali.

Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānan Mantranaya, palm-leaf ms. (*lontar*) Cod. Or. 5068, Leiden University Library.

Aichele, Walter, Vergessene Metaphoren als Kriterien der Datierung des altjavanischen Rāmāyaṇa, *Oriens Extremus: Zeitschrift für Sprach, Kunst und Kultur der Länder des Fernen Ostens* 16 (1969) 127-166.

Acri, Andrea, *Dharma Pātañjala: A Śaiva Scripture from Ancient Java Studied in the Light of Related Old Javanese and Sanskrit Texts* (second edition) (New Delhi, 2017).

Acri, Andrea (ed.), *Esoteric Buddhism in Mediaeval Maritime Asia: Networks of Masters, Texts, Icons* (Singapore, 2016).

Acri, Andrea, On birds, ascetics, and kings in Central Java: *Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin*, 24.96-126 and 25, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 166 (2010) 475-506.

Acri, Andrea, Re-configuration of divinity in Old Javanese Śaiva texts from the Indonesian Archipelago (with special reference to *Jñānasiddhānta*, chapter 19), in: s.n., *Travaux de Symposium International: Le Livre. La Roumanie. L'Europe. Troisième édition, Tome III* (Bucharest, 2011) 546-565.

Acri, Andrea, The Sanskrit-Old Javanese *tutur* literature from Bali: The textual basis of Śaivism in ancient Indonesia, *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici* 1 (2006) 107-137.

Acri, Andrea, The Vaimala sect of the Pāsupatas: New data from Old Javanese sources, *Tantric Studies* 1 (2008) 193-208.

Braginsky, Vladimir, *The System of Classical Malay Literature* (Leiden, 1993).

Brunner, Hélène, Analyse du *Kiraṇāgama*, *Journal Asiatique* 253 (1965) 309-328.

Brunner, Hélène, Analyse du *Suprabhedāgama*, *Journal Asiatique* 255 (1967) 31-60.

Davis, Richard H., *Ritual in an Oscillating Universe: Worshiping Śiva in Medieval India*, (Princeton, 1991).

Goodall, Dominic, *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra, Vol. 1: Chapters 1-6* (Pondicherry, 1998).

Goodall, Dominic (ed.) *Hindu Scriptures* (Los Angeles, 1996).

Goris, Rulof, *Bijdragen tot de Kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Balineesche Theologie* (Leiden, 1926).

- Dipaṅkarabhadra, *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, ed. Sabine Klein-Schwind, rev. H. Isaacson (based on ms. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. ms. sanscr. 257), (2008). e-text downloaded from <https://www.tantric-studies.uni-hamburg.de/research/e-texts/buddhist-e-texts/gusamavi.txt> (accessed May 2020)
- Hevajrasekaprakriyā*, ed. Louis Finot, Manuscripts sanskrits de *sādhana*'s retrouvés en Chine, *Journal Asiatique* 225 (1934) 1-85.
- Hooykaas, Christiaan, Śaiva Siddhānta in Java and Bali: Some remarks on its recent study, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 118 (1962) 309-327.
- Hunter, Thomas M., Bahasa Sanskerta di Nusantara: terjemahan, pemribumian, dan identitas antardaerah, in: Henri Chambert-Loir (ed.), *Sejarah Terjemahan di Indonesia dan Malaysia* (Jakarta, 2009) 23-47.
- Hunter, Thomas M., The *Bhagavad-Gītā* sections of the Old Javanese *Bhīṣmaparwa*, text-building and the formation of the state in pre-modern Indonesia, in: Shyam Saran (ed.), *Cultural and Civilisational Links between India and Southeast Asia: Historical and Contemporary Dimensions* (Singapore, 2018) 193-207.
- Hunter, Thomas M., *The Impact of Indian Forms of the Commentary on Text-building Strategies in Old Javanese*. Unpublished seminar paper (Pondicherry, 2005).
- Hunter, Thomas M., Translation in a world of diglossia, in: Jan van der Putten and Ronit Ricci (eds.), *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories* (Manchester, 2011) 9-26.
- Hunter, Thomas M., Yati, a structural principle in Old Javanese versification, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52 (2009) 1-52.
- Ishii, Kazuko, The correlation of verses of the *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya* with Vajrabodhi's *Jāpasūtra*, *Area and Culture Studies* 44 (1992) 225-236.
- Jordaan, Roy E. and Brian E. Colless, *The Mahārājas of the Isles, the Śailendra and the problem of Śrīwijaya* (Leiden, 2009).
- de Jong, Jan Willem, Notes on the sources and the text of the *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya*, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 136 (1974) 619-636.
- Kandahjaya, Hudaya, *Saṅ Hyaṅ Kamahāyānikan*, Borobudur and the origins of Esoteric Buddhism in Indonesia, in: Andrea Acri (ed.), *Esoteric Buddhism in Mediaeval Maritime Asia* (Singapore, 2014) 67-112.
- Kats, J., *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan: Oud-Javaansche tekst met inleiding, vertaling en aantekeningen* (The Hague, 1910).
- Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā*, ed. Ryugen Tanemura, E-text based on a preliminary edition of the *Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā*, Chapter 6. Unpublished PhD thesis (University of Oxford).
- Krom, Nicolaas J., *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* (The Hague, 1926).
- Lokesh Chandra, *Chanda-Karaṇa: The art of writing poetry*, in: Lokesh Chandra, *Cultural Horizons of India, Vol. 6: Studies in Tantra and Buddhism, Art and Archaeology, Language and Literature* (New Delhi, 1997).
- Lokesh Chandra, Sanskrit studies in classical Indonesia, in: Lokesh Chandra (ed.), *Cultural Horizons of India, Volume 4: Studies in Tantra and Buddhism, Art and Archaeology, Language and Literature* (New Delhi, 1995) 1-9.
- Miksic, John, *Borobudur: Golden Tales of the Buddhas* (London, 1990).
- Monier-Williams, Monier, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1899).
- Nihom, Max, *Studies in Indo-Indonesian Tantrism: The Kuṅjarakaraṇadharmakathana and the Yogatantra* (Vienna, 1994).
- Oglobin, Alexander K., *Irrealis in Old Javanese*. Unpublished seminar paper (Depok, 2005).

- Pollock, Sheldon, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India* (Berkeley, 2006).
- Pollock, Sheldon, Philology in three dimensions, *Postmedieval: A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies* 5/4 (2014) 398-413.
- Pollock, Sheldon, The Sanskrit cosmopolis, 300-1300 CE: Transculturation, vernacularization, and the question of ideology, in: Jan E. M. Houben (ed.), *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language* (Leiden, 1996) 197-248.
- Radicchi, Anna, More on the *Kāraṅgamaṅgraha*, a Sanskrit grammatical text from Bali, in: Jan E. M. Houben (ed.), *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language* (Leiden, 1996) 289-306.
- Raj Pant, Mahesh, *Jaṭarūpa's Commentary on the Amarakośa, Parts 1 and 2* (New Delhi, 2000).
- Sarkar, Himamsu Bhushan, *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java (Corpus Inscriptionum Javanicarum), up to 928 A.D.* (Calcutta, 1971).
- Sarvabuddhasamāyoga: Śrīsarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālasamvaranāmatantram (1-8), ed. Ṭhākurasena Negī, *Dhīḥ: Journal of Rare Buddhist Texts Research Project* 58 (2018) 141-201.
- Sudarshana Devi, *Viṣṇuśāstra-tattva, an Old Javanese Philosophical Text* (New Delhi, 1957).
- Soebadio, Haryati, *Jñānasiddhānta: Secret Lore of the Balinese Śaiva Priest* (The Hague, 1971).
- Speyer, Jacob S., Ein altjavanischer mahāyānistischer Katechismus, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 67 (1913) 347-362.
- Wulff, Kurt S., *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantrānaya: Ansprache bei der Weihe buddhistischer Mönche aus dem altjavanischen übersetzt und sprachlich erläutert* (Copenhagen, 1935).
- Zieseniss, Alexander, *Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus: Die Śaiva-Systematik des Viṣṇuśāstratattva* (New Delhi, 1958).
- Zoetmulder, Petrus J., *Kalangwan: A Survey of Old Javanese Literature* (The Hague, 1974).
- Zoetmulder, Petrus J. and Stuart O. Robson, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary* (The Hague, 1982).