C. Hooykaas

Saiva-Siddhanta in Java and Bali. (Met 1 afbeelding)

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 118 (1962), no: 3, Leiden, 309-327

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

SAIVA-SIDDHĀNTA IN JAVA AND BALI

SOME REMARKS ON ITS RECENT STUDY.

It is a generally known fact that Java's literary past is studied by using mss still to be found in Bali or originating there and scattered over libraries in Djakarta and Delhi, Leiden and London. The legend, improbable in itself and not substantiated by any fact known to historians, that this vast literature was introduced into Bali by Javanese fugitives fleeing the sword of Islam, say in the XVth or XVIth Century, seems to be ineradicable. The fact is that Bali has known Hinduism since the X. Century, originally by direct contact with India, and later from association with Java.

I hope shortly to present elsewhere a more complete bibliography for the study of Javano-Balinese religion; for this paper on Śaiva-Siddhānta-texts it seems sufficient to start in the twenties with the publication of de Kat Angelino's book on Balinese Mudrās, written in Dutch and translated into German and English.¹ Though the text was to some extent conceived as concomitant to Tyra Kleen's 60 pages of drawings, and though its author was no specialist, but a busy civil servant, he took great pains in describing the Balinese brahmin priest's daily *pūjā*, worship, adoration.

Only a few years later Goris, when preparing his Ph. D. thesis in Leiden, had the courage to produce his 'Bijdrage tot de kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Balineesche Theologie' (Contribution to the knowledge of etc.).² Basing himself upon his reading of de Kat's book and upon the study of the hitherto unexplored mss on Balinese ritual and its underlying philosophy available in Leiden, he presented a sketch of this ritual and an analysis of its course. In the second part of his

¹ Mudra's op Bali, Handhoudingen der Priesters, Teekeningen door Tyra de Kleen, Tekst van P. de Kat Angelino, 1922, Ādi-Poestaka, 's-Gravenhage. Mudras auf Bali, Handhaltungen der Priester, Zeichnungen von, Text von 1923; both Kulturen der Erde Band XV, Folkwang-Verlag, Hagen i.W. und Darmstadt. Unfortunately a new text has been written for Mudra: the ritual hand poses of the Buddha priests and the Shiva priests of Bali. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1924.

² Vros, Leiden, 1926.

book he dealt with the philosophical/metaphysical thinking to be found in the Leiden MSS; among them he distinguished between older texts e.g. BHUVANA-KOŚA, BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, TATTVA SAṆ HYAṆ MAHĀ-JĪNĀNA and two others, and a number of younger texts. In the course of the following decades Goris has been too much absorbed by other tasks to continue this pioneering work; he had shown the way and had succeeded in inspiring Crucq³ and Zieseniss.

In 1939, Zieseniss published his article 'Studien zur Geschichte des Īvaismus: Die Īvaitischen Systeme in der Altjavanischen Literatur I'.⁴ This treatise, containing 150 closely printed pages, 'has largely superseded the chapter written on these texts' [by Goris], as Gonda rightly remarks in his 'Sanskrit in Indonesia',⁵ and that is how it should be 13 years later, when an author has a predecessor and restricts himself to some of the philosophical texts.

Zieseniss' work has not attracted much attention, either because it was written in German, a language not generally known to Indian Sanskritists, or because it was a paper published in a periodical dealing with the Dutch Indies. However this may be, his 'Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus: Die Śaiva Systematik des VĪHASPATI-TATTVA' has now (1958) been published, posthumously, as a book (192 pp.).⁶ In these two books (one is allowed to say), Zieseniss dealt at length with BHUVANA-KOŚA I, BHUVANA-KOŚA II, BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, TATTVA SAṆ HYAṆ MAHĀ-JĪNĀNA and VĪHASPATI-TATTVA; these are all collections of Sanskrit-ślokas followed by their Old-Javanese paraphrases (260, 248, 103, 84, 74).

I must admit that some of the speculations to be found in these ślokas are above my comprehension, but completely inexplicable to me is the fact that Zieseniss dealt in two books with texts which he did not publish. It is my postulate that his critical text-editions did exist, that he may have hesitated between Bibliotheca Javanica (on its way out) and the Verhandelingen . . . Koninklijk Instituut (den Haag; by then scarcely established), and was, in the event, taken unawares by the outbreak of the second world war, from which he did not return.^{6a}

³ K. C. Crucq, *Bijdrage tot de Kennis van het Balisch Doodenritueel*, Ph. D. thesis Leiden, 1928; Mees, Santpoort, 1928.

⁴ In *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* (BKI) 98, pp. 75-225.

⁵ International Academy of Indian Culture, Nagpur, 1952.

⁶ International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, 1958.

^{6a} VĪHASPATI-TATTVA was destined for G.O.S., wide BKI 98 p. 76.

The International Academy of Indian Culture (New Delhi; formerly Nagpur), which in 1958 published Zieseniss' 'Śaiva-Systematik des VṠHASPATI-TATTVA', in the year before had published 'WṠHASPATI-TATTWA, an Old Javanese philosophical text, critically edited and annotated'; this book served Sudarshana Devi as a Ph. D. thesis at the University of Utrecht. Here we find 74 Sanskrit ślokas and their Old-Javanese paraphrases, sometimes enlarged to digressions. The whole text only occupies 38 pp. of print, its English translation 40 pp. The apparatus criticus is very elaborate, and leads to the conclusion: 'We have looked into over 250 Sanskrit works but strangely enough not a single śloka of ours could be traced to a Sanskrit source in exactly the same form as found in WṠHASPATI-TATTWA' — and that even when the trend of thought is clearly Indian. Next we find the remark 'The parallels from these varied philosophical Sanskrit texts will be found scattered all over the notes'; this is true, and we owe the Academy not only thanks for the fact that it published these bilingual texts, but also for the long quotations from relevant Sanskrit texts in the notes. The Academy would have added to our gratitude if it had compiled a list of the sources tapped with results, as well as one containing the 250 mentioned above.

From here onwards I will continue speaking about 'the Academy', preferring this to mentioning its founder and editor-in-chief Prof. Dr. Raghuvira, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. et Phil., M.P., his daughter Dr. Sudarshana Devi, now Dr. Sudarshana Devi Singhal, and his daughter-in-law Dr. Mrs. Sharada Rani, because I have no clear picture where exactly the initiative, the spade-work and the final responsibility lie for the four text-editions so far produced by the Academy.⁷ After some twenty years in Indonesia and more than half a year at several Universities in India I think it only self-evident that part of the work done in these four publications is institutional work done by pundits paid for doing it; moreover I agree that this is the way in which it should be done. And I think I can find traces of this healthy cooperation. But in the sections of these books accessible to me — unfortunately I read no Hindī — I find no acknowledgments, no delimitations

⁷ WṠHASPATI-TATTWA already mentioned;

ŚLOKĀNTARA, an Old Javanese didactic text, critically edited and annotated by Sharada Rani, Ph. D. thesis, Utrecht, 1957;

GAṆAPATI-TATTWA, an Old Javanese philosophic text, critically edited, annotated and translated by Mrs. Dr. Sudarshana Devi Singhal, 1958;

WRATISĀSANA, a Sanskrit text on ascetic discipline with Kawi exegesis, edited and annotated by Dr. Mrs. Sharada Rani, (1961).

of work done nor individual responsibilities. As moreover I am not much in favour of a sharp contrast between anonymous texts and unknown helpers in its publication towards starring the editors of these texts, the extent of whose responsibility I cannot find out, I prefer to deal with the impersonal Academy.

I am under the impression that the Academy is not in the habit of distributing its publications to learned journals 'for the favour of review', neither is it an easy task to review those in the Old-Javanese field. Apart from knowledge of śaiva-philosophy, Sanskrit and Old-Javanese, one must know Dutch as the vehicular language for the existing publications in the Old-Javanese field, Balinese to handle the 'Kawi-Balinesesch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek', and on top of that Hindī — in view of the fact that the Academy for its series of works, 'translated, annotated and critically evaluated by specialists of the East and the West', meant 'translated etc. into *English*' for the two first Old-Javanese works, but 'translated etc. into *Hindī*' for the two more recent ones. On the one hand I do not know of anybody living who is an acknowledged authority in all these subjects, able and willing to review the Academy's O.-J. publications. On the other hand I should like to discuss points regarding Sanskrit, Old-Javanese and Balinese as well as the Academy's method of presenting texts in these languages. Professor Gonda has taken three of the Academy's four Old-Javanese texts either under his supervision or under his protection. It happens that I have easily at hand the textual material for a discussion of the fourth one, GAṆAPATI-TATTVA.

Even although these texts are very short (ŚLOKĀNTARA 84 ślokas, VṠHASPATI-TATTVA 74, GAṆAPATI-TATTVA 59, VRATI-ŚĀŚANA 37), the number of Old-Javanese texts accessible in print is still so small, absolutely speaking as well as relatively in view of the number of MSS extant, that one can only be grateful to the Academy for its initiative; and in the second place, for its liberality in printing *in extenso* the relevant passages even of Sanskrit printed books. The Academy goes further: it prints the same ślokas and paraphrases in Balinese, Devanāgarī and Latin script, with the result that one has to pay an average of not less than a shilling for every śloka in these bulky books. A copy of the MAHĀBHĀRATA, produced in this way, would take some 1600 of these unwieldy volumes and cost some £ 5.000.—. Are these ślokas worth a shilling apiece? I have my doubts, and that is one of the points to be discussed in the following paragraphs.

I agree with the Academy that for constituting a text from a number

of MSS it is unavoidable to note *all* scribes' peculiarities and even mistakes on the collation sheets. I agree with Prof. Gonda's verdict that in the final published text-edition the notorious mistakes and inconsistencies should not be perpetuated,⁸ and I state with satisfaction that the Academy writes on p. 6 of ŚLOKĀNTARA that 'glaring scribal errors have not been noted in the readings of this colophon and of others'. VṚHASPATI-TATTVA p. 5 is still more assuring: 'Only the outstanding variants have been recorded'. If the Academy had been more consistent in its laudible principles and had summed up those scribal errors under some heading(s) in the prefaces, then much would have been saved, in tedium as well as to the purse of the purchaser of these texts.

I would also have agreed with the principle that all relevant texts should be consulted, but this principle for the editing of texts might be too self-evident to need expression anywhere. In practice, however, the Academy fails here lamentably: it overlooks the existence of TUTUR BHAGAVĀN VṚHASPATI, No. 1195a in the collection of the well-known library of Gedong Kirtya (Singaradja, Bali). For the constitution of its ŚLOKĀNTARA (84 ślokas) it used four texts, ignoring the Kirtya MSS No. 494 (83 ślokas) and 1277 (55 ślokas). I feel as uneasy about this overlooking of the Kirtya's printed list of stock and lists of additions⁹ as about the statement: Ms. A. 'Belongs to the collections of Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira.' Good, but why this secretiveness about its origin and no mention of place (Bali) and date ($\pm$ 1951)? There is no reason to be proud of the possession of a MS; the point is to make a reliable text-edition.

This same pride and this same secretiveness reappear in the first paragraph of the Foreword to the GAṆAPATI-TATTVA: 'Gaṇapati-tattwa is a new text. Only one palm-leaf manuscript is so far known to exist. It is preserved at the International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi.' Good, but I am much interested to learn, where the Academy got its texts from, how and where.

Pride and secretiveness may be minor flaws of character in the daily practice of life, but in matters of research they may be detrimental. Not only *one* MS of GAṆAPATI-TATTVA is known to exist, 'new', i.e. unknown to colleagues, but *four* at least; this small text (59 ślokas)

⁸ Cf. e.g. Het Oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa,, Bibliotheca Javanica 5, (1932), Inleiding.

⁹ In Mededeelingen van de Kirtya Liefrinck-Van der Tuuk, Singaradja (Bali) 1929-1941, *passim*; in Juynboll, (note 10) *passim*.

proves to be not an independent entity, but to consist of 5 fragments, of which the main two form part of a much bigger treatise. If the Academy had been less proud and secretive and had consulted the keepers of the 3 or 4 existing libraries of Javano-Balinese MSS, or the 3 or 4 persons in the world who know about these things, then all the painstaking work devoted to this book might have been done in a way more satisfactory to editor, public and reviewer.

The year of publication of GAṆAPATI-TATTVA, 1958, may have been coincident with that in which the Kirtya acquired its No. 2411, ĪŚVARA UVĀCA, GAṆAPATI MATAKVAN (Īśvara has spoken [after] Gaṇapati has asked), which on comparison proves to be exactly the same text. It is one of the disconcerting facts about those Balinese MSS which are known to those experienced in the field and which have been printed more than once,⁹ that the same title may cover entirely different contents (e.g. SĀRA-SAMUCCAYA),¹⁰ that exactly the same contents may be known under different titles (as is the case here), that parts of bigger works may have split off and assumed a new name (as here) or that small compendia have been incorporated into bigger ones.¹¹ Other accretions and omissions, sometimes intentional, sometimes accidental, are only too frequent, and taken together these circumstances make it rather difficult for an editor of Javano-Balinese MSS, working out of reach of a good informant and of a good library (in this order), to make satisfactory text-editions. ĪŚVARA UVĀCA, GAṆAPATI MATAKVAN (Lessons of Īśvara to Gaṇapati) for our purpose proves to have no more significance than that it provides us with some minor corrections for scribes' errors, and welcome though each 'new' MS will always be, its main significance is as proof of Balinese interestedness in this field and its accessibility as No. 2411 in the public library of palmleaf MSS Gedong Kirtya at Singaradja (Bali).

GAṆAPATI-TATTVA — when for the sake of convenience we continue to call this text after the shorter title of the printed edition — when it is shorn of its opening śloka and Gaṇapati's ten introductory questions followed by Īśvara's ten answers to them, and is considered as beginning with śloka 2, has its following 55 ślokas plus their Old-Javanese paraphrases in common with TUTUR KAMOKṢAN, Kirtya No. 2335, and

¹⁰ Dr. H. H. Juynboll, *Supplement op de Catalogus van de Javaaansche en Madoereesche Handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits-Bibliotheek*, II, Leiden 1911, pp. 193-194 and pp. 275-277.

¹¹ Dr. med. Wolfgang Weck, *Heilkunde und Volkstum auf Bali*, Stuttgart 1937.

TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, K. 2375, the existence and general character of which were made known in 1950 in the appropriate place.¹²

It took me some time to compare these three treatises, even though I could use the typewritten copies made by my former assistants after the war, and I think that students of Śaiva-siddhānta in Java and Bali might profit from the results of my textual comparison and unravelling. An obvious discrepancy between GAṆAPATI-TATTVA on the one hand, and TUTUR KAMOKṢAN and TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA on the other, is the elaboration of the last words in TUTUR KAMOKṢAN: *hayva cavuh, madoh marana donira*; SAMĀPTA.' This means: 'do not divulge; it aims at keeping away damage caused by fieldmice. THE END.' As the Hindī translation is inaccessible to me, I am not in a position to verify to what extent the Academy has understood these words, but I have my misgivings when I find the wrong word *adomrana denira* (in Devanagari the same misreading), for the 4-syllabic word has no sense, and *denira* is: 'by means of it', whereas *donira* is 'its aim is' — consequently ends and means have been mixed up in the Academy's presentation of this passage in the GAṆAPATI-TATTVA. In this edition there follows the whole final page 170, not found in TUTUR KAMOKṢAN or TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA. When instead of the abbreviation || *śa* ||, so common in Balinese MSS, we print *śarana*, 'means', 'by means of'; when we add, as in ĪŚVARA UVĀCA, GAṆAPATI MATAKVAN, the necessary comma after *ampel gadin* ('ivory bamboo'); when we print a capital for the initial g in *gana* (for the God Gaṇapati is meant), *pitik* (chicken) for *pithik*, in the Academy's Sanskritising style *śuddha-māla* (pure from stains) for *sudhāmala*; when we split up *prasasantun* into the two words *pras asantun* (kind of offering), and *gēnahin* according to the system followed in this book into *gēnah in* (place of), and finally print *mantra* in stead of || *ma* ||, then we see clearly that the text here deals with agricultural exorcism. This is an additional note for peasants; after the heading: 'Exorcism by means of Gaṇapati' it continues with the words: 'One may (or: should) make a circuit [scilicet: of his rice-field], using an 'ivory bamboo' [scilicet: adorned with] a drawing of Gaṇapati, with a disc in His left hand and a cudgel in His right' . . . etc.; ending with: 'after [Gaṇapati] has been worshipped, throw them (the offerings) away on.

¹² Vijfde lijst van (Balische) Aanwinsten der Kirtya Liefcrinck-Van der Tuuk te Singaradja, being pp. 184-188 in Indonesische Handschriften door R. M. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjaraka, Dr. P. Voorhoeve en Dr. C. Hooykaas, Nix, Bandung, 1950.

the spot(s) of the damage caused by field-mice; [use the following mantra'. — I think that after these emendations and this partial translation no more comment is needed to show that the immediately following ślokaś 57—59, the entire 'Exorcism by means of Gaṇapati', forming the whole of p. 170, not found in TUTUR KAMOKṢAN or in TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, forms only a rustic and picturesque accretion to our philosophical/metaphysical text.

The relationship between GAṆAPATI-TATTVA and TUTUR KAMOKṢAN appears clearly from the fact that both of them omit the śloka between GAṆAPATI-TATTVA 44 and 45 (p. 158; its paraphrase begins on line 10: *Nḍya ta . . .*), corresponding with TUTUR KAMOKṢAN 45 and 46, but actually found in TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA as (my) number 140 on *lēmṭir* (palmleaf) 64b: *Puruśasya* etc. Five times GAṆAPATI-TATTVA shows omissions in comparison with TUTUR KAMOKṢAN (and TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA): (a) GPT p. 160, from bottom lines 8—7: *iti prāṇāyāma samśipta pūjā na [ranya]*, 'this is [the subdivision called] breath-control of a so-called shortened worship'; here TUTUR KAMOKṢAN and TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA add: *yan magya*, 'when one is short of time'.

(b) GPT p. 163 top after 4 lines of small print omits the words *vyakti tēka riṇ sarva sandhi*, found in this connection in both TUTURS.

(c) GPT p. 161, between lines 4 and 3 from the bottom, omits a passage corresponding to one side of a palmleaf, found in both TUTURS.

(d) GPT p. 153 śloka 27 is followed by its paraphrase consisting of 2 lines only; after the word *tattwa* the śloka *Nādaś ca liyate śūnyam* has gone astray. This is No. 27 of TUTUR KAMOKṢAN, No. 121 of TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, the paraphrase of which begins with the words *mvaṇ ikaṇ nāda mulih mariṇ niṣkala* in our three texts.

(e) GPT p. 159 bottom we find śloka 49 = TUTUR KAMOKṢAN 50 and TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA 145. From the paraphrase in both TUTURS only the first half, in changed wording, is to be found in GPT; the second half has gone astray, and with it the following 4 ślokaś + paraphrases TUTUR KAMOKṢAN 51—54 = TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA 146—149. — To sum up: the Academy's unique MS of GPT is short by 6 out of 60 ślokaś.

On the other hand, GPT in comparison with both TUTURS is enriched with a beginning consisting of Gaṇapati's ten questions and Īśvara's ten answer to them; I am inclined to believe that the *old* text has recently been provided with a *new* façade (title and beginning). The text I call *old*, because either the ślokaś are genuine and borrowed Sanskrit, or they were composed in that dim past when in Java or Bali reasonably good Sanskrit was still written. The introduction (GPT

COMPARISON OF CONTENTS AND CATCH-WORDS IN THE CLOSELY-RELATED ŚAIVA-SIDDHĀNTA-TEXTS

TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, K 2375

TUTUR KAMOKṢAN, K 2335

printed GAṆAPATI-TATTVA = ĪŚVARA
UVĀCA, GAṆAPATI MATAKVAN, K 2411

lēm̐pir

- 1b. AVIGHNAM ASTU (*immediately followed by*)
1b. Nihan tiṅkah in vip̐hala, catur pva ya
2a. śloka 1: Laukikaṁ kārayet pūrvam, + *par.*
2b. rahasya tēm̐n, lēkas in kaptin iki.
2b. Nihan paturunira saṁ paṇḍita
4a. lakṣaṇa lakṣyanira S. H. Onkāra.
4a/b. Jñāna lēpas — Śiva-liṅga rambut vinuh̐l
4b/5a. i = Sadā Śiva, ba = Viṣṇu — kūṭa-mantra sira
5a. Param Brahmā- (7b) nabhi-sthāna, on (*reversed*)
7b. Vyakti tēka riṁ sarva sandhi
7b. On namaḥ Śivāya. Iki kaṁ pinaka-mārga niṁ
pralīnan de Saṁ Paṇḍita (*prose, unin-*
22b. *terrupted by ślokas*) mārga niṁ tan valuya
jadi janma mvah, + śloka 6 + *paraphrase.*
22b. AVIGHNAM ASTU (*imm. followed by*) śl. 7 + *par.*
(*from here until the end = 1.82b, śl. 208*
exclusively ślokas with their paraphrases).
51b. ślokas 93/94 + *paraphrases on* pañcātmā.
52a. 5 bijākṣaras to prāṇa/nirātmā, etc.
52a. śloka 95: Śvāso niḥśvāsaḥ saṁyoga, + *par.*

(*From here onwards, the four texts are nearly identical, but the TUTURS maintain captions, vanishing in the course of the other texts*).

- 59a. śloka 121: Nādaś ca liyate śūnyam, + *par.*
62b. ½ śl. 136: Pravakṣyāmy adhunā vira + *par.*
64b. śloka 140: Puruṣasya tryavasthānam + *par.*
66b. śloka 145 + *its paraphrase.*
67a/68b. ślokas 146—149 + *their paraphrases.*
69a. Nihan ulahakēna saṁ sād̐haka, yan pamūjā,
69b. Iti prāṇāyāma, saṁkṣipta-pūjā, yan magya.

cf. supra

- 69b. Mvah nihan saṁkṣipta-pūjā űken śarīra —
71a—77b. ślokas 150—182 + *their paraphrases.*
ITI SAṁ HYAṁ ŚIVA-SIDDHĀNTAM ATISAMĀPTAM.
77b—82b. ślokas 183—208 + *their paraphrases.*
ITI JñĀNA-SIDDHĀNTA, prathamah paṭalaḥ.

cf. infra

page

1. AVIGHNAM ASTU (*immediately followed by*)
Babahan (4×), *no ślokas*, pañcātmā.

1. śloka 1: Śvāso niḥśvāsaḥ saṁyoga, + *par.*
5. śloka 27: Nādaś ca liyate śūnyam, + *par.*
7. ½ śl. 42: Pravakṣyāmy adhunā vira + *par.*
8. *omitted between ślokas 45/6, par. present.*
9. śloka 50 + *its paraphrase.*
10. ślokas 51—54 + *their paraphrases.*
10. Nihan ulahakēna saṁ sād̐haka, yan pamūjā,
11. Iti prāṇāyāma, saṁkṣipta-pūjā, yan magya.
11. Nihan tiṅkah in vip̐hala, catur pva ya
11. śloka 55: Laukikaṁ kārayet pūrvam, + *par.*
11. rahasya tēm̐n, lēkas in kaptin iki.

12. Jñāna lēpas — Śiva-liṅga rambut vinuh̐l.
12. i = Sadā Śiva, ba = Viṣṇu — kūṭa-mantra sira.
12. Param Brahmā- (13) nabhi-sthāna, on (*reversed*)
13. Vyakti tēka riṁ sarva sandhi
13—18. *prose-paragraphs* 4—19, śl. 60—62 + *par.*

page

141. AVIGNAM ASTU (*immediately followed by*)
initial śloka No. 1 (without paraphrase),
Gaṇapati's 10 questions, Īśvara's 10 answers.
146. Babahan (4×), *no ślokas*, pañcātmā.

146. śloka 2: Śvāso niḥśvāsaḥ saṁyoga, + *par.*
153. *after śloka 27, śloka missing, par. present.*
156. *after śloka 41, ½ śl. missing, par. deficient.*
158. *omitted between ślokas 44/45, par. present.*
159. śloka 49: *par. first ½ diff., second ½ omit.*
160. Nihan vaneh ulahakēna saṁ sād̐haka, yapvan
160. apūjā — Iti prāṇāyāma, saṁkṣipta-pūjā na.
160. Mvah tiṅkah in vip̐hala, catur pva ya
161. śloka 50: Laukikaṁ kārayet pūrvam, + *par.*
161. rahasya tēm̐n, lēkas in kaptin iki.

161. Jñāna-lēpas — Śiva-liṅga rambut vinuh̐l.
161. Param Brahmā- (163) nabhi-sthāna, on (*reversed*)
163—169. *prose-paragraphs* 4—19, ślokas 54—56 + *par.*
170. Paṇḍukatan (*exorcism by means of*) Gaṇapati.

CAPTIONS (NOT HEADINGS BUT SUBSCRIPTIONS) TO BE FOUND IN THE TEXTS

TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA			TUTUR KAMOKṢAN			GAṆAPATI-TATTVA		
K 2375			K 2335			printed (K 2411)		
<i>śloka</i>		<i>lēm̐pir</i>	<i>śloka</i>		<i>page</i>	<i>śloka</i>		<i>page</i>
1. Iki Catur-viphala		1b	55. Catur-viphala		11	50. Catur-viphala		161
5. Iti Sañ Hyañ Praṇava-Jñāna, Kamokṣan		6b	59. Pr.J. kamoksan		13	53. Pr.J. kamoksan		162
Iti Sañ Hyañ Kahuvusan Jāti-viśeṣa		19a						
Iti Nirmāla-jñāna-śāstram, samāptam		22a						
15. Iti Sañ Hyañ Naistika-Jñāna		27a						
Iti Sañ Hyañ Mahā-Vindu		31b						
39. Iti Sañ Hyañ Saptoṅkāra (Param Brahmā)		36b						
63. Iti Sañ Hyañ Pañca-viṅṣati-pādārtha		44a						
85. Iti Sañ Hyañ Vindu-Prakriyā		49b						
92. Iti Sañ Hyañ Daśātmā		51b						
95. Iti Sañ Hyañ Upadeśa-Samūha		52b	1. Upadeśa-Samūha		1	2. Upadeśa		147
102. Iti [Sañ Hyañ] Ṣaḍ-aṅga-Yoga		54b	8. Ṣaḍ-aṅga-Yoga		2	9.		148
117. Iti Sañ Hyañ Ātmā-liṅga		58b	23. S.H. Ātmā-liṅga		4	24.		152
121. Iti Utpatti-sthiti-pralīna Sañ Hyañ Praṇava		59b	27. U-S-P. S.H. Praṇava		5	(27) U-S-P. S.H. Praṇava		153
133. Iti Catur-daśākṣara-piṇḍa, utpatti-sthiti-pralīna		62a	39. Caturdaśākṣara-p.		7	39. Caturdaśākṣara-p.		156
140. Iti Sañ Hyang Bheda-Jñāna		65a	(45) S.H. Bheda-Jñāna		8	(44) S.H. Bheda-Jñāna		158
143. Iti Sañ Hyañ Sadyotkrānti * kamoktan		65b	48. Sadyotkrānti * kam.		8	47. Sadudbhrānti * kam.		159
144. Iti Sañ Hyañ Mahā-Jñāna (N.B.)		66b	49. Sañ Hyañ Mahājñāna		9	48. Sañ Hyañ Mahājñāna		159
146. Iti Sañ Hyañ Bēñem Uñkal		67a	51. S.H. Bēñem Uñkal		10			160
149. Iti Prāṇāyāma-Sañ[k]ṣipta-pūjā, yan magya		69b	54. Pr. Sañkṣipta-Pūjā		10	49. Pr. Sañsīpta-pūja		160
152. Iti Sañ Hyañ Kaka-Haṇsa		71b						
157. [Iti] Sañ Hyañ Tīrtha riñ śarīra		72b						
182. ITI SAÑ HYAÑ ŚAIVA-SIDDHĀNTAM ATISAMĀPTAM		77b						
194. Iti Utpatti-sthiti-pralīna S. H. Vindv-abhyantara		80a						
208. ITI JñĀNA-SIDDHĀNTA, prathama-pāṭalam		82b						

Captions as found in both of the TUTURS,
have either been enclosed in sentences in
GAṆAPATI-TATTVA or have vanished altogether

* I apologise for the apparent inconsistency between those two words. The Balinese MSS — not only K 2375 and K 2335 — are perfectly consistent in always writing *Sadyotkrānti*, and so this word has been maintained here. The Academy prefers to present it as *Sadudbhrānti* (p. 159) and *Sadya-udbhrānti* (p. 162).

Another discrepancy between the Balinese MSS and the Academy's consistent presentation of them is this that the Balinese MSS continually speak about *Vyoma-Siva*, God in the Sky, whereas the Academy changes this into *Bhauma-Siva*, the Earthly God (pp. 162 and 163). I have my doubts.

pp. 141—146) I call *new*, though it is written in 'Old-Javanse', because these pages are additional in comparison with both TUTURS.

The preceding paragraphs may have made it clear that 6 out of 30 pp. GPT, in comparison with the TUTURS, run the risk of being additional, *new* indeed, and should be deleted from the text proper and printed in small type and/or under the line; and that the text, now reduced to 55 ślokas, in its present dilapidated state, has lost 6 ślokas which are still to be found in the other two corresponding texts. I now wish to call attention to the following facts:

1. GPT and TUTUR KAMOKṢAN with their $\pm$ 60 ślokas are only a fragment of TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA with its 210 ślokas, actually forming only 2 parts out of 7, if not 1 out of 4;
2. TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA itself after śloka 182 states: *Iti Sañ Hyañ ŚAIVA-SIDDHĀNTAM atisamāptam*, and in its final śloka claims to be only Jñāna-SIDDHĀNTA-*prathama-paṭalam*, first chapter of [a treatise on] Jñāna-siddhānta;
3. TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA moreover throughout its 210 ślokas constantly produces names of subdivisions, while these are not so frequent as captions in GPT, where they are incorporated in longer sentences or are sometimes even missing; by maintaining 25 of them TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA gives the impression of being a systematic manual, and probably deserves to be considered as a guide of primary importance.¹³
4. The last part of TUTUR KAMOKṢAN and GPT (beginning on p. 160, line 6 from the bottom, with the words *Tīṅkah in viphalā*) is also to be found in TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, there however forming the very beginning, immediately after *Aum Avighnam astu*. If in TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA we tried to remove those pages from the beginning to the same place as in the two short texts, the result would be that a piece of reasoning about *saṅkṣiptapūjā* (shortened worship) would be interrupted. Therefore I am more inclined to think that TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA, itself at the best a chapter from a still more voluminous treatise on Jñāna-siddhānta, should provisionally be left as it stands, until the relevant Leiden MSS have been consulted.

Consequently, GPT should be considered as consisting of 5 parts:

- (a) the prefixed later prose-pages 141—146;
- (b) pp. 146—160 containing ślokas 2—49 being the body of GPT; in common with TUTUR KAMOKṢAN and TUTUR ADHYĀTMIKA;

¹³ I have deliberately not gone into this possibility; this paper is only concerned with textual spade-work on MSS at hand; cf. TABLE: Captions etc. next p.

- (c) pp. 160—163 in common with TUTUR KAMOKṢAN and TUTUR ADHYĀTMĪKA, but probably attached in the wrong place;
- (d) pp. 163—169, the end of TUTUR KAMOKṢAN but not to be found in TUTUR ADHYĀTMĪKA;
- (e) p. 170. GPT's additional rural exorcism, not to be found in the TUTURS.

The Academy prints these heterogenous fragments as one flowing text, but I do not know what remarks may have been made in Hindi. For those who might wish to continue studies on Śaiva-siddhānta in Java and Bali, I add in tabular form my findings about the relations between these three texts.¹⁴

It would be unfair to the Academy only to point to the relevant and even indispensable texts *not* consulted, for it *has* used two other relevant texts worked on by Ziesenis: TATVA SAṆ HYAṆ MAHĀ-JĪĀNA and BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA. Unfortunately I do not have at my disposal the first mentioned text, but from BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, Kirtya No. 1526, I had a typewritten transcript in Latin letters made by my assistants, before the war, and according to GPT p. 56 one of the copies found its way to the Academy. Hence on my desk I have before me exactly the same type-written sheets as the Academy had at its disposal, and which have served for pp. 5—10 in the second part of the GPT, printed in Devanāgarī-script. The BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA as handed down to us in the MS. K. 1526 consists merely of some 120 ślokas, more or less misspelt and perhaps even distorted, followed by their paraphrases. These ślokas are presented to the reader not in that form, but remodelled, and perhaps emended. Therefore this seems to be the appropriate place to deal with the problem of restoration of ślokas in Balinese MSS. Only after some light has been shed upon this problem (*elucidated* would be too strong, not to mention *solved*), can we proceed with examining BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, its ślokas as well as its paraphrases.

There was scarcely a problem for Juynboll when at the beginning of this century he edited the Old-Javanese prose-extracts of ĀDI-PARVA and VIRĀṬA-PARVA;¹⁵ their ślokas or pādas he traced back to 'the' MAHĀBHĀRATA of his days. But Goris in 1926 clearly distinguished that in his texts part of the ślokas could be restored, part of them for the moment resisted attempts to repair them, and part could never have

¹⁴ Cf. the TABLE: Comparison of contents and catch-words in the closely-related Śaiva-Siddhānta Texts etc.

¹⁵ 's-Gravenhage, Nijhoff, 1906 and 1912.

been correct Sanskrit; for the last he coined the term 'Archipelago-Sanskrit'. When I came across numerous ślokas in the editing of TANTRI KĀMANDAKA, an Old-Javanese version of the PAÑCATANTRA,¹⁶ I printed the ślokas as I found them in my MSS, adding their supposed Sanskrit original when I could trace it in a version of the PAÑCATANTRA or in Böhlingk's 'Indische Sprüche'. At that time my experience with Balinese MSS was still restricted to those dealing with a dozen versions of the TANTRI, and I had not yet been in Bali. Gonda when explaining his principles in the edition of the Old-Javanese BRAHMĀṇḍA-PURĀṆA,¹⁷ writes: "[The Sanskrit-quotations], unfortunately, are often corrupt and it is not always possible to emendate them with certainty. But it is quite wrong to substitute the corresponding verses of a/the Indian recension known to us, as editors of texts have done too often. On the contrary, considerable carefulness and philological accuracy are needed to trace the possible readings. In my edition I have done my best to restore the quotations as precisely as possible, i.e. to produce them in the shape which they presented to the Javanese author; in the notes I have rendered an account of my endeavours to amend them.' (translation C.H.) Swellengrebel, a few years later, editing the Javanese XVth or even XVIth C. KORAVĀŚRAMA, a text dealing with religion, etc. in Java,¹⁸ clearly saw that the 'ślokas' in his text were mere tyings together of Sanskrit words, 'Archipelago-Sanskrit' and of low quality at that; he presented them as he found them in his MSS and wisely refrained from wasting his time upon them. For the sake of completeness in this matter I should like to point to the fact that it is not only religious and old works that have been 'enriched' and 'embellished' with this brand of ślokas; a profane history of the ruling families of the kingdom (now province) of Tabanan, coming down as far as the XXth Century,¹⁹ is also adorned by a score of 'ślokas', the author explaining what he means to say in the subsequent prose. The 'ślokas' here are neither quotations nor landmarks but fabrications, their rigidly four times eight syllables being filled up with difficult and unusual words, often ending in -am. These words are always Sanskrit, never Malay or Dutch or Sasak (the language of Lombok, 1744—1894 under

¹⁶ Bibliotheca Javanica 2, Nix, Bandoeng, 1931.

¹⁷ Einige Mitteilungen über das altjavanische Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, in Acta Orientalia XI, 1933, p. 220.

¹⁸ KORAVĀŚRAMA, een Oud-Javaansch Proza-Geschrift, uitgegeven, vertaald en toegelicht, Ph. D. thesis Leiden 1936; Mees, Santpoort, 1936.

¹⁹ ПАМАЊАНАХ ТАБАНАН, Kirtya No. 950.

Balinese sway, the place where the unique MS of the NĀGARAKṚTĀGAMA was found and many a Balinese MS). The Balinese, however, until quite recently did not know the word Sanskrit; they were only aware of the fact that the priests and literate people among them handled a considerable quantity of scriptural and bookish words not used by commoners and held in high esteem, words to be explained. That these words belonged to a different language, i.e. a completely different system of grammar and syntax, has escaped them, and this has been the case for several centuries, as appears from the KORAVĀŚRAMA.

The well-known Indologist, Sylvain Lévi, editor of the 'Sanskrit Texts from Bali',²⁰ after a stay of a few hectic but fruitful weeks in Bali, during which he was entirely dependent upon interpreters, made rather strong statements which have already been quoted with approval, but which I cannot entirely endorse; and I should discuss them here.

"The reader must be reminded that the Balinese, in reading as well as in writing Sanskrit, make no difference between short and long vowels, between sibilants, between aspirates and non aspirates, between dentals and cerebrals, and they are accustomed to divide words, or rather groups of syllables, in this traditional way, with no respect to meaning, *the text being of course a sealed letter to them.*"

Actually this is a reminder of what Lévi printed on p. X:

"those people ... do not understand one word of the Sanskrit texts they write, read and chant."

The first part of Lévi's assertion is only slightly exaggerated, if not a caricature, and definitely needs some comment to make it more acceptable; the second part which I have italicised for the sake of convenience, is nonsense, and dangerous at that; it needs some elaboration to explain Lévi's erroneous view and to obtain a fairer understanding of the present mastery of Sanskrit in Bali.

A not inconsiderable percentage of the Balinese vocabulary consists of Sanskrit words, specially in the field of religion, literature and their auxiliary sciences, as appears from a glance at a Balinese dictionary. In the same way the English language has been enriched by much French, Latin and even Greek; still, the average Englishman does not understand French, Latin or Greek speech or books. True, but an English priest may, because he has systematically learned those languages. Have the Balinese brahmin priests systematically learned Sanskrit?

²⁰ Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Volume LXVII, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1953.

No, neither according to the Western nor to any Eastern system. But they have their *paraphrases*²¹ which convey the traditional meaning to 'the Sanskrit texts they write, read and chant'.

Lévi must have misjudged the situation, the more easily so because the priests indeed invoked his help for passages not understood. They were utterly ignorant of the idea of the existence of grammar, and that may have caused Lévi to write as strongly as he did. Their knowledge is not analytical but purely traditional, and their spelling fairly consistent, but free, since the modern conception of a spelling system is alien to them.

More than a thousand years ago in Java royal edicts were composed in correct Sanskrit and were even adorned with frequent use of *alaṅkāra*.²² The poet of the Old-Javanese *rāmāyaṇa*, some decades later but omnium concensu still more than a thousand years old, mastered a text as difficult as the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya*, and followed it closely when composing the first half of his poem.²³ It looks, moreover, as if this Old-Javanese poet may have studied Daṇḍin's textbook on poetics, *kāvya-darśa*; ²⁴ this would fit in with Bosch's theory that the architects of the *chaṇḍis* in Java had studied the *śilpa-śāstra*.²⁵ Though the present day Balinese are admittedly far from any analysis of Sanskrit, they still preserve by copying their MSS of *kāraṇa*, the Sanskrit *kātantra*,²⁶ and of *cāṇṭaka-parva*, one of their bulkiest books, devoted to all kinds of knowledge for literati.²⁷ Numerous unpublished MSS

²¹ To begin with the four texts by the Academy. K. 1843, *ASTAVA MANTRA* consists of the fifty most usual songs in praise of the gods, each *pāda* followed by its paraphrase.

²² Dr. J. G. de Casparis, *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A. D. Masa Baru, Bandung, II 1956* (Prasasti Indonesia, diterbitkan oleh Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia).

²³ Dr. C. Hooykaas, *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, with special reference to the problem of interpretation in kakawins*, *Verhandelingen Koninklijk Instituut T. L. Vrkunde*, XVI, 1955.

²⁴ Dr. C. Hooykaas, *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, an exemplary kakawin as to form and content*, *Verh. Kon. Ned. Ak. v. Wet., Afd. Lett., Nieuwe Reeks Deel LXV, No. 1. Noord-Hollandse Uitgevers Maatschappij, Amsterdam 1958*.

²⁵ Dr. F. D. K. Bosch, *Een hypothese omtrent den oorsprong der Hindoe-Javaansche kunst*, in: *Handelingen van het Eerste Congres voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Java, Albrecht, Weltevreden, 1921*, p. 93-169 (Engl. transl.: *Rūpam XVII, 1924*, p. 6-71).

²⁶ *Sylvia in Lévi*, o.c. IV, 1 pp. 87-88; MSS of the *Kirtya* listed as *KRAKAH*.

²⁷ MS *Kirtya* No. 389 consisting of 243 *lēm̐pir*, inscribed on both sides.

deal with Skr. grammar and words; they are called Kṛtabasa, an obvious shortening of Saṅskṛta-bhāṣā.²⁸

There are here two seemingly contradictory facts: On the one hand, when a priest chants his ślokas during worship, and even when he reads them to you from a MS, the eight-syllabic character of the lines is completely lost, just as in Balinese recitation of *kakavin* the Sanskrit metres *sragdharā* and *rāgakusuma* are completely lost. On the other hand, after going through hundreds of Balinese MSS (faithfully transliterated) and coming across thousands of ślokas, I note, not without astonishment, that the scribal tradition has maintained the octosyllabic character with only few exceptions. This is the more remarkable as the Balinese, in ordinary life as well as in the copying of MSS, are far from slavish, to say the least of it.

It will be evident from the preceding paragraphs that some circumspection is necessary in the reconstruction of ślokas found in Balinese MSS. Bad Sanskrit was composed in Bali; but mediocre and even flawless Sanskrit also may have been written there. We are, however, sure that we have to do with Archipelago-Sanskrit when we find a non-Indian situation described in non-Sanskrit words, for instance an enumeration of the six days of the Balinese week *tuñleh*, *aryañ*, *urukuñ*, *paniron*, *vas* and *mavulu*, their evaluation as male (*pumān*) and female (*strī*), and the gods dominant in them, in these 'ślokas':

Tuñlena (?) pumsakañ jñeyah,
Urukun ca pumān nityam,
Vas pumān, Mavulu strī ca,

Aryañ vā strī nigadyate;
Paniron pāṇḍur eva ca;
ity ete ṣaḍ-vara-kramāt.

Urukun Mavulu Brahmā,
Aryañ [Vas] Mahādevaś ca,

Tuñleh Paniron [ca] Hariḥ;
ṣaḍ-vara-devatan tathā.

For a watertight constitution and explanation of these 'ślokas' it would be necessary to consult the other MSS available, but at the moment for our argument those 'ślokas' will be sufficient. They are neither Indian nor Sanskrit, but are Javano-Balinese and Archipelago-Sanskrit; they happen to be found in BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, K 1526, used by the Academy and by me. They belong to the last ten ślokas of this text and might have been added at some time; nevertheless this has not yet been investigated and we must be suspicious of such a text, at least suspicious of such a MS. And we should bear in mind the Aca-

²⁸ Op. cit. note 10, vol. II pp. 207-215.

demy's valuable finding that not one śloka could be found in its hundreds of possible Indian sources.

Summing up the preceding paragraphs about knowledge and ignorance of Sanskrit in Bali, 'with special reference to' the ślokas forming the framework of our TŪTURS and TATTVAS, I should like to draw three conclusions:

- (a) it is better to print the misspelt and even mutilated śloka found in the MS than to present a reconstructed śloka only;
- (b) it is better still to offer both, when the character of the edition allows this (as is undoubtedly the case here);
- (c) it is preferable not to present ślokas with pādas of 7 or 9 syllables; they are neither Sanskrit nor Indian, neither Archipelago-Sanskrit nor Balinese but run the risk of being mere absurdities.

In the Academy's presentation of the BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA (based upon the Balinese MS K 1526 not used by Zieseniss), which might have been such an enlightening addition to its editing of the GPT, only reconstructions beyond control have been offered, 46 of them; 12 of their pādas number 7 syllables, 17 pādas number 9 syllables. Sapienti sat.

After having explained the principal *a priori* objections to the Academy's handling of the ślokas found in the Balinese MSS, two examples will be given in the following paragraph of the results of this handling, one with a 7-syllabic pāda, one with a 9-syllabic one (the śloka-numbers used are those of the printed text).

Śloka 35 deals with *nāda-nādāntam eva ca*; the paraphrase repeats *nāda* and *nādānta*; śloka 37 deals with *nāda-nādānta-vindukam*, and its paraphrase runs: *Ikanan vindu, [nāda,] nādānta, katiga paḍa sūkṣmanya; yāvat vruh ika katlu . . .*, that is: 'vindu, nāda and nādānta, these three are equal in subtleness; as soon as one knows these three . . .' The supplying of the word *nāda* in the second paraphrase is easy and sure enough; then we have four times *nāda nādānta*. The printed text, however, in 35b has been changed into the 7-syllabic *nādāntaram eva ca*.

Śloka 9b: *s v a -rūp ā n daiivat ā ḥ smaret*; paraphrase: *Deyantānaku mavruh irikan devatā kabeh . . . idēpēnta rūpa Sañ Hyañ*; 'You, my son! must try to know the gods . . . imagine their appearances'. Instead of this in the printed text we find the 9-syllabic: *s a r v a -rūp a n daiivat a n smaret*, 'you must imagine that the deity assumes all appearances.' — And all these changes are made without a single note to make clear what exactly the Academy found in the typewritten text — not to mention the two Leiden texts, which it failed to consult.

All those endeavours to correct the ślokaś are to be found in an entourage of their Old-Javanese paraphrases, where not even the simplest emendation has been made and where the printed text suffers from arbitrariness (misjudgement) and slovenliness. It is arbitrary to suppress the essential first 10 lines of BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA, of which no less than 260 lines are quoted, and in doing so to extirpate the first śloka containing the reason for the whole treatise; to omit the paraphrases of the ślokaś (now) 2 and 3 without printing dots; in (now) 22 to print dots instead of *dhūmra*, though it was a common word and perfectly in its place; in (now) 23 to print dots instead of the correct word *gēlarakēn*; in (now) 36 to omit *maśabda t*. It is not in śloka (now) 23 that one pāda is missing in the MS; the pāda *Śivaḥ sphatika-varnaś ca*, printed as 22d, must certainly be 23a and is followed by *madhye ... pratiṣṭhitah*, 'and Śiva, crystal-coloured, is standing in the middle'. — Generally speaking: though the text of the paraphrase is indeed of such a quality that it needs some questions-marks, dots and brackets, too many of them are omitted where they belong and are put in the wrong place.

Kamu n Kumāra! i.e. 'O, you Kumāra!' is the usual way for Śiva to address his son Kumāra, and it does no harm to find a few times '*Kamban Kumāra!*', i.e. 'Flower (of) Kumāra', instead of it, for the expert reader corrects this mistake easily enough. At other times Śiva in the same situation uses *tanaku*, i.e. 'you my son', and the misprint *tan aku*, i.e. 'not I' is a lapsus easily corrected. But the words *valēntēn umuṅgan padma*, unintelligible but not put between the question-marks so frequently used for passages not understood (though perfectly clear), are not so easily corrected into *vehanta umuṅgeñ padma*, as found in the MS used by the Academy and me. Four lines before the long quotation from BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA is concluded with śloka 66 (now, in print; in the MS śloka 77; I object to this misrepresentation) we find: *Kamu n Kumāra! Sāmpun pun niyata tumaṅguh nirvāṇa n*. This is the Academy's substitute for the MS reading: *Sāmpun pva vruh irika, nyāta tumēmu n ka-nirvāṇa-n*, i.e. 'Once you know that, you find Nirvāṇa!' *Tumaṅguh*, however, has the meaning of 'to check, to hold up', which is exactly the opposite of the thought which the original author wished to impress upon us. — It will not be necessary to add more to these examples of slovenliness.

The Academy follows the good example given by Gonda and others after him in pointing to the 'new' words to be met in the published texts. The author of the big, four-volume 'Kawi-Balinesch-Neder-

landsch Woordenboek' (KBNW), Dr. Van der Tuuk,²⁹ consulted a very considerable number of mss for his pioneering work,³⁰ but it was only to be expected that in mss unknown to him 'new' words would crop up, and lists of them are only too welcome. Some thirty years after Van der Tuuk's death Dr. Juynboll produced a one volume 'Oud-Javaansche Nederlandsche Woordenlijst,'³¹ (ONW), which with its clear Latin print promised advantages for the beginner working with romanised texts. Additional word-lists, as made by Gonda and others, take Van der Tuuk as their starting-point, and I think they are right in doing so. It is astonishing, time and again to come across references to 'ONW' in the Academy's publications, the more conspicuous as these letters are the only Latin letters in the Devanagari pages of the Hindi commentary.

The bedevilling thought that the Academy might not have used Van der Tuuk, and certainly has not consulted it to a sufficient extent, finds confirmation in the top paragraph of p. 168 where we find *bubukṣah?* *mvañ gagakini?* with two question-marks expressing the Academy's puzzlement. The words are incorporated in Van der Tuuk; Bubhuṣah (Greedy-Guts, He-who-is-hungry-for-worldly-enjoyment — it is after all a word of good Sanskrit origin) and Gagan Akin (Dry Stalk) are well-known figures in Javano-Balinese literary history³² and are being still known all over Bali, and form a welcome object for illustrators. Dry Stalk, by eating grass and leaves, fasting and ascetism, tries to inherit heavenly bliss if not nirvāṇa, and his skeleton-like physique betrays the earnestness of his endeavours. His younger brother Greedy-guts followed the opposite method: he devours fresh and rotten food, raw and prepared, on top of that and above all: meat! and his prosperous physique bears witness of the excellent state of body and mind in which he feels himself. The Highest Lord now sends His messenger White Tiger from Heaven down to the mountain on the slopes of which the two brothers exercise their different kind of tapas. Near the arid peak he finds the shivering Dry Stalk who is definitely not agreeable to the thought of being devoured by White Tiger; he dis-

²⁹ Landsdrukkerij, Weltevreden, 1897-1912.

³⁰ Four volumes in: Dr. J. Brandes, Beschrijving HSS Dr. Van der Tuuk. Landsdrukkerij, Weltevreden, 1901-1926.

³¹ Brill, Leiden, 1923.

³² Verklaring van Basrelief-series. A. Bubukṣah-serie door P. V. van Stein Callenfels, TBG LXVIII/5 & 5, 1918, pp. 348-361.
Dr. W. H. Rassers, Siva and Buddha in the East Indian Archipelago, being pp. 63-91 in Pañji, the Culture Hero. Nijhoff, The Hague, 1959.

suades him from spoiling his appetite with his poor skin and skeleton and advises him to try his well-fed younger brother, lower down on the mountain-slope. White Tiger accepts his advice, goes further down and finds Greedy-guts quite prepared to be devoured; eating and being eaten is exactly the same to him. White Tiger is satisfied and does not devour him, but invites him to sit down on his back to be transported back to Heaven. On their way to higher regions they pass by the hermitage of Dry Stalk, who has the presence of mind to clutch the tiger's tail; by doing that he too manages to reach Heaven. — According to Balinese tradition, Greedyguts' conduct would be that of the Buddhist priest, and as in so many cases, corroboration for the popular tradition is still to be found; Dry Stalk's method would be that of the śaiva priest.

The Academy has done useful work in publishing its Old-Javanese texts and in trying to link them up with Indian sūtras and collections of maxims, as well as with other Old-Javanese works; I wish to stress this time and again. Though individuals are still able to make admirable editions or re-editions of texts, institutional work has its own undeniable advantages, as I had the privilege of witnessing in India. After the editing of Old-Javanese texts mainly by the Dutch (Royal Institute, the Hague; Royal Batavia Society, Batavia) not much more from the Dutch side is to be expected; the Indonesians are not yet working to capacity and so the Indians are the next heirs to a field opened for them. But the windfall caused by Zieseniss' spiritual heritage being transferred to the Academy is not likely to be repeated. It is awkward that the Academy's *WĪHASPATI-TATTWA* (Ph.D. thesis 1957) in the course of its 518 pp. not once refers to Zieseniss's book in preparation (1958; publisher: the Academy) and seldom to his previous publication. It is, moreover, remarkable that as soon as the Academy uses mss not known to Zieseniss (*GAṆAPATI-TATTVA*, *BHUVANA-SAṆKṢEPA* K 1526) it stumbles like an inexperienced, untutored and not too promising young student.

The difficulties in the editing of Old-Javanese texts should not be underrated: the interdependence of texts is treacherous and often forces one to enlarge one's scope considerably; the number of mss available, though not yet bewildering, does not make it plain sailing to make books by printing some 50 ślokas, once in Balinese script, once in Devanāgarī and once in Latin. Moreover, one should not be afraid of handling the four heavy volumes of Van der Tuuk, unwieldy though they may be in every respect.

The publication of mixed Sanskrit cum Old-Javanese texts in itself is as respectable as the diet and the fasting chosen by Dry Stalk. It is comforting to know that notwithstanding an obvious ethical failure and ill-chosen methods, he still managed to enter the ardently desired Heaven. Better results, however, are obtained by following the method of Greedy-guts, here to be explained as: absorption of all aspects of Javano-Balinese culture, old and new, religious and profane, musical and pictorial, dramatic and boring, 'historical' and pure fiction, hellish and heavenly. I am firmly convinced that initial mistakes can be overcome and I sincerely hope that the Javano-Balinese aspect of Indian thought will continue to be an interesting and rewarding field of study, especially for Indian scholars.

C. HOOYKAAS