J. Schoterman

An introduction to old Javanese Sanskrit dictionaries and grammars

In: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 137 (1981), no: 4, Leiden, 419-442

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

J. A. SCHOTERMAN

AN INTRODUCTION TO OLD JAVANESE SANSKRIT DICTIONARIES AND GRAMMARS¹

It is subject to speculation when, where or how the first contacts between the Indian Subcontinent and South-East Asia were established (cf. Coedès 1964: 15-72). All over South-East Asia, however, the first tangible evidence of such contacts — whether it be in the form of Sanskrit (Skt) inscriptions or sculptures fashioned in an Indian style — can be assigned to the first part of the first millennium A.D. The Indonesian Archipelago forms no exception to this rule: the seven Skt inscriptions on stone pillars (*yūpas*) of King Mūlavarman are the first evidence of contact between India and Indonesia. The inscriptions, written in fairly correct Skt,² originated in the region of East Kalimantan, the former sultanate of Kutai, and can be dated around 400 A.D. (De Casparis 1975: 18).

From the time of King Mūlavarman onwards, Indian culture in all its facets spread over the entire Archipelago, in particular the islands of Sumatra, Java and Bali. The end of the so-called Hindu-Javanese epoch is marked by the fall of Majapahit, the last Hindu-Javanese empire, in the 16th century. With the exception of Bali and West Lombok the major part of the Archipelago has since become predominantly Islamic. During the period of approximately 1200 years between the first Skt inscriptions of King Mūlavarman and the fall of Majapahit, however, Skt literature and language were diligently studied: Skt texts

J. A. SCHOTERMAN studied Indo-Iranian Languages and Culture at the State University of Utrecht, initially specializing in Vedic Literature and later in Hindu Tantric Literature both in India and Nepal. His research also focuses on Sanskrit Grammar and Lexicography in the Indonesian Archipelago. Mr. Schoterman's most important publications are: 'Some Remarks on the Kubjikāmata-tantra', *ZDMG* Supplement III, 2, 1977, p. 932-940; 'A link between Purāṇa and Tantra: Agnipurāṇa 143-147', *ZDMG* (1980); and 'The Yonitantra', New Delhi: Manohar Press, 1980. He can be reached at Plantage Doklaan 42, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

from the Indian Subcontinent were brought to Indonesia and provided with Old Javanese (OJ) commentaries, or were used as basis for genuinely OJ literary texts, of which the OJ *Rāmāyaṇa*, for instance, is a very early and outstanding example. Besides, it is agreed by scholars that during this period Skt texts were also composed in Indonesia (Hooykaas 1962: 309-327). It is therefore not surprising that the Chinese pilgrim I-Ching, who left Canton for India in 671, interrupted his journey for six months in Śrīwijaya (E. Sumatra) in order to study the Skt language before proceeding to India itself. Perhaps his statement that "thousands of Buddhist priests lived in Śrīwijaya and studied all kinds of subjects" is somewhat exaggerated. Nevertheless, it is evident that I-Ching found in Śrīwijaya the means to learn the Skt language. One may therefore safely assume that in the second part of the 7th century A.D. Śrīwijaya was a centre for the study of Indian culture in general, and of Skt in particular (Krom 1931: 115ff; cf. also Brandes 1888: 130 note 1).

We do not possess any specific information with regard to the teaching of Skt to Indonesian or Chinese students. Most probably, though, the tuition was given orally by teachers from the Indian Subcontinent and/or by native teachers trained by Indians (cf. Zoetmulder 1974: 5-6). In addition to this texts were in all probability compiled as aids for the student and the native teacher in their efforts to master the Skt language. To this category belong such bilingual texts as the *Caritra Ramayana* or *Kawi Janaki*, in which Skt sentences derived from the Indian *Rāmāyaṇa* are given, followed by their OJ translation, thus: *saḥ vṛkṣaḥ* = *ikang kayu*, 'this tree' (cf. Lévy 1933: XXXII; 93-107). Although these texts are undoubtedly important for the study of Skt in Indonesia, we will focus our attention in this Introduction on another category of texts which were used in, or were the result of, the teaching of Skt in Indonesia, notably in Sumatra, Java and Bali, namely dictionaries and grammars.

Both in Indonesia (Gedong Kirtya at Singaraja, Bali) and The Netherlands (Library of the University of Leiden) a considerable number of manuscripts are kept which treat such subjects as vocabulary and grammar. Many of the manuscripts concerned consist of only a small number of pages, or seem to be fragments of an originally longer text. Besides the two major collections just mentioned and several smaller ones,³ a large body of such texts has been discovered still to be kept in private collections in Bali.⁴ In many instances these texts from private collections have proved of great help in providing

a better insight into the textual material previously available on the subject of OJ Skt dictionaries and grammars.

The study of OJ Skt dictionaries and grammars was begun as early as the 19th century, when M. Holle drew attention to a manuscript which was identified later as the *Caṇḍakiraṇa* (Holle 1867: 461-463; Krom 1924: 203). The latter in the course of time became one of the show-pieces in the field of OJ Skt lexicography, mainly due to its place of origin (Java), its alleged age (going back to the Śailendra dynasty), and its possible connection with an Indian dictionary. Besides the *Caṇḍakiraṇa*, a text which has gained fame in the field of OJ Skt grammar is the *Svaravyaṇjana*. In this Introduction I shall deal mainly with these two texts and their relation to other texts in the fields of OJ Skt lexicography and grammar. Alongside these two celebrated texts a third, the *Kāraḥsaṃgraha*, deserves mention, however, and will be discussed in the following pages as well.

Despite the multitude of other texts available on the subject, scholars have directed their attention solely to these three texts, using an extremely limited number of manuscripts, moreover.⁵ Gonda has very adequately summarized the results of this research, spread over more than a century (Gonda 1973: 176ff.). By making use of the newly discovered material from Bali, however, it has become possible, in my opinion, to present a more satisfactory survey of the OJ Skt dictionaries and grammatical texts which are accessible at the moment, and to place the *Caṇḍakiraṇa*, the *Svaravyaṇjana* and the *Kāraḥsaṃgraha* in their proper context. It should be kept in mind that the present survey is meant only as an introduction to the subject. There are many other texts still relating to our subject in Bali which await copying and study.

Caṇḍakiraṇa, Kṛtabhāṣā and Bhāṣā Ekalawya

Although the *Caṇḍakiraṇa* (CK)⁶ has drawn the attention of several scholars (Holle 1867: 461-463; Kern 1885: 275-281; Brandes 1888: 130 note 1; Krom 1924: 203-206; 1931: 150-152) and has been described in some detail by Juynboll (Juynboll 1907: 170ff.), some additional remarks may prove useful. The text of the CK, which unfortunately is incomplete, can be divided into three separate parts, viz. 1) a portion on prosody, 2) a central part, the *Amaramālā*, and 3) a kind of OJ Skt dictionary. It is obvious from internal evidence that the first part on prosody is of a considerably later date than the central part, while the third part, the OJ Skt dictionary, may contain old elements supplemented with words from later periods to adjust it

to later conditions (Krom 1931: 150). Since the central part of the CK, the Amaramālā, appears to be the most authentic part I shall deal with this portion in the following paragraphs.

The actual Amaramālā section is preceded by an introduction (F. 23B), in which a certain King Jitendra of the Śailendra dynasty is praised as the instigator of the translation of the Amaramālā into the vernacular. Next there follow four, very corrupt, Skt ślokas provided with an OJ translation. These four Skt verses do not eulogize King Jitendra, as Krom suggests (Krom 1931: 149), but deal mainly with the three genders of Skt words, viz. masculine (*pums*), feminine (*strī*), and neuter (*klība*). After these introductory ślokas the Amaramālā or Mahāmaramālā, as it is also styled in the text itself, begins on folio 24B of the manuscript.

The Amaramālā itself opens with an enumeration of 25 Skt words for deity (*dewata*) in general, followed by similar lists of the various epithets for Bhaṭāra Guru (= Śiva), Bhaṭārī Umā, Bhaṭāra Brahma, etc. Noteworthy here is the fact that in the majority of cases the names of the various deities are enumerated first in verse (*śloka*), and then in identically the same way in prose. In some instances, however, the prose enumeration contains more names than the preceding śloka (cf. Kern 1885: 275-281).⁷ In view of the introductory lines mentioning King Jitendra and of the four Skt verses preceding the actual Amaramālā section, there is no difficulty in deciding where exactly this part begins. Where it actually ends and the OJ-Skt dictionary begins is open to some doubt, however. According to Kern "un simple vocabulaire sanskrit-kavi", enumerating all kinds of plants, animals, etc., begins on folio 34A (Kern 1885: 279). From folio 34A onwards there does in fact occur what looks like an OJ-Skt dictionary. Before this folio 34A we find enumerations of the epithets of various deities in both verse and prose; besides these, the different words for, for instance, *anak* (child), *kēdi* (eunuch), *ratu* (king), etc. are enumerated. The entries before folio 34A all have one thing in common, however: the epithets or synonyms are invariably first listed in verse and then repeated in prose.⁸ After folio 34A the character of the text quite clearly changes. It contains a fairly long list of names of all kinds of plants (*pari*, *atak*, *kacang*, etc.), animals (*iwak*, *mrak*, etc.), and other miscellaneous items. These entries mostly consist of one particular Skt word and its OJ equivalent, viz. *rājīva ngaran-ing iwak lajar* (a species of fish, probably with striped markings). Contrary to the part preceding folio 34A, this section contains no long enumerations in verse followed by the same

enumerations in prose. Obviously this difference led Kern to decide that another section, the 'simple' OJ-Skt dictionary, started on folio 34A of the CK. As it turns out, however, this simple list of individual Skt words with their OJ equivalent contains several items which are explained in a Skt *śloka* followed by the same enumeration of the same synonyms in prose. From folio 34B onwards the entries *gajah* (elephant), *kuda* (horse), *sajēng* (spirituous liquor), *istri* (woman), and *kilat* (lightning) are explained with a number of Skt words both in verse and in prose, just as in the case of the entries before folio 34A. It is only after folio 39B of the CK that another section of the text clearly begins. This is immediately apparent from the nature and arrangement of the entries themselves. In this third part we find homonymous Skt words listed together with their OJ translation, thus: *nāginī* = *ulā* (snake); *nagana*⁹ = *gunung* (mountain); *nagara* = *kaḍatwan* (town/kraton), etc. (CK folio 40A).¹⁰

If one were to suggest that the central part of the CK, the Amaramālā, continues up to folio 39B of the text, then obviously this central part does not constitute a homogeneous whole. On the one hand it contains entries consisting mainly of Skt words enumerated both in verse and in prose, while on the other hand it includes many entries consisting of only a single Skt word with its OJ equivalent. As will become apparent from the examples cited below, some of the non-Skt words found in this part of the CK can hardly be classified as OJ, but appear rather to be Middle Javanese, however vague the distinction between these two may be. Nevertheless, I personally am convinced that the central and most authentic part of the CK, the Amaramālā, runs up to folio 38B of the text. An external indication that this part of the CK should indeed be considered as a unitary whole is provided by the fact that it has been incorporated *in toto* into other texts outside Java, as we shall see below. It would of course be premature at the present stage of the research to try and account for this apparent heterogeneity of the central part of the CK,¹¹ but the following suggestions may be considered. Possibly the entries consisting of Skt *ślokas* were borrowed from the Indian Subcontinent, and were repeated in prose by the Indonesian compiler of the text, who in some instances added an additional number of epithets or synonyms which may have been of special interest to him; this part of the central section of the CK could then be regarded in the first place as a Skt encyclopaedia adapted for Indonesian use. The majority of the entries in this part are, moreover, to be placed in a religious context, since they comprise

mostly names of deities. The more or less simple list of individual Skt words with their OJ counterpart may have been added to the central part for practical purposes later, as Krom has already suggested (Krom 1931: 150). In this part the OJ language appears to predominate, since the entries are systematically arranged as follows: *māṣa ngaran-ing atak bāng*; *mudga ngaran-ing atak ijo*; *kākāṇḍa ngaran-ing atak kucung* (CK folio 34A), whereby all kinds of OJ words for 'bean' are provided with their Skt translation. In this way this part constitutes a genuine OJ-Skt dictionary. The practical reasons for which this part may have been added to the central part of the CK can perhaps be defined more precisely. It is probably no coincidence that at least eight varieties of rice are enumerated for instance. Rice, besides of course being a very important crop in Indonesia, in modern Bali constitutes a basic component of the various offerings, and it is always most important that the particular kind of rice prescribed for a particular sacrifice is used. The same is true for the other varieties of plants enumerated in this OJ-Skt dictionary: in contemporary Bali they are all connected with offerings. The names of trees may have been included for another reason: in Bali today these trees are all connected with *uṣadha*, 'medicine'. Perhaps the contents of the OJ-Skt dictionary in the CK were determined by the importance of the various entries with regard to religious and medical practices in pre-Islamic Java. It is of course unfeasible to use present-day arguments to explain conditions of centuries ago, but these may nevertheless provide a useful working hypothesis. A detailed study of the socio-religious conditions prevailing in Java at the time of compilation of the CK may establish certain links with modern Balinese religious practices.

The CK has always been considered rather a unique text, both on account of its assumed age (going back to the Śailendra dynasty), and because of its possible relation to an Indian text (the Amarakoṣa).¹¹ Moreover, it originates from Java, in contrast to the majority of OJ texts, which are now only preserved in Bali in relatively recent *lontars*. One may seriously doubt, however, whether the CK rightfully occupies this lonely place among all the texts with similar contents. Krom has already pointed to a resemblance between it and a category of texts from Bali known as *Kṛtabhāṣā* (Krom 1931: 150). It seems useful, therefore, to try and establish a connection between the CK from Java and these *Kṛtabhāṣās*, which are found in large numbers in Bali.¹²

Kṛtabhāṣās (from: *saṃskṛtabhāṣā*, 'the Sanskrit language') are generally described as dictionaries or encyclopaedias listing Skt words with

their OJ translation. They are arranged in accordance with mnemonic principles, as are the similar Indian *Koṣas*.¹³ Going through a number of these *Kṛtabhāṣās*, it becomes immediately apparent that no two *Kṛtabhāṣās* are completely the same, as their entries often differ considerably, the sequence of these entries differs, and the explanations are different, too. Moreover, there are many *Kṛtabhāṣās* containing hardly any Skt words, being mere Javanese-Balinese dictionaries (cf. MSS Z 349; Z 1516).

Most of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* which do answer the description of Skt-OJ dictionary, however, appear to have one feature in common: they contain a central part in which the epithets of various deities are enumerated. The resemblance between this part of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* and the *Amaramālā* section of the CK is too striking to be coincidental. There is one important difference between these texts, however: so far I have not found in any *Kṛtabhāṣā* enumerations in verse of the epithets of deities, these always being summarized in prose. It is admittedly very difficult to decide whether a particular enumeration of names is in verse or in prose. In verse enumerations the names are also placed one after the other, but here sometimes a word such as *ca* ('and') is inserted between two names for metrical purposes. One may obviously argue that unimportant words like *ca* were dropped by later copyists, whose intention was still nonetheless to enumerate the names in verse. It can be established beyond any doubt, however, that the enumerations as found in the *Kṛtabhāṣās* are indeed in prose. A *Kṛtabhāṣā* from Puri Kawan (Singaraja, N.Bali; MS S 102), for instance, displays the following characteristics. The 25 words for deity in general with which the *Amaramālā* section of the CK begins are lacking,¹⁴ but the 66 epithets for Bhaṭāra Guru agree exactly with those of the prose enumeration in the CK.¹⁵ The epithets for other deities as found in this *Kṛtabhāṣā* for the greater part also agree with those in the CK, a few significant exceptions aside. As was said above, in some instances the prose enumeration of the epithets contains more names than the verse enumeration in the CK. In the case of such a discrepancy between the two enumerations in the CK, the *Kṛtabhāṣā* appears to follow strictly the prose enumeration of the CK. Thus the CK lists 17 epithets for the Buddha in the verse enumeration, and 30 in the prose enumeration, which 30 epithets are also found in the *Kṛtabhāṣā*. In the other cases as well where the CK prose enumeration contains more epithets the *Kṛtabhāṣā* from Puri Kawan follows this prose enumeration. Besides the epithets for the various deities, the *Kṛtabhāṣā* also contains

the remaining part of the CK Amaramālā — e.g. the lists of plants, animals, etc. Although the order of the entries is sometimes slightly different, both the entries themselves and their explanation are the same. The establishment of any direct connection between this Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan in Bali and the CK from Java on account of the correspondence between the former and the Amaramālā can only be very tentative. The fact remains that the Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan comprises only the central part of the CK: the first part on prosody and the third part on Skt homonyms are not to be found in it. Perhaps both the Javanese CK manuscript and the Balinese Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan are based on an earlier text from Java which has disappeared with time. It is important to note that it is the central part of the CK, which probably constitutes the most authentic portion, that is found also in Bali. In view of the correspondence between this Amaramālā section of the CK and the Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan this particular Kṛtabhāṣā is obviously an important guide to an understanding of the central part of the CK. In addition it may be noted that the said Kṛtabhāṣā contains the missing pages of the Amaramālā, folios 35 and 36 for instance being missing in the CK. Where folio 34B ends in the middle of the prose enumeration of the various words for horse, in the Kṛtabhāṣā (folio 59B) the remaining part of this enumeration is found, concluding with the words *nagaran-ing kuda ika*, 'the meanings (of the foregoing words are all) horse'. In the same way folio 37A of the CK contains the end of a prose enumeration of the epithets for Bhaṭāra Varuṇa, the beginning of which again is supplied by the Kṛtabhāṣā (folio 61B).

The above-described similarity between the Kṛtabhāṣā in question and the central part of the CK is a unique one which is not found to the same extent in the case of any of the other Kṛtabhāṣās. The Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan hence occupies a place apart, being so far the only Kṛtabhāṣā from Bali to contain the complete central part of the CK. The majority of these Kṛtabhāṣās do, in fact, contain a central portion which is very similar to that of the CK, but they differ from it as regards the number of epithets and the deities listed. Apart from the Balinese Kṛtabhāṣās containing the list of deities with their epithets, this same list is found in a slightly different form in the first part of the Cantaka Parwa. The difference between the list as found here and that in the CK and the Kṛtabhāṣā is that the prose enumeration of the epithets in the former sometimes includes an explanation in OJ of a particular epithet. Thus the epithet *Sori* (Skt: *Śauri*) for Viṣṇu is explained as *dening ginawe danahaning* (wrong for *dahananing*?) *dewa*

kawignan aprang (Cantaka Parwa folio 3B), 'by him (sc. Sori) was effected the burning of a deity who was a formidable adversary in battle'.

Besides the *Kṛtabhāṣās* containing a central section which more or less agrees with the *Amaramālā* of the CK, there are many *Kṛtabhāṣās* lacking a central part of this kind. Nevertheless, the gods and their epithets are found mentioned in these *Kṛtabhāṣās* as well, although here they occur scattered throughout the text. Even so, they are at least mentioned, while the epithets all correspond to those found in the 'traditional' list of the CK. This absence of a clearly discernible central part in the *Kṛtabhāṣās* concerned coincides with a plainly apparent decrease in the number of Skt words in the text on the one hand, and an equally obvious increase in words about which it is difficult to decide whether they are OJ, Middle Javanese or even Balinese on the other. From these *Kṛtabhāṣās* it is only a small step to the *Kṛtabhāṣās* in which no Skt at all occurs, and which are mere Javanese-Balinese dictionaries.

As is well known, the manuscripts from Bali do not vary greatly in age: one hardly ever comes across a *lontar* older than 150 or 200 years. Consequently, the *lontars* themselves are of no use in determining the age of a given OJ text from Bali. In the case of the *Kṛtabhāṣās*, however, there appear to be fairly reliable other grounds on which to determine how close a particular text is to its original, assuming that such an original text ever existed at all. The CK from Java, with its mention of the Śailendra King Jitendra, places the date of origin of the text of the *lontar* in the eighth century A.D. at the earliest.¹⁶ This would make the *Amaramālā* section of the CK the oldest example of a *Kṛtabhāṣā*. The occurrence of the *Amaramālā* in some Balinese *Kṛtabhāṣās* suggests the existence of a more authentic and older version of these texts. The Balinese *Kṛtabhāṣās* in which this central part deviates considerably from the CK would therefore appear to be later adaptations. It is a hazardous undertaking to construct a relative chronology of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* at this early stage of the research, but the following, tentative, classification may prove useful as a basis.

- I] Those *Kṛtabhāṣās* which have a central part coinciding completely with, or resembling strongly, the *Amaramālā* of the CK.
- II] Those *Kṛtabhāṣās* which lack such an obvious central part, but in which the contents of the central part are scattered throughout the text.
- III] Those *Kṛtabhāṣās* which are mere Javanese-Balinese dictionaries.¹⁷

A question which should definitely be raised concerns the actual function of the *Kṛtabhāṣās*. In the older *Kṛtabhāṣās* it is possible to find the OJ translation of a particular Skt word and *vice versa*, provided one understands the 'system' of the text. The number of words which are to be found in a *Kṛtabhāṣā*, however, is restricted, being confined to epithets of deities, and names of plants, animals, birds, etc., which obviously constitutes only a minor portion of the total Skt vocabulary. Kern was therefore right in assuming that these texts were used in the first place as aids in reading OJ texts, especially *kakawins* with their considerable number of Skt words (cf. Kern 1885: 260). Assuming that the earlier *Kṛtabhāṣās* served a more or less general purpose, viz. that of aids in reading *kakawins*, one gets the impression that the later ones related more and more to a specific *kakawin*: the decrease in the number of epithets, or even their total absence, the disappearance of the names for the 'traditional' groups of plants, animals etc., and the completely arbitrary order in which the entries are arranged all seem to point to this change in function of the later *Kṛtabhāṣās*. This impression is strengthened by the frequent repetition of entries, sometimes with only a few other entries in between. Moreover, in these *Kṛtabhāṣās* are frequently found the personal names of heroes from the *Mahābhārata* stories, for instance, which is never the case in the older *Kṛtabhāṣās*. The supposition that these later *Kṛtabhāṣās* might each relate to a particular text is of course no more than a hypothesis, which can only be proved if a link can be established between a particular *Kṛtabhāṣā* and a *kakawin* that is beyond any doubt.

While the original function of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* may be open to speculation, the use they have for modern scholars is beyond all doubt. The importance of these texts obviously lies mainly in the lexicological field, as regards both Skt and OJ.¹⁸ It is interesting to see a distinction being made between Skt words themselves, for instance. Thus the entry *mṛṅganābhi*, 'musk', is explained with the word *kastūri*, which also means 'musk', but which also is Skt.¹⁹ Obviously the Skt word *kastūri* was already accepted as part of the OJ vocabulary, while *mṛṅganābhi* was still considered a foreign word. Almost inevitably the word *kastūri* has undergone a change of meaning in the course of time, and can be applied in Modern Balinese to any fruit which is 'fragrant'. Next we find Skt words being used in a meaning which is unique, both for India and for Indonesia. Thus the Skt word *meghadūta*, 'cloud-messenger', which is best known as the title of the famous poem by

Kālidāsa, is explained with *carak-ing tahun/tawun*, 'water-spout'. From India this meaning of the word *meghadūta* is unknown to me; whether it will be found in any text outside the Kṛtabhāṣā literature in Indonesia seems doubtful. Although Van der Tuuk has the entry in his dictionary (KBW I. 589), he does not refer to any text. It is likely that he took his entry from a Kṛtabhāṣā — something not unusual for him. As another category one may mention those Skt words which are not found in India itself at all. Thus OJ *ulā*, 'snake', is given as the equivalent of Skt *kṛmidūta*, 'whose messenger is a worm', or 'the messenger of worms',²⁰ and of *pattrajihva*, 'whose tongue resembles a leaf'.²¹ The fact that these Skt words have so far only been found in Indonesia and not in India proper should not lead one to assume that they are Indonesian Skt innovations. The majority of the Indian lexicons have remained unpublished, and for this reason are not easily accessible. Perhaps one day these words will be found in an Indian lexicon when more of them are published. The Kṛtabhāṣās, in fact, contain quite a few Skt words which so far are otherwise only known from Indian lexicons. So the Skt word *kākodara*, 'snake', is only otherwise found in Indian lexicons; in the Kṛtabhāṣās it is frequently found with its OJ translation, *ulā*.

But also from an OJ point of view these texts deserve the attention of scholars. In many instances OJ botanical names become more precisely definable. Thus the word *sumpang*, which is defined by Juynboll in his *Oudjavaansch-Nederlandsche Woordenlijst* only with 'plant', without any indication of what kind of plant this might be, according to the CK and other Kṛtabhāṣās is identical with *mēnur*, 'jasmine'. The word *agēl*, of which there seem to be no occurrences in OJ, but which is listed by Van der Tuuk for Sasak, where it means 'the fruit of the gēbang' (KBWI, 441), while in Modern Javanese and Indonesian the word *agel* denotes 'the rind of the gebang used as a rope' (Pigeaud 1938: s.v.; Poerwadarminta & Teeuw 1950: s.v.), is used in the CK as the equivalent of Skt *ketakī*, which denotes a species of tree (*Pandanus Odoratissimus*). This *ketakī* is described as 'a densely branched, rarely erect, evergreen tree growing in the low, moist swampy places in the Andaman islands and on the coastline of India. The plant with strong roots and with its trunk studded with short prickles is aphrodisiac and induces sleep' (Gupta 1971: 84). We have already seen that the Kṛtabhāṣās contain some 'unique' Skt words. The same is true of some OJ words. So the Skt words *markaṭa* and *vanaukasa*, both meaning 'monkey', are provided with the translation *raray alas* (lit. 'young-

ster of the forest'). The two Skt words are not unusual, but their OJ equivalent certainly is — to my knowledge the compound *raray alas* is not to be found in any Kawi text and seems to be rather an artificial construction for use in kidung. The occurrence of this Middle Javanese (?) expression here is even more surprising in the light of the fact that the usual OJ word for monkey, *wre* or *wray*, is also found as an individual entry.

Before concluding this section on the Kṛtabhāṣās, I would like to draw attention to two relatively modern Kṛtabhāṣās. Although perhaps not belonging strictly to the group of Kṛtabhāṣās discussed above, they still form part of the Kṛtabhāṣā tradition. The first of the two was published in eight issues of *Bhāwanāgara*, the journal of the Gedong Kirtya, between 1931 and 1933. The author of this Kṛtabhāṣā has signed each article with the initials R.G., in which one can easily recognize Roelof Goris. The text of this Kṛtabhāṣā was written by Goris himself, and consists of Skt and Balinese. It comprises a lengthy enumeration of Skt compounds with a numeral ranging from one to five as their first component, followed by an explanation in Balinese. The entries concern mainly religious concepts. The other Kṛtabhāṣā, which is actually styled 'Kṛta Bahasa' in the text itself (S 110), is also closely connected with Goris. It is a text in Balinese beginning with an enumeration of various varieties of rice, bananas, etc., followed by the names of famous wayang heroes. The main part of this Kṛtabhāṣā is made up of explanations of difficult words from various kakawins, which are all mentioned by name. This may not be sheer coincidence in this 'modern' Kṛtabhāṣā (cf. p. 429 above). It is perhaps a curious point that this second Kṛtabhāṣā ends with a description of the *angka rum*, 'the Roman numerals', explaining in a simple way how to write dates in Roman numerals! The author explicitly states himself to owe his knowledge to 'Tuan Dr. Goris'.

Another group of texts which are closely related to the Kṛtabhāṣās is formed by the so-called Bhāṣā Ekalawyas, which are often incorporated in specific Kṛtabhāṣās. The exact meaning of the term *ekalawya* is not certain. Van der Tuuk (KBW I, 146) suggests a corruption of the Skt *ekalāpya*, while Gonda explains it as a form of *ekārthabhyā*, "to be understood in the same meaning as (synonyms)" (Gonda 1973: 210 note 38). Whether or not this is correct, it at least points to the basic character of Ekalawyas. Actually an Ekalawya is the same as a Kṛtabhāṣā, except for one important difference: the former invariably begins

with an explanation of 11 groups of words, each of which groups consists of three words which are very similar in sound. These 11 groups are identical in every Ekalawya. Thus in all of them we find as the tenth group, for example, *sara/sari/saru*, which is explained as follows: *sara* = *kawaśa*, 'mighty'; *sari* = *wēkas*, 'the pick'; *saru* = *tan patūt*, which last pair is problematic, *tan patūt* meaning 'unbecoming, unfitting', but *saru* hardly occurring in OJ texts. Zoetmulder connects *saru* with sound, and translates it with 'loud',²² and one might imagine that under certain circumstances a loud voice could be considered 'unfitting'; in Modern Javanese *saru* indeed means 'unfitting' (Pigeaud 1938: s.v.). As in the Kṛtabhāṣās, in most of the Ekalawyas, too, we find a central section listing the epithets of deities, etc. In some Ekalawyas (cf. Z 1593; S 105)²³ this central part is preceded by the enumeration of the 25 words for 'deity' in general which we also came across in the CK. In some of the Ekalawyas, moreover, this central section is concluded with the phrase *iti candramarmala*, which reminds one strongly of the Caṇḍakiraṇa and the Amaramālā.

The Svaravyañjana

As is already indicated by its title, the Svaravyañjana deals with the vowels (*svara*) and consonants (*vyañjana*) of the Skt alphabet. The greater part of the text is, however, devoted to an explanation of the Skt rules of *sandhi*. The contents of one Svaravyañjana text have been described by Juynboll (Juynboll 1901: 630-635; 1911: 216). There is not much I can add to Juynboll's excellent description, but some remarks of a more general nature do seem to be called for. Juynboll's description of the Svaravyañjana is based on a single manuscript of the text — a manuscript which furthermore unfortunately appears to be rather 'sloppy'. Thus we nowhere find a completely correct enumeration of the letters of the Skt alphabet: there are always either some letters missing, or their sequence is incorrect. In the classification of the letters into gutturals etc., the labials are missing. There are many other similar cases of obvious sloppiness on the part of the author of this particular manuscript. The text discussed by Juynboll ends with an exercise of the type *saḥ vṛkṣaḥ* = *ikang kayu*, which characterizes, as we have seen above (p. 2), the category of texts such as the Kawi Janaki or Caritra Ramayana. Moreover, these exercises are referred to in Juynboll's text as Kṛtabhāṣā (sic). Since Juynboll's time other manuscripts of the Svaravyañjana have been collected, and many of these have proved to be much better. A Svaravyañjana manuscript from the Balai

Penelitian Bahasa, the former Lembaga Bahasa Nasional (No. LBN/088), for instance, contains a far more correct text, and lacks the Skt-OJ exercises at the end. Moreover, this manuscript contains several Skt *ślokas* along with their OJ translation — a feature which usually points to a more original state of a text as preserved in a *lontar*. It is an established fact that a knowledge of the Skt rules of *sandhi* was very important in Indonesia. The application of these *sandhi* rules is discernible not only in Indonesian Skt texts, but also in OJ texts. It may result in hypercorrect constructions which are not very common even in India. Thus in an undated OJ inscription from Dieng (Brandes 1918: 227), for instance, which probably goes back to the first part of the 9th century A.D., we find mentioned among the possessions of a deity (*dewadrawya*) which are enumerated here a *kaiṃl laki sajugala* (face B, line 1), or 'pair of *kains*'. Both Brandes and Sarkar (Sarkar 1972: II, 262) have read *kail* instead of *kaiṃl*, although the *anusvāra* (*ṃ*) is clearly visible in the incisions of the inscription. This *kaiṃl laki*, then, appears to be the result of a very rigorous application of the Skt rules of *sandhi*, the 'basic' form being *kain laki*. In a discussion of these rules in Indonesia we can hardly avoid mentioning the stone inscription of Dinoyo (Sarkar 1972: I, 25) from 760 A.D. This inscription is unique in its kind, as the rules of *sandhi* are not applied in it at all. Every word of it is presented in its *pausa* form. Thus we come across the sentence *limwaḥ api tanayaḥ tasya* (line 4), constituting one quarter of a *śloka*. This *pāda* consists of nine instead of the required eight syllables, however. Only the application of the rules of *sandhi* will produce a regular *pāda*, viz. *limwo 'pi tanayaḥ tasya*. The reason for this non-application of the said rules is unknown. The solution proposed by De Casparis is a very ingenious one, and may well prove correct. He suggests that the inscription in question may have served the purpose of teaching the rules of *sandhi* (De Casparis 1975: 31). One wonders, however, how this was actually done: should one imagine a class of students being led to the inscription by their guru, to be subsequently taught the rules in order to realize that the inscription was composed in verse? Or should one perhaps consider another possibility? The presentation of a verse in its *pausa* form is not unknown in India. The verses of the *R̥gveda-saṃhitā*, for instance, were memorized by the Brahmins in both their verse form (*saṃhitāpāṭha*) and their *pausa* form (*padapāṭha*). The memorization of these verses in their *padapāṭha* form served a definite purpose, viz. the preservation of the verses in their true form, by applying the rules of *sandhi* to which one obtains a correct *saṃhitāpāṭha*. The

same practice is found in connection with later Skt verse texts. In the case of the Skt Tantras, for instance, the commentary often contains a repetition of the verse of the original text in full, followed immediately by its *padapāṭha* version, on which the actual commentary is based. The presentation of the verses in their *pausa* form in these cases serves only one purpose: ignoring the rules of *sandhi* one is able to present the text in its most simple form, which certainly conduces to a better understanding of that text. In this way the words of the text are presented in their most elementary form, in which they are understandable to the entire group of people who at least know Skt, and who are able to recognize Skt words in their primary form. The same applies to the presentation of Skt texts in Indonesia. In the CK the epithets of the various deities are given first in verse, and then are immediately repeated in their *pausa* form. The main reason for such repetition in prose seems to be the promotion of a proper and correct understanding of the verse enumeration in which the rules of *sandhi* are applied. Returning to the inscription of Dinoyo, we have here only a *padapāṭha*, the text in correct verse being omitted. In the light of the foregoing remarks one might argue that the presentation of the text in its *pausa* form served the same definite purpose of enabling its being fully understood. People who were not well acquainted with the Skt rules of *sandhi* would have been able at least to understand the contents of the inscription correctly, while those who were well acquainted with these rules would have been equally able to understand its contents, but would at the same time have recognized the prosodic character of the text by applying the rules of *sandhi* to it. Whether one reads the text of the inscription with or without applying these rules, however, makes no real difference, since its contents remain the same. This could have been the only purpose of a text like the Dinoyo inscription.

Returning to the Svaravyañjana, it seems somewhat exaggerated to hail this text as “the main grammatical work which ancient Javanese scholars have left to later generations” (Gonda 1973: 181). Although phonology definitely forms part of the grammar of a language as a whole, in the case of Skt grammar one is inclined to think first and foremost of declensions, compounds and complicated verbal conjugations.

The Kāraṣaṃgraha

The only text so far published which answers the idea of a ‘grammar’ at least to some degree is the Kāraṣaṃgraha (Lévy 1933: 87-88).

Lévy's edition is based on two manuscripts, which he examined during his short stay in Bali. The editor presents only the Skt text, omitting the OJ translation of the Skt *śloka*s and the Skt and OJ examples illustrating the rules given. The title *Kāraṣaṃgraha* is best translated as 'A survey of the *Kāraṣa*'.²⁴ The text first explains how subject and object are defined in Skt grammar; next the seven cases are enumerated;²⁵ and finally the six *kāraṣa*s are explained. Lévy already remarked on the fact that some of the definitions of the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* are strongly reminiscent of the *Kātantra*, an Indian grammar (Lévy 1933: XXXI). The definition of the subject in the *Kāraṣaṃgraha*, for instance, corresponds most closely to a definition in the *Kātantra*, viz. *sa kartā yaḥ karoti vā* (*Kāraṣaṃgraha śloka* 3d), and *yaḥ karoti sa kartā* (*Kātantra* 386). The definition of the object differs somewhat more, viz. *yat kṛtaṃ karma tat proktaṃ* (*Kāraṣaṃgraha śloka* 3c), and *yat kriyate tat karma* (*Kātantra* 387). Nevertheless, apart from the fact that the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* is composed in *śloka*s and the *Kātantra* in prose, a very close relation between the two texts seems excluded. Even so, the *Kātantra* is explicitly mentioned together with another text, the *Mahātantra*, in the colophon of the *Kāraṣaṃgraha*. We have to bear in mind, though, that it was not unusual for an author to establish some connection between his own text and another, well-known text on the same subject, as in this case the *Kātantra* certainly is. The other text mentioned in the colophon, the *Mahātantra*, is not known to me, but it is obviously a grammatical text, as is indicated by the comment *mahātantra nāma vyākaraṇakēṇ pangwruhanta*.

There exist a fair number of manuscripts of the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* containing the same Skt *śloka*s — with, of course, the usual *variae lectiones* —, of which the OJ translation and commentary may vary considerably in length, however. It is noteworthy that one of these manuscripts is entitled *Prathamapariccheda*, 'The First Chapter', instead of *Kāraṣaṃgraha*. This title obviously presupposes the existence of at least a second chapter, implying that the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* is only the first chapter of a longer text. Juynboll, in fact, mentions a manuscript which opens with the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* and continues with an exposition on Skt compounds (Juynboll 1911: 215, Cod. 5075). This second part also contains Skt *śloka*s with an OJ translation and commentary. Of this second part, as it turns out, there exist a number of individual *lontars* entitled *Dvitiyapariccheda*, 'The Second Chapter'. In this second chapter the Skt compounds are discussed, as was said above. They are, in fact, done so in great detail, with every type of con-

ceivable compound being mentioned and explained in both Skt and OJ. To give one example which may illustrate the exhaustiveness of the text, all of the eight types of the so-called Tatpuruṣa compound which are found in Skt grammar are explained in every detail in the second chapter of our text, together with the two cognate types called Dvigu (which, although a kind of Tatpuruṣa compound, are considered separately because they have a numeral as their first component).

After the 'discovery' of this second chapter one wonders whether there is also a third chapter. There does, in fact, exist a text bearing the title *Tr̥tīyapariccheda*, 'The Third Chapter', but this actually proves to be the second chapter. Nevertheless, there also does exist a third chapter to the text. In the Gedong Kirtya are kept at least three manuscripts containing the *Kāraṣaṃgraha* along with the second chapter on Skt compounds and a third chapter. These are all three of them entitled *Aji Krakah*, in which context the word *aji* means 'manual; compendium' (Skt: *śāstra*), while *krakah* is a corrupt form of Skt *kāraka*, so that *Aji Krakah* might be translated with 'A Manual on *Kāraṣas*', a title which, however, covers only the contents of the first chapter. In this third chapter we again find Skt *ślokas* provided with an OJ translation and commentary. It constitutes a link with the previous chapter in that it deals with unusual kinds of Skt compounds, in particular the type called *viparīta*, 'inversion within the compound'. To give one example, the phrase *brāhmaṇena kṛtam*, 'done by a Brahmin', which can be turned into a compound *brāhmaṇakṛtam* possessing the same meaning, in the case of *viparīta* becomes *kṛtabrāhmaṇam*, still possessing the same meaning. This phenomenon is also found in Skt texts from the Indian Subcontinent which do not follow the rules of Classic Skt too strictly, but is especially important in OJ kakawins, where this type of inversion is frequently encountered (cf. Kern 1873: 273). Of this third chapter there also exist separate manuscripts, entitled *Sadyakṣara* and *Pañcasamasama*.

In view of the fact that the individual chapters of the *Aji Krakah* are also found in separate *lontars*, one is inclined to believe that this *Aji Krakah* was an important text, at least for the people making the *lontars*. Another argument in favour of its importance is provided by the existence of numerous texts bearing the same title which, however, have nothing in common with the text described above. Obviously its title was simply borrowed to give these other texts an aura of authority. So there are texts entitled *Aji Krakah* or *Krasah Śāstra* which merely contain endless lists of *mantras* (cf. K 1455; K 122). *Aji* can, in fact,

mean 'mantra', but then the reference to *krakah* in the title is out of place. In addition there are several texts with the title Aji Krakah which set out the declensions of several Skt words (cf. K 820/18). Hooykaas is probably right in stating that "the Sanskrit *kāraka* in Bali is used as a generic name for grammatical/linguistic/philosophic treatises" (Hooykaas 1964: 38), but I believe this to represent a later development as the result of the alleged authority of the 'real' Aji Krakah.

Declension of Skt words and the Skt verbal system

In the texts mentioned above we have not found anything about the declension of Skt nouns, nor is the Skt verb system explained anywhere in them. At the present stage of the research, one can only say that there seem to be no extensive texts on these two aspects of Skt grammar comparable to the texts treating lexicography, *sandhi* rules, or compounds.

There are a limited number of, mostly short, texts simply setting out the declensions of Skt words in the collections of the Library of the University of Leiden (cf. Juynboll 1911: 211 (Cod. 4263), 212 (cod. 5076), 214 (4266), etc.). Most texts of this category are still kept in private collections in Bali. They seldom number more than ten pages. Some of them are incorporated in longer texts some of which are entitled 'Kṛtabhāṣā'. The Skt words declined in them are mostly nouns and pronouns, especially demonstrative and relative pronouns. Perhaps this is accounted for by the importance of these two classes of words for a particular mode of commenting on Skt sentences, whereby the commentator explains the cases of the different words above the Skt sentence by repeating the case in the sentence itself with the corresponding case of the pronoun immediately above it. Thus where, for example, the word *aśvānām*, 'of the horses', is found in a Skt line, the commentator has neatly written above the word *aśvānām* the corresponding case of the demonstrative pronoun, *teṣām*, 'of these'. Complete declensions of numerals are also found, though less frequently so. It should be mentioned that in most cases the declensions are correct in every detail, and besides the singular and plural also the dual number is given. These short texts cannot be connected with any text from the Indian Subcontinent: they only provide examples of inflectional forms, probably for mere practical purposes. There may be one exception here, though, namely the so-called Krakah Pūjā (S 435), which sets out the full declension of a large number of nouns. The text is divided into

two parts, comprising 1) the declension of nouns ending in a vowel, and 2) the declension of words ending in a consonant. Each of these parts is then subdivided into special sections for masculine, feminine and neuter words. Of each gender a great many words are completely declined (sg., dual, pl.) by way of example, and to many of these examples a list of words which are to be declined in the same way is added. The second part of the text is most probably incomplete: of the words ending in a consonant only the masculine gender is treated, while the text ends in rather an abrupt way. The grouping of the words, as well as some of the words themselves, strongly remind one of the Indian grammar of Vopadeva, the *Mugdhabodha*. Only when other manuscripts of the *Krakah Pūjā* are found will it be possible to prove a relation. One unusual feature of the *Krakah Pūjā* deserves special mention. In some cases we find alongside the usual classical form of a particular case also the Vedic form. Thus besides the usual nom. pl. *devāḥ*, 'the gods', the form *devāsah*, which is only found in Vedic Skt, is found.

It is evident from the above that the declension of the various Skt nouns as found in these manuscripts is rather fragmentary. With regard to the Skt verbal system the available texts are even more unsatisfactory. As far as I know, the conjugation of the Skt verb is nowhere found in any text. It is only in some of the *Kṛtabhāṣās* and cognate texts that we find entries like *karoti*, 'he does', explained with *ginawe*, which, however, is a passive form; *bhaviṣyati*, 'it will become', with *dadi*; etc. There are some *Kṛtabhāṣās* containing short lists of conjugated verbal forms, but their number is very restricted. Moreover, they are only conjugated in the present active voice (sg., dual, pl.).

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion of this Introduction it may be useful to place the texts discussed above in a somewhat broader perspective, namely that of Sanskrit in Indonesia in general. Roughly speaking Indonesian Skt texts can be divided into two main categories:

- 1) Skt texts from India, or Skt texts written in Indonesia by Indians or by Indian-trained Indonesians.
- 2) Indonesian Skt texts compiled by Indonesians not directly trained by Indians.

To the first category belong, for instance, the early Skt inscriptions, the Skt lines in the *Ādiparwa*, and texts such as the *Ślo-kāntara*. In the second category may be classed such texts as are in-

corporated in *Stuti and Stava* (Goudriaan & Hooykaas 1971). The Skt that is found in this second category of texts is what is referred to as Archipelago Sanskrit. It is characterized by a great simplicity of forms, little use being made of case endings, while conjugated verbal forms are almost entirely absent except for a few stereotyped ones, etc. (cf. Goudriaan & Hooykaas 1971: 11ff.).²⁶

It is obvious that the texts discussed here can hardly have been of any help in composing a correct Skt verse. Texts such as the *Caṇḍa-kiraṇa* and the *Kṛtabhāṣās* evidently served primarily to help the reader understand OJ kakawins, which usually contain a large number of Skt words and compounds. Besides this function they may have offered the kakawin writer a variety of Skt words to choose from in his work, and so endow it with an air of some dignity. Texts such as the *Svara-vyañjana* and the *Aji Krakah* should be considered in the same light, although they seem to have been of importance mainly for the composition of OJ kakawins. The actual declension of Skt nouns or correct conjugation of Skt verbs was of no great importance for the writer of OJ kakawin, nor for the writer of Archipelago Sanskrit texts. Yet on the basis of the accounts of Chinese pilgrims actually learning Skt in Indonesia, we must accept the fact that in their time this was possible. If we further accept the hypothesis that part of the tuition was given orally by a guru, and part of it was provided by written texts as an aid for the student, then we might suppose that with time these written texts lost their significance for Indonesians, and consequently were no longer copied (cf. note 11). Perhaps the brief texts concerning the declension of Skt nouns are the last vestige of a far larger body of texts treating the complete Skt inflectional system. They may be the sole survivors of their genre because they served the purpose of explaining Skt sentences. Texts dealing with the conjugation of Skt verbs may have existed at one time, but may have ceased being copied as soon as interest in learning and writing correct Classic Skt declined, which may have been at quite an early stage in the spread of Skt over the Indonesian Archipelago.

Leiden - August 1979.

NOTES

- ¹ This article is based on an address to The Oriental Society of The Netherlands (Leiden, 22-1-1979). I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the late Prof. C. Hooykaas (The Hague), who put his collection of transcribed Balinese manuscripts at my disposal, to my Balinese informants I Gusti Ngurah Ketut Sangka (Krambitan) and I Ketut Suwidya (Singaraja), who un-

- covered and copied several manuscripts for me, and to Mrs. H. I. R. Hinzler (Leiden), who guided me through the two manuscripts written in Balinese.
- ² The Skt of the verses is correct but simple. It contains only some minor violations against Classical Skt grammar (cf. Cchabra 1965: 85ff.).
 - ³ E.g., the collections of the Museum Pusat (Jakarta) and of the Balai Penelitian Bahasa (Singaraja).
 - ⁴ Besides these texts on aspects of Skt grammar, etc., I have come across many other *lontars* which are important for both Skt and OJ. So there are, for instance, a number of *lontars* of the Ślokāntara containing a version which deviates considerably from the Skt *śloka*s in the text as published by Sharada Rani (Delhi, 1957).
 - ⁵ There appears to exist only one manuscript of the Caṇḍakiraṇa (Leiden, Cod. 4570 (4571 = BCB prtf. 80)) and of the Svaravyaṇjana (Leiden, Cod. 3965(1)) (cf. Juynboll 1911: 216); Lévy's Kāraḥsaṃgraha is based on two unknown Balinese *lontars* (cf. Lévy 1933: XXXI).
 - ⁶ In the manuscript itself the text is called Candakaraṇa (folio 55B), which may be corrupt for Skt Candaḥkaraṇa, 'The Composing of Metres', in which case the title of the complete work would cover only the first part, namely that on prosody.
 - ⁷ In the case of the words for deity in general (*dewata*) the reverse is true: according to Kern 25 synonyms are enumerated in the three *śloka*s (Kern 1885: 275), and only 23 names in the prose enumeration. This latter number appears to be correct, the prose enumeration ending with the words *ngaraning dewata ika kabeh* 23. In order to arrive at the number 23 instead of 25 in the verse enumeration, one should not count *devāḥ* and *devatās* among the actual synonyms, as Kern obviously did.
 - ⁸ There are nonetheless six entries with only a prose enumeration, namely those for Umā, Sarasvatī, Śrī, Saptarṣi ('The Seven Ṛṣis'), *botoh nita* ('dice'), and *malang* ('thief').
 - ⁹ The word *nagana* is not actually purely Skt, but is a combination of Skt *naga*, 'mountain' (lit: not moving), with the Archipelago Skt nominal suffix *-na* (cf. Goudriaan & Hooykaas 1971: 12).
 - ¹⁰ For other examples see Kern 1885: 279-280.
 - ¹¹ I intend to deal with this text in a separate study, which is to include an edition of the central part. The connection between the Amaramālā and the Indian Amarakoṣa seems, however, to be rather a loose one, if such a connection exists at all.
 - ¹² It is perhaps interesting to note that the Kṛtabhāṣā are still used in Bali today as an aid in reading kakawins, as I was informed by Ide Bagus Gde Griya from Sidemen. As a result these texts are still being copied, while texts concerning Skt grammar proper are becoming scarcer every day.
 - ¹³ There is at least one exception, however, a Kṛtabhāṣā from Lombok (K 2320) being arranged in Javanese alphabetical order.
 - ¹⁴ So far, I have not come across these 25 words in any Kṛtabhāṣā.
 - ¹⁵ The verse enumeration contains 38 epithets in four *śloka*s, while the prose enumeration lists 66 names. Kern supposed that the copyist had 'forgotten' some *śloka*s which contained the remaining 28 names. He tried — unsuccessfully so — to reconstruct these missing *śloka*s with the aid of the names in the prose enumeration (Kern 1885: 276). I do not believe that the copyist simply forgot a few verses. The prose enumeration does contain more epithets, but this difference between the verse and the prose enumeration is amply further attested by some of the other entries in the Amaramālā section of the CK.

- ¹⁶ The mention of a King Jitendra of the Sailendra dynasty in the introduction to the Amaramālā led Krom to believe that this entire part of the CK dates from around the 8th century A.D. (Krom 1924: 203). Assuming that this introduction constitutes a genuine and original part of the Amaramālā, Krom may in theory be right. We have indicated, however, that the Amaramālā section also includes a Skt-OJ dictionary which is of a later date, judging from the entries it contains. Perhaps the Amaramālā can be dated around the 8th century A.D., but only as regards its Skt *śloka*s. In the form in which the text has come down to us and has been incorporated into the abovementioned Kṛtabhāṣā, it seems rather to belong to the 11th or 12th century A.D.
- ¹⁷ The fact that the Kṛtabhāṣā which contain hardly any Skt words are still entitled 'The Sanskrit Language' is not surprising, as references to the Skt language in titles were very fashionable. Besides, these texts stand at the end of a long Kṛtabhāṣā tradition.
- ¹⁸ The examples following are taken from the CK and the Kṛtabhāṣā from Puri Kawan. As will become clear from the examples themselves, they are not strictly OJ, but may some of them be considered Middle Javanese.
- ¹⁹ In Skt the form *kastūrikā* is more usual.
- ²⁰ The translation 'whose messenger is [like] a worm' is probably preferable, the tongue of the snake being compared to a wriggling worm.
- ²¹ The comparison is between the forked tongue of the snake and a serrated leaf.
- ²² Professor Zoetmulder's OJ-English Dictionary has not yet been published, but some of the material which Zoetmulder has collected for it can be consulted in Leiden.
- ²³ Both the texts concerned are entitled *Daśa Nāma mwang Kṛtabhāṣā*, but contain a *Bhāṣā Ekalawya*, as is explicitly indicated.
- ²⁴ *Kāraka* is a Skt grammatical term whose meaning can be defined as 'the function of case-endings, including the indication of the agent and direct object, in relation to the verb'. There are only six *kārakas*: the genitive has no *kāraka*, since it involves only the relation between two nouns, and not between a noun and a verb.
- ²⁵ In Skt grammar the vocative is not treated as a special case.
- ²⁶ The characteristics of this so-called Archipelago Sanskrit are listed by Goudriaan and Hooykaas in *Stuti and Stava*. For some critical remarks on the subject, see Schoterman 1979: 326-333.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brandes, J. L. A.
 1888 'Een Jayapattra of Acte van eene Rechterlijke uitspraak van Śaka 849', *TBG* XXXII-2: 98-149.
 1918 *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden*, edited by N. J. Krom, Verh. Bat. Gen. LX-2.
- Casparis, J. G. de
 1975 *Indonesian Palaeography*, Leiden/Köln.
- Cchabra, B. Ch.
 1965 *Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture*, New Delhi.
- Coedès, G.
 1964 *Les États Hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*, Paris.

- Gonda, J.
1973 *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, repr. New Delhi.
- Goris, R.
1931 'Kertabasa (Skt. Kṛtabhāṣā)', *Bhāwanāgara* I-6/7/11; II-2/3/5/8/9.
- Goudriaan, T., and C. Hooykaas
1971 *Stuti and Stava*, Amsterdam.
- Gupta, S. M.
1971 *Plant Myths and Traditions in India*, Leiden.
- Holle, M.
1867 'Vlugtig Berigt omtrent eenige Lontar-Handschriften, Afkomstig uit de Soenda-Landen', *TBG* XVI: 450-470.
- Hooykaas, C.
1962 'Śaiva-Siddhānta in Java and Bali', *BKI* 118-3: 309-327.
1964 *Āgama Tirtha*, Amsterdam.
- Juynboll, H. H.
1901 'Eene Oudjavaansche Sanskritgrammatica', *BKI* LII: 630-635.
1907 *Supplement op den Catalogus van de Javaansche en Madoereesche Handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits-Bibliotheek*, Deel I, Leiden.
1911 (*id.*), Deel II, Leiden.
1923 *Oudjavaansch-Nederlandsche Woordenlijst*, Leiden.
- Kern, H.
1873 'Nog iets over 't opschrift van Pagarruyung in Mēnangkabau (1278 Śāka)', *Verspreide Geschriften* VI: 265-275.
1885 'Un Dictionnaire Sanskrit-Kavi', *Verspreide Geschriften* IX: 275-281.
- Krom, N. J.
1924 'Over het Śiwaïsme van Midden-Java', *Med. Kon. Ak. LVIII*, Serie B: 199-225.
1931 *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, The Hague.
- Lévy, S.
1933 *Sanskrit Texts from Bāli*, Baroda.
- Pigeaud, Th.
1938 *Javaans-Nederlands Handwoordenboek*, Groningen.
- Poerwadarminta, W. J. S., and A. Teeuw
1950 *Indonesisch-Nederlands Woordenboek*, Groningen.
- Rani, Sh.
1957 *Ślokāntara, an Old Javanese Didactic Text*, Nagpur.
- Sarkar, H. Bh.
1972 *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, two volumes, Calcutta.
- Śāstri, L. J. (ed.)
1895 *Kātantravyākaraṇam*, Bombay.
- Schoterman, J. A.
1979 'A Note On Balinese Sanskrit', *BKI* 135-II/III: 323-346.
- Siromaṇi, Ś. N. (ed.)
1911 *Mugdhabodha Vyākaraṇa*, Calcutta.
- Tuuk, H. N. van der
1897 *Kawi-Balinesesch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, four volumes, Batavia.
- Zoetmulder, P. J.
1974 *Kalangwan*, The Hague.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS

[K: Gedong Kirtya at Singaraja; LBN: Lembaga Bahasa Nasional at Singaraja, the present Balai Penelitian Bahasa; Z: collection of Prof. Hooykaas; S: collection of the author].

<i>Aji Krakah</i>	: K 92; K 1138; K 1578; K 820/18.
<i>Kṛtabhāṣā</i>	: K 2320; Z 349; Z 1516; S 102; S 110.
<i>Krasah Pūjā</i>	: S 435.
<i>Krasah Śāstra</i>	: K 122; K 1455.
<i>Caṇḍakiraṇa</i>	: Leiden, Cod. 4570 (4571 = BCB prtf. 80).
<i>Cantaka Parwa</i>	: K 389.
<i>Tṛtīyapariccheda</i>	: S 320.
<i>Dvītiyapariccheda</i>	: S 315.
<i>Pañcasamasama</i>	: S 350.
<i>Prathamapariccheda</i>	: S 308.
<i>Bhāṣā Ekalawya</i>	: Z 1593; S 105.
<i>Sadyakṣara</i>	: S 351.
<i>Svaravyañjana</i>	: Leiden, Cod. 3965(1); LBN/088.