



The Sanskrit Colophon of the Tanjung Tanah Codex and Its Malay Gloss as Illuminated by Balinese and South Asian Parallels

Andrea Acri

► To cite this version:

Andrea Acri. The Sanskrit Colophon of the Tanjung Tanah Codex and Its Malay Gloss as Illuminated by Balinese and South Asian Parallels. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, 2015, 171 (1), pp.56 - 68. 10.1163/22134379-17101001 . halshs-03905734

HAL Id: halshs-03905734

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-03905734>

Submitted on 19 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

The Sanskrit Colophon of the Tanjung Tanah Codex and Its Malay Gloss as Illuminated by Balinese and South Asian Parallels*

Andrea Acri

Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore
a.acri81@gmail.com

Abstract

This article highlights a parallel between a verse-quarter of the Sanskrit colophon of the Tanjung Tanah codex, the oldest Malay manuscript known so far, and the opening verse of the *Bhuvanaśa*, a Sanskrit-Old Javanese text from Bali. On the basis of the parallel, and of the Malay gloss, I suggest an alternative reconstruction of the verse-quarter to that proposed by Arlo Griffiths (2010). Having traced the parallel back to identical verse-quarters from South Asian texts, and building on the recent discussion by Hunter (in Kozok forthcoming), I advance the view that premodern textual materials from Sumatra and Bali, although originating from distant geographical areas, stemmed from a common, supralocal Indic tradition.

Keywords

Malay – Old Javanese – Sanskrit – Tanjung Tanah – Kerinci

An Indonesian-language critical edition-cum-translation and study of the so-called ‘Tanjung Tanah code of law’ was published by a team of scholars led by

* I thank Arlo Griffiths for his useful comments on a draft version of this article. Unless otherwise specified, the romanization of Old Javanese (and pre-Classical Malay) conforms to the norms adhered to by the present author in previous publications, which are discussed in Acri and Griffiths 2014.

Uli Kozok in 2006.¹ The 30-page *codex unicus* presented in the work, originating from Dharmasraya but found in Tanjung Tanah, further south in the Kerinci highlands of Central Sumatra, contains a legal text written in a form of Indic script and pre-Classical Malay language.² Being the oldest Malay manuscript currently known (ca. fourteenth or early fifteenth century), this codex is to be regarded as a tremendously important document of pre-Islamic Malay literary culture.

Griffiths (2010) is a detailed and critical review of Kozok (2006). In the concluding part of his useful review, Griffiths (2010:137) made some significant remarks on the codex's colophon:

The colophon is another aspect of the codex that clearly stands in a scribal tradition inherited from India. This is not the place for a full interpretation of its text, but what seems clear is that the sequence 30.5–31.2 *pranamya śrīsa divam tṛlūkyadipāti stutim, ṇāṇasattrudṛtaṃ vakitnītrisatrasamukṣayam*, which contains the title, may be restored to acceptable grammatical and metrical form, and then translated, as follows:

*praṇamya śrīmahādevaṃ trailokyādhipatistutam
nānāśāstroddhṛtaṃ vakti nītisārasamuccayam*

Having bowed to Śrī Mahādeva, who is praised as the Lord of the Triple World, [the author] expounds the Compendium of the Essence of Policy, extracted from various authoritative sources.

Griffiths's preliminary analysis, and restoration, of the relevant Sanskrit portion of the colophon is insightful, and makes amends for the unsatisfactory treatment it received from Kozok and his team. In particular, his identification of the verse as a eulogy to Śiva, as well as of what seems to have been

1 See Kozok 2006. An English-language monograph of the same title was published by Uli Kozok in 2004. A substantially revised and expanded English-language monograph by a team of authors led by Kozok is currently in press (see Kozok forthcoming). I thank Thomas Hunter for making accessible to me his chapter in the aforementioned publication, of which I have made grateful use here.

2 As the form of language preserved by the text is still free of the Arabic loanwords that characterize Classical Malay, it may be concluded that Tanjung Tanah Malay is an intermediate form of Malay standing somewhere between Old and Classical Malay.

the original title of the text, namely ‘Compendium of the essence of policy’ (*Nītisārasamuccaya*), takes the matter to a whole new level, as it pinpoints the fundamentally Indic nature of the scribal tradition from which it stems. While building on Griffiths’s discussion, as well as on the recent re-analysis of the Sanskrit verse and its Malay gloss (*saluka dipati*) by Thomas Hunter (in Kozok forthcoming), I suggest an alternative reconstruction of the first quarter of the verse, which is in harmony with the Malay gloss.³ In doing so, I will proceed on the basis of philological considerations, and especially of a textual parallel found in a Sanskrit-Old Javanese Śaiva source—the *Bhuvanakośa*—that has been transmitted to us through Balinese manuscripts. The discovery of this parallel verse-quarter in the *Bhuvanakośa*, as well as in other Balinese and South Asian Sanskrit sources, carries wider implications for the history of pre-Islamic—that is, Indic—literary cultures of Nusantara, suggesting as it does some fundamental analogies between the text-building and commentarial practices of the early modern scribal milieu of Sumatra and Bali.

The Sanskrit Verse and Its Reconstruction

Griffiths’ reconstruction of the corrupt (and unmetrical) verse-quarter *pranamyā śrīsa divam* into *praṇamyā śrīmahādevam* is acceptable on palaeographic grounds, and yields a perfectly metrical and grammatical clause. However, an alternative reconstruction, which has the advantage of being more faithful to the original text, would be *praṇamyā śīrasā devam*, meaning ‘Having bowed down with the head before God’. The verse-quarter can be analysed as follows:

3 With hindsight, one may partially revisit Griffiths’s (2010:138) claim that ‘[t]he interesting Sanskrit/Old Malay gloss, which terminates this principal part of the codex, is not a reliable guide for interpreting the colophon’. Admittedly, the preliminary treatment offered by Griffiths in his book review was not the place for a philological justification of the proposed restoration of the verse, or for an analysis of its Malay gloss. Hence, my purpose here is only to point at the existence of parallels that are helpful in restoring the first verse-quarter, and at the same time tell us something about the supralocal dynamics that shaped the literary cultures of pre-modern and early modern Nusantara.

Sanskrit form	Grammatical analysis	Monier-Williams's (1899) gloss
<i>praṇāmya</i>	absolutive (<i>pra-√nam</i>)	'to bend or bow down before (often with <i>mūrdhnā</i> , <i>śīrasā</i> &c.), make obeisance to (dat gen. loc. or acc.)'
<i>śīrasā</i>	instrumental singular, neuter (stem: <i>śīras</i>)	'the head, skull'; 'instr. with [...] <i>praṇam</i> [...] to touch with the head, bow or fall down before'
<i>devaṃ</i>	accusative singular, masculine (<i>deva</i>)	'a deity, god'

Griffiths assumes the substitution of an original *ma* with *sa* (of admittedly similar shape in the script) and the loss of a *ha*. The solution I envisage implies a somewhat simpler and altogether common process, namely: 1. the transformation (inversion) of *śīr* into *śrī*—*śrī* being a recurrent honorific prefix meaning 'illustrious'; 2. the loss of the short *a* that followed the original sequence *śīr*. This loss of *a* might have been triggered either by the inversion *śīr*>*śrī* or, conversely, the inversion might have taken place in an intermediate form: *śīrṣa*. The word *sīrsa* does indeed appear in the Malay gloss—*śīrṣa* being a phonologically similar stem-form that is historically related to the Sanskrit *śīras*, 'head, skull'. It must be noted that the word *śīrsa* features also in the line immediately preceding the start of the colophon, where we read the (largely similar) sequence *praṇāmya divaṃ śīrsa maheśvaraṃ*. Here *maheśvaraṃ* is likely to represent a corruption of *maheśvaraṃ*⁴ (the graphemes *h* and *l* being orthographically similar, and often confused in Nusantara Indic scripts); thus, the sentence can be restored to *praṇāmya devaṃ śīrasā maheśvaraṃ*, meaning 'Having bowed down with the head before God, the Great Lord (Maheśvara)'. Kozok and his team (2006:100, fn. 73) noted that both occurrences of *śīrsa*—which to them must be read as *sīrṣa*, in the light of the Malay gloss—reflect a Sanskrit *śīrṣa*, 'head'.

Griffiths's emendation of the corrupt second half-verse *ṇāṇasattrudṛtaṃ vakit nītrisatrasamukṣayam* into *nānāśāstroddhṛtaṃ vakti nītisārasamuccayam* is satisfactory. However, the *-sattr(a)* occurring in two compounds in both

4 Pace Kozok and his team (2006:100 fn. 74), who suggest to read *amaleśvara*, namely *amala* ('spotless') + *īśvara* ('Lord'). The occurrence of the sequence *śīrsa maheśvara* in this line is presumably the reason why Griffiths restored *śrīmahādevaṃ* in the verse.

the first and second quarters poses a philological riddle, multiple solutions to which are possible. While the emendation *-śāstra* constitutes the more natural outcome, one should also take into account, as done by Griffiths in the case of the second verse-quarter, *-sāra*. In fact, one notes the frequent occurrence of the cliché *-sāroddhṛta* ('extracted from/as the essence') on the one hand, and the relative rarity of *-śāstroddhṛta* ('extracted from the treatises') on the other, in Sanskrit texts of various genres from South and Southeast Asia, as well as in Old Javanese literature.⁵ Zoetmulder's *Old Javanese-English dictionary* (1982:1697) glosses *sāroddhṛta* as: '(Skt) "the selected essentials of the books of learning", name of a work containing rules for the conduct (policy) to be followed; cf *Sārasamuccaya*', but does not give any instance of *śāstroddhṛta*.⁶ This fact suggests to me that *nānāśāstroddhṛtaṃ* in the third verse-quarter could be a shortened versified version of an original **nānāśāstrasāroddhṛtaṃ* ('extracted from/as the essence of various treatises'), where the element *-sāra-* was dropped to suit the metre. The compound *śāstrasāroddhṛta* is attested in the *Tantri Dāmuṇ*,⁷ as well as in the full title of the legal code *Pūrvādhigama*, that is, *Purwadhigama Sasana Sastra Saroddherta*.⁸ Conversely,

5 See, for example, the Sanskrit portion of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, which speaks of the Brahman Hiranyadāman who 'carefully extracted the essence of [various Tantric] texts' (*dvijas samuddhṛtya sa śāstrasāraṃ*)—'evidently a manual for practical application, a Pad-dhati or Pañjikā' (Sanderson 2003–2004:356). The Śaiva Siddhāntatantra *Sarvajñānottara* (*Jñānapāda*, 1.4–5) characterizes itself as 'a compendium of all scriptures' (*sarvaśāstrasamuccayaṃ*), the essence extracted from all scriptures (*sarvaśāstreṣu sārāṃ uddhṛtya*), just like honey is the essence extracted from all flowers. See also: *vedasāroddhṛtaṃ*, *Jñānāmṛtasārasaṃhitā* 1.1.83; *kātyāyanasmṛtisāroddhāraḥ*, *Kātyāyanasmṛti* 1; *sarvaśāstrārthasāroddhāra*, *Ṣaṣṣaṇḍarbha* 4.73; *viśvasāroddhāre*, *Padārthādarśaṭikā ad Śāradātilaka* ch. 20, *passim*. For *śāstroddhṛta*/*śāstroddhāra*, see: *śāstroddhāraṃ*, *Mokṣopāyaṭikā* 1.1.3, and *subhāṣitāni ... śāstroddhṛtāni*, *Mahāsubhāṣitasāṅgraha* 7546.

6 On the basis of *Sorāṇḍaka* 1.64, 2.61; *Tantri Dāmuṇ* 4.20b, 24a, 29b, 1.3b (*saroddhṛti*).

7 See 1.3b: *Aji Uttara-manava mvaṇ sastrasarodrēti*; 4.24a, 29b: *tan tut sastra sarodrēta manuh don in atamah kevuḥ* (*Mānavaśāstra*) (as cited in Zoetmulder 1982, and standardized according to the romanization system used by Aciri and Griffiths [2014]).

8 See codex LOr 5023 = HKS 5268, *Purwadhigama Śiwasasanasastrasāroddhṛeta* (mentioned in Creese 2009:543), LOr 5098 (ff. 1–18a), *Purwadhigama Sasana Sastra Saroddherta* (Juynboll 1911:191), LOr 3723 (ff. 1–18, *Purwadhigama*, in the colophon *Śiwasasana Saroddherta*, Juynboll 1911:191), and LOr 6203 (transcript of mss. KBG Brandes No. 467 and No. 478; see also LOr 3852), *Purwadhigama, Śiwa Sasana Saroddhṛta*, also containing a chapter captioned *Sara Samuccaya*. One *Adhigamasasanasastroddhṛeta* is documented in various textual and inscriptional accounts mentioned by Creese (2009:535), including the aforementioned Old Javanese legal code *Pūrvādhigama*, which begins with the phrase *'nihan Purwadhigama sasana sarodrēta*

-*sattra* in the third verse-quarter could be alternatively rendered as *śāstra*, namely *Nītiśāstrasamuccaya*. While the sequence (*nīti*)*sāra*(*samuccaya*) is well-attested in Javano-Balinese literature—witness the Sanskrit-Old Javanese legal code titled *Sārasamuccaya*, and the Old Javanese *Nītisāra*—the word *nītiśāstra* is also found in Old Javanese,⁹ as well as in Sanskrit.¹⁰ More importantly, Monier-Williams's *Sanskrit-English dictionary* (s.v. *Nītiśāstra*) records a work named *Nītiśāstrasamuccaya*. Whatever the original form of the second half-verse might have been, the idea it conveys is clear: the work in question is a synthetic compendium containing material extracted from many legal codes.

The Malay Gloss

A set of Malay glosses on the *saluka dipati* is provided by Kuja Ali, the alleged author or re-compiler of the Tanjung Tanah codex. As argued by Hunter (in Kozok forthcoming), these glosses contain a number of lacunae and 'imperfections', which reflect the long process of 'drift' undergone by the local scribal tradition of enunciation, orthographic representation, and exegesis from the Indic tradition from which the codex, and especially its colophon, stem.

A close reading of the word-by-word Malay gloss supports the reconstruction of the first quarter of the Sanskrit verse proposed above. The text runs as follows:¹¹

Pranammya nāma, tunduk mañambah, sirsa na[ma] kapāla, diva nama divata.

sastra purwaramba sang telas wredhacarya sang purohita, and also attests the sequence '*sang hyang adigamasastrasarodreta*' in its preamble (romanization as in Creese 2009).

9 See Zoetmulder (1982:1200): '(Skt) the science of or a work on political ethics *Sut[asoma]* 4.5: *varahān riñ nītiśāstra*; TK 34.23: *mahyun iñ vivāhakrama sañke śāstrāgama mvañ nītiśāstra*; 16.27'. In fact the *Nītisāra* and *Nītiśāstra* are probably the same work (see Sternbach 1975:394).

10 This may be either a general term meaning 'the science of political ethics' or the title of a specific work (or a class thereof). Several works bearing this sequence as part of their title are known to exist in the Sanskrit and Tibetan tradition (see Sternbach 1975:370–3).

11 My transliteration differs slightly from the 'transliterasi diplomatik' by Kozok and his team (2006:101), which reads *pranemmya nama, tunduk mañambah, sirsa na[ma] kapala, diwa nama divata*.

My translation:

Pranammya (<*praṇamya*) means: to bow the head and pay homage. *Sirsa* (<*śirasā*) means:¹² head. *Diva* (<*devaṁ*) means: a divinity.

Notwithstanding the fact that all the Sanskrit words appear in a ‘corrupted’ or, rather, ‘localized’ form, their Malay glosses are correct, and reconstitute what must have been the original import of the verse-quarter, namely ‘to pay a respectful homage by bowing down before the deity with the head’—or, more idiomatically, ‘having bowed the head before God’.

The remaining part of the gloss (as transcribed, translated, and paraphrased by Hunter in Kozok forthcoming) runs as follows:

<i>tri nama svarga madhya pratāla</i>	<i>tri</i> means ‘heaven, earth and the underworld’
<i>dipati nāma lēbih dēripada sakaliyan</i>	<i>dipati</i> means ‘more than all others’ (e.g. possessing characteristics that are more than those of ordinary persons, hence the source of the superior social status of the <i>dipati</i> -s)
<i>nana nama bañak</i>	<i>nāna</i> means ‘many’
<i>dhṛtam nama yang dikatakan</i>	<i>dhṛtam</i> means ‘that which is spoken’
<i>satra nama yang satra</i>	<i>satra</i> means ‘those who are <i>satra</i> ’
<i>samuksayam nama sarva sakaliyan</i>	<i>samuksayam</i> means ‘all and everything’

¹² The use of *nama* in precisely the function and position of *nāran* (‘name’, ‘with the name’/ ‘called’ > ‘means’) in Old Javanese glosses is noteworthy. Kozok and his team insert *ma* so as to fill a gap between *na* and *ka* in the codex. However, as Griffiths suggests (email dated 13-01-2014), the use of *na* as an abbreviation of *nama* may be identical to the very common use of *na* as an abbreviation of *nāran(ya)* in Old Javanese texts.

Many of the Malay glosses are consistent with the meaning of the Sanskrit original, but in some cases a ‘shift’ has occurred. As noted by Hunter (in Kozok forthcoming), in *dipati* there is an ‘expansion’ of the meaning of the original Sanskrit *adhipati* (‘ruler, king’, here referred to as God, ‘the paramount in the Triple World’) that underlines the superior status of the bearers of this title of political rank. The gloss of *dhṛtam* does not capture the meaning of *uddhṛtam* (‘extracted’), but ‘refers rather to the aspect of speaking that can be understood as recoverable from the overall sense of the phrase *nānāśāstroddhṛtaṁ vakti*, “he speaks that which has been extracted (raised up) from many authoritative texts”’. While to Hunter the gloss of *satra* seems to have been incorrectly understood by Kuja Ali in terms of a local ‘*tadbhava* form’ of *kṣatriya*, ‘member of the warrior caste’, it is also possible that here *satra*—also attested as such in the Sanskrit verse—could be a ‘*tadbhava* form’ of *śāstra*, which Kuja Ali could have understood in terms of an (authoritative/normative) ‘text’ or ‘manual’ (*satra nama yang satra* = ‘that which is a *śāstra*’). I also add that the gloss of *samuk-sayam* (< Skt *samuccayam*) as ‘all and everything’ cannot be said to be, strictly speaking, incorrect, for the Sanskrit *samuccayam*, besides ‘compendium, collection’, can also mean ‘totality, aggregate’.

If we take into account, with Hunter, the fact that Kuja Ali ‘was working with a Sanskrit original that had already gone through processes of drift in terms of both phonological shape and meaning’, and, at the same time, that ‘his understanding of the local Sanskrit form of the Sanskrit original was imperfect, so that he only partially succeeded in giving an expert gloss’, the result is something remarkably similar to

the typical text-building strategies of a long tradition of didactic texts that may have been pioneered in the Buddhist institutions of Śrīvijaya, and to modern practices of extemporaneous glossing like those of the ‘reading clubs’ (*Pesantian, Sĕkaha Mabasan*) of Bali (Hunter in Kozok forthcoming).

What Hunter means by ‘extemporaneous glossing’ are hermeneutical strategies that do not (primarily) involve analytical means, drawn from a systematic knowledge of morphology and grammar, or try to establish historical derivations and etymologies; they are mainly based on contemporary/popular lexical know-how, ‘folk etymology’, and associative thinking effected through homology, metaphor, and assonance. It may be argued that these hermeneutical practices are not uniquely the expression of a ‘local’ or ‘embedded’ milieu, but represent a continuation, or ‘demoticization’, of the codified norms of semantic analysis and argumentation that characterized the Sanskrit śāstric tradition.

The Balinese and South Asian Parallels

An occasion to link a fourteenth-century Sanskrit-Malay document to the hermeneutical and text-building practices found in Sanskrit-Old Javanese textual sources that have come down to us from the Balinese scribal tradition is provided by a parallel in the Śaiva *tutur* text *Bhuvanakośa* (The storehouse of worlds). This voluminous work, consisting of some 200 Sanskrit verses provided with Old Javanese glosses, is of uncertain date. While my preliminary reading would date this text to the fifteenth or even early sixteenth century, extensive portions of it are likely to stem from several centuries earlier.¹³

The opening Sanskrit verse of Chapter One presents a quarter that is identical to the first quarter of the verse of the Tanjung Tanah codex. The verse and the ensuing Old Javanese commentary run as follows:

*praṇamya śirasā devaṃ*¹⁴ | *vākya(r)ṁ munir amanmathaḥ*¹⁵ |
devadeva mahādeva | *parameśvara śaṅkara* || 1.1

13 Although the *Bhuvanakośa* was studied in the first half of the twentieth century by the philologists Goris and Ziesenis, neither a critical edition nor an English translation have been published. The versions that have been published in Bali in recent years, which come with an Indonesian rendering of the Old Javanese portions (see, for example, Mirsha et al. 1994 and Budha Gautama 2009), appear to all be based on a single (as a rule, unspecified) source, namely a (rather faulty) romanized, typed transcription of a palm-leaf manuscript belonging to the collection of the Pusat Dokumentasi Budaya Bali in Denpasar. Although these publications are of great importance for the ‘socialization’ of the Hindu religion in the contemporary Balinese community, they are not very useful for scholarly purposes. Here I have used my own provisional critical edition of the text (Acri 2012); an edition of the first six Sanskrit verses plus Old Javanese glosses of the text, on the basis of the single codex LOr 5022, may be found in Goris 1926:78–81.

14 *Deva* is my emendation of *deva*, found in all the manuscripts that I have consulted.

15 *Amanmathaḥ* is my emendation of *amanmatha*, found in all the manuscripts. The Sanskrit *manmathaḥ* means ‘agitating’, ‘love or the god of love’, ‘amorous passion or desire’, therefore the adjectival compound *amanmathaḥ* could mean ‘he who is free from desire’. The form *vākya(r)ṁ*, from *√vac*, ‘to speak, declare, proclaim’, et cetera, is problematic. The verse-quarter could be the result of a contamination between a nominal sentence with nominative and genitive (*vākyaṁ muner amanmathasya*, which is, however, hypermetrical), where *vākya* > *vākyaṁ* is the substantive ‘speech’, and a verbal sentence (*vakti munir amanmathaḥ*); the present form *vakti*, it should be noted, also occurs in the Sanskrit colophon of the Tanjung Tanah codex. In *Bhuvanakośa* 1.3c we find *vākyaṁ te*, which is glossed as *nihan vuvusan in hulun i kita* (‘my speech to you is as follows’).

Having bowed down with the head before God, the sage who is free from (erotic) desire spoke: 'O God of Gods, O Great God, O Supreme Lord, O Śaṅkara!'

*śrī muni bhārgava | sira mahyun tumakvanakən ikaṇ pada nirbāṇa ri bha-
tāra | maṅkana pvābhiprāyanira | manambah ta sira ri bhaṭāra | śirasā
| makakāraṇa hulunira sira | ri tlasnira manambah | mojar ta sira || he
devadeva | kita devaniṇ devata kabeh | he mahādeva | kita bhaṭāra mahā-
deva ṇaranta | he maheśvara | kita bhaṭāra maheśvara ṇaranta | he śaṅ-
kara | kita bhaṭāra śaṅkara ṇaranta ||*

The sage Bhārgava desired to ask the Lord about the stage of extinction. Such was his intention. He worshipped the Lord *with the head*—he used his head. Having finished worshipping, he spoke: *O God of Gods*—you are the God of all the Gods! *O Mahādeva*—You are Lord Mahādeva by name! *O Maheśvara*—you are Lord Maheśvara by name! *O Śaṅkara*—you are Lord Śaṅkara by name!

The Old Javanese active verbal form *manambah* glosses the Sanskrit absolutive *praṇamya*, 'having worshipped'; the Sanskrit *śirasā* is quoted in the commentary and glossed as *makakāraṇa hulunira sira*, 'he used his head', literally 'he used as the instrument his head'. The gloss presents an exemplary semantical and grammatical analysis of the Sanskrit in the first verse-quarter.¹⁶

Insofar as it obviously represents an introductory eulogy to (various manifestations of) Śiva, the verse mirrors the colophon of the Tanjung Tanah codex with respect to both context and function. The two passages contain a verbal praise (*stuti*) of, and represent a physical act of worship towards, a paramount deity—that is, Śiva¹⁷—by either the text's author or, in the case of the *Bhuvanakośa*, the main interlocutor of Śiva and 'revealer' of the text. As we have seen, both the Malay and Old Javanese glosses of the identical first quarter of their Sanskrit verses can be considered as faithful renditions of its meaning.

16 Yet, as Arlo Griffiths suggests (email dated 13-01-2014), the Old Javanese gloss *mahyun* ('desired') might represent the Sanskrit *amanmathaḥ* ('free from [sexual] desire') in the second verse-quarter, where the commentator will have taken *a-* as an Old Javanese prefix rather than as the Sanskrit *alpha privans* that it is.

17 Note the mention of Mahādeva in the line preceding the colophon of the Tanjung Tanah codex, and the epithets Mahādeva, Parameśvara, and Śaṅkara in the *Bhuvanakośa*.

Additional evidence comes from the corpus of Sanskrit hymns (*stuti*, *stava*) handed down to us through Balinese palm-leaf manuscripts. The opening verses of several hymns attest the sequence *praṇāmya śīrasā* + name of the deity (for instance, *rudram*, *sūryam*, *viṣṇum*) to which the hymn is devoted.¹⁸ The verse-quarter *praṇāmya śīrasā liṅgaṁ*, found in the first stanza of the *Liṅgastava* (Stuti 670), is accompanied by an Old Javanese gloss:¹⁹

praṇāmya śīrasā liṅgaṁ dīvaliṅgaṁ maheśvaram |
sarvadevātidevanam tasmai liṅgāya vai namaḥ || 1

ai kita bhaṭṭāra, (t)āna-taṇa tiki sambah in ulun riṅ bhaṭṭāra, jēnnira umuṅv in śīrah. Paran ta don in ulun magave namaskṛta riṅ bhaṭṭāra śīvaliṅga? Kumva kadīryan bhaṭṭāra, an kita maśarīra liṅga viśeṣa, sājñā bhaṭṭāra. Sarva devatī devatā paśarīra bhaṭṭāra. Saṅ muṅv in liṅga bhaṭṭāra sinambah.

I bow my head down to the earth before the Liṅga, the divine Liṅga which is the Great Lord, the superior Lord of all Lords; to that Liṅga homage be rendered.

O Lord, pay attention to this salutation of mine to You! Your feet are before my head. What is my purpose in performing a reverent salutation to the Lord Śivaliṅga? With your permission, thus is Your divine quality, as You embody the supreme Liṅga: All the goddesses and gods form Your body. The [goddesses and gods] who dwell in Your Liṅga are worshipped.

The Old Javanese gloss depicts the image of a worshipper performing a *sambah* by literally bowing down with the head to touch the feet of the paramount Lord Maheśvara (that is, Śiva) embodied in the Liṅga, which is obviously a rendering of the Sanskrit verse-quarter *praṇāmya śīrasā liṅgaṁ*. The passage features clear similarities to the glosses found in both the Tanjung Tanah codex and the *Bhuvanakośa*.

The verse-quarter *praṇāmya śīrasā devaṁ* is found in the similarly eulogistic first stanza of the *Gaṇapatistava* (Stuti 667), a hymn dedicated to the elephant-headed god Gaṇapati, son of Śiva. As pointed out by Goudriaan and Hooykaas

18 See *Rudrakavaca* (Stuti 673 and 676), *Dvādaśādityastava* (Stuti 679), and *Viṣṇustava* (Stuti 682) in Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971.

19 Ms. K 1843, ed. Hooykaas 1964:151; the translation of the Sanskrit verse is by Hooykaas, while that of the Old Javanese gloss is my own.

(1971:390–91), this hymn finds a close parallel in the *Samkaṣṭanāśanagaṇeśa-stotram*, a Sanskrit hymn of South Asian provenance published in the *Bṛhat-stotraratnākara* collection. Besides in the Sanskrit hymn, an identical verse-quarter is also attested in a number of Sanskrit sources, spanning from the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* epics to the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa*, various Purāṇa and Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava Tantric texts.²⁰ This fact shows that the form *pranāmya śirasā devam* was not a Nusantaraian invention, but a cliché originating from South Asian Sanskrit sources.

Conclusion

My analysis has confirmed the following: 1. the first verse-quarter of the Sanskrit colophon of the Tanjung Tanah codex can be restored on the basis of a parallel found in the opening verse of the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *Bhuvanakośa*, as well as in several other Sanskrit texts from Bali and South Asia; 2. the restored reading of this quarter of the Sanskrit verse is in harmony with its Malay gloss. More importantly, the existence of these formal as well as contextual parallels suggests that Sanskrit materials from the highlands of central Sumatra and the island of Bali, although separated by a significant geographical (and perhaps, although not necessarily, chronological) distance, are witness to the existence of a supralocal textual tradition of, ultimately, a South Asian origin and a theistic (Śaiva) character. Although the distinct vernacular glosses discussed here were produced in different local contexts, characterized by different histories of reception, socio-cultural factors, and religious contingencies, they appear to have developed—in parallel, as it were—from what must once have been a common tradition of text-building and exegetical practices. This tradition might have had its heyday in the premodern Indicised cosmopolitan courts of Sumatra and Java, and, as suggested by Hunter (in Kozok forthcoming), might have continued—in a transmogrified form—to the present day through contemporary Balinese ‘reading clubs’.

20 See *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 70b.1.1, *Bhagavadgītā* 11.14, *Mahābhārata* 5.129.13, *Rāmāyaṇa* 7.10.15, *Brahmapurāṇa* 45.17, 176.28, *Nāṭyaśāstra* 1.1 (variant *devau*, eulogy to Maheśvara), *Harivaṃśa* 106.37, *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, *Mukhasūtra* 1.24, *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, *Śivapūjāpāṭalaḥ* 39, *Kriyākālaguṇottara* 1.1, and *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitāpariśiṣṭa* (*Sudarśanaśaṅkharānāmastotra*) 1.1, to mention only a few. Several instances with the variant *śambhum* or *devīm* exist (see, for example, *Uḍḍāmareśvaratantra* 1.1, *Kubjikāmatatantra* 22.29, *Rasārṇava* 1.3, and *Ānandakanda* 1.6.1, 1.13.1).

References

- Acari, A. (2012). '*Bhuvanakośa*. Critical edition and English translation'. [Unpublished manuscript.]
- Acari, A. and A. Griffiths (2014). 'The romanization of Indic script used in ancient Indonesia', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 170:365–78.
- Budha Gautama, Wayan (2009). *Tutur Bhuwana Kośa*. Surabaya: Paramita.
- Creese, H. (2009). 'Judicial processes and legal authority in pre-colonial Bali', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 165:515–50.
- Goris, R. (1926). *Bijdragen tot de kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Balineesche theologie*. Leiden: A. Vros. [PhD dissertation, Leiden University.]
- Goudriaan, T. and C. Hooykaas (1971). *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava) of Balinese Bauddha Brahmans*. Amsterdam/London: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Griffiths, A. (2010). 'Review of Uli Kozok (2006), *Kitab undang-undang Tanjung Tanah: Naskah Melayu yang tertua*', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 166–1:133–8.
- Hooykaas, C. (1964). *Āgama Tīrtha; Five studies in Hindu-Balinese religion*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Hunter, T.M. (forthcoming). 'Sanskrit in a distant land: The Sanskritised sections', in: U. Kozok (forthcoming). *The Tanjung Tanah codes of law* [with contributions by Thomas Hunter, Waruno Mahdi, and John Miksic], Chapter 7. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Juynboll, H.H. (1911). *Supplement op den catalogus van de Javaansche en Madoereesche handschrijften der Leidsche Universiteitsbibliotheek; Deel 2: Nieuwjavaansche gedichten en Oud-, Middel- en Nieuwjavaansche prozageschriften*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kozok, U. (2004). *The Tanjung Tanah code of law: The oldest extant Malay manuscript*. Cambridge: St Catherine's College and the University Press.
- Kozok, U. (2006). *Kitab undang-undang Tanjung Tanah: Naskah Melayu yang tertua*. Jakarta: Yayasan Naskah Nusantara/Yayasan OBOR Indonesia.
- Kozok, U. (forthcoming). *The Tanjung Tanah codes of law* [with contributions by Thomas Hunter, Waruno Mahdi, and John Miksic]. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Mirsha, I Gusti Ngurah Rai et al. (1994). *Buana Kosa. Alih aksara dan alih bahasa (Brahma Rahasyam)*. Denpasar: Upada Sastra.
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sanderson, A.G.J.S. (2003–2004). 'Śaivism among the Khmers; Part 1', *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 90/91:349–462.
- Sternbach, L. (1975). 'General appeal of Subhāṣita literature in Sanskrit', in: V. Raghavan (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Sanskrit Conference*, pp. 370–97. Delhi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. (1982). *Old Javanese-English dictionary* [with the collaboration of S.O. Robson]. 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. Two vols. [KITLV.]