

On Sylvain Lévi's Sanskrit Texts from Bali

by C. Hoykaas
(London)

It is an honour and a pleasure for me to be invited to contribute a paper to this Festschrift. Though I have never had the opportunity of attending one of the courses of Prof. Aichele, I consider him as one of my *gurus*. By his detailed papers in the field of Old-Javanese poetry he made himself known as a pioneer. Up to the late twenties Old-Javanologists had mainly been interested in the contents of the *kakawins* (court-poems) and their metres. But thanks to Prof. Aichele's investigations we now know that not only subject matter and the metres were borrowed from Indian examples, but much of the poetic style also. I do not know whether I would have dared to write my theory on the Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa's being an exemplary *kakawin* without his inspiring *guru*-ship.

But though it is a 'Gabe' for the pupil to contribute a paper in honour of his *guru*, I cannot deny that it is also a little bit of an 'Aufgabe'. He must know that the request reached me not so many days before leaving home and travelling to Bali for a year's study-leave. In my cabin, however, I had taken with me Sylvain Lévi's '*Sanskrit-Texts from Bali*' — (*Bali-dvīpāgranthāḥ*, GOS LXVII) and a handful of type-written copies from Balinese MSS stored in the library of palm-leaf-MSS. at Singaradja (Bali). The famous Indologist's visit to Bali dates from 1928, his book from 1933 — exactly the years in which Prof. Aichele occupied himself with the study of the penetration of Indian culture in Indonesia and wrote his leading papers.

The parallelism can even be drawn further. In those years, Prof. Aichele in pioneer articles established a new point of view and left the detailed elaboration to his pupils. Sylvain Lévi, returning from Japan, where he had been charged with the founding of the 'Maison Franco-Japonaise', only made an 'Abstecher' to Bali, where in a few weeks' time he collected vast and most remarkable materials. These (in the *Deva-nagari*-script) he presented to Indologists, without bothering about the MSS. available in Leiden or Singaradja, satisfied with referring only to Dr. R. Goris' Ph. D. thesis for Leiden University: '*Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Bali-neesche Theologie*' (Leiden, 1926), pointing to the disappointingly thin correspondence with Indian ritualistic literature, and leaving further investigation to his successors in the field.

Sylvain Lévi did not even hint that in giving his 'Sanskrit Texts from Bali' he had aimed at being exhaustive. He had brushed aside the whole genre of bilingual texts Sanskrit/Old-Javanese, two of which (*Wṛhaspatitattwa* and *Slokāntara*) in 1957 have been edited in the Sarasvatī Vihāra Series as Ph. D. theses at the University of Utrecht under the supervision

of Professor Gonda, the well-known author of 'Sanskrit in Indonesia' (same series, 195). Still more important perhaps are the texts to which Goris has drawn attention and which were the subject of detailed research by Prof. Aichele's pupil the late Dr. Zieseniss (BKI ± 98, ± 1939).

In this connection I might also mention the Sāra-Samuccaya, a collection of 517 Sanskrit maxims followed by their Old-Jav. translation or paraphrase. Even nowadays the Balinese continue to attribute great importance to this text; before the war they encouraged me to have it printed. In 1953 I was invited by the International Academy of Indian Culture (Nagpur, now New-Delhi) to prepare its edition in collaboration with its Director, Prof. Raghu Vira. The Balinese have incorporated this work among their versified translations into Modern-Balinese, called *parikan*, a literary genre which in the days of Van der Tuuk (1870—94 in Bali) appears to have been quite recent. The other day I learned that the Padanda Madé Kamēnuh, a Brahmin priest of the purest blood and a great authority in Bali, prepares its publication in Bali itself. — Much more could be said about the bilingual Skr/OJ texts, but this topic was neither Sylvain Lévi's thirty years ago nor will it be mine here and now.

Sylvain Lévi in his book gives I Catur-veda and Veda-parikrama, II Stotras, III Buddha-veda, IV (some minor texts), and it is wiser to confine myself here to some remarks on I & II and avoid the use of only Dr. H. H. Juynboll's catalogues and even Dr. J. Brandes '*Beschrijving*' etc. Apriori, I expect that the Old-Jav. & Bal. collections of MSS. in the Leiden University Library, mainly acquired by Van der Tuuk, may not have been particularly rich in MSS. on ritual, for the two reasons that Van der Tuuk was somewhat agnostic and the priests of his days, though no longer so reticent as in the days of Dr. Friederich, *still were* not so communicative as in the later days of the Kirtya.

This Foundation, dating from 1928, the year of Sylvain Lévi's visit to Bali, and originally called after the two meritorious Dutch students of Balinese culture, Liefrinck and Van der Tuuk, follow a unique method of collecting the Balinese MSS. Its aim was roughly twofold: preventing Bal. MSS. from getting lost by being sold to tourists, and trying to collect them in a centre where they would be accessible to everybody. The Kirtya did not buy or 'borrow' the MSS, but inquired which owner was in possession of which MSS, afterwards asking permission from the owners to have some of these MSS copied in the owners' premises by its own scribes. Now, thirty years later, it is difficult to see why the Balinese priests have been so communicative ever since the Kirtya's foundation. There may have been a trend after Friedrich's days more than a century ago, perceptible in Van der Tuuk's days more than half a century ago, and evident in the last three decades, of divulging their formerly secret knowledge. Sylvain Lévi's knowledge about their ritual and incantations may have accelerated this process. The fact that several well-known priests were local members of the Kirtya's board of caretakers will undoubtedly have helped to lessen

diffidences. And the fact that the Kirtya did not borrow MSS, but had them copied in the owners' premises will certainly have helped considerably.

However this may be, right from the start the Kirtya has acquired a considerable number of ritualistic texts. Sylvania Lévi could have used them for his publication in 1933. They would have helped him to give the correct reading on p. 26, No. 109 *Dirghâyuh* where line 16 should be read

śrīdam bhakti-kṛta-vimukti-karaṇam vyāptam jagad-dhāraṇam

according to K 3 (Arga-patra) 1. 8b; K 69 (Arga-patra) 1. 42a; K 84 (Astra-mantra) 1. 7a; K 87 (Arga-patra) 1. 8b, 1. 18; K 1186 (Pūjā Pañca Bali (recte: pari) krama) 1. 22b.

Another defective verse is to be found on p. 32 in No. 145, Bhaṭṭāra-Sūryastava, where lines 8 & 9 should be read as follows:

*om stambha-meru-parivarta-samṛsta-lokaṁ / bimbādhi-devaya nici(p)ta-
vājikāraya //*

according to K 3 1. 13b; K 69 1. 48b; K 84 1. 8 b; K 87 1. 10b, 25b; K 1843 (Astawa-Mantra) 1. 11a.

Two remarks must be interpolated here. In the first place you might ask me how, sailing in the Red Sea (for there it happened), I managed to quote the Kirtya's MSS. and denote the exact pages (1. = *lēm̄pir*) of the quotations. As a matter of fact, the majority of the Kirtya-MSS — themselves copies — have been recopied, for the umptieth time, in the years between 1939-41 and 1947-9 — but this time by typewriter, making use of the Latin script. This procedure opened the possibility of making several copies at the same time, and these sets are now to be found in the Bali-Museum (Den Pasar), the Museum Sana Budaya (Djakakarta), THE Museum (Merdéka Barat, Djakarta), The Legatum Warnerianum (Library of the University of Leiden) and in my private collection at London. Some of these copies I had picked out to take with me.

In the second place you will have remarked that though the Kirtya has three (rather different) MSS, called Arga-patra, the ritual and the *stotras* are also to be found in several other writings known by other names. Those responsible for the Kirtya Collections have not failed to draw attention to the fact that only too often the same name may be applied to MSS, which have nothing in common but the Balinese script on two sides of prepared palmleaves, and that (almost) the same contents of MSS may appear under different names. I should like to draw attention to a third complication, for the rest well-known to those versed in Indonesian religious literature in general, and already apparent from a reading superficially in Dr. H. H. Juynboll's catalogues of the Leiden collections of MSS i. e. that very frequently a MS comprises several small treatises (or parts of them) and a lot of short notes.

As a consequence I feel perfectly sure that the two emendations given above could be corroborated by at least as many other *loci*; I took only a dozen or so ritualistic texts with me, and the Kirtya has many dozens of them. Moreover, one should understand the Kirtya's aims. It collected Bal.

MSS by having them copied, and tried to find good *babons* (originals). If during the years of its activities it found a better MS, a new copy was added to the collection. But the philologist's ideal, i. e. that all texts existent are available, has never been striven after. To collect them would have been a Herculean task in view of the enormous amount of MS material current among the Bal. population. The Kirtya managed to copy more than 2000 writings on some 50000 *lěmpir* roughly during the thirties, and the Foundation is to be congratulated and thanked for what it did. But I hope, now that a few weeks ago a Fakultas Sastra has been opened in Den Pasar, with such able men as Prof. Dr. R.M.Ng. Poerbatjaraka and Dr. R. Goris attached to it, that a new impetus may be given to the collecting of MSS. I feel quite sure that not only useful variant readings will be found, and hitherto unknown versions, but that even new writings, unknown compositions or agglutinations will be detected which may help us to find a way in the somewhat garbled literary production of Bali.

Revenons à nos moutons. The same MSS, as have been quoted above, but now no longer to be quoted individually by number and name and *lěmpir*, give the opportunity to correct in several places Sylvain Lévi's jottings or MS, for most of them are slightly different. They split up his Nos. 18—19 in two well-distinguished parts; they make clear that in No. 13 (head 14, cf. 30, 45, etc.) the words

om um rah phaṣ astrāya namaḥ

constitute the frequently-recurring astra-mantra. — No. 45 does not deal with *Kara-wistani* but with *širo-wistani*; in No. 86 it is not a matter of a *stava* or *stotra* to the ghaṇṭā, but the MSS mention *ngaskara*, i. e. doing *saṁskāra*.

By having the Sanskrit liturgy of the Balinese priests (his main preoccupation) printed in the Deva-nagarī script, Sylvain Lévi has presented it to us in a much more easily recognisable shape and we owe him thanks for that. Unfortunately he has not found the leisure to have the Balinese from his notes corrected; so e. g. in No. 49 *gaghe* (*sang hyang atma vaveng Siwa-dwara*) should be read *gili* or *ngili* or *nggili*, a quite essential fact. — Some Balinese words, comparable to the theatrical indications which in printing a European drama are put in italics, have erroneously found their way into the Deva-nagarī text; and generally speaking all Balinese words, now nearly unrecognisable, should be reprinted.

Use of the available MS material would clarify the text considerably, for there we find many indications of the use of fingers (*peṭ.* = *pětanganan* = *mudrā*) and the directions to which the priest addresses himself. Most elucidating of all, I think, are those scattered indications which are introduced by word *iděp* or *iděpēn*: 'one should think, one should understand or imagine. 'So here the Balinese themselves explain what happens, metaphysically speaking. E. g. *I kang déwa pratista idepen Ardanariswara sirā* (K 3 1. 7a; K 69 1. 40b, between No. 93 & 94 of Sylvain Lévi's *Veda-parikrama*). — And *ad 133*, to be read *pungu* or *paungu*, the awakening of the God, our MSS. add: *sambut padupan, idep Batara Ardanareswari, supta aturu*

ing padmasana, pascima jēgnira, dumagakēna ri kita sang amuja, tēlas aturana sira mantra catur-sandya. Ndia ta? Brahma-sandya, Wisnu-sandya, Iswara-sandya, Rudra-sandya. — Twice mentioning Ardanareswari here I can not refrain from including another few words right at the end of my K 3 (1. 16b): Mantra: *aung Sri Dewa dampati pralianti, mama hrēdaye swaha, aung ang Ardanareswari ya ya swaha.*

Any reader of Sylvain Lévi's Veda-parikrama will be struck by its close parallelism with Dr. Goris' construction from the Leiden MSS. The Balinese K MSS at my disposal deviate one from another and most of all from the order in Goris and Sylvain Lévi. When in Bali I hope to find the solution of this problem.

This, however, now seems certain: the *stavas/stotras* as printed in the Vedaparikrama and in the collection of 39 of them (II) are far from exhausting their complete number. Several of my text include a Siva-lingga-stotra and another directed to Jagat-nātha (sic), not to be found in the Sanskrit Texts from Bali, but omit part of those which his informant(s) told Sylvain Lévi were forming part of the ritual. Moreover I could easily find twice as many stotras as those printed by S. L. under the heading II. K 36 (Pitra Pūjā) contains directed to Giripati, Brahma, Siva, Ākāṣa, Pitra, Durgā, Pitra, Buddha (3), Bhūta and Yama; K 69 (Kajang Pūjā Pitra) those directed to Sūrya, Brahma, Durgā, Giripati, Brahma, Sarasvatī, Viśve Dēvāḥ, Guru, Durgā, Gaṇa, Śiva (2), Gaṇa, Sarasvatī, Kumāra, Siva, Linggā, Dvādaśāditya. — They are to be found in K 102 (Pitra Kinaranan), K 189 (Dvijendra), K 883 (Mantra Ātma-rakṣa), K 1186 (Pūjā pañca-Bali-Krama), K 1423 (Pitra-Pūjā), K 1424 (Siva-Samūha), K 1457 (Pūjā Padudus Agung), K 1673 (Pūjā-Stava), and without doubt in many more MSS. The Singaradja collection of MSS in this respect too, is considerably better stocked than the Leiden one. It would be a rewarding task, I think, to collect all these materials and to analyse them, to investigate to what degree they link up with India and where they are clearly the result of Javano/Balinese inspiration and knowledge of Sanskrit.

Knowledge of Sanskrit in Bali is the last subject to which I should like to draw your attention. In this respect most of all Sylvain Lévi's book suffers from being a temporary visitor's book. "They (i. e. the priests) do not understand one word of the Sanskrit texts which they write, read and chant", he assures us on p. X. No wonder that S. L. drew this outspoken conclusion, for: "The local *pēdandas* had been requested to meet me at every place where I halted, and to bring with them all their *lontars* (id est, tālapattra MSS.) which they could not understand; this was the only way of indicating Sanskrit to people who did not even know its name" (XV). Sylvain Lévi, used to Indian brahmins and their peculiarities seems to have had no feeling for the essentially self-denying and modest attitude of life of the Indonesian, a feature so dominant that it seems to have obliterated the feeling of pride of being the best of those twice-born.

Sylvain Lévi in 1928 moreover could not know that in the weeks about the 7th of January (?) a Kirtya copyist had the opportunity of finding an Astava-Mantra in Soesoet (Bangli, in the centre of Bali, Bali Tengah or

Taman Bali) which was inscribed as No. 1843. It contains some 60 different *stavas*, $\frac{2}{5}$ of which are also to be found in Sylvain Lévi's *stotras*, and several of which occur also in the MSS mentioned above. The exceptional value of this MS consists of the fact that every *pada* of these Sanskrit (or: would-be Sanskrit) *ślokas* is followed by its paraphrase. I must admit that more than once the Skr. deviates from that given by S.L. and is definitely corrupt. And the paraphrase is not a translation but a somewhat free underling — but not free from misunderstandings. Moreover I feel sure that no Balinese of the older generation learned Skr. along the analytical lines which only too many of us consider to be the only safe and scholarly method of approach for a classical language.

The essential thing, however, seems to me the Balinese feeling that the *stavas* are understandable and actually understood to a considerable degree. This understanding may be partial, and sometimes even wrong, but the existence of this MS of 48 *lempirs* — perhaps not the only one of its kind; I have no opportunity to go through the whole lot — is sufficient proof that Sylvain Lévi was fundamentally wrong here. For the Balinese priest, part of his Sanskrit is well understandable and well understood.

It will not be a surprise to Prof. Aichele that a coryphee and a pioneer as has been S. Lévi has made a *faux pas*. The things which matter most are enthusiasm and devotion — strong sides in his character. Fortunately a subsequent generation is better equipped and stands on the shoulders of the preceding one. It must give Prof. Aichele a deep-felt satisfaction that he by his teaching and his writing not only pointed to new ways, but also that now a new generation of Balinese (and Javanese?) students is being trained to continue the research in the Old-Javanese field in its centre Bali. I may end my notes (they *could* not be better in the present circumstances) by expressing the hope that it will be given to him to witness the fruition of this newly planted tree of studies in good health of body and mind.