# ON MPU TANAKUṄ, DAṄ HYAṄ NIRARTHA, AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *BHUVANAKOŚA*[1]

**Andrea Acri**

École Pratique des Hautes Études (EPHE), PSL University, Prancis
École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), Prancis


Korespondensi: andrea.acri@ephe.sorbonne.fr

**ABSTRAK**

Artikel ini mengambil titik tolak dari pupuh Sanskerta pertama dari kitab suci Śaiva Sanskerta-Jawa kuno berjudul *Bhuvanakośa*, yang telah sampai kepada kita dalam manuskrip lontar Bali. Diperkirakan bahwa ayat ini membentuk sebuah himne pengantar (*maṅgala* atau *stuti*) dalam memuji Śiva dan, pada saat yang sama, mengungkapkan kepengarangan penulis teks—apakah asli atau fiktif yang muncul secara *ex post*—melalui "tanda" yang diungkapkan melalui kata Sansekerta yang mengisyaratkan nama Tanakuṅ, seorang pengarang karya sastra Jawa Kuno dan karya-karya agama yang hidup pada abad ke-15. Artikel ini kemudian menguraikan latar belakang sosio-historis dan agama pada periode itu, dan menghubungkan sosok Tanakuṅ dan teks-teks yang dianggap berasal darinya dengan sosok Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha, seorang tokoh agama penting Bali yang diyakini aktif di pulau itu antara akhir abad ke-15 dan awal abad ke-16.

**Kata kunci**: *Bhuvanakośa; Kesusastraan Jawa Kuno; Saskrit; Śaivisme; Buddhisme; Mpu Tanakuṅ; Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha*

**ABSTRACT**

This article takes as a point of departure the first Sanskrit verse of the Sanskrit-Old Javanese Śaiva scripture *Bhuvanakośa*, which has come down to us in Balinese palm-leaf manuscripts. It argues that this verse forms an introductory hymn (*maṅgala* or *stuti*) praising Śiva and, at the same time, revealing the identity of the compiler of the text—whether genuine or fictively attributed *ex post*—through a "signature" expressed by means of a Sanskrit word hinting at the name Tanakuṅ, an author of Old Javanese literary and religious works who lived in the 15th century. It then elaborates on the socio-historical and religious background of that period, and links the figure of Tanakuṅ and the texts ascribed to him to Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha, an important Balinese religious figure who is believed to have been active on the island between the late 15th and early 16th century.

**Keywords**: *Bhuvanakośa; Old Javanese literature; Sanskrit; Śaivism; Buddhism; Mpu Tanakuṅ; Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The *Bhuvanakośa* ("The Storehouse of Worlds") is a Sanskrit-Old-Javanese Śaiva tantric text of the *tutur* genre.[2] This textual source of anonymous authorship, probably compiled in various stages between the late first millennium CE and the early 16th century,

---

[2] On this class of texts, and the sub-genre of *tattva*s, see Acri 2006, 2017.

has come down to us through a handful of Balinese palm-leaf manuscripts (*lontar*), as well as typed Romanised transcriptions, kept in public or private collections in Indonesia and the Netherlands. Mainly arranged in a dyadic style (see Acri and Hunter 2020), the text is by far the bulkiest *tutur* known to us, comprising about five hundred Sanskrit stanzas (*śloka*) accompanied by translations, paraphrases, and/or commentaries in Old Javanese.

The *Bhuvanakośa* is still regarded in contemporary Bali as a "Classic" in the domain of Śaiva mysticism. The appreciation—or even "canonisation"—of this scripture is not a new phenomenon, but may date back to the pre-colonial period, for the *Bhuvanakośa* is included in a list of eight authoritative scriptures described as the "secret texts of the Brahmans" by the 19th-century observer Rudolph Friederich.[3] It is no wonder that this text has been known long since to both Western and Indonesian scholars. For instance, Roeloef Goris (1926) and Alexander Zieseniss (1939) described and studied parts of it in their pioneering works on Javano-Balinese Śaivism. The text was also used by Haryati Soebadio, who pinpointed several textual parallels with the *Jñānasiddhānta*, another Sanskrit-Old Javanese *tutur* preserved uniquely on Balinese manuscripts, which focuses on mysticism and yoga (Soebadio 1971). In spite of this state of affairs, the *Bhuvanakośa* has not yet been critically edited and fully translated into either Indonesian or European languages.[4]

A common opinion among Balinese and Western scholars is that the *Bhuvanakośa* is an early text—probably one of the earliest of the *tutur* genre. While its formal organisation in Sanskrit-Old Javanese "translation dyads" instead of Old Javanese prose (whether interspersed with Sanskrit *śloka*s or not) would suggest that this is the case, one can never be totally sure: witness for instance the bulky *Tutur Śivāgama*, which is organised in just the same way, and yet was composed by Ida Pedanda Made Sidemen, probably in the first half of the 20th century. While the first section of the *Bhuvanakośa* may very well be early, what is important to stress here is that the text is a heterogeneous source, formed by at least two discrete textual units, structured as follows:

Ch. 1–5: *Bhuvanakośa, Brahmarahasyaśāstra, prathamaḥ… pañcama paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 6: *Jñānasiddhāntaśāstraṁ, prathamaḥ paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 7: *Bhasmamantrasakalavidhiśāstraṁ, dvitīyaḥ paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 8: *Jñānasaṅkṣepaṁ, tṛtīyaḥ paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 9: *Bhuvanakośan, navamaḥ paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 10: *Siddhāntaśāstraṁ, jñānarahasyaṁ, daśamaḥ paṭalaḥ.*
Ch. 11 + *explicit*: *Bhuvanakośa, paramarahasyaṁ, jñānasiddhāntaśāstraṁ,*

---

[3] Friederich (1959, 28–29) listed the following titles [spelling as in the original 1849-50 edition in Dutch, pp. 22-23], 1) *Boewana Sangksepa*; 2) *Boewana Kosa*; 3) *Wrĕhaspati Tatwa*; 4) *Sārasa Moestjaja*; 5) *Tatwa Djnjāna*; 6) *Kandampat*; 7) *Sadjotkranti*; 8) *Toetoer Kamoksa*.

[4] A critical edition and English translation of the text by the present author is in preparation. The versions that have been published in Bali in recent years, which come with a loose Indonesian translation of the Old Javanese portions only (see, for example, Mirsha et al. 1994; Budha Gautama 2009), appear to be based on a single (unspecified) source, namely a rather faulty typewritten romanized transcription of a palm-leaf manuscript from 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 as they gloss over a number of crucial philological issues.

*śivopadeśaṁ samāptam.*

The *Bhuvanakośa* deals with cosmography, geography, soteriology, ontology, yoga, subtle physiology, connections between microcosm and macrocosm, mantric mysticism (both sonic and graphic), and other aspects of Śaiva doctrine and practice. Although it documents a form of Śaivism that in terms of doctrine is related to that of texts of the *tattva* genre transmitted in Java and/or Bali, such as the *Dharma Pātañjala,* the *Vṛhaspatitattva*, and the *Tattvajñāna*, the *Bhuvanakośa* does not deal extensively with metaphysics, and parts of it seem to betray a derivation from a different South Asian prototypical tradition. In this respect, some sections of the text present analogies that are found in the *Mahābhārata* and the Upaniṣads, early non-dualistic Śaiva Saiddhāntika texts, such as those belonging to the *Kālottara* (or Vātula/Āgneya) corpus, as well as Vedānta-influenced relatively late (post 10th-century) non-dualistic South Indian Śaiva Saiddhāntika texts.[5] While the Śaiva doctrine of the *Bhuvanakośa* displays several archaic elements, such as a list of 26 cosmic principles (*tattva*) encompassing the 25 principles of the Sāṅkhya plus Rudra at the top (vis-à-vis the 31 or 36 *tattva*s accepted by subsequent Śaiva schools), as in Pāśupata Śaivism (or Atimārga Śaivism), it espouses an Atimārgic gnostic approach to soteriology focusing on internalised yogic practices, including visualisations and the association of syllables to subtle centres of the body. Chapters 6 to 11 are characterized by a remarkable intertextuality with the *Jñānasiddhānta*, which shares with the *Bhuvanakośa* a similarly heterogeneous textual arrangement, and which may possibly be roughly contemporaneous to its eponymous second section, the *Jñānasiddhāntaśāstra*.

## 2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Having described the general features of the *Bhuvanakośa*, I will now focus on the Sanskrit verse (*maṅgala*) that opens the text. While I have already dealt with this verse elsewhere (Acri 2015a), in the context of a parallel between the *maṅgala* verse found in the "colophon" of the *Nītisārasamuccaya* ( *"Compendium of the essence of policy")*, a legal text written in Indic script and pre-Classical Malay language preserved in the Tanjung Tanah codex in the Kerinci highlands of Central Sumatra,[6] in what follows I will analyse it to advance a tentative hypothesis about the authorship—or, more precisely, the identity of the compiler—of the text.[7] This discussion will serve as a point of departure to elaborate on two emblematic literary and religious figures of the late Majapahit period in East Java and its aftermath in Bali, namely Mpu Tanakuṅ and Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha (or Dvijendra).

---

[5] For a discussion of some of these analogies, see Acri 2021a and 2021b.

[6] This may be the oldest Malay manuscript currently known (ca. 14th or early 15th century).

[7] It is notoriously difficult to determine the authorship, dating, and region of compilation of *tutur*s, for they are esoteric texts mainly concerned with metaphysical realities. Just like the tantric scriptures in Sanskrit from the Indian subcontinent, these revealed scriptures were studiously freed from any references to worldly realia and human agents (including their authors) in order to keep them consistent with the mythical/atemporal plane in which they are set, where a dialogue between the supreme deity (usually Śiva) and his interlocutor (usually the Goddess, Kumāra, or a sage) takes place.

The verse, together with its Old Javanese prelude and commentary, runs as follows:[8]

*saṅ saṅgrahakāri*[9] *sira mavuvus | liṅnira |*

*praṇamya śirasā devaṁ*[10] *| vakti*[11] *munir amanmathaḥ*[12] *|*
*devadeva mahādeva | parameśvara śaṅkara || 1.1*

*śrī muni bhārgava | sira mahyun tumakvanakən ikaṅ pada nirbāṇa ri bhaṭāra |*
*maṅkana pvābhiprāyanira | manambah ta sira ri bhaṭāra |* śirasā *| makakāraṇa*
*hulunira sira | ri təlasnira manambah | mojar ta sira ||* he devadeva *| kita devaniṅ*
*devata kabeh |* he mahādeva *| kita bhaṭāra mahādeva ṅaranta |* he maheśvara *| kita*
*bhaṭāra maheśvara ṅaranta |* he śaṅkara *| kita bhaṭāra śaṅkara ṅaranta ||*

The reverend author of the compendium spoke. His words were:

*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!'*

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 to worship, 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 verse, as it is customary for *maṅgala*s or *stuti*s in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese
literature, is a hymn of praise directed to the paramount deity worshiped by the poet, uttered
by the poet himself. In this case, the commentary explicitly tells us that the author or
compiler of the text—who is the interlocutor of Śiva, seemingly receiving his revelation in
the form of a vision—asked the deity about the state of extinction (*nirvāṇa*), thus triggering
the Lord to impart to him the lessons constituting the text itself. The compiler seems to be
hinted at by the expression *saṅ saṅgrahakāri*. I interpret *saṅgrahakāri* as a *tadbhava* (i.e.,
a Sanskrit loanword that has been morphologically altered) formed by the compound
*saṅgraha* ("a compendium, summary, catalogue, list, epitome, abridgment, short
statement", Monier-Williams 1899) plus *kāri*(*n*) ("doer, maker")—compare "[*saṅgraha*]-
*kāra*, m. the composer or author of the Saṃgraha" (Monier-Williams 1899). The label

---

[8] Here I have used my own in-progress critical edition of the text; an edition of the first six Sanskrit
verses plus Old Javanese glosses of the text, on the basis of the single manuscript (from Lombok)
Leiden Cod.Or. 5022, may be found in Goris 1926, 78–81.
[9] Em. All manuscripts read *sasaṅgraha kāri sira*. (The romanized version published by Pusat
Dokumentasi Budaya Bali reads *saṅ saṅgraha kāri* (where *kari* is an "emphatic particle (often, but
by no means exclusively, in interrogative sentences)", Zoetmulder 1982, 807), which is likely to be
an editorial improvement rather than reflecting a genuine variant reading found in the manuscript
prototype).
[10] Em. All manuscripts read *deva*.
[11] Conj. All manuscripts read *vākya*. See my discussion below.
[12] Em. All manuscripts read *amanmatha*.

*saṅgraha* used to define the text makes perfect sense in this context, as the *Bhuvanakośa* itself is a composite text, a compendium of material redacted together by a compiler. It may be noted here that in the *maṅgala* of the Old Malay *Nītisārasamuccaya*, which shares some similarities with the first verse of the *Bhuvanakośa*, the text expounded (*vakti*) by the poet is said to be "extracted from various authoritative sources" (*nānāśāstroddhṛtaṁ*), which equals to say, it is a synthetic compilation or compendium (= *saṅgraha)*. I should also like to point out that some early Śaiva Tantras from the Indian subcontinent are conceptualized as *saṅgraha*s, and bear that element in their titles—see, for instance, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*; compare the *Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā* (*saṁhitā* being a collection of texts).

The first quarter of the Sanskrit verse, *praṇamya śirasā devam*, is also attested, either in exactly the same form or with minor variants, in the *Nītisārasamuccaya* and in a number of Balinese and South Asian Sanskrit texts (Acri 2015a, 66–67). The second quarter, *vakti munir amanmathaḥ*, presents some grammatical and lexical problems, yet it is the most interesting, and constitutes the pivot of the argument presented in this article. *Vakti* is my emendation of *vākya*, from √*vac*, "to speak, declare, proclaim". *Vākya* may be either a non-standard form of the optative participle *vācyaṁ* ("what is to be spoken/desired to be spoken/going to be spoken"), or a non-standard form equivalent to the substantive *vākya(ṁ),* "speech". *Amanmathaḥ* (nominative) is my emendation from *amanmatha* (vocative)*.* If we accept either *vākya = vācya*(*ṁ*) or *vākyaṁ* (subst.),[13] the verse-quarter could be the result of a contamination between a nominal sentence with genitive (*vākyaṁ muner amanmathasya*,[14] which is, however, hypermetrical), and a verbal sentence, the correct form of which would be: *vakti munir amanmathaḥ.* Indeed, the shift from *vakti* to *vākya(ṁ*) is justifiable on palaeographic grounds, entailing the confusion between the subscript *ya* and *ta,* the drop of the *hulu* (or its transformation into an *anusvāra*), and the artificial lengthening of the first *a* (which is already metrically long as it occurs before a consonantal cluster). The form *vakti*, it should be noted, is not only reflected in the Old Javanese commentary (*mojar ta sira*), but, as I have mentioned above, also occurs in the *maṅgala* of the *Nītisārasamuccaya*.[15]

As for *amanmathaḥ*, the context requires it to be a qualifier of *muniḥ*, the sage who is the *saṅ saṅgrahakāri*, and who, having bowed down to Śiva, utters (*vakti*) the invocation to him. The Sanskrit *manmathaḥ* means "agitating", "love or the god of love" (i.e., Kāma[deva]), "amorous passion or desire"; therefore, as an adjectival compound, *amanmathaḥ* could mean "he who is free from [erotic] desire". The form with an added *alpha privans* is, to the best of my knowledge, unattested in both the Sanskrit and Old

---

[13] In *Bhuvanakośa* 1.3c we find the nominal construction *vākyan te*, which is (faithfully) glossed as *nihan vuvusaniṅ hulun i kita* ("my speech to you is as follows").

[14] Being equivalent to *amanmathinaḥ* (*manmathin* meaning "enamoured/impassioned/in love").

[15] Insofar that it obviously represents an introductory eulogy to (various manifestations of) Śiva, the verse mirrors the colophon of the *Nītisārasamuccaya* 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, Śiva—by either the text's author or, in the case of the *Bhuvanakośa*, the main interlocutor of Śiva and "revealer" of the text. Note the mention of Mahādeva in the line preceding the colophon of the *Nītisārasamuccaya*, and the epithets Mahādeva, Parameśvara, and Śaṅkara in the *Bhuvanakośa*.

Javanese textual corpus. We are, therefore, dealing with a hapax,[16] and a highly unusual form too, especially given the fact that it is used to qualify a person, for the same concept could have been conveyed through a number of well-attested synonyms (e.g. *virāga*, *niṣkāma*, *niḥspṛha*, etc.). In view of this fact, I would like to tentatively advance the hypothesis that the Sanskrit *bahuvrīhi* compound *amanmathaḥ* could be a "signature", i.e., reveal (and hide at the same time)[17] a reference to the name of the compiler of the text.

An element supporting the above-mentioned hypothesis is that one of the possible translations into Old Javanese of the compound *amanmathaḥ* would be *tan akuṅ*, "[he who is/one] without amorous passion/desire",[18] and (Mpu) Tanakuṅ happens to be the (pen) name of an author who flourished in the second half of the 15th century in East Java. In their discussion about the name of this author, Teeuw *et al*. (1969, 13) translate *kuṅ* as "sexual love", "pangs of love", "amorous yearning", and the derivation *akuṅ* as "enamoured", "filled with amorous desire". They note that the former corresponds to the Sanskrit word *rāga*—*tan akuṅ* meaning "without amorousness", "without passion", "indifferent", being more or less the equivalent of the Sanskrit *virakta*;[19] and they conclude that "[c]learly it is a fitting pen-name for a poet who, in his own words, strives to attain a state of passionlessness or indifference" (Teeuw *et al*. 1969, 14).[20]

Pen names (*parab*), either in Old Javanese or, less frequently, Sanskrit, were common in the literary world of *kakavin*s, and poets often hid them in the introductory *maṅgala*s or final verses of their works as signatures (sometimes making playful and ironic allusions about themselves).[21] Clearly, premodern Javanese authors were keen to exploit

---

[16] One may suggest that the Old Javanese gloss *mahyun* ("desired") might represent the Sanskrit *amanmathaḥ* ("free from [sexual] desire") in the second verse-quarter, where the commentator would have taken *a-* as an Old Javanese prefix rather than as the Sanskrit *alpha privans* that it is. While this possibility cannot be discarded, it seems to me rather unlikely, for the Old Javanese gloss quite faithfully renders the other elements of the verse (cf. Acri 2015a), and it is only natural that the commentator would have wanted to add an explanation about what he defines as the *abhiprāya* of the sage for speaking to Śiva.

[17] On the cryptic character of *parab*s or pen names, see Zoetmulder 1974, 151.

[18] Cf. Zoetmulder 1982, 925–926 s.v. *kuṅ*: "love, amorous desire, lovesickness, languishing with love"; *akuṅ* "1. in love, infatuated, full of amorous desire, lovesick, languishing with love; '*ṅ akuṅ*' may refer to a man or woman, but usually the former."

[19] Or *virāga*. If we go back to the word *amanmathaḥ*, we see that it may hide not only a pen name, but a playful pun: *virāga* (equivalent to *virakta*), if analyzed as Sanskrit *vi* "without" + Old Javanese and Balinese *rāga* "body", can also mean "the one without a body", an epithet of Kāma or Manmatha, the God of Love.

[20] Zoetmulder (1974, 365) noted that five out of the seven poems of the *Bhāṣa Tanakuṅ*, a collection of short lyrical poems attributed to Tanakuṅ, "are laments by the poet at his beloved being forced by her parents to marry another man, so that he (the poet) is now 'without love' (*tan akung*). Possibly it was such an event in his life which prompted him to adopt Tanakung as a nom-de-plume." I find this explanation rather unlikely, for Tanakuṅ's authorship of the *Bhāṣa Tanakuṅ* could have been spuriously attributed by the later Balinese tradition precisely on account of the contents of the poem rather than reflecting a genuine life event of the author (pace Robson: see below, fn. 22). Furthermore, one cannot even exclude the existence of two different Tanakuṅs.

[21] This is the case of, for example, Mpu Tantular (*tan tular*), the author of the 14th-century Buddhist *kakavin Sutasoma* (cf. also below, fn. 27). I tentatively advance the hypothesis that the Sanskrit word *dhairya* occurring in the opening hymn of *kakavin Bhomāntaka* (1.3) could represent one such "signatures", alluding to the name Tantular. *Dhairya* in Sanskrit means "firmness" (OJ: "fortitude, courage", or as an adjective, "firm, constant, steady, self-controlled", etc.). The first line of verse

the polysemy of Old Javanese and Sanskrit, and to use various synonyms to indicate their pen names. As noted by Supomo (1977, 4), since "the manipulation of synonyms is one of the most characteristic features of Old Javanese poetry […] it is not surprising to observe that in every *kakawin* a person, a god or a country is called by several proper names."

Now, we know that Mpu Tanakuṅ was the author of at least two Old Javanese *kakavin*s: the *Vṛttasañcaya* and the—strongly Śaiva in religious persuasion and theme—*Śivarātrikalpa*. Another didactic poem, the *Udyalāka*, explicitly states that its author is Tanakuṅ, but Teeuw *et al.* (1969, 13) cast doubt on the authenticity of this claim, and opine that it might have been either an early work of the poet (due to the presence of mistakes and other irregularities), or "it may be that it was written in Bali years later and for some reason traditionally ascribed to Tanakuṅ." Similarly, some short lyrical poems, like the *Bhāṣa Tanakuṅ,* are ascribed to this author;[22] but some among them are also ascribed to Nirartha (Teeuw *et al.* 1969, 13). In fact, in Bali, the collections of poems by Tanakuṅ and Nirartha are usually found in the same manuscript bundles. And some texts attributed to Nirartha,[23] like the *Usana Bali Mayāntaka*, do mention (and praise) Tanakuṅ. This association between the two figures, as we shall see below, is relevant. Teeuw *et al.* point out that at least two other Old Javanese poets had "negative" names, namely Tantular and, indeed, Nirartha. The latter is traditionally ascribed to the period between the late 15th and early 16th century, and plays a paramount role in the Balinese Śaiva tradition as the initiator of the lineage of the Pedanda Śiva, the highest Brahmanical ritual agents of Bali. The Śaiva didactic religio-philosophical poem *Nirarthaprakṛta*, existing in only one manuscript from the Puri Cakranegara collection in Lombok, has a colophon declaring that the text was composed by Pupuṭut Tanvriṅdeya (Student "Baffled") in Śaka year 1381 (AD 1459) in a location called Kañcana ("Gold"), a (predominantly Buddhist?) religious centre not far

---

1.3 runs: *maṅgalyāni ṅhulun dhairya sahaja makədə mrākətāṅ bhomakāvya*, "May he (i.e., Kāma, and the poet's sponsor, whom he embodies) be a sure source of blessing for me too, as of my own accord I do my best to render the *kāvya* of Bhoma in Javanese" (trans. Teeuw 2005, 71). It seems that Teeuw translates *dhairya + makədə* (Zoetmulder 1982, 837: "feeling the urge to, feeling impelled to, set on; [wanting, seeking to obtain, etc.] at all costs [by any means]; keeping on, cannot but unremittingly, insistently, obstinately, unavoidably") as "I do my best"; however, *dhairya* here is more likely to represent a (Sanskrit or Sanskritic) epithet of the poet (who is writing in the first person, *ṅhulun*), which is the positive equivalent of the negative Old Javanese expression *tan tular* "immovable, unchanging, unperturbed". Some elements in the *maṅgala* evoke the East Javanese cultural milieu of Majapahit, in which Tantular was active. For instance, the expression *dhyakṣeṅ kalaṅvan*, which Teeuw translates "Chief Judge in Poetical Affairs", recalls the title *dharmādhyakṣa*, "Superintendent of Religion", a figure that is often mentioned in inscriptions of the Majapahit period (cf. below); and also the emphasis on Kāma, a divine figure whose significance becomes rather central in the religious and literary culture of the time. Teeuw (2005, 57) characterized the *Bhomakāvya* as "a well-thought out and well-composed literary creation by an intelligent, creative, and well-informed author", which Tantular undoubtedly was. Darma Putra (2020), in a short study on the *maṅgala* of the *Bhomāntaka*, has advanced a different hypothesis, connecting the text to an earlier historical period, namely the reign of Jayabhaya (AD 1135–1157), and interpreting *dhairya sahaja* as referring to the unwavering quality of the poet-*viku* who authored the text. This remains an open issue that needs to be explored further. On the hypothesis that Prapañca, the author of the *Deśavarṇana/Nāgarakṛtāgama*, is to be identified with (the young) Tantular (*prapañca* being an antonym of *tan tular*), or perhaps with an opponent, see Supomo 1977, 2–3.
[22] Robson (1979, 304–305) considers this attribution verisimilar, on account of the author's seeming reliance on Sanskrit sources.
[23] See *Dvijendratattva* 25a.

from Majapahit.[24] Robson (1979, 305) correctly notes that "The use of a pen-name containing the word *tan* ("not") reminds us of the poets Tantular and Tanakung."[25] Both the *Sutasoma* by Tantular and the *Nirarthaprakṛta* display signs of mixed Śiva-Buddha religiosity.[26] Nirartha himself was, according to the Balinese tradition, a Buddhist who converted to Śaivism in order to marry the daughter of a Śaiva priest. As it is often the case, Balinese chronicles and other folk-accounts, even though containing imaginific narratives elaborated to make sense of certain literary, historical, or religious realities, reflect a kernel of historical truth, or in any event preserve a memory of important historical personalities.

There is one more *kakavin* that needs to be mentioned in this context, namely the *Dharma Śūnya*, a Javanese manuscript of which contains a colophon dated Śaka 1382, or AD 1460. Commenting on the date of this colophon, Robson (1979, 305) notes that "Assuming that this reading is correct, we can see that the works of Tanakung were not entirely alone." Then, we have a major didactic-religious poem written at the same time in which Tanakuṅ flourished. Is it a coincidence, or could this text have been penned by Tanakuṅ himself (or by somebody in his "workshop")? An association going into that direction has already been made by the Balinese tradition, according to which the author of the *Dharma Śūnya* was not the Kamalanātha mentioned in the text, but Nirartha (Dharma Palguna 1999, 6). According to Dharma Palguna, Kamalanātha states that he is a man of religion (*viku*) without any possession (verse 153), which he links to the name Nirartha, *nirartha* meaning "without (*nir*) material possessions (*artha*)" in Sanskrit.[27] This attribution is difficult, but not impossible, to reconcile with the date of AD 1463 given in the above-mentioned colophon, for Nirartha's stay in Bali is traditionally ascribed by *Babad*s to the period between AD 1488 and AD 1536. (On the other hand, the colophon of the *Nirarthaprakṛta* gives the date of 1381 Śaka or AD 1459, but it must have been copied from a previous manuscript as the *lontar* in question is obviously Balinese, and the same bundle contains texts with later colophons).

Now, some interesting connections between the *Dharma Śūnya* and Tanakuṅ have been advanced by Dharma Palguna. For instance, the late scholar has noted the presence

---

[24] The Old Javanese inscription of Kañcana records the purchase of land for the establishment of a Buddhist foundation. According to Sidomulyo (2018, 231), this charter dates from the 9th century, and as such represents "the earliest documentary evidence of the central Javanese court's interest in the Brantas Delta region." More recently, however, Griffiths (2020, 133) has argued in favour of a 10th century dating, accepting the argument advanced by Krom in 1914.

[25] This link was already pointed out by Poerbatjarka (1951, 204, note 9, along with the name or epithet Mapañji Tanutama (Tan Utama?), which is attributed to the *dharmādhyakṣa* of the Śaivas, Ḍaṅ Ācārya Śivanātha, in the Sarvadharma charter); cf. Supomo (1977, 3) and Teeuw *et al.* 1969, 14. Supomo (1977, 3) has noted how the words *tan akuṅ* and *tamatan tular* occur at the beginning of the first line of two stanzas of the *Rāmāyaṇa kakavin* (8.164a and 8.165a), which suggests that those pen-names could have denoted two authors living under the same ruler in Paṇḍan-salas, who must have had access to the same copy of the Old Javanese text.

[26] I do not say "syncretic", because this "mixed" religiosity could actually be the outcome of an inclusivistic attitude (see Acri 2015b).

[27] Another possible meaning is "without aim". But in the text *Dharma Pitutur*, attributed to Nirartha by the *Dvijendratattva*, the author uses the pen name "Braja Miskin", *miskin* meaning "poor" in high Balinese. Cf. *Dharma Pitutur*, 52b: *kaputus dharma kavi tan pitutur makasadhananiṅ mpu braja miskin*. I thank Putu Eka Guna Yasa of Udayana University in Denpasar for having pointed out to me this reference.

---

of a praise to the Goddess Sarasvatī in both the *Dharma Śūnya* and the *Vṛttasañcaya* (Dharma Palguna 1999, 227). Furthermore, he (1999, 307) pointed out that in Bali, some stanzas on Paramaśiva from the *Dharma Śūnya* and *kakavin Bhārgavaśīkṣā*,[28] as well as the *Śivarātrikalpa*—all works characterized by a similar religious content—are sung to introduce the *devayajña*, the worship to the highest Gods. I will discuss the implication of the name Bhārgava below; for the time being, let me note that the association between the *Dharma Śūnya* and the *Śivarātrikalpa* in Balinese worship seems to be relevant indeed. As a last point, I should mention that, as reported by Dharma Palguna (1999, 217), the Balinese scholar Ida Bagus Gede Agastia has linked the Kamalanātha mentioned in the *Dharma Śūnya* as its author to Kāmanātha, on account of the information found in Balinese *babad*s that the Buddhist priest Daṅ Hyaṅ Smaranātha (son of Mpu Tantular) was the father of Daṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha (a Buddhist converted to Śaivism).[29] While the superficial resemblance between the *kama-* in Kamalanātha and the *kāma-* in Kāmanātha seems to me not a strong piece of evidence to suppose an identity between the two (provided the former is, indeed, not the outcome of corruption), I believe that it is worthwhile to follow IBG Agastia's lead.

Dharma Palguna (1999, 214) has noted that in the portions of the *Dharma Śūnya* and *Dharma Putus*[30] that attribute the authorship to Kamalanātha, the authors are faithful to the well-established convention of self-critique as being of modest understanding, of not mastering *kakavin* prosody properly, etc. This stands in contrast, and is not consistent with, the adoption of the self-aggrandizing name Kamalanātha ("The Lord [*nātha*] of/in the Lotus [*kamala*]") instead of such names as Tanakuṅ, Nirartha, etc. Indeed, Kamalanātha would virtually imply an equation of the poet with Paramaśiva, the supreme deity that is said to reside in the lotus (= heart) inside the human body in a number of *tutur*s. However, since *kamala* in Sanskrit may also have the (much less common) meaning of "desirous, lustful" (Monier-Williams 1899, on the basis of BRD, as per *Atharvaveda* VII, 6, 9; compare *kāmala* "libidinous, lustful", L.), then Kamalanātha could be a Javano-Sanskrit "neologism" intended to be a synonym of Kāmadeva, and equivalent to Smaranātha.[31] A version of the *Babad Brāhmaṇa* mentions Nirartha as the son of (A)smaranātha, himself the son of Tantular (Dharma Palguna 1999, 262), giving the following genealogy: Bhṛgu > Bajrasattva > Bharada > Bahula > Mpu Tantular (also Saṅ Hyaṅ Aśokanātha)[32] >

---

[28] Another *Bhārgavaśīkṣā* is an Old Javanese prose version of the *Bhuvanakośa* without *śloka*s. The text is evidently named after the sage Bhārgava, mentioned at the beginning of the text.
[29] See Rubinstein 2001, 83.
[30] *Kakavin Dharma Putus*, Leiden Cod.Or. 19.526 (Dharma Palguna 1999, 207).
[31] Intriguingly enough, *kamala* appears to be the antonym of *tan akuṅ*.
[32] *Tan tular* in Old Javanese means "not moving, immovable, unchanging, unperturbed"; thus, Aśokanātha (sometimes spelled Aṅśokanātha) "The Lord (*nātha*) without (*a*) affliction/trouble (*śoka*)" would be an appropriate translation of *tan tular*.

(A)smaranātha [33] > Daṅ Hyaṅ Nirartha. [34] As noted by Rubinstein, Balinese *babad*s narrating the genealogy and biography of Nirartha attribute to many of his Javanese ancestors (including his father Ḍaṅ Hyaṅ Asmaranātha) the status of royal *purohita*s and poets of Majapahit, identifying them as the authors of certain Old Javanese *kakavin*s (Rubinstein 2001, 83–85). [35] Further, she points out that the list of Nirartha's ancestors given by these texts does not specify the existence of kinship ties, but rather depict a type of "intellectual genealogy" (Rubinstein 2001, 84).

All the above suggests that there was not only an association, but perhaps at some point even a "confusion", between the two figures of Tanakuṅ and Nirartha in Bali—or, at the very least, an attempt to link them together as belonging to the same spiritual, intellectual, and literary lineage. How is all this relevant to the issue of the authorship of the *Bhuvanakośa*? My tentative hypothesis is that the Sanskrit expression *munir amanmatha* in the *maṅgala* may be equivalent to the Old Javanese "Mpu Tanakuṅ"/"Asmaranātha", and that this could reflect a Balinese attempt to link the text to a (to some extent fictional, and to some extent historical) religious and intellectual tradition that orginated in Majapahit. [36] I will provide some further internal and external support to this idea below.

The Old Javanese commentary of the *maṅgala* of the *Bhuvanakośa* does not unpack this supposed "pen name", just passing over in silence the second quarter of the Sanskrit *śloka*. Yet, it does mention the name of the sage who is the interlocutor of Śiva, namely Bhārgava. Bhārgava means "son of Bhṛgu", or "descendant of Bhṛgu". As we have seen above, the *Babad Brāhmaṇa* traces the genealogy of both Tanakuṅ and Nirartha to Bhṛgu; the *Dvijendratattva* (2b) associates Nirartha to the "Bhṛguvaṅśa" of Griya Mās in Dāha by marriage. [37] Therefore, the mention of Bhārgava—who nota bene does not appear anywhere

---

[33] Smaranātha seems to have been a fairly common name in East Java, for two Old Javanese charters from Majapahit, viz. the Decree Jaya Song of c. AD 1350 and the undated Charter of Batur (Pigeaud 1960, 104–114; cf. Sanderson 2009, 119, fn. 267), refer to the officials known as *dharmopapatti* ("Assessors of Religion"), among whom is a certain Smaranātha (the latter inscription actually refers to two different Smaranāthas); the Bendosari copper plates, issued under the reign of Hayam Vuruk (Śrī Rājasanāgara, r. 1350–1389), mention a Smaranātha (along with Śivanātha and Agreśvara) as belonging to the Bhairava denomination (Brandes 1913 I, 209). Compare the Ācāryas named Smaradahana and Smaradeva mentioned in the Sarvadharma charter of AD 1269 (issued under Kṛtanagara's reign: see Pigeaud 1960, 99–103).

[34] The *Dvijendratattva* (2a–2b; compare the other versions of the same text, like the *Babad Dvijendra*) regards A(ṅ)śokanātha as the brother of Dvijendra, son of Asmaranātha, the *purohita* of Majapahit. Another version of the *Babad Brāhmaṇa* (Leiden Cod.Or. 13.733, 2a) gives the following genealogy: Mpu Śrīnātha > Mpu Aṅśoka and Mpu Nilartha.

[35] For instance, to Tantular is attributed the authorship of the *Arjunavijaya*, the *Sutasoma*, and the *Vṛttasañcaya* (contrast Supomo 1977, 1, reporting a passage from Friederich's account of a Balinese tradition assigning only the first two *kakavin*s to "Mpu Tantular Boda" from Keḍiri). The last *kakavin* is by Tanakuṅ, but see Supomo (1977, 3) on the connection or relationship between Tantular and Tanakuṅ; cf. above, fn. 25.

[36] Actually, the Balinese tradition rather consistently link Nirartha to Keḍiri rather than Majapahit. According to Hadi Sidomulyo (email dated 26/09/2020), this may suggest that he lived during the time when the Javanese royal family had abandoned the royal capital (after AD 1478) and fled southward.

[37] Nirartha is said to have married the daughter of a Brahman priest, named Daṅ Hyaṅ Panavaran, whose ancestor was Bhṛgu. Rubinstein (2000, 76) notes that, according to one version of the *Babad*

else to my knowledge in Old Javanese or Balinese literature as the name of a historical person, nor it appears again as such in the *Bhuvanakośa* itself, except in the colophon of the Lombok manuscript Cod.Or. 5022[38]—may just be an appellative to denote the familial line of the author. Indeed, in 3.24, in the Sanskrit *śloka* the Lord addresses his interlocutor as *bhṛgusattamaḥ* ("the excellent Bhṛgu/the excellent among the Bhṛgus"), which the Old Javanese commentary glosses with the Sanskrit compound *bhṛgutanaya*, "the son of Bhṛgu".[39] To make things even more complicated, elsewhere in the first chapter of the *Bhuvanakośa*, the interlocutor of Śiva is addressed by the Lord as *dvijarājendra* "Supreme King of Brahmins" (Sanskrit verses, 1.15 and 1.16; Old Javanese commentary, 1.16) and *dvijendra* (Old Javanese commentary, 1.15). Another name of Nirartha was Mpu Dvijendra. Of course, *dvijendra*/*dvijarājendra* could just be a general appellative applied to Brahmins (like *yogīśvara*, or *munisattamaḥ* in 1.31), and perhaps it may have had some specific linkage with the Javanese and Balinese Brahmanical milieus of that time. But it could also reflect an attempt by the text to associate itself to both Tanakuṅ and Nirartha/Dvijendra, thereby confusing/coalescing them, or rather, it should be understood in the context of what was perceived by the tradition to be a "priestly family" or "intellectual genealogy". Or, could it be that Dvijendra was regarded as being present, along with Amanmatha/Bhārgava (alias Tanakuṅ/(A)smaranātha), on the occasion of the "hearing" of the text from the mouth of Śiva?

Let us now go back to Asmaranātha, whom, as we have seen above, some scholars have identified with Tanakuṅ. In regular Sanskrit, Asmaranātha could mean either "he who does not have Kāma as Lord", or "The Lord without [erotic] love". But, if this is indeed a Javanese Sanskritic compound intended to be a pen name, could it have been understood as a synonym of Amanmatha? Both Smaranātha ("God of Love") and Manmatha refer to Kāmadeva, and both are prefixed by an *a*-. My hypothesis is that Smaranātha (occurring in East Javanese inscriptions) and its synonym (?) Kamalanātha (occurring in the colophons of the *Dharma Śūnya* and *Dharma Putus*) denoted a different individual than Tanakuṅ, but they might have been coalesced with Asmaranātha, representing Tanakuṅ, in the Balinese *babad* tradition.[40] As for the identification of Kamalanātha (= Smaranātha?) with Nirartha, it is not impossible that it is the result of an *ex post* association between the sage, who obtained release disappeared from this world at Maśceti in Bali, and Kāma, who was regarded as being without a body (due to its burning by Śiva)—witness his epithets Atanu

---

*Brāhmaṇa* (for instance, K. 237), "Nirartha acquired some ancestral writings from his father-in-law, a Brahmana Siwa priest from Daha, Java, around the period that Majapahit fell into decline".

[38] *Oṁ namaḥ śivāya | oṁ namo vāgīśvaraya | oṁ namo bhārggavāya || śrī gurubhyo namaḥ ||.*

[39] A recently discovered Merapi-Merbabu manuscript (dated Śaka 1493/AD 1571) of a Śaiva *tutur* entitled *Mahāpadmaśāstra*, belonging to a Griya in Buleleng, North Bali, appears to be arranged as a teaching imparted by Bhagavān Bhṛgu to his disciples. Although this Bhṛgu may represent the mythical sage rather than a historical figure, the possibility that it may refer to the Bhṛgu associated with Griya Mās of Dāha cannot be ruled out. (Although I have been unable to access this manuscript, a transcription of a few words at beginning and end of the text contained in it was kindly shared with me by Sugi Lanus via WhatsApp in July 2018. On this manuscript, see https://baliexpress.jawapos.com/read/2019/09/30/158436/lontar-merapi-merbabu-ditemukan-di-desa-jinengdalem-usia-300-an-tahun).

[40] Confusingly enough, the *a*- could be taken either as a Sanskrit *alpha privans* or as an Old Javanese adjectival prefix, resulting in the meaning of "he who has Kāma as Lord"/"he who is Kāma". See above, fn. 19, about the equivalence of *tan akuṅ*, *virāga*, and Kāma.

and Anaṅga, "the one without a body" (see above, fns. 19 and 40). This would evoke an important point of doctrine in the religious literature of the time, namely the achievement of release through a form of yoga causing the disappearance of the body into the nothingness/Supreme Reality (cf. e.g. *Kiduṅ Dharma Pitutur* 47–52a).

If Asmaranatha/Amanmatha was indeed Tanakuṅ, the legendary or pseudo-historical account of the *Babad Brāhmaṇa* does not seem to be too far off the mark, as the chronology of the two figures is not distant. As for Nirartha, Balinese oral accounts ascribe his arrival on the island to AD 1489, in the period of King Waturenggong of Gelgel. While Nirartha/Dvijendra was long deemed by Western scholars to be a fictitious figure, recently discovered manuscript evidence suggests that it might have been a historical figure after all. Worsley *et al.* (2013, 24) have described a colophon (actually, one of three) contained in a manuscript preserving the *kakavin Sumanasāntaka* (Leiden University Library Cod.Or. 5015), which states that "the copy was completed on 14 July 1537 in Bali, at 'the *sima* Kanaka by one whose *parab* was Nirartha' (*tlas sinurat ing nūṣa Bali, ring sima Kanaka, de sang aparab Nirartha*)." Worsley *et al.* note that all the elements of the elaborate dating system check, and conclude:

> Taking the date to be genuine, we may further assume that Nirartha mentioned in this colophon must be none other than *the* Nirartha, the priest and poet, who migrated from Java to Bali to found the *brahmana* families during the turbulent period preceding the demise of the kingdom of Majapahit at the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth century […]. As it happens, the date also conforms to the dates of Nirartha's other literary activities recorded in later Balinese sources. According to the *Dwijendratattwa* and the *Babad Brāhmaṇa*, in 1536—that is the year before he copied the *Sumanasāntaka*—he had just completed a work called *Mahiṣa Mĕgat Kūng* (Rubinstein 2000, 73).

Another element of interest is that the *sima Kanaka* mentioned in the colophon could be linked to the *kañcana* (both meaning "gold") mentioned in the colophon of the *Nirarthaprakṛta* copied by Tan Vriṅdeya (allegedly in 1381 Śaka), identified by Poerbatjaraka as a Majapahit (Buddhist) religious site, mentioned as the place of origin of the author. This may correspond to the Griya Mas of Dāha (*mās/mas* meaning "gold" in Old Javanese and Balinese) of the Bhṛguvaṅśa mentioned in the *Dvijendratattva*. Could it be that Nirartha "replicated" in Bali this *kañcana/*Griya Mas in East Java, or that perhaps there existed kinship links between the priestly institutions in the two locations?[41]

Further codicological evidence needs to be mentioned here. It is worth noting that the same manuscript bundle from the Lombok collection that preserves the *Nirarthaprakṛta* (Leiden Cod.Or. 5023) also contains the *Añaṅ Nirartha* and *Saṅu Səkar* by Nirartha, the *Śivarātrikalpa* by Tanakuṅ, and other late Majapahit works, some of which of Buddhist persuasion, such as the *Deśavarṇana/Nāgarakṛtāgama*, the *Jinarthiprakṛti*, and the

---

[41] I wonder whether the Buddhist *dharmādhyakṣa* Kanakamuni mentioned in the Decree Jaya Song (see above, fn. 33) could have been linked to this religious site, on account of the element *kanaka-* ("gold") in his name, and his Buddhist affiliation.

*Kuñjarakarṇa*. Here not only a work of Tanakuṅ is included, but in the whole, we come across the coexistence of Śaiva and Buddhist spirituality that was emblematic of late Majapahit, and that was attributed to Nirartha by the Balinese tradition (allegedly a "convert" from Buddhism to Śaivism). Furthermore, it may be not coincidental that one of the oldest known manuscripts of the *Bhuvanakośa*, Leiden Cod.Or. 5022, stems from the same collection.

One more intriguing piece of evidence is the Central Javanese Merapi-Merbabu codex Ms.Or.fol 410 preserved in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek, which contains the *Dharma Śūnya* and the *Dharma Putus*, plus other two unidentified mystical poems. Perhaps significantly, as I have mentioned above, the *Dharma Putus*, a text of mixed Śaiva-Buddhist religiosity, declares to have been composed by one whose name (*parab*) is Kamalanātha (Dharma Palguna 1999, 207). This text (along with the *Dharma Śūnya Kəliṅ* and the *Dharma Pitutur*, among many others) is attributed to Nirartha by the Balinese tradition, namely the *Dvijendratattva* (2a–2b; cf. pp. 116–117). The Merapi-Merbabu *Dharma Putus* bears a colophon dated 1535 Śaka or AD 1613. Dharma Palguna (1999, 278) notes that in Bali, too, several manuscripts of the *Dharma Śūnya* also contain the *Dharma Putus*.

There is much in common between Tanakuṅ and Nirartha as historical and literary figures. Both figures must have been remarkable indeed, and must have exerted an influence on the literary and religious culture of their time. Both Tanakuṅ and Nirartha were exponents of elite social milieus, and probably even held positions at the royal courts of Majapahit and Bali; Nirartha is depicted in Balinese texts as a poet, intellectual, wonder-worker, and advisor to rulers.[42] Tanakuṅ is regarded as an innovator who had access to Sanskrit sources that were unavailable in Java at his time, such as the *Padmapurāṇa* and Sanskrit treatises on prosody, as well as Śaiva texts and practices that did not exist in Java before the 15th century, for instance the ritual of *śivarātri* (after which his *chef d'eouvre*, the *Śivarātrikalpa*, is named).[43] This has led to the speculation that he might have visited India—more precisely, South India, by then part of the Vijayanagara Kingdom—by the second half of the 15th century, and introduced the new doctrines and texts to Java after he returned back to his homeland (Teeuw *et al.* 1969, 19–20). The view that Tanakuṅ's "knowledge of the religious and cultural life of South Asia was gained first hand" was supported by Hunter (2001, 90) on the basis of the analysis of the *Vṛttasañcaya* and its South Asian Sanskrit prototypes, which led him to conclude that the figures found in that text are not those "of a poet whose cultural horizons were bounded by the walls of an East Javanese court or monastery", his world being one in which the translocal "Sanskrit

---

[42] Indeed, Balinese Pedandas—an institution founded by Nirartha, according to the Balinese—were regarded as religious and ritual advisers (*purohita*) to rulers (Rubinstein 1991, 64–66), as well as scholars and poets (Rubinstein 2000).

[43] See Nihom 1997, 108, who suggests that the association between initiation (*dīkṣā*) and the five doctrinal and ritual items known as *kalā*s found in South Indian Śaiva texts and, in Java, uniquely in the *stuti* of Tanakuṅ's *Śivaratrikālpa*, "is a reflection of the continued, or renewed (?), contacts between the East Javanese kingdom of Majapahit and the southern Indian kingdom of Vijayanagara." It is worthy of note that the only other locus where the five *kalā*s are mentioned, both singularly and collectively as *pañcakalā*s, is the *Jñānasiddhānta* (Chapter 12), which also contains circumstantial evidence of late southern Indian influences: cf. fn. 45.

Cosmopolis" was very much alive. As for Nirartha, he is depicted by the Balinese tradition as a well-travelled innovator or reformer, who transmitted to Bali the form of Śaivism that was in vogue in Majapahit during his time, which is believed to be practiced by the Pedanda Śiva to these days.[44] This could be interpreted as an attempt by the compiler (whether Tanakuṅ, or more likely, Nirartha, or a subsequent author linked to that Brahmanical family stemming from East Java) to reform the prevalent mode of Śaivism in Bali, and initiate a new line of priests. Nirartha must have adhered to the Śaivism of the cosmopolitan East Javanese court as opposed to the more archaic form of the religion that must have constituted the mainstream religiosity of priests in the more isolated and religiously conservative island of Bali.

Finally, as I have pointed out above (see also Acri 2021a, 2021b), the *Bhuvanakośa* contains illusionistic metaphors—e.g., the reflection of sun or moon on water, or the space in pot—that seem to derive from a form of Śaivism influenced by non-dualistic Vedānta that developed in South India after the 10th century, which we do not find in other Old Javanese Śaiva sources of the *tattva* genre. This suggests a possible influence from South India, and a relatively late date of compilation.[45] The *Bhuvanakośa* is also characterized by a somewhat higher degree of reconfiguration of Indic doctrinal elements, which may reflect a cultural context—either late Majapahit or Bali—in which religious ideology and practice had progressively moved away from their prototypical traditions. One also notes the appearance of Buddhist or Buddhist-flavoured terms such as *nirvāṇa*, *śūnya*, etc., although one never finds any traits of clearly and explicitly mixed or syncretic Śaiva-Buddhist religiosity. All these aspects are compatible with the biographies and chronologies of the figures of Tanakuṅ and Nirartha.

## 3. CONCLUSION

It would probably be a fruitless (not to say misleading) endeavour to try to establish the authorship and date of composition of such a multi-layered and heterogeneous source as the *Bhuvanakośa*. Yet, the hints at the author(s) or compilers of the text that are found in its *maṅgala* verse as well as in other parts of Chapter 1 of the text may give us some clues on the context in/for which it was produced and in which it circulated—namely, its reception. The proposed association with either Tanakuṅ or Nirartha, or both—whether genuine or fictitiously attributed *ex post*—suggests that the *Bhuvanakośa* may stem from a late Majapahit, "Javano-Balinese" context, and probably reflects the "horizon of expectation" of the Balinese religious specialists who were the prime vectors for its circulation.

---

[44] Chapters 6–9 of the *Bhuvanakośa* give us some glimpses of what Nirartha's "reform" might have consisted in, namely a critique of a localized form Śaivism stemming from the Atimārga tradition from the perspective of a form of Mantramārga (Saiddhāntika) Śaivism, upholding a gnostic (*niṣkala*) stance against exterior (*sakala*) forms of worship.

[45] The *Jñānasiddhānta* preserves a verse from a South Indian version of the Śaiva Saiddhāntika scripture *Kiraṇatantra*, which is not found in the earlier Nepalese recensions, thus suggesting a late South Indian line of transmission to Java (see Acri 2006).

# REFERENCES

Acri, A. "The Sanskrit-Old Javanese Tutur Literature from Bali. The Textual Basis of Śaivism in Ancient Indonesia", *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici* 1 (2006): 107–137.

Acri, A. "The Sanskrit Colophon of the Tanjung Tanah Codex and its Malay Gloss as Illuminated Balinese and South Asian Parallels", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 171 (2015a): 56–68.

Acri, A. "Revisiting the Cult of 'Śiva-Buddha' in Java and Bali". In *Buddhist Dynamics in Premodern and Early Modern Southeast Asia*, edited by C. Lammerts, 261–82. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing. 2015b.

Acri, A. *Dharma Pātañjala; A Śaiva Scripture from Ancient Java Studied in the Light of Related Old Javanese and Sanskrit Texts*, Second Edition. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan. [First edition: Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2011]. 2017.

Acri, A. "Vedāntic Analogies Expressing Oneness and Multiplicity and Their Bearing on the History of the Śaiva Corpus. Part I: Pariṇāmavāda", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 49/4 (2021a): 535–569.

Acri, A. "Vedāntic Analogies Expressing Oneness and Multiplicity and Their Bearing on the History of the Śaiva Corpus. Part II: Vivartavāda", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 49/4 (2021b): 571–601.

Acri, A., and T.M. Hunter Jr. "Translation as Commentary in the Sanskrit–Old Javanese Didactic and Religious Literature from Java and Bali", *Medieval Worlds* 11 (2020): 213–240.

*Babad Brāhmaṇa*: Romanised transcription, Leiden Cod.Or. 13.733.

*Bhomāntaka*: see Teeuw 2005.

*Bhuvanakośa:* in-progress critical edition and translation by Andrea Acri, based on several palm-leaf manuscripts. Unpublished.

Brandes, J.L.A. *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden: nagelaten transcripties*. Edited by Nicolaas Johannes Krom, Parts 1 and 2. Batavia; 's-Hage: Albrecht; Nijhoff. 1913.

Budha Gautama, Wayan. *Tutur Bhuwana Koṣa*. Surabaya: Paramita. 2009.

Darma Putra, IGA. "Manggala Kakawin Bhomântaka [Petunjuk Penting Pengarang]", draft paper presented at the Rembug Sastra Purnama Badrawada, 1 October 2020, Denpasar. Unpublished.

Dharma Palguna, Ida Bagus Made. *Dharma Śūnya; Memuja dan meneliti Śiwa*, ed. and (Indonesian) trans. PhD dissertation, Leiden University. 1999.

*Dvijendratattva: Dwijendra Tattwa*. Edited and translated by I.B.G Agastia. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1992–1993.

Friederich, R.H. "Over de godsdienst van Bali". *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië* 11 (1849): 318–328.

Friederich, R.H.Th. *The civilization and culture of Bali*. Translated to English by R. Rost. Calcutta: Susil Gupta [originally "Voorlopig verslag van het eiland Bali", *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 22, pp. 1-63, and 23, pp. 1-57, 1849-1850]. 1959.

Goris, Roeloef. *Bijdragen tot de kennis der Oud-Javaansche en Balineesche theologie*. Dissertation, Leiden University. 1926.

Griffiths, A. "Rediscovering an Old Javanese Inscription: Mpu Mano's Donation in Favor of a Buddhist Dignitary in 888 Śaka", *Archipel: Études Interdisciplinaires Sur Le Monde Insulindien* 99 (2020): 107–141.

Hunter, T.M., Jr. "*Wrttasañcaya* Reconsidered", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 157 (2001): 65–96.

*Jñānasiddhānta.* See Soebadio 1971.

*Kakavin Dharma Putus*: Romanised transcription, Leiden Cod.Or. 19.526.

*Kakavin Dharma Śūnya* and *Kakavin Dharma Putus:* Ms.Or.fol 410, Berlin Staatsbibliothek.

*Kiduṅ Dharma Pitutur: Kidung Jayendriya* (*Grantang*), Romanized transcription, Denpasar: Kantor Dokumentasi Budaya Bali, 1993.

Mirsha, I Gusti Ngurah Rai, *et al*. 1994. *Buana Kosa. Alih aksara dan alih bahasa (Brahma Rahasyam)*. Denpasar: Upada Sastra.

Monier-Williams, M. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1899.

Nihom, M. "*Dīksā, kalā* and the *stuti* of *Śiwarātrikalpa* 33.1-2", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 153 (1997): 103–111.

Pigeaud, Th.G.Th. *Java in the 14th Century. A Study in Cultural History. The Nagara-Kĕrtāgama by Rakawi Prapanca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D. Volume I: Javanese Texts in Transcription*. Third edition, revised and enlarged. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1960.

Poerbatjaraka, R. "Nirartha-Prakreta", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 107 (1951): 201–225.

Robson, S. "Notes on the early Kidung literature", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 135 (1979): 300–322.

Rubinstein, R. "The Brahmana According to Their Babad". In *State and Society in Bali: Historical, Textual and Anthropological Approaches*, edited by Hildred Geertz. Ledien: KITLV Press. 1991.

Rubinstein, R. *Beyond the realm of the senses: The Balinese ritual of kekawin composition*. Leiden: KITLV Press. 2000.

Sanderson, A.G.J.S. "The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period". In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, edited by Shingo Einoo, 41–349. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo. 2009.

Sidomulyo, H. "Notes on the Topography of Ancient Java: Identifying Four Sīma Territories from the Majapahit Period". In *Writing for Eternity: A Survey of Epigraphy in Southeast Asia*, edited by Daniel Perret, 223–241. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient. 2018.

Soebadio, H. *Jñānasiddhānta; Secret Lore of the Balinese Śaiva Priest*. The Hague: Nijhoff. 1971.

Supomo, S. *Arjunawijaya: A kakawin of Mpu Tantular; Introduction and Text*, *Vol. 1*. The Hague: Nijhoff. 1977.

Teeuw, A. *Bhomāntaka: The Death of Bhoma*. Leiden: KITLV Press. 2005.

Teeuw, A., Th.P. Galestin, S.O. Robson, P.J. Worsley and P.J. Zoetmulder. *Śiwarātrikalpa of Mpu Tanakung: An Old Javanese Poem, its Indian Source and Balinese Illustrations*, ed. and trans. The Hague: Nijhoff. 1969.

*Usana Bali Mayāntaka*: Romanised transcription, Leiden Cod.Or. CB75.

*Vṛttasañcaya: Wrtta-Sancaya; Oudjavaansch leerdicht over versbouw. In Kawi-tekst en Nederlandsche vertaling,* edited by H. Kern. Leiden: Brill. 1875.

Worsley, P., S. Supomo, T. Hunter, and M. Fletcher. 2013. *Mpu Monaguṇa's Sumanasāntaka: An Old Javanese epic poem, its Indian source and Balinese illustrations*. Leiden: Brill.

Zieseniss, A. "Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus: die śivaitische Systeme in der altjavanischen Literatur", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, land- en volkenkunde* 98 (1939): 75–223.

Zoetmulder, P.J. *Kalangwan: A Survey of Old Javanese Literature.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1974.

Zoetmulder, P.J. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. (With the collaboration of S.O. Robson; 2 vols). 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff. 1982.