VERHANDELINGEN

VAN HET KONINKLIJK INSTITUUT VOOR
TAAL-, LAND- EN VOLKENKUNDE

DEEL XVI

THE OLD-JAVANESE RĀMĀYAṆA KAKAWIN

WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THE PROBLEM OF INTERPOLATION
IN KAKAWINS

BY

Prof. Dr C. HOOYKAAS



'S-GRAVENHAGE - MARTINUS NIJHOFF - 1955

PREFACE

Acculturation, the assimilation of culture, is a word for a process and a problem as widely spread as it is fascinating.

It is used to denote those elements of a culture which are assimilated by another culture with which it comes into contact; it affects people, their thoughts, their habits, works of art and technique, administration and organisation. A considerable number of those engaged in Asian or African studies have spent part of their lives in Asia or in Africa and have played their rôle in this huge process, whether they had direct contact with the indigenous people or not, and whether they realised it or not, as much by their activities as by lack of them. On the surface the tide is against us at the moment, but future historians may investigate the strength of the undercurrents.

It is highly interesting to study a specimen of acculturation in the past and to investigate which aspects have been absorbed and which rejected; whether the whole thing has been accepted without question or whether the recipient has been as wise as the Indian *haṅsa,* who absorbes the milk from a mixture of milk and water. The new shape of the adopted specimen and its modified function in the new surroundings, the influence it gains there — these are attractive and fascinating subjects to investigate.

"Comment, transplantée au Cambodge, à Java, et dans les autres pays, l'esthétique indienne a-t-elle donné naissance à l'art khmèr, à l'art javanais et aux autres arts hindous d'Extrême-Orient? C'est là un des problèmes les plus délicats qui s'offre aux archéologues."

This quotation from G. Coedès' "Les États Hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésié", 1948, p. 423, used as a motto to H. G. Quaritch Wales' book, "The Making of Greater India" [1]), was the kernel of a paper, recently read in the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts by the Leiden Professor Bosch on, "Local Genius and Old-Javanese Art" [2]). Dr. Bosch pointed to "the Indian art of the first eight centuries A.D.,

---

[1]) Bernard Quaritch Ltd., London, 1951.

[2]) Med. Kon. Ned. Ak. v. Wet., Afd. Lett. N. R. Deel 15 No. 1, Amsterdam, 1952.

known only fragmentarily due to the devastations mainly bij Muslim invasions in N. India on the one hand, on the other hand the Hindu-Javanese art, of which the oldest monuments date from the eighth century and which — however much Indian in design and related to the mother-country — still have a distinctively deviating character of their own, no equivalent or prototype of which can be indicated in India. Between the two: the gap. It is part of the primary task of archaeological investigation to bridge this gap, by facts if possible, by hypotheses if necessary."

The investigation offered in the following pages concerns the field of literary art; still it may be found to contain some contribution to this subject.

One is fortunate if the subject of one's studies happens to be the Rāmāyaṇa, for this vast poem is not only held in very high esteem in the whole of South East Asia, but it is also easily accessible in translations in European languages. Even in Indonesian connection, where generally knowledge of the Dutch language is a *conditio sine qua non,* unusual faculties present themselves. Stutterheim [3]) and Zieseniss [4]) wrote their books in German, Kats [5]) and Beryl de Zoete × Walter Spies [6]) in English. From Beryl de Zoete's book "Dance and Drama in Bali" we get a vivid picture of the important rôle that the Rāmā-story played some twenty years ago, (I am convinced: still plays); in recitations on special occasions; at cremations and at every important house festival. My own *guru* in the village in which I lived in Bali, who in his early youth had gone to the European School and also to a *guru* of mysticism in the hills, several days' journey away, was in the habit of studying the Rāmāyaṇa with his best school friend, a Christian, 'in order to become a better man'. Indeed it would be wrong if one assumed from Beryl de Zoete's book that outside Bali only Jogjakarta produced spectacular Rāmāyaṇa performances at the court, (illustrated brochure in English!). During my sojourn at this capital I saw the whole story lasting 10 complete nights, staged in the court-yard of a

---

[3]) Dr. W. F. Stutterheim, Rāma-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien. Textband, Tafelband. Der Indische Kulturkreis. Georg Müller Verlag, München 1924 (Thesis Leiden Univ.).

[4]) Alexander Zieseniss, Die Rāma-Saga bei den Malaien, ihre Herkunft und Gestaltung. Hamburg, Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co., m.b.H. 1928.

[5]) J. Kats, The Ramayana as Sculptured in Reliefs in Javanese Temples. G. Kolff & Co., Batavia, Leiden [± 1930].

[6]) Beryl de Zoete & Walter Spies, Dance and Drama in Bali, with a preface by Arthur Waley, Faber & Faber Ltd., London, 1938, 2nd imp. 1951.

private house. Also, the psychiatrist van Wulfften Palthe deals in a paper [7]) with one of his patients, who at times behaved absolutely in a monkey-fashion, convinced that he was Subali (= Vālin).

I owe sincere apologies to the spirit of Yogīśvara, author of the Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa, who died ± a thousand years ago [8]) for the way in which I have had to present his poem to the readers of this paper. Before evaluating the beauty in his lines of poetry I had to invoke the help of tables and statistics in order to defend some two hundred of them against the attacks of those well-wishing admirers of his who deem them unworthy of his genius.

---

[7]) Printed in Geneeskundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië, 1938; repr. in ch. on Bezetenheid (Being obsessed) in his book "Psychiatrie en Neurologie", lectures ed. by Wetenschappelijke Uitgeverij, Amsterdam, 1948.

[8]) R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, De Dateering van het Oud-Jav. Rāmāyaṇa, Gedenkschrift... Kon. Inst. T.L.V., 's Gravenhage, 1926 p. 265-72; R. Ng. Dr. P., Het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa, TBG 72, 1932 p. 151-214; C. Hooykaas, DJAWA 12, 1932, p. 244-7: between 919 and 929 date of OJR.

Frequently used abbreviations.

BKI = Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde [van Nederlandsch-Indië], uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut (for idem).
FBG = Feestbundel uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen bij gelegenheid van zijn 150-jarig bestaan 1778-1928, 2 vols. 1929.
GKI = Gedenkschrift Koninklijk Instituut (cp. supra) 1926.
KLvdT = Kirtya Liefrinck-van der Tuuk [Library of Palm-leaf-MSS., Singaraja, Bali].
OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
TBG = Tijdschrift voor de Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, uitgegeven door het [Koninklijk] Bat. Gen. v. K. & W.
VBG = Verhandelingen for id. from id.
VG = Verspreide Geschriften (author Professor Kern).
VKI = Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut (as supra).

I. INTRODUCTION

§ 1. *The literary genre of Kakawin.*

The so-called *Kakawin* (compositions of poets; poems) form such a conspicuous part of Old-Javanese literature, that the language in which they were written was called *kawi* after them [9]). They constitute a distinct group amidst the various literary genres, according to the indigenous [10]) and European views [11]); they appear moreover, to be closely interrelated, as much in common character and details [12]) as

---

[9]) Wilhelm von Humboldt, Die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java, 1836-9.
R. Friederich, Voorloopig Verslag van het Eiland Bali, VBG 22, 1849.
H. Kern, Kawi-Studiën; Arjuna-Wiwâha, Zang I en II, 's Gravenhage, 1871.
A. B. Cohen Stuart, Kawi-Oorkonden, Leiden, 1875.
C. F. Winter Sr. Kawi-Javaansch Woordenboek, 1880; reprint 1928.
H. N. van der Tuuk, Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek, Batavia, 1897, 1899, 1901, 1912.
W. Aichele, Grundsätzliches zur Kawi-Interpretation, Feestbundel Bat. Gen. I. 1-21, Weltevreden, 1929.
G. W. J. Drewes, Internationale Belangstelling voor het Oudjavaansch. Kolff, Batavia-C, 1935.

[10]) Njoman Kadjĕng, Assistant-Librarian of the [Library of palm-leaf-MSS.] Kirtya (= Foundation) Liefrinck-van der Tuuk, Singaradja, Bali, subdivides according to Balinese principles Group IV Itihāsa (epic works) in a) Parwa, b) Kakawin (Sanskrit metres), c) Kidung (indigenous *Tĕngahan*-metres) and d) Gaguritan (indigenous *Macapat*-metres) in Voorloopig Overzicht der op Bali aanwezige literatuurschat, Mededeelingen K.L.v.d.T.I. Bijlage I p. 19-40. In subsequent lists of newly acquired MSS., in Med. 3 (1931), 4 (1935), 5 (1937), 6 (1939), 11 (1940) & 13 (1941), this system was continued.

[11]) The Sanskritist Dr. R. Friederich in his above-mentioned Provisional Report, distinguished roughly 3 groups only: 1) Sanskrit-writings with Balinese commentary; 2) Kawi-writings, a) epic works which are holy for the people, like the Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa & the Parwas); b) the less difficult Kawi-poetry (sic), e.g. Wiwâha, Bhārata-Yuddha, etc. 3) Jav.-Bal. writings; it does not appear whether this division is his or his informants'.
A. C. Vreede, Cat. Jav. Mad. MSS., Univ. Leyden Libr. 1892, distinguishes 9 groups; I. Epic poetry.
H. H. Juynboll, Suppl. Cat. Jav. Mad. MSS., U.L.L., 1907 & 1911 distinguishes 6 (8) groups; II Kakawin.

[12]) Lastly A. Teeuw in his [translation of] Het Bhoma-kāwya, Groningen, 1946 p. 1 sums up a century of investigations thus: — "The connection as to outward appearance and contents of the various texts is so apparent that in studying those *Kakawins* one can hardly neglect one of them without incurring the risk of obtaining an incomplete or even a false view of the meaning of this [kind of] literature, and also of every text taken apart."

in their fate [13]); their number is considerable [14]). On Bali they are still held in high esteem; recitation of them forming an integral part of cremation ceremonies and musical competitions [15]), they are recited at homely gatherings [16]), and studied by study-groups [17]). They were the first literary works to command the attention of Westerners [18]), they [19]) and their Modern-Javanese counterparts [20]) were the earliest texts to be printed.

The progress made during more than a century of investigation is the more remarkable in view of the paucity of students devoted to Indonesian studies generally and to (Old- & Modern-)Javanese in particular, and to the intricate character of the difficulties they encountered; nevertheless it cannot be said to be satisfactory; prosodical studies must be said to have scarcely begun [21]).

During the 19th. century Friederich printed the Wṛtta-Sañcaya from one Ms., and edited the Bhauma-Kāwya from two, not daring to draw more MSS into comparison or to give a translation.

---

[13]) "The metres of all of them, more than a hundred difficult literary Indian elaborations, have fallen into oblivion and have become stumbling blocks for later Javanese who made innumerable mistakes in their copies. All of them are suspected of having been interpolated". — Poerbatjaraka in TBG 72, 1932, p. 151-214.

[14]) Juynboll, Suppl. Cat. Jav. Mad. MSS., U.L.L., mentions > 50 of them; the lists of the Kirtya L. v. d. T. mention more than twice as many titles, a considerable number of which are undoubtedly of more recent Balinese making.

[15]) Walter Spies, De Gamĕlan-wedstrijd te Gianjar, DJAWA 19, 1939, 197-207.

[16]) I Gusti Njoman Pandji Tisna, Ni Rawit Tjeti Pendjual Orang, Balai Pustaka, 1198, Djakarta, 1935. Cf. Dr. C. Hooykaas, Literatuur in Maleis en Indonesisch, p. 212-6 Makakawin; or Perintis Sastera, karangan Dr. C. Hooykaas, terdjemahan Raihoel Anwar gl. Datoek Besar, 1951, p. 212-6; 2nd. imp. 1953, p. 214-8; Berkakawin. Ed. Wolters, Djakarta & Groningen.

[17]) "Mabasan" [ma-bhāṣa-an] of beoefening van het Oud-Javaansch op Bali, door I Wayan Bhadra, Med. K.L.v.d.T. 5, 1937, Bijlage.

[18]) Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles in his monumental History of Java spends dozens of pages in an endeavour to edit and translate part of the Bhārata-Yuddha, as early as 1814.

[19]) R. Friederich, Wṛtta-Sañcaya, Verh. Bat. Gen. 22/12, 1849.
R. Friederich, Arjuna-Wiwāha, Verh. Bat. Gen. 23/15, 1850.
R. Friederich, Bhoma-Kāwya, Verh. Bat. Gen. 24/14, 1852.

[20]) J. F. C. Gericke, Wiwoho of Mintorogo, een Jav. gedicht met vertaling en aanteekeningen, VBG 20, 1844.
C. F. Winter, Romo, een Javaansch Gedicht, naar de bewerking van Joso Dhipoero, VBG 21/2, 1847.
Dr. W. Palmer van den Broek, Ardjoenå-Sasrå-Baoe, Jav. gedicht bewerkt en vertaald, VBG 34, 1870.

[21]) R. B. Slametmulyana, Licentiaat in de Wijsbegeerte en de Letteren, Poëzie in Indonesia, Een literaire en taalkundige studie, Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 36, Leuven, 1954.

Cohen Stuart had a MS. of the Bhārata-Yuddha in the R.A.S. lithographed [22]).

The famous Sanskritist Kern was the first to give a new text with translation and annotations of the Wṛtta-Sañcaya [23]). He also made a tentative text + translation + copious annotations of 39 stanzas of the Arjuna-Wiwāha [24]), of 28 verses of the Bhārata-Yuddha [25]) and of 9 verses of the Rāmāyaṇa [26]).

The beginning of the 20th. century saw Kern's monumental edition of the Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin [27]), which was followed by Juynboll's Glossary to this text [28]); Kern's translation of sarga I-VI [29]) was gradually completed by Juynboll [30]). Gunning edited the Bhārata-Yuddha [31]), but did not publish the promised translation, which was only done 30 years later by Poerbatjaraka & myself [32]). Brandes first intrigued students by printing the Nāgarakṛtâgama in Balinese script [33]),

---

[22]) Gvt. Dutch East Indies; lithographers S. Lankhout, The Hague, 1863.

[23]) Oudjavaansch leerdicht over versbouw. In Kawi-tekst [Jav. char.] en Nederlandsche vertaling bewerkt, Leiden, Brill, 1875. Reprint in Verspreide Geschriften (VG). 9, 1920, p. 67-190 [Lat. char.],

[24]) Kawi-Studiën, Arjuna-Wiwāha, Zang I en II in tekst en vertaling met aanteekeningen en inleiding. The Hague 1871, (not reprinted in VG; it is antiquated).

[25]) Zang XV van het Bhārata-Yuddha in Kawi, met vertaling en aanteekeningen, BKI 3/VIII = 20, 1873; reprinted in VG 9, 1920, p. 39-66.

[26]) Proeve uit het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa, BKI on the occasion of the 6th. International Congress of Orientalists at Leiden, 1883; reprinted in VG 9, 1920, 251-72.

[27]) Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, Oudjavaansch Heldendicht, The Hague, 1900.

[28]) Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Glossarium op het Oudjavaansche Rāmāyaṇa, bewerkt door Dr. H. H. Juynboll, The Hague, 1902.

[29]) I-III BKI, 73, 1917, p. 1-29; IV-V ib. p. 155-74; 6 ib. 472-94; reprinted in VG 10, 1922, p. 77-140.

[30]) Also in BKI: VII in 78/1922, p. 373-84; VIII in 79/1923, p. 569-90; IX in 80/1924. p. 11-22; X in 81/1925, p. 1-7; XI in 81/1925, p. 121-33; XII-XIII in 82/1926, p. 95-109; XIV-XVI in 83/1927, p. 481-502; XVII in 84/1928, p. 610-24; XVIII in 85/1929, p. 291-6; XIX in 86/1930, p. 537-56; XX in 88/1931, p. 451-60; XXI in 90/1933, p. 301-28; XXII-XXIII in 92/1935, p. 123-48; XXIV-XXVI in 94/1936, p. 409-47.

[31]) Bhārata-Yuddha Kakawin, Oudjavaansch Heldendicht uitgegeven door Dr. J. G. H. Gunning, The Hague, 1903.

[32]) Mpu Sedah en Mpu Panuluh, Bhārata-Yuddha, vertaald door R. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjaraka en Dr. C. Hooykaas, DJAWA, 14/1. 1934, p. 1-88 (also in separate ed., Kolff, Batavia, 1934).

[33]) Nâgarakrĕtâgama, Lofdicht van Prapanjtja op Koning Rasadjanagara (sic), Hayam Wuruk, van Madjapahit, uitgegeven door Dr. J. Brandes, naar het eenige daarvan bekende handschrift, aangetroffen in de puri te Tjakranagara op Lombok, VBG 54/1, Batavia/The Hague, 1902.

but then Kern gradually translated and explained this difficult text[34]), perhaps the most famous composition in Javanese and even in Indonesian literature. Poerbatjaraka edited and translated Arjuna-Wiwāha[35]), Smara-Dahana[36]), the Nīti-śāstra[37]) and recently Nirartha-Prakṛta[38]). Gonda included in his edition of the (prose) Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa[39]) also the homonymous Kakawin. Teeuw made a careful translation of the Bhauma-Kāwya[40]), nearly a century after its text had appeared in print, and edited and translated the Hari-Wańśa[41]).

The Nāgarakṛtâgama has been preserved in only one MS., fortunately this has proved to be excellent, though not flawless. This text, relatively small as it is, has been the subject of a considerable amount of learned papers, thanks to the importannt facts which it gives in the field of history, geography, archaeology, religion, law, etc.

Next comes the Rāmāyaṇa. A paper by Poerbatjaraka[42]) about its date provoked opposition[43]), whereupon its author girded up his loins and wrote a much larger article[44]), in which he not only added new material to support his view that the O.-J. Rāmāyaṇa dates from Siṇḍok's days, more than 1000 years ago, but also 3 appendices, no. 1 on interpolations, no. 2 a complete list of all metres, and no. 3 an alphabetical list [and complete – ∪ ∪ scheme] of all metres used in the OJR[45]).

Anterior to these studies were those of Aichele, mainly on the

---

[34]) Reprint in VG 7, 1917-8; 8, 1918; Het Oud-Javaansche Lofdicht Nāgarakṛtāgama van Prapañca (1365 A.D.), tekst, vertaling en bespreking, overgedrukt uit de VG Dl. VII-VIII van Prof. Dr. H. Kern, met aanteekeningen van Dr. N. J. Krom, The Hague, 1919.

[35]) BKI 82/2, 1926, p. 181-305.

[36]) Bibl. Jav. 3, Bandoeng, 1931.

[37]) Bibl. Jav. 4, Bandoeng, 1933.

[38]) BKI 107/2-3, 1951, p. 201-25.

[39]) Bibl. Jav. 5, 1932, p. 183-225; 6, 1933 translation of the prose text.

[40]) Groningen, 1946.

[41]) VKI IX, 1950, a) tekst en critisch apparaat, b) vertaling en aanteekeningen.

[42]) R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, De dateering van het Oud-Jav. Rāmāyaṇa, FKI 1926, The Hague, p. 265-72.

[43]) Dr. R. Goris in DJAWA 7, 1927, p. 268-9.

[44]) Het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa, TBG 72, 1932, p. 151-214.

[45]) Haritoṣamālā Nr. 1, Jayadāman (A collection of ancient texts on Sanskrit Prosody and a classified list of Sanskrit metres with an alphabetical index), Edited by H. D. Velankar, Poona ± 1950, seems to be the newest exhaustive source in this field. Actually it contains 3 metres which Poerbatjaraka [in 1932] could not yet identify: his Onbekend (= unknown) VI = Kāmadattā; VIII = Sāriṇī; IX = Sundaralekhā (TBG 72, 1932, p. 210).

Rāmāyaṇa, occasionally also refering to other Kakawins. These valuable papers can be better discussed in the next paragraph.

§ 2. *The problem of interpolation unsolved.*

The subject which interests us here: the interpolations, appears to be of real importance. Now some time ago a verse from a Kakawin was used to prove *e.g.* the relatively high antiquity of the shadow-play theatre [46]) — but, what is to be done when closer investigation refutes the authenticity of such a verse? [47]). Or — of more consequence for the text concerned — when evidence for the age of a work is found in a verse, the genuineness of which seems doubtful? [48]). How different is the aspect of a Kakawin itself, such as Arjuna-Wiwāha [49]) or Smara-Dahana [50]), after Poerbatjaraka has shorn them of some 20% of their too luscious foliage and flowers! Should we not perhaps suspect that the original nature has been corrected too severely and that vital and essential parts have been removed? Moreover, what is one to think when the editor of the Bhārata-Yuddha [51]) cuts away 'only' 12% and Poerbatjaraka rejects > 20% [52]). Or when he lays his hands even on the sacrosanct Nāgarakṛtâgama [53]), but there he finds Krom on the defensive [54]), not prepared to give way on one single syllable? Or, when the editor of the Rāmāyaṇa, Kern, puts only 4% of the OJR. between square brackets [55]), its translator, Juynboll, 6% and Poerbatjaraka 8%? [56]).

What is one to think when a scholar of Kern's fame declares (in 1873), that *all descriptions of love scenes, grief over the departure of a lover etc., in the Bhārata-Yuddha are interpolated* [57]), which words

---

[46]) G. A. J. Hazeu, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Javaansche Tooneel, Leiden, 1894.

[47]) Poerbatjaraka, BKI 82, 1926.

[48]) Goris, DJAWA 7, 1927, p. 268-9; Poerbatjaraka TBG 72, 1932, p. 152, both on OJR., XXVI, 22.

[49]) ed. Poerbatjaraka, BKI 82, 1926, p. 181-305.

[50]) ed. Poerbatjaraka, Bibl. Jav. 3, 1931.

[51]) Dr. J. G. H. Gunning, The Hague, 1903.

[52]) Translation in DJAWA 14, 1934.

[53]) Aanteekeningen op de Nāgarakrĕtāgama, BKI 80, 1924, p. 219-86, spec. p. 243.

[54]) Eenige opmerkingen over de samenstelling van den Nāgarakṛtāgama, FBG I. 1929, p. 375-82.

[55]) ed., 1900, The Hague.

[56]) TBG 72, 1932, p. 199-201.

[57]) Zang XV van het Bhārata-Yuddha, BKI 3/VIII = 20, p. 158-87.

are cited with approval by the editor of the poem, Gunning [58]), in 1903; repeated in the reprint in Kern's Verspreide Geschriften in 1920, and again quoted with agreement by Poerbatjaraka in 1931 [59]) when editing and translating (80% of) Smara-Dahana? I should say: to begin with, this is poetry, moreover poetry originating from a Hindu court which had no apparent reason to frown on love scenes and on the expression of sentiments in poetry. The matter seems worthy of investigation at closer quarters.

Actually the problem of interpolation has been dealt with seriously and repeatedly and at considerable length [60]). At one time 'incredible thoughtlessness' was attributed to the supposed interpolator [61]), at another time 'silly artificiality' was the charge [62]); 'difficulty' and 'obscurity' are also often recurring objections [63]), — but the primary cause of all the suspicion seems to be their erotical character. Kern, when introducing the problem of interpolation, as early as 1873, cut out 15 verses from the Bhārata-Yuddha Canto XV in translation, gave his motives, and then went on with the generalisation quoted above, for which he added no arguments. Nowadays, > 80 years later, in rather different times, one cannot easily disengage oneself from the impression, that in cutting out passages, specially more or less erotical ones, Kern notwithstanding the intellectual argument given in one instance, was here mainly acting as a gentleman of mid-Victorian days.

Thirty years later Kern's pupil Gunning, when editing the text (for-

---

[58]) Edition, The Hague, Preface.

[59]) Bibl. Jav. 3, p. VII-VIII note.

[60]) Kern, BKI 3, VIII = 20, 1873, repr. VG 9, 1920 (ad Bh.-Y.); Kern, Rāmāyaṇa-ed. 1900; Gunning in Album-Kern, 1903; Gunning in Bh.-Y. ed. 1903; Poerbatjaraka in BKI 78 & 80, 1922 & '4 (ad Nāg.), 82, 1926, (ad A-W.); Juynboll (ad Rām.) in BKI 82 & 83, 1926 & '7; Goris in DJAWA 7, 1927, p. 268-9 (ad Rām.); Aichele in Festschrift-Meinhof (1927) and DJAWA 8, 1928, p. 36 note 39; Aichele in FBG I. p. 14-5; Krom in FBG I. p. 378 (ad Nāg.); Poerbatjaraka in ed. Smara-Dahana p. VII-VIII, 1931; id. in TBG 72, 1932 p. 152-214; id. in transl. Bh.-Y. DJAWA 14, 1934; Juynboll (ad Rām. 24-6) in BKI 94, 1936; Prijono, Sri Tañjung 1938 thesis; Berg. BKI 97, 1938, p. 19-94 (ad A.W.); Teeuw, transl. Bhoma-Kāwya (& in general) 1946; Poerbatjaraka, Nirartha Prakṛta in BKI 107, 1951, p. 201-25.

[61]) Kern, BKI 3, VIII = 20, 1873, repr. VG 9, 1920.

[62]) Kern, ad Nāg. 96-8 in BKI 69, 1914; repr. VG 8, 1918; repr. Kern-Krom 1919; Poerbatjaraka, BKI 78, 1922 ad Nāg. 95-8; BKI 80, 1924 ad Nāg. 60; Krom in FBG I (avoids the qualification, considers as genuine); Poerbatjaraka ad. S.D. ed. 1931; id. ad Rām. TBG 72, 1932; Juynboll ad Rām. 26, 6.

[63]) Gunning in Album-Kern, 1903 and in Bh.-Y. ed. 1903; Kern-Krom-Poerbatjaraka ad Nāg. as in note 62; Juynboll ad Rām. 15 in BKI 83, 1927; Poerbatjaraka ad Bh.-Y. and in general, S.D. ed; Juynboll ad Rām. 24-6 in BKI 94, 1936; Poerbatjaraka ad Nirartha-Prakṛta in BKI 107, 1951.

tunately completely), cited those words and acted consistently in that direction, but failed to add one single word of justification for this procedure [64]), and Poerbatjaraka, for whom in later years erotical & obscene seem to be the same in literature [65]), went still further [66]); we have seen to what extent.

For two reasons at least this view could be objected to; to begin with, neither Gunning nor Juynboll nor Poerbatjaraka dared to be consistent in cutting out erotical, difficult and artificial passages. Where Kern had no objections at all in OJR. sarga XII, Juynboll and Poerbatjaraka disagree as to which stanzas are interpolated and which genuine. Juynboll rejects the major part of sarga XXV (which is very difficult, if not impossible to translate), qualifying these stanzas as interpolated, but (fortunately) translated several other passages, which have been constructed on the same principle and are just as artificial, e.g. XVI, 24—40.

Next Poerbatjaraka gradually evolves a hypothesis, according to which all the existing Kakawins, even all copies, without a single exception, should have been interpolated by the same poet, at a fairly late date of the Majapahit-period, but still before copies were introduced into Bali (and from there to Lombok) [67]). A priori unacceptable though it may be, this theory, devised to explain away the difficulty that not one single MS. of any Kakawin has been found without these 'interpolations', has not yet been refuted.

II. A WAY TO SOLUTION

§ 3. *Good Suggestions.*

However, warning voices have been heard. A sound critical scholar like Krom prefered attributing 3 'silly' cantos to Prapañca, poet of the Nāgarakṛtâgama himself and not to a hypothetical interpolator [68]).

Aichele in a very condensed paper [69]), Gonda [70]) and then Berg in

---

[64]) 1903 in ed. Bh.-Y.
[65]) ed. S.D. Bibl. Jav. 3, 1931; TBG 72, 1932, p. 199.
[66]) Gunning prunes 12 %, Poerbatjaraka more than 20 %.
[67]) BKI 104, 1951, p. 204.
[68]) FBG I 1929.
[69]) Altjavanische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Wunschbaumes, Festschrift Meinhof Hamburg 1927 or Oudjavaansche Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van den wenschboom, DJAWA, 8, 1928.
[70]) Het verraad van Salya in het Bhārata-Yuddha, TBG 72, 1932, p. 610.

his elaborate studies on the Çiwa-hymn of the Arjuna-Wiwāha [71]) and its initial verses [72]) will have made it clear to every student in this field, that some passages at least in the Old-Javanese Kakawins were just meant to be difficult and ambiguous, highly artificial and perhaps even misleading.

Aichele even gave us "Fundamental Remarks for the Interpretation of Kawi" [73]), not only in the paper of this name, but also in his "Outward Form of Kawi-Prosody", as early as 1926 [74]). Here he pointed to the occurrence in OJR of Sanskrit *alaṅkāras* as these are dealt with in the Sanskrit textbooks on prosody etc. He showed the existence of *Anuprāsa, Yamakas, Rūpaka, Utprekṣā, Apahnuti* or *Nirhnuti* & *Upamā* [75]).

Galestin in his paper "Aanteekeningen over de Arjuna-Wiwāha op Tjaṇḍi Djago" [76]) — which mausoleum dates from ± 1268 according to Krom in his "Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche Kunst" [77]) — makes it more than probable that some stanzas branded in Poerbatjaraka's translation as being interpolated cannot be dispensed with for a sound 'reading' (interpretation) of the text-in-sculpture; in this way the 'interpolation' is either forced back to a very early time (much earlier than Poerbatjaraka is generally inclined to assume), or points towards the genuineness of these passages.

The Javanese student, Prijono, when writing his thesis [78]) to obtain

---

[71]) De Çiwa-hymne van de Arjuna-Wiwāha, BKI 90, 1933, p. 173-238.

[72]) De Arjunawiwāha. Erlangga's levensloop en bruilofslied? BKI 97, 1938, p. 19-94.

[73]) Grundsätzliches zur Kawi-Interpretation, FBG I, 1929.

[74]) OLZ, 29, p. 933-9; De Vorm der Kawi-Poezie, DJAWA 11, 1931.

[75]) Daṇḍin's Poetik (Kāvyâdarça) Sanskrit und Deutsch herausgegeben von O. Böhtlingk, Leipzig, 1890: *Anuprāsa* (ein Nebeneinanderstehen von Worten mit organisch verwandten Consonanten in der Weise, daas man bei jedem beliebigen Klange — er komme aus diesem oder jenem Organ — Gleichartiges vernimmt) I, 44, 52-60. *Apahnuti* (Leugnung von etwas allgemein Angenommenem und Behauptung von etwas Entgegengesetztem) II. 6, 304-22. *Utprekṣā* (witzige Deutung) II. 5, 221-34. *Upamā* (Gleichniss) II. 4, 14-65. *Yamaka* (Wiederkehr einer grösseren Anzahl von Silben unmittelbar nach einander oder erst nach anderen Silben) III. 1-52. *Rūpaka* (das zu etwas Anderem Erhebende) II. 4, 14, 66-96. — These 6 *alaṅkāras* are so frequently applied that they make up for nearly 30 % of the contents of Daṇḍin's Kāvyâdarśa (Böhtlingk's edition, text + translation: 125 pp.) — In the meantime it remains to be investigated, whether Daṇḍin or one of his colleagues was a source of inspiration and normalisation for the Javanese poets; also, what they borrowed and what they rejected. — Cp. also S. K. Belvalkar, Kāvyâdarśa of Daṇḍin, Sanskrit Text and English Translation, Poona 1924.

[76]) BKI 97/1, 1938.

[77]) 1923, II, p. 55.

[78]) Sri Tañjung, The Hague, 1938.

the Leiden Ph. D. degree, adding some 'theses' to it according to Dutch University custom, was prepared to defend the following one as No. 11: — "It is undesirable to call 'interpolated' those passages in Old-Javanese Kakawins (,) which apparently are not related to the plot, before a comparative investigation has been made between the requirements to which these Kakawins must conform, especially as to the alaṅkāras, and those which are in force for the Indian kāvyas."

When editing and translating the Kakawin Nirartha-Prakṛta in 1951 [79]), Poerbatjaraka deemed it unnecessary to discuss the problem of interpolation again. For him this was solved. But Teeuw deliberately translated the complete Bhauma-Kāwya [80]), edited, translated and annotated the complete Hari-Waṅśa [81]) in the hope of adding at least more material for the ultimate solution of the problem, which he too considers to be not yet definitely settled.

In 1934, as No. 1 of the Greater India Studies, there appeared a useful compilation by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar: "Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali" [82]). Dutch students were not very enthusiastic about it [83]), failing however to substitute anything better, failing also fully to profit from it: for in his chapter on the Rāmāyaṇa the author mentions sarga II verse 19 — I quote Sarkar — "When the poet, like the author of the Bhaṭṭikāvyam, says: — 'There was no water-place which was without lotuses. There were no lotuses which were not full of bees, and the bees were buzzing. There were no bees which would allow their songs to go unheard', and so on."

In 1936, another Indian scholar, Manomohan Ghosh, wrote an article in the Journal of the Greater India Society under the heading: — On the Source of the Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin" [84]). He had been struck by three passages, first that quoted by Sarkar (OJR II. 19 = BhK II. 19), secondly by the description of Rāvaṇa's appearance in the guise of an ascetic (OJR V. 65—67 = BhK V. 61—4), thirdly by that of the conversation between Sītā and Rāvaṇa (OJR V. 69—73 = BhK V. 65—9).

After the first śloka Ghosh remarks: — "The striking similarity between the two passages, even after one of them has had to pass

[79]) BKI 104.
[80]) 1946, Wolters, Groningen.
[81]) VKI 9, 1950.
[82]) Greater India Society, Calcutta.
[83]) C. C. Berg, Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology for 1934, Vol. IX, 1936, p. 39-50. J. Gonda, De Indische Gids, July 1935, p. 637-43. F. H. van Naerssen, Museum 42, 1935, No. 11.
[84]) JGIS III p. 113-7.

through the media of two different languages, convinced me that this similarity might not be quite accidental and that Yogîśvara, the author of the *Kakawin,* was most probably acquainted with the Bhaṭṭi-kāvya itself."

After the following three ślokas Ghosh speaks about expressions [in the OJR] "Marvellously similar to those in the corresponding passages of the Bhaṭṭi-kāvya", and goes on to say: — "One can easily notice that expressions ... in Bhaṭṭi ... have been almost literally translated in the *Kakawin,* the author of which appears to have taken as much from the Bhaṭṭi as he could easily assimilate in his own work. A literal versified translation is surely an almost impossible task. Thus it may be assumed that Yogîśvara while writing the *Kakawin* had the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya* before him and adopted the theme of the latter in its details and, as often as possible, number of expressions as well."

Finally after comparing the last 5 ślokas mentioned, he concludes: — "Now the Bhaṭṭi-strophes, quoted above, show beyond doubt that the author of the *Kakawin* has deliberately copied the contents of the *Bhaṭṭi* and at times made a literal translation of some of the expressions. Due to the fact that Sanskrit strophes of *Bhaṭṭi* had sometimes to be expanded and sometimes original strophes were composed, the number of strophes in the *Kakawin* and the *Bhaṭṭi* is not identical. The former work contains 2771 strophes and the latter only 1624 (footnote: Dr. Poerbatjaraka thinks that some interpolations occur in the *Kakawin.* This may be one of the reasons for its greater bulk. See *Indian Influences* p. 173)."

Ghosh ends by saying: — "An examination of cantos VI-XX of the *Kakawin* [in those days Juynboll's translation had not proceeded further than that] reveals that unlike the first five ones their subject matter does not correspond canto by canto to that of the *Bhaṭṭi,* and moreover the *Kakawin* has 26 cantos while the *Bhaṭṭi* has only 22."

"Thus we can conclude finally that the *OJR* is partially a translation and partially an adaptation of the *BhK* and has nothing to do with the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, or its conjectured extinct translation in the OJ (footnote: — For conjectures about the origin of the *Kakawin* see Indian Influences p. 174)."

These conclusions, based upon comparison of 9 ślokas and some pages of extracts, were certainly somewhat rash and were insufficient proof, more guess than proof — to a great extent however, they prove to hit the nail on the head. Nevertheless for our purpose general comparison is not sufficient; what we want is a stanza by stanza com-

parison to know exactly how the relation between the two recensions stands. I undertook the task of making a complete translation, in the making of which I profited greatly from the encouragement and generous help given to me by my colleague C. A. Rylands. Only $^1/_3$ [85]) of the BhK had been translated, 545 out of a total of 1625 stanzas, to which recently 67 stanzas (4%) have been added by professor John Brough [86]). The OJR has been completely rendered into Dutch [87]), with the exception of only a few minor passages [88]), together being not more than 161 stanzas out of a total of 2774. The evidence thus gained shows Ghosh's conclusions to be justified.

§ 4. *Dr. Bulcke's results.*

When the making of my translation was nearly completed, it was interrupted for a considerable length of time by my visit to India in 1953, where I had the great advantage of meeting Dr. Camille Bulcke S.J., the author of several recent articles on various aspects of the Rāmāyaṇa [89]). He proved to have written a thesis for the degree of Ph. D., University of Allahabad, in 1950, which had been printed there in Hindī as Rāma-Kathā. He has compared the complete OJR in its Dutch translation with the BhK, and he has established the close relation between the two, which goes as far as (roughly) the first two thirds. He kindly sent me the English translation of his § 224 p. 182 on Bhaṭṭi-kāvya or Rāvaṇa-vadha (500—650 A.D.) and § 299 p. 232 on the Old Rāma-story of Indonesia. His conclusions, based upon investigation of the complete texts, state the dependence of OJR on BhK, and consist of an enumeration of peculiarities of BhK in comparison with other Rāmāyaṇa-texts and in common with the OJR.

Bulcke's field is a very vast one and a comparison between the details of OJR and BhK such as we need for our purpose was outside his

[85]) Several translations to Bhaṭṭikāvya I-V; Bidhubhushan Goswami MA Calcutta 1907, Canto XII; C. Schütz, Fünf Gesänge des Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya, 1837, Bielefeld, XVIII-XXII.

[86]) Prof. John Brough, in Selections from Classical Sanskrit Literature, with English translation and notes, London, Luzac, 1951, gives XIX and XX.

[87]) Mentioned at length in note 29-30.

[88]) XII, 4-30; XXIV 97-123; XXV 7-34, 40-9, 55-117; XXVI 11-6.

[89]) The Three Recensions of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa, The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, Vol. XVII part 1, Sept, '47. The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras, 1949, p. 1-32. An Indonesian Birth-Story of Hanumān, Journal Oriental Institute Baroda III, 2, Dec. 1953, p. 147-51. The Repudiation of Sītā, Journal Oriental Institute Baroda I, 1952, p. 48-50. The Genesis of the Bālakāṇḍa, Journal Oriental Institute Baroda, II, 4, June 1953, p. 327-31. La Naissance de Sītā, BEFEO XLVI, 1, Paris/Hanoi, 1952, p. 107-17.

scope. In the next § Detailed Comparison of Examples & Imitation, the facts to which he has pointed will be reviewed (§ 5. e).

Before proceeding, however, attention must be drawn to the fact that already Poerbatjaraka had pleaded for recognition of Yogîśwara's great knowledge of Sanskrit (Kern had denied him any knowledge of it). Following my objections to Poerbatjaraka's theory of interpolation it seems only decent to point to his keen gift of observation and to his sound argumentation, on the first occasion that offers itself.

III. DETAILED COMPARISON OF EXAMPLE AND IMITATION

§ 5. *The Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya. Form.*

a) The handbooks on Indian Literature: Winternitz, Keith and Dasgupta + De do not fail to instruct us concerning the age and character of this remarkable poem. The author, Bhaṭṭi used the well known story of the Rāmāyaṇa (Rāvaṇa-vadha, i.e. Killing of Rāvaṇa) in order to demonstrate with his verses the difficulties of grammar and the possibilities of literary embellishment (*alaṅkāra*). In taking this familiar theme he made it definitely less difficult for his pupils — readers are here not so much the category concerned — to learn the whole subject by heart, as the thread was already known to them. He managed to make verses, though he was mainly concerned with special cases of — and exceptions to Pāṇiṇi's rules on aorist, future, etc. For thirteen centuries at least this struggle between poet and teacher has enjoyed wide-spread attention throughout India, not less than thirteen commentaries have gained a reputation in the course of those centuries, and the text is still studied and printed even today. Bhaṭṭi's Rāvaṇa-vadha is not only a *kāvya,* one of many, but is numbered among the few *mahā-kāvya* of Indian literature; it became popularly known under the name Bhaṭṭi-kāvya, just as Māgha's Śiśupāla-vadha became known as Māgha-kāvya, and apparently as Candragomin's grammar (vyākaraṇa) became the Candra-vyākaraṇa = Canda-Kiraṇa (in Indonesia) [90]).

[90]) Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, Literary & Epigraphical Notes, JGIS III, 1. 1936, p. 108-12. I. A Sanskrit Grammar of Bengal in Java. Same author: Cultural Contact between Java & Bengal, Indian Historical Quarterly, 13, 1937, p. 589-99. Cp. H. H. Juynboll, Suppl. Cat. Jav. Mad. MSS., U.L.L. I 1907, p. 170-2; H. Kern, Verspreide Geschriften IX, 1920, p. 273-83; Dr. N. J. Krom, Het Çiwaïsme van Midden-Java, Med. Kon. Ak. v. Wet. Afd. Lett. Dl. 58, Serie B No. 8, 1924,

Indians of more recent days like Dasgupta + De have their objections to attributing much poetical value to Bhaṭṭi's great achievement, going further than Keith in 1920. It has occured to me that nobody has criticised the way in which Bhaṭṭi has skimped his concluding chapters, where he mentions episodes and then treats them sparingly, and in the second half of XIV. 1: *vimohya māyā-maya-Rāma-murdhnā, Sītām anīkaṁ prajighāya yoddhum* = [Rāvaṇa] deluded Sītā with a fictitious head of Rāma and sent out his army to fight — refers only to an episode, which both Vālmīki (VI. 31—3) and Yogiśwara (XVII. 1—60) deemed necessary to treat at length. Bhaṭṭi's method here does not harmonise well with Daṇḍin's instruction in his Kāvyâdarśa I. 18, that a *mahā-kāvyam* should be *a-saṅkṣiptam* (not condensed).

b) There is nothing exceptional in Bhaṭṭi's dividing his Rāvaṇa-vadha into 22 sargas, e.g. according to Daṇḍin's Kāvyâdarśa I. 18 (*mahākāvyam*) *sargair an-ati-vistīrṇaiḥ* (*upetam*) "that a classical poem should be divided into not-too-circumstantial sections."

c) The number of verses in a sarga is rather unequal: —

Number of sarga	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Raghu-Vaṅśa	95	75	70	88	76	86	68	94	82	87	93	
Kumāra-Sambhava	61	64	76	46	86	95	95	91	51	60	49	
Kirātârjunīya	46	59	60	38	52	47	40	57	78	63	81	
Rāvaṇa-Vadha (BhK)	27	55	56	45	108	143	108	131	137	74	47	
Śiśupāla-Vadha	75	118	82	68	69	79	75	71	87	91	67	
Naiṣadhīya	145	110	136	123	138	113	108	109	159	138	128	

Number of sarga	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	total
Raghu-Vaṅśa	104	79	87	103	88	81	52	57				1565
Kumāra-Sambhava	58	50	50	53	50	56						1091
Kirātârjunīya	55	71	65	53	64	64	48					1041
Rāvaṇa-Vadha (BhK)	87	50	113	123	42	112	42	30	37	23	25	1625
Śiśupāla-Vadha	77	69	88	130	85	69	80	120	77			1678
Naiṣadhīya	113	56	102	93	131	222	155	67	162	164	155	2828

p. 5 sqq. Gonda in his Sanskrit in Indonesia, Nagpur, 1952, does not mention this Grammar; it is not evident whether he has doubts about it or whether he has simply overlooked it.

d) Bhaṭṭi finishes his *sargas* with the usual 1 or 2 stanza(s) of a different metre (according to Daṇḍin in his Kāvyâdarśa I. 19a, that a *mahā-kāvyam* should be (*sargair*) *sarvatra bhinna-vṛttântair* (*upetam*); he uses Aśvalalita, Indravajra, Puṣpitâgra, Pṛthvī, Praharaṇakalikā, Praharṣiṇī, Mandākrāntā, Mālinī & Śārdūlavikrīḍitā. Praharaṇakalikā is only used by Bhaṭṭi and Yogiśvara.

e) Variation in metre also is usual; BhK is always in a middle-position.

Kāvya and Kakawin	No. of diff. met.	Total no. stanzas	variation of metres	var. met. per stanza
Raghu-Vaṅśa	19	1565	62 ×	1 : 26
Kumāra-Sambhava	13	1091	42 ×	1 : 26
Kirātârjunīya	24	1041	109 ×	1 :<10
Rāvaṇa-Vadha (BhK)	23	1625	103 ×	1 : 16
Śiśupāla-Vadha	41	1678	120 ×	1 : 14
Naiṣadhīya	19	2828	171 ×	1 : 16
O.J. Rāmāyaṇa	**81**	2774	**281** ×	1 :<10

f) Bhaṭṭi is also conventional — though the Sanskrit handbooks fail to stress this peculiarity of the *kāvyas,* unless I have overlooked it — in using one *sarga* for showing off his versatility in using a great variety of metres.

Kālidāsa	in his	Raghu-Vaṅśa	sarga IX	changes	13 ×
(„	„	Kumārasambhava	„ XII	„	4 ×)
Bhāravi	„	„ Kirātârjunīya	„ V	„	30 ×
Bhaṭṭi	„	„ Rāvaṇa-Vadha	„ X	„	39 ×
Māgha	„	„ Śiśupāla-Vadha	„ IV	„	50 ×
Śrī Harṣa	„	„ Naiṣadhīya	„ XII	„	46 ×

g + h) Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya is distinguished from the other *kāvyas* in two respects, and on these two points its successor and imitator (at least; up to a certain degree) OJR deserves extra attention.

g) Whereas Daṇḍin's Kāvyâdarśa I. 14 prescribes for a *mahā-kāvya*: — *āśīr-namaskriyā vastu-nirdeśo vâpi tan-mukham* (that the beginning of a classical poem should consist of a prayer/wish/benediction, worship/adoration or an exposé) our Rāvaṇa-Vadha begins with Rāma's father and the preparations to obtain male offspring, resulting in Rāma's birth. Yogiśwara here followed his example faithfully. (The other OJ. Kakawins — as far as is known to me — without exception

have their initial *maṅgala,* and an intricate one too! thereby proving that their poets were not inspired by Yogîśwara's Rāmāyaṇa only, but must have been conversant either with Indian poetics or with Indian *kāvyas,* or possibly with both of them).

h) Notwithstanding the numerous changes in metre, there remains a predilection for Vaktra/Anuṣṭubh/Śloka, being ¾ of the stanzas in this textbook. In § 7 e) we shall see how Yogîśwara choose just the opposite order.

N.B. The value of statistical methods largely depends upon the materials chosen and the way in which the dates have been handled. The treatment of the data I think is so simple, that no mishaps can have occurred here; the material, however, was not *chosen* but *found,* to be perfectly frank, in Kühnau, Metrische Sammlungen aus Stenzler's Nachlass, ZDMG 44, 1890, p. 1—82. They had only to be transposed, and (being so easily accessible) saved a considerable amount of time. I doubt whether a real choice would have been any more convincing or more worth while as to the results obtained. As it happened I found just what I needed.

§ 6. *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya: Contents.*

Whereas the outward appearance of the BhK had to be compared to the other Sanskrit *kāvyas,* and incidentally with the OJR — a subject reserved for the next § — the pecularities of its contents cannot be compared here with the hundreds of other Rāmāyaṇas. One of the two most outstanding versions must be chosen, and since Tulsi Dās' is far too modern, Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa has been taken, as if it were the prototype or standard. In fact it has attained an authoritative standard and is easily obtainable in print, in Sanskrit and in English and in Jacobi's German extracts.

Though in this § we should only be concerned with the contents of the BhK, in practice it is more satisfactory to discuss at the same time the corresponding peculiarities/deviations in OJR. The differences between BhK & OJR will be put together in § 8. As mentioned in § 4, Dr. Bulcke has already pointed in his book to most of the issues raised here.

a) BhK I. 3. Daśaratha is mentioned as being a Śiva-worshipper. So also in OJR I. 7. Dr. Poerbatjaraka o. c. p. 169—71 lays due stress on the 'almost fanatical' Śivaitic spirit breathed throughout the whole OJR, which is demonstrated at every possible occasion. This Śivaitic

tendency in BhK might perhaps be one of the reasons why Yogîśwara felt inclined to take just this *mahākāvya* as his example; its character as a textbook mainly of Sanskrit grammar is not likely to have inspired him.

b) BhK I. 13. At the sacrifice of Daśaratha no god appears, but Daśaratha's queens eat the remains of the burnt offering. OJR I. 31 says exactly the same thing, but Kern made a mistake in his translation [91]: "De overige groote Ṛṣi's die hulde bewezen met een volledig heerlijk offer van wat gezondheid bevordert door geur en smaak, ook zij werden gespijzigd door de gemalinnen des Konings." Some years ago a Balinese friend, I Wayan Bhadra, author of the interesting booklet on Mabasan [92] or the Study of Old-Javanese on the Island of Bali, wrote me a letter about this passage, the translation of which, he and his friends questioned. Their proposed translation was 'that the remains of the food, presented to the ṛṣis, but not eaten by them were distributed among the queens, who promptly conceived'. It is interesting to read how Wayan Bhadra adds, by way of support to his boldness in modifying Kern: — "Just as is still being practised by us in similar circumstances."

c) BhK II. 21. Instead of Balā & Atibalā as in Vālmīki, the sciences Jayā & Wijayā are mentioned. OJR II. 22. adds two more mantras, taught to Rāma & Lakṣmaṇa: Atidurjayā & Jayantī.

d) BhK II. 43. Only Rāma's marriage is mentioned. The same in OJR II. 63.

e) BhK IV. 34—V. 3. Both Rāma & Lakṣmaṇa kill Khara, Dūṣaṇa & the (14,000) rākṣasas. The same in OJR IV. 67—V. 6.

f) BhK VI. 41. Rāma meets Jaṭāyu for the first time AFTER the stealing of Sītā. OJR VI. 65.

g) BhK XI. 3-33. The love-play of the Rākṣasas. Bhaṭṭi includes this passage, non-essential to the plot of the poem, in order to demonstrate *mādhurya*. Yogîśwara XII. 3-45 follows his example faithfully. This passage is a key-stone, for the finding of which I was studying the BhK, since Juynboll and Poerbatjaraka consider it with equal horror, declaring it to be untranslatable & unworthy of their poet. Moreover, Poerbatjaraka cuts out some stanzas which Juynboll keeps, accepting on the other hand stanzas which Juynboll has rejected, with

---

[91] I. 31 in BKI 73, 1917, p. 5; reprinted in VG X, 1922, p. 84.
[92] Cp. note 17.

extremely clever and astucious arguments. The presence of this description in the BhK makes all these speculations invalid.

h) BhK XII. 1 Wibhīṣaṇa honours and consults his mother, OJR XIII. 3-15.

i) BhK XII. 80. In accordance with the Bengali & N. W. versions, Rāwaṇa gives Wibhīṣaṇa a kick, OJR XIV. 59.

j) In BhK & OJR only one council is held at Laṅkā (BhK XII, OJR XIII & XIV).

k) Instead of Brahma it is Śiva who reminds Rāma of his Brahmahood, BhK XXI. 16, OJR XXIV. 200.

l) The fate of some rākṣasas in the BhK & OJR deviates from that in Vālmīki, cf. App. IV.

m) Both BhK & OJR stop with the Yuddha-kāṇḍa in Vālmīki.

§ 7. *Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa. Form.*

a) Dr. Poerbatjaraka adds considerably to the value of his study "Het OJR" in TBG 72, 1932, p. 151—214 by adding his three appendices mentioned previously.

Kern's edition is not easily available, and when obtained partially difficult to follow; the same must be admitted for the Dutch translation, scattered over 17 issues of a learned paper. For these reasons a table of contents has been made and added to this study as Appendix I. Not only the contents from the OJR have been extracted, but also the corresponding *sargas* I-XIII of BhK have been taken into account; where they completely failed us (i.e. where OJR added stanzas to its prototype), the failing = added passage has been put into italics; where the connection was loose, the numbers only have been put into italics. For the last part comparison with Vālmīki has been added.

A second table had to be added, but constructed the other way round, first giving the complete number of stanzas in BhK I-XIII, followed by the corresponding numbers in OJR. It will not be necessary to stress for those conversant with the peculiarities of *Kāvyas* & *kakawins,* that this close comparison of a textbook/*mahākāvya* in Sanskrit with (we-do-not-yet-know-what-kind-of) a *kakawin* in OJR, is rather a hazardous undertaking. Details may have been overlooked or, on the other hand, have been stressed too much. It is partly meant to be a means of orientation, to form an indispensable basis for discussion & further research, but it will appear that more may be deduced from it. Here, reference to Vālmīki could also easily be added.

The first mentioned table could also be used to give a clear idea concerning the metres used in OJR, the *rasa* & *bhāva* of the passages (Daṇḍin I. 18), the frequency of variation and the unusual variety of metres, which will be discussed in this §. Those metres of which the names are mentioned in this text have been put into italics.

b) OJR acceptedly consists of XXVI *sargas,* only 4 more than the Naiṣadhīya, which contains roughly as many verses, or BhK which deals with the same story and which served as the example. To begin with BhK IX = OJR IX + X; BhK XII = OJR XIII + XIV; BhK XIII = OJR XV + XVI. Moreover, OJR XVII + XVIII — XIX. 11 are an addition to BhK. The battle until Rāwaṇa's death is narrated in BhK XIV—XVII, 4 *sargas* out of *22*; in the OJR XIX—XXIII = 5 out of 26 — which is the same proportion. The number of stanzas used for the battle in BhK is 390/1625 = 24%; in OJR 645/2774 = 23% — which is also the same proportion. But the way of dealing with the story's conclusion is not in keeping: Bhaṭṭi hurries through it in 5 exceptionally short *sargas,* altogether 167/1625 stanzas, 10% of the whole poem; OJR spends not completely 3 *sargas* on the dénouement (Rāwaṇa dies XXIV. 27), 402/2774 stanzas, which seems to be nearly 15% of the whole poem, but is actually a little bit more, as in the final *sarga* the poet uses several very lang Daṇḍaka-stanzas. At the moment no more need be said about the division into *sargas.*

c) The number of stanzas in the single *sargas* of the OJR offers nothing remarkable; 62. 78. 86. 76. **89**. **203**. 113. **215**. (93. 72.) 96. 65. (97. 70.) (69. 47.) 138. 52. 131. 80. **248**. 89. 85. 260. 117. 52.[93])

d) Dr. Poerbatjaraka o. c. p. 180—5 is much worried about the fact that not all *sargas* end as they should, according to the *kāvya*-principle, with one or two final stanzas of a different metre. He is quite right, but the discovery that BhK is the example for OJR can put him perfectly at ease again.

To begin with, *sarga* V seems to consist only of 1—89 Rajanī,

[93]) It will appear from the next § d, that probably 27 stanzas, now forming the beginning of *sarga* VI, should be considered to be the end of *sarga* V; then pro 89. 203 we should read 116. 176. Moreover in *sarga* VIII one single stanza is lacking in Kern's edition; if this stanza 135 is not to be found in any MS., then we have to take the total as 214. The same applies to *sarga* XXI, where 93-7 are missing, reducing the total from 248 to 243. None of these alterations are of any consequence — but see App. V. More important is the possibility that *sargas,* which we find as entities, should be taken together, (IX + X, XIII + XIV, XV + XVI at least according to § d infra) reducing the total of the *sargas* from 26 to 23 or even less — but even this major operation is not necessarily essential.

without any final stanzas. The Variae Lectiones to Kern's edition shed no light here. Dr. P. Voorhoeve, adiutor interpretis Legati Warneriani, Leiden University Library, was kind enough to examine 5 more Balinese MSS of the OJR in this respect, but all of them ended *sarga* V at exactly the same stanza, with exactly the same words in exactly the same metre as in Kern's edition. But — as can be seen from the concordance — the end of the narrative in BhK V coincides with OJR VI. 27 Puṣpitâgrā, a metre which Yogîśwara also used as the conclusion for the preceeding *sarga* IV (in I-III he uses Mālinī). In § 5 d it has been pointed out that Puṣpitâgrā is the concluding verse in BhK; actually it is a feature common to all the *kāvya* that have been used for comparison. So it seems not too dubious to surmise, that at some early date in the copying of the OJR an error has crept in here — apparently there is no reason for a deliberate reshaping of the division into *sargas* — and has maintained itself in many a copy. It remains to be investigated, whether indeed all existing MSS of the OJR — I expect there are many scores of them in Bali — reveal the same error; the placing of the rather easily-found words, *iti pañcamah sargga,* might prove to be the first and handiest shibboleth in further OJR-investigations.

There might be still some hesitation in accepting the possibility of this error in the venerated and generally well-preserved text of OJR, and it might not be superfluous to remind readers that as early as 1929 Aichele pointed to the early mistakes common to all OJR-MSS; his article: Grundsätzliches zur Kawi-Interpretation, which appeared in the Dutch publication, FBG I, p. 1—21, has been used by both Dr. Juynboll and Dr. Poerbatjaraka and has not been disputed; (nor, I am afraid to say, paid sufficient attention to). I think his argumentation is perfectly well-founded.

As a consequence I hope that in the next edition of the OJR, *sarga* V—VI will be slightly rearranged and will look as follows; V. 1—89 Rajanī. 90—107 Vaṅśastha. 108—115 Śārdūlavikrīḍitā. 116 Puṣpitâgrā. VI. 1—36 Mālinī; 37—86 Anuṣṭubh (Vaktra, Śloka); 87—102 Turagagati; 103—32 Vasantatilakā; 133—44 Śikhariṇī; 145—68 Upajāti; 169—70 Indravajra; 171 Upendravajra; 172—3 Citralekhā; 174 Dodhaka; 175 Tanumadhyā; 176 Mattamayūra (There is a slight divergence between the names given by Kern in 1900 and by Poerbatjaraka in 1932; P. here corrected Kern).

Dr. Poerbatjaraka's next worry concerned *sarga* XIII: 1—18 Rucira; 19—97 (end) Vaṅśastha. We have already seen that OJR XIII—XIV

together = BhK XII; this splitting up of a *sarga* which was not too long (XIV has only 70 stanzas, and XIII 97, whereas XXI has 248, XXIV even 260) has been done without apparent reason and without proper care; it is a moot point, whether by the author or by a redactor/interpolator. This could be a second shibboleth for further OJR-investigation.

Finally OJR in the case of 5 *sargas* seems to suffer from an *excess of conclusive verses:*

IV. 3 verses of Puṣpitâgrā (a metre common to all our *kāvyas*).
XVI. 7 „ „ Prabhā (nowhere in our *kāvyas* used as a conclusive stanza).
XVII. 5 „ „ Mālinī (common to all our *kāvyas*).
XVIII. 8 „ „ Śikhariṇī (used in Kirātârjunīya & Śiśupāla-vadha).
XXV. 9 „ „ Aparavaktra (only used in Kāmandakīya Nītiśāstra, but not in our 6 *kāvyas*).

For it appears from more than 110 *sarga*-endings in our *kāvyas*, that only 1 or 2 conclusive stanzas of a *sarga* are of a different metre.

The exceptions, however, do not fail to appear:

Bhāravi's Kirātârjunīya VIII ends with 3 stanzas Vasanta-tilakā;
Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṅśa IX „ „ 7 „ Vasanta-tilakā;
śri Harṣa's Naiṣadhīya XV „ „ 10 „ Śārdūla-vikrīḍitā.

These exceptions, however, are far from numerous in our *kāvyas*, nor do they occur there where we need them most: in BhK, even though we may assume that Yogîśwara had not only studied the BhK. It seems appropriate, in this connection, to point to another peculiarity; the *amplification of the conclusive stanzas.*

The first step seems to be: two conclusive stanzas of different metre; Raghuvaṅśa VI runs as follows: 1—84 Indravajra, 85 Mālinī, 86 Puṣpitâgrā; cf. also XI, XIX; Kumāra-sambhava III, IV, XIV, XVI, XVII; Kirātârjunīya I, IV, VI, XI, XIV, Śiśupāla-vadha I, VII, XV, XX; Naiṣadhīya VI, X, XI, XVIII.

The second step is: not 1 *or* 2 but 1 + 2 (resp. 2 + 1) conclusive stanzas: Raghuvaṅśa V, XVI; Kirātârjunīya IX; Bhaṭṭi-kāvya XXI; Naiṣadhīya XIII, XVII. Or 3 mono-metric conclusive stanzas: Kirātârjunīya VIII.

The third step seems to be: 3 stanzas of different metre: Raghuvaṅśa XII; Kirātârjunīya II, Śiśupālavadha II, Naiṣadhīya I.

The fourth step could be: 4 stanzas of 2 different metres or of 3: Kirātârjunīya III, or of 4: Kumārasambhava XII.

Continuing in this way, we find in our *kāvyas* the following number of conclusive verses:

5: Raghuvaṅśa VIII; Kirātârjunīya III, IX, XVII; Śiśupālavadha [IX, XX.
6: Śiśupālavadha XVI.
7: Kirātârjunīya XV.
9: (Bhaṭṭikāvya II).
10: Kirātârjunīya XVI.
11: (Bhaṭṭikāvya XI).
12: (Bhaṭṭikāvya XXII); Naiṣadhīya XIX.
13: Śiśupālavadha VI.

In fact in several cases the number seems to be higher still, up to some 20; or, in other words, a certain amount of freedom which we find already as early as Kālidāsa's poems, in later times gave rise to complete freedom and the complete merging of the rules of *sarga* and concluding stanzas. Śri Harṣa's Naiṣadhiya may end every *sarga* with one stanza śārdūla-vikrīḍita, but what is one to think of: 1—142 Vaṅśastha, 143 Dodhaka, 144 Vasantalilakā, 145 Śārdūla-vikrīḍitā?

Amongst Indian theorists Daṇḍin in his Kāvyâdarśa I, 14—9 is rather vague on this point. Refering to the *sargas* of a *mahā-kāvya,* he prescribes that they should be *sarvatra bhinna-vṛttânta* (Böhtlingk: ... Kapitel, in denen ... der Schluss im Versmaass stets wechselt).

As a consequence we may draw this conclusion from this § 7 d: the absence of different final verses could be explained by comparison with BhK, and their apparent redundance in itself presents no difficulty either in the theory of such an authority as Daṇḍin or in the practice of our well known *kāvyas.* (It is out of the scope of the present investigations to examine, whether the final stanzas in some *sargas* of OJR are rightly suspected by Poerbatjaraka).

As the number of conclusive verses gives rise to some misunderstanding, it is advisable to have also a look at their kind of metre:

	OJR	Raghu-vaṅśa	Kumārā-sambhava	Kirātârjunīya	Bhaṭṭi-kāvya	Māgha-kāvya
Aparavaktra	1	—	—	—	—	—
Aśvalalita	1	—	—	—	1	—
Aupacchandasika	—	—	—	—	—	1
Indravajra	1	—	—	—	2	—
Indrâyudha	1	—	—	—	—	—
Utsara	—	—	—	—	—	1
Citralekhā	—	—	—	—	—	1
Dodhaka	1	—	—	—	—	—
Dhṛtaśrī	—	—	—	—	—	1
Nārācā	2	—	—	—	—	—
Puṣpitâgrā	2	2	3	—	3	—
Pṛthvī	1	—	—	—	1	—
Prabhā	1	—	—	—	—	—
Praharaṇakalikā	—	—	—	—	1	—
Praharṣiṇī	—	3	—	1	4	1
Mattamayūra	1	—	—	—	—	—
Mattā	1	—	—	—	—	—
Mandarakrāntā	1	6	1	—	2	2
Mahāmālikā	—	1	—	—	—	1
Mālinī	5	5	8	9	5	4
Rajanī	1	—	—	—	—	—
Vaṅśastha	1	—	—	—	—	—
Vasantatilaka	—	1	1	7	—	2
Śārdūlavikrīḍita	—	—	1	—	1	3
Śikhariṇī	1	—	—	1	—	1
Sragdharā	1	—	—	—	—	1
Hariṇī	—	1	3	—	—	1
Halamukhī	1	—	—	—	—	—
na × 7	1	—	—	—	—	—
different kinds used	19	7	6	4	9	13

The metres used in the final stanza.

Śri Harṣa's Naiṣadhīyā has been left out of the picture, because its poet was satisfied to use only Śārdūlavikrīḍita, as a concluding stanza to each and every *sarga*.

We could draw the following conclusions from this chart: there is considerable freedom for variety of choice of metre for the concluding stanza(s).

Mālinī (36 ×) enjoys pre-eminence; next comes Śārdūlavikrīḍita (5 + 22 ×), Puṣpitâgrā (10 ×), Mandarakrāntā (12 ×), Vasantalika (11 ×), Praharṣiṇī (9 ×), Sārdūlavikrīḍita (5 ×) & Hariṇī (5 ×).

Yogîśwara in the OJR uses most of the much-loved concluding metres, several of which are less frequently applied by the poets of our *kāvyas*, and nine of which are not used as such in our other *kāvyas*.

In choosing 19 different conclusive metres Yogîśwara definitely strove after more than the usual variety, as will appear still more strikingly in his choice of metres for the narrative parts.

e) The figures given in § 5e show nothing unusual in column 2 & 4, but the variation of metres (3) is considerably more frequent than in any of our *kāvyas*; the number of different metres (1) is double that of Māgha-k., and 4½ times as much as the average of the other *kāvyas*. No wonder that 7 of the 81 metres used have not yet been met with even in such a collection as Jayadāman.

OJR not only uses a large variety of metres, and changes them rather frequently, but it avoids using a single one of them so often that in the long run it would appear to have been preferred. (see p. 29).

These 17 metres are the most frequently used ones, in OJR as well as in our *kāvyas*; the other 64 different metres together are divided over 40% of the verses. The greatest amount of stanzas in one metre ever used in the OJR is Vaṅśastha, < 8%. The difference between our *kāvyas* is not only considerable, but OJR clearly in this respect is conceived differently. In the beginning we still find 60 Āryā (I), 77 Vasantatilaka (II), 89 Rajanī (V) & 79 Punarmada (VIII) — but that is the end, and beginning from here Yogîśwara went his own way in the choice and frequency of metres; how he used all of them can be seen in detail in the table of contents.

Musing over this state of affairs, and the fact that OJR's example is a textbook, one feels inclined to surmise that Yogîśwara in his turn has deliberately also written a textbook, not on grammar and *alaṅkāra* like his example, but on metrics. If that were true, he would have surpassed his example by far in accomplishing his task in such an

Frequence of metres in OJR, in comparison with our *kāvyas* (in % or verse).

	OJR	Raghu-vaṅśa	Kumārā-sambhava	Kirātârjunīya	BhK	Māgha-kāvya	Naiṣadhīya
Aupacchandasikā	4%	2 v.	—	3½%	7 v.	5%	—
Indravajra	1 v.	**37%**	**39%**	**<17%**	**>16%**	6½%	**28%**
Turagagati	3½%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Drutavilambita	>1%	3½%	2 v.	3%	5 v.	<4%	4%
Punarmada	<5%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Puṣpitâgrā	<1½%	4 v.	2 v.	<7%	2%	<5%	½ a 1%
Pṛthvī	>5%	—	—	—	1 v.	1 v.	1 v.
Pramitâkṣarā	3%	—	—	2½%	4 v.	5%	—
Mālinī	3%	<1%	<1%	>1%	½%	3½%	<1%
Rajanī	4½%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rathoddhatā	<2%	>9%	8½%	>4%	—	5%	5½%
Vaṅśastha	<8%	>4%	**<17%**	**>20%**	6 v.	9%	**<20%**
Vaktra (Anuṣṭubh)	<3%	**>35%**	**>24%**	**12%**	**74%**	**14%**	**>13%**
Vasantatilaka	<7%	<3%	>5%	2½%	—	5%	7½%
Vaitālīya	>2%	<6%	4%	6%	6 v.	>5%	>4%
Śārdūlavikrīḍita	<4%	—	1 v.	—	2 v.	4 v.	4%
Svāgatā	<3%	1 v.	1 v.	7%	—	5½%	9%

unobtrusive way; much less obtrusive also than the later Wṛtta-sañcaya of Tan-akung.

f) True to custom in *kāvyas,* OJR in *sarga* XXV shows 37 changes of metre, the average.

g) A Ms. page of a Javanese poetical text is as studded with letters as a South-Indian temple with images and carvings; no square inch has been left unused. Repeatedly the metre changes, and since neither the script nor this way of writing and printing offers the reader any possibility of getting an impression at a glance, a stratagem has been evolved. In the last line before a new metre, e.g. *sinom* begins, the word *anom* or *sinoman* is used by way of introduction or suggestion; in the last line before the new metre *pañkur* begins, the word *muñkur* or *puñkur* is used etc. Now the reader knows how to sing or chant.

OJR also inserts the name of its metre, but, curiously enough, either

at the end of the 4th line of one of the first stanzas of a new metre, or even in the last line of the whole group of stanzas where this metre has been used. So VII. 54 d has as its last word *Śārdūla-vikrīḍitā,* the name of the metre used in stanzas 43—54; and 56 d ends with the word *Tvaritagati,* the metre used in the stanzas 55—70; 71 ends with *Tanumadhyā,* the metre used in this one stanza of its kind. The method followed in Modern Javanese poetry seems definitely an improvement on the old one.

It is curious that only in 45 cases out of 282, OJR makes its metre known by this device, mainly in the *sargas* XVI—XXI. In the table of contents the names of metres inserted in the poem are put into italics. A system or reason could not be discovered; but roughly the frequent denoting of metres coincides with the battle scenes, only to end with the appearance of Prahasta, Rāwaṇa's right-hand man. This, however, is only an observation, not an explanation.

§ 8. *OJR. Contents.*

The pecularities which distinguish BhK + OJR from Vālmīki have been dealth with in § 6.

A detailed table of contents has been added as Appendix I; here one sees printed in italics nearly all stanzas which are not contained in BhK and which thus are additions in OJR. It is remarkable that from these numerous passages, several of them decidedly longish, some of them even repetitions, and one even offering a contradiction, only four stanzas, VI, 106—9, have been recognised as additions or interpolations by the four scholars who have studied the OJR. These passages deserve to be examined together.

It seemed advisable to split up the material chiefly into two main groups. For in reading the last third of OJR it becomes manifestly clear that Yogîśwara had freed himself completely from his prototype BhK and must have known another recension or other recensions. Which these are, even Dr. Bulcke could not find out. Detailed comparison of BhK/OJR shows us, that from the very beginning Yogîśwara was not dependent upon BhK only, but was in a position to narrate properly a situation which Bhaṭṭi considered as known to his students (names of Daśaratha's queens e.g.), or which were inappropriate for him (list of names of monkey & rākṣasa officers).

Though fully realising that some arbitrariness cannot be avoided, I distinguish mainly these 2 groups: II better narration, addition of detail,

amplification; III deliberate addition/insertion/interpolation of passages.

Finally it is not devoid of interest to investigate, which passages that exist in BhK have not been incorporated into OJR, or have been condensed, as this procedure might give us a better understanding of Yogîśwara's literary taste. They can be deduced from the figures given in Appendix II and are treated here to some extent in I, which group has been dealt with first since it offers no definite results.

I. *BhK passages condensed in OJR.*

III.	24—7,	29, Bh.'s anxiety over D.'s death.
	33—6,	Daśaratha's funeral.
VI.	65—8,	Rāma's enquiries about Śavarī's penance.
VII.	35—46,	Su.'s sending out Hanumat to Sītā.
IX.	26—38,	Akṣa's mission for Rāwaṇa against Hanumat.
	46—56,	Indrajit's mission for Rāwaṇa against Hanumat.
	78—89,	The rākṣasas having bound H., discuss his guilt.

None of these passages appear to have been left out in OJR, they have only been given shorter descriptions.

II. *Better narration, addition of detail, amplification.*

I.	5—9,	Description of Daśaratha & his excellent qualities.
	16—20,	Enumeration of Daśaratha's queens; comparison.
	27—30,	Description of the offering in order to obtain sons.
II.	49—52,	Sītā's birth and the *swayamwara* to be held.
	72—7,	Paraśurāma/Jāmadāgni at greater length.
IV.	60—5,	Śūrpanakhā at greater length to her brothers.
V.	6—9,	Śūrpanakhā at greater length to King Rāwaṇa.
	55—60,	Sītā at greater length to Lakṣmaṇa.
VI.	71—2,	Rāma's outburst of sorrow at Jaṭāyu's death.
	78,	Dīrghabāhu's true character; he is a god.
	105—12,	Śavarī-episode into greater detail [94]).
	163—5,	168—70, Struggle Sugrīwa-Wālin at greater length.
	196—203,	Better narration of events after Wālin's death.
VII.	44—6,	Sugrīwa offers apologies to Rāma on Mt. Mālyawān.
	67—8,	76—8, 87—9, Swayamprabhā-episode extended.

[94]) Kern, unable to trace 106-9 in Vālmīki, put them between square brackets. As appears from Van der Tuuk, Kawi-Bal.-Ned. Wdbk., III 840b, this episode was known in several OJ writings.

VIII.	19—20,	Wikaṭâkṣiṇī-episode better narrated.
	24,	29—31, 33—5, 37, 40, H.'s first impression of Laṅkā.
	62—6,	Description of the *rākṣasas* in Laṅkā.
	99—101,	107—11, Sītā in the *aśoka*-grove near Laṅkā.
	115—7,	Rāwaṇa's addresses to Sītā interrupted.
IX.	2—8,	The guardians of the *aśoka*-grove report to Rāwaṇa.
	14—30,	The first *rākṣasas* driven back by Hanumat.
	56—7,	(Daṇḍaka) Destruction of the *aśoka*-grove.
	61—81,	The fight between Indrajit/Meghanāda amplified.
	64—8,	Discussions after Hanumat's capture.
X.	16—22,	Hanumat's challenge to Rāwaṇa.
	27,	29, 33—5, 39, Rāwaṇa's answer to Hanumat.
	43—56,	155—8, Hanumat's new challenge to Rāwaṇa.
	69—72	(end), Hanumat's tail set on fire.
XI.	1—2,	(Daṇḍaka) Laṅkā's palaces set on fire.
XV.	1—12,	W.'s arrival in the monkey-army camp.
XXIII.	52—3,	67, Indrajit's seven wives fight with their husband & fall on the battle field [95]).
XXIV & XXVI.		show amplifications to Trijaṭā's rôle; cp. Appendix IV. A. II.

III. *Deliberate addition/insertion/interpolation of passages.*

III.	53—86,	Rāma preaches much Nītiśāstra to Bh. on his departure.
VI.	7—14,	Sītā, on being abducted by Rāwaṇa, laments.
	177—81,	186, 190—1, Ethical thoughts at Wālin's death.
VII.	1—2,	6—8, 12, 15, 19—20, 22—30, Rāma on Mt. Mālyawān, wailing.
VIII.	24,	29—31, 33—5, 37, 40, Hanumat's first impressions of Laṅkā.
	41—58,	Description of the (Śivaitic) temple in Laṅkā [96]).
	143—77,	Sītā's laments to her faithful guardian Trijaṭā.

---

[95]) Seven sisters (as here) belonging to the same husband, is a donnée well known from the Malay fairy-tales, e.g. Hikayat Malem Deman (Malay Literature Series, Singapore, Methodist Publishing House, Vol. 8), and has even penetrated into the Central Malay Chronicle, Sějarah Mělayu (ib. vol. 9, both repeatedly reprinted; the last mentioned also accessible in English translation by C. C. Brown, Journal Malayan Branch Royal Asiatic Society, parts 2 & 3, 1952, Singapore/London).

[96]) Poerbatjaraka o.c. p. 161-5 translates and *discusses* this addition.

205, corr. to XI. 21—32, Sītā's letter to Rāma by Hanuman [97]).

XI. 21—32, Rāma reads Sītā's letter, sheds tears etc. (33—8).

XV. 20—36, The uproar in the ocean after Rāma has shot his arrow.

39, Waruṇa's telling R. that he is a Wiṣṇu-awatāra.

45—68, The monkeys collecting building materials.

XVI. 23—46, Loveliness of Mt. Suwelā in Laṅkā [98]).

XVII. entirely (1—138), XVIII entirely (1—52) & XIX. 1—11.

To avoid repetition: consult Appendix I.

This voluminous addition of 201 stanzas begins with the episode of the fake heads of R. & L., to which BhK, XIV I only alludes (Vālm., VI. 31—3); *tato Daśâsyaḥ smara-vihvalâtmā, cāra-prakāśī-kṛta-śatru-śaktiḥ, vimohya māyā-maya-Rāma-mūrdhnā, Sītām anīkaṁ prajighāya yoddhum.* Then the love-troubled Rāwaṇa, having through spies perceived the enemy's force, deluded Sītā with a fictitious head of Rāma and sent out his army to fight. (Follows the episode in Prof. Brough's "Selections from Classical Sanskrit Literature" p. 104). Dr. Bulcke in this connections points to Abhiṣeka- & Mahā-Nātaka.

In his enlightening paper; "The Three Recensions of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa", (JOR XVII, 1 Sept. 1947, 1949, p. 1—32) Dr. Bulcke offers a useful "Comparative Table", where he takes the most widely spread recension, called Southern for lack of a better name, as a standard of comparison, and then makes notes for each Kāṇḍa separately:

A. the subject-matter present in the S. recension & absent from one or both of the others;

B. the subject-matter absent from the S. recension & present in one or both of the others;

C. other differences which cannot be classified under either A. or B., or which are of minor importance.

As a means of determining the origin of large parts of Yogîśwara's poem, this paper proved to be most promising; this subject, however, though important in itself, lies out of our scope here and now.

Perhaps I may give as my provisional impression, liable to correction, and for that reason not included in the next paragraph's "Conclusions",

---

[97]) Juynboll at first incorrectly translated the cardinal word in this passage.

[98]) Poerbatjaraka objects to the conclusive stanzas XVII, 134-8 & strikes out 135-8, and objects to those of XVII 45-52, where he sees no solution to his problem.

that Yogîśwara did not use a second source, but worked on his poem under the motto: "Je prends mon bien où je le trouve". Perhaps it will be possible one day to make acceptable that he mastered his considerable knowledge of Sanskrit in India itself, where he learned many Rāmāyaṇa's — a support to Bosch' thesis concerning Indonesian students going to India, as we know the Chinese did.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

a) *Concerning OJR.*

1. As Dr. Poerbatjaraka had concluded, Yogîśwara knew Sanskrit very well.
2. He made an OJR, initially in close connection with BhK, (Ghosh, Bulcke), but then, for reasons not yet clear to us, he abandoned his model in the last third of his work.
3. To conclude his poem he seems to have borrowed from the flotsam & jetsam of general knowledge concerning the Rāmāyaṇa that was current in those days in S. E. Asia; at least Dr. Bulcke could not discover a particular source.
4. He might have felt attracted to BhK, because of its outspoken śivaitic character, since this appears also manifestly in OJR, (Poerbatjaraka).
5. He may also have had a certain preference for BhK as a poem or it may have haunted him as a textbook.
6. The examples of Sanskrit grammar, however, in *sargas* I—IV, V—IX, XIV—end were of no use to him for the composition of a poem in the OJ language.
7. BhK X is on *alaṅkāra* (prosodical figures), XI on *mādhurya* (the quality of sweetness), XII on *bhāvika* (vivid description), three topics which are treated at some length in Daṇḍin's Kāvyâdarśa; Yogîśwara here still followed rather closely his example (though not so closely as in the first *sargas*, perhaps); then he inserted his XVII—XIX.11 and for the rest either kept his former example at a distance or even did completely without it. The reason? Only guesses can be made. He may himself as a student never have mastered the whole BhK. He may have worked with a MS, which was defective, became defective, got lost — etc. Perhaps Yogîśwara, working in a language without any connection with the grammatical niceties dealt with in XIV—end, lost interest.

8. As early as 1926 Aichele already pointed to Yogîśwara's use of *Anuprāsa, Yamakas, Upamās, Rūpaka, Utprekṣā, Apahnuti* or *Nihnuti*; in the preceeding §§ we have seen where Yogîśwara may have learned them. He may have learned more; this remains to be investigated, as this treatise must have its limit somewhere.
9. The difficult and artificial passages, which continued to arouse the suspicion of having been interpolated, even after the appearance of Aichele's pioneer articles, for the moment should be said to be part and parcel of Yogîśwara's magnum opus (and in consequence; should be added to the translations).
10. Not only the erotical passage of BhK XI = OJR XII proves to be common to the two poems, and consequently must be accepted to be genuine, not interpolated, even not elaborated, but furthermore we must be prepared generally speaking, to accept in these fields (8, 9 & 10) the Indian standards as laid down in BhK, and Bhaṭṭi's textbooks, (the latter, as will be known to Indianists, are not yet identified, perhaps they are lost, perhaps not yet recognised amidst the numerous Skr. MSS, of which the description has not yet been published). It remains to Aichele's credit to have postuated all this, Prijono's to have repeated it.

b) *The traditional distinction: OJR versus the other Kakawins.*

The situation at the moment is this: arguments have been adduced to prove a number of things concerning OJR. The whole argumentation gains considerably in importance as soon as it is acceptable that it holds good also for the other 50 or perhaps even 100 *kakawins*. Are they similar? Do they form one group indeed? It has never been denied, even though their dates of composition seem to be separated by 2 centuries. A scholar like Prof. Dr. R. M. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, who edited and translated Arjuna-Wiwāha, Smara-Dahana, Nirartha-prakṛta, and who translated the Bhārata-Yuddha, Nāgarakṛtâgama and Rāmāyaṇa, and who made extracts from Kṛṣṇāyana, Bhīma-Wiwāha, Sumanasântaka and Sutasoma [99]), always took this point of view. Aichele also took this for granted and adduced new material. Berg, Sarkar, Prijono, Teeuw (translator of Bhoma-kāwya, editor and translator of Hari-

[99]) Indonesische Handschriften door R. M. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjaraka, Dr. P. Voorhoeve en Dr. C. Hooykaas, Lembaga Kebudajaan Indonesia "Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen", 1950. Woord vooraf.

vańśa) maintain the same, not to forget Kern, Gunning and Stutterheim [100]).

There remains, however, one objection, one small impish "but":

O. J. Rāmāyaṇa	consists	of	26	poly-metric	*sargas,*	whereas:
Bhoma-kāwya	„	„	188	mono-metric	*cantos*	
Hari-wańśa	„	„	54	„	„	„
Smara-dahana	„	„	40	„	„	„
Arjuna-wiwāha	„	„	36	„	„	„
Bhārata-yuddha	„	„	52	„	„	„
Nāgarakṛtâgama	„	„	98	„	„	„

We are in the habit of taking the last mentioned 6 (+ the other *kakawins*) together, and separating OJR from them only because of the *sarga*/canto-question. The aim of this § IV. b is to prove, that this distinction is not relevant, that the first mentioned 6 are closer together than they are congenial and conform to Nāgarakṛtâgama-practice.

Comparison with the BhK, again makes the difficulties seem not insuperable, to say the least of it. For it becomes apparent that either Yogîśwara or a later redactor or even a copyist split up BhK IX into OJR IX + X, XII into XIII + XIV, XIII into XV + XVI, omitted to add (a) new conclusive verse(s) to the new XIII and the new ending of V. One gets the impression that the Indian theory concerning the division into *sargas* and the necessity of concluding verses had gradually been forgotten and got lost. Moreover, the freedom with which the Indian poets handled the subject of concluding verses was completely baffling for those who had to deduce the principle from the practice of our *kāvyas* or OJR. In the *kāvyas* the practice of concluding stanzas had extended to a dozen and even a score or . . . a complete *sarga*! And in OJR, repeatedly one stanza of a new metre was introduced somewhere inside a *sarga*. (We do not find this in Kālidāsa's two poems, but the later ones of our other *kāvyas* have many isolated stanzas).

In § 7 attention has been drawn to the fact that Yogîśwara, mainly following his example in the division into *sargas,* again broke them up into a much greater number of smaller entities (exactly to be compared to the so-called cantos of the *Kakawins*).

---

[100]) Cultuurgeschiedenis van Indonesië II. Het Hindoeïsme in de Archipel 2, 1951, Wolters, Groningen/Djakarta, p. 150-4.

App. III shows this much quicker and better than words can do.

The longer a *kāvya* is, the longer are the mono-metric passages it contains, and generally also the more of them there are (this, of course, can also be postulated the other way round). Kumāra-sambhava has only fairly long mono-metric passages and conclusive stanzas; Raghu-vaṅśa has a few small mono-metric passages; Kirātârjunīya, Śiśupāla-vadha and Naiṣadhīya also only a few. But here the practice of the "show-metres" or "show-*sargas*" makes its entry, and Naiṣadhīya, long as it is, on the one hand, and containing the greatest number of mono-metric passages and also the longest of them, on the other hand introduces quite a number of very short metrical passages. Bhaṭṭi-kāvya, the first *kāvya* to have mono-metric passages of every length, still fits in very well with our other *kāvyas*.

OJR maintains in great lines its model's division into *sargas* and also still contains not less than 11 passages of 40—90 mono-metric stanzas, but it splits up BhK's 6 longer passages into a considerable number of smaller ones. It cannot be said that OJR introduced a completely new procedure, but the whole effect upon the listener to this complete poem must have been considerably different. This becomes still more evident when we remember that: Bhaṭṭi-kāvya used 23 different metres, and did 74% in Vaktra (Anuṣṭubh), its "imitation" OJR, used 81 different metres and did $< 8\%$ at the most in one metre.

This only tends to prove that OJR, closely related as it is to BhK, *re* contents, in the field of variety of metres went in an opposite direction, largely developing possibilities which some of our *kāvyas* had underdeveloped, specially the didactic ones. Seen superficially, OJR with its 26 *sargas* completely fits in with our *kāvyas*; in fact, however, a process of disintegration of the larger mono-metric passages had already gone rather far.

O.-J. Rāmāyaṇa has some 268 metrical changes in 2774 stanzas, Bhoma-kāvya has some 118 cantos = 117 metrical changes in 1375 stanzas. The average is more or less the same. The picture of the mono-metric passages offers a striking resemblance. But Bhoma-kāvya shows no longer a trace of the *sarga*-structure; this was already *en décadence* in OJR, and seems never to have taken solid root on Javanese soil. There are still 7 one-stanza-cantos, 10 two-stanza-cantos — queer cantos indeed, apparently the remainder of (a) former conclusive or intermediary stanza(s). These separate stanzas soon became obsolete; Hari-wańśa, Smara-dahana and Arjuna-wiwāha still have a few of them, but that passes.

The great formal difference apparently lies not so much between OJR (divided into poly-metric *sargas*) and the other *Kakawins* (divided into mono-metric cantos), since that whole borrowed *sarga*-superstructure, and the feeling for long mono-metric passages proved to be uncongenial to Yogîśwara. It lies more between the first 6 *Kakawins* and Nāgarakṛtâgama: the difference between meat and minced meat; for that is the appearance of the Nāgarakṛtâgama's short cantos.

Nobody has ever objected to including Nāgarakṛtâgama in the category of *Kakawins*; nor do I, provided that, on the other side OJR be included without (more) reservations.

The Indian theory as expressed in Daṇḍin's Kāvyâdarśa, referred to earlier, does not weaken this point of view.

c) *Concerning O.-J. Kakawin.*

Once we accept the unity of the group of *Kakawins,* the conclusions drawn with reference to OJR must be accepted for them as well. It seems superfluous to repeat them; to be on the safe side, however, I must point to the possibility of interpolations, not because some passages are long-winded and consist of repetitions, not because they are difficult, artificial or erotical, not because they do not conform to our preconceived standards of literary taste and decency, but because a redactor liked them, or a pedant thought them indispensable. Yogîśwara himself added hundreds of verses in comparison with his example (§ 8). Why should this process have stopped with him, contrary to so many other Rāmāyaṇa-recensions? Only we should be less prejudiced and more cautious than before, specially in studying OJR, generally in studying OJ Kakawin.

APPENDIX I

Contents of OJR; metres used there.

(Bh. = Bhārata; D. = Daśaratha; H. = Hanuman; L. = Lakṣmaṇa; R. = Rāma; Rāw. = Rāwaṇa; S. = Sītā; Su. = Sugrīva; W. = Wibhīṣaṇa; Wi. = Wiśwāmitra).

(words in italics: not found in BhK; figures only in italics: contents of BhK slightly differently told; names of metres in italics: mentioned in the text).

1. 1–60 ārya. Excellent D. (1-10), king at Ayodhyā (11-5) *enjoys life and his 3 queens* (16-8), queens like the wedas (19), *already during many years* (20), but has no sons (21). Ṛṣyaśṛṅga's help invoked (22-3); his oblations (24-6), *continued* (27-9); *food to ṛṣis* (30) & leavings to the queens (31). Birth of R. (32), Bh., L. & Satrughna (33). *Ceremonies* (34). Wasiṣtha their guru (36-7). Wi., hindered by rākṣasas (39), goes to D. (40). Asked about his aim (41). Wi. asks for R.'s help (42-4). D. hesitates (45). Wi. repeats his demand by force of argument (*46*-51). D. still hesitates (52-5), at last gives in reluctantly (*56–7*). Wi. contented (58); L. accompanies R. (59), being an ideal younger brother (60).

61-2 mālinī. Early in the morning Wi. + R. + L. start under good omens.

2. 1–77 vasantatilaka. R. + L. are journeying in lovely autumnal conditions (1-19), welcomed at the hermitage (20), *amuse themselves* (*21*). Instruction (*22*). Rākṣasī Tāṭakā (*23*) at once slain (24); general relief (25-8); R. + L. honoured (*29*-30): R. + L. reply (31) and are prepared for more attacks by rākṣasas (*32*-5). Headman Mārīca (36), challenged by R. (*37*), answers (38-40); R. again (41-*2*), hurls him away (43), hailed by gods (44). Ascetics (45) hail R. as Wiṣṇu (46-8) *and tell him about the swayaṁwara of Sīṭā, daughter of King Janaka (49); the conditions bow-bending (50-2)*. R. +L. go to Mithilā (53); people of M. enraptured (54-5). Janaka gives the bow (56) which R. breaks (57). Janaka glad (58) & honest (59). D. invited (60), entertained (61), addressed by Janaka (*62-3*). S. appears (64); the marriage (65). D. R. L. & S. return (66) & meet a frightful ascetic (67), R. Bhārgawa (68), who challenges R. (69). D. (70) soothes (71) vainly (72); *R. Bh. goes on* (*73*). *R. courageous* (*74*), *challenges R. Bh.* (*75*). R. Bh. collapses (76) & flees (77).

	78	mālinī	D. glad and proud; people of Ayodhyā welcome D. R. L. & S.
3.	1–51	pṛthvītala	R. popular (1-2); will succeed (3); preparations (4-5). Bh.'s mother Kaikeyī jealous (6). Bh. ignorant (7). K. demands R.'s exile (8). D. gives in (9). Subjects indignant (10), R. quite prepared (11-3). *L. S. & Sumantri econduct R. (14).* Night-quarters at river Tamasā (15); *R. L. & S. escape, Sumantri sad (16),* returns to Ayodhyā (17) seriously distressed (18). D. very sad (19), *heart-broken (20)* lost to this life (21-2), dies (23). Mourning (24). Bh. recalled (25), comes home (26); indignant (27); reproaches his mother (*28-9*), sad (*30*), placated (*31*), burns his father's corpse etc. (32) starts for the forest (33). From Tamasā (34) to Ganges (35) & Yamunā (36); Bharadwāja's hermitage (37); pārijāta's (38) and Widadaris (39). Mandākini (40). Citrakūṭa (41). L. vigilant (42), recognises Bh. (43). Bh. reports (44). R. tells Bh. to return to Ayodhyā (45), extolls his virtues (46), asks Bh. to reign in his place (47). *So R., but Bh. (48)* objects (49-50), *pointing to his own worthlessness and to R.'s superiority* (51).
	52	mālinī.	R. urges Bh. to accept his footwear as a symbol of his kingship.
	53–6	unknown 1.	*Exposition of Nītiśāstra by R. to Bh.*
	57–8	rucira.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „
	59–61	unknown 2.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „
	62–9	pavitra.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „
	70–7	pṛthvītala.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ (85).
	78–85	śikharinī.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ Bh. takes leave
	86	mālinī.	Bh. returns to Ayodhyā taking with him R.'s footwear.
4.	1–15	aupacchandasika.	R. S. & L. *on Citrakūṭa* (1), to Atri's hermitage (2), to Daṇḍakā forest (3). Encounter with ogre (*4*), Wirādha (*5*) who underrates R. & L. (*6*) & approaches (*7*). R. & L. kill him (*8*) and proceed to hermitage of Sarabhaṅga (9), *a superior ṛṣi (10),* who knows R. as Nārāyaṇa (11), sends him on to yogin Sutīkṣṇa (12) & is redeemed himself (13). R. proceeds towards Sutīkṣṇa's hermitage (14) & stays there (15).
	16–30	vaitālīya.	R. & L. share the hermit's life (16-20), only wearing weapons to protect the hermits (21), paying homage to the gods as they(22-6). Rākṣasī spy Sūrpanakhā roams in Daṇḍaka forest (27), *encounters R. & S. (28), flees ashamed and sees L. (29).* Enamoured of him, she assumes a perfect shape (30).
	31–8	aupacchandasika.	Specification of her attractiveness (31), adornments (32) and approach to L. (33); her undisguised propositions (34-5). But L. (36) begins by answering her courteously (37-8),
	39–64	vaitālīya.	then praising his eldest brother R. (39-43), whose weapons and exploits he extolls (44-7). Sūrpanakhā goes to R. (48), who points to his married state (50) & mentions L. (51). Sūrpanakhā again goes to L. (52),

			shameless (*53*). *L. sees her true nature* (*54*) & cuts her nose; she flies away, betraying her nature (*55*), & says who she is, and threatens (*56*) with Khara + Dūṣaṇa (*57*), with whom she seeks refuge (58), *giving her version of what has happened* (*59-64*),
	65–73	aupacchandasika.	invoking their help in revenge (65-6). Triśirah, Khara & Dūṣaṇa (67) promise to kill R. & L. (68) & approach the hermitage (69), take up positions (70). R. & L. kill all Rākṣasas (71); details of their deaths (*72-3*).
	74–6	puṣpitāgrā	Triśirah attacks once more (74) and is definitely killed (75). His frightful death; the hermits thoroughly afraid (76).
5.	1–89	rajanī.	Khara + Dūṣaṇa approach again (1) but all are conquered (2). Sūrpanakhā flees to Rāv. (*3*), reproaches him (4-5), *reports how Khara, Dūṣaṇa & Triśirah have been killed by R. & L.* (*6*), *incites Rāw. to take revenge* (*7*), rebukes his thoughtless pleasures (8), *tells how carefree the hermits are living* (*9–10*), not to mention Rāw. (*11*). Again she incites him (12), tells about S's beauty (13), loveliness (14), desirability (15), unsurpassability (16). Rāw. reassures her (17-20), & flies to the encounter (21). He meets Marīca, who warns Rāw. (*22-3*). He points to Jāmadagni (Paraśu-Rāma), killed by R. (24) & Tāṭakā (*25*), the death of the three rākṣasas (26), R.'s bow-breaking at the swayamwara (*27*), whilst Rāw. is a drunkard (28). Rāw. angry (*29*), scolds Marīca (30), excuses Tāṭakā (31), accuses Marīca of feebleness (*32*), pretends that the bow was rotten and insecteaten (*33*), & the rākṣasas careless (34). He scolds Marīca (35) & threatens him (36). Marīca excuses himself (*37*) & promises (38) first to elude R. & L., by assuming deer-shape (39). He approaches S. (40), who asks R. to catch him (41). L. left to take care of S. (*42*). Deer always escapes (43); at last shot by R. (44), gives frightful cry (45). S. sends L. (46). *L. unwilling* (*47*) & unbelieving (48-53). S. out of her mind (54), *accuses & offends L.* (*55-9*), *not realising what she is doing* (*60*). L. ruefully answers (61), *defending his honour* (*62*), *prophesying evil to her* (*63*). S. picking flowers (64). Rāw. disguised as a monk (65-8), extolls her beauty (69-78). S. bashful (79), praises R. (80-4). The monk
6.	1–18	vaṁśastha.	extolls Rāw. (85-9), gradually with "me" and "I" (1-4). Rāw. takes S, abducts her (5). S. (6), *laments* (*7-15*). Jaṭāyu hears it, goes in that direction and challenges Rāw. (16-8).
	19–26	śārdūlavikrīḍita.	He attacks Rāw. succesfully (19-21). Rāw.'s chariot damaged, horses wounded (*22*). Jaṭāyu takes S. (*23*). Rāw. ashamed (*24*). Jaṭāyu slow (25). Rāw. cuts off one of Jaṭāyu's wings (*26*).
	27	puṣpitāgrā.	Rāw. seizes S. & by new chariot abducts her to Laṅkā.

28–63	mālinī.	Rāw. continues to woo S. (28-30), but S. rejects him (31). R. sad (32), laments (33), approached by L. (34), who reports (35). R. sad (36), laments (37-47), faints (48), bathes (49), performs his oblations & visits the scene of the struggle (50); his impressions (51-3). His indignation (54-5) & challenge (*56-9*). L. approaches R. (60) *& tries to restrain R. (61-3)*.
64–113	anuṣṭubh. (vaktra)	R. calmed (64). Jaṭāyu found (65), suspected by R. (66), makes himself known (67). R. reconciled (68). Jaṭāyu *very feeble (69)*, reports & dies (70). *R. bewails his father's old friend (71-3)* & burns his corpse (74). An ogre (75), Dīrghabāhu (76), attacks R.; his long arms hewn off (77), *whereupon he becomes a deity again (78)*. Explanations (79-85) & good counsel: go to Su. on Mt. Ṛṣyamūka (86), *who is wise but sad (87)* because of what happened to him (88). Advice cont. (89-94). Their ways part (95). R. & L. in the forest (96), meet a Sabarī-anachorete (97) of excellent behaviour (98-9), whom R. addresses (100) by interrogating & preaching (101-3). She replies (104) *by telling of her previous repulsive action (105-10)*, is cured by R. (111) & recommends the gaining of Su.'s friendship, which will lead to good results (112-3).
114–29	turagagati.	R. & L. go to forest Pratita-kampa (114), *very lovely; so is its* lake (115); R. sad (116); bewails his sad fate amidst lovely nature (117-28). R. & L. go on to the frightful Ṛsyamūka-Mt. (129).
130–59	vasantatilaka.	Su. severely afflicted (130), goes to Mt. Malaya (131), sends H. tot R. (132). *H. as a flying giant (133)*, approaches R. as a mahātma (134), tells about the Mt.'s horrors (135-8) & dangers (139). R. introduces himself (140-1), *tells about Sutīkṣṇa (142)* & S's abduction (143). H. tells Su's sad fate (*144-147*). R. accompanies H. (148), arrives at Mt. Malaya (149). Friendship between R. & Su (150-1). Su. relates Wālins valor (152-6). R. shows his dexterity (157). Su. & R. go towards Mt. Kiṣkindha (158) to kill Wālin (159).
160–71	*śikhariṇī.*	*A huge cave is Wālin's residence (160)*. Su challenges Wālin (161) & the two monkey-kings struggle fiercely (162-4); yogins astonished (165). R. cannot distinguish who's who (166); Su. recoils (167), blames R. (168). *R. exculpates himself (169); finds a stratagem (170)*, kills Wālin (171).
172–95	upajāti. (mixture of indra-vajra & upendra-v)	Wālin mortally wounded (172), scolds R. (173-6). *Wālin acknowledges his misbehaviour & abuses R. (177-81)* with arguments (182-4). R. exonerates himself (185) *with argument (186)*, at some length (187-89). Wālin *ashamed (190); adoration of R. by W. (191)*; Wālin takes leave of Su. (192), *hopes for the future (193)*, exculpates himself (194-5).
196–7	indravajra.	*Wālin dies & is honoured (196)*; Su. accepts homage (*197*).

	198	upendra-v.	*Aṅgada becomes a yuva-rāja; monkeys endowed with presents.*
	199–200	citralekhā.	*The monkeys are satisfied (199), Su. pays homage to R. (200).*
	201	dodhaka.	*R. consents to a cessation of activities during the rainy season.*
	202	tanu-madhyā.	*Su. asks permission to take his leave.*
	203	mattamayūra.	Su. with his monkeys returns & reigns in Kiṣkindha. Rains.
7.	1–30	rathoddhata **gati**	*Su. enjoying himself, R. & L. going to Mt. Malyaṙwān (1), R. impressed by the lovely season (2).* Clouds & thunder (3), rains as Kāma's arrows (4), rainbow as Kāma's bow (5), *heron as Kāma's banner (6), clouds covering all (7), R. weeping (8).* R. laments (9-11), *compares the firefly (12),* mentions lightning (13) & thunder (14), *accuses Kāma (15),* mentions cātaka (16) & wind (17) & peacock (18) *rains (19), seers (20),* frogs & birds (21), *addresses Sītā with sighs and several similes (22-30).*
	31–42	pṛthvī.	R.'s deplorable condition (31). Autumn comes (32). R. appeals to L. (33); "Dry season comes (34); Su. forgetful (35) & negligent (36), rebuke him! (37). Su. is dazzled (38)". L. to Kiṣkindha (39). H. goes to his encounter (40). Su. apologises (41) & promises to send the monkeys (42).
	43–54	*śārdūla-vikrīḍita.*	Mobilisation (43). *Su. at Malyaṙwān (44), accuses himself of gross negligence (45-6);* R. satisfied (47). Monkey chiefs harangued by Su. *(48-51).* R. sends H. (52). H. starts (53). Satabali N-wards, Susena W-wards, Winata E-wards (54).
	55–70	*tvarita-gati.*	H. goes S-wards (55), reaches Windhya (56), difficulties (57); lions frightened (58); monkeys tired (59) & stop (60), on flat stones (61). Birds (62). Monkeys enter cave (63); white building (64), lovely virgin-guardian (65), who welcomes them (66). *She interrogates them; they answer (67); their aim (68).* They inform her of the situation (69-70).
	71	*tanu-madhyā.*	'She-with-the-slender-waist' answers them (71):
	72–5	āryā.	"Dānawa-king Wiśwakarma made this house and cave (72). Indra killed him (73). I am Swayamprabhā, daughter of Dānawa-king Merusāwarṇi (74). Cover your eyes (75)."
	76–7	upajāti.	*She deceives the monkeys (76). Dānawas & rākṣasas help one another (77).*
	78–110	vaṅśastha.	Monkeys deceived (78). They fall asleep (79) & lose a month in time (80). Monkeys sad (81-4). Bird Sampāti goes to them (85). Monkeys afraid (86), *complain (87-9),* hope to be eaten (90-1). Sampāti proves to be an elder brother of Jaṭāyu & encourages them (92-9) by telling them the future *(100-5).* Monkeys go to Mt. Mahendra (106), where one can see the S. Sea (107) with its waves (108), treasures (109), winds (110).

	111–2	kusuma-vicitra	The monkeys descend (111) & behold the fishes & crabs (112).
	113	pṛthvī.	Anggada gives orders to start; H. prepares himself.
8.	1–7	druta-vilambita.	H. in his flight (1-4) swallowed by Ḍākiṇī (5); Dākiṇī killed (6), her corpse devoured by sharks (7).
	8–17	praharṣiṇī.	Mt. Menakā seen (8). Mt. M. invites H. (9-14), but he refuses (15-7).
	18–58	pramitâksarā.	Rākṣasī Wikatâkṣinī (18), *swallows H. (19) & chokes (20)*, H. kills her (21). H. arrives at Mt. Suwela (22) & is very cautious (23). *H. finds fortifications (24).* Night (25). H. keeps himself aloof (26). Rākṣasas chat (27) & amuse themselves (28), *muttering sleep-arousing formulas (29), practice yoga (30), discuss śāstras (31), eat human flesh ((32-3), drink fat and blood (34), dance in their drunkenness (35)*, others are flying in the air (36). *Some tell exploits (37)*; no lack of girls (38). H. sad (39), increasingly (40). *Moon rises (41) at Udaya-giri (42); H. sees a temple (43), which is described in great detail (44-58).*
	59–91	śālinī.	H. sees rākṣasas (59-61), *amusing themselves (62-6)*, drinking (67). H. searches every house (68), in rākṣasa-shape (69), goes to Rāw.'s palace (70), abode of Rāw.'s wives (71), where Kāma reigns (72), sees Puṣpaka (73) and (74) Rāw. (75-8). H. disappointed (79) & bewildered (80). A monkey again (81), he looks for Sītā, whom he cannot find (82-4). H. sees aśoka (85), E. of Laṅkā (86), a luscious grove (87), where the moon stops (88). There are nymphs (89), rākṣasīs (90) & poor Sītā (91).
	92–170	punarmada.	H. careful (92); early morning (93); H. cautious (94); description of the aśoka-grove (95-7). S. cheerful (98). *H. glad (99). Music in the grove (100). Moon turns pale (101).* H. cautious (102), sees Sītā *(103)*, recognises S. *(104)*; S. very thin (105), dishevelled *(106), lying on the bare floor (107), teased by rākṣasīs (108-10); daybreak (111).* Rāw. comes to the grove (112), woes Sītā (113-4), *offers jewels (115), but S. is steadfast (116). Rāw. angry (117).* Rāw. again woes Sītā (118-26), but S. only extolls R.'s superiority (127-34). Rāw. menaces S. with a dagger (136) & words (137), then retires (138). Rākṣasīs threaten S. (139); only Trijaṭā, daughter of W. (140), defends S. (141-2); rākṣasīs retire (143). *S. to Trijaṭā on her frightful plight (143-70).*
	171–6	turagagati.	*S. bewails her unfortunate state.*
	177	mālinī.	*S. & Trijaṭā go to the temple to invoke the god's help.*
	178–91	punarmada.	H. satisfied (178); tells S. about R.'s sorrow (179). S. suspicious (180-6). H. says that R. sent him from Malyawān etc. (187-91).
	192–213	vaktra.	Su. mentioned (192). H.'s wanderings (193-4). R. thin, sent an envoy (195), with a ring (196); L. mentioned (197); monkey-army ready (198); H. praises S.'s cleverness in handling Rāw. (199), predicts Rāw.'s

			death (200), urges S. to give him (H) a message (201), *again mentions R. (202)*, S. rejoices (203), entrusts H. with a cuḍāmani for R. (204), *a picture* (better translation: a letter (*205*) & good counsel (206). H. plans to ruin the aśoka-grove (207-13).
	214	druta-v.	H. ruins the trees.
	215	aśva-lalita.	The devastation.
9	1–26	*kusuma-vicitra.*	The devastation cont. (1). *The guardians report to Rāw. (2-8).* Rāw. furious (9). Rākṣasas despatched (10). H. angry (11). Struggle between H. & the rākṣasas, many of whom are frightfully wounded (*12-26*).
	27–9	toṭaka.	*Continuation of frightful clash between H. & rākṣasas.*
	30–41	unknown 3.	Those who escape destruction (31) report to Rāw. (32). Rāw. sends his army (33-6), but H. is not afraid (37) & slays all of them (38-41).
	42–50	citraraśmi.	H. goes to the pārijātas (42), spendidly adorned (43), & other plants (54), which he ruins (45). Akṣa (46) attacks (47) & is defeated (48). He attacks once more 49), but now is killed (50).
	51–5	bhujangga-prayāta.	H. bathes in the ocean (51) & then continues the devastation (*52-5*).
	56–7	daṇḍaka.	Sad plight of the wild animals chased from the aśoka-grove.
	58–84	*bhujangga-prayāta.*	H. waits for his opponents (58) in the hope of fighting Rāw. (59). Comes Indrajit (60) with retinue (*61*) in an enormous chariot (*62*) to the grove (*63*). H. challenges him (*64*). Frightful struggle (*65-72*). Indrajit's horses killed (*73*). I. astonished at his lack of results (74-80). I. shoots nāgapāśa (81), snake-like (82) which clusters around H. H. falls (83). *H. does not fall for lack of forces, but in order to see Rāw. (84).*
	85–8	suvadanā.	Rākṣasas elated (85), Indrajit threatening (86). H. removed (87). Rākṣasas aim at death of treacherous envoy H. (88).
	89–91	unknown 4.	Rākṣasas bring H. to court (89), report (90). Rāw. "He must die" (91).
	92–3	halamukhī.	W. has compassion (92) and pleads for H. with Rāw. (93).
10.	1–9	unknown 5.	Rāw. argues that H. should be killed.
	10–41	campaka-mālikā.	H. extolls R.'s virtues (10-5), *those of L. & Su. (16-22)*, vilifies the slain enemies (23-5). Rāw. argues again (26-32) *at length (33-5)*, defends the slain rākṣasas (36-41).
	42–65	bhujaga-śiśusṛta.	*H. boasts of his exploits (42-6), accuses Rāw. (47-56)*, again mentions Wirādha, Mārīca, Wālin (57-61); *insinuations against Rāw.'s bad instigations* (62-5).
	66–70	kāmadattā.	H.: "return S. to R." (66-8). Rāw. *angrily*: "ignite H.'s tail" (69-70).
	71–2	nārāca.	*H.'s tail provided with highly inflammable material, set on fire.*
11.	1–2	daṇḍaka.	H. sets the palace on fire; general chaos and panic.
	3–13	sragdharā.	Laṅkā burns (3); H. goes again to aśoka-grove (4), to take leave of S. (5). His flight (6-8), arrival (9-12). He tells the monkeys that S. is alive (13).

	14–21	aupacchandasika.	H. goes to Windhya (14). R. L. & Su. on Mālyawān (16), living as ascetics (17). H. offers R. cūdāmaṇi & *letter* (19). R. glad (20).
	22–36	śardūlavikrīḍita.	*R. opens and reads S.'s love-letter (21). S. reminds R. of the past and urges him to liberate her (22-32). R. laments (33-4). H. and L. comfort him (35-6).*
	37–43	aupacchan.	H. encourages R. & incites him to fight,
	44–60	vaṁśastha.	points to S.'s sad plight (44-6). R. comforted (47-8), suggests they start (49). Monkeys go to Mahendra (50). Description of Mt. Mahendra (*51-60*).
	61–87	tāmarasa.	Descent to the ocean by day and by moonlight.
	88–94	praharṣiṇī.	R. very sad, comforted and encouraged by L.
	95–6	mattā.	R. relaxes and goes to sleep (95); the monkeys keep watch (96).
12.	1–20	jaladharamālā.	In Laṅkā, at the end of the night, the moon sets (1), the stars follow like loving wives (2); the girls and wives awaken (*3-20*).
	21–41	svāgatā.	in different moods after a love-night; their lovers address them,
	42–5	mattamayūra	& flatter them & remind them of their amorous pastimes.
	46–63	mālinī.	Audience in Laṅkā; Patih Prahasta, tokens of homage.
	64–5	nārāca.	Rāw. appears; Patih & Senāpati make their obeisance.
			(No further comparison with BhK.; the numbers on the right hand side refer to Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa.
13.	*1–18*	rucira.	W. prays to Sangkara (1-2); he pays his daily visit to his mother (3-4). His mother asks him to admonish Rāw. (5-13), conform to W.'s own design (14). W. enters (15), frightened to see Rāw. (16-7) & salutes him (18).
	19–97	vaṁśastha.	Rāw. asks his Patih's advice (19-26); general expression of loyalty (27-8) ..... VI. 6–8 Prahasta dissuades palaver now (29-30), as Rāw. is so valiant (31-3) ..... VI. 6–8 & R. & L. + monkeys are insignificant (34); the war should be waged (35-8). W. delivers a complete dissertation on nīti- & artha-śastra, advising restoration of S. to R. (39-97) ..... VI. 9
14.	*1–19*	vasanta-tilaka.	Rāw.'s maternal grandfather Sumāli does the same.
	20–63	turagagati.	Kumbhakarṇa awakes (20), takes W.'s side (22-3), but promises to help Rāw. until inevitable death (24-33), goes to sleep again (34). W. describes the bad omens and warns again (35-47). Rāw. furious at W. (49-58), menaces and hits him (59). W. silent; selfpossessed; says (60-3) ..... VI. 12
	64–9	śardūla-v.	"A king should dominate his passions".

	70	vaṅśastha.	Thereupon W. takes leave with attendants	VI. 16
15.	*1–12*	praharaṇa-kalikā.	W. goes N-ward to Mt. Mahendra (1), crosses the ocean (2). H. recognises W. (3), because H. is good and remembers good deeds (4-5). H. introduces W. to R. (6-7). R. being a wise king accepts the refugee (8-12)	VI. 17
	13–31	punarmada.	R. faces the difficulty formed by the sea (13-5), stretches his bow (16-8), & shoots (19); tremendous upheaval for the fishes.	VI. 21
	32–44	suvadanā.	Nāga-kings flee (32); Baruṇa kneels before R., advises dam-making (33-44)	VI. 22
	45–6	vatormi-mālā	R. satisfied, ceases arrow-fire (45); fishes revivified (46).	
	47	druta-vilambita	Monkeys commanded to gather stone for building material.	
	48–51	vegavatī.	Monkeys scattered in all directions; tremendous uproar.	
	52–63	aśva-lalita.	Unimaginable uproar during collection of materials.	
	64–8	*śikhariṇī.*	As previous.	
	69	mandā-krāntā.	The monkeys return with the collected mat.	
16.	*1–14*	*pṛthvī*	Nala dams the sea (1-4), the monkeys pass and reach Mt. Suwela (5-8).	
	15–23	*vasanta-tilaka*	Description of Mt. Suwela (9-14) (15-23).	
	24–29	*rucira.*	„ „ „ „	
	30–6	*bhramara-v.*	„ „ „ „	
	37–40	vaṅśa-patra-p.	„ „ „ „	
	41–7	prabhā.	„ „ „ „	
17.	1–6	vasanta-tilaka	Rāw. has fictitious heads of R. & L. made; goes to S. in aśoka-grove	VI. 31
	7–20	punarmada.	He tells S. that R. & L. are dead, and extolls his own luxuries & wealth.	
	21–36	aupacchandasika.	S. in her plight gives no direct answer, but laments to R.	VI. 32
	37–49	svāgatā.	S. gives utterance to ethical doubts.	
	50–60	puṣpitâgrā.	S. refuses Rāw. (50-3). Rāw. angry, replies, returns to his palace (54-60).	
	61–74	svāgatā.	S. invokes Agni (61-8); Trijaṭā also utters ethical doubts (69-74).	
	75–7	turagagati.	Trijaṭā receives a good omen & asks S. to have some patience	VI. 33
	78–88	bhadra-lalita.	Trijaṭā finds W. R. & L. on Mt. Suwela, returns to S., reports everything	VI. 34
	89–99	turagagati.	S., on her advice, invokes Agni & gives offerings to the fire.	
	100–18	pravaralalita.	S. sad & plaintive, but descends from her couch; amusements.	
	119–27	*candra-v.*	S.'s-retinue pick flowers, make wreaths etc.	
	128–33	*kusuma-v.*	Loveliness of the aśoka-grove.	
	134–8	mālinī.	Daybreak; S.'s religious duties and prayers.	

18.	1–16	aupacchandasika	Sukasāraṇa sent by Rāw. to Mt. Suwela to spy, discovered by W. R. sends him back to Laṅkā, where he reports to Rāw.	VI. 25
	17–21	aparavaktra.	He gives the first list of 30 monkey officers	
	22–32	vaṅśastha.	(cf. XIX. 40, XXII. 58)	VI. 26–8
			Sukasāraṇa recommends compliance. Rāw. angry. Suk. loyal	VI. 29
	33–44	pṛthvī.	R. sends Aṅgada with ultimatum (33-5); A. rather provocative	VI. 41
	45–52	*śikhariṇī.*	Rāw. refuses flatly; Aṅgada threatens; Rāw. impressed.	
19.	1–4	*praharaṇakalika.*	Monkeys & rākṣasas, having eaten, prepare to wage war	VI. 42?
	5–11	*upajāti.*	Rāw. plans to kill S.; his 6 councillors & 20 principal officers.	
	12–32	*sragdharā.*	Mobilisation of rākṣasa warriors, taking leave of their wives.	
	33–4	rajanī.	Prahasta, Ghaṭodara, Mahāpārśwa, Indrajit, main officers.	
	35–8	śikhariṇī.	Wirūpâkṣa, gives orders; rākṣasas boisterous, evil omens	VI. 43?
	39–68	*pṛthvītala.*	2nd. list 35 monkey-officers (cf. XVIII. 17, XXII. 58), Mobilisation. Lucky omens(45-6). Monkeys flood the whole of Laṅkā (47-59). Mobilisation of rākṣasas in *makarānana* & *bajrapañjara.*	
	69–87	*śārdūlavikrīḍita.*	The first clashes; monkeys losing; Su. calls Nala, Nīla & H.	
	88–103	*kusumavicitra.*	These three admonish the monkeys, who get fresh courage.	
	104–12	*śikhariṇī.*	The rākṣasas severely attacked, completely on the defensive.	
	113–23	*jaloddhatagati.*	The elephants, though armoured, in a very bad way.	
	124–9	*aśva-lalita.*	More and more brave monkeys & rākṣasas are killed.	
	130–1	rajanī.	Batte-field comp. to lake in the Yama-loka.	
20.	1–3	unknown 3.	Description of the horrible battle-field.	
	4–6	mānavakā.	Lake becomes dry; exhausted heroer retire.	
	7–14	śāliṇī.	Rākṣasa Prajaṅgha defeated by monkey Sampāti	VI. 43
	15–9	*pramitākṣara*	Sphutadākṣi & Pratapanākṣi slain by Nala	VI. 43
	20–4	sragdharā.	Demigods rejoicing. Jambumāli slain by Hanuman.	
	25–6	śārdūlavikrīḍita.	Rākṣasa Mitraghna slain by W.; Praghasa by Su.	VI. 43
	27	sragdharā.	Ṛṣi's & gandharwa's highly satisfied.	
	28	vasanta-tilaka.	Praise of Ṛṣi's encourages warriors.	
	29	sragdharā.	Rākṣasa Bajramuṣṭi slain by monkey Mainda	VI. 43

	30–2	toṭaka.	Rākṣasa Anikumbha slain by monkeey Nīla, ...	VI. 43
	33–4	vaṅśastha.	Rākṣasa Wirūpākṣa by monkey Lakṣmana, Rākṣasa Aśaniprabha by monkey Drawidha.	
	35–8	*pṛthvī.*	Rākṣasa Indrajit hit & chased off by monkey Aṅgada	VI. 44
	39–46	aparavaktra	Chances of the asura-army continually deteriorating	VI. 44
	47–9	rajanī.	The rākṣasas at sunset are driven back & retiring	VI. 44
	50–9	*bhujaṅga-prayāta.*	Indrajit asks for & gets Sarpâstrapāśa; monkeys afraid	VI. 45
	60–2	*vaṅśa-patra-patita.*	Monkeys & even R. bound by Sarpâstrapāśa	VI. 45
	63–75	*pravīra-lalita.*	Terror in monkey army; H. & W. come; Indrajit reports R. & L. slain	VI. 46
	76–7	*lakṣmīvatī.*	Rāw. believes that Indrajit has slain R. & L. & praises him	VI. 46
	80	dodhaka.	Great joy and festivities in Laṅkā	VI. 46
21.	1–13	aupacchandasika.	S. conveyed to battle-field, sees R. bound; laments & faints. Trijaṭā reproaches S. her going away without taking her servant ..	VI. 47
	14–35	upajāti.	S. laments her misfortunes; she is in a pitiable state	VI. 48
	36–55	*vaṅśastha.*	Trijaṭā laments in the aśoka-grove (36-40); S. asks Trijaṭā to prepare a good fire for her cremation (41-7), Trijaṭā to W. (48-55).	
	56–69	*puṣpitāgrā.*	Trijaṭā complains to her father W. (56-61). W. encourages her (62-70).	
	70–85	*rathoadhatgati.*	Tri. returns (71). R. awakens (72-4); W. tells him about S.; R. laments	VI. 49
	86–98	*svāgatā*	R. wails over his misfortunes & those of L.	
	99–108	*turagagati.*	R. takes leave of L. & W., expecting to die.	
	109–29	*bhramaravilasita.*	R. takes leave of Su., Aṅgada & H. (-117). Su. loyal. Night over.	
	130–44	*pravara-l.*	Early in the morning the ṛṣi's glorify R.	
	145–6	*śārdūla-v.*	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
	147–52	*vasanta-t.*	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
	153–9	*pravaralalita.*	The Nāgapāśa sprung; monkeys liberated. "Apparently by R. = Wiṣṇu."	
	160–8	*mālinī.*	Daybreak; monkeys boisterous; Rāw. terrified	VI. 51
	169–71	*vidyumālā.*	Dhūmrākṣa sees bad omens and is quite prepared to be the first victim	VI. 51
	172–81	*mattamayūra.*	Many monkeys slaughtered, but also many rākṣasas slain. Dhūmrākṣa approaches, chariot Singhāsya, horses Wṛkāsya	VI. 51
	182–90	*praharṣiṇī.*	Rākṣasa Dhūmrākṣa conquered by H. ..	VI. 52
	191–204	*sragdharā.*	Rāw. sends Ākampana, who is defeated by H. (cf. XXIII. 41)	VI. 55–6
			Rāw. sends for Patih Prahasta, who promises to do his utmost	VI. 57

205–21	*suvadanā.*	Prahasta sees bad omens; not discouraged; kills many monkeys.	
222–47	vaṣanta-tilaka.	Su. sends Nīla; after a very long fight Prahasta is slain	VI. 58
248	indravajra.	The rākṣasas flee without offering more resistance	VI. 58
22. 1–12	rajanī.	Rāw. orders Kumbhakarṇa to be awakened; vain endeavours	VI. 60
		he awakens when he wishes to do so, eats & drinks enormously; appears before Rāw. who relates the disasters	VI. 62
13–40	madayantī.	Kumbhakarṇa reproaches Rāw. for bad behaviour and conduct in the past, his intractability	VI. 63
41–9	śardūla-vikrīdita.	Rāw. scolds him; Kumbhakarṇa prepares to do his duty	VI. 63
50–3	daṇḍaka.	Tremendous struggle. Aṅgada encourages the monkeys	VI. 66
54	vaṅśa-patra-patita.	The monkeys, thus admonished, take fresh courage.	
55–7	sragdharā.	The monkeys, armed with sticks, prepare for new struggle.	
58–66	mṛgâṅsa.	The monkey officers (cp. XVIII. 17, XIX. 40) attack; thrown back again	VI. 67
67–73	upajāti.	R. sends Su.; frightful struggle of the two heroes	VI. 67
74–86	praharṣiṇī.	H. helps Su. Kumbhakarṇa throws a Mt. on Su. Su. faints	VI. 67
87–8	śārdūla-vikrīḍita	H. pursues Kumbhakarṇa; Su. conscious again, bites Kumbhakarṇa's nose off	VI. 67
89	sragdharā.	Kumbhakarṇa discouraged, but continues to maim monkeys.	
23. 1–7	vaṅśa-patra-patita.	W. instructs R. & L. to kill Kumbhakarṇa R. shoots his arrows. Kumbhakarṇa reduced to a torso	VI. 67
		still defends himself; mouth arrow-filled	VI. 67
8–9	vikasita-kusuma.	Kumbhakarṇa in falling crushes monkeys	VI. 67
		Gods hail his extinction	VI. 67
10–47	bhadra-lalita.	Rāw.'s sons Triśirah, Trikāya, Narântaka, Dewântaka & Atikāya killed (10-9)	VI. 69
		Rāw. sure of defeat, sends Indrajit, who makes the monkeys sleep (-26)	VI. 73
		W. applies *dīpa-sañjata,* & orders H. to fetch *amṛta*-medicine from Himālayas (27-31). H. lops off entire mountain (32-3)	VI. 74
		Monkeys revivified; ignite Laṇkā (34-5)..	VI. 75
		Several rākṣasa-heroes slain	VI. 75
48–73	suvaṅśapatra.	Rāw. thoughtful. Indrajit, accompanied by his 7 wives (sisters) starts	VI. 80
		Putting into position of the armies. L. shoots Baruṇâstra, etc. Indrajit slain (66).	

			His 7 wives also dead (67). Rāw. prays in Siwa-temple	VI. 90
	74–82	vilāsinī.	Rāw. & his retinue prepared for the final struggle	VI. 99
	83	sragdharā.	Rākṣasa Wirūpâkṣa slain by Su. (cf. XX. 34)	VI. 96
	84	śārdūla-vikrīḍita	Dhūmrākṣa slain by Su. (cf. XXI. 190) ..	VI. 97
			Mahodara by Anggada	VI. 97
	85	indra-yudha.	After the death of the 3 patihs Rāw.'s doom is sealed....	
24.	1–4	śārdūla-vikrīḍita	Rāw. confronted with 3 enemies: R. L. & Su.	VI. 99
	5–7	praharṣiṇī.	Rāw.'s charioteer, chariot & horses destroyed.	
	8–13	ṣārdūla-vikrīḍita	L. wounded. W. heals him. Indra gives arrow Guhya-wijaya, Brahmâstra, chariot & charioteer Mātali	VI. 102
			R. & L. mount chariot	VI. 102
	14–27	madhulinda.	Tremendous fight Rāw. v. R. Rāw.'s 10 heads cut off	VI. 108
	28–9	praharaṇa-kalikā	Monkeys delighted, nature satisfied, & peace	VI. 108
	30	praharṣiṇī.	Ṛṣis & siddhas thoroughly satisfied	VI. 108
	31–42	pṛthvī.	Wibhīṣaṇa's lamentations	VI. 109
	43–80	sāriṇī.	R. consoles W. by protracted nīti-preachings	VI. 109
	81–6	vaṅśastha.	R. consoles W. by protracted nīti-preachings	VI. 109
	87–91	puṣpitâgrā.	Rāw.'s corpse washed & cremated; W. succeeds to Laṅkā	VI. 112
	92–4	ṣārdūla-vikrīḍita	Laṅkā restored; monkeys revivified or go to heaven.	
	95–126	suvadanā.	Rebuilt Laṅkā rejoices in paradisical life; even the rākṣasas desist from bad habits & practice the arts.	
	127–68	udgata-visama.	H. visits S. (127-30). S. pleads for the life of the rākṣasīs, and to tell R. of her intended arrival (131-4)	VI. 113
			R. orders S. to purify herself (135-6)	VI. 114
			which S. does (137-8). R. is silent (139), S. crushed (140-3), W. & Su. & H. and all witnesses thoroughly disappointed (144-5)	VI. 115
			R. says to S.; "You are soiled; go to Mithilā, to W. or L. or Bh" (146-53). S. invokes earth, water, celestial bodies, wind & sky as her witnesses, and wishes to descend into the fire (154-64). Trijaṭā sent by S. to W. to inform W., the one who knows śāstra.	
	169–73	punarmada.	Trijaṭā points out that Sītā has been completely faithful.	
	174–87	vaṅśastha.	Trijaṭā continues. S. orders L. to make a pile of wood.	
	188–91	praharṣiṇī.	L. makes up the wood-pile; S. invokes Jwalana as a witness & judge.	
	192–8	rajanī.	The fire is changed into a golden lotus.	
			Agni reminds R. of S.'s pureness	VI. 117–8

199–202	śārdūla-vikrīḍita	Siva reminds R. of his being Wiṣṇu: R. completely satisfied re S.	
203–27	vaitālīya.	R. sends H. to Ayodhyā & describes the route (203-17). R.'s further plans.	
228–39	aupucchandasika	Su. & W. answer R. with kind and wise words. Night. Next day start.	
240–59	*svāgatā.*	Enumeration of monkey retinue (cf. XVIII. 17, XIX. 40). All of them embark in Puṣpaka	VI. 122
260	mālinī.	R. describes to S. beauty of Mt. Mahendra, and continues by those of Mt. Malaya.	
25. 1–3	matta-mayūra.	R. tells the story of the Windhya's aspirations & Agasti's help to Indra.	
4	turagagati.	R. mentions Mālyawān, Ṛṣyamūka & Daṇḍaka.	
5	suvadanā.	Next comes Pampā, the lake in which to take one's ablutions.	
6	druta-vilambita	The company continues its journey; R. describes the route again:	
7	praharṣiṇī.	The lovely forests, each with its own attractions.	
8–34	pramitākṣarā.	Sarabhaṅga's hermitage (8-9), Citrakūṭa (10-1)	VI. 124
		Ṛṣi Bharadwaja (11) & his ṛṣi-settlement (12-7), the different birds (18-25) & other animals (26-34).	
35–9	śārdūla-vikrīḍita	Yamunā, Gaṅgā, Tamasā, Sarayū & Ayodhyā mentioned.	
40–2	dodhaka.	Eulogy of ascetics & of several plants.	
43	kusuma-vicitra.	Plays of words based upon names of plants + ascribed qualities.	
44–8	puṣpitāgrā.	As previous....	
49	dodhaka.	„ „	
50–61	druta-vilambita.	Young girls are sporting in the R. Sarayū (50-5); so do the water-birds.	
62–4	mālinī.	Play of words based upon names of birds & ascribed qualities.	
65	bhramara-v.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
66–7	rambha.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
68–9	rukmavatī.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
70	sundaralekhā	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
71–2	pramitākṣara	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
73	vaṅśastha.	„ „ „ „ „ „ plants „ „	
74	rathoddhata.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
75–7	mālinī.	„ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „	
78–81	kusuma-vicitra.	Again the girls sporting on the banks of R. Sarayū (Feestbundel Kon. Bat. Gen. I 16).	
82	pṛthvī.	Plants enumerated; description & peculiarities.	
83	suvadanā.	„ „ „ „ „	
84–5	druta-v.	„ „ „ „ „	
86–9	pramitākṣara	„ „ „ „ „	
90	matta-mayūra.	„ „ „ „ „	
91	svāgatā.	„ „ „ „ „	
92–3	aupacch.	„ „ „ „ „	

94–7	rathoddhata.	Plants enumerated; description & peculiarities.	
98	suvadanā.	„ „ „ „ „	
99	vaṅśastha.	„ „ „ „ „	
100–3	aparavaktra.	„ „ „ „ „	
104–5	svāgatā.	„ „ „ „ „	
106–7	pramitākṣara.	Praise of R. Sarayū, fountain of life for Ayodhyā.	
108	rajanī.	Method of shrimp catching in R. Sarayū.	
109–17	aparavaktra.	The cattle & their conversation (continued word play with sapi).	
26. 1	suvadanā.	Description of old Ayodhyā, perpetual bringing of offerings.	
2–3	śardūla-vikrīḍita	Upheavel at the sight of the celestial conveyance Puṣpaka.	
4–5	kusuma-vicitra	Description of the nature of the world underneath.	
6	puṣpitâgrā.	Description of the people ibidem.	
7–8	mālinī.	Bh. comes to the encounter; so does H. & „My mother Kauśalyā	VI. 125
9–21	druta-vilambita.	R. honours Kauśalyā, greets Bh. & Kekayī mixture of joy & sorrow. W. & H. introduced to Kauśalyā; Bh. pays obeisance to R. Audience & mutual recognition of relations & friends.	VI. 127
22	daṇḍaka.	Offering of presents, general rejoicing & relaxation.	
23		The monkeys revelling in drink. Su. gives presents; festivities.	
24		Banquet in the hall for royalty; commoners in the open air.	
25	daṇḍaka.	Description of royal banquet partly by the clown Bhaṇḍira.	
26–35	vasanta-tilaka.	Marital delights of the re-united R. & S. on night of 4th lunar day.	
36	vaṇśa-patra-patita.	The royal banquet lasts a full week, ends on the 10th.	
37	mālinī.	The guests have gifts bestowed on them at their reparture & return home.	
38	śārdūla-vikrīḍita.	Trijaṭā takes leave of S. and is richly rewarded.	
39–40	dodhaka.	S. directs final words to her former maid & guardian Trijaṭā.	
41–2	praharṣiṇī.	Trijaṭā's prayers for R. & S.'s sake in the past may he heard.	
43–4	turagagati.	Trijaṭā must liberate innumerable geese & buffaloes.	
45–7	svāgatā.	S. grateful & flattered; Trijaṭā, W. & H. go back to their countries.	
48	aupacch.	R. stays in Ayodhyā, protecting the land.	
49	aśvalalita.	Hail to Paramêśwara; Lord of the Three Worlds.	
50–1	wohiṅrat.	Rāmāyaṇa fortune-furthering; Yogîśvara a noble poet.	
52	unknown 10.	Asking for forgiveness.	

1: -⏑⏑/⏑⏑-/---/-⏑⏑/⏑⏑- (bha-sa-ma-bha-sa)
2: ---/⏑⏑⏑/⏑⏒ (ma-na-laga)
3: ⏑⏑-/⏑⏑-/⏑⏑⏑/⏑⏑⏑/⏒ (sa-sa-na-na-ga)
4: --⏑/⏑--/⏑⏑⏒/ (ta-ya-na)
5: ⏑⏑-/-⏑⏑/-⏒ (sa-bha-ga-la)
7: --⏑/⏑--/⏑⏑-/ (ta-ya-sa)
10: ⏑⏑⏑/× 7 (na[7])

APPENDIX II

Concordance of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭi's Kāvya Rāvaṇa-vadha & Yogîśvara's Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa-Kakawin.

Vālm.	BhK.	OJR.
1	**1**	**1**
1. 5	1	1-2
	2	3-4
	3	5-7
	4	9
	5	11
	6	12-3
	7	14
	8	15
	9	19
1. 8	10	21-2
	11	23-4
1. 14	12	25-6
	13	31
1. 18	14	32-3
	15	35
	16	36-7
	17	38-40
	18	41
1. 19	19	42-4
1. 20	20	45
1. 21	21	46-9
	22	50-1
1. 22	23	52-6
	24	58
	25	59-60
	26	61
	27	62
	2	**2**
	1	1
	2	4
	3	5
	4	6
	5	7
	6	8
	7	9
	8	16
	9	17
	10	2
	11	3
	12	10
	13	11
	14	12
	15	13
	16	14
	17	15
	18	18
	19	19
	20	20
1. 22	21	22
	22	
1. 26	23	23-4
	24	25-6
	25	27
	26	28-9
	27	30
	28	31
	29	32
	30	33
	31	34-5
1. 30	32	36
	33	37
	34	38-40
	35	41-2
	36	43
	37	44-5
	38	46
	39	47-8
1. 31	40	53
	41	54-5
1. 67	42	56-7
	43	58-9
1. 68	44	60
	45	61
	46	62-3
	47	64
1. 73	48	65
1. 74	49	66
1. 75	50	67-8
	51	69-70
	52	71-2
	53	74
1. 76	54	77
1. 77	55	78
2	**3**	**3**
2. 1	1	2
2. 2	2	3
2. 3	3	4
	4	5
	5	
2. 7	6	6-7
	7	8
2. 10	8	
2. 18	9	9
2. 33	10	10
	11	11
	12	
	13	12
	14	
2. 45	15	13
2. 46	16	15
	17	17
	18	18

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
2. 48	19	
2. 57	20	19, 21
2. 64	21	22-3
	22	24
2. 68	23	*25*
2. 69	24	
2. 70	25	
2. 71	26	
	27	
2. 72	28	*26*
	29	
2. 73	30	*27*
2. 74	31	*28*
2. 75	32	*29*
2. 76	33	*32*
	34	
	35	
2. 83	36	*32*
	37	33
	38	
	39	34-6
2. 90	40	37
	41	
2. 91	42	38
	43	39
	44	
	45	40
	46	41
2. 96	47	42
	48	43
2. 99	49	**44**
2. 103	50	
2. 105	51	45
	52	46
	53	47
2. 106	54	49
	55	50
2. 112	56	52
3	**4**	**4**
3. 1	1	*2-3*
3. 2	*2*	4
3. 4	3	
3. 5	4	*9-10*
3. 5	5	11-2
3. 5	6	13
3. 7	7	*14-5*
	8	*16-7*
	9	18-9
3. 9	10	20-1
	11	*22*
	12	*23*

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	13	24
	14	25-6
3. 17	15	*27*
	16	31
	17	32
	18	33
	19	
	20	34-5
	21	36-7
	22	38
	23	39-40
	24	41
	25	42-3
	26	44-5
	27	46-7
	28	48-9
	29	50-1
	30	52
3. 18	31	55
	32	56
	33	58
3. 19	34	
	35	59
	36	
	37	66
	38	67
	39	68
	40	69
3. 25	41	70
	42	71-2
	43	73
	44	74-5
3. 27	45	75-6
	5	**5**
	1	
	2	1
3. 30	3	*2*
	4	3
3. 32	5	
3. 33	6	**4**
	7	
	8	**5**
	9	
	10	8
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	12
	16	
	17	

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	18	13
	19	14
	20	**15**
	21	
	22	16
3. 35	23	17
	24	
	25	**18**
	26	
	27	19
	28	
	29	20
	30	21
3. 37	31	*22*
	32	
	33	*24*
	34	25
	35	*26*
	36	*27*
	37	
	38	28
3. 40	39	29-30
	40	31
	41	*32*
	42	33
	43	34
	44	**35**
	45	
3. 42	46	36-7
	47	38-9
	48	40
3. 43	49	41
	50	42
	51	43
3. 44	52	44
3. 45	53	45
	54	*46*
	55	53
	56	*49*
	57	*51*
	58	
	59	56
	60	61
3. 46	61	*65*
	62	*66*
	63	*67*
	64	*68*
	65	*69*
	66	71
	67	**72**
	68	
	69	*73*

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	70	*74*
	71	**75**
	72	
	73	*76*
	74	*77*
	75	78
3. 47	76	79
	77	80
	78	81
	79	
	80	82
	81	83
	82	84-5
	83	
	84	86
	85	
3. 48	86	87
	87	**88**
	88	
		6
	89	1
	90	2
	91	3
	92	4
	93	
3. 49	94	5
	95	6
	96	15
3. 50	97	16
	98	17
	99	18
3. 51	100	19
	101	20
	102	21
	103	22
	104	23
	105	24
	106	25
	107	26
3. 52	108	27
	6	
3. 55	1	*28*
	2	*29*
	3	30
3. 56	4	31
3. 57	5	32
	6	33
	7	34
3. 58	8	35

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	9	36
3. 60	10	37
3. 63	11	38
	12	39
	13	40
	14	41
	15	42
	16	43
	17	**44**
	18	
	19	45
	20	*46*
	21	47
	22	**48**
	23	**49**
	24	
	25	
	26	
3. 64	27	50
	28	**51**
	29	
	30	52
3. 68	31	53
	32	54
	33	**55**
	34	
	35	**57**
	36	
	37	58
	38	59
	39	60
3. 65	40	65
	41	66
	42	67-8
	43	70, 74
3. 69	44	75-6
3. 70	45	77
	46	79-80
	47	82
3. 71	48	83
	49	84-5
3. 73	50	86
	51	
	52	88-9
	53	90
	54	91
	55	92-3
	56	94
	57	95
3. 74	58	96
3. 75	59	97
	60	98

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	61	99
	62	100
	63	101
	64	102
	65	
	66	
	67	
	68	
	69	103
	70	104
	71	113
3. 75	72	114
	4	
4. 1	73	117
	74	118
	75	119
	76	120
	77	121
	78	122
	79	123
	80	124
	81	125
	82	126
	83	127
	84	128
	85	129
4. 2	86	130
	87	131
	88	132
	89	134
	90	
	91	134
4. 3	92	135
	93	136
	94	137
	95	138
	96	140
	97	141
	98	143
	99	144
	100	145
	101	*146*
	102	*147*
4. 5	103	*148*
	104	149
	105	150
	106	151
	107	152
	108	153
	109	
	110	154

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	111	
	112	155
	113	
	114	**156**
	115	
4. 12	116	157
	117	158-9
	118	161-2
	119	166
	120	167
	121	
4. 16	122	171
	123	
	124	172
	125	173
4. 17	126	174
	127	175
	128	176
	129	
	130	182
	131	
	132	183
	133	184
	134	185
	135	187-8
	136	*189*
4. 18	137	190-1
	138	192
	139	
	140	194-5
	141	
	142	197
4. 26	143	203
	7	**7**
4. 28	1	*3*
	2	*4*
	3	*5*
	4	*9*
	5	10
	6	11
	7	13
	8	17
	9	18
	10	*14*
	11	16
	12	21
	13	31
	14	*32*
4. 30	15	33
	16	34
	17	35
	18	36
	19	37
	20	
	21	38
4. 31	22	39
	23	
4. 36	24	40
	25	
	26	**41**
	27	42
4. 37	28	
	29	43
	30	
	31	
	32	*45*
4. 38	33	47
	34	
4. 41	35	*48*
	36	*49*
	37	
	38	
	39	
	40	
	41	*50*
	42	
	43	
	44	
	45	
	46	
	47	*52*
	48	
	49	
	50	*53*
4. 42	51	
	52	54
4. 48	53	55
	54	56
	55	57
	56	58
	57	*59*
	58	60
4. 50	59	62
	60	63
	61	64
	62	65
	63	66
	64	
4. 51	65	**67**
	66	70
	67	*72*
	68	73-4
	69	75
4. 52	70	79
	71	80
	72	
4. 53	73	**81**
	74	82
	75	
	76	83
	77	84
	78	
4. 56	79	85
	80	86
	81	*88*
	82	90
	83	
	84	91
	85	92
	86	93-4
	87	95
	88	96
	89	97
	90	
4. 58	91	*98*
	92	
	93	99
	94	
	95	100
	96	101
	97	102
	98	*103*
	99	*104*
	100	*105*
	101	
4. 64	102	106
	103	107
	104	108
	105	*109*
	106	110
	107	111
	108	*112*
4. 66	109	113
5	**8**	**8**
5. 1	1	1
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
	5	5
	6	6
	7	7
	8	8
	9	9-10
	10	11

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	11	*12*
	12	*13*
	13	*12*
	14	*13*
	15	
	16	**14**
	17	
	18	**15**
	19	
	20	
	21	*16*
	22	17
	23	18
	24	21
5. 2	25	*22*
	26	*23*
	27	25
	28	*26-7*
5. 3	29	28
5. 4	30	*32*
	31	
	32	36
	33	
	34	39
	35	41
5. 5	36	*60*
	37	*61*
	38	*59*
	39	*66*
	40	*67*
	41	
	42	*68*
	43	*69*
	44	
5. 6	45	*70*
	46	
	47	*72*
	48	
	49	
5. 8	50	73-4
	51	75
	52	*76*
	53	78
5. 10	54	77
5. 11	55	79
5. 12	56	81
	57	83
	58	84
5. 13	59	85
	60	86
	61	87
	62	88
	63	89
	64	91
	65	94
	66	95-6
	67	97
	68	98
	69	99
5. 15	70	102
	71	105
	72	106-7
5. 18	73	112
	74	*113*
5. 20	75	*114-5*
	76	118
	77	119
	78	*120*
	79	*121*
	80	122
	81	123
	82	124
	83	125
	84	126
5. 21	85	127
	86	128
	87	129
	88	130
	89	131
	90	*132*
	91	*133*
	92	134
	93	135
5. 22	94	136
	95	137
	96	138
	97	139
5. 23	98	
5. 27	99	140
	100	141-2
	101	143
5. 31	102	178
	103	179
5. 32	104	180
	105	181
	106	183
	107	184
	108	185
	109	186
5. 33	110	187-8
	111	189
	112	190
	113	191
	114	192
	115	193
	116	194
	117	195
5. 36	118	196
	119	197
	120	198
	121	199
	122	200
	123	201
5. 38	124	203-4
	125	206
	126	208-9
5. 41	127	210
	128	211
	129	212
	130	213-4
5. 41	131	215
	9	**9**
	1	1-2
5. 42	2	3-8
	3	9
	4	10
	5	11
	6	12
	7	13
	8	*15*
	9	*17*
	10	*19*
	11	*21*
	12	*22*
	13	*25*
	14	31
	15	32
	16	33
	17	
	18	34
	19	35-6
	20	37-8
	21	39-40
	22	41
5. 43	23	42
	24	43-4
	25	45
5. 47	26	46
	27	
	28	47
	29	
	30	48
	31	
	32	
	33	*49*
	34	

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.	Välm.	BhK.	OJR.	Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	35			87		5. 53	137	69
	36			88			**10**	**11**
	37			89				
	38	50		90		**5. 54**	1	1
	39	51-2		**91**			2	
	40	53		92			3	2
	41	54		93			4	
	42	55-6		94			5	
	43	57		95	89		6	
	44	58	5. 49	96			7	3
	45	59		97			8	
5. 48	46	60		98	91		9	
	47		5. 52	99	92		10	
	48			100	93		11	
	49						12	
	50				**10**		13	
	51			101	1-2		14	
	52			102	3		15	
	53			103	4		16	4
	54			104	5		17	5
	55			105	6	5. 56	18	6
	56			106	7		19	
	57	64		107	8		20	
	58	65		108	9		21	
	59	66-7		109	10		22	7
	60			110	11		23	8
	61			111	13		24	9
	62	68		112	14		25	
	63	69		113	15		26	10
	64	70		114	16		27	11
	65	71		115			28	12
	66	72		116	23		29	13
	67	73		117	24-5		30	14
	68	74		118	26	5. 64	31	17
	69	75		119	28	5. 65	32	18
	70	76		120	30-1		33	19
	71	77		**121**	**32**		34	
	72			122			35	20
	73	78		123	36	5. 68	36	39
	74	80		124	37		37	41
	75	81		125	38		38	42
	76			126	40		39	44
	77	83		127	41		40	45
	78			128	42-3		41	46
	79			129				
	80			130			**6**	
	81			131		6. 1	42	47-8
	82			132		6. 4	43	49
	83			133	57		44	50
	84			134	59		45	53
	85			136	61		46	
	86			136	66-7		47	54

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	48	
	49	
	50	57
	51	60
	52	61
	53	
	54	
	55	67
	56	68
	57	69
	58	
	59	70
	60	71
	61	73
	62	74
	63	*75*
	64	76
	65	79
	66	*80*
	67	81
	68	86
	69	88
	70	89
	71	90
	72	91
	73	92
	74	94
	75	96
	11	**12**
	1	1
	2	2
	3	3
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9 }	**8**
	10 }	
	11	12-3
	12	
	13	14
	14	15
	15	25
	16	21-2
	17	24
	18	26
	19	23
	20	
	21	29
	22	

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	39
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	33
	32	
	33	
	34	46
	35	
	36	
	37	
	38	48
	39	
	40	
	41	59
	42	61
	43	63
	44	
	45	
	46	64
	47	
	12	**13**
	1	1
	2	6
	3	
	4	
	5	12-3
6. 9	6	14-5
	7	13
	8	16
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	19
	14	20
	15	
	16	29
	17	30
	18	
	19	
	20	
6. 9	21	39
	22	40-1
	23	
	24	
	25	

Välm.	BhK.	OJR.
	26	48
	27	
	28	52
	29	
	30	55
	31	
	32	63
	33	64-5
	34	
	35	
	36	69
	37	70-1
	38	72
	39	
	40	76
	41	
	42	
	43	80-1
	44	82-3
	45	
	46	
	47	
	48	
	49	87
	50	88
	51	89
	52	
	53	
	54	97
		14
	55	1
	56	2
	57	
	58	
	59	
	60	
6. 12	61	20
	62	22
	63	
	64	24
	65	
	66	28
	67	
	68	34
	69	35
	70	37
	71	
	72	
	73	41-2
6. 15	74	
	75	

Vālm.	BhK.	OJR.	Vālm.	BhK.	OJR.	Vālm.	BhK.	OJR.
6. 16	76	48		9	38		32	10
	77	50-1		10			33	*11*
	78	52		11	40		34	12
	79	53		12	43		35	*13*
	80	59		13			36	*14*
	81			14	44		37	*15*
	82	64		15	47		38	*16*
	83			16	48		39	*17*
	84	68		17	52		40	*18*
	85	69		18			41	*19*
	86	70		19	54		42	*20*
	87			20			43	*21*
				21	56		44	*22*
				22	57		45-50	
	13	**15**		23				
6. 21	1	13		24	66		**14**	**17**
	2	16				6. 31-3	1	
	3	19						
	4	20			**16**			**18**
6. 22	5	33		25	1	6. 25		
	6	34		26-9		41		
	7	35		30	8			
	8	36		31			14.2	**19.12**

APPENDIX IV

Rākṣasas & Monkeys.

Comparison of the fate of dozens of rākṣasas and monkeys might give a clue to the relation of the recensions in which they appear. It seemed out of the way in this study to produce complete lists of them; only those who have an extraordinary fate are therefore included.

A. I. Male Rākṣasas.

Rākṣasa chiefs are mentioned in Vālmīki VI. 9, 19, 36, 37, 43, 52-8, 59, 68-71, 75, 76 & 89.

1. *Triśiras* is killed in the early conflict caused by Sūrpaṇakhā (III. 27; BhK IV. 45; OJR IV. 76), but appears again on the battlefield without more, and is killed again (VI. 70; BhK XV. 84; OJR XXIII. 16).

2. *Nikumbha* is killed (VI. 43; BhK XIV. 34; OJR XX. 32), then shown by Vibhiṣāna to Rāma as one of his principal remaining adversaries (VI. 59) and is subsequently killed (VI. 77; BhK XV. 122; OJR XXIII. 47).

3. *Prajanggha* is slain (VI. 43; BhK XIV. 31; OJR XX. 14), enumerated as one of Rāvaṇa's last 6 principal chiefs (VI. 75) and is killed again (VI. 76; BhK XV. 116; OJR XXIII. 41).

4. *Ākampana* is slain (VI. 56; BhK XIV. 86; OJR XXI. 197), then shown by Vibhīṣaṇa to Rāma as one of his principal remaining adversaries (VI. 59). Vālmīki mentions him no more, only has in VI. 76 a certain *Kampana* slain, not

mentioned before; BhK XV. 115 and OJR XXIII. 41 kill *Kampana* in the same stanza, by them also not mentioned before, and *Ākampana* for the second time.

5. *Narântaka* dies only once in BhK XV. 79 and OJR XXIII. 12; twice in Vālmīki VI. 58 & 69, in the meantime (VI. 59) being shown to Rāma by Vibhīṣaṇa as one of his principal remaining adversaries.

6. *Virūpâkṣa* dies only once definitely in Vālmīki VI. 43, but twice in both BhK (XIV. 35 + XVII. 78) and OJR. XX. 34 + XXIII. 83).

7. *Dhūmrākṣa* is slain once (VI. 52; BhK XIV. 81; OJR XXI. 190) and once more only in OJR XXIII. 84, where he seems to have been confused with No. 8.

8. *Yupâkṣa,* slain VI. 76, twice in BhK (XV. 116 + XVII. 79), mentioned in OJR XIX. 8, but not in due time mentioned as slain.

The conclusions to be drawn from these 8 irregularities are: — 1-3 prove the high authority of the Vālmīki text and the early time at which the insertions have been made — if BhK goes back to Vālmīki. 4, 7-8 show confusions which do not admit of much conclusion: OJR XIX. 41 mentions *Ākrandana* as a monkey, XX. 59 and XXIV. 244 mentioning *Krandana*; the same rākṣasa/monkey must be meant. 5-6 show congruity in irregularities in BhK & OJR, which differ from the Vālmīki text.

Vālmīki has the duplicate Suka + Sārana (VI. 27. 28), Yogiśvara only knows one person Sukasāraṇa, Bhaṭṭi passed over the episode of their spying and so fails to give us a clue.

A. II. Sītā's rākṣasī-friend.

Sītā's rākṣasi-helper in Vālmīki V. 27/4 is called *rākṣasī Trijaṭā vṛddhā.* In V. 37/11 *jyeṣṭhā kanyā 'nalā nāma Vibhīṣaṇa-sutā* must be the same *rākṣasī,* devoted to Sītā; in the translation done by Makhan Lal Sen, Oriental Publishing Co., Calcutta (rather careless) we find; *Vibhisan's eldest daughter, named Kala.* V. 58/83 mentions *Trijaṭā* again without need to introduce her again. But VI. 33/1, speaks mir nichts dir nichts about *Saramā nāma rākṣasī,* which new name is mentioned in VI. 34/5 & 20. In VI. 47/5 & 15 it is again *Trijaṭā*; this name is maintained in 48/22, 39-40.

Hermann Jacobi in his Das Rāmāyaṇa, 1893, p. 133, mentions *Saramā,* queen to Vibhīṣaṇa, qualifies the episode VI/33 & 34 as 'secundary addition' but does not draw special attention to the other names.

BhK VIII. 99 & 101 corresponds to OJR VIII. 140 & 143, Vālmīki V. 27, *Trijaṭā,* the only place where she and her unfailing services are mentioned. In OJR she plays a much more important rôle, alwas as *Trijaṭā* (VIII. 140, 143, 145, 159; XVII. 61/2, 69, 78/9, 101/2, 116/7; XXI. 5, 7, 14, 36, 38, 41, 47/8, 55, 57; XXIV. 165, 168, 186/7; XXVI. 38-47) and is duely rewarded.

B. Monkeys.

Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa in a number of places sums up the rākṣasa-officers, but much more frequently still the principal monkeys are called by name; VI. 3. 4a. 4b. 24. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 37. 41. 42. 43. 45. 46a. 46b. 73a. 73b. But Bhaṭṭi on the other hand gives no list of monkeys, for they are superficial and foolish, as Yogiśvara tells us (XIX. 58); they cannot learn to be conjugated, nor do they bother about past and present, future and aorist. He mentions not many monkeys, and invented only one new name; Nir-ākula = Clear-Mind.

Yogiśvara liked the monkeys again much better. It is no use to compare his lists of monkeys (XVIII. 17-8; XIX. 40-1; XXIV. 243-52) with those in Vālmīki. But from internal comparison we see that XIX. 40-1 has some unusual names;

APPENDIX III

Comparative Table of Kāvyas and Kakawins, showing the number of times they have a mono-metric series of 2, 3, 4 etc., stanzas.

Legend:

1 41 above 45, etc., means: 41-45. **2** Numbers between brackets are those derived from the *sargas* where a special display of metres is held. **3** Neither the obligatory one conclusive stanza has been taken into account, nor a conclusion of only 2 stanzas.

Order of *kāvyas* as in Kühnau, ZDMG, 44, 1890; only Bhaṭṭi-kāvya lowered in order to get it in close proximity to OJR.

Order of *Kakawins* as in Balinese Wawatěkan, cf. Krom in TBG 57, 1916, p. 508-21 with intercalation of Hari-vaṅśa according to Friederich, ibid.

Number of verses / Kāvya & Kakawin	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Kumārasambhava																								
Raghuvaṅśa									1		2													
Kirātārjunīya	9 (46)	2 (10)	2 (2)	(1)			1					(1)				(1)								
Siśupāla-vadha	(78)																	(1)						
Naiṣadhīya	8 (55)	6 (4)	6 (1)	1 (1)	5 (1)	2 (1)	(1)	(1)													1			
Bhaṭṭi-kāvya	7 (30)	3 (7)	1		1		2					1				(2)				1		1	1	1
Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa	12 (28)	13 (16)	8 (11)	12 (6)	6 (4)	9	9	6 (2)	11	3 (2)	8	10 (1)	5 (2)	8	4	6	2	3	4	3	1	2		1
Bhoma-kāvya	7	10	4	7	7	8	6	2	5	3	9	3	4	2	1	2	3	3	1	5	1	1	1	1
Hari-vaṅśa	2	2	4	2	3	2	3	4	8	7	5	2	1	1	1	1		3	1	1	1			
Smara-dahana	1	1	3	1	1		2	1		1	5	2	5	3	5		3	1	2		1		2	
Arjuna-wiwāha		4		1	1	1	4	2	3	4	1	5	1	4	3	1				1				
Bhārata-yuddha			1	3	3	4	2		3	3	2	2	1	5		3	1	3	6	2				
Nāgarakṛtâgama		24	25	15	13	11	4	3	1		1													

Number of verses / Kāvya & Kakawin	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	38	39	41 45	46 50	51 55	56 60	61 65	66 70	71 75	76 80	81 85	86 90	91 95	101 105	106 110	111 115	116 120	121 125	126 130	131 135	136 140	141 145	151 155	156 160	210 220	total of stanzas
Kumārasambhava															1	5	3	2	1		1		1	1	2													1091
Raghuvaṅśa																1	2		1	3	1	1	2	4	2	2												1565
Kirātārjunīya										1		2		1	2	1	4	2	2		1	1																1041
Siśupāla-vadha																				6	3	3	3	1				1	1		1							1678
Naiṣadhīya																	2						1	1		3		2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2828
Bhaṭṭi-kāvya			1		1								2			3	1						1				2	2	1	1			1	1				1625
Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa	1	4	4	1		3		2	2		1		2		3	1	1	1				3		1														2774
Bhoma-kāvya		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		2	1		1																				1375
Hari-vaṅśa																																						499
Smara-dahana																																						489
Arjuna-wiwāha																																						355
Bhārata-yuddha	3							1			1				1																							724
Nāgarakṛtâgama																																						386

Kṛṣṇa, Draviḍa, Pralambôdara, Visaṅkaṭa, Siṅhânana; and also the passage XXIV. 243-52; Akaṃpya, Kāma-dṛṣṭ, Puṇyavān, Mahābāhu. Keśara *pro* Keśarī, and above all Sinta *pro* Sītā (XXIV. 251) make this last passage, even more than XIX. 40-1 rather suspect in my eyes. Kern & Juynboll had no objections here; Poerbatjaraka only stamps XXIV. 252 as 'annoying', giving no arguments.

APPENDIX V

Shibboleths for the study of OJR.

This last Appendix is mainly destined for those in Leiden, Jakarta, Singaraja and elsewhere, who have easy access to MSS of the OJR, the bulkiest poem of its genre in (India and) Indonesia.

The OJR. was held in such high esteem — et pour cause! — in Bali, that the „Verschil van Lezingen" in Kern's edition — based upon some 7 MSS., — took only 18 pages in comparison with 316 of the text itself. Now Kern, as early as 1900, did not bother his readers or himself by burdening his variae lectiones with obvious minor mistakes by copyists; even if he had done so, it would still have been apparent that OJR. is an essentially very well-preserved text. Still it offers perhaps in one or two of its copies a clue to the problems raised in this paper, and it might prove useful to scrutinize every MS on the following points:

1. Does every copy contain indeed 26 *sargas*?
2. If not, then are perhaps IX & X, or XIII & XIV, or XV & XVI taken together in one *sarga*?
3. Does every MS end *sarga* V and begin *sarga* VI as in Kern's edition?
4. Does any MS contain a stanza VIII. 135 or stanzas XXI. 93-7?
5. Does every MS in XV. 27 and XVI 24-9 read exactly the same as in the printed edition, or do they support the modest and astucious emendations proposed by Aichele in his "Grundsaetzliches zur Kawi-Interpretation, FBG I, p. 18-9, and his "Die Form der Kawi-Dichtung", OLZ 29, 1926, p. 933-9 (or in my translation "De Vorm der Kawi-poezie", in DJAWA 11, 1931, p. 174-80)?
6. After finishing this study I examined the 80 *yamakas* in *sargas* XVI, XVII, XIX, XXI, XXIII-XXVI. As a result I feel not certain about the present state of tradition in XVI. 31; XVII. 128, 131; XIX. 35, 114, 122.

CONTENTS

Blz.

PREFACE 3
(frequently used abbreviations) 5

I. INTRODUCTION 6
1. The literary genre of Kakawin 6
2. The problem of interpolation unsolved 10

II. A WAY TO SOLUTION 12
3. Good suggestions 12
4. Dr Bulcke's results 16

III. DETAILED COMPARISON OF EXAMPLE & IMITATION 17
5. Bhaṭṭi-kāvya: Form 17
6. Bhaṭṭi-kāvya: Contents 20
7. Old-Jav. Rām.: Form 22
8. Old-Jav. Rām.: Contents 30

IV. CONCLUSIONS 34
a) Concerning Old-Jav. Rāmāyaṇa 34
b) The traditional distinction: OJR versus the other Kakawins 35
c) Concerning Old-Jav. Kakawins 38

APPENDICES 39
I. Contents of OJR; metres used there 39
(unknown metres) 54

II. Concordance of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭi's (Mahā-) Kāvya Rāvana-vadha & Yogîśvara's Old-Jav. Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin 54

III. Comparative table of kāvyas and kakawins . . . . t/o 61

IV. Rākṣasas and monkeys (discrepancies) 61

V. Shibboleths for the study of Old-Jav. Rām. 63