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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the texts which Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/237) has classified as kawi miring, the Arjuna Sasrabau, Bratayuda, Rama, Bira Suci (Dewa Ruci) and the Panitisastra. These poems have been loosely ascribed to Yasadipura I and authorship will be considered in relation to individual texts. The term kawi miring has been used to describe a particular genre of literature which emerged in the Central Javanese court of Surakarta in the late eighteenth century. As the term literally suggests, texts classified as kawi miring were considered to have been written in a poetic medium that 'inclined' towards the 'kawi' texts of the Old Javanese period, hence Pigeaud's definition:

'sloping kawi in contradistinction to the real kawi of the old texts' (LIT.vol.I/23).

The genre remained in vogue for a brief period which corresponds with the so-called literary 'renaissance' in the Surakarta court.

The Modern Javanese versions of the kakawins are hardly representative of Javanese literary activity in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century but the refashioning of classical literature has been the cornerstone upon which notions of a literary 'renaissance' were built. Focusing upon the Modern Javanese kakawin-based texts necessitates a closer examination of the Javanese tradition kakawin manuscripts and raises the question of the manner of transmission and the tradition of interpretation of the kakawins over the passage of literary history in Java. The Javanese tradition variations on the Balinese manuscripts are commonly considered as corruptions and the eighteenth century versions of the kakawins are subsequently cited as evidence of an inability to 'correctly' render the Old
Javanese material into a Modern idiom. This study proposes the alternative view that the adjustments within the Javanese tradition manuscripts and the consistent tenor of the Modern Javanese versions argue for a continuity of interest and interpretation. The concept of a literary 'renaissance' should therefore be re-examined within the context of Javanese traditions rather than from a tabling of the many variations from the edited versions of the *kakawins* which were based on Balinese manuscripts.

The evaluation of the *kawi miring* texts during the course of this study, with reference to the established metrical forms of *kakawin* and *maeapat*, will not seek to defend or exaggerate the literary merits of the genre but rather to examine its relevance and function within eighteenth century court circles.
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1. KAWI MIRING: ARRIVING AT A DEFINITION

1.1 Introduction

Regarded more as a fleeting literary phenomenon or less objectively as the name implies, as pseudo or artificial kawi, kawi miring has received little attention apart from passing reference, mostly in relation to either wayang suluk\(^1\) or to the Modern Javanese macapat renderings of the kakawins. Only one kawi miring text has been published.\(^2\) There are two reasons for this apparent lack of interest.

Firstly, the availability of Balinese manuscripts of the kakawins in the nineteenth century confirmed scholars' impressions of the corrupt nature of their Javanese counterparts and the dubious worth of the kawi miring texts as an aid towards interpretation of the kakawins.\(^3\) Secondly, the many variations between the Balinese and the Javanese tradition manuscripts, which became increasingly apparent during the course of edition work, reinforced the notion that kawi miring was a genre based on imitation and tended to relegate the kawi miring texts further into the realm of artificiality.\(^4\)

Structurally, the genre employs a four-line arrangement that mirrors the kakawins, using the eighteenth century sèkar agèng metres that commonly occur in Modern Javanese wayang suluk fragments, the stately panèmbrama (welcoming song), and the basa (opening) melodies that preface the gendhings (gamelan ensemble compositions). The principles of quantity were not observed in eighteenth century sèkar agèng

\(^1\)Suluk are song fragments taken from either the kakawins or kawi miring texts which are inserted into the structure of the wayang lakon, often at potentially emotional or dramatic points.

\(^2\)A transcription of the Yasadipura Dewa Ruci sèkar agèng, (also called the Bima Suci) by Prijohoeotomo (1934). For reference to this text see Chapter 2.1.

\(^3\)Pigeaud (LIT.vol.1/238).

\(^4\)Poerbatjaraka (1940:43) discounts the possibility that the texts could be of any benefit to those working on the kakawins. He concludes that the texts bear witness only to the ineptitude of the eighteenth century poets.
but composition clearly revolved around caesura rulings (pédhotan) applicable to the number of syllables per line for a chosen metre.

A distinction is therefore made at the outset of this study between sëkar agëng, the metrical form and kawi miring, the genre which employed sëkar agëng metres. The majority of definitions of kawi miring describe its structural features, — Modern Javanese language idiom which made liberal use of kawi (in the sense of poetic language), within a framework of non-quantitative kakawin metres. As this definition could strictly be applied to the short pasindhen bëdhaya (court dance) texts, Modern Javanese wayang suluk or the bawa and panëmbrama fragments referred to above, kawi miring may perhaps be redefined as the genre which encompasses the Modern Javanese language sëkar agëng texts which have kakawin equivalents. These sëkar agëng texts also have macapat counterparts.

For a number of reasons, I have decided to use the term kawi miring throughout the study when referring to the genre itself rather than sëkar agëng. 5 Firstly, there was a nineteenth century tendency to position the sëkar agëng texts chronologically between kakawin and macapat and the use of the term kawi miring to describe these texts has all the overtones of a nebulous transitional genre. One of the aims of this study is to question this chronology and although there is only slight evidence to support the chronological link theory between kakawin, kawi miring and macapat, kawi miring texts may have had a significant role in the study and interpretation of the kakawins in the eighteenth century.

Secondly, the implications of artificiality in the use of the

5This is a matter of preference. Day (1981) preferred to use the term sëkar agëng throughout his study of Javanese poetry while Ricklofs (1978:239) refers to a chronogram text as being written in kawi miring metre rather than sëkar agëng. The term kawi miring is not found in any of the Modern Javanese poems examined. See Chapter 1.3.
term kawi miring fit neatly within the 'renaissance' context, an age of literary activity when poets may have attempted to emulate the technical expertise of a 'golden age' and to render, perhaps nostalgically, the contents of classical texts. The 'renaissance' theory carried to its extremes includes the notion of a gap in traditions and a decline in literary skills and standards until some impetus prompted jaded artistic circles to turn to the past for inspiration. Although there appears to have been increased literary activity and expansion in the fine arts area during the late eighteenth century, the evaluation of literature strictly within the 'renaissance' context bears not only on the minor genre of kawi miring but also upon eighteenth/early nineteenth century poetry in general.

Following an initial review of references to sekar ageng and kawi miring in the Modern Javanese texts themselves, in the catalogues and by nineteenth century scholars (Chapter 1), there will be some consideration of Prijohoeotomo's theory (1934:141) that puhotan (caesura) rulings in operation in eighteenth century sekar ageng served as a substitute for the kakawin principles of quantity (Chapter 2). While not accepting Prijohoeotomo's thesis that eighteenth century sekar ageng constituted a transitional genre, evidence will be produced to show a strong similarity between the caesura rulings for the Sanskrit Varna Vṛtta metrical category upon which kakawin was based and the caesura rulings for sekar ageng structure used in the kawi miring texts. These caesura similarities between Sanskrit and eighteenth century sekar ageng have considerable implications for the whole question of the level of competence with and interest in Old Javanese language and literature in the eighteenth

---

6 For reference to the literary 'renaissance', see Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/235), Drewes (1974:199) and Soebardi (1975:19-20). Ricklefs (1974:119-126, 1978:152-156 and 212-220) contests the notion of a 'renaissance' but suggests that there may have been some continuity of interest in Old Javanese language and literature until the Kartasura period.
century Surakarta court. Chapter 3 will therefore be devoted to references to the esteem in which *kawi* (Old Javanese) texts were held within court circles and to the possible streams of transmission in Java.

Chapter 4 deals specifically with the resources which the *pujangga* may have had at their disposal either to aid or influence the interpretation of the Old Javanese texts. These include the condition of the Javanese tradition *kakawin* manuscripts, the possibility of earlier renditions into Modern Javanese, study groups and oral tradition.

The structural and linguistic peculiarities of *kawi miring* are detailed in Chapter 5 while Chapter 6 seeks to examine the functional aspects of *kawi miring* as opposed to *maacapat*. Modern Javanese *sèkar agèng* fragments were used for *wayang suluk* texts and for *bawa* introductions and the apparent preference for Modern Javanese material to augment the ceremonial and theatrical repertoire is noted in this chapter.

The final two chapters are devoted to the results of a comparative analysis between the Old and the Modern Javanese poems. It should be stated at the outset that the decision to pursue a comparative line of approach seemed justified in view of the Modern Javanese texts being based on the *kakawins* but that the aim of the comparison was not to list every structural and interpretive deviation from the *kakawins*, nor to attempt to offer explanations for every departure from the Old Javanese narrative. The selective processes behind the omissions, extensions and substitutions became clearer when a wider range of Modern Javanese texts were compared with their Old Javanese counterparts and there was a consistent impression that with some adjustment and redefinition, contemporary issues, relating to statecraft and Islamic based philosophical thought, could be presented to an eighteenth century audience through a Hindu-Javanese frame story with little sense of anachronism. Comparison seemed a useful tool in the circumstances and it is sincerely hoped that its application is in no way detrimental to the appreciation of the
Modern Javanese poems within their own literary and aesthetic right.

The selection and presentation of material in the text and translation appendix was governed firstly by the principle aim of the study being to examine the structural peculiarities of kawi miring as a genre and secondly by the fact that the narrative frames of the Modern Javanese poems are already available in editions and translations of their kakawin counterparts. As the kawi miring texts are all lengthy, it seemed preferable to present six self-contained episodes from one of these texts, the Arjuna Sasrabau and to focus more critically upon this kawi miring version in comparison with the Javanese tradition kakawin manuscripts and the macapat equivalents. In addition, two episodes from the Bratayuda and the Panitisastra kawi miring are included in the text and translation section to enable a structural and linguistic comparison with the Arjuna Sasrabau. These two excerpts also contain common aspects of Modern Javanese emphasis and presentation.

The Arjuna Sasrabau material was chosen for a number of reasons; firstly, the kakawin, kawi miring and macapat texts were shorter than the Rama and Bratayuda equivalents while the Panitisastra was excluded because of the more pedagogical nature of this text. While there are references throughout this study to the Rama, Bratayuda, Panitisastra and Dewa Ruci collections, after having worked with these manuscripts, the Arjuna Sasrabau texts proved to be the more manageable alternative.

Secondly, whereas Modern Javanese versions of the macapat Bratayuda, Rama and Dewa Ruci have been published, there are no Yasadipura macapat or sēkār agāng editions or translations of Arjuna Sasra material available, although the Sindusastra Sērat Lokapala made

7The text of the Sērat Rama with notes by Kats (1925), Cohen Stuart's monumental edition of the macapat Bratayuda (1860), the sēkār agāng version of the Dewa Ruci/Bima Suwi by Prijohoeotomo (1934) and parallel Dewa Ruci material in the Sērat Cabolek edited by Soebardi (1975).
for interesting further comparison with the Yasadipura texts. 8

Finally, both Yasadipura I and II wrote maaapat versions of the Arjuna Sasrabau; the kawi miring version, authorship of which is open to question, was written after the first maaapat rendering while the Yasadipura II text was clearly based on the kawi miring. Although the maaapat I text, referred to by Yasadipura II in his later maaapat version, is not listed in catalogues and is justifiably noted by Day (1981: 58) as being lost, there are two copies of an Arjuna Sasrabau maaapat text in the British collection 9 which fit the description supplied by Yasadipura II and which employ almost the same vocabulary (with some allowance for metrical manipulation), as the kawi miring Arjuna Sasrabau text. The first three cantos of this maaapat Arjuna Sasrabau version are also contained in a bundle of manuscripts in the Leiden collection, Lor 2175(4) 10. The choice of the Arjuna Sasrabau therefore allowed for some insights into the structural adjustment from maaapat into sekar ageng and finally into a second maaapat version. A review of the basic Old and Modern Javanese material consulted is provided below to facilitate referencing in the following chapters.

Arjuna Sasrabau Material

I kawi miring

Br 306, Museum Pusat, Jakarta (Poerbatjaraka 1933a:286), a copy of Lor 185C(1), the Leiden manuscript being dated 1803 (LIT.vol.II/43). The manuscript is described as 'groote mate, Yasadipura I' on the front leaf. In the colophon in canto 63, the author is noted as Yasadipura, without the qualification first or second. The extant kawi miring

8 Palmer van den Broek (1900). The Winter edition (1853) of the Yasadipura Arjuna Sasrabau maaapat is not readily available and I was only able to consult this text briefly in Leiden.

9 IOL Jav 46, dated 1800 and Add. 12302, dated 1801. See manuscript description to follow.

10 See text description to follow.
version is probably by Yasadipura II although the possibility of a partial *sêkar agêng* version that ran parallel with the Yasadipura I *macapat* version should not be discounted. Certain variations between the Yasadipura II *macapat* poem and the *kawi miring* point to a re-editing or joint authorship process. Further reference to authorship is made in the notes in the translation appendix. This text has 63 cantos and 277 pages, designated *ASB KM* (MS A) throughout this study.

LOr 1793, dated 1807, 334 pages, 62 cantos (see description in LIT. vol. II/27). There was more variation in this manuscript, although most variants were metrically possible. Designated *ASB KM* (MS B).

NBS 219, dated 1817, 168 pages, 62 cantos, (see LIT. vol. II/751). This manuscript was closer to MS A. Designated *ASB KN* (MS C).

II *Macapat material*

IOL JAV 46 in the British collection, dated 1800, is an *Arjuna Sasrabau* *macapat* text copied in Yogyakarta. IOL JAV 46 is noted in Ricklefs/Voorhoeve (1977:64) as containing 59 cantos and being 420 pages in length. In addition to the *Arjuna Sasrabau* poem, this manuscript contains some *Sêrat Rama* fragments (1.17-2.4) as a preface to the *Arjuna Sasrabau*, as well as a *Rama macapat* tale at the end. The *Arjuna Sasrabau* text is 28 cantos long and corresponds with the description of the earlier *macapat* version of Yasadipura I, given by Yasadipura II in the final cantos of his own *macapat* version (51.25). According to Yasadipura II, the elder Yasadipura wrote a version which omitted the middle section of the *kakawin*. IOL 46 is therefore tentatively designated *ASB MAC I*.

BL Add. 12302, entitled *Sêrat Rêjunawijaya*, dated 1801 (see Ricklefs/Voorhoeve 1977:47). The *Arjuna Sasrabau* passages in this manuscript are a copy of IOL 46 but Add. 12302 contains ten bridging cantos in the middle of the text which correspond with the omitted *kakawin* section. The source material, however, was from the *Sêrat Kandha* rather than
from the *kakawin*. This manuscript also contains cantos 22-77 of the *Sêrat Rama*, possibly an early version. See note in Chapter 4.3, p.112. Designated *ASB MAC I*.

LOr 2175(4) contains cantos 1-3 of the *Arjuna Sasrabau macapat* version as found in the two manuscripts above. See LIT.vol.II/81 and Vreede (1892:378).

MS BG 232 from Museum Pusat, the *Arjuna Sasrabau macapat* version by Yasadipura II, dated 1819; 51 cantos, 127 pages, (see Poerbatjaraka 1933a:286). Designated *MAC II*.

*Sêrat Arjuna Sasra/Sêrat Lokapala*, the *macapat* version by Sindsusastra written in 1829. The 1900 edition by Palmer van den Broek was used for the text but the introduction contained in the VBG 1870 version was also consulted. The Sindsusastra version has several cantos in common with IOL 46 and Add.12302 *MAC I* versions (Cantos 22-28, Sindsusastra, which correspond with the narrative content in *ASB KM* cantos 7-14.). Designated Sindsusastra.

### III *Kakawin* material

*Arjunawijaya kakawin*, Javanese tradition, LOr 1855 (2), dated by Supomo (1977:86) as 1782 (see also LIT.vol.II/43). Each canto was prefaced by a metre name according to the eighteenth century Surakarta tradition. Designated Surakarta MS. Most quotations from the *Arjunawijaya kakawin* are taken from this manuscript.

*Arjunawijaya kakawin*, Javanese tradition, copy of MS 219, made in 1970 by Hadisutjipta from 75 *lontar* pieces held in the Museum Pusat, Jakarta. See Supomo (1977.86) and Poerbatjaraka (1933a:286) for reference to MS 219. This MS is written in an odd script which Supomo suggests is West Javanese. Although of the Javanese tradition, quantity symbols were marked throughout this copy and
the *Lontar* original. Probably a related but earlier version of the Surakarta MS and LOr 2048 (to follow). See reference to this MS in Chapter 3.3. Designated MS 219.

*Arjuna-vijaya* *kakawin*, Javanese tradition, MS LOr 2048, consulted briefly in Leiden to confirm that the same or similar variant readings were common to the three Javanese tradition MSS. See LIT.vol.II/63-64, where the script is described as 'antique quadratic' and Day (1981:52) who suggests early eighteenth century dating.

The Balinese tradition of the *kakawin* was represented by the edition by Supomo (1977). Designated the edition.

**Other**

*Sérat Kandha ning Ringgit Purwa*, LOr 6379, vol.II, cantos 30-51 for *Arjuna Sasrabau* and *Rama* material. (See LIT.vol.II/357.) Designated SK.

**Bratayuda Material**

**Kawi miring**

LOr 1789, dated 1809, 92 cantos, 425 pages. (See LIT.vol.II/26.) This MS was designated MS D by Cohen Stuart (1860:25) and is noted as *BY KM* in this study. Cohen Stuart (1860:18) discussed the possibility of joint authorship and re-editing of Bratayuda material. The extant *KM* version is probably by Yasadipura II.

LOr 2157 (*C*) dated 1826, was examined briefly in Leiden for completeness and caesura divisions. (LIT.vol.II/77).

**II Macapat**

*Brata-joeda, Indisch Javaansch Heldendicht*, the edition by Cohen Stuart of the *macapat* Bratayuda (1860:VBG 27 and 28) is attributed to Yasadipura I. Designated *BY MAC*. 
III  Kakawin

Bharatayuddha kakawin Javanese tradition, BL Add.12279, dated 1814, contains an interlinear text until canto 22. (See Ricklefs/Voorhoeve 1977:177). Designated by OJ Javanese tradition. The majority of quotations from the kakawin are taken from this manuscript.

NBS 9, 118 selected stanzas from the kakawin, Javanese tradition. (LIT.vol.II/714). See Chapter 4.1 for further reference.

The following kakawin manuscripts were examined for variant readings, completeness, metre names, caesura indicators and the extent and nature of the interlinear passages where included.

IOL JAV 4, Javanese tradition, complete, 52 cantos. Noted in Ricklefs/Voorhoeve (1977:58) as being the Bratayuda kawi miring. See Chapter 1.4 for reference.

IOL JAV 15, Javanese tradition, 21 cantos only, each prefaced by a Javanese tradition metre name; interlinear text included. Noted in Ricklefs/Voorhoeve (1977:59) as Bratayuda kawi miring. See Chapter 1.4 for reference.

MS LOr 1788, Javanese tradition, noted in LIT.vol.II/26 as being copied under the supervision of Winter. See Chapter 3.3 for reference.

LOr 2106 (LIT.vol.II/68). Fifteen cantos only, noted by Gunning (1903:iii) as being a Javanese manuscript copied from the Balinese. See Chapter 3.3 for reference.

Balinese tradition was represented by the Gunning edition of the kakawin (1903).
Nitisāstra Material
Lōr 1853, parts 1-6

I  Kawi miring

Panitésastra kawi miring by Yasadipura, probably the elder, Lōr 1853, parts 3 and 4, two copies of the kawi miring text dated 1798. Described on the front leaf as 'kawi miring'. 12 cantos, large kraton script. (See LIT.vol.II/43). Designated Paniti KM.

II  Maaapat

Lōr 1853, part 6 dated 1818, 15 pages. The author is noted as being Tumenggung Sastra Nagara (Yasadipura II). (See LIT.vol. II/43).

III  Kakawin

Lōr 1853, part 1, Javanese tradition MS with interlinear text in part 2 (LIT.vol.II/43). No date. This manuscript continues in a sequence parallel with the Poerbatjaraka edition of the Nitisāstra until canto 3. From cantos 3-5 until 7.1 where this manuscript ends, stanzas were omitted and out of sequence. The Balinese tradition was represented by the Poerbatjaraka edition (1933b).

Rāmāyaṇa Material

I  Rama kawi miring

Lōr 1791, 167 cantos, 763 pages, no date (see LIT.vol.II/26). Probably not by Yasadipura as this text exhibited certain features that were at variance with the ASB KM, BY KM, Paniti KM and the Bima Suci/Dewi Ruai KM. Designated Rama KM.

II  Maaapat

Sērat Rama maaapat, ascribed to Yasadipura I. The Kats edition
of 1925 was used in conjunction with the fragments in the IOL 46 and Add.12302 MSS. Designated SR MAC.

III Kakawin

Sections of the Javanese tradition MS of the Rāmāyana kakawin, LOr 1790, dated 1782 (LIT.vol.II/26); 736 pages but sarga division was most unclear. Kern (1900:1), Zoetmulder (1974:40) and Soewito-Santoso (1980:8) made reference to this manuscript. See Chapter 3.3 for further reference within the context of Javanese tradition manuscripts.

The Balinese tradition was represented by the Soewito-Santoso edition (1980).

Deva Ruai Material

I Kawi miring


II Macapat

Deva Ruai passages contained in the Sērat Cabolek, edited and translated by Soebardi (1975).

III Older Javanese material

Deva Ruai sēkar ageng, fifteenth century text published by Poesphatjaraka (1940). See reference to this text in Chapter 2.1 and 2.2.

1.2 The Term Kawi

Definitions of kawi miring hinge firstly on the interpretation of kawi and secondly on the direction and angle of the 'inclination'.
Perhaps the most succinct definition of kawi which best illustrates how alternative interpretations of the term kawi miring are possible, particularly after only cursory examination of the kawi miring texts, is the Gericke and Roorda description:

'Ve name for Old Javanese by the Javanese, and for poetic words in the present day language.' (1901:1/472)

By this definition, kawi miring could be interpreted as a later form of Old Javanese with Modern Javanese inclinations or an attempt by the Surakarta poets to imitate Old Javanese prosody. A review of references to kawi miring indeed indicates that definitions of kawi miring were flexible, as the following two descriptions will illustrate. Whereas Gericke and Roorda (1901:1/472) proceeded to define kawi miring as

'inclining kawi, later kawi that inclines towards the new poetic language',

Tjan Tjoe Siem (1938:243) suggests that the term describes literature

'written in Modern Javanese but cast in quasi - Old Javanese form, inclining to the Older Literature.'

During the course of attempts to establish some consensus of definition on the word kawi, terms such as old kawi, real kawi, later kawi, modern kawi and kawi miring appeared. The eighteenth century Modern Javanese poems gave the consistent impression of kawi as the language of their Old Javanese counterparts and basa kawi was also used by early nineteenth century scholars as a composite term for Old Javanese.

---

11 Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Dutch are mine.
12 Soebardi (1975:206) offers a similarly phrased definition:

'Kawi which leans towards Modern Javanese.'

13 See, for example, old and modern kawi in Roorda (1882:2-3), real kawi in Kern (1875:80) and later kawi in the Gericke and Roorda definition noted above.

14 Mounier (1843) and Cohen Stuart (1860) used the term kawi to refer specifically to Old Javanese. De Hollander (1848:218) defined kawi as a book language which had remained unchanged over time but was no longer understood in Java. Crawfurd (MS Add.18577:97) noted that in accord 'with the well known prejudices of mankind', kawi implied what was superior or excellent and Java what was modern and vulgar.
Winter (1911:334), for example, made reference to the five extant kawi texts in Surakarta and cited the Rama, Bratayuda, Wisaha, Arjuna Saera, and Nitiestra kawi.

Around the middle of the nineteenth century, at a time which coincided with the appearance of the Winter Kawi-Javanese dictionary, the simple notion of kawi as the language of the kakawins acquired a number of tangent aspects and definitions of kawi were often conflicting. Kern (1875:80) raised the question of precise definition in his preface to the Māttasānacaya, stating at the outset that a Javanese word marked kawi led to nothing but confusion and drawing an immediate distinction between real kawi (or Old Javanese) and simple or Modern Javanese. Roorda (1882:2-3) then complicated the issue by proposing that kawi should be considered as a separate language and that this language differed from the natural prose not only in vocabulary but in word formation. Poensen (1897:12) raised objections to the separate language notion and insisted in the introduction to his grammar that contemporary spoken and written Javanese idioms must be considered merely as younger forms of Old Javanese.

Van der Tuuk (1879a:vii) had already voiced some misgivings in his preface to the Winter dictionary when he called for an end to the 'reveries' about kawi and he proceeded to gather the disparate conceptions.

---

15 The Mechelen's informant (1879:74) provided the same information which te Mechelen concluded came from the same source responsible for Winter's facts.

16 Berg (1928:176) laid a considerable degree of the blame for the confusion with the Winter dictionary, asserting that Winter had created a norm and that the application of these standardised and often corrupt forms were in part responsible for the stagnation and decline of Modern Javanese poetry.

17 A similar problem of succinct definition exists with the term 'middle Javanese' and Zoetmulder's comment (1974:25) on the term bore comparison with the nineteenth century attempts to define kawi.

'Up to the present time, however, no-one has succeeded in finding a name which both avoids misunderstanding and is short and easy to handle. So we must resign ourselves to using it. But if we are not to be misled by it, the term must first be carefully defined.'
of *kawi* into a short article which he appropriately titled 'Misverstand?' (1881). Van der Tuuk's frustration with the term was most evident and the issue remained unresolved with his question:

'What names should we give to the different degrees of Old Javanese?' (1881:540)

By the twentieth century, *kawi* tended to be used almost exclusively for archaic or poetic forms of words. Whereas Berg (1928:176) defined *kawi* as a 'special literary language', Pigeaud's early use of the word 'idiom' (1926:361) came close to an acceptable compromise in definition.

A discerning use of *kawi* is listed in present day text books as one of the components of successful poetic composition, although most text books suggest that it is more effective to use known *kawi* words. Despite the controversy surrounding the term *kawi*, *kawi* works, in the sense of Old Javanese poems, were most respected texts in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century courts, from the point of view of both content and as exemplary poetic models.

1.3 References to *Sêkar Ageng* in the Modern Javanese Texts

There was considerable difficulty in tracing the origin of the term *kawi miring*; none of the definers ventured any suggestion as to the origin or the coiner of the expression, nor was there any reference to the term in any of the Modern Javanese poems consulted. In both the *maçapat* and the *kawi miring* texts themselves, it was often unclear whether the *kakawins* or the eighteenth century *sêkar ageng* poems were being discussed.

All the texts consulted contain expressions such as *lagwaning kakawin* (Arjuna Sasra MAC II 1.2), *sêkarnirang kakawin* (Arjuna Sasra KM

---

18 Hardjowirogo (1952:23) specifically cautions that one should not have to use a dictionary to understand Modern poetry.

19 This confusion was also noted by Day (1981:53) in relation to the *kawi miring* version of the *Arjunawijaya kakawin.*
1.1), tembang geng (Bratayuda MAC 1.2), ageng tembangipun (Sêrat Rama MAC 25.13). However, in the Arjuna Sasra MAC II text, Yasadipura II made specific reference to his macapat version of the Arjunawijaya kakawin having been written some time after the sekar ageng poem.

'Formerly, a jarwa had been made but it was still in kakawin metres.' (ASB MAC II 51.22)²⁰

'The language was in jarwa but the metre was still that of the kakawin.' (ASB MAC II 51.29)²¹

The Arjuna Sasra KN text describes itself metrically as sêkar nirang kakawin mêmêng ri basa jarwa (1.1d), while the Dewa Ruai (Bima Suci) KM author stated that he wished to relate an excellent tale ri lagu magêng (1.1). The Sêrat Rama KM contains no reference to its metrical form but the Bratayuda KM refers to lagunirang kakawin rikang basa jarwa (1.1b). The term jarwa lagu magêng is found in the opening stanzas of the Panitisastra KM (1.2).

Although Winter's Javaansche Zamenspraken (1911) does not strictly belong within a Javanese text category, it seems appropriate to examine Winter's references at this point rather than with later Dutch references²². Winter made no mention of the term kawi miring but he classified metrical forms into sêkar kawi, utawi sêkar ageng, sêkar têngahan utawi dhagêlan, sêkar macapat utawi sêkar alit (1911:313). When a Bratayuda sêkar ageng text was compared with the kakawin (1911:301), the Modern Javanese text was referred to as the jarwa sêkar ageng and the kakawin as the kawi.

One point that does emerge from these conversations on the various metrical forms is that there was little distinction between macapat

²⁰nguni pan sampun jarwa, ananging mêsênh lagunipun kakawin.
²¹basane wus jarwa, namung tembangipun kang misih kawi lagune.
²²Javaansche Zamenspraken falls into the period of literary activity prompted by what Ricklefs terms 'external stimulus' (1978:153). This work, however, does contain valuable information which can be used in conjunction with Javanese references.
and sekar ageng in terms of either a more respectable or less artificial genre. When asked the author of the jawra of the Bharatayuddha kakawin, the Javanese informant replies that Yasadipura I was responsible but does not refer directly to either the maaapat or the sekar ageng texts (1911:302). When the questioner specifically asks whether the maaapat and the sekar ageng texts compare favourably with the kawi original, the informant discusses both texts as comparable literary works. (1911:312).

1.4 References to Kawi Miring in the Catalogues

Only one sekar ageng text, the Panitisastra, was consistently classified as kawi miring in any of the catalogues. The remainder of the sekar ageng texts, which Pigeaud has since classified as kawi miring, were invariably described as jawra, often without any further qualification as to whether the metrical form was maaapat or sekar ageng. Vreede described the kawi miring texts used in this study, Arjuna Sasra KM Lor 1793 (1892:4), the Bratayuda KM Lor 1789 (1892:11) and the Rama KM Lor 1791 (1892:7) as jawra texts with no reference to metre. Juynboll (1907:501) gives no metrical details for the NBS 219 Arjuna Sasra KM text. Poerbatjaraka describes three equivalent texts in the Jakarta collection as Arjuna Sasrabau groote maten Br 306 (1933a:286), Bratayuda groote maten BG 233 (1933a:299) and Rama sekar ageng (groote maten) BG 240 (1933a:348). Brandes (1920:201 note 4) had cause to refer to a sekar ageng version of the Arjuna Sasrabau (which he attributed to Yasadipura I).

23 Pigeaud describes this text as 'modern Javanese but still in (quasi) Indian metres, called kawi miring, Yasadipura.' (LIT. Vol.I/105, Vol. II/43.) See Juynboll (1907:1/135), Vreede (1892:26) and Poerbatjaraka (1933a:337).

24 The MS BG 589, Rama sekar ageng, which Poerbatjaraka (1940:44) cited in conjunction with the Dewa Ruci sekar ageng to dispute Prijohoezomo's thesis on eighteenth century sekar ageng as a linking literature, is not described metrically in the 1933 Yearbook (348).

25 The text referred to is the Lor 1855(1).
in relation to the placement of metre names at the end of cantos in Old and Modern Javanese literature. Although his reference indicated some familiarity with the genre, he also preferred the term 'groote maten'.

It was not uncommon to find Javanese tradition manuscripts of the kakawins registered as kawi miring. The absence of quantity indicators perhaps led to the classification of two India Office Bharatayuddha kakawin manuscripts as kawi miring (IOL 4 and 15)26 while the accompanying stanza by stanza jarwa in the IOL 15 manuscript further complicated identification. Tjan Tjoe Siem (1938:244) supported Prijohetomo's complaint (1934:140) that catalogues frequently listed kawi miring manuscripts as either kakawins or Modern Javanese poems but when he proceeded to describe eight kawi miring texts, he listed two Central Javanese tradition kakawin manuscripts, the Rāmāyaṇa (NBS 121)27 and the Arjunawijaya Lor 2309 as kawi miring texts. Tjan Tjoe Siem also stated that there were three kawi miring texts based on the Arjunawijaya kakawin, the Lokapala kawi miring (LOr 1855), the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring (LOr 2309) and the Arjunawijaya kawi miring (no codex).

All the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring manuscripts in the Leiden collection that were used in this study were found to be virtual copies of the same text. The alternative names for texts in the Arjunawijaya collection often gave the impression of there being a greater number of texts than were actually in existence. A similar practice of referring to the Sūrat Lokapala, Arjuna Sasra and Arjunawijaya sēkar ageng texts was evident in present day song and suluk booklets when the compilers attempted to cite the source of t' sēkar ageng stanza and, if possible, the canto

26See manuscript description in 1.1.
27COD 121 is listed in Juynboll (1907:1/121) as 'kawi miring en groote tèlembang'. Pigeaud (LIT.vol.II/742) notes that the title page of this manuscript, which reads 'Rama Dewa kawi miring' was incorrectly titled. It is not clear from any of the catalogues when this kakawin text was classified as kawi miring. The manuscript itself is dated 1782, the same year as a similar Rāmāyaṇa kakawin text of Surakarta tradition, the LOr 1790.
from which it was taken. On a number of occasions, it was possible to confirm that the stanza quoted was, in fact, from the text which is referred to in this study as the *Arjuna Sasra kawi miring*. When referring to sources, the preference in the booklets on *suluk* and song was for the term *sūkār agèng* rather than *kawi miring*.

1.5 Early References to *Kawi Miring*

One of the earliest references to *kawi miring* was in 1843 by Mounier; the use of the term was, however, related to the *Panitisastra kawi miring* rather than a general reference to the genre itself. In his preface to a paraphrase of the *maaapat Panitisastra*28, Mounier (1843:236) stated that a *Panitisastra kawi miring* text had been written in 1798 by Yasadipura, that a *jarwa* (the *maaapat*) was written in 1808 by Raden Tumenggung Sastra Nāgara (Yasadipura II) and a prose text by Puspawilaga was composed in 181929.

The chronology in this case is quite clear. The question now arises as to whether the cataloguers' references to a *kawi miring* *Panitisastra* yet a *jarwa* or 'groote maten' *Rama*, *Bratayuda* and *Arjuna Sasra* were influenced by the fact that the *Panitisastra kawi miring* seems to have been rendered directly from the *kakawin* whereas, as Poerbatjaraka (1940:44) has since suggested, the *maaapat* versions of the *kakawins* predated the other three *kawi miring* texts. This seemed to be unlikely. The early cataloguers made no reference to the chronological factor but

---

28 Several pages from the preface of the Mounier paraphrase were included in the preface to the Poerbatjaraka edition of the *Mātisāstra kakawin* (1933b:2-5). Mounier made reference to a Modern Javanese rendering using the term *kawi miring* in this article. Poerbatjaraka made no comment on the use of this term.

29 Vreede (1892:26) and Pigeaud (LIT.vol.II/43) date the *maaapat* as 1818 and the Puspawilaga prose as 1842, taking the dating from the description on the manuscript itself which Mounier said (1843:240) applied to the copying. Poerbatjaraka (1964:135) accepts Mounier's dating and all are in agreement on the 1798 dating for the *kawi miring*. 
appear to have been more guided by the words 'kawi miring' written on the front leaf of two copies of the same Panitisastra sêkar agêng text in the Lor 1853 collection of Old and Modern Javanese Nitîsāstra material.

The second aspect to be considered is whether the Panitisastra kawi miring was written in a manner structurally and linguistically at variance with the other texts which have since been catalogued as kawi miring. Cantos 1-4 of the Panitisastra kawi miring are presented in Part 2 to enable a formal comparison with the Arjuna Sasa and Bratayuda kawi miring. There is a close relationship between the Nitîsāstra kakawin, kawi miring and the Yasadipura II macapat version but taking into account the didactic and rubrical nature of the Old Javanese text itself, there appears to be the same degree of affinity between the three genres as is in evidence in the other renderings of the kakawins. Whereas the Surakarta poets had more scope in the refashioning of the narrative kakawins to omit description, to expand a character's role or to include an episode of their own making, the rendering of a solid list of prescriptions in the Panitisastra Modern Javanese versions may have given the initial impression of a strict translation. This, however, was not the case; as the text and translation selection cantos will demonstrate, the Modern Javanese poets managed to strike some balance in their rendering of this kakawin.

The language employed in the KM version is no more stilted than that used in the other texts, nor is the vocabulary borrowing from the kakawin more pronounced. Metre choice is similar and the manipulation of sense within pêdhotan units is comparable. In conclusion, apart from the chronological aspect, there is nothing particularly distinguish the Panitisastra kawi miring from the ASE, BY, DR and Rama versions, nor do I consider that the Panitisastra text has a greater claim to the term, kawi miring.

30 See manuscript listing in 1.1.
Ironically, Mounier's description of kawi miring (1843:237) contained none of the misconceptions of the later references. Firstly, there was no impression that kawi miring represented a transitional metrical form. Furthermore, Mounier was of the opinion that the kawi miring and macapat texts employed the same proportion of kawi words, in content were very similar and that variation between the macapat and kawi miring texts could often be accounted for metrically. This was very much the general impression gained from an examination of the kawi miring texts in this study although there were some aspects (to be discussed in Chapter 6), which appeared to be more peculiar to either genres.

Early references to kawi miring tended to be couched cautiously and were subject to revision. A definition in the 1876 Jansz dictionary reads 'the later kawi' (p.183), yet it is expanded in the 1913 edition (p.276) to 'later kawi that inclines towards the present day language'. Poensen (1897:12) framed his summary of the development of kawi so as to leave no doubt that kawi miring was viewed as the metrical precursor of 'basa jarwa':

'We know that kawi has passed through different periods of development, so one speaks of a kawi miring and after that, basa jarwa.'

In an early article devoted to Rāmāyana renderings, Pigeaud (1926:35:) discussed 'the Old Javanese Rāmāyana, a rendering of it in kawi miring, and a third rendering in macapat metres by R. Ng. Yasadipura.' This sequence could be viewed as strictly chronological. It was therefore of some interest to find a similarly phrased sequencing which could justifiably be considered as a chronological enumeration of texts and genres in the Hooykaas preface to the Poerbatjaraka and Hooykaas translation of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin (1934:1).

'This literary form called kawi miring, never enjoyed great popularity and it was not long before all three of the named epics (the Bratayuda, Arjunaasasra and the Ramayana) were once again
reworked, this time re-rendered in *macapat*.'

Although Hooykaas alone was responsible for the preface to the joint translation, Poerbatjaraka's consistent use of the term *sêkar ageng* for all of the other *sêkar ageng* kakawin-based texts yet *kawi miring* for the *Panitisastra* is puzzling. The term *kawi miring* was not used during the course of his lengthy analysis of the *Dewa Ruci/Bima Suci* texts (1940) where he contests Prijohetomo's opinions on this genre, nor in *Kapustakan Djawi* (editions 1952-64) which has become a standard text, except in reference to the *Panitisastra*. Poerbatjaraka did not explain his rationale or preference for the *Panitisastra kawi miring* classification but it would seem that he had no objection to the use of the term in the Introduction to the *Bhâratayuddha* translation. Six years later, however, (1940), Poerbatjaraka dismissed the possibility that the *sêkar ageng* texts could have been written prior to the *macapat* counterparts, a suggestion that scholars have since been content to accept and cite without specific reference to texts.

1.6 The Charge of Artificiality

One final reference to *kawi miring* is Pigeaud's description (LIT. vol.1/237) of the *kawi miring* texts as 'modern Javanese paraphrases, still in the original Indian metres' and it is proposed to examine this categorization within the context of artificiality and imitation. As these texts were written in a period which has been termed a 'literary renaissance', it may be permissible to draw loosely on parallel aspects in European literary history at this point.

All the *kawi miring* texts are close to their *macapat* counterparts; the only justification, therefore, for considering the *kawi miring* texts

31 Wilkens (1851:1) suggested in the Introduction to his edition of the *Yasadipura macapat Sewaka* that there may have been a *kawi miring* version written between the *macapat* and a proposed Old Javanese rendering.
as paraphrases of the *kakawins* would be if the same classification was applied to the *maaapat* texts. The *Sérat Rama*, for example, has been acclaimed as one of the finest examples of eighteenth century *maaapat* poetry yet this text has been evaluated within the confines of its own particular genre and as a literary entity in its own right rather than a paraphrase of a classical text. Neither the *maaapat* nor the *kawi miring* texts constitute strict translations of the *kakawins*\(^{32}\). In the case of the *Arjuna Sastra* collection, both the *kawi miring* (dated 1803) and the *maaapat* II (dated 1819) contain sections additional to the *kakawin* and both have omitted, apparently with some degree of selectivity, certain passages from the *kakawin*. It is of some note that the *kawi miring* author added substantially to the first *maaapat* version which was clearly one of the texts that he consulted, while the *maaapat* II poet made further additions in his *kawi miring*-based version\(^{33}\).

Both the *maaapat* and the *kawi miring* versions stand apart from a class of text which could be more aptly described as a paraphrase, commentary or scholia, texts which were written as parallel interpretive aids to the *kakawins*\(^{34}\). An examination of two *Bhāratayuddha* *kakawin* manuscripts, the interlinear Javanese tradition Add. 12279, IOL JAV 15, and the *jarwa* in the *Panitisastra* collection (LOr 1853, part 2) indicated that these texts served a function in literary circles which differed from the more sensitively shaped *maaapat* and *sekar ageng* poems. The impression gained from the *kawi miring* and the *maaapat* texts was that the poets' aim was not merely to translate the epic texts, the themes of which would

---

\(^{32}\) Structural, linguistic and content variation between *maaapat* and *kawi miring* is examined in Chapter 6.1 and 2.

\(^{33}\) See Day (1981:45-62) for some insights into extension and embellishment in the adjustment from *kakawin* to *sekar ageng* and *maaapat* in the *Arjuna-wijaya* rendering.

\(^{34}\) In one period of early Greek and Roman history, paraphrases and margin-
alia were made for the classical texts, texts which Hall (1913:41) felt would have been unintelligible but for these aids. 'The Paraphrase was now a necessity since the Greek language was slowly changing in syntax and vocabulary. Such commentaries and paraphrases are of gradual growth, and the scholars who compiled them are either unnamed or merely names.'
have been familiar from wayang, but to exercise their technical and creative expertise in the reshaping of material within a Modern Javanese literary idiom.

There is no denying that kawi miring (or sĕkār agĕng) was a less familiar format than maoapat; artificiality is a difficult concept to apply objectively and its application has not been restricted solely to kawi miring. Similar charges have been brought against Modern Javanese literary language and prosody in general as opposed to the more natural day to day idiom35 while van Stein Callenfels (1925:153) claimed that kakawin literature represented the height of artificiality36. Kawi miring may well be considered contrived by virtue of the fact that its emergence coincided with what could be construed as a fashionable reinterest in the past. It is therefore tempting to draw some parallels with a literary genre which arose in the second century Greek provinces under Roman domination. Reynolds and Wilson (1968:38) summarise this style of writing as being prompted by nostalgia and a sense of inferiority:

'If men could no longer perform acts worthy of the great days of old, they might at least attempt to rival them in literary style.'

This genre, as opposed to kawi miring, lasted for approximately eight centuries until the end of the Byzantine period. Although Reynolds and Wilson feel that 'the fashion was artificial in the extreme and had undesirable effects on literary composition of every kind', one side benefit was that the tradition of interest and the reading of classical texts was maintained until a more scholarly approach was applied in the Renaissance period37.

---


36 Van Stein Callenfels (1925:154) likened the relationship between kakawin language and Old Javanese to that of 'kawi' (in the sense of a poetic language) and Modern Javanese.

37 Reynolds and Wilson (1968:40) sought a parallel for this form of 'stylistic archaism' in Eastern rather than European literature, citing Mao Tse-tung writing verse in the manner of an eighth century poet.
Compared with the classical *kakawin* texts, which employed 'real kawi, the *kawi miring* poems may seem imitative while in relation to *maapat*, the *pèdhotoan* divisions could appear restrictive. The emergence of *kawi miring* as a genre may have been prompted by a sincere rather than a fashionable interest in past literature, as composition within *sèkar agèng* would have enabled an additional aesthetic dimension in the presentation of *kakawin* material.
2. KAWI MIRING AS A NON-QUANTITATIVE LINKING LITERATURE

2.1 The Arguments

Only two scholars, Prijohoetomo (1934) and Poerbatjaraka (1940) have devoted any attention to eighteenth century sākar ageng as a genre, although both references were very much side issues of the topics the respective scholars were pursuing at the time. During the course of a short description of the salient features of kawi miring texts, Prijohoetomo (1934: 140) ventured the opinion that these 'Modern Javanese adaptations in old Javanese metres' constituted a link between what he cautiously termed old and new traditions in Javanese poetry. While presenting the text and translation of a short Dewa Ruci poem, tentatively dated from the fifteenth century and similarly cast in non-quantitative four line verse, Poerbatjaraka (1940) took objection to Prijohoetomo's claim that the eighteenth century Dewa Ruci sākar ageng poem by Yasadipura was related to an earlier tradition of non-quantitative poetry which Poerbatjaraka saw as being represented by the fifteenth century poem.

It is perhaps the non-quantitative aspects of eighteenth century sākar ageng, coupled with the absence of any indications in the Javanese tradition kakawin manuscripts that the principles of quantity were appreciated or observed, that have placed the kawi miring texts in the position of belonging to neither metrical camps. It could

1 The main thrust of Poerbatjaraka's argument is contained between pages 41-46. He dates his manuscript on the basis of its language (p. 10) which he says is almost Modern Javanese and on the fact that there is no reference to Islam in the text. Stutterheim (1940: 131-132) submits archaeological evidence to support the existence of such a text in the first half of the fifteenth century. See also Zoetmulder (1974: 120 and a note on p. 518) for further comments on the dating and classification of this text.
be suggested that in approaching the eighteenth century Dewa Ruci and trying to place it within an historical sequence of Javanese literature, Prijohoeetomo was faced with the options of either attempting to link the text with an earlier genre or to examine the form in its own right, within the context of eighteenth century literature. Prijohoeetomo (1934: 141) chose the first option; he presented his case for eighteenth century sĕkar agĕng being a remnant of an earlier literary form with the argument that the pĕdhotan (caesura) rulings in operation in the kawi miring texts 'compensated' for the absence of quantity.

Poerbatjaraka's most convincing evidence (1940:44) which severed the chronological link between kakawin and kawi miring was the fact that no further texts had been written in this non-quantitative genre after the fifteenth century.2 His second argument, based on a comparative analysis of the eighteenth century sĕkar agĕng and macapat Dewa Ruci texts, was that the Dewa Ruci sĕkar agĕng was modelled on the macapat, rather than serving as the intermediate text which Prijohoeetomo saw as the linking literature between the Old Javanese equivalent. Poerbatjaraka's impression was borne out by the comparative examination of macapat and kawi miring texts during the course of this study.

Two aspects of the debate between the two scholars are of particular relevance to this survey; firstly, that Prijohoeetomo sought, or indeed felt it expedient, to establish a link between the quantitative poetry of the classical period and the eighteenth century court literature in which macapat occupied pride of place. The second

2 Poerbatjaraka does not mention in the 1940 article a text entitled Suluk Sukarsa which according to Kapustaken Djawi (1964:90) dates from the Islamic period and is an example of a tĕngahan text; 'in metre, but in an older style, in slokas, lampah 8+8, times four, but without guru laghu.' See further reference to this text in 2.2.
point is Prijhoetomo's suggestion that pōdhotan (caesura), a concept basic to Javanese poetry, was substituted at some point in time for the principles of quantity.

The evaluation and classification of the eighteenth century sēkar agēng texts is perhaps related to the problem of how to approach the imposition of the rules of quantity upon a language which has no word accent. Poerbatjaraka and Prijhoetomo favoured, in essence, a gradual easing of quantity aspects from the sēkar agēng employed in the kakawins rather than a cessation of composition while the genre was still in its intact, quantitative form. Whereas Poerbatjaraka saw the non-quantitative form continuing parallel with the newly resurfacing indigenous (macapat) metres for a limited period of time in Java and slightly longer in Bali, Prijhoetomo considered a period of use which possibly extended into the eighteenth century. In a more recent appraisal of the reasoning proposed by both scholars, Zoetmulder (1974:120) sealed the debate when he stated that to his knowledge, there is no evidence that non-quantitative kakawins were written in Java or Bali, although the principles of quantity were subject to change and flexibility over the passage of literature from the Arjunawiwahā to the later Majapahit period.

3 Slametmulyana (1954:101) extends the importance of pōdhotan in determining the shape of poetry to Indonesian poetry in general.

4 See Teeuw and Uhlenbeck (1958:218) and Teeuw (1950:5) who discuss the imposition of long and short syllable alternation upon Javanese poetry.

5 Poerbatjaraka (1940:45) spoke of a 'rivalry' between macapat and sēkar agēng metres in the post-Majapahit period in much the same manner as Berg (1928:68) envisaged the earlier rivalry between macapat and Indian metres. Berg, however, suggests that the indigenous metres continued concurrently but were forced to adopt a much lower profile beside the court favoured Indian metres.

6 Zoetmulder (1974:120) disputes Hooykaas' assertion (1964:33) that some Balinese kakawins were written in metres that did not employ the principles of quantity.
The arguments of both Poerbatjara and Prijohetomo nevertheless tend to suggest that a degree of either ignorance or ineptitude played some part in the relaxing of the rules of quantity in Old Javanese poetry. Although Berg (1928:88) called for a little more objectivity in the evaluation of Modern Javanese literature, the technical ingenuity and the sensitive handling of language and sentiments in the *kakawins* has relegated any literature flanking this period to an inferior position.\(^7\) Prijohetomo's efforts to link eighteenth century *sākar ageng* to an earlier period may perhaps be viewed as an attempt to add some respectability and classical genealogy to this art form compared with the more commonplace *macapat* genre. Similar overtones of established metrical respectability are to be seen in Poerbatjara's conclusion (1940:44) that the eighteenth century settings in *sākar ageng* allowed for a wider aesthetic ambience which he succinctly terms 'deftigdoenerij'. If we accept Poerbatjara's opinion that eighteenth century *sākar ageng* was not linked with a proposed non-quantitative genre, some attention should be directed to the older *Dewa Ruci* text which he considered as being representative of this particular genre.

2.2 The *Dewa Ruci* 'Kakawin' and *Kawi Niring*

The impression metrically of the *Dewa Ruci kakawin*\(^8\) was of a symmetry based on units of eight and twelve syllables which seemed to hark back to some of the more fundamental elements of early *macapat* and

---

7 See, for example, Cohen Stuart's reservations (1860:120) in devoting his energies to the *macapat* rather than to the 'kawi' Bratayuda, the Modern Javanese rendering lacking what Cohen Stuart termed the 'classical succinctness and simplicity' of the originals. Also I Wajan Bhadra (1937:13) who states that in the Balinese competitions, *kidung* are considered to be 'second rate' material. Kartomi (1973:44) refers to 'the Javanese belief in the "inferiority" of their autochton verse 'r com­parison with poetry in *tembang gēdhe*, with its long lines, Sanskrit prosody, obsolete words and courtly origin'.

8 The full text and translation of the *Dewa Ruci* are published in *Djawa* (1940:11-28).
popular poetry. Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/19) has made reference to these elements in relation to a quatrain form and the Suluk Sukarsa, referred to by Poerbatjaraka as a further example of non-quantitative four line verse, exhibited the same metrical peculiarities.

The metrical scheme is as follows; one stanza from each canto is quoted below to facilitate discussion.

Canto 1. Sixteen syllables, clearly divided into 8+8. The divisions gave the impression of a greater syntactic independence than most sèkar agèng units were capable of producing.

Canto 2. Poerbatjaraka noted some problem of canto division. Canto 2 consists of two stanzas only, each containing twelve syllables per line.

Canto 3 contains five fractured stanzas, each with an average of twenty-four syllables. As these twenty-four syllables broke easily into 12+12, it is suggested that these two cantos may have been one longer canto with twelve syllables per line.

Canto 4. Twenty-eight stanzas of twelve syllables per line.

Canto 5. Eighteen stanzas of sixteen syllables (8+8) per line.

---

9 Nine stanzas of the Suluk Sukarsa are quoted in Kapustakan Djawi (1964:90-91) and are representative of the text as a whole. The MS LOr 6587, which I examined briefly in Leiden, is 105 stanzas in length and is written in one metre. Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/18) had some misgivings about Poerbatjaraka's classification of this text as non-quantitative 'sèkar cara kina' and suggests that considering the obvious octosyllabic metrical frame, it may be more appropriate to connect the Suluk Sukarsa with a popular quatrain or pantun form in which many poems of a religious nature were fashioned in the Islamic period. One verse is quoted below:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ki Sukarsa wus alayar'ing sakathahing sogara} \\
&margane tèkang ma'ripat tan aetang urip pèjah \\
&damare murup tan pèjah'panganggo mulya tan rusak \\
asangu tan kěna télas'angungsi ing desa jimbar.
\end{align*}
\]

Note also that the last syllable of each eight syllable unit is a rhyming a. Girisa, a metre common to macapat and kakawin, is, in the macapat form, 8a times 8. Further reference is directed to Noorduyn (1983:413) who quotes from and discusses an Old Sundanese religious narrative text, similarly written in octosyllabic verse which Noorduyn says was the form for Old Sundanese narrative poetry.
Canto 1.1 gatya lampahi nararya pangutusing dang hyang Driona ameta toya pawitra suci mawening ...
lali sireng pawwang sanak ibu tan ketang denira lagawa sireng antaka tan jrih durgamaning pesir

2.1 byatita uninga sang hyang suksma dining sukma sira makarya nusa mahalap apan sira wisesa tan wi (nisesa) (sang) mapurwa saisining jagat kabeuh

3.1 ndah sigra umuntas ta sang Bayusuta lênglêng lumiyat ing urubing êni ana kadi lilit kisik-kisikika mutyara sumên (su)mênê marakata karangnya prasomya mawor (lawan) pawal lawan bagorkoni kadi ri têpi singrong singgrongika widurya len manik bañunika aer-gulo sumrik miring.

4.1 yeka garjita manah sang Bayusuta manon ri sang satapêl alit ing wayah tunggal-tunggal (ta) sira datanpa rowang i(ênu) tunggal sing katemu pada tunggal

5.1 Sri Kuntisuta winarah yan tiga musuhing tapa karanya tan têkan i don’sang ataki-taki (n) lampah paroking tiga winuwus’tanpa pasah aneng raga yan tan kawilêt ing tiga’prasida mor ing tan ana.

In disputing Poerbatjaraka’s thesis on the passage of kakawin to non-quantitative sêkar agêng, Zoetmulder (1974:120) justifiably comments that the short Dewa Ruci text of some ninety stanzas provides an insufficient basis for sound theories of metrical evolution. However, if one point may be ventured from the admittedly scanty sample available, it is that there is a stronger case for linking the divisions into eight and the use of twelve syllable metres with popular and functional poetry than with eighteenth century sêkar agêng metres. The quatrains forms referred to by Pigeaud are thought to be of considerable age and include the alliterative, cryptic and often erotic wangsalan (riddle) poems. This form also appears to have been linked metrically with the pasindhen bêdhaya text choices. Although Pigeauud makes reference to these forms in relation to predominantly octosyllabic verse, examples of pasindhen bêdhyaya texts, wangsalan and sindhenan

10 Sindhenan is a song accompanied by gamelan.
song texts in booklets on song and verse were frequently framed in lines of twelve syllables.\textsuperscript{11}

There was a wide range of metres employed in the \textit{kawi miring} texts and an examination of over four hundred and fifty \textit{s\~kar ag\~ng} fragments in the te Mechelen \textit{lakons} (1842, 1844) indicated that metrical choice ranged between eight and twenty-four syllables to a line, with a variety of \textit{p\~dhotan} combinations. Although the Poerbatjaraka text only provides examples of sixteen and twelve syllable metres, there was an impression that the syntactic arrangement within these metres was similar to the arrangement of sense units within metres of sixteen and twelve syllables in the \textit{kawi miring} texts. Rather than connecting the \textit{kawi miring} texts specifically with the \textit{Dewa Ruci} poem or to a genre as represented by this text, it is suggested that some metres in \textit{kakawin}, \textit{s\~kar ag\~ng} and \textit{macapat} reflected elements of popular poetry or may have been fashioned as some concession to these familiar metrical elements.

Mention was made above to the syntactic completeness of units of eight in sixteen syllable metres in the \textit{Dewa Ruci} text. In every list of \textit{s\~kar ag\~ng} metres consulted, the only \textit{p\~dhotan} combination for sixteen syllable metres was 8+8, eight syllables being the largest \textit{p\~dhotan} unit in operation in \textit{s\~kar ag\~ng}.\textsuperscript{12} In the \textit{Arjuna Sasra kawi miring}, \textit{Prawiralalita} (16; 8,8) was used on three occasions. Although there were indications that the poet had attempted to apply \textit{p\~dhotan}

\footnotesize

11 A \textit{pasindhen b\~dhaya} text discussed by Poerbatjaraka (1964:140) is in a twelve syllable metre. Ricklefs' example (1978:243-4) of a chronogram text which he describes as \textit{kawi miring} is also in twelve syllables. A \textit{b\~dhaya} text published by Tirtaamidjaja (1967:58) is in \textit{R\~tna-mulya} metre (12;4,8). Other song texts in Probobhardjono (1963) contain twelve syllable examples. In NBS 133 and 94, there were ample examples of twelve syllable \textit{pasindhen b\~dhaya} fragments.

12 See Gonda (1975a:114 and 1975b:493) for analysis of average cola lengths and syntactic units in prose and poetry.
rulings throughout every canto of this text without undue fracturing of normal syntax and narrative flow, the divisions into eight in Prawiralalita cantos gave the impression of a more relaxed handling of sense units.

ASB KM 49.4 Prawiralalita.

duh Pukulun Sang Narendra Patih Paduka ngémasi rayinta Patih Suwanda' Dasamuka kang mëjahi miwah sagung para raja' kang abela duk kasambut Rëkyana Patih Suwanda' tatag titih saguh ing prang.13

It was also found that twelve syllable metres in the Dewa Ruci defied attempts to consistently any known pédhotan combination for twelve syllable metres throughout the canto.14 Kusumawicitra, one of the most popular sëkar agëng metres, was the only metre which exhibited a marked variation in pédhotan indication throughout the kawi miring texts. In the Bratayuda kawi miring, for example, pédhotan markings were omitted from Kusumawicitra cantos, although in Madurëtña cantos, a Modern Javanese twelve syllable metre with caesura at 5,7, the pédhotan was marked and the sense units were more neatly contained within sets of five and seven syllables.

On the six occasions on which Kusumawicitra was used in the Arjuna Sasra KM, the ruling 6+6 was difficult to apply without unfortunate breaks in the middle of words or creating unsatisfactory sense units. Pédhotan was occasionally marked after four rather than six syllables and it was not uncommon to find markings of four and six in the same stanza. The following example of Kusumawicitra may be compared

13 Pédhotan divisions are marked with a small cut when quoting from the kawi miring texts and in the text selection. See notes on the arrangement of text material in Part 2, p. 259.

14 Combinations include Kusumawicitra (12;6,6), Madurëtña (12;5,7) and Rëtna mulya (12;4,8). Poerbatjaraka (1964:71) stated with reference to the metre used in canto 4 of the Dewa Ruci that although the name of the metre was unknown to him, it was a common metrical choice in pasindhen bëdhaya. He suggested 12;4,8 but the line quoted by him does not fit effectively into this combination. 4.2a bagya ta ki/ta Bima mapa gatinta.
with the more marked divisions in the twelve syllable Madurētna fragment.

**ASB KM 2.1 Kusumawicitra 12;6,6**

Sri Sumali karenān denyantuk wulang
sangsaya mangungsā'lwirning pangawikan
meh kawingkis kahnānira Hyang Guru
tan samar yen ana'titah mardi kawruh

**ASB KM 36.1 Madurētna 12;5,7**

sanadyan dewa' ing Suralaya sami
yēktine samyā' angalēmbaneng laku
kus pasthi lamun jēnēnging Narapati
yen animbangē sarahsaning kang sastra ...

In conclusion, the only metres in the kawi miring texts that exhibited a greater degree of pādhotan flexibility were: Kusumawicitra, where not only were the 6+6, divisions often omitted from the text but neither could this division be applied effectively when read. Prawiralalita, where although the metre strictly consisted of 16: 8+8, lines seemed to have been formed on units of eight with no internal pādhotan division. Divisions within these units of eight and twelve syllables may have been as flexible as macapat caesura. Links between eighteenth century sēkar agēng and the Poerbatjaraka text are therefore restricted to elements of popular or older indigenous metrical forms.

### 2.3 Pādhotan as a Substitute for Guru Laghu

Prijohoeotomo (1934:141) did not elaborate upon the manner in which he envisaged quantity principles being replaced by pādhotan but his suggestion that pādhotan rulings were incorporated into kakawin structure appears to apply only to the newly emerging non-quantitative genre. There is, however, some evidence that strict pādhotan rulings were borne in mind when kakawin texts were copied and read in the eighteenth century Surakarta court. In some of the Surakarta tradition
manuscripts of the Arjunawijaya, Bhāratayuddha, Rāmāyaṇa, Nītisāstra and Arjunawiwāha kakawins, pādhotan divisions according to eighteenth century sēkar agèng rulings were found to be marked consistently throughout the texts.

A brief digression is necessary here to illustrate the way in which pādhotan was marked in these manuscripts. The first impression gained from the Arjunawijaya LOr 1855(2) was that a marking very similar to the length symbol used to indicate the long vowel a (\(\text{ā}15\)) was scattered throughout this manuscript. Occasionally, the placement of this long vowel symbol coincided with the correct form as noted in the edition based on Balinese manuscripts and also as found in the less accurate Cod 219 Arjunawijaya Javanese text which is written in what appears to be a West Javanese script. As the pattern of employment of this symbol became clearer, it was apparent that a formula other than an appreciation of the principles of quantity was to account for those occasions on which the appropriately placed long vowel symbol was common to the Surakarta and the Balinese manuscripts. The following example may illustrate the distribution and function of length symbols in the edition, representing the Balinese tradition, and the Surakarta LOr 1855 text.

Arjunawijaya 1.1a. The Edition
Ong Śrī Parwatarājadewa hurip ing sarwapramāṇēng jagat.16

The Surakarta manuscript.
Ong Śrī Parwatarājadewa hurip īng sarwapramaneng jagat.17

15 This symbol, the tarung, is found in combination with the taling in Javanese script. The Balinese name for this long vowel symbol is tādung. Drewes (1969:4) referred to a similar symbol marked in the sixteenth century Islamic text (attributed to the Pangéran of Bonang) as a length mark.
16 Hail! To the god Parwataraja, the life of all the vital spirits of the world. Supomo (1977:181).
17 Quoting from the Javanese tradition manuscripts throughout the thesis will use Javanese orthography which is often at variance with the edition. For example, pramaneng for pramāṇēng.
Rāja is marked with a long a in both texts. The placement of the length symbol traditionally associated with the long vowel a beside the word ing in the Surakarta text may be explained as follows: every canto of this Surakarta manuscript was prefaced by the name of an eighteenth century sākara ageng metre which had the same number of syllables as the kakawin metre that followed\textsuperscript{18}. Reference to a number of texts devoted to eighteenth century sākara ageng confirmed that pədhotan divisions applicable to sākara ageng metres had been marked into the kakawin texts with the symbol associated with the long vowel a\textsuperscript{19}. The previously quoted line from the Surakarta MS which was described in the manuscript as being in Sardulawikridita metre (nineteen syllables, divisions 6,6,7) is now presented with a slash to represent the pədhotan divisions in place of the symbol which was transliterated as a long vowel in the edition.

\textit{ong sri parwatara\textipa{ja} dewa hurip ing/ sarwapramaneng jagat.}

This system will be employed throughout this study when quoting from the Surakarta manuscript.

Prijohoetomo did not mention this feature, nor whether the employment of the symbol associated with long vowels to mark caesura prompted him to suggest that pədhotan served as a substitute for quantity. \textit{Pədhotan} is a device basic to intelligable presentation

\textsuperscript{18} There were four exceptions; cantos 3, 19 and 60 were cast in metres that had one extra syllable and canto 50 with one less compared with the Balinese manuscripts. Canto 3, \textit{Wəgangsulanjari} (23;5,6,6,6, Edition, Kilayu-\textipa{manageng} 22), canto 19 \textit{Rasanta} (14;8,6, Edition, Praharṣīnī 13), canto 60 \textit{Wəgangsulanjari} (Edition, Sandyakara 22), canto 50, \textit{Swandana} (20;7,7,6, Edition, Sragdharā 21).

\textsuperscript{19} The \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} Lōr 1790 began by marking pədhotan with the length symbol but converted to a pada lingsa-type slash mark at canto 2 (\textbackslash n). The Arjunawijaya Lōr 1855, Lōr 2048 and Lōr 2309 used a combination of slash and length mark, the Arjunawivāha Lōr 1857 preferred the length symbol and a double dot mark (:). The \textit{Nitiśūstra} Lōr 1853 used the length symbol consistently and Add-12279 \textit{Bhāratayuddha} kakawin marked pədhotan sporadically with a slash mark.
of verse and song. Although Zoetmulder (1974:559) states that there is no evidence that caesura was an important element in Old Javanese prosody, some division, of necessity, must have been made as the singer presented a line of twenty syllables in length. With respect to kidung, Robson (1971:21) notes that the lack of punctuation marks in texts of the Wangbang Wideya variety may have been due to the absence of a fixed punctuation system rather than scribal error. He adds, however, that the lack of punctuation symbols does not preclude the possibility of sub-divisions within a stanza.

Kunst's impression (1973:122) that 'the ancient Javanese forms of sākar aṅg are completely identical with the different metres in India Proper' may have been disputed by scholars who were primarily concerned with the poetic rather than the musical aspects of sākar aṅg but Kunst does include caesura as one of the elements of Indian metrics that he presumed would have been an integral part of Old Javanese prosody. Kern made reference to caesura in Old Javanese poetry on two occasions but it must be remembered that Kern approached Old Javanese studies from a strong Sanskrit background. In his preface to the Rāmāyaṇa edition (1900:IV), he referred to spelling variations that were likely to occur before what he termed the main caesura and caesura. He elaborated on caesura in Old Javanese as opposed to Sanskrit metrics in the Vṛttasaṅcayo

20 The kakawin poets appear to have preferred metres with a greater number of syllables than the most popular Indian metres. By far the most popular metre was Jagaddhita, 23 syllables, closely followed by Sārdūlawikrīdita, 21 syllables. Zoetmulder (1974:112).

21 De Casparis (1956:283) notes that in a Śikharinī verse on an OJ inscription, dated 856, caesura was made after the sixth syllable. Sākar aṅg Sikarini, seventeen syllables, is divided into units of 6,6,5.
preface (1875:77), where he suggested that caesura was more flexible in Old Javanese prosody in that a division could be made after a long syllable in the middle of a word; the Sanskrit practice, ideally, was for a caesura to occur after a word or a complete unit in a compound word.\(^{22}\)

Although p\text{\`d}hotan is a considered element in macapat poetry, breathing points and punctuation are flexible and the standard definition of 'reading in fours' should not be taken too literally.\(^{23}\) Macapat poems, however, were not conceived to be confined to the written manuscript page; the genre is a vital art form in Java to the present day and the verse and accompanying melody cannot be divorced from each other. Nevertheless, neither p\text{\`d}hotan nor notation are marked into macapat manuscripts. The accomplished singer has a highly developed sense of the melody appropriate to the metre and the text and his p\text{\`d}hotan decisions for a line of verse are related to melody and sense.

It has been argued that evidence is too scant to support the notion of a genre of non-quantitative Old Javanese verse developing in a continuum into Modern Javanese s\text{\`k}ar a\text{\`g}\text{\`e}ng of the eighteenth century Surakarta variety. If, as Poerbatjara\-raka (1940:45) suggested, 'a great chronological hiatus' existed between his proposed s\text{\`k}ar a\text{\`g}\text{\`e}ng of the transition period and the Surakarta s\text{\`k}ar a\text{\`g}\text{\`e}ng genre, the question arises as to when the p\text{\`d}hotan regulations were formulated for the s\text{\`k}ar a\text{\`g}\text{\`e}ng employed in the eighteenth century

---

\(^{22}\) Vernon Arnold (1967:190) defines caesura in relation to Sanskrit poetry as 'usually a pause in the sense as well as the sound'.

\(^{23}\) See Kartomi (1973:43).
texts and the extent to which the poets and performers were conversant with these regulations.

In view of Zoetmulder's impression that caesura was not as integral an aspect of *kakawin* composition as it apparently was in Sanskrit metrics, it could be presumed that the *pedhotan* rulings were the invention of the eighteenth century *pujangga* who attempted to design a set of caesura divisions for the longer length *säkar ageng* lines. The newly formulated regulations and a lack of familiarity in the manipulation of these units in performance would explain why *pedhotan* was more apparent in the *kawi miring* texts, why it appears to have been strictly observed in composition and marked into the manuscripts. It stands to reason that if the genre was developing at the same time as the rules were being formulated, the *pedhotan* rulings would have been taken into account in the construction of a line of *säkar ageng* verse, but bearing in mind the flexible approach to *macapat* *pedhotan*, it does seem inconsistent that these caesura rulings, if the invention of the eighteenth century poets, should have been imposed upon the *kakawin* texts themselves. Were then the *säkar ageng* *pedhotan* regulations related to a tradition of performing the *kakawins*, at least in Java, according to these divisions?

Kunst (1973:123), examining the musical aspects of the *kakawin*, concluded after consultation with Poerbatjaraka that the present day *säkar ageng* renditions in Java were guided by current styles and techniques in *gamelan* and provided no clue as to how the Old Javanese texts were meant to be sung. Indications as to how the *kakawins* were intended to be sung should perhaps be sought initially in Bali.

2.4 Caesura and Presentation

In his article on *mabasen* (the *linese* study groups whose
members perform and analyse *kakawins*, I Wajan Bhadra (1937:7) referred to *virama*, which he defines as 'song method according to the Hindu verse metres'. Bhadra did not expand on those song methods, nor did he mention the observance of *padhotan*. Although Kunst (1973:333) defines *virama* as tempo and Gericke and Roorda (1901:II/21) equate *virama* with *irama*, the metre of music and dance, the strict Sanskrit and Old Javanese connotation of *virama* is pause (Zoetmulder: 1982:2290).

In a more recent survey of *kakawin* performance in Bali, Wallis (1980:134) discusses *virama* in terms of the metres and melodies of the *kakawins*. Although Wallis states that the *kakawin* metres were modelled on the Sanskrit *Varna Vṛtta* metres (1980:25), he made no reference to a fixed caesura system in either *kāwya* or *kakawin* and, in fact, stresses that caesura in Balinese presentation was governed by sense and interpretation and tied to the paraphrase that follows the line of *kakawin* verse. Wallis, however, did make one important qualification:

"The actual singing of *virama* metres today is based on oral tradition rather than written theory, and there is no way of knowing how they were sung in Java when they were composed or even how they were sung in Bali a century ago' (p.169).

Robson (1972:312) stated that it was his impression that the *kakawins* were designed to be sung 'according to a fixed system (rather than, say, by improvisation)', adding that *virama* (metres) of the same number of syllables were sung to melodies that were very similar. As metres were distinguished by different patterns of long and short syllables, there were a greater number of metres than the melodies designed to complement them. This prompted comparison with the

---

24 Wallis (1980:139) felt that the *kakawin* performer was 'first and foremost a literary scholar, not a singer'. He notes that although mistakes in pitch and rhythm were tolerated, the proper grouping of a sense unit must be observed in performance and that the *juru basa* (the paraphraser) often corrected the singer.
sēkar agāng metres where pēdhotan rather than quantity was the differential in distinguishing metres of the same length. Although pēdhotan has been proposed as a substitute for quantity rather than any suggestion that it may have been an integral part of kakāwin prosody or the presentation, the apparent anomaly of two kakāwin metres of the same length with identical metrical patterns necessitated a footnote from Zoetmulder (1974:559) with the further qualification 'Was there a difference in caesura between Upendrabajra and Upasthita?'

There are a limited number of metres common to sēkar agāng, kakāwin and the Sanskrit Varna Vṛtta category which contain the same number of syllables and bear the same name. When these metres were compared, it was found that remarkably similar caesura divisions were in force for the Sanskrit and the eighteenth century sēkar agāng metres. The following table illustrates this aspect. Column 1 contains metres common to kakāwin, sēkar agāng and Sanskrit. The quantity pattern, which does not apply to the Modern Javanese metres is included to illustrate the incidence of sēkar agāng pēdhotan consistently coinciding with a long syllable, thus supporting Kern's observation (1875:77) that caesura in kakāwin was more flexible than in Sanskrit but that caesura should be made after a long accented syllable. Column 2 contains the Sanskrit caesura. Column 3 lists additional commonly used sēkar agāng metres with the same

25 It was not uncommon, however, to find metres in sēkar agāng lists which had the same number of syllables and identical pēdhotan divisions. See metre lists in Chapter 5.2.

26 The text consulted for the Sanskrit was Colebrooke (1977:62-165). Vernon Arnold (1967) provided additional information.
pĕdhotan divisions which would seem to have been modelled on the kakawin metre. Column 4 lists the eighteenth century pĕdhotan ruling which may be compared with the Sanskrit in column 1. Modern Javanese orthography is used throughout.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metres Common Sanskrit, OJ and MJ SA</th>
<th>Sanskrit Caesura</th>
<th>MJ SA additional variant</th>
<th>MJ SA pēdhotan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bramarawilāsita</strong></td>
<td>11;4,7</td>
<td>Lēbdajiwa</td>
<td>11;4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kusumawicitra</strong></td>
<td>12;6,6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12;6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sudiradraka (or Punarmada)</strong></td>
<td>13;5,8</td>
<td>Dadhap mantēb</td>
<td>13;5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basantā</strong></td>
<td>14;</td>
<td></td>
<td>14;8,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malini</strong></td>
<td>15;8,7</td>
<td>Manggalagita</td>
<td>15;8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prawiralalita</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16;8,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sikarini</strong></td>
<td>17;6,11</td>
<td>Tēpi kawuri</td>
<td>17;6,6,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangsapatra</strong></td>
<td>17;10,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17;4,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sardulawikridita</strong></td>
<td>19;12,7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19;6,6,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swandana</strong></td>
<td>20;7,7,6</td>
<td>Sasadarakākās</td>
<td>20;7,7,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swaladara (OJ Srāgḍhāra)</strong></td>
<td>21;7,7,7</td>
<td>Wisalāyharinī</td>
<td>21;7,7,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aswalalita</strong></td>
<td>23;11,12</td>
<td>Wēgangsulanjāri</td>
<td>23;5,6,6,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Kern (1875:155) noted that the caesura in Punarmada is after 5 syllables.

28 Colebrooke (1977:161) and Kern (1875:161) did not list a fixed caesura for this metre. De Casparis (1956:283) noted that the classical Vasanta may have a caesura after the eighth syllable.

29 The most popular OJ fifteen syllable metre was Malini. The SA manggalagita, 15 syllables, was divided into 8,7.

30 There was no caesura indicated for this metre in the Colebrooke list.
Apart from the two metres which have no fixed pause, the only difference between the Sanskrit and sêkar agêng metres was the Modern Javanese preference for breaking units larger than eight into smaller divisions. This preference was in keeping with pêdhotan divisions in evidence in the kawi miring texts and Modern Javanese lists of metres, where the largest unit comprised eight syllables. Identical caesura divisions for metres common to sêkar agêng and Sanskrit poetry is obviously no coincidence. The question which immediately arises is whether the divisions were observed during the composition and recitation of the kakawins. It was decided to examine the Arjunawijaya kakawin with this query in mind. In this kakawin, there were six metres common to Sanskrit, Old Javanese and sêkar agêng. These metres, according to the Surakarta tradition orthography were: Basanta, Bramarawilasita, Sikarini, Swaladara (OJ Sragdharâ) Swandana and Sardulawikridita.

There was no indication that pêdhotan rulings were in any way related to sense units in Basanta (8, 6), Bramarawilasita (4, 7) and Sikarini (Sanskrit ruling 6, 11). There were nine Sragdharâ cantos in the kakawin (21; 7, 7, 7). The sêkar agêng metre name Wisalyaharini had been written before eight Sragdharâ cantos in the Javanese tradition manuscript and Swaladara, apparently the sêkar agêng equivalent name for Sragdharâ, was used once to describe canto 70. In these cantos, the breaks were not as jarring and the pêdhotan coincided on four occasions with the commas which had been marked in the transliteration in the edition but, on the whole, the case for suggesting that caesura rulings were taken into consideration during composition was very tenuous. In Swandana cantos, there seemed to be less

31 See Supomo (1977:91) for internal punctuation principles in the edition of the Arjunawijaya. It should be noted that pêdhotan was not considered at all by Supomo.
instances of word division when these lines were broken down into 7,7,6 units. *Sardulawikridita* (Sanskrit, 12,7, *sëkar agêng* 6,6,7) was a most popular metre in the *kakawin*, being used on fifteen occasions. It became quite apparent that whereas the Sanskrit divisions of 12+7 could be applied on most occasions without breaking a word, the smaller divisions of 6,6,7 frequently fractured the line. The main point that emerged was that attempts to read lines according to the smaller *sëkar agêng* divisions rather than the larger Sanskrit units was not at all successful. It would seem that these smaller divisions were peculiar to the later *sëkar agêng*.

The conclusion to be drawn from the analysis was that there was little evidence that *pêdhotan* regulations common to Sanskrit and *sëkar agêng* were taken into consideration during the composition of the *kakawin* texts and therefore did not function as or signify sense units. If *pêdhotan* was an integral part of *kakawin* presentation, it was unlikely that the poems were designed to be sung strictly according to the divisions marked into the Central Javanese tradition *kakawin* manuscripts. It seemed improbable that the poet, having meticulously observed the rules of quantity and lavished care and sensitivity in his choice and arrangement of language, would have permitted the effect to have been marred by the rigid division of words and sense units throughout the text.

There still remains the quandary of how to explain the common caesura rulings for the two genres that flank the *kakawin*. The links between *sëkar agêng* and Sanskrit should perhaps be sought with the keepers of the texts in Java and may become clearer with a better insight into the transmission processes in Java itself rather than seeking a solution in present day Bali. The keepers of the texts are suggested in Chapter 3.5. At this point, I would like to focus
upon literary activity at the end of the fifteenth century and rather than adopting a 'dark ages' approach as a counterpart to the 'renaissance' theory, will pursue Robson's suggestion (1979:305) of a 'new cultural flowering in Java in the third quarter of the fifteenth century' and de Casparis' opinion (1975:66) that the variety of scripts in remote areas of Central Java were evidence of 'a peculiar culture flourishing during part of the fifteenth century'.

One notable omission from the metres common to kakawin and sēkar agēng was Jagaddhita, described by Zoetmulder (1974:112) as follows:

'The Jagaddhita ... occupies such a prominent place that it can be said to be the metre of Old Javanese poetic tradition par excellence. It is the only metre that occurs in all the kakawins I have investigated without exception.'

Jagaddhita, which was a metre of Javanese rather than of Sanskrit origin, was never marked in the Javanese tradition manuscripts but Jagaddhita cantos were described as either Aswalalita, of Indian origin, or Wēgangsulanjari, an eighteenth century metre name. All three metres, however, had twenty-three syllables and both Aswalalita and Wēgangsulanjari, by eighteenth century standards, had pēdhotan divisions of 5,6,6,6.

Texts on Old Javanese metrics are rare but the best known and probably the earliest specimen is the Wṛttasaṃcaya. It was therefore of some note to find that the name Jagaddhita was not included in this text although Aswalalita and other metres common to Old Javanese and sēkar agēng were employed; furthermore, as noted above, Kern made specific mention of caesura in his preface to the edition of the Wṛttasaṃcaya. Having rejected the possibility that the eighteenth century pujangga would have had first hand knowledge of Sanskrit, there seemed to be some justification for pursuing the theory that
the author of the *Vṛttasañcaya*, Tanakung's interest in Indian metrics in the late fifteenth century was directly linked with the phenomenon of the eighteenth century scribes consistently marking the 'correct' Sanskrit caesura throughout the *kakawin* manuscripts.

Teeuw et al. (1969:22) have proposed that Tanakung may have visited India in the late fifteenth century and that such visits could have prompted renewed spiritual and cultural enthusiasm. Although Zoetmulder (1974:113) most plausibly points out that Tanakung and perhaps other contemporary poets' interest in the finer aspects of Sanskrit metrics was a little late to have had any impact on the established *kakawin* tradition as represented in the Balinese manuscripts, the impact of works such as the *Vṛttasañcaya* may have been more enduring on Java itself. When the *Vṛttasañcaya* was examined with a view to *pĕdhotan*, it was found that the larger Sanskrit divisions appear to have been borne in mind in a number of the metres that were common to *kāwyā*, *kakawin* and *sēkar ageng*. This data is by no means conclusive but the following examples in known metres exhibit a much greater degree of manipulation of sense within caesura units and less examples of word division than was in evidence in the *Arjunawijaya* examination cited previously. I have marked the caesura units in the following lines although there are no indicators drawn in the Kern edition.

32 Attention is directed to Noorduyn's most recent article (1983) on fifteenth century Javanese religious and cultural activity. Noorduyn concludes as follows: 'Religious life continued in its old established way over practically the entire island, and the centres of religious learning in central and eastern Java were still able to attract attention from outlying regions such as the Sundanese one'. (p.439)

33 The Javanese tradition manuscript of the *Vṛttasañcaya* NBS 72, part V was consulted briefly in Leiden. Quotations, however, are from the Kern edition.
It seems possible that the fifteenth century poets were familiar with the Sanskrit caesura rulings for the equivalent Old Javanese metres but whether these rulings were applied in performance or whether there was any attempt to revitalize kakawin composition around these units is conjecture. The poets' conversancy with these divisions does not add any further fuel to Prijohoetomo's suggestion that pādhotan replaced quantity at this stage, nor that there was any attempt to write within a genre similar to kawi miring in the fifteenth century. Zoetmulder (1974:120) felt that the poets of the later Balinese kakawins observed the rules of quantity most rigidly and it is here suggested that if Tanakung and his ilk were sufficiently motivated to acquire first hand information on Indian metrics and to compose guide books on prosody, it seems unlikely that they would have parted lightly with the rules of quantity around which Sanskrit and Old Javanese poetics were based.

Some consideration could be given to the possibility that earlier poets had been aware of the Sanskrit caesura rulings but had decided not to incorporate these divisions within kakawin.
in the interests of greater flexibility in the manipulation of sense units and a freer style in performance. Pèdhotan is an important aspect of macapat poetry yet its application is subtle and flexible; there is no way of knowing the extent of the traditions of indigenous poetry which must have existed before and alongside kakawin composition but the same degree of caesura flexibility in evidence in present day macapat probably existed in the earlier poetic forms and may have extended into the kakawin approach to sense and breath control.

A further aspect to consider is that whereas Sanskrit and Sanskrit sentence structure is by its very nature a denser idiom, Old Javanese lines of verse had more of a tendency to break into sense units where the sequence was less involuted and word formation less compound. Caesura may have been more necessary in Sanskrit where there was little possibility of composing units of five or six syllables that followed a more natural prose sequence. Caesura rulings in Sanskrit would have at least ensured that compound words were not spilt.

The links between Tanakung and Yasadipura should perhaps be sought in the vicinity of the remo"" areas which were noted by de Casparis as being of palaeographical interest in the fifteenth century. Inscriptions on the Central Javanese temple complex at Sukuh were mentioned specifically by de Casparis (1975:66) while de Graaf and Pigeaud (1974:208-210) felt that the temple complexes at Sukuh and Cêta on Mount Lawu and the site remains of the Pengging kraton on the neighbouring Mount Märbabu could have been part of a once strong court centre.

It has been suggested that babad traditions should be approached
with caution\textsuperscript{34} but these sources have nevertheless been accorded a significant place in Javanese historiography\textsuperscript{35}. Two Javanese references are of special interest to the link between the fifteenth and the eighteenth century poets; the first is the tradition as noted by de Graaf and Pigeaud [1974:210] that although the ruler of the Indic/Javanese Pēngging court was converted to a pantheistic form of Islam, the eventual collapse of the kingdom was due to that ruler's reluctance to adhere to the more orthodox line expounded by the Sunan of Kudus. The second is the note in the Javanese tradition manuscript of the \textit{WṛttasaMcaya} to the effect that the poem was written

'in the kingdom of Kēdhiri but just before the shift to Pēngging, in the reign of King Kusumawicitra'\textsuperscript{36}.

This reference was noted by Kern (1875:70), dismissed as 'omong kosong' by Poerbatjaraka (1964:33-34) and defended by Zoetmulder (1969:66) whose concerns were more in relation to Kēdhiri and the dating of the text rather than to Pēngging. However dubious the reliability of the last reference which Zoetmulder (1969:66) suggests could be loosely interpreted as the shift of power from East back to Central Java, Pēngging was the heartland of the Yasadipura family\textsuperscript{37} and it

\textsuperscript{34} See for example, some of Berg's early articles (1938:5-148, 1955:97-128 and 1957:68-84). For a concise review of the stance of various scholars on the historicity of \textit{babad} literature, see Kumar (1976:5-7).

\textsuperscript{35} See Djajadiningrat (1965:75-85) for a summary of the value of local traditions in Indonesian historical research, de Graaf (1956:55-73) for a consideration of the role of tradition in Javanese historiography and de Graaf (1965:119-136) for a summary of later Javanese sources.

\textsuperscript{36} Lor NBS 72 Part iv, Introductory note. \textit{ingkang nama karaton ageng, nagari Kēdhiri, nanging meh ngalih dhateng Pēngging, panjēnēnganipun Prabu Kusuma-Wicitra}.

does seem possible that there may have been conservative pre-Islamic oriented elements in this area who could have been sufficiently committed to maintain, copy and study the Old Javanese texts.

In the absence of firm data on transmission processes between the fifteenth and the eighteenth century, attempts to ease the gap between Sanskrit and se\'kar a\'geng caesura similarities are open and tentative. These similarities do bear witness to a tradition of continuity and interest and perhaps lessen the notion of a degeneration of kakawin into a non-quantitative genre at the end of the Majapahit period. The similarities also help to place the kawi miring texts within a context of eighteenth century experimentation in a genre which perhaps had a functional and aesthetic role to play alongside the established macapat form.
3. OLD JAVANESE IN THE JAVANESE TRADITION

3.1 Interest in Old Javanese Literature in the Surakarta Court

The transmission and preservation of Old Javanese literature was primarily due to the diligence of Balinese scribes and to traditions of performance and study of the *kakawins* in Bali. Insufficient evidence of such dedication in Java, coupled with the poor condition of the Javanese tradition manuscripts, certainly adds more credence to the theory of a 'renaissance' after a period of void. Most appraisals of the 'renaissance' period begin with a statement to the effect that by the eighteenth century, knowledge of Old Javanese was almost non-existent in the Central Javanese courts and that the versions of the *kakawins* as contained in the Yasadipura texts stand as evidence of the *pujanggas' familiarity with Old Javanese language and prosody.¹

The period during which the Indianised kingdoms declined and the Islamic-oriented *pasisir* states emerged is generally accepted as the watershed between Old and newer Javanese literature. Old Javanese language proficiency and possibly the esteem in which it was held are considered to have been on the decline from the fifteenth century and, as a consequence, both comprehension and appreciation of Old Javanese literature would have been at a low ebb by the mid-eighteenth century. An alternative view has been proposed by Ricklefs (1978:153 and 202) who suggests that there could have been a continuum of interest and proficiency into the early eighteenth century, followed then by a period of decline. Ricklefs' premise (1974:223)

¹Cohen Stuart (1860:1/18) commented that the fact that he could not compare ten lines of *macapat* and *kakawin* verse without some deviation occurring was sufficient proof of the MJ poets' inability to cope with the Old Javanese texts. Poerbatjaraka (1964:128-140) tended to base his impression of the Modern Javanese versions on how closely they followed the originals. Gericke (1844:vii) considered the MJ versions as an indication of the 'revival of the old spirit' and stated that he chose to translate the MJ version of the *Arjunaawidhā* because it contained 'more of the spirit of the work'. (p.ix)
is that the semblance of a 'renaissance' may have been due to the zealous efforts of collectors and scribes and it is appropriate at this point to draw attention to his suggestion (1978:153), which will be discussed below, that manuscripts of the kakawins may have been copied under the supervision and initiative of Dutch scholars in the late eighteenth century.

As the Yasadipura texts are presumed to have been written before the period of strong Western interest, references in these texts to the kakawins should therefore reflect the eighteenth century evaluation of Old Javanese literature. The prologue or epilogue lines of most of the Modern Javanese texts contain some apology from the Surakarta poet for being ill-equipped for the task entrusted to him by his patron. As these apologies are very similar to kakawin poet's effusive expression of his inability to please his king, the ladies of the court and literary critics, these references cannot be taken as direct evidence of eighteenth century incompetence. With the exception of the Serat laboiek, the Yasadipura texts consulted in this study were set in a mythical period of Javanese history in which the heroes' proficiency in kawi (Old Javanese) may have been presumed by the eighteenth century audience to have been a knightly norm and kawi to have been the court venacular.

In examining references to 'kawi', some account was taken of the Yasadipuras' attuned sense of avoidance of anachronism. This aspect is well illustrated in Serat Rama canto 25 which relates the monkey Anoman's decision to present his message in song from his master, Rama, to Rama's captive wife, Sinta, so as not to startle the lady. The narrator explains firstly that Anoman's song

'was cast in kawi, in tembang ageng metres. At that time, there were no MiJil, Pangkur or Sinom metres.'

Anoman chose a variety of sekar ageng metres but the narrator explains

\[2\text{winongwong jro kawi, ageng tembangipun/ 14 duk samana durung ana mijil, pangkur miwah sinom (Serat Rama 25.13-14).}\]
the inconsistency in casting the song that follows into MijiZ metre (the metre of that canto) by saying that the song that Anoman sang in Old Java-
nese had been refashioned into maaapat.

'Anoman's song which told what had happened, is now taken up and rewritten in MijiZ metre.'

Anoman and the other monkey's skill at verse making is duly praised.

References in the Modern Javanese texts to kawi competence were framed so as to give the impression of an added character dimension rather than a mere skill. Although Cohen Stuart (1860:1/16) rightly stated that the ability to render snatches from an Old Javanese text by rote was proof of learning and scholarship, there were strong impressions in the non-epic texts consulted that the ability to comprehend kawi was equated with an awareness and appreciation of the metaphysical and the spiritual. One basic reservation, therefore, in the use of the term 'renaissance' in relation to eighteenth century Javanese literature is that certain aspects associated with the Western concept of a renaissance and more specific elements peculiar to the fourteenth to sixteenth century European movement itself, may be in no way applicable to a period of Javanese literary activ-
ity. Any attempt to define briefly the European phenomenon of the Renais-
sance must, of necessity, be simplistic and inadequate but for the purposes of comparison it may be suggested that the movement was essentially secular, intellectual and based upon a study and practice of classicism. Rey-
nolds and Wilson's comment (1968:102) that

'the latin classics were revived not only as an academic study but as the stuff of which eloquence was made'

covers but one aspect of the noted interest in Old Javanese literature in the Surakarta court in the eighteenth century.

In later texts such as the Sindusastra Sërat Lokapala, Cënthini and the Sërat Dërmagandhul, kawi texts were depicted as containing the key

\[\text{panëmbange Raden Maruti, kang nawung lëlakon, mangke pinet caritane bae, tinrapakën ing gëndhing pamiji.}\]
to the secret of existence and thus constituted one of the basic sets of
texts to be consulted, preferably in conjunction with a learned teacher,
by anyone intent on unravelling the esoteric. The Sērat Cabolek line,

'he is an ulama and in addition is versed in kawi',

which refers to the highly respected Kātip Amom Kudus, is not simply a
reference to this character's clever way with words or proficiency in a
classical language, as may well be the interpretation if applied to the
fifteenth century renaissance intellectual of diverse talents. The kawi
reference in Cabolek relates to the ulama's ability to render and explain
the subtleties of the Bima Suci text, a work which explores the mystery
of the union between God and man. One other passage from Cabolek is a
further important indication as to how the Old Javanese texts were viewed
in the eighteenth century court.

'In fact, however, the essence of kawi works such as the Bhima-
Suci and the Wisaha is expressed in many metaphors from which
the quintessence of mystical knowledge can be mastered if the
interpreter is penetrating and exact. And these, just as the
book of Rama in kawi, are books on ṣūfism.'

Sērat Cabolang 177.6-7 contains an interesting reference to the
mystical science, the sastra arjendra/sastra cētha which is found in canto
1.8 of the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring but which the Cabolang author pre-
sumed could be returned to an Old Javanese version. Yasadipura apparently
formed this episode around a cacographical error in the Javanese tradition
manuscript of the Arjunavijaya kakawin, sang sastrahajeng (fine knowledge
or book) for sang stry ḥajeng (beautiful woman, AMJ 1.11). According
to Cabolang, the science was revealed when

'King Sumali of Ngalēngka studied with the sage Wisrawa',

---

4 Soebardi (1975:115), Cabolek 8.9.
5 Soebardi (1975:114), Cabolek 8.6.
6 The sastra arjendra references in the macapat texts are at MAC I 3.11
and MAC II 1.12-17.
7 See Supomo (1964).
8 Sang Prabu Sumali, ing Ngalēngka kala puruhita mring Bagawan Wisrawane.
which, up to this point, is in line with the Yasadipura presentation of the sastrahajeng. Although the episode is not to be found in any form in the Old Javanese text, the Cabolang narrator is described as reading the passage containing the episode from the 'Serat Lokapala kawya'.

'Please excuse me, I am very ignorant of the words and the metre. This is the first time I have seen a kawya text. I can read it but not smoothly'. Dyan Tumenggung said quietly, 'Come now, just read it and don't worry about the melody.'

In the Arjuna Sasra, Wisrawa is depicted as a sage who is willing to explain a secret knowledge to the demon king, Sumali. Although Yasadipura does not connect kawi competence and the secret knowledge, the Sindusastra text, which drew heavily on the Arjuna Sasra macapat I version as well as other sources, extends this episode considerably to include this notion. Sumali laments his misfortune in being the father of an only child who although studious is regrettably female. His fortune would have been much improved by a son like Wisrawana who is clever, handsome and adept in kawi.10

A reference to astuteness and moral and political integrity being founded on a sound basis of kawi is contained in the Sastra Gendhing, a text attributed to Sultan Agung. In the first canto, it is stated that a man may not consider himself a descendant of the House of Mataram if he is not well versed in kawi.11 Furthermore, a knowledge of the essentials contained in the kawi texts would enhance the quality of rule in the kingdom.

9 nuwun kauninganah, estu juggul punggung, tumbung tuwin sêkarina, sajêg ulun sawêg sapitan punika, sumêrêp sêrat kawya/ 7 sagita maos nanging dlemik-dlemik, Dyan Tumenggung alon angandika, lah tôka vacanên bae, ywa anggoa têmbang lagu/Cabolang 177.6-7.

10 kalamun mijîla priyâ, putra tuwan pun Sukesi, mempêr lan pun Wisrawana, limpad pasangkung lulumidâ, waête pratameng kawi, saliring lukuita putus, .... eman mijîl pâwestro, alit demya karên mulah sastra·Serat Lokapala 10.20.

All descendants of Mataram should have a thorough knowledge of kawi. Indeed, one of the precepts of life is to understand the essence of knowledge which is applicable in an exemplary kingdom. Kawi poems contain the most precise aspects of knowledge, the rules of existence. All knowledge may be found (in kawi texts). 12

That these kawi texts should have been a source of ethical and spiritual guidance in an eighteenth century court is not as incongruous as first appears, considering the didactic appeal of wayang which draws upon the kawi tales for lakon material. Zoetmulder (1974:48) states that texts of a 'more strictly literary kind' were likely to have been preserved and in a better condition than religious or speculative texts, the contents of which may have become obscure and, as a consequence, were neither read nor copied. However, categorization of Javanese literature is fluid and dividing lines between historical, speculative and belletristic are often difficult to draw, as illustrated by the Cabolek description of the epic kakawins.

The above examples stand as some evidence of a tradition of consulting the Old Javanese texts, perhaps in much the same manner as they were in Bali but obviously on a lesser scale. Although the wayang purwa medium may have presented and reinforced the appropriate codes and morals of a past age, the texts themselves upon which the lakons were based were also consulted by certain groups, within and probably without court circles.

Although Cohen Stuart (1860:1/16) was of the opinion that appreciation of sung kakawin passages during a wayang performance was based purely on aesthetics rather than comprehension, there was no indication in the texts consulted that the mere fact of being attentively present at a kawi reading session would have been of any spiritual worth, as was the case with

---

12 marma sagung trah Mataram, kinen wignya tēmbang kawi, jer wajib uδering gēsang, ngawuhki titering ngelmu, kang tumrap ing prajā di, tēmbang kawi angsalipun, tar len titirining sastra, paugdran ing dumadi, noraka nana kang liyan tuduhing sastra, 1.16.
references to the parwa readings some centuries before. It could well be argued, however, that the suluk passages were considered as auspicious and, being inserted at emotional and potentially supernaturally charged points in the performance, could have been of some spiritual value if listened to carefully.

References to Old Javanese (kawi) in Modern Javanese texts indicated that interest in these texts was prompted by an appreciation of the intrinsic value of the ethical and metaphysical concepts that were seen to be contained in the texts rather than a fashionable reinterest in sonorous prosody. Comprehension rather than rote rendition was an important aspect of the eighteenth century interest in Old Javanese literature. The present study is restricted to the Surakarta court but there is sufficient evidence to indicate that Old Javanese texts and Modern Javanese poems based on the kakawins were appreciated in both the Yogjakarta court at the turn of the century and in the later Pakualaman court.

3.2 Availability of Old Javanese Manuscripts in the Surakarta Court

Although neither the Yasadipura macapat nor the kawi miring renderings of the kakawins can be considered as strict translations, these

---

13 The concluding lines of the Wirataparwa describe the spiritual benefits of being physically in attendance while the text was being recited. See Zoetmulder (1974:92) for a summary. Also Supomo (1972:61).
14'Tjan Tjoe Siem [1938:250] examines this aspect and raised the question as to where magic ends and aesthetics begins in contemporary wayang.
15Carey (1974:11) notes Dipanegra's interest in Old Javanese texts and cites references to the Arjunawijaya, Rama, Bhāratayuddha and Arjunawiwaha in the Babad Ngayogyakarta.
16Paku Alam I was able to provide Crawford with a number of Old Javanese manuscripts and epic-based texts (Ricklefs 1969:240-41) while Paku Alam II is reported to have studied Old Javanese and arranged several texts including the Bratayuda and Dewa-Rusti into 'nyanyian kawi' (Dewantara 1967:306). Dewantara further noted that a Patih of the Paku Alam I court was said to have been an expert in kawi. During the reign of Hamengkubuwana V, courtiers were sent to this court to study tembang kawi. See also Ricklefs (1981:120) for reference to court activity.
versions are more closely related to the textual than to the oral tradi-
tion of the epics. Cohen Stuart (1860:I/16) may have been justified in
his opinion that the Modern Javanese poets were not governed by a 'good
kawi manuscript' but it seems more likely that consulting a less than
perfect manuscript was a greater aid to translation than the poets' memory
which Cohen Stuart felt, too often failed them. 'Free rendering' could
possibly be considered as an acceptable and flexible alternative to the
'strict translation' categorization but it should be noted here that
there were occasions when the poets seemed intent upon persevering with
the kakawin versions rather than simply rejecting a difficult passage.
It is this relationship between text and Modern Javanese rendering that
perhaps prompted Palmer van den Broek (1870:III) to remark that the Yasadipura version of the Arjuna Saera was harder to understand than the
Sindusastra, although he further commented (p.VI) that the Yasadipura
rendering was one of Sindusastra's chief sources.

In proposing that the Yasadipuras were more dependent upon textual
rather than oral tradition or narrative innovation, one should not presume
that the poets rigidly worked their way through one manuscript. The
main tools and influences that governed the poets' interpretive decisions
are examined in Chapter 4, but it is here suggested that the availability
and condition of manuscripts had considerable bearing on the resultant
Yasadipura renderings. As a consequence, strict comparison with an edited
kakawin, based on Balinese manuscripts, will undoubtedly bring to light
innumerable departures from the edition and there is no denying that the
inability to decipher corrupt texts and a difficult idiom is to account

17 Gericke (1844:vii) did not consider the Modern Javanese version of the
Arjunaavivāha as a translation. He noted that the poets made use of sub-
ject matter but were restricted by their inadequate grasp of Old Javanese.
18 Johns (1965:13) raises the aspect of whether the Javanese TuhsFa may be
considered as a strict translation of the seventeenth century Indian text
and suggests that the Javanese author did not confine himself to one text
when he reshaped the Arabic original.
for some of these variations.

Winter (1911:342] made reference to manuscripts being available that could be bought, borrowed or copied but that it was common for the owners to possess only parts of manuscripts rather than the complete text. Both the kawi miring and the maaapat versions of the Panitisasta end some eight cantos short of the edited OJ Nitiśastra yet the Modern Javanese versions were found to follow the sequence of the partial kakawin version included in LOr 1853 manuscript collection. Insights into the type of manuscripts and sources used only become clearer when a wider range of texts of varying traditions dealing with the same subject matter are examined.

The IOL JAV 46 MAC I Arjuna Sasra manuscript dated 1800, for example, has omitted the entire middle section of the kakawin, (cantos 20-42) yet the earliest Arjuna Sasra kawi miring manuscript, dated 1803, follows the sequence of the kakawin faithfully. One could perhaps be excused for presuming that the kawi miring author may have had access to a better manuscript and was in a position to bridge the gap in the narrative but for the note in the second maaapat version, written some fifteen years after the KM and MAC I versions, where Yasadipura II acknowledged that the earlier poet had skimmed over these twenty cantos. He excused his predecessor on the grounds that he had only attempted to render the essentials of the tale and was pressed for time.

But much was omitted formerly. He only sought to render the essential [passages], dispensed with the embellishment from the kawi and in haste was supervised by the king, in order that the poem be written quickly. What was omitted was the beautiful [section] where King Arjuna Sasra enjoyed the splendour of the mountains, the forests and the fields, attended by many holy men. This was not related! (ASB MAC II, 51.25-26.)

---

19 A similar situation exists in Bali.
20 Poerbatjara 1933b.
21 nanging kathah kang tinilar ngumi, amung pinrih kang prēlu kewala, binu-wang kang ronce-ponce, saking ing kawinipun, lan kasesa dipun-jēnēngi, miring Sang Mahadibawa, supayenggalipun, dēnya miwaheng4 eairita, kang rinampas langēn-langēne duk lagi, Prabu Arjuna Sasra, 26.mangun kalangyaneng
The scribe responsible for the Add.12302 MAC I manuscript, dated 1801, was apparently aware of the gap in the narrative and proceeded to insert ten cantos which have parallels in the Sérat Kandha and oral tradition versions, as represented by the lakons. Whereas this scribe chose to draw upon more accessible Modern Javanese material, and possibly the popular story line, the KM and MAC II poets returned to a kakawin text which was very similar to and possibly the same one used by the author of the early partial MAC I version. This could be established by a comparison of quotations and borrowing from the Old Javanese text in both the KM and the MAC II versions which could be returned to the Surakarta LOr 1855 and LOr 2048. As these manuscripts were complete texts, there seemed to be no reason to suspect that the author of the MAC I version was forced to omit the middle section because the Old Javanese manuscript available to him was lacking the middle cantos of the kakawin.

There appeared to be a wider range of Bhāratayuddha texts available in the late eighteenth century and there is ample evidence to attest to this poem's popularity in Central Java. Old Javanese reading material cited in Modern Javanese texts was almost exclusively from the Bhāratayuddha, as was suluk selection. Many Bhāratayuddha manuscripts, minus quantity symbols, which can be classified as Javanese tradition, were either partial versions or contained partial interlinear texts, the latter variety, as Ricklefs (1978:152) appropriately points out, often originating from Madura. Raffles (1965:467) noted that the Javanese tradition manuscript of the Bhāratayuddha that he translated and paraphrased stopped at canto

---

21 cont'd

wukir-wukir, miwah wana-wana myang têtegal, sinewakeng pandhita keh, punika tan dinatur.
"miwaheng from wiwaha = rinêngga (G/R 1901:II/45) 'to arrange in an attractive manner'. Sérat Rama 1.2, ingkang rinêngga kadhanę.

22 Crawfurd (NS Add. 18577:57) stated that the Bhāratayuddha was the most popular work in Java and described in as 'paraphrase of the Mahâbhârata'.

in a passage relating the final attack upon the King of the Korawa by Bima. Although there was no discernible break at this point in the kawi miring or the macapat version, the final cantos of both Modern Javanese texts indicated that the last pages of the kakawin MS consulted may have been either in a poor condition or missing. This impression was more on the basis of the sequence and the corrupt form of the quotations from the kakawin rather than the Modern Javanese interpretation.

Scattered references support Ricklefs' claim (1978:156) that disruption in the Kartasura period was responsible for the destruction and loss of manuscripts during this time. Ricklefs (1978:153) cites the example of the copying of the Dharmasarya kakawin in 1716 in the Kartasura court as some evidence of both interest in and access to Old Javanese texts in the early eighteenth century. However, in the Javaansche Zammenspraken (1911:351) when 'Tuan Anu' asks specifically of his Javanese informant if a copy of the Dharmasarya kakawin was available, he was told that this text was most difficult to obtain either in Surakarta or elsewhere.

The Serat Cabolek, a pseudo-historical text, was set in the Kartasura period. In 1.12, the assembly of ulama is noted as being postponed due to the death of Mangkurat IV in 1726, some ten years after the copying of the Dharmasarya text in the same court. Yasadipura's sensitivity to anachronism has already been noted and the following reference may provide some clue as to the type of manuscripts available in the period immediately later.

---

23 A copy of the manuscript obtained from the 'raja of Bali Balitung' was used to complete the summary of the Bhāratayuddha. Raffles (1965:467) and Cohen Stuart (1860:1/27).

24 See also Ricklefs (1974:176-226) for a fuller exposition of his theory that there may have been a fair degree of competence in Old Javanese until severe disruption in the Kartasura period. Van Hoevell (1843:12) noted that many manuscripts were lost in the Kartasura period and that the works of older poets were obtained from Madura. My thanks to I. Kuntara Wiriyamartana for drawing my attention to this reference.

25 In Cabolek 7.7, it is also noted that the Bima Suai text read by Kōtib Anom Kudus could not be compared with the original as this text had been lost. (Soebardi 1975:111).
prior to the proposed Surakarta 'renaissance'.

In *Cabolek* 4.19, Ketip Anom Kudus, the *kawi* expert, is depicted as reading from a *Bima Suci* text which is written in *srikar ageng* metres and is presumably the *kawi* (Old Javanese). Yet before this acknowledged expert in *kawi* commences to read, one of his companions expresses amazement that Anom Kudus is able to *maca Jawa*, which Soebardi (1975:112) translates as 'read Javanese script'. If the operative word is 'read' rather than how the text should be sung or interpreted, was Yasadipura implying that the script was such that it would have presented some deciphering problems to literate Kartasura courtiers? It can be assumed that Yasadipura would not have envisaged the early eighteenth century Kartasura *ulama* reading from a text written in neat rounded Surakarta script; as the *ulama* proceeded to render the text in a Kudus style, it could be implied that a *pasisir* script was used, a script similar to the variety employed in the LØr 2048 Arjunawijaya and the NBS 95 Dharmasūnyā *kakawin* which Pigeaud describes as 'large perpendicular spiky'. This script, barring its 'spikiness', was not radically different from the Surakarta varieties whereas the letter formation of the older antiquated or *buda* scripts made for difficult reading.

It seems important to determine what is actually meant by the term 'Javanese tradition manuscript'. These manuscripts have attained a certain notoriety with editors of Old Javanese texts. The standard editorial practice is to comment on the unreliability of the manuscripts, rather than to discuss their peculiarities, and to proceed directly to a review of the more dependable Balinese counterparts. Raffles (1965:373), for example, stated at the outset of his review of Javanese literature that,

---

26 'Are you able then my uncle Kudus, to read Javanese script that you have brought the *Bhima Suci*?' Soebardi (1975:112).

27 'in *Bangsa-patra* metre in Kudus style.' Soebardi (1975:112).

28 Pigeaud LIT.vol.II/739 for a description and LIT.vol.III/32 for a facsimile of this script.
wherever possible, Balinese rather than Javanese manuscripts were consulted and Cohen Stuart (1863:145) found little benefit in noting the many variations in the Javanese MS Add.12279 of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin. Kern's summation (1900:1) of the Surakarta Rāmāyana kakawin (dated 1782) was that it constituted 'a continuous cacography' while Poerbatjara (1926:9) confessed that the two Surakarta manuscripts he consulted during the course of the Arjunawiwaha examination were 'unusable'.

3.3 Defining Javanese Tradition

Although the bulk of kakawin literature was preserved in Bali, several kakawin manuscripts are known to be directly related to prototypes which have remained in Java since composition. In addition to the Dharmaśīnya kakawin cited above, one Arjunawiwaha manuscript dated 1344 was found in the West Javanese regency of Bandung in 1852. It should be noted here that the Old Javanese manuscripts in the Jakarta collection still await detailed and systematic classification.

Confining the investigation initially to the Arjunawijaya manuscripts, there was a considerable difference between the codices 219, Lor 2048 and the Lor 1855 Surakarta text, all three manuscripts being

29 The features of the Arjunawijaya Surakarta MS were noted in Chapter 1.1 and will be further commented upon in the section to follow. See Supomo (1977:83-98) for a description of the Arjunawijaya manuscripts of both the Javanese and the Balinese tradition.

30 Poerbatjara (1933a:287). See Poerbatjara (1926:7), Netcher (1853:47) and Holle (1882:15) for description of this text. A copy of the Arjunawiwaha West Javanese text is held in the Leiden University Library (Lor 4070). This text, however, is a transliteration into Modern Javanese script and should be distinguished from the facsimile of the Cod 219 Arjunawijaya antiquated script MS which is held in the Menzies Library at the Australian National University. Cod 219 was in poor condition when this copy was made but Supomo has verified that the style of the script in the copy is a faithful replica of the original text. See text description in Chapter 1.1. The copyist of the Lor 4070 Arjunawiwaha attempted to mark quantity throughout the text but there was a number of 'Javanisms' in this manuscript; for example, bṛṣara for bhatara, sangkeng for sangkeng and the symbol for the dipthong aṭ was replaced by the familiar taling which was employed throughout the Surakarta manuscripts.
classified as Javanese tradition. Cod 219 was written in an antiquated script which Supomo (1977:86) suggests is West Javanese. Quantity was observed throughout this text and more importantly in the interpolation section of the kakawin in this manuscript. LÒr 2048 was written in the above mentioned 'spiky' variety and LÒr 1855 is in the Surakarta kraton script. Neither of the latter two manuscripts gave any indication that quantity was observed and, as noted previously, had been marked with slashes and long vowel indicators denoting sekar ageng pedhotan divisions. All three manuscripts are characterised by the interpolation section of two cantos and common orthographical features.

The definition of Javanese tradition has important implications for theories of literary and language continuity and the whole question of the degree of eclecticism in both a religious and social sense in Javanese society. Texts of the West Javanese Arjunawiwaha type are often described as being written in 'buda' (antiquated) script. Zoetmulder (1974:40) makes reference to this term and comments on Old Javanese manuscripts written in Java:

'Now these are written in what is definitely Old Javanese script—without exception as far as the present author knows, although it must be admitted that he has not made an exhaustive examination.'

This definition does not appear to include manuscripts dating from the late eighteenth century. It could therefore be presumed that Zoetmulder was confining his remarks to the Old Javanese texts found on Mount Merbabu in Central Java and in West Java in the early 1850's but for the continuation of his discussion where he justifiably comments on the

---

31 See Supomo (1977:326) for analysis of the interpolation section.
32 See Pigeaud (LIT.vol.1/54 and III/53) for reference to buda script.
33 See Holle (1882:3-4), Netcher (1855:469-79) and the Pigeaud description of the Schoemann collection (1975:111). My thanks to Willem van der Molen of the University of Leiden for clarification on the condition and extent of the Old Javanese manuscripts in the Jakarta collection.
number of errors in manuscripts of this variety.

'It is therefore hardly surprising that the manuscripts originating from Java should have earned a bad reputation with scholars occupying themselves with preparing critical editions of Old Javanese texts.'

Zoetmulder then proceeds to quote Kern's summation of the LOr 1790 manuscript of the Ramayana as 'one continuous cacography', thus linking Kern's manuscript with the Old Javanese script texts of the kakawins. The LOr 1790 Ramayana text, however, is of the Surakarta tradition, in Modern Javanese script, contains no trace of quantity aspects being observed and was marked consistently throughout with pedhotan indicators.\(^3\)

Cohen Stuart (1860:1/25-26) made no mention of antiquated/Old Javanese script manuscripts in his review of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin texts that he consulted during the course of his maccapat edition. Gunning (1903:iii) made a distinction between Javanese tradition manuscripts that were copies of Javanese originals and copies from Balinese manuscripts. Javanese tradition, therefore, as described by Kern, Gunning and Cohen Stuart applies to manuscripts in Modern Javanese script, exhibiting Javanese orthography and minus quantity indicators.

Whereas the lines of transmission for the Old Javanese manuscripts in Bali are reasonably clear and indicate that interest and copying was steady, transmission and maintenance in Java is most obscure. Even if palaeography is taken as a point of departure to pursue this problem, there is the daunting but nevertheless substantiated opinion from de Casparis (1975:67) concerning a 'serious gap in our sources between the middle of the fifteenth century and the end of the sixteenth century'. A detailed comparative analysis of the older Javanese script texts, manuscripts from Madura, Surakarta and Bali with this aspect in mind could

---

\(^3\)Kern (1900:I) lists two Javanese tradition MSS; LOr 1790 and one other which he describes as being 'no longer available'. Judging from his comments, the LOr 1790 MS was the text upon which he based his impression of Javanese tradition manuscripts.
possibly provide some clues as to how the *kakawins* were preserved and transmitted in Java but such a venture is obviously outside the scope of this present study.\(^{35}\)

It is, however, possible to confine this investigation to two points; firstly, Ricklefs' suggestion (1978:153) that Dutch initiative may have been responsible for the copying of manuscripts in the late eighteenth century\(^{36}\) and secondly, to determine with some degree of certainty the relationship between the *Arjuna Sasra* Yasadipura texts, the Surakarta LOr 1855 *Arjunastra* *kakawin* and the older Cod 219 version.

In an article commemorating the centenary of the Surakarta Institute for Javanese language, Kraemer (1932:262) reviews Dutch interest prior to the formation of this institute and activity after its inception. Kraemer emphasised that before the more systematic approach initiated by Englishmen such as Raffles, Marsden and Crawfurd, studies and interest in Javanese language and literature had been most fragmented.\(^{37}\) Uhlenbeck (1964:44) dates the beginning of linguistic activities by the missionary society associates from 1814, a date which is too late to account for the copying of the *Arjunastra* and *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts\(^{38}\) and most of the Yasadipura texts.

One important point that suggests that Javanese tradition manuscripts were the result of a continuous process of copying and transmission is the actual condition of the manuscripts themselves. Winter is said to have

---

\(^{35}\)Worsley (1972:92) touched on the aspect of Javanese and Balinese tradition transmission in relation to Old and middle Javanese texts. He suggests that a systematic categorization of scribal and spelling errors according to genre, script and locality would be a starting point towards a clearer impression of transmission.

\(^{36}\)Ricklefs cautions that as manuscripts now in the Leiden collection were obtained via the Netherlands Bible Society and the Koninklijke Akademie in Delft, copying could have been under the direction or at the impetus of these societies, both of which had language interests.

\(^{37}\)See also de Haan (1910-12:I/291) for an indictment of early Dutch disinterest in language study.

\(^{38}\)See manuscript description in 1.1.
supervised the copying of the LOr 1788 Bhāratayuddha but one cannot imagine that manuscripts of Balinese or Madurese origin would have been copied under Dutch supervision and that the critical aspect of quantity would have been ignored during the copying process. Both the LOr 1788 and the manuscript noted by Gunning as being a copy of a Balinese text, LOr 2106, exhibit features which set them apart from the majority of Surakarta manuscripts. In LOr 2106, there seemed to be a definite correlation between small curved markings in this manuscript and long vowel indicators in the Balinese manuscripts, whereas slash marks and length symbols only marked pĕdhotan in the Surakarta manuscripts. The metre Jagaddhīta prefaced the first canto of this text but this metre never occurred in the Javanese tradition kakawin or sĕkar agĕng manuscripts.

The markings in the LOr 1788 supervised text were by no means as consistent as either pĕdhotan in the Surakarta manuscripts or the small curved quantity-related markings in LOr 2106. Although copying and a more structured approach to the study of Old Javanese texts may well have been influenced by Dutch scholars in the early to middle nineteenth century, there is little evidence that such a catalyst was responsible for the Modern Javanese reworkings of the kakawins. The manuscripts available to the Yasadipuras in the late eighteenth century were in all probability copies of Javanese prototypes rather than fractured copies of Balinese manuscripts brought into the courts at Dutch initiative or recent copies of Balinese tradition manuscripts obtained from Madura. It may be appropriate at this point to draw attention to Kern's comment (1900:1) that although the Javanese tradition manuscripts bore no trace of quantity indicators, an older and better reading was sometimes discernible under the corrupt text.40

39Pigeaud (LIT. vol. II/26).

40Gunning (1903:ii) made the same comment.
It was noted in 3.2 that when the kawi miring author reshaped the macapat I version of the Arjuna Sasra into sêkar aqêng, he probably returned to the same kakawin manuscript that was used by the earlier poet. Borrowed vocabulary from the kakawin further indicated that the manuscript used was very similar to the Surakarta LOr 1855 text. MS 219, LOr 2048 and the Surakarta manuscript had many common readings; some of these readings found their way firstly into the MAC I text (represented by the IOL JAV 46) and finally into the kawi miring. There were more examples of spelling similarities and variant readings common to the kakawin and the kawi miring text in the middle section of the kakawin, the 'non-essential' section that Yasadipura I had omitted from his rendering in macapat. Kawi miring word choice was close to the kakawin in any section omitted from the macapat I version. More pronounced borrowing from the kakawin may have been due to the poet's insecurity in treating passages that had not been translated in the previous rendering; alternatively, the heavier borrowing could be considered as one of the features of kawi miring style. 1

There were, however, a sufficient number of readings common only to the KM and both the LOr 2048 and LOr 1855 kakawin manuscripts to indicate that the Modern Javanese rather than the antiquated script text was the base manuscript for the macapat I and kawi miring versions. 2 It seems fairly certain that the Old Javanese manuscript consulted in the eighteenth century can be linked with a Javanese tradition text in the true sense of the term, a manuscript that originated in Java and had been maintained for a period of time in a script close to the one in which it had been composed. These manuscripts may reflect in their structural arrangement and ortho-

---

41. This aspect is discussed in Chapter 6.1 and 2.
42. Examples of reading common to the MS 219, LOr 1855 and the KM. The Balinese reading as found in the edition is included in brackets.
OJ 27.2a tan ana dewa (bheda) KM 14.4c tan wonten dewa
OJ 30.1 panut i (panuka) KM 25.1b anut
OJ 30.3c kalarupa (kalabhuta) KM 25.7 kalarupa
OJ 31.3c sêrêt (pêrêd) KM 25.17 sêrêt
OJ 35.5c suwanda (sugandha) KM 29.9 suwanda
graphical variants the transmission processes through which they had passed.

The question arises as to when the older script texts were transposed into a Modern Javanese form. Transposition from Old Javanese into a Modern Balinese script appears to have taken place early in the transmission process, as evidenced by the fact of there being no manuscripts in Old Javanese script in Bali and by the complete and established tradition of manuscript copying in a Balinese script. However, a review of the genre and content of texts in Old Javanese/buda script in Java, with reference to their dating, revealed that it would have been possible for many of these texts to have been either composed or transposed into a Modern Javanese script whereas the authors or scribes' preference was for the antiquated form. \(^{43}\)

It could well be argued that old scripts were employed out of tradition and a certain caution when texts of a religious or speculative nature were copied or composed by persons who were part of the old-guard defenders of pre-Islamic beliefs. Although this may partly account for the continued use of this script, a number of texts which could justifiably be classified as belletristic were written in this old script. \(^{44}\) The concurrent use of old and modern scripts suggests that transposition from one script to another may have depended more upon the individual copyist or perhaps requests to convert particular texts into a more accessible form. Zoetmulder (1971:41) comments most plausibly that he doubted that conservatism in Java was carried to the extreme point where Modern Javanese script texts were transposed back into an antiquated script. This point

\(^{43}\) Zoetmulder (1974:40). Brandes (1899:55) describes the continued use of this script as both conservative and artificial. The artificiality manifested itself in the formation of letters and the fact that it was evident that copyists had difficulty distinguishing the letters. See also a second Brandes article (1889:382) for examples of copyists' errors in the old script in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

\(^{44}\) See Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/54). Also Brandes (1920:182-3).
is worth bearing in mind, considering the 'fashionable re-interest' overtones of the 'renaissance'.

Variations between the Balinese architype, the 219 version and the Surakarta manuscripts suggest a gradual accumulation of errors, perhaps due to an equally gradual decline in the scribe's ability to decipher what he was actually copying rather than transposing. The interpolation passage which seeks to establish that Arjuna Sasra was an incarnation of Wisnu and his wife, Citrawati, of Sri, represents yet another stage in the transmission process and may reflect local interpretation of this kakawin. As the interpolation passage is not to be found in any of the Balinese manuscripts, it may perhaps be dated from the period after the decline of the Hindu/Buddhist courts which actively fostered kakawin literature.\(^5\)

It is, of course, impossible to estimate the number and the nature of the intermediate texts between the composition of the interpolation passage and the Surakarta tradition manuscript dated 1782. Two points are of note; the type of script employed in the 219 manuscript seems very similar to the Holle (1882) Old and West Javanese illustrations and quantity symbols were marked in this text. The scribe responsible for the Surakarta manuscript, however, has omitted the quantity symbols. Some of the variations between MS219 and the Surakarta manuscript could be described as a more advanced stage of corruption and it may well be that some of these errors crept into the Surakarta manuscript prototype at the time of the transposition into Modern Javanese script and, that at this point, the quantity indicators were also discarded.

3.4 Oral and Written Traditions of Transmission

As some attention has been directed to dual forms of script in the transmission of Old Javanese texts in Java, it seems appropriate at this

\(^5\)Supomo (1977:14) dates the Arjunawijaya kakawin around 1379.
point to consider the dual possibilities of oral and written transmission and whether oral transmission may have replaced the written for some period. The consensus of editors of Balinese tradition *kakawin* manuscripts is that errors in the texts are of the type attributable to copyists rather than that these errors reflect oral misjudgement.\(^6\) In Java, where less manuscripts are available for comparison and traditions of transmission are vague, the possibility of oral transmission is more difficult to determine.

Nineteenth century references depict the Javanese *dhalang* as being mainly dependent on rote instruction from an older *dhalang* from whom he would have learnt to intone the *kakawin* derived *suluk* passages.\(^7\) As it is unlikely that the *dhalang* would have committed to memory the entire *kakawin* in sequence, there is little reason to suspect that the *dhalang*, in conjunction with a scribe, would have been responsible for a written text. On the other hand, the scribe's recollection of a popular sung passage from a *wayang* performance may have influenced his judgement in some aspect of the copying process.

The main aspect in support of continued textual transmission in Java is that the Javanese tradition manuscripts are, on the whole, sufficiently close to the Balinese in terms of content and, more importantly, sequence. Apart from certain spelling conventions, the main variation between the Javanese and the Balinese manuscripts of the *Arjuna*wijaya *kakawin* is that the Javanese manuscripts contain an additional two cantos. Major omission or sequence deviation would lend greater weight to an oral transmission theory.

The fact that quantity principles were adequately observed throughout these additional cantos in the Cod 219 manuscript is also some indication that transmission was at a visual and hence a textual level at that

\(^6\) Zoetmulder (1974:51) dismisses the possibility of an 'intermediate phase' of oral transmission in Bali on the basis of this fact.

\(^7\) See Kern (1882:IX-X), Palmer van den Broek (1870:vi), Hazeu (1897:144), Cohen Stuart (1860:I/16), and te Mechelen (1879:96-98).
stage. Wallis (1980:138) argues that visuality, the physical presence of the text rather than oral recollection of its contents, was an important factor in the appreciation and recall of the appropriate wirama (metrical and melodic pattern). According to Wallis, long and short syllable alternation (the guru laghu) is immediately apparent in a line of kakawin verse; as the long syllable (guru) denotes both a tone of longer length and a change of pitch, a line of kakawin verse would in a sense constitute a melodic skeleton and function as an instant guide or prompt to pitch and rhythm.

It could therefore be argued that the absence of quantity symbols in the later Modern Javanese script manuscripts is some evidence of oral transmission, particularly in view of Zoetmulder's opinion (1974:119) that there is some doubt whether quantity aspects were ever observed in pronunciation in the East Javanese period. However, as the kakawins emerged quantitatively intact and relatively unscathed from the transposition process in Bali, an active, performing interest in kakawin literature, as well as a commitment to copy the texts, may have been crucial to the appreciation of quantity principles in kakawin prosody.

There were a number of variant readings in the Javanese tradition texts which may have been due to aural misjudgement rather than scribal error but an aural impression is probably related to the interpretive approach to a passage. The pervading emphasis upon instruction and moral guidance in the Modern Javanese versions may perhaps explain the error prasastra (knowledge) for pradâsta (revered, praised) in the Râmâyâna LOr 1790 text (1.1) and the previously noted sang sastrahajâng for sang stry âhajâng. (A.W. 1.1). A more dubious example as to where to distinguish between an oral and an interpretive error is the form maweh astutî in the Javanese tradition Bhâratayuddha for the Balinese reading mawedâstutî

---

46 See Worsley (1972:92) and Robson (1972:312-14) for notes on the relationship between quantity and recitation in Bali.
(singing in praise from the *Wedas*, 2.2). The accompanying *jarwa* in the Add.12279 interlinear text offers the explanation *asung bakti* ('to give salutations'). Many elements obviously came into play when the text was copied but Hall's impression (1913:154) that 'the worst scribe cannot copy mechanically for long without allowing some play to his intelligence' should be borne in mind before a too hasty branding of the Javanese tradition manuscripts as examples of mindless mechanism.

The intact condition of the Javanese manuscripts is difficult to reconcile with the *babad* tradition that texts expressing pre-Islamic sentiments were systematically collected and burnt at the instigation of the later Sultan of Dĕmak when the Majapahit *kraton* was captured. The number and condition of Old Javanese manuscripts in Bali stand as evidence that a dedicated and committed core of copyists was essential if texts were to survive the ravages of time, climate and warfare. Deliberate intervention as opposed to gradual disintegration has certainly been a much discussed point in the parallel European 'dark ages' situation. Reynolds and Wilson (1968:43) are of the opinion that texts that were considered heretical, whether they belonged to the newly emerging philosophy or the superseded faith were more prone to conscious and deliberate destruction than texts which were no longer relevant or presented little threat to the new dogma. This theory would be perfectly in keeping with the Cabezak reference that a text couchèd in *laku buda* terms could, in fact, be a

---

49 Zoetmulder (1974:23). Most contemporary scholars dispute that the destruction was so complete and premeditated. See, for example, de Graaf (1965:151). Not all accounts of the vagaries of transmission of Old Javanese literature are as drastic as the 'burning of the books' legend. An informant of te Mechelen (1879:74) explains the inconsistency of the intact condition of the *kakawins* by the fact that all texts except the four epic *kakawins* and the Nitidastera were destroyed. The Babad Dĕrmangandhu, and the Babad Kĕdhiri mellow this story further by noting that Sultan Agung sent out scouts to the villages and that old books were brought out in a dilapidated form. The king then ordered that the books be rewritten by the pujangga. See Drewes (1966:320-321) for reference to both babads and this tradition.
useful tool:

'For it is only taken as a metaphor and not as a matter of belief. This metaphor has been used by many of the saints of God and through this metaphor (Reality has been) revealed."

That texts have survived so successfully in Bali and that there are remnants of the old literature in Java itself may be related to deeply rooted traditions of written literature. If the eighteenth century Yasadipura texts are any guide to a tradition of respect for the written word, there are ample references in the form of small asides and additions that do not appear in the kakawin texts. This is, of course, not to say that writing was not a valued skill in the kakawin period but the eighteenth century texts may reflect the traditional approach to the written word and the text in the intervening period between the composition of the kakawins and the eighteenth century versions.

In the Serat Rama 6.6, a king is exhorted to not merely give verbal advice and moral example by his exemplary conduct but that he should write down these codes in a clear form:

'...in fact, compose documents as guidelines for proper behaviour. Set down all these matters relating to service in an exact form, thus providing examples...'

In the Arjuna Sasra, it was unacceptable that a king initiate some act of aggression against a neighbouring kingdom without determining first by letter if the enemy was of a mind to fight or negotiate. Whereas the Arjunawijaya kakawin depicted the Prime Minister Suwanda rallying his

---

50 Soebardi (1975:73). A similar situation is described in Reynolds and Wilson (1968:41) where familiar allegorical terms used by Stoic and Platonic philosophers were used to explain the new Christian concepts. See also Hall (1913:71) for the absorption of 'profane' concepts into Christian philosophy.

51 Noorduyn (1983:418) notes, on the relationship between religious centres in Java in the late fifteenth century and religious students from West Java, that the terms used indicate that written materials were an important aspect of instruction in these centres.

52 malah dareda surat, surating krama wus, saliring sumewa pasang, ing pasanganing ayu, dadya palupi.


54 AWj OJ 53.1.
fleeing troops with a call to duty and courage, the Modern Javanese character decided that the best strategy in the circumstances would be to write hurriedly a long and involved reminder of their responsibility to their king, to tie this message to his disk (aostra) and to hurl it into their midst. Both methods achieved the desired effect however.\[55\]

In both the Old and the Modern Javanese versions of the Bratayuda, the Kalimasada, the weapon of Yudisthira, is described as a pustaka (letter, book or document).\[56\] The contents of this document and similarly that of the sastra arjendra in the Arjuna Sasra episode, a Modern Javanese innovation in this case, are never revealed.\[57\] Whereas the sheer possession of the text seems to be the factor which empowers the owner with amazing capabilities in the Bratayuda, the Arjuna Sasra passage depicts Sumali being in possession of the sastra arjendra text yet frustrated and powerless because he is unable to decipher the contents.

The significance of the Arjuna Sasra example is simply that this knowledge, crucial to enlightenment and salvation, was contained in a text rather than an orally transmitted dogma that could be explained by some enlightened mystic. Having concluded that transmission was through written rather than oral channels, some consideration should now be directed towards those responsible for the transmission.

\[55\] ASB KW 46.9 in Part 2. (VAC II, 35.6).

\[56\] See Kats (1923:89) for reference to the Kalimasada. Also Kats pp. 240 and 284 for the Lekons Barbang Kalingga and Mustaka Weñi which revolve around the Kalimasada. The Kalimasada was adapted into the Babad Sêra-luh ‘aton‘ version of the Babad Tanah Javî (Soewito-Santoso 1979:108) as the Islam Sahadat, the Islamic profession of faith.

\[57\] Anderson (1972:47) comments similarly on the unrevealed nature of the documents and suggests for the Bratayuda example the equation writing = knowledge = power. The ASB example could perhaps be extended to writing = knowledge = enlightenment.
3.5 The Keepers of the Texts

Pigeaud (LIT.vol.1/8) states quite categorically that the eighteenth century 
pujangga were beholden to the pasisir for their acquaintance with the k`akawins.

'It is a fact that the Surakarta scholars' knowledge of the admired Old Javanese k`akawins was second-hand. Manuscripts written in the Pasisir districts were intermediaries. The superior Balinese codexes of the Old Javanese texts were not available in Central Java.'

The relationship between the Javanese tradition manuscripts and the Modern Javanese renderings certainly attests to the fact that the 'superior' Balinese manuscripts were not available in Central Java but the essential question remains as to whether Balinese manuscripts were ever available in Java previous to the nineteenth century, when some manuscripts were obtained via the Madurese Panembahan of Sumenep. Robson's comment (1979:305) that works written in Bali did not find their way back to Java should perhaps be noted here.

Although the court of Sumenep had accepted Islam in the first half of the sixteenth century, the Sumenep aristocracy prided itself on its links with the glory of Majapahit. Firm references, however, to proficiency in 'kawi' in the Sumenep court date from the nineteenth century Raffles (1965:1/370) stated that

'the knowledge of the ancient characters seems, in Java, to have been almost exclusively confined to this family of the chief' and that a knowledge of kawi was gained when a family member 'visited Bali'. Raffles' information is a little too indeterminable to constitute strong evidence of a long tradition of interest in Old Javanese, prompted or maintained by contacts with Balinese courts and manuscripts. References to links between Bali and the Eastern corner of Java in the late sixteenth

---

59 Raffles (1965:1/370), Cohen Stuart (1860:1/27). See also Pigeaud LIT. vol.11/92, COD Ljr 2250b, a letter dated 1834 from Wilkens to Roorda, mentioning the Sultan of Sumenep as an authority on kawi.
century relate mainly to military incursions rather than to cultural exchange.\textsuperscript{60} Some consideration should nevertheless be given to the impact of the brief period of Balinese authority initiated by Dewa Agung of Gelgel over the Eastern Corner areas of Blambangan and Panarukan.\textsuperscript{61} There were, however, political alliances between the princes of Sumenep and Surabaya in the early seventeenth century, when the Sumenep rulers threw in their lot with Surabaya against the aggression of Mataram.\textsuperscript{62} The late sixteenth/early seventeenth century Surabaya court of Jaya Lögkara enjoyed a reputation for rich literary and artistic activity and, according to babad traditions, the last prince of Surabaya, Pangeran Pëkik resided in the Mataram court after the conquest of Surabaya.\textsuperscript{63}

Cultural exchange links relating specifically to the transmission of Old Javanese texts of Balinese origin from the Eastern corner states to Surabaya and finally to Mataram after the fall of Surabaya in 1625 are possible but tenuous. Even if one considers the intermediary pasisir texts referred to by Pigeaud as occupying some position between Bali and Central Java, by virtue of their chronology and provenance, texts of the West Javanese Arjunawiwaha variety and the condition of the Surakarta manuscripts stand as some evidence of a Javanese tradition that was independent of the Balinese.

The impact of pasisir literature upon the Mataram court could have been considerable but it may be permissible to consider a diversity in the transmission process and as an alternative to the strict chronological and dynastic sequence of the major courts, some account could be taken of the parallel climate and activity in the minor provincial courts


\textsuperscript{61}De Graaf (1958:255).

\textsuperscript{62}De Graaf (1958:84).

\textsuperscript{63}Traditions surrounding Pangeran Pëkik are many and various. See de Graaf and Pigeaud (1974:162-68) and de Graaf (1951:213). Babad Tanah Jawi references to Pangeran Pëkik being summoned to the court of Mataram are found between pages 132-33 of the Olthof Javanese text (1941a).
and in the non-court, the religious centres. One limitation in pursuing a single stream of transmission between Majapahit, pasisir and Mataram is that the gap between Majapahit and Mataram becomes inevitably wider and strengthens the notion of an inland social and cultural void between Old Mataram and Sultan Agung's powerful court. Mataram's indebtedness to the pasisir should not be extended to the generalization that the recipients of Pangéran Pékik's literary and artistic package were cultural philistines in relation to their conquered pasisir rivals, nor that the Central Javanese courtiers would have been totally ill-equipped to appreciate, copy or study the Older Javanese literature.

A clearer picture of inland cultural and social activity in the fifteenth and sixteenth century is made harder to gauge by the lack of what de Graaf and Pigeaud (1974:63) term 'independent sources', the historian presumably being forced to fall back on the babad traditions. The 'non-independent' sources may perhaps be supported by firmer evidence in the form of the eighteenth century interpretations of the Old Javanese texts and the accumulated adjustments in the Javanese tradition manuscripts which consistently fitted within a Modern Javanese interpretative context of a search for mystical knowledge and self awareness. These adjustments, which some may rightly view as corruptions, may provide some insights into the traditions of interpretation of Old Javanese texts in the provincial centres as well as reflecting the conditions under which they were maintained and transmitted.

Besides the courtly kakawín literature, there is evidence of para-

---

64 Krom (1931:206) was a proponent of the inland void theory. Schrieke (1957:293) disputes Krom's theories and quotes, in translation, the essence of Krom's opinion: 'In any case it is a fact that after the first few years of the tenth century, the cultural life of central Java completely ceased and Hindu-Javanese civilization continued to flourish only in eastern Java.' (Krom 1943:83). For a differing view, see Noorduin (1983:452): 'it would be rash to conclude that it (the area south of Mount Merapi) was completely abandoned or even uninhabited. Our text gives clear evidence of habitation and even of residential continuity through some six centuries.'
llel activity in the mandala, the religious establishments which existed in varying degrees of independence and dependence upon the courts. As the fourteenth century Arjunawiwaha West Javanese manuscript was found with collections of prose speculative texts, there is the possibility that the courtly, belletristic literature may have been appreciated in religious centres supported by the courts before the decline of these court centres. The strong didactic tone of the later kakawins such as the Śiwarātrīkalpa, Niratha Prakṛta, Dharmāśīnāya and the Kuṣjarakarṇa Dharmakathana may indicate a greater sympathetic interaction between the courts and religious establishments as Islam gained a firmer footing.

Pigeaud's suggestion (1924:55) that literate courtiers may have spent some time in a mandala situation is reflected in the impression of the eighteenth century poets that the people of the court looked to religious centres for education, protection and retirement. Although the Arjuna Sasra episode of the king visiting religious establishments is based on the parallel kakawin passages, the Modern Javanese description of the sage, Wisrawa and the demon king, Sumali, both abdicating in favour of their heirs and retiring to hermitages are small, Modern Javanese additions (ASB KM 1,3, 4,7). Similarly, the Modern Javanese Bratayuda reference to Banowati fleeing the besieged city of Ngastina into the safety of a hermitage is not to be found in any form in the Bhāratayuddha kakawin.

As courts disintegrated, there may well have been some exodus to religious centres which existed alongside the courts. Netscher (1853:469) extended the relationship between the court and the mandala and suggested

---

66The colophon of the Tantu Panggĕlaran indicates that literature, most of which was prose, was written in religious establishments. See Pigeaud (1924:28-39) for a description of the various mandala, the positions of the monks within these centres and their relationship to the court. Also Supomo (1977:63-68).

66BY MAC 64.7 Banowati tinilar aneng patapan KM 84.13 Sang Banowati tinilar aneng patapan, an addition on BY OJ 50.14.
that some court centres, particularly the smaller provincial types, could have developed into religious establishments dedicated to maintenance of both belletristic and sacred literature which reflected the former order. Belletristic literature may have been read and enjoyed in these provincial centres by the type of person that Berg (1928:89) refers to as 'the country squire'. These nobles were representatives of the central court who, living in close association with the local populace, developed their own particular amalgam of Indic-Javanese and local traditions and perhaps also their own interpretation of the courtly literature. Belletristic texts may have remained in these inland centres after the decline of the central court, thus constituting what Berg (1932:126) in a further article suggests would have been the only East Javanese literature which could be directly linked with the second Central Javanese period literature of the eighteenth century.

Babad tradition notes that the ruler of the inland court centre of Pëngging, Andaya Ningrat, was related by marriage to the Majapahit royal house and that Hayam Wuruk visited the Pajang area in his royal progress. If this area had been the domain of Berg's 'country squire' administrators, these provincial courts may have been more committed to the study and maintenance of Old Javanese literature than the newly emerging pasisir states. Although de Graaf and Pigeaud (1974:63) conclude that the Pëngging court was probably a force to contend with by the late fifteenth century, it is difficult to gauge the duration of this court's strengths and traditions. By the mid-sixteenth century, however, the Pëngging royal house, according to the babads, was distinguished not

---

67 BTJ (O1thof 1941a:32-33) relates that Adipati Jayeng Rat of Pëngging, 'dipun-eih dhatëng Prabu Brawijaya ing Majapahit sarta katariman putrini-pun.' See also de Graff and Pigeaud (1974:203).

68 Nag 17.6. See also JFC.vol.IV/47. Pigeaud notes that Hayam Wuruk did not venture further west into the Mataram area. Mataram was at this stage under the titular authority of one of the youngest princes of the Majapahit ruling family.
merely by its conservatism but also by its tenacity in maintaining its esteem against Demak. Whereas the coastal courts were fostering the distinctively pasisir literary style, there is little reference to similar activity in the inland courts of the newly arising Mataram. Given Majapahit's former links with the area and Sultan Agung's attempts to connect himself genealogically with the East Javanese royal house, coupled with the revival of what Schrieke (1955:77) terms 'a study of Javanese theosophy' under his reign, it may be suggested that the pasisir's contribution to the inland court was to augment the royal literary coffers from the former Pengging and Pajang court centres rather than to introduce the refining and civilizing streams of Old Javanese literature into the new court.

Some consideration should also be given to the fact that the accumulation of textual pusaka would have aided in the swifter legitimization process within the new Mataram court. One can imagine how texts of a more belletristic nature would have attained the status of pusaka, as defined by Moertono (1968:65-66) if some evacuation from the court centres took place and these texts were removed to more secluded areas in periods of disruption by scholars who were sufficiently committed to maintain and study these texts. Kéhdu oral tradition holds that a priest, Windu Soma, and his family sought refuge on Mount Merbabu where they maintained the

---

69 See reference above in Chapter 2.4, p.50 to the attack on the Pengging court at the instigation of the Sunan of Kudus. The HTJ reference is at Olthof (1941a:32-35).


71 Sultan Agung became more orthodox later in his reign. (de Graaf, 1958:103). Schrieke (1955:77) noted the esteemed position of the 'seer' (the ajar) with strong Hindu-Javanese leanings in Sultan Agung's court.

72 Netshcher (1853:470) noted that in the mid-nineteenth century, the regent of Bandung declared that some texts were considered as pusaka and had been safeguarded as such. Helle (1882:4), however, felt that 'Mohammaden fanatics' would have been ever on the alert for such texts.
four hundred or so texts now referred to as the Merbabu collection.\textsuperscript{73} These manuscripts appear to have been maintained in circumstances similar to the West Javanese manuscripts described by Netscher (1853:473-5). One manuscript mentions a \textit{wanasrama} (forest hermitage) in the colophon\textsuperscript{74} while the West Javanese manuscripts similarly bear witness to the isolated nature of their composition or storage with reference to \textit{mandala katyāgan} (the area of liberality) and \textit{giri sīnya} (remote mountain).

The admixtures of Javanese mysticism, Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam were typical of philosophical development in isolated provincial centres and religious establishments. Just as the fourteenth century \textit{mandala} tempered concepts from the Hindu/Buddhist court society with their own particular interpretations, the same concepts were subjected to a similar process of appraisal and adjustment as the \textit{mandala} society came under the influence of Islamic mystical thought. The possible development of the \textit{mandala} into the Islamic era \textit{pondhok} (religious centre) has been proposed by Pigeaud (JFC.vol.IV/484) and previously cited references from the \textit{Serat Cabolek} indicated that the epic tales and certain philosophical concepts could be smoothly accommodated within an eighteenth century court situation.\textsuperscript{75}

During the course of the comparative analysis of the \textit{kakawins} and their \textit{kavi miring} and \textit{maacapat} equivalents, certain consistently presented and recurring elements surfaced which were not to be solely accounted for by either the obscurity of the Old Javanese text or the eighteenth century poets' inability to deal with these passages. These elements, which include an emphasis on \textit{dharma} (MJ \textit{darma}, 'moral responsibility or

\textsuperscript{73}See Pigeaud (1977:111-12) for details of the Merbabu collection.

\textsuperscript{74}The \textit{Dharmaśūnya} Berlin S.B or Fol. 410 (Pigeaud 1975:229). See Supomo (1977:66) for comment on the \textit{wanasrama}.

\textsuperscript{75}See Soebardi (1976:38-45) for a review of the \textit{pēsantron} in Java. Berg (1932:127) and Ricklefs (1977:16) are of the opinion that Old Javanese texts and Hindu-Javanese literature would have been studied by Moslem scholars.
or religious law'), the combination of mountain and water imagery related to architecture, religious establishments and to cosmic symbolism, the constant references to monks and ascetics, the search for instruction and finally the expanded role of Wisnu in the Modern Javanese texts, may reflect the conditions of transmission and the traditional interpretation of the kakawin texts. These points of emphasis are treated in Chapters 7 and 8 in relation to the omission, substitution and extension of Javanese cultural aspects but it seems appropriate to discuss the first two aspects, the emphasis on dharma and the mountain and water imagery, in reference to theories of transmission. The following quotations from the kakawin are taken from the Surakarta manuscript. In cases of gross corruption, the edition reading is included in brackets in both the Javanese quotation and the translation.

**Dharma**

The word dharma has two connotations in Old Javanese, 'duty/religious law' and 'religious establishment'. The Modern Javanese interpretation, according to Gericke and Roorda (1901:I/547) includes both Old Javanese meanings. Kakawin passages which referred without definition to fourteenth century philosophical concepts, the names of religious establishments and the echelons within these monasteries presented the eighteenth century poets with problems of interpretation. Interpretive difficulties are apparent in the kawi miring rendering of cantos 26-31 of the Arjunawijaya kakawin.76

With all due credit to the eighteenth century poet, this section of the Old Javanese text is rather obscure. On several occasions, dharma could have been justifiably translated as either 'religious law' or 'religious domain'.77 The point to be made is that the Modern Javanese poet

---

76 KW cantos 24-25, MAC II 18-19, in Part 2.

elected almost exclusively for the first meaning of 'law, religious duty'.

The religious communities of the dharma lēpas, 'free establishment' (OJ 28.1a), the dharma haji, 'royal religious establishment' (OJ 28.2a) and the dharma sīma, an establishment similar to the dharma haji78 (OJ 27.2d), took on a totally different perspective in the kawi miring text. The dharma lēpas found its way into KM 24.6 as darma usal, a free code instituted or implemented by a most lax and arrogant king who paid no heed to the priests. Darma in this case seems to be related to a religious or higher law rather than a code of ethics which applied to all subjects in the kingdom.

The dharma haji establishments were described in the kawin as follows:

kunang tikang/ dharma haji/ ki yan sinuk/ mrasteng (prāptēng)
mahasangsa/ satus nī sang prabu/

As for the dharma haji, they are built for the use of the noble families, all the descendants of the king (OJ 28.2a).79

The parallel KM passage reads:

datan aroa pituturing maharei/ rēsi sewa-sogata dwijawara/ lan kang ulah darma ji lamun sinung/ sīh sang nata`yen anut ing sang prabu/

He had no desire to follow the advice of the priests, the sages80 and those who practised the darma ji; only those who followed the king enjoyed his favour. (KM 24.7, MAC II, 18.36).

Darma ji appears to have been interpreted as a worthy code or religious path that was followed by the monks and other ethically minded men.

As the context of the full translation will show, 'the law of the king' (aji) is not an appropriate translation. The term darma ji is, in fact, used in Cabolek 11.8 and Soebardi (1975:147) prefers the connotation of 'religious duty and holy lore'.

---

78 Supomo (1977:63 and 307).
79 Supomo (1977:222).
80 rēsi sewa-sogata occur at various points in the MJ rend··rings, often where there is a parallel OJ reference. As the MJ poet did not recognise kasogatan as a Buddhist complex, the above phrase was probably considered as a composite term for the clergy.
The dharmā sima were similarly religious centres:

\[ \text{ring dharmā sima tuwi ya/ tēn lapas ditya (OJ 27.2d).} \]

The edition is included for comparison:

\[ \text{ring dharmā sima tuwi yan lēpas adviṭṭya} \]

In the dharmā sima as well as in the dharmā lēpas, they are second to none.\(^1\)

Dharma sima found its kawi miring parallel in

\[ \text{dārma sīh tan uwal saking lewih} \]

the dārma sīh, the stricter, superior (dārma).

Dharma sima clearly presented problems of interpretation to the kawi miring poet and the macapat author chose to omit this most abstruse passage completely (MAC II 18.31). The solution was found in the substitution of sīh (love, affection) for sīma (freehold area). The form tēn lapas was interpreted by the kawi miring poet as tan lēpas and found its way into the text as tan uwal.\(^2\)

Although the Modern Javanese poet consistently favoured the connotation of 'religious law' over 'religious domain', he seemed to be aware on at least one occasion, that a building, a compound or a community was being discussed. The following kakawin line,

\[ \text{watēn (wotēn) dharmā lē/was (lēpas) rubuh katēmu/ de nira kahawr/}
\]

\[ \text{ing pinggir ing wukir} \]

they came to an old dharmā (a dharmā lēpas) in ruins situated on the mountain slope, (OJ 32.2)

has its KM equivalent in

\[ \text{wontēn wangunan rubuh (KM 26.13 MAC II 21.8).} \]

The Modern Javanese texts describe how this building was repaired:

\[ \text{linereskēn winangunan sinung rikang prabeya} \]

repaired, rebuilt at the King's expense (KM 26.13 MAC II 21.2).

Admittedly, it is difficult to ascertain whether the poet recognised the dharmā lēwas (lēpas) in this section as an establishment or whether his interpretation was prompted by the many references to statues in ruin,

\[ ^1\text{Supomo (1977:123 and 222).} \]

\[ ^2\text{This was a most common scribal error throughout the manuscripts.} \]
overgrown vegetation, a big temple in a state of disrepair and the King's men setting to work to repair something. (OJ 32.1-4). The substitution of ēswas (old) for ēpas (free) is also some indication of the interaction between copying and interpretation in this line.

It was quite evident a few lines down the verse that the poet did not recognise the kasogatan as a complex belonging to the Buddhists,

\[\text{muang tang dhiman (dharma)/kasogatan hana ka/rēnan (karsyan) tka pina/hajēng nareswara. (OJ 32.4b).}\]

Both the temple complexes belonging to the Buddhists as well as those (Ed. belonging to the r̄ṣis) were restored by the king.\(^{83}\)

Sogata in the Old Javanese context can be interpreted as either a buddhist or a welcome.\(^{84}\) The kawi miring poet chose the second interpretation:

\[\text{myang yen ana wadya lit' tani dhusun suga'ā'sinungan iana keh marma suka-pirēna'kang samya asugata'tuman sinung arta and if the common people, peasants and villagers gave gifts of welcome they were rewarded generously. So they were well pleased, for those who gave the welcome were given riches in return. (ASB KM 26.16, MAC II 21.15).}\]

The adjustment within the Old Javanese text is interesting here. The MS 219 is also fractured at this point, reading dhima for dharma and karnyan for karsyan. Once sogata was interpreted as 'welcome' or 'welcoming gifts', the karnyan was adjusted in the Surkarta manuscript to karēnan (pleasure, joy), finding its way into the KM as suka pirēna. The progress of karsyan through karnyan to karēnan into suka pirēna is one of the many examples of the transmission and interpretive processes over the passage from the original text to the kawi miring version.

In another kawi miring passage, dire consequences are predicted if the king does not follow the path of his darma.

\[\text{yen ratu datan anut ulah kadarman (KM 25.1).}\]

The Surakarta manuscript reads:

\[\text{datan panut i (Ed. panuka) dharma kewala ti/kang huwus iki pang/ ajēng nareswara (30.1b)}\]

\(^{83}\)Supomo (1977:227).

\(^{84}\) Zoetmulder (1982:1802 and 1881).
Do not only follow (Ed. build) new temple complexes but maintain existing ones as well.\(^8^5\)

The operative word in the \textit{KM} translation is \textit{panut}. \textit{Panuka}, from \textit{suk}, 'to establish', appears as \textit{panut i} in both the 219 and the Surakarta manuscripts and was interpreted as 'following' the path of \textit{dharma} in the Modern Javanese versions.

In relation to the suggestion that transmission processes may be reflected in the condition of the texts, three references to texts which post-date the \textit{kakawins} should be cited here. Firstly, the \textit{Kuṇjarakarma Dharmakathana}, which is thought to date from the late Majapahit period and to have been written in a \textit{mandala} environment, by 'Empu Dusun',\(^8^6\) is a \textit{kakawin} concerned with enlightenment and release. To quote Teeuw and Robson (1981:17),

'\textit{dharma} is one of the key words of the text; it is quite frequently used, and often occurs in connection with words for instruction.'

Secondly, the \textit{Tantu Panggélaran} stresses that a knowledge of \textit{dharma} was an essential prerequisite for ordination into a religious order.\(^8^7\) Finally, the Old Javanese manuscripts in the Schoemann collection described by Pigeaud, the \textit{Dharma Pātañjala} (1975:111), \textit{Dharma Śūnya} and \textit{Darma Putus} (1975:229), as well as the manuscripts that Netchar (1853:472-73) noted were found with the fourteenth century \textit{Arjunawiwaka kakawin}, deal largely with instruction from priest to pupil and make frequent reference to \textit{sang sewaka dharma} (one devoted to \textit{dharma}).

The eighteenth century poets' consistent choice of \textit{dharma} as religious law, moral code or duty and his ease in manipulating the many Old Javanese \textit{dharma}/religious establishment references into his own context may indicate that the Old Javanese poems were interpreted according to a tradition that extended beyond the Kartasura period and could be traced

\(^{8^5}\)Supomo (1977:222).
\(^{8^6}\)Teeuw and Robson (1981:46).
\(^{8^7}\)Pigeaud (1924:35).
to the *mandala* communities. The possibility of scolia or interpretive prose texts should also be considered.

*Darma* was not a mere civil code or a proper way to behave.\(^8\) When warriors were called upon to remember their duty and knightly good form, terms such as *parikrama* (loyalty) were used. Rama was quoted by Sinta as being aware of *krama niti* (nobility, *SR* 31.23) and levels of behaviour ranging from *nista*, *madya* and *utama* (base, mediocre and excellent) were frequently mentioned (*SR* 5.2, 31.23, *ASB* 46.10). Servants were exhorted to be guided by *pakarti prayogi* (appropriate behaviour, *SR* 6.4) and to *wruh susila* (to be attuned to correct form and etiquette, *SR* 5.23). *Kadarman* was used in *SR* 5.6 to refer to the king's understanding of his moral and spiritual responsibility. The many references to former times (*ngunt*) and to the conduct of great, ancient kings indicated that *darma* in the Modern Javanese sense was the term used for the contract or bond between the ruler and the Almighty which ensured continued cosmic harmony in ancient times. The concept of *darma*, irrespective of terminology, would have been equally applicable in the Surakarta Court as the *kawula gusti* relationship was still the ideal cornerstone of kingship.

**Mountain and Water References**

On a number of occasions throughout the Yasadipura renderings, a *kakawin* passage appeared to have been interpreted within a context of a mountain/water combination related to a religious centre or meditation site. In some instances, this interpretation was framed around elements in the *kakawin* itself while in other passages, the Modern Javanese poet saw an opportunity to insert some references to either water, a mountain

\(^8\) It is of some note that the word *darma* is not used in the well-known ode to duty and responsibility by Mangkunegara IV the *Tripama*, although all three characters chosen as exemplars of duty, Sumantri, Kumbakarna and Karna are from the epic texts. See Boedihardja (1935) for the text, translation and notes to the *Tripama*.
or the combination of the two. The status of the mountain in Javanese religious symbolism is a subject in itself and has been treated at length by various scholars. Carey (1974:26) noted 'the prevalence of water' in Dipanagara's own description of his places of meditation while Day (1981:196) comments that Rangewarsita's concept of the kali yuga era was associated with water imagery.

Pigeaud (JFC IV/45) notes the combination of water and the mountain as the Javanese symbol of cosmic unity and his reference to the description of the miniature 'fish pond mountain' (wukir poleman) carried in procession in Nag 65.5.3 was significant in relation to the Modern Javanese treatment of the following kakawin passage.

In Arjunavijaya OJ 26.3, the King and Queen

'withdrew into a lofty temple-tower, from which both the sea and the mountains were visible, but the Royal couple paid no heed to them.'

In the parallel Modern Javanese passage, the couple withdrew into an inner garden courtyard which contained a mountain surrounded by botrawi, the stone fence that surrounds a bathing pool (KN 23.18, MAC II, 18.20).

In the MJ texts, the King, unlike his kakawin counterpart, paid great attention to the mountain and water and begged the monk accompanying him to explain the symbolism of the mountain in the middle of the courtyard (KN 24.3). This strange reversal of elements is not to be solely attributed to misinterpretation on the part of the Surakarta poet. The Sārāt

---

89See Jasper (1926:185-189) and (1927:31-33) for a review of the Tengger mountain communities and their religious cults. Pigeaud (JFC vol.IV/483) has explored the relationship between Hayam Wuruk's sea side visits and the mountain deity cults. The role of the mountain in Javanese religious thought has been discussed by Supomo (1977:64-82).

90Among the numerous ponds, rivers and bathing places visited by Dipanagara was the Sunan's pond at Pongging.

91Supomo (1977:221).

92Botrawi according to Zoetmulder (1982:283) is an ornamental bathing place in stone. The AJ meaning (Gericke and Roorda (1901:II/698)) is the wall around a spring or pond.
Rama contains a very similar passage which has no equivalent at the OJ parallel point (OJ Rama 8.42-47). Anoman, in search of Sinta, enters an inner courtyard and finds a mountain surrounded by water:

'Anoman climbed the mountain, the mountain inside the palace surrounded by ponds.'

In another Sërat Rama passage, there is a further reference to a combination of water and places of meditation, the mandakini, floating pavilion.

...immediately welcomed [the guests] in the mandakini ditya, the floating residence of the monks.

Although this word is found at the OJ equivalent passage (Rama 3.40), Mandakini is an arm of the Ganges (Zoetmulder 1982:1099) and was the name of a lake in the kakawin.

It was clear that the eighteenth century poet considered that the place of worship, be it temple, pavilion or small isolated hermitage should be either surrounded by water or associated with water. Whereas the mountain was the predominant symbol in Indian cosmology, the significance of water or mountain/water imagery may have been a more distinctively Javanese element. The Babad Tanah Jawi records that Senapati, the founder of Mataram, became the consort of the powerful Goddess of the Southern Sea, Nyai Kidul, a relationship which was continued under Sultan Agung's reign and has been alluded to well into the eighteenth century.

---

93 SR 22.22 Anoman munggah ing wukir, wukir sajroning puri, samadyaning setu-setu.

94 SR 4.29 Sigra denya ngaoaran, munggeng mandakini ditya, kinambang gene sang r selects. See Stutterheim (1926:341-47) for references to temples surrounded by water and the implications of this symbolism. Also de Graaf and Pigeaud (1974:140) for a description of the court of Giri in 1485 complete with a pond which the authors suggest may have been the bale kambang (floating pavilion). See Pigeaud (JFC vol.IV/483 and 79) for reference and definition.

95 The meeting of Nyai Kidul and the founder of Mataram is on p.78 of the Javanese text and p.80 of the translation (Olthof 1941).

96 See Ricklefs (1974:85) for comments on the links between the Taman Sari (water palace) complex in Yogyakarta and Mangkubumi's efforts to connect himself with Senapati and Sultan Agung as established consorts of Nyai Kidul. Stutterheim (1931:14) notes that in one period of Hindu Javanese culture, the candi as a funeral monument was replaced by a water tank which was fed from mountain streams.
The manipulation of OJ AHJ 25.2-3 into KM 23.13-14 is therefore a classic example of interpretation within the prevalence of water context. The kakawin described the King's party sighting a small picturesque village:

desa keh (Ed. lit) ra/mya katôm su bagna/tal yan (nyû) makeh/sdhang (gêgang) ika mahiifo/gopalasyana (sthana) pangucap irî ya many ( small) hamlets, beautiful and thriving with many (coconut) and green (banana) trees. 'It is a village of cowherders' they said.98

The kawi miring author instinctively seemed to favour the adjustment of the error, sdhang to sêndhang (ponds) rather than to return the word to gêgang (banana trees). Although the yan for nyû (coconut) was fractured,99 the tal palm would have surely acted as an easy prompt, as would the word nahiifo (green), if the poet had approached the text with no preconceived idea of what this description should contain. The next step was to interpret the gopala as statues instead of cowherders and to position them in neat rows beside the pools.100 All that was now needed to complete this scene was a passing monk; one in fact conveniently appeared in the Old Javanese text at this point to beg some curds (dadhi) from the herders.

mwang sang wipre/swara teka maliwer kapwuminta/ dadhi sira n umulih (umulih) (3b)
and a priest hurriedly came there to ask for curds and then went home.101

Whereas the priest in the Old Javanese text 'asked for curds and then went home', the kawi miring poet maintained the consistency of a scene arranged for meditation by interpreting dadhi (curds) as dadi (existence) while umulih finds its parallel in waluya (welfare, restoration KM 23.13d). Thus, the final kawi miring text which is on first impression

---

97See full text in text and translation appendix.
99Yan and sdhang were also in the Cod 219.
100gopala is listed in Zoetmulder (1982:536) as a cowherder. In Gericke and Roorda (1901:II/605), gopala is entered under both cowherder and a large statue.
far removed from the *kakawin* passage reads:

charming villages could be seen with numerous ponds and springs. Statues and shady trees stood in rows beside the clear waters. Many wandering monks came to rest by the springs, from morning until evening, deep in meditation, praying for the welfare of humanity.

Any attempt to pursue the sequence of interpretative or transmissive processes related to this episode would be venturing into the realm of conjecture. One could suggest that the copyist's error, *sadhang*, was the first element in the interpretive chain. On the other hand, an impression of what the text *should* describe, perhaps guided by the physical circumstances and surroundings in which the text was copied, could have been responsible for the scribal error in the Javanese tradition manuscripts.

It stands to reason that the Yasadipura versions, written some four centuries after the *kakawin*, should reflect popular or more recent traditions. One curious aspect of the Yasadipura versions is either the omission or the variant interpretations of *Adiparwa* references, the *amrta*, water of life passages being the most notable example. Stutterheim (1926:336) drawing upon *Tantu Panggélaran* references, proposed that alternative versions of the obtaining of the water of life existed in an early period in Javanese history and that these traditions may reflect pre-Hindu myths common to South East Asia in general. In view of these traditions, as represented by the *Tantu Panggélaran* version, it may not be sufficient to attribute these variant *Adiparwa* references in the Modern Javanese texts to either the fact of the *parwa* texts being unavailable in Java or the poets' inability to comprehend the Old Javanese imagery and language.

---

102 The consistent omission of the reference to the Garuda being forced to act as Wisnu's mount is discussed in Chapter 4.4.

103 For the *Tantu* version of this myth, see Pigeaud (1924:134), Stutterheim (1926:335) and a review in Supomo (1977:75-76).

104 Kern (1877:217) and Pigeaud (1926:361).
If *kakawin* literature was read in the religious centres, the seeds of interpretation according to non-court traditions may have been sown at an early period. Continuing this line of reasoning, if transmission of the Old Javanese texts was entrusted to those either responsible for or sensitive to these non-court interpretations, *kakawin* texts which remained in Java up until the time of the Modern Javanese renderings of *Yasadipura* may have been accompanied by more valuable aids to interpretation, in the form of theatrical, oral and local versions, than the multifarious spelling errors and corruptions for which they are infamous.
4. AIDS TO THE TRANSLATION

4.1 The Condition of the Old Javanese Manuscripts

The eighteenth century interpretation of the *kakawins* and the resultant renderings into Modern Javanese were aided and influenced by a number of factors. Whereas the possibility of earlier complete or partial renderings and interlinear texts may be considered as tools to aid in the interpretive process, the impact of oral tradition and the actual condition of the *kakawin* manuscripts may have exerted a more subtle influence upon the poets' creative and interpretive decisions.

One important aspect of the relationship between the Old Javanese manuscripts and the Modern Javanese renderings is whether the *pębhotan* markings throughout the text influenced the interpretation of the *kakawin*. As no interlinear version is available for the *Arjunawijaya kakawin*, the main guide as to how the Old Javanese text was interpreted was whether the eighteenth century renderings indicated that the poet was governed by the division of the *kakawin* line into the smaller *pędhotan* units. It suffices to say that a greater number of elements came into play than the mere divisions within a line as the eighteenth century poet formulated his approach to the reworking of a *kakawin* verse into a fluid Modern Javanese idiom. Once interpreted, or perhaps at this basic level, translated, the poet exercised his artistic prerogative to be selective in terms of the concepts and narrative that were before him. He was further ruled by the aesthetics of Modern Javanese poetic expression and the metrical requirements of *pěkar ageng* or *macapat*.

The overall impression of the first stage of the renderings, the interpretation of a line, was that the poet may have read or intoned the text according to the *pępbotan* markings, but only in those lines containing unfamiliar words or phrases did the poet resort to considering the smaller grouping of six or seven syllables as a sense unit, rather than the possibility of enjambment over the *pędhotan* divisions or even
over the line. On a number of occasions, it was obvious that even by considering these smaller units in a strict, literal sense, the poet could not decipher the text to his satisfaction and was reduced to quoting, without explanation from the kakawin before moving on to the next point in the narrative.

One example from Arjunawijaya 32.11b and Arjuna Sasra KM 27.13 best illustrates the impact of pĕdhotan divisions in the kakawin manuscript upon interpretation. The Balinese manuscripts, as represented by the edition, describe the entrance of a lovelorn lady with her servant, carrying flowers.

1. ngkă tongguvan rasikatiduhka manahën lara saha kawulawin sēkar. There, accompanied by her servant, she endured her painful sorrow, carrying flowers.¹

Although there is no division between words in Javanese script, I have broken the following parallel passage from the Surakarta manuscript in line with the edition. A comparison with the kawi miring, however, will show how the eighteenth century poet grouped a string of letters into words and then interpreted them within the pĕdhotan units.

2. Surakarta MS.LOr 1855(2). ka tongguvan rasıkatiduhka mana/hēn lara saha ka/wulangawin sērēh

3. The kawi miring text reads:
   katon unggyaning Rasi anandhang sungkawa lan panakawan sajuga angampil sēdah

The maxapat II completes the interpretive picture:

4. ana kaeksı, Rasi anendhang sungkawa, kalawan antrik sawişi, ngampil pakinanganipun
   then a monk, bowed down by sadness, came into view, accompanied by an apprentice, carrying the container for betel. (21.33-34).

It seems probable that the reading of the text according to the pĕdhotan units influenced the choice of a monk (Rasi) over the third person demonstrative, rasika. On the other hand, the word manahën, broken by pĕdhotan, was interpreted as intended in the kakawin and employed in

¹Supomo (1977:229).
line KM 27.14:

denya sang rasti sanget manahen kung rimang.
as for the monk, bearing his sorrow and grief...

But there are also other factors involved here; although rasika has two
connotations in Old Javanese, 'erotic emotion' (Zoetmulder 1982:1517)
and the third person demonstrative, the Modern Javanese meaning was more
related to love, pleasure or sensuality. The pervading eighteenth cen-
tury emphasis upon the search for enlightenment, consulting the learned
monks and visiting their remote establishments also shaped the choice of
a monk instead of a lady in this segment. 2 The substitution of sereh
(betel) for sekar (flower) is also interesting. Can it be presumed that
the copyist thought it more appropriate that a monk's servant should be
holding his master's betel container rather than clutching a posy? One
further and somewhat tenuous aspect to consider is the aural impression
gained when the kakawin line is read while observing the padhotan stop:

katongwanrasi/

One similar example from ASB KM 25.11 (in text appendix) and OJ
30.4d further illustrates how the combination of a corrupt text, padhotan
divisions and perhaps unfamiliarity with a section of the story that was
not an essential part of the narrative and may not have been included in
the wayang versions was responsible for the resultant rendering in the
kawi miring text. The Old Javanese context concerns areas of land set
aside for particular religious communities and that the common people
should not trespass on these properties. The power and the possessions
of the clergy are likened to a poison which can generate misfortune and
miscontent.

1. Edition:

nda yoka tika rin swaputra kuta potraka sahana dinena pataka
and these can bring suffering to all their children, relatives
and descendants as well. 3

2 Further examples of similar substitution are noted in Chapter 7.
3 Supomo (1977:224).
2. The Surakarta text:
   nya yeka tka/ ri swapata kula sotraka sahana/ dinonya pataka

The older MS 219 reads swapatra. The copyists of the two later kakawin MSS favoured a reading, swapata, rather than returning the text to swaputra (kinsmen). Swapata is listed in Gericke and Roorda (1901:1/817) as a form of sapata or supata, 'a curse'. The kawi miring poet has therefore interpreted the line as a warning of the dire curses and misfortunes to descend upon the king who is lax in providing the monks with the necessities of life and maintaining their establishments. What is of interest, of course, is that for whatever reason the Surakarta scribe wrote sotraka sahana rather than potraka sahana (all the descendants), the kawi miring author read the line as sot rakasa hana and the KM accordingly reads sot kang rēkasa.

KM 25.11
angurusaka'ing panggenaning rēsi
yēktī dhatēngkēn'ing supatāning rikā
yen nganyia mētyakäkēn sot kang rēkasa
ingkang kataman'ing sot sang mahārīt
...and the establishments of the monks are destroyed, [the priests] will certainly conjure up curses. If they should utter these oaths, the ones to suffer will be those who incur the wrath of the clergy."

Pēdhotan appears to have been borne in mind during the process of copying the Old Javanese texts themselves. In a footnote on page 36, an example was cited of three cantos in the Arjunawijaya Surakarta MS that were cast into méres with one extra syllable compared with the Balinese reading. As the Cod 219 antiquated script text bore no metre designation at the beginning of each canto, the quantity aspects and the number of syllables per line were checked against the edition and the Surakarta text to determine whether, in fact, these cantos had also been reshaped into different metres. The script made for difficult reading but quantity aspects on the whole coincided with that of the metre in the edition. In the opening lines of those three cantos, there were instances of what could have been interpreted as an extra syllable but by no means was there

"See text and translation in Part 2 for full context."
the consistent impression of the canto having been refashioned into another metre. This seemed to indicate that the Surakarta copyist was at pains to ensure that the metre, in terms of eighteenth century sēkar ageng standards, was precise and consistent throughout the canto.\(^5\)

Berg's observations (1928:69) concerning the kidung poets' flexibility with respect to final syllables but rigid observance of the metrical requirements for a line were similarly borne out by examples in the Arjunawijaya Surakarta manuscript where one syllable, having been omitted or added earlier in the line, was suitably adjusted to the required number of syllables by the final word of that particular line.\(^6\) The following example from AWj 70.2a illustrates this point:


\begin{verbatim}
āpan noreka yogyā n gawayakēnana de sēri Mahābhūminātha
\end{verbatim}

Surakarta text. (Sraladara metre, 21; 7.7.7.)

\begin{verbatim}
āpan noreki yogyā/nya gawayakakēn/ā de sēri Mahābupati
\end{verbatim}

Scholars more exclusively concerned with oral traditions have frequently mentioned the advantages of familiar patterns and stock expressions, and particularly metrics over prose, in the process of recall for performance and transmission. Kern (1876:198), however, was moved to comment that the majority of variations between the 'classical' versions and the Modern Javanese renderings were due to scribal rather than aural errors and there are sufficient examples in the Arjunawijaya rendering alone to justify this conclusion. Nevertheless, there are a number of

---

\(^5\)This was also evident from the manner in which the previously cited manuscript supervised by Winter was copied, the BY OJ LOr 1788. Winter: \textit{īla tiwikraminīta/ vak ikang triloka} Gunning: \textit{ṭīla trīwikramo makhāvāk ikang triloka} (BY OJ 8.1) Cohen Stuart (1860:1/10) noted that in one \textit{Bhāratayuddha MS} designated F in his collection, canto 14, which was cast in alternating lines of 12 and 13 syllables (matrāḥandas category metres), was returned to a regular \textit{Kuṇmavisvitra} 12 syllable metre. See also Gunning's comment (1903:ii).

\(^6\)Palmer van den Brock (1870:iv) noted in the course of his edition of the Sindusastra Śūrat Lokapala that metre faults were rare. He commented that there was more concern for the way in which the text was to be 'sung' rather than 'comprehended'. Hazeu (1901:291) noted a similar preoccupation with metre precision in relation to sloka quotations in the Old Javanese ādiparsa text.
instances related to either the copying or the interpretation which indicate that an integral aspect of the poetry not apparent on the manuscript page, the melody appropriate to that metre, may have had some bearing on the manner of transmission.

Although the pédatotan markings had not been so meticulously drawn in the Bhāratayuddha interlinear text (Add·12279), this manuscript was of interest in that it was possible to affirm that interpretation was not governed by the narrow confines of five or six syllables. Where the slash mark in the text produced units such as tatan dumung ri kurunatata sira (BY OJ 3.1c) or nda mangkat sira sigra sangka Wira/ta (BY OJ 1.9a), the word broken into two was obviously perceived as the proper noun and rendered as such in both the individual word for word translation and the complete (jara) explanation that followed:

kurunata = Suyodana, Wirata = aran ing nagara

However, in line 8.6c,

myang Dropadi basama tan / pagélung gatinya7

prompted the interlinear interpreter to proffer the explanation basa = págélung, thus ignoring the syllable, ma, which could not be fitted into the context of the jara yet was not able to be omitted from the kakawin line because of the metrical requirements for that line.

Soebardi (1971:340) notes that the interlinear text was an essential study aid in the Javanese tradition. Copies of Islamic texts frequently contained either notes or interlinear translations and many of the texts described by Ntscher (1853:472-73) also contained a gloss. Although a percentage of the interlinear texts may be traced to Madura, the older Javanese interlinear texts of a moralistic or mystical nature and Arabic texts with Modern Javanese paraphrase bear witness to a tradition of scholia as a valuable interpretive aid.

---

7The Gunning edition (1903:13) reads biwana tan pagélung, 'determined not to tie up her hair', although all other manuscripts including the Javanese IOL 4 and 15 read basama.
Ideally, gloss should be lucid and simple, although the most common summation of both the Javanese and the Balinese interlinear texts was that the gloss was frequently as complicated as the base text itself.\(^8\)

As it was rare to find full interlinear versions of any of the *kakawins*,\(^9\) it therefore seemed unlikely that the late eighteenth century poets were largely dependent upon a complete *jarwa* version of the Old Javanese base text. The relationship between the extant interlinear texts and the *macapat* and *kawi miring* versions was difficult to determine with any reliability although Poerbatjaraka (1926:8) was of the opinion that the *Mintaraga macapat* of Paku Buwana III was based on an interlinear version of the *kakawin*. It was therefore of some interest to note the relationship between the *kakawin*, *jarwa*, *kawi miring* and *macapat* versions of *Nitiśāstra* material in the LOr 1853 collection.

The main point to be made is that neither the *kawi miring* nor the *macapat* gave the impression of simply constituting a metrical refashioning of the *jarwa* text although there were obvious interpretive and vocabulary choice parallels between all three versions. The flexibility that the *kawi miring* and *macapat* poets allowed themselves seemed to have extended to the manner in which the *jarwa* interpreter fashioned the initial word for word rendering into his final full stanza version. Not content with merely arranging the Modern Javanese equivalents into a grammatically intelligible prose sequence, the interpreter frequently added an explanatory aside or felt the need to expand or duplicate in what should be considered as a stricter parallel version of the Old Javanese verse. The interlinear passages that accompanied the *Bhāratayuddha* *kakawin* text in IOL JAV 15, however, bore little resemblance to the content in the *kakawin* equivalent

---

\(^8\) I Wajan Bhadra (1937:19), Cohen Stuart (1860:1/28) and Swellengrebel (1936:15).

\(^9\) Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/177) felt that this was indicative of the function of the interlinear texts, at least in Bali, as *mabasan* material.
verse and perhaps are more indicative of the interlinear author's incompetence rather than a measure of the flexibility permitted in interlinear renderings.\textsuperscript{10}

In view of the greater number of Bhāratayuddha manuscripts available and, as a consequence, more interlinear versions, it was possible to assess the relationship between the Modern Javanese Bratayuda renderings and the condition of the interlinear manuscripts with a little more certainty. A review of interlinear Bhāratayuddha material including the manuscripts consulted by Cohen Stuart (1860:1/24-28) revealed one important aspect. With the exception of a gloss text compiled by Ranggawarsita which treated from canto 30 until the end of the kakawin, the remainder of the texts dealt with the first half of the kakawin, a broad dividing line being around cantos 22-24. NBS 8\textsuperscript{11} contained scholia until canto 15 and Cohen Stuart's manuscript designated N (1860:1/28) until canto 24. Add. 12279 continued until canto 22 only while IOL 15 also stopped at canto 22. Although Cohen Stuart commented that he could not fathom the logic behind the selection of the Bhāratayuddha verses in the NBS 9 compilation,\textsuperscript{12} eighty of the one hundred and fourteen fragments were taken from the first twenty-five cantos of the kakawin.

It was therefore of some note to find that all OJ suluk and the vast majority of MJ sēkar ageng suluk that could be traced to the Bhāratayuddha were derived from cantos 1-22 of the kakawin and that only one suluk

\textsuperscript{10} Although interlinear texts do not rank aesthetically and technically with freer renderings of classical texts, Hall (1913:195) commented that the person responsible for the scholia on Greek and Roman manuscripts was rarely the copyist and generally possessed some degree of scholarship.

\textsuperscript{11} Pigeaud (LIT. vol. II/714). This manuscript was designated M by Cohen Stuart (1860:1/28).

\textsuperscript{12} Cohen Stuart's appraisal (1860:1/28) of this text, designated MS L, was that neither 'the most beautiful, relevant or important' appear to have been chosen but that selection seemed to have been based on the simple criteria of what was best known and understood. The majority of well-known suluk were included in this collection. Pigeaud (LIT. vol. II/714) lists one hundred and twenty-three fragments but a number of the selected passages were in consecutive one and a half stanza sequence.
listed in the Uhlenbeck summary (1960:66)\textsuperscript{13} was taken from a section of the kakawin after canto 22.

Several other factors point to a strong correlation between the availability of an interlinear text as an interpretive aid and the manner in which certain sections of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin were re-fashioned into Modern Javanese. The kawi miring extensions on the macapat\textsuperscript{14} which were based on the kakawin were concentrated in the first half of the kawi miring text. Both Modern Javanese versions were closer to each other in the second half of the renderings and were characterised by more pronounced borrowing from the Old Javanese text.

One particular feature of this borrowing deserves attention. Transposition of vocabulary from the kakawin into the Modern Javanese versions took two forms. Old Javanese words were inserted consistently throughout the Modern Javanese texts, a judicious use of kawi being one of the recommended elements of Modern Javanese poetry. However, on certain occasions, the transposed word or phrase seemed to constitute a quotation rather than an attempt merely to enhance the style. These quotations were followed by a standard tēgĕęe, ('the meaning is'), and a Modern Javanese translation followed.\textsuperscript{15} A word was borrowed and explained, with the tēgĕęe formula on three occasions in the first twenty-two cantos and on each occasion, this explanation may have been warranted. Unusual phrases such as rata jong bangun jring ('a chariot with an umbrella in the shape of a jring tree'),\textsuperscript{16} the battle formation, kagapati,\textsuperscript{17} and the word, Endrajala\textsuperscript{18} were singled out for clarification.

After canto 22, this practice of quote and translation was employed

\textsuperscript{13}This was the MJ version of BY OJ 32.1-4.
\textsuperscript{14}See Chapter 6.2.
\textsuperscript{15}For further reference, see Chapter 6.1.
\textsuperscript{16}KM 15.5, MAC 10.3, OJ 9.6.
\textsuperscript{17}KM 21.9, MAC 15.7, OJ 12.6.
\textsuperscript{18}KM 34.6, MAC 24.8, OJ 16.5d.
on at least fourteen occasions until the end of the text. This feature, as used in the first three examples, fitted quite smoothly into the narrative, reminiscent of the relaxed manner of asides from the poet which was an effective feature of macapat poetry. The quote and explanation in the latter half of the text often disturbed the flow of the tale and seemed to be related to some problem of interpretation. Its application in a direct speech passage where Suyodana, the King of the Korawa, implores the aid of Salya (W 60.1, MAC 45.1) and in another moving exchange between Salya and his distressed wife, Satyawati, (W 68.2-4, MAC 50.13-15) mark emotional and potentially dramatic points.

At times, the approach to the rendering of the second half of the Bhāratayuddha bore strong parallel with the presentation of kakawin material in the middle section of the Arjuna Sastra rendering. The frame of the story was well known and certain passages were obviously more familiar through the theatrical renditions. Problems arose, however, when the poet, particularly the kawi miring author, was intent on rendering finer points of narrative and description as closely as appropriate to the kakawin.

In conclusion, the actual condition of the kakawin manuscripts may be considered as one of the aspects that had some bearing upon the Modern Javanese interpretation. More direct references to reading and comprehension are examined in the section to follow.

4.2 Reading and Study of the Old Javanese Texts

Whereas references abound to the Javanese dhālang’s superficial knowledge of Old Javanese and the fractured condition of the suluk, the Balinese dhālang was reputed to have been capable of translating Old

---

19See Aern (1882:iv), te Meulenberg (1879:97) and Winter (1911:283-4). Hazou (1897:116-118), quoting from the Ugar Pēdhalangan of Pangèrān Arya Kusumadilaga (rule 10 Parana-sastra) noted that a dhālang must be familiar with the texts from which the suluk were taken.
Javanese prose narrative passages from the parwa texts into a Modern Balinese idiom for his audience.\textsuperscript{20} Kakawin texts in Bali are still considered as appropriate material for recitation and paraphrase on ceremonial and rites of passage celebrations. In Java, Modern Javanese maaapat texts are the usual choice for similar functions and all night text readings.\textsuperscript{21}

Although the practice of reading from maaapat texts is common in Java, there has been some discussion as to whether mabalasan in the Balinese sense had its Javanese counterpart, the general consensus being that there is little evidence of similar activity in Central Java.\textsuperscript{22} In Javanese study groups of more recent times, Modern Javanese texts such as the Sasanasunu (Yasadipura II), S\textit{\textsc{r}}at Wulang Reh, (Paku Buwana IV) and the\textit{\textsc{w}}edatama (Mangkuné\texttt{\textsc{g}}ara IV) appear to have been the choice for study material rather than Old Javanese texts.\textsuperscript{23}

References in the Modern Javanese texts cited in Chapter 3.1 showed that Old Javanese literature was considered as fitting reading material in the eighteenth century court. Passages in the\textit{\textsc{s}}\textit{\textsc{r}}at\textit{\textsc{c}}abolang (177.7),\textit{\textsc{s}}\textit{\textsc{r}}at\textit{\textsc{c}}abol\textit{\textsc{d}}ek (7.14-8.2) and Javanische Zamenspraken (Conversation 67 and 69) indicate that it was not uncommon for a small group of people to gather to read and interpret Old Javanese texts and that the Javanese reading session may have been conducted in a manner similar to the study groups in Bali.

In the\textit{\textsc{s}}\textit{\textsc{r}}at\textit{\textsc{c}}abol\textit{\textsc{a}}ng reference to a kavi reading session, one member of the group read and another interpreted.

It was read very slowly and with difficulty in pronouncing the words. Dyan Tunénggung then gave the\textit{\textsc{j}arwa} explanation quite fluently.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{20}See I Wajan Bhadra (1937:9).
\textsuperscript{21}See Kartomi (1973:8-10). Also Ras (1979:3) for a description of a maaapat evening.
\textsuperscript{22}Robson (1976:77) and Carey (1974:3-4).
\textsuperscript{23}See Ras (1979:4) and Robson (1976:77).
\textsuperscript{24}wus winaca kalangkung rindhik, angel k\textsc{d}aling lesan, Dyan Tunénggung\textit{\textsc{m}untén, miwah anyarwani pisan, ragi lanyah} (177.7).
The reading session was conducted similarly in *Javaanse Zamen spraken*:

'I'll read and you look at the *jarwa*.'

In this passage, the 'kawi reja' (the 'kawi expert') who has been asked to check the accompanying *jarwa*, disagrees with the explanation and offers another. This procedure for reading and discussion tallies with the I Wajan Bhadra description (1937:3) of Balinese *mabasan*, where 'one man reads the text while the other translates and where necessary, provides some commentary'. In *Cabolek* 8.1j, the reader recited three stanzas before he paused to explain the text. In this instance, however, the reader was responsible for the *jarwa* as well.

*Serat Rama* and *Serat Cabolek* both contain further clues as to how *kawi* texts were to be read. In *Serat Rama* 25.15, Anoman begins his song in *Tepi-kawuri* metre, a seventeen syllable metre with *pêdhotan* divisions of 6,6,5. After five stanzas, he changed the metre to *Sikarini*, another of the seven, seventeen syllable *sêkar agêng* metres with identical *pêdhotan* divisions, 6,6,5. He continued in this new metre for a further seven stanzas. As there is no apparent difference between these two metres, the distinguishing factor must be the melody. In *Cabolek* 2.12, a section of the *Bima-Suci* is described as being able to be read in *Brama-ravilasita* or *Lêbdajiwa* metre. Both metres have eleven syllables with *pêdhotan* divisions of 4,7.

It can also be put in *Brama-ravilasita* so as to be sweet sounding and harmonious, both having eleven syllables to a line it can be changed to *Lêbdajiwa*.

From these references, it could be concluded that once the number of syllables to a line of verse was determined, the reader could change

---

25 Winter (1911:286) *kula ingkang ngungêlakan, sampayan ingkang ningali jarwanipun*.
26 Layantuk tîgâng pada, ya ta layang dipun-pardikan.
27 Têmbang têpi kawuri wiwite, antuk limang pada nuli salin, têmbang sika-rini, pitung pada sampun/ SR 25.15.
28 Soebardi (1975:73).
the metre, or more strictly the melody, as long as he adhered to the same pĕdhotan ruling. How the singer determined which sĕkar agĕng metre with its appropriate pĕdhotan divisions to apply to a line of Old Javanese verse was not stated. Can one presume that the eighteenth century scholar scanned a line of, for example, twelve syllables and taking account of what he perceived to be sense units, decided on an arrangement of 6,6, rather than 4,8 or 5,7? Alternatively, was the pĕdhotan choice related to an extended tradition of reading the kakawins according to these divisions or marking each canto with the metre name?

The following Cabolek reference does indicate that pĕdhotan distinctions between metres of the same number of syllables were observed in the reading of a line of Old Javanese verse:

lan lagune iya bangsa-patra, aseje kavitana (8,4).

The word in question is kavitana. Soebardi has translated the line as follows:

'and the metre was Bangsapatra, now he will begin another part'.

Perhaps kavitana in this case could be interpreted as Kavitana, a seventeen syllable metre with its kakawin equivalent in Aweitaththa. The translation would then read:

'the metre was Bangsapatra which differs from Kavitana'.

The pĕdhotan divisions for Kavitana, however, are 5,6,6, at variance with the 4,6,7, divisions for Bangsapatra.

Reference was made in Chapter 3.1 to Yasadipura solving the problem of how to present Anoman's sĕkar agĕng song within a maaapat frame. The author of the Cĕnthini tried another approach when his character read passages from the Bhāratayuddha in Sulanjari (20:4,4,6,6,) and Sasadara-kawĕkas metres (20;7,7,6,). In this example, the singer was asked to explain the difference between these two metres. His example of how

---

Soebardi (1975:114).
Sasadarakawesakas should be read is as follows:

\[ \text{meh rahina semu bang hyang,} \\
\text{aruna kadi netraning} \\
\text{angga rapuh lajengtipun} \\
\text{gya sabdani kokila ring} \\
\text{kanigara lajengira} \\
\text{gya saketerni kidung ning} \\
\text{akung... (vol.3/4:18).} \]

The kakawin reads:

\[ \text{meh rahinasesemu bang hyang Aruna kadi netra ring ogha rapuh} \\
\text{sabda ri kokila ring kanigara saketerni kidung ning akung}^3 \text{(BY OJ 6.1)} \]

The Cethini arrangement does not reflect the sekar ageng divisions and it would seem that the Bhāratayuddha passage was fitted into the macapat verse to add a little colour or credibility to the narrative.

Quotations from the kakawins in Javaansche Zamenspraken, also marked with pedhotan, made a clear distinction between the reading of a line of Old Javanese poetry and the manner in which that line should be interpreted. In Conversation 67 (Winter 1911:286), the familiar lines of BY OJ 10.12 are chosen by Tuan Anu and the kawi rāja for discussion.

The line was rendered as follows:

\[ \text{mulat mara Sang Arjuna semu kaman/usan kaerapan. (Sikarini 17: 6,6,5)} \]

The kawi rāja had no quarrel with the reading of the line, although the breaks appear to have taken little account of the sense units. His comment was that the tuan would have had great difficulty understanding the line because the jarwa was 'out of sequence' (bibrah).

'The kawi is in metre but if explained in padalingsa units, it is not clear. Each sentence must be intact.'

The kawi rāja then proceeded to read the Old Javanese text, pausing at appropriate words to explain the unit he had recited; these units rarely corresponded with the pedhotan unit.

'\text{mulat mara Sang Arjuna semu kamanusan kaerapan ri tingkah ing mungsuh', tēgētipun, aningati majēng Sang Arjuna semu kējodhoran ngaloko datāng pratingkah ing mēngsahtipun, padha kadang', tēgētipun, sami sēdherek.} \]

This method of explaining sense units in a word sequence which

\[ ^3 \text{Gunning (1903:9).} \]
corresponded with the *kakawin* can be compared with the first phase of translation in the *Bhāratayuddha* interlinear Add.12279 text, where each word of the *kakawin* line was translated in sequence. When Tuan Anu complained that *kawi reja* may have translated the verse creditably but that he still did not understand the passage, he was quickly reassured that this was because the first translation followed the *kakawin* sequence strictly. In the *Bhāratayuddha* interlinear manuscript, the second stage of the *jarwa* was a full presentation of one line of verse which did not necessarily follow the sequence of the Old Javanese line; in some cases, a synonym of the Modern Javanese equivalent word given in the word for word *jarwa* was used in the full line.

In conversation 69 (1911:304) *BY* OJ 19.5 was chosen for reading and discussion. The selection of this passage is of interest on two accounts; firstly, this section of the *kakawin* seemed to be a popular part of the text. Ten fragments from canto 19 were included in NBS 9, the collection of *Bhāratayuddha* verses which Pigeaud (LIT. vol. II/714) suggests was compiled for *suluk* selection. *BY* OJ 19.22 is a *suluk* (*tatkala nṛēpa Ceda mati*) and the *kawi miring* equivalent of OJ 20.8 (*KM 43.1*) was also selected as suitable *suluk* material. *BY* OJ 19.5 is not listed in the Uhlenbeck analysis or any of the te Mechenl *lakons* as a *suluk* but is included in the NBS 9 collection. Te Mechenl (1879:98) nevertheless stated that Gatotkaca was the only character in *wayang* who had been allotted his own *suluk*, adding that the *suluk* was the 'kawi couplet' quoted by Winter, the *BY* 19.5 verse under discussion.

---

31 *amērgi angen kula saungêl-ungêlaning kawinipun* (p.287).
32 For example in *BY* OJ 1.2b, *musuh* is explained as *satru* in the first stage yet appears as *mungsuh* in the full line explanation.
33 The verse below is as appears in the Winter text (p.304).
34 *Numbers 58-68.*
The second point of interest is that Winter’s kawi réja proceeds to render the kakawin verse into sékhar ageng rather than into a simple prose jarwa. The sékhar ageng verse he quotes, however, is not the kawi miring version of this passage. Furthermore, the sékhar ageng version quoted by Winter is in the same metre as the kakawin, at least in terms of the number of syllables to a line (Sardulawikridita 19;6,6,7) whereas the kawi miring version is in Sikarini (17;6,6,5).

It has been suggested that the kawi miring versions of the kakawins were designed as an alternative source for suluk material. The Gātakacāya sékhar ageng suluk which could not be traced back to the Yasadipura kawi miring text is not an isolated case. At least two other examples can be quoted of sékhar ageng suluks based on Bhāratayuddha material which are not verses of the kawi miring text. These sékhar ageng suluk may have been created as isolated fragments but there is also the possibility that they may have been part of a complete or partial reworking of a Bratayuda text which may have been written in addition or perhaps slightly previous to the extant Yasadipura maaapat and kawi miring versions.

4.3 Earlier Renderings of the kakawins

As the Surakarta poets were heirs to the wealth of pasisir literature, the East Javanese romances and the Sūrat Kandha histories which contained the epic tales as well as popular Islamic stories, it is unlikely that Yasadipura I was the first poet to attempt to render the epic-based stories into Modern Javanese verse forms. Whether he was the first poet to render the kakawins completely into maaapat and sékhar ageng is difficult to determine. The reference in the Arjuna Sasra maaapat II text

---

35Pigeaud (LIT.vol.I/239), Uhlenbeck (1960:45).
36See Uhlenbeck (1960:64 and 66). Also a comparison between the suluk and the kawi miring equivalent verse in Chapter 4.3 to follow.
indicated that this, in fact, was the primary purpose of the Yasadipura II rendering. Modern Javanese poems based on epic material could have taken the form of free renderings in maaapat of popular episodes or could have been partial renderings of the epics using the kakawins as one of the source materials. Two examples of the latter category can be dated from the late eighteenth century; the Asta Brata fragments of the Rāmāyaṇa are dated 1784 (Pigeaud: LIT. vol. II/735) while the Yasadipura I Arjuna Sastra maaapat, referred to by Yasadipura II and represented by the British collection manuscripts, stand as evidence that certain sections were reworked prior to the complete refashioning of the kakawins.

Javaansche Zamenspraken contains lists of numerous pujangga from the Kartasura period whose works are no longer available.37 One poet, Sutrapana, is said to have written a Menak text which Yasadipura I subsequently reworked38 and an extant manuscript dated 1715 provided both proof of an earlier rendering and the opportunity to compare both versions for any indications of a change in approach to translation, selective processes and Modern Javanese prosody.39

Specific references to previous reworkings of the Bhāratayuddha into Modern Javanese are limited to fleeting reference from Raffles (1965: 410) to versions of the poem being 'common' throughout Java and a more substantial statement from Roorda40 (1841:7) that there were three reworkings of the kakawin in the eighteenth century. As noted in Chapter 3.2, the Bhāratayuddha was certainly the most popular of the kakawins and there

38 An earlier version of this 1715 Menak text dated pre-1627 is listed in Ricklefs and Voorhoeve (1977:43). See Ricklefs (1978 215) for a review of all three manuscripts.
39 Poerbatjaraka (1940:9).
40 Roorda's impression was that over time, the Bhāratayuddha was reshaped into more 'relevant' verse forms and that of the three reworkings, the last was composed in the latter half of the eighteenth century.
is some evidence to substantiate Roorda's claim that a third Modern
Javanese version was in circulation at the time of the composition of
the Yasadipura versions. Cohen Stuart (1860:II/237) noted that a sākara
ageng metre name, Ṣeṅgasulanjarī, rather than a maacapat sasmita\(^1\) was
found at the end of canto 50 in his maacapat manuscript designated A.
This metre name was in no way related to the kakawin or kawi miring
metre choice in the vicinity of this canto. He further noted (p.233)
that canto 46 in manuscript A was cast in Megatruh metre rather than the
Asmarandana metre employed in the other manuscripts. These isolated
examples hardly constitute firm evidence of another, or more specifically,
an earlier rendering but they do raise the question of how to approach
metre variation in different manuscripts of the same poem. Two variant
versions of the Sīrat Rama serve as an illustration.

As noted in 1.1, IOL JAV 46 and Add.12302 Arjuna Sasra MAC I
manuscripts both contain a number of cantos from Rama maacapat tales in
addition to the basic Arjuna Sasra maacapat text referred to by Yasadipura
II. IOL JAV 46 begins with cantos 1.17-3.2 of the Sīrat Rama version as
found in the Kats edition (1925). Metre choice was the same and devia-
tions appeared to be basically scribal. This manuscript also contains a
partial maacapat version of a Rama story at the end of the ASB text but
this Rama version, which relates how Subali's human features became ap-
like, reflects the Sīrat Kandha tradition (SK 42.40) rather than that of
the kakawin. The Add.12302 manuscript, however, followed the final canto
of the Arjuna Sasra poem with a text that is clearly a version of Sīrat
Rama cantos 22-77 with occasional metre variation.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Metre change indicator.
\(^2\)This version, incidently, appears to be one of the earliest extant texts
of this section of the Sīrat Rama. Apart from the 1784 Asta Brata frag-
ments, both the British and the Leiden catalogues only list texts dating
from the 1818 as containing a more complete version of the Sīrat Rama.
Ricklefs (1974:81) was quite justified in expressing some misgivings about
'the propriety of ascribing these versions to Yasadipura I', considering
that the elder poet died in 1803. This Rama version strengthens the claim
that Yasadipura I could have been responsible for a large proportion of the
extant Sīrat Rama.
The question arises as to whether variation in metre, canto divisions and the several omissions that are evident in this Sērat Rama version are indicative of a re-editing process by the Yasanipuras or are some evidence of an earlier version of the Sērat Rama, perhaps belonging to the Kartasura period. The sastra cētha/arjendra references noted in Chapter 3.1, for example, are present in the Arjuna Sasra passages in this most composite manuscript, but the sastra cētha reference at canto 25.6 of the Kats Sērat Rama is not to be found in the parallel canto 25 in this manuscript's Sērat Rama fragments.43 This would seem to indicate that this Rama version must have been written some years previous to the 1800 date on the manuscript to have found its way into a Yogyakarta text as some sort of appendage to the basic Arjuna Sasra tale.

The conclusion drawn from a comparative analysis of the Arjuna Sasra MAC I and II versions was that the later poet was prone to refashion completely the text metrically and to vary canto division but was in no way reluctant to adhere to the vocabulary choice of his model.44 He rarely omitted any episode from the earlier Modern Javanese version but felt at liberty to extend sections or even to add new material which often tended to be of an interpretive or didactic nature. The perplexing anomaly of the apparent ease with which Yasanipura I rendered the 'essential' parts of the kakawin into a Modern Javanese literary idiom, borrowed, extended and compressed kakawin material, while the kawi miring poet was clearly confused and often reduced to mass quoting in the middle section omitted from the macapat I text strengthens the premise that either an earlier Modern Javanese version or some other aid to translation may have been available for the outer sections of the kakawin. There is no reason to

3 25.2-11 were not contained in this manuscript.

4 For a kakawin example of two versions of the same poem, one clearly based upon the other, see Greese (1981:68-125) for a comparison of two versions of the Subhadraśivāha.
suspect that comprehension of Old Javanese would have degenerated so ram­
pantly in the brief period that separated the maacapat I and the kawi
miring poems,45 nor that the author of the maacapat I version would have
been so markedly more competent to deal with the language of the kakawin.46

One aspect that did emerge in an examination of the three Yasadi­
pura texts, the Sindusastra version and the relevant Sêvat Kandha passages
was that although the basic story frame was perceptible in all the tradi­
tions, similarly couched elements of description and identical direct
speech phrases were occasionally common to all texts. These common ele­
ments tended to be more related to the Arjuna Sasra narrative rather than
being stock expressions that the poet or dhalang could pull from his re­
serve of standard analogy and description and slot into a court audience,
a forest scene or the enumeration of an exemplary king's fine attributes.
Phrases common to a situation in the various traditions stand not only as
evidence of an overlap between traditions but also suggest that all poets
may have recalled either an oral or a written version of this particular
episode. One example may perhaps illustrate this aspect.

In ASB MAC I, 4.12, Sumali abdicates gracefully in favour of his
grandson, Rawana and retires to a hermitage. In the kakawin, Rawana seizes
the throne violently from his step-brother Danapati.47 Whereas all men
were reduced to abject fear in the kakawin (gupay tumungkul, AWj 2.7c),
Rawana's subjects in the Modern Javanese versions were submissive but
respectful.

45 The vexing aspect of dual authorship and re-editing must be borne in
mind. I refer back to the preliminary comments in Chapter 1.1 on the
proposed authorship of the ASB KM.

46 Cohen Stuart (1860:1/18), quoting from marginalia in his MS designated
P, noted that Yasadipura II was renowned for his kawi proficiency and
perhaps contributed substantially to the Bratayuda maacapat version.

47 pamah ni ra/kanya ya tenalasuya (alapnya in the edition). The vari­
ation alas (forest) for alap (seize) in the Balinese manuscripts is of
some interest in view of the reference to Sumali anagawan, commonly
interpreted as retiring to an ascetic life in a remote hermitage in the
mountains or the forest.
MAC I 4.12 suyud sakulagotranYa
his family and kinsmen were all devoted to him.\(^8\)

The same sentiment is expressed consistently in all traditions.

KM 4.8 suyud sakulagotranta
MAC II 2.18 suyud wadyaditya kabez
Sindusastra 17.22 suyud sakulagotranYa
Sêrat Kandha 33.17 sonya suyud.

Further examples of common phrases and sentiments could be
gathered and cited but it would be futile to attempt to trace all these
common elements to one standard source. Similarly, the interaction be­
tween oral and written traditions of the kakawin tales, as commented
upon by Brandes (1920:209-10) on a more general level, would be both
impossible and of little avail to measure in the search for the 'original
text'. Indications of earlier reworkings within the Yasadipura texts are
of value on two accounts; firstly, these references may indicate the type
of genre which was employed slightly previous to the extant texts.
Secondly, evidence of earlier versions detracts from the notion of a
'renaissance' and strengthens the premise of a continued interest in both
epic material and Old Javanese prosody.

Traces of sasmitaning têmbang, the cryptic signalling to change
the metre which is contained in the last line of a canto in macapat texts,
are perhaps of greater significance than the reoccurrence of a phrase which
is reminiscent of another passage. With the exception of the Panitisastra
renderings, a macapat version served as the base text for each of the
extant kawi miring renderings. As kawi miring canto division rarely corres­
ponded with the macapat, the poet was faced with the choice of either re­
taining the saamita from the macapat text within the kawi miring verse if
it were essential to the narrative, \(\text{tan nêdyâ mundw} \), for example, if a
character was making a resolute stand against the enemy), or deleting a
saamita which was in no way essential and would, in fact, have been

\(^8\text{Suyud or suhud (Gericke and Roorda 1901:738) has the connotation of}
\text{devoted to, dedicated, summissive to a king or spiritual lord.}\)
conspicuous and clumsy in the *kawi miring* line. The *ASB* and *BY kawi miring* texts were most consistent in the removal of non-essential *sasmita*; even the *Rama kawi miring*, which was the least successful of the renderings, observed this nicety. Those occasions when *sasmita* had been left in the *kawi miring* text therefore deserved some attention.

*Sasmita* are easily accommodated; an accomplished poet should be able to insert words such as *mas*, *mundur*, *taruna*, *kinanti* and *manis* into the last line of the canto without undue violence to the narrative. Although these expressions may have blended within the line, the variety of *sasmita* employed was not extensive and there was even the impression that the poet avoided the above words except in references to a change of metre; the object of the *sasmita* was to signal, not to confuse.

On five occasions in the *ASB macapat II* and *kawi miring* texts, phrases chosen seemed to indicate a *macapat sasmita*. In *KM 38.3* (*MAC II 28.26*), *ratu taruna* could be traced to a *sasmita* in the *MAC I* text (*IOL JAV 46, canto 17, Sinom*). *KM 41.11*, *tan ana mundur*, could also be returned to the *macapat I* text (canto 20 *Durma*). The phrase *Bangsapatreng wuri*, an odd combination of *macapat* and *sekar ageng* metres, was found at the end of *KM 56* but also corresponded with a *Pangkur* metre in the *macapat I* text.

It was possible to trace these three *sasmita*-type phrases to the earlier *MAC I* version as all three were found in the outer 'essential' sections of the *kakawin* that Yasadipura I chose to render. The following two references from the *MAC II* text, however, had no parallel in the *MAC I* rendering, being in those intricate *KM* and *MAC II* passages which correspond with the middle section of the *kakawin*.

In *MAC II 24.5*, *sabdanira sor kang madu gendhis* (in the middle of a *Dhandhanggula* canto) and *16.12*, *Citravati Sang lir sinom* (in a *Wirangrong* canto) seemed most reminiscent of *sasmita* expressions employed in *macapat* texts. The equivalent *kawi miring* passages, *KM 31.6* and *22.18*, bore no
trace of these expressions or any similar sentiment or description. Whereas borrowing from the *kakawin* was pronounced in the middle section of the *kawi miring* text, the *macapat* poet made a noble effort to render the *kakawin* in a more natural idiom. Yasadipura II related in *ASB MAC II* 51.29 that he had spent five months working on his *macapat* text while his father had completed the earlier partial version in a mere twenty days. These *sasmita*-type phrases found only in the *macapat* text could indicate that this author, who was intent on rendering the *kakawin* as lucidly and completely as possible, had re-edited his own text.

Alternatively, the approach to the rendering of the *kakawin* in the vicinity of this *sasmita*-type reference at *MAC* 24.5 does strengthen the possibility that both the *kawi miring* and the *macapat* poets consulted some additional aid to translation at this point. The *kawi miring* equivalent of *MAC* 24.5 is 31.6-7. Cantos 30 and 31, presented in Part 2, stand as an example of lavish borrowing from the *kakawin*. At *KM* 31.6-7, the *KM* poet appeared to gain new confidence in his rendering of the Old Javanese text, borrowed less extensively, and proceeded to interpret the *kakawin*. Although he deviated from the *kakawin* version in his interpretation of the passage, he followed the *kakawin* sequence in a more relaxed Modern Javanese idiom, employing vocabulary and syntax that were more characteristic of Modern Javanese literary expression than the preceding stanzas.

The pervading impression of the *Arjunasasra kawi miring* and *macapat* II versions was that the passages that presented the most difficulty were those for which there was no evidence that an earlier version or a *lakon*

---

"The *macapat* equivalent of part of cantos 24-25 *ASB KM* is presented in Part 2.

50 *tur angrampas mila saking kawi, parandene tan kongsi sawulan, mung rong puluh dina entek, mangke pangikṣṭipun, tīka kongsi ing limang sas...* 'what is more, fashioned from the *kawi* in less than a month, in only twenty days the task was completed. But the present composition has taken five months.'
existed as a possible aid to the translation. Whether these aids were part of an extended tradition of interest in Old Javanese literature is difficult to determine but worthy of consideration.

At this juncture, some attention should be directed to those *sekar ageng suluk* that cannot be traced to an extant *kawi miring* text. The essential point to be borne in mind is whether these *suluk* fragments constitute some evidence of either an earlier version or of an interest in *sekar ageng* composition within a Modern Javanese idiom before the complete *Yasadipura* renderings. One example is examined below in detail; the *kakawin, suluk, maaapat* and *kawi miring* verses are quoted to facilitate discussion.

*Bharatayuddha kakawin* 11.1 MS Add-12279 Javanese tradition

The edition reading is in brackets where required.

---

1 ngka Seta ēmasē masingit i pējaha ning sura kalih pisan yeke (sigran) tandang ama(h) gunung saja bala/ ngambah tēkuswini (tēkāksohini)
yeka syuh rata (nata) Salya ika pinahah myang wira yoda pējah Then Seta came forward, embittered by the death of the two warriors.

With an *akscə'ini* of troops, he attacked with the force of a mountain torrent.

Salya's chariot was totally destroyed and many brave warriors were slain by the arrows.

The *suluk*, Sardulawikridita (19;6,6,7). These divisions were marked in th. *lakon* text.

dan Seta umangsah krodhanira dening patining ari kalih tawanduk saabal'galaika lir sardula sēdhēng mangsa kumērug prawira Wirata umangsah mangukth'ir buta mangsa daging Seta senapati'gumrit ratanira' mēnthang langkap nglēpasti

Then Seta came forward, furious because his two brothers were dead.

He attacked with his men, as fiercely as roaring lions stalking their prey.

The warriors of Wirata charged like demons on the prowl for meat. The commander in chief, Seta, turned his chariot and drew his bow, releasing weapons.

The *maaapat*, Pangkur, 12.1.

---

1 dyan Seta sigra umangsah krodha dening patine ari kalih, tawanduk sawadyanipun, galaik lir sardula, umangsah kumērug pārēng angamuk, para prawira Wirata, kadiya buta mangsa daging. 2 Seta gumrit ratanira, mēnthang langkap...

The *kawi miring*. Canto 19.1 Wisalyarini (21;7,7,7).

---

kan Seta gya numangsah krodha eru dening putinira Sang ari kalih
When the four texts are compared, it seems likely that the suluk was fashioned from the kakawin before the other two Modern Javanese renderings. The common macapat and kawi miring readings, saradula (suluk, sardula), sawadya (suluk, sabala) and parēng ngamuk (no suluk equivalent) point to a close relationship between the macapat and the kawi miring. The break pati/nira in the kawi miring and the common macapat and suluk readings (buta) seem to place the kawi miring version at the end of a transposition from one metre to another. While the suluk shares some of the kakawin readings (bala), lines c and d of the suluk appear to be a Modern Javanese innovation. The compiler of the suluk seemed to cast lines a and b of the kakawin into Modern Javanese and to have added two lines based on Modern Javanese imagery found in many macapat battle scenes.

The reference to sardula is also related to the metre choice of the suluk, Sardulawikridita. A common feature of bawā texts and some suluk was to include the name of the metre in the last line of the sēkar ageng fragment. The inclusion of the sardula reference in the macapat renderings would seem to be accounted for by the macapat poet, in the course of his rendering, pausing at this section of the kakawin which he had been following carefully and either consulting or recalling the suluk which he than incorporated into his version. Although the kawi miring fragment is clearly based on the macapat stanza 13.1-2b, the contents of these macapat-based stanzas have been contained to one sēkar ageng verse, thus matching the arrangement of the suluk. This suluk may have been the isolated fragment as it presently exists or could also have been part of a partial or more complete earlier rendering into sēkar ageng.

An examination of texts such as NBS 9 collection of Bhāratayuddha

---

51b is missing one syllable.
fragments showed that certain sections of the *kakawin* were consulted more closely than others. Modern Javanese *suluk* selection, for example, was usually from the vicinity of a *kakawin* *suluk* fragment.\(^5^2\) These sections were either more popular because of the nature of their contents or may have been simply more familiar via the medium of *wayang* and theatre. Partial renditions of selected passages into *sékar ageng* to augment *suluk* repertoire and a greater familiarity with the narrative sequence within these episodes would have served as aids to the translation during the course of the complete renderings into *mocapat* and *sékar ageng* in the late eighteenth century.

4.4 The Impact of Orality upon Interpretation and Presentation

Variation between the *kakawins* and the Modern Javanese versions was sometimes able to be traced to a form of an episode contained in a *lakon*. In these instances, there seemed to be some account taken of the popular version of that episode. As noted by Kern (1876:171) and Hazeu (1897:152), the passage of an episode from the *kakawin* via oral tradition into a Modern Javanese version is impossible to pursue with any reliability. Oral tradition as documented in the *lakons* available dates from the mid-nineteenth century. Oral influence as opposed to oral tradition could manifest itself in a number of forms. Besides the more obvious interaction between the 'classical' written version of an episode and the multifarious oral tradition tangent versions represented by the theatrical and popular renditions, orality, or more strictly, aurality, probably exercised a more subtle influence upon both the copying and transmission of *kakawin* manuscripts and the interpretation of passages.

There were a number of occasions, for example, where it seemed possible that aural rather than scribal misapprehension could have accounted

\(^{5^2}\) See Chapter 6.3.
for the variation between the *kakawin* and the Modern Javanese text. These examples may be tenuous but deserve attention. Van der Tuuk's suggestion (1879c:436) that the actual sound of the word was one of the elements that came into play in the translation process after a period of non-use provides some justification for pursuing this aspect.

The emergence of proper names from either corruptions in the *kakawin* text or interpretive misapprehension has been noted by a number of scholars. Characterization was an important ingredient in Modern Javanese presentation; not only were characters given expanded personal attributes but new characters were often created from obscure phrases in the Old Javanese text. The name of the warrior Wisnungkara in the *ASB* *KM, MAC I* and *II* versions may perhaps be accounted for by an aural rather than a scribal or interpretive error. This character appears in all versions.

\[
\text{krodha wil Wisnungkara} \\
\text{the demon Wisnungkara was furious, (MAC I 7.20, KM 11.1, MAC II 5.29, Sindusastra 8.20).}
\]

The *OJ* text reference (*AWj* 6.15) on which the Modern Javanese reading was based is as follows in both the Cod 219 and the Surakarta manuscripts.

\[
\text{krodha kang Wisnu sigra.}
\]

This character Wisnu in the *kakawin* was a warrior of Lokapala, quite distinct from the god, Wisnu. The Modern Javanese texts expanded the role of Wisnu, the deity, considerably. Wisnu was depicted as reincarnating into the person of Arjuna Sasra and *KM* 15.6 explains how this reincarnation was achieved. As the identification of Arjuna Sasra with Wisnu is found in the interpolation section of the *kakawin* which would have been composed well before the eighteenth century, two characters by the name of Wisnu may have created some confusion. The name Wisnungkara could

---

53 Poerbatjaraka (1964:132-34) lists examples from the *Bhāratayuddha*. Characterization as an integral aspect of MJ presentation is treated in Chapter 7.2.
perhaps have evolved from an aural impression that Wisnu sigra was a character distinct from the deity, Wisnu.

This small example of a name change that cannot be traced to a corruption in the Old Javanese text may illustrate the aspect of interaction between dual modes of acquaintance with kakawin passages. The situation would have arisen where certain individuals in the courts, the dhalang and the pujangga may have had access to the text of a kakawin yet would have been familiar with certain passages via suluk and wayang presentation. Two aspects are worth mentioning in relation to this interaction evident in the Modern Javanese renderings; firstly, Hall's impression (1913:155) that a scribe perceived and copied words rather than letters with the exception of unfamiliar proper nouns which he tended to approach more cautiously. Although Hall's observations applied to European classical texts, van der Tuuk's observation (1879c:489) that proper nouns in the Malay versions of the epics were closer to the Old Javanese originals than were the Modern Javanese equivalents strengthens the possibility that the Modern Javanese poets were influenced by the oral versions in the matter of characterization.

The warrior Wisnu in the kakawin is referred to on two other occasions (OJ 6.8 Wisnu manggah and 6.17 Wisnu gumulak). There were several instances in the Modern Javanese texts where no amount of prompting by additional references could either persuade the poet to recognise a character or tempt him to abandon his initial impression that a character was intended. The kakawin character Prakopa is passed over in KM 8 (OJ 5.9) and KM 19 (OJ 17.7) even though the honorific sang, precedes the name in the 17.7 reference. However, in KM 18.5 (MAC II 10.39), the character Kraldagmi was created from kiwa kral Dagami ri tengen in the Javanese tradition manuscript which reads in the edition, kiwakral Daşapati ri tengen (in the left wing, Daşapati in the right' OJ 17.2). This new character is not only given a place in the battle formation but fights
valiantly against Rawana's demons.

Sang Prabu Kraldagami munggeng sumiwi tengëñ (KM 18.5, MAC II 10.59).

Passages in the vicinity of suluk seemed to contain potential examples of oral influence. The BY OJ line,

tis-tis rana lagi tinoloh ning Aruna (20.14d)

finds its parallel in the kawi miring and maaapat paparangan tis-tis yayah lir karuna,

an error which would be orthographically difficult to explain but could be accounted for by aural mis-impression. As three well-known suluk were concentrated in the vicinity of BY KM canto 9, certain features of canto 9 therefore deserve attention. The maaapat text omitted several kakovin descriptive stanzas in the vicinity of these suluk verses but the kawi miring poet returned to the kakovin to fill in some of these omitted passages. In KM 9.4-5 (OJ 6.1d-2a and b, the lines containing and surrounding the suluk), the kawi miring word choice bore strong traces of an aural rather than a written impression of the kakovin text. The kakovin text quoted below is from the Javanese manuscript Add.12279 and is close to the edited version.

mrak anguluh bromara/ rabasa kusuma ring parahayyan arum gandanting jangga mënumika anglayalata mërik angunukuma mar lot linawat ri kakuwing angunuma ri wimba bathara gana

Peacocks cried, bees ravaged the flowers in the perfumed inner chamber.

The scent of jangga and jasmine in the grove of vines were as fragrant as a kunyit plant.

Smoke from the flower offerings continually wafted towards the image of Bathara Gana.

54BY KM 44.6, MAC 32.10.

55See Uhlenbeck (1960:50, 48 and 59) for the texts of these suluk with kakovin comparison.

lëngëng ramya nikang sasangka.. BY OJ 5.1
kiliyan sangka rika ta taman. BY OJ 5.2
meh rahina sëmu bang. BY OJ 6.1

56The maaapat omitted OJ 4.11-14 and compressed all OJ 5 into two stanzas.

57This feature is discussed in Chapter 6.2.
The kawi miring text reads:

9.4d  mtrak manguwuh ngrabaseng kœmbang-kœmbang
5.  pinarwaseng arum-arum gandaring kang jangga mënur
kawitét ing lata mamrik' angum tepi ning botrawi
toyanya métal kukuñya' wijiling Bathara Gana
Peacocks cried, [bees] ravaged the flowers,
overpowered by the strong fragrance, the scent of jangga and
jasmine,
intertwined with the perfumed lata vines, dangling at the edge
of the bathing pond.
The steaming waters poured forth, from the [image] of Bathara
Gana.

Underlined passages bear some trace of an aural impression.

Angumkuma, 'like a kunyit plant' in the kakawin, has been interpreted
within the water and meditation context in the MJ version and rendered
as angun, from the word kum, 'to lie or soak in water'. Parahasyan in the
OJ texts has its parallel in pinarwaseng. Botrawi, the pond surrounds in
the kawi miring, has a certain aural resemblance to lot linawad ni in the
kakawin equivalent position. Wimba was therefore interpreted in the
Modern Javanese sense of vijil 'to emerge', rather than as a statue as
intended in the kakawin. The interlinear text in fact explains ri wimba
ni as wéti ni.

The above analysis indicates that there were a number of forces
at work here concurrently. One could suggest that the poet was simply
exercising his preference to include elements of water and water imagery
in depictions of picturesque, remote settings. The examples in Chapter
3.5, however, did indicate that when the poet approached a descriptive
passage with some pre-conceived notion of what the setting should contain,
his interpretive choices were often supported by a dubious reading or a
corruption in the kakawin manuscript itself which fitted neatly into the
appropriate Modern Javanese context. In the above example, it is suggested
that some aural familiarity with suluk and with passages surrounding the
suluk may well have influenced interpretation when the poet worked more
exclusively with the passage at a manuscript level.

There were numerous occasions when the oral tradition version was
at variance with the kakawin. In such cases, the Surakarta poet appeared to be faced with an interpretive choice but it is important to note that the resultant Modern Javanese version was not solely due to the fact that the poet could not understand the kakawin and was thus reduced to using the oral tradition version. The selection processes in these instances are of particular relevance to the evaluation of the Modern Javanese versions as either strict translations or free renderings.

It has already been noted that the passages that presented the most difficulty to the author of the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring were those omitted from the first maaapat rendering. When the Arjuna Sasra versions contained in the Śūrat Kandha, the Sīdussastra Śūrat Lokapala and the interpolated ten bridging cantos in the maaapat I Add 12302 manuscript were examined, it was clear that whereas those authors had drawn upon familial frame stories, the kawi miring/maaapat II author had persevered in his attempt to render the tale along kakawin lines. Oral tradition overtones, nevertheless, were apparent in the poet's interpretive decisions during the refashioning of the middle section of the kakawin. A general summation of the Arjuna Sasra rendering, as contained in the kawi miring text, was that if the poet seemed insecure in his treatment of a kakawin passage, there were likely to be several variations on a theme in the other texts consulted, as the following reference will illustrate.

When Raṇava defeated his step-brother, Wisrawana (Danapati), he seized his brother's chariot, the wimana and other valuables. This passage, where Raṇava boasts of his exploits, is not presented in the maaapat I texts. The kawi miring text reads oddly:

\[ \text{titahane Sang' Prabu Lokapala' wimana lawan' kaga' wus kalap miring sun' I seized the vehicle of the King of Lokapala, the wimana and the eagle. (\text{KM} 16.15 \text{ in Part 2.})} \]

The form, kaga, (eagle) can be returned to the Surakarta manuscript:

\[ \text{wimana pwa kaga/ahananya kalap tēkaping ngulun} \text{ (OJ 13.3c),} \]

whereas the edition reads:

\[ \text{wimāna pakawāhananya (his celestial chariot).} \]
The inclusion of the eagle in the \textit{KM} text obviously evolved from the corrupt form, \textit{pwa kagawahana} but the rationale behind this cacography was unclear until the \textit{kawi miring} treatment of the \textit{kakawin} references to the \textit{\=Adiparwa} episode where the \textit{Garuda} became the mount of Wisnu was examined.

In \textit{KM} 36.8-9 and 37.3, both \textit{kakawin} references to Wisnu defeating the \textit{Garuda} and forcing the eagle to become his mount were omitted (OJ 44.4 and 45.8-9). The Surakarta manuscript was not corrupt beyond recognition if the poet had been attuned to this reference. A familiarity with the frame of the story was evident in the ignominy of the suggestion by Pulasta, the grandfather of Rawana, (which had no equivalent in the \textit{kakawin}), that Rawana should be spared by Arjuna Sasra but made to serve as the mere assistant to his charioteer (\textit{KM} 58, in Part 2).

The link between the \textit{kawi miring} and the \textit{kakawin} passages, connected only by the reference to serving as a conveyance, surfaced with the consistent spelling error \textit{wilmana} for \textit{wimana} in the \textit{MAC I Add.12302} manuscript.\textsuperscript{58} Canto 32.28-56 of the \textit{\=Sepat Kandha} related in great detail the episode of the beloved son of Bisawarna named Wilmana or Wilmanaramya, Bisawarna being the character whose father had married the lady intended for his son. Wilmana is defeated by Rawana, who, bearing in mind the ties of kinship in a passage most reminiscent of \textit{Arjunawijaya} canto 68 and \textit{Arjuna Sasra} \textit{KM} 58.5, spares Wilmana but makes him his charioteer.\textsuperscript{59} The \textit{kawi miring} poet has therefore managed to incorporate elements of the oral tradition without unduly fracturing the \textit{kakawin} line. The \textit{Garuda} reference, for whatever reason, was omitted but being of the nature of a metaphorical...

\textsuperscript{58} Wilmana is listed in Gericke and Roorda (1901:1/47) under \textit{wil}, the name of a giant bird of service to Boma. Gericke and Roorda note that in the \textit{Ajisaka} (149), the \textit{wilmana} is a demon with wings. \textit{Wilmana} is a suggested corruption of \textit{winana}.

\textsuperscript{59} SK 32.56 \textit{Wilmana sireki dadya tunggangan ingwang, pan ingun munggani pribadi.} 'Wilmana, you will become my mount for I myself will ride you.'
aside was not essential. The origin of "nîma or "nîma was not accepted but the inclusion of the punishment proposed for Rawana is perhaps some token recognition of this oral tradition episode.

In another example, the Śrīmad I text related the birth of Rawana and his victory over his brother, Danapati, and the King of Ngayodya in a sequence that mirrored the kākṣāya until OJ canto 20 (KEN 21). The Śrīmad I text then resumed the story at OJ canto 43 (KEN 35) with Rawana's decision to wage war on Arjuna Sasra. In passing over the middle section of the kākṣāya, the incident that incited Rawana to launch his assault is omitted, as well as the description of Arjuna and his entourage at leisure in the forests. All traditions seemed to have been aware that a disturbance of some kind enraged Rawana but the precise nature of this disturbance differed according to the texts. The Śrīmad poet resisted the opportunity to amalgamate these story strands and presented the narrative as intended in the kākṣāya. The embellishments and omissions perhaps reflect the modern Javanese concept of presentation of a story.

The kākṣāya and the Śrīmad present a picture of Arjuna and his wife by the river. Citrawati is sullen and unresponsive because the deep waters prevent the court ladies from bathing. Arjuna lies in the river and effectively blocks the water. The ladies daily in the river bed collecting precious stones while Rawana and his court upstream are deluged by the flood from the dammed river. (OJ 39-41, KEN 31-34).

The Add. 12302 MAC bridging cantos drew upon the pervading Śrīmad strain that Rawana's lust for Sri, the wife of Kisman, was the cause of his downfall. Ten cantos were devoted to the staging of a cīrāci contest in which Arjuna Sasra, represented by his Prime Minister, Suwanda, was successful and Rawana foiled yet again. Suwanda delivers Citrawati to his master by the sea side after several adventures which have no parallel in the Śrīmad or the kākṣāya. This insertion is thus linked with resumption of the text at the MAC I equivalent of KEN.
35 where Rawana swears revenge and Arjuna and his party are by the water's edge. The IOL 46 MAC I scribe did not attempt to fill in this section. One stanza links Rawana's defeat of the King of Ngayodya with his planned attack on Arjuna Sasra.

The Serat Kandha elements are of particular interest and Pigeaud's reference (1924:54) to the same episodes being presented in a variety of seemingly unrelated ways in the Tantu Panggelaran had some parallel in the surfacing of the same story frame in this episode in the Serat Kandha. Arjuna Sasra sets out to find the lady of his dreams. (SK 37.79). He finds an empty kraton and assigns kings to guard it. (38.2). After many adventures which have no parallel in the kakawin, he wins the hand of Socawati (Citrawati in the kakawin) after being capable of detecting the true princess amid a hundred images of herself. (39.15) The party roams through the forests hunting. (40.41). All mount a giant garuda to transport them to the seaside. En route, the bird, burdened by its load, fouls Rawana's court assembly as he flies over Ngalı̍n̄gka. (41.2). Rawana swears revenge (41.18). Once by the sea, Arjuna leaves the ladies at play, and retires into the palace to tapa nendra (the sleep of penance). The chief minister, Suwanda takes control. (41.25).60

Although the story frame is perceptible, the bird's indiscretion rather than Arjuna blocking the river incited Rawana. Within this sequence, the only mention of water is the reference in 41.20 to the two wives of Arjuna Sasra, Sriwati and Socawati bathing and watching the fish. The aspect of a lady demanding access to the treasures of the sea or the river and the blocking of the water, as contained in the kakawin and kawi miring/MAC II versions, are treated in two unrelated stories on either side of the Arjuna Sasra tale in the Serat Kandha. The impression that these

---

60 This Serat Kandha sequence may be compared with the Old and Modern Javanese concordance which prefaces the text and translation appendix.
tales were not part of the ASB story was reinforced by the line,

'the had reigned for a long time. Now let us change the story
told by the poet.'

Sērat Kandha 37.40-47 relates the episode of a lady, Rontha, who
spurns her suitor's advances until he provides her with a kraton filled
with precious objects from the sea. At canto 42.54, the tale of Götah
Banjaran is presented. This demon is also spurned by the woman of his
choice who similarly demands to be shown the treasures of the sea. The
demon obligingly plunges into the ocean and attempts to drain it (42.59).
Dasamuka complains to Narada that this demon who is damming the sea with
his arm is creating havoc. (61). Subali is approached by Narada to fight
the demon. (67).

The comparison of these episodes in both traditions illustrates
the adaptation of a frame story from the kakawin into a variety of epi-
sodes in the oral tradition. The essential question remains as to whether
only the frame rather than the precise details of the kakawin were fami-
iliar in the versions based on oral tradition and whether the eighteenth
century Yasadipura versions constituted the first attempt to render the
tales according to the kakawin tradition. Winter (1911:337) commented
that the absence of waton (criteria) accounted for the diverse interpre-
tations of jarwa texts of the kakawins. The fact of the kawi miring and
MAC II versions of the middle section of the Arjuna Sasra tale being
closer to the kakawin than any of the other renderings could be explained
by Yasadipura either adhering to what he knew to be the kakawin version
or by-passing the variant episodes and scrupulously working his
way through the kakawin. However, the Yasadipura presentation of the
tale of Rawana attempting to enter the heavens (KM 14, OJ 10.8) differs
from the kakawin while some kakawin elements are evident in the Sērat
Kandha and Sindusastra versions of this episode. Traces of the kakawin

61 wus lami jënôngnya, wontën gênti oinarita de Sang kawi. (SK 42.2).
version in these two texts tend to be more in the form of small aspects of characterization and description.

In the *kakawin*, a monkey-faced guard tries to prevent Rawana from climbing the mountain where Siwa and his wife, Uma, are making love. Rawana laughs at the monkey (10.11) who predicts his downfall (12). Rawana attempts to lift the mountain (13) but the god presses down the mountain with the big toe of his left foot (14), clamping Rawana into a helpless position (15). Rawana withdraws after begging the Supreme Lord's pardon.

In the *kawi miring* version, there is no mention of a monkey guard. Rawana, on being informed that he may not pass through the door into an enclosure on the mountain where the nymphs dwell (14.6), dismounts and tries to appease the gods. His prayers, offered in the manner of a demon rather than a human (10), are not answered. Rawana attempts to push open the door (11) which closes on his fingers (12). On his release, he retires humiliated (15).62

In the *Srāt Kandha* (33.13), Rawana attempts to invade a small kingdom of Adiserat, the gate of which is guarded by a monkey. After many intervening adventures, Rawana enters the kingdom and attempts to molest the wife of Adiserat (34.8-27). Rawana kills the monkey who predicts his downfall as he lies dying. (34.36-43). Adiserat reappears and rebukes Rawana for behaving like a demon (48). A fight develops and Rawana is forced into a powerless position by the big toe of the left foot of Adiserat (53, *den-ī.:kā: siku kiwa wālikat*). Rawana withdraws in defiance (61).

In this final example, elements of the *kakawin*, the monkey guard, the husband and wife, Rawana clamped into helpless position by the toe of the left foot, have been applied in another story yet the Yasadipura version

62See full text in Part 2.
adapted the frame story with differing embellishments. Apart from the contraction of descriptive passages, there was only one example in the Yasadipura renderings of the *Arjunawijaya* where the poet diverged radically from the narrative of the *kakawin*, this episode being the interpretation of the *sastra arjendra* /secret knowledge session and the subsequent marriage of the sage to Sukesi, the daughter of the demon, Sumali. Deviations which took account of oral tradition tended to be related to character expansion or the inclusion of a popular character in an existing *kakawin* episode. Numerous examples, however, have been cited of what could be more strictly termed interpretive variations from the *kakawin*. In these instances, the poets appear to have approached the passage with some previously formulated impression of the context. The distinction is therefore made between these variations within the *kakawin* narrative frame and the more blatant concessions to or adoption of an oral tradition version of a *kakawin* episode.

---

63 Some examples include the reference to the eight hundred wives of Arjuna Sasra (*KM* 20.10 *MAC II* 13.2) and the inclusion of the *pancasoma* amulet or incantation in Rawana's possession which ensured his invulnerability. (*KM* 48.2, *MAC II* 37.4). The *lakon Arjuna Sasra jumĕnĕng nata* (Kats 1923: 193-5) contains the tale of the eight hundred princesses. *Bēdahipun nagari Lokapala* refers to the magic formula, the *pancasama* obtained by Rawana from the monkey, Subali (Kats; p.189-91). The scattered references to the relationship between Banowati and Arjuna cannot be traced to the *Bhāratayuddha kakawin*. *KM* 3.6 *MAC* 2.11, *KM* 91.7 *MAC* 69.2, *KM* 84.13 *MAC* 64.7. In the *lakon Parikĕsit Lahir*, Banowati dies and Arjuna is greatly distressed. A princess who bears a great likeness to Banowati is given to Arjuna to compensate for the loss of Banowati. (Kats; p.439).
5. STRUCTURAL ASPECTS OF KAWI MIRING

5.1 Formal Features

A depiction of the singer preparing himself to demonstrate his knowledge of sêkar agêng metres is contained in Cénthini (vol. 3/4:18). The performer clears his throat, hums a few notes to determine the pitch, shifts about and settles himself into an appropriately sedate position, adjusts his head-dress and proceeds to sing a stanza of Sulanjari metre from the Bhûratayuddha kakawin, keeping himself in check by rigidly counting off the 8,6,6 divisions on his fingers as he sings. Padmasœsastra (1942:248) also made reference to sêkar agêng presentation in Tatacara, a text that was styled in the interested party and knowledgeable informant pattern reminiscent of Winter's Javaansche Zamenspraken and certain passages of the Cénthini. When asked how one should set about studying (sinau) sêkar agêng, the following advice was given:

'It's quite easy; you should be able to memorise one metre. When you have learnt this by heart, you should then take account of the exact number of syllables in each pêdhotan unit without taking into consideration the guru lagu because têmbang kawi has no guru lagu. As long as you know all the pêdhotan rules, you will be able to recite sêkar agêng.'

A distinction was made in Chapter 1 between sêkar agêng, the metrical form and kawi miring, the genre. Apart from the sêkar agêng, kakawin-based texts attributed to Yasadiapura, the only other examples of sêkar agêng composition in the Surakarta period consist of fragments in the suluk, bawa, pâsindhen bâdhaya and chronogram collections. No babads for example, were written in sêkar agêng. These short poems exhibit the basic structural properties of sêkar agêng, - four lines of non-quantitative verse of equal length with

---

1 Guru lagu in the Modern Javanese sense of final vowel ruling.
an internal pêdhotan division. Although the macapat and kawi miring texts share a common sequential arrangement of the kakawin material as well as stylistic features and preferences which may be taken as representative of Modern Javanese presentation, there was an impression that certain elements in either genre may have been considered by the poets as being more appropriate to either macapat or kawi miring. The sêkar ageng fragments noted above were therefore only used to determine whether pêdhotan principles were borne in mind when these short poems were written and as a guide to popular metre choice.

The average length of a kawi miring canto was shorter than the macapat equivalent. Cantos of ten to twelve stanzas were not uncommon but cantos containing more than twenty-five stanzas were rare. The macapat practice of sasmita, the signalling word which indicated the metre to fol'w, was not employed in the kawi miring texts. Instead, each canto was prefaced by a number which indicated the number of syllables per line for that metre. Pêdhotan was not stated at the beginning of a canto although most manuscripts contained sufficient pêdhotan markings in the first stanza to enable the singer to quickly scan the lines to determine the correct divisions and the melody appropriate to that metre.

The name of the sêkar ageng was inserted into the last line of the completed canto (a practice which was in evidence in several kakawins) but the metre name being placed at the end of the canto consequently did not function as a sasmita. The Rama kawi miring,

2 See Chapter 6.1 and 2.

3 See Zoetmulder (1974:124) who cites the Râmâyana, Nîtišâstra and Naraka Wijaya kakawins as containing examples of this feature. This was not, however, a common practice in kakawin composition.
however, followed the macapat system of positioning the name of the metre to follow in the last line of the canto. This usage in conjunction with certain other features of the Rama kawi miring text suggest that an author other than either of the Yasadipuras may have been responsible for the sêkar ageng version of the Râmâyana.

There was no attempt to disguise the name of the metre in any of the sêkar ageng texts but on a few occasions in the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring there was a greater effort to accommodate the metre name within the narrative. As the word did not function as a sasmita the poets perhaps considered that there was no need to camouflage the metre name. It seems more plausible, however, that words such as Wêgang-Sulanjeri and Sasadarakawékas may have presented a greater challenge to the poets to disguise within the body of the text than the more flexible macapat sasmita such as asmara and kinanti. More restricted use probably would not have led to a tradition of indicating the metres with stock sentiments and expressions.

Eighteenth century sêkar ageng metre names were also written before every canto in the Surakarta tradition manuscripts of the kakawins. While a large proportion of the frequently used metre names were common to sêkar ageng, kakawin and Sanskrit metrics, the question arises as to how and when the remaining metres were determined and the relationship between these newer metres and those with kakawin equivalents.

---

4 ASBR KM 17.18. adrang tyasira dahat sudira tan daraka brashly, impatiently spoiling for a fight.

ASBR KM 25.18 tan amoting madurênta having no sweetness and jewels.

ASBR KM 31.14 amêng-amêng ing Suralaya lir rênta wandering in Suralaya, like a jewel. See translation in Part 2 for full context.
5.2 Metre Names and Metre Choice

The list of metres common to eighteenth century sekar ageng, kakawin and Sanskrit compiled in Chapter 2.4 indicated that the eighteenth century poets were not only familiar with the names of certain kakawin metres but that the ideal Sanskrit caesura for that number of syllables was also known. Sekar ageng metres which had no Old Javanese quantitative equivalent fell into two categories. The Probohardjono (1961) compilation of one hundred and forty metres reveals that some examples were probably variant names of popular metres. None of these variant names were in evidence in the texts although the base metres were most popular. Citramengeng, Citrakusuma and Jiwacitra, for example, all twelve syllable metres divided into 6,6, may have been variations of the popular Kusumawicitra. It would be incorrect, however, to consider all metre names which were not common to kakawin and sekar ageng as alternative names for familiar kakawin metres. This point will be pursued below.

The second category includes sekar ageng metres which Poerbatjaraka (1940:42) suggested came into being when the eighteenth century poets, during the course of examining the kakawin texts, settled upon a word in a line of Old Javanese verse as an appropriate metre designation. The Poerbatjaraka list of sekar ageng metre names which have no kakawin equivalent and the kakawin line which contains the word after which the new metre was named is presented below.
Zoetmulder (1974:125) examines the quandary of whether a metre was named after a word found in a particular line of the kakawin or whether that word has been inserted into the line because the poet, in fact, knew the name of the metre and included the word as a metre designation. Poerbatjaraka’s suggestion is therefore most plausible.

Whereas the names of some metres were cryptically woven into the kakawin line, an expression such as Bhramarawilasita in Rāmāyaṇa 16.26 would have been familiar to the eighteenth century poet and perhaps prompted him to consider certain other words and expressions as metre names. These words were also sometimes contained in the last line of a stanza before a change of metre.

It has already been noted that certain sections of the kakawins were either more read, available or popular than others. It is therefore of some note that three sets of metre names are closely positioned, the canto 15 and 16 Rāmāyaṇa examples being in the vicinity of the Bhramarawilasita.

---

5 Poerbatjaraka notes canto 20 only for Wisata-kandeh but this expression did not appear to be contained within this canto.

6 Both Zoetmulder (1974:456) and van der Tuuk (1897b:606) made reference to the name Sudhiradharaka in relation to the Old Javanese metre Punarmada although Poerbatjaraka lists Sudiradraka as a sēkar ageng innovation.

7 16.36 mangde ŝoka ng bhramarawilasita.

8 As was the case with the Bhramarawilasita and Sudiradraka examples and a Prawiralalita reference at OJ Rama 20.75.
reference. The Sasadarakawêkas reference found at Bharatayuddha 6.7 occurs a few stanzas after a most popular suluk at 6.1 and the Dhadhap-mantéb example (Rama 16.24) is also situated between two popular suluks at OJ 15.64 (aneke wre tunggal ...) and OJ 16.31 (jahni jahning talaga ...).

A canto division was made in the Rama kawi miring text at the parallel Lëbdajiwa reference (KM 74, OJ 15.46) while the macapat Sërat Rama borrowed the word into SR 39.26 (kabeh suka muwah-muwah lëbdajiwa). The contents of OJ 15.45, the stanza before the Lëbdajiwa reference, were selected as a sêkar agêng bawa text cast similarly into eleven syllables but seeming to be independent of the kawi miring9. These examples strengthen the premise that some passages in the kakawins were consulted more consistently than others.

The metres employed in the kawi miring texts are listed below and may be compared with the table on page 139 which contains the most common metres listed in references to metrics. Cantos in the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring where these metres were employed are noted in brackets. Metres common to kakawin and sêkar agêng are marked with an asterisk and the Gl' Javanese equivalent is given.

Sulisir, 8: 4,4. BY, Rama, DR.
Patramanggala, 8: 4,4. Rama.
Partalalita, 8:4,4. Rama.
*Bramarawilasita (Bhramarawilasita), 11:4,7. ASB (cantos 5, and 54), BY, Rama, DR, Paniti.
Lëbdajiwa, 11:4,7. ASB (cantos 24,32,60), BY, Rama, DR, Paniti.
*Kusumawicitra (Kusumawicitra), 12:6,6. ASB (cantos 2,9,22, 29,46,55), BY, Rama, DR, Paniti.
Nadurêtna, 12:5,7. ASB (cantos 16,25,30,36,59) BY, Rama, DR (* ) Sudiradraka, 13:5,8. ASB (Cantos 6,17,27,39,57,61).
BY, Rama, DR, Paniti. See footnote on page 136.
*Basanta (Basantatilaka), 14:8,6. ASB (cantos 14,28,35, 40), BY, Rama
Manggalagita, 15:8,7. DR.
*Prawiralalita (Wiralalita), 16:8,8. ASB (cantos 23,33,49) BY, Rama, DR, Paniti.

9 This text is quoted in Chapter 6.3, p 196.
In addition to the kawi miring texts, lists of metres were examined in sources dating from the nineteenth century. Text books on metrics and suluk were also considered, the Probohardjono lists being the most detailed and systematic. There was a marked consistency in all lists between metre names, syllable count and pedhotan. Cénthini (vol.3/4:13-15) listed thirty-seven sêkar agêng metres with an additional six noted as being Salisir metres. Padmasoesastra (1942:249-51) described forty-four metres, Mangkunêgara IV (1898) provided forty-three examples and Winter (1911:314-15) listed forty metres with six separate metres described as Salisir. Sêkar Kawî (1879) contains forty-nine examples of sêkar agêng metres with Western notation and Wawatnopin Sêkar Agêng (1899) lists fifty-six examples of sêkar agêng fragments.

---

10 Prìmboù Langôn Swara (1961), Sulukan Pelog (1956), Sulukan Slendro (1956), Gêndhing Djàwa (1963). Other texts consulted were Tedjohadisumarto (1958:vol. IV), Nardawa Basa (Lor 9882.2) and NBS 133, part 17. The MJ sêkar agêng lists were cross checked with Old Javanese metre lists in Sugrîwa (1978), Zoetmulder (1974), van der Tuuk (1897b), Kern (1875) and Gusti Poetoe Djlantik (1975). The Arjunawijaya metres are listed in Supomo (1977).
The most popular metres were Kusumawicitra and Sikarini, their popularity being attested not merely by the number of occasions on which they were used in the kawi miring poems but by reference to these two metres by way of example when sēkar agèng was being discussed.

The Cēnthini list was selected as the most accessible standard and is presented below with reference to the six other metre lists.

A mark in each column indicates that the metre is common to the Cēnthini list and to that particular text.

| Cēnthini | PLS | M | PADMA | W | Sā | WATON | tm
|----------|-----|---|--------|---|----|--------|---
| 11 Lēbdajiwa | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Bramarawilasita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 12 Kusumawicitra | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Candrawilasita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Wisatakandeh | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Nadurētha | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 13 Dhadhapp-mantēb | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Sudiradraja | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Aled-alad | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 14 Basanta | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Puspanjali | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 15 Mēnggalagita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Sastramanggala | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Pranaalika | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 16 Prawiralalita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Girisa | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 17 Sikarini | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Sapṛtitala | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Tēpikawuri | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Kawitana | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Naesabayangan | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Bangsapatra | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 18 Nagabanda | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Nagakusuma | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 19 Sardulawikridita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 20 Swandana | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Sulanjari | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Sasadarakawēkas | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 21 Wisalyarini | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Swaladara | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 22 Kilayunēdhēng | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 23 Kuswālalita | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Astakusala | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Wōgang Sulanjari | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 24 Candakusuma | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| Wohingrat | * | * | * | * | * | * | *
| 27 Langānjiwa | * | * | * | * | * | * | *

11 Primbon Langōn Swara (PLS), Mangkunēgara IV (M), Padmasoeasastra (Padma), Javānsche Zamensprakcn (W), Sēkar Kawi (SK), Wawatonipun Sēkar Agèng (Waton), te Mechelen lakons (tm).
Metre distribution in the sekar ageng texts reflected the kakawin poets' preference as described by Teeuw et al. (1969:33) of a core of popular metres common to all texts augmented by a number of metres used more sparingly. The majority of the most commonly used sekar ageng metres not found in the kakawin lists appear to have been based on Old Javanese metres and these new metres had the same syllable count and pndhotan divisions in operation in the Sanskrit equivalents. The remaining sekar ageng metres may have been patterned on kakawin metres for which the names are no longer known or could have been designed around alternative pndhotan units. Sulanjari, for example, a Modern Javanese metre of twenty syllables, is divided into 8,6,6, thus, providing an alternative to the popular kakawin metre Swandana, 7,7,6 and the sekar ageng Sasadarakawakas, also 7,7,6.

There was no suggestion in Cénthini or Javaansche Zamenspraken of a distinction between metres of kakawin origin and sekar ageng metres which had no Old Javanese equivalent. The arrangement of the Cénthini list, for example, is evidence of parity between all sekar ageng metres. One example of every metre ranging from eleven to twenty-four syllables was cited (vol.3/4:13) and a list of 'matching' (kancuh) metres followed (pp.13-15). The first list contains a mixture of kakawin and sekar ageng metres (Löbdajiwa, Kusumawicitra, Manggalagita, Sikarini, etc) and the list of matching metres with the appropriate pndhotan ruling was similarly compiled.

In addition to using metres which bore the same name and number

---

12 Colebrook (1977:160) lists one twelve syllable metre, Malati or Vananatu (5,7) which is not included in the Zaetmulder twelve syllable list. As noted in Chapter 2.3, pndhotan divisions seemed to have been made after a long syllable. Three of the unnamed twelve syllable metres of Javanese origin would break into this 5,7 division after a long syllable.
of syllables as the kakawin equivalents, later poets had therefore expanded the sêkâr ageng repertoire with metres which, at a textual level, had identical kakawin counterparts. In the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring there are several examples of seemingly identical metres being employed (Lebdajwa/Brenarawitasita; Aswalalita/Wegangsulanjari). The insertion of these cumbersome metre names into the last line of the stanza dispells any suggestion that the poet had selected an alternative name for a metre in an attempt to blend that metre designation more discreetly into the narrative. Neither were the metre names which prefaced every suluk in te Mechelen lakon collection applied arbitrarily. The popular suluk at BY OJ 6.1 (meh rahina sêmu bang) was consistently marked as being in Sasadarakawêkas metre (20;7,7,6) while the recommended metre for the equally well utilised suluk from the Panitisasra 1.1 (dan sambah nireng ulun), was Swandana, another 20 syllable metre with identical division of 7,7,6.13

In his study of Javanese têmbang, Hatch (1980:195) made mention of the inseparable relationship between prosody and melody. Although Hatch approached this relationship from a musical perspective, he formed the impression that when authors were discussing points of metrics, the musical aspects were inherent in this discussion and that new metres may have developed from the old as changes were made in the accompanying melody. Javanese poetry was designed to be sung, rather than read silently. In a Western context, 'sung poetry' (song), may imply performance or group activity involving an audience. Poetry was certainly performed in such circumstances in the eighteenth century courts and much poetry was either composed or selected with a specific ceremonial or functional purpose in mind. Nevertheless, there are examples in the

Modern Javanese texts of poetry being recited in solitary circumstances; the Cabolek example (2.11) of the ulama under suspicion of heresy, reading the Bima Suci to himself in Kusumawicitra metre is one example while the often cited reference to Dipanegara, being sad at heart, requesting one of his trusted men to read to him from the Arjunawijaya, is another.

The point to be made is that an augmented metrical repertoire, distinguished by melody, implies an expanded or continuing interest in a metrical form and genre, in this case, the interest applying to both kakawin and kawi miring literature.

5.3 Sense Units and Pĕdhotan

The main distinction to be made between the application of pĕdhotan principles in sĕkar agĕng and macapat is that a line of sĕkar agĕng verse was constructed around the pĕdhotan grouping as a minor sense unit whereas pĕdhotan was a much more flexible principle in macapat and was never marked into the text. Pĕdhotan suggestions for a line of macapat are related to breath control and are in groupings of two, three or four syllables, units that are substantially shorter than the average pĕdhotan unit in a sĕkar agĕng line.  

14 See Kumar (1972:97) and Carey (1974:11).

15 The allowance for the singer to breathe after two syllables in a macapat line does suggest that singing style in macapat was more florid. The only measurement of eighteenth century singing style is by present day practice. A Balinese rendition of passages from the Sutasoma kakawin revealed that the singer was capable of singing up to fourteen syllable on one breath if delivered in a simple, unadorned style. On the other hand, a Javanese rendering of a bawa fragment in Kusumawicitra was sung in units of two and four consistently throughout the four line text. Kartomi (1973:44) noted that contrary to popular belief, macapat singing style was not simpler than tĕmbang gĕdhe, macapat melodies were no less complex and were 'often more highly ornamented.'
Construction based on pèdhotan did not place any more rigid
an imposition upon the poet than did the guru wilangan and guru lagu
rulings for macapat (syllable count and final vowel ruling). If
sèkar agèng pèdhotan based construction is compared with macapat single
line composition, sèkar agèng would, theoretically, have allowed for
more flexibility than macapat where the final vowel rhyme for each line
had to be considered.

The arrangement of sense units within pèdhotan limits exhibited
the same tendencies either expand or contract phrases as were
apparent in macapat composition and the same stock devices for contraction
and expansion were similarly in evidence. Although the length of
the lines in kawi miring verse would have afforded the poet some
flexibility to expand into longer sweeps of expression or compound
sentences, the poets did not avail themselves of this opportunity,
thus adhering to the shorter more contained units which Gonda (1975a:122)
oberves are more characteristic of 'popular and archaic styles'.

Smaller pèdhotan units of four syllables were less malleable
but if Arjuna Sasra cantos 5 and 66 (in Part 2) in Bramarawilasita and
Lëbdajiwa metres may be taken as representative of the manipulation
of sense within small units, there were attempts, firstly, to avoid word
division and secondly, to employ a more staccato, statement/comment
type style to accommodate this division.

Wibisana’lami denya mratapa (5.1c)
Sang Hyang Guru’suka marwata suta (5.7c)
ingnya malih’Sang Bagawan Pulasta (60.1a)
eh Prahasta’wruhanta gustinira (60.8a)

16 For example the contraction of nagari, agèng, maring into nagri, gèng
mring. See Soebardi (1975:56) for reference to expansion and
contraction as occasioned by the metre.
The relationship between sense and pedhotan was examined in three sections of the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring. The poet closely followed the macapat I text in the outer cantos on either side of the omitted kakawin middle section and it was in these cantos that vocabulary and sequence were reshaped from the early macapat into the sekar ageng.

Two passages are cited below, ASB KM 7.5 in Wisalyaharini (21;7,7,7) and MAC I 5.22-23 Dhandhanggula.

KM

bala tanpa wilangan ngreh para ratu-ratu'unggawa patang yuta
ditya diyu rėksasa'heh yayi Prabu tama sira mamarenana
nguwus-uwus isining jagad paramusesa yayi age mariya
mivah para jawata'akeh kang padha susah 'va dening sira yayi

MAC. I

bala tanpa wilangan
para ratu-ratu
apunggawa patang yuta
ditya diyu rėksasa wil tanpa wilis
eh yayi Prabu tama
23. marenana sira iku yayi
nguwus-uwus mring isining jagad
ing mėngko mariya age
mivah ing jawata gung
akeh susah maring sireki

In line c of the KM passage, there is a slight example of enjambment over the pedhotan divisions as the pedhotan unit could not accommodate the longer utterance which fitted into the ten syllable Dhandhanggula line. The doubling feature in mamarenana has some parallel in the apunggawa prefix in the macapat text while the addition of ya in the KM and iku in the macapat were similar stop-gap devices. This stanza is a successful reshaping of macapat material.

In the middle section of the kawi miring text, the poet borrowed heavily from the kakawin and the arrangement of kakawin vocabulary and sequence placed more demands upon the poet's technical resources.
ASB KM 30.2, Madurëtna (12;5,7)\textsuperscript{17}  
nganti uwusing sēkar pudhak umēkar  
myang hyuning tadhaharsa rakya mamalar  
malara ring kényaring Sang Hyang raditya  
mwang tang cintaka ring tawang kalēngēngan

AWj OJ 36.2, marked Wégang (5,6,6,6,) in the Surakarta MS.  
... mangantyakna huwus/ ing pudhak umēkar  
myang hyun ing tadhah/arsa rakwe mama/lar malara ri kē/nyar  
ing nikskara  
mwang tang cintaka/ ri tawang lēngēng ...

This exercise in sēkar agēng composition was less successful.  
Not only is there an example of enjambment in line c but tadhaharsa and  
kényar straddle the pēdhotan borders. In the KM manuscripts, pēdhotan  
was not marked in line c as if to indicate that the poet or scribe  
could not bring himself to physically divide the word kényar.

The final example of sense in relation to pēdhotan is taken  
from canto 1 of the ASB KM which had no equivalent in either the macapat  
I text (which began in earnest at the equivalent of KM 2.18) or the  
kakawin which contained a variant version of the marriage of Sukesi  
and Wisrawa (OJ 1.9.11). The same devices that were apparent in the  
other two examples were employed; for example, the expansion by prefix  
(Aprabu, amagawan) and the addition of stop-gap words such as ya, Sang  
and Sri.

ASB KM 1.3.

Sang Aprabu Wisrawa nanging wus amagawan sumalah  
mring putra  
nama Sri Wisrawana'ya Sang Sri Danapati'Narpati taruna  
wontēn gantya winuwus'negari ing Ngalēngka'Narpati  
rāksasa  
Sang Aprabu Sumali'agēng karatonira darbe putra estri

5.4 Language Features

The language employed in both the kawi miring and the macapat

\textsuperscript{17} See text and translation in Part 2.
ASB KM 30.2, Madurétna (12;5,7)\textsuperscript{17}
nganti uwusing sēkar pudhak umēkar
myang hyuning tadhahārsa rakya mamalar
malara ring kēnyaring Sang Hyang raditya
mwang təng cintaka'ring tawang kalāngęngan

AWj OJ 36.2, marked Wēgang (5,6,6,6,) in the Surakarta MS.
... mangantyakna huwus/ ing pudhak umēkar
myang hyuning tadhah/arsa rakwa mamalar rē kē/nyar
ing nikskara
mwang təng cintaka/ rī tawang lēngęng ...

This exercise in sēkar agęng composition was less successful.
Not only is there an example of enjambment in line c but tadhahārsa and
kēnyar straddle the pēdhotan borders. In the KM manuscripts, pēdhotan
was not marked in line c as if to indicate that the poet or scribe
could not bring himself to physically divide the word kēnyar.

The final example of sense in relation to pēdhotan is taken
from canto 1 of the ASB KM which had no equivalent in either the macapat
I text (which began in earnest at the equivalent of KM 2.18) or the
kakawin which contained a variant version of the marriage of Sukesi
and Wisrawa (OJ 1.9.11). The same devices that were apparent in the
other two examples were employed; for example, the expansion by prefix
(Aprabu, amagawan) and the addition of stop-gap words such as ya, Sang
and Sri.

ASB KM 1.3.

Sang Aprabu Wisrawa' nanging wus amagawan' sumalal
mēng putra
nama Sri Wisrawana' ya Sang Sri Danapati' Narpati taruna
wontēn gantya wiuwus' nagari ing Ngalēngka' Narpati
rōksasa
Sang Aprabu Sumali' agęng karatonira' darbe putra estri

5.4 Language Features

The language employed in both the kawi miring and the macapat

\textsuperscript{17} See text and translation in Part 2.
kakawin-based texts was similar. There were language features in the 
kawi miring texts that were probably prompted by an attempt to mirror 
the kakawin language but the macapat texts also contained a good proportion 
of vocabulary that was classified as kawi in the Gericke/Roorda and 
Winter dictionaries. Kern's main grievance (1875:80) with the term 
kawi was in relation to a kawi classification for words of Old Javanese 
origin that were either unusual, fractured or abstruse while simple 
words common to Old and Modern Javanese were rarely classified as 
such. Where kawi miring and macapat word choice differed in the 
texts, the variation could often be accounted for by the metrical require-
ments of both genres. Occasionally, the kawi miring word choice which 
was listed as a common, non-literary (non-kawi) word was replaced by 
the macapat II author by a word lexically classified as kawi or Sanskrit. 
There were also instances where the macapat word choice was not classified 
as kawi yet the same form of the word could be found in an Old Javanese 
dictionary. When it is considered that on the one hand a word may have 
been included in Old Javanese word lists yet the same form of the word 
was entered in the Gericke and Roorda dictionary as a ropoko form of a 
common Modern Javanese word, any attempt to measure the percentage 
of kawi words by whatever definition would be hazardous. As a consequence, 
it seemed more purposeful to examine the language features and the extent 
and manner of borrowing and quotation from the Old Javanese text in 
both genres.

The kawi miring preference was for the more literary forms, for 
example ka and pa(ng) affixation over the kë and pë(ng) forms employed in 
the macapat equivalents.

18 Kern cited tölö, pat and lima.
19 For example tali, bisa and daya.
20 This aspect is treated in Chapter 6.2.
This preference extended into forms such as:

- taksih (3.6c)  
  - těksih (1.42)
- maksih (3.6d)  
  - měksih (1.42)
- nakseni (4.6b)  
  - někseni (2.16)

On a number of occasions, the form could be returned to the Old Javanese text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>KN</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yatna</td>
<td>yatna</td>
<td>yitna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AWj 51.2b)</td>
<td>(44.4)</td>
<td>(33.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayatna</td>
<td>prayatna</td>
<td>yitna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AWj 52.2a)</td>
<td>(45.13)</td>
<td>(34.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stylistic forms were quite commonplace:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kulwan</td>
<td>kilen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ASB 24.3)</td>
<td>(18.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unggwan</td>
<td>enggon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ASB 24.3)</td>
<td>(18.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakoswa</td>
<td>prakosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ASB 61.23)</td>
<td>(51.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While forms such as lwir (ASB KM 6.15, BY KM 4.1), kweh (ASB KN 30.13) and ywan or yyan (ASB KN 15.3, BY KM 2.1, DR KM 6.2) were preferred over lir, keh and yen.

Although Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (1979:210) notes that the pĕpĕt replaces the reduplicated vowel in duplicated forms (tĕtuku, wĕwadi), the KN text favoured the retention of the reduplicated vowel on the majority of occasions, thus adhering to the more formal style noted by Horne (1974:xxi). (ASB KN 22.9 andudu, lalangĕn, 22.13 mumusĕri, 23.16, kakalih, 24.3 wuwukiran, 58.1 puputra). As this formality is still occasionally employed in written Javanese but pronounced with
a pěpět, some account should be taken of whether the retention of the duplicated vowel is indicative of a change in spelling patterns rather than a grammatical shift. Forms such as lĕlampah (ASB KM 22.5), anĕnangkĕb (ASB KM 22.16), nevertheless were employed. The alternation of forms throughout all the KM manuscripts consulted raised the question of the appropriateness of returning the variant forms to a consistent norm and also the probability that this variation and alternation were features of this more mannered literary style.

The pronominal form, sirang with the genitive nirang, irang and the related form, denirang were common features of the KM ASB and BY texts but were not in evidence in those sections of the Rama KM that were examined. Sirang is listed in Gericke and Roorda (1901: I/781) as a kawi equivalent of sira or sira sang. In the BY KM 74.1,

sirang Duryodana arsa lumayuwa
can be returned to BY OJ 43.1, sira ng Pr. bu Suyodhana muruda, but the majority of occasions on which either sirang, nirang or denirang forms were used had no kakawin equivalent. The form was not used in either the macapat parallel passages or elsewhere in the macapat versions and was clearly employed as a stylistic device modelled on the kakawin form, - pronoun plus definite article. There is one example, for instance, in the first stanza of the kawi miring text (sūkarnirang kakawin) which was quite independent of the Old Javanese text.

21 Roorda (1882:161), Poensen (1897:252) and Prijohoenomo (1937:145) discuss the pronoun sira in its possible first, second and third person functions but make no mention of the form sirang.

Sirang: ASB KM 8.12 duk sirang miyarsa, ASB KM 26.2 lajêng sirang numijil, BY KM 61.13 sirang narendra.

Nirang: ASB KM 25.12 tustambêknirang, ASB KM 20:4 tumameng jajanirang, BY KM 65.1 waspanirang.

Denirang: ASB KM 61.20 wibuh denirang rungsit, BY KM 44.4 denirang Setyaki.
This sekarnirang example illustrates another kawi miring predilection for ning over the ing prepositional or possessive form when n was not required as a glidding or connective consonant after a vowel. On these occasions, the n seemed to be considered as part of the prefix rather than as a separate grammatical feature.\(^{22}\) Forms such as trangning (ASB KN 1.1) rather than tranging (MAC II 1.2) were scattered throughout the text but again there was an impression that the form was merely stylistic and was applied arbitrarily.\(^{23}\) ASB KN 20.1, for example, reads pamukirang yet the n connective was used in ambeknirang at ASB KN 25.12.

Verbal forms.

The formal, literary verbal prefix, ma, was preferred on innumerable occasions in the kawi miring texts over either the root form (mobukuh ASB KN 7.5, bukuh MAC II 3.35) or other active nazalised forms (madhändha, manyandhak, mangiwa ASB KN 19.3, anhändha, nyandhak, angiwa MAC II 11.17).\(^{24}\) There were several instances in the ASB KM text where the ma form was borrowed from the parallel OJ passage but the KM poet occasionally adjusted the OJ verbal form to the KM preference.\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{22}\) See Gericke and Roorda (1901:1/243) and Roorda (1882:167–8) for reference to the n as a connective.

\(^{23}\) Other examples include lirining (ASB KN 2.1), liring ASB MAC II 1.16 tingkahning sujana (ASB KN 11.5), tingkahning manusa (MAC II 5.36), tőmbungningkang ling (ASB KN 5.15), ingkang ling (MAC II 3.7), warahning Sang kaka (DR KN 8.7), gëngning ampuhan (DR KN 3.7). The scribbler responsible for the ASB KN MS LOr 1793 copied ing for ning on at least two occasions, (2.1 and 41.11).

\(^{24}\) For a description of this form, see Gericke and Roorda (1901:460), Poensen (1897:71) and Priyohoetomo (1937:54). Examples in other texts include:

- Rama KN 12.17 manguarah, MAC sëmbah 8.13
- Rama KN 11.23 malingal, MAC 7.13 tingal
- Rama KN 165.1 mangudan mangeja, MAC 90.1 udan ngeja.
- BY KN 4.11 manitip, manguyel, matimbul, MAC 3.12, titip, uyël, atimbul.

\(^{25}\) ASB KM 24.8 mamangan, OJ 28.3 mangan, MAC II 18.39, mangan.
One odd verbal form, which was clearly an imitative device, was the practice of prefacing certain um prefix verbs with the particle n, thus producing the form, numangsah (ASB KM 12.1), numijil (26.2) numarëk (34.4), numangkat (26.2) and numiring (38.2).

Some examples are listed below.

BY KM 19.1 kan Seta gya numangsah (MAC 13.1. umangsah)
BY KM 23.2 Korawa parëng numangsah. (MAC 16.11. mangsah.)
BY KM 71.1 lumëpas gya numijil. (MAC 53.6. umijil)
BY KM 38.7 parëng numangsah. (MAC 67.2. umangsah)
Rama KM 4.18 numulih maring Indrabawana (MAC 3.15. mulih)
DR KM 3.11 Sang Rukmakala sarëng numijil. (MAC 2.12 mëtu)

This form is not listed in any of the early grammars although Prijohoeotomo (1934:146) does refer to two Dewa Ruci forms, numijil and numangsah as being 'reminiscent of Old Javanese syntax'. The form was employed on at least six occasions in the Bratayuda kawi miring but only those verbs that were used in the Dewa Ruci text, numijil and numangsah were bases for this kawi miring verbal form.

It was possible to return three of these examples in the Bratayuda kawi miring to parallel passages in the kakawin where the particle n prefaced the um from verb.

OJ 11.1 Sweta n umaso (K; 19.1)
OJ 12.15 n umangsö Sri Duryodhana (KM 23.2)
OJ 51.17 n umangsö manudingi (KM 88.7)

Two similar examples of borrowing from the kakawin can be cited from the ASB KN26. ASB KN, however, extended into other nu + verb forms which had no kakawin equivalent:

ASB KM 34.4 Rëkyana Apatih numarëk ingayun (MAC II 25.7 praptengarsa)
ASB KM 26.12 numangkat Sri Mahanarendra (OJ 31.17 mëngkat, MAC II 21.6 budal)
ASB KN 38.2 myang rata kweh numiring (OJ 46.2 mangiring, no macapat equivalent).

26 (OJ 7.7b) n umangsah (umasö) lïwr Nrtyu (KM 12.1) Wisrawana numangsah (OJ 31.3b) n umijil sang sri mahabhupati (KM 26.2) lajëng sirang numijil ri Sang Anarendra
This extension may be a further clue to the chronology and authorship of the Modern Javanese epic based texts. It may well be that the forms, \textit{n umijil, n umangså}, were encountered by the author of the MJ Bratayuda and Dewa Ruci during the course of the rendering from Old into Modern Javanese. This author, presumably Yasadipura I, seemed content to regard these examples as forms of the verbs and to borrow them as such. The author of the ASB KN text, probably Yasadipura II, not only used the \textit{numangsåh} and the \textit{numijil} forms contained in the Arjunawijaya \textit{kakawin}, but felt sufficiently confident to extend the form into \textit{numarek, numangkat} and \textit{numiring}; this form was obviously stylistic rather than a convenient device to employ when an additional syllable was needed. In the ASB KM 53.4, \textit{numangsåh} is used while \textit{umangsåh} was preferred in the MAC II text\textsuperscript{27}.

It is perhaps of some note that these examples of extensions of the form into \textit{numarek} etc, are all found in the middle section of the ASB KN text, that section for which there is no Yasadipura I equivalent. As the ASB KN was flanked by two macapat versions, it was possible to establish with some degree of assurance that the kawi \textit{mirings} poet had embellished his work with certain features which, as Prijohoetomo aptly noted, were reminiscent of \textit{kakawin} language. The author of the second macapat text discreetly culled these features from his version.

\textsuperscript{27} Also in BY KN 88.7 \textit{numangsåh} for MAC 67.2 \textit{umangsåh}
6. FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF KAWI MIRING

6.1 The Relationship between Macapat and Kawi Miring

In Chapter 1.5, it was suggested that the kawi miring texts should not be viewed as paraphrases of the kakawins. There may be some justification for such a consideration if it could be established that the sekar ageng texts were written prior to the macapat, thus functioning as draft translations upon which the more discerning macapat texts were based, but there is no strong evidence in favour of this chronology. As it seems unlikely that lengthy sekar ageng texts would have been composed out of a practical concern for an expanded suluk repertoire, the macapat and kawi miring versions of the kakawins may perhaps be seen as complementing each other both functionally and aesthetically within the context of the presentation and interpretation of Old Javanese material.

Aesthetics and function are hard to divorce in this instance, but in view of the same material being presented in like sequence with similar emphasis and vocabulary choice, there should be some consideration given to the role of pure aesthetics as an impetus to composition in sekar ageng. Leaving aside the issue of whether sekar ageng may have been considered as a more sophisticated or 'genceel' metrical form, the combined factors of metrical structure and melody would have provided an alternative artistic format for the presentation of kakawin material. This is not to deny that there would have been occasions when sekar ageng was chosen as the more appropriate poetic medium but the preference for sekar ageng as opposed to macapat may not have been exclusively determined by the demands of ceremony and theatre.

1 See Kartom (1973:6) who noted that whereas macapat texts were sung in the courts during the midnight singing sessions, only sekar ageng was considered as the appropriate poetic medium for performance in the uyon-uyon concerts.
Although nineteenth century translators often commented that sense was sacrificed to form in the Modern Javanese renderings\textsuperscript{2}, the impression gained from the present study was that form was conditioned by function, the function being to present efficacious material in an attractive manner. In view of this close relationship between form and function, there should perhaps be some reappraisal of what one would normally consider as purely aesthetic or technical poetic devices.

Should a borrowed phrase from the \textit{kakawin}, for example, be viewed merely as a device to add a little assonance or verbal lustre to the Modern Javanese stanza or would it be more appropriate to consider the phrase as a quotation, designed as a reference point?\textsuperscript{3}

The arrangement of material in both genres was clearly governed by a Modern Javanese sense of narrative presentation. The poets strove to present the \textit{balungan} (frame) of the story and to interpret relevant ethical and cultural aspects within a Modern Javanese context. The stated aim in both the \textit{kawi miring} and the \textit{macapat Arjuna Sasra} was to present the \textit{kakawin} clearly (\textit{mrih trangning kata}). Similarly, in a \textit{Bratayuda} example, the sudden explanatory tangent from the Modern Javanese poet which breaks into a poignant scene where Satyawati

\textsuperscript{2} See, for example, Palmer van den Broek's comments (1870:III) on poetic devices in the Sindusasstra \textit{Sbrat Lokapala}.

\textsuperscript{3} It is the verbal content of \textit{tmbang} (defined here as unaccompanied song) which according to Hatch (1979:136) prompts many contemporary musicians to consider \textit{karawitan} (defined as instrumentally based music-making) as a more flexible and tenable art form while \textit{tmbang} is seen to belong to a court centred feudal past.
commits bela to her husband\textsuperscript{4} is most reminiscent of the parwa passage where an earlier writer pledged to tell his tale as faithfully and as lucidly as his skill would allow him\textsuperscript{5}.

If a general distinction is to be made between macapat and kawi miring composition it is that the macapat poet made more frequent use of characteristically Modern Javanese elements (elements that were also in evidence throughout the kawi miring texts) while the kawi miring poet occasionally returned to the kakawin to adjust his text to the Old Javanese. These adjustments rarely constituted major deviations from the macapat texts but were often of the nature of a compromise between the Old Javanese and the macapat, the middle course version which both Cohen Stuart (1860:II/215) and Gonda (1975C:517) noted characterised the kawi miring rendering of the death of Karna in the Bratayuda. Adjustments were easier to detect in the Bratayuda macapat and kawi miring renderings, where it seems certain that a complete macapat version which

\textsuperscript{4} BY MAC 58.11 (KN 79, 12-13). \textit{wus ngelmune ing Bratayuda, nora k\textit{ê}na yen pinahidowa, kudu m\textit{è}ngkono angg\textit{ê}pe, mangkana caturipun, k\textit{ang} amur\textit{wa} carita nguni, k\textit{ang} nama \textit{ê}mpu S\textit{ê}dhah, pan wus kaprahipun, k\textit{ang} anggit mangke tan k\textit{ê}na, mwahana malah kapara ngurangi, jrih tinutuh ing kathah. 12. bok winastan dora mumuwahi ...}

\textsuperscript{11} This was the lore as found in the Bratayuda and it may not be doubted, it must be accepted as such. The story [was told] in this manner by the original author, named \textit{ê}mpu S\textit{ê}dhah, for these were the customs. The present author is not at liberty to add; in fact, he is inclined to omit lest he be criticised by many, 12. perhaps accused of falsification if he adds ...

\textsuperscript{5} Zoetmulder (1974:88) quoting from the \textit{Wirataparwa}. Your Majesty need not be concerned. It shall be told in accordance with the truth and exactly as it happened, without ambiguities and without verbosity.
followed the sequence of the *kakawin* was written prior to the *kawi miring* equivalent. The *Bratayuda kawi miring* also gave the impression of having been written by a competent poet who was more sensitive to the demands of *sêkar ageng* composition than was the author of the *Sêrat Rama kawi miring*.

The following passages illustrate how the *kakawin* version of Salya's parting advice to his beloved nephew, Nakula, in the *Dhâratayuddha* was rendered into *kawi miring* and *macapat*. OJ 36.18 and 19 are taken from the Javanese tradition manuscript Add. 12279 and the quotation from the *kakawin* in the *macapat* version may be compared with the Javanese orthography in OJ 18c. The edition reading, where required, is included in brackets.

The *kakawin*.

18. samangka/ lingangki (kwe) kita bapa matanyan (matangyat) laku tulih
nda/ mah songandeh (songanteng) marga laki kawathingku n/ (kawadingku) kêmulakên
nda nahan ling sri Salya Nakula wihang/ lagi nideh (kîn'dî)
byatita n mantuk lwir ubaya tuhu asring (ãsãsrîng) anangis

19. nda tan warnan ri (ring) marga lakunira mantuk/
vêka huwus
ikang sojar sri Salya parwarahireng Dharmatenaya sukambêk/ sri Krêsnârjuna/ tata (taya) kasandeha ri hati
apan manggêh munggwing tanganira tulusing kawijayan

18. This is all I have to say to you so now you must return. But do not reveal what I have told you on your way back. So spoke Salya; Nakula was reluctant but [Salya] insisted. In short, true to his word, Nakula set off, weeping bitter tears.

19. The journey is not described here. [Nakula] arrived [at the camp].
Yudistira was informed of all that Salya had said. Krêsan and Arjuna were pleased and were no longer anxious. Victory was now firmly in their hands.
Bratayuda Kawi Miring Canto 64.2b–6. Kusumawicitra, 12:6,6

2b. lingira Sang Prabu`Nakula sutengsun
    aywa wancak ing tyas'muliya den-enggal
    pan wus karsaning'Bathara wus pinasthi

3. ing sekehe lalàkon iki nakingsun
    mung wèwèkasingsun'sira den-abisa
    wawadiningsun sásabana ing margi
    Nakula tur sëmbah'amit gya lumengser

4. wirandhungan pawuwusireng Nakula
    lampahireng marge'prapta pakukuwon
    Nate Pandhawa ngarsa Sri Arimurti
    Bimârjuna Yudistira Sahadewa

5. Sëtyaki Drstadyumëna sahadaya
    Nakula umatur'mring Narendra Krsna
    sapangandikanya'Narapati Salya
    yen ingkang pininta'Yudistireng rana

6. tëlas wèwèlingîra Narendra Salya
    Sri Krsna sukeng tyas'tuwin Bima Parta
    tan ana sangsayêning tyasira sami
    cipta lëstari ngungkuli kawaijayan

2b. The King said,'Nakula, my boy,
    do not be anxious. Return quickly.
    It is God's will, it has been ordained.

3. Of what has passed between us here, my son,
    my only advice to you is to make sure
    that you do not reveal my confidence on the way back.'
    Nakula made obeisance and took his leave quickly.

4. Haltingly, Nakula
    made his way back to the camp
    of the Pandhawa kings. He came into the presence of Krësna
    Bima, Arjuna, Yudistira and Sahadewa,

5. Satyaki, Drstadyumëna and all the men.
    Nakula informed krësna
    of Salya's message,
    that Yudistira had been requested [to meet him] on the battle
    field.

6. Having heard Salya's message,
    Krësna was pleased, as were Bima and Arjuna.
    No one was in any doubt
    for they realised that they would win through to victory.

Bratayuda macapat canto 48.1-11

Nateng Mandraka lingnya rum
oh Nakula sira kaki
 tôka muliha den-inggal
aywa sira wancak galih
pan wus karsaning Bathara
sakehing lëlakon iki
2. ing ēnu mung kawathikun
kēmulakēna den- bākit
tēgēse rahsaningwang
sasabana aneng margi
den- bisa sira nakingwang
Nakula amit wotsari

3. wirandhungan solahipun
lampāhe Nakuleng margi
prapteng pakuwon Pandhawa
ngarsane Sri Dwarawati
Bimārjuna Yudistira
Krsna rowangira linggih

4. lawan Campala Sang Prabu
Wirata Sri Narapatī
Satyaki Drstadyumēna
miwah sagung pra dipati
pēpak aneng ngarsanira
Nahaprabu Dwarawati

5. Nakula tur sēmbah matur
merang Prabu Dwarawati
Pukulun lampah kawula
pakuwon Nandraka prapti
saapun kapanggih pun uwa
kawula pamit ngēmadesi

6. Nateng Nandraka Pukulun
mangsit pangreheing sajati
pan uwa Nṛpatī Salya
pamisikpun sayēkti
pan inggih rayi Paduka
pininta mēthuka jurit

7. Yudistira kakang Prabu
angladenana ing benjing
pustaka kalimasada
tinamakēna ing jurit
yeku dadi marganingwang
ngatēr marang ing swarga di

8. mring Aribuwana tengsun
aja liyan kang amushti
sanadyan kalimasada
yen liyan kang ngagēm pasthi
tan tumameng angganingsun
yen kakangira kang musthi

9. tumama ring jajaningsun
nuli muliya den- aglis
tan wurung nagri Ngastina
kakangira kang duwoni
mōkatēn ingkang pitungkas
Nateng Nandraka sayēkti
1. The King of Mandraka said quietly: 'Nakula, my boy, go back now immediately and don't be anxious for it is God's will. Of what has passed between us here,  

2. on your [return] journey kawathikun kāmulakēna. Do this. This means, do not divulge my secret counsel on your way. Make sure of this, my boy.' Nakula took his leave respectfully.

3. Slowly and with great reluctance, Nakula made his way along the road. On arrival at the Pandhawa camp, he came before Krēsna. Bima, Arjuna and Yudistira sat with him,

4. as well as the Kings of Campala and Wirata, Satyaki and Drstadyumēna. All the chieftains crowded together in the presence of his Majesty, the King of Dwarawati,


6. The King of Mandraka, my Lord, advised as to what was the most appropriate course. Indeed, my uncle, King Salya, told me most truly that our elder brother here was whom he requested to meet on the battle field.
7. Yudistira should take up the challenge tomorrow and strike with the Kalimasada pustaka in battle. 'By these means' he said, 'shall I reach a glorious heaven,'

8. the abode of Lord Wisnu. But if the Kalimasada were to be used by another, it would certainly be incapable of wounding me. If your elder brother is holding it,

9. he can plunge it into my breast. So go back now quickly. Without fail, the kingdom of Ngastina will be the domain of your elder brother'. Truly, this was the advice of the King of Mandraka.'

10. Krësna laughed and turned to his younger brother, Yudistira, who cast his eyes downwards with embarrassment as Krësna turned towards him. Bima and Arjuna were delighted, as were the chieftains.

11. There was no cause for concern; the kings now realised that they would win through to victory, None doubted the fact.

The content and sequence of the two kakawin stanzas can be followed in both Modern Javanese versions. Additional elements, common to the kawi miring and the macapat, are the reference to Salya's fate being determined by the Almighty, a frequent Modern Javanese point of emphasis, the enumeration of the main Pandhawa present in the audience scene and Nakula reporting back to Krësna rather than to Yudistira. The latter substitution was consistent with the innumerable additional references to Krësna or Wisnu in the Modern Javanese texts, often in the form of seeking Krësna's approval or noting that he concurred with a decision. While the kawi miring poet was content t...

6 See Chapter 8.2 for detailed analysis of this emphasis.
retain these aspects, the following three devices characteristic of Modern Javanese presentation were not included in the *kawi miring* version.

**REPETITION**

One standard Modern Javanese technique designed to either promote a character or emphasise his exploits was for an event to be retold in the form of a report from an envoy to an assembled gathering, preferably in an audience scene. If the incident had been narrated in this 'messenger reports back' form in the *kakawin*, the second account in the Modern Javanese version took the form of an earlier, present tense situation version as part of the narrative; one example of this technique was the account of the slaughter of the Pandhawa camp in the *Bratayuda* Modern Javanese versions, which was followed by the later report from the envoy.

Perhaps the classic example of this device is to be found in the interpolation section of the *Arjunawijaya kakawin* itself, where the Javanese tradition manuscript contains between cantos 63 and 64, a scene between Arjuna's wife, Citrawati, and the demon, Sukasrana, who convinces the Queen that her husband has been slain and that she should commit ritual suicide. An attendant then related this scene to the King in the *kakawin* proper.

The *kawi miring* poets often chose to retain these second accounts as related in the *macapat* texts; Kršna recounting his unsuccessful negotiations with the King of the Korawa was included in the later

---

7 By OJ 50.10-15, *MAC* 64.7-15 and 65.5-7, *KN* 84.14-85.6, and 85.12-14.

8 Supomo (1977:176 and 327-320) for the text and translation of the interpolation section.
kawi miring text\textsuperscript{9}, thus constituting an addition of the terse kakawin statement:

Then Krśna related how the King of the Korawa was reluctant (\textit{BY OJ 8.18c})\textsuperscript{10}.

In the \textit{Arjunawijaya kakawin}, the report of the death of the Prime Minister, Suwanda, to his distraught master was passed over briefly;

and informed him that all the other kings had been annihilated and that Suwandha had been slain by Dassamukha. (\textit{AWj 57.7})\textsuperscript{11}.

The \textit{macapat} I poet, although committed to rendering only the 'essentials' of the tale, considered that this news should be suitably reported with a full account of the tragedy\textsuperscript{12} and the \textit{kawi miring} poet was happy to incorporate this account into his version\textsuperscript{13}.

Anoman's lengthy recapitulation to Sinta of all that had befallen her husband since her abduction by Rawana is a \textit{macapat} addition on the stock parallel \textit{kakawin} reference:

'as for your husband, he is staying on the mountain of Malyawan.'\textsuperscript{14}

This \textit{macapat} extension was considerably compressed in the \textit{Rama kawi miring} version\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{BY KN 13.10-15, BY MAC 8.25-31.}
\textsuperscript{10} \textit{ngka Kesawajar i wihangnira Hastinendra}.
\textsuperscript{11} Supomo (1977:263).
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{MAC I 24.10-14}.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{KM 49.11-15}.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Sūrat Rama MAC 25.11-44, KN 46.3-18}.
REACTION

The second feature of the macapat version of Salya's advice to Nakula is the inclusion of the reaction of Krēsna and Yudistira. Whereas both the kawi miring and the kakawin round off this episode with a fairly predictable 'Krēsna and Arjuna were pleased', the macapat emphasis is on the personal reaction of the characters and the impact of the message on them individually. Krēsna, the all-knowing, is depicted as laughing (gumuyu) rather than simply smiling contentedly upon confirmation of victory. The further reference to Krēsna turning towards Yudistira as he laughs and Yudistira bending down self-consciously could perhaps be interpreted as Krēsna's anticipation of the highly reserved Yudistira's scruples while Yudistira's embarrassment seems to be a response to Krēsna's amused reaction.

All the Modern Javanese texts consulted were characterised by the poets' attention to minor details of incident, reaction or physical stance. The Serat Kandha, for example, being of almost encyclopedic proportions, was forced to trim many episodes to the bare elements of the story frame but consistently preceded direct speech exchanges with a reference to the obeisance or the attitude of the speaker and qualified the utterance appropriately; boasted, pleaded, quietly, angrily, in tears, with a smile, etc. These small touches, often formal niceties, were obviously an important aspect of Modern Javanese presentation whereas the description of the characters' physical features and clothing, as contained in the kidungs, or the nature descriptions so typical of the kakawins, were not a Modern Javanese stylistic priority.

---

16 See Kumar (1976:356) who noted that the Balinese babad version of the Surapati chronicle contained descriptive elements related to dress that were not in evidence in either the East or West Javanese babads. Dr Kumar notes that this may have been a typically Balinese touch. For examples of this emphasis on physical appearance and detailed descriptions of clothing, see Wangbang Widade stanzas in Robson (1971:pp.87, 95, 139).
On the whole, these macapat nuances were retained in the Bratayuda kawi miring and created in the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring in those passages for which there was no macapat I equivalent. One typical Modern Javanese addition on the OJ Bhāratayuddha passage is Krēsna's leave taking from the Korawa king after the first audience. The kakawin reads:

*sang Krēsna mantuk* (OJ 3.6) (Krēsna withdrew),

but both Modern Javanese texts soften this somewhat brusque departure:

'I will return to the apartments. In the morning, [we] will not act in haste nor be irritable because [we] will be calmer.'

The macapat texts gave the impression that it was important that episodes be tidy, self-contained and that every step of the incident should be suitably recorded whereas the kawi miring text sometimes dispensed with these details and related the core of the episode. An effective Arjuna Sasra macapat extension on the kawi miring narrative is the following two stanza reference (*MAC* II 2.5-7 on *KM* 3.10). The *KM* text reads:

*the great sage, after the birth of his fourth child, fathered no more.*

No further reference was made to Wisrawa. The macapat II text neatens the whole episode with a note that after the death of Wisrawa, he was received into the heavens by the gods. His family all mourned his passing, as did his eldest son, the King of Lokapala who was immediately informed of his death. A further whimsical macapat touch is the extension to the dialogue between Sumali and Wisrawa (*KM* 1.9, *MAC* II, 1.13), which has some of the flavour of the Bratayuda passage cited above.

'Brother, I am nowhere near perfect'. But Sumali insisted. Well, let me tell you all I know, let's just help each other.


18 See text and translation in Part 2 for full context.
my brother, for we are both old men'. The demon king chuckled and then picked up [the book]'.

**QUOTATION.**

The third variation between *kawi miring* and *macapat* presentation is that the *macapat* text contains a quotation from the *kakawin* followed by the Modern Javanese equivalent whereas the *kawi miring* author chose to render the phrase directly into Modern Javanese as part of the narrative. This practice of quotation followed by Modern Javanese interpretation was by no means exclusively a *macapat* idiosyncracy but there are more examples in the *macapat* texts of *kakawin* vocabulary being marked with the word, *tēgose* ('the meaning is'), and subsequently explained while the *kawi miring* poet was more prone to heavier and uninterpreted borrowing. A distinction should therefore be made between borrowing (the incorporation of *kakawin* word choice) and quoting (incorporation followed by extension and paraphrase). Borrowing, as opposed to quotation is, of course, only apparent in a comparative analysis with the base text, the *kakawin*.

Two points now arise; firstly, whether the *kawi miring* preponderance towards unmarked quotation (borrowing) is indicative of the nature and function of the genre, in that the incorporation of Old Javanese vocabulary into the body of the *kawi miring* text ensured that this version would seem 'closer' to the *kakawin*. Secondly, it is necessary to direct some attention to the incidence of quotation and explanation in both genres, an element that has been one of the most considered aspects of *parwa* literature in relation to the Sanskrit original.

---

19 ASB MAC II, 1.14, nanging pun kakang punika yayi, mōɔsih kadung sangōt kikirangan. Sang 'rabu mrōsudi ing reh, inggih sawontēnipun, pan atuntun tuntunan ugi, kewala yayi nata, serehning punika, kapanggih sami wona tuwa. Sang yeksendra gumuŋg mundhut tumuli.
It was not uncommon in both the kawi miring and the macapat for words to be singled out for explanation. The distinction between borrowing and quoting is illustrated in the following example. In *Arjuna Sasra* KN 25.7, the word *sërët* is absorbed into the line,

> *ing buktinira sayékti asërët*, 'reluctant to give food',

while the word was seized upon and extended in the MAC II poem:

> *sërët kang budi, têgësipun nelare buntu tan mënga. pan katutup, budine amungup, kalingan saraksh*

he was indeed *sërët* (tight), this means his disposition was closed, grudging, niggardly, he was mean, shrouded in greed. *(MAC II 20:18-19).*

The manner in which *dwirada matta* (*BY* OJ 13.15), 'an enraged elephant', was taken into both Modern Javanese versions also deserves attention. *BY* KN 25.2 adjusts the *kakawin* phrase to read,

> *bala Korawa gëlarijup pan salin/ pan dirada mëta*

the Korawa changed the formation to the enraged elephant array,

The macapat reads:

> *bala Korawa gëlare salin, gajah bangun angrok. pan dwirada amëta têgëse* *(MAC 17.20).*

Both forms are listed in Gericke and Roorda; the KN *dirada* as kawi (570), *mëta* as *krama*/*ngoko* (496), but the macapat word choice, *dwirada* (570), is listed as Sanskrit. *Matta* is noted as Sanskrit and kawi (496).

The macapat in translation could thus read:

> 'the Korawa changed its battle formation to that of the enraged elephant, which is what *dwirada mëta* means'.

---

20 In addition to the examples noted in Chapter 4.1, p 103, two examples can be cited from the *Sërat Rama*. *SR* 23.6, *ana payung agung kaeksi .... têgëse kang kayon ëmas, kang pinindha payung*. There was an enormous umbrella .... this means a golden tree that was like an umbrella. The KN is fractured at KN 40.1 and reads *wätse* for *têgëse*. *(OJ 8.55 *hana teka payung wwarâ mutyaharny*), *SR* 53.20 *iya sira ingkang minangka bodhi, ya têgëse bodhi panirut*. Indeed, you are a bodhi, which means 'leader. *(OJ 21.131 kita bodhi ri kayu kayu).*
 Longer phrases from the final lines of the Arjunawijaya were incorporated with reasonable success into the kawi miring but were selected for pedantic analysis in the macapat. The macapat II passage below may be compared with ASB KM 61.20-21 in Part 2.

ASB MAC I 51.14-15 (AK'j OJ 73.1a-b).

14. sang awipra juga ya waler i kanang kata caritwa inikyat
   mangkana ta ing têgêse
   sang Yogiswara ñmpu
   wus prasabân denira nganggit
dan Arjunasahasra
   nênggih têgêsipun
   lalakone Sri Arjuna
   rakya rângêng titir
   inujarakân ing

15. tar antuk ri rasika
têgêsipin langkung tan udani
   pakewuh ing carita prayoga

Although this têgêse formula can be partly accounted for by a desire to be precise and clear, there was no reason in fact why the word or expression needed to be borrowed and explained at all, the alternative being to simply render the phrase or concept into a more lucid Modern Javanese idiom. The macapat poet, furthermore, had to bear in mind the guru lagu regulations as he fitted the kakawin phrase into the macapat frame.

The following two examples illustrate that, on the whole, quotation and paraphrase was not simply a stylistic insertion but a tool to employ when sections of the kakawin were seen to be ambiguous.

Lines 1.6c-7b of the Arjunawijaya kakawin clearly presented interpretive problems to the author of the Arjuna Sasra macapat I which were not resolved in either the kawi miring or the second macapat version (MAC I 3.7, KM 6.15-19, MAC II 3.29-32. The KM is presented in Part 2). The Surakarta tradition version of the kakawin passage is as
follows; the edition amendment is included, where required, in brackets.

6c. sambandan ring(nya) pējah / nikang danuja Malawal ring rana
de sang hyang harimurti durba bala/nya kweh mungsir
(musir) patala

7. yeka (n) rakwa tinut/ Dhanesyara haneng/ Lēŋka
pratisthapanggāh
de sang rama n upēd/yati (umidyani) suwung ikang
rajyatisobhandhira

6c. The story goes after the slaying of the demons Mali and Malvawan in battle.
by the god Harimurti, their army was powerless, and [as a
result this defeat] many of them sought refuge in
the nether world.

7. This episode is followed by Dhaneswara being enthroned in
Lēŋka,
because his father had told him that the well-established,
most beautiful kingdom of Lēŋka was now deserted.
(Supomo 1977:182)

All three Modern Javanese renderings are close but in the
KW and MAC II versions, these stanzas have been moved from the sequence
of the kakawin, which was followed by the MAC I poet, and repositioned
in KW canto 6 and MAC II canto 3 as a prediction of Rawana's downfall
before he begins his reign of terror in earnest. As the kawi miring
version is presented in Part 2, the macapat I rendering which is very
similar is quoted below.

MAC I, 3.7c-10d.

7c nanging sinēkca cinatur, benjang amarwasa, ing patine sira sang
yaksaprabu, dēnuja ing Malvawan, dēnuja kusuma luwih

8 buburoni ambék manusya, myang pandhita wus ambék jawata di,
tetela kaping sapuluh, tōṭēp andaniswa, pan punika langkung
kōrsane wong agung,
kathah kathah ingkang murad, tan kōna pinet satunggil

9 ēndi luwih ing kusuma, trahing nata pandhita luwih sayēkti,
prabawā lir jawata gung, asipat binēthara, ana dene
andaniswa liripun, punggawa ambék narendra, narendra ambék
jawata di
10 kang mateni Dasamuka, panjalmane nengghih, sang Wisnumurti, akathah palwago prabu, bala ngêbêki jagat ...

7. But it is foretold that in time to come, the one with the power to slay the demon king will be a dênuja from Malyawan, an exceptional being,

8. an animal with a human nature and a sage with the disposition of a great god.21 It is clear that on the tenth occasion, Daniswara will remain constant. I leave this up to the opinion of more able men. There are many interpretations and it is impossible to choose [just] one.

9. How will he be outstanding? He will be of true, sage-king lineage with the powers of a mighty god and the disposition of a deity. As for Daniswara, this means that warriors will have the nature of kings, and kings, the disposition of the highest deities.

Interpretation of the passage clearly hinged on the word Malyawan, which was seen as relating to Mount Malyawan, where Rama and his monkey band camped before the assault on Ngalênga rather than Malyawan, the demon of the Uttarakândha22. Sêrat Rama 21.34-35 contains very similar passage which can be returned to the kakawin (OJ 7.102-103).

Lord Wisrawana, who reigned as Daniswara, was formerly defeated in battle against Dasamuka. [Wisrawana] was taken into the heavens. All the earth was in flames and quivered before Rawana. But indeed, in time to come [Rawana], will be slain by him, by Ramawijaya, who is destined to kill Dasamuka.23

In the Arjuna Sasra passage, sang rama ('his father' in the kakawin) was thus taken as being a reference to the hero, Rama, which would have been consistent with the kakawin reference to Harimurti (Wisnu). The remaining problem for the poet was how

21 Translation of 8a is tenuous. The line could also be interpreted in a collective sense. 'Animals will have human natures and sages the disposition of great gods.'

22 Supomo (1977:342)

23 34. Bathara Wisrawanoki, kaprabone Daniswara, kasor inguni yudane, kalawan Sri Dasamuka, pinundhut marang swarga, basmi jagad sadaya wus, makotêr ing si Rawana.
35. nanging ta iku sayêkti, besuk sirna dening sira, Ramawijaya pasthine, kang mateni Dasamuka.
to explain *Daniswara*, which was subsequently attempted, using the *tegese* (*lire*) device and an almost apologetic aside to the reader that interpretations were various and that he had best decide for himself\textsuperscript{24}.

A similar formula of quote, explanation and aside to the reader was used in the *Bratayuda MAC* 24.18, with a condensed version in the *kawi miring* equivalent (34.6). The OJ passage (16.5d) describes Krēśna dispatching a horse with the speed of *Indrajala* towards the prince of the Sindhu, Jayadrata.

\[
\text{\textit{dhat\textog{a}ng i har\textog{a}p Jayadrata kadin/drajala haliwat sakeng ripu kabe}}\text{h}25
\]  

(MS Add.12279)

The *macapat* poet was at pains to inform the reader that although the word *Indrajala* could be interpreted in a number of ways, he had chosen the most appropriate explanation within the context of the passage. The *macapat* reads in translation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sindurēja's movements} \\
\text{could have been like an arrow} \\
\text{or could have been like a thief.} \\
\text{The writer leaves it} \\
\text{up to those more qualified [to judge].} \\
\text{It is not possible to ascribe} \\
\text{[just] one meaning to \textit{Indrajala}.}
\end{align*}
\]

It could mean 'eagerly', or be a word for sun and moon, for wind, water or a king or clouds; there are many interpretations of *Indrajala*. the most appropriate was chosen. He darted out without being seen, that was how Sindupati acted.

\textsuperscript{24} The Modern Javanese interpretation of *Daniswara* (Gericke/Roorda: 1901:1/566, the Lord of wealth) is treated in Chapter 8.2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{25} The Javanese tradition interlinear manuscript explains *indrajala* as \textit{andaru}, (falling star, omen).
Halting the narrative to explain a point was not restricted to quotations from the kakawin. In the Arjuna Sasra macapat II, 18.27, dewa kang among, which has no parallel in either the kawi miring or the kakawin, was singled out for explanation. This practice was noted in Cabolek, in the piwulang and in the sixteenth century Islamic text published by Schrieke (1916) and more recently by Drewes (1969).

Examples so far have indicated that words and expressions were singled out for quotation and explanation, mostly in the interests of clarity. It may well be that the macapat genre was seen as the more appropriate format for detailed explanation whereas this device was only employed in the kawi miring when explanation was essential to the narrative. Although the extended use of quotation in both genres in the second half of the Modern Javanese Bratayuda (from canto 30) could have been related to interpretive problems, there were several occasions on which neither the explanation seemed warranted nor the passage particularly relevant. By KN 68.7 (MAC 50.17) is a case in point.

Salya spoke again: 'One would have to keep searching [until] rug tang sala and sat tang jaladi yan, which means until the mountains tumble and the seas run dry.'

'Orrowing from the kakawin (38.7d) on this occasion bore comparison with Zoetmulder's comment (1974:90) in relation to parwa

---

26 See text and translation in Part 2.

27 See Cabolek 8.20 where tyan (heart) was explained within the context of the passage while the word kas (strong, resolute) was seen to be in need of explanation in Wedatama 3.1.

28 KN 68.7 wuwusnya malih Sri Salya'yen kudu met upayane /rug tang sala kalawanta' nenggih sat tang jaladiyan/ tégose gunung jugruga' lan êsata kang sagara/

* The OJ word is acala in the edition.
texts that quotation was often used to enliven the narrative in direct speech passages; Gonda's impression (1932:21) that quotation served as a reference point would probably be a fitting summation of quotation from the Arjunawijaya in the previously cited final stanzas of the Arjuna Sasra MAC II text.

The most blatant use of kakawin passages as reference points was the Rama kawi miring practice of beginning every canto with a quotation from the equivalent Old Javanese point. Canto division in the Rama kawi miring, however, did not coincide with that of the kakawin and this appeared to be one of the few occasions on which the author of the Rama kawi miring returned to the kakawin, being content to follow the sequence and vocabulary of the Sūrat Rama macapat having cited the Old Javanese. 29

Establishing contact points in the kawi miring and macapat texts was more subtly achieved by borrowing, less obvious quotation, by references to the exemplary conduct of kings of the past and by most effective cross referencing to similar instances in other kakawins. 30

6.2 Kawi Miring Extensions and Amendments on the Macapat.

Extensions.

Additions, extensions and larger scale interpolations on earlier material are common features of Modern Javanese writing. The distinction between the methods of extension in the macapat and the kawi miring texts is that the macapat tendency was to include material of the poet's own

29 See Kern (1877:225) and Swellengrebel (1936:14) for comments on a similar parwa technique of beginning new sections with Sanskrit quotations.

30 This aspect will be treated in Chapter 8.1, which is devoted to relationship between the Modern Javanese epics texts.
making, often character expansions or didactic asides, whereas the kawi miring author returned to the kakawin at certain points, borrowed lavishly and inserted stanzas which closely followed the kakawin sequence.

Borrowing from the kakawin in such circumstances could have been explained by the kawi miring poet's attempts to be more strictly in line with the kakawin if the poet had consistently adjusted his macapat-based text to the kakawin, filled in all the omitted description, expanded the battle scenes to kakawin breadth and deleted the macapat character expansions, audience scenes and didactic insertions. However, a general comparative summation of the kawi miring and macapat renderings was that the kawi miring poet was content to adhere to the content selection and presentation chosen for the macapat version and made no major deletions, minor omissions being of the nature of the quotation/explanation, reaction nuances noted in 6.1.

Patterns did emerge in the Bratayuda kawi miring and macapat comparison which were substantiated in the Arjuna Sasra texts. Kawi miring extensions occurred in popular sections of the Bratayuda, sections such as the death of Gatotkacu\(^{31}\), of Karna\(^{32}\), Salya\(^{33}\) and Satyawati\(^{34}\) and sections in the vicinity of suluk. There were also sections where the kawi miring insertions seemed to function as an acknowledgement that kakawin stanzas, often depictions of nature, had not been included in the macapat rendering and a few verses were then added as some concession to this gap in the kakawin narrative. The

31 KN 39.8-11 on MAC 28.1
32 KN 57.22-28 on MAC 44.4
33 KN 74.1 on MAC 55.1
34 KN 74.12 on MAC 56.1
macapat contraction of BY OJ 4.8, (the dispersal of the Korawa chieftains after the first meeting with Krśna) until OJ 6.1 (when Krśna meets with the Korawa to continue the negotiations) is a case in point.35. The macapat text acknowledges that a long and intricate description of moonlight and daybreak in Ngastina had been condensed with a standard, it would be impossible [to describe] the beauty of the inner palace, it would take too long, so [the tale] is condensed.36

The few descriptive stanzas from the kakawin that were retained in the Bratayuda macapat canto were incorporated into a more personal five stanza introduction to Banowati, the wife of the Korawa king, an innovation that the kawi miring poet was content to include. This macapat passage was, in fact, refashioned into a complete kawi miring canto devoted to Banowati (canto 8). Yet the next kawi miring (canto 9) suddenly veers from the macapat and as a token acknowledgement of the omitted kakawin description, includes about a dozen stanzas of the nature of the lines that follow.

BY KM 9.2c-3b (Prawiralalita, 16;8,8). The kakawin vocabulary is underlined.

2c mangkin gumingsir kang latri' lwir ambék ing amēpet sih tanpa noliha miring priya' wintang alih pararas

3. kēnthongning palu apinda' wansiting kakung koragyan anirah sabdaning kang sata' kukuluruk asahuran

The night slowly ebbed away like one parting from a lover. Without a backward glance, stars departed in sympathy.

3. The pounding of the time signal seemed to warn the enraptured lovers, the cry of cocks echoed, crowing, calling to each other ...

35 KM 7.1-9.6, 5.c 5.1-6.3

36 BY MAC 6.2 (c KN 9.8) tangoh langēning jro pura, adawa yen ucapēna, mangkana cinēndhak bao/
Explanatory asides to the reader were a common feature of macapat writing, one notable example being the stock apology in the Sbrat Rama that the beautiful kakawin passages recounting Rama's journey to the mountain hermitage were to be culled from the Modern Javanese versions. SR MAC 1.5! (KN 4.2) cinēndhak kang carita/ 52. langēning alas rēsmining marga, tan cinatur... 'The story is condensed. The magnificence of the woods and the beauty along the route are not described.'

37 This line is minus one syllable in the manuscript.
If it was merely the kawi miring author's intention to expand the text to accommodate some of the more lyrically descriptive Old Javanese passages, one cannot help wondering why the poet did not render the above into the same Modern Javanese literary idiom that he had been content to use in the surrounding stanzas. The style of passages such as the above is so reminiscent of the middle section of the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring text that the question arises once again of interpretive insecurity in sections for which there was no earlier macapat equivalent. It is of some interest that this kawi miring insertion is positioned between the three popular suluk at BY OJ 5.1, 5.2 and 6.1. The examples of suggested aural misconception cited in Chapter 4.4 are found in the kakawin stanza that follows the above example (OJ 6.1 and 2) while the KN wangsiting kakung could have developed from an aural impression of OJ wangsiting atungg (wing) at OJ 5.9.

In other examples of kawi miring augmentation that relied substantially on the kakawin, the later poet appeared to be attempting to interpret a kakawin passage that had either been omitted or unsatisfactorily rendered in the first macapat version. The rendering of Arjuna Sasra KN 16.12-20 in comparison with the MAC I version illustrates this feature.

ASB MAC I, 12.3c-4e Dhandhanggula

3c. pan ingsun iki badhene
ora lawas anusul
iya maring Wisnu di murti
ditya sira lungaa
"ya salah karyamu
"andurjana maring ingwang
Dasamuka mûksa sarwi
marûpekî
arsa nahut sang rëtna

4. Sri Widawati mingkôd
ngundhaki
Dasamuka anut separanya
ing gedhong padupan age
Dasamuka tutpungkur
Widawati wus mati gôni

"For I will
soon join
Wisnu incarnate.
Off with you, demon,
don't act with indiscretion
and insult me with your advances.'
Dasamuka persisted and as he approached,
tried to lay hold of the woman.

Widawati shrunk back and retreated.

Dasamuka gave chase
into the sacrificial pavilion,
following closely behind,
as Widawati perished in the flames.

38 See full text of this canto in Part 2.
The relevant section of the kakawin-based *kawi miring* insertion between MAC 12.3g and 3h is as follows: Underlining marks kakawin borrowing.

12. *eh Dasamuka* sira besuk pen pejah lan sabalanta ditya samya gong galak tumpes sadaya dening bala wanara margane saking ingsun ing patinira

13. *dosanira pan andhustha marang ingsun pininta maring lakiningsun tan paweh armene sira mari pinukul ing prang yen uwus besuk ingsun janma ping kalih*

12. *Ah Dasamuka, in time you will perish, along with your savage demon hand. All will be slain by an army of monkeys and I will be responsible for your downfall.*

13. *Your transgression will be abducting me and refusing my husband's request that I be returned. As a consequence, you will be vanquished and slain at the time of my second reincarnation.*

The *kawi miring* insertion, marked with Old Javanese loan words, fits smoothly into the context of the text, but when compared with the *kakawin*, this version differs and has been interpreted within the context *Wisnu* and *Sri* linking the *Arjuna Sasra* and the *Rama* texts into a continuous narrative and the familiar thread of Dasamuka's lust for *Sri*, the wife of *Wisnu*. The *kakawin* passage is as follows. Underlining marks words common to the *kakawin* and the *kawi miring* and the relevant edition variant readings are included in brackets.

*AMj 12.11 nging sang hyang ma kesawa manto tan nuru (mahā-Keśawa mantwa tan ṣurung) prayogyana mwang bibi ni ngulun rēsūp ndah bhagna moghoki pejah nira n kalih tēkap nikang raksasa samva gōng galak (Sambhu gōng galak)*

12. *dosa ngulun/ hētu nira/ n winēh pati tēcir pininta sira tar (tan) paweh kēdheh (kēdē) margaku mungsir bōta (tapa) bhakti akawitan mwakartha sang hyang Hāri Lakya ri hēlēm*

*It was none other than the great Keśawa who was to be his son-in-law, such was the excellent wish of my father and mother. But their hopes were shattered, for alas! Both my parents were slain by all the savage demons (by the most savage demon, Sambhu).*
12. It was indeed my fault that they were slain, for this demon asked my hand time and again, but they steadfastly refused him. This is why I practice asceticism: to remain faithful to my parents, for I wish, in time to come, to marry the god Harî.³⁹.

What is of interest to the aspect under discussion is that although the kawi miring text is at variance with the kakawin, borrowing indicates how the poet arrived at this interpretation of the passage. Pronounced borrowing in sequence may have been an attempt by the poet to justify his rendering. Certain elements from the kakawin have been retained and applied within a Modern Javanese context; 'my sin' (dosa) became 'your sin'; the demon, Sambhu asks for Widawati's hand and now Raavana makes advances; pājahira (her parents death) became Raavana's death and the kalih qualification before the word 'parents' was applied to Widawati's second reincarnation.

The question remains as to why this passage and passages of a similar nature were omitted from the MAC I text. Were these passages, in fact, in the earlier version but are missing from the extant manuscripts? To recapitulate, kawi miring passages which are additional to the extant Arjuna Sasra and Bratayuda macapat texts are characterised not only by the fact that they follow the kakawin sequence and content more closely but also by heavy borrowing from the kakawin. Furthermore, the Arjuna Sasra MAC I passages examined gave the impression of being abridged yet sufficiently neat and self-contained renderings of an incident, rather than that stanzas of the macapat text had been skipped by a copyist.

Were these passages difficult or regarded as peripheral to the narrative? With all due credit to the SundHRa poet, the Javanese tradition reading samya for Šambhu, the demon of the UttarakaNDa° would

³⁹ Supomo (1977:207)
⁴⁰ Supomo (1977:343)
have severely hampered arrival at an interpretation which corresponded with the *kakawin*. There are also indications that elements in earlier texts may have grown in significance and attained a different emphasis during the course of the re-editing and metrical refashioning. As the chronology and authorship of all of the Modern Javanese texts is difficult to establish, this aspect is hard to measure but one example of note was the marked Wisnu emphasis within a messianic context in the *Arjuna Sasra kawi miring* and *macapat II* texts as compared with the more muted Wisnu tone in the earlier version. 41

**Adjustments.**

The following two examples from the *Bratayuda* are prime examples of the *kawi miring* poet's attempt to adjust rather than to extend the *macapat* text. Both examples are characterised by an amalgamation of elements and by the rather curious aspect of the incident which the poet considered to be worthy of adjustment being a minor narrative deviation in the *macapat* text. It does seem important to note that both examples are related to characterisation of key *Bratayuda* figures, as was the case with the *macapat* portrayal of Salya's treacherous role in Karna's defeat.

In the first example, the sentiments of a fairly stock *sasmita*, *tan nödyka kondur ing prang*, 'he had no intention of retreating from the battle', actually contradict the tenor of the next *kakawin* canto (OJ 43.1), which portrays Suyodana, the King of the Korawa, not merely contemplating retreat but making every effort to effect his escape.

**BY OJ 43.1.**

We tell no further of the death of Salya, the brave hero of the battle field. The troops fled in confusion; hounded, none dared to launch a counter attack.

41 See Chapter 8.
King Suyodana would have retreated but he was taken by surprise and overwhelmed. He was at his wit's end, so abandoned all hope and, with his kinsmen, charged recklessly ahead.

The full macapat text is as follows.

54.15 kunéng palastranira
Mandraka Sang Prabu
Salya ingkang sureng rana
wadya mawur mung kari
Ngastina pati
tan nédya kondur ing prang

55.1 Prabu Suyodana
lan sakadangira
bingung mangseh pupulih
télas budinira
ingkang den- arsa- arsa
mila sami ambék pati
kabeh sarosa

Upon the death of the King of Mandraka, Salya, hero of the battle the troops were in disarray. Only the Korawa King remained with no thought of retreating from the battle. King Suyodana and his kinsmen were in a confused state but launched an attack. They had given up all hope of achieving their goal so they steeled themselves to fight to the bitter end.

The first point of note is that the Modern Javanese texts consistently portrayed Suyodana in a more sympathetic light. The sasmita, 'no thought of retreating from the battle', is therefore in line with the Modern Javanese preference to portray the King of the Korawa as a less malevolent figure. The kawi miring poet was aware of this adjustment and took steps to rectify the macapat innovation. The kawi miring text is as follows: borrowing from the kakawin is underlined.

KY 73.16d-74.1

kunéng patining' Sri Salya sudireng rana

74.1 Sikarini (17; 6,6,5)
ingkang bala larut' bubar binuru ton' wani mapulih

42 BY OJ 43.1. Javanese tradition NS Add.12279.
byatita ri péjah/ naradipati Salya sureng rana
ikang bala larut/ bubar binuru nora wanjapulih
sira ng Prabu Suyodanan muruda sep huvus kambulan
nda tan wring ulahanglugas hurip amuk/ mangantan (swang antén) kabeh

43 The more mellowed treatment of this character is discussed in Chapter 7.2
sira ng Suyodana 'arsa lumayuwa kasep kapengkok
lawan kang para ri' samya lopasakan' warastranira

And so Salya, the brave hero of the battle, was dead.

74.1 The troops fled in disarray, hounded, none dared to launch a counter attack.
Suyodana himself tried to escape but was overtaken and hemmed in with his kinsmen. Together, they released their arrows.

Having established by lavish borrowing and sequencing the kakawin point that Suyodana, given the chance, would have absented himself from the thick of the battle without much hesitation, the kawi miring author returns at 74.2 to the exact sequence of the macapat.

One cannot help but feel that the poet was a little pedantic in his approach to this passage and the passage to follow, bearing in mind that he appeared perfectly willing to accept the macapat extensions and deletions.

The second example falls into this same seemingly over-scrupulous category. Extended references to Salya and his devoted wife, Satyawati attested to their popularity as familiar wayang personages. As the main female characters in the Bratayuda, Sitisundari, Utari, Kunti and Banowati - were all given expanded roles in the Modern Javanese texts by added references and more opportunities for direct speech, the macapat version of Satyawati's more resolute reaction when informed of her husband's death, compared with the kakawin, did not seem an unreasonable variation on the Old Javanese account. A trusted envoy escapes from the thick of the battle to bring word of Salya's death to his wife and to the attendants.

BY NAC 56.1 Asmarandana
sawusnya matur ngẽmawi
otër pakuvon Mandraka
gumuntur rame tangise
santana kawulawarga
Satyawati tan etang
dandan sinjang songçêt
gྲlung

Having reported the news, [the messenger] died. The Mandraka camp was in uproar. and the sound of tremulous weeping arose from the family and kinsmen. Satyawati took no account [of danger]. She donned her kain, tightened her hair knot,
musthi patrem sigra mangkat and grasping a small dagger, immediately set off.

The *kakawin*, however, reads in translation:

Upon hearing the news, the whole court seemed to throb with a terrible weeping. Dewi Satyawati could not speak, but shuddered in pain. She was bewildered, oblivious to those about her, stunned by grief. She fell lifeless in a swoon and did not hear the cries of the attendants and the wailing of the women.

The *kawi miring* poet, who to this point had been working closely with the *macapat* text, again appeared to detect a *macapat* variation and preferred the following version of Satyawati's reaction.

KN 74.11 *Sikarini* (17; 6,6,5). The OJ vocabulary is underlined.

When they heard the news, the Mandraka camp was in total turmoil. Relatives and all the family wept and wailed. Satyawati could not speak, her heart pounded, she was overwhelmed by grief, a terrible anguish, insensible to those about her. Stunned, overcome by emotion, irrational, she fell in a swoon, and did not hear the wailing and lamenting of the attendants.

Although these two *Brataayuda* examples could be explained by a later editor's preference, prompted by a closer scrutiny of the Old Javanese text, to return the *macapat* version to the *kakawin* line, these simple adjustments may reflect both the prerogatives of *macapat* composition and the function of *kawi miring*. The reaction of Satyawati can best be described as a classic example of standard and predictable *kakawin* characterization. In the OJ *Rāmāyaṇa*, for example, we read that Sinta, on being deceived into thinking that her husband, Rama, is dead,  

44 *The Javanese tradition OJ MS reads *iba* for the edition *ina*. Baniba in the KN is related to this corruption.*
'swooned away on the floor of the jewelled aerial chariot. she lay there quietly ...

In the Serat Rama 51.24, Sinta acts similarly:

24. aniba putri Mantili
iya saking wimana rētna
kantaka

25. tan penon rat idhēpira
sasat kunarpa Sang putri.

The Princess of Mantili fell from the golden chariot,
senseless, lifeless, she was like a corpse.

In the Arjunawijaya kakawin, the envoy reports to the king that when his wife heard the news of his death,

'... she fainted: she did not know what to do. The Queen was silent and still.' (AWj 64.2a.)

The reaction was the same in the Arjuna Sasru Modern Javanese versions.

ASB KN 55.9-10.

9. duk miyarsa rētna'Dewi Citrawati
tan penon rat jagat'mung katon sakilan
emēng wibuh ing tyas'gumuling ing siti
aglar kang pra maru'dhomas samya marēk

10. samya nuhun parwāta marang Sang Dewi
Citrawati tumungkul sarwi rawat luh
tan bisa sumahur lajēng musthi patrēm
dadya pra maru sēdaya wruh ing sēmu.

When Citrawati heard, she seemed senseless and confused, dazed and overcome with emotion, writhing on the ground. The eight hundred wives came forward

10. and asked the Queen for news.
Citrawati bent low, weeping, and was unable to answer. Then she reached for a dagger and the court ladies understood.

As neither the Satyawati nor the Suyodana passages would have


46 The Surakarta text with the edition reading in brackets:
yā hētu nirang (nira)/ yanta mar kapati/ tan wring ulaha ru/mēnēng
nareswari (rumēngho nareswara.) The last unit of the edition therefore
was translated as 'did not know what to do on learning your [fate]' (Supomo:1977:272).
presented interpretive problems, the conclusion to be drawn from the above examples is that the macapat poet rejected the kakawin version in favour of an account that was either a personal innovation on the standard reaction or a concession to Modern Javanese theatrical or oral traditions. The latter seems more probable. It was noted in Chapter 4.4 that concessions to oral traditions of kakawin themes were mainly restricted to aspects of characterization rather than extending into new adventure episodes. As the macapat and the kawi miring versions are close, this concession to contemporary characterization was perceptible in both genres.

The two examples above seem to indicate that the kawi miring poet stood in a quandary between the variant depictions of the reaction of popular characters. Gonda's comment (1975c:517) that the kawi miring version of the death of Karna and Salya's role in his demise stood 'halfway between the OJ text and the other Modern Javanese one' is an apt appraisal of these two Bratayuda examples but the question remains as to whether kawi miring evolved and functioned as a 'halfway between' genre. Was it pure chance that the kawi miring poet, who may well have been responsible for the macapat texts, stumbled upon variations from the Old Javanese text that he was now in a position to rectify? Was it the function of kawi miring to adjust the macapat text to the kakawin or is the chronological fact of the kawi miring succeeding the macapat to account for a later author's interpretive or creative extensions and amendments? The Salya/Karna incident which Gonda analysed is unfortunately too extensive and complex to examine outside the Bratayuda context without the inclusion of large sections of kakawin, macapat and kawi miring texts. The episode is characterised by the same inclination to adhere to the Old Javanese sequence and to begin by borrowing from the kakawin, almost as if to provide reference points for those who might care to dispute the Modern Javanese account in a stricter comparison.
with the *kakawin*. Whereas the Old Javanese text gave the impression that Karna was simply plagued by bad luck as he matched himself against Arjuna, both eighteenth century versions include specific references to Salya jerking the reins of the chariot and thwarting Karna's efforts.\(^47\)

There is no eighteenth century definition of *kawi miring* and the poets gave no impression in the opening lines of their poems that they intended to adopt a stricter approach to their renderings of the Old Javanese texts. One control in determining the function of *kawi miring* as opposed to *macapat* in relation to the *kakawin* is the fact of the *Arjuna Sasra KM* being flanked by two *macapat* versions. The *macapat* equivalent of *KM* canto 24–25 which was not rendered in the *macapat* I text reveals that the later *macapat* poet did not incorporate all the *KM* borrowing into his poem but felt at liberty to alter the sequence, omit awkward constructions and concepts and to insert didactic asides.

In performance, the *kawi miring* texts may have given the impression at being more closely related to the *kakawins* but the inclination of the *miring* was distinctively Modern Javanese. Some Modern Javanese variants on the *kakawin* line can be accounted for by the poets' faulty interpretation but there are segments in both the *macapat* and the *kawi miring* texts where conscious selectivity is in evidence, where relevance and a Modern Javanese sense of presentation had priority over the 'correct version'.

6.3 *Suluk* and *Bawa*

In his review of the thirty three *suluk* common to the *te Mechelen* set of six *lakons* (1882, 1884) and the Tjan Tjoe Siem translation of *Kurupati Rabi* (1938), Uhlenbeck (1960:45) suggests that many of the

\(^47\) BY *KM 37.30 kusir/anyendhal tatali*

\BY *MAC 44.10 sarat Nateng Mandraka donira nyendhal tētali*
Suluk that could not be traced to the kakawins may have been derived from the kawi miring texts. Uhlenbeck’s further comment that identification of suluk was not only dependent on a broad knowledge of Modern Javanese literature but also on some measure of chance and good luck can be extended to identification of bawa verses which are often more fragmentary than the suluk texts. Suluk that cannot be traced to either the kakawin or kawi miring texts are usually characterised by a familiarity which prompts an eager return to the presumed source of the passage in a Modern Javanese poem. All too often, the Modern Javanese text consulted contains some element that is in the suluk but rarely the complete four line sêkar agêng verse. These familiar elements are either proper names or stock phrases.

Suluk No.13 in the Uhlenbeck list, for example, (1960:54) contains the names of three Arjuna Sasra characters, Dasawadana (Rawana) Dumraksa and Suwanda, but the suluk could not be returned to any Arjuna Sasra text consulted. Proper names and familiar phrases are often little guide to source48. Suluk No.17 (1960:57) contains the line,

Kya Patih Prahasta mungging rëngganing rata manik jong mabangun jring

the chief minister Prahasta was seated in a bejewelled chariot [complete with] an umbrella in the shape of a jring tree.

The original source of the phrase, jong mabangun jring, is the Bhäratayuddha kakawin 9.6a. Some indication, therefore, of the composite nature of this suluk is the inclusion of Prahasta, Rawana’s Prime Minister, in the same line as the Bratayuda reference.

Tracing suluk is further complicated by the fractured nature of the suluk language. Fragments which can be traced to a kakawin often

48 te Mechelen (1879:97) and Tjan Tjoe Siem (1938:246) both drew attention to this aspect.
contain Modern Javanisms in the form of particles, definite articles etc., one example being lumrang ingkang in the suluk version of the OJ Rāmāyaṇa 16.31 for lumrā pwekang. It is even unclear in some circumstances whether it would be more appropriate to begin the search for the source in Old or Modern Javanese texts 49.

All the suluk in the te Mechemelen lakons bore sūkar agāng metre names and pādhotan markings and there was no impression of a distinction between Old and Modern Javanese language suluk. It is not known when the Modern Javanese fragments came to be included in the suluk repertoire, but as Pigeaud (LIT. vol.I/238) points out, the relationship between suluk and wayang over the period of time from the earliest references in the Arjunawiwāha kakawin until the eighteenth century is far from clear 50.

The function of suluk has been ably discussed by many scholars 51 and it is beyond the scope of this study to examine this aspect in detail. Suluk have been frequently described as magically powerful passages and it is probably no coincidence that a high proportion of suluk were derived from the Bhāratayuddha, the most emotive and sacred of the epic based texts. In one of the lakons consulted, it was noted

49 Probohardjono (1961:3) noted that he was aware that many of his suluk and bawa examples taken from the kakawins were presented in a fractured form but that as the suluk had come to be known in this form, he felt that it was inappropriate to adjust the fragments to Old Javanese orthography.

50 Pigeaud (192:24) draws attention to a reference to panjang in the Tantu Pargiśalaran which he suggests may have been wayang songs derived from the kakawin as opposed to the kidung references which denote indigenous material. Further evidence of the relationship between literature and ceremony or theatre is provided by Hadiwidjaya (1921:89:) in reference to kakawin material as part of the Bōdhaya Kītawang dance ceremony in the Surakarta court.

51 See Kats (1923:99), Tjan Tjoe Siem (1938:241-251) and Brandon (1970:55-61).
that the *suluk* to follow was taken from the *Bratayuda* \(^{52}\) but the main stipulation was that *suluk* be in *sêkar agêng*. The preface lines to the *te* Mechelen *lakon*, *Kartawiyoja*, states that the *pakêm* was complete 'with *sêkar kawi suluk* *(mawi suluk sêkar kawi)*, while the instructions to the *dhalang* in the *lakon*, *Alap-alapan Prêgiwati*, suggest that the *apalan* (recitation) may be of one's own choice as long as it is taken from a *sêkar agêng* text \(^{53}\).

The aural impression created by four lines of *kawi miring* verse, internally divided by the same *pêdhotan* rulings applied to the *kakawin* and pitched in a *slendro* tuned *sêkar agêng* melody \(^{54}\), would have compared favourably with the effect produced by the rendition of a *kakawin* fragment of similar length. The inclusion of *kawi miring* fragments into the *suluk* repertoire deserves closer attention. Pigeaud (LIT.vol.1/238) has suggested that *kawi miring* verses were incorporated into wayang 'besides or instead of Old Javanese couplets'. The main question is whether the inclusion of *kawi miring* was prompted by an attempt to merely expand the *suluk* repertoire or to update the *suluk* choice. If there was some feeling in the eighteenth century Surakarta court that the repertoire was simply in need of augmentation, suitable passages could surely have been selected from the *kakawins* as there is sufficient evidence of interest in Old Javanese literature from the late eighteenth century.

*Lakons* and present day texts on *suluk* and *bawa* that were examined in this study revealed that only a limited number of passages

---

\(^{52}\) *lajêng kendêl ing pathêtan dipun-suluki ada-ada, apalanipun sêrat Bratayuda sêkarini.* (te Mechelen 1879:96). Five of the six to Mechelen *lakons* and the *lakon*, *Kurupati rabi* (1938.6) begin with *Panitisastra* 1.1. See Part 2 for this text.

\(^{53}\) te Mechelen (1879:97)

\(^{54}\) Text books on *suluk* and *wayang purwa* state that *slendro*, traditionally the older tonal system in relation to *pelog*, is the choice for *wayang purwa suluk*. It was rare to find a metre other than *sêkar agêng* quoted as a *wayang purwa suluk* example in these texts.
were in use in wayang and in ceremony. However, as extant pakem only date from the early nineteenth century, some account should be taken of standardization of suluk choice from this period, an attempt at a 'canonization' of traditions that Hazeu (1897:150) suggested was afoot from the eighteenth century.

Besides the suluk contained in lakons and present day collections of sulukan, books devoted more specifically to metrics quoted sekar ageng stanzas complete with laras (diapason) and pathet (tone system) to illustrate particular metres. Occasionally, the source from which the verse was taken was cited but there were innumerable passages for which the source was not stated, even though a verse from the same text may have been quoted previously. This seems to indicate that these verses, chosen to illustrate sekar ageng metres, were not taken directly from a manuscript but may have been separated from the text for some time, known orally and were cited as such as familiar sekar ageng stanzas. The inclusion of laras and pathet indicators with these stanzas designed to illustrate various metres, coupled with variations on the kawi miring manuscripts which could well have been accounted for by aural misjudgement, further indicates that these sekar ageng fragments may have been part of either a theatrical or ceremonial repertoire.

Variation between the quoted fragments and the kawi miring

---

55 Kern (1882:IX) and le Mechelen (1879:97) both noted the small number of known and popular suluk.

56 Ensink (1967:14-16) noted that the Balinese dhalang did not rely on a full text of a lakon but that works such as the Cantakaparwa may have been an aid to his art.

57 Probohardjono's example (1961:41) of Ragapita metre, 16:8,8, with no stated source, is ASB KM 62.1. A Salyarini example (p.45) 17:6,6,5, cited as being from the Sbrat Lokapala is from ASB KM 44.1 while the Banjeransari example (p.47) 19:6,6,7, also cited as being from the Sbrat Lokapala, was in no way similar to any passage in the ASB KM text.
texts was not merely restricted to word substitution but on a number of occasions the kawi miring verse was completely refashioned into another metre. ASB KM 41.1 in Sikarini (17:6,6,5), appeared in a bawa list in a revamped form in Têbu-Sauyon metre (10:5,5,). The two texts are cited below to illustrate how this transformation was achieved.58

One classic example is Probohardjono's selection of the combination of stanzas 1 and 2 of ASB KN canto 6 as a one stanza example of Kudukusuma metre. Kudukusuma (Probohardjono 1961:54) is listed as a twenty-five syllable metre (4,4,5,6,6). The kawi miring manuscripts clearly state at the end of canto 6 that the metre is Sudiradraka, a thirteen syllable metre with padhotan at 5,8. This example points to an aural impression that two short thirteen syllable lines constituted one of twenty six (in this case, twenty five) syllables. This misconception was unlikely to occur in macapat metres, where lines of uneven length and the melodies appropriate to the metre were more familiar, but the error was possible in a continuous canto of even lines. What is of interest is that rather than presenting the fragment as a twenty six syllable example, the present form of the combined verses is in a twenty-five syllable metre. There were probably two stages involved in this transformation, the first, being the combination of the two verses and the second either the scribal but more likely the oral deletion of a syllable from each line. One verse from the kawi miring

---

58 ASB KN sigra parêng nangsah'sagung para ratu sawadyanira parêng têmpuh ing prang'dityambyuk gumrujug'wong Naispati panggah anudhah'iKypatih Suwanda' kang munggeng jaja kadya bumi tangkêb'kalawan akasa'patêmpuh ing prang Bawa T johadisumarto 1958:vol.IV/4). ya ta umangsah'sagung pra raja sawadya bala'sarêng têmpuh prang ditya gumrujug'wong Naispati nangsah atadhah'rir bumi tangkêb
and the adjusted version are cited below:

\begin{verbatim}
ASB KM 6.1
marma Bathara'Girinata anuruti
de wus kinarya liya para dipatya keh
miwah kadangnya bineda sadaya yekti
Bathara Guru'nglairkèn kawasananya 59

Metre example:
marma Sang Hyang‘Girinata anuruti de‘wus kinarya liyan‘
para dipatya keh
miwah kadangnya bineda‘sadaya yekti‘Sang Hyang Guru
nglairkèn kawanira
\end{verbatim}

The table below lists popular suluk which can be returned to either the kakawin or kawi miring texts. Two aspects are immediately apparent: the most common method of selection was to choose the first stanza of a canto but there is little premise for suggesting that first stanzas were more auspicious or significant than those surrounding them. First stanzas, of course, are likely to be the best known in any one canto while stanzas such as BY OJ 10.12 suluk,

\begin{verbatim}
mulat mara Sang Arjunasèmu kamanusan karsèpan,
\end{verbatim}

where Arjuna realises the horrible impasse of his conflict between duty and affection, was probably selected because of the awesome nature of its contents.

The second aspect is that the Bratayuda KM suluk seem to have been selected from the vicinity of a kakawin suluk: this is, of course, presuming that the kakawin fragments had been in the suluk repertoire for some time prior to the selection from the kawi miring text. Only suluk found in the lakons and sulukan collections consulted are included in the table and not the stanzas of sèkar agèng designed to illustrate particular metres which may have been part of the theatrical or ceremonial collection. The equivalent OJ canto and stanza is included in brackets.

---

59 For the full context of this passage, see canto 6 in Part 2.
beside the KM suluk to give some impression of the positioning and selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OJ suluk</th>
<th>KM suluk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rāmāyaṇa</td>
<td>Bawa at KM 73.2 (OJ 15.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.64*</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.31*</td>
<td>19.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāratayuddha</td>
<td>KM 4.1* (end of OJ canto 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1*</td>
<td>KM 6.9 (final stanza of OJ canto 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1*</td>
<td>KM 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2*</td>
<td>KM 14.1 (derived. OJ 9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1*</td>
<td>KM 19.1 (derived. OJ 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KM 43.1* (OJ 20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KM 58.1* (derived. OJ 33.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a macapat suluk at OJ 33.4

Dewa Ruci 5.14* 9.1 and 2* (derived)

ASB Bawa at 41.1

44.1

48.1

The relationship between Old and Modern Javanese suluk is more pronounced in the Bratayuda fragments. If the kakawin verses were

---

60 Suluk marked with an asterisk are quoted in Uhlenbeck (1960).
61 Uhlenbeck (p.61) notes as Bratayuda jarwa 3.1.
62 Noted (p.64) as Bratayuda jarwa 13.1 and 2.
63 Noted (p.58) Bratayuda jarwa 31, end 19 and beginning of 20.
64 Noted (p.66) Bratayuda jarwa 45.1.
established wayang purwa suluk, these stanzas would have been familiar to both the poets responsible for the Modern Javanese renderings and courtiers and pujangga who studied the kakawins. It has already been shown that stanzas in the vicinity of suluk were subjected to closer scrutiny in the course of the rendering of the Bratayuda KM and that borrowing was marked in these passages. Perhaps those responsible for expanding the suluk repertoire considered that the most appropriate position in the text from which to choose new suluk was in the neighbourhood of known suluk. The choice, however, was from the kawi miring rather than from the kakawin, a choice which may have been influenced by a desire for clarity and relevance and an awareness that the strict application of podhotan upon the Old Javanese texts frequently fractured the sense units and broke words.

The selection of BY KM 4.1 in relation to the kakawin suluk at the equivalent point, OJ 2.1, is a case in point. Both suluk are noted in the lakons as being in Sikarini, (17;6,6,5).

The kakawin.

 долгом гати никар амани сва-saba- saba/ никар Astina samantara токенг/ тэгаль Kuru narar/ya Krësna laku sireng Parasu Ra'ma Kanwa Janaka/ дур Nerada kapanggih irikang/ тэгаль милу ing kar/ya Seng Bupati.

The attempt to recite the kakawin passage according to these rulings resulted in awkward and most obvious cuts in the words ra'ma, narar/ya and kar/ya. The kawi miring suluk at KM 4.1 is as follows:

lëla»w gumanghul' ring pang këbet-këbet'lwir milu susah ywan bisa muvus'pagene Pandhawa'tan ana tumut pribadi aminta'prajanta sapalih'sëkar ing tanjung rurah anggëiasah'läsah kadya susah'ngesah kapisah

A bat dangled from a branch, flapping its wings as if in sympathy and seemed to be saying, 'why did the Pandhawa not come in person to make a request for half of the kingdom? Tanjung blooms fell and lay scattered about withered, as if grieving, moaning, deserted.
The sense units as determined by the 6,6,5 divisions exhibit a greater degree of independence while enjambment between lines is only slight. There is some evidence, for example, of enjambment at the end of the second line but then only in terms of the total sense of the unit. The alliteration in the last line also makes for an effective aesthetic impression in performance.

This *kawi miring* passage was a popular *suluk*, being used on a number of occasions in all the seven *lakons* consulted and was quoted in a number of *sulukan* and metrical texts\(^6\). The *macapat* equivalent is the first line of canto 3 in *Pangkur* metre.

*Lêlawa gumandhul ing pang*, 'a bat dangled from a branch', Cohen Stuart (1860:18-19) was of the opinion that the *Bratayuda macapat* predated the *kawi miring* text and *gumandhul* (dangle) in the *macapat* does have a parallel in the word *agantungan* (to hang) in the *kakawin* descriptive stanza (1.12c) at the OJ equivalent point.

*lampus tanjung ikangênés layat agantungan i panawunging jaring-jaring*.

It was therefore of some interest to find that the opening lines of canto 2.1 of the *Sêrat Rama*, similarly cast in *Pangkur*, began, *gumandhul ana ing pang*, the 'dangler' in this case being a demon rather than a bat.

Chronology complicates the issue and re-editing of the Modern Javanese texts must be borne in mind. If this line was already familiar from the *suluk* rendering, there may have been a certain popular appeal in the incorporation of the line into the *Sêrat Rama*. The author of the *Lêlawa gumandhul* line, satisfied with the effect achieved by the first rendering, may have decided to begin the *Sêrat Rama* stanza in

\[^6\] For example, in Mangkunégara IV (1898:364)
a similar fashion. This technique would have been quite effective as the atmosphere would have been instantly 'evoked' if the listener was familiar with the sentiments of the Bratayuda descriptive passage where the same phrase was used.

Both Kern (1882:1x) and te Mechelen (1879:97) admitted that there were a number of suluk that could not be traced but were also of the opinion that many suluk were of the dhalang's own invention. Unknown source suluk were not as popular as those whose provenance could be established. In these fragments, the dhalang drew on stock phrases, proper names and, perhaps like the jong mabangun jring example cited above, expressions that had caught the imagination of the poets and were singled out for explanation. Two untraceable suluk are quoted below:

Wisalyarini 21:7,7
enjing nembang tengara’ sanguning pra Korawa’ samapta busana bra pindha surya wijil’ mungup pucak aldaka’ awra arsa madhangi umyang sru swardaning kango’ tötëg kenndhang gong beril’lir bëlah bumi kambah ri sang anindyamantri’ len arya Dursasana’ ingkang mangka manggala

At dawn, the signal was sounded. All the Korawa were at the ready, resembling the emerging sun peeping over the top of the mountain, spreading its rays.
The tremulous din of blocks, drums, gongs and cymbals seemed to cleave the ground as they passed over it.
The chief minister and Dursasana lead the way.

enjing nembang tengara’ gumuruh pra raksasa’ sadaya
asamapta
abra busaneng wadya’ samya sikëp badhama’ waneh dhandha candrasa bandera warna-warna’ tötëg gong beri gubar’ gurnang puksur thongthonggrit
kya patih Prahasta’ munanging rëngganing rata’ manik jong mabangun jring

At dawn, the signal was sounded. The demons howled, all at the ready.
Their attire was splendishly bright, all wielded knives, some had clubs and swords.

66 This suluk was used three times in the te Mechelen lakon set and was cited in Uhlenbeck (1960:64).
67 Uhlenbeck, (1960:57)
The banners were multicoloured; blocks, gongs and symbols sounded,
puksur and thongthonggrit clanged.

The chief Minister Prahasta, was seated in a bejewelled chariot
[complete with] an umbrella in the shape of a jring tree.

This standard description would have been part of the dhalang's
stock-in-trade repertoire but the tenor of both suluk bore strong resemblance
to the opening lines of a number of Old and Modern Javanese Bhāratayuddha
cantos.68

Bawa.

Bawa are the vocal introductions to gāndhing, (music for
gamelan ensemble) and are usually in sākar ageng although macapat bawa are
possible.69

Kunst (1973:311) stated that an instrumental introduction was
an alternative to the vocal bawa and that these instrumental fragments
were usually shorter than the four line sākar ageng verses. Some bawa
were more fragmentary, perhaps in imitation of their instrumental
alternatives and there was an impression that many of these shorter
bawa passages were contrived rather than that they were part of a
larger text.70

68 Some examples are BY 0J 9.1 ry angkat Sang Pandawenjing saka ri
kuthanikan rajaydhani Sirata

26.1 rahina tatas kumantyan umuni ng mrodanga kala sangha ghūṛṅitātara

40.1 mangkat āri Salya mungwing ratha hawus arasuk
bhūṣanānekawarna

69 Mangkunegara IV (1898:336) quotes an example of a bawa in Kinanthi.
Dea (1980:77) states that some bawa were written in macapat and
tōngahan and provides one example in Dhandhanggula metre (p.248-9).

70 As was the case with the Dhandhanggula bawa cited by Dea, which
stated that it was a bawa to a particular gāndhing.
Kunst (1973:311) also noted that the last line of a four line verse was often adjusted so as to merge smoothly with the sentiments of the gendhing that followed. One adjusted ASB KM passage (56.7) was quoted, without source, by Probohardjono (1961:45) as being an example of H&smubrngta metre (17;6,6,5). The Arjuna Sasra stanza is in Bangsapatra (17;4,6,7).

Kunst (1973:311) also noted that the last line of a four line verse was often adjusted so as to merge smoothly with the sentiments of the gendhing that followed. One adjusted ASB KM passage (56.7) was quoted, without source, by Probohardjono (1961:45) as being an example of H&smubrngta metre (17;6,6,5). The Arjuna Sasra stanza is in Bangsapatra (17;4,6,7).

ASB KM 56.7.

mirah langeningsun Citrawati teka kendel kewala
paran dosa' dasiara yayi'sirang gung aduduka
adangu Sang Prabu Naispati' solah karagan-ragan
kuneng para ratu sampun prapta'sakdyanya sadaya

'My dear one, Citrawati, why do you lie so still? What have I done wrong, dear, for you to be so angry?'
For a long time, the King was sad and melancholic.
But then the [tributary] kings arrived, with their troops.

In the Probohardjono version of this stanza, the last line has been altered to

rangrangu langleng karung-rungan mangu-mangu mangun kung,

thus replacing the KM final line version which leads into a new episode (the arrival of the tributary kings), with a line of alliteration which realises the sense of the verse to one aspect.

The verse has therefore been refashioned into a more flexible stanza which could easily function as a bawa text.

Shorter metres ranging from nine to sixteen syllables were preferred in the bawa examples examined; by far the most popular preference was for a twelve syllable bawa while sixteen was also a favoured metre, choices that were consistent with the impression noted in Chapter 2.3, that metres based on eight and twelve syllables were the common choice for ceremonial usage. Bawa texts were chosen from

71 Of the nine bawa metres quoted by Kunst (1973:312), three are in twelve syllables, (one in twenty four, which could have been a double twelve combination), three are in sixteen syllables and one, seventeen. Dea (1980:78) notes that most examples are framed in metres ranging from twelve to seventeen syllables.
twelve syllable kawi miring cantos, ASB KN 16.1 (in Part 2) being one example. *Rama KM* 29.4, also a twelve syllable example, was cited by Tedjohadisumarta (1958:8) as a bawa text although the kawi miring version is in *Kusumawicitra* (12:6,6) and the bawa example is noted as being in *Nadurëtna* (12:5,7)\(^{72}\). Another eleven syllable bawa text was clearly based on *Rama KM* 73.2, both stanzas being in eleven syllables\(^{73}\). It was of interest to note that several common bawa texts were longer length kawi miring stanzas, refashioned into shorter syllable metres, *ASB KN* 41.1, in seventeen syllables, *Sikarini*(6,6,5) has already been cited above as being the basis of a ten syllable bawa text. *Dewa Ruci KM* 3.1, in *Wisulvarini* (21;7,7,7), was reshaped into a twelve syllable bawa text\(^{74}\), while *BY KN* 29.1 (*Sudiradra* 13;5,8) was subjected to the same treatment and moulded into a twelve syllable bawa.\(^{75}\)

---

72 Probohardjono (1963:18)
*Rama KN* 29.4, kagagas ing driya' Ramawijaya ngling
dhuh ari Laksmana'iku talaga sri
uning kang brëmarumempër tangise
ari Nantili nyang'kukila sahuran.
Rama mused, then he spoke: 'O my brother Laksmana, the beauty of the lake and the sound of the bees can be likened to the Princess of Mantili in tears, while the kukila calling ...

73 Tedjohadisumarta (1958:5)
angling Sang Hyang'Baruna mina jiwa
tustambëk Sang' Ragapatra sinëmbah. The KM reads;
unëng atur'Hyang Baruna angrëpa
tusta Sang Ramawijaya sinëmbah.
So spoke Lord Baruna, pleading.
Rama was moved, as [Baruna] knelt before him.

74 Probohardjono (1963:9).
*DR KN* 3.1 kunëng kang samva suka'wau ta kawuwusa' lampahira
Sang Sena. The bawa reads:
kunëng ingkang samva'suka kawuwusa
lampahira Sena'ajëng sampun ngambah
And so all were pleased. Now let us tell of Sena's journey.

75 *BY KN* 29.1 (13.5,8) nahan wau ta'satriya Andananjaya
lawan Narendra'Krësna kang among rikang prang.
Bawa. *Candraawilasita*, 12;4.8 (Tedjohadisumarta 1958:10)
nahan sirë'satriya Andananjaya
Ian Narendra'Krësna kang among rikang prang.
And so the noble Arjuna and Krësna who were engaged in battle.
This passage is presented in part 2.
If the majority of unknown origin suluk and bawa were the invention of the individual dhalang, these short sèkar agèng passages were more likely to have been composed orally and perhaps spontaneously, but most importantly, with recitation and performance in mind. Untraceable suluk exhibited a degree of technical skill in the manipulation of sense within pèdhutan limits. Recordings of recitations of selected stanzas designed to illustrate the particular metres revealed that the singer did attempt to synchronise breath with the pèdhutan division for that metre, even though the divisions for a metre such as Sudiradraka (13:5,8), necessitated a less florid melodic line for the last segment of that line.

The neat sense units in these untraced suluk are perhaps evidence that composition revolving around pèdhutan in kawi miring texts cannot be considered as a makeshift compensation for the rules of quantity, which may have been apparent on the pages of the manuscript but had no application at a performance level.

76 One example of a fragment in sèkar agèng Gandakusuma metre, contained in a text entitled Punika Kagungan dalèm Sèrat Buk Pasindhen (1866) is some evidence that composition in sèkar agèng was not restricted to epic material. Selections from the stanza include: siyaganeng alun`lamun amiranti`prajurit kumpuni`jajari ing kanan ... prabupati Jawi lan wadana distrik ...
7. STRUCTURAL DETERMINANTS AND POINTS OF EMPHASIS IN MODERN JAVANESE POETRY

7.1. Structural Variation

This chapter seeks to examine the presentation of material, once interpreted, within a Modern Javanese structural framework and to suggest some factors which could have governed the choice of material to be presented in the poem and shaped the arrangement of that material. Patterns which surfaced during a preliminary and partial comparative analysis of the Sīrat Rama and the Rāmāyana kakawin were substantiated in a more detailed review of a wider range of Old and Modern Javanese texts.\(^1\) It is important to note that these structural patterns were apparent in the Sūdustra Lokapala and sections of the Sīrat Kandha consulted while ethical and philosophical elements selected for emphasis and expansion in the Yasadipura texts permeated works of a more strictly didactic nature, the pāwulangan, Wedatama by Mangkunegara IV and Wulang Roh by Paku Buwana IV being notable examples. In all probability, common structural and emphatic elements would be apparent in the Yasadipura works based on Islamic sources, the Sīrat Menak and the Sīrat Ambiya, but an extension into this material was regrettably beyond the scope of this study.

The interplay between structure and emphasis in the Modern Javanese texts is considerable - an important binding agent being the marked stress upon characterization in the Yasadipura poems. The Modern Javanese sense of the most appropriate arrangement of an episode may have necessitated the inclusion of various major or minor characters

---

\(^1\) McDonald (1979). This thesis was presented as partial requirements towards an Honours Degree at the Australian National University. The obvious shortcoming of the study was that only edited material could be used rather than manuscripts. The same patterns emerged in the present study where a wider range of texts and Javanese tradition manuscripts were available for consultation.
around which details of the narrative could be woven. Similarly, a point of ethics or etiquette could be successfully treated via the medium of characterization as the character's reaction or his consideration of a matter through direct speech, either in soliloquy or in discourse with a companion, was an effective tool in the circumstances.

Structural deviations between the Old and Modern Javanese versions may be partially accounted for by the *kakawin* poets' adherence to the episode/mood prescriptions for *kakawin* genre whereas there is no indication in any of the guides to Modern Javanese composition that the Indian based *kavya* rulings were borne in mind in either the *macapat* or *sêkar agêng* poems. Leaving aside the aspect of whether the eighteenth century poet was even aware of the *kakawin* regulations concerning content and balance, he probably felt he was under no onus to include passages of pure description which were not essential to the narrative and the omission of certain lyrical *kakawin* passages in the Modern Javanese texts may perhaps be attributed to this point of approach to presentation. It must be remembered that these passages of designed and subjective lyricism were more often than not the most difficult segments in the *kakawins* and the decision not to include these verses in the Modern Javanese poems may have been partly due to the fact that the poet simply could not understand this section of the text.

When faced with interpretative difficulties in these descriptive cantos, the eighteenth century poets resorted to either omitting or contracting the passage or to heavy, unexplained borrowing from the *kakawin*. In *ASB KM 15*, the whole of OJ canto 11 devoted to Widawati's physical charms has been condensed to one stanza which contains elements of the narrative.² Similarly, the MJ *Bratayuda* trims the poetically

²*AWJ* 11.1-4, *ASB KM 15.3*.
intricate leave-taking between Sitisundari and her pregnant co-wife, Utari, to Modern Javanese proportions, the emphasis being on an explanation that Utari, being pregnant may not sacrifice herself to her husband, Abimanyu. The Modern Javanese text by way of compensation includes a reference to Sitisundari respectfully obtaining her parent's permission before she commits bela. (OJ 15.5-19, KM 31.9, AC 22.18).

Descriptive passages in the kakawins constructed around metaphor, simile and allegory often presented the Modern Javanese poet with interpretive problems. Whether for balance or interpretive expediency, strings of OJ metaphors were frequently broken up in the MJ equivalent passages while it became clear that familiar and somewhat stock allegory could be accommodated within the Modern Javanese text. Occasionally, key elements of the allegory were taken into the Modern Javanese text in a different context; the poison allegory in OJ 30.4, relating to the power of the priests, was interpreted as the poison in man's heart which causes him to withdraw his support for the clergy (KM 25.8, MAC II 20.6). Although this interpretation may be traced back to a cacographic error, the MJ texts make ample reference to tainted, poisoned dispositions, those contained in Panitisastra being prime examples. 3

The Modern Javanese poet differed in his approach to battle scene imagery as opposed to the depictions of nature. Although battle scenes provided the Old Javanese poet with ample poetic scope, the Modern Javanese poet appeared to be less confused by this imagery and there was an impression of allowing himself a free hand with the structuring of those episodes. The most notable examples of compression of battle imagery were found in the Modern Javanese versions of the battle scenes. 4

See text notes to canto 25 in Part 2.

See text in Part 2.
Namaya and the Bhgavatayuddha, the Saktar Rama contraction of the protracted Kakawin description of the slaying of an elephant being one example (SR 49.1-7, OJ 20.113-131).

There was a sense of ongoing narrative in the Modern Javanese parallel battle scene segments - incident was recorded but allegorical and lyrically descriptive detail was compressed. Whereas balance and pause in these Kakawin segments were achieved by passages of battle imagery designed to enhance the pathos and horror of the situation, balance and pause in the Modern Javanese texts frequently took the form of a discourse on duty, the extension in ASB KM 46 being a good example (See Part 2). Balance that is the proportioning of narrative, description and didacticism was achieved by different means in the Old and Modern Javanese poems. While Kaya episode prescriptions ensured that some balance was struck between cantos in the Old Javanese texts, the eighteenth century poets were more intent on creating a balance within the canto itself. The Modern Javanese canto was generally constructed around fairly calculated proportions of narrative, direct speech and description and it is suggested that the interplay between theatrical and literary forms was as significant a structural determinant in Modern Javanese poetry as the more clearly defined guidelines for Kakawin composition.

Parallels between Lakon structure and the frame of several Kakawins have already been drawn by van Stein Callenfels (1925:170), Poerbatjaraka (1926:4) and Soewito-Santoso (1975:17-28). The suggestion that Modern Javanese narrative was influenced by theatrical and oral elements does not imply that Lakon structure was imposed upon the literary form. The structural parallels between episodes presented through either a theatrical or a literary medium are probably the result of a tradition of interaction between these two art forms (Layang/wayang), a strengthening of links that were perceptible in
kakawin structure but which became more closely integrated with the shift towards Modern Javanese as the literary idiom and the abandonment of the kāyā-based rulings.

The impact of the theatrical upon Modern Javanese literary structure therefore accounts for sequential differences, contractions, omissions and additions, the end product being a greater episodical sense in the Modern Javanese poems than was apparent in the kakawin. Cantos 29 and 30 of the Bratayuda kawi miring, in comparison with the kakawin, illustrate this aspect. In addition to extended direct speech passages and a more complete retelling of the death of Arjuna's son, Abimanyu, the major variation is the shift to the Korawa camp (KM 29.15-20 on OJ 14.12d-13a) to include an account of the grief of the Korawa King and Queen on the death of the crown prince, Laksmanakumara. All characters included are enumerated while the dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna concerning the best course of action for the next day has been contained to one canto (30), thus highlighting the expanded role of Wisnu in the Modern Javanese versions.

The expansion of an incident into a self contained episode is apparent even in the Panitisastra text which could be best described as a solid stream of maxims. In Paniti KM 3.6, the kakawin reference (1.10) to the lion and the forest prompted the poet to introduce some variety into the text with the inclusion of direct speech between the two characters. The reference to the snake and the garuda in KM 3.9 (OJ 1.11) has similarly been expanded into a direct speech exchange which effectively breaks the monotony of the heavy didactic tone.

The Modern Javanese preponderance to describe every step of

---

5See text in Part 2.
6This aspect is examined in Chapter 8.
7See text and translation in Part 2.
the action may be a reflection of the visual dimensions of theatre. Modern Javanese poets, particularly the macapat, were careful to note the characters' physical movements; in addition to their entrances and exits from a scene, finer points of movement and response were recorded, for example, whether a character was sitting, standing, moving closer or backing to the rear. These references were occasionally included in a rather stock manner, a feature which could also have some parallels in the mechanics of oral literature. The strong sense of scene setting is perhaps typified in the greater use of anticipation and strategically placed cross and back referencing. In ASB KM 15.6-8, the additional three stanza reference to Arjuna Sasra serves very much the same purpose as the Sêrat Rama 1.1-13 passages devoted to Rawana and his demon family which was to introduce the characters and a little balance between kingdoms before these equally important characters come into their own later in the text.

The audience scene, with opportunities for characters to state their prudent considerations on a wide range of matters through the medium of direct speech, was an essential element in Modern Javanese narrative, the meeting between Sumali and Wisrawa being an typical example of a Modern Javanese addition on the kakawin (KM 1-2). The audience scene between Arjuna Sasra and the god Pulasta in ASB KM 58.1-6 contains some of the best examples of Modern Javanese presentation. As an introduction to this important scene where Rawana's fate is decided, reference is made to the genealogy of the sage Pulasta, the startled reaction of the court ladies who witness his arrival, the King's greeting and the sage nervously darting about, glancing furtively at his grandson Rawana who is sprawled on the ground, surrounded by guards. When all the characters involved have been suitably introduced, the

---

8In Part 2. The equivalent OJ Section is 67.8.
Modern Javanese poet is then content to return to the sequence of the *kakawin*.

### 7.2 Characterization

In his appraisal of the Yasadipura *Bratayuda* version based on the *kakawin*, Poerbatjaraka (1964: 132-34) listed a number of examples designed to illustrate how the Surakarta poets frequently 'groped' for the meaning but missed the Old Javanese point. It is of some interest that the majority of Poerbatjaraka's examples are related to the emergence of a name and a character from the interpretation of the *kakawin*. Although Poerbatjaraka was perfectly justified in his observation that the Yasadipuras had interpreted the text in a manner which differed from later translators and editors, these errors may be of more value in relation to the Modern Javanese approach to the renderings than as further evidence of the pujanggas' incompetence.

Some consideration should therefore be directed to the ease with which the eighteenth century poet perceived and created a character from a line of Old Javanese poetry and the function of characterization in the Modern Javanese texts. 9

It is of some note that Kats (1912: 231) produced similar examples in his comparative analysis of canto 4 of the *Wiwaha Jarwa* and the *Arjunawisāha kakawin* but adopted a sympathetic approach to the eighteenth century renderings by suggesting that these versions provided some insights into Modern Javanese composition. The Javanese

---

9 There were several examples throughout the *BY, ASB* and *Rama* texts where two characters were perceived as one and given an expanded role in the MJ versions; Sarabasata (*BYKM 37.4, MAC 26.13*) from OJ 17.5, Sarabha and Satacandra who with a third, Gajaka, launch an attack (*troyānunγga-nunγgal*). In the *SR*, Kara and Dusana become Karadusana (*OJ 5.6 si Kara si Dusana* and *4.58 Kara len si Dusana*). See also Kats (1923: 213) for the *takon Tundungan true Gandhūng* where Sarpakanaka is listed as the first wife of Karadusana.
preponderance to extended characterization is evident from the earliest written literary efforts. Whereas the Indian kavya poets allowed their personalities to degenerate into anonymous stereotypical figures, the Javanese kawi preferred to name their characters and to provide them with a wife or son through which their personal strengths and weaknesses could be reflected.

The emphasis upon characterization in the Modern Javanese texts may again be attributed to the tradition of interaction between wayang/theatrical forms and written literature. In wayang kulit in particular, the characters are the cornerstone of the medium and its effectiveness depends upon immediate visual identification of a character and hence the anticipated reaction to a situation or another character. Although the major characters are included in the pakem for a given Lakon, te Mechelen (1879:98) noted that an experienced dalang should be able to invent names on the spur of the moment for minor characters, particularly in the rapid succession of boasts, brags and challenges in the lively combat scenes. The enumeration of all the characters present in audience scenes in the Modern Javanese texts perhaps reflects the dalang's spontaneity.

The wide variety of characters in wayang certainly allowed for personal identification on the part of the audience but the Modern

---

10 See Ingalls (1965:24) who comments that kavya characters tended to lose their identity as the genre developed.

11 The Rāmāyana character, Trijata, the faithful demon attendant to Sinta and daughter of Wibisana, is mentioned in only a few stanzas in the Bhāttikkavya (Hooykaas 1955:62). She appears on twenty two occasions in the kakawin. Supomo (1977:36) noted the extension to Arjuna Sasra's character in the form of a noble patih and a faithful wife in the kakawin as compared with the OJ Uttarākāmā. See Zoetmulder (1974:282) for references to character extensions of female personalities in the BY OJ, including the creation of Satyawati, the wife of Salya.

12 See Anderson (1965:7) who discusses the wide range of characters within wayang.
Javanese characters cannot be viewed merely as character types whose every response was predictable and constant. Characters who were, in a sense, the personification of good, evil, loyalty and deceit were obviously singled out to effect a moral point in the Modern Javanese texts but prominent characters often lapsed from their roles. When it is remembered that many of these personages had superhuman or divine attributes, their momentary lapses and manifestation of very human frailties tended to balance the supernatural and the extraordinary of the Old Javanese epics and to reinforce the practical and instructional tenor of the Modern Javanese poems. When a character's indiscretion was noted by another, be he father, brother, god or king, the advice was readily accepted and the fault immediately rectified. The p过渡文字语 texts and the Serat Rama contain references to the effect that a caution from an older and well meaning person must never be ignored.

As loyalty was the most valued of virtues in the Modern Javanese texts, it is not surprising that the roles and the personalities of chief ministers were extended by a variety of means in these renderings; Suwanda, one of the three characters of the Tripama and referred to in the Yasadipura Wisara Keras, is a prime example. He appears in the MJ version of the Arjunawijaya at an earlier point in the narrative which immediately follows the introductory reference to Arjuna's Queen. The three stanza passage devoted to him stresses that the troops frequently confused him for his master and that the only distinguishing feature was the King's tiwikrama ability. Arjuna Sasra is distressed when his patih is killed and tells the god, Narada, that he is only fighting Rawana to avenge his death. Revenge similarly prompts Danapati into action when his patih is killed. One small Modern Javanese insertion

13 ASB KM 21.7-9, MAC II 13.18 on OJ 21.
14 ASB KM 50.11, MAC II 39.4 on OJ 59.1.
15 ASB KM 12.1, MAC II 6.15 on OJ 7.7.
is that Citrawati is tricked into killing herself when the demon tells her that the king died committing bela to Suwanda's memory.\textsuperscript{16}

The demon Sukasarana is one of the lower echelon examples of loyalty as opposed to the faithful demon Prime Minister, Prahasta, who remonstrates more often and strongly with his nephew, Rawana, in the Modern Javanese text but is noted as standing close to Rawana as his fate is decided by Arjuna Sasra. Sukasarana's character was developed in wayang to the point where he became the well-meaning but ugly brother of Suwanda. Character dimensions are most apparent in this wayang story where the ever noble patih of the Arjuna Sasra text is ashamed of his demon brother and in an attempt to scare him away, accidently kills him.\textsuperscript{17}

Although deceitful and responsible for havoc in the Sërat Rama and the Arjuna Sasra texts, Sukasarana's redeeming quality is his loyalty, albeit misdirected. One noted variation in the Arjuna Sasra versions is Citrawati's plea to her husband to spare the demon who was only doing his duty on his master's behalf. The kakawin plea is on the basis that the Queen may have committed some sin in a former life.\textsuperscript{18} In a similar example, also additional to the kakawin, Krësna prescribes terrible punishments for Asvatama and Krtawarma who were the perpetrators of the massacre of the sleeping Pandhawa camp yet pardons Krpa who took part

\textsuperscript{16} ASB KM 56.12, MAC II 46.10 on OJ 64.1.
\textsuperscript{17} See Kats (1923:194) for reference to the Lakon Arjuna Sasra jumënëng nata. Also a summary of this story in Boedihardja (1935:68-69).
\textsuperscript{18} ASB KM 57.17-18 pun Sukasrama' punika apan ditya lit/sayktri amrith' kandële gemnya swita' pinarcaqaya' antuka sihing gustinya.18.mila ngupaya' kiwul mirth luhuring gusti.
'This Sukasarana is an insignificant demon. His attempt to gain [my] trust was, in fact, his way of serving [his Lord]. If he won his master's trust, he would have won his favour. He therefore sought revenge to add to his Lord's glory.'
but was merely following his kinsmen. 19

Perhaps the most notable example of a grey area of a character's personality is the more mellowed treatment of Suyodana, the King of the Korawa, in the Modern Javanese texts. Suyodana emerges as a pathetic rather than a malevolent figure in these versions. The more sympathetic handling of Suyodana could have been either due to the poet's personal fondness for a character or a concession to popular estimation. Poerbatjaraka (1932b:767) has suggested that personal preference prompted the author of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin to take liberties with the role of Salya in Karna's death but a nineteenth century dhālang's explanation of the name Suyodana as suyud para korawa, (the Korawa were devoted) and dana, (the King of the Korawa gave generously), indicates that in wayang circles, the Korawa King was not painted quite as darkly as he was in the older versions. 20

Reference was made in Chapter 6.2 to the maacapat adjustment of a sasmita which enabled Suyodana to stand and fight instead of retreating in panic with his men as he does in the kakawin. On three other occasions in the MJ versions, Suyodana is depicted as remaining on the battlefield while in the Old Javanese text, he runs with the troops. 21 A kakawin reference to his angry rejection of Bhima's advice is missing in the MJ texts, (OJ 13.11 KM 24, MAC 17.). The MJ texts paint a pitiful portrait of Suyodana being discovered by the Pandhawa, where Krēsna is

19 KM 90.11, (MAC 68.13-14) on OJ 51.29.
20 The dhālang, however, did not attempt to explain the etymology of Duryodana, always having a negative connotation in Javanese. See Carey (1981:XXII) for reference to the identification of Dipananegara with Suyodana in the Buka Kṛdhung Kĕbo by Cakranagara.
so disgusted by the spectacle of the bedraggled and sopping wet king that he commands that Suyodana be given all the trappings and regalia of kingship before his fight to the death with Bima.

13. Kresna immediately called for all the royal robes, the badhong and a crown, a chariot and an elephant. These were placed before him. Lord Kresna said 'Heh Suyodana! enough of your talking. Deck yourself in all the regalia of kingship.

14. Wear a crown and mount the chariot or ride an elephant if you choose not to use the chariot. Which would you prefer of the two? Don't violate royal standards [by standing there] all bedraggled and dripping wet, like a forest demon, with none of the marks of a king.^^

A final indignity which completes the pathetic sketch of this character is Bima's complaint to Yudistira that Arjuna is neglecting his duty because he is again in pursuit of the deceased king's wife, Banowati, a reference which in relation to Arjuna is typical of the 'momentary lapse of an exemplary character' discussed above.^^

When the Modern Javanese treatment of Rawana is compared with the kakawin equivalent, there were certain, fine adjustments to Rawana's character which could perhaps be explained by the eighteenth century Islamic oriented as opposed to the Hindu/Javanese attitude towards man's propensity to either good or evil. In the OJ text, Rawana hounds his brother Danapati from Ngalengka and seizes his kingdom. In the MJ equivalent, his grandfather abdicates in Rawana's favour and retires to a hermitage. All the kingdom are devoted to the new king.^^ The

---

^^KM 79.13-14 (MAC 59.10-11) on OJ 46.7, Swandana; 20,7,7,6. Sri Kṛṣṇa gya mundhut/sadandananing raja' babadhong lan makutha' rata lan dipongga/katur ingarening' Sri Kṛṣṇa angandika' eh Sri Suyodhana/awya keh dera wurus' anganggowa kuprobon' panganggoning raja 14 makutha nitih rato' mukah nitiya esthi' yan tan artip nitih/ 'ñini kang stra plith ya ing salak sawijja'aja ngruak kroma/ reyab- reyab katibus' dadi pindha druiksa' mir caraning ratu/

^^KM 91.8, (MAC 69.2). Arya Parta wua' panggih Lan Sang Banowati/ опыо marang ing' sanjata di cudhamani/ 'Arjuna has already met with Banowati and has completely forgotten about the splendid weapon, the Cudhamani'. In the kakawin, this jewel is Aswatama's soul but was interpreted as a weapon in the MJ versions.

^^KM 4.8, MAC II 2.18 on OJ 2.8. See Part 2 for full context.
Modern Javanese approach to Rawana's evil inclinations is clearer in the ASB KM canto 14-17 episode. In canto 14, Rawana is less malicious; there is no reference to his wanton destruction of the mountain on being refused admission to the heavens, as related in the kakawin, nor does he scoff at the guard. Instead, the emphasis is upon Rawana's misguided attitude, his inability to meditate and pray effectively due to his improper disposition. In a canto 17 addition on the kakawin, he sincerely requests the sage-king's advice which he then rejects when it does not suit his purpose. Modern Javanese villains were doomed to ruin because of their 'inadequate vessels' (kirang wēsadhaḥ, Cabolek 9.6.)25 their improper basis and misdirected approach which prevented any progress towards true knowledge or enduring success.

A web of relationships was carefully built up throughout the Modern Javanese texts which effectively emphasised the dilemmas of choice between duty to one's master and affection for one's kin. Arjuna Saera KM 58.1-2 is a notable addition on the kakawin devoted to an involved explanation of the relationship between the divine sage, Pulasta, and Rawana. These detailed introductory passages were often quite repetitious. In Serat Rama 1.4-10, Rawana's family is introduced in a four stanza addition, yet verses 9.9-13 which preface an audience scene with Rawana, are strikingly similar. Although there was a sense of a miniature genealogy in these passages, a common feature of Modern Javanese texts, none of the Yasadipura additions were as extensive as the Sindusastra introduction which insisted on working its way through the pangīwa/pauṅgōn lineages for seven cantos26 until reaching the four generations of Padma, Pulasta, Wisrawa and Rawana, in the Yasadipura


26 In the preface to the 1870 edition, it is noted that Paku Buwana VII ordered a new setting of the Arjuna Saera text to be written in macepat in 1829, complete with a genealogy of the Prince who had commissioned the work (1870:1).
The Modern Javanese poets were anxious to establish the relationships between characters and to construct allegory and incident around these relationships. The Danapati/Wisrwa/Sukesi episode (KM canto 1-2), additional to the kakawin, is framed firstly around the father's initial willingness to comply with his son's request but being overcome by self-interest, and secondly around the son's outrage and uncontrolled lapse when he discovers his father's deceit but his acceptance of fate when given counsel and compensation by God. The germ of this episode obviously caught the imagination of later poets. In the Sindusastra version, Danapati actually attacks his father and Wisrwa deliberates with his wife over the problem of waging war against his own son.

'My dear, in the morning I do battle with my son'. His wife was distressed and said, 'My Lord, how can you possibly fight against your son? Others will view this as highly immoral, a shameful act.' Wisrwa said quietly, 'If I can, I'll try to reason with my son, but if that is not possible and he insists on being so remiss towards his father, it must be God's will, how can it be avoided?'

In the Sêrat Dûrmagandhul, 'Danurdana', the son of Wisrwa, is cited as an example of a son who defied his father.

Although the Yasadipura poems and the piwulang caution against ignoring a father's advice, disrespect for an elder brother or uncle was an extended moral point. Danapati muses over his duty to bring Rawana back into line, bearing in mind that 'if the father is dead the elder brother becomes the substitute for the father', sentiments that

---

27 Sindusastra 16.31-32.

28 See Drewes (1966:34') for reference to this episode.

29 ASB KM 8.13, (MAC II 5.4) sayêktî yen bapa wus ngêmasi/kadang tiwa kang dadi gagêntine bapa...
were also voiced in the *Nulang Reh.* Salya extends this idea when he considers that his nephews, Nakula and Sadewa, are like sons to him, having already lost his own. Yet when Salya tries to reassure his wife, who fears that he will be slain rather than kill his beloved nephew, he compares her youthful appearance with that of her daughters, Erawati, Surtikanti and Banowati, the latter being the wife of the king to whom he has pledged his loyalty. Salya's dilemma as devoted uncle and father-in-law and the whole question of duty to the state and to one's personal sense of morality is most sympathetically drawn in the Modern Javanese texts by the inclusion of peripheral family members and casual references to these characters and to relationships.

Although there was a strong emphasis upon the father figure, responsible for the material and spiritual welfare and education of his family, the reciprocity between father and son was frequently noted with reference to the son's duty towards his father. In battle segments, it seemed important for the Modern Javanese poets to note that the sons took over their fathers' roles and titles or should be ready to act in their fathers' names. The *Panitisastra* extends the reference to the

---

30 5.15-16. *mulan sa'dulur tuwa, pa'n sin'e'mbah gëgentining bapa kaki, pa'n siman'ning bapa, sa'dulur tuwa guniti,* ... Therefore, an older relative is accorded respect as the deputy of one's father or grandfather. When a father dies, this older relative takes his place.

31 *BY KM 62.1, (MAC 46.19) on OJ 36.4. *Nokula sah'dewa pan datan prabeda/iptaning galih 'tönaya lawan pulunan/yen ugi sami' anak suta pulunan/abot mring suta 'laman datan ana*

32 *KM 67.19, (MAC 50.10), OJ 38.5. *sira wus putra kathah 'Erawati Surtikanti Banowati/tan pantö' ngaran kaka'ng adhi lan sira.*

33 *KM 38.10, MAC II 29.10, on OJ 45.5. *dening sogung para jöng' samya tilara bala/marang putrane samya 'swangkön pratandha' sogung putrong navpati/auapacareng raja 'ironing prakara iki' rasu pitwa kantun/*

For the kings should entrust their armies to their sons. I empower the crown princes with the emblems and insignia of kingship in matters pertaining to the senior rulers.
children of humans rarely following in their fathers' footsteps, despite care and instruction since birth³⁴ while innumerable pëwulang references bemoan the tragedy of a son who is a disgrace to his father and family.

Although there was an obvious emphasis upon maintaining family relationships and responsibilities in the Modern Javanese poems, Yasadipura's treatment of Arjuna's reaction on being informed of his son's death places the duty/affection dichotomy in a clear Modern Javanese perspective and is representative of the general tenor of the texts.³⁵ On hearing the news, the OJ Arjuna faints but then threatens to run instantly amuk in revenge. Krësna argues that this would be hila-hila (taboo) and that the Pandhawa are all too tired to be anyway effective. In the MJ text, Arjuna similarly faints when he hears the news, but there is no reference to a plan to run amuk. Krësna warns that however much he loved his son, a knight must not show his emotions. In doing so, he not only falls below his knightly expectations, but offends the Almighty.

7.3 Emphasis and the Pëwulang

In the above example, Krësna's advice has been adjusted to better accommodate the pervading stream of the Modern Javanese texts, that man must be aware of both his spiritual and temporal responsibilities and maintain the delicate balance between them. These sentiments are the basis of the ASB KM canto ¹⁴ extension, where Suwanda warns the panic-stricken troops that they would sin on two accounts, against their God and their master, if they were not mindful of their duty as warriors.³⁶

³⁴Paniti KM 4.3 in Part 2.
³⁵BY KM 29.5 (OJ 14.7.8). In Part 2.
³⁶See Translation in Part 2.
Structural variations from the *kakawin* were often due to the poet's decision to either expand a point of ethics or metaphysics or to include a new episode with a strong didactic tone. In the *ASB KM* episodes included in the translation section, didacticism was responsible for the majority of the interpretive or structural deviations. In *ASB KM* cantos 1-2, Sumali demands instruction in a secret knowledge, the *sastra arjendra* (*sastra caetha*), before he will allow the marriage between Suksesii and Danapati to take place. Sumali recognises in Wisrawa the marks of true scholar and teacher, just as Arjuna Sasra avails himself of more opportunities in the Modern Javanese text to consult the monks. The *pisulang* texts not only recommend obtaining a teacher but advise students to be discriminating in their choice, lamenting the contemporary inappropriateness of the teacher being forced to go out in search of students.

In *ASB KM* 17, all the OJ elements of sacrifice have been replaced by those of an instruction session. The OJ *pamursitan* (place of worship) becomes the *sanggar pamulangan* and *sanggar pamurukan* (hall of instruction) as *wureita* has the connotation of *pitutur* (advice) in Modern Javanese. When King Maruta acknowledges Rawana's supremacy in the MJ version, he gathers fruits and presents them to his guest, whereas the OJ Maruta collects his sacrificial oils and curds and continues with the sacrifice (OJ 15.5, KM 17.12).

Aspects of *sāmadi* (meditation) also served as a substitute for Old Javanese sacrificial elements. Although there was some evidence

---

37 *Wulang Reh* 1.4-8.

38 *Wulang Reh* 1.8. *ingkang lumrah ing mangsa puniki, mapan guru ngupaya sabat...* The usual situation in this present age is for the teacher to go out in search of pupils.

39 *ASB KM* 25.18 (in Part 2) for OJ 31.4, *myang yajña tan popama.* *BY KM* 91.12, (MAC 69.5), *lêstari kang sāmadineki for OJ* 51.32c, *lanayajña awei dana.*
of Modern Javanese selectivity in this process of deletion and substitution, the kakawin references to worship were occasionally fractured in the Old Javanese manuscripts themselves. In one notable example, the edited kakawin version reads;

\[
\text{ndah sampur pûnja pûjâ nira, tinut i larut sah watêk Hehâyawrêg.}
\]

Thus their sacrifice was now complete, and the Heyayas were routed in great disorder.\(^4\) (Awj.54.4d)

The Surakarta MS reading is sampin puna puna: puna was apparently construed as punah (destroyed) by the Modern Javanese poet who replaced the reference with

\[
giris dhadhal larut wong ing Maispati.
\]

The Maispati men fled in terror and total disarray.

In the KM 22-25 episode, kakawin references to the King consulting the monks have been expanded to the extent that every departure from the kakawin may be attributed to this emphasis upon instruction and a search for knowledge. The tone of canto 22 is evident in the Modern Javanese choice of imagery substitution in the last line of the canto:

\[
\text{‘the jasmine was [as pure] as the heart of a monk’}
\]

replaces one stanza of more erotic imagery based on the bride’s wedding night (OJ 22.1c). In KM canto 23.4, the kakawin lady and her female companion meeting secretly with a poet become the two endhang (servants) of a former monk.

\[
wontôn ta estri kakalih ‘tilas endhang sang wiku kakalih kari mangunéngˈlara gung wênting tinîlar
\]

Then two women appeared, the maidservants of the former monk.

The two women were most distressed because they had been left on their own.

\[
Pintôn kasih têkap sang kawî, ‘perhaps she was beloved of a poet’,
\]

(OJ 22.12d) reads pintôn kantun in the Javanese tradition manuscript

which was taken into the Modern Javanese texts as karî (left behind). In this context, sang karî, 'the poet' may have been interpreted in the sense of an expert in karî, the rural ascetics in the religious establishments. These small but consistent adjustments within the kakawin manuscripts raises the question as to the extent of the tradition of interpretation of the kakawins within the more specifically Modern Javanese context as reflected in the Yasadipura versions.

The substantial interpretive departures from the kakawin in the KM 24-25 section and the maâapat equivalent have already been noted in Chapter 3.6 in relation to interpretation within a known context. Although this KM passage is most obscure, the crux of the later maâapat extension is the arrogant folly of a king who refuses to acquire knowledge through the proper channels and, in his efforts to enhance his own spiritual state, totally neglects his temporal responsibilities. Arrogance was a much discussed vice in the piwulang texts, particularly intellectual arrogance. The ASB MAC II 18.2 reference to the king's refusal to acknowledge the dewa nayaka as the intermediaries to enlightenment is stated more categorically in Cabolek 11.2.

Indeed, it is an obligation to learn from one's fellow men. Only the Prophet had no mediator at all with the hiddenness of the Divine Soul.  

The MJ texts stress that neither conceit nor timidity should prevent a man from seeking instruction. Wedatama 1.10-11 and

---

"1 Whereas the adjustment from kasth to karî is orthographically possible, the word kantun in the Surakarta MS is perhaps indicative of further intermediate manuscripts. The KM poet's use of the word karî indicates that the MS available to these poets may have been older than the Surakarta MS and again raises the question of the number and nature of MSS available in the late eighteenth century.

"2 Soebardi (1975:146)."
Yasadipura's Sewaka advise that one should ask when in doubt, a sentiment that was stated consistently throughout the ASB texts until the final plea from Pulasta to Rawana and his patih, Prahat (KM 60.10, MAC II 50.1 in Part 2). The Wulang Reh has an extended discussion on the perils of feigning knowledge and hence being unreceptive to truth. Small elements of allegory and aside were often framed around the esteemed position of the teacher; Rama is reminded of his former teacher when, in the depths of despair, he meets an ascetic and Arjuna Sasra's troops regard him as they would a teacher.

Within the didactic segments of the Modern Javanese poems, some modification of material written within a pre-Islamic framework was necessary so as to be both relevant and doctrinally acceptable to the eighteenth century court audience. The kakavin formulation of man's social responsibilities and his relationship to his king needed only slight adjustment and the main variation was one of emphasis and terminology. Texts such as the Sewaka dealt specifically with the relationship between servant and master and were therefore of a more practical bent but the importance of being aware of one's place in society and of observing the rules of etiquette and state protocol was nevertheless woven into the Modern Javanese epic-based poems. Man's position in the macrocosmic sphere and his relationship to God needed considerable adjustment, the main stumbling block being the Hindu/
Javanese notions of karma and reincarnation. Man had to be redefined as a finite being, dependent upon his Creator. Although destiny was beyond man's control, there were rules and guidelines that could be followed so as to ensure a harmonious relationship between his Creator and his king. There was a greater urgency in the exhortations to seek instruction in the Modern Javanese texts, for man had a limited lifespan and was under every obligation to use that time to the best of his ability. The pîwulang texts therefore stress the importance of developing sound habits from youth and the catastrophe of following teachings that were anyway suspect.

While the format of the pîwulang and the Panitisâstra enabled the authors to state a principle firmly and to expand through examples of dire consequences, the Yasadipuras examined the same principles in a more subtle manner.

One clear example is the Modern Javanese adjustment of a Bharatayuddha passage where Salya explains to his wife, Satyawati, that he is a human king and therefore must be prepared to die. Both the Old and the Modern Javanese passages are quoted below.

yan tilari manah/ta kapwa/muliheng Surendrabasana (Suralayasabha)
rehning ngwang masarira/manusa teki n mohambala pati
ngka ngwang kalih amuktya ranyâ nî langëh nî Indrabhawana
asta (astam) yan walya/ngwang angwanga (anwana)⁴
munah mangaywa/turida

If you are in agreement, let us return to the heavens.
Because I have a human body, I must experience death.
There, we will enjoy the delights and pleasures of Indra's heaven,
Furthermore, when (youth)* returns, we may continue our love.

⁴ASB KM 1.8. because everything living must die.
Paniti KM 3.2. Such a man does not realise that life is short but
thinks that time has no limits. See both texts in Part 2.
Sûrat Kandha 37.6. gih punika caadaan kang mënthi mëti, kang aneng
matyapada. Indeed, this is the shortcoming, that every creature on
earth must die.
Wedatama 1.6. wripe sapisan rusek, his one life is ruined.
BY KM 67.9c-13, Madurëna (12:5,7)  
maungung caaade'gusti sariraningsun  
misih manungsa' kapindho dadi ratu

10. angreh wadya gung' tan këna tiru rési  
sumèngkeng ngawak'braja mring Ariloka  
laman jënlënging' nata tinut ing wadya  
ing pandhita kangi'sami badan sawiji

11. rési Narada'sumèngka ngawak braja  
uttah lan jësim' wadhage milu minggah  
misah Sang Rama' Parasu ya mangkana  
yen ing narendra' yëkti nganggo ngëmasi

12. ulehe maring' swarga Janaka Prabu  
lan maliu Maharaja Kanwa mangkana  
marmane gusti' raganingsun punika  
kadi-kadi ta'age-age mangkana

13. saking kumudJ tuluea among résmi  
aneng manungedpada pan wus atwa  
tan bisa lali'ya maring anom maliu  
sira lan inggo' pan wus pasugih buyut

9. But my shortcoming, my dear, is that [firstly]  
I am human and secondly, I am a king,

10. with authority over many men. I cannot emulate the  
divine sages,  
who transcend death when they pass into Wisnu's heaven.  
If one is a king, his subjects follow him,  
whereas the sage may act independently.

11. The priest Narada passed into the afterlife,  
ascended into the heavens corporally and spiritually intact;  
in like manner did Rama Parasu.  
But a king must face death.

12. This was the way King Janaka reached the heavens  
and similarly, King Kanwa.  
This is why, my dear,  
I seem to be impatient,

13. because I long to continue the love  
[we share] on earth. We are old now  
youth cannot be recalled.  
You and I have been blessed with many grandchildren...

The kakawin merely states that Salya is mortal but that on  
death, youth will return. The Modern Javanese text includes a  
reference to the divine sages and to mortal kings and adjusts the OJ  
text to read that youth cannot be recalled and that a couple who have  
led a full life should be resigned to death.

However finite man's nature, it was considerably higher than  
that of the animals and the Modern Javanese emphasis was on maintaining  
this superior state, with ample cautions that to succumb to one's lower
instincts was reprehensible behaviour. The Daniswara\textsuperscript{48} interpretation in the Modern Javanese text revolved around a time when all living creatures would attain a higher state while Wibisana's request in the MJ texts is for the gift of a human nature.\textsuperscript{49} Rawana's demon disposition prevents him from any effective communication with God\textsuperscript{50} and, in a similar extension on this theme in the Sĕrat Lokapala, Sumali begs Wisrawa to grant him the secret knowledge which will elevate him above his demon and therefore irredeemable nature.\textsuperscript{51} References to being no better than an animal were therefore common throughout the Modern Javanese poems.\textsuperscript{52}

Dependence upon God, the Ordainer and the Creator, was established in the MJ texts by small effective asides and by direct substitution. Suwanda notes on two occasions that success in battle was at the Almighty's discretion\textsuperscript{53} but the Modern Javanese presentation of one of the most popular suluk at BY OJ 10.12 (milat mara Sang Arjuna), where Arjuna is overwhelmed by the prospect of fighting his relatives, bears analysis. In the kakawin, Krūsna refuses to intervene on the

\textsuperscript{48}The MJ interpretation of Daniswara is discussed in Chapter 8.2 and was referred to in G.1.

\textsuperscript{49}ASB KM 5.4, (MAC II 2.27) on OJ 1.22. In Part 2.

\textsuperscript{50}ASB KM 14.10 on OJ canto 8. See Part 2.

\textsuperscript{51}Sĕrat Lokapala 10.20. sastra arjendra wing rat, pangruwat ing diyu, pun gayi liwat drahaka, tintah wil sato padhang neng bumi. The sastra arjendra is the deliverance from [my] demon nature. I am sin-laden and accursed for to be created a demon is no different from an animal on this earth.

\textsuperscript{52}ASB KM 36.5. jinising sato dudu jinus manusa, [he is] some kind of animal, not a man. Paniti KM 3.4. He lives a futile existence as do the forest game, beasts that make for tasty meals may be likened to men such as he. See full context in Part 2. Wulan Reh 14.42. pan sata papadhanipun wong doyan mangan nendra, He is like an animal, a man whose only pleasures are eating and sleeping.

\textsuperscript{53}ASB KM 46.24-25 in Part 2. ASB KM 38.11. tiwas ungguling prang pan wus karsaning dewa, defeat or victory in battle depends upon God.
basis that it is hila-hila (taboo) for a warrior to retreat from the field of battle. In the MJ texts, Krśna, in direct speech, prefaces the OJ prohibition on a knight shrinking from his duty with karsearing Bathara (it is God's will), thus neatly mirroring the sentiments of Suwanda's warning that when a noble violates his knightly codes, he also offends his Creator.

There was a clear case of substitution in ASB KM 3.5 on the OJ 1.25 passage:

for it was not the Lord who caused a creature to gain power or fall into insignificance; it was nothing but the product of his own karma that had brought about the Lord's affection.

The MJ text makes a point of the demon deformities of Kumbakarna and Rawana being of the Lord Guru's own making and stresses Lord Guru's role in Kumbakarna being rendered harmless by his fondness for sleep (ASB KM 6.1-3 on OJ 2.1-6, in Part 2).

Practical advice was offered throughout the Modern Javanese texts as to how man could best reconcile his roles and responsibilities as a creature of the Almighty and a loyal subject of the king. The Modern Javanese poems emphasise that man must work within his appointed station in life and advocated balance and moderation in his approach to spiritual and temporal matters. The caution against excessiveness applied equally to overzeal as well as to general laxity and intemperance and there were frequent warnings that a king should be on guard against ambitious and brash characters who are a little too eager to be of assistance. The kernel of the ASB KM 24-25 episode is the gross imbalance between a king's personal aspirations towards spiritual growth and his neglect of his responsibilities as defender of the realm. In one notable addition on the OJ Rāmāyana, Laksmana explores

54 BY KM 10.14, MAC 12.12.
55 Supomo (1977:185).
the quandary of living outside his appointed station in life. Although he feels sufficiently committed to follow his brother into exile in the forest, he seriously questions the expediency of living like an ascetic when he has been endowed with the talents to serve the state as a knight.

The passage is presented below.

Serat Rama 7.21-29.

21. *Sumitratanaya ngundikeng galih yen sun turutna, pangandikan kang iki ora mulih miring nagara*

22. *pasthi lali marang kasatriyaneki sumungku neng wana kang rayi matur wot sari punapa milih papan*

23. *dumeh wonën ing wukir lan ing prajadi utameng nagara yen sami marsudi budi tapa-tapaking warastra*

24. *mengku praja amrîh arjaning kang bumi tumungkul kalaran amarasakên ing sakit angîjarakên ing susah*

25. *pan rinêksa kasih-kasihipun sami alus lawan wadhag punapa nganggea milih jer sampun titahing dewa*

26. *pan tinitah manuswa awak puniki sayêkti winêng rumêksa wadhag sakêdhik mbuwang dhiri datan eoa*

27. *pas ingkang tinitah iêlêmbat sami datan ngangge wadhag sauska-sukane dadi atêbir lawan dru[h]aka*

28. *pan paduka tinitah putra narpati rumêkseng nagara yen tekad kadi mahasrî tuladhâ saoolahîra*

29. *yêkti tiwas satêmah rumêkseng bumi ing batin kewala panganggép kadi maharei sok sampun niaya ing lyan*

SR 7.21. Laksmana though to himself.

21. 'If I should follow what Rama is suggesting and do not return to the city,
22. we will surely be overlooking our knighthood by remaining here in the forest."
The young brother said with respect:
Why must we choose

23. between living on the mountain or in the city?
The city is the best [place]
for us to practise
the penance of those of noble station,

24. [that is], administering the kingdom, striving for the
prosperity of the realm,
tending to those in anguish,
curing the sick,
and consoling the distressed.

25. In such a way, [we] cater for both needs,
the physical and the spiritual.
Why is there any need to make a choice
when it has already been decided by God?

26. We were created as humans
and indeed have the right
to maintain our physical selves.
There is no point in wasting our lives.

27. It is a different matter for those spiritual beings,
who have no use for the physical.
They are free to do as they wish
without fear of sinning.

28. But you were destined to be the son of a king
[with the responsibility] to protect the realm.
If you are determined to live as a holy monk
and to follow his way of life,

29. you will fail in your duty to serve the kingdom.
Live as an ascetic in spirit only
but do not cause others to suffer.

As it was not at all uncommon for a knight or prince to spend
some time in a religious centre, Laksmna is questioning the appropri-
ateness of living and working outside one's appointed station on a
more permanent basis. The Paitisastra kawi miring and maaapat texts
which had less scope to expand on the kakawin original managed to
insert a small addition on the OJ reference to the effect that a
wealthy man who dresses badly and takes no pleasure in fine foods
lives like an ascetic (3.2 in Part 2). The sense of enjoying in
moderation one's God given talents and fortune is evident in the MJ
addition of Arjuna Sasra's advice to Rawana that he could wage wars that were justified and enjoy the battle spoils himself as long as he made wise use of this privilege. There were shades of Laksmana's quandary in the Wedatama where the royal author recalls that in his youth, he mistakenly tried to emulate renowned religious scholars and resented his calling to serve the state (bot Allah apa gusti) until he became aware that working within his noble station was more pleasing to God than empty imitation.

Within this Modern Javanese context, atinggal watok (to depart from what is expected of you) was not merely equated with bad manners but was usually associated with lali or supe ('to forget'), a momentary lapse from control and appointed station. The Modern Javanese poems contain numerous references (additional to the kakawins) to knights, kings, priests and servants forgetting themselves and behaving in an unseemly manner in a trying situation. Both the sage king, Maruta, and Yudistira are noted as 'forgetting that he was of a sagely disposition' while in one Bratayuda reference, Krṣna was so overcome with emotion that he was depicted as tyas supe ('was beside himself'). It is of some note that the edited kakawin line reads gupe hatinira; although it is difficult to determine the base manuscripts for the Modern

---

57 Wedatama 2.10-14.
lausas lausas nggraita, rohne ta suta priyayi, yen muriha dadi kaum tōmah nishta.
I gradually realised that as the son of a priyayi, it would be completely wrong to persist in my attempts to become a kaum.
58 See Supomo (1980:568-69) for references to lali in babad literature.
60 BY KM 86.1, MAC 65.7 (on OJ 50.16a).
In ASB KM 25.18, ltimet is used as a substitute for lali or supe. Two other examples of royal lali are discussed in Chapter 8.2.
Javanese *Bratayuda* renderings, the Modern Javanese substitution *supe* for *gupe* (dejected) could have been due to an adjustment in one of the Old Javanese manuscripts itself, as was the case with innumerable ASB references.

There was a greater emphasis within the Modern Javanese poems upon being aware of one's station in a social sphere as well as in a wider sense. The MJ *Panitisastra* poet paused at the word *subasita* (good form and etiquette) to deliver an extended caution to be mindful of social stratifications, to sit only with one's peers and to observe the appropriate speech levels in an assembly.61 The observance of *krama/ngoko* speech levels in audience scenes reinforced the Modern Javanese sense of social distinctions62 while small niceties like Arjuna constantly leaving decisions up to Kṛṣṇa's better judgement were scattered throughout the texts as guidelines to acceptable social behaviour. Although the Korawa elders in both the Old and Modern Javanese texts deplored Suyodana's rejection of Kṛṣṇa's request for half of the kingdom of Ngastina, Suyodana's mother's final point of reasoning with her son is that to walk out on a guest in an audience was the height of bad form.63

In conclusion, comparison with the *kakawins*, particularly the Javanese tradition manuscripts, aided in the formulation of aspects of

---

61 *Paniti KM* 1.3-5. In Part 2. *Paniti KM* 1.9-10. The word *jranadha* in the same canto was similarly singled out as an example of an exemplary character who knew how to behave in company.

62 See Soebardi (1975:56-58) who comments on the speech level distinctions in *Sūrat Cabolek*.


'His mother wept and immediately sent word to her son, the King of Ngastina that he should not behave so disgracefully, and that it was bad manners to leave a guest.'
presentation and emphasis that were characteristically Modern Javanese. The patterns which were evident throughout the poems not only enable a clearer impression of the function of Modern as opposed to Old Javanese poetry but also served to bind the eighteenth century texts to each other, as the following chapter will illustrate.
8. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MODERN JAVANESE VERSIONS OF THE KAKAWINS

8.1 Binding Features

The *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Bhāratayuddha* and *Arjunawijaya* kakawins, being the works of three poets from the tenth, twelfth and fourteenth centuries, exhibit features of the literary language and prosody of their periods as well as the religious and philosophical emphases and stylistic preferences of their respective authors. From a twentieth century vantage point and with access to a wider range of analytical tools than were available to the eighteenth century *pujangga*, philologists and historians have noted these distinguishing elements over the passage of literary history from the *Rāmāyaṇa* to the *Arjunawijaya* and may therefore consider the three kakawins to be only loosely linked to each other, by virtue of their common genre, Old Javanese language idiom and epic-based content. In the eighteenth century Surakarta court, these distinctions may not have been so apparent and hence the relationship between the texts may have seemed more intricate and complementary.

Both Balinese and Javanese traditions acknowledge the *Rāmāyaṇa* kakawin as being the oldest of the texts, although points of chronology and authorship in the Javanese tradition are at variance with the Balinese. However, when the contents of thirty-three kawi texts from the *Manik-Maya* to the *Nitiśāstra* were discussed in

---

1. *Javaansche Zamenspraken* may be taken as any guide to the Javanese tradition, Empu Puywa of the kingdom of *Māmānang* (Kōdhiri) was the acknowledged author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (1911:346) while both the *Arjunawijaya*, credited to Panuluh and the *Bhāratayuddha*, to Sōdhah, were considered to have been written during the reign of Jayabaya (pp.346, 363). According to the Balinese tradition, the *Rāmāyaṇa* was by Raja Kusuma or Yogiswara, the *Bhāratayuddha* by Sōdhah and the *Arjunawijaya* by Tantular (Krom 1916: 510).
Javaansche Zamenspraken (1911: 340), the three *kakawins* were ranked in a sequence which reflected the mythical chronology of the relevant kingdoms, Maispati (*Arjunawijaya*), Ngalêngka and Ngayodya (*Râmâyana*) and Ngastina (*Śrīratuuddha*). The Modern Javanese versions of the *kakawins*, written within a period of approximately twenty-five years by the Yasadipuras, gave the impression of being very much a linked series of texts. Common emphases, arrangement of material and stock description and analogy does not solely account for this semblance of cohesion for closer analysis reveals certain devices of the poets' ingenuity that would have ensured that these three Modern Javanese texts were perceived as a continuous and interlocking narrative.

The relationship between the content of the *Râmâyana* and the *Arjunawijaya* is straightforward; apart from the villains and demons common to both texts, the *Arjunawijaya* *kakawin*, written four centuries after the *Râmâyana*, refers specifically to Rawana's downfall at Rama's hands in a direct speech prophesy from the dying king of Ngayodya (*OJ* 19.2, *KM* 20.6) and in a curse from the ascetic, Wedawati (*MJ* Widawati), whom Rawana insulted with his amorous advances (*OJ* 13.10, *KM* 16.1). Although the account of the birth of Rawana's brothers, Wibisana and Kumbakarna, is given in the opening cantos of the *Arjunawijaya*, there is no further reference to these characters in this *kakawin* as the brothers play out their respective roles in Rawana's demise in the latter section of the *Râmâyana*. One of the authors of the Modern Javanese versions seemed to have been aware of this imbalance from an eighteenth century viewpoint and thus began the *Śrīrat Rama*, as contained in the Kats edition, with thirteen stanzas that were most reminiscent of the *Arjunawijaya* *kakawin* passage devoted to Rawana, his family and
kingdom. The *Sārat Rama* was further indispersed with small additional references to the Ngālīngka camp until the characters came into their own after the capture of the monkey Anoman (OJ 9.93, SR 28).

Although Wibisana and Kumbakarna are in no way involved in Rawana's challenge to Arjuna Sasra, Yasadipura employed a similar 'casual reference' device in the *ASB* texts. Danapati, astounded that Rawana would be so remiss as to attack an elder brother, enquires of his *patih*, Banendra, if Kumbakarna and Wibisana are accompanying Rawana and is assured that Rawana is acting alone. ³

A further effective linking device were the references in both the *MJ Bratayuda* and *Sārat Rama* texts to incidents in the *Arjuna Sasra*, one example being the episode where Citrawati was deceived into thinking that her husband was dead and commits ritual suicide. Satyawati, the faithful wife of Salya in the *Bratayuda*, wisely remembers how Citrawati

---

² These thirteen stanzas are not found in the *Sārat Rama kawi miring*. Poerbatjaraka did not note this in his review of the SR *KM* based on the MS BG 589 (1940: 44) but the description of this MS in the KBG catalogue (1933a: 348) states that it begins with the episode of Rama Parasu which is in canto three of the OJ *Rāmāyaṇa*. There was no opportunity to examine this MS cited by Poerbatjaraka but LOr 2054 was very close to the LOr 1791 SR *KM* used in this study. The opening stanzas, with a few variations, were the same as LOr 1791. As all the *suluk* and *sākar ageng* fragments cited in *sulukan* booklets as being from the *SR KM* were also found in LOr 1791, I am presuming that the *SR KM* used in this study is a copy of the most common *SR KM* in circulation and is in essence the same as the text discussed by Poerbatjaraka.

³ *ASB KM* 9.3-4. (MAC II 5.7), Kusumawicitra (12: 6,6).

³. heh Banendra apā angawaki dhewe/pang'urge-marā ngko si Dasamuka/ Kya Patih turirā pan rayi Paduka/ pribadi kinerig' punggawa sakehe/ 4. mung rayinta kalih'tan tumut mara ngko/ Kumbakarna Wibisana sabalane/ tan wonten kang tumut' sawiji ing mangke/.
was deceived formerly (nguni) and insists on seeing her husband's corpse while Rama, fearing for his own wife's safety, also recalls Citrawati's rash action. The word nguni in the Bratayuda text stresses the mythical chronology of the texts and reinforces the concept of an ongoing narrative.

In another example, Salya, lamenting his ineptitude as a poet, reminds his wife that he cannot hope to match the King of Maispati's clever way with words. The relationship between Salya and Satyawati was portrayed sensitively in the Modern Javanese texts and at times imagery was used that was similar to that employed in passages devoted to Citrawati and her husband, Arjuna Sasra. The use of stock analogy to describe similar episodes added to a sense of overlap and continuity between the texts but it is worth noting that recurring, similarly expressed sentiments and description extended into the texts of other authors. The Sindusastra depiction of the kingdom languishing at Wibisana's

---

4 By KM 75.3 (MAC 56. 3-5), Nagabanda (18: 5,6,7). pan wus ana ing nguni/ mangke lêpiyan' Dewi Citrawati'garwa Arjuna Sasra/ 4. belane luput'ngamungkôn pawarta'mila kang kantun-kantun/ kâdhah andulu'ing-kang den-belani ...
For already in the past, there was the precedent of Dewi Citrawati, the wife of Arjuna Sasra. Her sacrifice was a mistake for she relied only on rumour. Therefore, those after her should see the one to whom they would offer their lives.

5 SR MAC 19.9. pinindhâ puâl' manggada, ngunus patrêm abela, gandrung kapirangu, belane kuran utama/ 10. tan mulat kang den-belani, just like the Princess of Manggada who drew her dagger and killed herself in her love and despair. But her sacrifice was not of the highest order, 10. for she did not see (the corpse) of the one to whom she gave her life.

6 By KM 65.11, (MAC 49.9), Aswâalîta (23: 5,6,6,6,) deningsun kurang'kakawin tan mirib'Prabu Maispati'widâdgâng pangrun-grum 'For I lack the skill to write kakawins, I cannot compare with the King of Maispati who was well versed in words of love'.
departure 'as if a jewel had slipped from its casing' was expressed in
the same terms chosen by Yasadipura for the Sërat Rama depiction of the
kingdom of Mantili withering as the Princess Sinta departs with her new
husband.\footnote{Sindusastra 18.21. *tis tis Ngalëngka nagri, lir koncatan sotyanipun,
ungkure Wibisana, sëmune praja kadya gring .. SR 3.6. kusut nagari
Mantili, kadya koncatan sësotya, ..... marma lum Mantiliraja/
The state of Mantili was despondent, as if a jewel was loose (from
its casing) .. so the Kingdom of Mantili withered.
See Moertono (1968: 22) for reference to this imagery of the jewel
and the setting as applied to the king and the state. Also Moertono
(p.66) for some reference to the response and sympathy that should
exist between the state and the king, the state reflecting the joy
or depression of its ruler.}

Direct speech was clearly an important element of Modern Java-
nese presentation and it would be no exaggeration to say that almost
every occasion of direct speech in the *kakawins* had been extended in
the Modern Javanese versions. The nature of the direct speech, appro-
priate to the situation, was consistent throughout the texts, one exam-
ple being the wayang-like overtones of the goading of the defeated
Rawana in the *Arjuna Sasra* text which compared with similar taunts and
bragging in the *Sërat Rama* and the *Bratayuda*.\footnote{ASB KM 57.27, Sudiradraka (13: 5,8) *apa ta iki iya dewaning
jujurang/iya apa ta dadi dewaning gugunung/ tëka mëngkene’dhapure
pating panjutu/ 28. Ëndhase nora’kaprah baune tan kaprah/ 
\lwr babaksalâ’apa doyan mangan sëga/ pantëse iki’panganane kolang-kaling/
‘Why is this then the god of the ravines? Indeed, is this the god
of the mountains? Why is he all bruised and swollen? His head is
extraordinary, his arms are abnormal, like a centipede. Why would he
have any taste for rice? I would have thought he would have preferred
sugar cane fibre.’
SR 35.32. angel ngrëmék godhong kelor, suwe anjëjak sëmangka, suwe
ambacuk gëdhang, suwe wong amamah waluw/
Just a minor matter crushing him, quicker than kicking a melon, chopp-
ing a banana, chewing a pumpkin ....}
interest on two accounts; firstly as further indication of the status of the Bhāratayuddha as the 'exemplary kakawin' in the estimation of the eighteenth century court and as some insight into the mechanisms of composition in the Modern Javanese renderings. The Surakarta poets drew freely upon a stock pile of familiarly appropriate analogy and standard descriptive patterns, as did the kakawin poets themselves. The following example is some evidence that in the course of the rendering into Modern Javanese, an incident in the kakawin prompted the poet to recall how a similar episode was treated in a related text, in this case the Bhāratayuddha kakawin. In these examples, it is clear that the sequence as well as elements of the episode were recalled and translated into a new situation. In Arjunawijaya OJ canto 22, Arjuna Sasra's passage through a village is related in a brief one and a half stanzas (OJ 22.4-5). The reference to the King's entry into a village seemed to prompt a recollection of Krēśna's entry into Ngastina and the Modern Javanese poet extended the Arjuna Sasra episode to include similar elements. The BY KM passage is quoted below and may be compared with ASB KM canto 22 in Part 2.

BY KM 4.10 - 5.7 Sikarini, (17: 6,6,5).

10b. Sri Narendra Krēśna prapta sireng kikis ing kang nagara linirih ratanya iro praja ubėkan kang samya mēthuk miwah kang samyārsa' dudulu pēksa wruh' ring Narapati

11. orēg mawurahan' umēb wōng Ngastina matitip atap tōmbak pinggir marga' māuyēl matimbun' samya jrih kantun ywan kasep ing langkahira Prabu Krēśna samya lumajar maruhun-ruhunan' tan atolih rowangning Sikarini

Canto 5. Bramara (11: 4,7)

1. kweh para dyah' kasusu andudulu gēlung wudhar' tan nēdya mandhēg mangu miwah kēmbēn' lukar tan rinawatan pambayunta' sinangga rikang asta

2. kayuyun lir' pesok kapipit ngasta yeka kadya' naoškēn pambayunta marang sira' Narendra ingkang prapta tuwin ingkang' lagya nganggit puspita

3. kelawewan' cinangking punang sēkar marang Prabu Krēśna ....

5d. sigra denya' ngalap andha dadēling
6. gupuh ingungguhan ingkang andha pring
putung untungging andha pan kabanting
tibaning dyah kawalik pan kaguling

10b. King Krēśna reached the outskirts of the city
and slackened the pace of his chariot. Inside the city,
crowds of people were there to welcome him
and to catch a glimpse of the King.

11. The people of Ngastina surged forward noisily, greatly
excited, in droves,
crowding at the edge of the road, crushed, pressed against
each other, all anxious, lest they be left behind
and would miss King Krēśna passing by. So they ran, pushing
past each other, paying no heed to their companions.

Canto 5.
Many ladies hastened to see (the king).
Although their hairknots were loose, they would not stop
and were unconcerned that their sashes had slipped.
(They ran) supporting their breasts

2. which seemed flat under the pressure of their hand.
They appeared to be offering their breasts
to the King who was approaching.
Other ladies, presently arranging posies (came)

3. clutching the trailing garlands,
as if to present the flowers
to King Krēśna ....

5. ... (One woman) quickly grabbed a bamboo ladder,
6. As she scrambled up, the rungs of the ladder snapped
and the lady toppled, fell,
and lay sprawled on her back.

The Arjuna Sasra insertion has drawn on elements in the Brata-
yuda episode, - people pushing their way forward to see the King, women
seeming to offer the object that they were carrying to Arjuna Sasra,
another in her haste falling into an embarrassing position. The above
example differs from the practice of either designed or unconscious
employment of stock allegory and minor details of description in that
a particular and complete episode was recalled by the poet. The descrip-
tion of Rawana's attack on Suwanda was another such example; the refer-
ence in the Arjunawijaya kakawin to Suwanda's men resting under vines
may have prompted the poet to recall the attack by Karna on the Pandhawa

9 ASB KM 45.2-3 and BY OJ 29.18-19, KM 55.11, MAC 40.10.
who were similarly resting but were unaware of the impending attack.

Although these two episodes have some elements in sequence that may be returned to the Bratayuda texts, there is no direct vocabulary borrowing from either the Modern or Old Javanese texts and the possibility cannot be discounted that the episode in sequence was familiar from the intermediate medium of wayang. There is, however, a more blatant overlap between the Yasadipura kakawin-based texts and the other Modern Javanese renderings in the following example and there should be some consideration as to whether the interweaving of passages taken directly from another text was merely a convenient device or was designed to bind the Modern Javanese texts more closely to each other.

The Sindusastra Sêrat Lokapala has several cantos in common with the Arjuna Sasra macapat 1 version. In addition to drawing upon the Yasadipura version of the Arjuna Sasra, Sindusastra was not adverse to borrowing sequences of lines or a whole stanza from the Yasadipura Sêrat Rama. In Sêrat Lokapala 22.20, for example, the description of Rawana's tyranny bore stronger resemblance to the description from the Sêrat Rama than from the Arjuna Sasra text. However, when the author of the ten bridging cantos in the Add.12302 macapat 1 Arjunasasra MS attempted to fill in the gap in the narrative, sequences of stanzas from the Yasadipura Sêrat Rama and the Bratayuda texts were woven into a story that recounted a sayêmbara (contest) for Citrawati,

---

10 See Chapter 1.1 for reference.

11 Sindusastra 22.20 kucêm mingkus saisining bumi, tumon prabawane Sang Yaksendra, Rawana krura ambêke, yen ana para ratu, kang tan tungkul sigra ginitik, tumpês sasat karoban, ing sê aura gunung jinarahan binoyongan/
SR 1.11 kucêm isining rat kabe, yen ingkang ratu- ratu tan tungkul, sigra ginitik tumpês sasat karoban, ing sagara gunung, tan atolih kadang warga, yen tan anut ginêmpur sawadyaneki, jinarah binoyongan.
and Suwanda's test of Arjuna Sasra's qualities as an exemplary king, episodes that may be returned to the *Sérat Kandha* rather than to the Yasadipura/kakawin tradition of the epics.

Four passages were obvious transfers from the *Sérat Rama* and the *Bratayuda* macapat Yasadipura poems. The examples cited below illustrate how *Sérat Rama* and *Bratayuda* characters and courts were scrupulously removed and substituted with appropriate Arjuna Sasra personages without any disruption to the metre of the lines.

The fourth example of adjusted borrowing from *Bratayuda* MAC Canto 7 is of particular interest to the question of whether the texts were viewed as a closely interrelated series. In this example, the *Bratayuda* MAC version of Krēsna manifesting his tiwikrama form as Wisnu has been applied to Arjuna Sasra, whose show of might convinces Suwanda that his master is indeed Wisnu incarnate and a true sage king. The equation Arjuna Sasra = Wisnu, traced to the Javanese tradition manuscript interpolation section, was stated on many occasions throughout the macapat and *kawi miring* ASJ texts and is the single most important deviation from the Balinese manuscripts. It is this pervading Wisnu emphasis throughout the *Sérat Rama*, *Arjuna Sasra* and *Bratayuda* Modern Javanese versions which serves as the most apparent and effective binding agent between the texts. In this fourth example, the adjusted *Bratayuda* stanzas of Krēsna's manifestation of his Wisnu form fitted smoothly into the *Arjuna Sasra* text and would have been an appreciated

---

12 In bridging canto 3.2-5, *Sérat Rama* 2.17-20, devoted to Rama's father was used. Substitution was of the order of Sang Arjuna Sasra for Prabu Dasarata. Bridging canto 6 begins with *BY MAC* 9.3-7a, a description of the troops setting out from a city. Canto 8 begins with *BY MAC* 5.5, the depiction of the beauty of the palace of Ngālēngka. Name substitution included ya ta wau rēśining kang puri for the *BY* line ya ta wau rēṭna Banowati.
nuance for those familiar with the relevance of the passage in the Bratayuda text. Whereas this adjustment was obviously a considered and designed device in this manuscript, the odd substitution Sasrawijaya for Ramawijaya on several occasions in canto 74 of the Add.12302 Sêrat Rama fragments may have been an unconscious scribal error and is perhaps some indication of the role of allegory in the Modern Javanese versions of the three kakawins.

8.2 The Wisnu Link

In chapter 3.3, there was some consideration of the age of the interpolated cantos in the Arjunawijaya kakawin which contained the reference that Arjuna Sasra was Wisnu incarnate. By the eighteenth century in the presumed absence of Balinese manuscripts for comparison, it is unlikely that the pujangga would have considered these cantos as later additions. The three kakawins would therefore have been viewed as being bound by the common theme of Wisnu manifesting himself in the person of an exemplary king, guiding his realm through a time of chaos into an age of order and prosperity.

Once linked by this theme, passages that were ambiguous or abstruse were often interpreted within a Wisnu context, the Daniswara/Malyawan example, cited in Chapter 6.1 being a notable example. In the Arjuna Sasra Modern Javanese rendering, the noted consistency with

13 There has been no opportunity to examine whether this theme was extended into the interpretation of the Arjunawiwâha kakawin and the eighteenth century rendering by Paku Buwana III. Wisnu never manifested himself in the person of Arjuna alone but always in the combined personages of Krêśna and Arjuna. The MAC and KM Bratayuda extended the kakawin reference to this identification found at BY OJ 52.1.

BY KM 91.14 (MAC 69.7). Krêśna and Arjuna are in essence Wisnu incarnate. 15. The analogy is where Krêśna is the fire, Arjuna can be likened to the flame of that fire. Lord Krêśna is the flower while Arjuna is its fragrance. Indeed, two in one but still Wisnu.
which references to Wisnu were applied to Arjuna Sasra, which often required an adjustment of the *kakawin* line, stands as some indication of an extended tradition of interpretation of this *kakawin* within a Wisnu context. At OJ 72.1c (*KM* 60.12, *MAC* II 51.6), a statement from Arjuna Sasra that

'a priest who is a reincarnation of Wisnu and is famous for his courage will be the cause of my death' \(^{14}\)

was omitted from the Modern Javanese rendering yet the poets borrowed from the *kakawin* lines 72.1a and b on either side of this reference. \(^{15}\)

Perhaps the best example of consistency is to be found in the interpretation of *AWj* OJ 58.4d as contained in *KM* 50.5-8. In both texts, Narada warns Arjuna Sasra that the world is in fear of Rawana's tyranny. The *kakawin* reads:

4d. 'Even the god Wisnu is continually trembling in fear of him.

5. Only in time to come, when the god Wisnu (sira) is reincarnated into the world
and is accompanied by a monkey king with all his formidable army,
will he be able to slay Dasamuka on the battle field. \(^{16}\)

The *KM* poet selected key words from the *kakawin* and the text, suitably adjusted reads

'all tremble in fear of him',

with no reference to Wisnu being in awe of Rawana. The third person pronoun, 'sira', which refers to Wisnu in the *kakawin*, was interpreted as the second person and rendered as 'Paduka' (my Lord) in the Modern Javanese version (ASB *KM* 50.6d-7).

6d. ........ for it is not

7. the time for Dasamuka to die. But on the next occasion of your reincarnation, my Lord, when the army of monkeys (are assembled),

\(^{14}\) Supomo (1977: 279).

\(^{15}\) See text in Part 2.

\(^{16}\) Supomo (1977: 264).
it is indeed said that you will crush the kingdom of Ngalengka. 17

All three Modern Javanese versions of the kakawins contained extensions and additional references devoted to the Wisnu/hero identification. As both Krësna and Rama were considered as manifestations of Wisnu in the Old Javanese texts, there was no need for any identification adjustment in the Modern Javanese Bhäratayuddha and Rämâyana renderings, although extensions to existing expressions of this identification were most apparent. From the very beginning of the MJ Bratayuda, the accent is on the importance of seeking Krësna's approval and advice. Whereas the kakawin states succinctly at 1.8 that the Pandhawa sought Krësna's aid and he was despatched (kinon) to Ngastina to plead on their behalf, Krësna is approached by Yudistira in the Modern Javanese text in a direct speech passage which incorporates all the formal niceties of presenting a request for approval to an esteemed personage.

10c. 'Majesty and brother, you are my superior and my mentor. I leave (this matter)

11. up to your judgement. I wish to make a request for half
    of the kingdom of Ngastina, seeking to live
    amicably with my kinsmen.' 18

There were numerous occasions in the Modern Javanese texts where Krësna's opinion was sought and where Krësna rather than one of

---

17 KW 50.6 Bangsapatra, (17: 4,6,7)
   pan datan sapunika/ 7. ing mangsaniq' pati Dasamuka' benjang sapisan
   'ngkas/ panjanma Päduka lamun sampun'ababala wanara/ gih punika'
   kondhang tuwan benjing' ngrisak praja Ngalengka

18 KW 2.10 (MAC 2.6), Kusumawicitra (12: 6,6)
   Pukulan kakaji'kang mangka tutunggu/ panutaning ngulun' ing
   mangkyia sumangga/
   11. ing Päduka kawula minta sapali/ nagri Ngastina mrih'patuting
   kakadang/
the Pandhawa subsequently gave the appropriate order. 19 In other references, Kr̆ṣna was depicted as determining fate (andum swarga KM 91.1, MAC 68.17). The tributary kings, aware of Kr̆ṣna's role as cosmic controller, flock to his aid 20 while Gatotkaca states his willingness to be of assistance, bearing in mind that Kr̆ṣna will ensure his glorious place in the Afterlife if he is slain in battle. 21

The extended references to Wisnu differed from the casual asides scattered throughout the texts which were perhaps inserted as some concession to popular wayang personnages. Wisnu references can be reduced to two aspects of Wisnu's personality; firstly, Wisnu the controller, in both a macrocosmic sense as well as in a temporal sphere as the exemplary king, and secondly, Wisnu the messianic figure in an age of chaos and uncertainty.

Both these aspects of Wisnu's character were established notions in the Javanese world view 22 but some consideration should be

19 BY KM 38.4, (MAC 27.13), OJ 17.11 Kusumawicitra (12: 6,6). Pukulun Sri Bupati paran ing karsa/ pamuka Suryaputra sinten tiruduh/ 'My Lord and Majesty, what is your wish concerning the assault on Karna? Who is to be appointed.'

20 BY KM 15.22 (MAC 10: 14-16) OJ 9: 10-11, Sudiradraka (13: 5,8). marmasungung' para ratu kang rinatu/ 23, Sang Prabu Kr̆ṣna' janjining prang Bratayuda/ kang sapa mati'nglakoni tuduh Sri Kr̆ṣna/ patine manggih'sawarga luput ing siksa/ Narendra Kr̆ṣna' kang duwe swarga naraka/ ingkang mabagi/ This is why all kings consider Kr̆ṣna as king, for they had his pledge that in the Bratayuda, whoever was slain implementing his orders would merit in death a heaven free from pain and torment. King Kr̆ṣna controls and ordains heaven and hell.

21 BY KM 38.12 (MAC 27.20), Kusumawicitra (12: 6,6). yen tiwas ing yuda'Paduka mrenahna/ nugraheng kamulayan'ing Endrabuwana 'If I am slain in battle, ensure my place, grant me a position of glory in the abode of Indra.'

given to the fact that this emphasis may have been particularly relevant in the eighteenth century Surakarta court. An unprecedented political situation existed in Central Java after 1755 in that two courts, both subscribing to traditional notions of absolute kingship, were struggling to assert their legitimacy and win back the support of a confused and vacillating court elite. Given these circumstances, it would have been necessary to redefine the classical concepts of kingship and the epic texts would have provided an appropriate frame for the reiteration of these ideals in traditional terms. In defining the role and responsibility of the king, the duty and position of his subjects were examined at the same time, for the kawula gusti analogy applied to the ideal relationship between the king and his people as well as to the intimate bond between God and man.

The three kakawins contain examples of agonising decisions over loyalty to kin, ruler or one's own personal sense of morality and would have been particularly relevant in a time of divided loyalties. Wibisana's decision to defect to Rama's camp was extended in the Sërat Rama, one example being where Wibisana justifies his decision to a demon in a direct speech passage before engaging him in battle (SR 50. 2-6). Moral quandaries are more apparent in the Bratayuda where in Nitiśāstra terms, brother against brother is one of the calamitous features of a Kaliyuga era. The tragedy of the dissension that led to the Bratayuda and the clash between duty and affection were poignantly treated in the Modern Javanese versions, where characters such as Salya and Karna were singled out for sympathetic portrayal. Perhaps the suggestion in Modern Javanese Bratayuda that Salya was reduced to treachery and was responsible for Karna's death emphasises the compromises of conscience that are expedient in a time

23 Nitiśāstra 4.10 makol lawan bhratara wandhawa, contention between family and kin.
of civil confusion. The question of loyalty and justification of action as contained in the *kakawins* would have been real and debated issues in the eighteenth century and the examination of these issues within a mythical frame using familiar *wayang* imagery should not be viewed as merely falling back upon stock situations and analogy for popular appeal or theatrical effectiveness.\(^24\) The parallels between the eighteenth century political scene and the *kakawin* themes undermines the 'fashionable reinterest in classicism' overtones associated with the recasting of the *kakawins* and, as a consequence, the 'renaissance' classification should be reappraised from this angle.

**Wisnu the Controller**

References in the Old and Modern Javanese texts devoted to Wisnu as cosmic controller often emphasised the potential for imbalance and chaos if Wisnu withdrew his support or was enraged. Krěsna's violently angry manifestation of his *tiwikrama* form, which was effectively contained to one canto in both Modern Javanese *Bratayuda* versions, is one example.\(^25\) The awesome responsibility of kingship and the confusion that stemmed from abuse are accentuated in a small addition in the *Sūrat Rama* on the parallel *kakawin* episode. Rama loses control and threatens to destroy the world out of grief but is dissuaded by Laksmana (OJ 6. 64, *SR MAC* 13. 32). In the Modern Javanese text, Rama, on hearing his brother's caution, is startled and

\(^{24}\) See Carey (1974: 33 and 54-55) who draws attention to the choice of *wayang* imagery and situations in the *Dipan̄gara babad* to justify action. Carey is of the opinion that the use of *wayang* imagery 'transcends mere literary convention' and that it was possible that the *Dipan̄gara* struggle was seen in *Bratayuda* terms by the Javanese in the nineteenth century.

\(^{25}\) *BY KM* canto 11, *BY MAC* canto 7.
thanks Laksmana for guiding him back to a more responsible state of mind. Arjuna Sasra is similarly dissuaded in both the Old and Modern Javanese texts from embarking on a path of vengeance against the demon responsible for his wife's death. In the MJ version, however, where Citrawati points out that to wreak vengeance on a mere demon would belittle his status as an exemplary king, the contrite king thanks his wife for bringing him back from the brink of lapse from knightly good form (KM 57.22, MAC II 47.7).

Wisnu, manifest in Arjunaasra, Rama and Krēṣṇa, was given greater opportunity in the Modern Javanese texts to demonstrate his astuteness in the more practical aspects of statecraft. The liberal use of direct speech provided an effective frame for emphasising the importance of prudent deliberation between a king and his advisors. The majority of occasions on which Krēṣṇa's advice was sought in the Modern Javanese Bratayuda were contained in passages of conversation that reflected the sympathetic relationship between Krēṣṇa and his closest advisors and emphasised the fact that consensus was crucial to the smooth running of the state. Lack of consensus, the king's refusal to consult his advisors and the inherent dangers in the ruler being manipulated by self-interested courtiers, were cautioned against in

26 SR 13.31 kagyat Ramawijaya myarsa ngling, tyasira sumedhot kahu rum sa bade arine, minta aksama ring Bathara di, těrang tyasireki, kang rayi rinangkul ... Rama was startled as he listened to (Laksmana's) words, stunned by his younger brother's wisdom. He therefore begged the Almighty's pardon for now he saw everything clearly. He embraced his brother ...

27 ASB KM 57.22. Sudiradraka (13; 5.8). duk amiarsa' Mahaprabu Kartaviya' ing aturireng' garwa Sang Parameswara/ sigra rinangkul'duhu nak anger jiwansun/ bēnēr sira ri'meh kalēmpit raganingsun/ 23. tambuh- tambuh kang' ingsun rasakakān ugi/ When King Kartaviya heard the words of his wife, the Queen, he quickly embraced her (and said): 'Ah, my dear, you are right, I almost forgot myself. How remiss of me to think of such a thing ...
the Modern Javanese texts and it was, in fact, these very flaws in kingly conduct which Mangkubumi deplored in Paku Buwana the Second’s handling of the ceding of Pasisir territory to the Dutch in 1746. 28

One typical example of the Modern Javanese preference for stressing the practical as opposed to retaining the kakawin descriptions of beauty was the deletion of OJ Rāmāyaṇa canto 11.40-90, a depiction of nature, and all of canto 12, a description of Ngalēngka at dawn. Instead, the Serat Rama macapat canto 33 parallel was a neat, self-contained dialogue between Rama and the monkey king, Sugriwa. Heartened by the steady stream of monkey warriors, Rama suggests that the rear legions be placed under the command of able chieftains and is pleased to hear that Sugriwa has already taken this measure (33. 11-16). Rama then cautions against greed, arrogance and blind self assurance, warning Sugriwa that although he could muster great support, his success or failure was solely in God’s hands (33. 17-22). 29

This particular example of the substitution of a practical yet personal dialogue for a passage of rather abstract description emphasises the pervading 'applied ethics' tone of the Yasadipura texts and the model of the ideal kawula gusti relationship in this passage is even more apparent when compared with the kakawin reference to Sugriwa’s capacity for decision making:

'The king of the monkeys was instructed in the tradition, was given to know which was north and which was south. There was no possibility that he should follow the teachings, as basically the nature (of an ape) was thoughtless and dumb, but not recalcitrant.' (Rama OJ 19.58)30

---

28 For a full account of this incident, see Ricklefs (1974: 40-45).

29 SR 33.21. asor ungguling ayuda, apan dudu yayi saking sireki, karsaning Bathara Iuhung, awya ngandikën bala ....

Messianic Aspects

The Hindu/Javanese notion of Wisnu as the messiah figure and the Indian concept of cyclic eras (yugas) have their parallels in the ratu adil tradition, the coming of the just king. Prominent kings in Old Javanese literature were depicted as incarnations of Wisnu and although the god-king equation was adjusted with the court acceptance of Islam to a more mellowed definition of the king as God's representative on earth, the comment in the Babad Mangkubumi that the first ruler of the new court of Yogyakarta, 'looked like the god Wisnu' on the day of his installation was powerful analogy in the circumstances. The crux of messianic expectation whether couched in Wisnuite or ratu adil terms was a dissatisfaction with the present disorder and a belief in a better age to come. As the Jayabaya pralambang (prophesies) were of great significance in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century, the auspicious aspects of these predictions must have been borne in mind during the refashioning of the Bhāratayuddha kakawin which was dedicated to the namesake of the pralambang, Jayabaya. The interpretation of the word Daniswara as a future time or state when man would rise above his baser nature therefore deserves some attention.

31 See Wiselius (1872: 179-183 and 203-207) and Drewes (1925: 129-127 and 147-164) for a review of messianic notions with special reference to the Jayabaya pralambang. Also van der Kroef (1959) for a summary of Javanese messianic expectations.

32 Schrieke (1957: 83-88) lists kings considered as manifestations of Wisnu.

33 The Kalipatullah. See Moertono (1968: 28) for a summary of this adjustment.


35 See Wiselius (1872: 203-207) for proposed dating and authorship of these pralambang. Brandes (1889: 368-430) examined the prototypes of the ratu adil figure prior to the 1825 Dipanegara identification.
Wisrawana, the son of Wisrawa, is referred to as Dhaneswara, Dhanendra, Dhanarāja, Dhanapati and Wisrawaputra in the Old Javanese text but only as Danaraja, Danapati, Wisrawana and Prabu Lokapala in the Modern Javanese versions. The Dhaneswara references at OJ 1.7a, 1.14a, 2.8c, and 13.3b, however, were accepted by the eighteenth century poets as designating the son of the sage Wisrawa. The Modern Javanese explanation of Daniswara may be related to Dhaneswara, the Lord of wealth connotation as contained in the Nitiśāstra, a text which Yasadipura also rendered into Modern Javanese. According to the Nitiśāstra, in the Kaliyuga era, the age of disorder, Dhaneswara will be manipulated by those least able to use wealth wisely, the frugal and the greedy, while the benevolent will be impoverished and powerless. *(OJ 4.7-11)*. The Panitisāstra kawi miring *(11.10)* defines Daniswara as follows:

\[
\text{ing tēgēse wong papa dadi sugih} \\
\text{ring wong padha`keh-keh wisayane} \\
\text{ratu datan`wedi ing kasalahan} \\
\text{tan atolih`marang karatonira}
\]

This means that the poor man will become wealthy. All men will be very devious. The king will have no fear of evil and will neglect his kingdom.

The interpretation of Daniswara in the Arjuna Sasra texts was therefore possibly related to the notion of an age when the order of things would be reversed. This connotation, in combination with the prophetic tone of the Rama text, the identification of Arjuna Sasra with Wisnu and the expanded role of Krēsna in the Bratayuda is perhaps some evidence that the Old Javanese texts were interpreted according to messianic notions that were current and relevant in the eighteenth century.

---

36 Schrieke *(1957: 78)* described the kaliyuga age as an age when men were obsessed with wealth.
8.3 Allegory and Interpretation

The employment of a Hindu/Javanese mythical frame to examine aspects of ethics and metaphysics raises the question of the role of allegory in the Modern Javanese renderings and if the poets' application of allegory was contrived to the extent that only those capable of decoding the symbolism would be able to appreciate the subtleties of the texts.\(^{37}\) Admittedly, later authors did draw upon elements in the Yasadipura poems and construed them in a manner suited to the particular emphasis of their own texts. In the *Serat Suluk*, for example, Wisrawa's willingness to instruct Sumali in the *sastra arjendra* was equated with the foolhardiness of Seh Siti Jenar, Panggöran Panggung and Among Raga, who all dared to 'lift the veil' and reveal knowledge to the unworthy.\(^{38}\) The *Serat Dërmagandhul*, a text antagonistic to Islam, depicts the *sastra arjendra* as a pure form of knowledge which Sabdapalon much preferred to the Islamic faith that his master, Brawijaya, adopted.\(^{39}\)

Whereas the *Serat Dërmagandhul* author manipulated the *sastra arjendra* science to advocate a rejection of Islam and a return to the 'jaman buda',\(^{40}\) there was no impression in the Yasadipura texts that references framed in pre-Islamic, mythical terms favoured a revival of strictly Indic-Javanese religious thought over Islamic doctrine. The *nguni* (former time) references were more a reflection of an

\(^{37}\) Ricklefs (1976: 342) discusses the possible historical data to be obtained from a cautious deciphering of the allegory in texts of a more belletristic nature.

\(^{38}\) For detailed reference to this text, see Soebardi (1975: 38).

\(^{39}\) For a brief summary of this part of the text, see Overbeck (1939: 16-17). Drewes (1966: 309-65) provides a canto by canto review of this text as well as an analysis of the contents.

enduring tradition of Javanese ethics and cosmology than a nostalgia for the pre-Islamic past. Neither were the Yasadipura texts 'Islamised' versions of the *kakawins*, as, for example, was the *Hikayat Sri Rama* adaption of the *Rama* story or the more blatant *Suluk Seh Malau* refashioning of the *Bima Suci*.

There were obvious concessive omissions from the *kakawins* and an emphasis that was more in line with Islamic thought but there was also an impression that a more overt inclusion of Islamic terminology would have been anachronistic in the eighteenth century versions of the Old Javanese texts and would have marred the time-honoured quality of the more strictly didactic passages. Yasadipura, however, was not adverse to drawing liberally on *wayang* characters and analogy in the *Cabolek* text, both in reference to personalities in the tale and in an attempt to identify the *Dewa Ruci* and to explain the subtleties of the Union between God and man.

*Wayang* as a successful theatrical medium demands a highly developed sense of analogy and provides ample scope for personal, situational identification as well as interpretation on a wider social

---

41 See Soewito-Santoso (1971: 16-19) for a comparative discussion of this text.


43 Characters were likened to Anoman (2.33), Prince Seta, (4.25) and Baladewa (4.35) while Rawana, Kumbakarna, Sarpakêhaka and Wibisana were equated with greedy desire, anger, pure desire and holy desire (9.19-21, Soebardi 1975: 137).

Johns (1965: 16) raises the question as to whether the employment of *wayang* imagery implied a particular acquaintance with Indian religious thought but suggests that the choice of *wayang*-based analogy was more an indication of the eclectic nature of Javanese metaphysics and a guide to the expression of these concepts.
level. The effectiveness of wayang symbolism is that the theatrical form draws upon a wide range of aesthetic expression, both visual and aural. A reference, for example, in a text to a wayang character would therefore conjure up a spectrum of impressions related to situation, personality, timbre of voice, physical features etc. If the analogy in the Yasadipura texts lacked definition, this was more likely to have been due to the nature of allusion (to hint rather than to pedantically expound) rather than an inability to decode the texts according to a particular key. 44

Despite a wide allegorical margin, there were certain aspects within this pre-Islamic frame which needed to be adjusted. With respect to the Wisnu emphasis, the concept of the god/king and reincarnation appear to have been approached carefully in the Modern Javanese texts. It was noted in Chapter 4.4 that the Modern Javanese Arjuna Sasra texts included an additional episode which explained how Wisnu incarnated into the person of Arjuna Sasra. 45 The Wisnu/Arjuna Sasra identification therefore applied to a mythical character who may have been viewed as a shadowy king in the remote Javanese past, given that the scenery and cultural aspects depicted in the kakawin were familiarly Javanese. Although the Bhāratayuddha identification of Wisnu/Jayabaya was retained in the Modern Javanese versions, 46 Jayabaya was

44 Zoetmulder (1971.87) draws attention to the seemingly contradictory function of wayang allegory, in one instance, to elucidate and to make palatable expositions which by their very nature are theoretical and somewhat arid yet in the other, to conceal the esoteric in understated and allusive terms. See Zoetmulder (1953: 273-308) for a closer examination of wayang imagery in religious suluk texts.
45 ASB KM 15.5-7 in Part 2.
46 OJ 52. 5d MS Add.12279. The edition reading is in brackets. singgih dan tan sura sakti (tan hana nūsa sakti) wēnanga/ lawan (anglawan) ri sira Wisnu ngindharat. Indeed no one has the power (no island has the power) to oppose he who is Wisnu manifest on earth
BY KM 91.11, (MAC 69: 20) reads: duk Sri Bathara Wisnu 'janma mring Kadhiri' Mahraja Jayabaya 'sajatining Wisnu When the great god Wisnu incarnated in Kēdhiri, the illustrious King Jayabaya was in reality Wisnu.
no doubt conceived of as a more substantial historical figure and the manner in which these references to him were framed indicates that there was some reluctance to accord to Jayabaya the supernatural god/king attributes that were used in reference to Arjuna Sasra, Kṛṣṇa and Rama.

Perhaps the best indication of the extent to which the god/king concept was applied to Jayabaya is to examine how the Old Javanese references were interpreted and translated in the Modern Javanese versions and the interlinear text. In OJ 1.1 and 2, the word Bathara (Bhatara) was used on three occasions, twice as an honorific for Jayabaya and once before the god Girinatha. Although the interlinear text translated Bathara Jayabaya as aji (king) Jayabaya, the Modern Javanese poet has removed the word bathara before every reference to Jayabaya in his texts yet retained bathara when referring to Girinatha, which was translated as Bathara Guru (KM 1.5 MAC 1.8).

OJ 1.2b reads as follows in the Add. 12279 MS.

kapwasabda bathara nata/ samusuhira tékap i huwusnya kangrah
his vanquished enemies all acknowledged him as a god king.

Both the interlinear text and the Yasadipura versions mellow this reference. The interlinear text reads:

---

47 See, for example, lists of authors from Kādhirī to Surakarta in Winter (1911: 362-63) which are grouped according to kingdom and the ruling king. Many OJ texts were listed as being written during the reign of Jayabaya.

48 Gericke/Roorda (1961: II/761) translated bathara as 'god, incarnation of a god or king' but the examples quoted by the authors preface the words Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa and Guru.

49 In the final stanzas of the KM and MAC texts, the closing references to Bathara were similarly screened from the Modern Javanese versions before Jayabaya.
It is said of King Jayabaya that he checked the (hostile) action of his enemies.

In the Modern Javanese poems, Yasadipura borrowed freely from the lines surrounding this reference yet substituted the phrase saksat pèpakuning jagat, 'truly, the nail of the world,' for the Old Javanese 'all acknowledged him as a god king.' This substitution seems to be more of a reference to the poet's patron, Paku Buwana IV.

It is beyond the scope of this study to delve into the theological dimensions of the concept of Wisnu in an eighteenth century Islamic court. Wiselius (1872: 183) suggested that Jayabaya represented 'a personification of the highest level of development that the (East) Indies culture had achieved' and that according to eighteenth century tradition Jayabaya was a 'buddhist' who later embraced Islam. In this context, Jayabaya becomes the linking figure between the jaman buda and the Islamic era, although the above connection between Jayabaya (whom tradition positions in the twelfth century), and Islam is difficult to reconcile with the Javanese tradition dating of AD 1400 (AH 1478) for the decline of the last Hindu Kingdom of Majapahit.

The final stanzas of the Bratayuda kawi miring state that Wisnu's last descent to earth would be in the jaman caturana, an era which Cohen Stuart (1860: II/387) queried with a question mark but which is here suggested as being related to the first two words of the Jayabaya pralambang:

\[
\text{catur rana sèmune segara asat}
\]

four kingdoms resemble a dried-up ocean. 51

\( ^{50} \text{BY KM 1.4, MAC 1.7.} \)

\( ^{51} \text{Wiselius (1872: 193) translated rana as realm or kingdom although field or battle field may be more appropriate.} \)
The final canto of the Bratayuda kawi miring is confusing and incomplete. The contents, however, are clearly modelled on the traditional tale of Jayabaya as represented by the Wiselius summary (1872: 180-191). The most significant element in this kawi miring extension on the macapat is that the poet is at pains to link the age of the gods (jaman padewatan KM 93.8) with an era that began with Jayabaya.  

In seeking to establish this link, the poet states that with Wisnu's incarnation into Jayabaya, the age of the gods was to come to an end (ilang ingkang jaman padewatan benjing 93.8) and that Wisnu's mandate had been passed on to Jayabaya who himself had adopted the reh suci (93.11). According to this text, Jayabaya's assumption of the role of maintaining world order was no affront to Wisnu's past record as cosmic protector (Bathara Arimurti tan kōneng sasar / wit arēdyā ing saturun-turunira 93.8) and in recognition of his service to mankind, Wisnu was to 'retire' to a position of glory that surpassed Lord Utipati. (Wisnu amung kari nampan kewala/ ing kaluhuran kamulyan kasampurnan/ denya salaminta mangun arjaning rat 93.10). 

The Wisnu emphasis and the acceptance of the Jayabaya/Wisnu identification within the body of the Yasadipura text, coupled with the use of the Jayabaya pralambang material in the kawi miring extension, suggest an attempt to link the role ascribed to Wisnu in

---

52 Some indication of a familiarity with this kawi miring extension is the fact of KM 93.5 being quoted in Sūkār Kawi (1879-16) and Wawatonipun Sūkār Agēng (1899) as an example of Wisatakandhān metre. Sang Hyang Wisnu mari 'denira tumitah/ Prabu Jayabaya' wasananing titah/ winangun sasmita' kari juga nurun/ panca turas narapatā Jayabaya/. There was no metre name in the KM text for this canto.

53 Cohen Stuart (1860:II/378) interprets reh suci as the pure doctrine (Islam).
Old Javanese literature in pre-Islamic terms with the duty and function of the successive kings of Java, from Kédhiri to Surakarta. Wisnu's amicable relinquishment of his commission to Jayabaya and the recognition of his dedication to the maintenance of cosmic and temporal order smooths the passage from the pre-Islamic to the Islamic era and emphasises the notion of an essential and traditional stream of ethics and mystical thought that would be acceptable to all loyal subjects, for dissention and division were no basis for a stable and prosperous state.

The notion of Wisnu abdicating gracefully in favour of a new age and philosophy is continued in the lakon Sena Rodra, the outcome of the lakon being that the Pandhawa are promised that after the Bratayuda, their descendants will rule over Java and the descendants of Krësna (Wisnu) will 'watch over' the kingdom. The incident that gave rise to Krësna stepping aside for the Pandhawa is further evidence of a later attempt to link seemingly disparate elements in the Yasadipura texts into a common frame.

Bathara Guru is grieved to learn that Bima is teaching a secret doctrine (the sastra arjendra) which he obtained from the 'west' (tanah brang kilen). Lord Guru feels that this doctrine will lead to man losing his respect for the gods but Krësna cautions that the Pandhawa are not to be harmed. Narada is consulted and is willing

54 As evidenced by the saksat pëpakuning jagad reference in relation to Yasadipura's patron.

55 Kats (1923: 93).

56 amung ngëmbani ing karaton. See Overbeck (1939: 15) for a summary of this lakon and a comparative analysis of elements common to this lakon, the Arjuna Sasra texts and the interpretation of the sastra arjendra, as contained in the Babad Kédhiri and the sërat Dërmagandhul.
to accommodate Bima's new teaching as long as the gods are still respected. But Lord Guru is anxious and the Pandhawa are put into confinement. The gods are forced into a position of compromise when the heavens are attacked and pardon the Pandhawa on the condition that they aid the gods.

Although the sastra arjendra/sastra ṭatha references are found in both the Śṛat Rama and the Arjuna Sasra, there was no attempt in the Yasadipura versions to incorporate this mystical science into the Bratayuda. The age of this lakon is difficult to gauge but as it is listed in Kats (1923: 93) as a carangan (branch) lakon it was probably composed during the mid to late nineteenth century. What is of interest is the blending of elements in this lakon. In a plot that centers on a secret doctrine that threatened the hegemony of the gods, the sastra arjendra is the offending element and Hisnu, acting as arbitrator, takes a less active role once a compromise between the gods and the Pandhawa, the future rulers of Java, has been reached.

The dating of the Sindusastra text, on the other hand, is clearer; written in the early nineteenth century, the text took account of Śṛat Kandha episodes and Yasadipura elements. The sastra arjendra is not defined in the Yasadipura texts, neither does Wisrawa appear to have been particularly reluctant to impart this knowledge to the demon, Sumali. The Sindusastra text not only attempts to elaborate on the benefits of being in possession of this knowledge but stresses that the gods were most annoyed that Wisrawa had instructed a mere demon in this esoteric science.  

57 In Wedatama 4.3, it is noted that 'in former times, secret knowledge was not divulged to the uninitiated' (ing nguni-uni durung sinarawung wulang kang sinṛung).
Sœrat Lokapala. 11.13-14.

... that it was the sage Wisrawa causing a commotion by revealing the secret of the sastrajendra. The Supreme God Guru was furious. He then descended to earth, intending to test Wisrawa.

When Sindusastra explained the edifying effects of this knowledge, he defined the science in the same terms that Yasadipura used for Daniswaara.

Sœrat Lokapala. 10.32-33.

32. Once this science is mastered, — the supreme knowledge, demons, ogres and devils, all the animals of the mountainous forests, if able to comprehend the meaning of the sastrajendra,

33. will be redeemed by the gods and will die perfect deaths. Their souls will merge with mortals, mortals who are already superior. If a man comprehends (the science), he will merge with a deity when he dies, — an illustrious god.

It would be a difficult task to trace the passage of the sastra arjendra and its related elements through the maze of Modern Javanese texts and lakon extensions but one stream becomes clearer when the Yasadipura texts are compared with later works. Elements in the Yasadipura poems which constitute deviations in interpretation and emphasis from the kakawins were singled out by later writers who attempted to expand and interconnect these elements.

The sastra arjendra interpretation, which can admittedly be attributed to a corruption in the Old Javanese text, is not to be solely

\[\text{yen rēsi Wisrawa ingkang, karya gara-gara ambuka wadining, sastrajendra yuning rat, Sang Hyang Guru rēngune tan sipi, nulya tēdhak marang madyapada, godha Wisrawa karsane/}]

\[\text{10.32. wus kawengkapku sastra di, pungkas-pungkasaning kawruh, ditya diju rasēksa, myang sato saking wanadr-i, yen uninga artine kang sastrajendra/}
\]

\[\text{33. rinuwat dening jawata, sampurna patinireki, atmane mor lan manungsa, manungsa kang wus linuwih, yen manungsa udani, wor lan dewa patinipun, jawata kang minulya/}]

\[\text{58} \]

\[\text{59} \]
accounted for by Yasadipura's strictly objective interpretation and translation of what was on the page of the Old Javanese manuscript in this particular line. The adjustment in the kakawin line containing the sastra arjendra reference in the Surakarta and West Javanese manuscripts from the reading pandhita dibyacitta\(^{60}\) (sage of the Sublime mind), to pandhita widyacitta, widya having the connotation of knowledge, is an interesting substitution in relation to the sastra corruption. The interpretation of this episode and other passages in the kakawins seem to have been approached within the context of a search for knowledge and spiritual enlightenment and there is some indication judging from the pervading tone of the Modern Javanese texts, that this interpretation may have been considerably older than the eighteenth century.

**General Conclusions**

The Modern Javanese versions of the Arjunawijaya, Bhāratayuddha and Rāmāyana kakawins lack the metaphysical depths of the Dewa Ruci and the Arjunawiwaha, texts which have become associated with Javanese mysticism; to view the three poems as didactic vehicles dealing strictly with ethics, however, is an underestimation of these works. The sheer size of the Modern Javanese versions and their belletristic nature prevents a simple reduction to a basic theme and function but to attempt to reduce these texts to one point of emphasis would be to ignore the many strands within the poems. The Yasadipura texts were not designed as a set of maxims, which was the frame around which the piwulang and works such as the Panitisastrā were built. While presenting traditional concepts of religious thought to his eighteenth century audience, the Modern Javanese poet gave full rein to his sense of theatre, to character insights and relationships and to his poetic resources.

\(^{60}\) As found in the edition, Supomo (1977: 94).
The previously cited example of the Sūrat Rama episode between the monkey Sugriwa and Rama may perhaps be taken as the epitome of both the mechanisms of composition and the underlying emphasis of the Yasadipura texts. This episode is a well balanced blend of incident, narrative, description and dialogue. In complimenting Sugriwa on his good management and astute policies, the practical and temporal aspects of a successful life are noted. Man must live according to social guidelines and conform with knightly standards of etiquette, for order in society was dependent upon the individual observing these norms. But Sugriwa is warned that possessions and support in terms of followers or vassals are the mere trappings of a purposeful existence and that man must search inwardly for a deep spiritual awareness and be attuned to Divine directives.

In the Sugriwa/Rama episode and in the numerous examples examined in Chapters 7 and 8, the Old Javanese text has been adjusted to accommodate better the Modern Javanese emphasis. "Adjust" is the operative word in relation to the variation between the Old and Modern Javanese renderings, for in the vast majority of cases, points of ethics and statecraft treated in the Old Javanese versions were perfectly consistent with eighteenth century court values. Structural deviation from the kakawin narrative, in fact, frequently took the form of a digression where a particular aspect was reiterated by clarification and analogy. In 7.2, it was noted that the Modern Javanese texts promoted loyalty as the attribute most valued in an exemplary courtier. 7.2 and 7.3 contain a variety of situational
examples from the poems in which both high and low ranking personages were forced to confront some crisis of loyalty. Eighteenth century court values therefore revolved around maintaining the balance between loyalty to the state and one's own moral convictions or personal sense of duty towards kin.

The constraints of this study prevented a more detailed examination of the manner in which aspects worthy of reiteration in the Modern Javanese versions were similarly woven into other Modern Javanese texts of this period. One point to consider, however, is the extent to which the royal patron guided the structure and emphasis of the Modern Javanese poems. Apart from the perfunctory acknowledgement of a request to render the Old Javanese text in an aesthetically pleasing manner, the only suggestion from the Surakarta poet of direction from a patron is the Arjuna Sasra MAC II 51.25-26 reference to the King supervising the composition in order that the poet press on with his task with a little more speed.

By way of conclusion, I plan to examine four aspects that were instrumental in the shaping of the kakawin into the resultant Modern Javanese form. While collectively, a review of these four elements may aid in the analysis of the format and emphasis of the Modern Javanese versions in relation to the Old Javanese originals, each aspect leads to the inevitable question of the impetus behind the eighteenth century renderings, of the status and the function of Old Javanese literature in the Surakarta court and finally to the notion of continuity of
transmission and interest in classical literature as opposed to the concept of a 'renaissance'.

I. In 3.5, 4.4 and 8.2-3, I proposed that the Surakarta poets frequently approached sections of the Old Javanese text with some previously formulated impression of the contents. In 4.4, a distinction was made between this manner of approach to the interpretation of the text and the reliance upon scholia or the inclusion of a character as some concession to the theatrical/wayang version of an episode. Two examples of this seemingly preconceived approach are the poets' swiftness to consistently interpret incidents within a Wisnu/messianic context and the construction of episodes around a search for a secret knowledge and spiritual enlightenment. Admittedly, a review of a wider range of late eighteenth/early nineteenth century literature indicates that both these facets were considered and integral aspects of late eighteenth century thought but there is also some ground for linking this emphasis to an older, unbroken tradition of interpretation of the kakawins. The interpolation of the Arjuna/Wisnu identification episode within the Javanese tradition manuscripts at a period when the rules of quantity could be applied creditably, as well as small adjustments within the Old Javanese manuscripts which are too consistent to be dismissed as corruptions, strengthen the argument for an ongoing tradition of interpretation and detract from the notion of a 'renaissance'. Arguing in favour of continuity of literary activity and interest in the classical heritage leads inescapably to the problem of whether the Yasadipura texts were but part of a tradition of rendering Old Javanese
literature into a more accessible Modern Javanese format.

In 3.4, examples of sasmita were cited which could be interpreted as evidence of earlier renderings. It was also noted that while the poets approached certain sections of the texts with some measure of ease and confidence, other segments presented interpretive problems. This in itself suggests that the poets availed themselves of various aids to translation, one of which may have been an earlier rendering into Modern Javanese. In I.1, I proposed that the MSS IOL JAV 46 and Add.I2302 are in all probability the missing Yasadipura I macapat version of the Arjuna Sasra referred to by Yasadipura II in his own version of this poem. The paucity of manuscripts which date from before the eighteenth century prevents firm conclusions being drawn on the issue of earlier Modern Javanese versions. Although it seems most plausible that Modern Javanese renderings of stories which were the cornerstone of the wayang repertoire would have been written before the Surakarta era, one can only speculate as to the completeness of such versions and the relationship between these hypothetical renderings and the texts which have been attributed to Yasadipura. Caution, however, should be exercised before crediting Yasadipura with the restoration of classical literary traditions in the eighteenth century.

2. The Modern Javanese versions reflect the particular nature of the Javanese tradition manuscripts. This relationship is evident not only in sequence correlation, as is the case with the Modern Javanese version of the Nitiśāstra kakawin, but also in the transposition of vocabulary from
the Old Javanese manuscripts and in the construction of episodes or points of interpretation which can be explained by a closer examination of a reading which is at variance with the Balinese archetype. The small, scattered references to the value of the written word, cited in 3.4, point to a continuity of transmission through written channels and support the concept of a tradition of holding both scribe and text in high esteem. It seems most likely that the written text was prized not only for its value as court pusaka but as a source of traditional knowledge. The obscurity which surrounds literary and cultural activity in the sixteenth and seventeenth century courts prompts speculation as to the number and nature of texts available for consultation during this period but there is little ground for suggesting that the cultural climate in these courts was hostile to Old Javanese literature as part of a cultural tradition or that texts were spirited away until time and eclecticism ensured a more receptive atmosphere in which a 'renaissance' of classical literature could take place.

The later Javanese tradition manuscripts give no indication that the principles of quantity were appreciated in eighteenth century Java and have since been dismissed as inferior articles. As noted in 2.2, length symbols scattered throughout some Surakarta manuscripts were initially interpreted as random attempts to position quantity symbols. The fact that this positioning rarely corresponded with the appropriately placed length symbols in the Balinese manuscripts strengthened the notion of a breakdown in traditions from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century. The
identification of quantity-type symbols in the Javanese tradition manuscripts with caesura regulations in Sanskrit poetry of the Varna Vṛtta variety is perhaps the strongest evidence in support of a continued scholarly association with Old Javanese literature. I very much regret that there has been no opportunity to pursue this aspect via personal field work in Bali or Java. Conclusions have been based upon the most recent material available through publication, in which, to my knowledge, there has been no reference to the observance of Sanskrit caesura breaks in kakawin performance in Bali (or Java).

More detailed study of the significance of the pĕdhotan mark in the Javanese manuscripts will be required before any definitive conclusions can be made but it is here suggested that in by-passing the Javanese traditions manuscripts in favour of the more dependable Balinese texts, valuable clues as to the passage of Old Javanese literature in Java, as well as insights into kakawin composition, may have been overlooked. A sympathetic and systematic examination of the Javanese tradition manuscripts, to my mind, is imperative for a fuller understanding of Javanese literary traditions and cultural history.

3. In 3.2 and 7.2, I noted that the eighteenth century poet was restricted by his inadequate grasp of Old Javanese and that insecurity in interpretation was to account for a number of variations from the Old Javanese original. Some consideration should therefore be directed to the question of whether his limited philological skills should be seen in
terms of an inevitably gradual decline in acquaintance with a language that was no longer the court or literary vernacular or whether disruptive forces were responsible for the inability to correctly interpret the Old Javanese text. Throughout the thesis, I have argued for continuity and rejected the notion of a void, but the possibility of disruption, particularly in the period immediately prior to the Surakarta era, should not be discounted.

The problem of insufficient data on both Old and Modern Javanese manuscripts surfaces once again, as well as the vexing question of why some *kakawins* were refashioned into Modern Javanese in the eighteenth century whereas others were now longer current. References in Chapter 4 indicated that the *Bhāratayuddha* occupied pride of place in the Old Javanese repertoire and in this instance, esteem, availability, popularity and recopying are intertwined. Zoetmulder's impression, noted in 3.1, that works of a more belleurtristic nature stood a better chance of survival, goes but part of the way towards explaining the number and nature of the extant Old Javanese manuscripts in the Surakarta court. In view of the late eighteenth century rendering of the *Nītīśāstra* *kakasin* which follows the partial, extant Old Javanese manuscript quite faithfully, it is suggested that the Surakarta poets rendered into Modern Javanese all Old Javanese texts that were available to them at the time.

References cited in 3.2 to the difficulty of obtaining the *Darmasūnya* *kakawin* and to the loss of the original Old Javanese *Bima Suci* indicate that the poets
themselves were concerned that texts which had been consulted by earlier writers and scholars were no longer available to them. I would hesitate, nevertheless, to state without reserve that the Modern Javanese renderings were part of a concerted effort by the Surakarta poets to ensure that the Old Javanese literary tradition was not irrevocably lost to later generations. Without wishing to replace the 'renaissance' theory with yet another unqualified categorization, it may be more acceptable to view the Yasadipura texts as having been written within a period of re-appraisal and transition in which classical traditions were re-evaluated, almost as if in anticipation of the impending confrontation with external and Western concepts of statecraft, scholarship and the functions of literature. Some evidence of this reappraisal is to be seen in the decision to expand the suluk repertoire with Modern Javanese language sĕkar ageng fragments rather than to delve into the Old Javanese texts which the poets were currently refashioning. This choice may be indicative of the compromises and adjustments that were taking place in literary circles. Whatever the eighteenth century courtiers' aesthetic and aural perceptions of classical themes within Old Javanese language and kakawin melodies, macapat poetry was the established medium for literary expression. If the intention was simply to translate the poems, the question remains as to why the poets chose to render the kakawins into two contrasting metrical forms.
4. My final point, therefore, is that the Modern Javanese versions were shaped by the poets' perceptions of the requirements of sekar ageng and macapat verse. In I.1, I drew a distinction between sekar ageng, the metrical form, and kawi miring. The aim of this distinction was to establish kawi miring as a genre, albeit fleeting, minor and somewhat contrived in relation to macapat, I proposed that kawi miring evolved from an eighteenth century need or desire to write within that particular format. The eighteenth century time-frame was supported by the fact of there being no evidence of Modern Javanese sekar ageng texts written before the eighteenth century nor any indication of eighteenth century attempts to expand into sekar ageng babads or non-kakawin based belletristic literature. Kawi miring texts are therefore linked with those extant kakawin manuscripts available to the Surakarta poets and to the macapat equivalents. The notion of kawi miring as a transitional or intermediate genre in either a longer term or immediate eighteenth century sense was rejected on the grounds that the kawi miring texts in no way constituted strict, scholia-like versions of the Old Javanese poems upon which the macapat versions were based.

As noted in I.1, the term kawi miring was not used in any of the Modern Javanese poems to describe sekar ageng versions. This in itself indicates that the term was a later and somewhat judgmental evaluation of eighteenth century sekar ageng literature and does not reflect the status or relevance of the genre in the Surakarta court. I therefore suggest that these texts, if
written within the context of reappraisal and reiteration of time-honoured traditions, were designed as parallel and complementary versions of the Old Javanese originals.

Throughout the macapat and kawi miring poems, there was a strong impression of a prerogative on the part of the poet to structure incidents and episodues according to the Modern Javanese sense of narrative presentation. Section 6.2 drew attention to the kawi miring inclination to adjust the macapat-based text so as to be more in line with the Old Javanese account of an incident. It was noted, however, that these adjustments were usually quite peripheral to the narrative. The macapat preference to veer towards the popular/theatrical version of incidents and aspects of characterization is perhaps some measure of the poets confidence in an established Modern Javanese presentation of themes which were an integral part of the eighteenth century cultural heritage.

An analysis of the kawi miring texts has shown that the poets were familiar with the names of some Old Javanese metres, had access to a limited number of kakawin manuscripts and had structured their poems around caesura regulations which were apparently no longer part of the Balinese tradition of kakawin presentation and composition. The kawi miring texts therefore stand as some evidence of a continued tradition of transmission and interest in Old Javanese literature in Java. Comparison with the macapat equivalents, as detailed in Chapters 6 and 7, enables clearer insights into the subtleties of Modern Javanese
presentation. In conjunction with the macapat versions, the kawi miring poems reflect the process of retention and compromise involved in the refashioning of classical literature for a contemporary audience.
PART TWO

TEXT, TRANSLATION AND NOTES
THE ARRANGEMENT OF TEXT MATERIAL

The transliteration system and the arrangement of the kawi miring cantos that follow were governed by the consideration that kawi miring was a Modern Javanese literary genre rather than an imitative form modelled on the kakawin. The guidelines set out by the Lembaga Bahasa in 1973 were followed but the pepet (§) was marked. Adopting a Modern Javanese transliteration system meant that uppercase lettering was used for honorifics (Sang, Prabu, Bathara) whereas Prijohoeftomo (1934) favoured the Old Javanese system when he presented his transliteration of the Bima Suci sêkar agêng. The aksara gedhe or aksara murda is a capital lettering system in Modern Javanese which is not only used to begin a word but within the word itself. Although this system is mainly restricted to proper nouns and honorifics, the kawi miring texts exhibited such inconsistency and flexibility in the employment of these letters that it was impossible to adopt any system that could reflect the pattern of usage. MS Br 306 for example, was overzealous in aksara gedhe placement, some examples being ingsun (for ingsun), pribadi (pribadi), suphaya (supaya). Capital lettering was therefore restricted to the first letter of names, places and honorifics which referred to a particular character.

All manuscripts were characterised by the occasional doubling of consonants which were reduced to the single form in the transliteration; purwanireng, for example in ASB 1.1, for the MS reading purwaniireng. Similarly, the retroflex s(s) was often used after an r in words such as arsā and karsa in both the kawi miring and the macapat manuscripts. All three ASB KW MSS, for example, read kinarṣan in 1.9 and the macapat MS also reads karṣa at the equivalent MAC II 1.10. Although Roorda (1882:9) noted that the careful copyist used a retroflex ฿ following an r or before th (paṭhi), the dental s was used in the transcription.
Following the Modern Javanese system meant that the particle \textit{niring} and the genitive \textit{ni\textbar a} were joined to the preceding word even when the \textit{n} did not function as a gliding consonant (\textit{trangning}, \textit{s\textbar ekarnirang}). Prijohoctomo also used this system (BS/DR KM 1.7 \textit{pis\textbar egahni\textbar a} 3.7, \textit{g\textbar engning}). As noted in Chapter 5.5 the odd verbal forms \textit{numijil}, \textit{numa\-r\textbar ek} were rendered as such, as did Prijohoctomo, rather than following the Old Javanese practice of \textit{n\textbar umijil}.

The circumflex accent was used to indicate examples of external sandhi when the shared vowel was essential to both words: \textit{kase\textbar \\textbar asa}, for example, in \textit{ASB KM 22.1} but not \textit{Wisrawan\textbar aji} in 1.2, as the word \textit{ji} is entered independently in word lists as an abbreviated form of \textit{aji}.

Although Prijohoctomo favoured a capital letter to begin each \textit{s\bar okar ag	extbar eng} stanza and a full stop to conclude the verse, this practice was not used in the transliteration. One variant on \textit{ma\textbar apat} text presentation which was a concession to \textit{kawi miring} as a genre was the decision to incorporate the \textit{p\textbar edhotan} divisions, which were always marked in the \textit{kawi miring} manuscripts, with a small slash mark in the transliteration (\textbackslash{}). Related to the inclusion of the \textit{p\textbar edhotan} divisions in the text was the further decision to translate in a line for line sequence rather than to consider the whole four line stanza as a unit. The essential aim in presenting passages of text and translation was to enable an impression of the structural peculiarities of the genre rather than to present material which was familiar from other mediums and genres. There was no attempt, however, to translate following the \textit{p\textbar edhotan} unit sequence and there were occasions when adhering to the strict line for line sequence would have resulted in a clumsy reading in English. In these instances, lines were reversed or incorporated in the interests of a better reading and were marked thus: 7a/b. Honorifics such as \textit{R\textbar etna}, \textit{Dewi}, \textit{Prabu} were occasionally omitted, particularly in direct speech passages, in the interests of translation.
The aim of the notes to the text and translation is two-fold. There was no attempt to record every variant reading found in the *kawi miring* manuscripts but an asterisk was occasionally placed beside a word in the Javanese text to enable an impression of the type and extent of variants in the three manuscripts and to illustrate the point that most variant readings were metrically possible. On the majority of occasions, the asterisk was positioned at the end of a line in the translation. Notes to the translation were designed to pin-point the Modern Javanese emphasis, to draw attention to readings in the Javanese tradition MSS which may explain the Modern Javanese interpretation, to record some variations from the *kakawin* line, and to refer back to the relevant chapters and sub-sections in the body of the thesis where that line or a similar example was discussed within a particular context.

The eight episodes chosen from the *Arjuna Sasra*, *Bratayuda* and *Panitisastra kawi miring* are hopefully representative not only of *sêkar agêng* structure but also of the Modern Javanese sense of narrative presentation. The episodes contain examples of direct speech exchanges, audience and battle scenes, didactic segments and romantic or more lyrical episodes.

A canto by canto concordance of the *Arjuna Sasra kawi miring* and the *Arjunawijaya kakawin* follows, with reference to the canto divisions in the *macapat* I and II texts. The parallel canto and verse numbers are noted beside the *kawi miring* text in the two short *Bratayuda* and *Panitisastra* episodes to enable an impression of sequence, extension and compression compared with the *kakawins*. 
## COC:CORDANCE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kawi Miring</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
<th>MAC I</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 1</strong></td>
<td>Canto 1</td>
<td>(Prefaces ASB 1</td>
<td>no equivalent 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dating. Introduction to the kingdoms of Lokapala, Maispati, Ngayudya and Ngalëngka. Wisrawa is sent by son to Ngalëngka to propose to the daughter of Sumali. Sumali agrees on the proviso that Wisrawa will instruct him in the <em>sastra arjendra.</em></td>
<td>(Manggala 1-4)</td>
<td>poem with <em>SR</em> 1.17 - 2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>no equivalent</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bathara Guru and Durga descend and enter Wisrawa and Sukesi.) Wisrawa takes Sukesi as his wife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In Lokapala, Danapati hears of his father's deceit and decides to attack him. Bathara Indra descends and appeases him with two nymphs.) Birth of Rawana.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 3</strong></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kumbakarna and Sukesi. Wisrawa prays for a son like Danapati, his eldest.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 4</strong></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawana meditates on Mount GÖhkarna and is granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bracketting indicates material found only in that version.
Canto 4 cont'd

great favours. (He returns
to Ngalêngka and his grand-
father abdicates in his
favour.)
Kumbakarna is granted boons,
in proportion to his enor-
mous build.

Canto 5

(Wibisana requests the gift
of a human nature) and that
boons be directed towards
mankind.
Kumbakarna is given a boomi-
ing voice by the gods.

Canto 6

(Bathara Guru renders
Kumbakarna harmless by his
desire for sleep. His
sleep is a form of penance.)
Description of the kingdom
of Ngalêngka, compressed in
the MJ.
Rawana holds the world in
fear.
(Prediction of his downfall
at the hands of Wisnu.
Explanation of the term
Daniswara.)

Canto 7

Rawana receives envoy of
Danapati.
Scorns advice, murders envoy
and plans revenge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kawi Miring</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
<th>MAC I</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 8</strong></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troops march on Lokapala.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Patih</em> Banendra hears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the attack (head of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>envoy falls at his feet).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danapati laments his younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother's audacity.</td>
<td>6.5 - 7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Canto 9</strong></th>
<th>6.16</th>
<th>5.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Danapati enquires if Wibisana and Kumbakarna are with Rawana but is told Rawana is acting alone.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banendra and troops set out to meet Rawana.</td>
<td>6.8 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Canto 10</strong></th>
<th>6.10</th>
<th>7.6</th>
<th>5.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clash between Lokapala troops and the demons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Canto 11</strong></th>
<th>6.15</th>
<th>7.20</th>
<th>5.29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle continues. Rawana attacks the palace and Danapati prepares to do battle.</td>
<td>7.1 - 3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Banendra.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Canto 12</strong></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>6.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Danapati avenges the death of <em>Patih</em>.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danapati in combat with Rawana.</td>
<td>8.1 - 8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle reaches the heavens.</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Canto 13</strong></th>
<th>8.9</th>
<th>9.27</th>
<th>7.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indra orders Rawana and Danapati to fight on earth.</td>
<td>10.4 - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prahasta begs for the life of Danapati.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kawi Miring

Canto 13 cont'd

Danapati is taken to the heavens.

Canto 14

(Rawana seeks admittance to enclosure where the nymphs are waiting to reward fallen heroes.)
Encounter with the guard on the gate.
(Rawana jams his fingers in the gate attempting to enter under the mountain.)
Lord Guru orders his release.
Rawana withdraws.

Canto 15

Rawana wanders on Mount Kelasa.
(History of the ascetic, Widawati, who is Sri incarnate, awaiting Wisnu. Account of how Wisnu incarnated into the person of Arjuna Sasra.)
Rawana meets Widawati.

Canto 16

Rawana speaks to Widawati.
(She explains that she is waiting for Wisnu. Predicts Rawana’s death because of his insults.)
Rawana tries to caress her.
Widawati leaps to her death into the sacrificial flames.
**Canto 17**
Rawana interrupts an instruction session given by King Maruta.
Lord Guru descends and Maruta restrains himself (and entertains Rawana.)
(Rawana asks Maruta's advice, the whereabouts of Sri.)
Decides to attack Ngayudya.

**Canto 18**
Demons reach Ngayudya and clash with the Ngayudya troops.

**Canto 19**
Rawana launches an attack, defeat of the tributary kings.
Battle description.

**Canto 20**
Death of Banaputra who curses Rawana and his descendants.
Pillage of the palace.
Introduction to Arjuna Sasra and his court.

**Canto 21**
Praise of Citrawati (and Suwanda.)
Arjuna Sasra plans a pleasure trip through the forests to the seaside.
Along the route, villagers hurry to see the king. King arrives in the hills, (spends time studying and meditating with the monks.) Queen and ladies gather flowers.

A hermitage is sighted (and two *endang* of the former monk who remained behind). Reach a deep river and all bathe. Reach a field (where many monks are resting and meditating.) Party arrives at the ruins of a palace. All enter in amazement.

(Arjuna Sasra asks the monk why there is a mountain within the courtyard. Monk tells the tale of the king whose kingdom declined under his lax rule.)

Monk continues his advice on kingship. Arjuna Sasra assures the monk that he will do his duty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kawi Miring</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
<th>MAC I</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 26</strong></td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure trip continues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrive at camp, chiefs and wives bring gifts.</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>9 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much feasting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set out again on route.</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A deserted building is repaired by the king.</td>
<td>32.2 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 27</strong></td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The party reach the seaside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the ladies at play in sea.</td>
<td>32.7 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grieving monk addresses his plaint to unknown lady.)</td>
<td>young girl bemoans her unrequited love for the king 11 - 13.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of nearby island.</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl takes her life in the sea.</td>
<td>33.6 - 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 28</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue journey through ravines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach the river Narmada.</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bathe.</td>
<td>34.5 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 29</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty of the scene by moonlight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King entranced by the Queen's beauty and takes her to a pavilion.</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Built by Suwanda.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen is not responsive.</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 30</strong></td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King appeases the Queen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The couple make love.</td>
<td>37 - 38.1 - 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morning. Couple, attended by courtiers, to the river's edge. Queen dejected by the deep waters. King promises to dam the river and orders Suwanda to take charge. King assumes tiwikrama form and all pay homage.

Canto 32

Courtiers gather fish and precious stones.

Canto 33

Queen bathes in river, the King is overwhelmed by her beauty but controls himself. King and Queen praise each other.

Canto 34

Rawana meditates for world supremacy. (Disturbed because he was denied entry to the nymph's abode.) His camp is suddenly flooded. Rawana orders Prahasta to retaliate. Prahasta cautions against this plan.

Canto 35

Rawana infuriated by Prahasta's caution. Prahasta remonstrates again.
Kavi Miring

Canto 36
Prahasta continues his argument. (That Rawana has no chance against Wisnu.)

Canto 37
Rawana curses Prahasta and Arjuna Sasra. (Prahasta reminds Rawana of his sage ancestors.)

Canto 38
Demons set out. Suwanda sends out scouts. (Extension of his astuteness.) Maispati troops set out.

Canto 39
Suwanda orders a camp to be made. (Description.) Rawana mistakes Suwanda for Arjuna Sasra and challenges him.

Canto 40
Suwanda explains he is only the Patih. (Rawana compliments Suwanda) but declines to fight him. Orders chiefs to attack Suwanda.

Canto 41
Battle description.

Canto 42
Battle continues. (Account
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kawi Miring</th>
<th>Kakawin</th>
<th>MAC I</th>
<th>MAC II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 42 cont'd</strong>&lt;br&gt;of individual efforts, with mention of Suwanda.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 43</strong></td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation continues.&lt;br&gt;Maispati troops in tatters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 44</strong></td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwanda attacks, many demons killed. Maispati men retire.&lt;br&gt;Sukasarana reports (in direct speech) to Rawana. Rawana orders counter attack.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 45</strong></td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maispati troops are resting and taken by surprise by demons.) Demon attack.&lt;br&gt;Rawana joins fight. Tributary kings try to attack Rawana who is invulnerable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 46</strong></td>
<td>52.4 - 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawana disposes of the kings. (Suwanda addresses the troops.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canto 47</strong></td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troops remember their duty and return to the battle. Many killed. All fled but Suwanda remains. (Rawana challenges Suwanda to call Arjuna.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kawi Miring

Canto 48
Final battle between Suwanda and Rawana. Suwanda is slain.

Canto 49
Description of wounded (as they call on Arjuna.)
(Long direct speech account to Arjuna Sasra of the death of Suwanda.) Arjuna controls his anger when the god Narada descends.

Canto 50
Narada warns that it is not time for Rawana to die.
(Arjuna says that he only wishes to avenge the death of his Patih.)

Canto 51
Arjuna orders that the troops reform (in the same battle formation that Suwanda used.) Clash between demons and human army.

Canto 52
Clash continues. Rawana is killed but recovers.

Canto 53
Arjuna assumes tiwikrama form. Durga and Siwa come to assist but Arjuna sees through the gods' deception. Rawana falls wounded and is bound.
Canto 54

Rawana in bonds (taunted by the Maispati warriors.) Prahasta remains with him (and begs for Rawana's life.) Prahasta reproaches Rawana.

Canto 55

Troops set out for Maispati. (Sukasarana deceives the Queen in an audience scene. Queen commits bela to her husband.) Arjuna arrives at the camp.

Canto 56

Arjuna is despondent. A servant informs the king of the deception. Sudden arrival of a god who promises to revive all those slain.

Canto 57

The god revives the Queen. King is dissuaded by the Queen from taking vengeance on the demon (who was only doing his duty.) Rawana brought before the King. (Taunted by the courtiers.)

Canto 58

The grandfather of Rawana, the god Pulasta arrives. (His lineage.) Begs for Rawana's life,
Canto 58 cont'd

(that Rawana could serve as Arjuna's assistant to his charioteer). Pulasta explains his relationship to Rawana.

Canto 59

Pulasta offers to revive the slain. Advises Rawana. Arjuna speaks to Rawana who repents. Pulasta continues on duty of a king.

Canto 60

Pulasta continues. Arjuna concurs with Pulasta's advice. Troops are revived.

Canto 61

Arjuna tells Rawana to return to Ngalengka. Arjuna sets out for Maispati. Praise of Arjuna. The poet's intention, (the poet being Yogiswara.) (Tantular's intention)

Canto 62

(A reminder that Yogiswara cautioned against excesses, that goodness will prevail.) Heavy borrowing from the kakawin in the final stanzas.
ARJUNA SASRABAU KAMI MIRING

CANTOS 1-6
14-17
22-25

MACAPAT EQUIVALENT OF CANTOS 24-25

CANTOS 30-31
46-47
58-62
Canto 1 Suwandana (20:7,7,5) *

1. purwanireng makirtye, agnyeng Naprabwatmajeng \* Jaweng Surakarta
   ri Isnen ping wolulas Dulkijah tahun Wawu trus karna swareneng rat
   nihan ta kang winahyang cariteka Arjuna Sasrabau jearwanta
   sêkarnirang kakawin mëhëng ri basa jarwa \* mamrib tranqning kata

2. lampahning praja katri kang jinëjêr ing kandha nagri Lokapala
   lan Nata Banaputra' katri ing Maispati Prabu Kartawirya
   mangka purwaning wuwus Risang Wisrawana ji 'madya Banaputra
   wuri Sri Maispati wau ta nagri Lokapala kang jumênêng

3. Sang Aprabu Wisrawa nanging wus amagawan 'sumalah mring putra
   nama Sri Wisrawana'ya Sang Sri Danapati narpati taruna
   wonten gantya winuwus nagari ing Ngalêngka narpati rëksasa
   Sang Aprabu Sumali agëng karatonira derbe putri estri

4. nanging tan warni ditya warna manusa endah ran Dewi Sukesi
   tan mantra-mantra lamun' putrinireng danewa' tuhu keng warna yu
   nadyrat ratuning ditya' Sang Aprabu Sumali' ambëk pinandhita
   wau Sri Lokâpala' kang rama ingaturan' Bagawan Wisrawa

5. mring anagri Ngalêngka anglamara putrine' Sang Prabu Sumali
   Sang Bagawan Wisrawa sigra umangkat marang' nagari Ngalêngka
   ing margi tan winarna prapta sireng nagari Ngalêngka tur paksi
   Sang Aprabu Sumali garawalan amëthuk tamuan pandhita

6. wus tundhuk tata lëngghâg Sri Sumali lingirä bagya kamayangan
   kakang Prabu Bagawan prapte tuwan ing ngriki ulun tur pambagya
   Sang Bagawan Wisrawa nahuri inggih yayi Prabu basukinta
   Sang Aprabu Sumali suka-sukaniranting tamihan pandhita
1. sugatanira pĕnuh'ri wusnireng bojana mojar Sang Wisrawa
yayi Prabu marmita'ulun iki mara ngke 'ngĕbun-ĕbun sore
dinuta ing putranta'ki Prabu Lukapala'yen sarju rikang tyas
sutanta kaki Prabu'arsa amanakawan'upaya kanggeya

2. wusnya akathah-kathah'lingira Sang Bagawan'Wisrawa minta sih
sumahur Sang Yaksendra'ingga kakang Bagawan'kang punika gampang
kapanggiya ing wuri'pan kawula rumiyin'ingga minta wulang
sastra cĕtha arjeng rat'sarehning kang agĕsang'tan wande ngĕmisi

9. tuwin sastra arjendra'kang mugi ta jĕng kakang'sung nugraheng ari
nahuri Sang Bagawan'ingga ta yayi Prabu'punika saestu
pun kakang pun sumangga'sawontĕn-wontĕn'iran kinsakna
sigra denira ngambil sastra cĕtha arjeng rat'katur ing Sang Wiku

10. Sang Bagawan Wisrawa'nampani gya ambuka'ingkang sastra cĕtha
Sang Aprabu Sumali'winulang wrĕdinira rahsening kang cĕtha
purwakaning dumadi'wasanening dumadi'yuning jiwa muksa
dangu denira mulang'angsaya marĕpĕki'ujar Suwandana

Canto 2 Kusumawicitra (12:6,6)°

1. Sri Sumali karĕnan denyantuk wulang
sangsaya mangungsĕdiwirning pangawikan
meh kawingkis kahananira Hyang Guru
tan samar yen ana titah mardi kawruh

2. gya tumurun Sri Bathara Girinata
lan Sang Bathari Durga ingkang tumutur
2.2 prapteng gen Sang andon mrih kahanan tunggal warnanén putri Sri Sumali kang nana

3. sira Dewi Sukesi ngadhép ing rama neng wuri kapering datan pati těbih Hyang Guru saksana manjing mring Wisrawa Bathari Durga wis manjing mring Sukesi

4. Bagawan Wisrawa andulu Sukesi osiking Lyas sëngsém kasmaran mrih sëněng kendel denya ngraosakěn pangawikan dadya lon nçandika apitèmbung aris

5. yayi Prabu Sumali lampah manira ngêbun- ebun sore ngaturkěn putranta Prabu Lokapala ing mangke pan wande yen kenginga ugi kawula pribadi

6. ajodhoa lawan ni putri Sukesi sampun kumapalang ing lampah kawula Sang Prabu Sumalil nolih mring putranya nini putri sira kinsaran pribadi

7. mring Sang Wiku paranta sira ing mangke Sang Rëtna Sukesi umatur tur sëmbah Pukulun rama ji sumangga ing karsa dadya bubaran dēnya gunēm sastra di
2.8

8. tan cinatur lamēne ing ari mangsa
   Dewi Sukesi wus' panggih lan Wisrawa
   samya papasiyan'nutug mong asmara
   kunēng kawuwusa' Prabu Lokapala

9. ingkang rama lamē̃ganti tan prapti
   mangkya miya'sa yen Sang Putri Sukesi
   ginarwa pribadē maring ingkang rama
   dahat dukanira' Prabu Danapati

10. mring kang rama kadỹ age rēbut pati *
    undhang wadya-balā kang rama pan arsa
    linanggar ing yuda'wong tuwa tan patut
    sigra Sang Hyang Endra tēdhak maweh wangsit

11. heh ki Prabu Lokapala aywa duka
    wus pasthi karsanēng' jawata linēwih
    Sukesi jodhone'wong atuwanira
    ēnya iki ingsun'ingkang anglironi

12. widadari kakālah karyānēn garwa
    Nawangsih Sasmitāningsih samya endah
    Prabu Lokapala'ical dukanira
    wus tampi garwa ro'apsari kaendran

13. Prabu Danapati suka mong asmara
    lan apsari kalīh malīh kawuwusa
    nagari Ngalēŋka' Sang Dewi Sukesi
    anggarbini sampun' praptaning samaya
2.14

14. babar miyos jalu awarni raksasa
   asirah sadasa astane rong puluh
   langkung pinuja mantra ing rama eyang
   pinaparaban * Sang Rawana namanya

15. wus diwasa kapati denya mong tapa
   amrih ngluwihana ing rat pramudita
   denya sinung sipat beda lan sasama
   mila sanget pujya yoga samadi ning

16. pira-pira taunira neng patapan
   malah kongsi diwasa aneng patapan
   ing Gohkarna wukir ageng dahat pringga
   tan etang durgameng Kusumawicitra

Canto 3 Basanta (14: 8,6)

1. ing wuri kang ibu babar'malih mijil jalu
   warni ditya geng sawukir' wus sinungan nama
   ya Sang Wara Kumbakarna Bagawan Wisrawa
   kalangkung denya sungkawa dening putranira

2. kalih samya mijil ditya kang sawiji ageng
   nglangkungi samining ditya sawiji tan lumrah
   tan kadi putranira kang pambayun narpati
   kang umadeg Lokapala manusa * tur pekik

3. ambek santa pinandhita siniyan jawata
   wau* ta Sri Lokapala myarsa yen kang rayi
3.3
kakalih mijil danawa' beda angluwhi
lawan samaning raksasa' kang rama gung susah

4. Prabu Lokapala marang Ngalèngka titinjo
sapraptanireng Ngalèngka' arinira kinen
Kumbakarna sumusula' mring gunung Gohkarna
mring kakanira Rawana' sami amintaa

5. nugrahanireng Bathara' nadyan salah rupa
pen wus karsaning Hyang Guru' nanging pinaringa
pangwasa* kang anglangkungi' Kumbakarna nurut
kesah mring wukir Gohkarna' ing wuri kang ibu

6.babar malih putra estri' pasariran lungid
pamadya* ingkang wanudya' wus sinungan nama
nènggih Sang Sarpakènaka' taksih warna ditya
sira Bagawan Wisrawa' maksih sungkaweng tyas *

7. manjing ing sanggar pamuJan' amèsu samadi
kang pininta jroning puja' aderbeya malih
atmaja aywa doh lawan' pambayun Sang Wiku
Sang Prabu ing Lokapala' sèmbada apèkik

8. wus alami Sang Wisrawa' denira samadi
nulya mijil putranira' jalu warna pèkik
manusa kadya kang raka' Prabu Lokapala
sarta panèdhaning rama' undhagiya ing tyas*
3.9

9. putusan amangun teki\' tur bijaksan\'ra
wus sinungan namanira Koda Wibisana
kapanujon putranira kadya ingkang rama
jawata samya ngestreni Koda Wibisana

10. gunawan tyasira ngamar\' wiweka arjeng rat
wus mangkana Sang Maharsi sawusira mijil
putranira kang sakawan\' tan puputra malih
kun\'eng ingkang kawuwusa\' winarneng Basanta

Canto 4 Sulanjari (20: 8,6,6,)

1. wau ta Sang Dasamuka\' denira \# tatapa\' neng wukir Gohkarna
laminya nigitung sirahir\'a kang satunggale\' tinapan sadasa
pan sadasa warsanira \# dadya sirah sadasa pan satus warsa
satus warsa denya tapa\' ya ta amb\'en\'ri\'ing satuse warsa

2. tinarima tapanira\' Sri Bathara Girinata an\'dhaki
k\'ethen kang para jawata\' kang samya umiring mring wukir Gohkarna
m\'el\'ek ingkang riris wangi\' sampun prapteng gene\' Risang Dasamuka
jawata samya anguwuh\' Dasamuka sira\' dinangu Hyang Guru

3. apa ingkang sira s\'dy\'a\' kapati brata m\'agalar satus warsa
timbilan Hyang Girinata\' Dasamuka saks\'ana matur ing dewa
sukur\-sukur bagya mangky\'a wont\'en sihing jawata n\'dhaki ulun
dhuh Pukulun tur kawula\' mugi wont\'ena sihing jawata l\'wih

4. tulusa ing kawijayan\' kasudibyar. ulun\' inggih ngungkulana
seisining jagat kabe\' sangisoring wiyat\' saluhuring bumi
4.4

sampil wonten kadi ulun' nadyan para deva' ing Surabawana
samya jriha ing pukulun'sampil wonten nangga' bobot ing ayuda

5. kabe-kabe kang bataba' kasora prang lawan' kawula ywa purun
kumela mulat mring ulun' satru sabuwana' bêsmi ya tan kari
sakarsa-karsa kawula' ingugung kewala' mring Hyang Girinata
tuwin ta' ing tiwikrama' rupa-rupa ingkang angebat-ebati

6. ri wusnirang têlas turnya' Dasamuka mring javata kang andangu
wines tugering Sang Hyang Guru' umung pra javata' kang samya nakseni
saguning panedhanira' Sang Hyang Jagatnata' dhatêng anuruti
denya mantêp ing tapane' tan kegug tan osik' ing tyas satus warsa

7. Sang Hyang Guru wus wisata' ingiring para javateng antariksa
kang kari Sang Dasamuka' suka tyasnya sigra' mulih mring Ngalêngka
praptenireng Ngalêngka Sang' Dasamuka nulya' ingadebagaben raja
mring eyang Sang Sri Sumali' Sang Sumali Prabu' mangkya ambagawan

8. suyud sakula-gotrant'a satyra punggawa ditya samya asih
pra mantri raksasa nagri' Ngalêngka tan kêna' ingitung kwehnira
liyan bupati amanca' kethen tanpa wilang' bupati Ngalêngka
wau ta' kang kantun aneng' patapan Sang Kumbakarna den-turuni

9. jawata asung nugraha' angluwihi ing saisinging buwana
panedhanira ing deva' sinêmbadan lawan' gêngge kang sarira
miwah swaraning pêpétak netra kalih kadya' surya yen amandêng
panas akadya baskara' kalêwiyant' ing prang' ngasorêna dewa
4.10

10. sadaya wus sinėmbadan pinaryoga badañnya prasasat wukir
tan ana timbangenira suka Kumbakarna wus antuk nugraha
saking ing dewata samya sagung kasekten ing aprang kang linėwih
siga mulih mring nagara arsan ing tyas kadya Sulanjari

Canto 5 Bramarawilasita (11: 4,7)

1. kauwusa' putra ingkang wuragil
milya* mamrij' nugraha ring Gohkarna
Wibisana lami denya mratapa*
rare malah diwasa neng Gohkarna

2. katarima' denya amangun teki
tédhak Sang Hyang Bathara Giriraja
gumér dewa' kang samya ngiring-iring
sampil praptä gening Sang Wibisana

3. pan gumuruh ngudanakēn wawangi
dewa samya dhawuhkēn pangandika
utampiya' timbalane Hyang Guru
paran sēdyanīra amangun teki

4. Wibisana umatur mangastuti
Pukulun pan' panēnēdha' kawula
inggih datan' aminta paran-paran*
mung wontēna nugraheng kamanusan

5. sampun kadya' nugrahanya pun kakang
lan keninga mahambēk mangarjani
5.5
mamanisé tyasing wong sabuwana
winênangna mudhari tyasing punggung

6. myang rumêksa mrìng kang sarwa dumadi
singgahêna saking tyas kang sikara
ing sasama-samaning wong dumadi
rahayuning sapraja reh utama

7. gër gumuruh` dewa samya ngurmati
suka-su`ka` ingkang para jawata
Sang Hyang Guru` suka marweta suta
miyarsa ring pânênedhanirârja

8. Wibisana` jawata suka ngrungu
ing paminta` mrih mulyaning buwana
angenaki` mamanis ingkang tempung
budi yuvêna rahayu kaharjan

9. arjening kang` titah jawata sami
sami-sami` mulyaa rahayuwa
gumuruh kang` ngudanakën wawangi
angleketer` asanti jaya-jaya

10. ayu-ayu` rahayu wuwusira
musthikaning praja dining Ngalêngka
manik adi sosotya tanpa una
tumeja sîr` arum-arum candhana
11. ing pasthika sumotya-sotya ĕning wirotameng wiweka anrang westhi sagung para' dewa kang lĕwi-lĕwi
samya asung nugraha sowang-sowang

12. samya rĕsĕp umiyat dhewe-dhewe andulu tyas rahayu ambĕk ĕning sagung rĕsi-gana samya anĕlas panyĕpuhira pamumulang wahyu

13. berag sagung para jawata sami
Sang Hyang Guru datan kondur tumuli
denya suka'nganti lumrahing warah
Sang Gunawan Wibisana lir wulan

14. pinupuling teja wangkawa nawung
denya pamwahing guna nimpuna
sarwa sarı sumawur maratani
amrik ingkang reh nuraga mamanis

15. tan kewraning tĕmbung-tĕmbungningkang ling
denira lusing tyas suka kandhapan
panggĕh datan kagyat ing esi-esi
jati murti tyasnya pasthika maya

16. myang dibyaning kaprawiran ing aprang
samya lawan kadangira katiga
mung sinej wawatĕk tyas susila
Wibisana mrih ayunakanang rat
17. tan makireng kadhusthan mung sëtya yu
wusnya têlas pangudangning jawata
Sri Bathara Guru kondur mring wiyat
Sang Gunawan Wibisana umulih

18. langkung suka Dasamuka narpati
denya kadi kadange kalihira
subaga dibya kadigdayan sëkti
antuk sihira Sang Hyang Giriraja

19. Kumbakarna lidhahira nglangkungi
ten petungan dewa kang asung swara
dadya têrus saptenkang bumi langit
kadya bébrêt miyarsa swaranira

20. para dewa samya ngungun sadaya
ajrih malang ing reh Hyang Nilakanta
denya kathah denira sung kasêkten
marang Kumbakarna denya wus agêng

21. kadya wukir sarira Kumbakarna
netra kalih lir baskara dinulu
swaranira gora lvir gelap sasra
iya sapa kuwasa nadhahi prang

22. para dewa kasor tan bisa mulat
kumel mingkus kaplêngên yen miyarsa
pépétake lvir gora gara-gara
padhêm tekang Bramawilasita
Canto 6 Sudiradraka (13: 5.8)

1. marm Bathara Girinata anuruti
de wus kinarya liyan para dipatya keh
miwah kadangnya bineda sadaya yekti
Bathara Guru nglairak'en kawasanya

2. karya rupa geng anglangkungi isining rat
saksat Bathara Kala panglebur buwana
Kumbakarna yen' budiya jagat sadaya
kadya gempur kinemah-kemah ginilut

3. Sang Kumbakarna saking genging keng sarira
datanpa karya sukane amung anendra
tan anggo kala kala kalamun aguling
kinarya laku bratane Sang Kumbakarna

4. ri wus mangkana tuca pacikang kadhatyan
reregangatang jro pura kadya sawarga gung
tettap tan ana kuciwa busana nira
sotya-sinotya kumala nila widuri

5. kabei sarwa mas' pinatik-patik sosotya
wonten pemplo' emas gengira sawukir
pan kinarikil jumrut lan mutyahara*
bata mas rawan' akik wungu angunguwung

6. kang sasegaranira pan sinungan alun
binotrawi mas' sadaya sarwa kancana
tan ana liya' kancana lawan sosotya
tumpok sadaya jagat adinira dadya
6.7

7. busana ing jro pura Ngalengkâtisoba
tangeh wuwusèn srining kang pura Ngalengka
kunèng satriya samya kadhaton pribadi
Sang Arya Kumbâkarna kadhatone kidul

8. de Sang Gunawâ Wulisana puranira
saloring puraning raka Sri Dasamuka
samya srinira pura tri nagri Ngalengka
tèngah kadhatyaning raka Sang Dasamuka

9. ingkang rinaja Mahaprabu Dasamuka
Sang ari kalih wus sinungan bala sami
miwah punggawa lan para mantri wus sinung
mangkana malih warnanèn Sang Dasamuka

10. yen cinatura asri langèning kang pura
tangeh wuwusèn ing jagat datanpa sama
liyan sawarga kang tumimbang asrinira
kadhatonira Batharendra kang tumimbang

11. miwah kadhatonira Sang Hyang Girinata
yeku kang samya animbangi asrinira
yen ing manusèpada para raja-raja
tan ana ingkang mireb Ngalengkapura ya

12. ri wus mangkana Sang Dasamuka andadi
denira arsa mèngku saisining jagat
ratu sadunya aywa na kang tan sumiwi
marang Ngalengka rèksasa manusa sami
6.13

13. nembaha sukunira Sang Rawana Prabu
   wus kathah denyr'ngremak nagara geng-ageng
   makete'ng rat'tribuwana mring Dasaswa
   kontap deningkana'krura ambek agul-agul

14. julig makire'rat jinajah ambek rusuh
   sor tang prabawa'ngendraloka janaloka
   sagung manggala'di raja tatan tumama
   ing Sang reksasa'raja murka Dasamuka

15. nanging win sdka'benjang ana kang marwasa
   ing patinira'Sang yaksendra Dasamuka
   pan danuja ing'Maliyawan kang marwasa
   lwiring danuja'punika kusuma lwhih

16. endi ta lwhihing kusuma winursita
   trahing narendra'kapandhitene saykti
   prabawanira'aprasasat jawata gung
   asipat sireng'binathara lok minulya

17. dene ta basa'andaniswa lirira
   punggawa ambek'narendra narendra ambek
   jawata lwhih'buburon ambek manusia
   miwhah pandhita'wus ambek jawata lwhih

18. tetela * kaping' sadasa punika ttep
   andaniswa'wa* punika langkung karsa
   kathahing murad'tan kenging pinet sajuga
   ingkang mateni' Dasamuka ing ranangga
19. panjanmanira Sang Bathara Wisnurmiti
akanthi lawan wanara raja bala kyeh
tanpa wilangan ing tembe Ngalengka gempur
arjane saking wong agung Sudiradraka

Cantos 14-17

Canto 14 Bnsanta (14: 8,6)*

1. ana wukir Lokapala lu hur anglangkungi
mangayuh* marang awiyat Prabu Dasamuka
arsa wruh puputing arga gya nurut minduhur
sarwi anitih wimana Prabu Dasamuka

2. kang umiring amung kōdhik ditya kang pinilih
ditya ingkang kathah-kathah babahak jro pura
wau Dasaswa yaksendra prapteng pucak wukir
wontēn wangunan gapura korine ing jawi

3. ngayuh kakarangan swarga jroning kori ika
ënggoning sagung apsari gagantungan sami
badhe ganjaran satriya kang sureng ayuda
pējah madyaning ranangga sagung sesēngkēran

4. widadari lēwih-lēwih badhe ginanjarkēn
mangkana Sang Dasamuka prapteng wēkasanta
pucaking wukir punika kang dahat aluhur
nēnggih wastaning kang wukir Kelasa parwata
14.5

5. maksih manggung neng wimana Sang Prabu Dasaswa
   jawata kang tunggu pintu kagyat denya mulat
   praptane Sang Dasamuka'pan sarwi anitih
   wimana maksih amanggung kang atunggu kori

6. nguwh-uwuh Dasamuka' baliya den-gupuh
   sira tumuruna malih' wruhanira iki
   kori sêngkêran Hyang Guru'tan kêna den-ambah
   nadyan kang para jawata tan kêna angambah

7. sira yun° nutugkën kapti munggah mring sawarga
   nora lawan tinimbalan' kayunta' pribadi
   heh baliya dipun- agya'dinukan Hyang Guru
   manawa kêna ing papa'sayêkti ing mëngko

8. sira wus kôneng sasang'înira Sang Hyang Siwa
   ing benjing sira ayud'lan satriya dibya
   abala wanara apan'yêkti kang anumpês
   sakadang wargamu têlas' tinumpês wanara

9. bêdhaha Ngalêngka besuk'eh Dasamuka gya
   mëdhuna saking wimana Sang Prabu Rawana
   miyarsa sungkawa ing tyas' pëlinging jawata
   kang têngga kori sawarga' mung gening° apseri

10. têdhak saking ing wimana Sang Prabu Dasaswa
    mudya samadi sacara-caraning rèksasa
    tan ngangge cara manusa' kang pininteng puja
    bisaa manjing sawarga'ya ingkang sinêngkêr
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11. mung isi para apsari Dasaswa ayun wruh
ri wusnira asemadi saksana jumangkah
dinuwa menga kori duk'manjing asta tenggan
mneb tangkèb ingkang kori astane pinipit

12. tinarik-tarik tan kena pinèksa saya sru
pamipitira kong kori mandheg Sang Dasaswa
anjrit krura singa nabda sangêt sakitira
gora swaranira kadya manèngkèr akasa

13. angebèkî tribuwana' jawata kyeh kagyat
rènggang saking palungguhnya gonjing prakampita
gètèr pater maputèran mesèm Sang Hyang Guru
sukeng tyas sigra parentah mring para jawata

14. mring kang samya tunggu pintu kinen mènganana
winèngan korine sigra ingunus kong asta
sigra nèmbah Dasamuka neng ngarsaning kori
nanging sèmbahing sèmadi mring Bathara Guru

15. ri wusnira sigra mèntar sawadya rèksasa
piliyan kang samya ngiring lajèng angubèngi
sawèwèngkoning kong wukir' Kelasa parwata
lir lampahing macangkrama samarga Basanta

Canto 15. Sasadarakawèkas (20: 7,7,6.)

1. Sang Dasaswa andulu' ing parwata patapan' dahat sri kawuryan
kedèran toya wening' sangkèp sagung wowohan' duryan myang kapundhung
15.2

manggis langseb rambutan pisang pinggir andadi talés wi gembili
suka wadya reksasa samya mamet wowohan tuwin toya wéning

2. botrawinya inguki cinawi manik wilis rinambu tungtung bang
wacak suji ukirnya akik wungu myang wilis lunglungan sri tinon
mabra tag kembang-kembang seta pita myang rékta'alep pwa malangén
tangeh yan ingucapa sri langéning patapan wau kang palungguh

3. kusuma musthikeng rat' Sang Dewi Widawati rasikaning estri
srú sengsém tapanira malah akarya ojat tapiane Sang Rëtna
tinelad ing apsari kasor tapaning serat mring Dyah Widawati
tangeh yan cinature ayuning kang parwata myang mangudya teki

4. langén ruming patapan 'Dasamuka tumingal mudhun sing vimana
mërpeki ing patapan' mulat ana wanudya warnanya yu lëwiw
Rarasati myang Ratihkasor rëbut mamanis lan Dyah Widawati
sajatine Dewi Sri kendéyi panjalmanira marya pinaputra

5. mring sira Sang Bagawan 'Wrahaspati kang aran sedane Sang Wiku
ingkang angambil putra'dadya Sang Widawati' gumantyeng patapan
tétëp aneng patapanira Sang Wrahaspati' pan lami anganti
ubayanira lawan 'Bathara Wismumurti deñyarsa anitis

6. mring nagri Maispati lami tan antuk marga nulya na wong aprang
ing Lokapala mungsuh lan reksasa Ngaléngka 'Hyang Wisu sakala
ngampiri kang ayuda met marga panjilmanyasumurup milu prang
nénggih kang den-suru' punggawa Lokapala mati den Mintragna
7. enggal Bathara Wisnu nitis marang Sang Prabu Arjunawijaya kasub ing pramudita nagri ing Maispati Prabu Kartawirya rēp-sirēp sahananya tan ana ratu sēktī rēmek sinor ing prang ratu sewu sumēmbah anggēpe ambathara mring Sri Kartawirya

8. samya ratu digjaya suwiteng Maispati Sang Arjunasasra wus tētēp panjanmanyā Sang Hyang Wisnu Bathara anganti Dewi Sri maksih kendēl neng arga durung ana kang dadya marga udhunira nēdy a maring Kagada panitise Dewi Sri mring putri Magada

9. Sang Rētna Citrawati kalap Arjunasasra panggiya ing benjing mangkya misih neng arga Kusuma Widawati lagya amanggihī ratu kasasar aneng arga Sang Dasamuka yeku kang carita amēgati ing mangkya mangsuli kang ingucap Dewi Widawati

10. aneng sangar pamujan kagyat denirāndulu Dasamuka prapta neng lataring langgatan wruh yen rēksasa raja Dewi Widawati tumurun anambrama lah Sang Nata rēksasa paran karyanira prapteng arga patapan punapa kang kinapti tan ana kasukan

11. saksat papareng wiyat wung panas kang pinanggih tangheh manggya aub
miwah ingkang wowohan tan ana kang pinanggih tanpa karya tuhu papara pucak wukir wusnira ngling tatanya Rētna Widawati Sang Prabu Dasamuka miyarsa rikang ujar Sasadrakawēkas
Canto 16 Madurėtna (12: 5,7)\*  

1. lēnglēnging driya' mangu-mangu mangun-kung  
kandhahan rimang' lir lina tanpa kanin  
yen tan tulusa' mēngku Sang Dyah kang tapa  
Sang Dasamuka' wuwusira mangrēpa

2. dhuh wong punapa' yayi sira neng ngriki  
dene warnanta' kadya wulan purnama  
sēdhēng dhadhari' sumunu mrabani rat  
sēkar-sēkaring' sabuwana ya tēka

3. pathine uwu' aneng sira sadaya  
pagene yayi' tapa neng pucak wukir  
angur ta uga' muktiya neng Ngalēŋkā  
ingsun pan suka' sumiwiye ring sira

4. ing Ngalēŋkā pan' kasraha sira yayi  
amisesaha' siniweng wong sabumi  
Ngalēŋkā jalu' estri kabehe sumiwi  
mung sira yayi' pupujane kakanta

5. lah payo yayi' sun-gawa mring Ngalēŋkā  
eman-emane' neng wukir tanpa rowang  
angur payo ta' miluwa mringsun yayi  
eman tejaning' kusuma musthikeng rat

6. angēsorakēn' gēbyaring kang sasangka  
surēm prabawāning lintang-lintang kabehe  
kēmbang-kēmbang pan' wawangine wus ilang  
mring dyah ratuning' sosotya arum-arum
16.7

7. saestu sari-sarining rat sadaya
upama sekar sadunya yen jinahan
yêkти tan ana'mirib sira nak angger
tawusnya ngucap Sang Prabu Dasamuka

8. sigra nahuri Sang Rêtna Widawati
eh Prabuning ràksasa wya salah karya
tanpa dadiya'kaptinira punika
ingsun tan këna'singa kang anggadhuha

9. nadayan kang para jawata nora këna
liyane saking Sang Bathara Kesawa
ya kang amëngku tan këna liru sambat
sabanjure mung Sang Bathara Wisnu di

10. anjanmaa ping sewu myang satus ewu
nora apisah'iya kalawan mami
pan ing mëngko wu'janma mring Maispati
sumurup marang Prabu Arjunasasra

11. ratu subaga'Sri Maha Kôrtawirya
ingsun iki pan' nora lawas anusul
iya marang Sang'Bathara Wisnumurti
eh sira ditya'lunga'^ja mara ngke

12. eh Dasamuka'sira besuk pan pêjah
lan sabalanta' ditya samya' gëng galak
tumpës sadaya'dening bala wanara
margane saking ing patinira
13. dosanira pan'andhustha marang ingsun
pininta marang'lakinsun tan paweh
marmane sira'mati pinukul ing prang
yen uwus besuk'ingsun janma ping kalih

14. Prabu Dasaswa'alon denya sumaur
dhuh ariningsun'babobaywamangkana
ngendia ana kang'wani mapag prangingsun
Sri Lokapala'wus kasor prang lan ingsun

15. titahane Sang'Prabu ing Lokapala
wimana lawan'kaga wus kalap mringsun
tur iku ratu'sektri akadang dewa
parandene ta'kalah prang lawan ingsun

16. ingsun pan laju'mubeng-mubeng mring wukir
ya ing Kelasa'sun-ubengi sadaya
ing triloka tan'ana kang kaya ingsun
sektri subaga'ndyan dewa padha jrih

17. wanara malih'yen waniya maringsun
marmane yayi'mung ingsun jodhonira
dewa-dewa lan'wiku-wiku sadaya
wus tan'ana kang'wani mapag yudengsun

18. marmane payo yayi mulih mring Ngaiengka
kadhatoningsun'livat asri malang'en
tan ana ingkang'tumimbang asrinipun
Dasamuka ri'uwusnira mawuwus
16.19

19. marpɛki Sang Dyah‘angaras gelungira 
kagyat Sang Rêtna‘mundur asru duduka 
heh asu Dasâmuka sira durjana 
sira angaras‘marang ing gelungingsun

20. saestu dhusta’sira besuk tan wurung 
pinaten ing prang‘marganira deningsun 
Sang Rêtna wusnya‚nēpatani Dasaswa 
kesah mring gêdhong‘pahoman agni murub

21. Sang Rêtna manjing‘ing pawaka wus sirna 
Sang Dasamuka‘tut pungkur saparanya 
praptaning agni‘mangu Sang Dasamuka 
cangkelak wangsul‘sangēt cuwa tyasira

22. prapta ing jawi‘panggih lan balanira 
Sang Dasamuka‘lajēn ngubēngi arga 
aningali pan‘ana kanthining wukir 
pindha kadhatyan‘rakiting Madurētna

Canto 17  Sudiradraka (13:5.8)

1. namaning wukir‘Duksina kalangkung asri 
pan maksih wōngkon‘nēnggih ing wukir Kelasa 
ingkang palēnggah‘atatapa aneng ngriku 
nēnggih Sang Prabu‘Maruta pan angratoni

2. sagung maharsi‘para cantrik myang manguyu 
sakanan–kirîning arga sami sumiwi 
pakaryanira‘amumulang para wiku 
čūlēt sakenjing‘para rōsi samya kumpul
17.3

3. sumiwi aneng sanggar pamulanganira
kagyt sadaya denira wau kang prapta
Prabu rekhsa Dasamuka tanpa warta
laJI{g umangsuK marang sanggar pamurukan *

4. kang para reji kagyt samya bubur niuw
Sang Dasamuka ajing aI{nggah kewala
Prabu Narut astris denira tatanya
heh Dasamuka apa karyanta mariki

5. Prabu Dasaswa sumaur heh Sang Palunggul
wruhan a ingsun iki pan mentas ayuda
Sang Prabu Lokapala wus kasor deningsun
ratu linuwih prandene kasor deningsun

6. pinundhut marang sawarga Sang Danaraja
sawewengkoning wukir ing Kelwa kabe
pinaringake maringsun dening jawata
pratandha lamun ingsun unggul ing ayuda

7. sakiwa tengan Lokapala dewekingsun
yen sira datan arsa anungkul maringsun
payo anuli bandayuda lawan ingsun
wau Sang Prabu Naruta sakala runtik

8. sigra argunus sarotama wus ingembat
murub pawaka saking sarotamanira
supe marang tyasira ingkang kapandhitan
eh ndi ana ratu luput ing uripe
9. katiban dening sarotamingsun iki
nulya dhadhawuh parentahira Hyang Guru
lah pagene ta' sireku asalah karya
pan dudu karyanira mamateni ing prang

10. salawase wusira pinilih tinuduh
eman denira' nama Sang Prabu Naruta
kuciwa cēpak něpsune abarangasan
pan Sang Hyang Guru sung karya kinen mumuruk

11. mring para wiku kabeh sira kang baboni
lan iku Sang Dasamuka pan ora kěna
yen pinatena'ing saměngko durung mangsa
misih siněngkěr' denira Hyang Utipati

12. Prabu Naruta' sakala engět tyasira
aseleh sarōtama sigra denya ngunduh
wowohan kathah' sinugata Sang Rawana
suka Sang Prabu' Dasamuka lan sawadya

13. punggawa ditya' samya surak suka ing tyas
denira Prabu' Naruta sampun anungkul
lěnggah atata' Dasamuka mamangan woh
sawontěnira' pasugatanireng arga

14. sarwi tatanya' Sang Aprabu Dasamuka
heh ta Sang Nata' Wiku ngong tatanya yěkti
ana wanudya' endah atatapeng arga
Sang Widawati' manjing gěni nampik ringwang
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15. měngko neng ěndi jēbule Sang Widawati  
ingsun kaliwat' kasmaran mring Widawati  
Sang Raja Wiku'wus nampani ing pawarta  
heh Dasamuka' pan angel wuwus punika

16. tan kěna iku' yen kalapa dening sira  
aben-aben pan'iku ambandakalani  
Sang Dasamuka' lingira heh ěndi gone  
pan ingsun usir'sapa malangana ingsun

17. Sri Maruta ngling'akeh ěnggone dumunung  
ing Nagada ing Maispati ing Mantili  
ing Ngayunya ya'ing besuk padha unggyanya  
sigra Sri Dasamuka pamit abudhalan

18. sawadya-kuswâhìra tan ana kang kantun  
samya manapak'jumantara kang sinêdyâ  
nagri Ngayunya'pinrih ginitik ing aprang  
adrêng tyasirâ'dahat sudîra tan draka

Cantos 22-25

Canto 22 Kusumawicitr' (12:6,6)

1. jibēg wadya samurgya kang niningali  
urut desa-desa'kang lagya mring sawah  
bēkta garu myang walukunira sami  
kasēsârsa miyat' jêng Sang Ahulun

2. ton gebyaring rata rētna saking tōbih  
garu myang waluku sineleh binuwang
22.2

lumaj ar angithar' kasandhung ing tampar
sinampar tan lukar' kajepit ing lakar

3. suku sakit niba sarwi jelih-jelih
ing ngarsa tan nolih ing wuri angincih
sinandhung endhase bundhas kadheradhas
waneh kang ningali' wus celak manculat

4. ing laren kalumah' kelaput ing endhut
myang kang wus anggarumaluku neng tegal
tininggal kang kebo' sapi tan tinohih
waneh kang raryangon' neng galeng alunggh

5. sapi buyar myarsa' pangempret ing esthi
brengingihning kuda' kang samya lelampah
raryangon tan tolih' ing sapi lumayu
kasusu denya'rsa' miyat Sri Bupati

6. waneh rara kenyarsa ngangsu mring sendhang
buyut myang wantinga' binokta lumayu
rubed gya binuwang' buyung tan tinolih
waneh kang wus ngangsu' ngindhit buyung alit

7. taka age lakunya kadya ngaturken*
toya mring Sang Ulun Sang Kalenganing rat
kerut karahatan' tyasing sang umaksi
maksiya peksanta' ngantiya satata
8. minta-minta tan wrin' patuting tumitah
matah-matah ati' katutuh kapatuh
gayuh-gayuh tingal mundhak tyase giyuh
mundur kēdēr-kēdēr tan ana kadiryan

9. mung kang munggwing rata' ratna akeroror.
lan Parameswari' warsa Citrasmara
ririh rereh ingkang' rata lakunira
sarwi andudulu 'lalangōning awan

10. sirēm-sirēm hyang 'ima mangampak-ampak
ring ruhurira Sang' Arjunasahasra
lwir amayungi ring' laku Sang Aprabu
prabaweng bawana' aweh ing balēdug

11. anglimputi surēming Sang Hyang Aruna
mangkana prapta ring' pasir wukir-wukir
pra pandhita wiku-wiku pra maharsi
wus samya miyarsa' yen Sang Maharaja

12. apapara cangkrāma mring wana-wana *
wiku wukir-wukir mēdhun samya mēthuk
mring Sri Arjunasasra samya ngaturkēn*
tāpanira salāmine aneng arga

13. tan iyan Prabu Arjuna Sahasrabau
kang pinudyeng tapa' tētēping rahayu
ratu mustikeng rat' ambēk santa budyu
mumusēri ing bawana anglojēri
14. angaubi saisining pramudita
yen kalanira Sri Narendra dipaya
rērēb pan aneng pâtapaning pandhita
amanggih suka lan'garwa saha bala

15. pan sakala kang wûkir dadya nagara
saking gung ing wadya' para raja-raja
ababēthek angarâkad buron alas
miwah ulam kali-kali winisaya

16. anēnangkēb anjâjabung anjâjaring
kala-kala tulup-tulup pancandhētan
yen dalu Sang Prabu' gunēm lawan wiku
sēmadi mrih arjēhireng kauwusan

17. pratingkahing ratu' rumēksa ing jagad
miah gunēm ingkang prayogeng wēkasan
wēkasing pati pētitising patrapan*
ayya kawiēting̣ kkalulut kalaut

18. suka miyarsa Prameâwari Citrawati
gunēming raka lan' pandhita minulya
kweh kapyarsa tatētitining narendra
miwah tata titēning pati paritis

19. pantaraning utama namakēn* laku
lēlakoning praja-praja arja-arja
jinējah-jenahan rahayu utama
yayah wahyaning :uruwa kawiryawan
20. miwah wau Prameswari Citrawati
cangkrama mrih sekari-sekaritng asrama
lawan parestri selir-selir myang cethi
ramyanjrahning sekari kadya mapag ing rum

21. mrih kalangyan* andon langening puspita
jangga lunlung lwir lungayaning anyawe*
andul mekar lir gisi-gising asih
tunjung arjeng ranu lir wulating skung

22. mabra tang argulo tepining patapan
seta rekta anjrah ramya tang parestri
tekang menur lir tyase sang wiku kadya
tyasira sang amrih Kusumawicitra

Canto 23 Prawiralalita (16:8.8) *

1. suka Sri Arjunasasra miyat solahing pra garwa
kang samyandon ngalap sekari wusnya nangkana laju
ngalih pasanggrahanira ing wana-wana wulusan
myang sengkan-sengkan ujungning parwata mamrih kalangyan

2. samarga mamangun dana angecani tyasing bala
waskitha mayu kanang ratyyan * kalanira ararywan
rerbe aneng pasanggrahan sawadya sinung bojana
waradin tekeng pakathik tan ana kang kalintangan

3. wonten asrama katingal aneng pucaking aldaka
leyop kalamukan ima-tis-tis tan ana kawuryan
dukutnya dawa ngrêmbuyut' pandhitane kang atapa
wus muksa tan ana janma'marma samun katingalan

4. korine wus rinangkahan' jawining kori pan ana
labêting visma apelag' angungkuli jurang ajro
aneng satêpining marga' nyudênta wohnya andadi
wonten ta estri kakali' tilas endhange sang wiku

5. kakali' kari mangunêng' lara gêng wetning tinilier
wonten malih kang pratapan' kathah kang para maharsi
akontha-kanthi kikinthî' kinathik kinondhang-kondhang
pinanthèng sirnaning kathung' mënthag kunthara kapêtha

6. paphathening tyas pinathok' balêkthuthur pothar-pathir
kumêthak ngêlathak ngênthir' tyas kêthaha wus anginhar
saharsa sagung maharsi' angadhêp ing siyang latri
Sang Nata Arjunaasara' sêngsêm sagunging maharsi

7. kayuyun gêng kang pangestu' ngênting denya sugan-sugan
tumpêk saisining wukir' sanadyan cantrik urakan
pasugatanira katur' duk samana wonging praja
kweh kapengin dadi cantrik' denya gêng sih Sang Narendra

8. mring rêsi sewa-sogata' biksuka myang dwijawara
denyâmbek'. Sang Prabu tama' weh suka ing tyas prihatin
amamayu ring sangsara' anuwuki ing sokapti
ing bala-bala samuha' myang isining wukir-wukir
23.9

9. lajèng wau lampahira'Buminatârjunasasra
lawan Narendra Dayita'mwang sakwehning wadya bala
mëdãl ujungrung parwata'tumurun mring kali ajro
toyanya adrés awëning'kumëdhap-këdhap lajèrnya

10. sëmu manindra baswarà'tan wontën purun mangambil
wau kang wadya bala kweh'gajah myang turangga rata
samya dus angum ing warih suka tyasira umiyat
miwah sira Sang Aprabu'lawan Narendra Dayita

11. suka saja tuduh-tuduh'kadya tumingaling tulis
ri uwusnira samya dus'kapwa lumampah adulur
rereh lakuning kang rata' prapteng tégal langkung wiyar
sangang pandélëng dohnira'dukutnya ijo kawuryan

12. ri sisir ri tanjung ri pung'rükëm gumantung ing lëbak
ring têngah ana gurda gëng'ambulu kèpuh ajjar
ge'rovahing kayu têngah'kadya wiwara katingal
sumruwung katubing anging'sangsaya cëlak padesan

13. lor wetan katon warna sri'desa kweh tang sëndhang-sëndhang
sinung gopala majajar'sub kang toya awëning
kathah wiku malivëran'samyaso ing sëndhang-sëndhang
sëmdadi yen ari ratri' minta waluyaning dadi

14. lajèng sampun kalintangan'wontën wangunan kapanggùh
kongang saking gërger ika pagër myang gopuranira
myang wisma ngarseng lun-alun 'gopuranira maluhur
ing ngrikus Sri Naranata'rarywan saja wadyanira
23.15

15. kacaryan Sri Naranata'nggun denira tumingal
patilasing nagara di'kadhatyan pan dereng ewah
tuwin Sang Narendrapatni'tumurun saking rata mas
sakwehning wong dalem maräk sampun samya masanega

16. umiring mring Prameswari'umampah mring jro kadhatyan
korinya wus kalintangan' satuhu kalamun pelag
wontën candhi gêng kakalih' jronira ingukir patut
sélarja asri winangun' prapteng nataring jro pura

17. Sang Sri lan Supatniswari' myang parestri samya ngiring
wiyar nataring jro pura' pâpethetan tuhu asri
anjrah kang sarwa puspita' myang nagakusuma makweh
Sang Prabu lan Sri Garini' pinarëk munggwing mandhapa

18. râmya parestri mangalap sekar saka sënëngira
wontën wukir ing jro pura' kinubênganing botrawi
sinalisir sarwa sekar' wontën rëca amadupat
endah warnaning kang rëca' catur Prawirala'ita

Canto 24 Lëbdajiwa (11: 4.7*)

1. Sri Bupati'lan Narendra Dayita
prapteng unggwan' ing' rëca kang linuwih
mangkana Sri' Buminata tatanya
mring wiku kang' umiring Sang Aprabu

Underlining marks the extent of borrowing from the kakawin in the next four cantos.
24.2

2. eh Sang Wiku' paran punika nguni *
kaptining sang'ratu kang tilar puri
budi paran'punika kag aprabu
tan wruh eman'atilar ing sasana

3. lawan paran' karêpe sang ratweki
karya taman'wuwukiran jro pura
Sang Awiku'umatur ing Sang Prabu
Pukulun pan'taman wukir puniki

4. kang den-imba nêngghih ing Suralaya
ingkang kulwan'unggwan Bathara Rudra

[underline]ingkang kidul Sang Hyang Rêtna Sambawa

[underline]wetan unggwan Sang Hyang Amintabasa

5. Hyang Amolâsidi umunggwing êlor
kalinganta' prabu puniki nguni
budinipun tan wontên deva Sang Hyang
Sang Hyang Buda' lan Sang Hyang Siwaraja

6. kalih sira Sang pinangkesthi darma
ring darma sih tan uwal saking lëwih
nihan tekang darma uwal ucapên
kang den-umahken budya sang prabu
7. datan arsa' pituturing maharsi
   rēsi sevā-sogata dwijawara
   lan kang ulah derma ji lamun sinung
   sih sang nata yen anut ing sang prabu

8. sinami lan' wadya kang datan ulah
   ing kadarman yen tan manut sang prabu
   tan wonten kang kautamaning sarat
   tan ngarsakēn ing kadarman wisesa

9. mung satunggal rehira sang aprabu
   kautamanīra kang linampahan
   suka-suka ramya mamangen-inum
   lan putra santana myang garwanira

10. muwah wadya bala tan ana kāri
   samya sinung bojana andrawina
   pinrīh agēng rumēksaning sang prabu
   marma sināgotra ing bojana kweh

11. tan mangkana rakva sang sēdyā mangun
    dana boja' anurageng jagad
    datan saking' ana myang saking ora
    kang sinungan bojana martotama

12. nadyan tēbih kang tan ana ya sinung
    dadya kang sinungan tyas marwata
    ingkang asung' inganggēp jawata di
    saking datan' wikan purwaning kang sih
24.13

13. mangkana sang 'narendra arsa manggih
   budi kasudarman parimintaya
   arsa mencarakèn dana linuwih
   wékas-wékasìng pakarti den-ucap

14. kadibyaning 'narendra mati aprang
   sureng laga legawa manëmpuh byat
   yèkti manggih suwarga minulyendah
   kalampahan 'mati prang Lëbdajiwa

Canto 25 Madurëtna (12: 5.7)

1. sampun mangkana 'ing tyas ingkang pinusthi
   yen ratu datan 'anut ulah kadarman
   kang wus kalekwan 'narendra nguni-uni
   ingkang raharjeng lampah kang pantas tinut

2. lan aywa lupa mamriya puruhita
   dipun- asih ing rësi sewa-sogata
   asunga buktya sawataraning rësi
   supaya tajëm 'denya ulah manëkung

3. puja mantranya 'sang para wiku-wiku
   katur marang sang 'ratu tumrah ing bala
   samya sëngsèm mrih kautome laku
   denira sang sri 'angorsakèn darma ji

4. ajrih ing wadya 'kang samya ulah salah
   kapengin ingkang samya ulah darma ji
   denya sinungan ganjaran mring sang prabu
   pan ila-ila 'yen kinaryaa salah
25.5

5. mring sang narendra' dadyâwake pribadi
        ingkang akarya' salah deâ sang prabu
        nanging wadya kang' sampun nutâ ing pakarti
        ing kasusilan' ing kasudarman tuwi

6. sang prabu dipun' uningeng upadrawa
        yen enënapëna' kewala de sang prabu
        wadya kang uwus' mangkana bok manawa
        akarya susah' tan pedah ing prajaya

7. yen ana wadya' tyase amah-amaha
        gora wuwus tan' anggo ing subasita
        suka kadi kang' kelarupa sumaput
        datan wigih angëgagah pangulah salah

8. dohëna lawan' saanak-daranira
        matiya budinipun ingkang durwaka'
        supadi manut' saujaring agama
        dadya wisaning' ati yeku ngëmasi

9. wisaning driya' punika wisotana
        ingkang këna ing' wisaning tyas satëmah
        pëjah kabësmi' lamun datan paratra
        tëmahane susah' prihatin kasangsara

10. nënggih punika' namaning wisamaha
        dening sang wiku' yen datan tinuruta
        rikeng aturira marang sang narpati
tuwin kongsiya' siniya -siyeng tingkah
11. angrurusaka ing panggenaning rési
yékти dhātēngkēn ing supataningrika*
yen ngantya metya'kēn sot kang rēkasa
ingkang kataman ing sot sang maharsi

12. yékти anandhang ing papa myang pataka
mangkana tēclas aturing Sang Maharsi
denira mamrih sarahsaning Narpati
tusthāmbeknirang Sang Anarendra L ama

13. pan wis minusthi rikang reh pangawikan
lan kaarjaning wisesa sihing bala
kang sarwa sakit sajagat kinawikan
tuwin kang risak kang arebah pinayu

14. heh Sang Awiku sampun sangsaya ing tyas
pan wus manggeh ring' ambek manira tuhu
sasananing narendra kang paramarta
pakartya ingkang kadarmān manira nut

15. pakaryeng ulun neng bumi mangyasani
pakartya ayu’ sagung kang para nata
aywa na ingkang darbe tyas loba murka
lawan aywa na’ para ratu lenggana

16. denira rukun' asih ing wadya-tantra
yen tan mangkana' tanpa karya narpati
sinung nugroha de Sang Pramaneng j u gat
kinarya aģēng reh samaning tumitah
25.17

17. lamun pijēra' katungkul kaviryawan
   lali yen sinung' karya maharjekang rat
   upamaning kang' jana kang tyase kunẹd
   ing buktinira' sayektine asérēt

18. mangkana lamun'satriya para ratu
   yen tan ulaha' ing kadrēmaning nava
   dadya kainan' katungkul ing tyas limut
   nyamut-nyamut tan 'amoting Madurētna

Macapat Equivalent of Cantos 24 and 25

Canto 18.21-19.27

18.21 atatanya mring wiku ingkang tut pungkur
   eh Sang Rēsi paran iki
   karsane sang nata
   nēnggh kang tilar ing puri
   budi punapa den- anggo

22. tēka botēn angeman kangelanipun
   rēkasa karya nagara
   dadak tinilar ing dangu
   paran karēpe sang ratweki
   agampang tinggal kadhaton

23. lan maliye paran karēpe sang ratu
   karya taman jēro puri
   lan wukir kinubēng ranu
18.3 Sang Wiku umatur aris
dhuh Pukulun Sang Akatong

24. apan taman wukir neng jroning kadbhatun
ingkang den-imba punika
ing Suralaya Sang Prabu
kang kilen Ṛnggenireki
Bathara Rudra ingkono

25. ingkang kidul punika pan Ṛnggonipun
Hyang Rœ̂tna Sambawa në̈ngghi
dene kang wetan gyenipun
Sang Hyang Amintabaseki
dene ingkang aneng Ṛlor

26. Sang Amolasidi wastane Pukulun
kalingane ta puniki
nguni budine sang prabu
tan wontën den- wuningani
sagung ing dewa kang among

27. tĕgĕsipun dewa kang among puniku
jawata nayaka në̈ngghi
lire tan wontën kïnayun
kadya ta sĕ̃bahe maring
dewa wowolu sang katong

28. ing sangandhapipun Bathara Guru
tuwin saliyane
saking nayaka wowolu
tan pisan-pisan den-esthi
amung amucak kemawon

29. tingale - - térus ciptane ing kalbu*
Pukulun kang den-lēkēti
panēmbahipun sang ratu
puniku amung inggih
mring Sang Hyang Weñang kemawon

30. kaping kalihipun Sang Bathara Guru
sanes ing dewa kēkalih
sadaya kinarya suwung
karo reyaning pangesthi
ambibingung ing lēlakon

31. dene menggha kasudarmane sang prabu
sayēkti tan uwal saking
kalēwiyan kang ginayuh
amrih sampekaning dadi
kang tētēp arjaning batos

32. wontên dene kang tinihar ing sang prabu
kasudarmaning nrpati
kang den-umahakēn amung
budi tan arsa ririsak
lir ajēng wau sang katong

33. dados tilar tatakramaning kaprabon
pangkat-pangkat ing ahurip
kēdah kewala amucak
dadya sagung ing pra rōsi
wuwulange tan den-anggo
18.34
34. kang kathah-kathah tan wonten den-ingus
dene yen arsa paparing
sang ratu wau Pukulun
pan amung karana rai
nadyan wiku sujana wong

35. yen tan anut mring budining ratunipin
inggih boten den-paringi
dene yen wonten kang tumut
sinami denya paparing
lan wadya bala kimawon

36. nadyan balanipun pribadi puniku
mung kang anut kang kaeksi
kang pinaring dana prabu
tan etang trahing awōgig
trahing potang trahing bobot

37. trahing labēt kang nate nandhang botewuh
puniku boten pinikir
miwah kautamanipun
waradining bumi-bumi
kabeh siningkur kemawon

38. lan tan ngangge kasudarman wisesa nung
kang angèlebi ing dusih
mung satunggil sang aprabu
pratingkahipun ing nguni
kang dadya utamaning don
18.39
39. duk meksiye jënëng ing ratu puniku
   kang linampahan rumiyin
   suka-suka mangan-ningnum
   andrawina aneng puri
   lan putra santana kathong

40. saha garwa myang wadya-wadya lit agung
    sadaya binuja sami
    pinrih gén rumëksanipun
    maring sariranireki
    marma sinagotrah katong

41. ing bujana andrawina mangan-ningnum
    nanging reke tan kadyeki
    kalintu ing karsanipun
    langkah sëmune ing batin
    kirang mëngku kirang amot

42. yen sumëdyamun., gun kasudarman nung
    andane boja ing dasih
    saji. tan kalimput
    kabehe kang dipun- ratoni
    kasrambah dana song katong

43. botën ngamungakên kang wontën ing ayun
    tuwin wadyane pribadi
    nadyan wong ing dhusun-dhusun
    kang tëbih saking nagari
    punika ayun waspaos
ngulatana wadya kang mangun kung
wit saking malaratneki
tuwin wong liyan prajeku
kang umbara ingkang miskin
kasusahan aneng kono

nadyan têbih enggone ing dhusun- dhusun
kang sami apês puniki
nuntên paringana gupuh
ing dananipun sang aji
mijilna duta punang wong

Canto 19

1. kadya wong kang umbara inguni
tyasipun rumojong
bungah-bungah marwata-sutane
sangêt pamujine ing dewa di
kang paparing yêkti
punika Pukulun

2. pan inganggêp jawata kang luwih
saking tan wruh ing don
purwaning sih tan ana mulane
sabab wau ingkang apaparing
tan karana rai
tan amrih ginunggung

3. botên buru alêmaning janmi
adâmêla dolop
inggih wadya juru panitike
wong kang sami kasusahan tuwin
kamlaratan miskin
jinajah sinamun

4. makatēn ta aturipun malih
wiku mring Sang Katong
ya Prabu Arjunasahasra de*
Pukulun mēnggah para nrpati
ayun anēșēpi
kasudarman luhung

5. budi arja welas-sih ing dasih
liripun sang katong
sampun darbe cipta lewih dhewe
ywa ngathahkēn ing padamēlaning
kawula gēŋ alit
miwah ta Pukulun

6. sampun ngagungkēn kawiryan tuwin
kalanēnanipun
punika pan kalēbēt bangsane
ing pepeka sami lawan kibir
yen ratu puniku

7. tēbih lawan dewane sayēkti
datan wande cēlor
mangghih nistha yen tēmahe
kakēmbanging risak andhatēngi
sowong kang mēgari
mēsum ratonipun
8. mila tetepipun ing nrpati
punika sang katong
arsa mencar-mencar ing danane
myang bojane karanten sang aji
dados wêkasaning
pakartyeng tumuwuh

9. angemana manuswa sakehing
kabeh kang rinaton
aywa ngeman arta kancanane
yen angeman ing wadya baleku
parangmuka têbih
prajanipun kuku

10. lamun ratu ngeman ing mas manik
lumuh têmên kalong
ingkang arta utawi wastrane
yen tan lêpas pratikele yêkti
tan wande ing benjing
kadarbe ing mungsu

11. mungsuh ingkang angeman ing dasih
datan wurung jêbal
karanten ta kirang pambojane
kirang dana gung binotan kardi
dadya apês sami
prajarit prangipun

12. lamun ngantosa kalajêng inggih
wau ta sang katong
19.12

pējah munggeng madya rananggana
punika nisthanireng pati
palestreng ajurit
sakēdnik kang labuh

13.
abotēn sugih pahējah sang aji
angisis kemawon
sagung ingkang wadya bala kabe
samya tilar ing ratunireki
saking Sri bupati
kirang dananipun

14.
dening kautamaning nrpati
yen pārēp ing mungsu
wadya tumpēs neng arsa prabune
nuntēn ratune nēmpuh nglabahi
tan ajrih ing pati
rinoban ing mungsu

15.
mēngsah pirang yuta botēn miris
anēkad rarēmpon
ing wasana pralaya tēmahe
punika ingkang angantuk utomi
lanang ing ajurit
sayēkti datan wun

16.
manggih sawarga ingkang linuwh
ganjaraning katong
mati ing prang malih ta ature
Sang Awiku maring Sri Bupati
19.16
Pukulun Sang Aji
yen jënhëning ratu

17. këdah mëkatënh ingkang pinusthi
sëgungiing pra katong
lamun wontënh ratu upamîne
datan manut ulahing darma ji
pepeka sayëkîti
tan wande anëmpuh

18. kang wus kalampahan ngunî-uni
sëgung para katong
kang rahayu prayoga tindake
ing gung para katong
ingkang pantës tinut ing para ji
lawan sampun lali
mamriya Pukulun

19. puruhita dipun- sih ing rësi
pra wiku kinaot
miwah sagung sewa-sogatane
myang asung boja sawatawis
mring sakehing rësi
supaya Pukulun

20. tajëm denira ulah mahëning
mëlëng karahayon
puja mantrane punika kabel
katur maring ing ratune sami
19.20
tumérah bala ji
samudayanipun

21. samya sèngsèn mring kautamaning
laku kang kalakon
denya sang sri angarsakèn mangke
karahayon sagung ing dumadi
sih wadya kang bècik
milara laku dur

22. dadya samya jrih wadya nrpati
ingkang ulah awon
kèkès mulat'asalin tindakè
samya kapengan ulah darma ji
denya sinung sami
ganjara sang prabu

23. tan tèmu ing pilara pra sami
malah ta sang katong
asih marma mintir ganjarane
yen ana kang wadya laku sisip
dede ta sang aji
kang milara iku

24. yèkti inggih badane pribadi
ingkang karya awon
pawake dhewe iku kang gawe
bilahine wit solahe sisip
tan anut 'pakarti
barang reh rahayu
19.25
25. dede sang nata ingkang natrapi
   mring sagung wong awon
   ingkang salah iya saking dhoweke
   nanging lamun sampun nuting bēcik
   kasusilan tuwin
   pakarti rahayu

26. kēdah sang prabu anguningani
   aywa ta maleyot
   sampun bosēn miluteng asihe
   dadya kang wus bēcik
   manawi  Pukulun

27. karya susah tan pedah praja di
   tēmah ta sang katong
   tiwas tēmēd yen tunaha bae
   eman kinarya ratuneng bumi
   tan bisa mamari
   sakehing laku dur....

Cantos 30-31
Canto 30  Madurētna ( 12:5,7)

1. dhuh jiwaningsun 'unina raganingsun
   sira duduḵ mring sun tan tampeng lanāṉ
   apuranira̱ maskwari ring kakanta
   paran enaking̱ kang sadpada manganti

2. nganti uwusiṉ sēkar pudhak umēkar
30.2
myangs nyuning tadhah-arsha rakya mamalar
malara ring kényar ing Sang Hyang Raditya*
myangs tang cintaka-ring tawang kaléngénan

3. ngantysakén r'rising gëntéring petér
datan mangkana dasihira maskwari
kevala kadya' puspita ya mangamër
ngamër ring rumta'mungwing rarasning tilam

4. tan wring garutën'ring kanakanta yayi
prangën ing lungidëng tungtungireng alis
saking sangëting'sumaput driyaningsun
anon mring warnëhira karya wulangun

5. unang manungku' akung gëgës asmara
yen ingsun pëjah'silunglunga' lara kungë
rurubana ya' ri lungsur ingkang tapih
lawan masingsun tan panon rat idhëpiku

6. marang sira ri'kadya muksa këdheyna
lvrir hyang-hyangning kûsuma sariranira
tanpa karana 'ududuka ring dasih
nora wîsaa'dasih tan don lalana

7. marmengsun kadya' kapëñotan maskwari
tan etang-etang'dadya mëngkul ring têngah
paran ta iku'kaluputaning dasih
apan ta saking'ayunta tanpopama
8. pangidhêpingsun’lir ilangângarsengsun
kathah wêcuning’ pangrungrum ngarih-arih
denira mamrih naglipurekênh turida
wuyungira Sang’ pinarsudeng malat sih

9. narpa sangsaya manggehning kang turida
raganira lir’ salaga ngrênyêk gêrêh
lagya angudang-udang rikang pambayun
sarwi angidung kakawin ngarah° pipi

10. saha sung gantyan’ wau Sang minangkana
lwir kum da mekar ing tambanging wulan
dadya Sang antên’ paran yen amiwala
apan wus sinung sépah katarimeng sih

11. tan uninga rarasing amêdhar tapih
asêmu wirang kapêkseng katindiyan
ramya maparêng silih pulpé-pinuléth
ingkang lunggayan sêmu lunggah ing gadhung

12. kêkêth rumakêth’-rakiting ulah langên
apanjang lamun’ winarnaa ring tulis
ri polanira’ rêsêp mukti sanggama
vêkasing wêkas’ kalih samya rasasan

13. ujaring akung’ samya ris datan umung
sakwehning ujar’ kang sayoga kinênyêp
patêmoning kang’ raras reh karasikan
Sang Dyah umênêng’ anut sarehning kakung
14. kaleson sira'sare Sang Rêtnaning Dyah
samya ripira'wus sakalihan ulês
ri Sang Narendra'Dayita anupêna
amêng-amêng ing Suralaya lir rêtna

Canto 31 Swandana (20: 7,7,6)

1. kapatî denya nendra'wusira kaping kalih' denireng pulang hyun
meh rahina umunî tang manuk mawurahah' munggwing pang wowohah
pucang byar sumarambah' ingkang samya andadî neng têping banyu*
myang sêkar ningkang gadhung' wau mure wanginya' prapteng Nareshwari

2. sumilir kadya mapag' ing sira karahinan' kusut sing jinêm mrik*
pupusing pisang wau mûkar kadya tarihing' lunghlaning dahan
jalatara asêmû' ayun' susu malimuñan ing sêpêt gadhang
ana manggis andadî' tumiheng siti kadya' lathi vineh sêpah

3. lalu mangsanya sigra' mitil Sang Hyang Aruna' madhangi gagana
wuwusên Sang Narendra' lan Sang Parameswari' sampun asosotya
wus abusana kalih' sampun tata alênggah' wong dalêm umarêk
aglaring ngarsanira' Narpa' lan Nareshwari' neng ngarseng pakuwon

4. samya kaserân miyat' ing toya langkung wêning' kumrusuk swaranya
ajro santër toanya' barung lawan swaraning alunîng samudra
karya kangyêking driya' gênging toya Narmada' karya cuvaning tyas
tan kêna sinabragan' datan lêbêt ing têngah' weh emêng ing mangêng

5. marmanta Sang Narendra' tangsah marêk' ing ari' jêng Sang Nareshwari
katawis rikang netya' tanpa rêna nikang tyas' puguting kalangyan
31.5

wirangrong karikuhan dadya Sang Anarendra wikan tyasing swami
Sang Narendra Dayita marmanira Sang kaka Sri Narendra dipa

6. wacana mriyembada dhuh babo ariningsun aywa tyas sangsaya
mungguh panambaking kang bêngawan daht wiyar miwah kang samudra
kalamun sira yayi nigarsakakên ugi yêkti ingsun bisa
nadyan sira akarsa ngudhanakên sawarga lamun meksi ingsun

7. paran kinewuhêna yêkti bisa kakanta manggihkên karsanta
nanging ta ingsun arî wenangêna umulat sêdhêng sira wibuh
sira manugrahana ing dasih kang kaswasih kang daht rumëksa
nadyan wonging jro pura pipingitan kang caðhi sadaya mung sira

8. kang rinëkseng sakarsa tékaning wada-tantra prawira pra nata
tan gumingsir pagut neng sakarsanira yayi tan prabedeng ngulan
ênëngêna wuwus Sang Narendra dan tumëdhak saking ngarseng arî
sigra Sang Maharaja mangadêng ing têpining Narmada madalêm

9. timbali Kyanapatih Suwanda prapteng ngarsa lan sagung par ratu
mvang satriya punggawa ngandika Sri Bupati heh yayi Suwanda
ingsun arsa anendra aneng sungapan kene sira den-prayitna
rumëksa ing pakewuh lan sagung ing prawira Suwanda wot santun

10. Pukulun gih sandika sigra Sri Naranata garjita umiyat
toyaning kang kali gêng gembira jêro ing têngah sami lan samudra
sigra Sri Maharaja tiwikrama andadi kadya parbwa gêng
asta sewu mapanjang kadya narënp sanjata jawateng awiyat
11. ngudankên kambang-kambang umyung samya ngastuti tuwin pra maharsi samya marék ing Sang Sri myang Narendra Patni lan para garwa wong iro dalém sadaya pra samya angabëkti ing jëng Sang Aprabu kang rumiyin sira Sang Narapati Dayita ngabëkti ring kaka

12. mwang kang para pratiwa satriya para nata samya ngabëkti wusnya têlas kang samya mangënjali gya tindak'lwir bêlah kang bumi guntur têkeng parbwata gya tumëdhun gumuling têbahnya umalang ing sungapan samudra piyak toyanya kadya tinambak Swandana

Cantos 46-47

Canto 46 Kusumawicitra (12: 6,6)

1. Sang Rawana malah 'sangsaya gambira
tan takut kinarubut ing para nata sarikutan ngiwa nengën mamateni
Sang Prabu Srawangga dinékung wus pêjah

2. multak tang rudira mijil saking irung mojar Sang Rawana kadya gelap angrik heh heh para ratu tanpa guna padha sira kudu mapagakên wukku ngarsa

3. dora lamun mënang aprang lawan ingsun prasaset sira padha ngaturkên pati wusnira susumber Prabu Dasamuka
Sri Ngala wus pêjah lawan Sri Kalingga
46.4

4. Prabu Soda tulung binuwang tibeng doh dhadhal larut ingkang pra nata sasaren prawira ing Maispati samya takut giris miris mulat ing prang Dasamuka

5. liwat awrat sariranira lir agni kadya tan kēna ing pati Sang yaksendra mawur ana ngungsi ing jurang myang arga denya Sang Rawana krura kadya Kala

6. krodhārsa mangrurah buwana ginēmpur amung sira wau Sang mentri wisesa manggala pangirid senapatining prang pamungkasing pra dipati sahadaya

7. yekang mangka panutaning para ranu sira Sang Rākyana Apatih Suwanda sudira tan osik malang ratanira sru gumēbyar katrangan surya mateja

8. makutha sru lir Bōhara Surapati Rākyana Apatih anyandhak pustaka sinurat kanaka tan adangu dadya tinangsul ing cakra mēsat panah cakra

9. tiba ngarsanira kang para narendra pustakanira Sang Apatih Suwanda sagung kang lumayu miris ing ayuda satriya punggawa kang para prawira
46.10
10. tinibanan pustaka muni pitutur
   heh sagung para ji'kang padha lumayu
   kawruhana nistha'mad ya lan utama
   sagunging kang para'narpati manggala

11. awya na kang nor'a'amrih kautaman
    pan iya gustini'ta Sri Maispati
    ing nistha lan madya'sayk ti tinampik
    mung utama ingkang'tetep linakonan

12. sira iku heh sagunging para nata
    tinggal madya padha'ngarēpakēh nistha
    dad ya rong prakara'dosanira sami
    kang dhingin padha dosa mring gustinira

13. datan anut ing parikrama sayēk ti
   atinggal wawatak' pan Sri Ma'spati
   gone amēngku ing'wad ya para nata
   rinēngkuh ing kulit'daging pan sadaya

14. pinrih sami braya'inganggēp tēnaya
    tan lila sayēk ti y en nēmuwa ala
    kabe h pinrih padha'anēmuwa bēcik
    mwang ing jaman kapāten sireng dēlah an

15. pan rinēksa ing gustinira Sang Prabu
    ing mangke gustinira amanggih karya
    tēk a mangkana padha pratingkahira
    tangeh yen malēsa'rumēksa ing gusti
16. ruměksa ing awak pribadi tan bisa
tan wun ing patini⁰ra anemptu papa
kapindho dosanta mring Hyang Girinata
dening kita padha tinitah narendra

17. těka padha amilih nisthaning pati
lumayu prang wědįkasěktening mungsu⁰
lan ta ijab-ijab nisthaning narpati
wong lumayu ing prang tětěp wong urakan

18. ratu ingkang lumayu ing rananggana
anggedheken luput ing pati myang urip
tan antuk sanggone umadęg narendra
suwita ing Prabu Arjunawijaya

19. ratu ambęk santabudya mardikeng rat
undhagi wiweka pratameng ayuda
ratu wingit patitis mi⁰h pati mulya
kabeh yen měngkana ⁰iya aja tanggung

20. angawula ratu utama tan bisa
wong aurip ajaatanggung ing laku
wis padha suwit⁰a ratuning ditya
ambęk salah nora angel linampahan

21. kang jamak manusa mri⁰h utameng pati
pan satëngah ing prang⁰gone met ing pati
pati kang patitis mati têngahing prang
yen běněr pratikēlira tanpa timbang
22. angësorakën pati sajroning puja
yen narapati lumâyu miris ing yuda
tuhu tanpa sastra’uri su ngèlampra
tan arsa mamrih ing pati kang minulya

23. kudu amrih pati’amor lan mënëdi
nora mrih. ing pati’kang raharjeng wëkas
apan dadining cipta sajroning aprang
kang bëñër sinëdyå’kang tän dhompa ing prang

24. kasudiran kang tapa sirahing tapa
kang pasrah sajroning’asmaradilaga
amung Hyang Jagat Pratëngkah kang anitah
ing pati lan urip’manusa pan dërma

25. mung darbeke sumangå’ga karsaning titah
pagut ngasmareng prang’ciptanën upama
mangsah asëmadi’papaning ayuda
wawadhah padupan’gyaning pamumujan

26. panduking kang sagung’warastra ciptanën
urubing pawaka’dupa kang wawangi
utama morgan’pati kang minulya
gong tëngaraning prang’cipta gëntha këleng

27. amuja ajaya-jaya ing ayuda
mungsuh ruruwëding’pati yen lëstari
momot ing beka pan’anëmu kamulyan
yen tän mati ing prang’malah sangsaya gung
28. ganjarane denya' kweh amamateni
anumpes ing satru-satu salah ing prang
kadya sasangka lan'surya tan katingal
aluhur gyanira tan k'eneng mamala

29. yeku utamaning wong aulah sprang
yen t'akaning pati mulih ing kamulyan
sirnanira sami 'tempel pan tin'nu
lan Wisnu Bathara' Kusumawicitra

Canto 47 Sikarini (17:6,6,5)

1. wus mangkana sagung' para ratu myarsa' pitutur'i
Rekyana Apatih Soewanda kalangkung' saking prayoga
garjita kang para' raja sigra wangsur' mahambek pati
denyah kadi pitutur' Soewanda rinasa' rasa ing driya

2. prapta aglar mungkin' ngarsaning Apatih' kang para' raja
satriya punggawa' myang samanrinira' wus samya nusul
sagung para raja' wus samya anyipta' ngangg'ep pitutur
pitutur ing Patih Suwanda wus samya' ambek tan tolih

3. pareng tandang sagung' para raja miweh' para punggawa
prawira satriya' samya angembuli' mring Dasamuka
tan ana ngrasa jrih' kadiya den-kileni' saking pitutur
rame tempuh ing prang' ditya lan manusia' alit samya lit
47.4

4. punggawa prasamyapunggawa ayudakang para ratungrubut Dasamukana kang angunta'cakra anggadasanjata lir jawah'tibeng Dasamukabratsha tan têdhasyen mâlês anggada'anglimpung angunta'kwehangêmasi

5. para ratu miwah'satriyapunggawa'akeh rinangkêp
denya amateni'Prabu Dasamukakweh kasulayahPrabu Suryaketudityama gêrsaridinuk ing panahbratsha kangerksasa'salêksya ya pêjah'de Suryaketu

6. manêngah pêksa muk'mring Sang Dasamukasri Suryaketu'angungsi Rawana'sari ngayat dhêndha'sri Dasamukakrura ngayat kunta'Sang Nata pinanduk'jajanya kêni nibawus ngêmasi'Prabu Suryaketusigra Sang Prabu

7. Magada lan Prabu'Srawanti mangrêbut prang ing Rawanaramyanduk asilìhdarmaning ayuda'datanginewehmalês Sang Dasaswa'Sang Prabu Magada'lan Sri Srawantiwus kêna ing panah'prabu kalihipûn'kang ambêk pati

8. kalih sampun pêjah'pinanah dening Sang'Prabu Rawanabutêng Dasamuk'akeh para ratu'myang kang prawira pêjah kasulayah'ana kang binuwang'têngahing barisgiris dhadhal larut'wong ing Naispatikawus tumingsal

9. para raja miwah'kang para prawira'giris lumayumung Rêkyanapatih'Suwanda juga tan'tumut lumayusudira wirotangadôg mungswing rêmîngûng kang rata mas'tan arsa manut ing'kanisthaning pati'nut darmotama
10. gumrit ratanira nengah anglajeri Patih Suwanda Prabu Dasamuka sru denya susumbar ah ko Suwanda
dene sira maksih peksa anglawana wukku ring ngarsa
lumayuwa aglis matura gustinta Arjunasasra

11. apranga lan ingsun yen sira kang mapag dudu tandhingmu
sarwi anudingi Prabu Dasamuka denira muwus
Kyapatih Suwanda anauri sugali eh yaksadipa
sira kudu-kudu ngajak prang lan gustiningsun Sang Prabu

12. yen meksih Suwanda iki durung mati pasthi tan kena
angadu prabawa mrih jayeng ayuda lan gustiningsun
Sri Arjunasasra eman ratuningsun retnaning bumi
pekik subageng ratambek sadu nulus sireku ditya

13. goegdeging jagat sira kalamurka angrurusuhi
butsa palawija endhasmu tan kaprah ingsun kewala
iya anguwis aprang lawan sira sagendhingira
krodha Dasamuka wengis wuwusira mrih Sikarini

Cantos 58-62

Canto 58 Aswalalita (23: 5,6,6,6,)

1. kuneng wonten ta pandhita linwih wau sumengka ngawak broja
dadya dewa

pan wus alami kawijile nguni saking Lokapala Bagawan Pulasta
58.1

nenggih wastanya' puputra Bagawan Padma Sang Bagawan Padma
apuputra
wasta Sang Bagawan Wisrawa sir'a puputra akathah' kang asêpuh nama

2. Sang Wisrawana' Prabu Lokapala' warna manusa apêkik Sri Bupati
putra kang saking' Sukses Niugelengka' samya warni diyu' mung siji
manusa
Bagawan Pulâsta punika prênah' buyut marang sira' Prabu Dasamuka
wus dadi dewa' ing salaminira' sêmana tumurun' saking ing sawarga

3. tuwi* kang rawuh' saking mênang aprang' sir'a Sang Aprabu'
Arjunawijaya
prapta ingarsa' sarwi asasanti' ngleketer neng ngarsa' sago ang
para cêthi

wruh praptanira' Bagawan Pulasta' narka yen jawata' lampaha punika
bubar pra cêthi' marék ing Sang Nata' Sri Arjunasasra

4. sarwi amêthuk' ing sawataranya' lah suwawi ing ngûkî sami
alênggeh
sira Bagawan Pulasta' para maksî' ngigêl tan nauri' nanging
angungudang
mring Sri Bupati' ing sadangunira' dhuh Sang Mahaprabu' kang tuhu
linuwih
para ratu sangisoring akasa' sanginggiling bumi' prawireng prang
putus

5. prabawa Tuwan' ngasorkôn jawata' myang pîkikirâ' dewa tan ana
 timbang
cahya anuksma' sasangka duk wimba' pangigilira ngubëngi Sri Bupati
sarwi anglingling'sireng kanembering' wusnyântara dangu'Sang
Rësi wus lungguh
lawan Sang Nata' Pulasta anglik'marang buyutira' gumlintang
neng lëmah

6. wadya juru rëksa' kang angadhëpi' lan Patih Prahasta' angadhëp
tan tõbih
Sang Abagawan' Pulasta turnya ris' dhuh Pukulun jawata nang
para raja
ingkang nimpuna' sagunging kaarjan' paramarta santa' budya sìh
ing dasih
sudireng aprang' sor kalëwihaning' para dewa sami' tan ana
tumimbang

7. mring jëng Paduka' solah swabawa pan' saksat Sang Bathara' Hyang
Suksma Kawëkas
mwang pëkik miwah' cahyanta lir sasangka wimba nglanglangi' 
rësmining sabumi
andum ing langën' kang munggwing wanarga' miwah jroning
taman- taman samya nëmpil
ing cahya Nata' dhuh Sang Mahaprabu' pröpta kawula lumawad
rawuh tuwan

8. saking payudan' amboyong ratuning' rëksasa dhuh mangkya' paran
karsa tuwan

pun Rawana kang' kabësta punika' yen Paduka angarsakna' amëjahì
angukum dhatēng pun Rawana yēktī dados ing sakarsa-karsa
Padukendra
pan pun Dasaswa tuhu mudha punggung puwa-puwa ing prang ciptane
linuwih

9. ing aprang sampun ngesorkēn jawata tan nyana yen wontēn ratu
   kang pinunjul
   angreh manggalēning para narendra amurweng rat subēga amangun
   laga
   byakta krēt arte weskitha ing dunung ing jagat pramudēta tanpa
   sisiyan
   dhuh dewa ji yen kēņiya tur ulun inggih pun Rawana mung
   kawulakēna

10. pundhutēn sagung prajane kang kareh nagri ing Ngalēṅgka
   mēdālna ladosan
   sumiwiya ing sabēn-sabēn warsa ngaturkēn bulu-bēktī mring
   Maispati
   pun Dasamuka karyanēn panggonōng srēṅgala mīwah panggonōng
   menda
   karyanēn panggonēndhel kusiring rata Paduka Narendra pun
   Dasawadana

11. sakarsa-karsa mung sok basukiya gusti pun Rawana inggih dasihōna
    langkung ngrarēpā Bagawan Pulasta pan sarwi karuna denya mrih
    luōtura
    sihira Prabu Arjunawijaya mosēm angandika heh Sang Maharēsi
    punapa marma dene sangēt asih mring murka ruhara gōlahing jagad
12. matur Bagawan 'Pulasta Pukulun' pan inggih saestu pun Rawana murka

gelahing jagad' nanging ta punika' pan kapreñah buyut' kawula
sayěkti
estu susukè' ing paramudita' nanging kawula tan' purun umatura
ing Paduka ji' mangsa ta kilapa' ing raos punika' Paduka. Narendra

13. sarwi aněnggak' waspa aturira' Bagawan Pulasta' wor wèlas ing
buyut
Dasamuka duk' miyarsa sadangünira apocapan° Bagawan Pulasta
lan Sang Aprabu' Arjunawijaya' Dasamuka astrè' tyose ngrasa urip
anglirik marang' Sri Arjunasasra' pangušikanirà kathah esèmipun

14. lan Sang Bagawan 'Pulasta asangët' panuwunira mring' Sri .
Arjunasasra
Dasamuka pan' lagya duk' punika' wruh yen darbe buyut' Bagawan
Pulasta
mesèm ngandiša' Sri Arjunasasra' heh Sang Rèši paran' yen tan
sun-pateni
si Dasamuka' dene wadyaningsun' wus akeh kang mati' suh
Ngaswalolita

Canto 59 Madurëtna (12: 5.7)

1. Rèši Pulasta umatur ing Sang° Prabu
sampun Paduka' sungkawa dening wadya
kathah kang pøjah' neng madyanis° rananggo
ulun manawa' kening anggèsangakën
59.2

2. sarta pangestu Paduka Narapati
   lêga ing driya Prabu Arjunasasra
   miyarsa aturira Rêsi Pulasta
   denya asagah'nggêngêngkêng wadya Prabu

3. angandika mring'wadya kang juru rêksa
   si Dasamuka uculêna saosna
   ing ngarsaningsun'sigra wus inguculan
   binêkta marêk'ing ngarsa Naranata

4. Prabu Rawana anungkêmi pada ji
   angaturaken'sewu ing sêmbahira
   Rêsi Pulasta'mulat yen Dasamuka
   sampun linuwar'sêm bah sumungkêm pada

5. marang Sang Prabu Arjunasasrabau
   Rêsi Pulasta'suka giyak anjêlilih
   dhuh babo-babo'buyutingsun den-kapok
   den- bêkti sira mring gusteinira Prabu

6. Arjunasasra yeku ratu piturun
   rêtnaning ratu samanusa sadaya
   prajanira ya'aturna saisine
   aja rumasa'sira darma têtêngga

7. lawan anuta'ing pakarti rahayu
   ing sabarang reh'gusteinira manuta
   supaya antuk undhaking kaluhuran *
   dene ta antuk'pangestuning gusteina
8. Sang rētnaning rat' ratu rumēkseng jagad
guruning para' ratu-ratu sadaya
aywa lēnggana'sabarang ing sakupsa
sayēkti manggih' papa yen lēngganaa

9. sireku bēgja'dinasihakēn mangkin
malar antukā' ing tuladan rahayu
ya ta Sang Prabu Arjunasasrabau
alon ngandika mrung Prabu Dasamuka

10. heh ta Rawana sira apasrah praja
ing Ngalēngka lan'saisine sadaya
ya uwis ingsun'tarima prasētyanta
ing sayēktine' ingsun pan datan arsa

11. wētuning praja' upēti raja-brana
teka muktekna' pribadi den-atutug
mung marenana'tingkahmu ingkang murka
ujēr sireku'tinitah madēg raja

12. nganggoa sira'sapratingkah'ing ratu
sabarang solah' tan kēna ngayawara
anyingkirēna'tindak ingkang kanisthan
aja marahi' karya laku ruhara

13. amriha bēnēr' pratingkahing kaprabon
ratu tan kēna' laku savijah-wijah
dadya angrusak'sakramaning narendra
nyanyampuri ' rehing jagat kang utama
14. dudu bawaning' ratu yen sakênane
  pan dudu wadya' wadya pan dudu raja
  raja kinacek' sasamaning tumitah
  kinen ruměksa' ing wadyane samuha

15. nadyan ta sirâ yen aprang amrih cidra
  mënange ratu lamun' apêrang cidra
  amung sadela' wiwitane kewala
  mënange aprang' kalah sireng kaprabon

16. ing wêkasane'tan wurung kalah ing prang
  lan iku sirâ'den-wiweka nêstiti
  yen nêrajanga'sira ing walêringsun
  angrusak laku' sacar'ning kaprabon

17. sayêkti nêmu' papa tekeng dêlahan
  heh Dasamuka' yen tan wêlasa ingsun
  mring buyutira'sira maksih sun-rante
  ngong-têtêpakê'n aneng panjara wêsi

18. Dasawadana'nêmbah matur sandika
  Pukulun datan' rumasa darbe urip
  urip pan saking' Paduka Naranata
  paran ta lamun' lêngganaeng' sapakwan

19. punapa ingkang' winalêskê'n Pukulun
  Rêsi Pulasta'myarsa gumuyu suka
  iya mëngkene' Rawana buyutingsun
  wus lêga ing tyasingsun sira wus bisa
20. suwiteng gusti'ya měngkono den-bisa
aja-aja tan' wiweka barang tindak
tindaking raja tan kěňa tambuh laku
kudu mrih laku' kangprayoga lĕstari

21. Sang Mahaprabu Arjunawijaya ngling
sanadyan sira' andon prang bĕdhah praja
iya den-anggo' tata-titining raja
kaya ta kakāhira Sri Lokapala

22. tan pantĕs lamun' pinĕrĕp ing ayuda
pan wus tĕtĕp yen' iku prabu utama
miwah ta Prabu Banaputra Ngayudya
tanpa doseng prang' tan patut sih pukul

23. mangsa kuranga mungsuh ratu kăng sŏkti
arĕp andadar' kagunan kaprawiran
nanging anggoa' layang panantang ing prang
ngantĕp budine'nungkul apa anglawan

24. awya ta murang' tatakramaning ratu
lamun narpati' nindakna paracidra
nyĕdh'hi bumi' bumine panas-perih
dene kancikan' ratu amurang krama

25. tan pĕnging aprang' podha ratu mrih lĕwih
nanging ta aja' tinggal kramaning raja
ngĕlar jajahan' yen ana ratu salah
tan amrih anaking bala raharjeng rat
26. Bedhahen aglis pajane tan sangsaya  
ingsun-ajani'ngrusak ratu ruhara  
oleya pira'muktekëna pribadi  
amung aweha'wëruh ing jënëngingsun

27. Rësi Pulasta'nyarsa suka tan sipi  
denya buyute'sinung urdi Sang Prabu  
kinen anggecek'yen ana ratu salah  
oleya pira'den-muktekna pribadi

28. Mëdhun agigël' Sang Bagawan Pulasta  
masanti jaya-jaya acërik-cërik  
eh sira Patih'Prahaswa ingkang tuwa  
poma den-eling'pratingkah Madurëtna

Canto 60  Lebdajiwa 11: 4.7)

1. lingnya malih' Sang Bagawan Pulasta  
nuhonana'wisesaning Narendra  
pan wus tatanging sang maha narendra  
nora këna'yen télængke ing karya

2. pan karyaning ratu rumëkseng jagad  
den-karëksa'soisining buwana  
ingkang aneng'praja myang gunung-gunung  
para wiku'kang angulah sëmadi
60.3

3. kang amēneng ing tapa pujamantra
den-karēksa mrih lēstarining puja
yen lēstari sang ratu ambawoni
kaharjan ta kahuwe ing sang nata

4. ingkang murka dhusta dursila juti
yen nagara keh kanggonon laku dur
tan wun karya urēging bumi-bumi
yen andadra ngrusak sagung panggonan

5. karya eru kang ulah pujamantra
myang pandhita kang tapeng wukir-wukir
bubrah tyase tan mēndēng pujabrata
tuwin tyasnya yekang mangulah praja

6. para wignya pakewuh ing wardaya
tēmah ilang tyase yen ēnēngēna
sajatining durjana durtaning rat
yen ēnēngēna dening sang narpati

7. saya kathah marma prabu ywa arsa
kacsilakan durjana upayanēn
aywa bosēn sang ratu amateni
ing durjana kēkēsēn rina wēngi

8. eh Prahaswa wruhanta gṛstinira
Sang Ratwagung Prabu ing Maispati
panjanmaning Bathara Wisnumurti
siniwi ing pra nata dibyotama
9. kaping sapta panjanmanireng tembe
tansah dadya prabutama linewih
pakaryane mong maharjeng kanang rat
tulusanig puja semadining rat

10. ywan sira tan wurh kramaning dumadi
atakona ing sang mahapandhita
sakweh wuwus' kang praptaning kasidan
uriping tribuwana tan prabeda

11. wusnya wuwusira Sang Maharési
kathah-kathah pitutur ing Rawana
angandika Sang Narendra utama
heh Sang Rési kasinggiyan lingira

12. lamun bener pratingkahing Narendra
ulihireng tembe maring delahan
pan cinadhang kamuktyan swarga muwah
angungkuli kamuktyanireng dunya

13. tan apanjang wasitanira Prabu
Sri Maha Kartawirya lingira ris
heh Sang Rési Pulasta lah suwawi
lakasena maweh urip samuha

14. yeka samya matya madyaning rana
manusa myang ditya aywa na kantun
Sang Bagawan Pulasta tan lenggana
suka ing tyas saking pakwan * Sang Prabu
15. mwang Sang Prabu Rawana suka myarsa de Sang Prabu'ken nguripaneng ditya sigra Resi Pulastra ya umėnėng andhêkukul sarwi rêm-êrem ayam

16. gya tumėnega ngucêmil kêthip-kêthip amucicil dangu nulya tumungkul prapta riris dhadhak toyane kênthêl warna putih anibani paprangan

17. nulya samya'tangi kang mati aprang katibaning riris pêthak usada ciptanira sami lwir anupêna myang danawa sadaya samya urip

18. tuwin kuda dipongga samya gêsang myang kêndhang gong'ata kang samya rêmuk samya pulih'wus samya wutuh-wutuh satriyane'wus samya nitih rata

19. samya mantuk'mring pasanggrahanira mwang danawa 'sampun sami umarêk Prahasta kang'nampani bala ditya samya suka'ya muwah Lëbdajiwa
Canto 61  Sudiradaka (13: 5,8,)

1. gumuruh swaränira duk prapteng pakuwon
   lajëng umarëk'ing ngarsa Sri Maharaja
   Prabu Arjuna'sahasra suka tan sipi
dening kang wadjya sadaya wus samya gësang

2. mangkana Rësi'Pulasta pamit umantuk
   marang ing Surälaya ing kadewan prapta
   wau Sang Prabu Arjunasasra parentah
   mring Dasamuka heh Buminata Ngalëngka

3. sira muliya marang prajanira nuli
   engët-engëtën'pituturingsun mring sira
   matur anëmbah'sira Sang rëksasa Prabu
   Gusti sëdyëmba'andherek mring Maispati

4. angandika sru'Prabu Arjunawijaya
   iya wis ingsun'tarima prasëtyanira
   nanging muliya mangkata saking ing ngriki
   ingsun tan lawas'mulih marang prajaningsun

5. aywa keh susah'yen sira mring Maispati
   mangkata saking'prajanta Ngalëngka besuk
   Prabu Rawana tur sëmbah datan lënggana
   sandika ing reh'wawëling jëng Padukendra

6. mangsah sumëmbah'Rawana nungkëmi pada
   mwang Kyanapatih Prahasta sampun manëmbah
   wus tata baris'Rawana lengser ing ngarsa
gumuruh wadjya rëksasa ingkang umiring
7. sapraptanira tēbīh saking pasanggrahan yaksendra sigra mēsat napak jumantara sawadyanira dēdhēt surēm ing awiyat kasumuk dening lampahing bala rēksasa

8. datan winuwus lampahira Sang yaksendra prapta ing praja Ngelēngka wus angadhatyan kunēng Sang Prabu Arjunawijaya sampun ngudhangi wadya sanega arsa budhalan

9. saha pra garwa ʻkondur marang Maispati nurut pinggiring samudra wadya gumuruh tanpa wilangan wadya gung ing Maispati daten kawarna ing marga Sang Mahaprabu

10. prapta ing praja Maispati saha wadya kapwa gurnita sapraja asuka-suka jalu myang estri agēng alit samya suka dene gustine raḥarja ing praptanira

11. ing nguni kang wus kawarti balane rusa prang lan ditya ji mangkya doraning warta wadya Sang Prabu wutuh malah wus katawan ratuning ditya Rawana sampun kabala

12. ri wusnya tēntrēm praptanireng Maispati Sri Mahaprabu Arjunahasrabuja wuwuh misuwur prabawanta ing triloka tētēp nglajērī ing ayuda tanpa lawan
13. ratu piturun pantës tinuting pra raja
   ing prabawanya saliring reh kasusilan
   myang kasudarman kaprawiranira putus
   anulus ambëk santa budya paramarta

14. amudhari tyasing dasih kang mudha punggung
   tinarik maring kaprawiran kasusilan
   sëmbada sandining reh ing wiweka putus
   miwah punggawa satriya sami linuwih

15. ing kagunane' tuwin kang para narendra
   putus ing kaprawiran kasudiran tangguh
   ing rat makëtë' kweh ratu asrah kaprabon
   sumiwi nungkul tan anggo pinukul ing prang

16. lawanä kasëngsëm 'sagung kang para narpati
   ing kadibyaning 'ayuda subageng jagad
   ing tivikrama' ratu musthikaning bumi
   mamrih arjaning' sajadag paramusesa

17. saksat ta sira' Sang Hyang Bathara Pamungkas
   pratamaning rat 'tuhu akarya la-ëla
   asih ing garwa' winot among ing sakayun
   myang wadya- tantra' winong tan ana kang rëngató

18. mila Sang Empu Yogisware mangikët ing
   wasita dibya' kaprabon Prabu Arjuna
   mamalar dadya' tuladaning wuri-wuri
   denya kapencut lëlakone Sang Aprabu
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19. ing Maispati sampun utameng karatwan
kinajriyan ring parangmuka dursilântek
juti durcara' durjana têlas tinumpès
bangsat kinêbat' babatoh sampun kabutul.

20. Sang Empu Yogiswara yeku aprasabên
denya mangiköt' ing katârjunasahasra *
datân uninga' wring ing gita sakalangyan
wibuh denirang' rungsit ingkang pralampita

21. dadya tumitah' ing satitah amamatut
saking dahat srûning pamrih mamrih mamarna
mêhêng karanähira lir sumiweng suku
sukunira Sang'Abathara Wisnumurti

22. sru kapilêngên' denya mangusir kalangyan
lwir sadpada mrih' lebuning pada Hyang Wisnu
malar rumêbês tumêraha ing tumuwuh
sumiswa ring salaku rêsêp ing linuhung

23. rehning Dasaswa' prakoswa dibya rêksasa
ing reh ruhara' arda murka puwa-puwa
têmah tanpândon' nir don sunya kadibyannya
kawirotamanêria tan Sudiradraka
Canto 62 Prawiralalita* (16: 8.8)

1. kang ambëk murka ruhara'linawan ing santa -budya
   swuh sirna kasudibyanta'pinarwaseng ambëk sadu
   mila Empu Yogiswa-rmemengëti* ing reh arda
   syuh sirna wasananira'kang minge pakarti ayu

2. tan tuwas ing wuri-wuri purun ing reh haruhara
   marwata mriya mahambëk'ya kang para raja-raja
   abiprayaning pakartya'yekang warta anindita *
   ing têmah brasta syuh sirna'kwehning; puwa-puwa budi

3. beda budining rahayu'kang tumon samya kayungyun
   swuh brastha curna kang murka'tinapis madyeng palagan
   pinandhuk ing tyas raharja'kesthi gëng marbuk sru minging
   ing wasana sakayunta'yen panggah ing tyos pinanggih

4. sru gumunaning*wardaya'yayah masiwakeng taji
   tumunjëm datanpa karya' sakaring wahyadyatmika
   wuta panjrahning puctaka'Yogiswa mrih pramana
   sudarsananing varamkawi kawidi kawantu

5. mudha siguning utama'para nindita tan titi
   titi katêka ing wadi'wadakaning tindak- tanduk
   tumindak tan wrin ing basa'basukining wasite di
   tatan yumaneng pramana'ciptaningkang animpu.a

6. tar beda budining badan'kadya lulumunging gadhun
   mangayam-ayam ya amrih'masewaka ring sasangka
   nging tan sumimpang ring krama'krama yöktining kalangyan
   lênglêng lalana lumayan'lingling-lingling tyas lumingling
7. mangaja kirim rum-arum'winideng pudhake swamrik
lesah sikareng kalangyan'langen ingkang winangun
swârjunasasra dipeng rat'tangeh kinayun ing budi
kang mangka utamanira'putus ing susila -arja
Canto 29 Sudiradraka (13:5,8)

1. nahan wau ta'satriya Andananjaya
   lawan Narendra Krēśna kang among rikeng prang
   neng sukuning kang'arga rame denira prang
   Sri Gardapati mungshira wus ngēmasi

2. bubar wangsulnya gumuruh miyarsa tangis
   umung tanpa parungwan sagotranya sami
   saking ibu lan'rama miwah garwa kalih
   samya makundhah ing kiswa kawelas-arsa

3. Rĕtna Subadra' walikan awor ing siti
   raja putri ing Wirata Dewi Utari
   lagya garbini' wolung wulan laminira
   angaduh-aduh' angēsah sasambatira

4. umrĕk swaraning karuna sapabarisan
   wuwusēn praptēning Sang Parta lan Sri Krēśna
   sarēng praptanē'lan Sang Arya Wrkodara
   saking kidul lan' saking lor pinggir samudra

5. mungshihra Sang Wērsaya sampun ngēmasi
   Sang Dananjaya' duk miyarsa putra lalis
   kantu gumuling' ing siti lir tanpa non rat
   Narendra Krēśna' ngandika amituturi
6. pan ila-ila’ lamun ujaring satriya
sungkawa dening tinilar putrane lina
suda darajat’sira tur anēmu dosa
ing Bathara di’ Dananjaya duk miyarsa

7. pangandikane’ Sri Maha Nṛpati Kṛṣṇa
wangwang mawungu’ manēmbah aminta sisip
Pukulun inggih mugi ta ingapunțēna
lajēng manēmbah’ ing pada Sri Yudistira

8. alon turira’ paran purwane Pukulun
ing pējahipun’ Bimanyu neng pabaratan
Sri Yudistira’ ing patine sutanira
rumusaking gēlar’ dwijawara cakrabyaha

9. gēlar cakraning’ swandana kang linēbonan
Sindurja munggeng’ kiping ing gēlar nginēbi
yeku patine’ sutanira si Bimanyu
sanak-sanakmu’ kabei padha apupulih

10. Drstadyumēna’ Madrin tanaya Satyaki
tuwin si Gatoκaca parēng amuk sami
mamrih patine’ Sindurja nanging tan kōna
sadina mau’kasapih suruping arka

11. dene belane’ sutanira si Bimanyu
ya si Lēsmanāmondrambāra ngēmasi
lawan satriya’ Kartasuta Wrahata bala
lan Satyasrawa’ tri mati dening Bimanyu
12. ing pangamuke sanakira kapitemen
    akeh bupati' ingkang padha angeması
    mung Sindupati' kang luput tan kena pinrih
    sigra angadeg Dananjaya sru pratignya

13. inggih kawula punagi yen pan Sindurja
    tan pèjah dening kawula sadinten benjing
    kawula lebu tumangan obong sontêne
    mangkana pratignyanira Sang Dananjaya

14. gumyak tang Koràwa samya amiyarsa
    dadya Sang Arya' Sindureja kinen mulih
    sadina benjing 'sadereng ing surup surya
    mintaa pujanira arja mring Sang Dwija

15. Sang Sapwani sùdarmanira Sindureja
    miwah agême panah kang antuk Bimanyu
    den-semadiya sanjata wuwuh saêkti
    wau sata Koràwa Prabu Duryodana

16. langkung sungkawà dening Lèsmanakumara
    mangkya ngemasí putra binadhe narendra
    myang Banowati tangisira awuyungan
    aneng jro pura' wangunan Sang Prameswari

17. Sri Duryodana'ana lëjare sakêdhik
    dening miyarsa Dananjaya apratignya
    alèbu geni'marmanta Sang Sindureja
    rinëkseng westhi' kunëng solahing Korawa
18. suka-suka\' cipta yen Arjuna mati
iya ing dina\' benjing al\'bu tumangan
kawarnaakang\' lagya samya g\'eng sungkawa
Nata Pandhawa\' patinira Sang Bimanyu

19. Sitisundari\' ciptanya kudu tumuli
abela l\'bu\' tumangan lawan priyanya
nanging wong agung\' ing rembali dereng dadya
ing pangupayaniireng prang ing dina benjing

20. marmane Sitisundari maksih cinandhat
putri Wirata\' Dewi Utari tan k\'ena
tumuta bela\' dereng mijil wawratanya
mangkana ta Sang\' Sri Kr\'esna angandika aris

21. mring Dananjaya\' paran ta ing budinira
j\'er wus angrungu\' Korawa kalamun sira
pratignya arsa\' mateni marang Sindurja
pasthine ingkang\' rin\'ksa si Jayadrata

22. iya mangsa den\' w\'etokna ing dina benjing
ubayanira\' ingkang pinrih an\'kani
Sang Dananjaya\' tur s\'mbah alon turira
Pukulun mangsa\' borong Paduka Sudira
Canto 30 Madurëtna (12: 5.7)

1. Narendra Krësna' pangandikanira ris sarate iku' pujanën den- waspada sira wëruha' kabez kang wërit-wërit katona dening'sira aywa sangsaya

2. matur anëmbah'Dananjaya ngastuti sumanggeng karsa'Paduka pan kawula darmi lumampah'ing reh Padukeswara mojar Sri Krësna'yeki ana ratengsun 15c

3. janjine nguni' ratangkwa kina wasa papat kudane' pangirid kang ingarsa pan si Walaha'lawan si Abrapuspa dene ing wuri' pan iya si Sukanta 15b

4. lawan si Sënyësëkti sajiangkepe catur wësuk yen aprang' iku sira anggoa watëking rata' iku sagung sanjata luput datan aha ingkang tumama 15d

5. lawan tëngaran'ingsun si Pancajanya aywa doh lawan' sira' besuk ing aprang sira påëma' iya sanjata cekra kaya patine' iya sadina benjing 16d

6. si Sindurëja' jëmparingira besuk si Pasopati' tibakëneng Sindurja 16b
pan ika abot dene bapakne wiku
si Sapwani ullah samadi manenguung

7. laya katrima denira Sang Hyang Guru
yen becikira lah atasena ugi
pujanira den banget sawengi mangkin
pintanen sireng Bathara Sinduraja

8. ing patinipun ywa luput panarkengwang
payo pujenen den enggal den amesu
anembah lengser Dananjaya tumulya
semadi sireng mangraup puja mantra

9. dupa kumutug mangsah ngeningken cipta
sumembah ring Sang Bathara Utipati
sidhakcep maring sajuga tan sangsaya
nora. nana kang kapyarsa katingalan

10. Sang Dananjaya mati sajroning gesang
nunkem tumancab eningira kang cipta
tan dangu nulya katingal sariranya
Bathara Jagad Pratingkah sor ing jangga

11. pan sapangandhap wau kang katingalan
trahing "ungsiting" ah Dananjaya age
racuten puja mantra samadinira
dene patine si Arya Sinduraja
12. ingsun lilakên'ya ing pandhānira
tamakêna sanjata si Pasopati
ratane Krēsna'sira anggoa, besuk
lawan gonge kang'aran si Pancajanya

13. awya tebih'lan sira ing ranangga
sigra angracu' puja Sang Dananjaya
lajēng umarēk'mring Prabu Dwarawati
alon turira' Pukulun pan saestu

14. tan wontēn ewah'sarambat sabda tuwan
lan ingkang wangsit Bathara Girinata
mesēm Narendra' Krēsna lah yayi uwus
payo padha ta'ngatēr kang nēdyə bela

15. nini putri Sītisundari mangkya
ya ta wau Kūsumā Sītisundari
sampun siyaga'sabusananing pējah
rakiting bela'ing priya Madurētna
Panitisastra Kawi Miring
Cantos 1-4

Canto 1 Suwandaria (20: 7,7,6)

1. ndah sambahireng ulun kapurba ri Sang Murbeng 'rat
   sahananika
   nikanang sihing dasih maweh boga sawegung masih
   ring delahan
   lan tekanang pamudyeng 'Ari jeng nayakeng rat' duteng
   rat Kotama
   mangguha manugraheng len siswanta sagotra' tang uwus minulya

2. ata ri uwus mangky' kitorsa ri makedheh' lumakya ri agnya
   makirta ri pustaka Panitisastreng aran' jarwa lagu mageng
   samakena ri ulun' budya dahat mamindha' mheeng tur paguywan
   dan teki rikang lekas' pamugutireng kata' manulat kawuryan

3. yen janma nora wikan' nenggih ing subasita yeku mudha
   punggung
   tegesipun wong mudha' punika pun wong bodho' tegesing kang
   punggung
   wong asor pamilihe' lawan malih murading' subasita' kocap
   kang dhingin silakrama' kapindho basa krama' basa sila lungguh

4. dening tegesing krama' iya basa kang bacak' kadi ta yen lungguh
   ana ing pasamuhan' den-abacak tatane' eywa carub awor
   kaya ya wong ambekel' lawan wong ambaturan' yan yogya wor lungguh
   miwah babasanipun' tan sayogya worena' sor luhuring janma
1.5

5. saking jenenging ratu 'marmame aywa gempok 'ing sitining ratu
lawan malih yen janma 'tan wruhing subasita 'saksat noran wikan
ing rasa nem prakarasining rasa kangen nem ingkang
dhingin kecut

sepit asin lan pedes 'pahit legi ping nemnya jangkepe sad rasa

6. kadya ta wong dereng wruh 'rasanining sedhah wohan 'liring wong
tan nginang
yen aneng pasamuhan 'yekti pucat mukanya 'saka lathira
janma kangen mangkaneku 'yen ana wong rasan 'ing sastra
umeneng
datan tumut angucap 'arsa tumut angucap 'sarwa noran bisa

7. janma kangen mangkaneka 'mukanira pan kadya 'ling guwa
kewala
mangkana ta ing wisa 'wisaning wong abekti 'ing Hyang
Mahasuci
yen rinewang carobo 'tyasira dadya reged kethuh saya matuh
ilang pangabekti 'nya 'yekti tan katarima 'dadyeman kewala

8. wisaning wong adhahar lamun tan menggal ajur 'akarya
sangsaya
janma tan duwe artalire iya wong miskin 'saujare tuna
kan kadinemen temah wisa awake 'denya tan katokan
ing sakarapanira 'kadi ta ing wirawan kangen dadya wisaya

9. yen wus tuwa sayekti 'akararaban nguwar 'wisanewake
denya kangen sami dulu 'ewa tan resop ing tyas 'tan ana kangen seneng
1.9
kang aran janma dhika' kang angrē̆sepi ati' rowangnya lungguhan 4a
tan kainten wacana' tangsah anduga-duga'ing netyaning janma

10. tan pēgat jaga baya' tan pinurikan dening' wong rucah kacakup'
angrē̆sepi tyasireng' para sujana tama' lan bisa mumungu
ing kawanen ing janma' ingkang angulah yuda' yeku ingkang aran
nēngghih kang janma dhika' amumpuni ambēkning' ujar Suwandana:

Canto 2 Sudiradraka (13: 5,8)

1. sayogyanipun' ing wong kakung yen aparē̆k 4b
lawan wanodya' rabine malih sēlire
angrasanana' raras rumireng papē̆man
lawan viyosing' sabda den-alus aririh

2. prihē̆n lunture' inggih aja kongsi rēngat
lamuna parē̆k' lulungguhan lan pandhita 4c
atē̆takona' ya ujaring kasinggihan
lan trus ing kawruh' lan sampurnaning panē̆mbah

3. yen ing paprangan' awicaraa' kawanan 4d
lan kadigdayan' prihē̆n ta wanining rowang
galak ing ula' lan mandine kē̆na ilang
saking ing japa' mantra kang ngilangkē̆n wisa

4. galaking macan' ilang dening japa mantra 5b
gajah amē̆ta' yē̆kти rubah dening angkus
temah atutut' ilang kruraning dipongga
amung nē̆psu' ing mungsuh kakarening mati 5d

5. mari-mari yen' sampun katēkaming pē̆jah
2.5
lenpsun'ing durjana mangigit-igit
yeka tan mari'dening japa lawan mantra
yen sir'arsa wruh pan'geraning kang toya 6a

6.
tunjung kang munggweng' toya punika jabud'en
pira kang kacub'ing toya iya sëmone
yen pan'egrining'wong abëcik awasëna
ing pratingkahe'dhingin katoning pangucap 6b

7.
kaping kalihe' iya katoning alungguh
ruuh sëmone' akathah sentosanira
nestiti lamun' amamangan sahanane
alus tur ririh' tan barabah sabdanira

8.
momot tyasira'ing sasamaning tumuwuh
tulus tan amrih' karusakaning sesana
pan iya iku' cihnane' wong jati kula
kadya ta yang aran pandhita sastra gënyang 6c/d

9.
tëgëra daten' ngandhëg patakoning janma
janma susantra' linadenan sakarsanya
lan den-inaki' sabdane lirih ngalap yun
nuduhkën marang' patakon Sudiradraka

Canto 3 Wisalyaharini (21: 7.7.7)

1. amadhani tyas pëtëng' ngenakkën kasusahan' wruh wirasaning sastra
yeku kang ingaranan' pandhita sastra gënyang' tan akarya saking
tyas
3.1

ing wong asugih arta kancana lan sosotya nanging panganggenira busana tanpa rupa pangane tanpa rasa tan weneh ing pandhita

2. wong kang mangkana ika tan wruh celaking awak nyana dawa tuwuhe ana kang wong wus limpad ing sastra tur sampun wruh sakramaning nagara

lakune teka anut ing durjana lakune padha lan kang nora wruh dadya tanpa karyaa kabisane pan padha lan wong kang nora bisa

3. ana wong wus atuwa tur adawangumura tan karap kabezikan iku sudarman datan ing sastra nora bisa janma kang mangkaneka aran janma nir ing raturi lan gan gawe padha lawan buburon sata kang ngenak enak pinangan awakara padhaning wong mangkana

4. kang kaonang ing jagat kang candhala pan papat yen buron

kang candhala nora kaya garda ha lamun mungguh ing budi kang kocap 8b

candhala
ten karap kabezikan atinggal pangabakti katunggul kadi 8c

badan
wong anguciwani mring wong sanake puniku ngungkuli tri 8d
candhala

5. buyung iku yen lukak banyune nora kedak watike kocak kacik yen penuh ingkang toya watike menang ugi anling tan kocak kacik

panenggeraning sapi yen agdhe swarane watok kedhik puhane 9b

wong miskin iku aranakeh akeh bawane mrih pakolihing awak 9c
6. mangkana malih ing wong’ingkang ala rupane’keh-akeh tanagane 
   mrih katona baguse’lan wong ingkang anut ing saujaring sastra" 
   aja kaya sang singa’lan wana anut waune’samya rōksa-rinēksa 10a

7. bōsen denya sanakan’padha ababangkelan’pangucape sang singa 10b 
   sang alas iku lamun’aja anaa ingsun’yēktine dadi apa 
   linēpur ing manusa’prandene angrēsula’kanggenan awakingsun 
   sang alas ujarira’rang singa iki lamun’aja sun-alingana

8. sayēktine katingal’dening para manusa’mangsawurung rinusak 
   sang singa gya matilar’kesah saking ing wana’mara marang 
   jujurang 10d
   nukya rinujad dening manusa singa pējah’sapējahing kang singa 
   alas gya binabadan’dening para manusa’wrksanya sirna 
   padhang 10c

9. singa lan wana sirna’yeka lirning manawa’sraya kang aprayoga 11a 
   lire pawang sanak kang’satuhu atirupa’duk sang naga binujung 11b 
   denira sang garuda’dumadakan kati’mu’lawan Bathara Sramba°

10. lingnya eh sang anaga’paran ta sira dening lumayu kapiyandēm 
    sang naga aturira’Pukulun kawulūrsa’minangsa ing garuda 
    saking ajrih kawula’marma ulun lumaǰēng’mojar Bathara Sr’amba 
    sira pan arsa urip’ingsun sang anulungi sang naga aturira

11. inggih kawula minta’tulung mrih gōsangana’lingnya Bathara Sramba 
    lah sira kumalunga’iya ing guluningsun’rang gya amulēt 
    ring jangga Sang Bathara’garuda sigra prapta’anon mring sang 
    anaga
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dadya sawitnya dewa'garuda nir krudhanya'tan Wisalyaharini 11c

Canto 4 Kilayu-Nedheng  (22: 5,6,6,5,)

1. sang garudârsâ'manêmbbah ya dening'ana sang anaga'arsa tan
   nêmbbah
   ajrih ing dewa'lan ing ila-ila'dadya sang garuda'nêmbbah ring
   luhur
   ri wusnya nêmbbah'sang narendra pâksi'kesah saking luhur' 11d
   arsaning dewa
   tingkahning anak'yogyane anuta'ing wong atuwane'solah
   tingkahe 12a

2. kadi ta bulus'ycn mangsane ngédhog'pinéndhêm tinilar'
   iya prandene
   yen uwus nûtès'salir pratingkahe'lan kadoyanira'tiru wong
   tuwa
   miwah anaking'iwak lawan manuk'lan sutaning bulus'yeka
   tirunën
   sapolah tingkah'sakadoyanira'saparibawane'tiru wong tuwa 13c

3. yen ing manusâ'pan datan mangkana'den-anakakên duk'
   sangkaning alit
   rinêkseng pangan'winulang ing krama'prandene yen tuwa'atinggal
   bapa
   arang kang tiru'anaking durjana'pan dadi pandhita'
   anak pandhita
   dadi durjana'yeku kang tan tilas'tilas wong atuwa'tinilar pisan
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4. sang apandhita'awya sah abėkti'lawan den-akukuh'
   tata-bratane
   ing pakoliho'mulyakën nēgar'yen tuhu pengkap'ing pra pandhita
   lamun wong anut'sawelinging sastra'pan kukuht budine'kang mrih
   rahayu
   nora candhala'mrih wong sanēgara'budine alingan'bisa noraraga

5. ring kang wong agung'art a kancana'sēkul ulamirun'yogya
   danakna
   mring wadyanipun'palanya pan kēdhēp'ing saparentahe'tur
   wēdi-asih
   prajane kukuht karta tēker,3 tēpies'reng pan kawēngan'dana
   Sang Prabu
   yen ing wanodya'kalamuna laki'palane antuka'ya anak lanang

6. kang luwih kēndēl'nanging awya kadi'singa asusuka' amung sapisan
   mulya busana'kang linēwiha'ken'ing para sujana'pan amung .
   dodot
   yen ing panganan'kang linēwiha'ken'dening sang pandhita'pan
   puwan sapi
   yeku marmane'Brahmana tan mangan'ing dagging sap'i'pan alit mila

7. sira Brahmana'pinakanan puwan' dadya sapi iku'inganggēp biyung
   lamun sujana'ya ingkang pinilih'pan saraning sabda'linēwiha'ken
   yen ing wanodya'kang minangka mulya'gēmuhi ng pambayun'
   linēwiha'ken
   ingōma-ēm' marang kakungira'neng jro papēman lir'
   Kilayu-nōdhēng
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Canto 1

1. This poem, written at the command of the Crown Prince of Java in Surakarta, was commenced on Monday, the eighteenth day of Dulkijah, in the Wawu year, 'through the ears, the voice of the world' (1729). The tale of Arjuna Sasrabau is refashioned into jarwa* within kakawin metres; only the language has been rendered into jarwa for clarity.

2. The story is an account of three kingdoms; the state of Lokapala, [the realm] of Banaputra and thirdly, of King Kartawirya of Maispati. The beginning of the tale concerns Lord Wisrawana, the middle section, Banaputra and the final passages [are devoted to] the King of Maispati. Now the ruler of the state of Lokapala,

3. King Wisrawa, had turned to asceticism, having abdicated in favour of his son,* the Crown Prince Wisrawana, also known as Lord Danapati. Let us now tell of the kingdom of Ngalengka and the demon king, Sumali, who ruled over a vast domain. He had one daughter,

4. but her appearance was not that of an ogress. She had beautiful, human features and her name was Dewi Sukesi. None would suspect that she was the daughter of a demon for her beauty was exquisite. Although lord of the demons, Sumali was of sagely disposition. Now the King of Lokapala requested that his father, the sage
Wisrawa,

5. journey to the state of Ngalengka and propose marriage [on his behalf] to the daughter of King Sumali.

The sage Wisrawa set out immediately for Ngalengka.

His journey is not related here.* When his arrival in Ngalengka was announced,

King Sumali hastened to greet his venerable guest.

6. With the welcoming formalities complete and all seated, Sumali said: 'I am greatly honoured, my sagely brother, by your visit. I bid you welcome.'

Wisrawa replied: 'And I return the good wishes, brother.'

Sumali was overjoyed that the sage should be his guest and refreshments were lavished upon him. After the feasting,

Wisrawa spoke:

'Brother, my purpose in coming here is to present a proposal of marriage*
on behalf of my son, the King of Lokapala. May this meet with your approval
and may my son be considered as a suitor.'

8. The sage spoke at length, seeking the King's consent.

The lord of the demons replied: 'Good brother, this is indeed a simple matter
and shall come to pass later. But beforehand, I ask that you instruct me
in that pure knowledge, the sastra caitha, for all creatures must ultimately face death.*

9. If it is possible, brother, grant me this favour, the sastra
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arjendra.'

The sage replied: 'Why indeed, my brother,
I am willing to give you every assistance.'

[Sumali] quickly took up the book of the sastra aetha and
handed it to the sage.

10. The monk Wisrawa received [the text] and opened the sastra aetha.

King Sumali was instructed in its essence, the significance of
the [sastra] aetha,
[that is], the origin of life, the ultimate aim of existence
and the bliss of spiritual release.*

The instruction was lengthy but gradually centred on the crux
of the matter.*

Canto 2

1. Sumali was elated as he took instruction
and became all the more eager to understand the science.
When the reality that was Lord Guru was about to be revealed,
the god became aware that one of his creatures was seeking
true knowledge.*

2. Lord Girinata then descended,
 accompaniended by the goddess Durga,
and approached the one intent on union with the Almighty.
Meanwhile, the daughter of Sumali,

3. Sukesi, was waiting in attendance on her father,
close by, but standing a little to the rear.
Lord Guru then entered the person of Wisrawa
and the goddess Durga merged with Sukesi.
When the sage Wisrawa glanced at Sukesı, his heart stirred and he was overwhelmed with desire. Abandoning his exposition of the secret knowledge, in gentle tones he addressed [Sumali]:

'My brother Sumali, my plan was to propose on behalf of my son, the King of Lokapala; this is no longer the case, as I would like to present myself [as a suitor] for the hand of your daughter, Sukesı.

May there be no objection to the match.'

King Sumali turned to his daughter.

'My girl, the sage now desires you for himself. What are your thoughts on the matter?'

Sukesı replied respectfully:

'Father, the decision is yours.'

So ended the discussion of the superior science.

It is not told how, as the days passed, Sukesı was united with Wisrawa and the couple delighted in all of love's pleasures. However, let us tell of the King of Lokaπa, who waited long and in vain for his father's return. When he learnt that Sukesı had been taken to wife by his father himself, King Danapati was so furious with his father that he immediately planned a fight to the death.
Calling up his troops, he decided

to wage war upon his father who had behaved so deceitfully.

Lord Indra, in haste, descended to offer his advice:

11. 'Ah, King of Lokapala, control yourself,

for certainly the Supreme Deity has ordained

that Sukesi be taken in marriage by your father.

Accept my offer of compensation.

12. Take these two heavenly nymphs as consorts

[called] Nawangsih and Sasmiteningsih, who are equally lovely.*

The King of Lokapala was no longer angry

and accepted the celestial pair as wives.

13. King Danapati enjoyed love's delights

with the two nymphs. We return once more

to the state of Ngalengka. Sukesi

was with child. In due course,

14. she gave birth to a son with demon features,*

with ten heads and twenty arms.

His father and grandfather offered earnest prayers [for his

well-being]

and conferred on him the name, Rawana.

15. As the boy reached maturity, he devoted himself totally to

asceticism,

striving for world superiority,

for his attributes set him apart from his own kind.

He therefore intensified his prayer, meditation and penance.

16. For many years, he dwelt in the hermitage;
in fact, until he attained manhood, he remained there on the mighty and most awesome Mount Gohkarna, for Rawana was oblivious to the dangers around him.

Canto 3

1. In time, his mother gave birth to another son with demon features and of mountainous build. He was given the name, Kumbakarna. The sage Wisrawa was deeply distressed that his sons

2. were both born demons, one, a giant, larger than any other demon, while the other boy had abnormal features. Neither bore any resemblance to his first born son, the ruler of Lokapala, who was human and handsome,

3. a gentle, sagely-natured man, beloved of the gods. The King of Lokapala, meanwhile, heard that both of his brothers were born with demon attributes that were far superior to those of their fellow demons and that his father was distraught.

4. The King of Lokapala journeyed to Ngalëngka. On arrival there, he urged his young brother, Kumbakarna, to proceed to Mount Gohkarna and to join his elder brother, Rawana. Together, they should request

5. boons from the Almighty in spite of their hideous forms, for [their appearance] was of Lord Guru's making. They should,
therefore, be granted
exceptional powers. "bakarna obeyed
and set out for Mount Gohkarna. Some time later, his mother
gave birth to another child, a daughter with a trim, shapely
form."
The third child who was named
Sarpakarna, nevertheless, had the features of an ogress.
Wisrawa was still distressed.

Entering his prayer shrine, he devoted himself to meditation
and fervently prayed for another child,
a son who would resemble his first born,
the handsome King of Lokapala.

After Wisrawa had meditated at great length,
the child was finally born, a charming boy
with human features, resembling his elder brother, the ruler
of Lokapala.

As his father had requested, the boy would be gifted,
a master of asceticism, wise and virtuous.
He was named Koda Wibisana."
And so it came about that the child was the image of his father.
The gods approved of Koda Wibisana

whose benevolence [wafted] like a fine fragrance, enriching the
world with his discernment.
The great sage, after the birth
of his fourth child, fathered no more.

Now let us continue with the tale told in Basanta metre."
Meanwhile, Dasamuka had been practising his penance on Mount Gohkarna.

He measured the duration of his penance by the number of his heads, one head being equal to ten years.

Having ten heads, he therefore meditated for one hundred years.

After one hundred years of fasting,*

his ascetic practices were acknowledged and Lord Girinata descended to Mount Gohkarna, escorted by the heavenly multitude.

In a haze of fragrant mist, the gods came before Dasamuka chorusing: 'Dasamuka, Lord Guru demands to know what you seek. Your penance has been most severe, of a hundred years duration.

Such is Lord Girinata's command. Without hesitation, Dasamuka replied to the gods:

'I am honoured and fortunate to have won the favour of the gods [and that you have] descended before me.

Majesties, if the Supreme Lord feels well disposed towards me,

let my invulnerability and invincibility be eternal. Indeed, may I claim supremacy over all the world, over every living creature under the heavens and on the face of the earth.

Let no man be my equal! May even the deities in the heavens be in fear of me. May no-one be capable of matching me in battle!*

All gods who oppose me will be defeated, none shall dare, [but instead] shall tremble at my sight. Let all my foes be
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burnt to cinders!

Lord Girinata may indulge my every whim.

Furthermore, in my tiwikrama form, I should be hideous and incredible.'

6. After Dasamuka had replied to the gods' inquiry,
   Lord Guru gave his consent. The witnessing deities shouted uproariously
   for the Supreme God was willing to comply with all the demon's demands,
   by virtue of his penitential determination, unwavering and staunch for one hundred years.

7. The Divine Guru then took his leave, accompanied by the celestial hosts.
   Dasamuka, left behind, was satisfied and immediately set out for Ngalengka.
   On arrival there, Dasamuka was installed as king by his grandfather, Sumali, who was retiring to a hermitage.

8. Family and kinsmen were devoted to him, knights, warriors and demons were in awe.
   The demon ministers of the state of Ngalengka were innumerable, tributary kings numbered tens of thousands, Ngalengka chieftains were infinite.
   Now Kumbakarna, who had remained in the hermitage, was visited [by the gods]

9. who bestowed more boons upon him than on any other creature on earth.
   The gods granted [all] his requests. Because of his enormous body,
his booming voice and his eyes that burned like twin suns, radiating a heat that rivalled the sun itself, he would be capable of overwhelming the deities in combat.

10. Every request was granted in proportion to his mountain-like build which was truly unique. Kumbakarna was pleased with the favours he received from the gods, powers that enabled invincibility. He returned at once to the kingdom, most enthusiastically.

Canto 5

1. Let us now tell of the youngest son who also sought favours on Gohkarna. Wibisana assiduously performed asceticism from adolescence until manhood on Gohkarna.

2. His penance was accepted and Lord Giriraja descended. The attending deities were in noisy uproar when they finally arrived at Wibisana's [hermitage].

3. Fine fragrances poured down in torrents as the gods conveyed [Lord Guru's] message: 'Receive the command of the Divine Guru! What is the goal of your asceticism?'

4. Wibisana replied, making obeisance: 'My Lords, this is my request. I make no excessive demands,
only that I be granted the gift of a human nature.*

5. I do not seek the favours that were accorded to my older brothers,
but let my nature be open and generous
and gladden the hearts of my fellow men.
Permit me to enlighten the ignorant

6. and to afford protection to all mankind.
Spare me from a heart that has no compassion for humanity
- and may there be peace and order throughout all kingdoms.'

7. The deities were loud in their praise,
all were delighted.
Lord Guru was overjoyed
to learn of Wibisana's magnificent request.

8. All were glad to hear
of his plea to promote world prosperity,
his gentle, pleasing tone as he spoke
of his commitment to peace and security,

9. that the gods and mankind alike should prosper
and enjoy a life of comfort and plenty.
Sweet scented rains cascaded down [as the gods]
danced in jubilation, applauding: 'Victory, victory,

10. splendid peace!' they cried,
'Bright jewel of Ngalangka!
Precious and flawless gem,
shining radiantly, [emanating] a fragrance as penetrating as the candhana.
11. as pure as pristine crystal!
Eminently discerning, defying all dangers.'
The highest echelons of the gods
then bestowed their individual boons.

12. In turn, they gazed with delight
upon a soul that was tranquil and pure.
The divine priests completed
and perfected the instruction and revelation.*

13. The gods were all satisfied.
Lord Guru did not return immediately to the heavens,
for he was eager and pleased to offer his counsel.
The noble Wibisana was like the moon,

14. ringed by bright, radiant beams,
for he emanated virtue
[like] a strong, pervading essence,
the aroma of meekness and gentility.

15. Eloquent and confident,
refined and modest,
composed, unperturbed by coarseness and disrespect,
purity personified, his soul was like an unblemished crystal.

16. His battle prowess was supreme,
as was that of his three elder brothers;*
yet his fine, noble disposition distinguished him [from his kin],
for Wibisana's concern was for the welfare of the world.

17. He had no inclination towards evil and was guided by virtue
alone.
The gods' approbation now complete, 
Lord Guru returned to the heavens 
and Wibisana set out [for the court].

18. Dasamuka was most heartened 
[that Wibisana] had fared as well as his two older brothers. 
Might, invincibility and victory [were his], 
for he had found favour with Lord Giriraja.

19. Kumbakarna had the most remarkable tongue.*
Countless numbers of deities had granted him the gift of a 
voice 
that resounded throughout the seven layers of earth and sky, 
which seemed to split at the very sound.

20. The gods were in total awe, 
but they feared to oppose the will of Lord Nilakanta 
who had bountifully granted supernatural might 
to Kumbakarna because of his enormous features.

21. Kumbakarna's body was like a mountain; 
his eyes blazed like suns 
and his voice boomed like a thousand thunder-claps. 
Indeed, who could hope to withstand him in battle?

22. The deities, powerless, dared not look upon him, 
but cowered and shrunk away at the sound of his terrible voice, 
his shout that threw all nature into chaos and disarray.

Canto 6

1. Lord Girinata therefore consented [to Kumbakarna's requests]
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because he had been created in a manner which distinguished him
from all other monarchs
and even from his own kin.
Lord Guru made manifest his power

2. [when] he created [Kumbakarna's] enormous form which surpassed
every living creature.
Like the god Kala, the world destroyer,
c/d Kumbakarna, if inclined, could have shattered,*
devoured, swallowed the whole world,

3. so immense was his body.
Kumbakarna, however, was harmless, for his only desire was to
sleep
and had no regard for time while he slept.
Kumbakarna's sleep was a form of penance.

4. But now let us describe the Royal compound.
The ornamentation within the palace itself mirrored the highest
heavens.
The decoration left nothing to be desired,
bejewelled as it was with diamonds, sapphires and agate.

5. Everything was golden inlaid with gems,
one island of gold was as big as a mountain.
Emeralds and pearls served as pebbles
and bricks of gold, agate and amethyst emitted rainbow rays.

6. Waves formed in the ornamental ponds
which were surrounded by golden retaining walls.
In fact, only gold and precious stones [were in evidence],
an overabundance of all the treasures of the earth.

7. The inner apartment were splendidly adorned; it would be impossible to describe the luxury of the palace of Ngaléngka.

The Princes resided in separate palaces. Kumbakarna's compound was in the south,

8. while Wibisana's palace was north of his brother Dasamuka's apartments. The three palaces in the city of Ngaléngka were all very fine, with Dasamuka's court occupying the central position,

9. for Dasamuka reigned supreme. His two younger brothers were allotted their own armies and were assigned officers and ministers.

Now let us return to Dasamuka.

10. Any attempt to describe the splendour of his palace would not do it justice, for it was without equal on earth. Only the heavenly courts could match its opulence, the court of Lord Indra being a fit comparison

11. and the palace of Lord Girinata. Indeed, these courts equalled its magnificence but no earthly monarch could hope to rival the palace of Ngaléngka.

12. After some time, Dasamuka became obsessed with his goal of world supremacy. All the kings of the earth were to be submissive to Ngaléngka; demons and humans alike
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13. would kneel in homage at Rawana's feet.
Many vast and powerful kingdoms were laid waste.
The three worlds trembled in abject fear before Dasaswa,*
notorious for his tyranny and arrogance.

14. By stealth and cunning, he subjected the world to his over-
bearing disposition.
Heaven and earth were utterly powerless,
chiefs and kings were no match
for the grasping demon king, Dasamuka.

15. Nevertheless, a prophecy foretold of one
who would slay the demon king, Dasamuka.
A *danu\ja* from Malyawan would have the power,*
*danu\ja* implying a fine, exceptional being.

16. And in what way would he be outstanding? It is said
that he would be of royal lineage, a true sage king.
His might would be equal to that of the highest god
and he would manifest all the attributes of an esteemed deity.

17. Now the expression 'andani\swara' is explained as follows:
the servant will have the nature of a king and the king, the
nature of the highest god. Beasts of the forest will have
human attributes
and the sage, the disposition of the sublime deities.

18. Clearly, this [situation] will be constant on the tenth
occasion.*
Still, I leave the meaning of *daniswara* up to the reader's
judgement;*
there are many interpretations and it is not possible to choose
just one.

But the one [destined] to slay Dasamuka in battle is Lord Wisnu incarnate, aided by the monkey king and his vast army. In time to come, Ngaløngka will fall and peace and prosperity [will be restored] by a man of great courage and determination.
CANTOS 14-17

Canto 14

1. There was a very high mountain in Lokapala soaring into the sky. Dasamuka, wishing to see the mountain's highest peak, began the ascent, mounted in his chariot.

2. Only a few of his trusted demons accompanied him, as the bulk of the army continued the pillage of the palace. When the demon lord, Dasamuka, finally reached the top, he saw the portals of a building, the outer gates of which reached into the heavens. Behind these gates* dwelt the celestial nymphs, especially chosen* as future reward for valiant knights slain on the field of battle. All the nymphs within this secluded compound were very beautiful, all fitting recompense.

3d/4a And so Dasamuka had reached the summit of this lofty mountain, known as Mount Kelasa.

5. Dasamuka remained in his chariot. The god guarding the gate was startled to see Dasamuka arrive in his vehicle, still firmly seated. The sentry shouted to Dasamuka: 'Go away from here at once! Go back down again. I'll have you know that this is the entrance to Lord Guru's seraglio and that none may pass. Even the deities are denied entry.
7. You may well wish to pass into the heavens but you have no authority other than your own self interest. So turn back immediately, for you will certainly incur Lord Guru's wrath and misfortune may befall you. Even now, you have already been cursed by the god Siwa. In time to come, you will do battle with a powerful knight and an army of monkeys. He will defeat you and all of your kin will be totally annihilated by the monkeys at the fall of the kingdom of Ngaléngka. So make haste, Dasamuka and dismount from your chariot'. King Rawana was most disgruntled to hear the warning of the god who guarded the threshold to heaven, the abode of the nymphs.

8. Climbing down from his vehicle, King Dasamuka began to meditate in his demon-like manner, for he did not meditate in a human fashion. His fervent request was that he be granted access to the forbidden precincts of the heavens, for Dasamuka longed to see where the nymphs were dwelling. Having completed his meditation, he strode forward and pushed the gate ajar. When he slipped his right hand inside, the doors snapped shut, jamming his hand.

9. Dasamuka wrenched and tugged but the harder he tried, his hand became all the more clamped between the doors. He
paused,
yelping in pain, roaring like an enraged lion.
His terrible voice rent the heavens

13. and reverberated throughout the three worlds. The gods were
in consternation
and tumbled from their thrones. [The heavens] shuddered and
shook
as thunder rumbled and lightning flashed. Lord Guru smiled
contentedly. Then he sent a command to the deities

14. on guard at the gate, ordering it to be opened.
As the doors parted, Dasamuka released his hand smartly
and made swift obeisance before the entrance.
His low obeisance and meditation, however, were directed
towards Lord Guru.

15. He then hastily withdrew with his select band of demons
escorting him. Dasamuka then proceeded to ramble
throughout the area surrounding Mount Kelasa,
like a party [of courtiers] at leisure, enjoying the scenery.

Canto 15

1. On the mountain, Dasamuka spied a hermitage. It was indeed a
charming sight,
ringed by clear waters, thickly planted with fruit trees, *duryan, kapundhung,*
mangosteen, *langseb, rambutan* and banana. At the edge [of the
gardens] were *talés, wi* and *gëmbili* crops.
The demon band were delighted and partook of the fruits and the
fresh water.
2. The walls of the ornamental ponds were delicately engraved and inlaid with green precious stones, bright with red lotus. The fencing was encrusted with green and purple gems in a most attractive leaf motif. White, yellow and red flowers bloomed in fine profusion*. It is impossible to adequately describe the beauty of the hermitage. Now the occupant, was the lovely Dewi Widawati, a paragon among women,* who had devoted herself completely to asceticism. Her penitential exercises were, in fact, renowned and were imitated by the heavenly nymphs. None could match the ascetic standards of Widawati. How could one hope to depict the magnificence of the mountain and the anchoress.

4. When Dasamuka saw the splendour of the hermitage, he dismounted from his chariot. As he approached, he saw a woman of flawless beauty. Rarasati and Ratih were put to shame by Widawati's charms, for indeed, she was Sri incarnate in the guise of the daughter of a monk named Wrahaspati. On the death of this priest who had reared her, Widawati took her father's place and remained in Wrahaspati's hermitage. She had long awaited the fulfilment of a pledge with Lord Wisnu, who was to reincarnate in the state of Maispati. [Wisnu] had sought in vain an opportunity [for his rebirth]. Eventually, during the course of a battle
between the warriors of Lokapala and the demons of Ngalengka, Wisnu quickly approached the warriors, seeking some means of rebirth. In the thick of the battle, he entered the body of a warrior of Lokapala who was then slain by Mintragna.

7. Lord Wisnu immediately incarnated in the person of King Arjunawijaya, renowned throughout the world as King Kartawirya of Maispati. All men paled into insignificance beside him; no king, however powerful, could match him in battle. A thousand kings paid him homage and regarded him as the supreme overlord.*

8. All mighty rulers paid court to Arjuna Sasra of Maispati. Lord Wisnu having taken human form now awaited Dewi Sri, who until this time had remained on the mountain, for there had been no means for her to descend. Sri sought rebirth in the person of the Princess of Magada, the Lady Citrawati, who would wed Arjuna Sasra at a future time. And now, Widawati, while still in the mountain, happened to meet this demon king wandering aimlessly on the hillside. Having paused in the story [to explain these events], let us now return to the tale of Widawati.

9. From her prayer shrine, she was startled to see Dāsamuka arrive in the courtyard of the hermitage. Recognizing him as a demon king, Widawati
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came down to greet him: 'O lord of the demons, what do you seek
in this mountain retreat? What could you hope to find? There is nothing to afford any comfort.

11. You will be as hot as you are in the open sky, with no prospect of shade.
Furthermore, the area is barren of all fruits. It is truly a useless venture,
wandering about on this mountain.' So spoke Widawati.
Dasamuka listened to her [charming] words.

Canto 16

1. [Dasamuka] was bewildered, infatuated, smitten with desire, overwhelmed by a yearning that he felt could kill him without inflicting a [single] wound, if he were unsuccessful in his wooing of the lovely ascetic. Dasamuka plaintively spoke:

2. 'Why my dear, what are you doing here?
Your face is like the full, bright moon spreading its radiant beams over the earth.
The essence of every earthly scent

3. is gathered into your person.
My dear, why stay here in deprivation on this mountain top?
Surely it would be preferable to enjoy a life of pleasure in Ngalâṇgka.
Indeed, I would be glad to wait upon you.

4. I offer Ngalâṇgka to you, little one.
[There], you will reign supreme and all the realm will be at your service.

The men and women of Ngalāṅka will be your slaves and I will be devoted to you alone.

5. So come my dear, I will take you to Ngalāṅka.

It would be a tragedy if you remained in solitude on this mountain.

Now would it not be better to join me, my little one?

Have a care for your glowing, jewel-like radiance

6. which puts moon-beams to shame.

Stars blanch and lose their lustre,

flowers are bereft of their fragrance

in the presence of the queen of jewels and sweetness.

7. You are the flowers of all flowers.

Even if all the flowers of the world were gathered into bouquets,*

how could they hope to compare with you, my dear?'

When Dasamuka had finished speaking,

8. Widawati replied without hesitation:

'King of the demons, do not behave badly!

Your desire will never be satisfied,

for no man may claim me for his wife.

9. Not even the gods have that right with the exception of Lord Wisnu.

He alone shall be my consort. The sequence must remain constant,*

for Lord Wisnu is my eternal partner.
10. If we were to be reborn a thousand times, even a hundred thousand times, we would be inseparable.

He has, in fact, already made himself manifest in Maispati in the person of King Arjuna Sasra, the esteemed King Kartawirya.

Soon I will be reunited with Lord Wisnu incarnate.
So begone, you devil, do not come near me!

12. Ah Dasamuka, in time you will perish, along with your savage demon band.
All will be slain by an army of monkeys and I will be responsible for your downfall.

13. Your transgression will be abducting me and refusing my husband's request [that I be returned].* As a consequence, you will be vanquished and slain at the time of my second reincarnation.'*

14. Dasamuka replied in low tones: 'Come, come, my dear! Do not behave like this! Who would dare oppose me in battle?
I defeated the King of Lokapala and took possession of his vehicle, the celestial chariot, and his eagle.* He was a mighty king and on brotherly terms with the gods but nevertheless, he was my inferior.

16. I then continued to roam this mountain,
indeed, I have wandered over the whole of Mount Kelasa. Throughout the three worlds, I am incomparable, all-powerful, infamous! Even the gods are in fear of me.

17. How could a monkey constitute any threat?* My dear, this is why I am such a splendid match for you, for neither the deities, nor the priests would dare to challenge me.

18. Let us then dear, return to Ngalengka. My palace is magnificent, exquisite! No other court can match its splendour.' When he had finished speaking,

19. Dasamuka approached Widawati and caressed her hairknot. The lady was shocked and drew back, deeply offended: 'You dog, Dasamuka! You wicked scoundrel! How dare you touch my hair.

20. You really are vile! It is inevitable that in time to come I will be the cause of your death in battle.' Having cursed Dasamuka, the woman fled into the offering pavilion where a fire burned brightly.

21. She entered the flames and was quickly consumed. Dasamuka gave chase but upon reaching the fire, he became despondent and withdrew, deeply disappointed.

22. Once outside, he rejoined his men and continued to roam once again through the mountains. On the mountain side, he sighted
what seemed to be a palace, richly bejewelled.

Canto 17

1. The beautiful mountain, calle Mount Dukhsina*, was still within the boundary of Mount Kelasa.

c/d The ascetic who dwelt and administered there was a king called Maruta.

2. Many venerable monks, their apprentices and religious scholars from the surrounding area were devoted to him, for it was his practice to offer advice and instruction to the holy men.

One morning*, as the many monks assembled respectfully in the instruction hall, they were startled by the arrival of the demon king, Dasamuka, who without any warning, suddenly entered the instruction chamber.

4. The monks dispersed in total confusion as Dasamuka calmly took a seat.

In a controlled voice, King Maruta said:

'Dasamuka, what do you seek here?'

5. Dasamuka replied: 'Good priest*, do you know that I am fresh from battle with the ruler of Lokapala whom I conquered? Although he was an exceptional king, he was no match for me.

6. Danaraja was taken up to heaven and all his domains on Mount Kelasa
were ceded to me by the deities
as a mark of my martial supremacy.

7. I now control all of Lokapala.
If you are not willing to submit to my authority,
come, let us do battle.'
King Maruta, incensed,

8. reached for his marvellous arrows and was at the ready;
flames issued from his weapon.
[The King] was most uncontrolled and lapsed from his priestly
disposition:*'Ha! Show me the king who could escape with his life

9. if struck by my arrow!' At that moment, the command of Lord Guru was heard.
'Why do you behave so badly?
It is not your task to slay men in battle

10. since you have been appointed to a particular duty.
You should be ashamed to bear the name of Maruta.'
How disappointing is this impetuous outburst,
for Lord Guru has entrusted you with the task of teaching.

11. You are to minister to all of the priests and monks.
Furthermore, Dasamuka may not
be slain [at this point] for his time has not yet come.
He is still shielded by Lord Utipati.'

12. King Maruta immediately recollected himself,
laid aside his weapon and quickly gathered
an assortment of fruits which he offered to Rawana.
Dasamuka and his band were satisfied.

The demon warriors shouted with delight,
for King Maruta had admitted defeat.
Dasamuka sat at ease, feasting on the fruit
and all manner of delectable foods from the mountain.

Then he posed a question:
'Listen sage king, I ask you this in all sincerity.
I met a beautiful woman practising asceticism on the mountain,
the Lady Widawati, who leapt into a fire, spurning my advances.

What has become of Widawati now,
for I am quite infatuated with the woman.
The sage king considered the question:
'Dasamuka, this is indeed a grave matter.

Do not entertain any hopes of success [with the lady].
Indeed, it would be rash to pursue the affair further.'
Dasamuka persisted: 'Well then, where is she,
for I mean to pursue her, - who could prevent me?

Maruta said: 'She may be sought in many places,
in Magada, in Maispati, in Mantili,
and in Ngayudya. In the future, she will be in all these

cities.'

Dasamuka immediately took his leave and set off.

None of his men were left behind.
They flew into the air heading
for Ngayudya, intent on attack,
brashly, impatiently, spoiling for a fight.
CANTOS 22-25

Canto 22*

1. The road-side was crowded with onlookers
   [watching] the procession through the villages. Men on their way to the rice fields carrying hoes and ploughs, rushed to catch a glimpse of the King.

2. Seeing the flash of the bejewelled chariots in the distance, they flung aside their ploughs and hoes, hurled them down and ran, sprinting ahead. [One man] tripped and became entangled in the ropes, tried to kick them away, but became even further entwined in the coils.*

3. Having injured his feet, he fell wimpering [to the ground] but those in the lead paid him no mind, while those behind tried to overtake him,* tumbling over his head, bruising him, running on in confusion. Other onlookers close to the scene leapt

4. across the canals, [but slipped] and lay flat on their backs covered in mud. Labourers, harrowing and ploughing in the fields, left their buffalo and cows without a second thought. There were some young herders sitting on the dikes

5. whose cows scattered at the sound of the trumpeting elephants and the whinnying horses of the travellers. The young lads paid no mind to their cattle but raced off, intent on a glimpse of His Majesty.
6. Young maids about to draw water from the spring scurried off, still carrying the earthenware jugs and buckets. The cumbersome vessels were hurled away as they ran and lay forgotten.

Other women had just drawn water which they bore on their hips in little containers.

7. In their haste, they seemed to be offering the water to His esteemed Majesty, the King. The onlookers were deeply moved* and waited obstinantly in line,

8. begging and pleading [for his attention] with no thought of propriety.

They seemed despondent and melancholy,* desperate for a glimpse. [If unsuccessful], in great disappointment they withdrew, crushed and bruised, for they could think of nothing else*

9. except the one who sat in the bejewelled chariot with his queen, Citrawati.

The vehicle moved at a leisurely pace as [the couple] enjoyed the beauty of the scenery.

10. A gentle mist gathered, hovering above His Majesty, Arjuna Sasra, seeming to shade the passage of the King.

Fine dust rose from the earth,

11. shrouding the sun and dimming its brilliance.

By now, the party had reached the hilly coastal regions.
Priests, monks and holy men
learnt that the King
was travelling at his leisure through the forests.
The mountain monks descended to greet
Arjuna Sasra and to tell
of their asceticism while on the mountain.

It was to Arjuna Sasra alone
that their steadfast penance was directed, to ensure the
continued well-being
of this exemplary and compassionate monarch,
the pivot, the pillar of the realm,
who protected every living creature.
When the King
rested in the hermitages of the holy monks,
he enjoyed the company of his wife and his men.

The mountain was suddenly [as lively] as the city itself
with the presence of large numbers of troops and regents,
hunting and trapping the forest game,
fishing in the rivers and streams.

Traps, snares and nets were employed,
bird catching nets, blow pipes and other ploys. *
In the evenings, the King joined the monks in conversation
and practised meditative exercises for their well-being in the
afterlife.

The discourses concerned the conduct befitting a king, who is
the defender of the realm, *
and the most appropriate attitude towards death,
life's ultimate goal, as well as the most efficacious means
[of release],
lest they become ensnared, obsessed with baser passions.*

18. Queen Citrawati delighted to listen
to her husband's dialogue with the esteemed priests,
as they considered the principles of kingship
and the ordering of eternal salvation.*

19. [They discussed] the application of this level of excellence*
in the running of a prosperous state,
[a kingdom] governed by peace and order,
fostering integrity.

20. Queen Citrawati
wandered contentedly, gathering the flowers of the hermitage,
accompanied by the ladies of the court.
Flowers unfurled and seemed to assault the senses of those*
in pursuit of beauty as they sought the splendid blooms.
The tendrils of the jangga vine could be likened to arms waving
gently,
while the andul blossoms opened and parted like a lover's smile.*
The lotus, resplendent on the lake, seemed to have a sad
expression.

21. Bright arguilo at the edge of the compound
bloomed in an array of crimson and white. The ladies were
delighted.
The jasmine blossoms were [as pure] as the soul of a priest,
whose heart was set on the most precious of flowers.
Canto 23

1. Arjuna Sasra was happy to watch his wives as they sought and gathered the flowers. After some time, the party set out again, making camp beside the forest streams, on hilly slopes and at the foot of the mountain in pursuit of beauty.

2. Along the way, alms were distributed and the people were well satisfied, [for the King] wisely ensured that all were content. When the party rested* and spent the night in the pavilions, provisions were dispensed to all the servants. Even the horse boys had their share and no-one was overlooked.

3. A hermitage was sighted on the mountain top, picturesquely shrouded in mist and fog. The site appeared deserted for the tall grass was very overgrown. The priest who dwelt there in penance had vanished, not a soul was in sight; the scene was most desolate.

4. The doors at the entrance were blocked with thick vegetation for here were the remains of a [once] fine building which towered over a steep precipice. At the edge of the road, ivory coconuts grew in abundance. Then two girls appeared, the maidservants of the former monk.*

5. The two girls were most distressed because they had been left
Yet another hermitage came into view. Many monks lived there,* aiding and supporting each other in an atmosphere of trust, intimacy and respect.

[The monks] were intent on ridding themselves of all ignorance and applied this principle in their lives.*

With the utmost determination, they distanced themselves from evil and confusion, abhorring conceit and hardness of heart, untainted by avarice. The monks were glad to be of constant service to King Arjuna Sasra, to whom they were totally devoted.

Delighted by this great blessing, they welcomed [their Lord] splendidly.

All the mountain dwellers surged forward, even the lowly apprentices had gifts to offer. At that time, many people sought to become religious students, because of the King's deep affection for the monks, priests, ascetics and holy men.*

It was the nature of this excellent king to offer consolation to those in sorrow, to comfort the destitute and to provide for the needs of his own men and of those who lived on the mountain.

Arjuna Sasra then continued the journey,* accompanied by his wife and all his retinue. Passing through the mountain slopes, the party descended to a deep river.
In the clear, swiftly flowing water, Zajër gleamed like sparkling gems; none were bold enough to collect them.

Then the soldiers and servants, together with the many elephants, horses and chariots, bathed in the river, a most agreeable sight. The King and Queen happily admired [the scenery] which looked like a picture book. After all had bathed, they continued on their way, slackening the pace of the chariots as they reached a wide expanse of open land. Green grass stretched for nine times as far as the eye could see.

Thorny sisir and tanjang trees, prickly ṣpung and rukêm bushes hung low in the valley.* In the centre [of the field] was a huge banyan tree, ambulu and kēpuh trees grew in rows. The hollow in the centre of the tree was like a cave through which the wind howled as it blew. A village complex was close by.

In the north-east, charming villages could be seen with numerous ponds and springs.* Statues and shady trees stood in rows beside the clear waters.* Many wandering monks came to rest by the springs, from morning until evening deep in meditation, praying for the welfare of humanity.

[The Royal party] continued and came upon a building overlooking the ridge. The enclosing fence, portals
and the residence faced an alun-alun. The outer gates were imposing.

Here the King rested with his men.

15. He was astounded to see what appeared to be the remnants of a fine court centre and a palace that was still intact.*

As the royal couple alighted from the golden chariot, all the courtiers came forward, ready to accompany the Queen as she entered into the inner palace.

They passed through the doors; truly, it was a magnificent sight. There were two large temples with beautifully ornate interiors, fashioned with precious stones. As they continued into the courtyard within the palace,

the court ladies were still in attendance.

In the open interior yard, fine blossoming plants and flowers bloomed. Nagakusuma trees were in abundance.

The King and Queen sat in the hall

18. [while] the court ladies enthusiastically gathered the blooms to their hearts' content.

There was a mountain within the palace, surrounded by a bathing pool* with floral borders. Statues stood in the four corners of the yard.

Those splendid images represented four great warriors.

Canto 24

1. The King and Queen
stood before the extraordinary images.

His Majesty then questioned

the monk who was accompanying him:

2. 'Good priest, why
did this former king leave the palace?*
For what reason would a king,
without any regret, vacate this site?

3. Furthermore, what prompted the king
to design this mountain garden within the palace?'
The monk replied to the King:
'My Lord, this garden and the mountain

4. were fashioned in imitation of Suralaya.*
The god Rudra is in the west,*
Rētna Sambawa in the south,
Lord Amintabasa is in the east

5. and the god Amolasidi is in the north.
It is said that this former king
was of the opinion that there was no Supreme Deity.*
Lord Buddha and the god Siwaraja

6. were both the focal point of worship
in the *darma sīh, the strict and therefore superior [*darma].*
However, the *darma wawal, it is told,
was the philosophy that the king subscribed to.*

7. He had no desire to follow the advice of the priests,*
the monks, the sages
and those who practised the *darma ji.*
Only those who followed the king enjoyed his favour.

It made no difference whether or not a subject lived up to his religious and moral obligations. If he were not of the king's persuasion, [he received nothing].
There was no sense of excellence in the kingdom, nor any aspiration towards duty and responsibility.

The king followed only one principle* that was anyway exemplary; he took great pleasure in feasting and drinking with his kinsmen and his wives.

All the king's warriors and servants were invited to take part in the great banquets, so that they would guard him loyally and well. This was the reason that they were treated as kin to splendid feasts.

A king who performs acts of charity must not be similarly motivated but should be modest and unassuming.* It should not be on the basis of whether or not a person is directly present that they be favoured with feasting.

Even those in remote places and those absent should be assisted. The recipient will thus be content and the donor will be thought to be the Almighty himself, for the receiver will not be aware from whence this liberality came.
13. Thus a king who aspires
to a disposition founded on concern and compassion
and wishes to widely distribute his excellent gifts,
is said to be conducting himself in the most exemplary manner.

14. [Such action] is to be likened to the sublime state of a king
who dies in battle,
courageously willing to confront danger head on.
Truly, this king will gain the highest heavenly rewards,
that of death on the field of battle.

Canto 25

1. Never adopt the same attitude*
as the king who would not perform his moral obligations.*
From ancient times, it has been the practice of kings
to conduct themselves prudently and to be ruled by propriety.

2. Do not neglect to seek the advice of a religious teacher.
Show concern for the monks and priests
and send them provisions,*
so that their ascetic exercises will be effective.

3. [The merit] of the monks' prayers and incantations
will be directed towards the king and further transmitted to his
subjects.
All will be dedicated to the promotion of moral excellence
because the king [himself] aspires to the dharma ji.*

4. Subjects will fear to behave badly
and will want to practice the dharma ji
because the king will reward them.
Any transgression against the king will be against the codes of 

5. The perpetrator of the crime will be the one at fault and not the king. But if a subject has been conducting himself decently and virtuously,

6. the king should be informed if he is in any distress. If the king is insensitive to his plight, subjects in such a situation may well become subversive and will be of no benefit to the state.

7. If any of your men are grasping, brash and uncouth, with the manners of a fiend, prone to bravado and misdemeanours,

8. cast them out, along with their wives and children. Root out their evil inclinations so that they will follow the prescriptions of religion; it is the poison within the heart that can kill.

9. Poison in the soul is the ultimate venom and those tainted with this poison of the spirit will perish, be burnt to ashes. If they manage to survive, they will be miserable and anxious.

10. Indeed, this is the most potent poison; if the good priests are not consulted and the king does not consider their advice, moreover, if they are mistreated and persecuted
11. and the monks' establishments are destroyed, the priests will certainly conjure up curses. If they utter these terrible oaths, the ones to suffer will be those who incur the wrath of the clergy.

12. They will be plagued by adversity and ruin.' So spoke the priest, concerned that the King be completely aware [of his responsibility].

The King was most satisfied,

13. for he had already absorbed these wise principles, [the importance of] compassionate authority and concern for his men. He was mindful of the sick in the kingdom and everything that had fallen into disrepair would be set right.

14. 'Good priest, have no fear. I am determined to apply the principles of just kingship. I will fulfil all my religious and moral obligations,

15. for my task on earth is to practise benevolence and to perform meritorious deeds. No king should be tainted by greed and avarice and no ruler should be unwilling

16. to live in affectionate harmony with his subjects. If a king behaves otherwise, there would be no benefit in him having been specially favoured by the Almighty and exalted above his fellow man.
17. If the king is engrossed in the pursuit of power and forgets that his role is to maintain world welfare, he is likened to a miser who is frugal with his wealth.

18. For this reason, if any knight or king will not live up to his moral responsibilities, he is at fault, absorbed in ĭlaţi, utterly bereft of sweetness.
The King asked the monk who was following behind:

'Good priest,

for what reason did the king

leave this palace?

What could have prompted him

to have taken no account of the toil

and hardship in establishing the kingdom
to have left it so suddenly?

How could he

simply leave his kingdom.

Furthermore, why did the king
design this garden within the palace,
with the mountain, surrounded by the lake?'

The monk answered quietly:

'My Lord,

this mountain garden within the palace
was fashioned as imitation
of Suralaya, Sire.

In the west, is the abode
of Lord Rudra.

In the south
is Lord Rētna Sambawa.

In the east
is Lord Amintabasa

while in the north,
26. is Lord Amolasidi, Your Majesty.
Now it is said
that this former king
did not acknowledge
any of the guardian deities, [the dewa kang among].

27. Now the guardian deities
are the [eight] leading deities.*
This means that [the king] had no desire
to pay homage
to these eight deities

28. below Lord Guru,
nor to any other [god]
additional to the eight.
He did not consider them at all,
but [prayed] only to the Ultimate, [the Supreme God].

29. With single-minded devotion,*
my Lord, the king directed
his homage
only, in fact,
to Lord Wênang*

30. and secondly, to Lord Guru.
Apart from these two deities,
all others were deemed insignificant.
Dual goals within his [religious] scheme
confused his path.*

31. Now, as for the king's magnanimity,*
he resolutely pursued
the loftiest of goals,
seeking to unravel the secret of existence
and maintain a flawless spiritual state.

But what the king had neglected,
was the magnanimity that should befit a king,
for his only concern
was that his perfect state be undisturbed.
This was his wish.

So he departed from standard royal practices
[and from working within] the ordained stations in life
by insisting only on the zenith.
As for the priests,
their guidance was ignored.

He took no notice of their great store [of wisdom].

Now if this king wanted to bestow a gift or favour, my Lord,
he only gave to create an impression.*
Even among the monks and devout men,

if they were not of the same mind as the king,
they received nothing.
But if they followed him,

d/ε they were given in the same measure as his warriors.

Even among his own men,
only those who followed him received any recognition
and were rewarded by the king.
No account was taken of them being descendants of men of com-

petence,
of substance or of rank,

37. or from families who had rendered past services in time of trouble.
This was not considered.
Even those whose excellence was renowned throughout the realm were totally ignored.

38. He saw no value in the superior benevolence [as he] flooded his servants [with gifts].
There was only one aspect of this former [king's] conduct that was anyway exemplary.

39a/b While he was reigning,
he enjoyed eating and drinking,
feasting within the palace with his children and kinsmen,

40. as well as with his wives. Furthermore, all of his servants of high and low rank were feted and feasted

c/d so that they would guard him loyally and well.
It was for this reason that they were treated as kinsmen

41. to marvellous feasts.
But it should not be so.
This is a misguided approach for it seems that his conduct was narrow, not sufficiently accommodating.
18,42

42. If [a king] plans to practise true magnanimity, he should give alms to all his subjects and overlook no-one. All under his authority should receive of his bounty.

43. He should not merely give to those immediately before him and to his own men, but also to those villagers living in remote areas. He would be wise

44. to be on the lookout for subjects suffering because of their poverty, as well as people from other kingdoms who may be wandering about destitute and wretched.

45. Even though they live in distant villages, every unfortunate should be given immediate assistance from the king. Scouts should be sent out to investigate.*

Canto 19

1. People who had previously drifted aimlessly will be amicable, satisfied and most content. They will give thanks to the Almighty for the giver, my Lord,
2. will be thought to be the Supreme Lord Himself because [the receiver] is unaware of the origin of the alms. This is because the donor is not ostentatious and does not seek to be complimented.

3. He does not chase fame and praise. You should appoint investigators, that is, *juru panitik*, examiners. Those undergoing hardship and in impoverished circumstances will come to their attention as they do their rounds.'

4. The sage spoke further with King Arjuna Sasra: 'My Lord, kings who are intent on a superior form of benevolence, who are concerned for the welfare of their men, these kings should not be motivated by self interest. Do not overburden your subjects, neither the high or low ranking. Furthermore Majesty, do not be intoxicated by power and worldly pleasure, for this would amount to capriciousness which is to be equated with arrogance. If a king
7. distances himself from the gods,
he will inevitably come to grief
and disgrace. Once disgraced,
decline would set in.
People will desert the state
and the king will wither.

8. Therefore, if a king wishes to stay in office,
this king
should distribute his riches
and provisions. This is because the king
is the crowning point
of creation.

9. He should be concerned for everyone
under his authority
and should not be preoccupied with his own wealth.
For if he is genuinely concerned for his men,
the enemy will keep its distance
and the kingdom will be firm and secure.

10. If a king begrudges his gold and jewels
and is reluctant to part
with his wealth and finery,
if he is not wholeheartedly generous,
he will inevitably
be displaced by the enemy,

11. an enemy who cares for his men.
[The kingdom] will disintegrate.

c/d All this will be due to the king's failure
to provide sufficient food and alms but [instead] overburdened [his men].

As a consequence, the troops will be defeated in battle.

12. If it should come about that such a king is slain on the battlefield, this would be a disgraceful way to die, to be killed in combat with only a few supporters who were willing to die with their king. [This king] then stands alone, for his men will have deserted him, all due to the king's parsimonious nature.

13. On the other hand, [when] an exemplary king is hardpressed by his enemy, his men fight to the death before him. Then their king hurls himself into the fray, having no fear of death as the enemy overwhelm him.

15. Even if the enemy number a million, he is unafraid, determined to fight to the finish. If, finally, he is slain, he attains the honour of a battle hero. That will certainly come to pass.
16. The highest heaven is the just recompense for the king who falls in battle." The priest continued: "My Lord, one who bears the title of king,

17. must be governed by these codes. If any ruler
c/d does not practise the *dharma* ji,
e/f he will be overwhelmed by shallow indifference.

18. It was customary in former times, for kings to be mindful of propriety. Every ruler should conduct himself in a manner befitting a king. Never forget, my Lord, to seek

19. the advice of a religious teacher. Show concern for the priests, esteemed monks and other ascetics. Send provisions to the monks so that, my Lord, their meditation will be effective and will focus on peace and prosperity. Their prayers and incantations will be directed towards the king and transmitted in turn to the king's men.
19,21a/b

21a/b All will be drawn towards excellence,
    for the king himself desires
    that the realm be secure and prosperous.
The good servants will enjoy his favour
    and the scoundrels will suffer.

22a/b Corrupt servants will therefore be afraid
    and in terror will repent.
    All will aspire to practise the *darma jì*
    because the king will provide well for all.

23. No-one will be punished,
    in fact, the king
    will be compassionate and shower his subjects with gifts.
    If a servant behaves badly,
    the king will not be responsible
    for his punishment,

24. for indeed, the malefactor will have brought this on himself.
    The perpetrator of the crime
    will come to grief because of his own misdemeanours
    in not conducting himself
    virtuously.

25. It is not the king, therefore, who inflicts the punishment
    on the wrongdoer,
    but the one at fault brings the punishment upon himself.
    But if he reforms
    and behaves decently
    and ethically,
26. the king must acknowledge this. 
    Do not be lax in this regard
    and never tire of trying to win their affection.
    If the king takes no notice,
    reformed servants,
    perhaps, my Lord,

27. will create havoc in the kingdom
    and as a consequence the king
    will be brought to ruin.
    How unfortunate is the king
    who is powerless to halt
    the spread of evil.
Canto 30

1. 'My dear, I understand why you are angry with me and turn from [love's] pleasures. Pardon me, my love.
   The bee should wait in pleasant anticipation for the pandanas to unfurl.
   The *kedhesih* bird should crave the sunbeams*
   and the *ointaka* bird in the sky is in ecstasy
   awaiting the gentle rains as the thunder rumbles.
   But I acted otherwise, my dear.
   c/d I sought to caress your loveliness in our chamber as I would pluck a flower.

4. I paid no mind to your scratching nails, my love, nor to the attack by your finely arched eyebrows, because I was overcome with desire, filled with a wistful longing as I beheld your beauty.

5. Yearning and sad despair overwhelmed me, my ardour is distressing.
   If I die of pain and heartbreak, cover me with your shed *kain*.
   Furthermore, my dear, I was oblivious to the world about me,

6. for it seemed that you would disappear if I withdrew my gaze.
   You are [as beautiful] as the goddess of the flowers.
   You have no reason to be angry with me, to be unsympathetic, to reject my love.*
7. My dear, that was why I seemed obsessed and insensitive as I embraced your waist. This is why I am at fault then, because of your incomparable beauty.

8. I felt that you would disappear before me. So he coaxed and cajoled at length, hoping to soothe the displeasure and vexation of the one whose love he sought.

9. The King's desire grew stronger, his passion was like a sepal attacking the thunder.* While praising her breasts in kidung and kakawin, he kissed her cheeks

10. and offered her betel nut. And so the Queen was like a night lotus opening to the moon. Why would she be reluctant, having been given his betel which she accepted with affection?

11. We will not describe how delightfully she loosened her kain and feigned timidity as they made love. Eagerly, they exchanged caresses, their arms like the tendrils of a gadhung,

12. intimately intertwined as they sought pleasure. It would take too long to describe in verse the way in which they enjoyed love's delights. At last, the couple exhausted their exchange

13. of endearments and fell silent, bearing in mind all that they had so appropriately expressed
as they indulged in all of the pleasures of love.
The Queen quietened and yielded to her husband.

14. Wearily, she fell asleep.
As the couple slept together under a kain,
the Queen dreamt,
that she was wandering through the heavens, like a jewel.*

Canto 31

1. The couple slept soundly after they had made love for the second time.
It was almost dawn. Birds sang noisely on the branches of the fruit trees.
Puasang trees growing in profusion at the water's edge burst into bloom
and the scent of the gadhung flowers wafted into the Queen's presence.

2. A gentle breeze seemed to wend its way towards those who drowsily slept on in the perfumed chamber.
Young banana leaves unfurled like a rolled-up kain at the end of a bed.
Clouds draped themselves over the ivory coconuts like [a kambiñ] covering the breasts.*
Manggis fell to the ground [and opened] like the lips of one given a betel nut.

3. The sun gradually rose higher and brighter in the sky.
Let us now tell of the King and Queen who decked themselves in jewels
and finery and sat together in state. Courtiers came forward
to stand in attendance before the Royal couple in front of the pavilion.

4. All were astounded to see the clear surging water, deep and swiftly flowing, resounding like the waves of an ocean. The broad waters caused the onlookers to feel hesitant and disappointed, frustrated because the river could not be forded, and so they did not venture into the middle.*

5. The King therefore approached his wife, the Queen, seeing the disappointment in her eyes and how her pleasure had been cut short. She seemed saddened and ill-humoured. The King appreciated his wife's feelings and so the King

6. consoled her saying: 'Come little one, you have no need to worry about the damming of this very broad river; even the ocean, if you should desire it [to be dammed] my dear, is within my capabilities. If you require the heavens to be brought down to earth, as long as I am alive

7. there would be no problem. I am certainly able to fulfil your every desire. But my dear, you should allow me to see that you are unhappy.* Grant this favour to your pitiful slave who cares for you so deeply. Even among the courtiers, the palace ladies and the attendants,
it is only your wishes

8. that concern them. The soldiers, warriors and all the kings would not hesitate to carry out all your wishes, my dear, as if they were mine.'

But we tell no more of what the King said. Stepping down from the Queen, the King then stood at the edge of the deep Narmada.

9. He summoned his chief minister, Suwanda, who came before him, together with the kings, nobles and officers. The King said: 'My brother Suwanda, I wish to sleep here in the estuary. Keep alert, be on your guard with all the men.' Suwanda said respectfully:

10. 'My Lord, it will be done.' The King looked eagerly at the deep waters of the river, which were as deep as an ocean in the centre.

He then manifested his tiwikrama form of mountainous proportions, with his thousand arms extended, all clutching weapons. The deities in the sky

11. showered down blossoms, loudly acclaiming him and venerable monks approached His Highness. The Queen, his wives and the courtiers all bowed low in homage at the King's feet, the Queen being the first to pay homage to her husband.

12. Kings and nobles likewise paid their respects. When all had made obeisance, the King moved; the earth seemed to quake and mountains rumbled. Then he lowered himself and lay across the river, dividing the waters as if they had been dammed.
Canto 46

1. Rawana, in fact, became even more spirited and in no way intimidated by the many kings pressing around him. He fended off his opponents, dispatching them to his left and right.

The King of Srawangga, felled by a kick, lay dead,

2. blood oozing from his nostrils.

Rawana, in a voice like thunder, spoke:

'Hey, you useless kings!
You insist on confronting my fury head on

but you have no hope of victory against me.
It is virtual suicide.'

So boasted King Dasamuka.

The Kings of Ngala and Kalingga were already dead.

4. King Soda, who came to their assistance, was hurled away and landed in the distance.

The tributary kings were thrown into total disarray and fled.
The Maispati warriors were terrified and shuddered in fear as they beheld Dasamuka in battle.

5. His body expanded and spread like a fire that could not be extinguished.

In panic, some fled for their lives into ravines and into the hills,
as Rawana manifested a ferocity that rivalled [Lord] Kala on the rampage, intent on devouring the earth.

Only the noble chief minister,
the supreme commander of the troops,
the leader of all the chieftains,

7. and the mentor of all the kings,
the Prime Minister, Suwanda,
bravely positioned his chariot firmly in the path [of the
fleeing kings].*

[His vehicle] gleamed brilliantly in the rays of the sun;
in his shimmering crown, he resembled Lord Indra.
The Prime Minister took up writing material
and wrote quickly, using his thumb nail.
Then he tied the message to his disc and hurled the weapon
[into the air].

9a/b Suwanda's message fell before the kings.
All those fleeing in terror from the battle,
knights, nobles and warriors

10. were overtaken by the document which read:* 
'Hey, you kings in retreat!
Can you not distinguish between baseness, mediocrity and
excellence?
All you kings and chieftains!

11. There should not be one among you who does not aspire to
excellence,
for has not your master, the Lord of Maispati
spurned baseness and mediocrity
and constantly maintained the highest moral standards?

12. Yet you kings
have [even] cast aside mediocrity and have opted for shame and dishonour.

You have, therefore, sinned on two accounts.

In the first instance, you sin against your master;*

13. by not complying with knightly codes, you are acting out of character. His Majesty of Maispati administers his people and the tributary kings as he would his own flesh and blood.

14. He sought to establish familial bonds and considered you as his children.

He ensured that you never suffered any hardship, your well-being was his sole concern.

Furthermore, in the afterlife,

15. your Lord, the King, will be your safeguard.

Now your master has need of your services and you choose to act in this manner.

How could you hope to offer your master any support when you are incapable of defending yourselves?

It seems inevitable that torments await you in the hereafter.

On the second charge, you have sinned against Lord Girinata for you were all created kings,

17. yet you choose to die so disgracefully, running from the battle in fear of an enemy's superior strength.

Well, for a king, this is the basest of conduct.

Only a coarse, low fellow would run from the battle field.

18. A king who deserts the battle arena
commits a very grave sin, marring his life and his death.
He is unworthy of his royal station
and to be in the service of King Arjunawijaya

who is a gentle [yet] powerful monarch,
adroit and cautious on the battle field,
a meticulous ruler, whose goal is to die gloriously.
Bearing these facts in mind, do not be half-hearted.

If you are incapable of serving an exemplary king,
you should not do things by halves.
Offer your services to the king of the demons,
for it is a simple matter to do wrong.

Man's natural goal should be a death that is beyond reproach
and indeed, the battle ground is where you should seek such a
death.
To be slain in the thick of battle is to die in a flawless state.
If you choose the proper course of action, there can be no
comparison.

[Death in battle] transcends dying while carrying out your
religious obligations.
If a king runs in terror from the battle,
he is ignorant of lore and scripture; his life has no meaning,
for he does not see the nobility of death as his goal.

He is determined to spend eternity in the company of spirits,
as he does not seek peace and tranquility in the afterlife.
One's state of mind in battle is reflected in the outcome;
if you are sincerely motivated, you will be astute and effective.
24. Brave resolution is the ultimate in asceticism, a complete surrender [to God] in the heat of the battle. Lord Jagat-Pratingkah alone determines life and death and man’s role is to merely accept that he belongs to God, that destiny is in His hands. As you plunge into the battle frenzy, bear in mind the analogy* of practising meditation. Consider the battle ground as the container for the incense in the offering shrine.

25. Regard the striking weapons and the raging fire as the fragrant incense. This is an excellent way to die. Think of the gong, the signal for battle, as the bells ringing out in prayer for victory in battle, attacking the fear and confusion in death. If you can successfully cope with the dangers, glory will be yours. If, in fact, you do not perish in the fight, you will be greatly rewarded for you slew many men, annihilated a treacherous foe in the course of the battle. Just as the moon and the sun cannot be seen [clearly], [because of] their lofty position and thus appear flawless,*

26. so also is the exalted state of a warrior who is slain and attains glory. After death, he will meet with Lord Wisnu.
1. And so it was that the kings listened to the admonition of the Prime Minister, Suwanda, [advice] that was most apt. Eagerly, the kings now returned, ready to fight to the death as they reflected upon Suwanda's warning.

2. The kings formed rank before the Chief Minister; knights, warriors and ministers followed suit.

   Having considered and accepted Suwanda's caution, the tributary kings now had no intention of retreating.

3. Kings and warriors launched their attack together, nobles and knights charged Dasamuka en masse.

   None were afraid, it seemed that Suwanda's strong words had stirred them into action.

   The battle raged fiercely between the demons and the humans, common soldier against common soldier,

4. officer against officer. The hosts of kings attacked Dasamuka wielding spears, discs and clubs.

   Weapons which fell like rain upon Dasamuka disintegrated without inflicting a blow.

   However, when [Dasamuka] retaliated with mace, lance and spear, many were slain.

5. Snatching up kings, nobles and officers, Dasamuka then slew them in great numbers.

   King Suryaketu bombarded the demon palace guards with arrows.

   Ten thousand ogres lay dead, devastated by Suryaketu.

6. [Then] he thrust even deeper into the fray in pursuit of
Dasamuka,

but Rawana made his escape, brandishing his mace. Swinging the club in a wild frenzy, he struck the chest of King Suryaketu who fell dead. Quickly, the kings

7. of Magada and Srawanti made a stand against Rawana, alternating with each other as they heartily fulfilled their duty as warriors. But they had no chance, for Dasamuka took his revenge. The Kings of Magada and Srawanti were struck by his arrows [but] both kings fought to the bitter end.

8. The pair now lay dead, slain by Rawana's arrows. Dasamuka flew into a frenzy. Countless kings and nobles were massacred, some were hurled into the midst of the troops. The men of Maispati broke ranks and fled in abject terror as they witnessed

9. their kings and officers running in terror. Only the first minister Suwanda remained at his post, standing courageously and resolutely in his golden chariot. He had no wish to die dishonourably for he had chosen the path of integrity.

10. Turning his chariot, he manoeuvred his way into the centre. King Dasamuka challenged loudly: 'Hey you, Suwanda! So you still insist on a confrontation with me. Go now quickly and inform your master, Arjuna Sasra,

11. that he is to do battle with me. If you were to fight, you would present no challenge.'
So spoke Dasamuka, pointing accusingly [at Suwanda].
The Prime Minister answered harshly; 'Hey, demon king!
You keep insisting that my Lord, the King, meet you in battle,
but as long as I am alive, there will definitely be no chance
to test your might and supremacy against my master,
Arjuna Sasra. It would be a great shame if my Lord, the jewel
of kings,
who is handsome, esteemed and virtuous, were to fight you, a
demon,
the lowest form of life. You are a meddlesome fiend,
a deformed ogre with mis-shapen heads. I myself
will accommodate your every whim in battle.'
Enraged, Dasamuka replied, seeking terrible revenge.*
CANTOS 58-62

Canto 58

1a/b * Now there was a great sage who long ago had been elevated* to divine rank. He was originally from Lokapala and his name was Pulasta.

His son was the priest Padma, who was the father of the sage Wisrawa. Wisrawa had many children, the eldest son

2. being Wisrawana, the King of Lokapala, a handsome, human monarch. [Wisrawa's] children by Sukesı of Ngalēngka were all demons, only one child was human.

Pulasta was therefore Dasamuka's great-grandfather.

Having already attained the status of a god, he now descended from the heavens to pay court to Arjunawijaya as he returned triumphant from battle.

[Pulasta] came before the King, muttering incantations, dancing and darting about. The court ladies,* who saw Pulasta enter, realized by his mode of arrival that he was a deity and scurried off towards the King. Arjuna Sasra said gently as he greeted his guest: 'Come, let us sit here together.' Pulasta still danced about and did not respond, although he continued to sing the King's praises. 'O Sovereign Majesty, who outranks every ruler under heaven and on the face of the earth. Great hero!

5. You are mightier than the gods! Who among the deities can boast such handsome features,
for your aura is like the soul of the full moon.' The monk
danced about the King,
glancing furtively to his right and left. When he finally sat
down
with the King, Pulasta caught sight of his grandson who lay
sprawled on the ground.

6. Guards stood by at the ready and Prahasta waited in attendance,
close at hand.*
The sage Pulasta said gently: 'O Majesty, lord of kings,
you are goodness itself, gentle and compassionate with your
people.
Your daring in battle is far superior to that of the deities
who are no match

7. for you. Your bearing and disposition reflects the Supreme
Deity Himself,
while your fine aura may be compared with the full moon, radiating its gentle beauty over the earth.*
The splendour of the mountains and the woodlands is but a frac-
tion
of your lustre. O great King, I come to bid you welcome on
your return

8. from the battle field, having captured the king of the demons.
My Lord, what do you intend to do
with Rawana, who lies here in bonds? If Your Majesty wishes to
sentence him to death,
that is indeed your prerogative, my Lord.
Dasaswa is certainly foolhardy and ignorant. He wages war
capriciously, presuming his superiority*
in battle. He had already conquered the gods and never thought that he would encounter a mightier king who is the overlord of all monarchs, the renowned and ultimate warrior, [a king] whose astute perception of the direction of world affairs is unrivalled.

O god-like King, may I be so bold as to suggest that you merely enslave Rawana?

Seize all the lands under Ngaléngka's domination and make them serve you, paying annual court to Maispati with tribute. Give Dasamuka the position of keeper of your dogs and goats. Use him as the assistant to your charioteer.*

Do what you will, but I pray you to spare him, my Lord and make him your slave.' Pulasta pleaded in tears, beseeching the King's clemency. Arjunawijaya smiled and said gently: 'Good Priest, why such concern for this scoundrel, this trouble making scum of the earth?'

Pulasta replied: 'My Lord, it is true that Rawana is rapacious and baseness itself but nevertheless, he is my great-grandson. Indeed, he is blight upon the earth. I do not wish to beg your favour, but surely Your Majesty must appreciate my sentiments.'

Pulasta held back his tears as he interceded pitifully for his great-grandson.
When Dasamuka heard the monk Pulasta pleading at great length with King Arjunawijaya, a glimmer of hope kindled in his soul. Stealthfully, he glanced at Arjuna Sasra, in amicable conversation with Pulasta who was seeking the King's compassion. Dasamuka then realised that this was, in fact, his great-grandfather, Pulasta.

Arjuna Sasra smiled as he spoke: 'Good priest, is there any reason why I should not execute Dasamuka? Have not many of my men been cruelly slain?'

Canto 59

1. The monk Pulasta answered the King:
   'Your Majesty, do not mourn because many of your warriors were killed in battle. I am capable of restoring them to life with your blessing, my Lord.'

King Arjuna Sasra was relieved to hear Pulasta's words, promising to revive his men.

2. [The King] then commanded the guards:
   'Release Dasamuka and bring him before me.' [Dasamuka] was immediately set free and brought into the King's presence.

3. Rawana knelt humbly at the King's feet, making obeisance a thousand times over. When Pulasta saw that Dasamuka
was free and had fallen in homage at the feet

of King Arjuna Sasrabau,
he was most gratified and cried:
'Oh my grandson, repent
and profess your allegiance to your Lord.

Arjuna Sasra hails from a tradition of great kings,
the imperial monarch of all mankind.
Surrender your kingdom and all it contains.
Do not even presume you have the right to govern it in the
King's name.'

Follow the path of righteousness
and obey all your master's orders.
In doing so, your own virtue will increase
as you will have won the approbation of your Lord.

[Your master] is the bright jewel, the sovereign protector of
the realm,
the teacher of all kings.
Do not hesitate to carry out his every command,
for if you are reluctant, catastrophe will befall you.

It is indeed fortunate that you have been taken into the King's
service
and that you have the opportunity to emulate goodness.'

King Arjuna Sasrabau
then said gently to Dasamuka:

'Ravana, you have surrendered your kingdom
of Ngalönka and all it contains.
I have accepted your pledge of allegiance
but in truth, I have no desire

for its produce and wealth as a form of tribute.
Enjoy them yourself, make full use of them.
My only [condition] is that you cease your avaricious ways
for you were destined to be a king.

Conduct yourself then in a manner befitting a king.
You should be honest in all your dealings
and avoid disreputable action.
Never be the instigator of chaos and disruption

and try to implement sound principles of kingship.
A king should never be wanton and arbitrary,
for he damages the fabric of kingship
if he tampers with the proper progress of the world.*

A king is not free to behave as he choses,
for he is not a servant and the servant is certainly not the
king.
The king is created differently from his fellow men.
He is entrusted with the care of all of his subjects.

Although the object of war is the defeat of the enemy,
the victory of an unchivalrous king
is short-lived. Initially,
you may win the battle but you will forfeit your kingship.

Eventually and inevitably, you will suffer defeat.
So be alert and fastidious,
for if you fail to observe my rules
and violate the codes of kingship,

you will surely come to grief in the future.

Dasamuka, if it were not for my sympathy
for your grandfather, you would still be in bonds.
I would have kept you in your iron prison forever.'

Making obeisance, Dasawadana replied:
'My Lord, I am aware that my life
is dependent upon your mercy.
Why would I be reluctant to obey you?

How can I repay you, My Lord?'
The monk Pulasta chuckled as he listened:
'Yes quite so, Rawana my grandson,
it would be a great relief if you were able
to be of service to your master. Ensure then that you are!
Do not be careless as you carry out your tasks.
A king should never be lax and indifferent
but should always have the most seemly course of action as his
goal.'

His Majesty Arjunawijaya spoke.
'Even if you do mount a campaign and invade another state,
always conform with the accepted code of kingship.
Your brother, the King of Lokapala, was a case in point.

There was no justification for the attack against him,
for he was ever the exemplary ruler.
Furthermore, King Banaputra of Ngayudya
bore you no malice. To wage war upon him was most inappropriate.
23. Powerful kings surely abound*
who are eager to test their strength and courage.
However, a letter of challenge must be issued
to determine if the king is of a mind to submit or to do battle.

24. Never veer from established royal standards.
If a king makes a practice of deceit,
he is a distress to his kingdom. The realm collapses in chaos
under the rule of an unjust king.

25. I do not forbid you to wage war against other kings to assert
your supremacy,
but in doing so, never depart from the royal code of ethics.
You may expand your territory if any king is at fault
because he is insensitive to the happiness and comfort of his
people.

26. Invade his lands then quickly, without any qualms.
I give you full authority to conquer such tyrants
and to enjoy the riches and booty yourself.
My only condition is that I be informed.'

27. The monk Pulasta was overjoyed to hear
that his great-grandson had been granted the King's permission
to mount campaigns against unjust rulers
and to avail himself of the spoils.

28. Pulasta approached and danced about,
crying out in jubilation:
'Heh Prahasta, venerable old minister,*
make sure that you also bear this splendid strategy in mind.'
Canto 60

1. The monk Pulasta continued:
   "Be faithful to the sovereignty of a king, for it is the order of a great ruler to be ever alert to his responsibility.

2. The king's task is to be the defender of the realm and to protect every member of the kingdom, the city and the mountain dwellers, the monastic communities, practising penance and meditation.

3. Those devoted to prayer and asceticism must be supported to ensure the continuation of their ritual. If the king maintains his support, prosperity will be in his hands.

4. If the greedy, the wicked, scoundrels and gamblers abound in the kingdom, they will surely create havoc. If this decadence is rampant,

5. it will disrupt the contemplatives and the mountain ascetics. [Their composure] will be shattered and their ritual ineffectual. As a consequence, those who administer the state,

6. the intellectuals, will be plunged into confusion and become disheartened if no action is taken.

c/d If the king turns a blind eye to reprobates and villains,

7. their number will increase. For this reason, the king should
have no wish

to be surrounded by ruffians and should make every effort,
never tire, of suppressing
criminal elements, relentlessly casting them out.

8. Prahasta, be aware that your Lord,*
His Majesty, the illustrious King of Maispati,
is Wisnu incarnate,
revered by all monarchs of high esteem.

9. He will reincarnate on seven future occasions,
always in the person of a king of high moral repute.
His function is to safeguard world security
and the perpetuation of ritual and contemplation in the world.

10. If you are unsure of the ordering of creation,
ask the great sages,
all those who have gained perfect knowledge.
All life in the three-fold world is subject to the same law. *

11. After the sage
had delivered his lengthy counsel to Rawana,
the excellent King spoke:
'Good monk, what you say is indeed true.

12. If a king behaves in a just and proper manner,
he will reap the benefit in the after life.
The pleasures of heaven await him,
far superior to earthly comforts.'

13. The King did not dwell on this matter.
King Kartawirya said softly:
Pulasta, if you are willing,
make haste and revive all those

who were slain on the field of battle.
Let not one demon or human be overlooked!
The priest Pulasta had no objection
but was pleased to comply with the King's request.

Rawana was delighted to learn
that his demons were to be revived at the King's command.
The sage Pulasta fell suddenly silent
and bending low, closed his eyes in intense concentration.

He then raised his head, muttering [an incantation].
He stared ahead with a glazed expression for some time before
bending low again.
A gentle, opaque rain began to fall,
a whitish colour, drizzling down onto the battle arena.

All those slain in battle then arose
as the soft, white, healing rain descended upon them.
To their minds, they had merely been dreaming.
All the demons came to life,
horses and elephants were revived,
the battered drums, gongs and chariots
were restored to their former, intact state.
Knights mounted their chariots,
and returned to their quarters.
The demons also came forward
and were received by Prahasta.
All had been restored to life.*

Canto 61

1. With a noise like thunder, [the men] reached the camp and came before the King. Arjuna Sasra was overjoyed that all the warriors had been restored to life.

2. The sage Pulasta then took leave to return to Suralaya. [He] arrived in the heavens. Arjuna Sasra then commanded Dasamuka: 'King of Ngaląngka,

3. return to your kingdom now and bear in mind my advice to you.' The demon king bowed low as he spoke: 'My Lord, I had planned to accompany you to Maispati.'

4. Arjunawijaya said firmly: 'Indeed, I have accepted your pledge of loyalty but you must return. Set off [now] from here, for I will shortly return to my own kingdom.'

5. Do not be disappointed. If you want to come to Maispati, make the journey from your kingdom, Ngaląngka at some later time.' Rawana made obeisance, no longer reluctant: 'I shall do as you suggest, my Lord.'

6. Rawana came forward and prostrated himself at the King's feet, the chief minister, Prahasta also paid homage. The troops were assembled and Rawana withdrew from [the King's]
presence.
The sound of the demon army escort was deafening.

7. Some distance from the camp,
the demon king took to the skies.
His droves of warriors darkened the heavens,
thick with the passage of the demon army.

8. We will not describe the demon king's journey.
On arrival in the state of Ngalëngka, he went [directly] to the palace.
Meanwhile, King Arjunawijaya
ordered the troops to prepare to depart,

to return with his wives to Maispati.
The army thundered its way along the roads bordering the ocean,
the men of Maispati were infinite.
The journey is not described. When the King

9. and his men reached Maispati,
the populace was in delighted uproar.
Men and women of high and low rank were all glad
that their Lord had returned safely,

10. for it was rumoured earlier that the army had suffered a defeat
against the demon king. Now this news was seen to be false.
The King and his men were all safe and well and had, in fact,
captured
the king of the demons, Rawana, who had been subjugated.

11. Peace and order had now returned to the state of Maispati.
His Majesty, Arjuna Sasraba"
was renowned for his might throughout the three worlds and retained his reputation for military supremacy.

13. All rulers would do well to emulate this king of royal lineage, for his authority embraced every aspect of propriety, benevolence and chivalry. He was ever serene, caring and compassionate.

14. Freeing his servants from the bonds of ignorance, he drew them towards integrity and decency. He had mastered all knowledge and was highly discerning. Chieftains and knights therefore were all exemplary, kings were atuned to knightly ideals and were brave and dependable.

The world trembled in awe. Many chiefs surrendered their kingdoms and bowed down in submission without force of arms.

16. All monarchs admired his military excellence. The world marvelled at his tīwikrama form, truly, a jewel among kings, fostering world peace and order.

17. He was like the Supreme Being himself,* outstanding, a source of constant wonder. He was considerate and loving of his wives, respecting their every wish. His troops were well treated, none were discontented.

18. So the sage Yogiswara composed* this excellent story of Arjuna's kingship,
so that it would become a standard for generations to come,*
who would be delighted by the tale of the King

19. of Maispati. Excellence pervaded the kingdom,
enemies cowered in fear, there was no crime.
Rogues and evil mongers were swept away
villainy stamped out, gambling abolished.

20. The sage Yogiswara acknowledged
that when he wrote the tale of Arjuna Sasra,
he was ignorant of the rules of fine sounding prosody,
bewildered by the difficulty of this edifying tale.

21. So, within the limits of his own frailties and capabilities,*
he persevered in his attempt to write the poem,
but only because he likened his efforts to serving at the feet
of Lord Wisnu incarnate.

22a/b He was as obsessed as a bee with the pursuit of beauty,*
hoping that the dust at the feet of Lord Wisnu
might gently filter down to mankind below,
promoting conduct that is beyond reproach.*

23. Because Dasamuka, a strong and powerful demon,
was tyrannical, greedy and wilful,
he finally lost his sense of direction and without a goal, his
might vanished.
His valour had no substance.

Canto 62

1. A greedy, aggressive man when confronted by the pure of heart
is devastated. His supremacy topples in ruins as his noble
opponent attacks.
The sage Yogiswara therefore cautions against excesses, for in the final outcome, those who turn from righteousness will be destroyed.

2. There will be no reward for those who dare to indulge their reckless natures.
Kings therefore should make every effort to choose a worthy course of action. It is well known* that eventually all tyrants will be crushed, exterminated.*

3. Men of noble disposition stand apart, all who look upon them are full of admiration.
The wicked are totally annihilated, swept aside in the thick of the battle, struck down by integrity which pervades like a strongly scented essence.
Ultimately, your every wish will come to fruition if you are resolute.

4. * My arrogance [in attempting to write this poem] is to be compared with the cleaving of an arrow* that penetrates deeply but makes no impression, due to my [inadequate grasp] of all the dimensions of true knowledge.* I am blind to the poetic intricacies of the story, whereas Yogiswara strove for clarity and precision,* to set a standard for all great poets who are naturally talented.*

5. [This poet] is stupid and being insensitive to the excellence of the experts, is careless, so much so that the essence [of the story] has suffered in his
He is ignorant of the best language required for this fine tale, for he is not blessed with the sharp insights of clever men.*

His efforts are no different from that of the tendrils of the gadhung, reaching upwards, trying to wait upon the moon.* Nevertheless, he will not falter in his attempts to present and arrange true beauty, devotedly searching, dedicating himself wholly to the task,* so as to be able to render the sweet essence written on the fragrant pudhak.*

b/c The extreme beauty [of the language] and the appeal of the tale* of the renowned King Arjuna Sasra have exhausted [this poet's resources], for it is impossible to fully appreciate the extent of [the King's] eminence and the fullness of his virtues.
Canto 29

1. Meanwhile, the noble Dananjaya and King Krēśna were engaged in combat at the foot of the mountain. The battle raged fiercely and the enemy, Gardapati was slain.*

2. As [the troops] dispersed to return, they heard a terrible weeping, the unbearable sound of the relatives and kinsmen, mother and father [in mourning]. The two wives [of Abimanyu] writhed pitifully on the ground.

3. Subadra lay tossing from side to side in the dust* and the Princess of Wirata, Utari, who was eight months pregnant, moaned and lamented miserably.

4. The dull roar of mourning arose from the ranks. Let us now tell of the arrival of Arjuna and Krēśna who had reached camp at the same time as Wrkodara, from the south and from the northern sea-shore.

5. [Wrkodara's] enemy, Wērsaya, was now dead.* When Dananjaya learnt of the death of his son, fell to ground in a swoon, insensitive to the world about him.

   King Krēśna spoke, admonishing him,

6. for a knight is forbidden to show his grief upon the death of a son.
Apart from falling below his [knightly] standard, he sins against the Almighty. When Dananjaya heard

7. King Kršna's words,
he immediately arose and making obeisance, begged his pardon:
'Majesty, please forgive me.'
Then he bowed low at the feet of Yudistira

8. and said calmly: 'My Lord, tell me how
Abimanyu met his death on the battle field.'
Yudistira [replied]: 'Your son died
while breaking down the cakra-byaha formation of the priest [Drona].

9. He worked his way into the cakra svundana array.
Sindurcēja, who was positioned on the tip of the formation,
closed him off
and so your son, Abimanyu was slain.
All of your kinsmen launched a counter attack;

10. Drstadyumēna, the sons of Madri, Satyaki,
and Gatotkaca charged violently in an attempt to kill Sindurcēja
    but were unsuccessful,
    [although they fought] all day, until sunset.

11. As for those who fell at the same time as your son, Abimanyu,
    Lēśmanamandrakumara was slain*
and the three nobles Kartasuta, Wahatbala,
and Satyasrawa were killed by Abimanyu.

12. All the kinsmen attacked in earnest
    and many chieftains were killed.
Only Sindupati managed to escape and could not be apprehended. 'Dananjaya immediately stood erect and swore loudly:

13a/b 'I vow that if I cannot slay Sindurēja by tomorrow, I will cast myself into the flames at nightfall.' Such was Dananjaya's solemn pledge.

14. The Korawa cheered as they listened. Sindurēja was thereupon ordered to return for one whole day until sunset, and request the priest [Sapwani] to pray for his safety.*

15. Sapwani was the father of Sindureja. Furthermore, he was to meditate upon the arrow that he had used to slay* Abimanyu, so that the weapon's effectiveness would increase. Meanwhile, the Korawa King, Duryodana,

16. was in mourning for Lēsmanakumara, the crown prince who now lay dead. Banowati wept bitter tears within the Queen's Royal apartments.

17. Duryodana was cheered slightly by the news of Dananjaya's pledge to die in flames. Sindurēja was therefore kept out of harm's way. As for the Korawa themselves,

18. they were elated by the prospect of Arjuna's death, that by the next day he would enter the flames. Let us now tell of those in mourning, the Pandhawa kings[lamenting] the death of Abimanyu.
Sitisundari was determined to follow him, to perform the ritual immolation beside her husband. The elders, however, had yet to reach a decision on battle tactics for the following day.

Sitisundari was therefore restrained [from acting] until then. The Princess of Wirata was forbidden to follow her husband for she was pregnant.

King Krësna said quietly to Dananjaya: 'Now, what is your plan? For the Korawa will have learnt of your oath to kill Sinduñåja and he will certainly be well protected.

Why would he venture out tomorrow when you are determined to find him and carry out [your pledge]?

Dananjaya said softly, bowing low: 'My Lord, the decision is yours.'

Canto 30

King Krësna said quietly:
'These are the means then. Pray and be on the alert,* for you must be fully aware of all the dangers.* If you have considered every [aspect], you have no cause for concern.'

Dananjaya replied, making obeisance most respectfully: 'My Lord, it is your decision, for I am bound to carry out whatever you suggest.'

Lord Krësna said: 'Here is my chariot,
3. which is guaranteed to be a superior vehicle.*
Four horses draw it. In front,
are Walaha and Abrapuspa,
while behind them, Sukanta

4. and Śnyasākīti complete the foursome.
Use it tomorrow when you do battle.
The nature of this vehicle is that no weapon
can damage it in any way.

5a/b Stay close to my signalling gong, the Paścajanya
tomorrow in the battle.
Use my cakra
and Sindurēja will certainly be slain by the end of the day.

6. As for your arrows tomorrow,
smite Sindurēja with the pasopati weapon.
This is a difficult undertaking, because his father, the monk
Sapwani, is practising earnest meditation

7. which has been acknowledged by Lord Guru.
As it is important that you surpass his efforts,
you must maintain steadfast meditation throughout the night.
Beseech the Almighty [to allow] Sindurēja

8. to be slain and that my plans will be successful.
Come, begin your meditation now in earnest.'
Danapati bowed low and withdrew.
Then he began to meditate, performing the ritual ablutions
while muttering incantations.

9. As incense wafted about him, he began to free his mind from all
distractions.

He bowed in homage to Lord Uti\-pati.

Crossing his hands over his chest, he was calm and composed, neither sensing nor hearing anything about him.

10. Dananjaya had transcended the physical realm,* his focus was clear, sharp and penetrating.

After a short time, the person* of Lord Jagat Pratingkah appeared

11. [but only] his trunk was visible.

His advice was: 'Make haste, Dananjaya, you may cease your prayers, incantations and meditation.

As for Sindur\-\-ja's death,

12. your request meets with my approval.

Strike him with the Pasopat\-\-i arrow, make use of Kr\-\-\-\-\-na's chariot tomorrow and the gong, the Panaajanya.

13. Remain close to it tomorrow on the battle field.'

Dananjaya concluded his ritual immediately and approached the King of Dwarawati.

He said quietly: 'Truly, my Lord,

14. there was not a jot of difference between your advice and Lord Girinata's counsel.'

Lord Kr\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-\-na smiled: 'Now that is complete, come, let us join the one who plans to practise the death ritual,

15. the Princess Sitisundari.'

Indeed, Sitisundari,
had already decked herself in the robes of death,
preparing to sacrifice herself to her beloved husband.
Canto 1

1. This is my homage, to be offered to the Creator of the Universe.*
   In His concern for His servant, He provides him with food and sustenance and will continue to do so in the afterlife. Furthermore, praise to Lord Wisnu, the world leader, the supreme emissary.*
   May [my poem] find favour with others, [with] the family of His devotees who have already attained glory.

2. This then is why I feel compelled to fulfil the request* to compose this poem called the Panitiestra in jamwa within sekar ageng metres*.
   Pardon this writer, who is so clumsy and stupid, in fact, a mere laughing-stock.
   So now I set about the task of arranging the story and take as [my] model [poetry] from a past age.

3. If a man is ignorant of etiquette, he is masha punggung*.
   Masha means that the man is a fool while punggung implies that he makes imprudent decisions. Let us further discuss the connotations of subasita.
   The first is related to stilakrama, the second to basa krama.

4. Now [basa] krama means the most seemly language. For example, when sitting
   in an assembly, you must take note of the social echelons* and do not confuse them.*
   Village heads and servants, for instance, should not be seated together,
nor should language levels be mixed and flexible. The rank [of a commoner] is inferior to the status of the king and for that reason, one should not come into close contact with the king. Furthermore, if a man has no sense of etiquette, he is to be likened to one who cannot distinguish between the six palatal sensations. These six tastes are firstly, sour, then tart, salty, hot and bitter and the sixth sensation, sweet, completes the list.

Let us take the example of the man who has never experienced the taste of betel leaves and betel nut, that is, someone who has never chewed betel. In a gathering, his face is ghostly and his lips white. Such a man is silent when others are discussing lore and scripture. He does not join in the conversation for although he would like to, he is not able.

This man's face is just like the mouth of a cave. Now let us consider what constitutes poison. Poison, to a man praying to Almighty God, is to be attended by impurity. His soul becomes tainted, defiled and he is easily distracted. His ritual is ineffectual, for indeed, it is not acceptable to God and is of no avail.

To a man eating, poison [is food] that is indigestible and causes
discomfort.*
If a man has no assets, that is, he is a pauper, his every word and wish are empty and do not come to fruition. His body becomes a poison, for his hopes are never realised. To the warrior, poison*

9. is old age as his hair turns grey. His poison is his body for in the sight of others, he is abhorrent, unattractive, no-one feels comfortable.

A man may be called *janmadhika* if he is a delight to have in company;*

there is nothing remiss in his conversation as he constantly takes note of the countenances of his fellows.

10. He is ever alert and cautious, patient and forebearing with coarse, ill-mannered men.

Eminent scholars enjoy his company, he can stir his comrades on to valiant deeds on the battle field. Indeed, this is the mark of a *janmadhika*, gifted and eloquent.

Canto 2

1. It is best that a man approach a woman, be she wife or mistress, with gentle loving words in their chamber, in tones that are soothing, soft and low,

2. seeking her affectionate response so that she will not be sullen. When one is in conversation with a sage, question him about the fundamental truths, the crux of knowledge and the perfection of worship.
2, 3

3. On the battle field, speak of valour and prowess, so as to rally your comrades into daring action. The aggression and venom of the serpent can be counteracted by incantations, formulas that can nullify the poisonous effects.

4. The tiger's ferocity abates with incantations, an enraged elephant can be brought to its knees by the angkus rod and once tamed, its fury vanishes. But the enemy's wrath remains where all else perishes.

5. Only when he dies will his rancour cease. A villain's seething vindictiveness cannot be halted by spells and incantations. If you want to know the depth of water,

6. uproot the lotus that are growing in it and gauge [the depth] of the water by the water mark.* As to the mark of a man of propriety, that may be observed in his conduct. Firstly, it is evident in his speech and secondly, from the way he sits, outwardly calm, in total control scrupulous whenever he takes his meals, refined and subdued, never raising his voice shrilly,

7. well disposed towards his fellow man, he is sincere and bears no-one any malice. This indeed is the stamp of a man of breeding. One who is called a pandhita, for example, is renowned for his scholarship.*
9. He will not discourage people from consulting him but will be responsive to requests from scholars, pleasing them in his gentle, agreeable voice, as he provides the solution to questions on courage and constancy.

Canto 3

1. He enlightens those in confusion, gives consolation in sorrow and interprets science and scripture.
Indeed, he deserves to be known as a sage of great erudition.
There is no point, in a man being wealthy, possessing gold and fine jewels, if he dresses badly, has no taste for [fine] foods and lives like an ascetic. *

2. Such a man does not realise that life is short but thinks that time has no limits.
There are men who are well versed in science and scripture, who have a good understanding of statecraft, yet they behave like rogues and fools.
Their potential is totally wasted for they are on a par with incompetent men.

3. If an older man, one quite advanced in years, does not aspire to decency, nor does he live by knightly standards, having no appreciation of lore and scripture, this man is of no benefit to society. He lives a futile existence as do the forest game.
Beasts that make for tasty meals may be likened to men such as he.
4. There are four notoriously vile forms on earth. Among animals,* none is [as accursed] as the ass. In relation to man's disposition, the most despicable attitudes are to not aspire to goodness and to abandon religious practices, both equally [deplorable].
But a man who breaks his oath to a kinsman is more [depraved] than the other three.

5. When a bucket is half empty, not full of water, it splashes from side to side.
When full, the water is still and deep and does not spill over.
If a cow bellows loudly, she produces little milk.
A poor man will use every means at his disposal to better his situation.

6. Furthermore, an ugly man will try his utmost to improve his appearance.
Do not take as your model the lion and the forest, who mutually protected each other,

7. until they tired of their intimate bond and quarrelled. The lion said:
'Listen forest, if I wasn't here, what would become of you? Mankind would ravage you, yet you complain about me being here.'
The forest said: 'Lion, if I did not shelter you,

8. it is obvious that men would be able to see you and that surely would be the end of you.'
The lion went away, left the forest and headed for the ravines where he was attacked and killed by men. When the lion was dead, the men then cleared the forest, vegetation was destroyed and
laid waste.

The lion and the forest were no more. Now this is related to seeking the most appropriate means of support, for example, kinsmen and comrades who are sincere and true.

When the serpent was being pursued by the garuda, he happened to meet Lord Sramba.

who said: 'Hey snake, why are you running away in such a hurry?' The snake answered: 'My Lord, I am being hounded by the garuda and I am running because I am so afraid. 'Lord Sramba said: 'If you want to stay alive, I will help you.' The snake answered:

'Yes, I need your help to survive.' Lord Sramba said: 'Well then, you drape yourself around my neck.' The snake quickly wound itself around the neck of the god. The garuda suddenly arrived and saw the snake, wound like a necklace around the deity. The garuda was no longer angry, he was now harmless.*

Canto 4

The garuda wanted to pay homage but because the snake was present, felt that he could not bow down in veneration. He was afraid of the deity and of committing a grave offence. So the garuda paid his respects from above. Having paid homage, the king of the birds departed on high from the presence of the deity. Offspring should follow the behavioural patterns of their parents.
2. The tortoise, for example, having laid its eggs, buries them then abandons them. Nevertheless, when the eggs hatch, the young tortoise's every action and preference mirrors that of his parents. Also, the offspring of fish and birds, as well as the young turtle, imitate the behaviour, preferences and habits of their parents.

3. Yet a man does not behave similarly. Nurtured from infancy, [the child] is sustained with food and taught manners but when he is grown, he deserts his father. Rarely does [the child] model himself [on his father]. The son of a villain becomes a sage while the child of a sage turns to crime. These children, therefore, show no trace of the attributes of their parents.*

4. A priest should never cease his veneration and must be staunch in his asceticism. The state will benefit as a result if the priests bestow their blessing. If a man follows all the precepts of religion, he will be resolute in his pursuit of peace and happiness, not [like] the scoundrel, who seeks to deceive all men and can feign humility.

5. A man of rank should freely distribute his wealth and food to his subjects to ensure that his orders are faithfully implemented and to gain their respect. The state will be secure and prosperous as far as the borderlands if the king's bounty is open to all.* When a woman marries, she sees her reward in a son,
6. who shows great courage. Do not, however, be like the lion 
whose heart is set on one thing only.* 

Men consider the dodot as the most important article of their 

apparel. 

A priest prefers cow's milk above all other foods. 

This is, in fact, the reason why the Brahmans do not eat the 
flesh of a cow. From infancy,* 

7. a Brahman is raised on cow's milk so he thinks of the cow as 
his mother. 

A scholar places esoteric knowledge above all else. 

A woman considers her well-rounded breasts as her greatest 
asset, 

to be treasured by her lover in their ch:hor, like Kiwayu- 

nedheng.
Arjuna Sasra Kawi Miring

1. The opening stanzas of the macapat and kawi miring texts are written in a more mannered style. See also Paniti KM canto 1 to follow. The first lines of the ASB MAC II text are included for comparison: purwaning reh pandoning mamanis, makirtya ring agnya Prabwatmaja, ri Surakarta mandhireng, Jawi saananipun.

1.1a. AB, Mapubwatmajeng, Prabwatmaja. As the forms aprabu, anagari and ahulun are common throughout the MJ texts, the ma prefix is presumably a stylistic variation on the a form.

1.1c. jarwa has the connotation of a Modern Javanese rendering of kawi (Old Javanese) material. See G/R (1901 H/329) and Soebardi (1975:205). It seemed preferable to retain the term in the translation rather than to incorporate the expression 'rendered into Modern Javanese'.

1.1d. A, mēhang rikang ṇasa jarwa, B, mēhang mudhar ri ṇasa.

1.3a. In the MJ versions, Danapati, the son of the sage, is ruling in Lokapala whereas the OJ text (1.7) relates that Danañati was 'securely enthroned in Lengkap' (Supomo 1977: 182). One major variation in the MJ texts is that the sage journeys to Ngalngka to seek the hand of the demon's daughter for his son while in the OJ version the demon initiates the marriage between the sage and his daughter.

1.5c. ing margi tan winarna. A stock MJ (and OJ) device but sometimes inserted into the MJ texts when an OJ descriptive passage was omitted, perhaps in the interests of the MJ narrative.

1.5c.B, tur uning.
1.6a. B, wus tumundhuk ta ichanged. Metrically possible but not a satisfactory reading.

1.7b. marmita is listed in G/R (II/486) as a form of marma, 'the reason, cause'. B and MAC II 1.10 read maminta. There is no MAC I equivalent.

1.8d. The terms sastra cūtha and sastra arjendra, the latter emerging from a corruption in the kakawin Javanese tradition manuscripts, have not been translated and are used interchangeably as they occur in the MJ version. See Chapters 3.1, p.55 and 8.3, p.252 for reference to this mystical science.

1.10c. yun is taken in the context of hayuning (joy, well-being) rather than hyuning (desire).

1.10d. Suwandana, the metre of the first canto. The metre designations were difficult to accommodate within the translation and were generally omitted.

2. As noted in Chapter 2.2, pedhatan divisions within Kusumawicitra appear to have been more flexible than in other metres. For consistency, the 6,6 markings have been drawn in Kusumawicitra cantos although this division often occurs in the middle of a word.

2.1b. B, mangu iwire, C, mangusēd, MAC II 1.16, ngungsēd.

2.1d. This episode has no parallel in the OJ text and has been framed around the imparting of the secret knowledge to the demon, Sumali. In OJ 2.1-6, the goddess Saraswati and other gods enter the person of Kumbakarna and so deceive him into requesting that he sleep for thousands of years. The MJ versions make no reference to the gods merging with Kumbakarna but it is of some note that similar elements have been either employed or transferred into the present episode.
2.6d-7a. Enjambment over the line into a.

2.8c. ABC, MAC II 1.21, papasiyan. There was a consistent substitution of γ for h in all MJ manuscripts.

2.10a. A, pata.

2.12b. MAC II 1.24 adds kang jujuluk after Nawangsih Sasmitanengsih. Mounier (1844:302) notes in his paraphrase of an Arjunasasra text that Nawangsih and Sasmitanengsih are the names of the nymphs given to the King of Lokapala.

2.14. Both the KM and the MAC II return to the OJ sequence at this point. In the MJ texts, Wisrawa is most anxious to have a son with human features whereas in the OJ poem, Sukesi requests a human child.

2.14d. A, pinaraban.

3.1b. B, geng alubur.


3.2d. B, manungsa, MAC II 1.29, manuswa.

3.3b. Wau counts as two syllables in this line.

3.5c. Pangwasa is in all MSS but is not listed in G/R. MAC I 4.12, kawasa, MAC II 1.41, pangawasa.

3.6a. Lungid is borrowed from the OJ 1.12 which reads nakagralungid, 'sharp pointed nails'. In view of the name of the ogress, Sarpa-kēnaka, 'nails' rather than 'body' would be a better reading but the KM, MAC I 4.3 and MAC II 1.43 read sarira.

3.6b. B, pangahira.

3.6d. B, kalangkung sungkawa.
3.8d-9a is modelled on the MAC I text but is out of sequence.

MAC I 4.5 reads undhagiya ing tyasipun, arja tur wijaksana, putusa amangun teki.

MAC II 2.3. undhagiya tyas arjeng reh, bijaksana raharjeng ratya, ing driya mumpunana.

Sindusastra 18.4. undaliya(?) ing tyasipun, arja tur bijaksana.

3.9b. Koda Wibisana. As noted by Supomo (1977:286, 1964: 184), the MJ version of Wibisana's name, prefaced by the word Koda, may be traced back to a corruption in the Surakarta manuscript, tangên koda Wibisana for tan gông krodha Wibisana (OJ 1.13). MS 219 appears to read tan gông (?) koda. It is important to note that there is no mention of koda in the MAC I manuscript; the KM author was following the MAC I text closely at this stage. As there was considerable variation in all the readings in the previous line, the KM poet may have returned to the OJ text for some insights into the reading. Although lines 9a and b have no parallel in the OJ text, it would seem that the KM poet chanced upon the reading tangên koda and decided to adjust the MAC I reading to Koda Wibisana. The Yasadipura II and Sindusastra texts also preface Wibisana's name with koda. Wibisana is consistently referred to as Sang Arya or Gunawan Wibisana in the Kats. edition of the Sêrat Rama and the only occasion where the word koda is used is in SR 1.7. Stanzas 1.1-13 of the Sêrat Rama are not included in the SR KM nor in the version of the Sêrat Rama which is appended to the IOL JAV 46 manuscript, the Arjuna Sasra macapat dated 1800. This version began at SR 1.14, as did the SR KM version, passages which run parallel with the first stanzas of the Old Javanese text itself. This example and other similar variations between the MAC I and the KM/ MAC II versions point to Yasadipura II as the author of the greater proportion or perhaps the re-editing of the Arjuna Sasra kawi miring.
10. d. Basanta, the metre of canto 3, applies to the completed canto rather than functioning as a sasmita which indicates the metre of the next canto.

4. Manuscript B noted canto 4 as being in Swandana rather than Sulanjari metre. Although both contain 20 syllables, the pēdhotan for Swandana is 7,7,6. Pēdhotan divisions for Sulanjari, 8,6,6, were difficult to apply successfully in the opening stanzas and the fracturing of lines and sense units may have prompted the copyist of MS B to apply the 7,7,6 divisions.


4.1c. B, tahun.

4.1d. In the OJ text, Rawana severs one of his heads at the completion of one thousand years of asceticism (1.16, tēndhasnya tunggal pinōk). Although the reading is intact in both the 219 and the Surakarta MSS, the MJ preference was for Rawana to merely measure the years of his penance by the number of his heads.

4.4d. MAC II 2.14, kawula, ABC, pukulun. There is no equivalent in the MAC I text but pukulun is used in the first person sense in the KM MS. G/R (II/259) noted second person for pukulun.

4.6b. Winestu. G/R (II/42) from estu. MAC I 4:11, MAC II 2.15, winestu.

5.1b. MAC I 5.1, MAC II 2.23, B, milya, A, milu, C, milwa.

5.1c. B, tatapa.

5.4b. ABC, panēndha, MAC I 5.2, panēdha. The duplication was perhaps designed to fulfil the metrical requirements for this unit but the same form occurs at 5.7d.

5.4c. Line c is missing from MS A.
5.4d. nugraheng kamanusan,'granted the gift of a human nature'. At OJ 1.21, the text reads manusya maha/nurawa kaharepku; the edited version reads manusya mahårnråga kaharepku, 'only wish to be loved by others'. The MJ interpretation therefore involved the adjustment of nurawa to nugraha, a minor variation but nevertheless perfectly consistent with Sumali's efforts to rise above his low, demon nature and the interpretation of the term Daniswara in canto 6.17-18.

5.7d. The form panënedhanira as in 4b.

5.8c. B, mamanis kramanireki, MAC II 3.2, ingkang têmbung.

5.12d. MAC I 5.6, panyëpuhira, A, pajëpuhira, MAC II 3.5, sêsëpuh. This form is not listed in G/R but nyëpuhakën means 'to refine: purify'. The word in this context implies a finishing touch.

5.16b. MAC I, 5.8, ABC, katiga, presumably referring to the step-brother, Danapatì, rather than to the third member of the immediate family, Sarpakënaka. MAC II 3.8 however reads kalih. The variation between the KM and the MAC II texts again raises the question of authorship of certain sections of the KM and the later macapat version.

5.17a. makireng. The form makire is used at KN 6.14 in the OJ sense, 'to plan'. MAC II 3.8 reads tan mikireng. There is no MAC I equivalent.

5.19a. ABC, MAC I 5.9, MAC II 3.17, lidhah, literally means 'tongue' and has been translated as such, although the power of Kumbakarna's voice is implied. The word was borrowed from OJ 2.2b into the MJ texts but the context differs. See note for canto 2.1.


6.2c. The translation sequence of 2c-3d is tentative. There is no MAC I equivalent for 3b-3c.
6.5c. ABC, mutyahara, MAC I 5.13, MAC II 3.22, mutyahara.

6.13. From 13c until the end of canto 6, the KM and MAC II sequence varies from that of the MAC I version. This passage was discussed in Chapter 6.1 and can be returned to OJ 1.6-7. The MAC I text follows the sequence of the Old Javanese text, the equivalent MJ version being at MAC I 3.6-11.

6.15a. ABC, MAC I 3.8 read pinēkca, MAC II 3.29, pinēca. Pēkca is not listed in G/R but pēca (G/R II/207) is registered as a form of wēca, 'a prediction'. Wēca/ wēkca can also mean 'to tell: inform'. (G/R II/10).

6.15c. Danuja is borrowed from OJ 1.6. The word needed to be explained in all the MJ versions, the B MS in fact substituted tēgēse for ūndi ta. Danuja was therefore left untranslated. Danuja means 'a demon' and this connotation appeared to confuse the MJ poets who attempted to manipulate the demon called Malyawan in the OJ text into the MJ context of a hero who is an incarnation of Wisnu from Mount Malyawan. See Chapter 6.1, p.167.

6.18a. tetea. ABC, MAC II 3.31 and LOr2175 (4), the partial version, all read tatalok. Both the MAC I MSS read tetea. The alternative reading based on the later texts could be tataloka ping sadasa (tenth ordering of the world). The MAC I reading was adopted although both meanings are far from clear.

6.18b. ABC are minus one syllable. MAC II 3.31, ewa punika, LOr 2175, wa punika, MAC I 3.8, pan punika.

6.18b. langkung karsa. MAC I 3.8, langkung karsa wong agung. MAC II 3.31, sumangga ing karsa. The sense of the MAC II reading has been extended to the KM translation.
14. The 8.6 divisions in Basanta allow for more flexibility in the shaping of sense units in this canto and forms such as awiyat, anitih, were employed within the stretch of eight syllables.

14.1b. B, MAC II 8.6, meh ngayuh, MAC I 10.15, ngayuh. The A and C reading is consistent with the KM preference for the more formal verbal prefix, as noted in Chapter 5.4.

14.3a. The variation in this canto between the OJ and MJ versions was noted in Chapter 4.4. There is no reference to the goddess Uma, and her consort, Siwa, in the MJ versions, the 'female interest' being provided by the reference to the nymphs. Nymphs from the abode of Wisnu waiting to reward fallen heroes was an element common to both OJ and MJ literature (See Berg 1927: 138. Also ASB KM 46.29). Whereas the god mentioned in the OJ text is Siwa, the construction of the MJ episode around the nymphs places it within a Wisnu context. Further elements in this canto accentuate the pervading Wisnu stream throughout the episode contained in KM cantos 14-17.

14.3b. gagantungan (G/R II/541) is literally something kept in reserve or trust. Gagantungan is listed with(sə)sengkəran (I/893), something or someone confined and G/R suggest 'harem'. The word has the same connotation as pingitan.


15.2c. alēp pwa. There is no MAC I or II equivalent. Alēp is a synonym for asri, 'fine, beautiful'. Pwa (G/R II 283) is listed as an emphatic particle of OJ origin.
15.3a. The MJ connotation of rasika as 'pleasure, sensuality' was noted in Chapter 4.1, p. 97. The edition and MS 219 read dewi Wedawati ngaran rasika sang tapi, 'the anchoress (who dwelt there) was called Wedawati' (OJ 11.1 Supomo 1977: 205) but the Surakarta MS reads ngaran ring siti, 'name on earth'. It is tempting to speculate how much the identification of Wedawati as an incarnation of Sri, the wife of Wisnu, prompted this corruption. In the MJ versions, Widawati incarnates into the person of Citrawati, Arjuna Sasra's Queen. The ngaran ring siti corruption also raises the question of the type of manuscripts consulted by the MJ poets. The KM text nevertheless reads rasika and has been translated in the sense of 'the loveliest, the epitome of beauty'.

15.7d. ambathara. Bathara (G/R II 762) refers to a saint, deity, or king. 'As supreme lord' fitted into the MJ context rather than 'regarded him as a god'.

15.11d. miyarsa counts as three syllables in this line.

16. The 5,7 divisions in this Maduran canto generally form more satisfactory units than the 6,6, Kusumawicitra groupings in canto 2.

16.7b. jinahan. Supomo (1977:296) noted the obscurity of this word in the OJ parallel passage. G/R (II 380) list jinah as a unit of ten whereas jaha (G/R II/378) is a tree which produces a type of ink. The first connotation was chosen for the translation and 'groups of ten' was rendered as 'gathered into bouquets'.

16.9c. tan kēna liru sambat, also in MAC I 12.2 and MAC II 8.38, is a reference to the incarnation sequence of Wisnu and his wife, Sri.

16.12b. samya, as noted in Chapter 6.2, p. 175. The Surakarta MS reads raksasa samya for raksasa Šambhu, the demon of the Uttara-kāṇḍa and the Old Javanese text who kills Widawati's parents.
16.13a-b. Two difficult lines which seem to be framed in a prophetic sense in reference to Sita's abduction by Rawana in the Rāmāyaṇa.

16.13d. Kalih in the OJ text refers to Widawati's two parents (OJ 12.11c). 'Second incarnation' is not strictly correct. Sri was manifest in Widawati and in Citrawati, Arjuna Sasra's Queen, according to the MJ texts. Sinta would have therefore been the third incarnation of Sri. MAC II 8.41 also reads kalih. There is no MAC I equivalent.

16.15b. Kaga, the eagle, a corruption in the Surakarta MS on the edited version, pakawāhana (13.3c). See Chapter 4.4, p. 125.

16.17a. wanara in OJ 13.4b refers to the monkey-faced guard who sought to prevent Rawana entering the heavens, hanēka ya mawaktra wanara. The Surakarta MS reads hanekā ya mawa/ta wanara. MS 219 reads mawaktra. In the MJ version, the monkey reference was interpreted within the Rama and the monkey army context. It is difficult to determine whether the corruption of mawaktra, 'with facial features', confused the poets or whether the copyists' error was prompted by his impression of the context of the episode. The main point to be made is the consistency between the corruption in the OJ manuscript and the omission of any reference to the monkey-faced guard, either in canto 14 or in this episode.

17.1a. Duksina means 'the south'. The Surakarta MS reads Ayasina, the edited version, Uśināra. The mountain is unnamed in the MAC I version. Although the poet followed the sequence and vocabulary of his MAC I model, it would seem that he consistently cross-checked with the kakawin manuscripts.

17.2d. Āt. Strictly, 'after one morning' or 'on alternate mornings'. 
17.3d. B, pamulangan; OJ 14.2, pamursitan,' a place of worship'. See Chapter 7.3 for reference to the substitution of elements of sacrifice for instruction. In addition to the monks in the OJ sacrificial session, Suranatha, Yama, Baruna and Danapatí were present. These gods were omitted from the NJ versions although the Surakarta MS was intact.

17.5a. Sang Palungguh. G/R(II/177), sang atapa, 'an ascetic'. Strictly, 'the one who holds office, the incumbent'.

17.8c. See Chapter 7.3 for reference to lali(supa), a lapse from control.

17.14. Stanzas 14-17 are additional to the kakawin. These four stanzas effectively round off the four canto episode, the emphasis being on Rawana's rash pursuit of Wisnu's wife which will result in the inevitable confrontation between Rawana and Wisnu.

22. These is no macapat I equivalent for the next six cantos presented in text and translation (KM 22-25, 30-31). When compared with the later MAC II version, the KM seems rather compressed while the macapat II tends to extend and, at times, to veer from the KM interpretation. Both versions, however, are characterised by heavy borrowing from the Old Javanese text. The episode in canto 22, which has some parallels with the Bratayuda rendering of Kréśna's entry into Ngastina, was discussed in Chapter 8.1.

22.2c. B, anyampar ing tampar.

22.2c-d. The alliteration in these two lines makes for difficult translation. Lakar is strictly 'wood; base materials' (Zoetmulder 1982: 957, G/R II/109). Lökär however means 'coils'.

22.3b. angincih 'to long for; strive'. The ih ending alliteration in lines a and b probably accounts for the word choice.
22.7a. B, age-age kadya ngaosakën.

22.7c. sang umaksi. MAC II 15.12 reads tyasira umiyat.

22.8b. katutuh kapatuh. Katutuh (G/R I/649), means 'broken off' or 'burdened, afflicted'. The listing notes that the meaning is similar to kępatuh (G/R II/266).

22.8d. kadıryan is listed as a synonym for katon ( 'seen' G/R I/574). MAC II 15.15 reads mung kang munggeng rata rētna kang cinipat, kalbune/ malah-malah sami supe ing sasana, sangête/ 16. srunung carya miyat kang neng jroning rata, solahe/. This passage is fairly representative of the extension by the MACII poet of the equivalent compressed KM version.

22.12a and 12c. When pēdhotan divisions of 6,6 are drawn in these two lines, cangkrama and Arjuna Sasra are broken. It is of some note that these divisions could have been avoided if the lines were to read papara cangkrama 'maring wana-wana and mring Arjuna Sasra' samya ngaturaken. Once again, construction within Kusumawicitra cantos seemed to have been more flexible.

22.16. The MJ reference to the royal party hunting and fishing with an enumeration of the various ploys used seems to have been prompted by the sole reference to a blow-pipe (tulup) in OJ 22.6d.

22.17. Purwakanthi and the play on words between pati, 'king' and 'death', complicates translation. At 17c, MS B reads wekas pati-pati pat ping patitis, MAC II 16.10, reads myang gunēm wekasing, pati-pati wekasan sampekanireng trapan.

22.17d. MAC II 16.10 reads awya kawilet ing kulit, kalulut ing alot-alot, kalulun mring lena pan kalahut.

22.18d. Literally, 'an exact death'.

22.19. Purwakanthi is most obvious in this episode and translation was aided by the macapat and the general tenor of the passage.

22.19a. namakën, also in MAC II 16.13. Namake (G/R I/691), 'to apply' or 'to use'. The connotation of 'to apply' fits within the context although tama as a root could also be related to the choice utama which precedes it. The form namakën as opposed to nama-k-akën was not a common feature of the MJ texts.

22.20d. From 20 until the end of this canto, the KM borrows grossly from the kakawin. KM 21a and MAC II 17.1 both read kalangyan, as does the Surakarta MS (22.9a). The edition reads kalangwan. Only kalangènan is listed in G/R (I/169).

22.21b. anyawe, similarly in all MJ MSS and the Surakarta MS (22.9b). MAC II 17.1 reads lir panyawening lung ayu. Nyawe (cawe) is listed in G/R (I/276) as 'to warn with a signal'. A subheading suggests further reference to awe.

22.21c. lir gisi-gisining asih as found in the Surakarta MS. The edition reads gisi-gisi n angasö, 'like the gums of a girl coming forward (showing herself to be affectionate and submissive)' (Supomo:1977:218). Asih is therefore a reasonable corruption within the context.

What is of interest is the interpretation of gisi-gisi in both the KM and the MAC II. Gisi-gisi is listed in G/R (II/578) as gisik (sand or sea-shore). Whereas the KM author prudently borrowed the OJ phrase, andul mèkar lir gisi-gisining asih (OJ 22.9c), the MAC II poet tried his luck with lir gisi-gisining tirta, which according to the MJ listings translates as 'like sand in the water'. Once again,
it is difficult to determine if the same poet was responsible for both versions.

23. As noted in Chapter 2.2, the 3,8 divisions within Prawira-lalita cantos allow for greater syntactic scope within the pěhohan units and give an impression of a more relaxed handling of material.

23.1d. Ujungning in the KM, ujung ing in MAC II 17.4. See Chapter 5.4 for language aspects.

23.2b. Although the OJ description of the King's passage is trimmed down considerably in the MJ versions, a small practical aside was included in the MJ texts to the effect that the King maintained good relations with the villagers en route and with his own retinue by supplying adequate provisions.

23.2b. B, MAC II 17.5, yen, AC, yyan. The hyper-correct form, yyan, is listed as a kawi form of yen. (G/R II/ 446).

23.4d. endhang, the maidservants of the monk, replace the two ladies meeting secretly with the poet (OJ 22.12-23.5). See Chapter 7.3, p.215 for reference. Moral scruples over secret meetings cannot be seen to wholly account for this MJ substitution. Apart from the consistent MJ substitution of elements of instruction for more frivolous pursuits, the poet may have recalled the earlier episode in canto 15, where Widawati remained in the hermitage upon her father's death.

23.5a. Kari, OJ 22.12d, kantun: pintėn kantun tėkap sang kawi 'perhaps left behind by a poet', as opposed to the edition reading, pintėn kasih tėkap sang kawi, 'perhaps she was the beloved of a poet'. See Chapter 7.3 for reference within the context of the insertion and extension of elements of instruction.
23.5b-6c. Translation is tenuous but revolves around the monk's search for spiritual enlightenment. There is no MAC equivalent. akontha kanthi, taken as 'leading each other'; kinthil, (G/R I/408) fits with kanthi, 'following closely'. Kanthik (G/R II/555) is listed with kanthi, 'intimate, faithful'; panthang means 'focusing upon', pānthang, 'straining towards' (G/R II/206). Kunthara in the sense of pratingkah, 'behaviour'; Kapētha, 'modelled upon', borne in mind'.

23.8a. Rṣis, Siwaites and Buddhists. There is no parallel grouping of the clergy in the OJ text at this point although the denominations are mentioned frequently throughout the kakawin. In KM 24-25, the poet either missed or selectively omitted the references to the various religious establishments of the rṣi, Siwaites and the Buddhists. For reference, see Chapter 3.5.

23.9. The MJ text returns to the sequence of the kakawin at this point. The kakawin narrative was followed quite closely and with reasonable security until the end of the canto. Problems then arose in canto 24-25 with the interpretation of a passage devoted to the different religious orders.

23.9d. lajār. The KM, MAC II and the Surakarta MS read lajār, listed in G/R (II/138) as a prop for a dam. The edition reads lajar, a type of fish, but lajar is entered in G/R under lumajar ('to run'), or as a form of plough (waluku).

23.12a. OJ 24.3d lists sisir, tanjang and gula gumantung bushes. Although gula is intact in the Surakarta MS, gumantung has been rendered as 'hanging low' in the KM text.

23.13. The remarkable manipulation of OJ 25.1-3 into the KM text as a scene arranged for meditation was noted in Chapter 3.5. Sēndhang, (ponds), dadi (existence), and waluya (welfare), the words
around which the MJ episode was constructed, may be returned to sđang (gđang), 'banana trees', dadhi, 'curds', and umulih, 'return' in the Old Javanese version.

23.13b. MAC II 18.7 reads kauban ing wrksaning toyanipun.

23.15b. The MJ poet envisaged the temple complex as being the remains of a court centre (MAC II 18.13), although he noted that it was still intact. In the OJ text, there was more of an impression of this centre being occupied and utilised. In the Srāt Kandha 37.69-38.2, Arjuna Sasra, while searching for Sri, happens upon an abandoned kraton which he then repairs and briefly occupies.

23.18b. See Chapter 3.5 for the significance of the mountain and the pond in the centre of the courtyard.

24. Cantos 24 and 25 constitute the most difficult sections of the KM and MAC II versions. Although the kakawin enumeration of the religious establishments may have confused the eighteenth century poets, the MJ interpretation was further hampered by corruptions in the OJ MSS, many of which precipitated interpretive streams which were not unreasonable in the MJ context. As the MAC II poet extended upon the skeletal and diplomatic KM version, the macapat equivalent is included in full to allow for comparison. Underlining marks the extent of borrowing from the OJ text in the following four KM cantos.

24.1b. B, genira, MAC II 17.20, gen.

24.2a-c are missing in MS A.

24.2b. The MJ texts again note that the establishment was deserted and presumably the monk accompanying the King was a caretaker/guide. In the OJ text, the King is informed that it was a Buddhist temple (26:4b). The reference is intact in the Surakarta MS but was not taken into the MJ versions.
24.4a. Suralaya. The Surakarta MS reads saksat Siwalaya, a corruption on the edition reading, sākṣāt Śivasadā, 'he is in truth like Śivasadā, (a stage of Śiva's emanation).

24.4b. The names of the gods follow the Surakarta MS reading. The edition reads Rudra, Ratnasambhawa, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi (OJ 27.10).

24.5c. tan wontën dewa sang hyang, returned to a vital corruption in the OJ MS, tan hana dewa sang hyang, 'there is no Supreme God', for the edition reading, tan hana bheda sang hyang, 'there is no distinction between the deities' (OJ 27.2a. Supomo 1977: 222).

24.6b. As noted in Chapter 3.5, darma was interpreted as a religious code rather than a religious establishment. The MJ interpretation thus hinged upon this choice. Darma sih, darma ji, darma uwal have been retained rather than translated.

24.6d. umahakën. The macapat also reads kāng den-umahakën budya, (18.32), returned to OJ 28.1, bhudana parnahnya, 'built on lands bestowed (by the King)'. Bhūdāna is not listed in G/R but was clearly perceived as budya (budi), 'mind, intellect'. In the Sūrat Rama 5.2, umah (omah) seems to have been used in a similar context of 'occupied, settled'. Omahna den-pasthi, wulanging sastreku.

24.7a. The crux of both the KM and the macapat is contained in this sentence, the king's rash pursuit of his own goals and ideals with no account of his royal responsibilities or religious guidelines.

24.7c-b are compressed in the KM. See MAC II 18.38.
24.9a. Although borrowing from the Old Javanese text continues until the end of the canto, the MJ poet rendered the OJ text in a more confident manner from stanza 9 onwards. The tenor of both the OJ and the MJ versions, to which the MJ poet would have been attuned, was that a king cannot buy his power and mandate to rule with much feasting and pandering to courtiers and kin. The MAC II extension notes that the king who insists on giving before an assembled crowd is motivated by self interest rather than a true sense of kasudarman. Although the word pamrih (self interest) is not used in this text, self interest and ambitious expediency are condemned on numerous occasions throughout the MJ texts.

24.11a-b. Nurageng jagat. Anuraga in OJ has the connotation of 'love, pity'. In Modern Javanese, nuraga means 'humble'. The Old Javanese passage has the sense of 'a king should not merely give to assure the affection of his people' whereas the MAC II text notes that a king should not be ostentatious (karana rai). Nuraga was therefore interpreted as 'modest' rather than 'affection'.


25.1a. sampun mangkana. Sāmpun has been translated as the negative imperative rather than as the perfect tense indicator. The OJ text reads nda hawya juga/ mangkaneki. MAC II 19.17, however, reads kĕdah mēkatēn at the parallel point but within a different context.

25.1a-b. Lines a and b revolve around datan anut kadarman, able to be returned to the OJ 30.1b, tan panuka dharma, 'do not(only) build temple complexes', which reads tan panut i dharma in the Surakarta MS. See Chapter 3.5 for reference to the MJ interpretation of dharma.

25.2c. asung buktya, 'give provisions', an exhortation to the King
to support the clergy, corresponds with subhuktya (OJ 30.1c), 'prosper'. 'Make every effort to ensure that the common people do not intrude, so that the priests may prosper' (Supomo 1977:223).

25.3d. darma ji. MAC II 19.21 reads ngarsakêkn mangke, karahayan sagung ing dumadi rather than darma ji.

25.4d-5b. The KM is very compressed. The parallel MAC II passage is at 19.23-25.

25.6d. prajaya. MAC II 19.27 reads prajadi, 'excellent state'. Prajaya (G/R II/242) means 'defeated, killed, in chaos'. Although 'no benefit in time of trouble' would be an alternative, some account was taken of the di/ya alternation in words such as upaya/ upadi, supaya/ supadi. Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (1979:180) notes that the syllable ya is often added to words in a poetic context to accommodate the guru lagu rulings. Pura/puraya, gita /gitaya.

25.7a. amah-amaha from a corruption at OJ 30.3b, mangamaha/ mahanuhu for the edited version mangahah manguhuh, 'moaning and sighing'. The text was interpreted within the consistent tenor of a caution against arrogance, greed and ambitious ill-mannered servants.

25.8b. Durwaka in the KM and MAC II manuscripts. Only duraka is listed in G/R (I/570). The OJ word is drotaka.

25.9-11. These two stanzas were noted and discussed in Chapter 4.1. On the basis of several corruptions, the MJ poet centered the passage around the poison in man's heart rather than the poison that was the power in the hands of the clergy. Wisaning ati, ing driya and ing tyas may be returned to OJ 30.4d: wişa mamati ya tan wisöttama.
'a poison which kills is not the best kind of poison'. (Supomo 1977: 223). The Surakarta MS reads wisa mamati/ ati n wisottam.. The sequence of corruption and interpretation would be impossible to measure in this instance.

25.11b and c. Suṣa ta and sot rekasa from a corruption of the OJ phrase, swaputra kula potraka sahana. See Chapter 4.1, p. 98.

Macapat Equivalent of Cantos 24 and 25.

18.27b. Dewa nayaka, G/R (I/238) lists nayaka as 'leader' and dewa nayaka as 'the eight leading deities'.

29a. This line is corrupt and minus two syllables. Translation is dubious.

29e. 'To Lord Wênang and secondly to Lord Guru'. In the KM equivalent, which attempted to follow the Old Javanese text more closely, Siwa and Buddha were the objects of devotion in what the KM poet interpreted as the darma ji. Sang Hyang Wênang is a byname for Bathara Guru yet the macapat appears to be making a distinction between the two aspects of the godhead. Perhaps Bathara Guru, the teacher, was considered as a suitable equivalent for Buddha. In Cabolek 9.17, Dewa Ruci is described as being 'master of the path of God Guru' as well as 'in reality is Sang Hyang Wênang who is the first dhalang' (Soebardi 1975: 136).

30c-e. reya (G/R I/356) is listed as a form of reka, an image, plan or scheme. This passage is difficult and the macapat poet seemed to be making an effort to interpret the heavy borrowing in the KM text.

31a. Kasudarman. G/R (I 793) suggest 'magnanimity' which may
not be sufficiently wide enough to cover this aspect.

34c. karana rai, (G/R I/420), 'face to face'. The macapat text expands the KM 24.11, anurageng rat, 'modest and unassuming'.

45c. mijilna, the sasmita for the following canto, Mijil.

19.4c. de, perhaps di (adi), occasioned by the macapat guru lagu requirements. The alternation of e/i is not noted by Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo (1979:177-181).

Kawi Miring Canto 30.

30.2c. Sang Hyang Raditya. The Surakarta MS and MS 219 read niksakara, the edition niśakara, 'the moon', at OJ 36.2c. The MAC II poet has adjusted the text back to kōnyar ing Hyang Sasi (23.26), apparently after consideration of the corruption in the OJ text. The question of authorship of both texts surfaces once again.

30.2d. cintaka, as found in the Surakarta MS and listed in G/R (I/247) as a form of cataka. The edition reads cātaka (36.2d).

30.5b. silunglunga from the OJ text is included in the KM but not in the MAC II version. The word is not listed in G/R. Zoetmulder (1982:1770) notes silunglung as either a provision for a journey or to accompany, especially in death.

30.5b. The Surakarta MS reads lara kung, the edition, larangku. The misplaced cānacak (ng) was responsible for a number of variant readings in the MJ texts.

30.6c-d. The Surakarta MS reads tan pakarana ma/wilasa jalana (OJ 364b) 'amusing herself, dallying her time away' (Supomo 1977:235). The KM and MAC II have added a negative before both wilasa and jalana. Wilasa has the connotation of pity as well as pleasure in Modern Javanese. (G/R I/56). Once the sympathetic connotation was chosen, the
phrase was manipulated so as to imply that Citrawati was insensitive to the King's feelings.

30.9b. The Surakarta MS reads ngrẹnyẹg gẹrẹh as opposed to ngrẹngọ gẹrẹh, 'the sound of rumbling thunder'. The KM reads ngrẹnyẹk which has a similar meaning to rẹmuk, 'broken: to destroy'. This reading was retained although the sense of the phrase is rather suspect.

30.9d. Ngarah, 'to approach' in the Surakarta MS rather than the edition reading, ngaras, 'to kiss'. Ngarah was taken into the MJ texts although the implication is probably to kiss than to approach. In KM 16.19, the phrase ngaras gẹlungrẹ was borrowed from the OJ text.

30.14d. lir rẹtna Madurẹtna, the metre of canto 30.

31.1c. B, ranu.


31.2c. The line is a quote from the OJ text, the variation being ayun for hayatan (OJ 38.4a). MAC II 24.1 reads singsal saking genipun pindha kasẹmẹkan duk lagi linukar saking jaja. Kasẹmẹkan is a form of kẹmbẹn, 'a sash'.

31.4d. datan lẹbẹt. Lẹbẹt means 'deep' and the verbal form from lẹbẹt, 'to enter' should read mlebẹt. Strictly, the line reads 'although it was not deep in the middle'. The MAC II, however, states that the waters were very deep (jroning toya nglangkunci) while the KM notes at 31.10, 'deep in the middle', (jroning tẹngah). The choice therefore was for 'to enter' rather than 'deep'.

31.7b. Wibuh. in the Surakarta MS for wimbhū in the edition which refers to Arjuna Sasra's triwikrama form (Zoetmulder 1981:2259). The MJ interpretation centered around wibuh which is listed as a form of
wimbu (G/R II/69), 'sad'. Lines 7b-c are unclear but the sense seems to be that the Queen should let the King know when she is unhappy. Perhaps this context was prompted by a similar scene in the Bratayuda where Salya begs his wife to tell him why she is so neglectful of her appearance and seems so distressed. At ASB KM 40.13 and 41.3, the poet consistently omitted the OJ references to Citrawati being afraid of the King's trimukrama form.

31.8b. tan gumingsir, 'would not hesitate', in the KM text has some aural parallel in the OJ tan gumiris, 'not afraid', at the equivalent point (OJ 38.9b).

46.7c. The MAC II text adds two stanzas of physical description devoted to Suwanda at this point.

46.10c. tiniban, literally 'fallen upon by'.

46.12d. See Chapter 7.3 for reference to these two aspects of decline in knightly standards, to sin against God and to commit treason against king and state.

46.20b. The subjunctive form ajaa tanggung was preferred although the podhotan division breaks the negative.

46.25a. The KM and MAC II now return to the sequence of the OJ text. Stanza 24 summarises the essence of Suwanda's advice, that man is dependent upon God and destiny, that he must accept this fact and live within these limits.

46.28b and c borrowed sun and moon allegorical elements from the kakawin and attempted to construct an alternative analogy. These two lines are not very clear.

47.13d The metre name sikarini which has some parallel in sikara, 'to inflict pain', was incorporated as 'revenge' in the translation.
58.1a-4c. This extension on the OJ text was noted in Chapter 7.2.

58.1a. suměngka ngawak braja. This expression is not listed in G/R but suměngka (G/R I/892) is noted in the sense of rising or being elevated above one's usual position. Poerwadarminta (1939:572) noted that the full expression has a similar connotation to the G/R explanation. Pigeaud (1938: 539) lists suměngka pangawak braja as 'ascending to the heavens'. Horne (1974:542) includes the explanation 'to arrive in great haste and without advance notice'. Lines a and b have been combined in translation.

58.3a. A, MAC II 47.17, tutuwi.

58.3b. G/R(II/115) list ngleketer as 'to shift, dance about'. In 58.4, the verb, ngigel, 'to dance', is also used. Angleter was used in SR 1.50 to describe the manner in which the monks and their pupils moved about before Rama and Laksmana.

58.5a. B, pëkik tuwan.

58.6. MAC I MS IOL JAV 46 stops at 58.6. Add,12302 continues for about twenty stanzas with a version that is at variance with the OJ text.

58.7b. nglanglangi, MAC II 48.4, nanglangi, has a similar connotation to kliling, 'to wander around'. Nglangkungi would perhaps have been a better reading, 'to transcend (all the beauty of the earth)'.

58.8d. mudha punggung, 'foolish, ignorant', needed no explanation in this text but was singled out in Panitisastrasra KN 1.3 for lengthy analysis. See text and translation in Part 2.

58.10d. panggondhel. Gondhel (G/R II/545), 'to hang down'. Nggondhel means 'to attach oneself to something or someone'. Also a bolt or a screw. The connotation of slave, 'one attached', seems to fit the context.
58.11c. BC, MAC II 48.16, angandika aris, a common reading but two extra syllables for that line.

58.13b A, pocapan.

59.1a. wS A is missing the honorific sang.

59.1c. A, madya.

59.6d. tatĕnggu. G/R (I/727) list tatĕngga, tatĕngga as 'to care for something placed in one's keeping'. MAC II 48.30, prajanira buyutingsun, aturna saininiki, rumahsa mung tatĕngga, aja rumahsa darbeni.

59.7c-d. A omits parts of these lines due to a copyist's confusion over antuk in both lines.

59.12a. AC, pratingkah.

59.13d. B, MAC II 49.3, nyanyampuri, AC, nyampuri. Nyampuri in the OJ sense has the connotation of 'to defile, to pollute'. It is listed in G/R (I/296) as 'to disturb the peace, to interfere'.

59.18d. længganaeng, the subjunctive form længana + ing. MAC II 49.8, længgana saparentah.

59.23-26 is an MJ addition inserted between OJ 71.1 and 2. These three stanzas are of a practical bent and round off the King's advice to Rawana.

59.28c. ABC, read prahast-a. MAC II 48.18, Prahasa. At OJ 71.5, the equivalent of KM 60.8, the Surakarta MS reads prahasa kita for the edition reading prabhawa nira (his power). Prahasa has therefore been interpreted as a vocative aside to Rawana's minister, Prahasa, to also take heed of the King's excellent advice.

60.2b. den-karĕksa, also at MAC II 49.20, could be considered as a double passive form. Karĕksa is not listed in G/R as a verbal root. The parallel OJ point reads karĕksa ning jagat (OJ 71.2). The same
form occurs in **KM**60.3b where the OJ equivalent is **rinëksa**.

60.6c. A, **duta**, B, **satruning** rat. Durta is listed in **G/R** (I/571) as a **kawi** form with the sense of 'evil, evildoer'.

60.8a. In the **KM** text, Prahasta is reminded that his new master is indeed Wisnu incarnate rather than 'as powerful as Wisnu'. The OJ context is not in reference to Arjuna Sasra but rather to any excellent king who can withstand the forces of evil.

60.10d, a difficult line and a partial quote from the **kakawin**. *MAC II* 51.1-2 expands the **KM** text to include a reiteration of man's finite nature: sakëh wuwus kang sayëktos/ 2. praptanîng kasidän urip prapteng lampus, urip ing jagad sakalir, tan prabeda ing tumuwuh.

60.11d. C, kasinggihan.

60.14d. B, pakon.

60.19d **lëbdajiwa**, the metre used in canto 60, means 'restored to life'.

61.9a. A, **saparagra**, C, **saparagraha**, **MAC II** 50.2, saha garwa.

61.16a. B, malah.

61.17a. At the parallel OJ position, there is a reference to **bhatara** Buddha: 'and so the Lord Buddha was well pleased to behold him from the Void' (Supomo 1977: 280). The Surëkarta MS reads **batha/ra** muddha siwa for **bhatara** Buddha sira. The corruption, siwa, is in keeping with the MJ reference to **Hyang Pamungkas**.

61.18c. **Yogiswara** (G/R II/451) is an ascetic of the highest order and according to Balinese tradition, the author of the **Râmâyana** **kakawin**. The name of the author of the **Arjunawijaya** kakawin, Tantular, is noted in OJ 73.1c: antuk rasi/ka sang aparab mapu (Ed; **ëmpu**) tantular amar/na kawin (Ed; kakawin) ngalangën. 'This is the poetic
composition of one whose parab' is Tantular'(Supomo 1977: 281).
Although this reference was reasonably intact in the Surakarta MS,
the name was omitted from the MJ versions. Javanese tradition holds
that Panuluh was the author of the Arjunawijaya kakawin.

61.18c. Tuladaning wuri-wuri. The KM poet was working closely with
OJ 73.1, the stanza that noted that Tantular was the author of the
kakawin. Mangikét may be returned to OJ 73.1a, inikét. Tuladan
has a certain aural resemblance to (tan)tular which was omitted from
the MJ versions but tuladan occurs at the parallel position in the
MJ text. The interpretation again rested upon the pervading stream
of example, instruction and ethical guidelines.

61.20b. katārjunasahasra in all MSS although kata Arjunasasra would
have been metrically possible.

61.21. Furwakanthi complicates translation in this stanza. Tumitah,
'all creation', satitah, 'one's lot, natural state', patut, 'in har-
mony, concord', mamatut, 'to be in accord, conformity'.

61.22.a. BC, kapilēngēn, A, sukāpilēngēn. Kapilēngēn (G/R II/303)
means 'to be annoyed by a deafening sound'. The translation is tent-
ative and lines a and b have been combined.

61.22b. There is no reference to a bee in the kakawin. MAC II 51.16
reads lir bṛēmara anguswa sari.

61.22d. sumiswa. MAC II 51.17, sumiswaring Sang Hyang Wisnu Murti,
ing sasolah bawa laku mulya, rūsāp kārēm ing sāe.
Sumiswa, if from siswa, 'a student' is not listed in G/R but in add-
ition to the synonym sakabat (pupil), mēdal, 'to emerge' is also
noted (G/R I/805).

62. Prawiralalita. The metre name is not included in the last line of
As noted in Chapter 2.2, the only sixteen syllable metre used throughout the *kawi miring* text was *Prawiralalita, pĕdhotan, 8, 8*. This final canto is characterised by heavy, uninterpreted borrowing from the Old Javanese text, as were the final stanzas of the *Bratayuda* Modern Javanese versions. In the notes to canto 1, reference was made to the stilted nature of the opening stanzas in the MJ texts. Whereas the interpretive difficulties, with respect to translation, in the initial stanzas were more related to the mannered style, the final stanzas depended upon quotation and borrowing to achieve the same level of contrived formality. Translation in a number of instances is therefore tentative.

62.1b. BC, swuh. *Swuh, syuh, suh* are all listed in G/R (I/736) as equivalents of *lĕbur, rĕmuk*, 'smashed or broken'.

62.1c. *memengeti* in all MSS. The duplicated form in the MAC II 51.18 is *pepengeti*.

62.2c. BC, *warta nindita, MAC 51.19, pawarta anindita*. This phrase may be returned to the OJ MS *makawı̂tto anindita*, 'as a mark of great favour' (74.1c, Supomo 1977: 281). *Warta, wrta* (G/R I/18) is explained as *aweh kabar*, 'to inform'. From the *pawarta* reading in the Mac II MS, it seems clear that this was the MJ context. A strict translation, independent of the OJ text, would be 'splendid news'. 'It is well known' is proposed as a compromise between the two texts.

62.2d. MS C ends at 2d.

62.4. From stanza 4, borrowing is most pronounced and seems to be framed within a reference to the poetic excellence of the OJ poet and the ineptitude of the MJ author. The OJ context relates to the standard apology from the poet to his patron and audience.
62.4a. gumuna from guna. MAC II 51.21 reads gumuna gumuning pakartini, anggupita, 'amazingly arrogant of me to try to write this poem'.

62.4a. masiwakeng taji, the possibility of a play on words, considering the addition of the word tumunjem, 'to penetrate deeply'. The OJ edited text reads sumewake haji, 'to serve the king', while the Surakarta MS reads sumewakeng taji (74.2b). Taji in the OJ sense is a sharp pointed instrument (Zoetmulder 1982: 1902) but the MJ listing includes nagara (state) and bedhor (arrow head).

Sewaka (siwaka) G/R I/813 is 'to serve' but sewak (siwak) means 'to cut something away'. If taji is accepted as nagara, the translation could read 'like serving the state', (the king) whereas the form masiwaka also allows for the 'cleaving of an arrow'.

62.4b. wahyadyatmika, from the OJ text (74.2c), 'exoteric and esoteric knowledge' (Supomo 1977: 281). The term is expanded in the MAC II 51.21 to imply an imperfect state: saking wahyadyatmika, kataweng tan tulus. This term is not listed in G/R or Pigeaud. Poerwadarminta (1939: 653) notes kang katon ing lair lan kang gaib.

62.4c. panjrahning pustaka, OJ 74.2d, panjrahning sêkar in both the Surakarta and the edited text. Literally, 'the unfolding of literature, of letters'. At 4c, the MAC II poet inserts a ten stanza passage which explains that Yasadipura I wrote an earlier, basic version in macapat which omitted much of the kakawin filigree.

62.4d. kawidi kawantu. MAC II kawideng widagda supports kawidi as 'chosen, blessed' rather than kawi di excellent poet'.

kawantu. MACII 51.33, winawantu. Wantu means 'by nature' (G/R II/8). Winawantu is noted as 'naturally inclined'.

62.4b. wadaka (G/R II/31) has the connotation of 'flaw, blemish' which is consistent with OJ 74.3b cacadên.
62.5d. yumana from yu and mana (G/R II 451), 'fortunate, blessed with fortune'.

62.6b. masewaka in this line clearly refers to the gadhung vine waiting in attendance upon the moon. The analogy was taken from the OJ text (74.4d).

62.6d. Translation is tenuous but hinges on the following connotations; ləngəng (G/R II/166), 'facinated, absorbed', lalana (II/81) 'to wander'; layan in the sense of nglayani, 'to work at something earnestly' (Poerwadarminta 1939: 256). Lingling, lumingling, 'to consider something carefully'.

62.7a. mangaja. MAC II :52.35, mangajari (mangaja ri?). Aja (G/R I/ 144) is listed as the negative imperative and as ngajani, 'to permit'. Aja is also a form of ajak, 'to urge'.

62.7b. Both ləsah and sikara are taken from the OJ text but not necessarily in the same context as the OJ line. Sikara in OJ 74.c refers to 'the peak of his attempts to write poetry' (Supomo 1977: 282), ri sikara nikamangun langən (Ed: langə). Sikara in the MJ sense means 'to inflict pain or punishment' (G/R I/ 786), although Poerwadarminta (1939: 562) includes the notion of 'peak' which he qualifies as 'Sanskrit'. Again, there is the possibility of a play on words: 'exhausted, having reached the peak of beauty' or 'exhausted, tormented by beauty'. Ləsah, which refers to the withered pudak in the OJ text, may have been more related to the MJ poet's resources at the end of his task. The MAC II poet avoided both interpretive quandaries by adjusting the line to ləmah saking kalangyan langən-langən ing, kang winisudheng kandha.
NOTES TO CANTOS 29 and 30

29.1d. Gardapati, Arjuna's single opponent in the MJ versions, as opposed to the OJ reading sang Trigarta pati saptā (13.20a), 'the seven kings of Trigarta'. As noted in Chapter 7.2, one character in the MJ renderings often emerged from several in the kakawin. Single combat encounters afforded an opportunity for direct speech taunts and challenges before the confrontation in earnest.

29.3a. Subadra is Abimanyu's mother, Utari, his wife. The second wife, Sitiisundari, appears in 29.19.

29.5a. Sang Wersaya, the warrior who engages Bima, evolved from Parthiwaśraya (OJ 13.21), 'the allied warriors'. This band was further augmented in the OJ text by ten princes but the MJ poet again preferred that Bima do battle with one character.

29.11b. The KM reads Lēsmanamondrakumara, the macapat. text, Laksmanamondrakumara, and the OJ, Laksmanakumara. In the fragments of the Rāmāyaṇa-based story in the IOL JAV 46 MS, Laksmana, the brother of Rama, is consistently referred to as Lēsmana.

29.14d. Sang Dwija at the OJ parallel point (13.2d) is the priest, Drona.

29.15. The arrow as an object of meditation is a MJ addition.

30.1b. The MJ texts place added emphasis upon the power of sāmadi and Krēśna stresses that the sākti (power) that Sindurēja hopes to achieve through his father's meditation must be counteracted before Arjuna has any hope of success. Krēśna's advice is to pray for alertness and enlightenment (a suggestion that Arjuna acknowledges), before proceeding to offer Arjuna more practical advice relating to
30.1c. wërit-wërit, (G/R II/18) is 'the secret sense of words'; also 'awesome' (as in a forest). Pigeaud (1938:617) notes the connotation 'to hide, take cover' as does Poerwadarminta (1939:661). Both connotations fit within the context of a deep spiritual and mental awareness as well as the more practical logistics of tracking down Sindurëja who is hiding from Arjuna.

30.3a. Nguni is not in the macapat text. Strictly, 'promised in the past'.

30.10a. Literally, 'died while living'.

30.10c-11a, as in the Macapat at 21.16. The OJ text reads sang hyang Rudra sira katon têkäśarîra. The MJ poet has taken têka literally as 'up to, as far as' and sari as 'body, trunk' rather than the full physical person of the god.

30.11. Wangsiting. There is no macapat equivalent. Ira ,ipun, are not metrically possible but nya and e were used in the previous and following lines.

NOTES TO THE PANITISASTRA KAWI MIRING

CANTOS 1-4

1.1a. This line is close to the OJ text, the Surakarta MS Lür 1853/I reads sëmbahning hulun sang ( Ed:ing) bathara Harisar/wajñatma bhuh nityasa. The OJ text is therefore dedicated to Wisnu. The MJ poet, however, seems to be making a double dedication, firstly to the creator of the Universe and then to Wisnu.

1.1c. The extension of the messianic and intermediary aspects of Wisnu's character was noted in Chapter 8.2 and 3 but the terms applied to Wisnu in this stanza deserve attention. According to
G/R (I/239), **nayakaning rat,'the world leader',** usually refers to Mohammad. **Nayaka** was used in *AS* MACII 18.27 to refer to the eight deities below Sāng Hyang Wĕnang and Bathara Wisnu. The word **duta 'emissary',** is also commonly applied to Mohammad (*duta Allah, G/R I/583*).

1.2a. A very stilted line, exhibiting the same contrived style as was noted for 1.1 of the *ASB MAC* and *KM* versions.

1.2b. **lagu magăng;'in great metres'** is a strict but clumsy equivalent. As **macapat** is a common unqualified equivalent for *tēmbeng cilik/sekar alit,sekar agēng* seemed an appropriate substitution.

1.3-4. **Mudha punggung, silakrama and basa krama** are left in the Javanese as each is followed by the *tēgo*se (the meaning is) formula noted in Chapter 6.1. The OJ reading is **punggung** only. **Mudha** in MJ (G/R II/512) has the connotation of 'young' as well as 'stupid'.

The MJ extension in 2a deals with the importance of observing social conventions and stresses that a man must conduct himself according to his social status.

1.4b. **tata,'order'** is too broad. 'Social echelons' is consistent with the further directives as to where one should sit and how language levels must be observed.

**awyā carub wor,'do not mix'.** *NAC* 1.3 reads **awyā carub awor ing lungguh.**

1.5b. A return to the OJ sequence.

1.6c. LOr 1853/I OJ MS reads **sabda** for **sastra** but **sastra** found its way into the MJ versions.

1.8a. *MAC* 1.7 *tan ajur panggilute*. The interlinear text to the OJ
LOr 1853/I reads yen tan lëmbut menggal.

1.8d. The imagery in the OJ text is a young woman who finds an old man unattractive. Kanya (maiden) was omitted in the MJ version although the word is intact in the LOr 1853 MS.

1.9c. As janmadhika was subjected to the same extension and explanation as words qualified with lîre, têgêse, the term was not translated. Literally,'a man of eminence'. Adhika (superior) is not listed in G/R, Pigeaud, or Poerwadarminta but G/R (I/577) listed dhika/dika as 'exceptional'. Although the OJ form is strictly janmâdhika, it may not be necessary to mark the a with a circumflex in the KM version. The long a was not marked in the Surakarta OJ MS.

1.10a. The last unit is corrupt in the KM MSS and was not included in the MAC version. Tan pinurikan, 'not easily angered'; rucah,'low, coarse'. Perhaps kacakup may have been intended in the final unit in the sense of 'contained, grasped'.

2.6b. kacub (G/R I/301) means 'dipped in and pulled out', usually applied to ironsmiths.

2.8d. sastra genyang. The edited version reads sāstrājña, 'knowing the scriptures', but the OJ LOR 1853 version is corrupt and appears to read sastranya. This reading may have prompted the MJ gōnyang. J and G were often interchangeable in the Javanese MSS, yajña, sacrifice, for example, frequently appeared as yagnya in the AWj MS. Gōnyang (G/R II 616) means 'clever, skilled'. The phrase has been rendered as 'renowned for his scholarship' although the sastra gōnyang is reminiscent of the sastra jñātha/sastra arjendra sciences in the ASB texts. See also Drewes (1966: 335) for reference to the sastra endraprawata, sastra rancang in the Sērat Dīrmagandhul.
3.1d. tan weneh ing pandhita, 'no different from a priest', a small MJ addition. See Chapter 7.3 for reference to living within one's appointed station.

3.4a. papat. The four examples in the OJ text are the crow, the ass, man's violent passions and the man who betrays his friends. The crow was omitted from the MJ version and line 1c has been translated so as to accommodate the two evil aspects of man's character. Four, papat, is perfectly correct in the KM text but the OJ edited text reads pāpātmaka ing caṇḍala, 'evil nature of a despicable fellow', which corresponds with kaṇḍa caṇḍala pan papat in the MJ versions. The Surakarta OJ HS reads caturmaka for pāpātmaka. Without the quantity indicators, papat was interpreted quite reasonably as 'four' while maka may not necessarily have been considered as atmaka, the soul, life principle.

3.6. Part of lines c and d are missing from the KM MSS. As it stands, 6c reads 'and a man who follows all the teachings of scripture'.

3.9. Bathara Srama, also in the Surakarta MS. The Poerbatjaraka edition reads bhaṭara tryambakangarcana, 'the three-eyed god', (Siwa).

3.9d. Missing in both MSS.

3.10a. The KM reads garuda which is metrically correct but the wrong character. Anaga has been substituted.

3.11d. Wisalyaharini, the metre of that canto. Tan wisa, 'not poisonous', has been included within the context of the line.

4.3c-d. is an MJ extension. Translation is very tentative.

4.5c. The reference to the border-lands is an MJ extension.
4.6a. An alternative translation is 'who shows great courage but should not be like a lion'. Both translations are rather clumsy, due to the poet's incorporation of the metre name used in the first canto of the *kakawin*, *Sardulawikridita*, which is contained in the last line of OJ canto 1.

4.6b. The *KM* MS reads *dodak*, probably the *dodot*, an article of court dress. This reference is an MJ addition.

4.6d. The extension in lines 6d-7a are typical of MJ style. The poet ventured his opinion to the eighteenth century audience as to why the Brahmans did not eat flesh meat. Another example of a similar aside and extension is to be found in the MJ *Bratayuda* (**KM** 31, **MAC** 22), where the poet made note of the practice of *bela*, the wife following her husband in death. The MJ poet stressed that women who were pregnant were excluded from this ritual.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Arjuna Sasrabau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>The Australian National University, Canberra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWj</td>
<td>Arjunawijaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Indonesica, published by the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY</td>
<td>Bhāratayuddha and Bratayuda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod.</td>
<td>Codex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Djawa, Tijdschrift van het Java Instituut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dewa- Ruci.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOL</td>
<td>India Office Library (London).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFC</td>
<td>Java in the Fourteenth Century. See Pigeaud, (1960-63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBG</td>
<td>Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Kawiniring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Literature of Java. See Pigeaud (1967-70).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOr</td>
<td>Leiden University Library Oriental manuscripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Macapat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Modern Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAG</td>
<td>Nāgarakṛtāgama. See Pigeaud (1960-63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBS</td>
<td>Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap manuscript collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OJ  Old Javanese.

Paniti  Panitisastra.

Rama  Rāmāyāna kakawin.

RIMA  Review of Indonesian and Malayan Affairs.

SA  Sĕkar agĕng.

SK  Sĕrat Kandha.

SR  Sĕrat Rama.


TNI  Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch- Indie.

VBG  Verhandelingen published by the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

VG  Verspreide Geschriften, See Kern.

VKA  Verhandelingen, published by the Koninklijk Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde.

VKI  Verhandelingen, published by the Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.
Javanese Manuscripts and Unpublished Javanese Material

(See also description of frequently referred to manuscripts in Chapter 1.1)

Kawi Miring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna Sasrabau</td>
<td>Br 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Poerbatjarsaka 1933a: 286)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lor 1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBS 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/751).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratayuda</td>
<td>LOr 1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lor 2157(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIT. vol. II/77).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama</td>
<td>LOr 1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOR 2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/65).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panitisstra</td>
<td>LOr 1853 (3 and 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/43).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Macapat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna Sasrabau</td>
<td>IOL JAV 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ricklefs/Voorhoeve 1977: 64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BL Add. 12302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ricklefs/Voorhoeve 1977: 47).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOr 2175(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/81).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BG 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Poerbatjarsaka 1933a: 286).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panitisstra</td>
<td>LOr 1853(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/43).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kakawin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arjunawijaya</td>
<td>LOr 1855(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LIT. vol. II/43).</td>
</tr>
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