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

**IV. CONCLUSIONS**

a) *Concerning OJR.*

1. As Dr. Poerbatjaraka had concluded, Yogīśwara knew Sanskrit very well.

2. He made an OJR, initially in close connection with BhK, (Ghosh, Bulcke), but then, for reasons not yet clear to us, he abandoned his model in the last third of his work.

3. To conclude his poem he seems to have borrowed from the flotsam & jetsam of general knowledge concerning the Rāmāyaṇa that was current in those days in S. E. Asia; at least Dr. Bulcke could not discover a particular source.

4. He might have felt attracted to BhK, because of its outspoken śivaitic character, since this appears also manifestly in OJR, (Poerbatjaraka).

5. He may also have had a certain preference for BhK as a poem or it may have haunted him as a textbook.

6. The examples of Sanskrit grammar, however, in *sargas* I—IV, V—IX, XIV—end were of no use to him for the composition of a poem in the OJ language.

7. BhK X is on *alaṅkāra* (prosodical figures), XI on *mādhurya* (the quality of sweetness), XII on *bhāvika* (vivid description), three topics which are treated at some length in Daśāsin's Kāvyādārśa; Yogīśwara here still followed rather closely his example (though not so closely as in the first *sargas*, perhaps); then he inserted his XVII—XIX.11 and for the rest either kept his former example at a distance or even did completely without it. The reason? Only guesses can be made. He may himself as a student never have mastered the whole BhK. He may have worked with a MS, which was defective, became defective, got lost — etc. Perhaps Yogīśwara, working in a language without any connection with the grammatical niceties dealt with in XIV—end, lost interest.
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8. As early as 1926 Aichele already pointed to Yogiśwara’s use of Anuprāsa, Yamakas, Upamās, Rūpaka, Utpreksā, Apahnuti or Nihnuti; in the preceeding §§ we have seen where Yogiśwara may have learned them. He may have learned more; this remains to be investigated, as this treatise must have its limit somewhere.

9. The difficult and artificial passages, which continued to arouse the suspicion of having been interpolated, even after the appearance of Aichele’s pioneer articles, for the moment should be said to be part and parcel of Yogiśwara’s magnum opus (and in consequence; should be added to the translations).

10. Not only the erotical passage of BhK XI = OJR XII proves to be common to the two poems, and consequently must be accepted to be genuine, not interpolated, even not elaborated, but furthermore we must be prepared generally speaking, to accept in these fields (8, 9 & 10) the Indian standards as laid down in BhK, and Bhaṭṭi’s textbooks, (the latter, as will be known to Indianists, are not yet identified, perhaps they are lost, perhaps not yet recognised amidst the numerous Skr. MSS, of which the description has not yet been published). It remains to Aichele’s credit to have postuated all this, Prijono’s to have repeated it.

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

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

99) Indonesische Handschriften door R. M. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjarak, Dr. P. Voorhoeve en Dr. C. Hooykaas, Lembaga Kebudajaan Indonesia “Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen”, 1950. Woord vooraf.
vañśa) maintain the same, not to forget Kern, Gunning and Stutterheim 100).

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

O. J. Rāmāyaṇa consists of 26 poly-metric *sargas*, whereas:
Bhoma-kāwyay "" 188 mono-metric *cantos*
Hari-wañśa "" 54 "" "" ""
Smara-dahana "" 40 "" "" ""
Arjuna-wiwāha "" 36 "" "" ""
Bhārata-yuddha "" 52 "" "" ""
Nāgarakṛtāgama "" 98 "" "" ""

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

O.-J. Rāmāyaṇa has some 268 metrical changes in 2774 stanzas, Bhoma-kāvyā has some 118 cantos = 117 metrical changes in 1375 stanzas. The average is more or less the same. The picture of the mono-metric passages offers a striking resemblance. But Bhoma-kāvyā shows no longer a trace of the sarga-structure; this was already en décadence in OJR, and seems never to have taken solid root on Javanese soil. There are still 7 one-stanza-cantos, 10 two-stanza-cantos — queer cantos indeed, apparently the remainder of (a) former conclusive or intermediary stanza(s). These separate stanzas soon became obsolete; Hari-waṁśa, Smara-dahana and Arjuna-wiwāha still have a few of them, but that passes.
The great formal difference apparently lies not so much between OJR (divided into poly-metric sargas) and the other Kakawins (divided into mono-metric cantos), since that whole borrowed sarga-superstructure, and the feeling for long mono-metric passages proved to be uncongenial to Yogîśwara. It lies more between the first 6 Kakawins and Nāgarakṛtāgama: the difference between meat and minced meat; for that is the appearance of the Nāgarakṛtāgama’s short cantos.

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

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

c) Concerning O.-J. Kakawin.

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