Figures of Repetition (*yamaka*) in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, the *Raghuvamśa*, the Śiwagr̥ha Inscription and the Kakawin *Rāmāyaṇa*

Thomas M. Hunter

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to reopen a discussion of the poetic figures called *yamaka* in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (BK) and their reflection in the KR that goes back to a seminal review of the subject in an essay by Christiaan Hooykaas (1958d) and earlier work by Walther Aichele (1926, 1931b).¹ I will proceed by first reviewing the comments of Hooykaas and Aichele, then turning to more recent studies of *yamaka* in the Sanskrit tradition, and finally looking at instances of *yamaka* in the ninth canto of the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa, the BK, the Śiwagr̥ha inscription of 856 AD and the KR.

Gerow (1971:223–38) has catalogued and commented on the various types of *yamaka* found in the Sanskrit tradition, and given us a good working definition of this figure

[...] in which a part of a verse, specified either as to length or position or both, is repeated within the confines of the same verse, usually in such a way that the meaning of the two readings is different.²

As should be clear from a review of Söhnen's study (1995) to follow there was an evolution of the understanding of *yamaka* in the Sanskrit tradition that began with the simple repetitions (*āmreḍita*) of the Vedic hymns, then moved through

1. All references in this paper are to the KR edition by Soewito Santoso (1980a). However, in a few cases I have made emendations based on metrical or contextual considerations.

2. The sequence *pramadāpramadā*- ('young women, joyless') in BK 10.9 is a typical case of *yamaka*. The initial phrase *pramadā*, 'proud young women' is followed by a repetition of the same phrase, but with a differing interpretation, as *apramadā*, 'without joy'.

several stages to a state where the tendency for the two repeated phrases to differ in meaning became a fixed rule of composition. I will suggest in this paper that the stage of development reflected in *yamaka* of the Old Javanese tradition is that of the BK, a work which is well-known to have served as a model for the KR that was produced at a time when ‘figures of sound’ (*śabdālaṃkāra*) were highly regarded in the Indian tradition.

Walther Aichele on yamaka in the KR and other works of Old Javanese literature

Aichele (1926) was the first Western scholar to note the popularity of alliteration (*anuprāsa*, *anuprāsavat*) and the related ‘figures of repetition’ (*yamaka*) for the poets of ancient Java. He traced this fact to the influence of the BK, which he grouped with works like the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa as a major source of the Javanese development of a tradition of ‘figures of sound’ (*śabdālaṃkāra*) and ‘figures of sense’ (*arthālaṃkāra*) based on Indian models. Hooykaas found Aichele’s remarks of such compelling interest that he translated his article ‘Die Form der Kawi-Dichtung’ (1926) into Dutch (1931b), and based his later study (1958d) of what he termed ‘four-line *yamaka*’ on Aichele’s comments.

Aichele (1926:934) first notes frequent cases of the repetition of syllables (KR 23.11d, 23.12e) and the great frequency of *yamaka* in *sarga* 24, describing ‘the depiction of the curiosities of the miraculously regenerated Langkā empire’ and *sarga* 25, describing ‘the journey home of Rāma with the reclaimed Sītā’. He goes on to call attention to line-initial *yamaka* in KR 16.15 and 26.20, then a large number of ‘end-[line]-placement of the *yamaka*’ that he notes may have been the source of the development of end-rhyme in India (KR 7.21ab; 10.34bcd; 16.30, 16.37–40, 21.144; and 26.20cd).

Moving on to ‘linked *yamaka*’ (*kañci-yamaka*), which he describes as ‘the agreement of the final syllables of a *pāda* with the beginning syllables of the next’, Aichele (1926:934) again notes a large number of examples (KR 2.19; 16.24–29; 24.81–86; 25.113; 26.12–15; 26.21bc).³ These examples include a use of this type of *yamaka* as part of the figure *ekāvalī* in KR 2.19.⁴

3. See note 39 and pp. 46–50 below for further discussion of the term *kañci-yamaka*, with examples. Gerow (1971:229) follows the *Nāṭyaśāstra* in describing this *yamaka* under the term *cakravāla-yamaka*, rather than the term given to this figure in the early commentators on Bhaṭṭi.

4. See Hunter (forthcoming) for a discussion of the translation of this figure from the BK (2.19) into Old Javanese. For a definition of *ekāvalī* see MW (230). Based on the literal meaning of *ekāvalī* (‘a single string of pearls or flowers or beads’) the figure consists of a series of sentences ‘where the subject of each following sentence has some characteristic of the predicate of the preceding one’.

Aichele (1926:935) makes an especially interesting point when he demonstrates the way that a correct understanding of *yamaka* can reveal copying errors that can then be deconstructed by way of *yamaka*. First he corrects *ikomurub* ('that blazed up') of KR 16.24c to *ikomarab* ('that flared up'). Then he shows that KR 16.26–27 can be reconstructed by recognizing in these verses a series of 'linked *yamaka*' (*verschränkte Yamaka*) whose presence has been obscured by later copyists unfamiliar with the figure. Aichele's reconstructions based on the *yamaka* allow us to dispense with the anomalous uses of *amogha* ('it happened that; suddenly') and *ikā* ('that'), replacing them with *aho yateka* ('ah, behold') and *rikā* ('to that') to arrive at a more felicitous reading of the original:

kucur nikañ wway umēlēkah sakeñ watu
wētunya šitala tuwi yālilañ maho
*aho yateka milu maweh panas rikā*⁵
ri kāla niñ priyawirahā tatan matīs (KR 16.26)

The gush of water spouting from stone,
 Emerges coolly, and is moreover pure and clear,
 Ah, behold! That too joins in giving a feeling of heat to him (the sufferer),
 At the time one suffers the pangs of separation (cool water) has no coolness.⁶

While *yamakas* are rarely found in works later than the KR, Aichele (1926:935) has noted that what he terms 'the two-way *yamaka*' was employed as late as the fourteenth century by the learned author of the *Deśawarṇana* (DW), or *Nāgarakṛtāgama*. Noting that this difficult figure '[...] was clearly—and happily—not taken up very enthusiastically by the Kawi poets', Aichele (1926:936) cites DW 97.3 as an illustration of this type of *yamaka* used by a poet (Mpu Prañca) writing nearly six hundred years later than the composition of the KR. In this complex use of the figure *yamaka* the first clause (*mataruñ tuhu wany*) is then repeated in a clause that, in terms of *akṣaras* used, is the mirror image

5. Prior to the corrections Aichele made based on an analysis of *yamaka*, KR 16.26c has been read by Santoso (1980a:396), in agreement with Kern, as: *amogha teka milu maweh panass ikā*.

6. Aichele's translation (1926:935) reads:

Sprühend strömt das Wasser aus dem Fels,
Kühl kommt es heraus, hell und klar.
Aber ach, auch es bringt ihm (nämlich dem nach seiner Sītā sich sehnenenden Rāma) nur
wieder neue brennende Qual.
Denn ist man von der Geliebten getrennt, erscheint es nicht kühl.

of the first ([*prañ*] *nya wahu turuñ tama*):⁷

mataruñ tuhu wany aprañ, prañnya wahu turuñ tama

He clashes truly, daring to give a fight.

His fight is just begun, he is not yet skilled.⁸

Robson (1995:150–1) in his notes on DW 97.1–3 expresses strong displeasure with these verses:

These stanzas are utter doggerel; the Old Javanese is scarcely susceptible of translation into sensible English. This is because in each stanza lines a and b, c and d are the mirror-image of each other, a feat that could only be achieved at the cost of sense.

While Robson may be justified in his complaint against Prapañca we will briefly discuss recent works by Bronner (1999) and Tubb (2003) that suggest that uses of figures like *yamaka* and *śleṣa* (overlaying of two separate meanings in a similar word or phrase) were an essential part of the Sanskrit tradition whose reflections in the Old Javanese tradition deserve a less pejorative reading.

C. Hooykaas on *yamaka* in the BK and KR

In one of several articles written in the period 1955–1958 Hooykaas demonstrated the remarkable resemblances between the BK and KR and claimed the status of ‘exemplary Kakawin’ for the KR, noting that of all works from the corpus of literary creations in the Old Javanese language the KR most clearly incorporates South Asian figures of speech that were the focus of the work of

7. See Minkowski (2004) for a discussion of ‘bidirectional poetry’ in the Sanskrit tradition.

8. The translation here is that of Robson (1995:85). The third and fourth hemistichs of DW 97.3 are also in the form of a ‘two-way *yamaka*’, as are each of the half-verses of DW 97.1–2. DW 97.3cd reads as follows:

masa liṅgara śūnya prih / prihnya śūra galiñ sama

See Pigeaud (1960:75) for the Old Javanese text of this verse. Robson (1995:96) translated these lines as follows:

He would never falter, for the Void he strives,

His striving is heroic, he is fierce in quietude.

Robson understands *gal* of DW 97.3d as perhaps related to Modern Javanese ‘*agal*, “rough, coarse” or [...] Old Javanese *agul-agul*, “fierce, warlike”’; and *sana* as perhaps derived from ‘*sama*, “quietude”’.

early theorists like Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha.⁹ As he notes these were exemplified by the poet Bhaṭṭi in his BK. He called special attention to Bhaṭṭi's treatment of 'figures of sound' (*śabdālaṃkāra*) in BK 10.1–22 and his treatment of 'figures of sense' (*arthālaṃkāra*) in BK 10.22–74, noting that in the first case the exposition of *śabdālaṃkāra* by Bhaṭṭi is not directly mirrored in the thematically corresponding passages of the KR, but is rather dispersed throughout the entire work.¹⁰ Addressing the question of the chronological order of these works Hooykaas (1957:356, 358) noted that a group of early copyists of the BK, whom he aptly termed 'precommentators', added explanatory sub-headings to the figures exemplified in the tenth canto of that work. In doing so they made a number of errors of identification when they assumed that Bhaṭṭi followed the order of presentation of *yamaka* as found in the *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin and *Kāvyālaṃkāra* of Bhāmaha, which were later corrected by the commentator Jayamaṅgala (circa eighth–ninth centuries AD), or still later by Mallinātha (circa 1325–1425 AD).¹¹ Hooykaas concluded from these considerations that Bhaṭṭi was writing prior to the time of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, thus sometime prior to the early seventh century AD.¹² We will return to this point below.

9. Departing somewhat from Hooykaas' description (1955, 1958c) of the KR as 'exemplary', I have claimed elsewhere (Hunter forthcoming) that the KR is 'exemplary' only in the sense of its reflecting most closely the figural tradition of the Kāvya of South Asia, and that it is the *Arjunawiwāha* of Mpu Kaṇwa, composed circa 1035 AD, that is most clearly 'exemplary' for the later tradition of composition in Kakawin form. To this the caveat must be added that the Kakawin composers of the Balinese tradition drew heavily on the poetics of the KR, and in that sense the latter work remained 'exemplary' alongside the *Arjunawiwāha* and its successors. See Creese (1998:133) on the latter point.

10. The thematically corresponding verses for BK 10.1–22 are KR 11.1–7, which are developed in terms of lengthy verses in Daṇḍaka metre that do not directly reflect Bhaṭṭi's exposition of *anuprāsavat* (BK 10.1) and twenty-one forms of *yamaka* (BK 10.2–22). On the other hand not a few of Bhaṭṭi's examples of 'figures of sense' (*arthālaṃkāra*) in BK 10.22–74 are directly reflected in KR 11.9–96. Hooykaas (1957) intended to make a thorough comparison of the figures of KR 11.9–96 to those of Bhaṭṭi, but was not able to accomplish this goal during his lifetime. The same goal remains a desideratum for the present author, and represents a theme that calls out for the attention of the next generation of scholars. That the *arthālaṃkāras* of Bhaṭṭi are developed more generally in the KR, as well as specifically in KR 11.9–96, makes this a more challenging project than it would be had the composers of the KR confined their development of *arthālaṃkāra* to the passages directly reflecting the exposition of Bhaṭṭi.

11. In his *Ekāvalī*, a work on rhetoric, Mallinātha refers to king Vīra-Narasimha who was reigning in 1314 AD, while in another work on rhetoric, titled *Pratāparudriya*, he refers to King Pratāparudra, who reigned 1295–1323 AD. Based on these considerations Kale (1981:xxxix) concludes that 'the date of Mallinātha approximately falls somewhere between 1325 and 1425 A.D'.

12. On the date of Daṇḍin, see Rabe (1997). He uses the autobiographical prologue to the *Avantisundarikathā* as the basis of his estimate of a period between 685–729 AD for Daṇḍin's life.

In his study of the occurrences of *yamaka* in the KR, Hooykaas (1958d) called attention to two aspects of the use of *yamaka* in the text that have a continuing role to play in further studies of the subject. The first of these is his recognition that the various types of *yamaka* exemplified by Bhaṭṭi in BK 10.2–22 were not directly translated into corresponding verses of the KR. He found instead that the poet (or poets) of the Old Javanese text made use of *yamaka* on numerous occasions and that they are thus spread throughout the work.¹³ Perhaps more important still, he also noted a number of points at which numerous *yamaka* are employed in what he termed ‘*yamaka* blocks.’ These are found at the following three points in the KR:

- the depiction of the building of the bridge to Laṅkā (KR 16.1–40)
- the description of the restoration of Laṅkā (KR 24.97–123)
- the description of the return of Rāma and Sītā to Ayodhyā by an aerial chariot (KR 24.253–26.9)

A second important point put forward by Hooykaas (1958d:130–2) is the question of what he termed ‘assonances.’ It appears that in his efforts to demonstrate the large number of *yamaka* to be found in the KR, Hooykaas was led to include passages that may not have been framed so much as *yamaka* as combinations of *yamaka* with effects of alliteration and assonance, the *anuprāsavat* of BK 10.1. For our purposes, what is most interesting about his presentation of these effects of assonance is not so much what they tell us about the relatively free interpretation of phonological constraints on the construction of *yamaka* in the many instances Hooykaas enumerates in the appendix to his article (1958d:136–7) but what they reveal about working methods of the poets and pedagogues of ancient Java.

One type of assonance which Hooykaas describes is based on the pairing of words where a medial or final /k/ can alternate with a medial or final /g/ in sets like *warak/warĕg* (KR 2.26d) and *sāk/sāgara* (KR 24.33a). This suggests that while /k/ and /g/ were phonemic in Old Javanese there was a tendency toward similarity of pronunciation, especially in the final position, where the non-release of the final stop reduces the degree of acoustical difference between voiced and unvoiced velar stops. That the poets of ancient Java appear to accept

13. See Hunter (forthcoming) for a discussion of the possibility that the KR was composed by multiple authors, in this sense comparable to the collective work that went into the *Rāmāyaṇa* reliefs of Caṇḍi Loro Jonggrang.

assonant sets like *warak/warĕg* suggests that they were sensitive to the relatively low degree of acoustical difference between these phonemes of Old Javanese, and incorporated this sensitivity into their construction of *yamaka*. A similar degree of latitude at the phonemic level can be found in works of the Sanskrit tradition, where (as is the case in the extended *yamaka* series of *Raghuvamśa* 9.1–54) *yamakas* apply at the pre-*sandhi* level, and so appear ‘assonant’ in the post-*sandhi* realization of the text.

Another type of assonance studied by Hooykaas in connection with *yamaka* of the KR corresponds to the accommodation of phonemes that are contrastive in Indian phonology to the Old Javanese case, where they are not. These are very telling cases of ‘assonance’ in that they suggest an early understanding of differences between the phonological contrasts of Sanskrit and those of Old Javanese that was later reflected in the development of a system of ‘orthographic mysticism’ in Bali.¹⁴ In the Balinese case the development of a metaphysics of the written sign appears to have grown out of the close attention paid in the priestly tradition to retaining Indian phonological contrasts in orthography that were not reflected in pronunciation, thus preserving in graphemic form the high status language of liturgy (Sanskrit) and thus in a sense recapitulating the Indian concern with correct preservation of the Veda that had given rise to auxiliary sciences (*vedāṅga*) like metrics, phonetics and grammatical analysis.

Hooykaas (1958d:133–4) developed his brief comments on the types of ‘assonance’ that reflect alternations between Indo-European and Austronesian phonological systems in his rules numbered 11 (*t* and *ṭ*), 12 (*d* and *ḍ*), 13 (*n* and *ṇ*), 14 (*p* and *ph*), 15 (*b* and *bh*), 17 (*b/bh* with *w*), 22 (*s* and *ś*), 23 (*ṣ* and *ṣ*) and 24 (*ṣ* and *ś*). A few examples should bring out the fact that these are all contrasts that depend on sensitivity to differing phonological constraints between Sanskrit (an Indo-European language) and Old Javanese (an Austronesian language). We have printed in roman type cases of *yamaka* that result from these differing phonological constraints:

- assonance of Old Javanese /d/ and Sanskrit /dh/:
asiṇ-asiṇa ta sādhyān / dadya tan dadya madwā (KR 6.59d)
- assonance of Old Javanese /b/ and Sanskrit /bh/:
biṣama bhīṣaṇa (KR 3.34bc)

14. See Hunter (2007a) for a study of ‘orthographic mysticism’, Rubinstein (2000) for a study under the term ‘alphabet mysticism’.

In the ‘orthographic sets’ reproduced above we find evidence of a conscious choice around the treatment in Old Javanese of contrastive phonemes of Sanskrit that had no parallel in the Old Javanese phonological system. The decision made by the poets and scholars of ancient Java—and I believe we must count it as a decision—was to retain the contrasts orthographically, but to treat them as non-existent with respect to the production of *yamaka*. In these cases, the *yamaka* of the KR are thus figures that depend not on orthography (or a unity of orthography and pronunciation) but on pronunciation. These were thus ‘figures of reading’ whose enjoyment depended on their sonorous qualities as appreciated in the environment of a public reading of the text, but also referred back to phonological contrasts retained in orthography that bespeak the importance of the written letter in the Javano-Balinese tradition.

Other instances of what Hooykaas regarded as ‘rules of assonance’ evident in the KR can be understood as reflecting matters of morphosyntax that appear to provide evidence of a particular treatment of crucial morphophonemes in the Old Javanese system of voice affixes. A careful examination of the ‘rules’ adduced by Hooykaas suggests that the ancient Javanese poets and theorists were aware of the difference between morphosyntactic markers and the lexical base of their language. This comes out in their treatment of voice affixes like *-um-* and *-in-*, which can be described in terms of what Himmelman (2005:112–3) calls Actor and Undergoer Voice constructions in his study of the typological characteristics of Austronesian languages.¹⁵ Hooykaas describes these under his Rules 25 and 27, in so doing citing several examples that suggest that these morphosyntactic makers were regarded as ‘invisible’ with respect to the formation of *yamaka*. Let us first review his discussion:

- Rule 25 (Hooykaas 1958d:134): assonance that depends on disregard of the Undergoer Voice marker *-in-*

For the purpose of assonance the grammatical infix *-in-* [...] may not be heard and can be overlooked: *piṇḍan piṇaṇḍēm* (xxi.197a); *akuṇ kinuṇkuṇ* (iii.21c), *pinatih patih* (xiv.19); *awurahan/winarahan* (xvi.38cd).¹⁶

15. Himmelman speaks of ‘symmetrical voice’ as a defining characteristic of one of two basic types of western Austronesian languages (the other being ‘preposed possessor languages’). In this type of language ‘[t]he defining characteristic [...] is the presence of at least two voice alternations marked on the verb, neither of which is clearly the basic form’. The two voices correspond with those called Active and Passive in the terminology traditional before the development of linguistic typology as a field of scientific enquiry.

16. There is no doubt that an infix like *-in-* or *-um-* would be ‘heard’ in the recitation of a text; what is crucial is that these affixes were understood as operating at a higher level of linguistic

- Rule 27 (Hooykaas 1958d:134): assonance that depends on disregard of the Actor Voice marker *-um-*

The grammatical infix *-um-* [...]: *agaliñ gumuluñ* (v1.137d); *akēlēm kumēlēm* (v1.138b), *lumumpat*, *analimpētakēn* (v.42d), *tumurun matāku maturū hanēn lēmah* (VIII.159).

While more evidence from the KR supporting Hooykaas' rules 25 and 27 would be useful, *yamaka* sets like *pinatih patih* and *akēlēm kumēlēm* are sufficiently clear to offer convincing evidence that the poets of ancient Java did indeed understand voice-marking affixes as distinct from the lexical base, and therefore could be treated as 'invisible' with respect to the formation of *yamakas*.

In conclusion, the 'rules of assonance' of Hooykaas can be reanalysed in ways that shed light on phonological phenomena within Old Javanese (similarity of voiced and unvoiced final velar stops), between Old Javanese and Sanskrit (sets like *d/ḍ* and *b/bh* that were non-contrastive in Old Javanese) and between differing levels of morphosyntactic arrangement within Old Javanese (the 'invisibility' of voice-markers in the construction of *yamaka* sets).

Some of the *yamaka* adduced by Hooykaas are based on the full or partial reduplication of a lexical base, thus falling within the more primitive category of *āmredita* and arguably not eligible as true *yamaka*, at least in Daṇḍin's system, where a difference in meaning in the repeated phrase is required.¹⁷ At other times, however, the use of reduplicated words is positioned in such a way that we can be sure a *yamaka* is intended. KR 17.127, for example, is a case of what appears to be intended as a *pādādi-yamaka* (*yamaka* occurring at the beginning of each of the four lines of a verse):

madulur-dulur yārapukan asana
mañiduñ-iduñ yācañkrama kasukan
maturu-turū roṇ-ḍon pinaka-tilam
tumēña-teñā riñ candra-wilasita || KR 17.127 ||

Together they arranged flowers in each other's hair,
 Singing together they strolled about happily,

organization than the lexical, and hence could be treated differently with respect to the formation of *yamaka*. We should also note that Hooykaas' examples incorporate other types of 'permissible assonance' in the formation of *yamaka*, for example the equivalence of *-ṇḍan* and *-ṇḍēm* in his first example for Rule 25.

17. A typical example of a simple repetition *āmredita* that in terms of the classical Sanskrit tradition should not be eligible for interpretation as a *yamaka* can be found in the phrase *wināni-wāni* (*metri causa* for *wināni-wāni*) in KR 8.60a, cited by Hooykaas in his discussion of *yamaka*, where the reduplicated form is redundant, both *wāni* and *wināni* meaning 'brave'.

At times they reclined to sleep on sleeping mats made of leaves,
Or looked up again and again at the play of the moonlight.

With this charming example of the ways that the poets of ancient Java developed *yamaka* as a prominent form of figure in the KR we will close this brief review of the work of Hooykaas and move on to a consideration of more recent works dealing with *yamaka* in the Sanskrit tradition.

Renate Söhnen (1995) and Gary Tubb (2003) on yamaka

Söhnen's critical study (1995) of *yamaka* in the Sanskrit tradition represents an important step forward in our understanding of the history of Indian poetics in that she traces the development of systematization in the analysis of *yamaka*. While we can only briefly summarize her work here, it is important to note that she traces a line of development from the *āmreḍita*, or 'simple reductions' of the Vedic hymns, through the exposition of a variety of *yamaka* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata. As she notes, the *yamakas* of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* are presented without any apparent attempt at systematization, and the work of Bhaṭṭi in BK 10.2–22 is thus innovative, in that there is very clear evidence there of a systematization based on the materials of Bharata. She notes, for example, that Bhaṭṭi has based his *sarvayamaka* on Bharata's *caturvyavasita-yamaka* 'where the same *pāda* ['verse-quarter'] is to be read 4 times, each with a different meaning' (Söhnen 1995:498). In a similar vein she notes that Bhaṭṭi's *mahā-yamaka* (repetition of an entire stanza) 'seems to be one logical step further from [Bharata's] *samudga-yamaka* (the repetition of half a stanza)' (Söhnen 1995:498). She further notes that Bhaṭṭi has rearranged the materials of Bharata so that all representatives of what she terms 'end-rhyme' and 'geminate' types of *yamaka* are grouped together.¹⁸

Our understanding of the historical sequence of Bhaṭṭi with respect to Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha is also greatly enhanced by Söhnen's study. As she notes, it was not Bhaṭṭi, but Daṇḍin who first introduced a fundamental distinction between *avyapeta* (contingent) and *vyapeta* (non-contingent) forms of *yamaka*, a theoretical move of great importance that she notes is reflected in the *Agnipurāṇa*, but not in Bhāmaha.¹⁹ Söhnen's study thus supports Hooykaas' conclusion noted above that Bhaṭṭi should be understood as anterior to Daṇḍin

18. See Söhnen (1995:508–9) for a concordance of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and BK. As she notes, a close examination of the list suggests that 'one can hardly maintain any longer that the sequence [introduced by Bhaṭṭi] is due to chance'.

19. The terms 'contingent' and 'non-contingent' here mean that the repeated phrase of a *yamaka* falls immediately after its original ('contingent') or is separated by several other words, phrases

and Bhāmaha, thus falling sometime in the late sixth or early seventh century, well after the time of Kālidāsa and roughly contemporaneous with Bhāravi.²⁰

Another important contribution to the study of *yamaka* has been put forward by Gary Tubb (2003) in a seminar paper titled 'Kāvya with Bells On: *Yamaka* in the *Śiśupālavadha*' that draws immediate attention to the importance of sonorous or musical effects in the composition of figures like *yamaka*. For the present purposes one of the most useful insights to be gained from a review of his work is his analysis of an extended series of *yamaka* in the first fifty-four verses of the ninth canto of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* (Ragh). First of all, we note his comments on the sonorous aspects of this series of *yamakas* (2003:21):

This passage is apparently the model for many of the features connected with the use of *yamaka* in Māgha and in Bhāravi before him, including some things that can be seen in Bhaṭṭi as well, such as the association of *yamaka* with the Drutavilambita metre and with the use of a series of different metres.

[These *yamakas* follow] a very regular and simple scheme, in which the series of sounds composed by the second, third and fourth syllables in the last quarter of each verse is repeated once:

◡ ◡ ◡ - [y] ◡ ◡ - [y] ◡ ◡ - | ◡ |²¹

The regularity of repetitions, verse after verse, allows for the use of the hypnotic possibilities of extended *yamaka* performances.

As Tubb also notes (2003:18), Bhaṭṭi's emphasis on the systematic aspects of *yamaka* means that he cannot 'exemplify effects that depend upon the repeated

or lines ('non-contingent'). The repeated phrase *pramadāpramadā*- ('proud young women [became] devoid of joy') of BK 10.9 (see above, note 2 and below, p. 38) is an example of a 'contingent' *yamaka*, while the phrase *nārīṇām* repeated at the beginning of each of four lines of BK 10.13 (see below, p. 38) is an example of a non-contingent *yamaka*.

20. We should not fail to note that Tubb (2003:19) has problematized Söhnen's account, first by noting that one of the *yamakas* in BK 10.21 may have been borrowed from verse 5.13 of the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi. He concludes:

If we look at literary borrowings within the poetry of the *yamaka* sections, however, there are possible connections not only with Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, but even with Māgha, and the direction of borrowing in each instance is not immediately clear.

I myself find less reason to doubt Söhnen's reconstruction of a chronology that positions Bhaṭṭi prior to Daṇḍin (seenote 12 above for a dating of Daṇḍin in the period 685–729 AD), and certainly to Māgha, whose *Śiśupālavadha* is said to have been inspired by Bhāravi. More caution may be necessary in the case of Bhāravi, whose *terminus ante quem* is provided by Ravikīrti's mention of his fame in the Aihole inscription of 634/35 AD.

21. For this paper I have used the identifying symbol [y] to mark the *yamaka*, which are marked in Tubb's seminar paper by enclosing the *yamaka* in boxes. I have also altered Tubb's original (2003:22) by adding a vertical line following the penultimate division of the metre.

use of a particular variety of *yamaka*. At the same time, an analysis of the interaction of *yamaka*-based groupings of syllables with metrical constraints suggests that Bhaṭṭi was well aware of the sonorous qualities of *yamaka* and could use them to great effect.

To take one example, we note that Bhaṭṭi has chosen Praharṣiṇī metre for his exposition of the line-initial ‘stem-*yamaka*’ of BK 10.13. Here he takes advantage of the three heavy (*guru*) syllables that initiate each line of the metre to strengthen the ‘stem-like’ effect of the *vr̥nta-yamaka*:

nārīṇām apanunudur na dehakhedān
 nārīṇāmala-salilā hiraṇya-vāpyaḥ |
 nārīṇām analāparīta-patra-puṣpān
 nārīṇām abhavad upetya śarma vṛkṣān || BK 10.13 ||²²

- - - [y] ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ - ∪ | - ∪ - | ≈
 - - - [y] ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ - ∪ | - ∪ - | ≈ |
 - - - [y] ∪ ∪ - | ∪ - ∪ | - ∪ - | ≈
 - - - [y] ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ - ∪ | - ∪ - | ≈ ||

When we turn from formal to figural aspects of Bhaṭṭi’s use of *yamaka*, we can also profit from Tubb’s insights. Like Bronner (1999), Tubb is interested in developing a critical understanding of figures like *yamaka* and *śleṣa* that depend either on differing interpretations of repeated phonological sequences (*yamaka*), or the overlay of two differing meanings on identical sequences (*śleṣa*). While the advent of the ‘school of suggestion’ (*dhvani*) appears to have led to a de-emphasis on ‘figures of sound’ (*śabdālaṃkāra*) like *yamaka* in South Asia, *śleṣa* continued to grow in popularity to the extent that entire works might be superimposed one upon the other in Kāvya like the *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* that is the focus of the dissertation work of Bronner (1999).

Tubb focuses his analysis of the literary effects of extended passages of *yamaka* with a study of Kālidāsa’s use of *yamaka* in the ninth canto of his *Raghuvaṃśa* to bring out inherent tensions between Daśaratha’s ordinarily restrained nature and the intoxicating—and ultimately disastrous—effects that the thrill of the hunt has on his career. We can follow Tubb’s lead here to look more closely at how Kālidāsa achieves these juxtapositions through the use of *yamaka*. In the beginning of an extended series of verses containing *yamakas* that focus on the virtues of Daśaratha (9.7 of the sequence Ragh 9.1–54) Kālidāsa hints at what is to follow by portraying Daśaratha as being ‘not carried away’ (*na [...]*

22. See p. 38 below for a translation of this verse.

apāharat) by ‘the pleasures of the hunt’ (*mṛgayābhiratiḥ*), and develops a ‘non-contingent’ (*vyapeta*) *yamaka* that contrasts the ‘striving’ of Daśaratha in the service of his kingdom (*yatamānam*) with the potentially intoxicating effects of the youthful beauty of ‘his beloved’ (*priyatamā*). Near the end of this sequence of verses containing *yamakas*, Kālidāsa more clearly presages the tragic consequences of Daśaratha’s slaying of the son of a sage in a hunting accident. In a verse (9.49) that lays out the reasons he has given to his ministers to ensure their agreement to his setting out for the hunt, Kālidāsa develops a *yamaka* that shifts attention from the positive effects of the act of hunting on the health and strength of the king’s body (*tanum*) via a conjunction of cause or reason (*ataḥ*) to the agreement of his ministers (*anumataḥ*):

paricayaṃ cala-lakṣya-nipātena |
bhaya-ruṣoś ca tad-īṅgita-bodhanam |
śrama-jayāt praguṇām ca karoty asau |
tanum ato ‘numataḥ sacivair yayau || Ragh 9.49 ||²³

Becoming familiar with shooting down a moving-mark, knowledgeable in the subtle gestures that reveal the fearful or ferocious disposition of one’s (prey) and making one’s body full of good qualities through the conquest of fatigue, he set out, having received the consent of his ministers on these grounds.

Returning to the analysis of Tubb we cite here at some length his comments on how Bhaṭṭi achieved similar effects with his use of *yamaka* in BK 10.2–22, and the more general theme of relationship of *yamaka* to *śleṣa*:

Probably the most important difference between *yamaka* and *śleṣa* is that while *śleṣa* may lend itself to treatments of disguised characters because it involves two meanings masquerading as one, *yamaka* is more likely to be used in connection with two identities that are both on public display [...] whether these two identities are simultaneous, as we [...] see in Kālidāsa’s [...] description of Daśaratha, with its exposure of the contrasts and balances in his character, or sequential, as we will see in the fear and destruction brought about by the violence in the battle cantos of Bhāravi and Māgha, and as can be seen in Bhaṭṭi’s description of the effects of the fire in Laṅkā [...]

[Bhaṭṭi] announces the theme of discord in his first *yamaka* verse and, in many of the *yamakas* that follow, the effect is one of the deconstruction of an identity

23. Note that in this verse *yamakas* are assumed to be based on phonological sequences prior to the application of rules of euphony (*sandhi*). This exemplifies the process of basing *yamaka* on the pre-*sandhi* reading of a phrase mentioned above, p. 31.

previously assumed to be stable—a sort of linguistic examination of the reliability of designations:

*na gajā nagajā dayitādayitā
vigataṃ vigataṃ laliṭaṃ laliṭaṃ
pramadāpramadāmahatā mahatām
araṇaṃ maraṇaṃ samayāt samayāt || BK 10.9 ||*

Mountain-born elephants, prized, were not protected;
Flocks of birds vanished; the cherished was tortured'
Young women became joyless, injured by running;
Death without a fight came to the great because of fate.²⁴

We can add here that the same 'unreliability of designations' comes out clearly in the previously analysed verse BK 10.13, where the normally cooling effects of water and shade-trees have been cancelled by the fire raging in Laṅkā:

*nārīṇām apanunudur na dehakhedān
nārīṇāmala-salilā hiranya-vāpyaḥ
nārīṇām analāparīta-patra-puṣpān
nārīṇām abhavad upetya śarma vṛkṣān || BK 10.13 ||²⁵*

Women were not able to ward off the intense heat of their bodies,
With the dried-up pure water of golden wells,
And there was no comfort for those women of the enemy side
who came near to trees whose leaves and flowers had been seized by fire.

Bhaṭṭi also uses *yamaka* to heighten particular aspects of a description. In BK 10.19, for example, he capitalizes on the insistent repetition of a *sarva-yamaka* to bring a veritable crescendo to a description of Hanuman's triumphant return from Laṅkā to suggest that all nature, and even the gods revel in his victory:

*babhau marutvān vi-kṛtaḥ sa-mudro
babhau marutvān vikṛtaḥ sa-mudraḥ
babhau marutvān vikṛtaḥ sa-mudro
babhau marutvān vi-kṛtaḥ sa mudraḥ || BK 10.19 ||*

[Hanuman], son of the wind, who had accomplished many tasks and
who bore [the crest-jewel of Sītā as his] insignia, shone forth,

24. Cited from Tubb (2003:20–1).

25. I have taken the liberty of changing the syntax of the (a) and (b) lines, which should have the extended noun phrase of the (b) line as subject to the verb phrase of the first line, using instead a passive formation using 'with' rather than the usual 'by' of a by-phrase.

[Indra], lord of the gods of wind, along with the *apsaras*, became radiant [on account of Hanuman's victory],
 The ocean broke free from its banks, churned by the gales [roused by Hanuman's flight],
 [Even Vāyu], lord of the winds, joyous [at the arrival of his son], took a slower pace, and became all the more attractive.

As Tubb (2003:21) has suggested, Bhaṭṭi's uses of *yamaka* 'bring out the possibilities available in the device [...] that [were] put to good effect by other poets.' As we will see below, several poets of ancient Java can be counted among those who made effective use of the *yamaka* exemplified by Bhaṭṭi. We cannot yet be certain that Bhaṭṭi was the only Indian author whose uses of *yamaka* influence the poets of ancient Java—indeed we must consider at least Kālidāsa in this respect—but the evidence that he was an important influence is no longer in dispute.

Yamaka in the Śiwagrha inscription of 856 AD

As De Casparis (1956:281) has noted, the metrical inscription of 856 AD is important to students of the Indonesian archipelago for three distinct reasons:

- first, it gives us the first evidence for writing in the Kakawin form, using the Old Javanese language but incorporating metres, figures and tropes of the Sanskrit tradition
- second, it is an important source of information on the history of central Java in the mid-ninth century
- third, it describes in some detail a major temple complex that may well be the Śaivite complex at Caṇḍi Prambanan

I follow here Aichele's claim (1969:142–7) that the description of a 'sanctuary of Shiva' (*śiwālaya*) in this inscription is strongly suggestive of the Śaivite complex of Caṇḍi Prambanan and that both the language of the inscription and a similar description of a *śiwālaya* found in KR 8.43–59, suggest that the KR and the Śiwagrha inscription are products of the same historical period. While De Casparis' interpretation (1956:280–330) of the historical details reflected in the inscription has been largely accepted in the past, there may be reason to doubt his claim that it refers to the dedication of an important temple by Rakai Pikatan, possibly upon his abdication in 856 AD in favour of his son Pu

Kayuwangi, and his simultaneous dedication of a temple whose functions included the apotheosis of his father, Pu Gading. I will not attempt to carry forward an analysis of claims for and against those of De Casparis, but will simply note that the inscription itself speaks of a momentous occasion, one that would quite reasonably be expected to exemplify the kind of rhetorical composition favouring *yamaka* that Tubb has spoken of as being favoured (in this time period) when (royal) identities are on public display.

Recalling Tubb's comments (2003:20) on the use of *yamaka* when 'two identities are on public display' and the crescendo-like effects of sequential *yamaka* in the praise of Hanuman in BK 10.19, there are good reasons to suppose that the author(s) of the Śiwagr̥ha inscription employed *yamaka* for similar effects, seeking through the repetitions of the *yamaka* form to add weight and grandeur to the dedicatory verses for a monument that must have been of great importance to the ruling monarch. That the work of Bhaṭṭi may have served as a model for the composition of this inscription as much as it did for the composition of the KR comes out in the fact that *yamakas* in this inscription are linked with a variety of metres, thus parallel with Bhaṭṭi's practice in BK 10.2–22.

There are serious lacunae in the transcription of De Casparis due to weathering of the stone on which it was engraved, and several lines pose challenges to analysis that to date remain unresolved; however, there are also a good many lines containing *yamaka* that can be understood with reasonable certainty that our interpretation has not gone too far astray. I will review a number of representative lines below:²⁶

a. From verses in Vasantatilaka metre

- 6.b *maṇrakṣa bhūmi ri jawārjawa - -*
 sincere and upright (*arjawa*) he protected the land of Java (*jawa*).
- 10.a *rājñe ta saṇ patih ayat patihākalaṅka*
 the prime minister began to prepare spotlessly pure royal funerary rites for the king.²⁷

26. All translations are my own except where otherwise indicated. In large part my translations are consonant with those of De Casparis (1956).

27. De Casparis (1956:319, note 21) claims that *rājñe* 'is not a Sanskrit dative' but rather represents the Old Javanese-Sanskrit amalgam *ra-ājñā* + locative preposition *i*. However, it is clear that he misunderstood the construction, since it is impossible for the locative preposition (*i*) to precede the main marker of discourse prominence in Old Javanese (*ta*). It appears rather that the Sanskrit *rājñe* is indeed intended here and that the phrase should be read 'for the king'. See Hoff (1998) for a recent discussion of discourse salience in Old Javanese. De Casparis notes that

10.c *merañ ñuni n ñuni-ñuni n samarān thanīwun*

He was ashamed that in the past the battle in Iwung village had been excessive.²⁸

b. From verses in Rajanī metre

15.d *mahayu kuaih ta pānti tinapān tiruan sawaluy*²⁹

beautiful were the many smaller buildings, fitted out as hermitages, proper to be imitated in their turn.³⁰

16.b *nikāṭa bhaṭāra yan tuwuh apūrwwa ri pūrwwa-diśa*

its being close to a deity was the reason for its unprecedented growth, there in the eastern quarter (of the temple yard).³¹

patiha is a derivative of *tiha*, otherwise (and more commonly) spelled *tiwa*; see OJED (2026) s.v. *tiwa*, 'cremation, funerary rites'.

28. It can be argued that *ñuni-ñuni* should be taken in the more usual sense of 'moreover'; however, I believe the context supports my interpretation of this reduplicated form as 'in the past'. As De Casparis notes the inscription partly concerns the gift of 'tax-free' (*sīma*) land to Wantil, who may be presumed to be the official termed *pamēgat* (perhaps: 'ritual surveyor of *sīma* lands') of *Iwung*, a village that presumably had been devastated in a war referred to in the inscription, which De Casparis takes to be the struggle of Rakai Pikatan with Bālaputra which he believed marked the end of Śailendra power in Central Java.

29. The treatment of the Undergoer Voice infix *-in-* in the phrase *tinapan* of 15.d as 'invisible' with respect to the formation of *yamaka* gives us another illustration of Hooykaas' 'Rule 25' discussed earlier in this paper (p. 32). It seems possible as well that the 'complementizing particle' *n/an* was counted among these morphosyntactic elements understood as representing a level of linguistic structure separate from the lexical base, and that sequences including the complementizing particle *n/an* were also treated as 'invisible' with respect to the formation of *yamaka*. Thus the sequence *ñuni n ñuni-ñuni* should be read as a 'contingent' (*avyapeta*) *yamaka*, parallel with the other *yamaka* in this sequence of verses.

30. De Casparis (1956:323, note 57) doubts that small buildings designed to be used by ascetics would be beautiful (*ma-hayu*), but there are many descriptions of beautiful hermitages in the Kakawin. Note that once again the Undergoer Voice marker *-in-* (in the phrase *tinapan*) has been treated as transparent with respect to the formation of the *yamaka*. It need hardly be added that the identical treatment of morphosyntactic markers as 'invisible' in the formation of *yamaka* in both the KR and the Siwagrha inscription strongly supports Aichele's claim (1969) that these two works were products 'of the same workshop'.

31. Referring to a great tree first mentioned in 16.a.

- 16.c *atisaya pārijātaka-tarūpama rū<pa>niyān*³²
extraordinary, comparable to a heavenly-corral-tree, its form.
- 17.d *sa-gupura parhyaṇan agaṇitāṅgana tā pacalān*
the sanctuary had tall, temple-gates (and) countless immobile
(sculptures of) beautiful women³³
- 18a *apa ta paḍanya diwyatama diwyakēnā ya hanā*
what could be its equal in divine splendour? it existed in order
to be deified.³⁴
- 18d *atiśaya taṇ ṇaranya taṇaranya mahātisa ya*
it could only be called extraordinary; that was the sign (that it)
might bring relief.

This final example from the metrical inscription of 856 AD calls for special note. In formal terms it must be counted among the type of *yamaka* Daṇḍin described under the category of *duṣkara*, ‘difficult’. It begins with a ‘non-contingent, verse initial and final’ *yamaka* (*vyapeta, pādādyanta-yamaka*) based on the mirroring of verse-initial *atiśaya* with verse-final [*mah*]ātisa ya. This is followed by a contingent, verse-medial *yamaka* (*avyapeta, pādamadhyā-yamaka*) based on the mirroring of *taṇ ṇaranya* in the following phrase *taṇaranya*. But note that the second half of the line (*taṇaranya [m]ahātisa ya*) represents a redistribution of the elements of the first half, and is thus a type of mirror of the first half

32. There are a number of points that should be clarified here: 1) *atisaya* should read *atiśaya*; 2) <*pa*> represents a reconstruction where there is a lacuna in the text; the reconstruction of De Casparis is perfectly reasonable; 3) the sequence *-niyān* represents a variant on *-niya*, written thus *metri causa* (and fairly commonly) for the more familiar form *-nya*; there are two morphemes spelled *nya* in Old Javanese; one (*nya* II, OJED 1204) represents the dependent form of the third person pronoun, while the other (*nya* I) is explained as a ‘deictic particle: look! see! here!’. It is this form of *nya/niya* that we find here. The addition of *-n* appears to represent the incorporation of a particle *n/an* that often appears as a complementizing morpheme, but sometimes appears simply to be a ligature. See Uhlenbeck (1986:334–41) for a discussion of several particles and clitics in Old Javanese, including *n/an*.

33. *Gupura* is *metri causa*, but is also quite common in this form in the later language; *tā* is a known variant on the negative morpheme *tan*. De Casparis supposes that the phrase *tan (m)a-calān* likely derives from Sanskrit *cala*, ‘moving’ and is part of a compound phrase which includes the prefix *ma-* and suffix *-an*, the *ma-* converting to *pa-* following *-n* of the negative morpheme (or its equivalent), and to be read ‘not moving, immobile’. The slight differences within the presumed *yamaka*-sequences *-gaṇitā-* and *-ganatā-* appear to be acceptable duplets in Old Javanese, as such variants can also be included as *yamaka* in the KR.

34. See De Casparis (1956:325, note 66) for a discussion of *diwyatama* and *diwyakēnā*.

of the verse (*atiśaya tañ nāranya ta*).³⁵ The complexity of the uses of *yamaka* in this verse, and the identical treatment of voice-marking affixes as ‘invisible’ with respect to the formation of *yamaka* in both the Śiwagr̥ha inscription and the KR suggest that both of these works were produced ‘in the same workshop’ and that both were exposed to a high level of learning in Sanskrit, especially in terms of the study of the BK. We are on somewhat less firm ground when we look for the influence of rhetoricians like Daṇḍin on these works. However, considering the widespread popularity of Daṇḍin in mainland Southeast Asia, Tibet and other areas outside of the subcontinent, we are not without cause in entertaining the possibility that Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* was known and studied in the Indonesian archipelago.³⁶

From the selection of examples of *yamaka* in the Śiwagr̥ha inscription enumerated here it seems clear that the composer of this inscription understood *yamaka* as a very special figure indeed. If we consider that the composer of the inscription appears to have been tasked with recording the inception of post-mortem rites for Rakai Pikatan, the deceased elder brother of the reigning king, Rakai Kayuwangi, as well as the description of the dedication of a magnificent temple complex that may have served as the site of apotheosis of Rakai Pikatan, and then consider Tubb’s comments (2003:20–1) on the role of *yamaka* where identities are on public display we can understand why *yamaka* may have seemed the proper poetic vehicle with which to create a literary simulacrum of the splendours of kingship, and its realization in architectural form. That it was specifically *yamaka* that was chosen in this case suggests an orientation toward the poetic norms of the sixth and seventh centuries on the Indian Subcontinent, well before the period when the *rasa* theory of Ānandavardhana and his followers had begun to erode the position of eminence that *śabdālaṃkāra* like figures like *yamaka* enjoyed in the time of Bhaṭṭi, Bhāravi and Māgha. This in turn suggests that a long history of pedagogy and literary praxis of a translocal character lies behind the metrical inscription of 856 AD. No other explanation can account for a state of development in which the conventions of *yamaka*

35. I concur with De Casparis (1956:325, note 70) in reading *tañaran* as *tēñēra*, ‘sign, standard, flag’ and *mahātisa* as a compound based on *tis*, ‘cool’ plus the prefix *maha-*, which is used with adjectives with the sense ‘make-be-*x*’ (where *x* is the quality of the base), and the irrealis suffix *-a*. This would thus mean, ‘that it might bring relief’ (from spiritual pain, as well as the physical heat of the sun).’

36. For studies of the influence of Daṇḍin on the literary traditions of Tibet and Southeast Asia see Hudak (1990), Van der Kuip (1996), Terwiel (1996) and the review of Hudak by Teeuw (1993). Hooykaas (1956, 1957, 1958c) has noted in his conclusions that Daṇḍin was the primary influence in Java in a number of articles.

could be applied in a manner so close to the Indian practice exemplified in the BK, yet with frequent adjustments to the ‘vernacular’ norms of Old Javanese.

Yamaka in the KR

We now turn to the question of the role played by *yamaka* in the poetics of the KR. As Hooykaas has shown *yamakas* are spread all throughout the KR, though rather sparsely in the first ten cantos. Surprisingly, the *yamakas* of BK 10.2–22 are not reflected in the corresponding passages from the KR, but this may be because the poet has chosen to portray the vigorous scene of Hanuman’s burning of Lañkā and return to Mount Mālyawān through the use of extended passages in *daṇḍaka* metres, which lend themselves to vigorous and often virtuoso displays of descriptive power.

Hooykaas has called special attention to three extended passages that make use of *yamaka* in some form in nearly every line. These are the depiction of the building of the bridge to Lañkā in KR 16.1–40, the description of the restoration of Lañkā in KR 24.92–123 and the description of the return of Rāma and Sītā to Ayodhyā by aerial chariot in KR 24.253–26.9. While these extended passages in many ways represent the highest degree of frequency of *yamaka* in the KR there are other somewhat shorter passages that use an extended ‘block’ of *yamaka* verses with what appear to be particular purposes in mind.³⁷ I thus propose here to look closely at several ‘*yamaka* blocks’ that occur prior to KR 24.92 in order to gain some understanding of how *yamaka* may contribute to the larger, thematic structure of the KR. I call attention first to KR 8.155, where a tightly constructed series of *yamaka* is used to heighten the effect of a description of Sītā’s despondency:

kapanānta nora ta kuněṅ [ñ]-iken uněṅ
mananā manah-ku manasar manān lanā
manaranta sañ Madana medi mañlare
mamanah sirāmanasi mañrurah hati || KR 8.155 ||

When will there be an end to it, then, this longing
 My heart is annihilated, wondering aimlessly, crying out without cease,
 The Love God is tormenting me, teasing me, causing biting pain,
 Shooting his arrows he has inflamed and overthrown my heart.

37. For purposes of the present paper I have chosen to avoid a discussion of the *yamaka* passages occurring after KR 24.92, since these have to do with the ‘change of voice’ that Zoetmulder (1974:230) has noted comes into the poem at this point, and which appears to me to represent a sufficiently different aesthetic to require a special treatment.

In formal terms we can speak here of a series of *yamaka* of the ‘verse medial and final’ (*pādamadhyānta-*), ‘verse-medial’ (*pādamadhya-*) and ‘verse-initial and final’ (*pādādimadhya-yamaka*) types. But the greater power of the verse derives not just from its extended use of *yamaka*, but in its insistence on the sequence *mana-* and the ‘painful’ aspect of a series lexical items concealed within verbal predicates based on the Actor Voice prefix *maN-*. These include *sasar*, ‘go astray, wander aimlessly’ (in *manasar*), *anāñ*, ‘wail, whimper’ (in *manāñ*), *saranta*, ‘tormented’ (in *manaranta*), *panah*, ‘arrow’ (in *mamanah*, ‘shoot with arrow’) and *panas*, ‘hot’ (in *mamanasi*, ‘to inflame’). The cumulative effect of these concealments and their concentration within the hypnotically repeated *yamaka*-grouping *mana-* creates a sense of tension and despair that is perfectly suited to this expression of Sītā’s pain and longing.

In the description of the building of the causeway to Laṅkā in the sixteenth canto of the KR a ‘*yamaka* block’ is used for purposes that are reminiscent of uses of *yamaka* in the metrical inscription of 856 AD, the BK or KR 8.155 cited above. In KR 16.2 a series of assonances that in some instances can be said to constitute full *yamaka* are used to suggest the enormous size of the undertaking of the building of the causeway, in this sense reminding us of the use of *yamaka* in the inscription of 856 AD to suggest the grandeur of the sacred sanctuary described there. Note that there are both intra-line *yamakas* and *yamakas* that extend across two lines in this passage and that in some cases they overlap, with the result that the *yamakas* of this passage are as ‘layered’ as any architectural construction.³⁸

tibākēn ikaṇaṇ gunuṇ anuṇ agōṇ ya tomuṅwi sor
tumūt gunuṇ anak[k] anakana ikāṇ umuṅwiṇ ruhur
śilātala subaddha kapwa tinatān tinumpaṇ tinap
ya teka tinibān lēmah ya maratā tumūtaṇ hēnī || KR 16.2 ||

Mountains, each one enormous, were thrown down, taking a position at the base,

While smaller hills were piled up, taking their position as the upper section,

A well-formed stone surface was then arranged, formed in well-organized layers,

That was then overlaid with soil until it became level, with sand joining in as the top layer.

38. The ‘layering’ of *yamakas* in descriptions of architectural features in the metrical inscription of 856 AD and the KR may be more than a coincidence.

After the completion of the construction of the causeway to Laṅkā is described the poet turns attention to the arrival of Rāma and his troupe on Mount Suwela on the island of Laṅkā. This leads into an extended, Kāvya-like description of the beauties to be seen on Mount Suwela. Perhaps not surprisingly, as the description of flowering and fruit trees reaches a crescendo, the poet introduces a meditation on the power of the Love God to bring pain and longing. There can be little doubt that this passage harks back to the *yamaka*-laden description of Sītā's longing in KR 8.155, nor is there much doubt that several passages in this sequence hark back to several of the *yamaka* verses of BK 10.2–22. It must then be more than a coincidence that the entire passage on the power of the Love God (KR 16.24–29) are couched in a series of *kañci-yamaka* (or: *cakravāla-yamaka*) that are not only internal to the verses, but connect each succeeding verse to its predecessor.³⁹ This produces a tightly controlled formal structure that might be read as a meditation on the power of Madana to 'bind' hearts in the same way that a *kañci-yamaka* binds the lines and verses of the poem:

ḍaḍap matōb dalima paḍānēḍēñ kabeh
kaweni tañ mulati ya sañsayeñ apuy
apuy nira-ñ Madana kunēñ [ñ] ikomarab⁴⁰
maran gēsēñ hati nira sañ wiyoga weh || KR 16.24 ||

39. It is important to note here that Aichele (1926:934) followed the system of the early commentators on the BK (and the tradition following upon the BK) in assigning the name *kañci-yamaka* to the concatenation of lines and verses of a sequence through mirroring of the phonological sequences at line-end and line-beginning. This type of *yamaka* was termed *cakravāla-yamaka* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (16.72), and in the *Agnipurāṇa* (343.16). Gerow (1971:228–9) adopts the usage of Bharata for his glossary of Indian figures, and so uses *cakravāla* to describe concatenated lines and verses. He then bases his explanation of *kañci-yamaka* on the usage of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (16.66), *Agnipurāṇa* (343.15) and *Alaṃkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka (3.44):

kañci, 'Conjeeveram' [...] a type of *yamaka* in which the repeated elements are located severally at the beginning and end of each *pāda*, or in the manner of *madhya yamaka* and *ādyanta yamaka*, are the first and last quarters and second and third quarters of each *pāda* [...]

cakravāla, 'circle' [...] a type of *yamaka* in which the last part of each *pāda* is the same as the first part of the following *pāda*.

The implication of Gerow's choices appears to be that he views the version of 'Bhaṭṭi' not as responding to the system of Bhaṭṭi himself, but of the early commentators, who are known to have at times introduced confusing elements into their analysis of the figures of Bhaṭṭi. See also note 2 above.

40. I have used *ikomarab* here rather than *ikomurab* based on Aichele's emendation (1926:935; see above, p. 27).

Daḍap and pomegranate trees with luxuriant foliage were all at the height of their bloom,

Along with *kaweni* [blossoms], to look at them one might think they were aflame,

With the fire of the Love God, then flaring up,

So that the hearts of those separated from their lovers might indeed consumed with fire.

gawe nira-ñ Madana lareñ jagat
jaḡāñayat laras anihāñakēñ panah
panādhya riñ priya-wirahātikātara
tatan wuruñ rucira kataṅga yan kucup || KR 16.25 ||⁴¹

The work of the Love God is to bring pain to the world,

Ever alert [he stands] with his bow outstretched, putting his arrows at the ready,

That are the means of causing excessive pain to those separated from their lovers,

Never failing, formed from buds of *rucira* and *kataṅga* blossoms.

kucur nikañ wway umēlēkah sakeñ watu
wētunya śītala tuwi yālilañ maho
aho yateka milu maweh panas rika
ri kālā niñ priyawirahā tatan matīs || KR 16.26 ||⁴²

The gush of water spouting from stone,

Emerges coolly, and is moreover pure and clear,

Ah, behold! That too joins in giving a feeling of heat to him (the sufferer),

At the time one suffers the pangs of separation (cool water) has no coolness.

atīta sañ wiraha karih niroṣadha
sadharmma lāwan ikana sañ kēneñ unēñ
upāya tan hana kawēnañ maḍōmana
manah kēneñ Madana-śarāgni tīkṣṇa ya || KR 16.27 ||⁴³

41. Observe the apparent lack of *yamaka* at the transition between lines c and d. This might indicate that the received text is corrupt here.

42. See above (p. 27) for Aichele's emendations to KR 16.26c based on his analysis of the *yamaka* of this verse.

43. The sequence *unēñ upaya* in KR 16.27bc suggests the possibility of a scribal error like those corrected in KR 16.26 by Aichele, but I am at a loss to see what the proper sequence might be.

Excessive are the pains of one separated [from a lover], [an illness] for which there is no medicine,

One in nature are they with those who are struck hard by passionate longing,

There is no means that might be capable of quenching the fires,

Of a heart struck hard by the sharp, fiery arrows of the Love God.

nayādi tan papakēṇa teki nirguṇa
guṇāṇliput ya kasakitan ta denya weh
nya weh manah Raghusuta śokamānasa
sasar hiḍḍep nira humēṇēṇ sirāsuwe || KR 16.28 ||

Moral guidance and the like that might be applied have no value in such a case,

[The three] *guṇas* envelop one, their very nature to cause pain,

Thus indeed the heart of the scion of Raghu was deeply grieved,

His life-force went astray and he remained silent for a long time.

Suwela parwwata ramaṇīya uttama
tamāla kamala tamalah rike tēmēṇ
taman nira-ṇ Madana hiḍḍep-ku yānurun
n ururwakēṇ priya-wirahāmaṇun[n] unēṇ || KR 16.29 ||

The Suwela mountain is foremost in attractiveness,

Tender *tamāla* trees blossom there, truly without cease,

I think it must be the garden of the Love God, come down to earth,

To intoxicate those who suffer the pain of separation from their beloved, causing deep feelings of passionate longing.

The poet has at this point not only employed a series of *kañci-yamaka* in this verse to achieve particular aesthetic effects, but also produced a passage that is rich with inter-textuality. The entire passage is highly suggestive of Sītā's lament in KR 8.151–176, and indeed repeats many of the same themes, while KR 16.26, based on the figure of water which cannot bring coolness, is strongly suggestive of BK 10.13, where the golden wells of Laṅkā no longer have the power to cool the burning heat of the bodies of the women of Rāvaṇa's kingdom.

The final series of *yamaka* that I will discuss in the present paper is to be found in KR 24.81–86, in a series of verses once again 'bound' together through a series of *kañci-*, or *cakravāla-yamaka*. Here the purpose of the *yamaka* series is not to enhance the description of strong emotions, but rather to lend the power of a tightly controlled rhetorical structure to the culminating verses of Rāma's instructions to Wibhīṣaṇa on the ethical behaviour befitting a king. This

passage is of special interest because it remains in contemporary Bali among the most well-known and oft-repeated passages from the KR:

prihĕn tĕmĕn dharmma dhumāraṇaṇ sarāt
sarāga saṇ sādhu sireka tūtana
tan artha tan kāma pi donya tan yaśa
ya śakti saṇ sajjana dharmmarākṣaka || KR 24.81 ||

Strive intently for the Dharma that supports the world,
 It is the passion of the holy man that you should follow,
 It is not wealth that should be your aim, neither pleasure nor fame,
 The power of good men depends on their protection of the Dharma.

sakānikaṇ rāt kita yan wĕnaṇ manūt
Manūpadeśa prih atah rumākṣa ya
kṣayā nikaṇ pāpa nahan prayojana
janānurāgādi tuwin kapaṅguha || KR 24.82 ||⁴⁴

You will be the supporting-post of the world if you are able to follow
 The teachings of Manu—it is that which you should strive to protect,
 Sin and evil will be destroyed if you make them your means of accomplishment
 The affection of the people will then be ensured.

guhā pĕtĕn taṇ mada moha kaśmala
malādi yolānya magōṇ mahāwiṣa
wiṣa ta saṇ wruh rikanan juraṇ kali
kalīnan in śāstra suluh nikāprabhā || KR 24.83 ||

Like a dark cave are intoxication, vanity and defilement,
 Impurity and the like are its snake, immense and very poisonous,
 Powerful is the one who understands the straight way of the river chasm,
 The meaning of the sacred texts, the torch that gives light.

prabhā nikaṇ jñāna suśīla dharmma weh⁴⁵
maweh kasiddhyan paḍa mukti nirmmala
malāmilĕt tan pamatuk makin⁴⁶ mariṇ
mariṇ wiśeṣān yaśa siddhatāpasa || KR 24.84 ||

44. Santoso (1980a:630) gives *munuṣadeśa* as the first phrase of KR 24.82b, but Zoetmulder (OJED 1108, s.v. *manūpadeśa*) has noted that this should be emended to *manūpadeśa*.

45. I have emended Santoso's (metrically incorrect) *jñana* to *jñāna*.

46. I have emended Santoso's *makīn* of KR 24.84c to *makīn*, which he notes as the reading of Kern's text, K (1980a:531). *Makīn* is not attested in the OJED and would force us into an unlikely reading based on *akiṇ*, 'dry' (OJED 872).

The brilliant light of discerning wisdom, right behaviour and the Dharma indeed,
 Bring the attainment of spiritual powers, all pure and free [from the fetters of existence],
 Impurity ensnares us, though it doesn't bite—the more it ensnares us, the quieter it becomes,
 So we abandon the supreme state of the merit of perfected asceticism.

The unique feature of the various *kañci-yamakas* in this passage is the way in which each line-final word, or section of a word, provides a cue to the didactic content of the following line. At times the line-final phrase is consonant with what is to follow (*yaśa*, 'fame gained through good works' matched with *ya śakti* 'that is the power [of good men]' in 24.81cd), at times it cues a 'turn-around' in the following line (*rumakṣa ya* 'protect that' matched with *kṣaya*, 'destroyed' of 24.82bc). It is surely this elegant application of the *yamaka* form to a didactic purpose that has helped to ensure that this classic example of the *tutur* ('instructional') aspect of the Kakawin literature has remained a lasting favourite among the Balinese.

Conclusion

I have endeavoured in this chapter to call attention to the development of *yamaka* in the context of the culture of Central Java during the formative era of Javano-Balinese civilization (circa 700–928 AD), a period when the Archipelago was deeply immersed in the larger, transcultural world of the Sanskrit cosmopolis. Through a review of comparative work on *yamaka* in the Indian and Javanese traditions (Aichele 1926; Hooykaas 1958d) and a review of recent work on *yamaka* in the Sanskrit tradition (Söhnen 1995; Tubb 2003), I have laid the basis for further efforts to understand the status and role of *yamaka* in two closely related products of the textual tradition in Old Javanese, the KR and the Śiwagrha inscription of 856 AD.

In addition to demonstrating the degree to which the poets of ancient Java were sensitive to the rhetorical possibilities of the *yamaka*, and expert at employing them for a variety of literary purposes, I have shown that minute details of the exposition of *yamaka* can shed light on matters of literary chronology and the question of local understanding of syntactic form in a tradition that appears not to have developed an explicit tradition of grammatical analysis like that of the subcontinent. The 'invisibility' of voice affixes in the construction of *yamaka* sheds light on both these matters, in the first instance since the 'rules'

on the construction of *yamaka* are identical for both the KR and the Śiwagr̥ha inscription, and in the second instance because of the uniformity of these rules of ‘invisibility’, a fact that can only be related to a consistent form of syntactic analysis that must have been part of the pedagogy and practice in the teaching of Old Javanese, which by the time of the Śiwagr̥ha inscription had clearly been transformed from a language of everyday speech into a vehicle of inscriptional and literary expression with a status equal, or nearly equal, to that of Sanskrit.

It may also be that we can learn something about the state of the Indian practice of poetics during the second-half of the first millennium AD by giving renewed attention to developments in the Archipelago. Our understanding of the function and importance of *yamaka* may be obscured to some degree by a tendency, most notable in Indian studies of poetics, to devalue figures that depend largely on formal, sonorous aspects of the sign in favour of figures that depend on the effects of ‘suggestion’ so highly valued by Ānandavardhana and his followers. An understanding of the importance of *yamaka* in the poetics of the Central Javanese period might thus act as a corrective to this over-emphasis on one side of the familiar equation of ‘sound and meaning’ (*śabdārtha*) and stimulate a reappraisal of the development of figures like *yamaka* as a source of innovation and inspiration that appears to have enjoyed great popularity during the first centuries of the second half of the first millennium AD.

A renewed attention to the study of *yamaka* may also prove beneficial in efforts to understand the complexities of language and diction that are a marked feature of the KR following what Zoetmulder (1974:230) termed a ‘change in voice’ at KR 24.92. It may be that there are consistencies with the use of *yamaka* in earlier sections of this important document that suggest a similar period and locus of authorship, or it may be that we will find differences that are striking enough to suggest a different period and/or locus of authorship for the sections prior to, and following KR 24.92. One thing is certain: the study of *yamaka* in the KR cannot be exhausted in a single study, but rather calls for a continuing attention to this important form of poetic text-building in the ancient traditions of India and Indonesia.