E. Uhlenbeck

The problem of interpolation in the Old Javanese Ramayana kakawin

In: *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 145 (1989), no: 2/3, Leiden, 324-335

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

THE PROBLEM OF INTERPOLATION IN THE OLD JAVANESE RĀMĀYAṆA KAKAWIN

I

The discovery of the existence of a close relationship between Bhatti's Rāvaṇavadha and the anonymous Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* (Bulcke 1950, Hooykaas 1955, 1958) has had important consequences for the problem of interpolation, a problem which has troubled Javanese philology from its earliest beginnings.¹ Comparison of the Javanese *kakawin* with the Bhaṭṭikāvya revealed that stanzas in the past considered to be later insertions are probably intrinsic parts of the Javanese poem, while conversely passages never suspected of not belonging to the original may prove to be the result of later scribal activity.² A reexamination of the criteria by which the presence of interpolated passages in Old Javanese *kakawin* used to be judged was clearly in order. Two of them in which some scholars had put faith, namely 'erotic' content³ and artificiality of formal expression, could no longer be accepted as reliable indications of the presence of interpolations. On the contrary, it appeared — as Aichele had understood many years ago (Aichele 1929) — that elaborate love scenes and complicated patterns of assonance are part and parcel of Javanese *kakawin*, just as much as they are of the Indian *kāvya* literature from which many of these Javanese poems ultimately derive.

However, even if Hooykaas was right in assuming that the primary ground for all suspicion (of interpolation) was the erotic character of these works (Hooykaas 1955:11), there are other touchstones proposed by

¹ For a survey of the literature on the problem of interpolation see Hooykaas 1955:10-12, and also his discussion of the problem in chapter III, Hooykaas 1958.

² One of the most conspicuous cases of misjudgement concerns *sarga* 12, see Hooykaas 1957, Aichele 1958.

³ The attitude of these scholars on this subject is hard to understand for a later generation. See, for instance, Gunning's naive remark that it is difficult for people from the West to fully grasp comparisons and images in which a parallel is drawn between a battle and love-play (Gunning 1903:159, note; see also Poerbatjaraka 1931:VII-VIII).

E.M. UHLENBECK is emeritus professor of Javanese and general linguistics at the University of Leiden. His publications include *De structuur van het Javaanse morpheem*, 1949, and *Studies in Javanese morphology*, 1978. Prof. Uhlenbeck may be contacted at Dr. Kuyperslaan 11, 2215 NE Voorhout, The Netherlands.

Poerbatjaraka and Aichele which have very little to do with erotic content.

Poerbatjaraka, who occupied himself more than anyone else with the problem of interpolation, mentioned in his Rāmāyaṇa articles (1926, 1932), in his Arjunawiwāha edition (1926), and on several other occasions five characteristics of interpolated passages, apart from the two mentioned above. They are the following.

(1) Obscurity, even to the point of uninterpretability (Poerbatjaraka 1931: VII, 1951:206). Poerbatjaraka was not very explicit about this criterion, although it is clear that he attached great importance to it. In his introduction to the edition of Smaradahana (Poerbatjaraka 1931:VII) he speaks of passages only partly understandable because of confused reasoning and a high frequency of meaningless words; and in his Nirartha-Prakrēta edition of 'obscurely reasoned passages, nearly completely incomprehensible, although the words, strangely enough, are clear' (Poerbatjaraka 1951:206). It is true that this characteristic is not only ill-defined, but is also a highly subjective one. Moreover, passages difficult to understand at present may become transparent later, through renewed interpretational efforts or because of a new piece of evidence becoming available. Nevertheless, judgements of obscurity coming from experts such as Poerbatjaraka and Aichele, who spent a lifetime in the study of Javanese *kakawin*, should not be dismissed too lightly. Every reader of the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* will have experienced the fact that the degree of difficulty of the text varies greatly. There are many *sargas*, especially the narrative ones, which can be interpreted with relative ease and with a high degree of certainty, although even these *sargas* sometimes confront us with delicate problems, lexical as well as syntactical, which simply cannot be solved, because of our limited knowledge of the idiom. On the other hand, there are many passages, especially in the final *sargas*, which are notoriously difficult; some of them even seem to defy interpretation altogether. Obscurity, then, is relative. As a more or less objective criterion for interpolation it could perhaps be defined as a sudden and unexpected accumulation of interpretational problems within a given stretch of textual material, which makes such a passage stand out within its textual environment.

(2) Afunctional enumerations of names, for instance of animals or fruits (Poerbatjaraka 1932:183). This criterion gives rise to several questions. What is afunctional? How is this to be determined? Also: are all enumerations suspect in *kakawin*, and if not: how do we find out at what point they become indicative of interpolational activity? Is it a matter of number? If one finds stanzas consisting almost completely of names and trees, as, for instance, in the *sarga* in which Rāma's journey in Laṅka is described, is this an indication of later elaboration?

(3) Recurrence of similar beginnings within a short stretch of the poem (Poerbatjaraka 1926:186). This stylistic characteristic was considered by Poerbatjaraka as more or less decisive. It even seemed to him that with

its help 'all spurious parts of every Old Javanese poem could easily be detected' (Poerbatjaraka 1926:186). However, there is an unhappy discrepancy between the import of this claim and the lack of elaboration of this criterion.

(4) High frequency of duplicated forms (Poerbatjaraka 1924:243, 1926:186). In many Indonesian languages, including Javanese, duplication is a widely used device which plays a lexical, a morphonological, a morphological, and a syntactic role. Without any further specification and without detailed information about the functions of duplication in Old Javanese, this criterion is difficult to apply. Aichele agreed with Poerbatjaraka that frequent occurrence of doubled forms may be indicative of later insertions, but — as he rightly stipulated — only if they do not make sense, and if they are used as a (poor) surrogate for what he calls real alliteration, defined as 'identical or similar-sounding sequences of words which are formed from etymologically different⁴ elements' (Aichele 1929:17-18).

(5) Flaws in patterns of alliteration (Poerbatjaraka 1932:184). This criterion is used by Poerbatjaraka in order to show that stanzas 43-46 of *sarga* 16 of the *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin* are interpolated. Poerbatjaraka followed here essentially the same type of argumentation as Aichele used for the emendation he proposed for stanza 27b of *sarga* 16 (Aichele 1929:18). This criterion rests on the assumption that the original *kakawin* did not show such flaws, and that later scribes apparently were less competent in handling the various *alangkaras* than the poet himself.

Aichele has added to this list two more characteristics, namely the importance of internal inconsistencies in the narrative (Aichele 1967:218-222) and the presence in the text of Balinese loanwords (Aichele 1929:17-18). The problem with the former criterion is that it is difficult to determine what 'the narrative' exactly comprises and what will count as an inconsistency; finally, is it permissible to assume that the *kakawin* in its original form was in all respects consistent? As for the matter of borrowing, there may be simple cases in which this criterion may be applied, for instance when one is dealing with relatively recent *kakawins*. But do we know enough about historical lexical influences on the languages involved to determine in a *kakawin* like the *Rāmāyaṇa* when we are dealing with a Balinese loan?

It is clear that none of the seven criteria can be used, at least at present, as a sufficiently reliable yardstick for identifying interpolated passages in Old Javanese writings. Some of them seem to rest on the questionable assumption that supposedly newly added or reworked passages are necessarily of lower literary value than the original text. This assumption may to a certain extent be tenable for the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Arjunawiwāha*

⁴ What Aichele means by 'etymologically different' would be rendered in present-day linguistic terminology as 'lexically different'.

kakawin - literary works generally recognized as masterpieces of Indonesian literature — but such an assumption cannot be said to hold in general.

This is not to say that those of the proposed characteristics of interpolation which have to do with particularities of grammatical or textual structure are entirely without value. They may be appreciated as the results of first attempts at stylistic analysis — a field which for quite understandable reasons is almost completely unexplored within the study of literary Javanese.

The question remains, however, whether our largely negative assessment of the criteria proposed so far leads to the conclusion that, given the present stage of our knowledge, the quest for interpolations in Old Javanese literature should be abandoned. We are of the opinion that we cannot afford such an attitude, least of all in the case of the *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin*. This *kakawin* is widely considered to be a work of the highest literary art within Indonesian literature (Berg 1928:54, Poerbatjaraka 1940:18, 1952:4, Hooykaas 1955:187). If we accept — as I think we must — the thesis of the Prague Circle (see 'Thèses' 1929:18) that a work of verbal art is a functional structure the elements of which cannot be understood apart from their connection with the structure of the poem as a whole, one cannot forgo an investigation directed towards the discovery of elements foreign to the original, as such foreign elements may prevent us from getting a clear view of our object of research, and this will hamper our understanding and our appreciation of the poem. Moreover, it is very unlikely that the poem as we know it from the manuscripts at present available is still identical with the poem as created some eleven hundred years ago. Even if it should turn out to be true that 'any attempt to decide which passages are later insertions written by another hand risks becoming subjective and unreliable' (Zoetmulder 1974:228), that risk has to be taken. We simply do not have any other choice. Moreover, subjectivity is not to be feared in literary studies. That is not to say that we for a moment expect that we will ever be able to restore the poem to its original form. This would be extremely unrealistic. As we know from other recent inquiries into authenticity (see Bruyn 1982:XIII), our possibilities in this respect are limited. It would be even more unrealistic to believe that application of one single criterion will enable us to separate infallibly the spurious from the genuine. However, convergence of a number of criteria, preferably quite independent ones, may lead to reasonably well founded hypotheses subject to confirmation by future research. There is one basic requirement for such a renewed study of interpolation: a detailed examination of the structure of the poem as a whole, with due attention to formal and semantic characteristics.

II

The simplest form of interpolation one might think of may be represented by the following formula: $A_1 - X - A_2$, in which X stands for the interpolated passage, while A_1 and A_2 stand for the original environment in which X has been inserted, A_1 being the text which immediately precedes the interpolated passage, A_2 the text which immediately follows it. Many cases of interpolation are certainly much more complicated than the case represented by our simple formula, as it presupposes that the interpolated passage has been simply inserted at a certain point in the text without affecting it in any way. Very often an interpolation will entail simultaneous changes either (in one or more places) in A_1 or in A_2 or in both. Sometimes, when such retouches have been made with insufficient skill, it is possible, as Aichele has shown with great acumen⁵, to discover the seams in the fabric where the new has been woven into the old. For the moment, however, we will restrict ourselves to the simpler case where interpolation has taken place apparently without radical changes in the environment. It is this case which presents itself in the third *sarga* of the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin*, where stanzas 53-85 are in all probability later additions. This case will be the subject of the following discussion.

The third *sarga* of the *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin* has been translated twice: first by Kern (Kern 1917:19-29), and many years later by Poerbatjaraka (Poerbatjaraka 1940:17-39). Neither Kern nor Poerbatjaraka gave the impression that they had noticed the heterogeneity of this *sarga*. Thanks to the possibility of consulting the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, Hooykaas, however, was able to observe that nothing in the Sanskrit text corresponds to the content of the thirty-three stanzas in which Rāma delivers a long discourse on the duties and the necessary qualities of a good king, after having persuaded Bharata to return to Ayodhyā and to assume his royal task as Rāma's representative. On the basis of this discrepancy Hooykaas assumed that the passage was a later interpolation.⁶

It cannot be denied that the absence of this *Nītiśāstra* passage in the corresponding canto of the Sanskrit text is an indication that one is dealing with an interpolation, but it does not constitute definite proof.⁷ This is not so much because the correspondence between the two texts is only partial, but mainly because of the nature of the correspondence itself. Without having direct access to the Sanskrit text, it seems possible to conclude on

⁵ In his analysis of the passage in *sarga* 8, in which Sītā gives Hanūmān a jewel as well as a letter to be handed over to Rāma, Aichele tried to prove that stanza 8.205 as well as the corresponding passages in *sarga* 11 are interpolations (Aichele 1967:218-222).

⁶ See Hooykaas 1955:32, where the passage is mentioned under the heading 'Deliberate addition/insertion/interpolation of passages'.

⁷ Notice that the situation is quite different where a clear parallelism is found to exist between the two texts. The fact that *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 11 is parallel with the twelfth *sarga* of its Old Javanese counterpart makes it highly improbable that this *sarga* did not belong to the original text.

the basis of a comparison of the English translation (Leonardi 1972) with the Old Javanese version that the Old Javanese poet used the Bhaṭṭikāvya as a starting-point and a source of inspiration, perhaps also as a sort of aide mémoire, rather than as a text which he set out to render faithfully into another idiom. The Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* is neither a translation nor an adaptation of the Sanskrit text, but first and foremost a largely independent creation of literary art.⁸ Therefore it remains conceivable — in the absence of further evidence — that the third *sarga* was at one time created by the unknown Old Javanese poet as it is in its present form. In order to prove that the thirty-three stanzas were later inserted, evidence beyond the lack of correspondence noted by Hooykaas is needed. This evidence may perhaps in favourable cases be provided by a structural analysis conducted on three levels, namely the levels of linguistic, metrical and narrative structure. By means of the formula $A_1 - X - A_2$ one may specify this in the following way. If X is an interpolated passage, one should be able to show that without X, $A_1 - A_2$ would form a homogeneous whole. That is to say:

1. that the metrical structure of A_1 would fit in with the metrical structure of A_2 ,
2. that the narrative structure of A_1 and A_2 taken together would display no structural gap, and
3. that the text of A_1 is grammatically as well as lexically closely similar to the text of A_2 .

At the same time, analysis of X would have to show:

1. that metrically X differs from A_1 as well as from A_2 ,
2. that the narrative structure resulting from the presence of X damages or even spoils the overall narrative structure, or at least that part of the narrative structure to which A_1 and A_2 belong, and finally
3. that the text of X is grammatically as well as lexically different from A_1 and A_2 .

Only after one has examined X and its environment $A_1 - A_2$ from these three angles can one give at least the beginning of an answer to the question about interpolation.⁹ Such a threefold analysis then can be seen

⁸ Cf. Poerbatjaraka's high opinion of the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* (Poerbatjaraka 1940:18): '... het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa (is) mij gebleken een voortreffelijk werk te zijn. De dichtkunst is hemelhoog vergeleken bij zijn soortgenoten; het verhaal is vloeiend, pakkend, levendig en overzichtelijk; de beschrijvingen zijn aandoenlijk, bevatten zeer vele leringen, die zeer vaak en wel op onverwachte wijze opgesierd worden met een zin, die van groten menschen-, neen zielenkennis getuigt zodat deze 't hart altijd treffend aangrijpt'.

[... I have reached the conclusion that the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa is an excellent work. Poetically it is superior to other *kakawin*. The story is smoothly and attractively told, it is vivid and well arranged. The descriptions are touching, providing many teachings often unexpectedly enhanced with a deeper meaning which always moves the heart because it derives from intensive knowledge of human nature or, better, of the human soul.] See also Uhlenbeck 1975:212.

⁹ See the reasoning of Poerbatjaraka concerning a suspected interpolation in *sarga* 16, which reveals a comparable approach (Poerbatjaraka 1932:183-184).

a final verdict on 'suspect' passages of the poem. As will be shown later on, the case of *sarga* 3 is a nearly perfect one, in the sense that the results of the various investigations converge, so that it becomes difficult not to accept the conclusion that the passage did not belong to the original Javanese text and must have been inserted later.¹⁰

The text of the third *sarga* consists of 86 stanzas. The first fifty-one are all composed in *pr̥thvīṭala*. Then follows one stanza (52) in *mālīṇī*, then four in an unknown metre (53-56), then two in *rucira* (57-58), then three again in an unknown metre (59-61), then eight in *pavitra* (62-69), then eight in *pr̥thvīṭala*, then another eight in *çikharinī*, and finally one in *mālīṇī* (86).

It cannot escape the attention of a careful reader of the Old Javanese text that without stanzas 53-85 the *sarga* would have a metrical structure quite similar to the first two *sargas*, which also have concluding verses in *mālīṇī* and only one metrical change, as the following table shows:

<i>sarga</i> 1	1-60 in: <i>ārya</i>	61-62 in: <i>mālīṇī</i>
<i>sarga</i> 2	1-77 in: <i>vasantatilaka</i>	78 in: <i>mālīṇī</i>
<i>sarga</i> 3	1-51 in: <i>pr̥thvīṭala</i>	52 and 86 in: <i>mālīṇī</i>

From a metrical point of view the first three *sargas* would thus form a homogeneous group which is quite distinct from the fourth *sarga*, which follows a quite different metrical pattern, consisting of an alternation of the two metres *aupacchandāsika* and *vaitālīya*, with concluding verses in *puspitāgra*.

It is clear that the conclusion that *sarga* 3.53-85 is an interpolation would be greatly strengthened if it could be shown that:

1. from the point of view of narration there is no gap between 53 and 86, and

2. from the same point of view the three *sarga* taken together constitute a well defined part of the whole poem.

As regards the first point, it turns out that the two *mālīṇī* verses fit quite well together, as can be seen if one presents them in sequence:

3.52 nahan ikana wuwus sañ Kekayīputra sādhu
dadi sumahur ikā sañ Rāmabhadraṣi maswī
mulihā ata kitāntēn űkā ry Ayodhyā tamolah
yadin alēmēha sewan pādukañkwīki ratwa

¹⁰ It is extremely hazardous to say anything relevant on the question of the time of insertion. That all insertions were made by the same person, as Poerbatjaraka suggested (Poerbatjaraka 1951:204), is very unlikely.

3.86 Atha lumaku mulih sañ Kekayīputra lunhā
tinawanakēnirêkañ pādukātyanta dibya
yata siniwi sinēmbah denikañ wwañ ry Ayodhyā
Bharata sira tamolah bhakti mañrākṣa rājya

3.52 Thus spoke the honest son of Kekayī.
And therefore Rāma again said to him, urgently,
Please do return, younger brother, yonder to Ayodhyā to stay there
If reluctant to be treated as the king, let then this, my footwear, reign.

3.86 Thereupon the son of Kekayī went on his way home,
Taking (Rāma's) most splendid footwear with him.
To this they paid homage, the people of Ayodhyā;
Bharata, he stayed (there), faithfully guarding the kingdom.

As concluding verses these two stanzas function very well. After the preceding discussion between Rāma and Bharata, the former finally orders Bharata to reign in Ayodhyā, but only as his deputy. This sort of compromise proposed by his elder brother can only be accepted by Bharata: he takes leave and sets out to do what he has been ordered to do.

Looking now at the first three *sargas* of the poem together, one finds that the narrative content of these three forms a distinct whole, which stands in marked contrast to the other *sargas*. The first three *sargas* constitute an important and necessary, but preliminary, part of the poem. It forms the introduction to its main theme, leading up to the actual beginning of the central story: Sītā's abduction by Rāwana, followed by Rāma's successful attack on Rāwana's residence, leading to Rāwana's death and the happy reunion of Rāma and Sītā. The first three *sargas* provide all the necessary information about the reason why Rāma, the young hero beloved by his people, cannot return to Ayodhyā as his father's successor. His duty of obedience to his dead father prevents this, and his father had no other choice but to act in accordance with the promise given to his wife Kekayī. The return of Bharata to Ayodhyā effectively ends this introductory part. Attention from now on can be focused on Rāma and all the adventures which are in store for him. Indirectly, the poet seems to remind his audience or the readers of his poem of Kekayī's crucial role in Rāma's exile by twice calling Bharata in the two concluding verses Kekayīputra, a designation for Bharata not occurring elsewhere in the poem, except once in the final, 26th, *sarga*.¹¹

If this interpretation of the function of the first three *sarga* is correct, then

¹¹ Cf. for the same type of reasoning Poerbatjaraka (1932:183) on the suspected interpolation in *sarga* 16.43-46, and Aichele 1967:222, who says: 'Werden nun ... die Strophe 11₃₈ also unmittelbar an 11₂₀ angeschlossen, so erscheint der ursprüngliche Text wieder in lückenloser Klarheit und Anmut'.

the metrical similarity between them is not accidental, but emphasizes their coherence, just as the concluding verses in *mālīnī* in each of the three *sarga* signal an important point of transition in the development of the theme in this introductory part. In the first *sarga*, after sixty *ārya* stanzas, the two *mālīnī* stanzas describe the departure of the young Rāma full of confidence and eager to perform his duty by acting as a protector of *reṣis*. In the second *sarga* the final *mālīnī* stanza informs us about the happy return of Daśaratha and Rāma to Ayodhyā after the formidable Paraśurāma has been humiliated; while in the third the two *mālīnī* stanzas mark the end of the discussion between Bharata and Rāma, with Bharata's return to the capital as Rama's deputy.

Poerbatjaraka has suggested (Poerbatjaraka 1932:182) that the poet of the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* constructed each *sarga* carefully, following as a general principle the Indian tradition that each *sarga* had to have a short final concluding canto consisting of not more than three stanzas. However, Poerbatjaraka did not raise the question of whether there are also significant internal contrasts between the twenty-six *sargas* themselves. I consider it not at all unlikely that to a certain extent the structure of the story is reflected formally in the composition of the poem in groups of *sargas*. If Hooykaas is right (as I think he is) in assuming that the first twenty-seven stanzas of *sarga* 6 originally formed the end of *sarga* 5 (Hooykaas 1955:24), then one would have a case for considering the 4th and the 5th *sarga* (in its augmented form) as the second part of the poem. Metrically this would be signalled by the fact that both *sargas* would then have concluding stanzas in *puspitāgra*. From the point of view of narrative structure they also constitute a closely connected whole, as they contain the story of the adventures of Rāma, Sītā and Lakṣmana in the forest, leading up to Rāwāṇa's abduction of Sītā to Laṅka. Apart from the question of whether further structural articulations may be found in the remaining twenty-one *sargas*, one may observe that all these remaining *sargas*, with the exception of *sarga* 13, are characterized by frequent metrical changes. That *sarga* 13 forms an exception is probably not accidental. A large part of this *sarga* (13.39-97) consists of a long and moving speech by Wibhīsaṇa, the younger brother of Rāwāṇa. Wibhīsaṇa in vain urges Rāwāṇa to realize that he is facing an invincible enemy, and that he would do better to give in. Wibhīsaṇa's long warning comes at a crucially important point in the development of the theme. Rāma is about to launch his final attack on Rāwāṇa's residence, and Wibhīsaṇa's wise and moderate but inevitably unsuccessful plea greatly heightens the dramatic suspense.

Finally, some attention should be given to the language used in the third *sarga* before and after the passage suspected of being a later insertion. Grammatically as well as lexically there is no indication that stanzas 52 and 86 are dissimilar. More cannot be said about such a very limited amount of textual material. However, if one looks into the language used in the first three *sargas*, then one is again struck by the homogeneity of

these three narrative pieces. The syntactic structures are largely the same, their interpretation presents no insurmountable difficulties, and also lexically these *sargas* seem to draw from a single common vocabulary. It is our impression — subjective, but nevertheless very real to us — that the style of the poem in this section is crisp and concise, neither unduly dwelling on unimportant details, nor indulging in those descriptive exuberances so well-known from later *sargas*.

III

It is now time to look into X itself, that is into the thirty-three stanzas which intervene between stanza 52 and stanza 86, in order to see whether the nature of this passage itself provides evidence which corroborates what we have found so far.

Metrically, the passage displays great diversity: no less than six different metres are used, two of them of an unknown type. However, as we have noticed, nearly all the *sarga* after the fifth are composed in many different metres, and there are also unknown metres in three other *sargas*, be it only very few.¹² Therefore, according to our present knowledge of the metrical structure of the *sarga* in the Rāmāyaṇa poem, the fact of diversity in metre, although remarkable, is by itself not a strong argument in favour of interpolation.

From the point of view of narrative structure things are different. One might perhaps argue that *in abstracto* the moment when Rāma tells Bharata to reign over Ayodhyā in his absence is quite appropriate for a discourse on royal conduct in general. However, if one takes into account its position in the whole of the poem, and especially in the introductory part formed by the first three *sarga*, one comes to a different conclusion. First of all, the fact of Bharata's reign as deputy for Rāma is an element in the story of quite subordinate importance. Therefore, to emphasize it by an elaborate treatise on royal duties of no less than thirty-three stanzas would be difficult to justify, especially in a poem which in its introductory part (to which this third *sarga* belongs) is concise and well balanced as to the amount of attention it devotes to the various elements of the narrative.

Secondly, Rāma has not yet acted as king; he is a young prince, and it is not at all to be expected of him that he would instruct Bharata on the rules of royal conduct. In short, the long discourse of *sarga* 3.53-85 gives the impression of being an afunctional delay in the completion of the introductory part of the main theme of the poem.

It is much more difficult to adduce linguistic evidence for interpolation. It is not very surprising that the rather abstract topic of 3.53-3.89, Rāma's good advice about royal conduct to his brother, should lead to the employ-

¹² According to Hooykaas' table these are: *sarga* 9.30-41 and 89-91, *sarga* 10.1-9, *sarga* 20.1-3 and *sarga* 26 final stanza (Hooykaas 1955:45, 48 and 53).

ment of quite a number of imperative forms and to the use of lexical material not found in the preceding or the following stanzas. It is also true that there are stylistic and syntactic differences, but these can easily be explained by the nature of the subject of the passage. One might also point out that in a few places the text is not as transparent as in the remainder of the first three *sargas* (for instance, 3.61 cd). However, it is impossible to make a case on purely linguistic grounds in favour of the hypothesis that the passage was composed by another poet. A detailed analysis of the text leads to no other results than that it contains a few unusual words (such as *kinila-kila* in 37 d), a few unusual forms (such as *linagi-lagin* in 61 c), and two different forms of the imperative (*pahapagēhēn* alongside the regular suffixless form *pahapagēh*), although such *paha-* imperatives with *-ēn* (or *-n* after a vowel) are not completely absent in other texts. But the passage as a whole, taken out of context, seems at least to the writer of this article rather straightforward Old Javanese. Whether its literary quality is such that it also qualifies as part of the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* is extremely difficult for a non-Javanese reader to determine. It is, however, a fact that among the Javanese themselves this piece of political and moral wisdom has always been highly popular, and that Poerbatjaraka himself never voiced any doubt about its authenticity.

IV

Some final remarks ought to be made about the nature of interpolation in Old Javanese texts in general. It is important to realize that *kakawin* are meant to be chanted, and that they are written by a poet who knew that his work would be recited. It is likely that he expected that the person who recited his text would perhaps want to elaborate on it in various directions. In other words, the text possessed a certain flexibility and could assume a somewhat different form in the hands of different performers. Such a point of view implies that interpolations should not be viewed as simply spurious material from which the text should be freed, but rather as possible elaborations on or even as different recreations of a basic text. If this is plausible, it becomes extremely important to pay close attention to the articulation of the poem and to the points where elaboration would seem attractive: Rāma's urgent request to Bharata in 3.53 seems to have been such a point.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichele, W., 1926, 'Die Form der Kawi-dichtung', *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 1.
 —, 1929, 'Grundsätzliches zur Kawi-Interpretation', in: *Feestbundel uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen bij gelegenheid van zijn 150-jarig bestaan 1778-1928* I, pp. 1-21, Weltevreden: Kolff.
 —, 1958, 'Liebe in Laṅka', *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 83:18-34.

The Problem of Interpolation in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin 335

- , 1967, 'Fragmente; Kleine Beiträge zur Interpretation altjavanischer Dichtung', *BKI* 123:217-249.
- Berg, C.C., 1928, *Inleiding tot de Studie van het Oud-Javaansch (Kidung Sundāyana)*, Soerakarta: De Bliksem.
- Bruyn, J., et al., 1982, *A Corpus of Rembrandt Printings I*, The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Bulcke, C., S.J., 1950, *Rāmā-katha*. [Ph.D. Thesis University of Allahabad.]
- Gunning, J.G.H., 1903, 'De dood van Abhimanyu', in: *Album-Kern; Opstellen geschreven ter eere van Dr. H. Kern ... op zijn zeventigsten verjaardag den VI. April MDCCCIII*, pp. 157-160, Leiden: Brill.
- Hooykaas, C., 1955, *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, with special Reference to the Problem of Interpolation in Kakawins*, The Hague: Nijhoff. [VKI 16.]
- , 1957, 'Love in Lēnkā', *BKI* 113: 274-289.
- , 1958, *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, An Exemplary Kakawin as to Form and Content*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co. [Verhandelingen Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie v. Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, 65-1.]
- Juynboll, H.H., 1902, *Kawi-Balinesch-Nederlandsch Glossarium op het Oud-javaansche Rāmāyaṇa*, The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Kern, H., ed., 1900, *Rāmāyaṇa; Oudjavaansch Heldendicht*, The Hague: Nijhoff.
- , 1917, 'Zang I-III van 't Oudjavaansche Rāmāyaṇa in vertaling', *BKI* 73:1-29.
- Leonardi, G.G., 1972, *Bhaṭṭikāvyaṃ; Translation and Notes*, Leiden: Brill. [Dissertation Utrecht.]
- Poerbatjaraka, R.Ng., 1924, 'Aanteekeningen op de Nāgarakrētagama', *BKI* 80: 219-286.
- , 1926, 'Arjunawīwaha; Tekst en vertaling', *BKI* 82:181-305.
- , 1931, *Smaradahana*, Bandoeng: Nix. [Bibliotheca Javanica 3.]
- , 1932, 'Het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa', *TBG* 72:151-214.
- , 1940, 'Vertaling van den derden Sarga van het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyaṇa', in: *Supplement op het Triwindoe-Gedenkboek Mangkoe Nagoro VII*, 17-39, Soerakarta.
- , 1951, 'Nirartha-Prakrēta', *BKI* 107:201-225.
- , 1952, *Kapustakan Djawi*, Djakarta/Amsterdam: Djambatan.
- Robson, S.O., 1972, 'The Kawi Classics in Bali', *BKI* 128:308-326.
- Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague I* (1929), Thèses.
- Uhlenbeck, E.M., 1953, 'Woordverdubbeling in het Javaans', *BKI* 109:52-61.
- , 1975, 'De interpretatie van de Oud-Javaanse Rāmāyaṇa-kakawin', *BKI* 131: 195-213.
- Zoetmulder, P.J., 1974, *Kalangwan*, The Hague: Nijhoff. [Translation Series 16 KITLV.]
- , with the collaboration of S.O. Robson, 1982, *Old Javanese English Dictionary*, 2 vols, The Hague: Nijhoff.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

- BKI* *Bijdragen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, i.e., Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*
- TBG* *Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, i.e., Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*
- VKI* *Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.*