Indic Ornaments on Javanese Shores: Retooling Sanskrit Figures in the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*

YIGAL BRONNER and HELEN CREESE
HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM and UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

The Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin*, the earliest known Javanese literary work, is based on the sixth-century Sanskrit *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. It is an outcome of a careful and thorough project of translation and adaptation that took place at a formative moment in the cultural exchange between South and Southeast Asia. In this essay we explore what it was that the Javanese poets set out to capture when they rendered the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* into Old Javanese, what sort of knowledge and protocols informed their work, in what way the outcome was different from the original, and what the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* can teach us about Bhaṭṭi's poem and the nascent poetics of *kakawin* literature. In particular, we show how Sanskrit figures of speech, or ornaments (*alaṃkāra*) were understood, commented upon, expanded, and reconfigured. A close look at these texts allows us insights into this remarkable moment of cultural exchange.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, a number of scholars have highlighted and mapped cases wherein cosmopolitan cultural models travelled and productively engaged with a variety of local vernaculars. In particular, in the wake of Sheldon Pollock's 2006 *Language of the Gods*, much attention has been paid to Asia-wide processes of literization, philologization, literarization, and finally translation or vernacularization, when local "languages of the place" came into contact with global "languages of the road," such as Sanskrit, Arabic, or Persian.[1] Despite this initial wave of thought-provoking studies, there is still much we need to learn about the process of cultural negotiation between prestigious universal models and evolving local ones, especially in cases that do not exactly replicate Pollock's typical model. One such case is the island of Java, where a flourishing literature that later spread to Bali did not seem to involve, at least at first, the production of a large library of theoretical treatises on grammar and poetics.[2]

In what form did knowledge about cosmopolitan codes arrive on new shores, how was it unloaded, mediated, and decoded, and how did it come to be adopted, adapted, and "owned" by local agents? Such questions, relevant to every case of cosmopolitan vernaculars, are particularly pertinent to Java, with its relative lack of interest in formal poetics (especially in

We started working on this paper in Jerusalem, at the Israel Institute of Advanced Studies, and we would like to thank the Institute and its staff for its amazing hospitality. Thanks also to Whitney Cox, Thomas Hunter, Andrew Ollett, and David Shulman, who commented on earlier drafts, and to the three anonymous readers for their excellent suggestions.

1. Pollock 2006, Ricci 2011.

2. Pollock 2006: 399. There is some textual evidence for an ongoing interest in certain aspects of lexicography, prosody, and poetics that continued until the late Balinese period in treatises such as the *Caṇḍakirana* (Lokesh Chandra 1997, Rubinstein 2000) and grammatical texts such as the *Kārakasaṅgraha* (Schoterman 1981, Radicchi 1996). The development of śāstric traditions in Old Javanese is the focus of Creese and Hunter forthcoming.

the narrow sense of treatises on figuration)—a culture, that is, that offers plenty of *prayoga* (practice) but much less written *śāstra* (theory). Here an important study by Thomas Hunter provides a key insight. For Hunter, the Javanization of Sanskrit literary models comprised two contrasting modes that underpinned the prose and poetic (*kakawin*) traditions respectively.[3] Within this framing, the Javanization of prose works involved a commentary-like process developed initially in religious institutions wherein an original text was taken apart, and each of its constituting elements received exposition, expansion, and a local flavor. This process partly replaced, pedagogically and institutionally, the codified grammars familiar from Sanskrit and other parts of the large world interacting with it. To account for *kakawin* literature, Hunter then posits a second poetic mode of transcreation that drew on the resources of *kāvya* to produce an indigenous literary form.

The purpose of this essay is to peek behind the scenes and deduce the protocols that guided this process and to suggest that, rather than two contrasting modes, the commentarial tradition operated, at least in some cases, in tandem with the poetic mode in the composition of *kakawin* literary works. For this purpose, we provide a microlevel analysis of a selection of verses from a text that is particularly suited to this task: the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* (hereafter OJR).

The OJR is the cornerstone of the *kakawin* literary tradition and of the entire project of poetic interchange between ancient South Asia and the Indonesian archipelago. This text stands near the beginnings of recorded *kakawin* literary history and is the sole survivor from the Early Mataram period (ca. 730–928 CE), which came to an end when the center of political power shifted from Central to East Java.[4] It is also one of the few Old Javanese *kakawin* poems for which a clear Sanskrit source can be identified. This source is Bhaṭṭi's *Rāvaṇavadha* (ca. 600 CE) also known as *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (hereafter BhK), a work that is distinctive in offering, in addition to the story of Rāma's exploits, a comprehensive teaching of grammar and poetics, two of the main building blocks of Sanskrit literary culture. This means that this work, even more than other Sanskrit poems, necessarily anticipated a commentary that would unpack the formal teachings its poet interwove into the narration.[5] Therefore, it may have been of particular interest to Javanese pedagogues and translators. Naturally, it is also of interest to us.

Despite the long history of examining the OJR, the BhK, and their interrelations, there is more that can be said about the specific interaction that took place between and around them. In this essay we offer a new comparison of chapter 10 of the BhK and chapter 11 of the OJR, the two chapters that offer a methodical presentation of figures of speech (Skt. *alaṃkāra*, or "ornaments"). Our main argument is that the Javanization of Sanskrit ornaments was not by chance or random but rather was the result of a careful and studied approach on the part of the OJR poet (or poets) to grapple with the complexities of Sanskrit ornamental principles and to make them his (or their) own.[6]

3. Hunter 2011b: 11–21.

4. For an overview of this historical period in relation to the development of the *kakawin* tradition and the composition of the OJR, see Hooykaas 1955, 1958a, 1958b, Zoetmulder 1974, Saran and Khanna 2004, Worsley 2009, Acri 2010, Acri, Creese, and Griffiths 2011, and Hunter 2014a.

5. As is explicitly noted in the poem's penultimate verse (BhK 22.34: *vyākhyāgamyam idaṃ kāvyam*).

6. The identity of the author of the OJR is unknown, although later traditions ascribe its composition to a certain Yogīśwara on the basis of a reference to "the lord of yogis" in the epilogue of the poem (26.50): "The minds of the learned lord of yogis and of the good man are purified having read it" (*sang yogīśwara śiṣṭa sang sujana śuddha manah ira huwus mace sira*). There are strong arguments to suggest that the OJR was not the work of a single author but, like the contemporaneous architectural monuments of Central Java, Prambanan and Borobodur, represented a longer-term cooperative venture (Hunter 2014a, 2014b). The later chapters, including the epilogue, regarded by

MATERIALS IN THE OJR'S LAB

The understanding of the early analysis of ornaments in Sanskrit is hazy in several ways. First, from the period before 600 CE, we know the names of only a handful of texts, practically all of which have been lost.[7] Second, the earliest extant works are rather uninformative about the framework in which ornaments are to be understood: what defines them, how essential they are, what explains their charm, and how they differ from the related category of "poetic virtues" (*guṇa*) are questions that rarely received attention in this phase. It is likely that much of this discussion took place orally in gatherings of literati (*sabhā*), and it can be said more generally that Sanskrit poetics was slow in becoming an academic discipline, certainly in comparison with other fields.[8]

An important watershed in this early period is Bhāmaha's *Ornaments of Literature* (*Kāvyālaṃkāra*).[9] The author discusses a large set of nearly forty ornaments, far more than the mere handful mentioned in the foundational treatise on dramaturgy, the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, and likely more than in any other forerunner. Bhāmaha, moreover, takes credit for a "law of ornaments" (*alaṃkāravidhi*), namely, that all ornaments entail intensification (*atiśaya*) and hence indirect or nonfactual (*vakra*) expressivity.[10] He goes on to use this criterion to reject some ornaments that he believed lacked it.[11] It is probably in recognition of such achievements that his work became the standard textbook for poets and the standard reference book on poetics for intellectuals from other disciplines.[12]

Indeed, it can be stated more strongly that all the extant works from the early phase of Sanskrit poetics share a very tight kinship with Bhāmaha's *Ornaments*. This is certainly true of Daṇḍin's famous *Mirror of Literature* (*Kāvyādarśa*), in which the author engages in a detailed and conscious response to his predecessor (whom he never names),[13] and the same can be said of the BhK. Bhaṭṭi's tenth chapter offers an illustration of ornaments that is extremely close to Bhāmaha's discussion in selection and order and sometimes even in imagery and vocabulary.[14] In fact, readers of both Bhaṭṭi and Daṇḍin have often read their works along with Bhāmaha's. This is particularly apparent in Jayamaṅgala's commentary on the BhK (date unknown), in which he systematically cites Bhāmaha's definitions for every relevant ornament and shows how they apply to the illustration at hand.[15] It is easy to imagine that these three texts—Bhāmaha's *Ornaments*, Bhaṭṭi's BhK, possibly with a commentary such as Jayamaṅgala's, and Daṇḍin's *Mirror*—travelled together not just in South Asia but

---

earlier generations of scholars as interpolations, may have been the work of other hands (Zoetmulder 1974: 229–30), although the consensus is that these chapters do not date from a significantly later period than the earlier sections. See Hooykaas 1955, Aichele 1969, and Acri 2010: 477.

7. Primarily the *Acyutottara* of Rāmaśarman and a work attributed to one Medhāvirudra.

8. On the moment at which this academic turn did happen under Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (r. 776–807), see Bronner 2016.

9. The work's place of composition is unknown, and the date perhaps falls somewhere in the sixth or early seventh century (for this estimate, see Bronner 2012).

10. KA 5.69, 6.64, 3.58: *svayaṃ paritarkya; avagamya svadhiyā ca kāvyalakṣma; girām alaṃkāravidhiḥ savistaraḥ svayaṃ viniścitya dhiyā mayoditaḥ*. For the necessity of *atiśaya* and *vakra*, see KA 2.84–85.

11. See, for example, KA 2.86–87.

12. See Bronner 2012: 89–90, 95–96.

13. He does, however, nod respectfully to the person who composed the law of colorful language (*vācāṃ vicitramārgāṇāṃ nibabandhuḥ kriyāvidhim*; KĀ 1.9).

14. One unmistakable echo between the two works that has been long recognized concerns poetry's dependency on commentaries (BhK 22.34 and KA 1.20 and 2.20). A more systematic study of KA and BhK 10 is a desideratum.

15. Daṇḍin's earliest known commentators, Ratnaśrījñāna and Vādijaṅghāladeva (both of whom lived in the tenth century), consistently quote Bhāmaha's statements and contrast them with Daṇḍin's (see Bronner 2012: 80–86).

also to Java along with other scholarly treatises (on grammar, prosody, lexicography, astral sciences, dharma, and other subjects) and other works of literature that are represented in the later Old Javanese tradition. In fact, it is impossible to make sense of Bhaṭṭi's poem as a whole and of its tenth chapter more specifically if it is read in isolation, and it is hard to imagine a massive and creative work like the OJR without its author's full mastery of this larger discourse.

Little scholarly evidence has been adduced thus far to explain how or why the *kakawin* genre emerged at this historical moment, but it is clear that the OJR can hardly have arisen spontaneously and must instead belong to a tradition that is far longer and deeper. Indeed, although Bhaṭṭi has long been known as the main influence on the OJR, at least to the end of chapter 16,[16] there are certainly other influences that reflect the broad translocal spectrum of *Rāmāyaṇa* traditions that flourished in mid ninth-century Java.[17] There is a growing body of evidence that the OJR drew on a number of other śāstric and literary sources from both the Sanskrit and the Old Javanese traditions, including written and oral commentaries.

Although the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa* does not appear to have been a direct source for the OJR, echoes of its influence have been traced in certain episodes. From the Prambanan complex temple reliefs we also know that the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa* was independently well known in Java at the time at which the OJR was written. In addition to the BhK and the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa*, however, there is a long list of major Sanskrit works whose footprints can be traced in the OJR and other literary and artistic works from Java. These works may have included the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Manusmṛti*, and verses from Kālidāsa's poetry.[18] Indeed, as Hunter observes, there are a number of shared features between the OJR and the *Lalitavistara*, an early Sanskrit Buddhist work that is copiously illustrated on the second and earlier great architectural monument of Central Java, Borobodur, built ca. 760–850 CE.[19] To this list we can also add the well-attested presence in the Old Javanese and Balinese textual corpus of Kāmaśāstra, legal, and religious traditions.[20] There is also clear evidence in later periods of the influence of specific literary works, such as Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* on the eleventh-century *Arjunawiwāha* and Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa* on the thirteenth-century *Sumanasāntaka*.[21]

In short, there is every reason to believe that the creation of the OJR did not happen in a vacuum, and evidence, both direct and conjectural, suggests that the BhK was read and adapted in the context of a long process wherein the broad Indic cultural package was absorbed, a process that involved a careful selection and a conscious retooling. A close look at OJR 11 reveals a similar picture at the microlevel of the individual poetic devices, again despite the absence of evidence for the existence of formal treatises on the topic in Java. Below we offer a series of case studies for the mediation and translation of Sanskrit figures into Old Javanese.

TAKING NOTES FROM THE OCEAN: NIDARŚANA AND VIRODHA

The two chapters at the heart of this essay, BhK 10 and OJR 11, have many things in common. For one thing, they begin at exactly the same point, with Hanūmān's tail set ablaze,

16. In fact, the correspondence goes well beyond chapter 16, as is shown by Khanna and Saran 1993 and Acri 2010. See also Aichele 1931 and Hooykaas 1958a, 1958b.

17. See Worsley 2009, Acri, Creese, and Griffiths 2011.

18. For the discussion of textual influences see Khanna and Saran 1993, Saran and Khanna 2004: 88–111, and Hunter 2015, and for architectural influences Jordaan 2011 and Levin 2011.

19. Hunter 2014a.

20. See Creese and Bellows 2002, Creese 2009, Acri 2011a, 2011b.

21. See Hunter 2011a, Worsley et al. 2013.

and end at exactly the same point, when the army of the monkeys stands ready to cross the ocean and free Sītā. Of course, in addition to narrating a segment of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, BhK 10 also follows another plan, namely, the presentation of poetic ornaments more or less in the order in which they appear in Bhāmaha's standard textbook. Generally speaking, the OJR follows this program rather closely and thoughtfully, and as we will argue, even significant divergences in this regard are based on well-informed decisions.

Our first test case finds Rāma and his allies on the shores of the ocean, which they have reached several verses earlier. The ocean is described in both poems as teaching the onlookers a lesson. In Bhaṭṭi, the lesson is about the humility needed from those in power, or the constant awareness that power is momentary:

na bhavati mahimā vinā vipatter
avagamayann iva paśyataḥ payodhiḥ |
aviratam abhavat kṣaṇe kṣaṇe 'sau
śikharipṛthuprathitapraśāntavīciḥ || (BhK 10.63)

There is no such thing as greatness
without loss, the ocean imparted,
as it were, to those observing it
ever changing: waves huge as mountains
one moment, the next moment,
lying calm.

This striking verse tells us that the ocean was using its rolling of waves, depicted in the final and highly alliterative metrical foot that consists of one long compound word, to demonstrate, as it were, that every rise must lead to a fall. Jayamaṅgala correctly identifies this as a case of the ornament *nidarśana* (also *nidarśanā*), or "teaching a lesson," and it should be noted that both examples of *nidarśana* in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin are about similar political lessons directed at those in power. Bhāmaha's example consists of a cautionary tale (the sun's setting teaches the wealthy that every rise leads to a fall), whereas Daṇḍin pointedly has both a positive and a negative lesson to offer (the sun's sharing its luster is a good example for those in power, and the moon's impact on darkness is a warning to their foes).[22] Bhaṭṭi's verse can be said to combine both options. He still keeps the notion of rising and falling, but the waves rise and fall in endless succession. Moreover, at this moment in the plot, Rāma is miserable and lonely. The cyclical nature of the ocean's instruction can be seen as at least partly positive or even encouraging. Finally, it should be noted that Bhāmaha explicitly forbids the use of words such as *iva* ("as it were") in *nidarśana*, but Bhaṭṭi allows himself to use it nonetheless.[23]

The OJR keeps very close to Bhaṭṭi, but with significant subtle changes:

hana maḍĕmit salĕngĕnn ikanang ryak
hana ya magöng kadi parwata māwān
pasili-silih nikanang sukaduhka
winarahakĕnya kadi pwa matangguh || (OJR 11.75)

There were waves as slender as arms,
and others as high as tall mountains.

22. KA 3.34, KĀ 2.347–48.

23. KA 3.33. Note that Daṇḍin removes this stipulation from his definition (KĀ 2.346) even though he does not employ *iva* in his examples.

Joy and sorrow follow in turn,
they told him, as if to admonish him.[24]

We lose the alliteration, and the lesson veers from the political to the personal, perhaps because the ocean of the Old Javanese poem is more attuned to Rāma's emotional state.[25] Nevertheless, no key element is lost in translation. First, the distributive duplication *kṣaṇe kṣaṇe* ("one moment, the next moment") is replaced with a Javanese twin, *pasili-silih*, also denoting constant alternation. Second, the causative formation that is found in all the early Sanskrit examples, including Bhaṭṭi's, is significantly reproduced in the Javanese verb *winarahakĕn*, which refers to the act of communicating or imparting. Even "as if" (*kadi*) is carried over, Bhāmaha's stipulation notwithstanding. Most important, the entire conceit of teaching a lesson is perfectly preserved, even though it could have been easily simplified by replacing it with merely likening big waves to joy and small waves to sorrow. In fact, the OJR poet enhances this notion by segueing into the next verse, where Rāma's suffering is highlighted with the word "but" (*ndan*). Rāma is thus singled out, as we shall see, as the one onlooker who has failed to get the reassuring message because his heart was "reaching out to his beloved more and more."

Bhaṭṭi continues:

mṛdubhir api bibheda puṣpabāṇaiś
jalaśiśirair api mārutair dadāha |
raghutanayam anarthapaṇḍito 'sau
na ca madanaḥ kṣatam ātatāna nārciḥ || (BhK 10.64)

Although soft, the flower arrows pierced Rāma.
Although cooled by the water, the wind
was burning him alive. No wound, no flame—
Love is such a master of misfortune.

Rāma fails to heed the ocean's message of solace, and he is entirely devastated, as separated lovers are, by things soft and cool. As Jayamaṅgala explains, this is a case of "antithesis" (*virodha*). In fact, the verse is particularly close to the way in which Bhāmaha defines this ornament. Bhāmaha has two subtypes of antithesis, action with a contradictory attribute and action with a contradictory action, and as Jayamaṅgala shows, both are elegantly packed into this verse. The softness of the flower arrows (attribute) is antithetical to their piercing of Rāma (action), as is the case with the cool wind "burning him alive." But then there is another pair of contradictions that involve actions: the piercing and burning are inconsistent with leaving "no wound" and igniting "no flame," respectively.[26] Bhaṭṭi's verse is thus particularly dense: it not only illustrates both types of Bhāmaha's antithesis in a single stanza but also provides two examples for each. The OJR author clearly understood the double contradiction, but in typical fashion he chose to rearrange the materials and unpack the complex Sanskrit verse by apportioning different aspects of it to three consecutive stanzas:

ndan ika manah nira tan mari monĕng
makin angalah dayitā ya paranya

24. Excerpts from the Old Javanese text of the OJR are from the re-edition of Kern's edition (Kern 1900) by van der Molen (2015). Although our translations from the OJR are inspired by Stuart Robson's new translation (Robson 2015), in order to bring out the similarities to and differences from the BhK text, we have often modified or retranslated individual OJR verses.

25. For a discussion of the links between language and emotion in the last chapter of the OJR, see Becker and Ricci 2008.

26. In Bhaṭṭi, unlike in our translation, the latter effects are expressed through a verbal rather than a nominal construction.

Madana aho wihikann umanah ng wang
priyawirahālara mūrcita denya. || (OJR 11.76)

kusuma panah nira komala yāpĕs
tuwi taya tan panganī hati sūkṣma
kathamapi kāmaturan hati sang śrī
Raghusuta mogha tĕñuhh alah onĕng || (OJR 11.77)

pawana mirir ya malon tuwi mātīs
pinaka apuy nira sang hyang Anangga
atiśaya kādbhuta denya manunwi
hati nira sang wirahālara denya. || (OJR 11.78)

But his yearning was never-ending,
his heart reaching out to his beloved more and more.
Love is a master, his arrows raining down,
stupefying those who suffer the pain of separation.

His flower arrows are soft and powerless—
but without fail they wound the heart invisibly.
Somehow lovesick Rāma's heart
was suddenly shattered, and he was filled with longing.

A cool breeze blew gently,
serving as the flame of the god of Love.
Truly astonishing, it burnt up
his suffering, lonely heart.

The first verse connects this triplet to the example of "teaching a lesson" (*nidarśana*) on which it comments. It shows, as we noted, that Rāma was in too much pain to heed the lesson of the ocean and explains this as the result of Love's unique weaponry. In fact, it seizes and expands on Bhaṭṭi's adjective "master of misfortune" (*anarthapaṇḍita*) to portray the capacity of Love to toy masterfully (*wihikan*) with Rāma's emotions and further highlight his predicament. The Javanese poet thus mediates the *kāvya* convention of the flower arrows and their tormenting power, and by doing so, he helps frame the strange antithetical occurrences of the following two verses, each dedicated thematically to one aspect of Love's paradoxical impacts. In verse 11.77 the flowers' being "soft and powerless" is contrasted with their ability to penetrate, unseen, deep into the heart (*sūkṣma*), leaving the reader to wonder how this seemingly harmless blow can shatter it into pieces "somehow" (*kathamapi*). In verse 11.78 the poet turns to the wind, which blows gently and coolly but acts as the fire of Love, scorching Rama's heart.

In this way, the Javanese poet decodes and recodes Bhaṭṭi on several levels. First, he unpacks the extremely dense Sanskrit verse with four types of contradictions (two relating to flowers, two to the wind) by distributing them into two separate verses (one about flowers, the other about the wind), itself framed by an introductory stanza. Second, he further highlights the contradictory effects of both entities as incredible and unique. In other words, the very presence of an antithesis is specifically and repeatedly marked and commented on by words such as "somehow" (*kathamapi*) and "truly astonishing" (*atiśaya kādbhuta*).[27] But throughout this small section of the poem, it is clear that the OJR poet was aware of the

27. Zoetmulder (1982: 819) indicates that the meaning of *kathamapi* in Javanese is "however," "yet," "nevertheless," or "even." But here the Sanskrit meaning "somehow or other" is indicated even though all the meanings listed by Zoetmulder equally mark a contradiction.

aesthetic essence of *virodha* as Bhaṭṭi understood it, including the subtle distinction between an antithesis of an attribute and an action and between that of two actions.[28] The complex ornamental structure of the Sanskrit *virodha* is thus fully incorporated into Javanese; nothing is lost in translation even as new emphases are potentially added.

EXCHANGES WITH THE MOON: PARIVṚTTI

A few verses later the moon rises, again altering Rāma's fragile emotional state by taking away his diversions and forcing him to think of Sītā's being alone. Bhaṭṭi describes moonrise as a complex give and take:

adhijaladhi tamaḥ kṣipan himāṃśuḥ
paridadṛśe 'tha dṛśāṃ kṛtāvakāśaḥ |
vidadhad iva jagat punaḥ pralīnaṃ
bhavati mahān hi parārtha eva sarvaḥ || (BhK 10.67)

Then, above the ocean, dispelling darkness,
the moon came into sight and gave the eyes a chance,
as if creating the world from oblivion.
What makes one great is caring for others.

The main point here for Jayamaṅgala is that moonrise is described as an exchange between the moon and the world. This, he explains, fits into the figurative model of *parivṛtti*, or reciprocity, wherein an action is phrased as barter: the moon, merely by virtue of its rising, takes darkness away and gives "the eyes a chance." Indeed, closely agreeing with Bhāmaha's stipulation that the ornament of *parivṛtti* be topped off by a more general "citing of another case" (*arthāntaranyāsa*), the verse ends with just such an afterthought about the nature of the selfless one, a statement that indeed echoes Bhāmaha's example.[29] All these elements are carefully preserved and in fact tightened in the OJR version, even though, as we have come to expect, two verses are dedicated to unpacking and presenting the same imagery:

mĕtu ta bhaṭāra Śaśāngka sateja
ring udayaparwata bhāswara rāmya
kadi anumoda tumon sira mopĕk
suluh ikanang daśadeśa ya māwā || (OJR 11. 81)

athawa parārtha kunĕng sira ring rāt
kalĕbur ikang pĕtĕng ardha gĕlāna
ya ta watĕkĕn nira wehĕn anona
prakṛti sang ārya parārtha rikeng rāt || (OJR 11. 82)

The moon rose over the Eastern Mountain,
radiant, shining, charming,
as if feeling for Rāma, seeing him so cast down:
A torch lighting up every corner of the universe.

Or perhaps he cared for all those

28. In verse 11.77, the softness of the flowers (attribute) contradicts their deep penetration (action), and this invisible penetration contradicts the shattering of the heart (both actions). In 11.78, the situation is a bit less clear, but the wind's coolness (attribute) stands in contrast to its flame-like quality (attribute) and its gentle manner of blowing to its burning effect (two actions).

29. Jayamaṅgala ad BhK 10.67, KA 3.41–42.

deeply distressed and engulfed[30] in darkness—
so he drew it back and gave them sight.
What makes one great is caring for others.

The first verse, which sets up the complex interchange in the second, is original and again betrays a special sensitivity to Rāma's emotional state. Like this Javanese moon, the reader is perhaps expected to look at the hero with added sympathy. But it is in verse 11.82 that the real work of the *parivṛtti* is done. It opens by speaking of the moon's generosity more generally, not just toward poor Rāma but also with an eye to the entire suffering world, which the moon illuminates, as in the Sanskrit, precisely because of his selflessness. Only then comes the line that has the two actions that make up the conceit of barter, the drawing back (*watĕkĕn*) of darkness (*pĕtĕng*) and the granting (*wehĕn*) of sight (*anona*). Note how close to each other the two opposed actions are, a fact that makes the figurative exchange much clearer than in Bhaṭṭi, where the actions appear in separate lines and do not literally denote taking (*kṣipan* means "dispel") and giving (*kṛtāvakāśa* literally means "making an opportunity"). This strengthening is a clear indication that the translation of the verse was mediated by an understanding of the figurative processes it entailed. Indeed, the general statement (*arthāntaranyāsa*) that for Bhāmaha and Bhaṭṭi was essential to the ornament of *parivṛtti* is faithfully reproduced in the last line of the Javanese stanza, which closely echoes not only the final words of Bhaṭṭi's parallel verse but also of Bhāmaha's example.

THE OCEAN GETS RICHER: THE CASE OF UDĀTTA/UDĀRA

It is not just the moon that lights up the world when Rāma is so gloomy. Earlier in both poems the ocean produces a similar effect:

pṛthugurumaṇiśuktigarbhabhāsā
glapitarasātalasaṃbhṛtāndhakāram |
upahataraviraśmivṛttim uccaiḥ
pralaghupariplavamānavajrajālaiḥ || (BhK 10.53)

Lit by massive heavy pearls in oyster wombs,
the darkness of the lower world receded.
And above, the sunbeams were disrupted
by floating webs of weightless diamonds.

This amazingly dense Sanskrit verse, technically consisting of only five words, describes the dual action of the ocean's riches in two opposite vectors. The sheen coming from oyster pearls lights up the darkness below, all the way down to the underworld, and the rays emanating from lattices of tiny floating diamonds obstruct even the flow of the sun's rays in heaven. Note how this dual directionality is iconically encoded. The first and last lines are compounds, each depicting one shining element, the heavy pearls and the light gems, and the two middle lines consist of compounds that modify the ocean through its impact on the dark rock bottom and the shining sun, respectively.[31] Almost as a complement to the rich spatial and syntactic effects is the verse's ornament, "richness" (*udātta*, also known as *udāra*), defined, content-wise, as entailing great opulence. Jayamaṅgala notes its presence, and this is a rare case where the medieval commentator Mallinātha agrees with him about the figure at hand.[32]

30. Following Robson (2015: 300), we read *kalĕbur ikang* here *as kalĕbu ikang*.
31. The word "above" (*uccaiḥ*), the only one that is outside this pattern, points forward to the fourth line.
32. Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha ad BhK 10.53.

The OJR, again, unpacks this tight compaction in two verses and adds a unique touch:

hana ta karang ya katon i dalĕm wwai
bahuwidharatnamaṇik ya isinya
atiśayabhāswaramutya ya tan krah
kadi ta ya pawwata ning jaladhi n ton || (OJR 11.64)

hana ta maṇik mahangan ya kumambang
paḍa ya mabāng maṇibajra sateja
jwalita lumöng kĕna ring rawiraśmi
kadi guyu ning jaladhi n tĕka mangling || (OJR 11.65)

You could see the reefs under the water
bearing myriad jewels and gems
and masses of pearls, dazzling bright,
as if they were the ocean's gift.

And there were weightless jewels floating,
red, radiant pearls and diamonds
struck by sunbeams, all aflame,
as if the ocean smiled in welcome.

The most obvious difference from the Sanskrit is, of course, the fact that the two vectors are now apportioned, each to a separate verse. The pearls and their top-down illumination are the topic of 11.64, and the gem lattices and the bottom-up radiance occupy 11.65. Additional unpacking and explanation are found in the replacement of the Sanskrit *rasātala*, literally the netherworld, with the Javanese *karang*, or coral reefs. This makes far more sense: what the ocean gems can and do illuminate is not some subterranean domain but the submarine reefs, where oyster shells are indeed found. But in addition to making more sense of the Sanskrit (if not, we dare say, understanding Bhaṭṭi better than some of his Sanskrit readers), the reefs are a set piece in ocean description in later Old Javanese poetry. There are also interesting changes in 11.65, where, for example, the obstructive effect the gems have on the sun is replaced with the harmony of mutual reflection.

In both verses, moreover, the description is topped off by an *utprekṣā*, an attributive "seeing-as," which is the favorite mode of the OJR author and is a part of an extended set of such figures that carries over to the following verses. Why, we can ask, does the ocean display such riches when Rāma and his allies arrive? The OJR author intuits that it treats them as its guests, and the extended *utprekṣā*, consisting of the effects of both verses, supplies the two key components of showing hospitality in Old Javanese poetry: a gift, which should be a substantial offering, and a smile, which is the lighter part. Suddenly the Sanskrit is seen in an entirely new and even more appealing light, and one wonders how it could have ever been read differently, as not about welcoming guests.

But with all the unpacking and elegant repacking, the author of the OJR again seems keenly aware of the original ornament, consisting of the actual display of wealth, and makes sure to preserve it. Indeed, there is a faint echo in the Javanese not just of the Sanskrit of Bhaṭṭi but also of Bhāmaha. The words of Bhāmaha's definition of *udātta* as a statement "containing different kinds of gems" (*nānāratnaviyuktam*) resonate, as if above the shoulders of Bhaṭṭi, with those of the OJR's "[with] many different kinds of gems and jewels" (*bahuwidharatnamaṇik*).[33] Note also that this phrase in Javanese is really a long Sanskrit

33. KA 3.12.

compound in itself, and that as such, it is a marker of the literary culture from which the rich gift of ornaments has arrived.

There is more richness to follow. Here is Bhaṭṭi's immediately following verse, still describing the ocean as displaying wealth:

samucitajalaṃ vivardhamānair
amalasaritsalilair vibhāvarīṣu |
sphuṭam avagamayantam ūḍhavārīn
śaśadhararatnamayān mahendrasānūn || (BhK 10.54)

With surging waters from spotless streams
it welled up at night, thus clearly revealing
Mahendra's all-flowing peaks
to be nothing but moonstones.

At night, when the moon is out, the sea level rises. But this is described here not as the result of an ordinary tide but rather as the moon's transformation of the moonstones that form Mount Mahendra's peaks. In Sanskrit poetry, when moonbeams touch moonstones, the latter begin to melt and become a pure watery fluid. The point of the verse is thus to suggest the immense quantity of such precious stones by ascribing the tide to the flood of water from melting stones gushing down from the mountain. For Jayamaṅgala, this is a second example of *udāra*, and we can see why he thought that the verse's aesthetic effect is primarily tied to the image of great wealth, although, technically speaking, Mallinātha has a point in labelling it an "equal mixture" (*saṃkara*) of intensification (*atiśayokti*) and richness (*udātta*).[34]

Now take a look at the following two verses from the OJR:

hana ta gunung ri tĕngah nikanang wwai
pinakawatunya maṇik śaśikānta
wuhaya ulā ya umunggw i guhānya
kadi kumĕmit tikanang maṇiratna || (OJR 11.66)

hyu pĕñu kakap kaḍiwas hana banglus
himi-himi tan papasah saparanya
kadi ta ya medi ri sirang Raghuputra
hati nira mogha katangguhan onĕng || (OJR 11.67)

A mountain rose up in the middle of the ocean:
its rocks were the gems beloved of the moon.
Crocodiles and snakes dwelt in its caves,
as if to protect its hoard of pearls.

There were sharks, turtles, *kakap*, *kaḍiwas*, and *banglus* fish,
and the inseparable pairs of *himi-himi* crabs,
who seemed to tease Rama
so that the burden of his heart's longing
felt lighter.

In the first of these two verses, the author is again keenly aware of the need to preserve the *udāra*/*udātta* of the Sanskrit by emphasizing the plethora of gems (*maṇik śaśikānta*, *maṇiratna*) that are found on or that actually constitute the mountain. However, the suggestion

34. Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha ad BhK 10.54.

that water rises as a result of the melting of moonstones is removed.[35] Instead, the poet turns to his favourite mode of intensification, *utprekṣā*. Here the crocodiles and snakes of the mountain, which recur in 11.71 (parallel to Bhaṭṭi 10.60), are prefigured, and to them is attributed the intention of protecting the unimaginable riches of the mountain. We thus see the dual vectors of simplification and complication in action. On the one hand, Bhaṭṭi's tight construction that insinuates a causal relationship between the mountain's constitution and the ocean's tide is passed over. On the other hand, a series of local Javanese species is inserted, the *utprekṣā* mode is introduced, and sensitivity to what goes on inside Rāma's heart (*hati*) is highlighted. All these tendencies are exemplified by the *himi-himi* crabs, local to Indonesian waters and quintessentially embodying inseparable lovers in Old Javanese poetic convention. Their ever-amusing mating dance is as if intended to put a momentary end to Rāma's suffering and perhaps also promises his union with his own lover.

OCEAN, TREES, FLOWERS, FLOWERBEDS: DĪPAKA AS A CHAIN REACTION

Here is another example from earlier in the narrative. Hanūmān is just returning from his mission, and his powerful approach triggers a whole sequence of events that culminates in the lovemaking of couples from a much higher order:

gacchan sa vārīṇy akirat payodheḥ
kūlasthitāṃs tāni tarūn adhunvan |
puṣpāstarāṃs te 'ṅgasukhān atanvan
tān kinnarā manmathino 'dhyatiṣṭhan || (BhK 10.23)

Flying, he stirred up the ocean's waters.
They rocked the trees on the shore.
These laid inviting carpets of flowers—soft beds
on which divine couples lay to make love.

The couples in question are *kinnara*s, mythical musicians that roam the world, usually in amorous couples. Jayamaṅgala classifies this verse as a case of illumination (*dīpaka*). *Dīpaka* is when one element, situated either in the beginning, middle, or end of a verse, is elliptically construed with the remaining portions, which is why it is compared to a lamp that throws light beyond its immediate location. However, in the early texts of the Sanskrit poetic tradition, "initial illumination" (*ādidīpaka*) was typically conceived of as a chain reaction set off by an element mentioned only in the beginning and referred back to by means of pronouns, a connection explicitly noted by Daṇḍin.[36] Later tradition moved away from this view of *ādidīpaka* as a chain, which is why the medieval commentator Mallinātha had an entirely different classification for Bhaṭṭi's verse just quoted, and why modern scholars find it a problematic example.[37] Jayamaṅgala, however, correctly identifies the type of "illumination" involved as per Bhāmaha's stipulations,[38] and as we have come to predict, the OJR poet stays close to this early notion of *ādidīpaka*:

35. The convention of moonstones as melting when they are touched by moonlight is found in other parts of the OJR. See, for example, 8.95 and 12.25.

36. KĀ 2.108; See also KA 2.27.

37. Mallinātha ad BhK 10.23, Fallon 2009: 496.

38. Jayamaṅgala ad BhK 10.23, KA 2.27. Note, however, that Jayamaṅgala goes on to state that there are two kinds of *ādidīpaka*, and he supplies an illustration for the second kind (which is absent from both Bhāmaha and Bhaṭṭi).

meh prāptā sang Hanūmān pracalita ikanang ryak magöng kapwa mombak
kontal tĕmpuh ta pāng ning kayu ri tĕpi rurū rāmya kĕmbangnya saśrī
lumrā ring bhūtalātap mṛdu kadi ta tilām komalā rūmnya mār mrik
darpekang kinnarācumbana tĕka maguling ring sĕkar ngkā n tĕkānglih || (OJR 11.8)

As Hanūmān approached, its swelling waves trembled and rose up.
These crested and crashed on the branches of trees by the shore,
whose glorious flowers fell sweetly down,
spread over on the ground, layer upon tender layer—
a soft bed spreading fragrance everywhere—
where passionate divine couples made love,
until, exhausted, they fell asleep among the blossoms.

Here the chain begins with Hanūmān's passage through the air. It has the waves (*ryak*) crest (*mombak*) and crash down on (*kontal tĕmpuh*) the branches (*pāng*) and make the flowers (*kĕmbangnya*) fall sweetly down (*rurū*), spread over the ground (*lumrā*), pile up (*atap*), and emit a delightful fragrance (*mār mrik*) so that the passionate divine couples lie down there (*maguling*) to make love (*acumbana*) until they fall asleep (*anglih*). As can be seen, this is a much-expanded version of the same sequence of events, set off by the same causes and leading to very similar results, although in more loving detail. And as in all the examples we have looked at so far, here too the Javanese poet is keenly aware of the form and the essence of the ornament as it was understood by Bhaṭṭi (and explained by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin) and is cautious not to disrupt them; if even one of the elements in the chain had been repeated, the elliptical effect of this ornament would have been lost.

RĀMA, LAKṢMAṆA, SUGRĪVA: ATIŚAYOKTI AND THE CHAIN OF COMMAND

Let us turn from a chain of reactions to a chain of command:

atha lakṣmaṇatulyarūpaveśaṃ
gamanādeśavinirgatāgrahastam |
kapayo 'nuyayuḥ sametya rāmaṃ
natasugrīvagṛhītasādarājñam || (BhK 10.43)

Then Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa's like in garb
and in form, pointed his finger ahead,
his command. Devout Sugrīva bowed down,
and the monkeys followed en masse.

At first blush, there is nothing special about this verse. The narrative advances in a way that is certainly sensitive to subtle signs: Rāma gives his command to go to war speechlessly, with a simple bodily gesture,[39] and this silent order goes down the chain of command, from Rāma to Sugrīva and from the latter to his fellow monkeys. Beyond this, however, no ornament forces itself on our attention. Still, the commentator Jayamaṅgala identifies an *atiśayokti*, or "intensification," on the basis of an otherwise unremarkable phrase, namely, that Rāma was "Lakṣmaṇa's like in garb and in form." This, he explains, is because a statement that the two brothers are identical to the point of indistinguishability (*na tu pratyakṣapramāṇaparicchedya*) transgresses the boundaries of possibility in the world

39. For a similar gesture in Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*, see McCrea 2014: 131.

(*lokātikrāntavacanam*), for "surely there was some difference between the two" (*avaśyaṃ ca kaścid viśeṣo 'sti*).[40]

At first, this seems like a strange observation. But as is often the case with Jayamaṅgala, once you start thinking about his identification of ornaments, you begin to realize his point. In this case, there are two factors in his interpretation that are worthy of consideration. First, it reminds us of the theme that runs through many examples of *atiśayokti* in Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, and the later adaptations of Daṇḍin's work, namely, that an entity is described as distinctive precisely because it becomes indistinguishable. For Bhāmaha, this is the dita tree, whose blossom is so bright that it becomes invisible in moonlight; for Daṇḍin, it is the fair and brightly clad women who can remain undetected while making their way to their lovers on a moonlit night; and in a verse from the Kannada *Kavirājamārga*, it is a huge elephant covered with vermilion that becomes inconspicuous during twilight.[41] Second, and equally important, Jayamaṅgala calls attention to a part of the verse that otherwise makes little sense. Why are we told that the two brothers looked alike, and how is this related to the silent chain of command from Rāma to the monkeys?[42] As we can see, the Javanese poet was well aware of this aspect of the verse and its ornamental effect:

mulat sire sang taruṇārya Lakṣmaṇa
ikāng abhiprāya makon umangkata
kapīndra Sugrīwa wĕruh ring inggita
r atagg ikang wre sahananya mangkata || (OJR 11.49)

He looked at noble young Lakṣmaṇa
with the intention of giving the order to depart.
Monkey King Sugrīwa read the signal
and summoned them all to set out.[43]

Once again, all is not as it seems: the similar garb is lost in translation, but the OJR poet understands that this verse is about more than giving an order to depart. Rather, something about the symmetry between the two brothers is key to the aesthetic effect, and it is this symmetry that the adapter seeks to heighten or improve, which is the very idea of *atiśaya*. What we see in the new verse is that the chain of command actually goes through Lakṣmaṇa, or rather that there is a simultaneity of gazes and, indeed, a heightened indistinguishability in the sense that, visually speaking, Rāma is no longer distinguished from his brother by raising his finger, as he does in the Sanskrit. In fact, the need for marked physical gestures is no longer felt. It is enough for Sugrīwa to intercept midway the unspoken interchange between the two brothers and to act on the order before it is uttered. In effect, the Javanese poem thus participates in a complex hall of mirrors that includes Bhāmaha, Bhaṭṭi, Daṇḍin's *Mirror* along with its many adaptations, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its many reflections, and it improves on the original, so that you could say that the younger brother, in this case the Javanese literary tradition, looks right back with no inferiority at his elder brother (or source) as a distinctive equal.

40. Jayamaṅgala ad BhK 10.43. At this point he quotes, as he does routinely, Bhāmaha's definition of this ornament (KA 2.81).

41. KA 2.82; KĀ 2.213; KRM 3.92.

42. In an earlier verse in the chapter, the two brothers are already described as alike in every physical and mental aspect. There this is used as a first step in a simile that compares them to the mythical pair of Nara and Nārāyaṇa (BhK 10.31). Here, however, the poet emphasizes only a close affinity between the two.

43. The translation is adapted from Robson 2015: 287–88.

We find support for our understanding of Lakṣmaṇa's new role in the OJR elsewhere in the poem. Consider, for example, the end of the first chapter, when Rāma and his younger brother set out for the forest at the behest of Wiśwāmitra. In Bhaṭṭi's poem we are told that "bold Lakṣmaṇa, son of three mothers, who mastered all arrows and armaments, became his companion, because he cared deeply only about what was best for Rāma." Rāma himself is described in the first half of this verse as "ready to set out to the sacred forest, eager for victory, his face all bright."[44] In the OJR two verses replace the single Sanskrit stanza, as is often the case, but significantly, they are all about Lakṣmaṇa:

sang Lakṣmaṇa sira dibya
sira samasukhaduhka mwang sang Rāma
rumakĕt citta nira lanā
dadi ta sira tumūt mareng patapan || (OJR 1.59)

sira magawe pratiwimba
tulada nikang wwang ulah nirār paniwi
sakwan sang Rāma tumūt
tar dadi kantun asing saparan || (OJR 1.60)

Lakṣmaṇa the excellent
shared weal and woe with Rāma—
his thoughts were always with him,
so with him, he went to the hermitage.

He thus set an example—
let people imitate the way he served.
Everywhere he followed Rāma,
inseparable wherever they went.[45]

Note that, as in the verse we discussed earlier (OJR 11.49), the emphasis is on the total symmetry between the two brothers. Lakṣmaṇa is explicitly said to be equal in "weal and woe" (*samasukhaduhka*) with Rāma. This is an interesting choice of phrase because in Sanskrit the compound often refers to a person who is serene and composed and in whose eyes pleasure and pain are equal. Here, however, this compound is used to depict Lakṣmaṇa as a person who shares the entire range of his brother's emotional experience: in addition to partaking in his elder's ups and downs, his thoughts are always with him, and so is his body, so that the two are "never parted." Moreover, it is in this capacity as a mirror image (note the term *pratiwimba*) that is never detached from its source that Lakṣmaṇa is singled out as the one model that people should follow, now in the voice of the author speaking directly to the readers at the close of the chapter (just before the meter switches for the last two stanzas). So although the *Rāmāyaṇa* is about Rāma, the quintessential ideal character, the readers, at least in Java, are directed to a more accessible ideal—the devoted companion whom they, in turn, can follow. In other words, they should themselves mirror Rāma's mirror image, for only by doing so can they approximate the example that Rāma sets. Again, there are metapoetic implications for positioning the younger brother, perhaps standing for the younger tradition, in this prominent intermediate position vis-à-vis the senior role model. Indeed, we will see

44. *prayāsyataḥ puṇyavanāya jiṣṇo rāmasya rociṣṇumukhasya dhṛṣṇuḥ* | *traimāturaḥ kṛtsnajitāstraśastraḥ sadhryaṅ rataḥ śreyasi lakṣmaṇo' bhūt* || (BhK 1.25).

45. The translation is adapted from Robson 2015: 43.

in the following section that like chapter 1, chapter 11 also ends by giving Lakṣmaṇa the final word.

A YOUNGER BROTHER'S WISDOM: THE CASE OF NIPUṆA

Bhaṭṭi concludes the chapter with a short speech delivered to Rāma by his younger brother Lakṣmaṇa. Standing on the shores of the ocean and faced with the moonrise, Rāma is confused and overwhelmed by his longing for Sītā. Lakṣmaṇa urges his older brother to wait no longer and attack his enemies immediately, noting that great men fall hardest if they are inattentive or negligent (*pramādī*; 10.72–73). He then concludes his short oration with further prodding that is followed by an apology:

boddhavyaṃ kim iva hi yat tvayā na buddhaṃ
kiṃ vā te nimiṣitam apy abuddhipūrvam ǀ
labdhātmā tava sukṛtair aniṣṭaśaṅkī
snehaugho ghaṭayati māṃ tathāpi vaktum ǁ (BhK 10.74)

What is there to know that you don't already know?
Even the flicker of your eye is knowing.
Still, this flood of affection has taken on a life of its own,
thanks to past good deeds, and fearing for you,
impels me to speak.

What is the ornament in this verse? By this point Bhāmaha's list of ornaments, which Bhaṭṭi has been following rather faithfully, has basically exhausted itself.[46] Lakṣmaṇa praises Rāma's omniscience and explains his need to speak nonetheless by being impelled by his great "flood of affection." Mallinātha takes this great show of emotions as the key for identifying the ornament as *preyas* (affection or joy) as Daṇḍin has defined it, and he even quotes Daṇḍin's definition to corroborate his point.[47] There is also the trope of affection being reborn, as it were, perhaps because of its own past deeds, if this is the correct interpretation of the compound.[48] Jayamaṅgala, however, seems more interested in the depiction of Rāma as all-knowing. He thus identifies this verse as a case of *nipuṇa* (skill, cleverness), an ornament not mentioned by Bhāmaha, and says that it should really have been given under the already discussed figure of *udātta* because of its "depth of meaning."[49] Indeed, *udātta* is known to have two subtypes, one dedicated to magnificent opulence, which we have seen in two verses of Bhaṭṭi and their corresponding Javanese stanzas, and the other to a magnificent character, so far missing from the chapter. Moreover, both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin choose Rāma as their example character for this type of *udātta*,[50] so it seems fitting for Bhaṭṭi to do the same and perhaps even to highlight Rāma's loftiness by placing it out of order.

46. As Jayamaṅgala notes, the last ornament, *bhāvikatva*, operates on the level of the work as a whole and therefore cannot be demonstrated in just this one stanza. Jayamaṅgala ad BhK 10.74: *bhāvikatvam ity alaṃkāra uktaḥ. tadbandhaviṣayatvāt pṛthak pradarśayiṣyati*. It could, however, be the case that Bhaṭṭi did intend a *bhāvika* here, although in a different sense than that found in Bhāmaha (at least as understood by Jayamaṅgala): an ornament that is suffused by emotion (*bhāva*).

47. Mallinātha ad BhK 10.74, KĀ 2.273.

48. This is how Jayamaṅgala seems to take the compound. For Mallinātha, the good deeds are Lakṣmaṇa's (ad BhK 10.74). For a different take on *labdhātmā*, see Fallon 2009: 247.

49. Jayamaṅgala ad BhK 10.74: *arthāvagāḍhatvād asya coddāte 'ntarbhāvo draṣṭavyaḥ*.

50. KA 3.11, KĀ 2.299.

Support for this position is found in the parallel Javanese passage, again divided into two verses:

tan sangkeng guragaḍa ta nghulun matangguh
lāwan tan hana kakurangta ring wiweka
solah tāngĕn-angĕn atah pūrwakanya
tan yogyāt wara-warahĕnn apan huwus wruh || (OJR 11.93)

kabwatnya n nipuṇa rikang wiweka yukti
ndan mĕnggĕp nghulun awarah kiteng kalīnga
tṛṣṇāsih ya juga makon matangguhātah
hetunyāk pawara-warah tatan sakeng wruh || (OJR 11.94)

It is not out of insolence that I admonish you.
After all, you do not lack discernment:
The origin of your every action is thought, and then more thought.
It's not my role to tell you what to do. You already know.

By nature you're skilled in discerning right from wrong.
It may seem I'm telling you what all this means.
But it's love and affection that compel me to admonish you.
That's the reason I've been telling you what to do. It's not as if I know.

What caught our eyes about these two verses in the first place was the appearance of the Sanskrit term *nipuṇa*, which is Jayamaṅgala's name for the device.[51] This indicates to us the possibility that both Jayamaṅgala and the OJR poet had access to the same commentary or textbook, or at least to specific knowledge of the existence of a figure by this name in Bhaṭṭi 10.74. Indeed, in both Jayamaṅgala's classification and the Javanese rendition, it is Rāma's skill and pervasive knowledge that are highlighted by the term *nipuṇa*. This, then, is another instance where a discursive Sanskrit source on poetics (in this case the learned commentary of Jayamaṅgala) and the Javanese poem appear to be trading knowledge about ornamental devices above the shoulders of Bhaṭṭi.

However, there is more to the Javanese stanzas than first catches the eye. One unique feature of these verses is that they not only mirror Bhaṭṭi but also closely mirror each other. Note, for example, the recurrence of the words *matangguh* (to admonish) and *wiweka* (discernment), representing Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma, respectively. Then there are the last lines of both verses, each containing a reduplicated form of the verb "to tell, instruct" (*wara-warah*) and an occurrence of the verb "to know" (*wruh*). But while the instruction is Lakṣmaṇa's doing, the distribution of knowledge is more complex. In the closing phrase of 11.93, Lakṣmaṇa presents Rāma as knowing everything; in the closing of 11.94, he portrays himself as knowing nothing. Rāma's perfect knowledge is what makes him skilled, but as the Javanese poet helps us see, Lakṣmaṇa's portrayal of his brother's omniscience and his own utter lack of knowledge helps create an image of himself as also quite skilled in the difficult task of speaking firmly but politely to his elder. This skill relates to the clever apology found in both languages, namely, that the speech is not Lakṣmaṇa's own initiative but was forced on him by an overwhelming outpouring of emotions. This apology, as we said, is doubled in the Javanese version, and perhaps not by coincidence, if we take it to identify consciously with the role of the younger brother here, as we have suggested above. In this sense, the new

51. This was also noted by Hooykaas (1957: 362–63), who made some insightful comments about the potential relationship between *nipuṇa* and causality (*hetu*).

distribution of *nipuṇa*, if we are correct in our interpretation of these verses, is the sign of a polite but confident younger tradition that it too has what it takes to know and speak.

WINNING A DISTINCTION: A NOTE ON VYATIREKA

Let us leave Lakṣmaṇa and turn to another key ally of Rāma. Here is how Hanūmān, who has returned with news of Sītā, concludes his report to Rāma, first in a verse from Bhaṭṭi and then in two verses in the Javanese version:

samatāṃ śaśilekhayopayāyād
avadātā pratanuḥ kṣayeṇa sītā |
yadi nāma kalaṅka indulekhām
ativṛtto laṅghayen na cāpi bhāvī || (BhK 10.40)

You could compare Sītā, spotless
and wasting away, to the crescent moon,
had it not been sullied by the stain it bore
and will forevermore.

gĕlāna manglih mawĕnĕs sirākurū
wulan rikang kṛṣṇa paḍā nireng kṣaya
kunĕng kasor ning śaśiwimba de nira
ikā kalĕngkanya ya jāti tan hilang || (OJR 11.45)

sirār hana ngkā kadi padma ring latĕk
apann ikonggwan nira mūrkatanmaya
ikā kasatyan nira śuddha nirmala
lanā haneng citta ya keśarā nira || (OJR 11.46)

Exhausted, weary, pale, thin—she's wasting away
just like the moon dissolving in the dark half of the month.
But she outshines the moon because its stain
is there from birth and will never go away.

There she is like a lotus in mud,
for the place in which she dwells is sheer madness.
Yet her faithfulness, pure and untainted,
constantly in her mind, is her filament.

As can be seen, the Sanskrit and the Javanese are very close in meaning, including Sītā's outshining the moon. This is what makes this a case of *vyatireka*, or distinction, when the subject of comparison is said to be superior to the standard. Note, however, the distinctive nature of the OJR in this case. First, Bhaṭṭi's counterfactual mode ("You could compare . . . had it not been") is replaced with a straightforward comparison that is then countered ("Just like the moon . . . But she outshines the moon"). This, by the way, is closer to the standard illustrations of *vyatireka* as found in works such as Daṇḍin's *Mirror*.[52] Second, much is added in translation. For example, what is emphasized in the Javanese is not the sliver remaining when the moon wanes but the much larger part of it that is hidden in the dark. It could even be that the poet hints at the fact that the moon is hiding itself in shame, given the contrast between its blemish and the faultless beauty of Sītā. There is also a nice play on something

52. KĀ 2.178–96.

only implicit in the Sanskrit, namely, the accidental nature of Sītā's situation compared with that of the moon. She is in Laṅkā through no fault of her own, or at least through no inherent flaw, whereas the moon's stain (*kalaṅka*) is inborn. Indeed, the Javanese poet may have introduced here a bitextual "embrace" (*śleṣa*), speaking both of Sītā as being only temporarily in Laṅkā and of the moon as permanently blemished with the same expression (*kalĕngka*).[53]

Sītā's distinction is further explored in the next verse, which has no direct source in Bhaṭṭi. Here Hanūmān sets aside the moon, Sītā's pathetic standard of comparison, and concentrates instead on the contradiction between her unstained faithfulness and her terrible surroundings: the sheer murky madness of Laṅkā. He does this by comparing her to a lotus, a flower known to be spotless despite being rooted in a dark and wet substratum. Just like the lotus's bright filaments, Sītā's pure thoughts rise up "untainted" in stark contrast to her muddy backdrop. So in the pattern we have by now come to recognize, the OJR, once it has unpacked the Sanskrit ornament, repacks it with added figurative power: in this case the distinction (*vyatireka*) is topped off by simile (*upamā*) and antithesis (*virodha*) in addition to the aforementioned seeing-as (*utprekṣā*) and embrace (*śleṣa*).

The full import of the last verse, which suggests that the OJR is also distinct in being far more attuned to Sītā's situation and her inner world,[54] can be understood only if it is taken in context. Here, when Hanūmān comes back from his mission, he presents Rāma not only with Sītā's jewel but also with a handwritten missive that is eleven verses long—one of the most distinctive moments of innovation in the OJR. In the above verse, Hanūmān is responding to Rāma's reaction to Sītā's heartfelt letter. In Bhaṭṭi's version, Rāma learns very little of Sītā's plight other than the fact that she has been found alive in Rāvaṇa's den and is quickly fading away. He never hears about her feelings toward him or in general, and certainly not from her directly, because the entire conversation is mediated by Hanūmān and is short and mostly action-oriented. In her letter in the OJR, however, Sītā pours out her feelings, blames herself for her current situation, and pleads for understanding and forgiveness. This plea then leads to Hanūmān's added defense of Sītā's utmost faithfulness. It is thus another instance of a subordinate politely and skillfully directing Rāma, who tends to forget himself when he is overcome by the darkness of his emotional state, in the right path.

THE ISLAND WRITES BACK

Let us then turn to this letter.[55] We read it along with Rāma and observe his tearful reaction to it. It is significant that such a long passage finds its place in a chapter meant to illustrate the beautifying elements of poetry. In fact, it may be seen as a kind of a poem within a poem, as hinted at, first, by the distinct metrical pattern. All verses in Sītā's letter are in *śārdūlavikrīḍita*, and these are the only verses in this meter in the entire chapter. This poem also has its own form, as a letter, and its own aesthetics, based on a clever and powerful blending of ornaments and other effects, and it thus hints at the way these should be appreciated.

Consider, for example, the letter's opening verse:

sĕmbah ni nghulun āryaputra ya tĕke pādadwayanta prabhu
nyeking reka wacān uninya ya iko cihna ny unĕng ni nghulun

53. For the former interpretation, we consider *ka-lĕngka* as a hypothetical stative passive form, "to be in a state of (being in) Lĕngka."

54. Old Javanese *kakawin* poetry routinely gives prominent roles to women and the social world, especially to virtuous and loyal wives. See Creese 2004.

55. For a discussion of rhetorical devices in this letter episode, see van der Molen 2003.

mwang cūḍāmaṇi tulya ni nghulun ike mangsö sumĕmbah kita
nyāng simsim pakirim narendra ya ikā sparśanta tekāk hiḍĕp || (OJR 11.22)

May my humble bow, lord prince, reach your feet.
Here it is, a written word; read it aloud. It is a sign of my longing.
My crest jewel, too, draws near to bow before you, as if it were me,
just as the ring you sent me, my king, I consider your very touch.

The first stanza in Sītā's poetic letter highlights a closely connected pair: ornaments and written words. Two ornaments in particular are featured here as tokens of their owners: the crest jewel Sītā sends to Rāma and the ring he has already sent her. Through their exchange of these tokens, the separated lovers experience each other's presence. In fact, each of the ornaments forms a direct extension of the body part on which it is borne and thus performs its function. Sītā's crest jewel, like the head that bears it, bows down to Rāma's feet, and Rāma's ring is his "very touch." So it is through these powerful ornaments that Sītā and Rāma can intimately unite and directly touch each other, and the same can be said for Sītā's "written word." This is a text that she has written with her longing, and that Rāma is to perform by reading it aloud. Thus in accordance with the Sanskrit ideal that poetry can and should rise above the real, here Sītā's words, once enacted, can succeed in creating a union between lovers whose spatial separation the verse cleverly insinuates.[56] Moreover, it is clear that ornaments are inherent in achieving this aesthetic ideal. Indeed, the physical ornaments (ring and crest jewel) are allotted their respective roles in this stanza by means of poetic ornaments, namely, simile ("My crest jewel . . . as if it were me"), identification ("the ring . . . is your very touch"), and seeing-as ("draws near to bow before you"). The showcasing of these tropes carries added weight in a chapter that will soon present, in an orderly manner, the ornaments that make poetry effective.

It is not only ornaments, of course, that make poetry worthy. As the author of the OJR knows well, a poem's aestheticized emotional flavors (*rasa*) and virtues (*guṇa*) are just as important. Another verse from Sītā's letter highlights these aspects as well:

sakweh ning maraseng dangū ya rinasan tātan hanāng angrase
kĕmbang bāp hana ring taman taman ikā tāmbā ny unĕng ni nghulun
sakweh ning karĕngö manohara lawan sakweh nikang srak marūm
yekān wyartha hananya nirguṇa kabeh wway tan pasuk ring gulū || (OJR 11.25)

All the tastes I once tasted are now tasteless.
A gardenful of flowers fails to cure my longing.
Everything that sounded sweet or was sweet-scented,
all that is meaningless, all worthless—
water that cannot wet one's throat.

The first line offers three different grammatical forms based on the Sanskrit word *rasa*, which in Javanese, too, has a wide range of meanings, including "love," "essence," "taste," and "poetic flavor." Each of the three occurrences is different in form. The first is an intransitive verb (*marasa*, to have *rasa* or taste), the second is a passive verb (*rinasan*, "tasted"), and the third is the active verbal form (*angrase*, to enjoy or taste). The reader is faced with a meditation on the topic of *rasa*, augmented by the alliteration and the grammatical cleverness

56. On this ideal, see Shulman 1991. For an insightful discussion of the effects of distance as a function of the usage of different deictic pronouns in this verse, see Hunter 2012.

that underlies the repetition of this stem in three different forms (a cleverness that readers of Sanskrit poetry in general and Bhaṭṭi's poem in particular have also come to relish).[57]

But it is not only a mastery of verbal pyrotechnics that the Javanese poet demonstrates here. The aesthetic ideal of love in separation (*vipralambhaśṛṅgāra*) has been entirely absorbed and perfected. On the one hand, the separated characters can no longer enjoy any sources of past enjoyment. In fact, they are now acutely painful, as the final beautiful line suggests. On the other hand, readers, beginning with Rāma himself—here, as in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, he is the first and prototypical listener to poetry—relish it precisely because of its intense flavor of love, here reinforced by the almost subliminal repetition of the word *rasa* itself. The strong metapoetic flavor of this verse is further intensified by the loaded references to worth (*guṇa*) and meaning (*artha*). What is more, two additional ornaments top off this perfect stanza: twinning (*yamaka*; the word *taman* means both "garden" and the negative particle "not") and the "citing of another case" (*arthāntaranyāsa*) with which the verse ends. The image of water that cannot slake this thirst most powerfully captures the idea of pain caused by normally pleasure-giving sounds, tastes, smells, and sights on top of the touch mentioned already in verse 11.22 (and again in some of the following verses). It is also a powerful reflection, as is often the case with such ornaments, about the verse itself, with its various poetic elements.

The reflection continues in Sītā's letter as she thinks back to the early phases of their relationship, and here, too, *rasa* continues to figure prominently:

ringng Indrāṇi lawan Śacī tama tuwin tātan mapunggung kita
ri pratyeka nike rasanya ya kabeh sāmpun kita wruh rikā
nāhan teki dumeh manahku kalaran śīrṇān tĕñuh tang hati
āpan tan hana len paḍanta rikanang jñānādi lāwan guṇa || (OJR 11.28)

You were well versed in the teachings of Indrāṇī and Śacī,
you knew them all, each and every flavor.
All of this is why my heart is overcome
with pain and smashed to pieces. No one else
is your equal in knowledge and expertise.

The details of their love life that she is invoking here could have a variety of intended implications.[58] First, Sītā is speaking of something very intimate, so much so that only she can have this knowledge, which is a proof of her identity as the sender and author of this letter. In later *Rāmāyaṇa*s and messenger poems in Sanskrit, conveying such items of private knowledge is a set piece, and it may well be that the Javanese Sītā is doing something similar.[59] Second, she reminds him that their relationship is one that has such deep and strong roots that it should be able to withstand their current forced separation. She even reminds

57. For a similar triple repetition of *rasa* in another section that forms a meditation on this topic, see OJR 26.35.

58. Sanskrit kāmaśāstra traditions were well known in Java and Bali (Creese 2004: 201–9). Specific erotic treatises entitled *Indrāṇīśāstra* and *Rukminitattwa*, in which Śacī is the teacher who imparts esoteric erotic knowledge to her pupil, Rukmini, are still found in the Balinese tradition (Creese and Bellows 2002: 391–93; Creese 2004: 267). We therefore prefer the translation "teachings of Indrāṇī and Śacī" (Creese and Bellows 2002: 386) to that of "Indrāṇī and Śacī postures" adopted by van der Molen (2003: 341, 352) and Robson (2015: 283). The *Indrāṇīśāstra* text in relation to knowledge of amorous play, including a posture called "the play of swans" (*ulah hangsalīlā*), is also referred to in OJR 8.71.

59. Verses delivered by trusted messengers who act as go-betweens for lovers temporarily separated are also common in *kakawin* poetry (Creese 2004: 62, 86–87, 106–8).

him in the preceding verse (OJR 11.27) that their marriage had the blessing of their fathers.[60] Third, she continues to portray her devastating situation precisely as the result of the contrast with their former intimate togetherness, thereby also intimating that she has stayed entirely faithful. Finally, there is the portrayal of Rāma as unequalled in knowledge, expertise (*guṇa*), and connoisseurship of *rasa*, which, we presume, would also make him the ideal reader of her poem. We are reminded of Lakṣmaṇa's statement to a similar effect in his description of Rāma as *nipuṇa*, or highly knowledgeable and capable.

Rāma's reaction to the letter is profound. Tears well up in his eyes, he begins to cry, and to his horror he discovers that his tears have obliterated the ink so that he can never tell how the letter ends (OJR 11.33). Not knowing what to do, he despairs and appeals to Hanūmān and Lakṣmaṇa (OJR 11.34). They both respond by reminding him that he does know exactly what he needs to do and that the letter has indicated as much (OJR 11.35–36). It is only now that the chapter switches back from the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* meter that was used for Sītā's letter to the carrying meter that was used earlier. Here we are told that once the letter had been read, Rāma held Sītā's jewel, examined it, rubbed it against his cheek, only to feel her actual, painful presence, and then embraced or even addressed it (*kinudang*; OJR 11.37–38) before the action resumed and the army set out for the ocean. We find it fascinating that this poem within a poem expands to include the first reactions to it, indeed in a way that overwrites its final lines. Again, this could be read as reflection on the power of poetry and how it can affect the readers. It can also be seen as a comment on the power that Sanskrit poetry had on the island of Java and on the island's ability to master this genre and to write back.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The OJR is an outcome of a careful and thorough translation project that took place at a formative moment in the cultural exchange between South and Southeast Asia. But the term "translation" merely masks a host of pressing questions: What was it that the Javanese poets set out to capture when they rendered the BhK into Old Javanese? What sort of knowledge and protocols informed their work? In what way was the outcome different from the original? And what can the OJR teach us about Bhaṭṭi's poem? We believe that the case studies discussed above afford us new insights into these and related queries, at least as far as the compared chapters are concerned.

We can begin by asserting the simple, important fact that just as BhK 10 systematically sets out to display the basic kit of *kāvya*'s figurative tools, so does OJR 11 with respect to the nascent aesthetic form of *kakawin*. Put differently, the ornamental devices are not incidental to rendering the poem into Javanese but rather form a main target of the project. One clear indication of this is the care the Old Javanese author took to retain the particular structures, textures, and conceits of the ornaments in question when these could have been easily replaced or lost in a translation dedicated merely to the narrative elements. Another indication is the familiarity that OJR 11 displays with the Indic discourse on ornaments. Indeed, it sometimes engages in direct conversation with this discursive world even as it renders Bhaṭṭi into Javanese, as we have seen with the figures of magnificence (*udāra*) and skillfulness

60. As van der Molen (2003: 342–43) notes, the principal, unspoken purpose of Sītā's letter is not only to convince Rāma of her faithfulness but also to find out whether he will take her back now that she has been so long in the home of another man. Indeed, this letter skillfully foregrounds the end of the entire *Rāmāyaṇa* narrative: Sītā's forebodings turn out to be correct when, having rescued her from Rāvaṇa's clutches, Rāma then cruelly casts her aside (OJR 24.147–53). This act of cruelty finds its particularly Javanese response in the OJR when Trijaṭā, daughter of Wibhīṣaṇa, who has been Sītā's companion throughout her ordeal, rounds on Rāma and berates him for his cowardly, improper treatment of his wife (OJR 24.169–86).

(*nipuṇa*). Moreover, as we have shown, there are instances where the OJR version of an ornament departs from Bhaṭṭi's wording and veers closer to its Sanskrit textbook understanding. For instance, the verse illustrating reciprocity (*parivṛtti*) in the OJR is phrased unmistakably as a case of give-and-take, and the verse illustrating distinction (*vyatireka*) unambiguously states the superiority of a subject over a standard within the framework of an explicit analogy. In both these cases the ornament is expressed more clearly and straightforwardly than in the BhK original.

Bhaṭṭi may have had more leeway with the standard theory if he assumed a readership well versed in the treatises on ornaments.[61] He may have also anticipated a commentary like Jayamaṅgala's, where his stanzas presenting the ornaments are matched with definitions and illustrations from Bhāmaha's primer on a one-to-one basis. The author of the OJR seems not to have had this luxury. From the start, he had to create an embrace of *prayoga* (practice) and *śāstra* (theory) that is far tighter than that of the Sanskrit original. In this sense, the Old Javanese poem itself acts as a commentary. Not unlike Jayamaṅgala's exegesis, OJR 11 silently aligns Bhaṭṭi's verses with scholarship about the pertinent ornaments. And as noted, it occasionally emends the original to better meet scholastic guidelines.

Another commentary-like function of OJR 11 is its tendency to simplify the original. We have seen how the Javanese author regularly unpacks an extremely dense stanza of Bhaṭṭi into two or even three verses. This is often done by apportioning elements that in the Sanskrit are bunched together in a way that may confuse the reader into separate verses in the Javanese poem. Consider, in this context, the assigning of antitheses concerning the injurious nature of Love's flower arrows and the burning power of the cool breeze into two separate *virodha* verses, or the similar severing of the upward and downward movement of light emanating from the ocean in the case of *udāra*. Occasionally, a third verse may be added to set up the situation or sum up its lessons (e.g., *atiśayokti*). If necessary, additional explanatory language may be added along the way. For example, the chain reaction in illumination (*dīpaka*) is extended in a way that clarifies the pattern of this ornament (in its ancient form) beyond doubt, vocabulary is inserted that calls attention to the contradiction underlying antithesis (*virodha*) and the notion of the indistinguishability of the brothers is clarified and enhanced in *atiśayokti*, if we are correct in our interpretation of this passage. In all these practices, we find support for *kakawin*'s indebtedness not only to *kāvya* poetics but also to Indian forms of commentary for its pedagogical and aesthetic goals. Indeed, it is extremely tempting to speculate that a commentary on the BhK, either written or delivered orally by an informant from the subcontinent, was involved in the act of translation, in a conversation that must have taken place in Javanese centers of learning, be they monastic or royal.[62]

Another dimension of the commentarial function of the OJR is the way it familiarizes the Indic elements by serving them with a distinct Javanese dressing. Consider, in this connection, the insertion of local items that pertain to the landscape, flora, and fauna of the island, such as coral reefs and the *himi-himi* crabs. The added emphasis on the younger brother (and Rāma's juniors more generally) may also partly reflect the social sensibilities and kinship matrixes of the target audience. This Javanization of Bhaṭṭi is surely related to a theme that runs throughout OJR 11 (and the work as a whole) but is far less developed in the original, namely, the keen interest in the emotional state of the protagonists, Rāma and Sītā, and the

61. He certainly expected his poems to work as a lamp for readers who had studied grammar (the teaching of which occupies chapters 1–9 and 14–22 of his work), and he predicted that without such knowledge, his work would be as useless as a mirror for a blind man (BhK 22.33).

62. For example, later texts include the detailed description of the training of women poets in Princess Indumatī's entourage in *Sumanasāntaka* 41.1 (Worsley et al. 2013: 183) and *Kṛṣṇāyana* 10.4–10 (Creese 2004: 48–49).

sensitive reactions these elicit in their surroundings, from Lakṣmaṇa and Hanūmān to mountains and oceans. This also means that despite the effort to understand and faithfully preserve Indic ornaments, they receive a local twist and are made to feel at home.

This tendency is related to an aspect of OJR 11 that seems to stand at odds with its trajectory of clarifying and simplifying Bhaṭṭi's poem. As we have seen in each case study, once the ornaments of BhK 10 are analyzed and decoded and elements of the dense original are allotted to separate statements, they are also enhanced and recoded, or "recon-figured." This figurative remaking typically involves added layers of figuration, including embrace (*śleṣa*), simile (*upamā*), antithesis (*virodha*), identification (*rūpaka*), intensification (*atiśaya*), distinction (*vyatireka*), and, above all, seeing-as (*utprekṣā*). Time and again human motives are attributed to the ocean, the moon, crabs, snakes, and alligators, often (but not always) with an eye to the emotional well-being of Rāma. With the added figurative layer or layers comes a second-order suggestiveness that includes a reflexive element. This reflexivity pertains deeply and widely to the ornaments in question, the act of translation itself, and the relationship between the Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Sanskrit original. Such meta-awareness is then thematized, as we have seen most clearly in Sītā's letter and its meditation on meaning (*artha*), ornaments (*alaṃkāra*), qualities (*guṇa*), and the tastes (*rasa*) of a poem.

This complex process of reflection allows us to read Bhaṭṭi's poem in a new light. It also supplies the emotional depth that, in hindsight, seems sorely missing in the original. This is a good illustration of the Borgesian principle according to which the original must be faithful to the translation. For those who read the poems side by side, the BhK will never be the same again, as we have argued, for example, in the case of the ocean's smile and gift for Rāma (*udāra*) or the full symmetry of the two brothers (*atiśayokti*).

Ultimately, OJR 11 with its insertion of the letter episode can be read as a declaration of independence on the part of a nascent Javanese literary culture. The ships from the subcontinent arrived and unloaded endless cultural treasures, including many narrative gems and ornaments of language. The local literati unpacked them with utmost care, inspected them closely, and took them apart with precision, likely with the help of expatriate experts and manuals. When the time came to put them together again, they reminisced over their additional potentials, reconfigured them, and came to own them in a process that gave these ornaments added depth and new external contours. Perhaps anticipating something of the long career that these ornaments would come to enjoy in later praxis, the OJR poet chose to leave the letter inserted into the narrative open ended, made the younger brother the model, and left him with the last word.

In fact, it may be better to avoid the term "translation" altogether in speaking about the OJR and instead consider the terminology that informs the poetic illustrations in the chapters under discussion. In this connection, the devices of intensification (*atiśayokti*) and distinction (*vyatireka*) present themselves as powerful tools for thinking about the intercultural project of the Javanese poets. As we have seen, these and other tropes involve a playful and creative attempt to posit an entity that both reflects its original and is improved and consciously distinct. We believe that something very similar was attempted on a much larger scale in the formation of the OJR.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acri, Andrea. 2010. On Birds, Ascetics, and Kings in Central Java: *Rāmāyaṇa* Kakawin, 24.95–126 and 25. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 166: 475–506.

________. 2011a. *Dharma Pātañjala: A Śaiva Scripture from Ancient Java Studied in the Light of Related Old Javanese and Sanskrit Texts*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

________. 2011b. Glimpses of Śaiva Siddhānta: Echoes of Doctrines Ascribed to Bṛhaspati in the Sanskrit-Old Javanese *Vṛhaspatitattva*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 54: 209–29.

Acri, Andrea, Helen Creese, and Arlo Griffiths, eds. 2011. *From Laṅkā Eastwards: The Rāmāyaṇa in the Literature and Visual Arts of Indonesia*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Aichele, Walter. 1931. De Vorm der Kawi-Poezie. *Djawa* 114: 174–80. [Dutch tr. of Die Form der Kawi-Dichtung. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 29 (1926): 933–39.]

________. 1969. Vergessene Metaphern als Kriterien der Datierung des altjavanischen *Rāmāyaṇa*. *Oriens Extremus* 16: 127–66.

Becker, A. L., and Ronit Ricci. 2008. What Happens When You Really Listen: On Translating the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*. Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, Sargah 26, Translation and Essay. *Indonesia* 85: 1–30.

BhK. Bhaṭṭi, *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, with commentaries by Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha, ed. Bāñkelāla Miśra. Varanasi: Sampūrṇānanda Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, 2004.

Bronner, Yigal. 2012. A Question of Priority: Revisiting the Debate on the Relative Chronology of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 40.1: 67–118.

________. 2016. Understanding Udbhaṭa: The Invention of Kashmiri Poetics in the Jayāpīḍa Moment. In *Around Abhinavagupta: Aspects of the Intellectual History of Kashmir from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century*, ed. E. Franco and I. Ratié. Pp. 81–147. Leipziger Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte Sud- und Zentralasiens, vol. 6. Leipzig: Lit Verlag.

Bronner, Yigal, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb, eds. 2014. *Innovations and Turning Points: Toward a History of Kāvya Literature*. Delhi: Oxford Univ. Press.

Creese, Helen. 2004. *Women of the Kakawin World: Marriage and Sexuality in the Indic Courts of Java and Bali*. Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe.

________. 2009. Old Javanese Legal Traditions in Pre-colonial Bali. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 165: 241–90.

Creese, Helen, and Laura Bellows. 2002. Erotic Literature in Nineteenth-Century Bali. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 33.3: 385–413.

Creese, Helen, and Thomas Hunter. Forthcoming. Beyond the Mirror: Sanskrit Poetics and the Old Javanese *Kakawin* Tradition. In *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's Mirror and the World of Asian Letters*, ed. Yigal Bronner.

Fallon, Oliver, tr. 2009. *Bhatti's Poem: The Death of Ravana*. New York: New York Univ. Press and JJC Foundation.

Hooykaas, C. 1955. *The Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, with Special Reference to the Problem of Interpolation in Kakawins*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

________. 1957. On Some *Arthālaṅkāras* in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* X. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20.1/3: 351–63.

________. 1958a. *The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin: An Exemplary Kakawin as to Form and Content.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.

________. 1958b. Stylistic Figures in the Old-Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* Kakawin. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 7.2: 135–57.

Hunter, T. M. 2011a. Echoes of the Ecumene: The Wrestling Match in the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi and the *Arjunawiwāha* of Mpu Kaṇwa. In *From Beyond the Eastern Horizon*, ed. ManjuShree. Pp. 89–104. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.

________. 2011b. Translation in a World of Diglossia. In *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*, ed. Jan van der Putten and Ronit Ricci. Pp. 9–26. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

________. 2012. Alton Becker's "Textual Coherence": Two Examples. Paper presented to the panel "Leading beyond Translation: A. L. Becker and the Interpretation of Southeast Asian Literature and Performance." Toronto: Asian Studies Association Conference.

________. 2014a. A Constant Flow of Pilgrims: *Kāvya* and the Early History of the *Kakawin*. In Bronner, Shulman, and Tubb 2014. Pp. 195–231.

________. 2014b. A Distant Mirror: Innovation and Change in the East Javanese *Kakawin*. In Bronner, Shulman, and Tubb 2014. Pp. 739–86.

________. 2015. Bhagavad-Gītā Sections of the Old Javanese Bhīsmaparwa: Text-building and the Formation of the State in Premodern Indonesia. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on ASEAN-India Cultural Links: Historical and Contemporary Dimensions*, ed. Prabir De. Pp. 183–94. New Delhi: Research and Information Centre for Developing Countries/ ASEAN-India Centre.

Jordaan, Roy. 2011. The Causeway Episode of the Prambanan: *Rāmāyaṇa* Revisited. In Acri, Creese, and Griffiths 2011. Pp. 179–208.

KA. Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, ed. B. N. Śarmā and B. Upādhyāya. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1981.

KĀ. Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa* [*Kāvyalakṣaṇa*], with the Commentary of Ratnaśrījñāna, ed. A. Thakur and U. Jha. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post Graduate Studies, 1957.

Kern, H. H. 1900. *Râmâyaṇa: Oudjavaansch heldendicht*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Khanna, Vinod, and Malini Saran. 1993. The *Rāmāyaṇa* Kakawin: A Product of Sanskrit Scholarship and Independent Literary Genius. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 149: 226–49.

KRM. *Śrīvijayaprabhūtaṁ Kavirājamārgaṁ*, ed. T. V. Venkatachala Sastry. Tumkur: Tumkur University, 2011.

Levin, Cecilia. 2011. The *Uttarakāṇḍa* of the Loro Jonggrang Temple Complex. In Acri, Creese, and Griffiths 2011. Pp. 149–78.

Lokesh Chandra. 1997. Chanda-karaṇa: The Art of Writing Poetry. In *Cultural Horizons of India: Studies in Tantra and Buddhism, Art and Archaeology, Language and Literature*, vol. 6, ed. Lokesh Chandra. Pp. 140–242. Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.

McCrea, Lawrence. 2014. The Conquest of Cool: Theology and Aesthetics in Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*. In Bronner, Shulman, and Tubb 2014. Pp. 123–41.

Molen, Willem van der. 2003. A Token of My Longing: A Rhetorical Analysis of Sita's Letter to Rama, Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* 11.22–32. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 31: 339–55.

________. 2015. *H. Kern. Rāmāyaṇa: The Story of Rāma and Sītā in Old Javanese. Romanized Edition.* Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

OJR. Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa*. See van der Molen 2015, Robson 2015.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.

Ricci, Ronit. 2011. *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Radicchi, Anna. 1996. More on the Kāraka-saṁgraha, a Sanskrit Grammatical Text from Bali. In *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, ed. Jan E. M. Houben. Pp. 289–306. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Robson, S. O. 2015. *The Old Javanese Rāmāyana: A New English Translation with an Introduction and Notes*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Rubinstein, Raechelle. 2000. *Beyond the Realm of the Senses: The Balinese Ritual of Kekawin Composition*. Leiden: KITLV Press.

Saran, Malini, and Vinod C. Khanna. 2004. *The Rāmāyaṇa in Indonesia*. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal.

Schoterman, J. 1981. An Introduction to Old Javanese Sanskrit Dictionaries and Grammars. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 137: 419–42.

Shulman, David Dean. 1991. Towards a Historical Poetics of the Sanskrit Epics. *International Folklore Review* 8: 9–17.

Worsley, Peter. 2009. Budaya Bahasa Daerah Kosmopolitan dan Relief-Relief Kisah Rama di Candi Loro Jonggrng, Prambanan. In *Sadur: Sejarah Terjemahan di Indonesia dan Malaysia*, ed. Henri Chambert-Loir. Pp. 775–89. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia / École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Worsley, Peter, S. Supomo, Thomas Hunter, and Margaret Fletcher. 2013. *Mpu Monaguṇa's Sumanasāntaka: An Old Javanese Epic Poem, Its Indian Source and Balinese Illustrations*. Leiden: Brill.

Zoetmulder, P. J. 1974. *Kalangwan: A Survey of Old Javanese Literature.* The Hague: Nijhoff.

________. 1982. *Old-Javanese English Dictionary*. With the collaboration of S. O. Robson. 2 vols. The Hague: Nijhoff.