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Publisher's Note

Sahitya Akademi is pleased to bring out the 2nd volume of A Critical Inventory of Ramayana Studies in the World. The first volume of the inventory published in 1991, listed the Ramayana Studies in Indian languages and English. The 2nd volume of the Inventory lists Ramayana Studies in foreign languages. For the collection of material for this volume, the Akademi had to fully depend on the help of foreign as well as Indian scholars. Information furnished in this volume is entirely based on the material supplied by these scholar-consultants especially from Indonesia, Cambodia, France and other countries.

The editorial staff of the Akademi had a tough time consolidating and classifying the material thus received. The volume also includes entries from Arabic, Persian and Urdu studies. It also includes entries from Nepali other than the Nepali entries included in the first volume. We have also included the entries from the microfilm and microfiches from the U.S. Library of Congress holdings.

The classification of data received from different sources for this second volume has been all the more difficult because of the multiplicity of languages and overlapping source of origin in scattered geographical regions. The entries are generally arranged in alphabetical order under languages. Under certain languages entries, besides text, include material for studies, arts, architecture etc.

The inventory of Ramayana Studies in Indonesia was supplied by Dr. Soewito Santoso whose note on Ramayana Studies in Indonesia is as follows:

1. As commonly known, the Rama study in Indonesia consists of three main redactions, based on the language it is written in e.g. the Old Javanese (OJ), the Modern Javanese (MJ) and the Classical Malay (CM) languages. These three main redactions then find their expression in other field of arts, such as literature of earlier dates in Bahasa Indonesia, Balinese, Javanese, Sundanese etc, dramatic arts, e.g. wayang (Shadowplay) dance-drama etc. All these kinds of activities in relation with the Ramayana are included in the term study.

The term Indonesia is also used in a broad sense.
Works done by Indonesians, whether in or outside Indonesia are included, so for instance:

2. Dr. S. Soebardi, a reader at the Australian National University, Canberra, writes an article on Josodipoero I, the court poet of Kartasura, who happened to be the writer of the *Serat Rama*, a Modern Javanese version of the *Ramayana*. It is published in the magazine *Indonesia*, Cornell Modern Indonesian Project, No 8 (October), 1969. As there is no mention of the Rama-story in the title of the article, a compiler of an inventory of the Ramayana study in Australia might overlook it. Products of non-Indonesian writers, known to the present writer as a study relating to the story of Rama in Indonesia, though published outside Indonesia are also listed, e.g. S.O. Robson "The Kawi Classics in Bali" in *BJI* 128 (1972). It happens, that the writer states, that the article is a product of his study in Bali.

3. Unpublished lectures, papers etc. by people mentioned in point 2. are also included, because they are sometimes deposited in certain libraries.

4. The annotation is kept as brief as possible, but hopefully informative enough.

The Cambodian entries have been collected by Mr. Saveros Pou. Regarding the arrangement of the Cambodian Ramayana Studies, the following note by Mr. Pou may serve as a guide for the users of the inventory.

This first attempt at an inventory of studies in the Khmer (or Cambodian) Ramayana does not claim to be complete on account of the circumstances. The political situation precludes all contacts with the native land, and the short notice prevents deeper research, in particular into private collections, however small they may be. Regarding the arrangement, the readers would perhaps expect to see the times categorized according to the subject-matter. In actual fact, such a categorization proves difficult, at least presently, owing to the intermingling of subjects dealt with. For instance, one author would examine stone bas-reliefs of monuments in the light of literature; another would

endeavour to highlight the magical content of traditional dance, and so on, and so forth. In other words, we are dealing with comparative studies in most cases, not to mention brief accounts of Khmer Ramayana in general studies, or studies in the Ramayana of other countries, mainly Malaysia and Thailand. It is obvious that the multifarious subjects could be sorted out only by means of numerous cross-references, which we cannot produce in such a short time (of *Supra*).

Consequently, we deem it more realistic to confine ourselves to two main sections for this catalogue (a) materials for studies (texts, hide cut-outs, etc.) (b) miscellaneous studies which, incidentally, can be easily identified, as most of the titles speak for themselves.

We are conscious of the fact that to make a comprehensive inventory of the Ramayana studies of the world requires committed field work by a number of scholars devoted to the subject. With the limited resources at the disposal of the Sahitya Akademi, and the lack of proper international infra-structure it was not possible to take up a more comprehensive project. However, it is hoped that this attempt for an international inventory will serve as a basic guideline and a tool of reference for Ramayana scholars in India and abroad. This inventory, we hope will pave the way for more comprehensive work in the field of Ramayana scholarship. The Inventory clearly shows how the national epic of India has turned over as a repository of an ancient Indian heritage which had travelled across the boundaries of India, to several foreign countries including Asian ones.

Sahitya Akademi is grateful to the scholars of the International Editorial Committee and scholars associated with this 2nd volume of the Inventory for their co-operation in the completion of the project. Sahitya Akademi thanks the authorities of U.A.I for their co-operation in this unique project. Akademi also thanks the general editor Sri K.Krishnamoorthy for his able guidance and handling of the project.

New Delhi
30th April 1993

SAHITYA AKADEMI
The Rāmāyaṇa has remained a constant and perennial source of inspiration down the centuries to men of letters in all the regional literatures in India.

It even drew a larger circle of writers as it came to be invested with a sanctity and religious merit unknown elsewhere in the history of world literature. Thus we find a large number of devotional authors writing small or big works as their whim dictated, to be sung or staged or recited prayerfully. This is a steady and continuous phenomenon in all the literatures in India right from their inception up to date.

While the number of expositions or the commentaries on the whole or parts of the Rāmāyaṇa is modest in the previous periods, the advent of modern studies, which is about two centuries old, has been the rise of a whole library of writings on the Rāmāyaṇa, often appreciative and laudatory of the message or illustrative of devotional fervour, some times critical and scholarly, but mostly interpretative or expository.

The populist worship of the Rāmāyaṇa made for the rise in Sanskrit of a number of puranic variations of the main theme as found in Vālmiki and which stress other than literary perspectives to prove Rāma as an avatāra or to portray him as an ideal follower of Vedānta, Yoga, etc. Above all, the puranic mythology and legends were freely drawn upon the raise the stature of the hero in as many ways as possible.

Thus the Rāmāyaṇa is not just an epic but a national fountainhead of all legendary lore and ideal ethical conduct which has grown with the people like the Indian Banyan with countless roots and branches in the imagination of the different regional men of letters.

This inventory which is an outcome of material gathered meticulously by several scholars in the different languages, will give an idea of this vast body of Rāmāyaṇa literature.

The interest of the Rāmāyaṇa has gone far beyond the frontier of India proper and has fired the imaginations of scholars and general public all the world over, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries. Like the ancient Far East countries and the neighbouring countries in which the Rāmāyaṇa entered in the past, we find almost every nation in Europe and America open to its attraction today. What is included in this Inventory
Prefatory Note

represents the material supplied by reputed indological scholars from various university centres in the country and abroad.

Because of the sanctity attached to the text, many individuals and societies are found publishing either a part or the whole of the work with or without commentary throughout India, ever since printing was introduced in the country.

In course of time, scholarly interest has added to this number and brought out editions of several commentaries from manuscripts deposited in various Manuscript Libraries.

A third incentive has come from the quarter of educational institutions in need of a Rāmāyana passage for their textbook in their courses of study. On the top of it all, we have the Baroda critical edition.

While information on this is exhaustive, it is well nigh impossible to give a full coverage of the vast body of the religious, the literary and the popular works in Sanskrit, based on the Rāmāyana or running parallel to it, which have arisen in the course of several centuries and only a small portion of which has seen the light of day. Hence, this section has been rather selective.

This Inventory is more than what a mere Sanskrit scholar might expect. An Inventory of all editions, translations, studies on Valmiki's work in Sanskrit in the medium of English or Sanskrit, would satisfy a Sanskrit scholar; we have already in the field works like N.A. Gore's Bibliography of Rāmāyana and Amarendra Gadgil's Rāmāyana kośa. But this project of Sahitya Akademi is much more inclusive and ambitious. Nothing significant about Rāmāyana in any form in the cultural life of any region in India or abroad is to be dropped. The success of such an inventory depends entirely on the conscientious labour of a large team of devoted scholars and we are happy that the Akademi has been able to secure it as far as possible.

A word about the scheme adopted for the first volume of the Inventory may not be out of place. Since all entries in languages other than Sanskrit presuppose Sanskrit writings, the entries relating to Sanskrit naturally appear first, in disregard to the alphabetical order. The rest of the entries relating to different languages are, however, indexed in their alphabetical sequence.

Regarding the classification adopted, it might be stated that the editions of the Valmiki-Rāmāyana text, in full or in parts, with or without commentary are given the first place as providing the basic material. Translations, in full or in parts come next. This is followed by other Rāmāyanas or various versions of the Rāma theme in Sanskrit and other languages. The literary works based on the Rāmāyana in some languages are also given.

Each entry will contain the name of the author, title of work, name of editor if any, place of publication, publisher and the year of publication, in order. Under important heads, additional information about the nature of the work is given.

Diacritical marking has been done only in respect of ancient authors and all titles. It could not be given to modern names of authors since in the written practice, a single name is spelt in diverse ways.

This Inventory is entirely dependent on the information given by scholarly consultants who compiled the material in different languages (their names are given on a separate page). The editor has taken all pains to see that the entries are accurately classified. It will be found in a few cases that the entries are incomplete in respect of publication details. Still they have been retained because this could be rectified in a subsequent edition.

I feel much relieved on the completion of this Inventory in two volumes. I am extremely thankful to the authorities of the Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, for assigning me a work which is of great moment as a reference book for scholars as well as the general public.

Mysore 1993

K. KRISHNAMOORTHY
Scholarship in the 20th century has helped to revive forgotten memories of India’s cultural links with her neighbours, by bringing to light how, among other things, a single story succeeded in establishing a shared ethos in many parts of Asia. That story and that ethos belong to Rāmaṇa; originating in the region of Kosala in India, the manner in which it spread to regions in S.E. Asia is a fascinating study, if only because the phenomenon belongs to the era that preceded means of communication that are perceived as sine qua non for the spread of human knowledge.

Before tracing the manifestations of the Rāmāyaṇa tradition, in the many art forms in the different parts of S.E. Asia, it is necessary to record two major factors that may be deemed as primeval: firstly, the literary tradition that lent sustenance and secondly, the association with nobility that the personality of Rāma was imparted.

**Literary Tradition**: Vālmīki’s epic is generally regarded as having taken shape in the pre-Christian era; his work is known as ādi-kāvya (primeval epic) not because of its antiquity but on the ground that it has been the pioneer and model in literature, down the centuries. Bhoja, in the medieval period, refers to Vālmīki as mārgadāri. The power of the Rāma story was, evidently, such that the massive Mahābhārata includes a version, known as ‘Rāmopākhyāna’. However, the next great poet in the Sanskrit tradition who handled the Rāma story is Kālidāsa, whose long epic narrates the glory of the distinguished lineage, before telling the story of Rāma in six beautiful cantos. (Raghuvamsa canto IX - XV). Stressing the debt which Kālidāsa owes to Vālmīki, V. Raghavan observes, ‘Not only in his Raghuvamsa, but in all his writings — both poems and plays—Kālidāsa has laid in his lines gold and gems culled from the mine of Vālmīki’. Thus, Meghasandesā is perceived as having been inspired by Vālmīki’s depiction of Hanuman’s journey through the sky, taking the message from Rāma, and the portrait of Sakuntala, abandoned by King Dusyanta, in the hermitage of Mārica is seen as modelled on the uttarakāṇḍa passages which describe Sītā in the hermitage of Vālmīki.
By the middle of the 7th century A.D., the royal poet Kumāradāsa of Śrī Lanka produced his epic in Sanskrit, known as Jānakiharana. (The work, which closely follows Valmiki, was rendered into Sinhalese in the 12th century).

Another significant contribution, also of the 7th century, is Rāvaṇavadham of Bhaṭṭi, more popularly known as Bhaṭṭikāvya. This work has remained The lesser-known verisons of Rāmāyaṇa in India, may be because it is interspersed with illustrations of grammar. Perhaps for that very reason, it became very popular in Indonesia where the teaching of Sanskrit seems to have been actively pursued in the period between the 7th and the 10th century, known as the period of Hindu influence. The inscriptions of King Pūnavaraman of West Java (5th cent.) and of the Sailendra rulers later are all in Sanskrit.

When the first version of Rāmāyaṇa took shape in old Javanese in the 9th cent. A.D., when Yōgēśwara, also known as Kusuma Vicitra, produced Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, narrating the story in 2774 stanzas, divided into 26 cantos, employing different Sanskrit metres. It was in 1936 that Manomohan Ghosh drew the attention of scholars to the Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin as a rendering of Bhaṭṭikāvya; the first five cantos are a regular translation from Sanskrit into Javanese, while the rest represent a free adaptation. (S.O.Robson is of the view that two-thirds of it is from Bhaṭṭi) The entire work is in what is known as Manipravāla — a mixture of Sanskrit and another language (Javanese, in this case).

A similar manipravāla work in Balinese Mss. brought to light by T. Rai Sudharta of Jakarta at the Seminar on Ramayana (1971); it was published by S. Levi in 1933. Known as Mattrkākṣara Rāmāyaṇa, it tells the story employing svaravyaṅjana, with the Sanskrit script in alphabetical order forming the beginning of each verse; this too is interspersed with passages in Javanese prose. However, two attributes in which Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin became the pace-setter are: the elaborate detailing of battle scenes and the long exhortations on public morality (Rāma to Bharata and Rāma to Vibhiṣāna). These were to eventually become integral to the tradition in all the regions of the neighbourhood. As regards literary style, rich in alamkāras, the Old Javanese Kakawin is held as model even today.

In India, the poetic tradition continues with Rāmacarita of Abhinanda in the tenth century; according to V. Raghavan, 'it contains fine poetry and is noteworthy also for story elements not found in the original'. Kṣemendra, the Kashmiri poet of the 11th cent. produced 'Rāmāyaṇa mañjari' in 6400 stanzas of Sanskrit, richly reminiscent of Valmiki. King Bhoja's 'Rāmāyaṇa campū', available up to the sundarakāṇḍa only, is another well-known work.

Playwrights, beginning with Bhāsa (2nd. cent A.D.), have turned to the theme of Rāmāyaṇa. After Bhāsa's Pratīmā and Abhisēka nāṭakas, we have the famous Uṭtara-rāmacarita of Bhavabhūti which appeared in the 7th cent. and 'threw into oblivion several excellent Rāma-plays produced before him' (V. Raghavan). Among them are listed Rāmabhūyadaya' and Uḍāttarāghava'. Murārī, who held the title of 'Bāla Valmikī', wrote Anargha Rāgahava and Rājāśekhara, the versatile writer, produced his'Bālarāmaghāṇa'. Saktibhadra, the South Indian writer in Sanskrit, is the author of Āscarya Cūdāṇamī - a play which is kept in vogue by the actors of the Kūdiyāṭṭām style in Kerala. Dinnāga's Kundamālā, modelled on Bhavabhūti, is another play of the medieval period. By far the richest of that period, if only because it is oft-quoted in discourses, is Mahānālaka (also known as 'Hanumānālaka'). Ascribed to Bhoja, it seems to be a choice collection of well-known passages, put together as a play. Raghavan has suggested that it was a script for a pageant or shadow-play.

In the era of bhakti, the Rāma story underwent transformation at the hands of different schools; thus Bhusūṇḍi Rāmāyanam blends the story of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, while 'Ādhyaṭṭāma Rāmāyaṇa' projects the philosophy of advaita in the devotion to Rāma. 'Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa, equates Sītā with Śakti (Durgā) and 'Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa' is rich in anecdotes.

While the languages of India and other countries carried forward the literary tradition, as we shall see, what lent an impetus to that literary tradition as well as to every tradition in fine arts deserves to be recorded. It is the convention by which royalty came to be associated with Rāma; whether it be valour or nobility of character, if anyone in power had to be recognised there was no better way of doing it than by comparing him to Rāma. C. Sivaramamurti cites the inscription
on the rock at Girnar (A.D. 457) wherein Skandagupta is described in identical language which Vālmiki employs to describe Rāma viz. ‘one who prefaces his talk with a smile’ (smitapurvābhāhs). A copper-plate grant of the 8th cent. in the Pallava period speaks of the glory of Narasimharvarman as having excelled that of Rāma who vanquished Lanka. (Epigraph. Ind 8, p. 320). The reference to Narasimharvarman’s victory over Ceylon as parallel to Rāma’s victory over Lanka is one of the contributing factors for the later confusion between the Lanka of Rāmāyana and Ceylon (modern Śrī Lanka).

Outside the Indian territory, the same phenomenon is seen to manifest itself. In Kambuja-desa (modern Cambodia) numerous inscriptions have been traced, which establish how during the medieval period beginning with the reign of King Yasovarman, the association with Rāmāyana was a matter of pride. One striking example is a verse which compares the city (Kambu-puri) to Ayodhya and the king to Rāma; reference is also made to Sumantra, Sītā and Vibhīṣaṇa. In a similar inscription dated A.D. 967, king Rājendravarman is compared to Rāma and his enemy to Mārica, who was terrified to hear even the first letter of Rāma’s name.

In Thailand, Ayudhya which lies 70 km north of Bangkok, was the capital of a line of 37 rulers beginning with Ramadhibhodi, from A.D. 1350 to 1767. Rulers of the succeeding Chakri dynasty have also adopted Rāma’s name, chakri itself being an epithet for Rāma as Viṣṇu; the present ruler of Thailand is Rāma IX.

Champa (modern Annam) also traces the association with Rāma to ancient times. An inscription dated 7th century, during the reign of Prakasadharmar, is a noble tribute to Vālmiki whose sorrow (soka) was the origin of poetry (sloka); the intimate knowledge of the text of Vālmiki Rāmāyana, revealed here and the veneration in which the poet was held even outside India are both remarkable.

The identification of a territorial chief with Rāma, the model ruler, soon led to two things: the building up of temples of worship for Rāma, (whom the Satwatas projected as an incarnation of Viṣṇu) and the institution of the practice of recitals of Rāmāyana in public. Rulers, Indian and others, are known to have given liberal grants for the purpose of sustaining such recitation and exposition. The story of Rāma thus spread, keeping pace with the glory of Rāma. By and by, every form of creative expression began to address itself to the prestigious task of interpreting the great story of a great hero. A panoramic view of that fascinating phenomenon, fostering a tradition may now be essayed.

**Literature**

The character of Rāma as the archetype of nobility, and the popular appeal of the story which Vālmiki created, captured the imagination of the Asian mind, increasingly. For one thing, the theme—self-denial in the commitment to truth — lent itself to the propagation of any form of ethical teaching, required in any form of religious belief. If Rāma could be an incarnation of Viṣṇu. He could also be a Bodhisatva, or a Jaina preceptor. The Jātaka tales, thus, extol Rāma as a wise man, ‘Rāma pāṇḍita’ who renounced the crown (similar to Buddha) and the Jaina epic in Prakṛt language, ‘Pauma carī’ of Vimalasūri (5th cent.) upholds Rāma as the evolved saint who spends his last days in recluse and penance, while Rāvana is a vidyādhara, not rākṣasa. Adaptations such as this are indicative of a commonly shared reverence for the epic and, as a consequence, a certain freedom to take liberties with the story. Combined with the eagerness to interpolate local legends and local convention into the story, this trait of taking liberty may itself be deemed to have been a vital force in sustaining the tradition.

In India, Tamil was the first language in which regional versions began to appear. Kamban’s Rāmākathai, ascribed to the 10th cent., is a long epic of about 10,000 stanzas; in terms of literary merit, it is classic, representing the grand style. Closely followed the ‘Pampa Rāmāyana’ in Kannada, written by Nagacandra and the ‘Ranganaṭha Rāmāyaṇam’ of Gona Buddha Reddy in Telugu in the 13th century. ‘Vilanka Rāmāyaṇa’ of Sarala Dāsa in Oriya and Ezuttacchan’s Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa in Malayalam reflect the growing influence of medieval cults; while the former glorifies Sītā as Sakti, (the death of Rāvana is at her hands finally, after Rāma and Laksmana have failed), the latter sings of Rāma as Viṣṇu incarnate, — a view which was to find eloquent expression in the 16th cent., in ‘Rāmācaritamānas’ of Tulsidas, in Hindi. Prakāsārāma’s ‘Rāmāvatāra carita’ in
Kashmiri, which belongs to the 18th cent., employs both Persian and Kashmiri metres in its poetry. There were, during the Mughal period of Indian history, many Persian versions of Rāmāyaṇa, one of them being a profusely illustrated calligraphed Mss. at the instance of King Shah Jahan. One interesting feature about the Indian versions is that, ever so often, the beginning of literature in each language coincides with the essay on Rāmāyaṇa,—exactly the same way it happened in Sanskrit.

Of the many versions that took shape in neighbouring countries, the Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin in old Javanese has already been mentioned. A recent version, Serat Rama, is an abridgement of Yogesvara’s Kakawin, mainly to serve the performing arts. Innumerable versions have been springing up in Java and Bali, thanks to the lively tradition of theatre arts that draw upon the story.

Thailand traces the classical tradition to the days of Rama I (late 18th cent.) when the Ramakien (also known as Ramakirti) appeared in Thai language. Many later versions, abridged or modified, have since come up; but, it is sufficient to dwell upon the first, held in high esteem. It is this version which stands illustrated in the mural paintings along the corridors of the Emerald Buddha temple — grand in conception and delicate in execution. It is also a testimony to the Asian capacity for assimilation of different stories or versions into a single epic.

The notion of Sītā as the daughter of Rāvana (found earliest in ‘Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa’), the story of Ahimahi Ravana and his magical powers and anecdotes linking Rāvana and Vali in conflict are all woven into the Thai version. (Interestingly, Thailand is said to have been unaware of Vālmīki until the reign of Rama VI, in this century.) On the nature and extent of what the story covers, Subhadradis Diskul says, “The Ramakien version of King Rama I the Great (1782 — 1809) is by far the longest version of that story in the Thai language and can be divided into five episodes.”

The first episode deals with the eulogy of King Rama I the Great, his desire to compose the complete version of the Ramakien, and then begins with the origin of the Rama dynasty commencing with the foundation of the town of Ayudhya (Ayodhya). Then follows the birth of Rāvana (Tosakan in Thai) with the foundation of the town of Langka(Laṅkā) and the story of Nontok who died in order to be reborn as Rāvana. The origin of the monkey race comes next with the birth of Pāli (Balin) Sukhrip (Sugriva) and Hanumān. The story goes on successively to the birth of Montho (Maṇḍodāri) who later on becomes Rāvana’s consort; the birth of Onghkot (Aṅgada) the son of Pāli and Montho; the birth of Intarachit (Indrajit) Rāvana’s son, and of Nontakarn who is cursed by Śiva, one of the greatest Hindu gods, to become a white bull who will be killed by his own male offspring.

The story continues with the fighting between Tosorath (Daśaratha) Rāma’s father with a demon, Patuttatan. One of his wives, Kaiyakesi (Kaikeyi) helps him in the fighting and Tosorath grants her a wish whenever she desires. Later, five hermits perform a ceremony to ask for sons for Tosorath. Then appear four lumps of divine rice. Montho who lives with Rāvana in the town of Laṅka smells of the fragrance and asks her husband to find out the source. Rāvana’s cousin, Kakanasun (Taraka) transforms herself into a crow and takes half of one lump for Montho. Later, the three queens of Tosorath give birth to four sons: Rāma (the incarnation of Viṣṇu, one of the greatest Hindu gods), Prot (Bharata), Lakṣmāṇa and Satrud (Satrughna), these three being the incarnations of Viṣṇu’s weapons and his nāga seat. Montho also gives birth to a daughter, Sītā (the incarnation of Lakṣmī, Viṣṇu’s consort) but Piphek (Vibhīṣana), Rāvana’s younger brother, and other astrologers at Laṅka predict that she will destroy the demon race. So Sītā is put in a bowl and set adrift on the ocean until found by the hermit Chanok (Janaka) who is king of Mithila.6

The Thai version is said to be derived from a Cambodian version, also known as Ramakirti (author not known). The earliest available palm-leaf manuscript of it belongs to the 17th cent. Closer to Vālmīki, the version depicts Sītā as the foster-daughter of Janaka (not as Rāvana’s abandoned daughter) and in the end following the banishment by Rāma, Sītā is shown as living in Vālmīki’s hermitage. Yet, there are some details in which it is similar to the Thai version and the Indonesian; e.g the demons that disturb Visvāmitra’s yajña are crow-demons (Kāka) and the rocks that are put into the sea for building a bridge are swallowed by the fish.
A significant detail in which there is deviation from Vālmiki is in the scene in Janaka's court: instead of breaking the bow, Rāma is depicted as bending it to shoot an arrow, establishing his strength. It has been pointed out by scholars that the Angkor Wat sculptures follow this version.

Laos, north of Cambodia, is seen to have localised the Rāma story by making Daśaratha (known as Dataratha) the ruler of Laos in the capital Chandaprisattanaga mahanagara (Vientienne) and Rāvana at a place called Indrapatta nagara. In the ancient Rāma Jātaka in Laotian (15-16th cent.) also called 'Phra lak phra lam' the story follows the Buddhist tradition and shows similarities with the Thai version. After the fall of Rāvana, Sīta is restored to Rāma; there is no fire-ordeal.

Malaysia, which cherishes the story of Rāma in both the literary and the folk tradition, is another country (besides Indonesia) where the advent of Islam did not make a difference; if anything, fresh vitality has been imparted by appropriate adaptation. Hikayat Seri Rama, the Malay version, offers fascinating material for a study in acculturation. "The Malaysian literary version of Rāma story in Malay is generally regarded as the manifestation of the cultural ideals of a traditional society such as fidelity among members of the family, love and heroism, loyalty and righteousness, so that the Rāma story has been readily acceptable to the society even after the adoption of Islam. Indeed, the Rāma tradition has been held in high esteem of the ruling elite and the subjects. Thus, for example, the author of the Malay Hikayat Acheh acclaims that the lineage of Sultan Iskander Muda, who ruled over the kingdom of Acheh (in Sumatra) between A.D. 1607 and 1635, was as glorious as that of Sri Rama...... As for the title Laksamana being still used in Malay language to designate the Admiral of the naval fleet, this traditional usage is apparently connected with the fact that the Admiral played the role of the Commander-in-chief in the Malay maritime kingdoms such as the kingdom of Malacca".

Malaysian versions being the story with Rāvana and his antecedents and he is shown as having the gift of boons from Allah (instead of Brahma) and king Daśaratha is said to be the great grandson of prophet Adam. Vibhiṣana is characterised as an astrologer whom Rāvana consults; later, he moves over to Rāma's side and offers advice.

The Philippines has a version in Maranaw, known as Maharaja Lawana which follows the Malay version, Hikayat Maharaja Rawana'. While many of the S.E. Asian versions depict Rāvana as having been guilty of killing the innocent, the Maranaw version shows him as having a vile tongue and a vile nature. In the abduction of Sīta, Rāvana himself takes the form of the golden deer, which doubles itself in order to lure the two brothers in two different directions. One more point is that Hanumān is called Laksmana.

In Burma, the earliest written version of the Rāma story is the poem, Rama Thagyin by U Aung Phyo in 1775. Dasagiri (Daśagriva, i.e. Rāvana) is among the kings invited by Janaka at the bow contest; he manages to lift it but cannot string it. Yet, he asks for Sīta's hand! Another curious feature is that in the battle with Indrajit, it is Laksmana alone who can see the invisible Indrajit, because he has not seen a woman's face for 12 years.

China and Japan retain evidence of Rāma's influence, partially though; for only aspects are cherished. The episodes that are available seem to be derived from Śyāma Jātaka in Pali, not the Daśartha Jātaka which is better known. However, two stories are known in Chinese, viz jātaka of the un-named king, and Nidana of the king of ten Jewels.

The latter is said to contain passages closely resembling Vālmiki e.g. Rāma's declaration of commitment to dharma, when banished from Ayodhā.

Medieval Japan, deriving from the Chinese Jātaka of the unnamed king, produced two tales that are popular: the 'Hobutsushū' and 'Samboekotoba'. The former is a continuous tale while the latter deals with the anecdote of Daśaratha's killing of the innocent rṣi -kumāra through sabda vedhi. Of the former, Minoru Hara of Japan has drawn attention to the differences between the Chinese and the Japanese version. In particular, the Japanese emphasis is on the power of pranidhāna (vow) while the Chinese accent is on Kṣānti (perseverance). Legends of Rāma have been traced in many manuscripts in Tibet and Mongolia cherishes it in the form of the story of king Jiwaka.
Some of the major themes that are manifest in the versions of *Rāmāyaṇa* in different regions may be noted. The first is the story of Mahī Rāvaṇa or Pāṭālā Rāvaṇa, the powerful demon who is depicted as a friend or cousin of Rāvaṇa. With magical powers, it is he who helps to keep Rāvaṇa’s soul in the secrecy of the underworld. Secondly, the version of Sītā as daughter of Daśaratha (and thus the sister of Rāma) occurs in Malaysian stories. Of course, the version that Sītā was the daughter of Dasaratha (and thus the sister of Rāma) occurs in Malaysian stories. Of course, the version that Sītā was the daughter of Rāvaṇa and had to be abandoned in the sea, placed in a casket to be discovered by Janaka later, is more common; the Thai stories are an example. Also occurring in Thailand is the story of Maṇḍodari, wife of Rāvaṇa as having emerged out of a frog (maṇḍūka) remarkably preserved in the popular dance form, “Manduka Sābdam” in India.

Hanuman as the son of Rāma, depicted in the Laotian or Malaysian versions, might be a device to justify Hanuman’s prowess as well as his closeness to Rāma. In Thailand Hanuman is invariably victorious with women, a popular lover!

This brief survey must be concluded with an important point which offers insight into the popularity of *Rāmāyaṇa*, all over. It is that the *phalasruti* (benedictions of prosperity) which is recited at the conclusion of Viṃśi *Rāmāyaṇa* is seen to be duplicated in the Javanese Kakawin and the glowing picture of rāmarājya, as in *Viṃśi* is reproduced in the *Chinese* jataka of the un-named king. These elements, combined with royalty’s eagerness to identify itself with Rāma, have contributed in no small measure to keep *Rāmāyaṇa* alive in all societies.

**Performing Arts**

Recitations and discourses, in temples and elsewhere, paved the ground evidently for the performing arts by building up an eager audience. Theatre arts in the medieval period are seen to respond to the literary lead that each region provides. Kamban’s depiction of the story is seen to provide material for the puppet theatre in Kerala, for example; similar is the use of the Kakawin, in an abridged form, for the presentations of *Rāmāyaṇa* in Indonesia and the use of Rāmakien for the mask-dance, Khon in Thailand. The leather puppeteers of Andhra Pradesh in India draw upon Rāganātha Rāmāyaṇamu the classic in Telugu and their counterparts in Malaysia are seen to employ the ’Hikayat Seri Rama’ for their shadow-puppet show, known as Wayang Kulit—. Literature is harnessed to theatre as in medieval Kerala (India) when rulers commissioned poets to write for the mask-dance, known as Kathakali, the colourful pantomime to enact episodes from *Rāmāyaṇa* and Mahābhārata. Chhau is a popular form of mask-dance in eastern India, devoted to *Rāmāyaṇa* themes. It draws on Krittivīsa *Rāmāyaṇa*.

In regard to stylisation, Kathakali and Khon share many things alike—masks, movements, music etc; the emphasis on battle scenes and vīra (as a rasa) is also similar.12 Even in the matter of recitation, the traditional reciter of Kakawin in the island of Bali is seen to employ a styled sing-song manner not very different from what the reciter in Kūdiyattam of Kerala adopts.

Asia is rich in puppet theatre — leather, shadow, doll, rod, and so on. Every form has thrived of *Rāmāyaṇa* themes and the dalang (puppeteer) displays skill and versatility, while narrating the story and linking contemporary topics with events that belong to Rāmāyaṇa. Thanks to the custom of organising puppet shows on auspicious or religious occasions, the Wayang tradition is flourishing in many parts of S.E.Asia. In the words of Amin Sweeney, ’the characters of Lord Rāma’ his lady Sītā, and their loyal followers still come to life nightly on the shadow-screens of the north-west Malaysia where the performance of a good dalang can still draw a larger audience than a local open-air cinema showing the latest in Hollywood Coca-cola culture.

Theatrical forms in India which present *Rāmāyaṇa* are many; each region has its own. What is striking is the range — from street-shows (the Tamil Terukoottu literally means that) to classical dance-dramas in stylised forms. In the period following Tulsidas, North India evolved what is known as ‘Ramlīlā’, a popular form of enactment, which is staged annually during Dussera. The film and television media have offered their own versions of *Rāmāyaṇa*; a recent film, shown on TV seeks to present an operatic version in Sanskrit, built on ślokas from Viṃśi.

However, story-telling, in the form of ākhyāna or harikathā, has remained, perhaps, the most direct form of transmission of the literary as well as the devotional element in *Rāmāyaṇa*. This tradition has a direct link with the temple tradition in India,
following royal edicts making it an integral part of daily ritual to recite passages from Rāmāyana.

Sculpture

Medieval India is seen to steadily harness human skill in the service of Rāma as God, thanks to the notion of Rāma as an avatāra of Viṣṇu which gained ground. Wonders in stone and bronze thus bear testimony to aesthetic dedication, manifest in skilled hands. The Chola king, Pārantaka (A.D. 907-955) gave himself the title Saṅgrāma Rāghava (perhaps after his expedition over Sri Lanka) and it is said, “The building of separate shrines for Rāma and the construction of the image of Rāma with Lākṣmana and Sītā became a regular feature of the temple-building activities of the Cholas in the tenth century A.D. Chronologically, the earliest reference to a Rāma temple occurs in the inscriptions of Pārantaka”.¹³

Temples of worship for Rāma abound, especially in South India; Kumbakonam, Vāduvoor, Tillaivalagam and a host of other places are sacred, if only because of a Rāma shrine. The stone images in Kumbakonam, of Rāma, Sītā, Lākṣmana with Hanumān playing the viṇā (to sing the glory of Rāma) are described as the ‘most imposing group of sculptures in a sanctum anywhere in India’ (C. Sivaramamurthy). Chola bronzes, with Rāma in a tribhuhga pose, are ‘the most noble creations of Chola art’ (R. Champakalakshmi). An exquisite set is housed in the Madras Museum.

Although a 5th century terracota depicts Rāma and Lākṣmana in conversation, the depiction of episodes from Rāmāyana in sculpture has not been widely manifest in India. So, the Hazara Rama temple in Hampi (Central India) where the narration in stone of the story of Rāmāyana is executed in exquisite panels of dramatic force, must assume importance. It belongs to the period of the Vijayanagara empire, by which time Rāma had been fully deified; yet, the bas-relief panels on the wall tell the story in human terms and the narrative is taken up to the final exit of Sītā in uttarakāṇḍa.

Larger in size and conception, the bas-relief figures in the Siva-Viṣṇu temple at Prambanan in central Java stand in eloquent proof of the early hold of Rāmāyana on the creative mind. Ascribed to the 10th cent. A.D. of the Sailendra kingdom, the panels, numbering 42, cover the story from the beginning to the monkeys reaching Lanka; the rest of the story is carried forward in the neighbouring temple, concluding with a moving panel showing Sītā pregnant, listening to Vālmiki’s consolation. Since The Rāmāyana Kakawin does not carry the story beyond Rāma’s coronation, it is evident that the sculptor derived from other sources as well.

The depiction in stone at Panataran in eastern Java belongs to a later period (14th cent.) but its significance lies in the attestation of Rāmāyana’s continuity in Indonesia; the characters, which in Prambanan have a distinct Pallava style of physiognomy, are here typically Javanese.

The account of sculpture will be incomplete without reference to Angkor Wat in Cambodia — a shrine of Viṣṇu, erected by king Suryavarman II in the 12th century. The battle-scenes in the western gallery are considered ‘a marvel of workmanship... it is unparalleled, fantastic, breath-taking’ (V. Raghavan).

Mural painting

The temple of emerald Buddha in Bangkok has an outer gallery which serves as a grand mural running into 178 sections, so as to cover the entire Ramakien as told by Rama I of the Chakri dynasty. Magnificent paintings, with great attention to details as in the battle scenes, fill the covered gallery that surrounds the temple. Renewed from time to time, the murals are enriched by poems on the accompanying marble slabs—poems that were composed by King Rama V. The episode of Rāma and Sītā having a glimpse of each other before marriage as found in Kamban’s epic, is depicted in one mural, while Sītā’s fire ordeal is shown in the Thai tradition whereby the fire turned into a lotus at the feet of Sītā. In the words of Diskul, “The story of the Ramakien teaches virtues of honesty, faithfulness and devotion. Though the theme comes from the Hindu epic, the characters and the settings in the painting as well as the technique are all Thai”.

Interestingly, there are no murals worthy of notice in India; those that are found in the temple at Matīranći (Kerala) are in a state of neglect, though they deserve better because they represent an elegant style of painting.
Innumerable artisans carry forward the tradition — makers of dolls, batik-painters, charcoal drawings on rice paper etc. Whatever from it takes, the story of Rāma lives, fulfilling the benediction that as long as mountains live and rivers flow, the tale of Rāma shall live on Earth.
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The story of Rāma is well known in Tibet and it is told in many texts. The oldest known version is found in six manuscripts from Tun-huang. Tun-huang in the north-west of China was occupied by the Tibetans during a period of about sixty years from 787 to 848. It is probably during the Tibetan occupation that this version of the story of Rāma was written in Tun-huang. It is also possible that the manuscripts containing this story could have been written in Central Tibet and brought to Tun-huang during the Tibetan occupation. The six manuscripts containing this story are all incomplete and they differ in details. The six manuscripts which are usually designated with the letters A, B, C, D, E, and F can be divided into two groups. Manuscripts A, C, D, and F, represent one Recension: Recension I, and manuscripts B and E another recension Recension II. The main difference between the two recensions is that Recension I is more detailed, containing several episodes which are missing in Recension II. Recension I is preserved almost in its entirety in manuscripts D and A which together contain 491 lines. Only a few lines are missing. The complete manuscript of Recension I must have contained almost 500 lines. The second recension is only partly preserved, mainly in manuscript E. The 276 lines of manuscript E correspond to about 340 lines of manuscripts D and A. Probably Recension II contained about 400 lines.

It is not my intention to repeat the detailed summary of the two recensions which I presented to the First International Sanskrit Conference in New Delhi in March 1972. However, it is necessary to briefly sketch the main lines of the story in order to explain the relationship of the Tun-huang version with the later versions of the story of Rāma and Sitā.

The narrative begins with a description of the country of Lankapura situated in the midst of the ocean. It is ruled by the king of the demons, Yajasakori, who cannot be defeated by the gods. The gods request the rṣi Viśravas and Śrīdevi to bear a son who will be able to vanquish him. This son, Vaiśravāna, kills all demons but spares Malhyapanta, the son of Yajasakori. Malhyapanta plans revenge and devotes himself to serving a divine rṣi a son of Brahmā, called Śvapasina or Biṣurasena, to whom he offers his daughter, Mekesena. Three sons are born from this union: Daśagrīva, Udppakarna (Ampakarna) and Ciriśāna (Birināśa). They obtain power over the gods from Mahādeva, and go to Lankapura to kill both gods and men there. In this way they avenge the death of Yajasakori for Malhyapanta. In Recension II this episode is told very briefly, but in Recension I it is much more detailed. According to the latter, the three sons of Mekesena first ask Brahmā for three miraculous powers. When Brahmā refuses, they go to Mahādeva and try to propitiate him. Daśagrīva even cuts off one of his ten heads as an offering. Mahādeva’s wife, Upade (Upame), offers them their own miraculous power, which they reject. Upade thereupon prophesies that they will be destroyed by a woman. Then Mahādeva’s minister, Prahaṣṭi, offers his miraculous power, which they likewise reject, and Prahaṣṭi prophecies that they will be destroyed by a monkey. Finally, they obtain from Mahādeva the three following powers: (1) power over the gods; (2) the death of any being who is struck by the first arrow shot; and (3) immortality, as long as Daśagrīva’s horse-head is not cut off.

After the victory of the three sons of Mekesena, the gods deliberate as to what do against Daśagrīva and the demons. They ask Viṣṇu for help. Viṣṇu incarnates himself as Ramana, the son of Daśratha, and his own son appears on earth as Lagśana. A daughter is born to Daśagrīva, but it is predicted that she shall cause the ruin of her father and the demons so she is placed in a copper box and committed to the waters. She is found by Indian peasants and named ‘Found in the furrow’ (Rol-r̥ned-ma). Daśratha is wounded in a battle between the gods and the demons, and Ramana renounces the throne and Lagśana is appointed as king. Rol-r̥ned-ma grows up and the peasants offer her to Ramana who accepts her as his wife and gives her the name of Queen Sitā. Ramana now becomes king.

When one of Yagasakori’s ministers, Marutse, prevents five hundred brāhmaṇas from obtaining a siddhi, Ramana throws a ring at Marutse and injures one of his eyes. The brāhmaṇas obtain their siddhi and gave Ramana a blessing: all those who die by his arrows will be reborn as gods.
Meanwhile, Daśāgrīva's sister, Purpala, has fallen in love with Ramana who rejects her and Purpala advises her brother Daśāgrīva to abduct Sītā. Marutse now transforms himself into a deer, which Ramana pursues. Lagšana, who thinks that Ramana is in distress, leaves Sītā to go to his assistance, and Daśāgrīva carries off Sītā together with a plot of ground.

Ramana and Lagšana search everywhere for Sītā. They meet with the monkey-king Sugrīva who fights his elder brother Bālīn for possession of their kingdom. Ramana makes a pact with Sugrīva, promising to make him king if he helps him to find Sītā. Ramana is unable to distinguish between Sugrīva and Bālīn. The next day a mirror is attached to Sugrīva's tail and Bālīn is killed by Ramana; Ramana and Sugrīva return to their homes. Ramana waits three years for Sugrīva to return and fulfills his pledge, and eventually sends him a message by means of an arrow. Sugrīva comes with an army of monkeys, and the monkeys Paśgu, Sindu and Hanumanta are sent off to search for Sītā. They meet with Pada', the elder son of Agajaya, king of the eagles. Pada' tells them that Sītā was abducted by Daśāgrīva.

Hanumanta jumps into the sea and goes to Lankapura. He finds Sītā in a castle with nine walls without gates and gives her a letter and a ring from Ramana. Hanumanta uproots the trees in the park and kills many demons. Hanumanta is captured and asks as a favor to be killed in the same way as his father was killed, so the demons wrap his tail in cloth, dip it in butter and set it on fire. Hanumanta thereupon burns the castle of the demons, and returns to Sītā who gives him a letter for Ramana. Hanumanta returns and gives the letter to Ramana.

The monkeys and men now set out for Lāṅka. The monkeys Maku and Damsi (Dan'du) construct a bridge, and they all reach Lāṅka. Daśāgrīva's younger brother, Ampakarna (Udpakarna) advises his brother to flee. Daśāgrīva does not listen to him and Ampakarna joins Ramana.

The demon Kumbhakarna is plunged into eternal sleep. Daśāgrīva and the other demons finally succeed in waking him up, and he swallows the men and the monkeys, but Ramana and Hanumanta escape. Hanumanta is sent to fetch a herb from Mount Kailāsa. He returns with the entire mountain which he then replaces again. All the men and monkeys are revived.

Ramana fights with Daśāgrīva whose younger brother, Birīnaša, deserts him and flees. Lagšana is killed, but Ramana cuts off Daśāgrīva's horse-head. Daśāgrīva dies, falling on the demons and killing most of them. Ramana liberates Sītā and revives Lagšana, and Sugrīva and Ramana return to their respective countries. Hanumanta is appointed minister of Sugrīva after whose death he becomes king.

The tale does not end there. The last part of the story tells how Ramana goes to suppress a revolt by King Benbala, leaving Sītā and her son Lava in the care of five hundred rṣis on Mount Malayana. When Lava is lost, the rṣis create another son out of Kusa grass. On his return, Ramana overhears a conversation between the Licchavi Vimala (? Dri-ma dag-pa) and his wife who accuses Sītā of adultery. Ramana thereupon rejects Sītā who departs with her two sons. Hanumanta visits Ramana and explains that Daśāgrīva was in fact unable even to approach Sītā. Ramana is convinced and sends for Sītā and his two sons. Hanumanta returns to his own kingdom, and Ramana, Sītā and their two sons live happily in the palace 'Old Earth' (sa-rniṅ).
must assume that either it is not preserved, or that it does exist, but under a different title.

In the first half of the thirteenth century the famous Sa-skya Pandita (1182-1251) composed a collection of four hundred and fifty-seven quatrains called in Tibetan: Legs-par bsdad-pa rin-po-che'i gter and in Sanskrit: Subhāṣītaratnaniḥdi—This work was first studied by Csoma de Körös (1784-1842), whose translation and edition of 234 stanzas was published after his death. Of special interest is the old Mongolian translation of Sonom gar-a which was edited and translated by Ligeti. Both the Tibetan text and the Mongolian translation of Sonom gar-a were edited and translated by James E. Bosson in ‘A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels’ (Bloomington, 1969). Sa-skya Pandita was well versed in Sanskrit literature, and in the past it has even been assumed that his work was actually first composed in Sanskrit. However, according to James E. Bosson, this is not the case: ‘Although many of the stanzas can be traced directly to Sanskrit originals, and, although there is an obvious Indian flavour in most of the verses, there is no basis for doubting that Sa-skya Pandita actually made the collection himself and independently composed most of the verses, albeit on a popular Indian pattern’ (op. cit., p.1). Stanza 321 refers to the killing of Rāvana. Bosson’s translation of the Tibetan text is as follows: ‘The Great should abandon their desire for play and enjoyment and food. As a reprimand for having desired voluptuousness, it is renowned that Rāvana was killed in Lanka’ (chen-po rnam-skyi rtsed-mo dan-bde. daṅ zas la chags-pa sān[īdod-la zen-pa’ i le- lan-gyis’ bod-greg laṅ-’kar bsdad ces grags’). The Mongolian translation is slightly different: ‘Great persons should abandon their desire for play, food and enjoyment. By reason of having lusted for enjoyment, there is the saying that Tisegiri was killed in Larika’. Bosson remarks in a note that the Mongolian translation of the name of Rāvana seems to be thoroughly confused. According to him, this seems to be the name Tise, which is the Tibetan name for Mount Kailāsa, and the Sanskrit word girī (sic !) The Mongolian translation has Tes-e girī. Undoubtedly, this represents Daśagrīva. It happens quite often that the Tibetan translators translate Sanskrit proper names, but that the Mongolian translators make use of a transliteration. Bosson quotes from another manuscript a variant Desegri which is even closer to Sanskrit Daśagrīva.

The story of Rāma is told in a commentary to the Subhāṣītaratnaniḥdi by Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal of Dbus. A blockprint of this commentary was described by E. Gene Smith, who writes: ‘This commentary was written by a disciple of the author and is the best known in Tibet of the numerous commentaries’. Dmar-ston’s commentary is based upon an older commentary by Rin-chen-dpal which was incomplete and full of errors/ Dmar-ston Chosrgyal received oral explanations from Sa-skya Pandita and wrote his work in accordance with these. Recently, Damdinsüren has published in Russian a work on the Rāmāyana in Mongolia (‘Ramajana v Mongolii, Moskva,’ 1979) in which he gives the text and translation of Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal’s commentary on stanza 321 in which he tells the story of Rāma. According to Damdinsüren, Rin-chen dpal is the name of a scholar who lived from 1230 to 1310 and who received an invitation from the Mongolian emperor Qubilai in 1292 (op.cit., p.136, n. 4). However, it is difficult to suppose that Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal was able to make use of the work of a scholar who was born only 22 years before the death of Sa-skya Pandita in 1252. The name Rin-chen dpal is quite common and it must be left to further research to determine his identity. It is quite clear from the colophon that the author of this commentary is Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal and not Rin-chen dpal as is asserted by Bosson (op. cit., p.14) and Heissig. Dmar-ston Chos-rgyal’s commentary on the Subhāṣītaratnaniḥdi was published in 1968 by Tanzin Chhagdor, but the text is not free from errors. Damdinsüren’s edition of the story of Rāma in this commentary is based upon a nineteenth century Mongolian blockprint (op. cit., pp.173-177). I have not been able to use other editions.

The story begins with Rāvana’s fruitless efforts to propitiate Mahādeva. Umā offers him her own miraculous power instead, but this is rejected by Rāvana and Umā predicts that his kingdom will be destroyed by a woman. Mahādeva sends his own son whose offer of his miraculous power is likewise rejected. Mahādeva’s son predicts that his kingdom will be destroyed by a monkey. Finally, Mahādeva comes himself. Rāvana asks Mahādeva for many things: a fortification, Trikuṭa,
surrounded by the ocean; the physicians of heaven: the Apsaras; an army of demons; more possessions than Kubera has; an indestructible iron wall; and finally the siddhi of immortality. However, Mahadeva places Sarasvati on his tongue and she distorts his wishes so that instead of the siddhi of immortality Rāvana obtains the siddhi of immortality as long as his horse-head is not cut off.

A daughter is born to Rāvana, and brāhmans say that she possesses marks of ill omen. She is therefore placed in a copper box and committed to the waters. She is found by peasants who give her the name ‘Found in the furrow’. They offer her to Ramana and she is given the name Sītā. Ramana wants to hand over the throne to his younger brother Lakuma who refuses. The youngest of the three brothers Bhīmasena (`Jigs-sde`), is therefore appointed king, and Ramana Lakuma and Sītā depart for the forest of penance.

Daśagriva is very happy with his wife; he asks whether there is on earth a more beautiful woman. He is told that in Jambudvīpa there is a very beautiful woman. Daśagriva goes to the forest of penance and makes a beautiful deer, appear before the eyes of Ramana, Lakuma and Sītā. Sītā asks Ramana to capture the deer. Ramana at first refuses but finally cedes to Sītā’s wishes, and goes in chase. Daśagriva meanwhile imitates Ramana’s voice and Sītā thinks that Ramana is in distress, and she asks Lakuma to go to his assistance. Lakuma does not want to leave Sītā but she reproaches him with wishing for the death of the king so that he will be able to take possession of her. Lakuma surrounds Sītā with a fence and tells her not to go beyond it. Daśagriva now appears in the guise of a brāhmaṇ and asks for alms. Sītā refuses to move from her enclosure and Daśagriva carries Sītā off together with the whole plot of ground. Ramana and Lakuma return and see that Sītā has been abducted, and Ramana understands that the deer was the manifestation of a demon.

Ramana and Lakuma search everywhere for Sītā. They meet with a monkey-king Sugrīva who is fighting his brother for the kingdom of the monkeys. Ramana promises to help him, but is unable to distinguish between the two monkeys, so Sugrīva attaches a mirror to his forehead and the king kills Bālin. Before dying, Bālin complaints of the fact, that Ramana has taken the side of Sugrīva. Bālin’s wife takes the corpse of her husband to the snowy mountain.

Sugrīva rejoices and promises to do whatever Ramana desires. Together they go to the valley of the monkeys, where they find Sugrīva’s minister, a tall monkey with three eyes. This minister, Hanumandha, makes one enormous jump and arrives in the palace of god Vāyu. While waiting outside for food, Hanumandha tries to use the plough there but is unable to move it. His uncle, the god Vāyu, explains that the Nāgas under the earth fear his force and are holding firmly onto the plough. With another jump Hanumandha arrives in Lāṅka and sees that Sītā is imprisoned in a fruit garden. He is told that she is kept imprisoned because she does not want to marry the king of the demons. He goes to Sītā and tells her that he is sent by Ramana. Sītā does not trust him until he shows her Ramana’s ring, when she gives him message for Ramana saying that she is unable to escape. Hanumandha asks for food from Sītā and receives only a little.

Hanumandha uproots the trees in the park and replants them with their tops in the ground and their roots in the air. The demons surround him, but each time he escapes by means of a jump. He is finally captured, and asks as a favour to be killed either in the way of the mother or that of the father. The first way consists of putting him in a store-room and giving him so much delicious food that he chokes to death. The way of the father consists of wrapping his tail in cloth, pouring oil on it and setting it alight. This latter is done and Hanumandha burns the crystal palace of the king and all the other castles, which are made of lacquer. Finally, he wishes to dip his tail in the ocean. The Nāgas prevent this and extinguish the fire by means of vapour.

Hanumandha returns to Ramana and tells him why Sītā is unable to come. The king asks Hanumandha to bring an army together near the ocean. While they are constructing a bridge, Ramana asks the great rṣi Vālmīki (Grog-mkhar) what kind of creatures there are in the great ocean. Vālmīki tells him that there is a creature which swallows fish and is called Timin. There is another which swallows Timin and another who swallows the one who swallows Timin.
King Ramana and the army of the monkeys cross the bridge and are met by Rāvana with his army, and Ramana cuts off his horse-head. King Ramana returns to his own country.

Some of the demons rouse Daśāgriva's younger brother, Kumbhakarṇa, who is plunged in meditation, by pouring molten bronze in his ear. He wakes up and asks what has happened. The demons tell him that his elder brother has been killed. Kumbhakarṇa inhales through his nose and, with the exception of Ramana and Hanumandha, all are transformed into skeletons.

Ramana sends Hanumandha to the snowy mountain of Kailāsa (Ti-se) to fetch a medicinal herb. Hanumandha does not find it, and is sent a second time. This time he brings the entire mountain back with him. With the help of the herb all the soldiers are revived. Ramana now orders him to return the mountain; Hanumandha throws it from afar back to its original place. This is the reason why, it said, the top of the mountain is slanting.

Ramana arrives and takes Sītā back. The story concludes with the remark that all this happened to Rāvana on account of the two curses.

In many respects this story is remarkably similar to the old Tun-huang version. There are some very interesting variations, however. In the Tun-huang version the two curses are uttered by Umā and Mahādeva's minister, Prahasī. In this story Prahasī is replaced by a son of Mahādeva. In both versions Daśāgriva asks for immortality and in both versions Sarasvatī changes his wish. However, in the Tun-huang version Daśāgriva expresses three wishes, all of which were changed by Sarasvatī. In Dmar-ston's version, Bhīmasena is brother of Ramana and Lakuma. In neither version is Bharata mentioned. In Dmar-ston's version Marutse is not transformed into a deer. The deer is an optical illusion created by Daśāgriva. Another difference between the two accounts is that in the Tun-huang version a mirror is attached to the tail of Sugrīva. In Dmar-ston's version the mirror is attached to his forehead. Still another difference between the two versions is that the Tun-huang one does not mention the way of the mother as a possibility for killing Hanumandha. In Dmar-ston's version Vālmiki is mentioned but only as a rṣi who tells Rāma about the sea-monster Timi, Timingila and Timitimingila. These three monsters are mentioned in the Divyavādāna, and must have been known to the Tibetans from the Vinaya of the Mulasarvāstivādins.

Dmar-ston's version omits much, but also adds details which are not found in the Tun-huang version: for instance, Hanumandha's visit to the god Vāyu, the story of the Nāgas and the plough, and the extinguishing of the fire on Hanumandha's tail by the Nāgas. It is obvious that the story as told by Dmar-ston cannot have been derived directly from the Tun-huang version. This version or a version similar to it must still have been known in Tibet in the thirteenth century. Several details are different and there are some additions. Of course, many things have been omitted. The first part and the entire latter part dealing with the rejection of Sītā by Ramana are completely absent. It is of course quite probable that these parts of the story were perfectly well-known in Tibet in the thirteenth century but that it was considered superfluous to tell the entire story in explanation of stanza 321 of the Subhaśitaratnaniṇī'hi.

There are many later commentaries on the Subhaśitaratnaniṇī'hi, both in Tibetan and in Mongolian. In his book, Damdinsüren studies six Mongolian translations or adaptations of Dmar-ston's commentary. He edits and translates one written in 1778-1779 by Cagar gebsi Blo-bzan tahul-khrims. Damdinsüren remarks that the Mongolian versions contain details which are not found in Dmar-ston's text and that it is possible that the authors of these versions had at their disposal other sources relating to the Rāma story. As regards other Tibetan versions of the commentary on the Subhaśitaratnaniṇī'hi Damdinsüren mentions a version the author of which is unknown. According to him the story of Rāma in this version is substantially the same as that found in Dmar-ston's version. Another one, written by a certain Tshulkhirms dpal, contains only a brief extract from Dmar-ston's version of the Rāma story. There are many other Tibetan commentaries on the Subhaśitaratnaniṇī'hi, and I hope that Tibetan scholars will bring together as many different versions of the Rāma story as possible. By publishing them in a chronological order it will become possible to see to what
extent they depend on Dmar-ston’s version and to what extent they provide new details.

One of the most popular Indian works in Tibet is Dandin’s Kāvyādārśa, which was translated at the instigation of the famous Phags-pa (1235-1280) in the thirteenth century. The translation was revised by Blo-gros grtan-pa of Dpaṅ who lived from 1276 to 1342. Tibetan scholars have written very many commentaries on the Kāvyādārśa. I am most grateful to Mr. Gene Smith for pointing out to me that the story of Rāma is told in the commentaries on the twenty-second alamkāra the udāttalamkāra, of the second pariccheda. Mr. Gene Smith has been so kind as to provide me with the text of several commentaries on this alamkāra. These commentaries were written between the fifteenth and the nineteenth centuries. I would like to select two of them for further consideration. The first was written by Dge-duṅ-phel or Sanghasṛi from Snar-than, probably in the year 1429. His version of the story of Rāma is often referred to by later authors. His detailed commentary on the Kāvyādārśa (Snān-nag me-lon-gi rgya-che-gral-pa) was published in 1976 in Thimphu in Bhutan. The story of Rāma is found on pages 107-128.

The story begins with the participation of Daśaratha in the battle between the gods and the demons. During the battle the axle of his chariot is broken. The younger queen perceives it and holds the axle firm with her hand. The gods are victorious and Daśaratha returns to his palace. He sees that there are many bloody wounds on the queen’s hand and asks her the reason for it. She tells him what she has done for him during the battle. The king says to her that if this is true he will give her a great present. His retinue confirm her words and the king asks her what she desires. She tells him that at this moment there is nothing she wants, but if later she has a desire, he must not forget his promise. They live for a long time in great happiness. The king makes preparations to install Ramana as king. The younger queen comes to see him and asks him if he has forgotten his former promise. She now has a wish: that the throne will be given to her own son. The king remembers his promise and tells Ramana that, although he ought to be made king because he is the son of the elder queen and much stronger, this cannot be. He tells him to take Sitā with him and to remain twelve years in the forest, because he has promised to give the throne to Bharata, the son of the younger queen. The prince is very high-minded. He obeys the words of his father and departs with Sitā for the forest.

The king of the demons, Rāvana of Lāṅka, also called Daśagriva, had in the past fathered a beautiful daughter but he was told that she was a human girl and would destroy the city of the demons if she remained in the land of the demons. She was put in a copper box and thrown into the ocean. Peasants find her in a furrow and see that she is very beautiful, they decide to offer her as wife to King Ramana. Ramana marries her and she received the name Sitā. Her other name is Röl-rfied-ma “Found in the furrow”. Some time later, the king of the demons discovers the beautiful Sitā in Jambudvīpa. He abducts her and carries her off to the land of the demons. Ramana, who had left Sitā in order to search for food, returns and cannot find her. He realises that she has been abducted by a demon. He follows his trail and arrives in a valley where there is a stream of warm and foul-smelling water. He discovers that this river has been produced by the drops of sweat of two monkey kings who are fighting for the kingdom. A female monkey asks him who he is. He tells her that he is Ramana and asks why these two monkeys are fighting. She tells him that the former king has died of old age and that they do not agree about the succession. She asks him why he has come here, and Ramana tells her that he is searching for Sitā. She proposes a pact of mutual assistance and asks him to kill the enemy of her son. She points out her son to him but when they are fighting the following day, Ramana is unable to distinguish between the two monkeys. The female monkey says to Ramana: ‘You are very clever. You must know a way’. The king tells her to attach a shell ornament to the face of her son. The next day they fight again and Ramana kills the other monkey. The author adds that since that time it has become a custom to attach shell ornaments to monkeys. The mother of the dead monkey, looking very terrible, goes towards Ramana who is on the point of shooting her with an arrow. She asks him if he is King Ramana. When he answers: ‘Yes’. She tells him that all those at whom he shoots an arrow will be hit. All those who are hit die, and all who die are reborn in noble families. Her son has also been reborn in a
noble family and therefore she will do him no harm. She departs with the corpse of her son.

The monkeys go back to the forest and enjoy food and drink, and time passes. One day King Ramana goes to the forest and sees that they are living on a hilltop and enjoying food and drink. He is not content and plans to shoot an arrow. A female monkey arrives in haste and asks the king to forgive the monkeys for their forgetfulness. She promises that they will do all he tells them, and Ramana asks the monkeys to assemble an army and to go to Lanka. When they arrive at the shore of the ocean, they see heaps of foam which look like snowy mountains. The monkeys have always lived in sandy deserts and are dejected by the idea that they have to climb these mountains. The king shoots an arrow which passes through the foam without any resistance. The monkeys are comforted and go straight forward without any hindrance. They see the great ocean and the expanse of heaven. In the middle of the heavens they see a dark spot which looks like a city. The king of the monkeys asks Ramana to shoot an arrow towards it, and a monkey who is very small and resembles a snake, coils around the arrow before it is released.

After five or six days they arrive at the other side of the ocean by means of many bridges which they lay one after the other. The army of demons awaits them. At this point in the story there is a long description of the fortifications of the city of the demons, and of the palace of Daśagṛiva which is made of crystal, rubies and other precious stones. The gates of the palace are guarded by terrible many-armed doorkeepers. Tigers and other wild animals utter terrifying roars. Many birds, such as jivājīvakas are making many different sounds. King Ramana kills everybody with his arrows and enters the palace, where he sees a golden throne which is richly adorned. Daśagṛiva himself has strong and coarse arms and legs, an enormous belly and wrinkles and veins which are as bulky as fore-arms. The claws of his feet and hands are made out of the iron of thunderbolts. On his ten necks are ten furious heads. His mouth is wide open and shows terrible tusks. He laughs with a loud laugh. He utters confused words and angry threats. Fire and smoke bellow forth from his mouth, nose and eyes. The hair of his head and beard is yellow-reddish and bristling, and his limbs are adorned with bloody serpents and monsters. Many demon kings made of pearls are visible. The monkey king and his followers are afraid, thinking: 'It is difficult to kill one demon king. How is it possible to kill many demon kings?' Ramana tells them not to be afraid and comforts them, saying: 'They are probably reflections of the demon on the walls made of precious stones'. He sends the monkey king and two strong monkeys to have a closer look but they flee in fright. Ramana tells them that it is not possible that there are so many demon kings; certainly they must be reflections. He sends them again and again to have a good look. They discover that the demon on the throne is warm and that the others are reflections without any warmth. The king kills the demon king with an arrow. He is said to have been reborn immediately as a god. King Ramana with Sītā and the monkey king return to their own countries. Two strong monkeys carry burning rags in their hands and burn the walls made of lac, and the city of the demons, Trikūṭa, is destroyed. The authors add that the Gur-mgon (a divinity of the Sa-skya school) is an incarnation of Ramana.

King Ramana arrives at the ocean and stirs it up with his mighty bow so that the water whirls in circles. The demons are all killed. Ramana returns home and the dead demons are reborn in heaven. The Lord of the gods, Indra, is an old friend of the demons. A rain of spears, etc., descends on the army of the monkeys who are cut to pieces and killed. In the space between the clouds Indra is seen to draw his bow and to go towards Ramana who draws his bow and aims at Indra. Indra is afraid and trembles. He says to Ramana: 'Do not shoot. I shall revive all your monkeys.' Indra causes heavenly nectar to rain and all monkeys are revived. The author concludes by saying that by means of this story one understands easily the loftiness of Ramana's spirit and the greatness of the wealth of the demon king, i.e., the two meanings of the word udātta (rgya-che-ba). This refers to Kavyādarsa.

II. 297:

āśayasya vibhūter vā yan mahattvam anuttaram/
udāttaṁ nāma tam prāhur alamkāram maniśīnab//
and II. 300

puṇḍratrāṣayamāhātmyam atrāhyudayagauravam/
suvyāñjitam ativyaktam udāttadvayam apy adah//

Sanghaśrī’s version also refers to Kāvyādārśa II.299 with regard to the reflections of the demon king on the walls:

ratnabhittisu samkrantaḥ pratibimbaśātair vṛtaḥ/
trīto laṅkeśvaraḥ kṛcchraḥ añjaneyena tattvataḥ//

However, he has not made use of verse II. 298:
guroḥ śaśānam atyetum naśāsaka sa rāghavaḥ/
yo rāvanāśirāschedakaryabhāre ‘py aviklavaḥ//

In several respects Sanghaśrī’s version is rather aberrant. For instance, the story of the broken axle of Daśaratha’s chariot is not mentioned in other commentaries on the Kāvyādārśa which I have seen. Other details also are missing in later commentaries. The authors of these commentaries do not fail to point out that Sanghaśrī’s version of the Rāma story contains many errors. A scholar who lived in the eighteenth century, Bstan-dzin chos-kyi ni-ma, Khams-sprul IV (1730-1779), is extremely critical of Sanghaśrī and lists several errors made by him.10

A more orthodox version of the story of Rāma is found in a commentary written in 1586 by Rin-spuns-pa nag-dhan jig-rten dbaṅ-phug grags-pa. The author first quotes Kāvyādārśa II. 297 and 298. The story begins with Rāvana’s efforts to propitiate Mahādeva. He cuts off all his ten heads as sacrifice to him. Only his ten necks remain and that is why he is called Daśagrīva. As in Dmar-ston’s version, Umā and Mahādeva’s son offer their own miraculous powers and curse Daśagrīva when he rejects their offers. In this story the son of Mahādeva is said to have the face of a monkey. Perhaps this detail has been added in order to explain his curse, according to which Daśagrīva’s kingdom will be destroyed by a monkey. Finally, Daśagrīva’s heads are returned by Mahādeva who also grants him the siddhi of immortality provided his horse-head is not cut off. Daśagrīva boasts of his power, and that he can only be overcome by somebody of incomparable strength.

In the past Daśaratha had been wounded by the weapons of the asuras in the battle between the gods and the asuras. After

his return to Ayodhya he was cured by his younger wife Kekeya. He grants her a wish. Later, when he wants to enthroned Ramana, Kekeya asks him to make her son Bharata king and to send Ramana to the forest for twelve years. The king tells Ramana to depart for the forest with Śītā. Ramana is not able to disobey the order of his father. The author adds that this shows the loftiness of his spirit (āsāsasya mahātattvam). He refers also to the story of Manicūda. The verse he quotes is in the third pallava, verse 95, of the Bodhisattvāvadānaśākalaṭā.

sa virakuṭijaraḥarhi śakto ‘py arividārane/
janakṣayabhayodvignaḥ kāruṇyāt samacintayat//

The author now quotes Kāvyādārśa II. 299 and explains the greatness of wealth (vibhūte mahātattvam).

A beautiful girl was once born in the land of the demons but bad signs indicated that, if she remained there, she would destroy the city of Laṅkā. She was put in a copper box, confided to the waters, found by peasants, and offered to Ramana as his wife. Rol-rme-d-ma or Śītā enjoys herself with the king. Once when they are in the forest, the king of the demons discovers that she is the most beautiful woman in Jambudvīpa. His sister, Śla-byed-ma, transforms herself into a deer in order to lure the king away. The king surrounds Śītā with a wall of light and tells her not to pass beyond it: ‘If you do, you will die.’ The king pursues the deer to the seashore. The author adds that the time has now arrived for the fulfilment of the curses uttered by the goddess and the one with the monkey face. Rāvana does not know that Śītā is the girl thrown in the waters. He appears before Śītā in the guise of a brahman and tries to abduct her. As Śītā is unwilling to disobey the order of the king, Rāvana uses magic to take her away, together with a plot of land, to the country of the demons. The King is unable to capture the deer and realises that it is an optical illusion. He returns and discovers that Śītā has been carried away by Rāvana. He goes in search for her and comes upon a river of warm water produced by the drops of sweat of the two monkeys ‘Bable and Sugrīva, who are fighting for the kingdom. Ramana promises his help to Sugrīva, but on the first day of the fight he is distracted by the spectacle, and the second day he is unable to distinguish between the two monkeys. On the third day a
mirror is attached to Sugrīva’s forehead and the king kills Bable with an arrow. Sugrīva promises to do for Rāma whatever he wishes and Rāma tells him that Sītā has been taken away by a demon. Sugrīva tells Rāma that his minister Hanumantha is very clever. They go to Hanumantha, who is said to be the son of Mahādeva with the monkey face. He is very tall and has three eyes. When Hanumantha is asked if he knows a means of bringing Sītā back, he reflects a moment and then makes one big jump to the palace of his uncle, the god Vāyu. From there he arrives with one jump in Lāṅka. He sees Sītā who is imprisoned in an orchard. He goes to Sītā and tells her that he is sent by Ramana. She does not trust him, but Hanumantha shows her Ramana’s ring. She gives him a message for the king, telling him that she is unable to escape and that if he has the necessary strength, he must come and fetch her. Hanumantha returns with one jump to Ramana who assembles an army of monkeys. He arrives at the seashore and asks Vālmiki what kinds of creatures live in the ocean. Vālmiki tells him about the three kinds of sea-monsters, Timi, etc. The monkeys make a bridge over the ocean and arrive at the palace of the demon king. The walls of his palace are made out of jewels and are brilliant like mirrors. Hanumantha is surrounded by hundreds of reflections of Daśāgrīva and is unable to distinguish between the real Daśāgrīva and the reflections. Finally, by means of his miraculous powers he is able to know which is the real Daśāgrīva and points him out to Ramana who cuts off his horse-head and thus kills him. He also kills millions of demons. The author adds that it is said that in order to redeem himself of the sin of killing, Ramana will appear in the Kali age on earth in the form of the Buddha, an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

Hanumantha goes to the orchard, uproots the trees and puts them upside down in the ground. The demons surround him and try to kill him. Although he can easily escape, he lets himself be captured in order to show his great magical skill. As in Dmar-ston’s version he explains the two ways of killing, the way of the mother and the way of the father. Hanumantha tells them that it is a bad omen if the monkeys see him die. They must hide in their houses. With his fiery tail he burns the palace of the demon king and the city Trikūṭa together with the iron wall. King Rāmana then takes Sītā and goes home.

Some monkeys have escaped, and they pour molten bronze in the ear of Kumbhakarna, the younger brother of Daśāgrīva, who is plunged in meditation. Kumbhakarna is thus awakened, inhales deeply through his nose, and Sītā and all the monkeys are transformed into skeletons, but not the king and Hanumantha. The king sends Hanumantha to the snowy mountains to fetch a medicinal herb. He brings the wrong one and is sent off again. He now brings the whole mountain with him and tells Rāmana to search for the herb himself. Ramana cures everybody with the herb and tells Hanumantha to put the mountain back in its place. Hanumantha throws it in its place. Since that time the top of the mountain has been askew. A piece of the mountain was cut off, and according to Vālmiki this is the mountain of Kailāsa, (Tise). King Ramana returns with Sītā by means of Puṣpaka, the aerial palace of Rāvaṇa and is honoured by Bharata, goes back to Ayodhyā and lives there happily.

The author adds that the splendid of the palace of the demon king is an example of the greatness of wealth. He refers to the story of Māndhātṛ and quotes verse 79 of the fourth pallava of the Bodhisattvavādānakalpalatā:

bimbitaśaṁśaṁ yanmaṇibhūstambhahhītiśaṁ/suralokopibhāvyekopī anekasuralokatām//

He also quotes Kāvyādāra II. 300. At the end, the author enumerates among his sources the Sanskrit commentaries on two hymns, the Viṣeṣastava and the Devāṭśayastotra, the commentary on he Subhāṣitaratanidhi, etc. and makes a disparaging remark about Saṅghaśri’s version of the story. Prajñāvarman’s commentaries on the two stotras mentioned were translated into Tibetan and can be found in the first volume of the Tanjur. His commentaries contain several extracts from the story of Rāma, for instance, the promise given to Kekeya and her request to have her son enthroned are told by Prajñāvarman in almost exactly the same words. However, it has to be pointed out that according to the colophon, the text of the Viṣeṣastavatīkā was not translated in its entirety by Rin-chen bzaṅ-po (958-1055) and his work was completed by Sa-skya Paṇḍita.12 It is obvious that Dmar-ston’s version of the Rāma story has been used extensively by Rin-śpuṅs-pa.
The versions of the Rāma story by Saṅghṣrī and Rim-spun-spuns-pa are only two of the many which can be found in the numerous commentaries on the Kavyādarśa written by Tibetan and Mongolian scholars. The later versions which I have been able to see are, in general, rather similar to Rin-chen-spun-spun-pa’s version but there are many differences in details which ought to be further examined. As in the case of the commentaries on the Subhāṣītaratnamatrīti, I hope that Tibetan scholars will collect as much material as possible and publish it in chronological order.

This brief examination of four versions of the Rāma story in Tibet may have given some idea of the wealth of material which awaits further research. The story of Rāma has been popular in Tibet since about A.D. 800 up to the present day. Thanks to the efforts of Tibetan scholars very many Tibetan works have been reprinted in India and Bhutan in recent years. It has now become possible to study in much more detail the Indian stories which were known to Tibetan scholars in the past.
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The written or oral versions of the Rāmāyaṇa in South-east Asia in the form they reach to us are rather modern works. But evidences of the knowledge of Rāma's story are available even in the old periods of the relations between India and Indo-Chinese Peninsula.

Epigraphical evidences

The most ancient document seemingly implicating the knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa more precisely of the Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa, is the most ancient inscription found on the Eastern coast of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula at Vo-canh (Vietnam). It is in Sanskrit and, unfortunately, much damaged. It is undated, but, according to the Plaeographical evidence, belongs to the 3rd century A.D. It is engraved by descendants of a king Śrīmarā. This name is a Sanskrit transcription of a regular Tamil title of Pāṇḍyan kings of South-India: Śrīmarān.

The composition of the text in Sanskrit by Tamil speaking peoples is quite natural. Sanskrit alone, in those days, was an all-Indian language, used even in foreign countries as a link language because it was taught and known at least by some persons in every country. Also the easiest way to reach South-east Asia was from Pāṇḍyan coasts or from Laṅkā to Sumatra where Tamilians used to collect camphor (Manimekalai, 15.3). One big mountain called Maleus by Plinius was known by Indians and gave shadow alternatively towards the North and the South during six months every year. So this Maleus (Tam. Malai) was located on the equinoctial line or very near of it. The only one fulfilling this condition is the Gunung Kerinci (= Tamil kuriṇći), near the Western coast of Sumatra (3805 m. high). One cape Maleoukolon is situated in the same area by Ptolemeus and actually is located near the foot of this mountain. From South Sumatra, through the Sunda-strait, it was rather easy to sail to the Indo-Chinese Peninsula or to Indonesian island.

Whatever may have been the way of propagation of the Sanskrit poetry to Vo-canh, the inscription expresses in the very words of the Rāmāyaṇa the rule of this world of coming back for those who have departed:...lokasyasya Gatagatim....(Vo-canh, I.II,Rām. South. rec., II, 110, I, North, II 119), it may be supposed these words may have also existed in some other text or composed in coincidence with the wording of Vālmīki. But the probability is much more in favour of an actual reminiscence of the famous text of Vālmīki.

Vālmīki himself is named in another inscription found also in Vietnam at Tra- Kieu. This inscription has been engraved long before the Vietnamese annexation of the country. It comes from the king of Campā Prakāśadharma who reigned there in the second half of the A.D. 7th century. It is also damaged but runs as follows according to Paul Mus who published it.

\[
yasya śokāt samutpannam ślokam brahmābhipū (jati)⁴/\nniṣṇoh pumsah purāṇasya mānuṣasyātmarūpiṇāh//

xxxx ritam kṛtyam kṛtam yenābhisecanam/
kaver ādasya mahārṣer v vālmike's śru xx riha//
pūjāsthānam punah tasya kṛta xx y xxxx/
prakāśadharmanrpatiḥ sarvārīgasūdanāh//
vidyāśāṅkṣamākalaksūrās-mārūpiṇāh (ganpānvītāh)/
xxty eṣa jagatkāntas śārāde' ntarite n(r)pi/a//
\]

As the verbs have disappeared it is not possible to completely translate this text, but it is evident it refers to the creation of the śloka originating from the sorrow of Vālmīki, primordial poet and mahārṣi and being a human form of the antique Man Viṣṇu. The story of this origin of the śloka praised by Brahman is the subject of Bālakīṃḍa second sarga.

There are in Vietnam some late echoes of the knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa in the ancient kingdom of Campā. The name given to Daśaratha in Vietnamese means “Ten-cars” and Rāvana is named as ‘Ten-heads’ (i.e. Daśānana).⁵

In Cambodia the knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa is evidenced already at the beginning of the 7th century in the inscription of Val Kantel (K 359)⁶ which emanates from Somaśarman, a brahmān, who was foremost among the knowers of the Bāmadeva and husband of a daughter of a prince Viravarma, sister of one Bhavavarman and mother of the Hiranyavarman. The exact position of these princes is not ascertained and there are two Bhavavarmans but they belong to the beginning of the
7th century. This is in accordance with the palaeographical evidence. According to the text “Somasarman established Trabhuvanesvara joined with Arka, and having great ritual of homage with very large fees, gave, with the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇa, the whole Bhārata and make fixation of their recitation uninterrupted every day”.

śrīsomasarmmārkayutaṃ sa śrītribhuvanesvaram/
atiśṭhīpan mahapujam atipuskaladakṣiṇam//
rāmāyana-śastra-bhāṣā-bhāratam aśeṣam bhāratam datad/
akṛṭāṃvāham acchheyāṃsa ca tadvācānāśtitinim//

(st. 3-4)

In the inscription Rāmāyaṇa is written with dental na. This spelling is not isolated. It is found in a later inscription (Prāsāt Sankhāh, K 218 st.11) which also alludes to the telling of stories (kathā) from Purāṇarāmāyaṇa(sic) bhārata, etc... This inscription belongs to the 11th century and give evidence of continuity of the practise of such recitations in Cambodia throughout the centuries. We shall find later other examples of this spelling.

The long inscription of Pre Rūp, (K 806) a monument in the Angkor’s Area built by Rājendravaranman who reached the kingship in A.D. 944, alludes to Atharvaveda (st. 64) Bhārata (83), Panini (47 and 258), Raghuvanśa (164, 199, 211 and 299) and to Rāmāyaṇa itself (207). The allusions are implicit. They consist in the utilisation of these texts in comparisons or puns without mentioning their titles. That implies these texts were well known in the literary circles where the inscriptions were composed. Only one is a little more explicit reference to the ‘ātharvanič (ātharvanika siddhiḥ, st. 64) performance’ which, as George Coedes has pointed out, is an abhiṣekā ceremony using AV. IV. 8, 59.

[The passage which alludes to the Rāmāyaṇa is (st. 207) :]

mārīca iva rāmāsaya nāmādyekākṣaraśravā (t)/
yasyāriṣa āpi pi jagāmānanyajām bhiyam//

‘Like Mārīca by hearing the single first syllable of Rāma’s name, his foe-king though a hero, went to the fear without any more reason.’

The Rāmāyaṇa which inspired this stanza which is also a śloka unlike many others in different parts of the inscription is this saying of Mārīca to Rāvana:

rakārādini nāmāni rāmārastasya rāvāna/
ratnān ca rathāścaiva vitrāsam janayanti me //

South Rec. III, 39, 18

rakārādini vākyānī rāmād bhātasya rāvāna/
ratnān ca ramanyās ca trasam samjanayanti me//

North. Rec.III, 43, 35.

‘For whom who has fear of Rāma, O Rāvana, the names (words) beginning with rā (e.g) ratna and ratha (ramanya) produce the fear.’

In the 11th century A.D. several other Cambodian inscriptions mentioned the Rāmāyaṇa.

The inscription K 598 of Prāsāt Trāpān Run dated A.D. 1006, making the eulogy of one Pāncagavya, qualified of Kavindrapaṇḍita, who was the author of several foundations, says :

śabhārthāgamaśastraṇi (sic) kāvyāṃ bhāratavistarāmaṃ/
rāmāyanaṃ ca yo dhīṭya śīṣyān apy adhayajgapat//

‘He who, after having learnt the words, the meanings, the Āgamas and Treatises, the extensive Bhārata poem and the Rāmāyaṇa, also taught his disciples.’ st. A. 28.

This man was a sātvata (A.27) wroshipper of Vāsudeva. (A,1).

So the Āgamas he had learnt were probably some Pāncavātra-

samhitās. Devotee of Viṣṇu, he had established an image of Viṣṇu in Śaka 917 (A.D. 995) and was giving one village together with land, workers, cows and furnitures. One son of him, an ascetic (yati), was deeply versed in the Saivasiddhānta and established there one liṅga and one Vināyaka (A, 38, 41). So this one used surely the śaiṭāgama ritual. We know by these facts there was no sectarian opposition between those recognised the same and unique supreme Being under the mūrti of their predilection, either Viṣṇu or Śiva. That is ordinarily considered as an evidence of syncretism but, in any way Viṣṇu is included in the saiva religion and the Tradition of the smārta brāhmaṇas in India has been liberal all along the centuries. That is why the Rāmāyaṇa is accepted by both the vaiṣṇava and saiva, in spite of
the facts Rama is Visṇu and Ravaṇa a devotee of Śiva. That is also why Tulsidas, at the beginning of every kāṇḍa of his Rāmacaritmānas, invokes first Śiva (k.1,2,3), then Rama with Laksmana (k. 4), Harj in the shape of Rama (k. 5), Rama as Lord of Gods (sūrēś) and Śaṅkara as Lord of Kāśi (k. 6), finally Rama as Lord of Jānakī and Śaṅkara as Ambikā’s husband (k. 7) God, for him, being essentially unique.

Two more inscriptions of Cambodia, both badly damaged are mentioning the Rāmāyaṇa.

One from Prasāt Barmei (k. 744)11 which belongs to circa 1000 Śaka (A.D. 1078) according to which ‘the explanation of stories from Rāmāyaṇa (once more with na instead of nā), Bhārata etc.’ (.rāmāyanabhāratādikathāvivakṣa..st. 4)12. The other one, little later (end of 11th century A.D.) emanates from a Yogiśvara paṇḍita, hōtar of Jayavarman VI (A.D. 1080-1107).

At the beginning of the 13th century, one of the numerous inscriptions for dedications to deities at the Prah-khan of Angkor, ordered by Jayavarman VII, though a Buddhist king are devoted to Rama, Laksmana and Sītā.

In Java, the epigraphy, like in Cambodia, gives at least one evidence of Rāmāyaṇa’s recitation, in a festival at the occasion of a foundation. Two copper-plates, designated as Copper-plates of Sangsang are preserved in Amsterdam. One of these, mentions a foundation at Wukajana and indicates: ‘Si Jaluk recited the Rāmāyaṇa, blowing flutes and making buffoonry’ (II plate verse, 10)14. Rāmāyaṇa is written with nā instead of nā like often in Cambodian epigraphy. The date of the inscription is circa 830 Saka, A.D. 908.15 So at that time was prefigurated the use in festivals which has been developed in Indonesia till our own time in spite of the turning of the country of Islam.

Archaeological evidences

In the old Campa16, the country where the most ancient epigraphical references to the Rāmāyaṇa stories, have been found, we find also some representations of these stories in sculptures in the monuments. These sculptures are later than the inscriptions we have already referred to. They constitute a series of bas-reliefs on a basement of sand-stone. One of these bas-reliefs bears an hardly decipherable line in old Cam language and writing probably belonging to the beginning of the 10th century. The original location of the piece is not known but it has been found in the region of Mi-son and Tra-Kieu and the style of the sculptors is characteristic of the Tra-Kieu style.

One big monkey is represented between tow archers, all three standing. Separated from them by plants, one unidentified man is also standing. On another bas-relief one fighting monkey has seized one man and is going to throw him away. The old Cam line is above this figuration. On a third bas-relief appears one lady seemingly tied by one foot and seated on the edge of one stone seat. Rama, Laksmana, Sītā and one of the monkeys associated with Rama could be recognised.

In Cambodia the illustrations in stone of Rāmāyaṇa episodes are numerous. They alternate in many Khmer monuments with illustrations Bhārata and Purāṇa stories, i.e. from the same texts which, according to the inscriptions, were prescribed for recitations in temples and festivals, as well as the Rāmāyaṇa.

These sculptures appear in bas-reliefs on walls of big temples as it is the case at Angkor Vat, but chiefly in smaller compositions on pediments and lintels. They are also used, again on walls, as elements of decorative motives. They consist rarely in statues in ronde-bosse. In modern times the figurations are existing in wood-carvings, paintings, hide-figures for shadow-play and masks for masked-play and dancing.

Some stories are common to the Rāmāyaṇa and to other texts, like the ‘churning of the Ocean’, famous in Mahābhārata and in all the classical Sanskrit literature. In this case it is not always possible to ascertain which particular text has been a source for the artist’s inspiration. Not only there are in Sanskrit numerous stories of Rama other than Vālmiki’s version, but also there are in India Rāmāyaṇas in various languages and, in Cambodia too, several versions in Khmer language. So the Khmer iconography of Rama stories may have various imported or locally elaborated sources. We may sometimes distinguish among these ones with probability and be able to ascertain a precise origin to such or such figurations. But we are sure the Vālmiki’s Sanskrit text has been the main original tool of propagation of the Rāmaic legends in South-East Asia.

From the very beginning we have got from the Sanskrit inscriptions verbatim quotations of this very text and formal
prescriptions of reading it in ceremonies. The Sanskrit recitations cannot have been understood by the laymen of the country but we know the traditional way through which the communication of Sanskrit stories, as well as of Sanskrit religious teachings, are ordinarily propagated among uneducated peoples. Sanskrit has been for centuries the only link language well fixed by a regular grammatical teaching, available throughout India and Eastern Asia. Later, in all the area of the Theravāda Buddhism, Pāli has also played the role of link language. Priests, monks and story-tellers receiving Sanskrit or Pāli texts from abroad, used probably, like they do even now, first to recite some verses from the basic text and then to explain and comment fluently in the mother-tongue of the public assemblies. Moreover, we are sure they kept, when talking many words from the original texts, since we observe the modern national languages of the Indianized South-east Asia have borrowed a great deal of Sanskrit and Pāli words in the Indo-Chinese peninsula (Burma, Thailand, Laos and Cambodia) and, of Sanskrit words only, in Indonesia.

If we want to enumerate the most important of the Rāmaic sculptures found in Cambodia, we must follow a chronological order, but this order will not indicate a progressive evolution of the knowledge of the Rāma-story in the country: the whole theme has been received at the very beginning. Actually details in the episodes have been diversified, by the variants in the stories, with the development of public telling. Evidently the sculptors have been more influenced by the popular variants than the authors of the Sanskrit inscriptions. That is why the iconography is more free and more significative of changes in the stories than may have been the epigraphy. Unfortunately we still ignore the dates of the first appearances of these changes, because we only know the period of composition of the Rāmakirti, 16th, 17th century, period which is later than the appearing of some peculiarities referred to in this text, but already illustrated long before on older monuments.

The image in ronde-bosse of a standing archer is among a group of three Vaiṣṇava images of natural size found on the Phnom Da, in the South of Cambodia and anterior to the 7th century. It has been identified without any apparent reason with Laksmana and is more probably an image of Rāma, the most ancient so far discovered in Cambodia.

In the 10th century A.D., on the temple of Bantāy Srei we find one bas-relief representing Rāma shooting at Vālīn when this one was fighting with Sugrīva. An isolated subject is sometimes use simply as a central element of piece of decoration. That is the case with Virādha carrying Sītā off (Valm. Aranya, 2), on a lintel of the central tower. The identification with Rāvaṇa instead of Virādha has been proposed, but a very similar complete representation of the episode, including in addition Rāma and Laksmana shooting at Virādha simultaneously, appears later in Angkor-Vat as we shall see.

The Bantāy Srei temple is Śaiva with three sanctuaries: the main and central one for the linga, on its right side for Brahman and on the left for Viṣṇu. The most important inscription K. 842, has been engraved in A.D. 968 on the temple founded in A.D. 967. The cult was āgamic. He had been ordered by two brothers bearing Vaishnavite names, Yajñavaraha and Viṣṇukumāra (st. 27) but who were Saiva devotees as it is evidenced by many stanzas of the same inscription. Viṣṇukumāra had specially studied Śivasanakhita and Pārameśvara together with the grammatical kāśikārītti (st. 30). The pārameśvara is śaiva-gama well known in the Indian tradition. Being now no more available it is represented by a Matangapārmeśvaragama. Another inscription at Phnom Sandak (K. 191) dated A.D. 1110 begins with two stanzas in kavya style which are illuminated by a teaching of this Matanga.

The inscription Bantāy Srei does not refer to the Rāmāyana but the temple itself gives evidences of the popularity of Rāma’s stories in their milieu.

The fight between Vālīn and Sugrīva is also represented by a huge ronde-bosse in Phnom Penh Museum, found at Prasāt Čeň (10th cent.) in the Kohker group of Monuments.

In the middle of the 11th century, at Vat Ik Phnom, Sītā is represented in a garden of Laṅkā, in the custody of two rākṣasīs, while Hanumān behind her back brings the Rāma’s ring.

In the second half of 11th century, at Baphuon (A.D. 1060), we find Rāma comforting Sugrīva.
Shortly later the temple of Pimay (written Bimāya, in epigraphy Vimāya) has been built on the Korat Plateau (now in Thailand). The temple has been completed in the end of the 11th century though it received several additions later, under the reign of Jayavarman VII. There are three Buddhistic, Śaivite and Rāmaite reliefs. Among the main figurations are Śiva as king of Gods (devarājā), the Gods being Brahman, Indra and Viṣṇu represented below him, Śiva dancing with Karīkkalāmmaiyār at his feet and also Rāmaṇa war reliefs. One lintel represents Rāma and Laksmana tied with magical snakes by Indrajit (Valm. Yuddhak. XI, V foll.). These reliefs belong to the original building (c. 1085).

In the 12th century the most impressive Rāmaṇa reliefs found in South-east Asia are at Angkor Vat. They have been sculptured during the first half of this century, under Sūryavarman II or early after his death. They have been fully reproduced by the Ecole française d’Extreme-Orient in the publication, in seven volumes, of a full description of the temple. They have also been described by George Coedes and occasionally by many other authors few years ago. The Ecole française d’Exteme-Orient, Paris, collected new photos of these reliefs.

Those concerning various episodes of the Rāma’s stories are located in the North-western pavilion at the angle of the Northern and Western galleries and on the wall of the Northern wing of the Western gallery. Some are separate from the others in the South Western pavilion. The churning of the ocean occupies the South wing of the Eastern gallery. Also, as Coedes has noticed in his ‘Second study’, many times the central figures of various episodes are engaged in the decoration of small surfaces of basements, pillars, doors, etc... That is a development of the decorative use of elements of scenes we have already noticed with Virādha carrying Sitā off at Bantāy Srei. At Angkor Vat small personages are each one in medallion and the medallions are arranged on a floral background in such a way they formed one scene like ‘churning of ocean’, ‘Vālin’s murder’ or ‘Agreement between Rāma and Vibhiṣṇa.’ Episodes from the Bhārata or other sources are also represented in the same way.

The reliefs located in North-West pavilion and reproduced are: Gods inviting Viṣṇu (pl. 325-328) Sitā’s svayamvara (pl. 332-337) Virādha’s murder (pl. 320) Kabaṇḍha’s murder (pl. 328) Hanumān visiting Sitā at Lāṅkā (pl. 343-344) Alliance with Vibhiṣṇa (pl. 345) Sitā’s ordeal (pl. 349-350) Rāma’s return on Puspaka flying-car (pl. 346-348). In the South-West pavilion we find: Mārica’s murder (pl. 288-289) Vālin’s murder (pl. 300-304).

The study of the representations of the gods inviting Viṣṇu has given to François Martini the opportunity to establish that was already existing the tradition about the Gods which has been expressed later, in the 16th century in the Rāmakerti.

In the period around the middle of the 12th century other Rāmaite reliefs have been engraved at Thommanon and Bantāy Samrē. But the most important group of representations remains those of Angkor Vat.

Besides the significant relief analysed by Martini we find there the two largest ones, one of which is also very significant. Lanka’s battle (West. gall. North wing) is the biggest scene and the most animate with the prowess of the monkey’s against the rāksasas (pl. 471-496). The churning of the ocean (pl. 351-373) illustrates a story slightly different from the Vālmiki’s version. One big monkey, not mentioned in the Sanskrit text is helping to pull the tail of Vasuki (pl. 367). It has been tentatively identified in various ways. But his presence cannot be simply a Khmer addition, because there is one allusion to the presence of Vāli, i.e. Vālin, at the churning in the Tamil Rāmaṇa of Kambar, almost certainly a contemporary of the Khmer bas-relief. Kambar in his Kitkiddākāndam (3rd, patalam, st. 38) and his Sundarakāndam (5th patalam, st. 30 or 31 according to the different editions), alludes to the strength of Vāli churning himself the ocean, after having removed both devas and asuras, by moving the Mandaram used as a churning stick with the snake as rope. The full story is not given by Kambar but is told in another South Indian text (existing in two versions, one in Sanskrit, Kāncimahātmya, the other in Tamil, Kāncippurāṇam) gives more details on the tradition about Vālin’s participation to the churning. After separate vain attempts of the asuras and of the devas to move the Mandara mount as the churning stick, the devas required Vālin for help. He agreed and
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said to devas and asuras to join all together for pulling Vāsuki from the head. He placed himself at the tail but his traction was too strong and Mandara was bent to him. Then the Kūrma consolidated the mount and Vālin himself, seizing Vāsuki on both sides of the mount churned alone.

The representation at Angkor Vat is in accordance with Vālmīki, Mahābhārata etc....in representing the asuras placed on the side of the head and the devas on the side of the tail. It is also in accordance with a moment of the South Indian story in placing at the tail a big monkey who cannot be none else than Vālin.

We have no indication about the time of the composition of the Kāṭcīcārātmya. We know merely it has been a source for the Tamil Poet Ėivānāncuvāmī, author of the Kāṭcippurāṇam. This poet died in 1785. He was in the Tiruvāṉavāṭuraiätinam. That means he belonged to the Kailāyaparamparai from which brahmanas and pakkuvā (skr. pākuva) have been established in Thailand and Cambodia not before the 14th century. In this conditions it is evident the introduction at Angkor Vat of Vālin as participating to the churning of the ocean results from a much earlier communication with South India and the allusion of Kambar to the final phase of the churning by Vālin alone supposes the existence in India before the 12th century of the full story later told in the Kāṭcīcārātmya and the Kāṭcippurāṇam. But the coming of peoples of the Kailāyaparamparai has been able to reinforce the popularity in Thailand and Cambodia of the stories of Rāma. In these countries the shadow theater has been much developed at least during the last centuries, like probably more ancently in Malaysia and Indonesia. In Thailand the shadow play called Nang is allied to or, possibly, a source of the masked play or Khon. Both are playing Rāma’s stories. In South India also two kings of similar plays are still performed though on the way of disparition. They are called in Telugu Bommalāṭa for the puppets show, and Tōlbommalāṭa for the shadow play. In Tamilnadu the name is Pāvaikkūttu. There the puppets (pāvai) are of skin and similar to those of the Indonesian Wayang kulit but thinner and transparent. Reciprocal influences are very probable in these plays. In any way, The Rāma stories are still now everywhere very popular.

In ancient Indonesia where we have seen the epigraphy has preserved the evidence of the popularity, of the Rāmāyana, which is also given in an Old Javanese version, the sculpture has also supplied concrete evidences which have been studied by several authors and specially by W.F. Stuttterheim. But owing to the conversion of Malaysia and Indonesia to Islam representations of Rāma’s stories are preserved only in the various kinds of wayang or ‘plays’.

On the contrary in Thailand and Cambodia the representations of the Rāma’s stories have always continued to be used in religious and official buildings. The final adoption of the Theravāda Buddhism in the place of Mahāyānaic Buddhism or Śaivism has not involved any disaffection to the Rāmāyana. In the last period of the kingdom of Angkor, under the reign of Jayavarman VII, not only, as we have seen, Rāma, Laksmana and Sītā are referred to in one Parh Khan’s inscription but also, it seems probable, according to an hypothesis of Bernard-Philippe Groslier, that the relief of the first floor of the Bayon represent episodes of the life of the king in a way evoking a parallel with the epic of Rāma.

After Jayavarman VII, a Mahāyānist king, Śaivism superseded again the Mahāyāna religion before being replaced by the Theravāda Buddhism. Since this time, episodes of the Rāmāyana have been used to illustrate the Buddhist monasteries as well as Indo-Khmer temples in the antecedent period. But, as the building in stone became rare, the sculptures have been ordinarily in wood. Nevertheless at Vat Kōdol (Battambang) the western part of the enclosure of the monastery is decorated on both faces with long panels in relief representing scenes of the Rāmāyana. The wood panels and the paintings which have been used till our days have been described in the last book we have to mention by Madelemegitean. They are generally based on the Rāmakerti version or on the Thai version, Rāmakien.
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The Rāmāyaṇa in South-East Asian Sanskrit
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THE LITERARY VERSION OF THE RAMA STORY IN MALAY

S. Singaravelu

The literary version of the Rāma story in Malay is generally regarded as the manifestation of the cultural ideas of the ruling elite in the traditional Malay society. Since the Rāma story and the traditional Malay society shared in certain common cultural ideals such as righteous warfare, contests of skill and strength, undivided loyalty of the subjects to the king, and fidelity among the members of the family, the Rāmāyana tradition was readily acceptable to the Malay society even after the adoption of Islam. The high esteem in which the Rāma story was held is evident in some of the classical Malay historical works. Thus, for example, according to the author of the Hikayat Acheh, the lineage of Sultan Iskandar Muda, who ruled over Acheh between A.D. 1607 and 1635, was as glorious as that of Rāma, for the ruler’s ancestors also had their origin in the bamboo clump (buluh betung), just as Rāma’s mother is said to have been discovered in the bamboo clump by king Daśaratha in the Malay literary version of the Rāma story. According to the Sejarah Melayu, the famous Malay hero Hang Tuah was called Laksamāna, because whenever he was jesting with youths of his own age, he would roll up his sleeves and defiantly declare that only Laksmanā was his match. The Sejarah Melayu also records the fact that Hang Tuah was officially conferred with the title of Laksamāna during the reign of Sultan Mansur Shah (A.D. 1459-1477). According to the Sejarah Melayu, by virtue of the conferment of the title Laksamāna, Hang Tuah’s status in the royal audience hall was equal to that of the Bendahara or Dato’ Naradiraja, and whenever Dato’ Naradiraja was absent, it was the Laksamāna who acted for him as the bearer of the sword of the state. The conferment of the title Laksamāna on Hang Tuah, who was a high-placed dignitary in the ruler’s immediate vicinity, is apparently based not only on the pre-Islamic royal Malay tradition which characterised the Malay ruler as the manifestation of the ideal king Rāma, but also on a popular Indian tradition, which refers to Rāma appointing his younger brother Laksmanā as the commander-in-chief of his realm at the time of his enthronement as king of Ayodhya. It
is significant to note in this connection that Hang Tuah identified himself as the commander-in-chief of the king of Malacca. As regards the title Laksamana being used to designate the Guardian of the sea-coast, or Admiral of the naval fleet in Malay kingdoms, this usage came into being apparently because the admiral played the role of the commander-in-chief in the Malay maritime kingdoms.

The literary version of Rama story in Malay, which is a long and comprehensive prose narration, is generally known as the Hikayat Seri Rama ('Story, or Chronicle, of Śri Rāma'). It would seem to have been written in its present form, or adapted to that form, in Perso-Arabic (jawi) script after the coming of Islam to the Malay archipelago and peninsula by an unknown author sometime between the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries A.D.

The Hikayat Seri Rama (HSR) has survived in several manuscripts, which contain differing recensions of essentially the same basic story or part of the same basic story. Of these, two recensions have been published, one by P.P. Roorda van Eysinga in 1843, and the other by W.C. Shellabear in 1915. It must be noted, however, that there are at least five other recensions of HSR still in manuscript form, of which brief accounts have been given by various scholars in their writings.

A significant feature of the various recensions of HSR is that, though they differ from each other in respect of certain aspects such as the sequence of episodes, name-forms, and the degree of Islamic influence found in them, there is nevertheless close identity between one text and the other in regard to their overall contents, and this characteristic would seem to indicate that all these texts were apparently derived from some older version of the Rama story, which was a common source of all the recensions.

The question regarding the source or sources of the original HSR has been open to discussion for a long time ever since A. Dozon refuted Roorda van Eysinga's description of HSR as a translation of Vālmiki's Sanskrit epic, by pointing out that HSR was indeed a distinct work, though dealing with the same characters and following for the most part the narrative of the Hindu epic. Subsequently in 1899, H.H. Juynboll tried to trace the origin of HSR to the southern Indian Tamil source, because of the apparent Tamil-like forms of some proper names such as Baradān, Bibusānam, and Mahameru Parwālam, occurring in the Malay versions. In 1919, Ph. S. van Ronkel also drew attention to some Dravidian or Tamil features relating to the name-forms such as trisulam in the Malay version, without however venturing to judge its origin. In 1922, W.H. Rassers dealt with the problem of the sources of HSR in his work De Pandji-roman, by comparing the most important features of the Malay version and Vālmiki's epic, and his conclusion was that those motifs and episodes of HSR, which differed from the Sanskrit epic, were derived from Indonesian sources. The next scholar to examine the question was W.F. Stutterheim, who thought that HSR had originated in Indonesia and that it had its source in a mixture of Indonesian tales and the predominantly oral tradition from the western as well as eastern regions of the Indian sub-continent. Three years later, A. Zieseniss wrote a systematic monograph by giving a full textual synopsis of the entire Malay tale in its two recensions, namely, the texts edited by Roorda van Eysinga and W.G. Shellabear, and comparing it with the Sanskrit epic of Vālmiki. His conclusions were two-fold, namely that the texts of both the Malay recensions were to be traced back to one original version, from which they originated orally, and that the Malay version is a more extensive form comprising of numerous innovations and amplifications drawn from diverse textual and oral legendary sources such as the purānas and popular tales, which reached Indonesia from various parts of India, especially from the eastern and the western parts of India.

**Major Characteristics of HSR**

The first major characteristic feature of HSR is that, unlike the Hindu versions such as the Sanskrit epic of Vālmiki, in which the story of Rāvana's birth and antecedents is narrated separately by the sage Agastya to Rāma after his triumphant return from Lanka, nearly all the recensions of HSR are known to commence the Rama story with an account of Rāvana's birth and antecedents as an intergal part of the story, the only exception being the Roorda van Eysinga text (HSR, RO), which begins with the events relating to the birth of Rāma. It may be also recalled in this connection that a Malay recension of...
HSR is entitled *Hikayat Ceritera Maharaja Rawana*, and this work also begins with an account of Ravana's birth and his early career. A notable feature of the narrative relating to Ravana's ancestry in the Malay recensions contained in the Raffles and the Wilkinson manuscripts, is that they refer to a character named Sirancak, who is described as a ravisher of beautiful women in the heavenly world of Keindraan, and who reincarnates himself as Ravana, the son of Citrabaha and the grandson of Beramaraja in the earthly kingdom known as Indrapuri. The motif of Sirancak reincarnating himself as Ravana is reminiscent of the references in the Hindu *purāṇas* to the demon Hiranyaksha reincarnating himself as Ravana.

Another significant feature to be found in certain recensions of HSR such as the Bodleian, or Shellabear text (HSR, SH) and the Berlin text of *Hikayat Maharaja Rawana*, is that some episodes relating to the antecedents of Ravana have been remoulded on Islamic lines, and indeed, Ravana's tale is depicted as unfolding during the time of the Prophet Adam. According to the Raffles and the Wilkinson manuscripts, Ravana at the age of twelve is banished by his grandfather to the island of Bukit Serendib (Laṅkā) as a punishment for maltreating his playmates. Ravana then becomes an ascetic and performs penance by hanging, head downwards over a fire at night for twelve years. According to the Shellabear text, Allah Subhanahu-wata'ala sends down the Prophet Adam to meet Ravana at the time of his ascetic practices and convey to him his granting of a boon of sovereignty over the four kingdoms, namely, the Keindraan, the Netherworld, the Sea and the Earth, on condition that he rules over the kingdom justly. It is also noteworthy that in the Shellabear text, which is believed to contain a younger recension than the other texts, Allah Ta'ala takes the place of Lord Brahma, who confers the boon of invincibility on Ravana in the Hindu versions of the Rāma story and that king Daśaratha is said to be the great grandson of the Prophet Adam.

The story of Lord Viṣṇu's reincarnation as Rāma would also seem to have been subjected to varying degrees of Islamic bowdlerization on the part of successive copyists of HSR manuscripts, in which the direct mention of Lord Viṣṇu's reincarnation has been excised, leaving only certain traces of the original version. Thus, for example, in the Shellabear text,
Rāma is merely mentioned as being of emerald green complexion, which is indeed the complexion of Rāma as the reincarnation of Lord Viṣṇu. It may be also noted in this connection that the Roorda van Eysinga's text, which is believed to contain an older recension than the Shellabear text, happens to retain certain passages making clear mention of Lord Viṣṇu's reincarnation as Rāma.

Another notable feature of HSR is that the chief characters such as Rāma, Sītā, Rāvanā, Vālin, Sugrīva, and Hanumān are closely related to each other through their birth stories, and this feature may be illustrated in the diagram above (Fig. 1), showing their relationship. As for the details of the primary and secondary relationships of the chief characters shown in the diagram, Rāma is the son of king Daśaratha and a princess named Mandūdāri, whom the king discovers in a bamboo clump. Rāma is said to have been born as the result of his mother partaking of the king's sacrificial meal (according to the Roorda van Eysinga text) and the bezoar stone of geliga (according to the Shellabear text). Rāvanā, who hears of king Daśaratha's beautiful wife, demands to have Mandūdāri for himself. However, Mandūdāri resorts to a strategem of creating a replica, or a pseudo-image, of herself named Mandūdaki, who becomes Rāvanā's wife. King Daśaratha, who is enamoured of Mandūdaki's beauty, makes a clandestine visit to the inner apartment of Rāvanā's palace in Lanka and sleeps with Mandūdaki. Moreover, Rāvanā is also said to partake of a portion of king Daśaratha's sacrificial meal, which is brought to him by the crow-demon named Gagakswara. As a consequence of these events, Rāvanā's consort Mandūdāki gives birth to a daughter. Soon after her birth, the astrologers in Rāvanā's court including Bibusānam (Vibhiṣana) predict that the child will cause the destruction of Rāvanā. Though Rāvanā wants to kill the child there and then, finally in response to Mandūdāki's appeal he agrees to the suggestion that the child be abandoned. The infant is placed in an iron box and set adrift on the sea. Eventually, she becomes the adoptive daughter of Durwati purwa's ruler Maharīsi Kali, who names her Sītā Dewi. Subsequently, Sītā Dewi becomes Rāma's wife after he wins her hand in an archery contest, in which the suitors are required to shoot through forty lontar palm trees with a single arrow from a divine bow. Thus, in HSR, Sītā is represented nominally as the daughter of Rāvanā as well as king Dašaratha through Mandūdāki, who is the pseudo-Mandūdāri, and she also happens to be Rāma's half-sister, whom he marries after winning her hand in the archery contest, and subsequently Rāvanā carries off his own daughter.

As regards Rāma's relationship to Vālin, Sugrīva and Hanumān, according to HSR, Balya Rāja (Vālin) and Sugrīva are born of Dewi Indra, the wife of Bēgawan Kutama (Gautama) as the result of her adultery with a divine being (dewa) and a spirit (mambang). Later when Bēgawan Kutama immerses them into a pool of clear water in order to test their legitimacy, they become monkeys and vanish into the forest. Subsequently, Vālin becomes the ruler of the monkey kingdom and Sugrīva his deputy. Meanwhile, Dewi Indra curses her daughter Dewi Anjatī to keep her mouth wide open for a hundred years as a punishment for having exposed the secret of her adultery. When Dewi Anjatī is performing penance by standing on the point of a needle in the sea with her mouth wide open, Rāma's sperm is transferred by the wind-god into her open mouth, and later she gives birth to Hanumān in the form of a white monkey with earrings. Hanumān's paternal great grandfather Sang Pĕrdana declares that Hanumān's father is one, who will recognise his earrings. Subsequently, Hanumān observes Rāma sleeping in the lap of Laksmaṇa under a tamarind tree, and after Rāma is awakened by him, Rāma recognises him as his son by his earrings. It would seem evident, from the above birth-stories of Vālin, Sugrīva and Hanumān that Hanumān is a son of Rāma and Dewi Anjatī, who is the sister of Vālin and Sugrīva, and Hanumān are related to each other.

As regards Rāvanā's relationship to Vālin, Sugrīva and Hanumān, according to HSR, when Rāvanā is on his way to Lanka with his consort Mandūdāki, Vālin seizes her and secures a son named Seri Anggada by Mandūdāki, who is later restored to Rāvanā at the intercession of Vālin's teacher. As for Hanumān, during his journey to Lanka his sperm fall into the sea and it is swallowed by a fish, who later gives birth to a son named Hanuman Tuganggah. Hanuman Tuganggah is first brought up by Rāvanā's son Gāngga Mahāsura, who rules over


the sea, and later he becomes the guardian of the fortress in the kingdom of the Netherworld, ruled by Rāvana’s son Pātalā Mahārāyaṇa. Hanumān recognises his son when he visits the Netherworld in order to rescue Rāma from the fortress of Pātalā Mahārāyaṇa. It is also pertinent to note in this connection that Hanumān does not allow the filial connection between him and his son to interfere with the duty of his son as the guardian of the fortress. This is evident from his refusal of his son’s offer to fetch Rāma, as such a conduct will be treacherous and unworthy of his ancestry. Hanumān also exhorts his son to remain faithful to his master during his lifetime.

On the question of the originality of the innovations concerning the relationships of the major characters as found in HSR, it may be of interest to draw attention to the observations made by J. Kats regarding the occurrence of similar motifs in some of the Javanese versions such as the Serat Rāma Keling. According to him, the close relationships forged among the chief characters on the basis of odd and unnatural combination of the birth stories of the various character need not necessarily mean that they were merely invented by the authors of these versions, either because of their ignorance of the original story, or because of their attempt to give a new turn to the story. On the contrary, the tales, which may seem odd and unnatural now, may in fact be reflective of very old manners and customs, and therefore they may well be regarded as more original than the original story itself. Moreover, it may be also pointed out that, though certain elements of the birth stories such as the king’s consorts giving birth to children after partaking of divine food, the wife of a sage committing adultery with divine beings, the transfer of a person’s sperm or even embryo of a child to another person, and transformation into animal or human form as a result of plunging into mysterious pools of water, are to be found in some of the literary as well as the folk versions of the Rāma story in India and elsewhere, nevertheless the manner in which the various disparate elements have been moulded into a unified whole is certainly reflective of the distinct originality of the authors, who composed the versions such as HSR.

Another characteristic feature, which marks HSR as a distinct work is that it has several motifs and episodes, which are not to be found in other versions and which appear in modified form in HSR. The following may be mentioned as examples of such motifs and episodes:

1. Sirancak, who is depicted as the future Rāvana, is pushed into the Underworld by Lord Viṣṇu with his great toe, and Sirancak makes a violin from one of his heads, arms, and three fingers, and plays it in honour of Dewata Mulia Rāya, who allows him to ascend to the earth in order to reincarnate himself as Rāvana.

2. Rāvana as an ascetic hangs his head downwards over a fire at night for twelve years in Bukit Serendib (Laṅka) and performs penance.

3. Allah Subhanahu-wata ala grants Rāvana a boon, which makes him the ruler of four kingdoms, namely, the Earth, the Keindraan, the Sea and the Netherworld.

4. Rāvana has three sons named Indrajat (Indrajit), Gaṅgga Mahāsura, and Pātalā Mahārāyaṇa, who are born of Rāvana’s first three consorts namely Nila Utama of the Keindraan, Gaṅgga Mahā Dewi of the Sea, and Pertiwi Dewi of the Netherworld.

5. Rāvana’s younger brother Vībhīṣaṇa is known as Bibusāṁ, and he is depicted as an astrologer.

6. King Daśaratha has also a daughter named Kikewi Dewi, born of his favourite concubine Balyadari.

7. Rāma is excluded from succession to the throne of Mandurapuri Negara, because king Daśaratha has promised his favourite concubine Balyadari twice that her son will be the heir to the throne in gratitude for her timely help in averting the danger of the king’s palanquin collapsing during a royal procession and later in saving his life by curing him of a malignant boil.

8. Rāvana’s sister Śūrpanakha is known as Śūrpandaki, and after Śūrapandaki’s husband named Berga Siṅga is inadvertently killed by Rāvana, Berga Siṅga’s son Darsa Siṅga begins to perform a penance in the forest of Indrapawānām in order to obtain a magic sword from heaven, and his mother Śūrapandaki visits him every week to supply him with food. One day,
Lakṣmana, who happens to be near the bamboo bush, where Dārśa Śīṅga is performing penance, sees a sword falling from the sky and he catches it. When he tests its edge by cutting the bamboo bush, he kills Dārśa Śīṅga inadvertently. Surapandaki assumes that Lakṣmana is responsible for her son’s death, and she seeks the aid of her relatives to take revenge on Lakṣmana.42

(10) At Rāvāṇa’s command, two demons named Martanja and Takī assume the forms of a golden and a silver gazelle in order to attract Śītā’s attention.

(11) Lakṣmana draws a magic circle around Śītā’s hut before he goes in search of Rāma.43

(12) When Jātāyu falls to the ground after his valiant fight with Rāvāṇa in his attempt to stop him from abducting Śītā, Śītā drops her ring into Jātāyu’s beak.

(13) When Rāma remains unconscious after learning of Śītā’s disappearance, a celestial voice predicts that he will be parted with his wife for twelve years.44

(14) Vālīn is known as Balya Rāja, and when he and the leader of the buffalo herd are engaged in a duel in a cave, Sugrīva, who is guarding the mouth of the cave, sees both white and red blood flowing out of the cave and therefore he assumes that both his brother and the buffalo are dead and closes the mouth of the cave.

(15) After Vālīn banishes Sugrīva to the forest, Sugrīva becomes an ascetic, and a river springs from the tears shed by him over his misfortune.

(16) At Sugrīva’s request, Rāma proves his skill and strength by felling a whole forest of palm trees with his arrow, then by shooting through seven gigantic nangka45 trees growing on the back of a mighty serpent, and finally kicking a mass of skeletons belonging to a demon named Katabihara with his great toe into the sea.

(17) When Rāma shoots an arrow at Vālīn from a hidden place, Vālīn catches it in his hand, and subsequently when Rāma asks him to return the arrow, Vālīn replies that Lord Viṣṇu’s arrow must reach its target, and then he flings the arrow towards the ground. The arrow rises into the air, swerves back, and pierces Vālīn to death.46

(18) Rāma enlists the help of a monkey king named Sambūrāṇa, in addition to the assistance of Sugrīva and his warriors including Hanumān.

(19) Hanumān is willing to fly to Lāṅkā, if he is permitted to eat from the same leaf with Rāma, who complies with the request.

(20) Hanumān jumps from Rāma’s arms towards Lāṅkā.

(21) After reaching Lāṅkā, Hanumān casts Rāma’s ring into a pitcher of water, which is meant for Śītā’s bath, and when Śītā finds the ring, she calls for Hanumān.47

(22) When Hanumān is brought before Rāvāṇa, because he has eaten all the fruits of Rāvāṇa’s grove, he extends his tail, coils it, and perches on top, thus sitting higher than Rāvāṇa on his throne.48

(23) When the causeway is being built, Rāvāṇa’s son Gaṅgga Maḥāsura asks the fish in the sea to destroy the causeway. Hanumān whips up the water with his tail and causes the fish to be paralysed. When a mighty crab tries to destroy the causeway, Hanumān tosses it on the land, where it reduces a great forest to a plain by its fall.

(24) Rāvāṇa’s younger brother Vibhiṣaṇa defects to Rāma after the building of the causeway.49

(25) Rāvāṇa tries to deceive Śītā by showing her the heads of two demons as those of Rāma and Lakṣmana, whom he claims to have slain in battle, but Vibhiṣaṇa’s daughter Dewi Seri Jāti (Trijāti) visits Rāma’s camp, and on her return she assures Śītā that Rāma and Lakṣmana are alive.50

(26) There is a forty-day respite in battle after the fall of Rāvāṇa’s brother Kumbhakārṇa.51

(27) Hanumān plays the role of Rāma’s emissary to Rāvāṇa.52

(28) Rāvāṇa’s son Pāṭāla Maḥārāyaṇa abducts Rāma to the Netherworld, but Rāma is rescued by Hanumān, and Pāṭāla Maḥārāyaṇa is slain by Rāma.53
When Indrajita creates a woman resembling Sītā and kills her, Hanumān assumes the form of a bee and flies to Sītā's dwelling to ascertain that she is alive.\(^{54}\)

Indrajita's arrow changes into floral wreath around Rāma's neck.\(^{55}\)

After Indrajita is killed by Rāma, his wife Komala Dewi enters the funeral pyre of her husband.

When Lakṣmaṇa is wounded by Rāvana's arrow, Hanumān is sent to fetch the medicinal herbs from the mountain of Anjani and as the herbs can only be ground upon a stone, which is hidden beneath Rāvana's bed, Hanumān goes to fetch the stone as well. During his visit to Rāvana's bed-chamber, Hanumān ties Rāvana’s hair to that of his wife, and leaves a note that the knot can only be united when his wife beats him on his head. As Rāvana allows himself to be beaten by a woman, he makes himself liable to defeat.

When Rāma sends Hanumān to Sītā to find out how Rāvana may be killed, she tells Hanumān that, though Rāvana cannot suffer death, he will lose all his strength and power if the little head under his right ear is struck off, for it is the dwelling place of his soul. Accordingly, when Rāma cuts off the little head under Rāvana's ear, Rāvana collapses and Rāma makes his triumphant entry into Lankā.

Rāma builds a new city known as Duryapuri Negara and becomes its ruler.

When Sītā is six months pregnant, Kīkewi Dewi persuades her to draw a picture of Rāvana on a fan, and when Sītā is asleep, Kīkewi Dewi places the fan on Sītā’s breast. Rāma, on seeing the picture of Rāvana, accuses Sītā of unfaithful conduct and orders her to leave the palace. Sītā goes to live with her adoptive father Mahārishi Kali of Durwati purwa.\(^{56}\)

Sītā gives birth to a son named Tablawi (Lava), and Mahārishi Kali creates another boy named Gusi (Kuśa) from a bundle of grass.\(^{57}\)

Rāma and Sītā are eventually united in marriage again.

Tablawi is married to Indrajita's daughter and he is appointed as the king of Duryapuri Negara.

Gusi is married to Gaṅgīga Mahāsura's daughter and he becomes the ruler of Lankā.

Vibhīṣaṇa’s daughter Sandari Dewi becomes Tablawi’s second consort, Hanumān falls in love with her. When Tablawi comes to know of the love-affair, he fights against Hanumān. Rāma stops the fight and chides Hanumān for the offence and reminds him of his origin, so that he may exercise more decorum in the future.

Rāma builds a new city known as Ayodyapuri Negara in the forest, where he goes to live with Sītā, Lakṣmaṇa and Hanumān.

Barādān (Bharata) and Citradan (Satrughna) rule over Mandurapuri Negara and Isfahāboga, respectively.

Rāma and Sītā devote themselves to ascetic life in Ayodyapuri Negara, and after spending forty years of ascetic life, Rāma passes from the transitory world to the world of eternity.

**Characterisation in HSR**

The chief motive behind HSR is to show the ideals of heroism, righteous conduct, love, loyalty, selfless devotion, compassion, and asceticism. Accordingly, these ideals are portrayed through the various facets of human character as reflected in the conduct of the chief characters. First of all, it is noteworthy that, in accordance with the epic character of the story, there is a great deal of emphasis on heroism demonstrated in battles and in various kinds of contests involving skill and strength of the chief characters. The finer human qualities such as brotherly loyalty, wifely devotion, and asceticism are brought out clearly in conjunction with numerous hardships and privations at the time of Rāma's journey in the forest both before and after Rāvana's abduction of Sītā.

Rāma and Hanumān exemplify the heroic qualities of almost superhuman kind. Rāma's greatness is further enhanced by the role he plays as an obedient son, a devoted brother, a loving husband, an able leader of the family as well as the kingdom, and as an ascetic. Rāma is depicted as an epitome of heroism.
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and righteousness. He is a champion of right and honour. All good forces come to his support. He is always prepared to destroy the evil and wicked elements. At the same time, he shows concern for the wellbeing of his fellow warriors, and he tries to reach an honourable compromise with his foe in an attempt to save them from destruction, but Rāma’s initiative for peace is rejected by Rāvana.

Rāma as an obedient son abides by his father’s decision to exclude him from succession to the throne of Mandurapuri Negara on account of the king’s previous promise to Balyadari to make her son the heir to the throne. It is noteworthy that Bharata continues to rule over Mandurapuri Negara even after Rāma’s conquest of Rāvana, and indeed Rāma builds new cities for his son Tablawi and for himself instead of returning to his father’s kingdom.

The brotherly loyalty and devotion between Rāma and Laksmana is evident from the fact that they never part with each other from birth to death. Laksmana’s selfless devotion to his brother has given rise to the general conception that he is an ascetic.

Rāma’s effective role as the head of the family may be seen in the performance of his duties in connection with the arrangement of marriage relationships between the members of his family and those of his erstwhile foe and also in establishing new cities for his son and his followers. Rāma as an ideal monarch of a righteous government also instructs his sons in the art of a just, humane and firm administration.

Rāma’s inclination towards asceticism is seen not only at the time of his journeys in the forest, but also after his conquest of Rāvana. In the final stage of his career, he leaves the worldly and mundane duties of ruling the kingdom to his son Tablawi and devotes himself to asceticism for forty years.

As regards Sītā’s character, she is depicted as one whose purity and honour are not to be questioned or doubted by anyone, and she exemplifies unwavering loyalty and steadfastness especially in times of hardship and even in the face of Rāvana’s intimidation and trickery.

Hanumān as a great warrior would sometimes seem to play a greater heroic role than Rāma himself. However, his heroic and noble character is somewhat tarnished by the incident of his adultery with Tablawi’s second consort, but eventually he is forgiven by Rāma and Tablawi.

Vibhiṣaṇa, the younger brother of Rāvana, is a supporter of truth and honour, and he provides a foil to the unrighteous deeds of his unreasoning brother.

Rāvana’s son Indrajita would seem to be caught in a conflicting human situation in which he has the courage to speak for the rightful course of action when he pleads with his father to release Sītā, but at the same time he chooses to remain loyal to his father till his death.

Rāvana represents evil, and his defeat is the conquest of evil by righteousness.

To sum up now, it would seem evident from the above discussion that the Rāma story in the Malay folk and literary traditions has assumed distinct forms incorporating both localised elements and popular elements from oral sources reaching the Malay archipelago and peninsular from the different parts of the Indian subcontinent, and that it is a highly developed and well-balanced account containing many innovations, modifications, and embellishments in regard to motifs, episodes, and characterisation.
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22. The manuscript containing this recension belongs to the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, and it is found to be more or less identical with the Leiden manuscript, or which H. H. Juynboll has given a short description in his catalogue. See H. Overbeck, *Hikayat Maharaja Rāvaṇa,* *JMBRAS.*, Vol. XI, pt. 2 (1933), pp. 111-132; H. H. Juynboll, *Catalogus van de Maleise en Sundanesse handschriften der Leidse Universiteits Bibliotheek* (Leiden, 1899), p. 47.
The Literary Version of the Rama Story in Malay

23. Cf. The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, III, xvi, 7-12; VII, i, 35-46.
25. Ibid., p. 59.
28. The motif of Sītā being Rāma’s sister and queen-consort is also to be found in the Buddhist Daśaratha-jātaka, See Daśaratha-jātaka, the Buddhist story of King Rama edited and translated by V. Fausbøll (Copenhagen: Hagerup, 1971).
29. In the Shellabear text, Rama and Sītā are changed into monkeys as a result of bathing in a forbidden pool of clear water, and after they have distorted themselves, they are thrown by Laksman into another pool of muddy water and then assume human form. Later, Rāma’s sperm is transferred from Sītā’s body into the mouth of Dewi Anjāti by the wind-god.
32. Cf. HSR (WILL), 13; also E.C.G. Barrett, “Further light on Sir Richard Winstedt’s “Undescribed Maly version of the Rāmāyaṇa”,” BSOAS, Vol. XXVI, pt. 3 (1963), p. 537. According to the Tamil Uttarākāṇṭam and the Tamil Tēvārām verses of the saint Tirunāvukkaracar, (Appar), when Rāvana tries to uproot the mountain of Kailāśa, Lord Siva presses the mountain with his great toe and crushes Rāvana’s arms, and Rāvana then makes a lute from one of his heads and one of his arms, and sings the Sānāveṣa to the accompaniment of the lute in praise of Lord Siva for a thousand years. Lord Siva who is impressed by Rāvana’s devotion, releases him from the pressure of his great toe on the mountain and confers upon him a magic sword known as Candrahāsa and a boon of long life to rule over the Three Worlds. See IR (OU), 68-75; Tēvārām, IV, 28: 10; IV, 34: 10. It may be also noted in this connexion that several of the Waynag Siam versions in Malaysia have the motif of Sīrancak making a voil with his skull, one arm, three fingers, tendons, and hair, and playing it to Dewata Mulia Rāya for twelve years, P.L. Amin Sweeney, The Rāmāyaṇa and the Malay Shadow-play (Kuala Lumpur, 1972), pp. 138, 154, and 217.
33. According to South Indian folk tradition, Rāvana performs penance in Gokarna for ten thousand years between five fires with his feet suspended in the air. B. Ziegenbalg, Genealogie der Malabarischen Götter (Madras, 1867), p. 187; A. Zieseniss, op. cit., p. 105.
34. The Hindu versions of the Rāma story generally refer to Rāvana’s sovereignty extending to the Three Worlds, namely, The Earth, the Heaven, and the Netherworld. Cf. IR (OU)., 7 : 75.
35. The name Pātāla Mahārāja is derived from the term Pātāla (‘the nether region’) and the word Mahārāja, which is a Tamil form for the Sanskrit word mahārāja (‘supreme king’).
36. The names of Rāvana’s consorts Niṭa Utama, Gaṅga Mahā Dewi, and Pītiwi Dewi are apparently derived from such names as Tilottomā (name of a celestial damsel), Gaṅga (the river Ganges, personified as a goddess), and Prīthvi (the goddess of the Earth). Cf. A. Zieseniss, op. cit., p. 105.
37. The name-form Bibūśāṇa seems to be a Tamil name-form for the Sanskrit word Bibūṣaṇa or Vibhūṣaṇa meaning the adorning one’.
40. The name-form Berga Singa seems to be related to the Tamil name-form Viṭturucīkkan or Viṭturucīkku for the Sanskrit name Viṣṇujīghva. Cf. IR(OU), 6 : 56, pp. 340-342.
41. The name-form Indrapawāṇam appears to be a Tamil name-form for the Sanskrit word Indra-Bhavan (‘Indra’s abode’), but it may also have been a misconstrued form for the word Tanṭakāvānan in Tamil, which refers to the Danḍaka forest where Rāma and his companions take up their residence before Sītā is abducted by Rāvana.
42. In Vimala Sūri’s Jaina version entitled Paumacariya, Śambūka, who is said to be the son of Candranākha (Sūrpanākha), practises asceticism in a bamboo thicket in order to acquire the divine sword Sūryahāsa. When the sword descends from heaven, Laksman finds it, and trying
It is customary to observe a forty-day mourning for the death of a prince, who is also the heir-apparent to the throne in Malay kingdoms. See A. Zieseniss, op. cit., p. 139; Alwi bin Sheikh Alhady, Malay Customs and Traditions (Singapore: Donald Moore for Eastern University Press Ltd., 1962), p. 117.

In VR (VI, 41) and KR (VI, 13 : 8-43), Valin’s son Angada plays the role of Rama’s emissary to Ravana.

According to the Bengali version entitled Mahi Ravaner Pāla, composed by Kṛttivāsa in the fifteenth century A.D., Ravana’s son Mahi abducts Rama and Lakṣmaṇa with the intention of sacrificing them to the goddess Kāli. Hanumān assumes the form of a fly, enters Mahi’s palace, slays the demon and rescues Rama. D. Sen, The Bengali Rāmāyana (Calcutta, 1920), pp. 254-283.

According to the Hindu versions such as the Sanskrit epic of Vālmīki, the period of Rama’s exile is fourteen years. The twelve-year period of Rama’s parting with his wife in HSR is probably related to the motif of Rama’s absence from the capital for a twelve-year period to be found in the Buddhist Dasaratha-Jātaka.

Artocarpus heterophylus. According to VR (IV, 11), Rama demonstrates his strength by pushing away the heap of skeleton belonging to a buffalo-demon named Dundubhi with a single kick of his great toe, and by shooting through seven sāla shorea robusta trees as well as the mountain and the earth with a single arrow, which finally returns to his quiver.

According to KR (IV, 7 : 57, 67, 71 and 153), after Rama’s arrow pierces Valin’s chest, he pulls it from his chest, finds that Rama’s name is engraved on it, and begins to accuse Rama of attacking him from his hiding place, and finally as Valin’s grip on the arrow is relaxed at the point of death, the arrow pierces right through Valin’s body, dips itself in the pure water of the sea, and returns to Rama’s quiver.

According to KR (V, 36) and VR (V, 5 : 63), Hanumān himself shows Rama’s ring to Sītā as a token of his identity.

In the Bengali version entitled Angader Raivara, composed by Kavicandra in the eighteenth century, Rama’s envoy Angada elongates his tail, rolls it up and sits on it. so as to be on the same level as Rāvana. D. Sen, The Bengali Rāmāyana’s (Calcutta, 1920), pp. 218-219.

In VR and YK, Vibhīṣaṇa seeks refuge with Rāma even before the building of the causeway.

In VR (VI, 31) at the command of Rāvana, a demon named Vidyujjihva creates an illusion of Rāma’s head and his bow before Sītā, and she is consoled by Vibhīṣaṇa’s wife Sārana.
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RÂMÂYÂNA IN ŚRÎLANKÂ AND LANKÂ OF THE RÂMÂYÂNA

C.E. Godakumbura

The Sinhalese poet Kumâradâsa's Mahâkâvyâ the Jânaki-harana (Jnk.), is now published in full, and I believe is known to students of Sanskrit literature, particularly to those who interest themselves in the Râmâyâna and the ornate poetry and drama which followed, based on the same theme. Before dealing with any special features noticeable in this poem of Kumâradâsa, I want to place before you a folk story related to the Râmâyâna, with important characters of the epic, Râma, Sîta and Râvana, also Vâlmiki, and further three sons of Sîta (not twins as in the epic): one a real son and two created miraculously for Sîta by the sage. Here also are related the exploits of the monkey-chief Valin, who is credited here with the exploits of Hanumânt in the epic. To this story Uûa or Pûrvati, the consort of Śiva, is also introduced. In this connection I shall attempt to deal chronologically with the spread of the Râma-Sîta and Râvana story in the island, both from literary sources and folklore. Here we will have to take into account the geographical position of Lanka, from time to time as it was in the imagination of the Sinhalese during different periods, both by the literate and by the common folk.

Now let me first relate the folk version of the Râmâyana story in Sri Lanka. I must add that this story is not wide-spread, and that it is even now known only to traditional performers of the occult rite or folk ceremony practised only in a few villages in the central districts of the island. Others who know it are only students of folklore and folk art who have read it in recent publications.

The Folk Version

This version of the story of Sîta is related during the performance of the ‘Kohombâ Yakkama’ or the ‘Kohombâ Kankâriya’ popularly called ‘Kankâriya’, the most interesting and elaborate ritual dance drama extant among the Sinhalese in order to recount the origin of the cult. The rite is said to have been first performed during the reign of Panûdvâsadeva, the second Sinhalese King of Ceylon. (c. 5th century B.C.)
Panduvasadeva, it is said, was tormented by frightful dreams believed to be due to his predecessor’s, that is, King Vijaya’s violation of a promise of marriage to the Yakṣa princess Kuveni. Magicians, charmers or medicine men could do nothing until finally, at the request of the gods, King Malaya came from India and performed the first Kohomba Yakkama ceremony.

During this ceremony several-stories or legends are related some of which may have a historical basis, and others mere myth. Among them is the story of the birth and childhood of Prince Malaya. Malaya (Sinhalese: mala = a flower) was created out of a lotus flower and was brought up by Sītā in her exile with her own son, and another boy who had a similar miraculous birth. The dancers and drum-beaters who perform the rite know from memory the whole text of the ceremony with all the anecdotes, in Sinhalese verse, together with detailed narratives in prose. Among them is the story of the three sons of Sītā. The following account of the story of Sītā is gathered from the text of the Kohomba Yakkama obtained from a dancer in the village of Kotaligoda in Yaṭhinuvara in the district of Kandy.

Viṣṇu (incarnate as Rāma) was under an inauspicious aspect of Saturn, the malefic planet, and in order to avert its evil effects, he left his queen, Sītā, and taking the guise of an elephant passed the seven unlucky years in the forest. Meanwhile, when there remained but one week to complete the period of exile, Rāvana, the ten-headed Rākṣasa king, carried Sītā away in his aerial car to his capital in Lanka and attempted to seduce her. Sītā told him that she was under a vow of chastity for three months and added that at the end of that time she would allow him to fulfil his wishes.

A short while after, Sītā conceived a child and at this time Viṣṇu had to attend a meeting of the assembly of the gods, leaving Sītā alone at home. Umā paid a visit to Sītā and inquiring about her life in Lanka, asked her to describe how Rāvana looked like. To satisfy the curiosity of her friend Sītā made a sketch of Rāvana’s figure on the leaf of an ash-plantain. Hardly had Sītā completed her drawing when Viṣṇu came home, and seeing him come she threw her drawing under the bed. Viṣṇu sat on the bed, but by the puissance of Rāvana the bed began to shake, and when Viṣṇu looked underneath to see what the matter was he discovered Sītā’s drawing. Enraged at the sight of it, and suspecting Sītā to be in love with Rāvana, Viṣṇu sent for his brother Saman (= Sanskrit: Sumana) and commanded him to kill Sītā, adding, “I want you to take this wicked woman into the forest and behead her”. Saman led Sītā to the Himalayas, left her near a hermitage, and returned with his sword wet with the blood of a wild animal which he had cut, and reported to his brother that his command had been carried out.

Viṣṇu then entered Rāvana’s park, climbed the best of his mango trees, and ate the fruits thereof. The park-keeper tried in vain to capture the vicious animal, and in the end brought the matter to the notice of the king. The royal guards surrounded the monkey; amused at his antics, Sītā, too, was present there enjoying the fun in the company of Rāvana, and she suggested that they wrap cloth round his tail and set it on fire. The guards dipped the monkey’s tail in oil, wrapped rags round it, and set fire to them. Viṣṇu jumped on the roof, setting fire to it, and setting the whole city ablaze. Then while confusion reigned in Rāvana’s court he seized Sītā and carried her back to Viṣṇu.

Sitā was weary and slept there for a long while. At last she woke, and wept being afraid of the lonely forest where she was left helpless. The sage Vālmiga (= Sanskrit: Vālmīki) who lived in the hermitage close by, went towards the direction of the cries and saw Sitā in that pitiable condition. The compassionate sage thought it his duty to help a pregnant woman and therefore built her a hut of leaves near his own pond. Sitā lived in this hut subsisting on the fruits of the forest, and when her time of delivery came she gave birth to a son whom she showed against arrows. Vālin then entered Rāvana’s park, climbed the best of his mango trees, and ate the fruits thereof. The park-keeper tried in vain to capture the vicious animal, and in the end brought the matter to the notice of the king. The royal guards surrounded the monkey; amused at his antics, Sītā, too, was present there enjoying the fun in the company of Rāvana, and she suggested that they wrap cloth round his tail and set it on fire. The guards dipped the monkey’s tail in oil, wrapped rags round it, and set fire to them. Vālin jumped on the roof, setting fire to it, and setting the whole city ablaze. Then while confusion reigned in Rāvana’s court he seized Sītā and carried her back to Viṣṇu.

A short while after, Sītā conceived a child and at this time Viṣṇu had to attend a meeting of the assembly of the gods, leaving Sītā alone at home. Umā paid a visit to Sītā and inquiring about her life in Lanka, asked her to describe how Rāvana looked like. To satisfy the curiosity of her friend Sītā made a sketch of Rāvana’s figure on the leaf of an ash-plantain. Hardly had Sītā completed her drawing when Viṣṇu came home, and seeing him come she threw her drawing under the bed. Viṣṇu sat on the bed, but by the puissance of Rāvana the bed began to shake, and when Viṣṇu looked underneath to see what the matter was he discovered Sītā’s drawing. Enraged at the sight of it, and suspecting Sītā to be in love with Rāvana, Viṣṇu sent for his brother Saman (= Sanskrit: Sumana) and commanded him to kill Sītā, adding, “I want you to take this wicked woman into the forest and behead her”. Saman led Sītā to the Himalayas, left her near a hermitage, and returned with his sword wet with the blood of a wild animal which he had cut, and reported to his brother that his command had been carried out.

Sitā was weary and slept there for a long while. At last she woke, and wept being afraid of the lonely forest where she was left helpless. The sage Vālmiga (= Sanskrit: Vālmīki) who lived in the hermitage close by, went towards the direction of the cries and saw Sitā in that pitiable condition. The compassionate sage thought it his duty to help a pregnant woman and therefore built her a hut of leaves near his own pond. Sitā lived in this hut subsisting on the fruits of the forest, and when her time of delivery came she gave birth to a son whom she showed
to the hermit. The holy man gave his blessing to the little one and the mother and child continued to live there enjoying his protection. One day when the mother left the child in bed and went to the forest in search of fruits he fell off his bed and began to scream. The hermit drawn by the shrieks of the infant, went to the hut and discovered him on the ground. The sage could not touch him to put him back on the bed, for it did not befit his holy life. He therefore, plucked a lotus from the pond and threw it on to the bed where it turned into child. Ignorant of what had happened, Sītā came back took up the child that was on the bed, and was feeding him when her own child cried from under the bed. Seeing her son there she was confused and ran to the ascetic, who told her what had happened and tried to console her, but it was all in vain. "I shall not believe you", said she, "unless you create for me another child." How will you feed a third child? asked the sage. I shall feed two at my breasts and third I shall feed on my little finger", replied Sītā.

Valmiga went back with her and threw a blade of sacrificial grass on to the bed from which forthwith another child was created. When the three boys were only seven years old, they left their mother and went to the Malaya country where they built three royal parks and places and flourished under the names of Sandalindu, Mala, and Kistri (Kit- sī, Kisti).

Traces of the Rāmāyaṇa

Before commenting on the date of this folk version of the Rāma-Sītā story and the occult ceremony in the course of which it is related, we must search for traces of the Rāmāyaṇa epic in the early literature and the art of Śri Lankā.

The oldest chronicle of Ceylon, the Dipavaṃsa (c. 4th century A.D.) has nothing about the Sinhalese Prince Vijaya’s dealings with the Yakkhini (Yaksini) girl Kuveni or Kuvanna, nor of his promise of making her his queen. The name Lankā is employed when speaking of the Simhala-dvipa, but there is no mention of Lankapura. The Mahāvaṃsa (Mhv.) (5th century A.D.) gives the incident of the encounter of Vijaya and his men with the Yakkhinis (Skt. Yaksini) and the prince lives with Kuvenā as man and wife. There are two cities of the Yaksas, one Sirisavattthu (Mhv. ch 7v. 32), and the other Laṅkapura or Laṅkanagara (Mhv. vv. 33, 62). In order to be crowned with a

queen of equal birth Vijaya sends away the Yakṣa girl, and lets her down but there is no account of the result of curses suffered by Paṇḍuvaśadeva, Vijaya’s successor, on account of his predecessor’s breach of promise to a woman to stand by her. The account of the frightful dreams of Paṇḍuvaśadeva appears only in the Rājāvaliya, a Sinhalese chronicle of about the fifteenth century, and in an occult text, the Kuveniasna “the story of Kuveni” of the same period. The Rājāvaliya mentions Rāvana, and further more, attempts to give him a date, about 2300 B.C. The chronicle also goes on to say that by the time of the Buddha, that is, the arrival of Vijaya in Śri Lankā, in the sixth century B.C. there were no piśācas (Rākṣasas) in the island. The Rājāvaliya also speaks of the rock Lak-gala and the city Sirisayatthu (Sirivatpura). The Lak-gala here may be the Laṅkapura of the Mhv., but there is also another Yakha settlement, Lok-gala or Lot-gala (Rājāvaliya, ed. Watuwatte Pemananda, 1926, pp. 17-22).

The name Laṅkā for the island of the present Śri Lankā or the former Simhala-dvipa or Ceylon, is no evidence to place the home of Rāvana in Śri Lankā, and in this connection, reference may be made of T. Paramasiva Iyer’s Rāmāyaṇa and Lanka, Parts I & II, Bangalore, 1940; and H.D. Sankalia, Rāmāyaṇa, Myth or Reality, New Delhi, 1973. True, there was an ancient port which still bears the name Illankaturai situated south of Trincomalee, but this Ilankai is only the Tamil form of the word Laṅkā.

One may be tempted to take Laṅkapura as the rājadhāni or the capital of the Rākṣasa king Rāvana. It is possible that the name may have been suggested to the author through the name of the Rākṣasa city in the epic, and in the language of the Mahāvaṃsa we clearly notice the influence of the Sanskrit epics. But it is only the name and nothing more. Laṅkapura (Nagara) is a city of the Yakṣas and not of the Rākṣasas.

It has been pointed out in a thesis that the name of Rāvana’s brother Vibhīṣaṇa, who for a just cause befriended Rāma and became his ally, is connected with Śri Lankā in the Mahāyāna magical text, the Mahāmāyuri as “Vibhīṣaṇas Tömraparnyām” (Ananda Guruge, the Society of the Rāmāyaṇa, Maharagana, 1960, p. 68). The text has been taken to be before the fourth century A.D. on the strength of a Chinese translation which is dated in that period. The position has, however, to be re-examined.
Common material can exist in two texts, and names of gods can be interpolated. We can find examples in the 'Atanatiyasutta' of the Dighani[k]a. We shall presently come to instances where the name of Vibhiṣaṇa occurs in the inscriptions and literature of Sri Lanka. This is in and after the fourteenth century A.D.

The Epics

Allusions to the Rāmāyaṇa story, and figures of speech, usually similes with the names of the chief characters of the epic, Rāma, Śiṣṭā, and Rāvaṇa, occur in the latter portion of the Mahāvaṃsa, namely, the Cūlavāṃsa, in the portions that were added to the chronicles in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. In the accounts of King Parākramabāhu I (A.D. 1153-1186) we meet with the following statements. This king heard the worldly stories such as those contained in the Rāmāyaṇa and the (Mahā)bhhārata, while yet a boy (Mhv. ch. 64, vv. 43-44). Once when his ministers told king Parākramabāhu that they could not build a causeway or bridge across the Dādurū-oya (a river in the North Central Province of Ceylon), he replied to them: "The whole world still knows how King Rāma once built a causeway across the ocean, employing only monkeys" (Mhv., ch. 68, v. 20). Similarly the king's soldiers who had crossed a certain river are likened to the monkeys who waded over the waters of the ocean in the Rāma-Rāvaṇa war (Mhv., ch. 75, v. 59). One of the King Parākramabāhu's queens, Rūpavati, loved the King as Śiṣṭā did love Rāma; and she won the affection of the King, as Śiṣṭā earned the love of Rāma. Her praise is like the eulogies of poets on Śiṣṭā: "... most beauteous of beautiful women, clever, virtuous, pure in action, highly famed ..." (Mhv., ch. 73, vv. 137-143). During the reign of Parākramabāhu II (A.D. 1236-1270) Prince Virabāhu slew numbers of the enemy as Rāma did the Rākṣasas (Mhv., ch. 83, v. 46). The king who followed Parākramabāhu II, namely Virabāhu (A.D. 1270-1272), "went forth with Vijayabhū ... surrounded the great army of Candrabhānu on all sides and fought a great battle, terrible as the combat of Rāma (with Rāvaṇa) (Mhv., ch. 88, v. 69). These are poetical and learned figures of speech and not folklore; and as to their sources we have to look for a recension of the Rāmāyaṇa; or it can be Kumāradāsa's Jānakiharana, for which there was a sanne, that is, a word-for-word translation, which may be dated on the evidence of language in about the twelfth century. The Raghunāṁśa had been studied by the Sinhalese. Rājaśekhara was known to the author of the Sasadāvata-sanne (12th century) and among quotations from his Kāvyamitmāṇsā in this commentary, there is also one from the Bālārāmāyaṇa (Br.) as comment on verse 117 (Sasadāvata-sanne, 1934, p. 37), and this agrees with Br., Banaras ed. v. 35.

Idle Talk

Papātīcasūdani, the Pali commentary on the Majjhima-nikāya (of the fifth century A.D.), classes narratives such as the story of the Bhārata war and the tale of the abduction of Śiṣṭā as frivolous and useless talk: "Bhārata-yuddha-Śīṭharaṇādīnirathāthā-kathā-kūṭikā, tathārūpī-kathā-kathanaṃ ca." (op. cit. P.T.S. ed. Pt. I, p. 201). This was re-echoed and elaborated upon by Sinhalese writers. The preacher monk, Dharmasena, a contemporary of the writer of the above cited portions of the Cūlavāṃsa, who was slightly earlier, in his book of Buddhist stories, the Sadhārana-rāṇāvaliya (Jayatilaka ed. p. 952), while speaking of the recital of the epics in the North Indian kingdoms and cities, a list of which he gives,—says that the people of those countries paid gold, bullion and coins, and got the stories such as those of Rāma and Śiṣṭā, which are a hindrance to the attainment of heaven and Release, related to them. Dharmasena adds that they merely neglect the hearing of stories that are productive of good thoughts. This collection of Buddhist stories is meant to be read out to the masses, and the author’s admonition and the condemnation of the stories of the Epic may be to prevent the common folk beginning to relish these tales in preference to Buddhist religious stories. It is after this period that we find the Rāmāyaṇa story beginning to be popular, and the worship of Viṣṇu, Utpalavarna and Rāma getting some prominence. King Parākramabāhu II was a loyal devotee of Utpalavarna, and other gods of Devinuvara and he had the statue of one of them conveyed to a new temple at Alutnuvara, closer to his capital at Dambadeniya, and near the home of his viceroy who advised him in such matters. We shall shortly see that this God was identified with Rāma before long.
Rāmāyana and Sinhalese Literature

(i) Vibhiṣaṇa:

We come to Vibhiṣaṇa again and also to Utpalavarna, the Lotus-coloured God. Their names are found in the rock inscription of King Bhuvanaikabahu IV, dated Saka 1268 (A.D. 1344). Here, as well in copy of it we get Kihirali and Upulvan as one and the same God, and we need not go into details about this God; but it is of interest to us if Saman (Sumana) and Vibhiṣaṇa is the same, as then we can see that at one time, Vibhiṣaṇa was the God of Adam’s Peak, a very important Buddhist shrine. Vibhiṣaṇa’s alliance with Rama is spoken of very favourably in some of the literary works of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.

Kelaniya (Kālanjīyā = Pali; Kalyāṇi) near Colombo has been and still is the seat of this tutelary God Vibhiṣaṇa, and he is eulogized in a number of duta or sandesa kāvyas, messenger or message poems, written in Sinhalese somewhat on the lines of the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa. (There is sanne-translation of the Meghadūta contemporary with the Ínk-sanne.) Dondra or Devinuvara, as we have seen, was the seat of Utpalavarna. Now the name of this God is forgotten and Viṣṇu is worshipped there instead, and Rama who was taken to Alutnuvara also has given place either to a local god or to Viṣṇu, whose avatāra Rāma was. According to tradition it was to Utpalavarna that the Buddha entrusted the care of Śri Lanka when the Aryan (Simhala) Prince Vijaya and his men landed in Sri Lanka, but now the belief is that it was Viṣṇu who was appointed as the protector of the Buddhist religion in the island. In the Tisarasandesaṣaya or the “Swan’s Message”, written in about the middle of the fourteenth century, the messenger bird starts from Devinuvara in the South, the southernmost point in the island, and goes to Gampola, the capital in the hill country, with the blessings of God Utpalavarna. On his way the bird is to stop at Kelaniya, and go to the temple of Vibhiṣaṇa. In this context when speaking of the local God it is said that he befriended the God of Dondra, Upulvandev-rāda, in very early days, thus identifying Utpalavarna with Viṣṇu and Rāma (op. cit. Jayatilaka’s ed. 1935, vv. 100-101).

The messenger bird, the peacock of the Mayūrasandesā written a short time after the former poem, on his way from Gampola to Devinuvara has also to halt at Kelaniya and pay his homage to Vibhiṣaṇa. He is also to pray to the God to bless and increase the power of the King of Gampola just as he obtained victory for Rāma, the son of King Daśaratha (op. cit. ed. Amaramoli, 1934, v. 39).

The messenger bird of the Hamṣasandesāṣaya “the Goose-MESSAGE”, on his way from the capital Jayavardhana-Kotte, near Colombo to Keragala (Kāragala) in the interior of the western province also has to pass through Kelaniya, and he is enjoined to inform the God the purpose of his journey. Here the allusion to the Rāmāyana is very definite and clear; “Rāma, who was in human guise, with his fearless voice which resembled the roar of the best of Kesara lions, put to fright the countless hosts of Rākṣasas, and scattered them about. Then in the company of the gods, Vibhiṣaṇa was anointed as the sovereign Lord of Śri Lanka. On kings who made offerings to him he bestowed wealth and gave them victory over their enemies. They were made prosperous and their fourfold armies were strengthened” (ed. Godakumbura, 1953, v. 113 with the reading nirindunhaṭa, “to kings” in line 6).

The Salalihini-sandesāṣaya, the “Starlings’s Message”, completed in A.D. 1450, is sent to God Vibhiṣaṇa at Kelaniya from the Capital of Koṭṭe not far distant. Since Vibhiṣaṇa was himself the receiver of the prayer, there is a glowing praise of the God, touching his physical or bodily characteristics and also his valour, prowess and virtues. In this the poet has not forgotten that the God was by birth a Rākṣasa. He has a pair of tusks, that shine as two crescent moons, if there can be a pair of them, shining on either side of a row of evening clouds, namely, his red lips. The eulogy ends with : “He is the brother of Rāvana who brought the three worlds under his sway, with full knowledge of the past, the present and the future, he chose to be the devoted ally of Lord Rāma. He is the gem-made light to illumine the noble family of Pulasti. (ed. Dharmarāma- vv. 77-93.)

The Kokila-sandesāṣaya the “Cuckoo’s Message” presents Utpalavarna at Dondra, and Viṣṇu as different gods, and
Vibhīṣaṇa reigns at Kelaniya (ed. P.S. Perera. 1906, vv. 22ff, and v. 120).

(ii) Kausalyā, Temple of Rāma:

In an eulogy of the Kokila-sandesaya, the mother of King Parākramabāhu VI (A.D. 1410-1468) is compared to Kausalyā: "Ram-raduta dinitiya Kosalindu dū- radū mena," "like the daughter of the Kosala King, the mother of King Rāma" (op. cit. v. 109).

Further in the same Sandesa. God Rāma is eulogized as flourishing in Yapapatuna, the modern Jaffna, but this was a provincial seat of a prince who, though a Sinhalese, had a foreign origin, and many foreigners such as Tamils and Javanese were living there (op. cit. v. 251). God Rāma is described thus: "in that city flourishes the Lord of the Gods, God Rāma, his body shining with a colour as if the lustre of the ocean got stuck there when with great effort the causeway was being built to bring over the hosts of fighters in days of old for the battle against the Ten-headed Rāvana." (op. cit. v. 252). Perhaps this later became a Viṣṇu shrine.

In the Parevisandesaya, "the Dove's Message" of Śrī Rāhula of Totagamuva, we find an interesting position. The poem is one of Rāhula's early works, which may be dated between about 1435 and 1445. The poet's close acquaintance with the jānakiharana is clearly evident. In this Sandesa, Rāhula takes the God of the Bow as the son Utpalavarna, and he is likened to Rāma, who armed with the Golden Bow, defeated Paraśurāma (1925 edition v. 201). Later on we shall see that the God of the Golden Bow was Rāma, and it was God Rāma's statue which was taken from Dondra to Alutnuwara.

(iii) Sitā:

Coming to other classes of poetry, we find Śrī Rāhula in his Kātyānaśekharnīya, a court poem with a Jātaka story for its theme, comparing the beauty and virtues of Princess Lokanātha, the daughter of King Parākramabāhu VI (A.D. 1410-1468) to those qualities of Sitā (op. cit., I, 15). At the same time, when the poet is in a preaching mood, he re-echoes the words of Dharmasena Thera, including also the (Mahābhārata) the Rāmāyaṇa as consisting of useless words, and their narrative to be of no use (ibid, IX, 25).

(iv) Rāma-Sitā:

The Girāsandesa, "the Parrot's Message" states that in a certain Rest-hall in the western coast, the bird will meet when he stops there on his journey, persons tarrying there, among them those who have accepted false beliefs, and some who appreciate poetry and drama, relating the stories of Rāma and Sitā (Dehigaspe- Palonnaruve ed. 1933, v. 107). It is also stated that in the Rest-hall were travellers who had come from foreign countries and thus the people who related the tales from the two epics may have been foreign merchants and pilgrims.

(v) Rāma, Rāvana, Hanumant:

The well-known poem, the Gutttilaya, the poetical version of the Guttila-jātaka, belonging to about the second half of the fifteenth century, has the following apt simile to illustrate how the Bodhisattva attained to greater fame through the ingratitude of his pupil: "Just as King Rāma's fame spread still more on account of the wicked Ten-necked Rāvana" (op. cit. v. 331). The Buduguṇaḷaṅkārāya of a poet of Vīdagama who was opposed to the worship of the gods, quotes the Rāmāyaṇa story for a different purpose. He says, "Look at the power of the gods! Rāma, a god, could not cross the sea over which a monkey had jumped!" (op. cit. v. 180).

(vi) God Rāma:

As we have seen God Utpalavarna of Devnuvara, was identified as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and thereafter appears to have been taken as Rāma who was an avatāra or an incarnation of Viṣṇu, although the scholar Rāhula took him otherwise in his parevisandesaya. Thus we have similar lines about the seventeenth century, in connection with the building of the new shrine at Alutnuwara for a God from Devnuvara, where Rāma is spoken of as Rāma-deva-rāja, Rāma-dev-raja in Sinhalese: Rāma devurada Devundara sita Aluthnuvarata vadinagamane...

"When the Lord God Rāma was so gracious as to come to Alutnuvara from Devundara." (Bell, Kegalla Report, p. 125.)
Devundara is the common popular name for Dondra or Devnuvara.

About this time the acceptance of Rāma as a God caught the popular mind also at least to a certain extent. A folk poem of 101 quatrains of about the seventeenth or the eighteenth century, called the Ram-dunu-paralaya “the Inspiration or the Possession of the God of the Golden Bow” (printed 1925, Nevill 750) eulogizes the heroism and prowess of God Rāma, who is at the same time Utpalavarna and Viṣṇu. The important theme here is Rāma’s victory over Rāvana. Rāma or Viṣṇu gets the Golden Bow from the Milky Ocean. Rāvana also has his great bows. Both fight with bow and arrow. The work by its nature is a magical text, to be used at occult ceremonies. The Rāma cult seems to have spread to some extent among the common people. Stanzas from the Randunuparalaya are heard as fugitive verse, which show their popularity. Randunumangale “Ode to the Golden Bow” (Nevill, 108), Randunukavi “Hymn of the Golden Bow,” (ibid, 751) and Randunu-upata “Origin of the Golden Bow” (ibid, 752) also deal with the same subject.

Vaikuṇṭalamkāraya, “the description of Vaikuṇṭha, Viṣṇu’s Heaven”, (printed 1926), a poem of 48 quatrains, speaks of the avatāras of Viṣṇu particularly that as the God of Devundura (Devi-nuvara), who according to tradition, was born of a log of sandal-wood in Śaka era 712, that is, A.D. 800. Details of the year, month, day and time are also given (v. 6). This God is Viṣṇu, who vanquished the proud Rāvana (vv. 29-30). In the next verse (31), he is Rāmaguru of the dark blue or black colour. Hanumant is Rāma’s son (v. 35, Rāmputra v. 37). Saman (Lakṣmaṇa) has a golden bow in his right hand (v. 46), and Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) also has one (v. 47). This leads to a ceremony where the golden bows are kept on an altar with flower arrows (v. 48).

There are some ballads dealing with the story of Rāvana and these may be about four centuries old. Of these Rāvana-Katāva, “Story of Rāvana” (Nevill 177) shows only a slight variation. It says that Rāvana ruled over twenty-five palaces and four hundred bazaars in Laṅkā. As it is the habit with later Sinhalese writers, Rāma is spoken of as Viṣṇu in Rāvanahatana “the War of Rāvana” (Nevill 689); but the Rāvana-puvata “the History of Rāvana” (Nevill 690) is of some special interest. Here the story commences with an account of Viṣṇu going to bathe at the pond in his park, and finding the purple lilies plucked, and the water turbid. Determined to sift the outrage, he concealed himself, and watched the pond. Seven goddesses came to bathe there, leaving their celestial clothes on the bank. Unperceived by them Viṣṇu stole one cloth, and when upon seeing him six of the fair nymphs flew away, one whose cloth he had secured was left behind. This goddess was Sītā, and Viṣṇu took her away with him, and made her his wife.

(vii) Sītā as Lakṣmi:

In the court of Kandy, at least one poet took Rāma as Viṣṇu and Sītā as Kamalā (or Lakṣmi i.e. Śrī Devī) the consort of Viṣṇu. One of the courtiers, a minister by the name of Gaskon had an intrigue with the Queen and the enraged King condemned the man to death. On his way to meet the executioners, the unfortunate minister is reported to have sung a verse which has been translated literally thus: “Since Rāvana in days of yore offered for Lakṣmi (Sītā) his ten heads, upon the mere gratification of his eye-sight without enjoying connubial happiness; what signifies if my only head fall for thy sake, whose ambrosial love I have enjoyed” (James D’Alwis, the Sidath Sangarawa, Introduction, 1852, p. ccxv), and its versified English translation is also given here.

“Lanka’s giant king entrall’d, only by beauty’s sight
Laid down his twice five heads, uncropp’d the flower of Love’s delight.

Then why should I, a happier swain, who with the Gods above,
Have revelled at the banquet rare of thy ambrosial love,
Repine with my one head to atone for my bold adventure,
To gain what sweetens human lives as long as they endure.”

This attempt at English verse has been added as it brings out the spirit of the original which has been inspired by the lovely story of Sītā and Rāvana. At this stage at least to some Rāvana has become the hero.

(viii) Rāvana and Rāma:

In the Imgrisis-hatana “the Ballad of the English war,” a poem describing a battle between the Sinhalese and the English
(British) fought near Kandy in 1803, a court poet compares the Sinhalese leader and the British General to Rāma and Rāvaṇa (op. cit. v. 176).

We can multiply examples, but what has been brought out will be sufficient to demonstrate that both the writer of ornate literary poetry (kavya) as well as the folk poet, took characters from the Rāmāyaṇa stories, and incidents out of them, for their compositions.

The last king of Kandy (A.D. 1798-1875), who was Nayakkar, however, was a devotee of God Rāma and there was a temple of Rāma at Hanguranketa, about twenty miles off Kandy, a retiring place of safety for the Kandy court. A Pali poem in honour of Rāma the Rāma-sandasa is mentioned. (Malalasekera, Pali literature of Ceylon, Colombo, 1958, pp. 288-289), and Somadasa, K.D., Mss.Catalogue (in Sinhalese) Nos. 235, 761, 817.

Folklore

There is an abundance of folklore in Ceylon connected with the story of Rāma and Sītā. Some of these explain place-names; some point to special geographical features, others the lay of the land, the position of hills, nooks, and bends in rivers, the colour of the soil and various curiosities. All this is folk-lore and nothing archaeologically provable or tested historically.

Here is one of these stories. Almost on the historical Galle Harbour in the South-west of Śrī Laṅkā island, there is a beautiful promontory named by modern educational missionaries in the Latin idiom “Bona Vista”, Good View. All kinds of herbs, every one of them known to any system of indigenous medicine, are said to grow there and are to be found on this hill. I have heard that the older local people go to this hill, when they are in need of a special herb to prepare a rare herbal decoction or render some medicinal treatment and they will search for the herb here. This is how it came about. The hill goes back, according to tradition, to the time of the Rāma-Rāvaṇa war; although as we shall see Śrī Laṅkā was not the battle-field in the mind of the creators of this story.

Those who have read the Rāmāyaṇa or the Jānakiharana know the incident when Laksmanā lay senseless, believed by all, friend and foe, to be dead, as the result of wounds he received from the weapons of Rākṣasas. Then Sūceṇa, the physician of the monkeys, said that the life of the prince could be saved if he could have a certain herb which grew on the Himalayan peaks. To be sure of obtaining this ‘life-bestowing’ herb with all possible speed, Hanumant, the son of the Wind God, was sent to fetch it. As the good monkey-chief started off in haste, he had no time to learn exactly the name of the herb, but he remembered the name of the rock and its position; so he tore it off completely and carried it with all trees, creepers and everything alive or dead to be with Sūceṇa and Laksmanā as soon as he could and proceeded south faster than the wind itself.

The Galle Sinhalese folk add that as Hanumant was proceeding to be with the patient, carrying the rock, his eye caught the herb and he recalled its name. Now the monkey did not want to be burdened by the rock any more, and having torn off what he wanted of the herb, he threw the rock down by the sea, perhaps as he did not want to hurt any living being on land. It is this portion of the Himalayas, which now bears the name of Rūmassala, the meaning of which is explained in different ways, giving various etymologies. The missionary school built here is called Bona Vista and modernized people use that name. Seeing that Hanumant was coming from the Himalayas in the North and when he passed over Śrī Laṅkā, he would have been going southwards; and thus it is interesting to note that those local folk, among whom this story of the origin of Rūmassala originated, also would have taken Laṅkā to be the south of Simhala just as the classical Sanskrit poets and dramatists, such as Murāri and Rājaśekhara did. Or was it simple coincidence? (Godakumbura, Sāhityaya, September, 1975).

Place-Names

Folklore relating to Rāvaṇa of Laṅkā and Sītā in captivity in his city has provided the occasion in Śrī Laṅkā for the creation of place-names, or to the greater extent, for attributing fanciful etymologies to existing ones. Thus to the South-East of the coast of Śrī Laṅkā, about six nautical miles off the shore, are two rock-cliff formed islets, and they are known to the outside world, as the Great and Little Bases. They are in Sinhalese the Maha-Rāvaṇa-kotuva (or-kotive) and the Kuđa-Rāvaṇa-kotuva (or-kotive). It is not known how old these names are, but may
be taken as later than the older Rājāvaliya chronicle texts. According to the popular meaning the names signify the Large Fortress of Rāvana and the Small Fortress of Rāvana. So also we have near Badulla in the hill country a high fall in a stream called Rāvana-ālla, the Rāvana-falls, and they are said to be waters under which the Rāksa king had his bath.

The Sinhalese speakers who have not studied Sanskrit pronounce Rāvana as Rāvana. It is the form in which the name is met with in the manuscripts, and most printed texts, of the Rājāvaliya chronicles, and other related contemporary texts, so that the word-endings with the masculine singular 'a'-ending, are common to the nominative and accusative cases. The derived Sinhalese or older Elu form from Rāvana is Rāvulū, from which we get the nominative and accusative singular, Rāvalā (This form belongs only to the old literary language and in modern parlance rāvulā or rāvula is a long-bearded man). In the short treatise on Sinhalese grammar, the Sidatsāṅgara of the fourteenth century a composition possibly of the same author as of the Mayūrasanāda citad earlier, in its fourth chapter dealing with syntactical use of cases, for the examples of an accusative ending in a we get: Rāvula māri Rām-raja, King Rāma killed Rāvana. We do not know whether the sentence was the author’s creation, or whether he cited it from an earlier grammatical text or from older literature.

Now let us turn back to names Rāvana-kōtte (-kōtuva) and Rāvana-ālla. The Sinhalese word Rāvana does as a common noun also mean a kind of mollusc-shell, found in water, used for rubbing earthen-ware pots and other kitchen utensils for cleaning and washing. The place concerned, the rocks and the falls are where such shells can be found. These may have given them the names, of some other derivations have to be looked for. We then come to two other names of villages near Kandy, Udu-Rāvana and Yayi-Rāvana. Notwithstanding the fact that Rāvana was not associated with Kandy, and Kandy is not taken to be an ancient royal seat, yet the recent popular etymology is that they are parks of Rāvana, where another component vana has to be supplied to make it Rāvana-vana. One may reasonably think that, considering how syllables waste away and syncope takes place with place-names, Udu-Rāvana and Yaṭi-Rāvana, are the upper and lower royal forests or parks (rāja-vana). The cerebral n in the modern spelling is the result of the false etymology.

There are place-names, now pronounced and also written with the first member of the compound Sīṭā, such as Sīṭā-vaka, a royal seat in the later fifteenth and the early sixteenth century, near the modern town of Avissawella. The late traditions are that Sīṭā in her exile bathed at the bend of the river (vaka) which is a tributary of the Kelaniganga. There is also Sīṭā-eliya near the hill health-resort of Nuvara-eliya. Also in the hill country are Sīṭā-gāṅgula and Sīṭā-ālla. Sīṭā-gāṅgula is a broad pond-like spot in a stream, and Sīṭā-ālla is a fall in a stream both near Nuvara-eliya. These are also said to be bathing spots of Sīṭā. Sīṭā-eliya is an open space, a patana land near Nuvara-eliya, and here the ground being black due to strata of patana grass rotting yearly is pointed out as the result of the burning by Hanumant. It is clear that in these cases the first member of the compound was Sīṭā, meaning cool or cold, and was later associated with Sīṭā. Except the name Sīṭā-vaka, the rest are of modern modification, and the result can also be due to English spelling where the length of vowels are not marked. Early English writers in Ceylon were much enamoured with the idea that Ceylon was the home of Rāvana.

It must also be pointed out here that there is no place-name with Rāma used as the member of a compound. One may explain that it was due to his not being long in Lāṅkā. But what of Vībhīṣaṇa? The association of places with Rāvana and Sīṭā, are very late, and this is after the Sinhalese accepted Rāvana as an ancient giant king of their island.

Art

So much for literature and folk-lore. There is no evidence even in art to show that either the story of the Rāmāyaṇa epic was popular in Śrī Lāṅkā in ancient time or there was any worship of Rāma in his own right separately or as Viṣṇu who had appeared on earth as Rāma. True that some Lakṣmī plaques have been found. These could have been brought in by merchants, both foreign and Sinhalese. They could also have been minted in imitation of such plaques as were accepted by dealers in goods, just as Roman coins were minted locally. So far as we know, the earliest Gaja-lakṣmī figure found in Śrī
Laṅkā is on a side of the Galpota-inscription of Niśaṇāmalla (A.D. 1187-1196), a king who had foreign associations, with the Kālingas of South-East Asia. There is also a Gaja-Lākṣmi sculpture at Yāpahu which was the capital in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries. These sculptures are after the Cholian occupation of the northern portion of Śrī Laṅkā, including Polonnaruwa.

Classical Indian Writers

Indian writer, at least those between the eighth and the twelfth centuries, have distinguished between Laṅkā and Simhala. Two authors of two dramas on the Rāmāyaṇa-theme are very clear and definite in showing this distinction. In his account of the homeward journey of Rāma and his party from Laṅkā to Ayodhyā, Murari in his Anargharāghava (ninth century A.D.) brings them over the Simhala-dvīpa only some time after they had left Laṅkā. Murāri has also that the Rōhana mountains are in the Simhala-dvīpa, and this is correct. More precise are the accounts of Rājaśekhara in two of his works (9th-10th centuries). In his drama, the Būlarāmāyaṇa, Rājaśekhara makes Rāvāṇa describe the location of Laṅkā to be south of the Simhala country. The lords of Laṅkā and Simhala are separately mentioned. Not only the Rōhana mountains, but the city of Anurādhapura also is in the Simhala country. Further, at the contest of the bending of God Śiva’s bow, Rāvāṇa speaks of the Simhala King as a person other than himself. During the journey by air, when the party goes back to Ayodhyā, Rāma looks back and points towards Laṅkā as being the capital of the new King Vibhīṣaṇa. It is only after the vimāna had ascended to the sky and come down that Vibhīṣaṇa points out Simhala-maṇḍala to Śītā. In his chapter on geography (desavibhāga) of the Kāvyarāmāyaṇa also, Rājaśekhara is very definite in distinguishing Laṅkā from Simhala. The former is a rājadhānī a capital; the latter is a janapada, a settlement (of Aryan speaking people, or a district).

To Indian writers in mediaeval times Simhala was not the home of Rākṣasas. The heroine of Śrī Harṣadeva’s drama, the Ratnavali, is the daughter of King Vikramādīhā, the lord of Simhala. In the Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva we read of a king by the name Vikramādīyā marrying the daughter of the king of Simhala. A king of Simhaladvīpa by the name of Sirimeho (Sanskrit: Śrimegha) is eulogized in Mahārāṣṭri poem Līlāvatī (Līlāvatī) of Kouhala (before 12th century). Śrimegha was an alternative throne name of Sinhalese kings from about the eighth century to the twelfth century A.D., the other being Sirisantha bodhi. Malik Muhammad, in his Avadhi poem Padumavati also speaks of the Simhala-dvīpa as the birth-place of charming women. The Brhatasmhitā of Varāhamihira (section on geography) and the Rājatarangini also mention Simhala.

All these statements go to show that in the Aryanized countries in the North of India the country of the Simhalas was not considered to be a place inhabited by Rākṣasas or uncivilized people.

Spread of the Rāmāyaṇa

Prof. H. D. Sankalia has brought out evidence to show that the Rāmāyaṇa had not spread in South India until the tenth century (op. cit. pp. 54-55, etc.) Paramasiva Iyer, after recounting the conquests of the Sinhalese by the Pandya and Chola kings, up to the temporary restoration of Sinhalese independence by Parakramabahu I continues, “The Cholas claimed Solar descent, and it is likely that it was during the two centuries of Chola dominance in Ceylon the Simhala King and his army were made out to be Rāvana and his Rākṣasa hosts. It would seem that in the Tamil Inscriptions of Rājarāja and Rājendra, Ceylon is called ‘Ila’... If ‘Ila’ is short for Ilangai and Laṅkā, that would suggest that verses 17-25 of sarga 41 of Kīṣkindha. were interpolated during the sway of Rājarāja or Imperial Rājendra whose dominions extended to Malayā beyond the sea. The great Tamil poet Kambār flourished in the second half of the 12th century ...” (op. cit. Introduction and particularly pp. xiv ff.).

The findings set out above agree with what emerges when the literary evidence of every kind is subjected to a critical examination in respect of the Rāmāyaṇa story or any Rāma cult. It is true that still during the earlier centuries a poet of the Sinhalese royal family wrote the excellent mahākaviya, the junuktharanā. Many Sanskrit books had been known in Ceylon and good original works were produced in the island; but this knowledge was limited to a few, the court circles of the higher ranks of city-dwelling Buddhist monks. The stories or ideas
from Sanskrit literature had not reached the masses, nor had they begun to borrow extensively the worship of South Indian Gods. Some of the common folk were completely ignorant of them. Their interest was in Buddhist stories and Buddhist practices. When after polonnaruwa kings of Śrī Lanka beginning from Parākramabāhu II of Dambadeniya made allies of South Indian kingdom accepted their culture along with Buddhism, brought priests and books from foreign lands, the rustics following their rulers began to be interested in those cultures and their traditions. It was not only South India that gave the Sinhalese new ideas, beliefs and practices. Other countries of Asia such as Siam, Malaysia and Burma contributed at least in some measure. It is not impossible that the Rāmāyaṇa stories and cults connected with it, could have reached South-East Asian countries before they reached the extreme south of the Peninsula and Śrī Lanka, and they came to Śrī Lanka from the direction. We have no knowledge as to whether the Kamaba-Rāmāyaṇa was known in Śrī Lanka soon after its composition. An abridged version of this was translated to Sinhalese only in 1840. Under these circumstances we are safe in dating the acceptance of the story of Rāma, Sītā and Rāvaṇa, as taking place in the Śimhala country was in about the thirteenth century. Thereafter we find some notice of characters from the Rāmāyaṇa in the literature, and the gap between the learned writings and the popular ones begin to be narrower, to judge from what is existing. There is, however, hardly any representation of the Rāmāyaṇa themes in art, classical or popular.

In Kumāradāsa’s Inka we see the poet following the Rāmāyaṇa except for the change of a few incidents in the order of their occurrence. These may have been to work the events of the mahākāvyāya in a smooth sequence. It is also possible that some other recension of Epic which is not available to us was followed by the poet. The account of the return journey from the Rākṣasa City to Ayodhya gives a good deal of material for thoughtful study. It appears that Kumāradāsa, as other classical Indian writers have done, takes his Lāṅkā to be somewhere other than in the island of Śrī Lanka. In studying the geography of the Rāmāyaṇa as other scholars have already pointed out, not only the position of Lāṅkā has been confused, but also that of river Godā of Godāvari. Kumāradāsa gets Rāma to point out to Sītā, the river Goda by which the two of them had spent happy moonlit nights (Inka, xx, 32). This Goda started from the Vindhya Hills according to the next verse. The river had vanished in the sands, and the copyist of manuscript has altered anu-Godam to anu-geham. It is retained by the poetaster who altered Kumāradāsa’s poem and made many interpolations, but he has confused the river with the Godāvari in South India which starts near Aurangabad in Mahārāstra. The poetaster takes in number of rivers and mountains that are not in the original poem, including the rivers Tāmraparṇī, Kāverī and Narmadā (Revā), showing that he took Lāṅkā to be to the South of the Peninsula. It is not possible in this paper to go into full details of the journey in the two versions of the poem, but one can easily conclude that the additions and alterations were done after the thirteenth century. This was the time when Śrī Lanka had been taken as the kingdom of Rāvaṇa and his Rākṣasa hosts by their neighbours in South India. The position was accepted by the Sinhalese, and as if it were to compensate, they made a hero of Rāvaṇa, declaring him to be a great physician versed in medical lore. Several treatises on medicine, such as a text called the Kumāra-tantra, “a treatise on the treatment of children” are attributed to Rāvaṇa.

Finally it is desirable that we examine the Buddhist version of the Rāma-Sītā story as we find it in the Daśaratha- Jātaka (D) comparing it with Rāmāyaṇa (R). This is also appropriate as the Jātaka tales, even though brought to Śrī Lanka by Buddhist teachers from India, they grew in the island, were first written in Sinhalese, and finally translated into Pali in Śrī Lanka. Thus there should be plenty of Sinhalese influence in them. The geography of the stories is different. With regard to details about characters some agree and others do not.

(i) Geography:
Place of Banishment: D.—Himalaya, R.—Dandakāranya.
However, the translation from Sinhalese also could be the cause of this difference, as in Sinhalese “Himaya” means any thick forest.
(ii) **Characters:**

Daśaratha is the old king in both D and R, but in D, the chief queen, the mother of Rāma and Lakkhaṇa (Laksmaṇa in R) had died, and the king had promoted a young queen to the position of the chief queen, and she becomes mother of Bharata. (The Sinhalese version has once the Sanskrit form Laksmaṇa in place of Laksana, the equivalent of Lakkhaṇa. This may be due to the influence of the name of the character in the Rāmāyaṇa story on a copyist. We may summarise this in tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.</th>
<th>R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mother queens are all alive.</td>
<td>The mother queens are all alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sita was a sister of Rāma and Lakkhaṇa, only at the coronation she became the chief queen of both the brothers who were consecrated simultaneously. (This may be compared with other instances of sister marriages in ancient India, particularly by members of the royal families.)</td>
<td>Rāma and Sita were sisters who were consecrated together as chief queens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Daśaratha sets a limit of twelve years and sends the two elder sons to the forest, and dies after nine years.</td>
<td>King Daśaratha sets a limit of fourteen years for the exile, and dies immediately after the departure of the two sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharata does not follow the brothers at this stage.</td>
<td>Bharata follows as soon as Daśaratha died.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Bharata goes to the forest after the death of the father and invites Rāma, but Rāma does not come, and gives his sandals in his place.

R. Incidents are same, but for the time factor.

D. Sītā lived happily in the forest.

R. Rāvana’s interference.

D. Rāma and Lakkhaṇa return to Banares after the full twelve years are over and are both consecrated kings, with Sūrī as the chief Queen.

R. Rāma and Sūtā return to Ayodhyā and the rejection of Sītā.

Could both stories have had the same original kernel?

**Anjana and Hanumant**

Finally I should also refer to a magical practice to which Sinhalese people resort when they lose something valuable, or when they wish to avert an evil threatening them. On such occasions they seek the aid of Hanumant, through his mother Anjana devī, but using anjana literally, making a collyrium paste with certain rare herbs, which they apply on a glass, a saucer or tumbler for gazing through. It is claimed that Hanumant appears and shows the thief or where the stolen goods are or show some sign in other matters like the healing of a gravely ill patient. Very few people know anything about the connection with the mother of Hanumant; they simply call the practice “Aṇjanam balanavā” understanding it to mean “looking through the collyrium paste.” It appears that some actually say, “O! Aṇjanā-devi, mother of Hanumān, do show us the truth.” I do not know whether this is a learned addition of modern times or whether it was known earlier. This magic cult must be separately studied as to its origin and age.
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The Ramayana in the Philippines

Jaun R. Francisco

This paper is a discussion of the Ramayana version as found in the literature of one of the ethnic groups in the Philippines. It will discuss the story relative to the Indian Ramayana and to the version found in the Malay literatures. It shall also deal with the interpolations and accretions of the Philippine version; and its probable date.

In an early work\(^1\) I discussed the Indian influences in Philippine literature in two levels, parallel elements and motif indices. The discussions were limited only to brief, or even fortuitous, some-times hazy, episodes or indices. At that time, I had not discovered narratives showing extensive borrowings from a much greater literary tradition like the Indian. In a later work\(^2\) I refuted some of my earlier conclusions, and put into sharper focus the indigenous nature of some of my earlier conclusions.

In 1968, I discovered a Maranao text titled Maharadia Lawana, a condensed version of the Ramayana.

The Maranao version tells of Maharadia Lawana, the eight-headed son of the Sultan and Sultaness of Pulu Bandiarmasir. He was so irascible that his father banished him to Pulu Nagara, and island. Later he returned to his father's kingdom where he regained his father's grace.

In another kingdom, Radia Mangandiri and Radia Mangawarna, sons of the Sultan and Sultaness of Agama Niog, set out on a 10 year sea journey to court Tuwan Potre Malaia Tihaia, daughter of the Sultan and Sultaness of Pulu Nabandai. On the way, they were shipwrecked and were, by coincidence, washed ashore to Pulu Nabandia. Soon Mangandiri won the hand of Tuwan Potre Malaia Canding (Tihaia). But after some time, he and Mangawarna became homesick and decided to return to their homeland.

During the journey, Malaila Ganding saw a golden-horned deer grazing and wanted it caught. But the deer turned out to be a ruse so that Maharadia Lawana could abduct Malaila Ganding.

Meanwhile, Mangandiri dreamt that he begot a monkey child-Laksamana. It turned out the dream was true. Later,
Laksamana, by accident, met Mangandiri, and Mangawarna and helped them rescue Malaila Ganding.

In the end, Lawana rules with justice, Laksamana metamorphosed into a handsome datu. Mangandiri and his wife and his brother returned to Agama Niog, where they lived happily ever after.

To show the Indian epic Rāmāyaṇa’s influence on Maranao literature, the Maharadia Lawana (ML) will be compared with the Hikayat Seri Rama (HSR), the Hikayat Maharaja Ravana (HMR), and a Malay Fairly Tale (FT) based on Rāmāyaṇa. The comparison shall be primarily on three aspects—the major characters and their relationships with each other; the names of the important places and episodes connected with these places; and interpolations and accretions.

**The Major Characters**

In the Maranao version, the birth of Radium Mangandiri or of his brother Radium Mangawarna, is not described, unlike in the HSR/HMR and the Rāmāyaṇa. The brothers are merely described as sons of Sultan and Sultaness of Agama Niog. Similarly, in the fairy tale, there is no mention of the birth of Śri Rāma (Mangandiri) nor of the heroine’s. The Fairy Tale merely relates that Śri Rāma was unhappy about his childless marriage with Princess Sakutum Bunga Satangkei.

Major Characters and Their Relationship with each other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maharadia Lawana</th>
<th>Fairy Tale</th>
<th>HSR/HMR</th>
<th>Rāmāyaṇa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radium Mangandiri</td>
<td>Sri Rama</td>
<td>Sri Rama/Rama</td>
<td>Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuwan Potre Malano</td>
<td>Sākutum Bunga</td>
<td>Sita Dewi/Dewi</td>
<td>Śita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tihaia</td>
<td>Satangkei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksamana, son of Radium Mangandiri by Potre Langawi</td>
<td>Kra Kechil Imam</td>
<td>Tabalwari/Terganga</td>
<td>Kuśa, Lava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radium Mangawarna</td>
<td>Terganga</td>
<td>Janggapulawa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksamana</td>
<td>Raja Laksamana</td>
<td>Laksamana/Laksamana</td>
<td>Lakṣman/Lakṣmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksamana</td>
<td>Shah Numan</td>
<td>Hanuman</td>
<td>Hanumān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharadia Lawana</td>
<td>Maharaja Duwana</td>
<td>Ravana</td>
<td>Rāvana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of Śitā and of her sons, Kuśa and Lava, are entirely different in Maharadia Lawana, as well as in the Fairy Tale. Śitā becomes Tuwan Potre Malano (Malaila) Tihaia (Ganding) in Maharadia Lawana, and Sakuntam Bunga Satangkei—“Single Blossom on a Stalk” in the Fairy Tale. In HSR’, She is Sita Dewi, born of the second Mandu-dari (the double of Ram’s mother) and Daśāratha. It implies that Rāma in Rāmāyaṇa married his own half sister.

In the Fairy Tale, Kuśa and Lava are Kra Kechil Imam Terganga, which implies that ‘the son is born a monkey (Kra), ‘small monkey” (Kechil)” a leader among simians” (imam tergangga). Kra Kechil’s monkey birth is explained by the transformation of Sakuntam and Sri Ram into monkeys on their excursion to acquire a son.

There is no clue to the entirely different development of his name from Kuśa-Lava (Rāmāyaṇa) to Tabalwari (HSR) and Janggapulawa (HMR). The question may be assigned to an independent source which may be indigenous Malay. In HSR, Ram’s monkey son was not directly born of Sita Dewi. As an embryo, he was massaged out of Sita Devi’s womb, wrapped and thrown into the sea, where it fell into the mouth of Dewi Anjati who gave birth to a monkey son.

But in the Maharadia Lawana, the identities of Kuśa and Lava are not clear. They could not be sons of Mangandiri and Malaila Ganding who were childless. Nor could they be represented by Laksamana. Laksamana’s birth (ML) is similar to the monkey-sons’ birth in other versions, except the Rāmāyaṇa. Laksamana is born of Potre Langawi, Queen of the East, who mistaking Mangandiri’s testicle for a precious stone, swallowed it. (In ML, Mangandiri dreamt he was gored by a wild carabao and his testicle was thrown to the east where it was swallowed by Potre Langaw). In Rāmāyaṇa—even in its popular version—this episode is entirely absent. Thus it may be safely said that this episode is traceable to indigenous literary traditions.

Laksamana’s birth is relatively complicated to trace. In Rāmāyaṇa the monkey son is Hanuman. Hanuman becomes Shah Numan in the Fairy Tale, and Shah Numan is a ‘Grand parent’ of Kra Kechil. (Shah appears to be corruption of the Sanskrit Hanumān, the monkey general in the army of Sugriva,
who helped Rama recover Sita. The title Shah may have been mistaken by the rhapsodist from Perak, who narrated the tale, to be corrupted in Hanumān. Shah Numan is a monarch in the monkey world by the sea. Yet Hanumān’s adventures are those of Kṛṣṇa, not of Shah Numan. In HSR, Hanumān is the son of Sītā Dewi, and Sri Rama and is born through Dewi Anjati. There seems no internal evidence to suggest Hanumān’s development to Laksamana in Maharadia Lawana. Even in the larger versions of episode in Daragen, this development is not verifiable.

A most interesting development is the relationship of Laksamana and Sri Rama (FT). Laksamana, who bears the title of Raja, is Sri Rama’s elder brother. But this relationship changes slightly in Rāmāyana. Here, Rama (Sri Rama, FT) is the first born of Daśaratha and Laksmana the third, born of a different mother. In Maharadia Lawana, they are Rādha Mangandiri and Rādha Mangawarna, respectively, brothers born of the same parents. Their relationship therefore forms a double single consanguinal line in contrast with the Rama-Laksamana kinship that forms a single double line. It is indeed interesting to note that certain cultural factors may be operating in the kin structure of the dramatis personae of the story.

Basing on the kinship pattern in Rāmāyana, it would appear that Mangawarna is Mangandiri’s younger brother. But the Mangandiri Mangawarna relationship seems more equals than that of Rama and Laksamana.

Laksamana in the Fairy Tale is also a diviner, a man well versed in sorcery. This attribute seems to be an allusion to the art of divination still practised by Malay sorcerers and devil dancers. The attempts to divine whether Sri Rama would have a child are exactly those of a Malay Pawang of present day. Raja-Laksamana’s title and name are contradictory terms in the Malay language. Laksamana, in Malay, means “Admiral”, the name with which Hang Tuah compared himself in 15th century Malacca.

Maharadia Lawana (Rāvana in Rāmāyana and HSR/HMR) in the Maranao story is both villain and hero—although he is considered less of a hero because he abducted Mangandiri’s wife. It is interesting to note that the Maranao story presents him first, describing him as an ambivalent young man—one with vile tongue.
Rāmāyāṇa was first told although it may already have been known when later versions—like the Tamil Rama story of Kambar came out. Probably, the Fairy Tale may have other sources, besides HSR, from which this interesting interpolation may have been lifted. Even the phonetic development of the word is curious. Rāvana’s island kingdom, Bukit Serindib (HSR), was already known in Arab records on South-east Asia as Serindib. It was later called Langkapuri, which follows closely Lankā, the island kingdom in Rāmāyāṇa, with the Puri accretion.

The geographical identity of Pulu Agama Niog and Pulu Bandiarmasir has not yet been ascertained. A check with Maranao historical records and literature yielded negative results. So did a check with known historical and literary texts in Old Malay and Old Javanese, particularly those contemporaneous with the introduction of the Rāma story in Indonesia and Malaya.

Important Episodes

The Maranao version reduced the Rāma story to almost microscopic size. The Fairy Tale is equally microscopic. However, the HSR version is relatively voluminous.

The episodes selected for discussion here are the winning of Sīta, the abduction of Sīta, the search for Sīta, and the return of Sīta. These episodes roughly correspond to the Bala, Āranya, Sundara and the Yuddha Kanda-s of Rāmāyāṇa.

The Winning of Sīta

Radia Mangandiri and Radia Mangawarna had learnt of the incomparable beauty and charm of Tuwan Potre Malano (Malaila) Tihaia (Ganding), daughter of the Sultan and Sultaness of Pulu Nabandai, and set out to court her. On their way, their ship was wrecked by strong waves and without their knowing, they were washed ashore to Pulu Nabandai. While recuperating there, they heard the sound of agongs and the music of Kulintangs. It was told that a sipa contest was being held to determine who should marry the princess—Malaila Ganding. The suitor who could kick the sipa, a rattan ball, into the Lamin, the princess’ penthouse, would wed her. Mangandiri joined in the contest and won.

The Abduction of Sīta

In the Fairy Tale, Maharaja Duwana, by supernatural powers, flew from Kachapuri to Tanjong Bunga where he transformed himself into a golden goat. Sri Rama, fascinated by the unusual animal, with his men, tried to capture it. But it escaped into the deep jungle. There, it became Duwana again, who by magic entered Sri Rama’s palace. Soon Sakutam fell under Duwana’s spell, and they eloped to Pulu Kachapuri. There Duwana discovered that he could not marry her. He was her kin and stood as a father to a daughter. When Sri Rama returned from the chase, he discovered his wife was gone.

In the Rāmāyāṇa, Sīta’s abduction was accomplished by deception. Rāvana (Duwana, FT) had ordered Marica to assume the form of a golden deer to lure away Rama and his half-brother, Lakṣmana. While the brothers were capturing the deer, Rāvana, disguised as a Brahmin (as in HSR/HMR) went to Sīta. After he won her confidence, he abducted her.

As in the HSR, the conversation between Sīta and Rāvana in Rāmāyāṇa was congenial until the latter revealed his true intention. In the Fairy Tale, it was also friendly.

The setting in HSR is the jungle where the couple, accompanied by Lakṣmana, were in exile. In the Fairy Tale, the setting is a kingdom, specifically Sri Rama’s palace. This interpolation seems to be an independent development. The variations in the use of these motifs—the silver and golden lawns (HSR/HMR), the golden goat (FT), and the golden deer (Rāmāyāṇa)—show close affinity and also give a clue to the origin of the Fairy Tale.

The Fairy Tale does not tell how Sri Ram (Mangandiri, ML) won his wife Sakutam Bunga Satangekei (Malaila Ganding, ML). It starts with a description of the royal couple, who were childless. The HSR and HMR tell of how Rāma won Sīta by fulfilling her guardian Kula’s condition—shooting an arrow through 40 palm trees. Only the bow is significant in winning Sīta. In the Vālmiki Rāmāyāṇa, King Janaka offered Sīta in marriage to whoever could raise and string the bow. Rāma, not only raised and strung the bow with one arm, but also snapped it asunder.
The cause of Sītā's abduction in Rāmāyana is also shown in HSR, although with variations. Śūrpanākhā (Sura Pandaki, HSR) who suffered humiliation in the hands of Lākṣmāna, Sītā's brother-in-law, told Rāvana of the princess, exquisite beauty. Thus the abduction was motivated by revenge (Śūrpanākhā's) and by a desire (Rāvana's) to possess a woman of such unsurpassed charm and beauty. In the Fairy Tale, the revenge motive is absent. Maharaja Duwana (Rāvana in Rāmāyana HSR/HEM) having heard of Sakutam's beauty falls in love with her.¹⁶ In HSR, Rāvana's attraction to Sītā's beauty is not mentioned.

There is no evident cause for Malailla Ganding's abduction in Maharadīa Lawana. In the Maranao version, Malailla Ganding, spotted a golden horned deer grazing in a cogon field and wanted it caught. Radia Mangandiri set out to catch the deer, but before departing he told Mangawarna not to leave Malailla Ganding, even if he called for help—which he did. But Malailla Ganding on hearing her husband's call, threatened herself if Mangawarna would not leave her and help his brother. Mangawarna agreed but he warned Malailla Ganding—"When I go down, you close the windows and whoever knocks, do not open".

The deer, on seeing Mangawarna, divided itself into two and both deer ran away. One of them led Mangawarna in circles and soon Mangawarna found himself back to their house. There, he saw the wall of their house destroyed and was told that Malailla Ganding has been forcibly taken away by Maharadīa Lawana. He said to himself, "That which we were after was Maharadīa Lawana who disguised himself as a deer."

It is interesting to note that there is a common identifying element in the stories, particularly in the HMR/HSR/ and Maharadīa Lawana: the presence of the golden deer, or golden goat or silver goat or golden gazelles or a deer with golden horns. These animals are coveted by the heroine in each story. These fantastic animals are in each story, Rāvana who drew away the heroes from the heroine.

No drawing of the protective magic circle is evident here as in the Malay versions and some Indian versions, nor of Sītā accusing Lākṣmāna of desiring to possess her if Rāma died in the pursuit of the golden deer.
shoulder to Pulu Kachapuri. He landed on an island, but through the side of a jinn he finally landed on Kachapuri. There, Kra Kechil and his mother Sakutum, recognized each other through the ring that the monkey prince had slipped into a water jar. Then he destroyed Duwana’s favorite trees—a coconut tree and a mango tree. Infuriated, Duwana ordered his army to subdue the monkey prince. But nothing could hurt the prince. After a seven day truce, the battle continued and Kra Kechil was finally caught. He instructed his captors to swathe him in cloth soaked in oil and to set it on fire. This done, he jumped about the palace, setting it on fire.

Hanuman’s adventures in the Ramayana HMR and HSR are those of Kra Kechil (FT) and of Laksamana in the Maharadia Lawana. The meeting between mother and son in the HSR is not quite represented in Maharadia Lawana because the son (Laksamana) in Maharadia Lawana is actually a step-son whom she had not seen. Hence, there merely was Laksamana identifying himself, just as Hanuman did in Ramayana (To identify himself, Hanuman used rings—a motif found in varied forms in all versions, except Maharadia Lawana).

In the HSR, there is no evidence of these developments, although the meeting between mother and son is shown. Kra Kechil’s appearance in monkey form before his mother is perhaps an echo of Hanuman’s appearance before Sītā in the Ashoka groove of Rāvana in Ramayana. Hanuman in HSR appeared first as a brahmīn before Sītā Dewi, but in HMR, he took first the form of an old woman. The magic car motif appears in Ramayana; in HSR, and HMR, it is a flying chariot.

The Jatayu-Rāvana combat in Ramayana is not found in the Fairy Tale. The Duwana Kra Kechil combat in the Fairy Tale is not found in the other versions. But the burning of Kachapuri has a descriptive counterpart in Ramayana, HSR/HMR, although again interesting accretions and developments are found in the Fairy Tale. In Ramayana and HMR, Hanuman’s tail was swathed in cloth soaked in oil (petroleum, minyak tanah) and bestrewn with saltpeter (sendawan). In HSR, he was bandaged all over, but he grew and grew until there was no more cloth left with to wrap him. His wrap was then set to fire and Hanuman leapt over the roof and set the palace on fire. No bodily expansion of the monkey son takes place in the Fairy Tale bodily expansion of the monkey son takes place in the Fairy Tale nor in the Maharadia Lawana. There seems therefore, to be no significantly sustained nourishment of the literature, either due to political changes in the area, or to a misreading of the motif by the borrowers who belong to a different socio-cultural mould.

The Return of Sītā

The return of Malaila Ganding in Maharadia Lawana is not as dramatic as that found in other versions. In Maharadia Lawana, there is no trace of Kra Kechil’s carrying Sītā Dewi (FT) nor of Sītā’s use of a flying car or chariot in her return (Ramayana). Moreover, there is no fire ordeal to purify Malaila Ganding from her “contact” with Maharadia Lawana but there is a fire barrier, which is reminiscent of the fire purification of Ramayana.

Details of the return of the princess as found in Maharadia Lawana and the Fairy Tale are presented here for comparison. These will further show the various interesting aspects of the Maranao story in relation to the Southeast Asian versions.

In Maharadia Lawana, Radia Mangandiri returned home to Agama Niog after his victory over Lawana. His escorts—the crocodiles that created waves and the caraboas whose footsteps made the earth tremble, created fear among his people. But Laksamana told the people that it was Mangandiri who had returned from long journey. The people then gave him a joyous welcome. Laksamana meanwhile metamorphosed into a handsome datu.

In the Fairy Tale, Sakutum’s return to Tanjong Bunga was marked with rejoicing and feasting, but the celebration was shortlived; Duwana came to avenge his defeat at Kachapuri. In the ensuing battle Laksamana was killed but was immediately brought back to life by a powerful remedy that Kra Kechil had brought from Mount Enggil-ber Enggil. In defeat, Duwana left. Afterwards, Sri Rama and Sakutum acknowledge Kra Kechil as their son and heir.

Whereas Sītā’s return in Ramayana agrees with the return of Sītā Dewi in HSR and of Sītā in HMR, Sakutum’s Ramayana Rama brought Sītā home in the magic car of Kubera, the god of wealth. In the Fairy Tale, Kra Kechil brought home his mother...
Sakutum. No magic car of flying chariot which is not mentioned in HSR/HMR is used.

Perhaps in the *Fairy Tale*, the fire ordeal to purify the heroine was not necessary. Sakutum, who was taken back by her own son, was consanguinely related to Duwana. Therefore no chastity test and purification ceremonies were necessary. In HSR/HMR and *Rāmāyaṇa* is no clue to Duwana’s invasion of Tanjong Bunga and to Śrī Rāma and Sakutum’s recognition of Kra Kechil as their son but there is Laksamana’s death and resurrection.

*Rāvana*

Rāvana’s position in *Maharadia Lawana* shows a very important link with the HSR/HMR. The Maranao version opens with a description of Lawana who had eight heads (seven heads, in Par. 61, 65 and 73 Text and Translation). He was said to have caused the death of many a man in the realm because of his vile tongue; he intrigued. To punish him, he was exiled to Pulu Nagara where he one day burned leaves and wood and from a tree cried that world was chained. Diabaril (Angel Gabriel) reported it to the Lord (Tuhen) who told him to ask Lawana not to sacrifice himself because nothing could cause Lawana’s death, except a tool (knife, sword etc.) that would be sharpened on a whetstone in the palace of Pulu Bandarmasir.

The HMR commences with Rāvana’s genealogy followed by his banishment for being unruly and for posing a danger to his sire’s dynasty. In Langkapura, Rāvana practised austerities, collected firewood during the day and at night slept hanging head down over the fire. After 12 years, Allah sent down Adam and asked Rāvana what he wanted. And God informed of Rāvana’s desire, granted him his wish—that rule over the worlds—the earth, the heavens, the seas and the nether world.

Rāvana in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is described as having 10 heads and 20 arms. He performed austerities for conquering the four worlds. There seems to be no clue to the change in the number of Rāvana’s heads, from ten (*Rāmāyaṇa* and HSR/HMR/ to eight, then seven (L). There is also no mention of Rāvana’s other hands in *Maharadia Lawana*, not even a reference to it when he fought Mangandiri and Mangawarna.

**Interpolations and Accretions**

A number, if not all, of the interpolations and accretions in *Maharadia Lawana* cannot be traced back to the *Fairy Tale* and HSR/HMR. It may be inferred that these interpolations and accretions are independent developments. Some accretions and interpolations in HSR and the *Fairy Tale* relative to the *Rāmāyaṇa* are not found in *Maharadia Lawana*. For instance, in the *Fairy Tale*, Śrī Rāma’s desire for an offspring is, not distinctly shown in either HSR or *Rāmāyaṇa*. Although Śrī Rāma’s feeling is universal, its depiction may have been derived from Indian custom and tradition. In another instance, Raja Laksamana’s use of sorcery to predict the birth of Śrī Rāma’s son is purely an indigenous accretion, an allusion to the art of divination practised by Malay sorcerers.

In all four stories, the asceticism—and offshoot of Rāvana’s banishment—is the common denominator, varied on slightly. The use of fire in the ascetic acts is patently Indian in character. The appearance of Allah and Adam and the Angel Gabriel (Diabarail) in *Maharadia Lawana* and the HSR/HMR may be and could be interpolations of Brahmā and Viṣṇu (gods in the Hindu pantheon) to give the stories an Islamic character, considering that Islam was newly introduced into the area, infused its spirit into, if not entirely superseded, the earlier
overlay of the literature and other social aspects. But these developments may just well be indigenous. For instance, the importance of fire was known even in the most 'primitive societies in the area.

An interesting aspect is Lawana’s lament on the world being chained. What this means to the Maranao is not clear. But ostensibly it was to relieve the world of the sins (desires) which chained it. This concept appears to be of Buddhistic/Hinduistic orientation, considering the influence of Hindu and Buddhist teachings in the area. However, the Malay versions—the HMR do not seem to follow this trend. This may be explained by the fact that in Southeast Asia, there developed through the long years of encounter between Brāhmaṇism and Buddhism a blend expressed in the Śiva-Buddha syncreticism. Explanations to these discrepancies might be found on close examination to Darangen (which still is being compiled into one volume), particularly Lawana’s genealogy.

In excursions of Śri Rāma and Sakutum in the Fairy Tale seem to be shades of Śri Rāma’s decision not to return to his father’s country after he married Sitā Dewi. They also explain Sakutum’s pregnancy. The FT/HSR connection is carried on to the transformation of the royal couple into monkeys an episode found in both the Fairy Tale and HSR. The transformation explains the monkey birth of their son, which varies in this detail; in HSR, as well as in HMR Hanumān was born of Sitā Dewi through Devi Aṅjati, whereas in the Fairy Tale Kra Kechil was directly born of Sakutum. In Maharadia Lawana, the monkey birth of Laksamana is not in any way explained. Laksamana’s queries on his birth connote concern about incest, a taboo in Maranao society and also reflect the Maranao’s inherent interest in genealogy.

In Rāmāyana, Sitā gave birth to sons in exile; in HSR, Sitā Dewi gave birth to Hanumān, later to another son, Tabalawi, also in exile. These other sons are not mentioned in the Fairy Tale and in Maharadia Lawana.

What is interesting, however, is that only Fairy Tale tells of the royal couple’s expressed desire for an offspring, but it does not describe the ceremonies held on the son’s birth which are found in other versions. The lebis, Hajis, imans and khatips and the Koran reading in the Fairy Tale do not have any reference in Rāmāyana, nor in HSR/HSR/ which were already influenced by Islamic ideas. They may be attributed to the influence of the complete Islamization of the Malay (Perak) peoples. There are no clues to the incidents on the breaking of the news of the monkey sons’ birth to Śri Rāma and of the sending away of Kra Kechil in either the Rāmāyana and HSR.

In the Fairy Tale, Kra Kechil was banished to a forest and after he left it, met Shah Numān (Hanumān in Rāmāyana and HSR/HSR/). This episode is paralleled in Maharadia Lawana by Laksamana’s search for bigger food sources, Laksamana—leaping from tree to tree—landed between his sire Mangandiri and uncle Mangawarna. This chance meeting ended Laksamana’s search for his father and cleared doubts on his origin; that is he might have been a product of an incestuous relationship between his mother and grandfather. But how he was able immediately to recognize his father and uncle is still not clear.

Sugriva’s and/or Bāli’s position in Rāmāyana appears to be that of Shah Numān (Hanumān, HSR) in the Fairy Tale. But Hanumān in HSR/is the same as Rāmāyana’s Hanumān whose birth offers no clue to link it with Shah Numān’s birth. (Shah Numān is described as an aged sagacious monarch in the kingdom by the jungles and as a friend of the Sun, Mata Hari).

Shah Numān’s declaration—that he already knew of the origin of Kra Kechil who is related to Śri Rāma and Sakutum and who is his “grandchild”, is very, very interesting. It will perhaps give clue to the parentage of Śri Rāma or Sakutum. It may not be without basis to conjecture that Shah Numān might be the father of either Śri Rāma or Sakutum, judging from his filial affection, concern and loving care for Kra Kechil.

Kra Kechil’s other adventures cannot be traced back to the other epics. But since his counterpart Hanumān in Rāmāyana and HSR/HSR/—occupied a prominent position in the cynosure of the hero, it may be assumed that logically Kra Kechil would be a prince of all monkey tribes since the Fairy Tale is traceable to either or both HSR and Rāmāyana. In this context it is understandable why no traces of the presence of Sugriva and Bāli are evident in the Maharadia Lawana. It seems however that the roles of Sugriva and/or Bāli, as those of Hanumān (Rāmāyana HSR/HSR/) and Shah Numān (Fairy Tale)
were taken by Laksamana. This is evident when Laksamana enlisted an army of carabaos and crocodiles to invade Pulu Bandiarmasir and when he stringed the rattan bridge.

Like Hanumán, Laksamana, in the Maranao story, occupied an important position, but there is no evidence of his being a prince notwithstanding his being a son of a princess, Potre Langawi. No evidence of his kinship with the simians could be established. Perhaps an examination of the Daragen would clarify these points. However, Laksamana’s monkey form may be traced back to HSR/HMR/ even further back to the Rāmāyana with the Fairy Tale as the intermediate story.

There seems no parallel in HSR to Kra Kechil’s eating from one leaf with his father, Śrī Rāma, nor for his sleeping on his father’s lap. (But in HMR, father and son ate from the same banana leaf.) There is also no parallel in HSR to Kra Kechil’s metamorphosis into a handsome prince.

The metamorphosis motif, however, may be explained as an influence of the folk literature of the Malays. But an assumption that this assertion is independent of any folk literature development cannot also be ignored because the metamorphosis motif is comparatively widespread not only in local but in all forms of folk literature.

In this context, it may readily be seen why there are no traces of Kra Kechil’s eating and sleeping with his father in the Maharadia Lawana. However, there is a parallel to Kra Kechil’s metamorphosis. Laksamana is metamorphosed into a very handsome datu, but this motif may also be an influence of folk literature, as can be gleaned from the many metamorphosis stories in Maranao kunst and folk literature.

But here the parallel ends: whereas in Maharadia Lawana, the metamorphosis ends the story (no other events followed it) in the Fairy Tale, Kra Kechil, henceforth known as Mambang Bongsu, married the daughter of Raja Shah Kobad. The Raja abdicated his throne in favour of Kra Kechil who reigned as Raja Bandar Tawhil. These subsequent events are not found in the greater Malay text—the HSR/HMR/or in Rāmāyana. This is understandable. The HSR/HMR seem to have been resistant to the introduction of new elements and interpolations despite an evident attempt at their Islamisation because they are closer to the traditional story of Indonesian origin—than to the developing literature which found its way into the folk tradition.

The probable date of Maharadia Lawana: The attempt to date the Maharadia Lawana in the context of its appearance in Maranao literature is indeed a perplexing one. This attempt to date the piece would be done on two levels, e.g. internal and external.

Internal evidences may constitute mostly (a) Islamic religious aspects e.g. reference to Diabarail (Angel Gabriel) the Muslim prayer corrupted in Maranao (see par. 6, in text, and transl.); also reference to Muslim titles as Sultan, Shah. References to (b) Indian titles as potre (Skt. putrī), Radia (Skt. rājā), Maharadia (Skt. maharājā) and other Indian terms, such as manosia (Sans. manusya), Nagara (Skt. nagara), Sowara (Skt. svara) and many others that would also have some bearing upon the date of the piece of literature. (c) The metamorphosis of Laksamana from a monkey form to a man form.

In terms of the movement of cultures in Philippines protohistoric times, the Indian aspects of Philippine culture came earlier than the Arab. However, in the light of the Maharadia Lawana story, it is possible and significantly probable that both the Indian and the Arab elements seen could have reached their present setting simultaneously. More precisely, the story itself, or the theme, reached the Maranao area already complete with these elements at a period after the Islamization of the adjoining area e.g. Java, Sumatra, and Malaya. This date would be extended further into the period of the early incursions of the European in the area. The references to Islamic terms itself do not invalidate the view that the piece of literature has its early beginnings in pre-Islamic times and that these terms found their way into the literature as an attempt on the part of the recipients of this culture to infuse Islamic spirit into it to make it acceptable to the new institution.

The transformation of Laksamana from a monkey aspect to a human form, may reveal that the story dates back further in time into the mythological age of Maranao folk history. The presence of a parallel event in a piece of literature with the same theme and plot in a different setting is evidence of its antiquity. However, such a phenomenon is also found in other tales not
necessarily of the same plot and theme and in one setting alone but in other folk literary traditions.

Without referring to item (c)—for it shall be adverted to again subsequently,—the date of the story may now be set in the light of items (a) and (b). Considering the aspects referred to under these items, and in relation to the date of entry of Indian and Arab culture elements into the Philippines, it seems that the piece of literature may have reached its present setting sometime between the middle of the 17th century and the early 19th. The range of very significant Maranao elements in the literature is itself an indication that the story has floated in Maranao society for quite sometime, and that it would have taken that long to assume an entirely Maranao character and image (see Text and Transl. for details of this reference). Between the 17th and 20th centuries is a relatively long period of adjustment to the literary traditions, in the context of its cultural milieu; hence, the result was no longer one in which the sharp distinctions between the local and the alien elements have been blurred.

As the date of the Maharadia Lawana has been set arbitrarily, it may be instructive to look at this date in collation with the date of the Malay Fairy Tale with which it is compared. The date of this Fairy Tale constitutes the external evidence of the Maharadia Lawana date. In the essay, I wrote that the date of the Fairy Tale shall be inferred from two points (internal as they were): “(a) the presence of religious men (Lebis, Jahis, Imams, Khatibs) during the birth of the monkey son and the reading of the Koran at such an important event; (b) the changing of Kra Kechil Imam Teranggga’s name to Mambang Bongsu after his metamorphosis.

Among other references to the Malay Muslim religion the presence of religious men—lebis, hajis, imams, khatibs during the birth of the son certainly points to the late date of the Fairy Tale. Moreover the readings from the Koran present another clue to the very late composition of this piece. These two accretions show that the tale developed during the later period of the incursions of Islam into Malay society. It may even be surmised that following a conservative number of years from the earliest conversions in Malaya, the Fairy Tale may be dated not earlier than the 16th century. This conservative estimate may be collated with the second internal evidence.

The changing of the monkey son’s name from Kra Kechil Imam Teranggga to Mambang Bongsu after his metamorphosis to man’s form is significant in the historical development of Malay literature. This phenomenon in Malay literature, while it may not be recurrent in the Fairy Tale seems to reveal a character trait of the Panji tales—that is the hero in the course of his adventures changes his name in almost every important episode in the story. The Panji tales are not indigenous in Malay literature. According to R. M. Ng Dr. Poerbhatjaraka,21 the Panji Tales may have first appeared in 1222-1292, the Singhasari period of Javanese history. But Winstedt22 believes that the cycle appeared during the early Majapahit period, c. 1350 A.D. and that the cycle was introduced in Malacca in the middle of the 5th century A.D.23 Another hundred years or more may have elapsed before the cycle reached the interiors of the Malay peninsula.

If the phenomenon in the Malay story was borrowed from the Panji Tales, it shows that it was yet in the early years of the introduction of the tales, owing perhaps to the occurrence of only one instance in the Malay tale.

The Panji Tales had already picked up influences of the Islamic faith, the date of whose introduction in Java is towards the middle of the 14th century A.D.; perhaps the end of the 16th century A.D. or even later may therefore be taken as a terminus a quo for the composition of the Rama Fairy Tale.

The Maharadia Lawana would have appeared in Maranao literary milieu at the date set for it (17-19th centuries). For as the date of the Fairy Tale has a significant bearing upon that of the Maharadia Lawana, it becomes equally important to the whole Maranao literary tradition. This is particularly so in relation to the Darangen, which belongs to the classical period of Maranao literature, for it belongs to a date relatively earlier considering the language of the folk epic and the many cultural elements that no longer persist in present Maranao society.
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Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* is believed to be the primary source of *Rāmakathā*, although several scholars have sought to trace the original source of *Rāmakathā* and the prototypes of its main characters in the veda literature. The *Rāmāyaṇa* by the sage Cyavāna written prior to Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, has been discussed in *Buddhacaritams* by Aśvaghosa. It can also be maintained that many ākhyānams dealing with Rāmakathā were prevalent before Vālmiki *Rāmāyaṇa*. However, traditionally, Vālmiki is accepted as ādi Kavi, the original poet. Rāmakathā is narrated at several places in the *Mahābhārata* as well, in which the most elaborate is *Ramopākhyāna* in 704 verses. Even though Rāmakathā is included mainly in *Viśnu Purāṇa*, *Vāyu Purāṇa*, *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and *Kūrma Purāṇa* apart from *Varāha*, *Agni*, *Vāmana*, *Brahmā*, *Garuḍa*, *Skanda*, *Padma*, *Brahmavaivarta* and other Purāṇas, the character of Rāma has not been fully developed. Rāma of Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* is a supreme human being and not a divine incarnation. Rāma of *Ādhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* and *Bhāgavata Rāmāyaṇa* is installed as a household deity. Sahasragiti of Rāmānūja-cārya and *Rāmacan Paddhati* established Rama-bhakti as a particular sect. Abundant literature has been written in Sanskrit in pursuance of the tradition of Rāmakathā. *Yogavāśīṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*, *Ādhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*, *Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa*, *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa*, *Bhūṣundi Rāmāyaṇa Mahārāmāyaṇa*, *Hanumantha Samhitā*, *Rāmagītāgovinda* are the important sacred treatises based on Rāmakathā and they can be well discussed.

*Bṛhadārthā Purāṇa* describes the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the original source of history, purānas etc. The author of *Prasanna Rāghava* has raised a question in his introduction: *kathāṃ purṇarpī kavyaḥ sarve rāmacandrāmeva vāryayanti* “Why do all the poets go on describing only Rāmacandra again and again ?” The narrator answers this question by saying “The fault is not with poets. It is because of all the virtues that have been epitomized only in Rāma, and hence, the tree in the form of poetic diction can never be attain significance without the fruit in the form of adulation of Rāma.
Tulsidas says:

sad jānat prabhū prabhutā soyī
tadapi kahe binu rāhā na koyī

Everyone knows about the great power of the Lord (Rāma) yet none can help talking about it. Lord Rāma, who is eternally praised by Sarasvatī, Śeṣa, Śiva, Brahmā, Śāstras, Vedas and Purāṇas by referring to him as neti-neti (not this, not this). Yet no one can help narrating the story of his greatness. In the words of Maithilsarāṇ Gupt

rām tumhārā vrīt svayaṁ hi kavya hai,
koyī kavi ban jāy sahaj sambhāvyā hai

The noble character of Rāma has remained a source of inspiration not only for religious writing but also for belle lettres. Apart from Raghuvamsa of Kālidāsa the abundant Sanskrit poetic literature includes Rāmacarita by Abhinanda, Rāmāyaṇa Maṇjīry by Kṣemendra, Udāra Rāghava by Sākhyamalla, Raghunāthacarita by Bānabhātta which deserve to be mentioned. The uttarakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa has been the primary source of themes of Sanskrit plays. Pratima and Abhiseka by Bhāsa, Uttararāmacarita by Bhavabhūti, Kundamāla by Diṇnāga are based mainly on the story contained in the uttarakāṇḍa. Among other works can be mentioned Anargha Rāghava by Murāri, Bālarāmāyaṇa by Rājaśekhara, Prasanna Rāghava by Jayadeva Udātta Rāghava by Anāṅga Harṣa Māṭṛajā and Hanumamnātaka by an anonymous poet. Rāmakathā has an important place not only in Vaiṣṇava literature, but in Jaina and Buddhist literature as well. In Buddhist Rāmakathā, Dāsarathā Jātaka, the Buddha says in conclusion: “At that time, King Śuddhodana was king Dāsaratha, Mahāmāya was Rāma’s mother, Yasodhara was Sūti, Ānanda was Bharata and I was Rāma Paṇḍīt. Two other Buddhist Rāmakathā, Anāmaka Jātaka and Dāsaratha Kathānām are available in Chinese translations. In the purānic literature, both Rāma and Buddha are the incarnations of Viṣṇu. In Buddhist literature, Rāma is the previous incarnation of the Buddha.

In Jaina literature, Rāma, Laksmana and Rāvana are among the triṣaṭhī great Jainas. Among the Jaina Rāmakathā, Vimala Sūrī’s “Pauma carī” (Padmācarita) is the most well-known. This poetical composition was originally written in Prākrit and was later translated into Sanskrit as Padma Purāṇa by Acārya Jinasena. Another form of the Jaina Rāmakathā can be found in Uttar Purāṇa written by Guṇabhadrā. Both these Rāmakathas, though different, are in accordance with the tenets of Jainism and Buddhism. In both, Rāma attains salvation after being initiated into the order. Based on these kathas, several Jaina Rāma-kāvyas were composed in Apabhramśa as well. Among them, Padmācarita by Swayambhū and Mahā Purāṇa by Puṣpadanta are particularly important.

Among the modern Indian languages, Punjabi is the only language in which no significant Rāmāyaṇa has been written. One reason may be that during that particular period of Rāmabhakti, the Sikh Gurus and the majority of poets of Punjab wrote their works only in Hindi. Among the modern Indian languages, Kamba Rāmāyaṇa in Tamil, written in the 10th century, is the most ancient. Among other Rāmakathas, Tiruppukal by an unknown poet deserves a special mention. In Telugu, there are nearly 200 works related to Rāmakathā, among which the most important and the earliest is Dwipada Rāmāyaṇa (12th century) by Gaṇu Buddha Reddy. The earliest Malayalam poetical work is Rāmacaritam (12th century) written by Cīrāman. Among other works, the most famous are Kaṇṭhaśa Rāmāyaṇa (14th century) by Kaṇṭhaśa Panickar, Rāmāyaṇa campi (15th century) by Punam Nambudiri Ādyatma Rāmāyaṇam (16th century) by Tuṇcattu Ezuttacchan, Kṛṣṇa (17th century), Kerla Verma Rāmāyaṇa by Pājā Kerla Verma. In Kannada, between the 10th and 14th centuries, innumerable Rāma-kāvyas were written by the poets who rose from the common ranks. Narahari, who belonged to the Tokhe village, wrote the Tokhe Rāmāyaṇa (16th century) in the Vaiṣṇava tradition. Like Telugu, Kannada literature is also very rich in poetical works dealing with Rāmakathā.

The earliest Assamese poetical work, Saptakāṇḍa Rāmāyaṇa by Mādhav Kandali, is believed to have been written in the 14th century. Its uttarakāṇḍa has been written by Shankar Dev and Adikāṇḍa by his disciple Mādhav Dev. Among other Assamese Rāmākīvyā, Gītī Rāmāyaṇa (16th century) by Durgāvar is also quite well-known, Kṛṭitibāsā Rāmāyaṇa (15th century) written in Bengali by Kṛṭitībās is as important as Rāmacaritamānas by
Tulsīdās. Dāndī Rāmāyana (latter half, 15th century) in Oriya, written by Balaramadasa is the best known work. The most important works in Marathi are Bhāvairtha Rāmāyana (17th century) by Eknāth and Rāmavijaya (18th century) by Śridhar. In Gujarati, in spite of the greater importance given to Krṣṇalilā a large number of akhyānas devoted to Rāma are available. Gīrīhardāsa Rāmāyana (18th century) and Narmad's Rāmāyana (19th century) are the important works. Kāṃśīrī Rāmāyana (latter half 18th century) was written by Diwakara Pravarabhāṭṭa. Rāmalabhāyā Anād Dilsād's Rāmāyana (18th century) was written in Punjabi.

This widespread impact of Rāmakathā was not confined to India. The modern version of Budhist Jātaka tales is the Pāli translation of a fifth century Sinhalese work. Anāmaṇkāṃ jātakaṃ and Daśaratha Kathānaṃ were rendered into Chinese in the third and the fifth centuries respectively. Innumerable manuscripts related to Rāmakathā are available in the Tibetan and Khotanese (Eastern Turkey) languages. These were said to be of the eighth and the ninth centuries. We are familiar with the widespread influence of Rāmakathā in South-East Asia. The earliest Indonesian Rāmāyana Kakāwin, by Yogeśvara, is believed to be an 18th century work. It has also been translated into Dutch. Among Rāmakathās of Java, Carī Rāmāyana (Kāvi Jānaki) and Sarātarāmā are worth mentioning. Prambanam (Param Vanan) in central Java has a Śiva temple (9th century), and on its walls the incidents from Rāmāyana have been engraved. Rāmāyana was widely known in the ancient Champa state in Indo-China. There is also a statue of Vālmiki in a seventh century temple there. In one of the edicts in that temple, Vālmiki has been described as an incarnation of Viśṇu. According to the 18th century version of Rāmāyana, Rāvana's domain was south of Annām and Daśaratha's kingdom was in north Annām. In that Rāmāyana, Rāvana abducts Siṭā after a military attack on Daśaratha's kingdom. In the world-famous sprawling temple at Angkor Wat, the ancient capital of modern Cambodia (Khmer), there are a number of stone-engravings pertaining to Rāmakathā, believed to be of 11th-12th centuries. The Khmer Rāmāyana is called "Re ām ker" (Rāmakṛtī). The ancient capital of Siam (Thailand) was called Ayutiya (Ayodhya). The ruler of that place is called Rāma even today. The Siamese Rāmāyana, "Rāmkātī" has been translated into English as Rāmakṛtī. The Rāma Jātaka was written in the 16th century in the Lao language. An Indian scholar, Dr. Sachchidanand Sahay has made a thorough study of the Lao Rāmāyana. From Siam, Rāmakathā reached Burma in the 18th century. Around 1800, U Ta wrote the Burmese Rāmāyana, Rāmājana palyas related to Rāmakathā (yām deo) have always been very popular in Burma.

In Akbar's time, Mullah Abdul Qadir Bedayuni translated Rāmāyana into Persian in verse at the emperor's behest. Even in Jahāngir's time, there were two Persian translations of Rāmāyana, one by Gīrīhardās and the other by Mullah Sadulah Masīh Panipati. Mullah Panipati had learnt Sanskrit, spending 12 years in Kāśī. His Persian translation was published in 1899 by the Nawal Kishore Press. Chandraman Bedil wrote the Persian Rāmāyana entitled Nargisistan, published in 1875 by the Nawal Kishore Press. In 1884, Misir Ramdas Qabil's Persian translation, Rāmānāmā, was published by the Madho Press. Munshi Jagan Kishore Hasan, the author of Nairange Hasan or Bahīr Ajudhya (1867) in his brief life of 21 years, has described the places associated with Rama in a very touching manner, in his aforesaid works. Makkhanlal Jaffer wrote Rāmāsvamedha in the masnavī style which was published in 1872 in Lucknow. This tradition continued till the early 20th century. Haravallabh Seth gave the substance of Rāmakathā in 250 shers. Rai Mahadev Wali wrote Rāmāyana Manjūn in the kaseeda style. It was published in 1915. There is a manuscript of a Persian Rāmāyana in the library of the India office in London, whose author is unknown. A Persian manuscript of the Rāmāyana is available in the Maulana Azad Library at Aligrah, its author too is unknown. All these works are written in verse. Considerable literature related to Rāmakathā is available in Persian prose too. Mullah Abdul Qadir Badauni has translated the complete Rāmāyana in Persian prose and the manuscript is well-preserved. Devidās Kāyasth has translated Rāmacaritamānas of Tulsīdās fully in prose. Amersingh's Persian Rāmāyana in prose, Anar Prakāṣī was done by Professor Abdul Badood Azhar Dehalvi and was published in 1972 by 'Buniyade Farhangi Iran'. In Prof. Azhar's view, the original source of Rāmakathā lies in the central Asian legend "Vis o Rāmani". The Aryans had brought the tale with them to India. This tale has
also similarities with the Buddhist, Jaina and South Asian Rāmāyāna. That is exactly why the references about the Rāmāyāna characters have been found even before Vālmikī, who, with poetic imagination, adopted popular aṣṭāṣṭāśa to suit the local social conditions and turned it into an immoral epic.

With the European races coming into contact with the Asian countries, the elements of Rāmakathā entered the narratives of many European travellers and missionaries. However, these accounts have no significance in the European languages. In 1609, Libro da Saiťa was written by a missionary called J.Phinisco. In 1651, a Dutch priest A. Rosario’s, Rāmakathā Open Doru was published. Ofgodrai der os Indische Hydenen by P. Baldeus was published in 1672, which contains the story up to Rāma’s ascent to heaven. Dr. Carles wrote the Rāmāyāna in Portugese which he also translated into Dutch. Rāmākathā has been included in several accounts in various European languages, whose list is available in the Rāmākathā of Camil Bulcke.

The Vālmiki Rāmāyāna is available in many English translations. In the past few decennium, many English translations of Tulsi’s Rāmacaritamānas have been done. The earliest English translation is probably by F.S. Growse which appeared in 1880 under the title The Rāmāyāna of Tulasīdās. This translation is in prose. In 1952, W. Dagnal P. Hill’s prose translation The Holy Lake of the Acts of Rāma was published by the Oxford University Press. Raymond Ālācīn translated Kaviṭāvalī and Vinayā Patrika under the titles Kaviṭāvalī and The Petition to Rāma and were published in 1934 and 1966 respectively. The Jaico publishing house published from Bombay in 1972 S.P. Bahadur’s translation The Rāmāyāna of Tulasīdās which is partly prose and partly in verse. A.G. Atkinson’s translation of Rāmacaritamānas, published by the Hindustan Times in 1954, can be said to be the most significant translation. It is a translation in verse and, as far as possible, the style of the original Rāmacaritamānas has been maintained. Like in the original, in the translation too, the metres are changed. This translation is in three parts and is the result of 35 years of hard work, by the translator.

It is not possible to think of Hindi literature without Rāmacaritamānas. Before Tulsidas, Rāmā-ākhyaṇas of Bhupati (14th century) and Bhagawatidas (15th century) are available, Prithviraj Raso of Chandbardāi also contains the narration of Rāmākathā. Rāmāyāna of Viṣṇudās is a work written 1442, in which chaupais, dohas metres and śloka styles have been used. It was published in 1872 by the Sagar University. Rāmacaritamānas of Tulsidas has greatly contributed to the spread of Rāma-bhakti in North India. Apart from Rāmacaritamānas, Tulsidas depicted various incidents of Rāmākathā in his works like Kaviṭāvalī, Dohāvalī, Gitāvalī, Jānaki Maṅgal Ramalālānacchucchu, Baravai Rāmāyāna written in almost all the styles in vogue at that time. Even though no other poet after Tulsidas has been able to attain the popularity he has enjoyed, an uninterrupted current of Rāmākathā literature has run through in Hindi till today. There is a long list of poets like Swāmi Agrādās (Dhyānamaṇi), Nābhādās (Aṣṭāṣṭāśa) Haridayarām (Hanumāṇānātaka) Prānchand Chauhan (Rāmāyāna Mahānātaka), Māndās (Rāmacaritra), Mohandās Miśra (Rāmāswamedha), Sahajrām (Raghuvamśa Dipaka), Jānaki Prasād (Rama Rasāyana), Bābā Rāmacharandās (Amar Rāmāyana), Bābā Raghunathādās (Viśrām Sāgar), Māhārājā Raghuṅrāj Sīṃh (Rāma Swayaṁvara, Rāmaslayyam etc.), Sambhunāth (Kuṣāṇāmilātās) who have kept up the trend of Rāmākathā uninterrupted till the 20th century. After Tulsi’s Rāmacaritamānas, another significant work depicting Rāmākathā is Rāmacandrikā by Keshavdaś, written in the style prevalent in the past medieval period. In 1858, Sant Dharamdas wrote Avdāha Vilās in Avadhi language, following the doha-chaupai style of Rāmacaritamānas. It is a work giving detailed description of the social conventions and customs, along with the rites and rituals from the time of Rāma’s birth to his marriage. It is mellifluous devotional poetic composition dominated by śrīgāra sentiment. The original text has been written in the Persian script.

In the first half of the 20th century, Ayodhya Singh Upadhya wrote Vaidehi Vanavās, Maithilliśaṅga Gupt wrote Pancavati and Sākēt and Nirāla wrote Rāma ki Šakti-Pujiya and thereby, carried the Rāmakathā tradition up to khari boli which is the recognized form of Hindi today. Sākēt is a significant work of the modern times in which, in the background of Rāma’s exile to forest, his return to Ayodhya has been narrated in a natural, fluent and captivating style. As a devotional poetic work, Rādhēśyām Rāmāyāna of Radheshyam, the Kāthāvācaka, has been fairly popular in North India. In the seventies, Narendra
Kohli wrote a quartet in the form of four novels, *Dikṣā Avsar, Sanghaṛś ki or*, and *Yuddha*, (two parts), and thereby gave a new dimension to Rāmakathā in prose. In Narendra Kohli’s novels, the historical and mythological characters of Rāmāyana are reborn as the main characters belonging to the present age. Discarding the elements of miracles, Narendra Kohli has given a lively and thought-provoking analysis of the conflict between the local and world power.

The *uttar sāket* of Sohanlal Ramrang is the latest epic in the tradition of Rāmakāvya. Based on the *uttarakanda* of Rāmāyana, it is an epic of 1200 pages written in two parts and the bhavana in which he has narrated in varied poetic dictions the story of Rāma after his coronation. The story of *Rāmacaritamānas* ends and concludes with Rāma’s great departure. The poet has strung together various strands of the story. “Meghdoot” and “Pādavali” can be called the significant parts of *uttarśāket* for which the poet was probably inspired by Kālidāsa and Maithiliśarāna Gupt. The entry of Lava-Kuśa on the occasion of Rāma’s rājasuya yajña is the most touching and effective portion in *uttar sāket*.

From Ādi kavi Vālmiki to Rāmrang, innumerable poets and thinkers in every age have sung Rāmakathā in the light of their own feelings and aptitudes. Rāma belongs to every place where Rāmakathā has reached. And these too is Rāma’s Ayodhyā, as also all the characters included in Rāmakathā and the spots where they indulged in all their acts. Rāma is the concrete embodiment of the concept of Universal Man. He is an incarnation as well as human being of highest virtues. Instead of being a special possession of any particular country, Rāmakathā is an invaluable cultural heritage of the whole world.

(Translated from Hindi by Sarala Jag Mohan)
paintings, wall-paintings, miniatures, terracottas and wood carvings, have also been traced to a great extent.

References to Rāmāyāṇa in Jātakas, Gāthas, Rāmalilās and wedding songs significantly referring to Rāma and Sītā have also been studied. Manuscripts including palm leaves have been examined in detail. Outstanding scholars in the West as well as in the East are still conducting in-depth studies of the many problems, connected with the dissemination of the Rāmāyāṇa tradition. Efforts are also being made to dig out untraced manuscripts, palm leaves etc. in connection with the theme.

However, little is available by way of discussion regarding Rāmāyāṇa in Arabic, Persian, Urdu and Punjabi.

In this brief article, we intend to discuss only Arabic, Persian and Urdu Rāmāyāṇas. These three languages have played a significant role in the understanding of this theme. Presently we know of 3 Rāmāyāṇas in Arabic, 86 Rāmāyāṇas in Persian and 170 Rāmāyāṇas in Urdu. The whole work is derived from Vālmiki, Tulsī, Ādiyātma and Abdhut Rāmāyāṇa. We find that more than 30 Rāmāyāṇas in 6 languages were written by Muslims alone and one has been written by a Christian in Arabic.

**Arabic Rāmāyāṇa**

Most of the religious books, written in Sanskrit, e.g. the Vedās, the Upaniṣads, the Rāmāyāṇa, the Mahābhārata, the Gītā, the Purāṇas, the Smyritis, the great plays, books on arithmetic, politics, palmistry, medicine, music etc., were got translated into Arabic by rulers of Arab countries, who would invite Pāṇḍits from India to help in the translations. Scholars like Al-Beruni, Berneir, and MaxMueller have done a wonderful job in this area. A list of more than 1500 books translated from Sanskrit into Arabic, Persian and Urdu, has Just been completed.

Mahābhārata was translated into Arabic by Adu Saleh, before A.D. '1026. Vedas are being translated by Dr. Shiv Raj Chowdhury, formerly Head of Arabic Deptt. of Delhi University, in Arabic. 13 translations of the Gītā and one each of Mahābhārata, Rāmāyāṇa, Śākuntala and Manuṣmṛti in Arabic are available in the library of the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, Azad Bhavan, New Delhi, in manuscripts or printed form. One of the 3 Gītās is by Dr. Mākhan Rai Chowdhury D.litt., former Head of Deptt. of Islamic Studies, Calcutta University, the second is by Wadi-ul Bustani of Lebanon and the third, by Gurdial Singh 'Majzoob' of Delhi. There is also another Gītā, a voluminous one, by Rabia-Unis, which has been published by ISKCON.

Presently we find three Rāmāyāṇas in Arabic:

1. **Rāmāyāṇa** by Wadi-ul Bustani of Lebanon in verse. This is available in Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi. The author is a Christian.
2. **Rāmāyāṇa** in the shape of a pamphlet got printed by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi.
3. **Rāmāyāṇa** by Kamal Gelani, printed in Cairo. The author of this work is a Muslim. The book could not be located.

**In Persian**

Whatever has been translated into Arabic, has been translated in Persian too. The Persian language was widely known in India even before the advent of Mughal rulers, whose court language was Persian. It was the court language of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. A lot of literature-chronicles and histories—is thus available in Persian. In Indian States Muraslas used to be sent by one State to the other States in Persian, although Persian ceased to be the court language of the States.

Even before the advent of Safvi dynasty, in Iran, Dastan-e-Sīkandar, Bikhtiarānāma, Darbārnāma etc. had been written in Persian. These became so famous that the stories of Rāmāyāṇa and Mahābhārata and other Devmala stories were translated in Persian prose and became equally popular. We learn that Mahābhārata was translated into Persian from Arabic by Abu Hassan Ali in A.D. 1226. King Ferozeshah got 1300 manuscripts in Sanskrit from Jwalamukhi temple and ordered translation of some in Persian, in A.D. 1362. The first attempt, to translate the Rāmāyāṇa in Persian was made by Zain-Ul-allbdin, ruler of Kashmir, who was a very liberal and secular-minded person. Nothing is, however, available.

The real work of translating Sanskrit works in Persian was done during the reign of Emperor Akbar. He organised a 'Dar-ul-tarjama' and under the guidance of Abul Fazal, got Atharvaveda, Rāmāyāṇa, Mahābhārata, Gītā, Purāṇas,
Under Akbar's order the first translation of *Rāmāyaṇa* in prose was done by Abdul Qadar Badauni, in the year 997 (Hijri). Badauni took four years to complete the job. He says that he had to do this work and did it reluctantly but the Emperor praised and gave him a prize. A manuscript is available in Pakistan.

Faizi Fayazi translated *Rāmāyaṇa* in Persian. A manuscript is available in India. A manuscript entitled ‘Wazīfā-i-Faizī’ is available in Pakistan. Abul Fazal also wrote a Rāmāyaṇa, the manuscript of which is available in Pakistan.

In Jehangir’s time, two Rāmāyaṇas were written. Mullah Saad-ullah Masih of Kerana wrote *Dāstan-e-Ram O Sīta* in verse. He went to Banaras to learn Sanskrit and stayed there for some time. His first verse is:

```khudavanda ze jam-e-isq kun mast  
ke darmasti fishanam bar jehan dast.```

He was influenced by Sufism. Masih praised Jehangir. This Rāmāyaṇa became so popular that manuscripts are available in many libraries of India and abroad, including the India Office Library. In Central State Library Patiala, alone there are three manuscripts. In the year 1899, Nawal Kishore Press published it for the first time. It consists of 321 pages.

Iqbal wanted to translate this work into Urdu verse. He requested Maharaja Krishan Prasad to send him the copy of this Rāmāyaṇa from his library. It was not available then.

Dr. Abdul Wadud Azhar, in his doctoral thesis has treated this Rāmāyaṇa as one of the best.

Dr. Wali-ullah Saifi in his doctoral thesis concluded that Masih was a poet of average genius and he could not become famous at the Mughal court.

Another Rāmāyaṇa written in Jehangir’s time is of Girdhar Das in verse. It was written in 1036 (Hijri). Girdhar Das says that his Rāmāyaṇa consists of 5900 verses. A manuscript is available in Pakistan.

Another manuscript is available in Karachi (Pakistan). One more manuscript is available in Lahore. It is of 1033 (Hijri). Manuscripts are also available with the Asiatic Society of Calcutta.

The next Rāmāyaṇa in verse is of Gopal. It was written in 1092 (Hijri). A manuscript is available in Karachi (Pakistan). Another manuscript is also available in Pakistan. A manuscript is available in India.

It is said that in Aurangzeb’s time, four translations were done. We, however, know of one Rāmāyaṇa of Chanderman ‘Bedil’ named *Nargistān* in verse, composed in 1105 (Hijri). The name of the poet and that of his native place have been given by the poet himself. This work has been attributed to Abdul Qadir ‘Bedil’ which is totally wrong. It was written in prose also earlier to it and the manuscript is available in India Office Library. According to Ethe its date is 1097 (Hijri). This Rāmāyaṇa is dedicated to Aurangzeb. This Rāmāyaṇa was published by Nawal Kishore Press in 1875 and a copy of it is available in Azad Library of Muslim University, Aligarh.

Rai Amar Singh wrote *Rāmāyaṇa Amar Prakash* in year 1117 (Hijri). A manuscript is available in Azad Library. It was published by Nawal Kishore Press in A.D. 1877 with a note that it was written in 1119 H., in the reign of Shah Muazzam but the author puts the date as 1117 H. Copy of Nawal Kishore Press edition is available in Delhi Harding Library and Delhi University Library. It is not a translation.

*Samar-tul-Hyat* by Bhola Nath ‘Nadan’ was written in 1195 H. A manuscript is available in the Azad Library, Aligarh. He was alive in the reign of Shah Alam Shah. It is a translation of *Tulasi Rāmāyaṇa*. The book has been divided into 7 parts.

*Ram Gita* by Shital Singh was written in 1271 H. A manuscript of this Rāmāyaṇa is available in the Azad Library, Aligarh. The verse Rāmāyaṇa by Amanat Rai ‘Amanat Delhvi’ was published by Nawal Kishore Press in 1288 (Hijri). It consists of 979 pages. Amanat had so much mastery on Persian verse that he wrote full *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* in Persian, which was published by Nawal Kishore. A manuscript of this Rāmāyaṇa is available in Pakistan.

Iqbal Yaghmai wrote *Mukhtsar Rāmāyaṇa*. It was published in Iran in 2535 Shanshahi, in prose.

In the end we talk of *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* by Mohar Singh of Distt. Gujranwala (Punjab), in verse published in A.D. 1890. It is a wonder that a Punjabi poet has written a large volume in verse keeping the purity of the Persian idiom in tact. Mohar
Singh beautifully explains the fair image of Kaikeyi, whom King Dasaratha loved the most.

‘Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa’ was written in Persian in 1246 (Hijri). A manuscript is available in the Research Library of Kashmir, as per list of manuscripts in Persian, published by Markaz-e-Tehqiqat Farsi Dar Hind.

Markaz-e-Tehqiqat Farsi in Islamabad and India have dug out manuscripts in Persian and have published them in book form.

Work on Rāmāyaṇa is still going on. We have two theses, one by Dr. Abdul Wadud ‘Azhar’ and the other by Dr. Wali-ullah ‘Saifi’, both Muslims.

Urdu Rāmāyaṇa

Rāmāyaṇas in Urdu are either translations of Vālmīki, Tulasī, Ādhyātma and Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa in verse and prose or are written on the basis of these Rāmāyaṇas or are in nāṭaka or saṅgīta forms written for theatre. Novels have also been written. We find many transliteration in Urdu of Rāmāyaṇa were available throughout India and were read in homes, out of literary interest or out of respect.

The first is ‘Pothi Rāmāyaṇa’ written in Urdu, copied by Ganga Bishan in 1180 (Hijri)/1766. It is in ‘Nastalique’. The manuscript is available in the Azad Library of Muslim University, Aligarh. Garsin-De-Tassy, a French scholar in his fourth lecture of 29th Nov. 1853 says that Rāmāyaṇa’s translation in Urdu, was published by the Maharāja of Banaras and was completed in Jan A.D. 1852. He does not say as to whether it was in verse or prose and of which Rāmāyaṇa the translation was.21

Next comes the Rāmāyaṇa of Lakhpat Rai Mainpurvi. It was published in 1863 in Shola Press, Kanpur. It consists of 150 pages of demi octavo size. The author has a mastery of language. His description of scenes is wonderful. Jagan Nath Khusshar ‘Lucknovi’, translated Tulasī Rāmāyaṇa in verse. It was written in 1850, in the reign of Wajid Ali Shah. It was published by Nawal Kishore Press in the year 1864. Asghar Ali ‘Nasim’ wrote the date in verse in the publication. More than 16 reprints came out. No other Rāmāyaṇa in Urdu has been able to match this Rāmāyaṇa in quality and popularity. Garsin-De-Tassy in his lecture of 3rd Dec. 1866 says that from Lucknow a translation of Urdu Rāmāyaṇa has been published, with hundreds of pictures. He does not give details.

Shankar Dyal ‘Farhat’ also translated Tulasī Rāmāyaṇa. For the first time it was published in September 1885 in the reign of Wajid Ali Shah. Nawal Kishore Press reprinted it for the seventh time in 1938. In popularity it was next to Khushttar’s Rāmāyaṇa.

Farhat also wrote in verse: 1. Jānāki Bijay; and 2. Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa.

These are small books. Jānāki Bijay was published in 1903 from Nawal Kishore Press for the 17th time. Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa was first published in 1870 and was published again.

In 1887, Tulasī Rāmāyaṇa was translated word by word, by Sukhdev Lal along with the original text. It was reprinted for the fourth time in 1931 by Nawal Kishore Press. It is in prose. It is a huge volume. So many reprints speak of its popularity. It is not known as to when Hafiz Allah Khan of Sandila, distt. Hardoi wrote in verse, the Bālakāṇḍa and the Sundarākāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa but it was published in 1889 by the Nawal Kishore Press for the fourth time.

In 1902, Rāma Gītā was published by Nawal Kishore. It is in verse and its author is Mewa Lal ‘Ajiz’. A wonderful and unique work is of Dwarka Prasad ‘Ufq Lucknowi’s who wrote Yak-Qafṣa Rāmāyaṇa. Although it consists of only 88 pages of demi size, it has been declared as a masterpiece. Its descriptions are vivid. He portrays scenes as though he saw them with his own eyes.

We have a copy of this Rāmāyaṇa published in 1914 by Nawal Kishore Press. The Press says that it was published earlier also.

‘Ufq’ also wrote: 1. Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa in prose, and 2. Śrī Rāma Nāṭaka in four volumes. Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa was published in 1921 consisting of 1034 pages. Some reprints are also available. Śrī Rāma Nāṭaka was played by clubs in Lahore.

Ufq also wrote some lengthy poems in praise of Rāma.

It is not known when Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa written in prose by Parmeswar Dyal, was first published but we have a copy of this voluminous work published by Nawal Kishore for the second
time in 1916. Thereafter some more reprints came out. Nanak Lucknowi wrote Rāmāyana in musaddas in 9 parts. 3 parts were published in 1931. Sayed Masud Hassan Rizvi says that he was an illiterate person but he could write ghazals too. According to Sayed Rizvi, his was a unique personality. His Rāmāyana was published by Usafi Press, Lucknow and has 328 pages. Ramji Mal Kapur Sambhli’s Rāmāyana in musaddas was published in 1932 by Nawal Kishore Press.

During those days the Bālakānda of Tulasi Rāmāyana was written in verse by Suraj Prasad ‘Tasawar’ which was also published. In 1958 Āḍhyaṭma Rāmāyana, was written in verse by Guru Narain, which was published by Hindustan Academy, Allahabad. It consists of 656 pages and is of a big size. Āḍhyaṭma Rāmāyana was also published by Martand a Delhi magazine in 1957. Another wonderful and unique work is of Viceroy ‘Wahmi’ of Hyderabad, who wrote in verse Yak Qafia Rāmāyana of 272 pages. It was published by Rafiq Machine Press, Hyderabad, in March 1960. It is a translation of Tulasi Rāmāyana, Dr. Muhi-ud-din Qadri ‘Zor’ has described it as a wonderful work.

We know of two Yak Qafia Rāmāyanas, one written by ‘Ufq’ and the other by ‘Wahmi’. It is not easy job to write a lengthy nazm in one qafia. These two works are miracles. ‘Wahmi’s Rāmāyana was transliterated in Hindi and stands published.

Ufq’s elder brother Munshi Ram Sahai ‘Tammana’ wrote about 10 Rāmāyanas, small and big.

Munawar Lucknovi son of ‘Ufq’ Lucknovi, like his reputed father wrote a huge volume Vālmīki Rāmāyana which was published (in prose) by Sant Singh & Sons, Lahore (year not given).

Shiv Bharat Lal Verman wrote a Rāmāyana of 1320 pages which also is a voluminous work—Mahā Rāmāyana. Rai Sidh Nath Bali Daryabadi’s Rāmāyana in musaddas has been published by U.P. Urdu Academy, in two volumes.

Jaswant Singh Verma Tohanvi’s Aṛya Sangīt Rāmāyana has been published for the 27th time. Rāmāyana in Haryanavi, published in Urdu is also available. Nur-ul-Hassan Naqvi’s Rāmāyana is of 487 pages and is a translation of Tulasi Rāmāyana.

Nafis Khalilli’s Rāmāyana though small in size is really a very fine work. It was published twice. Mohd. Imtiaz-ul-Din of Pratapgarh’s (U.P.) Masnavī Rāmāyana is worth mentioning. We know of more than 40 Rāmāyanas written by Muslims in 6 languages.

Safdar Ali Aah has written a complete book on Tulasidas and Ramcharitmanas, Wahid-ul-Din Panipati has written a complete article on the poetry of Tulasidas. Mohd. Fyaz has discussed Rāmāyana in Indonesian literature and Zaidi Jafar Riza has discussed Rāmāyana’s Persian manuscripts lying in Azad Library in Muslim University, Aligarh. An article, ‘Rāmāyana Almi Adab Mein’ by Dr. Tara Charan Rastogi is very illuminating.

Scores of poems have been written on this theme by poets. Chakbast and Banwarilal Shola’s poems were recited in homes and are remembered even today. About 50 Muslims wrote poems in praise of Rāma including Iqbal, Zafar Ali Khan and Saghar Nizami. There was a time when Hindus started their work praising Allah and then wrote a ‘naat’ in praise of Prophet Mohammad and Muslims would translate works from Sanskrit literature.
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Sculpture:

VIŚṆU AND HIS AVATĀRAS: The Viśṇu-cult in the Nepalese art was a popular theme since c. 5th. The famous Cāṅgunarāyana temples of the Kathmandu Valley, in which the Icangunarāyana dates according to Gopāl Vamsāvali, 300 B.S. i.e., A.D. 243, and Cāṅgunarāyana B.S. 521 or A.D. 424. The sculptures of Viśṇu-vikrāntamūrtī, anthropomorphic form of Viśṇa, discomfiture of Bāmana, Kāliyamardana of Kṛṣṇa, Jalasayan of Viṣṇu, symbolic presentations of gurudā or sāṅkhā, cakra, gaddā etc. are all vaisnavite themes which also date c. 5th, if not earlier.

RĀMA: The Rāma-cult does not appear in the earlier works of art, however, the Nepalese conception of Rāmābhidhāno Harirityuvāca is apparent in several arts. ‘Harihara’ conception is also no less important. The earliest inscriptional reference to a temple of Rāma or of Śiva linked with Rāma occurs in Aṃśūvarma’s Hāṃḍīgaum inscription of the year A.D. 608. mentioning a temple of Rāmeśvara.

Another earliest inscriptional evidence indicating a fairly detailed acquaintance with Rāmāyāna occurs in the Pasupatināth stone slab inscription of Jayadeva II, dated A.D. 733. The inscription relates the lineage of Solar dynasty, right from Sūrya to Dasaratha and his eight sons and grandsons and the Licchavi dynasty.

A sculpture of Rāma in tribhaṅga posture, with a bow in one hand and in another hand varada mudra, accompanied by Lākṣmaṇa, Sitā and Garuḍa as well, is fixed into the wall along-side the steps leading from Mrgasthali, lying east of the Pasupati temple. It is assumed a work of late c. 7th.

To the north of Pasupati, near Rudragakidesvara and auburn stone slab bears a distinct figure of Rāma, leaning against a life-size bow in tribhaṅga pose, flanked by Lākṣmaṇa and Sitā embraced by a woman (Ahalyā ?) at his feet. From its manner and style it is believed an art of c. 8th.

Sculpture of Paśurāma, although a Vaisnavite presentation of later Licchavīs and that of Hanumān, a prominent figure of the Rāmāyaṇa of the early Malla period are the specimens worth to
mention. Hanumânghât, Hanumân Dhokâ, Hanu-tîrtha throw ample light on the Hanumân-cult of mid-medieval culture among the Nepalese.

King Viśṇusimha of Pātān had an inscription in the Nârâyaṇa temple that salutes Viṣṇu who crushed the pride of Râvana. It dates A.D. 1563.

King Siddhi Narasimha Malla, in his darbâr square in Pātān constructed a Krśṇa temple that bears a Râma sculpture as one of the ten avatâras and also carries a series of bas-relief scenes from the Râmâyana on the edge of the upper row of the roofs, while the edge of the lower roofs carries similarly a series of scenes from Mahâbhârata. All the scenes are labelled and bear a didactive value.

Râmâyana theme in the similar manner can be seen in the Nautale darbâr of the Hanumân Dhokâ palace that depicts the Râmâyana episodes in three registers. The scene opens with Râma, Sitâ and Lakṣmana resting in Citrakût and being enticed by Mârica. The next scene shows Mârica being punished by Râma. The third scene shows Râvana deluding Sitâ in the disguise of a mendicant. The following scene shows Sitâ seated in a chariot with Râvana and the chariot, being pursued by Jâtâyu. Down below is Kîshindhâ, were Sugrîva and Hanumân are being approached by Râma and Lakṣmana. The next scene shows Râma befriending Sugrîva and witnessing the fight between Sugrîva and Bâli.

The second row begins with the lament of Târâ over the death of body of Bâli. It is followed by the scene of Râma and Lakṣmana conferring with Sugrîva and Hanumân. Next comes the scene of Hanumân flying over the sea and arriving at the Aśokavana of Laṅkâ.

The lowest register shows Hanumân in the presence of Râvana. He is then setting fire to the city of Laṅkâ with the flame of his tail. Hanumân then takes leave of Sitâ, and makes over the details of his adventure and experience to Râma and Lakṣmana. Here the succession of the scenes is as in a cinema and one scene is separated from another by a line drawn most naturally on the landscape.

The sculptures of Râma and Sitâ at the Râma-Jânâkî temple of Janakpur in the terai area are comparatively modern carvings. The Hanumân-mûrtis constructed in the spring-water sources in Darjeeling area and a Hanumân as deity in observatory hill are further recent work of early this century.

An image of Vâlmiki at Vâlmikîśvâra mandir in the bank of river Tamasâ, in Vaisaloṭan, Nepal is still latter-days work. Statues of Âdikavi Bhânubhakta in marble and bronze are erected all over the country of Nepal, and in India, where the Nepali speaking people dominently stay.

Woodwork : Of the two panels at Bhaktapur Museum of Woodworks, one illustrates Râvana with ten heads and twenty hands on his war-chariot in pratyalidha posture and the other shows Viṣṇu on his Garûda, donned with saṅkha, cakra, gada, padma in the same pose. The panel is datable to the c. 17th.
stylistically.

The other panel has three figures, of which the central figure is Viṣṇu with Garûda and an umbrella-bearer, on either side. The two panels together make a war scene. This panel synchronise the first in date.

Paintings : The Râmâyana theme in painting and sketches has been dealt in several medieval mss, such as Râmâyana, Mahrâvaṇabadha, Hanumânmâtaka etc.

The backcover of the Viṣṇudharma (A.D. 1220) shows the painted scene of Râma in a dasdvatâra group. Râma stands in tribhaṅga pose with a bow in his left hand and an âyuḍha in his right hand. Paraśûrâma stands next to him. The cover of Daśâvatâra, another ms. of comparatively later period, (c. 18th) bears Râma holding kodânda in his left and an arrow in his right hand.

An illustrated Nepali ms. of the c. 16th. called Kalâpustaka, now preserved in the Bhrat Kalâ Bhavan, Varanasi has several printed scenes from the Râmâyana including one of a composite deity of Hanu-Bhairava.

Another Kalâpustaka, dating A.D. 1235, now in the possession of Doris Wiener, New York represents Râma seated with Sitâ on his left and Lakṣmana on his right. On the right of Lakṣmana is seen Hanumân and on the left of Sitâ, Sugrîva. All are looking at Râma, while Râma, is looking front.
Two more Kalāpustaka, that portray Rāmāyana scenes are now one in the University of Cambridge and the other at the National Art Gallery, London. Both of them date 16th. c.

A Nepalese painted scroll dated A.D. 1681, in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay shows two kneeling figures of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa respectively.

Another painted Nepalese scroll at the Denver Art Museum in the United States shows the incarnations of Viṣṇu in two rows. The lower register in the extreme proper right of the panel shows Rāma fighting with Rāvaṇa. The figure of Hanumān is also seen behind Rāma.

The Rāmāyana theme does not appear to have been in profusion in Nepāli art, as there should have been, even though literary evidences are remarkable. An ever-earliest Vālmikiya Rāmāyana ms. dating A.D. 1019. found in Bir Library in Kathmandu indicates the Nepalese awareness in the Rāmāyana theme since early 11th century.
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7. Yama-Pwe; or The Ramayana in Burma. (Triveni Quarterly, v. 14, p. 239-245. Bangalore, 1942). To the Burman, Rama, the hero is a future Buddha. To them Yama (Rama) and thid (Sita) are Burmese.

CAMBODIAN (KHMER)

I. TEXTS


2. Gām bāk(y) rāmākiyerti bhasā khmer (Khmer text in Siamese script, edited by Tāmra Rājānubhāb) Bangkok, 2471 B.E.

3. Rām ker Ms. of Trabāṃ Seḥ : 1 krāṃṇ (very short fragment).

4. Rām ker Ms. BN, Cambodieng 25, Indochinois 103 F : 1 bundle of palm-leaves, (fragment).

5. Rām Kir Ms. BN, Cambodieng 24, Indochinois 102 B : 2 bundles of palm-leaves, Nos I and II (fragment).

6. Rāmm ker Ms. BN, Cambodieng 68, Indochinois 146 : 10 bundles of palm-leaves.

7. Rāmm ker, Riem ker,... Ms. EFEO, N° C 94 : a collection of 10 and 6 bundles of palm-leaves.


SLIDES


PHOTOGRAPHS (Musée de l’Homme, Paris)

1. Ayang (M.H. 70. 120. 526) Representant le combat de Lakṣmanā et d’Indrajaīt. C 70-2170-493, 97 x 55cm, CI.D. Destable.


4. Nang Sbek (M.H. 70. 526) Reprsentant le combat de Rāma et de Hanuman. E 79-1020-493 70 x 60cm, CI. Lemzaouda.

5. Nang Sbek (M.H. 70. 120. 529) Reprsentant un singe et son petit. E 79-1023-493, 74 x 35cm, CI. Lemzaouda.

6. Nang Sbek (M.H. 70. 120. 531) Reprsentant un yakṣa tuant avec son épée un être humain. D 79-1027-493, 100 x 90cm CI. Lemzaouda.

HIDE CUT-OUTS (Musée Guimet, Paris)

1. Combat entre singe blanc et singe noir (MA/3720/3719/3718/3677/3641) 5 pièces.

2. Dernier combat d’Indrajaīt (MA 3663/3689/3640/3735/3617/3734/3672) 7 pièces.


RECORDS


STUDIES

Critical Inventory of Rāmāyaṇa


4. Bastian A. 1868, Die Völker des Oestlichen Asien... IV. Reise durch Kambodia, Iena.


15. ——. 1955, La statuaire khmère et son évolution, Saïgon, EFEO, 2 vol. XXXVII.


30. ——. 1913, "Trois piédroits d'Añkor-Vat", BCAI, 2, p. 105-118.
4. Bastian A. 1868, Die Völker des Oestlichen Asien... IV. Reise durch Kambodja, lена.
15. ———. 1955, La statuaire khmère et son évolution, Saigon, EFEO, 2 vol. XXXVII.
30. ———. 1913, "Trois piédroits d'Añkor-Vat", BCAI, 2, p. 105-118.
31. ——. 1913, "Etudes cambodiennes. VII. Seconde étude sur les bas-reliefs d'Ankōr-Vat", BEFEO, XIII, 6, p. 1-5. 78
32. ——. 1936, "Légendes indiennes illustrées par les imagiers du Cambodge", Cahiers de l'EFEO, n° 6, 1er trimestre, p. 24-29. 79
33. ——. 1962, "La date d'exécution des deux bas-reliefs traditionnels d'Angkor Vat", JA, 2, p. 235-248. 80
34. ——. 1963, "Origine et évolution des diverses formes du théâtre traditionnel en Thaïlande", BSEI, nelle série, XXXVIII, 3-4, p. 491-505. 81
35. ——. 1970, Angkor. An Introduction (Transl. and ed. by E.F. Gardiner), Hong Kong. 82
37. Commaille J. 1912, Guide aux ruines d'Angkor, Paris. 84
39. Commission du Ramker 1968, Rāmker (Rāmāyana khmer), Phnompenh, URBA. 86
40. Corinth G. de, 1938, Les arts de l'Indochine, Paris. 87
41. ——. 1951, L'Art khmer, les grandes étapes de son évolution, Paris. 88
42. Cuisinier J. 1927, "The gestures in the Cambodian Ballet: Their Traditional and Symbolic Significance", Indian Art and Letters, New Series, I, 2, p. 93-103. 89
44. ——. 1951, La danse sacrée en Indochine et en Indonésie, Paris, PUF. 91
45. D. 1943, "The Svayamvara of Sita" (Notes and Queries) JSS, 34, 1, p. 69-72. 92
46. Dagens B., 1968 "Iconographie de quelques fondations de Sūryavarman 1er", AA, XVIII, p. 173-208. 93
47. ——. 1969 "Etude sur l'iconographie du Bayon" (Frontons et linteaux), AA, XIX, p. 123-167. 94
48. Dalet R., 1935 "Dix-huit mois de recherches archéologiques au Cambodge", BEFEO, XXXV, 1, p. 117-146. 95
49. ——. 1936, "Recherches archéologiques au Cambodge", BEFEO, XXXVI, 1, p. 23-64. 96
53. Deneck M.M. 1959, "L'exposition d'estampages d'Angkor-Vat au Musée Guimet", AA, VI, 4, p. 311-314. 100
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87. ———. 1925, La sculpture khmère ancienne, Paris.

88. ———. 1931, Les collections khmères du Musée Albert Sarraut à Phnom Penh, Paris, Ars Asiatica XVI.


98. Krasem. (Braḥ Mahābīdūr) 1966, Padānukram Rāmakerti (Rāmakerti’s Lexicon), Phnompenh.


100. Laṅ H.A. 1966-67, Śīkṣā Rāmakerti Khmaer (Study of the Khmer Rāmakerti), Phnompenh, 2 vol.

101. ———. Rāmakerti niṅ Rāmāyana : (Rāmakerti and Rāmāyana), Phnompenh.

102. Leclère A. 1907, La crémation et les rites funéraires au Cambodge (Crémation de Sa Majesté Noroudom, Roi du Cambodge), Hanoi.

103. ———. 1917, Cambodge, Fêtes civiles et religieuses, Paris.


106. Li Dh.T. 1960, Aksarasāstra khmaer (Khmer Literature), Phnompenh.


117. Marchal S. 1926, Danses cambodiennes, Saigon.
122. ———. 1978, La gloire de Râma (Râmakerti), Paris.
Critical Inventory of Rāmāyana

143. ———. 1977 Rāmakerti (XVIe- XVIIe siècles), Paris, EFEO, vol. CX. 190
147. Raghavan V. 1975, The Rāmāyana in Greater India, Surat, South Gujarat University. 194
150. Sarkar K.K. 1968, Early Indo-Cambodian contacts, Literary and Linguistic, Santiniketan. 197
151. Sedov L. 1967, Angkorskaja Imperija, Moscow. 198
154. Silice A. 1924, “Exemples d’art cambodgien contemporain”, AAK, II, 1, p. 27-29. 201
155. ———. 1924, “La céramique dans l’ancien Cambodge. (Essai d’inventaire général)” AAK, II, 1, p. 31-63. 202
156. Singaravelu S. 1966, “The Rāmāyana and its influence in the Literature, Drama and Art in South and Southeast Asia”, Tamil culture, XII, 4, p. 303-314. 203
157. ———. 1968, “A comparative Study in the Sanskrit, Tamil, Thai and Malay versions of the story of Rāma with special references to the process of acculturation in the Southeast Asian versions”, JSS, 56, 2, p. 137-185. 204
158. Stern Ph. 1927, Le Bayon d’Angkor et l’évolution de l’art khmer, Paris. 205
159. ———. 1934, “Evolution du linteau khmer”, RAA, VIII, 4, p., 251-257. 206
162. ———. 1979, (Le Monde de) Angkor, Paris. 209
164. Sunseng S. 1977 “Une importante série de cuirs découps du Cambodge au Musée Guimet”, La revue du Louvre, Déc., 5- 6, p. 358-365. 211
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EGYPTIAN

1. Ratnam, M. Venkata. Rama; the geatest paroah. of Egypt. Rajamahaendri, 1934. 2v.

2. Stubbs, Ulysses. Ramayana; the Egyptian priest story of creation and the spirit world.


FRENCH

Translations (COMPLETE)


Translations (IN PARTS)
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SUMMARIES

1. Aranyakānda extrait de Rāmāyaṇa. tr. par. H. Fauche Paris, 1855, 12° 238

2. Gaston Courtillier, La légende de Rāma et Sītā, Paris, 1927, 8°, 8° 275 pages (Designs by Andrée Karpelès). 239


LITERARY WORKS BASED ON RĀMĀYAṆA THEME


TRASLATIONS FROM

Hindi


Tamil


Sanskrit
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10. Sylvain Lévi. *Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyana*, JA, janv-fév 1918, p. 5-161. 265


CAMBODIA EDITIONS


TRANSLATIONS


PHILOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDIES


3. ———. *Etudes sur le Rāmakerti (XVle-XVIIe siècles)*. Paris, EFEO, vol. CXI. Gr. 8°, 4, IV, 201 p. 276

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ART


3. ———. *Le Rāmāyāna dans l'ancien Cambodge in Rāmker (Rāmāyāna Khmer)*. Phnompenh, Université des Beaux Arts., 1969. 279


11. ———. *Etudes cambodiennes VII. Seconde etude sur les bas-reliefs d'Angkor Vat*, BEFEO, XIII, n° 6, 1913, p. 1-5. 287


16. ———. *The shadow Theaters of Cambodia*, ibidem, p. 52-59. 292


30. ———. Notice explicative sur un porte-siège du vassa où sont sculptés quelques épisodes du Rāmāyaṇa, Kampuchea Sauriya, 2e année, n° 7, p. 3-17.

31. ———. The influence of Indian civilization in Furehe India. The expression of Rama in the Cambodian version, in Indian Arts and Letters, London, n.s.; n° 1, 1927, pp. 30-39, pls. I-XVI.

LAOS EDITION

MALAYSIA


THAILAND


VIETNAM


TIBET


GERMAN

1. Baumgartner, A. *Das Rāmāyaṇa und Die Rāma literatur de Inder*. Freiburg, B., 1894. This book gives the survey of the whole Rama literature. The contents of the book are as follows:

   Introduction : (1) Rāma Viṣṇu; (2) Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa, summary of Books I-VII; (3) Source and date of composition of the Rāmāyaṇa; (4) Poetic value of the Rāmāyaṇa; (5) The Rāmāyaṇa in the Mahābhārata and in Purāṇas; (6) The Rāma legend as Buddhistic narration; (7) The Rāma story of classical Sanskrit literature (Kālidāsa's Rāghuvamśa); (8) The Rāma legend as grammar examples book (The Bhaṭṭikāvyā); (9) The Poem of Rāvana's death, The Setubandha or Rāvanavadha; (10) The Rāma dramas of Bhavabhūti (The Mahāvīracarita and the Uttararāmacarita); (11) Later Rāma dramas; (12) The Hindi Rāmāyaṇa of Tulasīdāsa; (13) The Rāmāyaṇa in other dialects of India; (14) The Rāmāyaṇa in the present day life of the nation.
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51. ———. Vier Liebestragödien des Rāmāyana. 1950. (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Bd. 100.)

52. ———. Kālidāsa’s Raghuvamsa, der Klassische indische Fürstenspiegel. 1947 (Ankara Universetesi yilligi, no. 1).


64. Vide Monatsberichte der K. Ak. d.W. 1859 p. 330 ff Ind Stud. V 415ff. Ind. Streifen, I 235 ff., abd Rogers, "Buddhaghosa's Parables" p. 175. (The legend had already been made known by Turnour, Csoma Korosi and Hardy, if not textually at all events in substance).
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12. ———. *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century AD.* Prasasti Indonesia, diterbitkan oleh Dinas Purbakala Republik Indonesia, II, Bandung, Masa Baru, 1956. (No. XI deals with ‘A metrical Old Javanese Inscription dated 856 AD’. Related to Oldjavanese version.)


25. ———. Senggana duta [Senggana as Messenger]. Djakarta : Aryaguna, 1962. (Senggana is another name of Hanuman.)


30. ———. *Sinkretisme jeung variasi dina wayang* [Syncretism and variation in the shadowplay-theatre]. Bandung, Lembaga Kebudayaan Universitas Padjadjaran, 1978. 438


33. Josodharmodjo, Ki S.B. *A brief outline on the aspects of the Javanese wayang kulit*. Djakarta, KOSGORO, Institute of Arts and Culture, 1967. 441


38. ———. *The Ramayana as sculptured in Reliefs in javanese Temples*. Batavia - Leiden, 1930. (Related to Oldjavanese version.) 446


42. Mc Donald, Barbara. *The serat Rama of Yasadipura in the context of the eighteenth/nineteenth century Literary ‘renaissance’ within the Surakarta Court*. Honour’s sub-thesis, The Australian National University, Canberra, November 1979. 450

43. Moertono, S. *State and Statecraft in Old Java*. Ithaca, N. York, 1968. The appendix contains a translation of the Astabratra derived from the Serat Rama. 451


47. Partokusumo, Karkono. *Sri Rama bersabda : ajaran tentang budipekerti dan kebajaksanaan oleh Kamajaya* [Sri Rama spoke : instructions is good character and wisdom by Kamajaya]. Yogya, UP. Indonesia, PT Tarate, 1979. 455

48. Pigeaud, Th.P. ‘De dood van Indrajit’ [The death of Indrajit], in *Djawa*, 6, 1926. (Related to Oldjavanese version.) 456
49. ——. *Javaansche Volksvertoningen* [The Javanese Folkstheatre]. Batavia, Volkslectuur, 1938. See Rama and Rawana in Topeng and Wayang [Mask and shadowplay].


54. ——. *'De dateering van het Oud-javaansche Ramayana'* [The dating of the Oldjavanese Ramayana], in *Gedenkschrift van het 75 jarig bestaan van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal, Landen Volkenkunde*, 4 Juni, 1926 ('s-Gravenhage).

55. ——. *'Het Oud-Javaansche Ramayana'* [The Oldjavanese Ramayana], in *TBG*, 72, 1932.

56. ——. *'Vertaling van den derde Sarga van het Oud-Javaansche Ramayana'* [Translation of the third Sarga of the Oldjavanese Ramayana], in *Supplement op het Triwinde Gedenkboek Mangkoe VII*. Soerakarta, 1940.

57. ——. *'Onbegrepen ontkenningen in het Oud-Javaansche Ramayana'* [Incomprehensible negation in the Oldjavanese Ramayana], in *BKI*, 106, 1950.


68. Ratmojo - Abas. *Ramayana*. Jakarta, Proyek Pengembangan Media Kebudayaan, no date. (It is in Bahasa Indonesia.)


76. ———. *Rāmāyāna Kakawin*, penulis dan penulisannya. Lecture presented at the Faculties of Arts, Gadjah Mada University (Yogyakarta) and Udayana University (Denpasar), 1979.


78. Sastrowardojo, Trajono. *Rama dan Sita*, diterjemahkan dari bahasa Djawa oleh... [Rama and Sita, translated from the Javanese language by...]. 2nd ed. Djakarta, BP, 1952. 3rd ed, 1969, 5th ed, 1975. (Though the writer claims it to be a translation from the Javanese version, it is very unlikely, as it has only 31 pages, while the Javanese version is about 20 times bigger.)


80. *Serat Romo*. Semarang, 1918. (It is written in Javanese.)

Sang Rama ring Sang Baratha [the episode of the teachings of Rama to Baratha], 8. *Arti kapusun Sang Anoman* [the episode of the capture of Hanuman], 9. *Arti Kesambut Dewi Sita* [the episode of the rape of Sita], 10. *Arti Keutus Sang Sukaserana dan Keutus Sang Anggada* [the episode of Sukaserana as messengers and Anggada as messenger]. 489


83. ———. *Serat Wahyu Makutharama* (hastha brata kawedhar), *sinawung sekar matjapat* [The Book of the Glory of Rama's Crown, being the exegesis of the Astabrata, in Javanese metres]. Ngajogyakarta, 1956. 491

84. ———. *Serat Guna Tjara Agama* [The Book of Arts, Tradition and Religion], 2nd ed. Ngajogyakarta, 1957. 492

85. Soebardi, S. ‘Raden Ngabehi Yasadipura, Court Poet of Surakarta, his life and works’, in Indonesia, Cornell Modern Indonesian Project, 8, October, 1969. 493


88. Soediman. *Chandi Laradjonggrang at a glance* Jogyakarta, 1969. 496

89. Soetarsa, Ki Slamet. *Lahiripun Rama-Brubuh Ngalengka* [From the birth of Rama to the fall of the kingdom of Lengka]. Solo, Keluarga Soebarno, 1964. 497
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91. Soma. A.S. *Ramajana, Lahirnya Sri Rama* [Ramayana, the birth of Shri Rama]. No date, no publisher. 499
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102. Surjanata, K. Rama dan Sinta, ditjeritakan kembali oleh... [Rama and Sita, retold by ...]. Djakarta : Sunrise, 1961.
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112. Wijk, Gerth van. ‘Iets over verschillende Maleische redacties van den Sêri Rama’ [Something about the various versions of the Sêri Rama], in TBG, 34, 1891.
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4. ———. *Il Ramayana di valmici* per G. Gorresio (Translation only), seconda edizioneda lui riveduta e ritoccata. Milan, 1869-70. 3v.
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7. Suvanna Sama Jataka. Illustrated., Institut Bouddhique, Vientianne, Laos.

LATIN


5. ———. Ramayana id est carmen epicum de Rama rebus gestis, poetae antiquissimi Valmicis opus. Textum codd. mss. collatis reconsuit interpretationem latinam et annotationes criticas adject Augustus Guillimus a Schlegel, August Willem von... Bonnae, apud Eduardum Weber, 1846. 3v., plates. Half title : Remeidog Valmiceiae libri septem v.i. (in 2 parts) and part 1 of v. 2. containing books 1 and 2 eighth a Latin translation of book 1 and the first twenty chapters of book 2.

NORWEGIAN


PHILIPPINES
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POLISH


RUSSIAN


SINHALESE


SPANISH
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4. ———. Ensayo de una traduccion literal de los episodios indios, la muerte de Yachnadatta y la eleccion de esposo da Draupadi, acompanada del testo Sanscrito y notas por Leopoldo de Equilaz Yanguas. Granada, J.M. Zamora, 1861. (6), 7 (1), 41 (1), 15p. (Autograph presentation copy from the editor to O.Böhtlingk). 586

5. ———. Vyāsa Mahābhārata. R. Ballester Escalas. Barcelona, Mateu. 234 grab 30 pts. 587

SWEDISH


TURKISH


THAI
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### Critical Inventory of Ramayam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Die Rāmakrishna-Bewegung. Muller, Hans-Peter, Dr. Theol. Guterslohei</td>
<td>Muller, Hans-Peter, Dr. Theol. Gutersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, c 1986. (Missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen, ISSN 0076-9428; Bd. 18).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>His Lakhon phut rüang ninthãsãmôn, t.p.</td>
<td>Muller, Hans-Peter, Dr. Theol. Gutersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, c 1986. (Missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen, ISSN 0076-9428; Bd. 18).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Khamphák Râmmakan/Khannam doi Somdet Krom Phraya Dâmrongrâchânapâh. 2462 (1919) Unpaged. Transcript of Rammakan, play based on Ramayana of Indian literature; with preface by Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince.</td>
<td>Muller, Hans-Peter, Dr. Theol. Gutersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, c 1986. (Missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen, ISSN 0076-9428; Bd. 18).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


40. King of Siam, 1881-1925...Rammakian (2464 i.e., 1961) Summary: Six Khones, or classical Thai musical masques, on themes from Rámâyana and Rámakian with text and commentary; volume brought out on occasion of conferral of gold letter-patent on Lieutenant General Chaophraya Râmrâkhop (Füa). Contents: Sidâhâi—Phao Longkâ—Phisêk thük khap—Chông thanon—Pradoem suk Longkâ—Nâkkhabât. Romanized record. I. Râmårkhop (Füa), Chaophrayâ. II. Válmiiki. Rámâyana. III. Râmmakian. IV. Title.
41. La’Q Thongmisit. Botphak “Nangyai” ru’ang Rammakian. 138 p. (Dialogues transcribed into modern Thai from the Thai shadow play based on Rammakian the Thai version of Ramayana.) 631

42. ———. Khamphak nangyai Wat Khanon, Ratchaburi. 262 leaves. Xerox of the original version of dialogues from the Thai shadow play based on Rammakian, the Thai version of Ramayana. (Filed and preserved at the Siam Society Library). 632

43. LC data base 6-24-83 (Hdg : Vajiravudh, King of Thailand, variants : Phrabat Somdet Phra Maha Thirarat Chao; King Vajiravudh). 633
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57. Phao Rammakian/Phrabat Somdet Phra Paramintha Maha Phumiphon Adunlayadet song thai.—(Bangkok : Samnak Ratchalekhathikan), 2495 (1952) 2, (35), 62p., (38) leaves of plates (some folded) : ill., port.; 24 cm. Th Tha 3767 In Thai. Prakop duai khlong kamkap phap taeng khun nai ratchakan thi 5 khrao chalong Phra Nakhon Khrop roi pi Phutthasakkharat 2425; lae, Botathibai laksana Khong ruang Phra Ram suang mi Phraborommaratchaongkran prot kloo—hai Phra Worawongthoe Krommamun Phitthyalapphrutthiyakon song khian khun. Prot kloo—hai Phinai ngan phraratpathan phloeng phrasop Somdet Phračhao Borommaawongthoe Krom Phraya Chainatnarenthon. Summary:- Partial pictorial history of the Ramayana with accompanying verses composed by Chulalongkorn, King of Siam, 1853-1910 and other officials of his reign, kept in the Royal Temple of the Emerald Buddha (Bangkok, Thailand); also, a history of the Rama epic by
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60. Phitthayalâpphrutthiyâkôn, Prince, grandson of Mongkut, King of Siam, 1885-1974. Phâp Rammakian Prakôp dûai khlông kamkap phâp tânng khu'n naî Ratchakan thi 5, khraô chalông Phra Nakhôn khrop rôj pi Phutthasakkaraät


Prachum botsakkrawa len thawai nai ratchakān thi 5. Rongphim Thai, Phọ. Sq. 2461 (1918) 234 p. Sakrava, songs improvised on certain occasions in presence of H.M. King Chulaongkorn; based on episodes of Ramakiarti, a Thai version of Ramayana.


85. Ramakiarti; anonymous verse, in Kap style, on Rama theme (Bhaga 1-4).

86. Ramakrishna and his disciples. Isherwood, Christopher, 1904.—New York, Simon and Schuster (1965).


<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Rāmāyana (Chefd) oevrede la literature Thaie racontee (Par Manich Jumsai) d'ares (1) la version originale ecrite par le roi Ramaaler de la dynastic regante de Bangkok, ed en francais. Bangkok, Charlemnnit, 1970. 86p.</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Rāmmakian, botlakhon du’ kdamban tôn chong thanon. 28p. Play based on Ramayana theme.</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Rāmmakian, Khāmkōn phāsām Mōn. (Xerox of original Mon version) 2 v. (177 &amp; 47 p.) Rāmmakian, Southeast Asian version of Ramayana in Mon (Burmese) language.</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Rāmmakian (Rāmāyana) mural paintings along the galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha. Chittakam fāphānhang rīaung Rāmmakian rōp phrarābiang Wat Phrāsrīrattanasāsādāram... —(Krungthēp); Sammnngān Salak Kīnbeng Ratthabān, 2525 (1982). nuc 89-6887 c-400-809.</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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poem-play in klon style; most popular Thai adaptation of Ramayana; composed in 1797 by assembly of sages under patronage of Phutthayotfa Chulalok, King of Siam, 1737-1809. Romanized record. I. Rama (Hindu deity)—Poetry. I Phutthayotfa Chulalok, King of Siam, 1737-1809. II. Valmiki. Ramayana. III. Ongkan Kha Khong Khurusapha (Thailand) IV. Title.


123. Rancangan Repelita III berkata mengenai transmigrasi (microform) Maritono, 1925.—Djakarta : (s.n., 1979) Microfiche 88/80039 (H). (So Asia) 88-943218 c-963-335.

131. Sahai, Sachchidanand. The Ramayana in South East Asia, Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies, 1981.


137. Satyanandpuri, Svami. Ramakirti; Thaidesh (Sym) mam prcalita Rama Katha, translated by Gangaprasad Upadhyay. Delhi, Sasta Sahitya mandal, 1940. 156p., ill 19 cm. The Ramakien; the stone rubbings of Thai epic, illus, with the bas-reliefs of Wat phra Jatuben. Tokyo, Kondansha International, 1975. 256p., front, ill. 28cm.

138. ———. Rama Kirti; Thaidesh (Sym) mam prcalita Rama Katha, translated into Sanskrit by Satyanandpuri and Charoen Sarahiran. Bangkok, Birla Oriental series, 1940. (B.I.H.O.R., v. 4 (1941), no. 343; Bombay Historical Sociecy, 1938.)


150. The *Rāmāyana Masterpiece of Thai literature*, retold (by Manich Jusmai) from the original version written by King Rama I of Siam. (The story was also depicted in frescoes on the walls of the temple of the Emerald Buddha in the Grand Palace of Bangkok), Chalenmnit, 1967. 101 p.


153. Thīraluk Sayām Rat Phīpīthṭaphān, Sūn Lumphīni...1928 : p. 109 (I group) (King Rama VI).


45. ———. Ram Lila Lucknow : Mataba Tammani. 1883. 98 p.
The Valmiki Ramayana has been incorporated in the first collection of Indian literatures constituted in Europe. The full text has been sent to Paris in 1732 from Chandernagar by Father Pons and is repertoried in the first printed Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts which has been published at Paris in 1739 (Catalogus manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae. I. Codices Orientales Codices indici (287 entries) pp. 434-448).

The Ramayana manuscripts are numbered in this catalogue as CII. CV, CVI, CVII. The entry CIII is a part of the Adhyatmaramayana.

These manuscripts have been in the next century among the sources of the first complete edition of the Ramayana in Paris by the Italian scholar Gaspare Gorresio. One Hindi LaṅkaKanda has also been included in the Catalogus of 1739 (number IV).


SANSKRIT

VALMIKI RĀMĀYANA : Complete Texts
Northern text (gauda). Bengali script
Ādikanda, Ayodhyakanda, 321 palm-leaves, 1687 A.D. — Sanskrit 348 Āranyakanda, 98 palm-leaves, c. 1700 A.D. Sanskrit 388
Kiśkindhakanda, 82 palm-leaves, c. 1700 A.D. — Sanskrit 389 Sundarakanda, 177 agaru leaves, 16th cent. ? — Sanskrit 393
Laṅkākanda, 180 fol. paper, 1670 A.D. — Sanskrit 398

Southern text ("Bombay"). Grantha or Telugu script.
Bālakanda, Ayodhyakanda, Āranyakanda, 263 palm-leaves, 18th cent. — Sanskrit 385
Kiśkindhākāṇḍa, Sundarakāṇḍa, Yuddhakāṇḍa, 318 palm-leaves, 18th cent. — Sanskrit 386
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Uttarakānda, 98 palam-leaves, 18th cent. — Sanskrit 400
(Same hand for 385, 386 and 400).
Complete text in one ms., 203 palm-leaves, grantha script —
Sanskrit 402 A.

Complete text less Sundara and Uttarakānda, 177 palm-leaves, 17-18th cent. minute Telugu script—Sanskrit 406.
Complete text, less Yuddhakānda sarga 47 to end, 278 palm-leaves, 1600 or 1660?—Sanskrit 404 A.

Mixed text:
Complete, 593 fol. paper, nāgarī, 1760—Sanskrit 383.

Loose kāṇḍas:
Northern text. Bengali script.
Sundararākānda, 127 fol. paper, 1807 A.D.—Sanskrit 395
Laṅkākānda, 188 fol. paper, 18th cent.—Sanskrit 387
(10 ślokas missing at the end.)

Southern text. Grantha script
Bālākānda, 102 palm-leaves, 17th-16th cent.—Sanskrit 384
Āranyakānda, Kiśkindhākānda, 156 palm-leaves, 17th-18th cent. Sanskrit 390

Sundararākānda, 77 palm-leaves (some missing), 18th cent. —Sanskrit 394
Yuddhakānda, sargas 1-98, 160 palm-leaves, 18th. cent. —Sanskrit 397
Yuddhakānda, sargas 79-131 (end), palm-leaves, 17th cent. —Sanskrit 403

Fragments:
Bālākānda, sarga 1-13. palm-leaves, 1706 or 1766 —Sanskrit 405 A
Kiśkindhākānda 67 to Sundararākānda 58 — 26 palm-leaves, 17th cent. — Sanskrit 392
Yuddhakānda, small fragment, 4 palm-leaves, 18th-19th cent. —Sanskrit 404 B Ādiyāthdagayastotra from Rāmāyana
(Yuddhakānda sarga 105), 5 palm-leaves, grantha script, 18th-19th cent. —Sanskrit 414, 1.

Abridgment
Samgraharāmāyana by Nārāyanapāṇḍita - Sundararākānda, 26 palm-leaves, nandinaṅgari, 18th cent. —Sanskrit 396, 2.
Adbhutottarakānda, 90 fol. paper, Bengali script, 17th cent. —
KHMER

Rām ker (Rāmakerti), 227 palm-leaves in 10 bunches, 19th cent. — Khmer 172
Rām Kir, fragment, 46 palm-leaves in 2 bunches, 19th cent. — Khmer 49
Būmnol angut or Samnuor angut. Šcenical adaptation in verses of an episode of the Rāma story: Āṅgada’s mission to Rāvaṇa, 11 palm-leaves, 19th cent. — Khmer 48
Ramakavi, 279 fol. paper, 18th cent. — Malayo-polynésien 127
Fragment, 60 palm-leaves, 19th cent. — Mal-p. 167
Fragment, sarga 24 stanzas 81-128 ed. H. Kern, 6 palm-leaves, 19th cent. — Mal-p. 171
Fragment, sarga 1-3, 20 ed. Kern, 15 palm-leaves, 19th cent. — Mal-p. 175
Fragment, 7 palm-leaves, 19th cent. — Mal.-pol. 219.

ADDITIONAL

NEPALI

(Critical Studies; Articles, papers, reviews etc.)

2. ———. “Bhānubhaktako Ādikavitva”, Madhupark sr. 9. no. 2. 829
4. ———. “Bhānubhakta Jhyālkhanma?”, Bhānubhakta Smārak Grantha, ed. Sāuryavikram Jīnāvāli; Nepāli Sāhibya Sammelan, Darjeeling (1940) pp. 73-74. 831


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


60. G. Tsering: "Nepali Bhasama Adikavi Bhanubhakta Acarya ra Mahakavi Laksiprasad Devkota", Asa, ed. Gopinarnayan Pradhun, Nepali Sahityakar Samparka Samiti, Shillong, Meghalaya (1964) sr. l. no. 1
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70. ———. “Ādikavi Bhānubhakta”, Diyo, ed. Dīnes Khāling, Nepālī Isāī Sāḥitya Saṅgh, Darjeeling (1963) sr. 7 no. 5.


113. ———: "Bhanubhakta Adikavi Mātra Thienan", Gorkhāpatra, ed. Gopalprasad Bhatṭārāi, Gorkhāpatra Sansthān, Kāṭhmandu. (13-7-61). 940


119. ———: "Nepāli Sāhityākāśma Bhanu", Bhārati, ed. Pārasmani Pradhān, Bhārati Kāryālaya, Darjeeling (1951) sr. 3 no. 1. 946
120. ———. : “Bhānubhakta Ācārya : Euta Prṣṭbhūmi”, Gorkhā, ed. Tikārām Sarmā, Akhil Bhāratīya Gorkhā League, Kalimpong, Darjeeling, (1949) sr. 5 nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14-19. 947


133. ———. (ed.) : “Bhānu-Jayantīmā Bhāṣān”, Bhāratī, Bhārati Kāryālaya, Darjeeling (1952) sr. 4 no. 2. 960


136. ———. : “Ādikavi Bhānubhakta”, Diyo, ed. Dīneś Khāling, Nepāli Tsār Sāhitya Sangh, Darjeeling (1963) sr. 9 no. 5. 963


139. Prasal, Ganesbahadur : "Bhanubhaktalai Punh Prthvima Ohralne Yojana-Patrako Masyauda", Mantra, ed. Sailendra Sakar, Kathmandu (1968) sr. 1 no. 1. 966

140. ———. : "Ādikaviko Pad-Anveśakko Bātāmā Tagāro", Juneli, Madhav Bhandari, Karphok Vidyā Mandir, Nepal (1964) sr. 5 no. 5. 967


142. ———. : "Bhānubhakta Ācārya ra unkā Samakālīn kavīkā Kṛti", Viśvaḍip, ed/pb., Kesāv Ācārya, Jhāpā, Nepal (1983) pp 7-17, sr. 5 no. 15. 969

143. Rāi, B.P. Dās : "Nepālī Sāhiṭyamā Krānti", Gorḵhā, ed. Tikārām Sarmā, Akhil Bhāratiya Gorḵhā League, Kalimpong, Darjeeling (1948) sr. 4 no. 50. 970


Akademi Publications on Rāmāyaṇa

A Critical Inventory of Rāmāyaṇa Studies in the World (Volume I)
A joint project of Sahitya Akademi and the Union Academique Internationale, Bruxelles, edited by K. Krishnamoorthy. lxxv, 515 p. Rs. 325

The Ramayana Tradition in Asia
Papers presented at the International Seminar on Ramayana Tradition in Asia, 1975. Edited by V. Raghavan. xvi, 727 p. Rs. 100

Valmiki Ramayana
An introduction to and a critical appreciation of the poetry of Valmiki by V. Sitaramaiah. 192 p. Rs. 25

Asian Variations in Ramayana

Epic Beautiful
An English verse rendering of the Sundarakanda of the Ramayana of Valmiki by K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar. ix, 512 p. Rs. 80

The Ayodhya Canto of the Ramayana as told by Kamban
English verse rendering from the Tamil Classic with introduction by C. Rajagopalachari. 128 p. Rs. 15