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MB’s message to Anna Bonisoli Alquati (plus attachments) **Eternal Rāma box file**Bonisoli Alquati 2016 emphasises that Kālidāsa gives more space to the *Bāla* and *Uttarakāṇḍa* events (*sargas* 10-11 and 14-15), with just one *sarga* (12) devoted to the events of the *Ayodhyā* to *Yuddhakāṇḍas,* although *sarga* 13 describes the aerial return to Ayodhyā and in the process mentions Rāma’s experiences during the search for Sītā. She also notes his highlighting of the divinity of Rāma.

In the *Raghuvaṃśa* Kālidāsa describes the lives and exploits of successive rulers of the Ikṣvāku or Solar dynasty. The text appears to lack unity, since it consists of a number of episodes connected only by the fact that their heroes belong to the same dynasty. There are also major discrepancies in the length of treatment, from five *sargas* on Rāma to one, fairly short *sarga* on the 21 kings following Atithi, which is little more than a string of names. The text seems to end abruptly at a critical point (at the end of *sarga* 19) with Agnivarṇa’s death without an heir. This has led to suppositions that the last two chapters were not written by Kālidāsa (so Hillebrandt), or were only a rough draft (Keith, *HSL* p.97), or that the poem is incomplete (so Jacobi and Renou). However, Tieken has recently argued that ‘In a text which is styled a *vaṃśa* (genealogy) the presence of the theme of the continuation of the line is an almost necessary condition.’ He points to the poem’s beginning with Dilīpa’s childlessness and suggests that this and Agnivarṇa’s lack of an heir thus frame the narrative, further pointing out that Agnivarṇa’s wife is pregnant and seeing this as a kind of prophecy for the continuation of the line, comparing the end of the *Kumārasaṃbhava*. [Tieken, *St.I.I.* 15 (1989)]

Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvaṃśa* contains a number of verses which seem to allude to events in the reigns of Samudragupta and Candragupta II. In the 4th canto he seems to hint at the handing over of the empire to Samudragupta by his father (4.1), the rejoicing of the people on his accession to the throne (4.3), the jealousy of the tributary kings (4.2) and their subjugation by Samudragupta, who easily established his control over his enemies and so confirmed his grip on the throne (4.4). Part of the canto (4.28-50) seems to refer to Samudragupta’s conquests and to show resemblances to the Allāhābād *praśasti* of Samudragupta, while the next part (4.51-79) perhaps alludes to the victories of Candragupta II as detailed in the Mehrauli pillar inscription with the mention of Raghu conquering the Pārasīkas and the Hūṇas. [Ashvini Agrawal]

Goodall and Isaacson (2003) suggest that the Kashmiri version of the *Raghuvaṃśa* on the whole preserves an earlier form of the text and that this is witnessed in the Kashmiri version of Vallabhadeva’s commentary, written early in the 10th century. p. lxiii:  
“Secondly, we hope that we have demonstrated that on examination this testimony [i.e. Vallabhadeva’s commentary] proves to be of enormous value for the reconstruction of Kālidāsa’s original. Vallabhadeva supports what appears to be a distinct Kashmirian *pāṭha* of the *Raghuvaṃśa,* in which many arguably original readings that have elsewhere been supplanted by ‘improvers’ are retained.”

The *Raghuvaṃśa* seems to be drawn on by the *Narasiṃha Purāṇa*, Kumāradāsa’s *Jānakīharaṇa* and Bhoja’s *Campūrāmāyaṇa.*

*Raghuvaṃśa* 3.13 refers to Raghu’s horoscope as birth when five planets are in exaltation and not setting; Rāma’s horoscope is given in detail by the *Agastyasaṃhitā* (cf. Kane, *HDhś,* vol. 5 pp. 84-5)  
cf. Pingree (ed.) 1978: *Yavanajātaka* II, 268-9 – [ad 8.5cd] “For all seven planets to be in their exaltations (cf. 9,1) is, of course, an impossibility; for the exaltation of Mercury is in Virgo, five signs from that of the Sun, while Mercury’s maximum elongation from the Sun is in the neighborhood of 22°. However, modified forms of this yoda are frequently claimed in India to have marked the births of famous men; thus there are the horoscopes of Rāma and of Bharata in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (see P.V. Kane, "Some Rāmāyaṇa Problems," *JOI Baroda* 1, 1951, 5-8) ...

Vālmīki is seen as “Lord of Animals” by Hofstetter (1980: 97-99) on the basis of animals round his hermitage (*Raghuvaṃśa* 14.79, 15.37) and the story of the Niṣādha and the *krauñca* at the beginning of Bāla (i.e. protection role).

Bajpai 1984-85: “Rāma, Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa stayed for some time at a place called Rāmgarh, 45 kms. south-west from Ambikapur. Rāmgarh has preserved to this day the relics of Rāma’s association with it. The place can be identified with the Rāmagiri of the great poet Kālidāsa.” [so places it in Surguja dist., M.P.]

Saran and Khanna 2004: 115(**own copy**) – “The poem *Sumanasantaka*, composed by *Mpu* Monaguna (c.1204), draws its subject matter from a small but particularly beautiful portion of Kalidasa’s famous *mahakavya, Raghuvamsam,* which the Sanskrit poet devotes to Rama’s grandfather Aja and his beloved queen Indumati. [It] merely borrows the outline of the story from Kalidasa but produces an entirely independent work of literature.”

*citing Zoetmulder 1974: 306* (*not part of our* ***photocopy***); correct ref. is pp. 307-11 (esp. 307) [**see** entry on Mpu Monaguṇa’s *Sumanasāntaka* within 12. Southeast Asia (verbal)]

**title (and author)** *Setubandha / Rāvaṇavaha* of Pravarasena

**date (and provenance)** 5th century, in Mahārāṣṭrī Prākrit

**edition(s)** \* Pravarasena 1880: *Râvaṇavaha oder Setubandha,* prâkṛt und deutsch hrsg. von Siegfried Goldschmidt, 2 Bde (Strassburg: Trübner, 1880).  
 **download; pp. 45-52 + 240-48 photocopied**

Pravarasena 1959:*Pravarasena's Rāvaṇavaha-mahākāvyam, with the commentary of Setu-tattva-candrikā,* ed. by Radhagovinda Basak (Calcutta: Sanskrit College). **download**

**translation(s) \*** Pravarasena 1976: *Pravarasena’s Setubandha,* trans. by Krishna Kanta Handiqui, Prakrit Text Series, 20 (Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society).  
 (**Ind) Sansk ser F 6/20; pp. 30-49 photocopied**

**studies** Dundas, Paul 2022: “The second phase of Prakrit Kavya: towards contextualising Pravarasena’s *Setubandha*”, *BEI* 35: 49-100. **download**

Granoff, Phyllis 1998: “Rāma’s Bridge: some notes on place in medieval India, real and envisioned”, *East and West* 48.1/2: 93-115. **download**

Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz 1949: “Rāvaṇavaha (“Sētubandha”) a Rāmāyaṇa”, *Sprawozdanie TNT w Toruniu* 1949/III: 67-71. **reprint in Słuszkiewicz 2022**

Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz 1953: “Le Rāvaṇavaha et le Rāmāyaṇa”, *RO* 3: 107-32.  
 **offprint + reprint in Słuszkiewicz 2022**

**notes** cf. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Lit.,* vol. 3, pp. 155-165 (§§ 1431-1443); in 15 *āsāsaa* (Skt *āśvāsaka*) and *skandhaka* (*āryagīti*) metre, employing subtle word play; by Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II (r. c. 419-50), who ruled first from Nandivardhana (mod. Nagardhan) and then from Pravarapura (mod Mānsar). There is evidence of his devotion to Viṣṇu.

cf. Raghavan, *The Rāmāyaṇa in classical Sanskrit and Prākrit Mahākāvya Literature* (Gune Mem. Lectures, 1977), Poona: Univ. of Poona, 1985: 23-30 [repr. Chennai: Raghavan Centre for Performing Arts, 2004 and 2017].

includes story of fish attacking the causeway but not her giving birth to a son by swallowing Hanumān’s sweat (**see** Sahai 1976: 24-25).

Pravarasena and *Setubandha* referred to in an inscription of Yaśovarman of Kambuja (889-910 A.D.) **see** Sharan, Mahesh Kumar 2003: *Studies in Sanskrit inscriptions of ancient Cambodia* (Delhi: Abhinav): 48-49

Granoff 1998: 97 –  
In the 7th century A.D. Pravarasena wrote his *Setubandha*, a lengthy poem in Prakrit, which tells the story of building the bridge. Pravarasena embellished the *Rāmāyaṇa* account and described really two attempts to build the bridge. Curiously enough, the first effort failed, when the mountains used to make the bridge simply sunk into the ocean and out of view. In the second attempt, through the efforts of the marvellous monkey named Nala, the bridge was constructed in such a way that it formed a solid, visible structure across the ocean. This saga of the invisible bridge seems to me to be particularly telling, for one of the more trying questions that the accounts of actual pilgrimages to the bridge raise is, in what sense did or could a pilgrim ‘see’ this bridge of Rāma, reaching from India to Sri Laṅkā?

**title (and author)** *Rāghavābhyudaya*

**date (and provenance)** now lost (?? c. 6th century)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** on this play, thought lost, **see** Warder, *Indian Kāvya Lit.,* vol. III: 248-49   
(§§ 1584-1585, with outline of plot) [**own copy**]

**title (and author)** *Jānakīrāghava*

**date (and provenance)** now lost (?? c. 6th century)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** on this play, thought lost, **see** Warder, *Indian Kāvya Lit.,* vol. III: 249-53   
(§§ 1586-1595, with outline of plot) [**own copy**]; **see also**  Raghavan 1961b [*Some old lost Rāma plays*]: 60-73

It covers the main story from Sītā’s abduction to Rāma’s installation after the killing of Rāvaṇa; 22 occasions on which Sāgaranandin draws his illustrations from the play; a *nāṭaka* in 7 acts. Act 1has Sītā and her friend Priyaṃvadā conversing, with Sītā already fearing abduction by Rāvaṇa (who has attended her *svayaṃvara*) [cf. Bhavabhūti, Māyurāja and Rājaśekhara]. In act 2 mention of Paraśurāma being vanquished by Rāma and also (context unclear) of Janaka’s *purohita* Śatānanda, includes story of fish attacking the causeway but not her giving birth to a son by swallowing Hanumān’s sweat (**see** Sahai 1976: 24-25).

**title (and author)** *Rāvaṇavadha / Bhaṭṭikāvya* of Bhaṭṭi

**date (and provenance)** 6th-7th century (Maitraka court, W. India)

**edition(s) \*** Giri, Kapildeva (ed.) 1989: *bhaṭṭikāvyam bhaṭṭiviracitaṃ anvitārthaprakāśikābhidhayā ṭīkayā vibhūṣitam, vyākhyākāraḥ caṇḍīprasādācāryo dādhimathah, sampādakaḥ kapiladeva girih*̣ (Vārāṇasi: Caukhambhā Saṃskr̥ta Saṃsthāna). **Ind. Inst. 5 Bhaṭṭi 12**

[**downloads** of Trivedi’s 1898 edn and 8th (1934) edn by V. N. Shastri; available on SARIT, from Goldschmidt’s 1880 edn]

**translation(s)** Leonardi, G. G. 1972: *Bhaṭṭikāvyam,* Orientalia Rheno-traiectina, 16 (Leiden: Brill). **Ind. Inst. 5 Bhatti 10 / OIL 545.62 Leo**[*extensive footnotes to translation but* ***no*** *introduction or the like*]

\* Fallon, Oliver (trans.) 2009:  *Bhatti’s Poem: The Death of Rávana* (New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation) **own copy**

**studies** Kawamura, Yūto 2018: *The Kāraka theory embodied in the Rāma story: a Sanskrit textbook in medieval India* (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld). **(IND); pp. 4-10 + 22-25 scanned**

Knutson, Jesse R. 2019: “An orgy of order: the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*’s scientific experiment and the reproduction of aesthetic and political life in early medieval South Asia”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 92.1-2: 121-36. **download**

Mazumdar, B.C. 1904: “On the Bhattikavya”, *JRAS* 1904: 395-97.

Narang, Satya Pal 1969: *Bhaṭṭikāvya: a study* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).  
[*only possibly relevant material is ch. II (pp.9-15) “Changes and Innovations” which basically lists in two columns divergences from VR*] **OIL 545.62 Nar**

Raghavan, Venkatarama 1985: *The Rāmāyaṇa in classical Sanskrit and Prākrit Mahākāvya literature,* Professor P.D. Gune Memorial Lectures 1977(Pune: Board of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Poona; repr. Chennai: Dr. V. Raghavan Centre for Performing Arts, 2004 and 2017): 43-55. **(IND) 4.4. 44; own copy of 2017 reprint**

Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz 1938: *Przycznki do badań nad dziejami redakcyj Rāmāyany: Contributions à l’histoire des recensions du Rāmāyaṇa* (Kraków: Nakladem Polskiej Akademii Umiejȩtności) 39-86. **reprint in Słuszkiewicz 2022**

Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz L. 2022: *Dzieła zebrane, tom 1: Studia nad Ramajaną,* ed. by Marcin Lisiecki (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK). **download (from editor)**

Sudyka, Lidia 2000: “What does the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya* teach?”, in Balcerowicz and Mejor 2000: 449-60. **own copy (vol.)**

Sudyka, Lidia 2016: “The repudiation of Sītā in canto XX of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* with special reference to the use of imperatives” , in Andrijanić and Sellmer 2016: 417-31.  
 **own copy**

**notes** A *kāvyaśāstra* in 4 *kāṇḍas* (*Prakīrṇa, Adhikāra, Prasanna, Tiṅanta*) and 22 *sargas* (c. 1650 verses); extracts from MB’s analysis on Bhaṭṭi’s sources for Rāma’s allies and comparison of Bhaṭṭi and Pravarasena in Eternal Rāma box file. The *Bhaṭṭikāvya* is drawn on apparently by Bhaumaka and definitely by the OJ *Kakawin Rāmāyaṇa.*

from Jesse Knutson’s abstract for 17th WSC (Vancouver, 2018):  
“The Rāmāyaṇa is a story of mutually implicated temporal and divine order, while Pāṇinian grammar is a story of order per se, perhaps even the order of orders. Bhaṭṭi often uses grammar as itself an aesthetic factor, which is at the very least undertheorized in Sanskrit literary theory. The poem as a whole becomes iconic of order, just as grammatical structures become keenly iconic of what they are describing.” i.e. grammar + narrative both iconic of order as such   
[He also noted in his paper that the work begins with a eulogy of Rāma’s father, Daśaratha, seemingly free of Oedipal tension.]

Raghavan notes (1985: 44) that Bhaṭṭi makes Daśaratha a Śaiva exclusively (*na tryambakād anyam upāsthitāsau*).

Saran and Khanna 2004: 98 – “The *Bhattikavya* lacks a sense of drama. A number of the most exciting and moving episodes of Valmiki’s epic become rather matter-of-fact under the impact of Bhatti’s relentless scholasticism. The leading characters of the epic, who have fascinated lovers of the Rama tale for more than two thousand years, become disconcertingly two-dimensional.”

Saran and Khanna 2004: 105 “Bhatti, having an entirely distinct objective, skirts around the moral issues involved in the epic drama.”

**title (and author)** *Jānakīharaṇa* of Kumāradāsa

**date (and provenance)** ?? 7th century (Śrī Laṅkā)

**edition(s)** Kumāradāsa 1907: *The Jànakìharaṇam of Kumàradàsa (I-X)*, ed. by G. R. Nandargikar (Bombay: printed at the Indu-Prakash steam-press). **Ind. Inst. 5 Kum 1**

**\*** Kumāradāsa 1967: *The Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa,* ed. by S. Paranavitana and C.E. Godakumbura (Colombo: Government Press, Ceylon, for the Sri Lanka Sahitya Mandalaya). **Ind. Inst. 5 Kum 3**

Kumāradāsa 1977: *Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa : a study, critical text and English translation of cantos XVI-XX*, by C. R. Swaminathan, ed. by V. Raghavan (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass). **Ind. Inst. 5 Kum 4 / OIL 545.63 Jan.2; parts photocopied**

Kumāradāsa 2009: *jānakīharaṇaṃ mahākavikumāradāsapranītaṃ, saṃpādakaḥ rāghavakumārajhā* (Vārāṇasī: Kiśora Vidyā Niketana).

**translation(s)** *see* Kumāradāsa 1977

**studies** Barnett, Lionel D. 1926: “Janakiharana XVI”, *BSOS* 4: 285-93. **printout**

de Casparis, Hans 1995: “The Rāmāyaṇa and Śrī Laṅkā”, (?unpublished) paper presented at the 12th International Rāmāyaṇa conference, Leiden. **copy in Leiden folder**

Chanda, Ratna 1990: *Kumāradāsa: a study* (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar).  
 **Ind. Inst. 5 Kum 6; pp. 44-62 photocopied**

Godakumbura, C.E. 1967: “A Note on the Jānakīharaṇa”, *J. Ceylon Branch of the RAS* n.s. 11: 93-98. **download**

Keith, A. Berriedale 1901: “The Date of Kumāradāsa”, *JRAS*: 578-82. **download**

Leumann, E. 1893: “Zum Jānakīharaṇa des Kumāradāsa”, *WZKM* 7: 226-32.

Satya Vrat 1979: “Kumāradāsa’s indebtedness to Kālidāsa”, *VIJ* 17: 28-38. **(IND) Per 10 d 14**

Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz 1938: *Przycznki do badań nad dziejami redakcyj Rāmāyany: Contributions à l'histoire des recensions du Rāmāyaṇa.* Kraków: Nakladem Polskiej Akademii Umiejȩtności. **reprint in Słuszkiewicz 2022**

Suri, Satya 1984: *A critical study of Jānakīharaṇa* (Delhi: Nirman Prakashan).   
 **(Ind) 5 Kum 5; pp. 28-34 and 54-61 photocopied**

Thomas, F.W. 1901: “The Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa”, *JRAS* 1901: 128 and 253-80. **download**

**notes** in 20 *sargas* with 1425 verses in variety of metres (totals from Allahabad edn.)

**see** summaries of contents from Suri 1984 (photocopied; based on Allahabad edn of 1960 ed. by Vrajamohana Vyasa) and also Warder, vol.4, pp. 253-4 and 258-69; on vocabulary, see Thomas article; n.b. *tanucchada,* ‘feather’ in v.l. at 4.62.9b of B1.3 reproduced at *Jānakīharaṇa* xi.17, and *śukānana,* in apposition to *turaga* at 5.205\*5 pr. [insert of Ś1 Ñ2 V B D1-4.6.10.11], occurs at *JH* xii.18

Paranavitana’s discussion of Kumāradāsa and his date is on pp. li-lxxii of his and Godakumbura’s edn, with inscriptional evidence mentioned at pp. lxi fin.–lxii (cf. Raghavan’s comments in intro. to Swaminathan’s edn [photocopied]).

cf. Raghavan 1985: 31-42.

[Hiebert, Julie H. 1989: "Tradition and Innovation in Sanskrit Mahākāvya: The Harem Sunset" in *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts,* ed. by Anna Libera Dallapiccola, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner): I. 269-83. **OIL (IND) 20 D 238/ Sackler IW Dah**focuses on Kumāradāsa’s Jānakīharaṇa and Rāmabhadrāmbā’s Raghunāthābhyudaya – nothing relevant to Rāma story]

There is evidence that the *Jānakīharaṇa* was known in Java around 9th century; **see** Chandra, Lokesh 1978: “Sanskrit studies in classical Indonesia”, *IT* 6: 113-23 [repr. in *Cultural Horizons of India,* vol. 4 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture/Aditya Prakashan, 1995): 1-9].

**ANALYSE**

*[Kālidāsa describes Sumitrā as a princess of Magadha: Raghavan 1985: 7*

*other gods go to Viṣṇu (RaghuV 10) rather than Brahmā (VRm 1); Kālidāsa’s version followed in first panel of Prambanan reliefs: Raghavan 1985: 9*

*“In metre, ideas and some expressions, [Jānakīharaṇa 2.1-18] is an imitation of Kālidāsa’s treatment of it in Canto X of Raghuvaṃśa”; also compares it with Kumārasaṃbhava 2.20-32: Raghavan 1985: 32*

*compares women of Ayodhyā rushing to their windows to see Rāma as he returns from Mithilā (Jānakīharaṇa 9.52-64) with Kālidāsa in similar marriage contexts for Aja and Śiva (Raghuvaṃśa 7 and Kumārasaṃbhava 7); JH modelled on RaghuV 12: Raghavan 1985: 36*

*Mātali reveals Rāvaṇa’s vital spot (JH 19.27), cf VR E text 6,92.41 but not other recensions (in S Mātali reminds Rāma of brahmāstra): Raghavan 1985: 40*

*JH 20 modelled on RaghuV 13: Raghavan 1985: 41*

*“... new and interesting information on Kumāradāśa and his JH revealed by some epigraphical evidence from Śrī Laṅkā. According to this evidence [fn. See pp.lxi-lxvi, Introduction to the Ceylon edition of the JH] Kumāradāsa spent some time in the Śrīvijaya capital in Sumatra where his poem JH was appreciated. Therefore the influence of the JH may also explain the development of S.E. Asia of the motifs of the crow and the whales swallowing the rocks” Raghavan 1985: 42 ]*

**title (and author)** *Pratimānāṭaka* and *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* [ascribed to Bhāsa]

**date (and provenance)** 3rd century A.D. (??); more probably 7th-8th century

**edition(s)** Bhāsa, *Pratimānāṭaka* 1927: ed. and trans. by Shivaram Mahadeo Paranjape 1927 (Poona: Oriental Book Agency).

Kale, M.R. (ed. and trans.) 1977: *Pratimānāṭakam mahākavibhāsapranītam = Pratimānāṭakam of Bhāsa* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass) [1st edn: Bombay: Gopal Narayan, 1930]  
 **Ind. Inst. 5 Bhasa.Prat. 6**

\* Raghavan, V. (ed.) 1977: *mahākaviśrībhāsapraṇītaṃ pratimānāṭakam,* saṃpādakaḥ Ve. Rāghavaḥ (Madrās: Kuppusvāmiśāstrisamīkṣāsamitiḥ). **(IND) 5 Bhasa Prat. 4**

\* Shastri, V. Venkataram 1930: *Abhiṣekanāṭaka*, crit. ed. with Sanskrit commentary, introduction, notes and trans. by V. V. S. (Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Dass).  
 **(IND) 5 Bhasa Abh. 1**

Venu, G. 1989: *Production of a play in Kūṭiyāṭṭaṁ : text and translation of the first act of Abhiṣeka nāṭaka of Bhāsa, with the kramadīpika (production manual) and the āṭṭaprakāraṁ (acting manual) from the Sanskrit drama tradition of Kerala,* Documentation of Kūṭiyāṭṭaṁ series, no. 1 (Irinjalakuda, Trichur District: Natana Kairali).  
 **(IND) 5 Bhasa.Abh. 2; pp. 2-7, 23, 30-31 scanned**

**translation(s)** Paranjape, Shivaram Mahadeo (ed. and trans.) 1927: *Pratimānāṭaka* (Poona: Oriental Book Agency). **Ind. Inst. 5 Bhāsa Prat 1**

Rao, Amiya, and B. G. Rao (trans.) 1971: *Three plays of Bhasa* (New Delhi: Orient Longman) [includes *Pratimānāṭaka*] **OIL 545.51 Rao**[*free translation, with nothing of significance in its background material*]

\* Janaki, S.S. (trans.) 1978: *The statue: Bhāsa's Pratimā in English translation* (Madras: Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute) **Ind. Inst. 5 Bhasa.Prat. 5**; **analysed**

**studies** Ayyar, A.S.P. 1942: *Bhāsa,* Indian Men of Letters Series(Mylapore: Madras Law Journal Office). **download**

Banerjee, Biswanath 1989-91: “Treatment of the Rāma-story by Bhāsa and Bhavabhūti”, *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* 32-34: 23-39. **scan**

Chatterjee, Asim Kumar 1983-84: “Date of Bhāsa”, *JAIH* 14: 71-79.

Chenna Reddy, J. 1972: “The probable sources of deviations from Vālmīki in Bhāsa’s Pratimā-nāṭaka”, *SVUOJ* 15: 73-79. **download**

Sastri, Hirananda 1926: *Bhasa and the authorship of the thirteen Trivandrum plays* (Calcutta: Central Publication Branch, Govt of India). **(IND) Per 2 c 1/2**[totally rejects hypothesis of Bhāsa’s authorship and notes greater similarities to Śaktibhadra’s *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi,* though not suggesting him as author]

Słuszkiewicz, E. 1957: “Bhāsa et le Rāmāyaṇa”. *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 21: 409-421.  
 **scan + reprint in Słuszkiewicz 2022**

Tieken, Herman 1993: “The So-called Trivandrum Plays Attributed to Bhāsa”, *WZKS* 37:   
5-44. **download**

Tieken, Herman 1997: “Three Men in a Row (Studies in the Trivandrum Plays II)”, *WZKS* 41: 17-52. **download**

Verpoorten, J.M. 1995: “The Character of Rāma in Bhāsa’s *Abhiṣeka”,* in Pollet 1995: 53-57. **download**

Winternitz, Moriz 1916: “Mahābhārata II,68,41ff und Bhāsas Dūtavākya”, in *Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients Ernst Kuhn gewidmet* (Breslau: Marcus): 299-304.

**notes** cf. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Lit.,* vol. 2, pp. 308-313 (§§ 1026-1042) and Freeman 2001: 213-15 (in Richman ed. 2001).

In these plays Rāma is regularly called Nārāyaṇa (as he is in the SE Asian adaptations in the shorter form Nāray). He is explicitly divine at *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* 4.16 and 6.27.

Tieken 1993 + 1997 rejects the ascription of Trivandrum plays to Bhāsa and dates the *Pratiyajñāyaugandharāyaṇa* as later than, because borrowing from, *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravarman (= Pallava Mahendra-vikramavarman, r. 610-630 A.D.); so that play is after beginning of 7th century and S Indian, which he implicitly extends to the other Trivandrum plays too. The Rājasiṃha, mentioned as patron in seven of these plays, including the *Abhiśekanāṭaka,* could be Narasiṃhavarman II (Mahendravarman’s great-great-grandson, r. 690-720 A.D.). Tieken’s arguments for links with ritual of several of the plays could also support a dating and location to the Pallava period and South India.

**photocopy** of Paranjape 1927: 66-67 (Act 6 – Bharata confronts Kaikeyī) in Eternal Rāma box file; **abstract** of Verpoorten’s paper at Leuven Rām. conference in “relevant handouts” in same box.

Słuszkiewicz 1957: 410: “On sait bien que les deux drames rāmaïtes présentent une histoire de Rāma assez différente de celle que nous donne l’epopée de Vālmīki; il suffit de rappeler à titre d’exemple l’acte III du *Pratimānāṭaka* et le fait que le sacre de Rāma se fait avant son retour à Ayodhyā (*Abhiṣekanāṭaka,* acte VI), sans parler de nombre d’autres différences plus ou moins essentielles. Ceci seul fait comprendre pourquoi notre examen n’a pu donner beaucoup de rapprochements justicatifs, que la cause en ait été l’originalité personnelle de Bhāsa ou bien une connaissance peu profonde de l’épopée chez l(es) auteur(s) anonyme(s).”

p.421: “... nous bournons à faire remarquer que, à notre avis, les concordances ci-dessus, y compris maint rapprochement marqué du point d’interrogation, attestent d’une manière assez évidente l’existence, probablement vers le milieu du Ier millénaire ap. J.-C., d’une recension ou d’une version différent de C et de B, mais plus ou moins proche de ces deux recensions. L’examen ci-dessus ne fait que confirmer, croyons-nous, nos recherches antérieures.”

*Pratimānāṭaka*

Action all reported, transferred to much briefer, crisper dialogue without long speeches (e.g. Rāma asks Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā each to dissuade other from accompanying him). This throws much greater emphasis on subsidiary characters, reducing stature of Rāma.

Dramatic revelation by priest affective (as was halting of *abhiṣeka* in mid-stream in Act I) but the need to introduce the 3 widows (just unveiled !), as well as Sumantra, to Bharata strains credibility [*for sake of audience*]: III, 39. So too the need for Sumantra to identify Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma to Bharata at their hermitage: IV, 47

Bharata’s visit to triumphant Rāma at hermitage (leading army mobilised to help Rāma in battle, but also including priests and 3 queens) substitutes for the VRm Citrakūṭa expedition [Bharata goes alone with Sumantra first time].

Bharata given much greater stature than in many other versions; he approaches the position of leading hero. Kaikeyī too has a much more prominent role; she directs all the action in Ayodhyā, clearly taking on role of queen mother.

Act I: preparations for installation as *yuvarāja*; installation aborted in middle; exiles leave without confronting Daśaratha.

Act II: Daśaratha’s grief; return of Sumantra; Daśaratha imagines he sees ancestors Dilīpa, Raghu and Aja summoning him to die.

Act III: Bharata’s return journey; enters Ikṣvāku shrine, discovers truth, meets Daśaratha’s widows, declares he will go to forest.

Act IV: Sumantra takes Bharata alone to Rāma’s hermitage.

Act V: abduction

Act VI: narration of battle between Jaṭāyus and Rāvaṇa; Sumantra returns from attempt to visit exiles, tells Bharata of abduction and that Rāma has allied himself with monkey-king to oust Vālin; Kaikeyī exculpates herself and is reconciled with Bharata; Kausalyā faints.

Act VII: Rāma and followers return to Janasthāna hermitage after defeating Rāvaṇa, installing Vibhīṣaṇa and having Sītā declared pure by gods. Bharata leads army and 3 queens to meet them; ecstatic reunion; Rāma installed [*there*] as king.

**title (and author)** *Mahāvīracarita* and *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti

**date (and provenance)** early 8th century

**edition(s)** Bhavabhūti 1921: *Bhavabhūti’s Uttara-rāma-charita,* edited by S.K. Belvalkar (Poona: Oriental Book-Supplying Agency). **own copy**

Bhavabhūti 1924: *Bhavabhuti's Uttaracharitam, with Sanskrit commentary, English translation, critical and explanatory notes*, by Saradaranjan Ray (Calcutta: Kohinur Print. Works).  
 **EUL PK3791.B58 Bha**

Bhavabhūti 1928: *Mahāvīra-caritam: a drama by the Indian poet Bhavabhūti,* ed. with crit. app., intro. and notes by Todar Mall, rev. by A. A. Macdonell (London: Oxford University Press). **OIL 545.56 Mah.1 / Wolfson Lib. / download**

**\*** Bhavabhūti 1989: *Mahākaviśrībhavabhūtipraṇītam Mahāvīracaritaṃ Vīrarāghavakr̥tayā bhāvapradyotinīvyākhyayā samalaṃkr̥tam = Le Mahāvīracarita de Bhavabhūti accompagné du commentaire de Vīrarāghava,* éd. et trad. par François Grimal, Publications de l’Institut français d’indologie Pondichéry 74 (Pondichéry: Institut français). **own copy; analysed**

**translation(s)** *see*  Bhavabhūti 1989 (Grimal) for *Mahāvīracarita*

Bhavabhūti 1871:  *Mahá-Víra-Charita, The adventures of the great hero Ráma, An Indian drama in seven acts*, trans. by John Pickford (London: Trübner). **Ind. Inst. Sansk. 5.67 (download)**

**\*** Bhavabhūti 2007: *Rāma's last act, by Bhavabhūti*, trans. by Sheldon Pollock, Clay Sanskrit Library (New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation). **own copy**[review by Peter Bisschop in *ZDMG* 160.1 (2010): 243-45 (**download**)]

**studies** Banerjee, Biswanath 1989-91: “Treatment of the Rāma-story by Bhāsa and Bhavabhūti”, *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* 32-34: 23-39. **scan**
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Karmarkar, R.D. 1957: “The title ‘Mahāvīracarita’”, *ABORI* 38: 148-43. **download**
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[*see notes*] **OIL 545.56 Mir**
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Sankalia, H.D. 1965-66: “Kundamālā and Uttararāmacarita”, *JOIB* 15: 322-34. **download (vol.)**
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Shulman, David Dean 2001a: “Bhavabhūti on Cruelty and Compassion”, in Richman 2001: 49-82 (repr. in Shulman 2001b: 255-92). **own copy**

Sutherland Goldman, Sally J. 2019: “Revamping the *rākṣasa:* the critics and Bhavabhūti’s *Mahāvīracarita*”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 92.1-2: 137-49.

Thiruvengadathan, A. 2009-10: “Deviations from Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa effected by Bhavabhūti in his Mahāvīracarita and Uttararāmacarita: an assessment”, *JORM* 81-82:59-74. **photocopy**
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Wells, Henry W. 1966-67: “Uttararāmacarita and ‘The Descent of the Ganges’ ”, *JOIB* 16: 144‑48. **download (vol.)**

**notes** On the *Mahāvīracarita* and *Uttararāmacarita* **see** further: Warder1972-92: IV, 309‑31 (§§ 2269-2314) and 338-68 (n.b. textual point about Bhavabhūti following N rec. on p. 365 mid.); also *RR* pp. 245-47 and Ghosh 1963: 153-60

De 1930 notes that from *MVC* 5.46 to the end (= end of act 7) most printed edns and 8 of Todar Mall’s N mss give what T. M. calls Recension A and Hertel the vulgata, whereas Ratnam Aiyar’s edn and T.M.’s single Mysore ms give a different text (T.M.’s Recension C) attributed to Subrahmanya. A 3rd recension (T.M.’s Recension B) has a different text from A only for the rest of act 5 after v.46, which is attributed to Vināyaka Bhaṭṭa.   
from p.18: “We are now in a position to conclude with great probability that (1) the text from Act I to the end of Act V,46, forms the only authentic text of Bhavabhûti, and (2) that the vulgata or Recension A of the rest of the drama (and not merely of Acts VI and VII) is as spurious as Recensions B and C, which are expressly attributed to Vinâyaka and Subrahmanya respectively.  
 ... ... But the text for Acts VI and VII on Recension B is identical with the text for those Acts in Recension A, which therefore must be also the work of Vinâyaka, but which was indiscriminately incorporated into the anonymous Recension A. In other words, the Recension A extends only from Act V,46, to the end of that Act and does not include Acts VI and VII, for which it merely borrows the text of Recension B.”

Grimal’s text is that of edn by T. R. Ratnam Aiyar et al. (Bombay 1892; rev. Wâsudev Laxmaṇ Shâstrî Paṇśîkar, 1926), which is very similar to ms Mt of Todar Mall’s crit.edn (London, 1928); Grimal gives Todar Mall’s readings in his apparatus. Vīrarāghava’s comm. belongs to end of 18th century.

Mirashi 1974 notes the absence of mention of Bhavabhūti by Bāṇa and Daṇḍin and his linking by Kalhaṇa to Yaśovarman of Kanauj and to Vākpatirāja, so dates him to early 8th century: “Bhavabhūti’s literary activity thus lay between A.D. 700 and 730” (p. 11). He also notes that Bhavabhūti was a native of Vidarbha, born as he tells us (in the *Mālatīmādhava* prologue) in Padmapura, identified by Mirashi (p.35) with Pravarapura, capital of the Vākāṭaka Pravarasena II (modern Pavnār on the banks of the Dhām, Wardhā dist.). Mirashi summarises and analyses the *MVC* in ch. V (pp.111-51) and the *URC* in ch. VII (pp.209-83); n.b. also pp. 292-305: “The chronological relationship of the Uttara-Rāma-charita and the Kundamālā” (Mirashi placing Bhavabhūti earlier than Dhīranāga).

The *MVC* often follows *VR* NE (*acc. notes*).

Many carefully planned innovations to allow long poem to be transferred to stage (with all physical action reported); credible and effective, relying on audience’s intimate knowledge of plot for almost all details. Action is all verbal. Much political scheming amongst *rākṣasas*.

Enhanced roles for Kuśadhvaja, Paraśurāma, Mālyavān, Śūrpaṇakhā, Janaka, Śramanā = Śabarī and Yudhājit; Śūrpaṇakhā is presented sympathetically, as Mālyavān’s dear little grand-daughter.

Rāma’s prime object in leaving for forest is to exterminate *rākṣasas* in obedience to Paraśurāma; Kaikeyī is completely innocent.

Act I: In Viśvāmitra’s hermitage. Kuśadhvaja arrives with Sītā and Ūrmilā; Rāma and Sītā admire each other; Rāvaṇa’s messenger seeks Sītā in marriage; Rāma kills Tāṭakā; Rāma presented with divine weapons; breaks bow [*offstage*]; fourfold marriage arranged; Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa ordered to kill Mārīca and Subāhu.

Act II: Reports of defeat of Mārīca and Subāhu disturb Mālyavān; Śūrpaṇakhā brings news of 4-fold marriage; Paraśurāma demands Mālyavān restrain followers from harming Daṇḍaka ascetics; Mālyavān decides to foment enmity between Rāma and Paraśurāma in the hope they will kill each other.

Paraśurāma goes to Mithilā to avenge insult to Śiva’s bow; Sītā attempts to hold Rāma back; Paraśurāma won over by Rāma’s noble demeanour; confrontation ends when Rāma is called back in by Sītā’s mothers to complete the marriage ritual.

Act III: Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, then Śatānanda, Janaka and Daśaratha, try to persuade Paraśurāma to withdraw from fighting Rāma; quarrel develops; Rāma challenges Paraśurāma.

Act IV: Mālyavān discusses plot with Śūrpaṇakhā.

Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra praise Rāma; Rāma and Paraśurāma express their mutual friendship; Paraśurāma, Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra leave.

Śūrpaṇakhā in Mantharā’s body arrives and immediately claims boons from Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa; Yudhājit and Bharata report to Daśaratha that populace are asking for Rāma to be installed; Rāma asks for fulfilment of Kaikeyī’s boons and departs.

Act V: Saṃpāti and Jaṭāyus summarise events in forest up to death of Khara.

Jaṭāyus witnesses abduction, challenges Rāvaṇa; Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa mourn and set out on search.

Lakṣmaṇa rescues Śramaṇā [*= Śabarī*] from Kabandha; she delivers letter from Vibhīṣaṇa and reports that *vānaras* have found Sītā’s veil; Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa decide to go to *vānaras*; reborn Kabandha warns that Mālyavān has instructed Vālin to kill Rāma.

Śramaṇā leads Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to Ṛṣyamūka; Vālin challenges Rāma; alliance of Sugrīva and Rāma; death of Vālin.

Act VI: Trijaṭā reports Hanumān’s exploits in Laṅkā to Mālyavān; Mālyavān has gloomy forebodings.

Rāvaṇa dismisses fears expressed by Mandodarī, then by Prahasta.

Aṅgada’s embassy to Rāvaṇa.

Indra, Mātali and Citraratha watch battle and describe it.

Act VII: Conversation between Laṅkā and Alakā.

Sītā’s purification by fire and installation of Vibhīṣaṇa reported.

Journey to Ayodhyā in *puṣpaka*.

The ***Uttararāmacarita***basically as *VR.* Sītā remains sweet and tender; disappearance into care of Earth placed earlier so it can be coupled with happy ending; boys grow up separated from both parents.

I: At end of homecoming celebrations; Sītā is pregnant. Public gossip, doubts about fire-ordeal. Past events reviewed in picture gallery. Rāma is unhappy because feels obliged to exile innocent Sītā.

II: Sītā in labour commits suicide by jumping into Gaṅgā, taken by Earth and Gaṅgā to underworld, twins taken when weaned to Vālmīki to be fostered.

III: Śambūka beheaded, returns as purified heavenly being [*see pp.49-50*]. Rāma faints, tended by forgiving, tender Sītā (invisible ghost); Vāsantī reproaches Rāma (III, 130-49) against Sītā’s wish.

IV: Janaka and Kausalyā meet at Vālmīki’s hermitage, see Lava and note his resemblance to Rāma and Sītā; Candraketu is guarding *aśvamedha* horse [*see II.56*]; Lava knows Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa only as ‘heroes of *Rm’*, tries to liberate horse.

V: Lava fights army, bonds with Candraketu.

VI: Candraketu and Lava fight, separated by Rāma; Rāma sees resemblance of Lava and Kuśa to Rāma and Sītā, suspects their identity, asks to hear *Rm.*

VII: Lakṣmaṇa arranges for public performance of Vālmīki’s drama: Sītā throws self into Gaṅgā, birth of boys, sustained by Earth and Gaṅgā. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa convinced of identity of Kuśa and Lava; Earth and Gaṅgā restore Sītā to Rāma who has fainted; Sītā revives him with touch; Vālmīki presents Kuśa and Lava; populace told to accept Sītā’s purity. Śatrughna returns from defeating Lavaṇa [*see I,205-9*].

Divergences of treatment between the two plays:

*MVC URC*

suitor test at Viśvāmitra’s *āśrama* at Mithilā (I. 71)  
Janaka not present Janaka present (I. 72-73)

Śramaṇā met at Mataṅga’s *āśrama* (I. 128)

Kabandha has enhanced role Kabandha has standard role

Śūrpaṇakhā has new role Śūrpaṇakhā has standard role

Mālyavān has new role Mālyavān is absent

Paraśurāma: early appearance, Paraśurāma has standard role  
modified role

Vālin: enhanced role, challenges Rāma stealth criticised by Lava  
to open duel

Vibhīṣaṇa: present early Vibhīṣaṇa absent

The *Uttararāmacarita* quotes directly Rām.1.2.14 (identical in all), 1.1394\*3-6 (≈ NE) at VI. 31-32 and 2 App.I.26.11-12 (N), strongly indicating that Bhavabhūti follows the N recension.

Grimal 1989 notes that Bhavabhūti follows VR CE, including books 1 and 7 (Anaraṇya 7.19), except:  
 1.717\* (S) Lakṣmaṇa also has divine weapons  
 Agastya presents **Indra’s** bow, cf. CE 3.11.33 and 214\*  
 4.18.401\*-41ab death of Vālin; also 417\* and 410\*  
 1.490\* Jāmbavān  
 6.3116\*5  
 6 App.68.66-67  
 6 App.3.142-151 Prahasta  
 6.90.4-12 incl. 2082\*  
 5 App.2.13-18  
 7.15.293\*  
 4 App.4.1-2  
 4.11.1-4 NE *tāla* NOT *śāla*  
 3.63.4 quoted at *MVC* V,24 with *vicinoṣi* and *sītā* (leçons exclusivement celles des mss représentant la recension du N.-E.).

Bhavabhūti himself seems to be drawn on by *Anargharāghava, Bālarāmāyaṇa, Prasannarāghava, Hanumannāṭaka, Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi, Kundamālā, Ānanda Rām., Bhuśuṇḍi Rām.*

**title (and author)** *Udāttarāghava* of Māyurāja (Mātrarāja) Anaṅgaharṣa

**date (and provenance)** before 9th century, Kalacuri kingdom

**edition(s)** Māyurāja 2016: *Udātta Rāghavam of Māyurāja: a rare Sanskrit play,* discovered and critically ed. by V. Raghavan (Chennai: Dr. V. Raghavan Centre for Performing Arts). **own copy**

**translation(s)** [translation by M. Jayaraman in Māyurāja 2016: 125-235]

**studies** cf. Warder, A.K., *Indian Kāvya Literature,* vol. 4, pp. 223-233 (§§ 2089-2113)

Raghavan, Venkatarama 1976b: “The Udātta Rāghava of Māyurāja: an old Rāma-play”, in *Proceedings of the 28th International Congress of Orientalists, Canberra, 1971* (Canberra: Publication Committee) [repr. in *Udātta Rāghavam of Māyurāja,* ed. by V. Raghavan (Chennai 2016): 2-13]. **own copy**

Upadhye, A.N. 1967: “A Note on Hemacandra and the *Udāttarāghava*”, *VIJ* 5: 198‑99. **scan**

**notes** “An old Rama play which I have discovered and am bringing out is the *Udattaraghava* of Anangaharsha Mayuraja, a Kalacuri prince.”

V. Raghavan, “The Ramayana in Sanskrit Literature”, in *Ram. Trad. in Asia*, p.12

Lakṣmaṇa rather than Rāma goes to hunt the golden deer, with Sītā subsequently sending Rāma to help his brother; Rāma entrusts Sītā to a disguised Rāvaṇa (he and a subordinate, Citramāya, have already appeared, disguised as ascetics); Rāvaṇa reverts to his own form and carries Sītā off, defeating Jaṭāyus as he does so. As the brothers search for Sītā, an ascetic brings a letter written by the dying Jaṭāyus in his own blood on a leaf, telling Rāma that Rāvaṇa has abducted Sītā.

omission of episode of Rāma killing Vālin from concealment (death merely reported without details, acc. to Warder, from Raghavan); a commentary on Dhanaṃjaya’s *Daśarūpa* 3.29 notes that the *Udāttarāghava* omits the killing of Vālin

major new episode after Rāvaṇa’s death where his chamberlain impersonates Nārada to inform Bharata that Sītā is returning without Rāma and a *rākṣasī* impersonates Sītā to confirm that Rāma is dead. Another *rākṣasa* impersonates Sumantra to tell Rāma that Bharata is dead but Hanumān, sent by Rāma to seek news of Bharata, is just in time to forestall his suicide and, hurrying back, that of Rāma too.

**title (and author)** *Rāmacarita* of Abhinanda

**date (and provenance)** end of 9th century (from Bengal)

**edition(s)** Abhinanda 1930: *Rāmacarita of Abhinanda,* critically ed. with an intro. by K.S. Rāmaswāmī Śāstri, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, 46 (Baroda: Oriental Institute). **download**[volume contains first 4 *sargas*]

**translation(s)**

**studies** Raghavan, Venkatarama 1934-35: “The names of Abhinanda, the author of the Rāmacarita and the extent of the Rāmacarita [Literary Notes IX]”, *ABORI* 16.1-2: 141‑42. **download**

Raghavan, Venkatarama 1985: *The Rāmāyaṇa in classical Sanskrit and Prākrit Mahākāvya literature,* Professor P.D. Gune Memorial Lectures 1977(Pune: Board of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Poona; repr. Chennai: Dr. V. Raghavan Centre for Performing Arts, 2004 and 2017): 56-74 [= ch. 5]. **own copy (2017 reprint)**

Tubb, Gary 2014: “Something new in the air: Abhinanda’s *Rāmacarita* and its ancestry”, in Bronner and others 2014: 357-94. **Bod.**

Vatsyayan, Promila 1966: *Rāmaćarita of Abhinanda (a literary and socio-cultural study)* (Ph.D. thesis, Panjab University, Chandigarh). **download**

Vatsyayan, Promila 1987: *Rāmacarita of Abhinanda: a literary and socio-cultural study* (Ranchi: Rajiv Prakashan). xvi, 279 pp. **[not on COPAC]**

**notes see** Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature,* V: 100-115 (§§ 2928-61; **photocopy**) and Raghavan 1985: 56-74 (**photocopy**); in 36*sargas,* dealing with the story from the point where R. + L. are waiting at the end of the rains for Sugrīva to fulful his promise of help up to the killing of Kumbha and Nikumbha, with an extension added by Bhīmakavi; acc. to Tubb 2014: 369 *sarga* 36 ends with a verse that seems to mark the end of Abhinanda’s work and 37-40 are probably not his work in either of the two versions known.

Tubb 2014: 368 notes that a hymn to Rāma at *LaghuYogavāsiṣṭha* 6.17.11-58 is found in almost exactly the same form at *Rāmacarita* 3199-148 but rightly argues that this is not conclusive for identity of authorship. Abhinanda probably knew the *Mokṣopāya*, acc. to Hanneder, *Studies on the Mokṣopāya* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006): 50**.**

**photocopy** of Raghavan 1972: 54-55 on Abhinanda’s identity

Tubb 2014: 388 notes that Abhinanda began his activity as a poet around 850.

On identification of Hanumān’s opponent Saramā with Durgā **see** Sarkar 2017: 191-93.

**title (and author)** *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* of Śaktibhadra

**date (and provenance)** late 9th or early 10th century (probably Kerala)

**edition(s) \*** Jones, Clifford Reis (ed.) and Venkatarama Raghavan (trans.) 1984: *The wondrous crest-jewel in performance*: text and translation of the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* of Śaktibhadra with the production manual from the tradition of Kūṭiyāṭṭam drama, ed. by Clifford Reis Jones; introd. and Sanskrit translation by V. Raghavan (Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies / Oxford University Press). **own copy**

**translation(s)** [as text]

**studies** Bansat-Boudon, Lyne 2019: “Some remarks on the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*: reflections, reflexivity, and wonder”, in Oberlin and Shulman 2019: 10-36. **download from OSO**

Gopalakrishnan, Sudha 2019: “*Aṅgulīyāṅkam* and *Mantrāṅkam*: two wondrous crest jewels of Kūṭiyāṭṭam”, in Oberlin and Shulman 2019: 3-9. **download from OSO**

Janaki, S.S. 1993-94: “Śaktibhadra’s *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* – an appreciation in the light of *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa”, IT* 19-20: 169-86. **own copy**

Johan, Virginie 2011: “Actresses on the temple stage? The epic conception and performance of women’s roles in Kūṭiyāṭṭam Rāmāyaṇa plays”, in *Between Fame and Shame: performing women—women performers,* ed. by Heidrun Brückner, Hanna M. de Bruin and Heike Moser (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz). **download**

Johan, Virginie 2019: “*Aṅgulīyāṅkam, Rāmāyaṇa-Vēda* of the Cākyārs”, in Oberlin and Shulman 2019: 187-224. **download**

Oberlin, Heike, and David Shulman (eds.) 2019: *Two Masterpieces of Kūṭiyāṭṭam: Mantrāṅkam and Aṅgulīyāṅkam* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press). **Bod.**

**notes** strongly influenced by Māyuraja’s *Udāttarāghava* acc. to Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature,* vol. 4 p.233 (§2113; **own copy**); **see also** vol. 5 pp.2-23 (§§2760-2807; **photocopied**) and Freeman 2001: 214 (in Richman 2001). The *Kūṭiyāṭṭam* performance *Aṅgulīyāṅkam* is based on the 6th act but includes further verses from previous acts, as well as from other sources.

Jones and Raghavan 1984: xviii — “. . . it is the first of the three plays forming cycle known as *Rāmāyaṇanāṭaka.* *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*, *Pratimānāṭaka* and *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* form a series of twenty-one acts which, according to traditional belief, were performed in the temple throughout the full year preceding the coronation of the kings of Cochin.”

Jones and Raghavan 1984: 3 — “From the Prologue of the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*, we learn that the poet came from South India and that he wrote a poem on the well-known romance of Udayana and Vāsavadattā called *Unmādavāsavadatta.*”

for a short description of this *Kūṭiyāṭṭam* performance tradition and its Cākyār performers **see** Jones and Raghavan 1984: xi §2 – x §1

**title (and author)** *Anargharāghava* of Murāri

**date (and provenance)** 9th-10th century

**edition(s)** Murāri 1998: *Viṣṇubhaṭṭaviracitā Anargharāghavapañcikā / The commentary of Viṣṇubhaṭṭa on the Anargharāghava of Murāri,* crit. ed. by B. R. Harinarayana Bhat, 2 vols. [vol. 1. The commentary of Viṣṇubhaṭṭa; vol. 2. Anargharāghava of Murāri as read by Viṣṇubhaṭṭa, notes, appendices], Publications du Département d'indologie, 82 (Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry). **OIL 545.58 Mur.1**   
[**see** review by Törzsök (cf. below)]

**translation(s)** Murāri 1997: *Anargharāghava. Das Schauspiel vom kostbaren Raghusproß: Einführung und Übersetzung,* tr. by Karin Steiner.Drama und Theater in Südasien, 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. **Ind Inst 5 Mur. 3**[**n.b.** reviews by Jamison (**download**) and Tieken (**download**)]

\* Murāri 2006: *Rama Beyond Price,* tr. by Judit Törzsök (Clay Sanskrit Library). New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation. **own copy**[**n.b.** review by Steiner (**download** in CSL reviews of individual volumes doc.)]

**studies** Shulman, David 2014: “Murāri’s depths”, in Bronner and others 2014: 443-90. **Bod.**

Steiner, Karin 1999a: “Valins Tod: das Anargharāghava und Seine Vorlagen I”, *IIJ* 42: 235-47. **printout**

Steiner, Karin 1999b: “Vom Epos zum Drama: Das Anargharāghava und seine Vorlagen II” *StII* 22: 167-90. **(IND) Per gen d 119**

Sternbach, Ludwik 1978: *Verses attributed to Murāri* (Lucknow: Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad). [reprinted from *Ṛtam* 8] **(IND) 5 Mur. 2**

**notes** *supposed to be from Andhra area or (less likely) Orissa, but* **n.b.**II, 102: ‘curly hair of Keralan women’.

The *Anargharāghava* seems to be drawn on by *Ullāgharāghava, Bālarāmāyaṇa* and *Hanumannāṭaka*; it has attracted a number of commentators. One of its stanzas is quoted in an inscription of 1521 A.D. (D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy,* p. 174).

Sternbach 1978: 1 — “He must have lived not later than the fourth quarter of the tenth century, for one verse of his *Anar.* was quoted in the *Daśarūpaka* of Dhanañjaya (verse 3.21), but probably lived in the middle of the ninth century already, since Ratnākara in his *Haravijaya* (38.68) refers to Murāri. He is, probably, earlier than Rājaśekhara and later than Bhavabhūti. Maṅkha (AD. 1135) in the *Śrīkaṇṭhacarita* (25.74) refers to Murāri as earlier than Rājaśekhara and it is evident from *Anar.* that Murāri knew the *Mahāvīracarita* and the *Uttararāmacarita,* the contents of the latter’s verses 6.31-32 he included in the prose passage of *Anar.* (1.6-7). Murāri mentions Māhiṣmatī as the seat of Kalacuris in Cedi-maṇḍala country; it is, therefore, possible that he lived under the patronage of some kings of this dynasty.”

p.3 — “Out of five-hundred-sixty-seven verses quoted in *Anar.*, we find as many as one-hundred-twenty-nine verses from *Anar.* quoted in anthologies.”

**see** review by Judit Törzsök of Bhat’s edn (1998) in *JAOS* 123: 431-4 (**download +** **printout** in grey box file in folder of reviews)

Steiner 1999b: 167-8 — Es | steht außer Frage, daß das AR starke Einflüsse aus den drei dramen des Bhavabhüti aufweist7 und daß das MC als unmittelbare Vorlage gedient hat.  
7 Z.B. ist der Prolog des AR vom Prolog des Mālatīmādhava beeinflußt, s. Steiner 1997.28f. [i.e. 28-29]

**see** Warder, vol. 5 (The Bold Style): 23-41 (§§ 2808-2836)

characterised by humour and statecraft/military tactics, also by deliberately difficult language (much obscure vocabulary and morphology)

Shulman 2014: 459 – “Is the *AR* an integrated text that can be studied as a whole? I believe it is, but not as a *nāṭaka;* it is, rather, a non-standard form of *mahākāvya.*”

Rāvaṇa and almost all *rākṣasas* absent from stage (violence and death reported).

features:

role of Mālyavān and Śūrpaṇakhā in directing plot

enhanced role of the Śabarī

innocence of Kaikeyī and Mantharā

?? innovations:

Jāmbavān as instigator of exile, helped by the Śabarī

enhanced role of Guha

Śunaḥśepa as disciple of Viśvāmitra

arrow pierces 7 palm trees, then Vālin, then returns to quiver: Murāri, *Anargharāghava*: Törzsök 2006: V, 218

**see** JLB + MB 2010: 56 (Singapore) for possible reproduction

**title (and author)** *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara

**date (and provenance)** beginning of 10th century

**edition(s)** Rājaśekhara 1869:Rájasekhara, *The Bálarámayana*, ed. by Pandit Govinda Deva Śástri (Benares: Medical Hall Press). **(IND) 5 Raj. 1/download**

Rājaśekhara 1884: *Balaramayana: a drama by Rajasekhara,* ed. by Jibananda Vidyasagara (Calcutta: New Valmiki Press), **download**

Rājaśekhara 1995:  *Bālarāmāyaṇam, rājaśekharaviracitaṃ mahānāṭakam,* sampādaka-samīkṣaka Bhāskarācārya Tripāṭhī (Dillī: Nāg Pabliśars). **(IND) 5 Raj. 10**

**translation(s)** Rājaśekhara 1910: *A Literal Translation of the first five acts of Rajasekhara’s Balaramayana,* by S. Venkatarama Sastri (Bangalore: Irish Press).  
 **OIL 568 Raj.S** (*photocopy of BL copy***)**

**studies** McCrea, Lawrence 2014: “The poetics of perspective in Rājaśekhara’s *Young Rāmāyaṇa*”, in *Innovations and turning points: toward a history of kāvya literature,* ed. by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, Gary Tubb (New Delhi: Oxford University Press): 415-42. **download**

**notes** **see** Warder, vol.5: 441-45 (§§ 3625-35, with some summary; **photocopy**)**.** Drama in 10 acts (741 verses), much from the point of view of secondary characters.

The*Bālarāmāyaṇa* is drawn on by Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita’s *Jānakīpariṇaya,* Jayadeva’s *Prasannarāghava,* and Subhaṭa’s *Dūtāṅgada,* while itself showing influence from Bhavabhūti’s works.

Rājaśekhara introduced some new features into Skt drama, such as puppets or motifs related to puppet theatre; in the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* a puppet of Sītā is brought on stage to entertain Rāvaṇa. He also presents a fight between Rāvaṇa and Paraśurāma. He mentions a female fish attacking the causeway but not the birth of a son to her (Sahai 1976: 25 §1).

Rājaśekhara’s earlier plays, the *Bālarāmāyaṇa,* *Bālabhārata* and *Karpūramañjarī*, were staged at Kanauj under the patronage of the Gurjara Pratīhāra Mahendrapāla. Later, when the Pratīhāras declined as a result of the raids of the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva I, Rājaśekhara seems to have gone to Tripuri in his train.

His *Bālabhārata* (of which only 2 acts are extant) shares many verses with the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* and also mentions Vālmīki at 1.12 and 1.15 (“born from an anthill” – an early reference), as well as uniquely Mahīpāla besides Mahendrapāla, perhaps all indicating a felt need to emphasise the connection ot the Gurjara-Pratīhāras with the *sūryavaṃśa* of Rāma and his descendants.

**title (and author)** *Rāvaṇārjunīya* of Bhaumaka (Bhaṭṭa Bhīma/Bhūma/Bhauma)

**date (and provenance)** pre 11th century, 13th century (?) (Valabhī)

**edition(s)** Bhaumaka 1900: *The Râvaṇârjunîya of Bhaṭṭa Bhîma,* Kāvyamālā 68, ed. by Śivadatta and K.P. Parab (Bombay: Tukârâm Jâvajî, Nirṇaya-sâgara Press). [text only]   
 **OIL 545.68 Bha + download**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** *see* Warder IV: 128-33, §§1889-98 (who thinks (§1889) his name was Bhosa)

According to some, Bhaumaka was a courtier of king Śrīdharasena (c. 600 A.D.), which would make him a contemporary of Bhaṭṭi; more probably he was a Kashmiri.

*Rāvaṇārjunīya* in 27 *sargas* telling the stories of Arjuna Kārtavīrya and Rāvaṇa, while illustrating the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (and quoted in the *Kāśikā*) in imitation of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*; Bhaumaka’s work is mentioned along with Bhaṭṭi’s as an example of a *kāvyaśāstra* by Kṣemendra (Suvṛttatilaka 3.4), so it must be earlier than 11th century. Nevertheless, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* assigns it to the 13th century (*NCC* 25: 92).

**title (and author)** *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* of Kṣemendra (also *Daśāvatāracarita*)

**date (and provenance)** 11th century (Kashmir)

**edition(s)** Shastri, Bhavadatta and Kashinath Pandurang Parab (eds) 1903: *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī of Kṣemendra,* Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 3 (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press; repr. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 1985).  
 **(IND) Sansk. 4.835/83 and 5 misc. 35/34** [1903 edn] **and download**

*Rāmāyaṇa-mañjarī of Kshemendra,* ed. by Bhavadatta Śāstrī and Kāśīnātha Pāṇdurang Parab, Krishnadas Sanskrit Series 78 (Varanasi: Krishnadas Akademy, 1986). **own copy**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Borsani-Scalabrino, Giuseppina 1959: “Il «Rāmāvatāra» di Kṣemendra”,   
*Aevum* 33.3: 189-205. [includes translation] **download**

Sūryakānta 1954: *Kṣemendra studies,* Poona Oriental Series 91 (Poona: Oriental Book Agency). **download**

**notes** cf. Raghavan, *The Rāmāyaṇa in classical Sanskrit and Prākrit Mahākāvya Literature* (Gune Mem. Lectures, 1977), Poona: Univ. of Poona, 1985: 84-106.  
 **own copy (2017 reprint)**

**see**Singaravelu 1982: 235 (**printout**) for Sītā’s birth as daughter of Janaka and Menakā *citing* Bulcke 1952: 109 **analyse**

For background on Kṣemendra *see* Warder VI: 365-6 (§§ 4875-76; **own copy**); on his *Daśāvatāracarita* at VI: 488-94 (§§ 5079-84, esp. 5083); also on a play, *Kanakajānakī,* quoted in his *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa* at VI: 428 (§ 5006).

*Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* contains 6,400 verses often reproducing actual wording of VR; the section on Rāma in themore devotional *Daśāvatāracarita* is much shorter (vv. 104-294 in the *Kāvyamālā* edn).

Banerjee 1986: 262 “Kṣemendra has shown no originality in his *Rāmāyaṇamañjari*. He, however, in his *Daśāvatāracharita* has given a new dimension to the Rāma story. He has made Rāvaṇa the main centre of attention around whom the whole story moves.” [features include Sītā as Rāvaṇa’s daughter]

Interestingly Kṣemendra does not include Śambūka’s final attainment of heaven in his *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* but does in his more devotionally oriented *Daśāvatāracarita* (Sherraden 2019: 160-65).

**title (and author)** *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva

**date (and provenance)** 11th century (Kashmir)

**edition(s)** Somadeva 1903: *Kathāsaritsāgara,* ed. by Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, 2nd edn (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press). **Ind. Inst. 5 Som 7**

**translation(s)** Tawney, C.H. (trans.) 1880: *The Kathā Sarit Sāgara, or Ocean of the Streams of Story*, 2 vols (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 3rd edn repr. 1992, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal). **own copy**

Penzer, Norman Mosley 1923-28: *The Ocean of Story, being C.H. Tawney’s translation of Somadeva’s Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, 10 vols (London: Sawyer, repr. 1968, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass). [*extensive annotations*] **Ind. Inst.**

Somadeva 1997: *Océan des rivières de contes,* éd. publiée sous la direction de Nalini Balbir (Paris: Gallimard). **OIL 544.74 Bal**

**studies** Bollée, Willem 2015: *A cultural encyclopaedia of the Kathāsaritsāgara in keywords, complementary to Norman Penzer's general index on Charles Tawney's translation,* Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis, 8 (Halle: Universitätsverlag Halle-Wittenberg). **OIL PK3741.S8.B65 BOL 2015 Ref.**

Nelson, Donald 1978: “*Bṛhatkathā* Studies: the problem of an Ur-text”, *JAS* 37.4: 663-76. **printout**

Serebryakov, I.D. 1995: “A note on the *Ramayana* in Somadeva’s *Kathasaritsagara”,* in Pollet 1995: 43-45 **OIL 544.36 Int**

Teshima, Hideki 2023: Notes on the ‘Lava-Kuśa episode’ in the *Kathāsaritsāraga*”. in Andrijanić and others 2023: 463-77. **own copy (vol.)**

**notes** typed extracts from Penzer 1923-28 in “Further Notes (verbal/general)”;   
cf. JLB 1985: 265-6.

A major literary work where narrative is foremost (not style, poetry, drama, religious / philosophical developments) in tradition of early Sanskrit narratives (*VR* stages 1-2), but cannot improve on that — summaries not needed, story so well known, not vernacular; so either introduces **allusions** that rely on prestige of *Rm* to enhance *KSS* narrative (affective, emotional appeal, similes etc.) or brief narratives with some **new / unfamiliar material.**  
Some allusions are ornamental; others, where *Rm* characters or their relatives e.g. Svayamprabhā and her sister Somaprabhā, or Vibhīṣaṇa and Mandodarī, appear in the narrative, enable the author to locate his undated tales in the remote mythic past, endowing them with a sense of dignity, awe, mystery or wonder.

Somedeva’s *Rm* references, overt or not, locate his series of *Märchen* in mythic time, imparting greater depth to these superficial wonder-tales. Only rarely are characters from MBh or other individual mythic characters used as role-models.

Since the story of Rāma is included within the story of Vegavatī both in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* and in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (*Rāmāyaṇavṛttānta*, 107.12–26 **[= Tawney 1880: II, 441-42; cf. also Vegavatī’s husband is *Naravāhanadatta*]**), there is some likelihood that this point of attachment is owed to their source, the *Bṛhatkathā*; Kṣemendra’s *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* includes a *Rāmākhyāyikā*.

Text numbers in books and chapters as in Tawney (where the first number indicates the *lambaka* and the second the *taraṅga,* numbered from the beginning of the work), with page refs to his trans. if necessary  
 [**e.g.**] Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* IX, 51: Tawney 1880: I, 486-88

***Rm*  telling with variations:** *exemplum: practise patience*:  
couple distressed at having to spend one night apart before wedding: Rāma and Sītā spent a long time apartSomadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* IX, 51: Tawney 1880: I, 486-88  
 **analysed**

***Rm* summaries:** Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 102: Tawney 1880: II, 390 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*; *see below*] *elevates tale; gives sense of mystery and danger* **analysed**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XIV, 107: Tawney 1880: II, 441-42 *brief account to Naravāhanadatta when living near Pampā, few details, appropriate to Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa setting* [*see below*] **analysed**

Ahalyā narrative alluding to future redemption by Rāma without narrating it: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 17.143): Tawney 1880: I, 122-23

**New tales built around *Rm* characters**:

**Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī**

Book XII in general is a loose *Rm* analogue:

*King of Ayodhyā exiles his son to forest unjustly, making his half-brother his successor; hero undergoes many hardships, fights great battle, wins bride, sends for parents before will wed. Father has learned he has acted unjustly, is heartbroken, retires to Nandigrāma to practise asceticism in Śiva temple. Messenger finds Ayodhyā disconsolate as it was for absence of Rāma. Interspersed with many in-tales, often with Rm reminiscences. Concluding episode emphasises Rm echoes of whole frame story (*Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 103: Tawney 1880: II, 402)*.*

*Affiliation Śaiva.*

*Amalgamates and re-orders exile by Daśaratha, Bharata’s withdrawal to Nandigrāma, marriages in Mithilā.*

Overt allusions on pp. II, 175; 215-30 (esp. analogue p.229); 251; 259; 297; 390; 402; 409   
[*see notes*]

**Tale of Naravāhanadatta and Vegavatī**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XIV, 105: Tawney 1880: II, 427-30 and sporadically to p.456:

*Vegavatī’s wicked brother Mānasavega carries off Naravāhana’s wife Madanamanchukā, to Madanamanchukā’s distress and encloses her in garden, guarded;*

*Madanamanchukā repels Mānasavega’s advances. Mānasavega cannot force her because of curse threatening death for violence against women. Vegavatī tricks Naravāhana into marriage, takes him to seek Madanamanchukā. Vegavatī overcomes her brother by magic, deserts Naravāhana. Naravāhana has further unconnected adventures. At last (p.434) told that Madanamanchukā has been seen dirty, emaciated and distressed in garden, single plait, talking of Naravāhana, surrounded by female guards; speaker promises to take Naravāhana there. Takes him, tricking him into marriage [another of his many] on the way, to reunion with Madanamanchukā, who demands Naravāhana kill Mānasavega. Madanamanchukā tells her story: Śiva had reproached Mānasavega (p.437); curse narrated (after attempting to abduct beautiful hermit maiden, her relations cursed his head to fly into 1000 pieces if he try to force another’s wife, p.438); Madanamanchukā comforted by Mānasavega’s mother Pṛthividevī. Naravāhana captured, fights [like Hanumān in Sundarakāṇḍa], taken before court; fight breaks out, Śiva intervenes, takes Naravāhana’s side, takes him back to Ṛṣyamūka (p.440), leaving Madanamanchukā still in captivity. Naravāhana hears story of Rāma while living on forest fare near Pampā. Naravāhana is taken back home, Vegavatī returns. Battle. Mānasavega pretends to captive Madanamanchukā that Naravāhana has been killed, Madanamanchukā disbelieves and rejects Mānasavega’s advance (p.447). Another battle; Naravāhana kills Mānasavega and many others, recovers Madanamanchukā.*

*Vegavatī shares role of Śūrpaṇakhā and Vibhīṣaṇa (wooer and ally)*

**Tale of trickster Lohajangha:**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* II, 12: Tawney 1880: I, 77-79+82: *burlesque element; Rāma’s defeat of rākṣasas; Vibhīṣaṇa as king of Laṅkā; creation of Laṅkā*

**Svayamprabhā and subterranean palace**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* VI, 29: Tawney 1880: I, 257, 259-60:  *introduces wonder-motif into featureless narrative*

**Vibhīṣaṇa gives good advice to Maya**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* VIII, 45: Tawney 1880: I, 421: *appeal to authority [limited respect; hero is Śiva’s protégé and prospers despite rejecting advice]; Vibhīṣaṇa, accompanied by wife Mandodarī, gives good advice to father-in-law Maya not to risk defeat by making war on gods; advice [as usual!] rejected;  
 war eventually ended by antagonists contracting friendship.*

**Maidens play with golden deer**

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XVIII, 120, 121, 122: Tawney 1880: II, 569, 583-85, 586-87:

*Anangadeva sees 2 maidens playing with bejewelled, golden dancing deer; deer was created as toy for Indra’s son Jayanta, captured by Indrajit, taken to Laṅkā; after Rāvaṇa and Indrajit killed by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to* ***avenge abduction of Sītā****, deer remains in Vibhīṣaṇa’s palace until Vibhīṣaṇa gives it as present to the visiting narrator* [*a yakṣiṇī, wife of Kuvera’s younger brother*]; *narrator presents maidens and deer to Anangadeva’s sovereign, Vikramāditya.*

*Rm echoes reinforce the parallels between Vikramāditya and Rāma, elevating status of Vikramāditya.*

**New tales reminiscent of *Rm* episodes**:

Lovesick *vidyādhara* resolves not to carry off his beloved by force as he has been cursed to die if he does so; decides instead to propitiate Śiva by asceticism; Śiva advises him to impersonate her true love, the hero: *hackneyed plot device* Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* VI, 30: Tawney 1880: I, 267

Naravāhanadatta dreams father Udayana is being dragged away towards the south by a black female [= *is dead*]: *common trope?*

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XVI, 111: Tawney 1880: I1, 482

**Brief allusions, similes etc**. [*not included on analyses*]:

Rāma, because he was a god, was strong enough to endure pain of separation from wife for the sake of killing Rāvaṇa; human hero will not be strong enough to endure separation from his wife: *embellishment of romantic narrative*

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 15: Tawney 1880: I, 105

heroine separated from husband draws comfort from mural paintings of Rāma and Sītā: *embellishment of romantic narrative* Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 16: Tawney 1880: I, 110

intrepid hero crosses ocean like Hanumān did for Rāma: *embellishment of romantic narrative*  Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 18: Tawney 1880: I, 140

king engages in austerities to propitiate Śiva, as Rāma and *vānaras* did to build causeway: *enhances heroic narrative subordination of Rāma to Śiva?*  Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 19: Tawney 1880: I, 145

hero destroys *mlecchas* as Rāma at head of *vānara* army destroyed *rākṣasas*: *enhances heroic narrative*  Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* III, 19: Tawney 1880: I, 151

distressed *rākṣasī* comforted by Śiva telling her she is of the race of Khara and Dūṣaṇa [*Rāvaṇa not mentioned!*];   
virtuous heroine, persecuted by mother-in-law, reunited by her own efforts and endurance with absent husband, as Sītā shared hardships with Rāma: *enhance romantic narrative* Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* VI, 29: Tawney 1880: I, 264; 266

king deliberates whether to allow son to marry girl born to virtuous but apparently unchaste woman: Rāma repudiated chaste Sītā because of slander; allows marriage: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* VI, 34: Tawney 1880: I, 315

Daśaratha as type of man unhappy at lack of son; allusion to reciter of *Rāmāyaṇa*: *adds gravitas to narrative:*

*king performs tapas, is granted son by Kārtikeya but cursed to be separated from queen and son for 1 year; Śaiva setting with vague plot similarities to Bāla and Uttara kāṇḍas*  Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* IX, 55: Tawney 1880: I, 543-44

effect of unjustified slander: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 86: Tawney 1880: II, 285 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*; *one of* ’25 Tales’ of Vampire]  *Minister’s reputation falsely damaged because he looks after kingdom for dissipated king; even Rāma suffered similarly adds gravitas to light-weight narrative*

*rāmrājya*: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 72: Tawney 1880: II, 175 *adds gravitas* *hero given ring with power of averting natural calamities rules his kingdom so that it is as free from sickness and famine as was Rama’s*

Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 103: Tawney 1880: II, 409

returning hero delights mother, as Rāma did Kausalyā: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 74: Tawney 1880: II, 229 cf. II, 215-30 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*] *hero returns to delight of mother after long, undeserved exile*

king’s glorious reign eclipses even Rāma’s: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 78: Tawney 1880: II, 251 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*] *king’s splendour greater even than Rāma’s, glorifies earth / Earth; Earth bewails his destined death; servant sacrifices self and family to avert king’s death, so king prepared to sacrifice self for servant*

fight between hero and *rākṣasa* resembles that between Rāma and Rāvaṇa: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 79: Tawney 1880: II, 259 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*; *one of* ’25 Tales’ of Vampire] *3 human suitors unite their skills to rescue girl abducted by rākṣasa; simile appropriate*

Ayodhyā is former home of Viṣṇu when incarnate as Rāma: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XII, 88: Tawney 1880: II, 297 [*in-tale in Story of Mṛgāṅkadatta and Śaśāṅkavatī*; *one of* ’25 Tales’ of Vampire] *elevates tale*

woman carried off as Sītā by Rāvaṇa: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XIV, 105: Tawney 1880: II, 428 [*part of story of Naravāhana and Vegavatī*] *abductor cannot force her because of curse threatening death for violence against women.*

*Rm* names in telling of *Vessantarajātaka*: Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XVI, 113: Tawney 1880: II, 499-503

[*Rm names give children greater status than in VJ*]

*Prince Tārāvaloka, who never refuses a request, and wife Mādrī have twin sons*

*named Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa; parents retire to forest taking twins with them.*

*Tārāvaloka gives boys away to brāman who beats them.*

*Indra tests Tārāvaloka by asking for Mādrī, then forbids Tārāvaloka to give her away;*

*king buys grandsons from brāhman, restores them to Tārāvaloka*

*who is rewarded for his generosity.*

Rāma endured separation and was reunited with wife:

*Rāma’s reunion with Sītā used as example to encourage Naravāhanadatta after abduction of Madanamanchukā* Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XVII, 114: Tawney 1880: II, 506

hero’s skill with bow causes witnesses to pay less attention to stories of Rāma: *Prince Vikramāditya with 3 companions* (*a gaṇa dispatched by Śiva at request of gods to be born as human to combat troublesome asuras reborn as mlecchas*) *grows up to universal admiration* *parallel* *with Rm plot made more overt* Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* XVIII, 120: Tawney 1880: II, 566

**Prominence of Vibhīṣaṇa**

Śiva revered; Viṣṇu rarely mentioned, once presented with less respect. Rāma is a figure of narrative, not devotion; human, not divine, although *avatāra* status sometimes pre-supposed.

Many brief allusions, similes etc.:

Tawney I, 105

Tawney I, 110

Tawney I, 110

Tawney I, 140

Tawney I, 145

Tawney I, 151

Tawney I, 266

Tawney I, 315

Tawney II, 175

Tawney II, 229

Tawney II, 251

Tawney II, 259

Tawney II, 285

Tawney II, 297

Tawney II, 409

Tawney II, 428

Tawney II, 566

*rāmarājya* (from Serebryakov): 72.92, 78.7, 103.240

**title (and author)** *Campūrāmāyaṇa* ascribed to Bhoja (*Yuddhakāṇḍa* by Lakṣmaṇasūri)

**date (and provenance)** 11th century (?)

**edition(s)** Bhattacaryya, Jīvanandavidyāsagara (ed.) 1878: *Campūrāmāyaṇam bhojanṛpatinā viracitam,* jīvanandavidyāsagara bhaṭṭācāryyeṇa saṃskṛta prakāśitam (Kalikatā: Sarasvatī Yantre). **(IND) 5 Bhoja. Campu. 1 / download**

Misra, Ramacandra (ed.) 1956: *Śrībhojarājasārvabhaumaviracitaṃ Campūrāmāyaṇam,* ‘Prakāśa’ saṃskṛta-hindīṭīkopetam, ṭikākāraḥ Śrīrāmacandramiśraḥ, Vidyābhavana saṃskṛta granthamālā 26 (Vārāṇasī: Caukhambhā Vidyābhavan). **OIL 545.68 Bho.1**[*Hindi intro. has no useful info*] [2nd edn, 1971, in BL]

Paṇaśīkara, Vāsudeva Śarma 1917: *śrībhojarājasārvabhaumaviracitaṃ campūrāmāyaṇam,* lakṣmaṇasūriviracitaṃ yuddhakāṇḍam, rāmacandrabudhendraviracitayā vyākhyayā sametam, paṇaśīkaropāhvavidvadvaralakṣmaṇaṣaśarmatanujanuṣā vāsudevaśarmaṇā saṃskṛtam, 5th edn (Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press). **download**[10th edn (Mumbai: Nirṇayasāgara, 1956) at **OIL 545.68 Bho.2 (also Ind. Inst.)**]

**translation(s)** [one listed at Saikia 2004: 24 but not found on COPAC or IndCat]

**studies** Słuszkiewicz, Eugeniusz 1925: “Notes sur le Campūrāmāyaṇa de Bhoja”, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 3: 107-132. **scan**

Saikia, Indira 2004: *The epic hero in campū kāvya: a study of the Campūrāmāyaṇa* (Kolkata: Punthi Pustak). **own copy**

**notes** Raghavan 1985: 75-83 (**photocopy**) has the best summary (analysed). Saikia 2004 has a summary of the plot at pp. 17-20, some comparison with the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa at pp. 65-81, and notes on characters at pp. 89-107; cf. also Lienhard 1984: 270.

Słuszkiewicz 1925: 107 – “Il serait intéressant, sans doute, de savoir laquelle des trois recensions du *Rāmāyaṇa* a servi de source à Bhōja dans la composition de son *Campūrāmāyaṇa.* M. Jacobi a été le premier à mettre cette question su le tapis.1) Il a fait remarquer que Bhōja ne s’arrête guère à décrire le séjour de Bharata chez son oncle maternel, ce qui, à son avis, déterminerait la provenance du *Campūrāmāyaṇa*: car la recension Bombayenne seule raconte ce fait-là tout au long, tandis que les deux autres ne font que le mentionner brièvement. Or, l’assertion que le savant allemand n’a fait que suppose, se laisse établir.  
 Nour n’avons qu’à rapprocher les débuts et les fins des livres du *Rāmāyaṇa* at les débuts et les fins des livres du *Campūrāmāyaṇa,*2) pour pouvoir supposer avec quelque certitude que c’est dans la recension Bombayenne que Bhōja puisa. En voici les détails, par ordre de succession:3)” [pp. 108-27 contain parallel columns of evidence]  
1) Voyez son *Das Ramayana,* p. 15.  
2) Éd. Vâsudeva Laxmaṇ Shâstrî Pansîkar2, Bombay (NSP) 1907.  
3) Nous avons omis de début du livre I et la fin du livre V (Bhōja n’a achevé que cinq livres, le sixième a été ajouté par un autre) – chose don nous n’avons pas à nous justifier.

Słuszkiewicz 1925: 127 – “Bhōja n’a pu ce défendre, en écrivain classique, de subir l’influence de tel auteur qui avait écrit avant lui. C’est un fait qui ne saurait étonner personne. Il en est de cela comme de tout d’autres cas, pas seulement dans la littérature sanscrite. J’ai réussi à determiner l’influence du *Raghuvaṁśa* de Kālidāsa sur l’auteur du *Campūrāmāyaṇa.* En voici les preuves.” [pp. 128-32 have parallel columns of evidence]

Besides the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* by Lakṣmaṇasūri (of unknown date), there is a substantially later continuation, the *Uttararāmacampū* (or *Uttararāmavṛttacampū*) by Vyaṅkaṭa Kavi, who is to be identified with Veṅkaṭādhvarin, author of the *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū* acc. to Gode 1933-34. Gode notes (p. 175): “we may safely infer that the work *Uttararāmacampū* was composed about the beginning of the second quarter of the 17th century or roughly between A.D. 1670 and 1640.” There is also a much later Yuddhakāṇḍa by the 17th-century author, Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita (**download**placed with Bhoja’s *CR*)

Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature* VI: 175-76 —  
**4537.** The *Rāmāyaṇacampū* is often supposed to be Bhoja’s work, though its colophons ascribe it to an unidentified Vidarbharāja. Viśveśvara (late +14 in Āndhra) in his *Camatkāracandrikā* (III.52) refers to the *campū* as *Bhojarāmāyaṇa.* Lakṣmaṇa in adding a *Yuddhakāṇḍa* to the unfinished *campū* refers to the author as Bhoja. It has been conjectured that Bhoja might have conquered Vidarbha, in Mahārāṣṭra directly South of his known realms, and then taken the title Vidarbharāja. Nevertheless the colophons of all his known works uniformly name the author as Bhojadeva and give him the imperial title *mahārājādhirāja.* A deviation from this seems inexplicable. What appears decisive is the rather uninteresting style of the *campū,* paraphrasing the story without any originality and insistently alliterative as almost the only **|** ornament, generally spoiling the *rasa.*

“Lakṣmaṇasūri describes Laṇkā [sic] as Siṁhala in the Yuddhakāṇḍa of the *Campūrāmāyaṇa.”* Saikia 2004: 158 (giving ref. in fn. as *CR* Yuddhakāṇḍa, p. 478)

Besides the work ascribed to Bhoja, the NCC lists works entitled *Rāmāyaṇacampū* by Kṛṣṇamācārya, Govindarāja, Ghanaśyāma, Bālamukunda Dīkṣita, Rāghava, Rāmānujācārya (son of Śaraṇammācārya), Śivarāmasūri (of Kauṇḍinyagotra), Śrīśailācārya [= *Uttararāmāyaṇa(campū)* of Nallān Cakravartin] and Sundaravalli; cf. Raghavan 2009: 175 (“The Rāmāyaṇa Campū of Śivarāma Sūri”) noting a *Rāmāyaṇa Campū / Śivarāma Campū* by Śivarāma Śāstrin/Śivarāma Suri. NCC vol. 25 also lists texts called *Rāmāyaṇottaracampū* by Nallān Cakravartin (in Mysore catalogues), by a Nambūdri of Kumāranallūr, by Veṅkaṭakṛṣṇa Sūri (continuing Bhoja’s work) and by (Vātsya) Rāghavācārya, son of Veṅkaṭārya.

**title (and author)** *Hanumannāṭaka* or *Mahānāṭaka*

**date (and provenance)** 11th century (?) or later

**edition(s)** Vidyāsāgar, Jīvānanda (ed.) 1890: *Mahānāṭakam mahakavi śrīlahanūmatā viracitam, ... śrījīvānandavidyasāgarabhaṭṭācāryeṇa viracitayā vyākhyayā samalaṅkṛtam, dvitīya­saṃskaraṇam* (Kalikātā: Nārāyaṇa Yantra). **EUL .89122 Han; download**

Mishra, Jagdish (ed.) 1967: *Hanumannāṭakam,* with the 'Vibhā' Sanskrit and Hindī commentaries (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).  
 **(IND) Sansk. ser. B 9/271** (Weston David ref.)

**translation(s)** Bahadur, Kalikrishna 1840: *Mahá-nátaka: a dramatic history of King Ráma,* ed. and trans. by Mahá-Rája Kálí-Krishna Bahádur, 2 vols (Calcutta: N. Robertson and Co.). [trans. in vol.1, text in vol.2] **(IND) 5 Han. 1/Sansk. 4.94; download; analysed**

**studies** De, Sushil Kumar 1931: “The problem of the Mahānāṭaka”, *IHQ* 7: 537-627 and 629-34 [709-23]. **download (vol.)**

Esteller, Adolf 1937: *Die älteste Rezension des “Mahānāṭakam”: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des indischen Bühnen- und Schattenspiels und der Rāmasage,* Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 21, 7 (Leipzig: Deutsche morgenländische Gesellschaft).  
 **OIL 542.5 Est; pp. 1-7, 27-52, 122-31 and 183-96 photocopied**[**n.b.** review by T. Burrow in *JRAS* 1940: 217-19 (**download**)]

Pandya, Vijay 2001: “*Hanumannāṭakam*: date and place of its origin”, *Anusaṃdhāna* 18: 46-54  
 **photocopy**

Satyavrat 1991: “Observations on Hanumannāṭaka”, *JGJKSV* 47: 15-30. **photocopy**

**notes** The version called the *Hanumannāṭaka* is in 14 acts (548 verses, half in *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre) and redacted by Dāmodara Miśra. The *Hanumannāṭaka* claims in its final verses to be fragments of an enormous *Rāmāyaṇa* composed by Hanumān himself but then thrown into the sea (to avoid casting Vālmīki’s version into the shade), recovered by king Bhoja and edited by his courtier Dāmodara Miśra (*HN* 14.96). A summary of this version in H.H. Wilson: *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus,* 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: Parbury, Allen, and Co., 1835):II, 363-73.

The version usually called the *Mahānāṭaka* is in 9 acts, arranged by Madhusūdana; Bahadur’s edn contains 613 verses. Bahadur in his introduction notes that he collated “a dozen manuscript copies both ancient and modern, and a printed copy in the Bengālī character ... to present the reader with a correct edition of the work in *Dēvanāgara,* and with a translation in every respect faithful to the original, except in the omission of a few passages which would appear exceptionable to modern taste and refinement.”

In addition, there is what S.K. De termed the Textus Simplicior, preserved in eight manuscripts in Dacca (De 1931). There is clear evidence that Dāmodara’s recension is the oldest and Madhusūdana’s is derived from it, aiming to improve the work by bringing it closer to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and to then current views of Rāma’s divinity, while De’s Textus Simplicior is in fact a secondary reworking of Madhusūdana’s version (Esteller 1937).

Many verses are taken from Bhavabhūti, Rājaśekhara and Murāri, some are shared with Jayadeva’s *Prasannarāghava* (the direction of borrowing is uncertain). Brief summary at Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 271 (**download**) + brief refs in Lutgendorf, *Hanuman’s Tale,* pp. 178 and 210-11.

Sītā falls in love with Rāma when she sees him at the suitor contest (so Sahai 1976: 12 n.6). Lakṣmaṇa draws circle round hut (*Hanumannāṭaka* 3.59; so Sahai 1976: 14 §3); for this and other details of plot see Satyavrat 1991. Piercing of seven *tālas* includes the snake, acc. to Banerjee 1986: 27 (**photocopied**)

source for Sūrdās (**see** Aklujkar, Vidyut 1991: “Battle as Banquet: A Metaphor in Sūradāsa”, *JAOS* 111: 353-361) and also, it seems, for Subhaṭa’s *Dūtāṅgada, Adhyātma Rām.,* Kṛttibās(?), Tulsīdās and Mukteśvara’s Marāṭhī version.

Aklujkar 1995: 111 — In the *Hanumannāṭaka*, (9-11th century), Vālin's censure is taken more seriously by Rāma. Rāma in the HN admits his fault and promises Vālin that in Dvāpara Vālin will be born as the hunter who will kill Kṛṣṇa and thus justice will be done. [*HN* 5: 57] The Ā. R. echoes the solution of the HN. and elaborates on it in Sārakāṇḍa sarga 8.

*Mahānāṭaka* and *Hanumannāṭaka* (MB — notes from Wilson’s summary):

Salacious.

Occasional allusions to *Uttara*, but no narrative in either.

Few material differences between 9-Act and 14-Act versions.

*HN*, according to Wilson 1835, has many narrative/descriptive/lyrical passages without on-stage action. [*e.g. fire ordeal. It’s a play!!!*]

Most notable innovation is that Aṅgada is throughout motivated by hostility to Rāma; after return to Ayodhyā challenges Rāma to fight to avenge Vālin, restrained by heavenly voice assuring him that Vālin will be reborn as the hunter who kills Kṛṣṇa (Wilson 1835: II, 366, 372).

**title (and author)**  *Kundamālā* of Dhīranāga / Vīranāga (or Diṅnāga)

**date (and provenance)** before 12 century (4th-6th acc. to K.K. Dutta in edn)

**edition(s)** *Kundamālā of Diṅnāga,* ed. by Kali Kumar Dutta (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series 28), Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1964. **OIL 548.77 Kun**

*Kundamālā of Diṅnāga,* ed. with a Sanskrit commentary by J. L. Shastri, and trans. into English with a critical introduction by Saran Dass Bhanot and Veda Vyas (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983, 3rd edn [1st edn – Lahore: Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, 1932]). [*summary of plot on pp. XII-XVIII*] **OIL 545.58 Din.2**

**translation(s) \*** *The Jasmine garland ...,* trans. into English by A.C. Woolner (Punjab University Oriental Publications,27)**.**  London: Oxford University Press, 1935.  
 **Ind Inst 5 Dhir.Km. 2 / OIL 545.58 Din.1**

Shastri edn (above) has English translation on pp. 163-318.

**studies** Dezső, Csaba 2007: “A parallel edition of the Nepalese and South Indian recensions of the first act of the Kundamālā”, *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 3: 9-24 and 4: 6-18. **printout + download**

Mirashi, V.V. 1969: “The author and the date of the Kundamālā”, in *Dr Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume,* ed. by B.P. Sinha and others (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office): 34-41. **download (vol.)**

Mirashi, V.V. 1974: *Bhavabhūti: his date, life, and works* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).  
[*pp. 284-305 scanned and printed*] **OIL 545.56 Mir**

Mirashi, V.V. 1975: “The author and the date of the Kundamālā – some objections critically examined”, in V.V.M., *Literary and historical studies in Indology* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass): 54-60. **BL / SOAS  
cf.** Mirashi, V.V. 1974: “The Author and the Date of the Kundamālā” in Mirashi 1974: 284-305. **photocopy**

Sankalia, H. D. 1965-66: “Kundamālā and Uttararāmacarita”, *JOIB* 15: 322-34.

Thomas, F.W. 1924: “The Kundamala of Dignaga Acarya”, *JRAS* 1924: 261. **download**

Woolner, A.C. 1933-34: “The date of the Kundamālā”, *ABORI* 15: 236-39. **download**

**notes**  on author’s name see Burrow’s review of Dutta’s edn in *JRAS* 1965: 77-78 (**download**) and Loman’s in *JAOS* 86: 220-22 (**download**); cf. also Pollock 1995: 153 fn.1 (**own copy**) for him as king of Anūpa

Drama in 6 acts dealing with events of *Uttarakāṇḍa* loosely following *VR*; episodes expanded, new material introduced to bring out the emotional implications; happy ending. It begins where Lakṣmaṇa takes Sītā into banishment and ends with the consecration of Kuśa and Lava as Rāma’s heirs. It is modelled to some extent on the *Uttararāmacarita*, taking its name from its distinctive feature, the use of a jasmine garland as a recognition token; however, Datta (edn 1964), naming its author as Diṅnāga, assigns it to some time between the 4th and 6th centuries and therefore regards the *URC* as borrowing from it, in which he is followed by Sankalia (1965-66).

[from Woolner’s intro. (pp. v-xiv)] Quotations of the work are traced back only as far as 11th century (apart from one doubtful instance in Vallabhadeva’s *Subhāṣitāvalī*) and it seems later than Bhavabhūti’s *URC.*

Thomas 1924: “It is worth while to point to one touch which is suggestive of a Ceylonese authorship. This is the expression *jyotsnānirmoka* “slough of moonlight” (resting on the ground). I am not acquainted with this idea of the moonlight patches (on roofs, etc..) as comparable to a snake's (white) cast-off skin, except in verse 4 of the *Jānakī-harana* of the Ceylonese poot Kumāra-dāsa. Or is it known in south India, e.g. in Tamil literature?”

Sītā in a dialogue with her **friend** Vedavatī reveals her sorrow (Act 2).

As Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are beside the Godāvarī, they see a jasmine garland washed up; its skilful arrangement reminds Rāma of Sītā’s skill (Act 3).

Tilottamā takes Sītā’s form to test Rāma’s feelings. Episode where Sītā is (largely) invisible to Rāma, who sees only her reflection or her dress. Jester (*vidūṣaka*) tells him of Tilottamā’s plans, leaving him confused. (Act 4)

In Act 5 Vālmīki’s two pupils are revealed as Rāma’s sons. In Act 6 they recite the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Sītā invokes Earth who proclaims her innocence and Rāma takes her back.

**title (and author)** *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin

**date (and provenance)** mid 12th century (Pāla court in Bengal/Bihar)

**edition(s)** Sandhyākaranandin 1939: *The Rāmacaritaṃ of Sandhyākaranandin,* ed, with Sanskrit commentaries and English trans. by R.C. Majumdar, Radhagovinda Basak and Nanigopal Banerji (Rajshahi: Varendra Research Museum).  
 **(IND) Sansk. ser. E 8 (5) / download; analysed**

Brocquet, Sylvain (ed. and trans.) 2010: *La geste de Rāma: poème à double sens de Sandhyākaranandin (introduction, texte, traduction, analyses),* Collection Indologie 110 (Pondichéry: IFP / Paris: EFEO). **own copy**[review by Knutson in *JAOS* 131 (2011): 131-33 - **download**]

**translation(s)** *see above*

**studies**

**notes n.b.** typed extract from S.K. De, “Bengal’s Contribution to Sanskrit Literature” **and** handwritten notes on plot (4 pages) in Eternal Rāma box file.

*śleṣakāvya* telling simultaneously story of Rāma Dāśarathi and Rāmapāla of Pāla dynasty (accession c. 1072); very brief allusions, not narrative; relies on reader’s knowledge; no mention of Daśaratha’s role in exiling Rāma.

[from JLB Ind. Civ. lecture notes] An important source for Rāmapāla’s reign is Sandhyākaranandin’s *Rāmacarita,* which by constant play on words (*śleṣa*) and splitting up of word-units in different ways – sustained throughout in its 215 *āryā* and some other *gaṇacchandas* verses (of which 195 survive, in four chapters) – tells simultaneously the story of Rāma of Ayodhyā and Rāmapāla of Bengal, a literary *tour de force* but of limited merit as poetry.]

Very brief allusions, not narrative; relies on reader’s knowledge [**n.b.** *śleṣa*]

No mention of Daśaratha’s role in exiling Rāma

Brocquet 2010 p. 19: “L’unique manuscrit du *Rāmacarita* est accompagné d’un autre manuscrit comportant un commentaire qui glose le poème, strophe par strophe jusqu’à la strophe 35 du chapitre II: il couvre donc environ 40% de l’ensemble.”  
[though roughly contemporary with the base text, its author is not the same].

from p. 26: Chapter 4 covers the *Uttarakāṇḍa* in its first 10 verses but then continues beyond with the suicides of Bharata (11) and Śatrughna (12), Kuśa succeding to the throne of Ayodhyā (13-15), praise of his ally Candraketu (16-21), marriage with KumudvatI (22) and alliance with a great king (23); it ends with a long panegyric on Kuśa (24-48), including Viṣṇu revealing himself to Kuśa (42-48). Cf. *Raghuvaṃśa* 16.

**other śleṣakāvyas:***Rāghavapāṇḍavīyas* by Dhanaṃjaya (a Digambara Jain, 1st half of 12th century; under Jain *Rāmāyaṇas*) and Kavirāja (**see** separate entry), a *Rāghavayādavīya* in 30 verses by Veṅkaṭādhvarin (1st half of 17th century; **see** separate entry),a *Rāghavanaiṣadhīya* of Haradatta Sūri, son of Jayaśaṅkara of the Gārgya gotra (not before 17th century; Kāvyamālā edn **download**), the *Kośalabhosalīya* (in 6 cantos) of Śeṣācalakavi, which deals with the story of Rāma and Shahji, the *Śabdārthacintāmaṇi* (Rāmāyaṇa when read left to right and Mahābhārata when reversed) and the *Rāghavapāṇḍavayādavīya* or *kathātrayī* of Cidambarakavi (17th century; *Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*). Similar is the palindromic *Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya* by Sūryadāsa (also known as Daivajña Sūrya (mid to late 16th century), on which **see** Lienhard 1984: 148 and Minkowski, Christopher 2004a: “On Sūryadāsa and the invention of bidirectional poetry (*vilomakāvya*)”, *JAOS* 124.2: 325-33 (**download**).

**title (and author)** *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* of Mādhavabhaṭṭa Kavirāja

**date (and provenance)** end of C12 (fl. 1182-97) acc. to K.B. Pathak (*JBBRAS*22: 11ff.) composed between 1236 and 1307 acc. to Venkatasubbiah   
 (in Kamath, Suryanath U. 1980: *A concise history of Karnataka*) composed c. 1175 acc. to Brocquet 2013 and 2014

**edition(s)** Kavirāja 1897: *The Râghavapândavîya of Kavirâja, with the commentary of Śaśadhara,* ed. by Śivadatta and Kâśînâth Pâṇḍurang Parab,Kāvyamālā 62 (Bombay: Tukârâm Jâvajî). **(IND) 5 misc. 35/22 / Sansk. 4.835/62**

Kavirāja 1965: *Kavirājapaṇḍitaviracitaṃ rāghavapāṇḍavīyaṃ,* subodhinī-saralā-Saṃskr̥ta-Hindī-vyākhyopetam ed. by Damodar Jha, Vidyābhavan Sanskrit Granthamala 128 (Vārāṇasī: Caukhambā Vidyābhavana). **OIL 545.68 Kav**

**translation(s)** of canto 6 in Brough 1951

**studies** Brocquet, S. 2013: “ La fabrique du double sens dans la poésie sanskrite: l’exemple du Rāghavapāṇḍavīya de Kavirāja”, *BEI* 31: 13-70. **digital copy from author**

Brocquet, Sylvain 2014: “Dialogisme du double sens: l’exemple du *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* de Kavirāja”, *Études Romanes de Brno* 35.2: 119-43. **digital copy from author**

Brocquet, Sylvain 2016: *L’Histoire de Rāghava et des Pāṇḍava de Kavirāja: un exemple de poésie sanskrite à double sens,* in *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* 160e année, N. 2: 1075-112. **download**

Bronner, Y.D. 1999: *Poetry at its extreme: the theory and practice of bitextual poetry (śleṣa) in South Asia* (PhD thesis, University of Chicago).

Bronner, Yigal 2010: *Extreme poetry : the South Asian movement of simultaneous narration* (New York: Columbia University Press). [**see** pp. 122-54] **PK2916.B72 BRO 2010**

**notes** a *śleṣakāvya* in 13 cantoscommented on by Warder vol.VII: 418-20 (§§ 6454-59; **photocopied**); extract translated in Brough, *Selections from classical Sanskrit Literature*; the second sustained attempt (following Dhanaṃjaya’s) at such a *śleṣakāvya* on the narratives of the two epics; fuller discussion (with plot details) in Bronner 2010: 140-54 (**scanned**); summary of *sarga* 7 at Brocquet 2013: [17-18]; for the *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya* by Dhanaṃjaya, also called Hemasena and Śrutakīrti (in 18 sections, c. 800 A.D.) **see** under Jain Rāmāyaṇas

Brocquet 2013: “Son auteur est Kavirāja, un poète protégé par le roi Kāmadeva de la dynastie des Kadamba, et l’on peut dater sa composition en 1175. Il comporte treize chapitres (*sarga*) qui rassemblent 770 strophes composées dans différents types de vers, majoritairement des *upajāti.*”

**Depuis début 2012, Sylvain Brocquet a entrepris de traduire le *Rāghavapāṇḍavīya*, un poème du XII° siècle** qui résume simultanément, selon le même procédé narratif que celui de la *Geste de Rāma*, les deux épopées du *Rāmāyaṇa* et du *Mahābhārata*, et qui n’a jamais été traduit.  
 [from website of Centre Paul-Albert Février, Université d’Aix-Marseille]

**title (and author)** *Prasannarāghava* of Jayadeva

**date (and provenance)** c. 1200 A.D.

**edition(s)** Jayadeva 1922: *The Prasannarâghava of Jayadeva,* ed. by Vâsudeva Laxmaṇ Shâstrî Paṇsîkar (Bombay: Nirnayasagara Press). **photocopy + download**

Jayadeva 1956: *Prasannarāghava of Mahākavi Śrī Jayadeva,* with the Chandrakalā Sanskrit and Hindi commentaries, ed. by Acharya Sesharaj Sarma Regmi, Vidyābhavana Saṃskṛta Granthamālā, 20 (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan). **OIL 545.8 Jay; scan**

Jayadeva 2008: *mahākavijayadevaviracitaṃ prasannarāghavam,* ed. by Ramashankar Tripathi (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass). **(IND)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** background + summary at Warder VII, 488-98 (§§ 6641-64; **photocopied**)

Play in seven acts, modelled in part on Kālidāsa’s *Vikramorvaśīya,* while it seems to be drawn on by Mahādeva’s *Adbhutadarpaṇa* and definitely by Tulsīdās; first quoted in the *Sūktimuktāvalī* of Jalhaṇa (of 1257 A.D.);

In the first act Bāṇa and Rāvaṇa appear as suitors for Sītā and are ridiculed. In the final act, two *vidyādharas* describe the battle and the recovery of Sītā.  
cf. Shukla 1984: 28 (=*Sambodhi* 12: 28 § 3).

**title (and author)** *Ullāgharāghava* of Someśvaradeva (? 1179-1262)

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 13th century, Gujarat

**edition(s)** Someśvaradeva 1961: *Ullāgharāghava-nāṭaka: a Sanskrit drama* *by Someśvaradeva,* ed. by Muni Puṇyavijaya and B.J. Sandesara, Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, 132 (Baroda: Oriental Institute). **OIL 508 Gae/132; download  
 summary of contents (pp.xi-xvii) photocopied**

**translation(s)**

**studies**  Bhatta, Vibhuti 1989: *Ullagharaghava: eka adhyayana / Somesvaradeva: a critical appraisal* (Ahmedabad: V.V. Bhatt).

**notes** The *Ullāgharāghava* is a *nāṭaka* in eight acts; **see** Warder, vol. VII:   
633-51 (§§ 6956-7008), mainly comprising summary

Someśvaradeva was a protégé of Vāstupāla, the famous minister of the Vāghelās of Gujarat, and hereditary priest of the Caulukyas (edn p. i). Theplay “was acted in the famous temple at Dvārakā on the Prabodhinī Ekādaśī, as stated in the prologue.” (edn p. vi). Someśvara also composed a hymn to Rāma in 100 *sragdharā* verses, the *Rāmaśataka* – “Judging from the number of manuscripts of the poem and of its two commentaries — one by Ekanātha and the other by some unknown author — we can say that the Rāmaśataka was a fairly popular work.” (edn p. vi).

Leclère 2013: 149

Dans le prologue de l’*Ullāgharāghava* de Someśvara, de même, le directeur dit que l’interprétation d’une pièce inspirée de la légende de Rāma va le sauver des malheurs du cercle des existences:

Alors à présent je vais satisfair mon être tourmenté par le cercle des existences en représentant l’histoire de [Rāma], l’époux de la fille de Janaka, conformément à l’ordre que m’ont donné les gens de l’assemblée venus des quatre coins du monde devant le vénérable dieu Kr̥ṣṇa, qui orne tel un saphir l’illustre ville de Dvāraka, à l’occasion de la fête d’Ekādaśī qui célèbre l’éveil de Viṣṇu.778

Le développement des pratiques de dévotion (*bhakti*) à l’époque médiévale aurait donc conduit les dramaturges à place l’apaisé au cœur de leur pièces.

778 *tad adya bhagavataḥ śrī-dvārakālaṅkāra-nīlamaṇeḥ śrī-kr̥ṣṇa-devasya purataḥ śrī-dhara-prabodhaikādaśī-parvaṇi sarva-dig-gatānāṃ sāmājikajanāṇāṃ janaka-sutā-pati-caritābhinayadeśa-sampādanena kr̥tārthayāmi saṃsāra-kadarthitam ātmānam* (UR I. 4+ ]2. 5-7]). . . .

**title (and author)** *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhaṭa

**date (and provenance)** mid 13th century

**edition(s)** Subhaṭa1891:*The Dūtāṅgada of Subhaṭa,* ed. by Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnāth Pāndurang Parab, (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar [5th edn 1935]).  
 **(IND) Sansk. 4.835/27; download** (2nd edn, 1900)

Subhaṭa 1950: *Dūtāṅgadaṃ nāma chāyānāṭakam* (Banārasa: Caukhambā Saṃskr̥ta Sīrija Āphisa). **(IND) Sansk. ser. B 9/188**

**translation(s)**  Gray, Louis H. (trans.) 1912: “The Dūtāṅgada of Subhaṭa, now first translated from the Sanskrit and Prākrit”, *JAOS* 32: 58-77. **printout**

Subhaṭa 1931: Dutangada*: das ist wie der Affenprinz Angada als Gesandter auszog : ein altindisches Schattenspiel,* Übertragung als Entwurf für eine Aufführung mit Einleitung und Kommentar versehen von Georg Jacob (Leipzig: Akad. Verlag).  
 **pp. 10-13 photocopied (in Eternal Rāma box file)**

**studies** Sharma, Sudarshan Kumar 1998: “Historicity of Tribhuvana-pāladeva and Kumāra-pāla-deva in Dūtāṅgada of Subhaṭa: a critical review”, *Sambodhi* 22: 57-68. **download**

**notes see** Warder vol. VII: 672-7 (§§ 7064-79; **photocopied**) for background and summary; Gray 1912 is study and translation ofshorter recension only; see n.1

*from* William Ridgeway**,** *The dramas and dramatic dances ...* (C.U.P., 1915): 164 —

The Shadow-Play. At this point it will be convenient to discuss the relation between the puppet-play and the shadow-play, termed in Sanskrit chaya-nataka, concerning which so much has been written in later years, and which is so widely spread in the Indian Isles, Malaysia, Cambodia, Burma, Siam, China, Japan, Arabia, Asia Minor, and North Africa. The chaya-nataka is not recognized as a dramatic form in Sanskrit works on the drama, yet to this category belong at least seven dramas,1 chief of these being the Dutangada, the earliest extant play of its type, the only one yet printed, and of which an English translation has lately been published by Dr. Louis H. Gray. Its theme is taken from the Ramayana, and of course Rama, Sita, Ravana, and Hanumat the Monkey-general figure in it.

My late colleague and lifelong friend, Professor Cecil Bendall,2 has proved that this play was presented at a festival in honour of Kumarapaladeva, a Chaulukya king of the dynasty of Annilvad or Anhilpur who ruled in Gujerat from 1143 to 1172, the particular event commemorated being the restoration by the king of a Siva temple at Devapattan or Somnath in Kathiawar, Bombay. It was performed at the Dhooly festival, March 7, 1243.

The Dutangada exists in two main recensions, the longer one 'being a curious hybrid between a dramatic piece (with stage-directions) and a narrative poem. In the shorter recension it is divided into three scenes, and from a comparison of it with the corresponding portions of the Ramayana it would seem that its action implies a period of three or four days'.3

1 For the full list see Dr. L. H. Gray's paper, 'The Dutangada of Subhata' (Journ. American Oriental Soc., vol. xxxii, Part I, pp. 58 seq.).

2 Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS., Brit. Mus., 105-6 ; Journ. R. A. Soc., 1898, pp. 229-30 (cited by Gray).

3 Gray, op. cit., p. 59.

**title (and author)** *Amogharāghavacampū* of Divākara

**date (and provenance)** Śaka 1221 = 1299 A.D.

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Warriar, A. Govinda 1941: “King Rāghava of the Amogharāghavacampū”, *IHQ* 17: 251-54. **download (vol.)**

**notes** “The only available manuscript of this *Campū* [now in Or. Ms. Lib., Madras] was obtained from the Kaṭṭumāṭas Mana near Chowghat (S. Malabar), and it is stated to have been transcribed by a scholar named Viśvanātha in Śaka 1323 (1401 A.C.).”  
 Warriar 1941: 251

Warriar 1941: 253 “The *Campū* relates the story of the *Bālakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in seven *Ucchvāsas.* At the end of first *Ucchvāsa* the author names the *Campū* as *Amogha Rāghava.* The last *Ucchvāsa,* namely, *Purapraveśakathanam* ends with the recital that the Mahākāvya written by the author was read over to the king, and that king Rāghava satisfied all his desires.” [Vīra Rāghava Cakravartin of Kerala is also known from Kōṭṭayam plate dated 1320 A.D.]

**title (and author)** *Udārarāghava* of Śākalyamalla (also Mallācārya / Kavimalla)

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 14th century (Andhra area)

**edition(s)** Venkatacharya, T. (ed.) 1990: *Udāra-rāghava of Śākalya Malla, with the commentaries Śiśubodhinī, Pradyotanī, and Saṃjīvinī,* Adyar Library Series, 118 (Madras: Adyar Library). **Ind. Inst. Sansk. ser. A 1 (vol. 118)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Shulman, David 2014: “Śākalya Malla’s Telangana Rāmāyaṇa: the *Udārarāghava”,* in Bronner and others 2014: 613-47. **Bod.**

Venkatacharya, T. 1992: “The Humorous Episode of Śūrpanakhā in the *Udāra-Rāghava* of Śākalya Malla”, *Contacts between Cultures, vol. 2: South Asia,* ed. Kay Koppedrayer (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press) pp. 161-64.

**notes** Venkatacharya locates Śākalyamalla in Āndhra and dates him to mid 14th century, linking him (p. v) with the courts of Kākatīya Pratāparudra (1296-1323), Harihara I of Vijayanagara (1336) and the Recarla chief Singa I (1330), whereas Shulman gives 1st half of C14 and Telangana on same basis; he also wrote three other works: *Akhyātacandrikā, Avyayasaṃgrahanighaṇṭu* and a now lost *Niroṣṭhyarāmāyaṇa* (i.e without using labials). The work, a poem in 9 surviving *sargas* (out of 16), follows the Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa* up to the *Śūrpaṇakhāvṛttānta* but with minor differences. Fine descr. of Lakṣmaṇa’s anger and arguments against going to forest (5.20-44) and *rāmaguhasaṃvāda* (6.6-39) also well handled acc. to editor. Śūrpaṇakhā **herself** tells Rāma his history (9.76-80), then her own, including 9.88 [cf. 4-5 below]:  
 *dhanado daśakaṇṭhakumbhakarṇau  
 sa mahābhāgavato vibhīṣaṇaś ca* |  
 *iti vaiśravaṇān avehi rājan  
 mama bandhūn kharadūṣaṇatrimūrdhān* ||  
Lakṣmaṇa cuts off her ears, nose and lips (9.106), she rushes to Khara + Dūṣaṇa to tell them and Khara vows to crush the enemies (9.108) – end of poem as extant.

from Venkatacharya’s summary (pp. 163-4):

“In summary:

1. In the *Udāra-Rāghava* Śūrpaṇakhā narrates the story about Rāma up to the point of their present stay in Pañcavaṭī; in Vālmiki’s version, Rāma does the narration.

[p.164] 2. In this narration, she mentions the sages as her ancestors and puts forth her arguments of auspicious family ties to propose union with Rāma. These arguments are nowhere to be found in Vālmiki’s version.

3. Śūrpaṇakhā was indifferent as to whether Rāma gave up Sītā or retained her, but she volunteered to make arrrangements for the comforts of Rāma, Sītā, and Lakṣmaṇa if Rāma agreed to marry her.

4. Kubera, Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa and Vibhīṣaṇa were her full brothers.

5. Khara, Dūṣaṇa and Triśiras were her relatives.

6. She promises to see that Rāma would rule over Ayodhyā, instead of Bharata as a reward for marrying her.

7. Rāma humourously [sic] suggested that Lakṣmaṇa might be the suitable one for her, as he was alone at that time. She followed this suggestion up with blunt and romantic overtures to Lakṣmaṇa, which are unique to Śākalya Malla’s version.

8. Also unique are Lakṣmaṇa’s arguments about her first approach to Rāma and his being only a servant (*dāsa*) of Rāma, which would make her a *dāsī* (maid-servant) if she were to marry him, and finally, Lakṣmaṇa’s brilliant suggestion that she go to Ayodhyā and wait fourteen years, whereupon he would try to get permission for their alliance.”

**title (and author)** *Haṃsasaṃdeśa*of Vedānta Deśika (traditional dates 1269-1369)

**date (and provenance)** 14th century

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)** Veṅkaṭanātha 2009: *“Self-surrender”, “Peace”, “Compassion” & “The mission of the goose”: poems and prayers from South India*, trans. by Yigal Bronner and David Dean Shulman (New York: New York U.P. and JJC Foundation). [*Haṃsasaṃdeśa* on pp. 4-79; comments on pp. xxiii-xl] **OIL PK4474.C66 VEN 2009**

Veṅkaṭanātha 2016:  *The Flight of Love: a messenger poem of medieval South India by Veṅkaṭanātha,* trans. with commentary by Steven P. Hopkins (New York: OUP).  
 **(IND); parts downloaded**

**studies** Bronner, Yigal 2013: “Vāmana Bhaṭṭa bāṇa’s *Haṃsasandeśa* and its intertexts”, *JAOS* 133.3: 495-526. **download**

Bronner, Yigal, and David Shulman 2006: “ ‘A Cloud Turned Goose’: Sanskrit in the vernacular millenium”, *IESHR* 43.1: 1-30. **printout**

Hopkins, S. 2004: "Lovers, Messengers and Beloved Landscapes: Sandeśa Kāvya in comparative perspective", *IJHS* 8 (1-3): 29–55. **download**

Hopkins, Steven P. 2009: “Sanskrit in a Tamil imaginary: Sandeśakāvya and the *Haṃsasandeśa* of Veṅkaṭanātha”, in *Passages: relationships between Tamil and Sanskrit,* ed by M. Kannan and Jennifer Clare (Berkeley: Tamil Chair, DSSEAS, University of California): 281-312. **scan**

Krishna Aiyangar, A.N. 1941: “South India as depicted in the Hamsa-sandesa of Venkatanatha”, *Proceedings IHC* 5: 219-24. **download**

**notes** A short lyric poem of 110 verses in *mandākrāntā* metre in two *āśvāsas*, which describes how Rāma sends a message via a *haṃsa* to Sītā, abducted by Rāvana. The poem belongs to the *saṃdeśakāvya* or *dūtakāvya,* ‘messenger poem’, genre and is closely modeled on Kālidāsa’s *Meghadūta*. The first half of the poem is entirely taken up with the itinerary that Rāma describes for the *haṃsa.* It has particular significance for Śrīvaiṣṇavas. The author also wrote the *Pādukāsahasra* (1008 verses in 32 *paddhatis* on the sandals of the Raṅganātha image at Śrīraṅgam but identifying them as Rāma’s sandals) and the *Mahāvīravaibhava* or *Raghuvīragadya* (in prose, summarising the Rāma story), as well as the *Abhayapradānasāra* in *maṇipravāla* which claims that Vibhīṣaṇa’s surrender to Rāma ‘epitomizes the all-important Śrīvaiṣṇava act of total surrender to God (*prapadana*, *prapatti*) and presents the core lesson of the poem’ (Bronner 2011: 48).

It is not the only *saṃdeśakāvya* that takes the Rāmāyaṇa as its base, although it is probably the earliest.  Others such asRudranyāyapañcānana’s Bhramaradūta (17th century, also in *mandākrāntā* metre) and the Abdadūta of Kṛṣṇaśrīcandananābhi use the same device of a second messenger — a departure from the epic — sent to Sītā to keep her going, in these cases a bee and a cloud respectively.  Nityānandaśāstri’s Hanumaddūta remains faithful to the epic in having Hanumān as the messenger.

[from blurb for Hopkins’s translation] After a sleepless night spent longing for his absent wife Sita, Rama, god-prince and future king, surveyed his army camps on a clear autumn morning and spied a white goose playing in a pond of lotus flowers. Seeing this radiant creature who so resembled his lost beloved, he began to plead with the bird to send her a message of love and fierce revenge.   
. . . . . . In *The Flight of Love,* Steven P. Hopkins situates Vedantedesika's Sanskrit sandesa within the wider comparative context of South Indian and Sri Lankan literatures. He traces the significance of messenger poetry in the construction of sacred landscapes in pre-modern South Asia and explores the ways the piece re-envisions the pan-Indian story of Rama and Sita, rooting his protagonists in a turbulent emotional world where separation, overwhelming desire, and anticipated bliss, are written into the living particularized bodies of lover and beloved, in the "messenger" goose and in the landscapes surrounding them.

**title (and author)** *Unmattarāghava* of Bhāskarabhaṭṭa

**date (and provenance)** 14th century (?), Karnataka (?)

**edition(s)** Bhāskarabhaṭṭa 1899: *The Unmatta-Râghava of Bhâskara Bhatta,* ed. by Durgaprasad and K. P. Parab (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press). **download**

Bhāskarabhaṭṭa 1973: *śrīmadbhāskarakaviviracitam unmattarāghavam ‘subodhinī’ hindīvyakhyopetam,* vyākhyākāraḥ ācāryaḥ śrīramapālaśāstrī (haridāsa saṃskṛta granthamālā 296) (Vārāṇasī: Chaukhambhā Saṃskṛta sīrīj āphis).  
 **own copy (in Eternal Rāma box file)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** The *Unmattarāghava* (called a *prekṣaṇaka*) of Bhāskarabhaṭṭa is a soliloquy by an enraged Rāma after Sītā’s sudden disappearance, in imitation of the *Vikramorvaśīya.* According to its prelude, this one-act drama was staged before an assembly of learned men gathered to honour Vidyāraṇya. If this Vidyāraṇya is the same as Mādhava, Sāyaṇa’s brother, the work belongs to the 14th century. [from Winternitz, *HIL* 3]

cf. Vidyut 1991: 358 —  
“True, Rama's belief in the theft of his beloved's characteristics by the creatures in the woods is a much used theme; Kālidāsa adapted it in the *Vikramorvaśīyam* (act 4, vs. 17); later, Bhāskara has used it in his play *Unmattarāghava* (vss. 28-30), and so on. However, in these places the specific details of the presentation are quite different. In the *Unmattarāghava*, Rāma believes that the elements in nature and the creatures in the woods have stolen the *ornaments* of his beloved.”

[notes from Ghosh 1963: 174-75] 1-act play on Rāma’s madness at Sītā’s disappearance but this is caused when she strays, while picking flowers with Madhukarikā, into an area cursed by Durvāsas that any woman entering it will be turned into a gazelle. Rāma learns what has happened from Madhukarikā after his arrival at the hut with the golden deer and turns mad with grief. However, his grief subsides when Agastya arrives and discloses what has happened. Moved by pity Agastya frees Sītā from the curse. The play ends with the happy reunion of the couple. There are clear signs of influence from Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya.*

**title (and author)** Rāmāṅkanāṭikā of Dharmagupta, alias Bālavāgīśvara

**date (and provenance)** Nepāla saṃvat 480 (= 1360 A.D.) (Nepal)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** according to NCC vol. 25, *Rāmāyaṇanāṭaka / Rāmābhiṣekanāṭaka / Rāmāṅkanāṭikā* in 4 acts composed in 1360 A.D. by Dharmagupta alias Bālavāgīśvara, son of Rāmadāsa, to celebrate the birthday of Jayadharma Malla, son of Jayasthitimalla.

In its first act Rāma is fooled by Śūrpaṇakhā disguising herself as Sītā while Sītā is off bathing and embracing him, despite his reservations about such vulgar behaviour in daytime; when the real Sītā returns from bathing he actually takes her for a *rākṣasī* and Lakṣmaṇa has to intervene, proposing a test to distinguish them, fetching a pārijāta flower from Indra’s heaven, which the real Sītā has no idea how to achieve and so faints, whereas Śūrpaṇakha goes off happily to get it and on her return is seized by Lakṣmaṇa who wants to kill her but, restrained by Rāma, merely cuts off her nose.  
 [source: Wendy Doniger, *Splitting the Difference,* pp. 19-20]

ms in Cambridge Univ. Lib.: Add. 1409, a palm-leaf autograph of the Rāmāṅkanāṭikā, a drama written in Nepal by the Buddhist author Dharmagupta and dated Nepāla Saṃvat 480 (1360 CE). Two more mss of this work have been catalogued by the NGMCP (reel no. C 6-9/ inventory no.57047 and reel no. A 351-13/inventory no. 57048). One of them (C 6-9) is dated Nepāla Saṃvat 496 (1376 CE), i.e. only 16 years after the Cambridge manuscript.  
 [from Skt Ms Project website]

**see** additional notes under Dharmagupta, *Rāmāṅkanāṭikā* incorporating information from Camillo Formigatti in “Further Notes (verbal/general)”

**title (and author)** Mahārāmāyaṇanāṭaka of Maṇika/Māṇikya

**date (and provenance)** Nepal, 2nd half of C14

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Formigatti, Camillo A. 2016a: “Towards a cultural history of Nepal, 14th-17th century. A Nepalese renaisance?”, in *Studies in honour of Luciano Petech: a commemoration volume, 1914-2014,* ed. by Elena de Rossi Filibeck and others, Rivista degli Studi Orientali n.s. 89, supp. 1 (Pisa: Fabrizio Serra Editore). **download**

Formigatti, Camillo A. 2022: “A gateway to the six languages: Cambridge, University Library, MS Add.1698”, in *Medieval multilingual manuscripts: case studies from Ireland to Japan,* ed. by Michael Clarke and Máire Ní Mhaonaigh (Berlin: de Gruyter): 183-97. **download**

**notes** in four acts; staged at the ceremony for erecting gates of Paśupaninātha temple (f. 3r3-4); text found inNGMCP A 20-2 (on author **see** Formigatti 2016a: 56-62 and 2022: 185-6)

**title (and author)** *Unmattarāghava* of Virūpākṣadeva

**date (and provenance)** early 15th century (Karnataka)

**edition(s)** Virūpākṣadeva 1946: *Unmattarāghavam nāma prekṣaṇakam virūpākṣadevakṛtam,* ed. by V. Krishnamacharya, Adyar Library Series 57 (Adyar: Adyar Library).   
[repr. from *ALB* 10.4,Oct.-Dec. 1946]. **OIL 545.58 Vir / (IND) Sansk. ser. A 1/57; download**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** edition based on 1 ms in Adyar Library; editor identifies author as the Vijayanagara ruler (p. v)

*Unmattarāghava* 1946: iii-iv —  
The present publication —*Unmattarāghava* of *Virūpākṣa* — is a hitherto unpublished work. A different work under the same name but by a different author — Bhāskarabhaṭṭa and a different plot was published at Bombay in 1889 as No. 17 of the Kāvyamālā Series. ... ... So far as our knowledge goes the only manuscript of the present work is the one in the possession of the Adyar Library, on the basis of which the present work has been edited. ... ... Both works ... have certain features in common. They are both One-Act Dramas of the class of *Prekṣaṇaka*; ŚrI Rāmacandra is the hero in both; and both seek to portray *vipralambhaśṛṅgārarasa* when **|** the hero-lover becomes distracted (*unmatta*) by separation (*vipralambha*) from the beloved – heroine. ... ...

[notes from Ghosh 1963: 175-77] Another *Unmattarāghava* by Virūpākṣadeva (grandson of Bukka and himself ruler of Vijayanagara at beginning of 15th century) provides a novel ending after the main part on Rāma’s madness (the play opens with a description of the golden deer, Rāma and then Lakṣmaṇa leaving Sītā, returning to find her gone; then Rāma's madness): a voice announces that Lakṣmaṇa has learnt from Jaṭāyu about Sītā’s capture and will soon return after destroying the rākṣasas. In a single verse (I.89) it is declared that Lakṣmaṇa has returned on Puṣpaka with Sītā, after the monkeys have built the causeway and he has killed Rāvaṇa and the other rākṣasa leaders.

**title (and author)** *Raghuvīracarita* of Mallinātha

**date (and provenance)** early 15th century

**edition(s)** Mallinātha 1917: *The Raghuvîracharita,* ed. by T. Gaṇapati Sâstrî, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 57 (Trivandrum: Government Press). **download**

Mallinātha 2002:  *Raghuvīracaritamahākāvyam of Śrī Mallinātha,* ed. by Manju Upadhyaya, Sarasvati-bhavana Granthamala 145 (Varanasi, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University).

**translation(s)**

**studies** Lalye, P.G. 2002: *Mallinātha,* Makers of Indian Literature(New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi). **(IND) gen d 71 (272)**

**notes see** Lalye 2002: 92-99 [**download**] for summary of plot. Gaṇapati Sâstrî’s edn based on 3 mss.

**title (and author)** *Abhinavarāmābhyudaya* of Abhirāmakāmākṣī

**date (and provenance)** 15th century

**edition(s)** Gibbons, George Meredith 1979: *An edition of the Abhinavarāmābhyudaya of Abhirāmakāmākṣī* (University of Toronto: PhD thesis).

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes**

**title (and author)** *Janakajānandanāṭaka* of Kalya Lakṣmīnṛsiṃha

**date (and provenance)** mid 16th century (?), Ahobalam, Andhra Pradesh

**edition(s)** Moorty, C. Lakshmi Narasimha (ed.) 1992: *Janakajānanda-nāṭakam of Kalya Lakṣmīnṛsiṃha* (Arakere: Vidya Samvardhani Parishat). **own copy**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** The text of edn is based on 3 palm-leaf mss in Mysore (2 in Or. Res. Inst. Ms Library, 1 in Palace Sarasvatī Bhandār), all incomplete and confused.

Uniquely, the plot of the play centres on Śatrughna’s defeat by Kuśa and Rāma’s consequent recognition of Kuśa and Lava as his sons (summary of plot in edn, pp. 17-22). The author also wrote the *Kavikaumudī* and *Viśvadeśikavijaya,* both mentioned in the prologue to his *Janakajānandanāṭaka.* The play is stated to have been staged at Ahobalam (Kurnool dist., A.P.) at the court of a king Abhirāma, whom Moorty plausibly identifies with Aḷiya Rāmarāya (Āravīṭi Rāmarāja, 1543-65), the regent for the Vijayanagara ruler Sadāśivarāya (1543-70).

**title (and author)** *Rāghavollāsa* of Advaitayati/Advaitārāma

**date (and provenance)** Advaitayati active in 16th century

**edition(s)** Advaitayati 2011: *Rāghavollāsamahākāvyam advaitayatipraṇītam,* ed. by Ram Kishore Jha (Allahabad: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Ganganatha Jha Campus). **(IND); pp. scan of xxvi-xxix**[*Rāghavollāsa* edn p.xxviii last line: *janakanandinī sītā śrīrāmasya nīrājanam ācarati taccaraṇayoḥ praṇāmāñjaliñcārpayati* | *atrāpi*]

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** *mahākāvya* in 12 *sargas,* mainly in the *indravajrā* metre

Jhā’s edn (2011) uses 5 mss, including IOL 3914 (sic – correctly 3915, written in *saṃvat* 1682 = 1625 A.D. by Mānasāhi Kāesth, but incomplete)

summary (from pp. xxv-xxix of edn) —

*sarga* 1: After various homages to teacher etc., the author sets out Rāma’s going to the forest and describes the state of Ayodhyā <about to be> deprived of him, hence *sarga’s* name “the description of the expression of separation by the citizens and people”.

*sarga* 2: More on the people’s feelings; Rāma gives wealth to minor gods and brāhmans and pontificates on merits of giving to brāhmans.

*sarga* 3: R. + L. + S. go to the forest; descr. of how R. avoids those who try to follow; at Śṛṅgaverapura R. offers *śrāddha* and praises Gaṅgā, then accepts Guha’s hospitality; after they have slept beneath a/the banyan tree, early next morning Guha embarks R. + L. + S. in a boat and takes them across the Gaṅgā. They all put on bark-cloth clothes and go to Citrakūṭa. Reaching Citrakūṭa, they accept the hospitality of *ṛṣis* and *munis.* In this journey, descriptions of their bathing in the Mandākinī and of L. constructing the leaf hut; through R.’s going to Citrakūṭa the beasts of prey there, abandoning their enmity towards each other became joyful and playful together. An aged brāhman living on Citrakūṭa, approaching R., praises him elaborately. Following the stay at Citrakūṭa in the leaf hut, a description of their setting out for the Daṇḍaka forest.

*sarga* 4: Kauśalyā narrates Rāma’s childhood to Sumitrā, which was full of glorious and powerful deeds; description of R.’s waking in the morning reminiscent of Aja’s waking in *Raghuvaṃśa* 5; this description provides an opportunity for Kauśalyā to remember Rāma fondly (*vātsalyarasagarbhitaṃ*) now he has gone to the forest.

*sarga* 5: Viśvāmitra comes to Sāketa to Daśaratha in order to take R. + L. to guard his sacrifice. Daśaratha welcomes Viśvāmitra, who describes to him R.’s greatness and lordship (i.e. divinity), then describes the sudden appearance of Subāhu, Mārīca and <other> rākṣasas, and then asks Daśaratha to give him R. + L. At first Daśaratha does not agree to Viśvāmitra’s request but finally on Vaśiṣṭha’s advice he reluctantly hands over R. + L.

*sarga* 6: R. + L., leaving Sāketa with Viśvāmitra, on the way see the rākṣasī Tāḍakā. Viśvāmitra urges R. to kill this rākṣasī; obediently R. swiftly brings about Tāḍakā’s death. Tāḍakā achieves release and praises R. Pleased with Tāṭakā’s killing, Viśvāmitra gives R. + L. spears and a divine weapon. He tells R. + L. to kill the various rākṣasas causing obstacles to his intended sacrifices. Subāhu and Mārīca are the foremost rākṣasas; but Mārīca is hurled into the ocean by R.’s arrow and Subāhu is killed. Janaka, king of Mithila, in Kauśika’s presence sends a letter of summons to observe the bow-sacrifice. Kauśika accepts that letter joyfully and sets out for Mithilā with R. + L. As they go to Mithilā, Gautama’s wife Ahalyā is freed by the mere touch of the dust on R.’s feet.

*sarga* 7: Following her release from the curse to take the form of a stone, Ahalya praises R. in a hymn of gratitude. Name of *sarga*: “Named Ahalyā’s praise/hymn”.

*sarga* 8: Kauśika is greatly honoured on his arrival at Janaka’s city with R. + L. Sītā’s companions, seeing R.’s beauty of form, describe his charming form to S. S., seeing Rāmacandra’s charming form in a dream, becomes enamoured of him and describes her feelings to a companion. This companion, named Vīṇāpriyā, encourages S. and foretells success. Description of the breaking of the bow.

*sarga* 9: Once the bow is broken, the gods are delighted and the goddesses dance. S.’s companions perform *nīrājana (= āratī*). A letter is sent by a messenger from Janaka to Daśaratha about the breaking of the bow. On receipt of the letter all the inhabitants of Ayodhyā along with Daśaratha become very pleased. Ayodhyā, filled with auspicious archways, became very joyful. Daśaratha sets out with his handsomely adorned army to Mithilā, where he is given a hearty welcome. Gratefully accepting Janaka’s welcome, Daśaratha went to Kauśika and praises him. Kauśika, pleased, informs Daśaratha of R.’s lordship and ability to bear the burden of the earth. Rāma enters and ascribes the whole of the already narrated killing of the rākṣas(s) and so on to the grace of his guru.

*sarga* 10: Under Vaśiṣṭha’s guidance, the astrologers belonging to both parties decide the auspicious moment for the wedding. Vaśiṣṭha declares it to Janaka’s priest, Satānanda. Elaborate description of the ritual preparation of both R. and S. for their wedding. Kauśalyā continues her narration to Sumitrā by saying “My supreme happiness/good fortune was getting a son like R. and my supreme misfortune/sorrow is being separated now from him; my thoughts are always longing to see again the splendour of his body.”

*sarga* 11: Mostly a description of the wedding of R. and S. Janaka, accompanied by Viśvāmitra, Vasiṣṭha and his wife, uttered the relevant mantras at the auspicious moment for the wedding and gave Sītā’s hand to Rāma. Applause from world of gods, sound of drums. shower of flowers.

*sarga* 12:R. + S. go to the marriage hall (*kautukāgāra*). Kauśalyā narrates to Sumitra what in this description I am unable to. In the marriage bedecked with jewelled lamps Sītā performs *nīrājana (= āratī*) to Rāma and makes obeisance to his feet. Despite the concealed mockery of Sītā’s companions, Rāma is completely happy. After accepting the presents given by Janaka, R. + S. set out for Ayodhyā, where they are welcomed by the mother(s)-in-law. The author ends with renewed homage to his guru and to king Pratāp Śāh.

**title (and author)** *Abhirāmamaṇi* of Sundaramiśra

**date (and provenance)** 1597 (?)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Tripathi, Radhavallabh 2015: “Reconstructing Abhirāmamaṇi, a lost Sanskrit play”, *Sanskrit Studies* 4: 45-51. **own copy**

**notes** an  *Abhirāmamaṇi* (drama in 7 acts) by Sundaramiśra (author also of a *Nāṭyapradīpa*) written apparently in *śaka* 1521 = 1597 A.D., noted by H.H. Wilson, who had consulted two mss (Wilson 1835: II, 395).

Tripathi notes that it precedes the author’s *Nāṭyapradīpa,* completed in *śaka* 1535 = 1613 A.D., which refers extensively to it (Tripathi 2015: 46-47).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject:** | Re: Sundaramiśra's Abhirāmamaṇi |
| **Date:** | Tue, 13 Sep 2016 19:31:08 +0530 |
| **From:** | Radhavallabh Tripathi <radhavallabh2002@gmail.com> |
| **To:** | John Brockington <John.Brockington@btinternet.com> |

Dear Prof. Brockington,

I could not acquire the mss. of Abhirāmamaṇi. I will come back to you if I get any clue about them.

RADHAVALLABH TRIPATHI,

Former Vice Chancellor,

Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, New Delhi.

Former Professor of Sanskrit,

Dr. Harisingh Gour University, Sagar.

On Tue, Sep 13, 2016 at 3:51 PM, John Brockington wrote:

Dear Professor Tripathi,

I have just received through the post a copy of *Sanskrit Studies* 4, containing your article "Reconstructing Abhirāmamaṇi, a lost Sanskrit play".  Its title intrigued me because the only information that I had previously about this play indicated that there were at least two manuscripts extant.  This was a very brief notice in H.H. Wilson's *Select Specimens* (I will attach a copy of the title page and the relevant page).  I wondered whether you were aware of this mention and knew what had happened to the manuscripts which Wilson had seen.  I shall be very interested to learn any information that you may have about this.

Best wishes

John Brockington

**title (and author)** *Ānandarāghava* of Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita

**date (and provenance)** end 16th century

**edition(s)** Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita 1971: *Ānandarāghavam* *Rājacūḍāmaṇidīkṣita viracitam, Pu.Ma. Padmanābhaśarmaṇā saṃśodhya pariṣkr̥tam, Ve. Gopālaiyaṅgāryeṇa āṅgalabhāṣābhūmikayā saṃyojitam,* Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Granthamālā 134 (Thanjavur: Tañjāpurī Sarasvatīmahāl Granthālaya). **(IND) Weston David**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dīkṣita was also the author of another continuation of Bhoja’s *Campūrāmāyaṇa* (**download** filed with Bhoja’s *CR*)

**title (and author)** *SItārāmavihārakāvya* of Orgaṇṭi Lakṣmaṇādhvari

**date (and provenance)** prob. 17th century, Andhra Pradesh

**edition(s)** Lakṣmaṇādhvari 1962: O*rgaṇṭivaṃśavardhanalakṣmaṇādhvarikṛtaṃ Sītārāmavihārakāvyam,* ed. by D.G. Padhye, Sanskrit Academy Series 9 (Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy). **Weston David (IND) Sansk. ser. B 5/9**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes see** brief notice by L.S. in *JAOS* 88: 377-8 (**download**; **printout** in folder of reviews in grey box file), also IOL cat. 3918 (ms 586c).

Orgaṇṭi (= belonging to Orgalla, C16 capital of Kākatiya dynasty, mod. Warangal). Orgaṇṭi Lakṣmaṇādhvari’s exact dates are unknown but probably end C16 to beginning C17 (Lakṣmaṇādhvari 1962: iii-iv); alternatively named Lakṣmaṇa Somayājin (NCC 39: 200-1)

*SItārāmavihārakāvya* contains 720 verses in 12 *sargas,* in 36 different metres; it describes the early life of R. + S., ending in *sarga* 12 with Rāma’s confrontation with Paraśurāma and his installation on the return to Ayodhyā (Lakṣmaṇādhvari 1962: v-vii). It shows influence from Vālmīki, Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti and Śrīharṣa, as well as Telugu literature and folklore ((Lakṣmaṇādhvari 1962: ix)

**title (and author)** *Raghunāthābhyudaya* of Rāmabhadrāmbā

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 17th century (Tañjāvur)

**edition(s)** Rāmabhadrāmbā 1934: *Raghunāthābhyudaya of Rāmabhadrāmbā (A Historical Poem),* ed. by T. R. Chintamani, Bulletins of the Sanskrit Department, No. 2 (pp. viii + 78) (Madras: University of Madras). **OIL 549.2 Ram** [review by Charpentier in *BSOAS* 7 (1935): 961-62; **download**]

**translation(s)**

**studies** Narayana Rao, Velcheru, David Shulman and Sanjay Subrahmanyam 1992: *Symbols of Substance: Court and State in Nāyaka Period Tamilnadu* (Delhi: Oxford University Press). **download of ch. 5;** *see pp. 191-201*

Hiebert, Julie H. 1989 "Tradition and Innovation in Sanskrit Mahākāvya: The Harem Sunset" in *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts,* ed. by Anna Libera Dallapiccola, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner): I. 269-83. **OIL (IND) 20 D 238 / Sackler IW Dah (vol. 2)**

**notes** basically on king Raghunātha Nāyaka of Tanjore (by one of his consorts) but he is considered an incarnation of Rāma and so his battles and deeds are compared to Rāma’s; in 12 cantos (summary of contents at pp. iii-viii of edn)

Hiebert 1989 focuses on Kumāradāsa’s Jānakīharaṇa and Rāmabhadrāmbā’s Raghunāthābhyudaya but has nothing relevant to the Rāma story

**title (and author)** *Rāmaliṅgāmṛta* of Advaita kavi

**date (and provenance)** *śaka* 1530 = 1608 A.D. (Vārāṇasī)

**edition(s)** ms in BL (India Office Catalogue no. 3920, ms. 890a)

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** *kāvya* in 18 *sargas,* composed at Vārāṇasī. Its narrative is in the form of a dialogue between two *gopikās* of Gokula.

**see** **photocopies** of Maity 1992: 147-150 and Nagar 1999: I, 90-92 (with brief summary); also refs in B.P. Singh 1980: 495-6, Richman 1991: 230 and Stasik 2009: 53

**title (and author)** *Adbhutadarpaṇa* of Mahādeva

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 17th century (Tanjore)

**edition(s)** Mahādeva 1896: *The Adbhutadarpaṇa of Mahādeva,* ed. by Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāndurang Parab, Kāvyamālā 55 (Bombay: Tukârâm Jâvajî [2nd edn 1938]).  
 **(IND) Sansk. 4.835/53 and (IND) 5 misc. 35/20; download**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** In 10 acts; uses device of a magic mirror through which Rāma sees what is happening in Laṅkā, where Sītā is imprisoned. General emphasis on the magical. It covers the story from Aṅgada’s mission to Rāvaṇa as far as Rāma’s installation.

Chitra P. Shukla 1984: “The Rejection of Sītā in Rāmāyaṇa-based plays (up to 17th century), *Sambodhi* 12: 23-30 — “The Adbhūtadarpaṇa of Mahādeva, depicts the incidents from Aṅgada’s incident <to> Rama's coronation. The drama is full of mistaken identities due to the tricks of the demons. Due to Sugrīva’s attack miraculous gem fell down from Rāvaṇa’s crown. Sampāti took it and gave it to Vibhīṣaṇa, who in his turn gave it to Rāma. The gem enables Rama to see the incidents happening at Lankā. In a scene at Lankā Mahodara, the friend of Rāvaṇa advises Rāvaṇa to cheat Sītā and Rāvaṇa says that this is not possible because Sītā is a very chaste woman. Rāma hears it, and says that in spite of this Sītā will have to give a proof of her chastity. When Ravana died, Maya and Śūrpaṇakhā arrange a conspiracy. Maya takes the form of Rāma, and rejects Sītā. He thinks that Sītā will either enter fire or will drown herself in the ocean. The fire ordeal is suggested from Nepathya. The trick of Maya saves Rāma from being unfair to Sītā. Rāma is ignorant of Māya's [sic] trick and thinks that Sītā underwent the fire ordeal only for convincing the people. The dramatist has taken up a very thin outline from Rāmāyaṇa. His only aim is to depict striking incidents. The rejection of Sītā is not a central incident here. Rama delays his meeting after the fire ordeal but the dramatist does not show any reason for the delay. The drama does not give rise to any profound sentiment. The dramatist is imaginative and differs far from the original story hence he may be called a romanticist.” (pp. 28-29)

cf. Ghosh 1963: 177-79 — (from p. 177) “In the first act, a demon Śamvara by name in the guise of the monkey Dadhimukha relates to Lakṣmaṇa the false news of the treachery of Aṅgada, who has reacted to the policy of dissension successfully applied by Rāvaṇa, ... The same demon in disguise in the second act creates confusion by making Rāma and Lakṣmaṇ believe that Sugrīva has been killed. By his art of magic, he shows the severed head of the lord of the monkeys and deludes them.”

(from p. 178) “The following three acts [i.e. 6-8] describe the incidents of Laṅkā which are visualised by Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa through the magic mirror. The presence of false Rāvaṇa, false Rāma and false Lakṣmaṇa in these acts does not achieve any appreciable success by this innovation. The real Rāma, real Lakṣmaṇa, real Rāvana too are present there, and they enjoy the conversation of their false counterparts and at places make appropriate remarks too.”

**title (and author)** *Citrabandharāmāyaṇa* of Veṅkaṭeśvara Bhaṭṭa

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 17th century**,** Tanjore

**edition(s)** Veṅkaṭeśvara 1992: *Śrī Citrabandha Rāmāyaṇam,* ed. by Satyavat Tripathi, Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series, no. 34 (Allahabad)/ *Śrīcitrabandharāmāyaṇaṃ veṅkaṭeśvaraviracitaṃ,* saṃpādaka Satyavrata Tripāṭhī, Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, text series no. 34 (Prayāga: Śrīgaṅgānāthajhākendrīyasaṃskṛtavidyāpīṭha). **(IND); extracts scanned**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Tripathi, Satyavrata 1989: “Introducing Citrabandharāmāyaṇa (a hitherto unknown citrakāvya by Veṅkateśvara)”, *JGJKSV* 45: 33-39. **photocopy**

**notes** The 6 *sargas* of the poem correspond to *kāṇḍas* 1-6 (i.e. no Uttara). The author also composed: *Unmattaprahasana, Kṛṣṇarājavijaya, Bhānuprabandhaprahasana, Rāghavānandanāṭaka, Rāmābhyudayakāvya and Veṅkaṭeśvarīkāvya.*

from English foreword (= pp. 1-8) by G.C. Tripathi to 1992 edn:

Veṅkaṭeśvara “who flourished in the first half of the 17th century” (p. 5)

“... Within a comparatively small framework of 6 cantos, the poet has narrated the story of the whole of the Vālmīkīya Rāmāyaṇa in such a masterly manner that almost each verse exhibits a rare combination of letters and words giving rise sometimes to alliterations (*anuprāsa*), sometimes to repetition of sound-clusters (*yamaka*), sometimes to puns or *double entente* [sic] (*śleṣa*) and sometimes to figurative arrangement of syllables (*citrabandha*). ...” (p. 5)

composed in a subdivision of *citrakāvya* called *citrabandha* (“picture-poetry”), where a pattern is formed resembling recognisable objects in day to day life, for example a lotus or serpent; this is done by an interlocking of the syllables which outline the various parts of the object represented. Examples of *citrabandhas* given in *pariśiṣṭam – 3* [end of volume]: 3.17, 6.125 (swing), 6.127 (*kaṅkuṇa*), 6.115 (sword), 4.1 (*gomūtrikā*), 1.40 (drum), 6.47 (wheel) and 2.46 (*sarvatobhadra*).

**title (and author)** *Rāghavayādavīya* (or *Yadavarāghavīya*) of Veṅkaṭādhvarin

**date (and provenance)** 1st half of 17th century, Kāñcī area

**edition(s)** Veṅkaṭādhvarin 1972: *Rāghavayādavīya par Veṅkaṭādhvarin,* texte sanskrit édité par M.S. Narasimhacharya, étude et traduction par Marie-Claude Porcher, Publ. de l’Inst. Fr.d’Indologie 46 (Pondichéry: Institut Français d’Indologie). **own copy**

**translation(s)** [as above]

**studies** brief remarks at Lienhard 1984: 148

**notes** An *anulomavilomakāvya ­–*read forward the text praises Rāma through a summary of his main feats in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (ending with the triumphant return to Ayodhyā, so no *Uttarakāṇḍa*) andread backwards it praises Kṛṣṇa by narrating the abduction of the Pārijāta tree; in 30 verses or, in some mss which diverge from verse 25 onwards, 32 verses, with an auto-commentary.

**title (and author)** *Jānakīpariṇaya* of Cakrakavi

**date (and provenance)** 17th century

**edition(s)** Cakrakavi1913: *The Jânakîpariṇaya of Chakrakavi,* ed. by T. Gaṇapati Sâstrî, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 24 (Trivandrum: Travancore Government Press). **download**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** Deals in 8 *sargas* with events from Rāma’s marriage with Sītā up to his return to Ayodhyā, but also including in *sarga* 2 both some description of Rāvaṇa’s deeds and the divine figure appearing at the end of the *putreṣṭi* to present the *pāyasa* to Daśaratha; other episodes included are the departure of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with Viśvāmitra, the killing of Tāṭakā, the breaking of the bow, Viśvāmitra’s narration of the descent of the Gaṅgā, the marriages (*sargas* 6-7) and the encounter with Paraśurāma.

Cakrakavi was probably a contemporary of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita (1st half of 17th century) and author also of two other *kāvyas, Rukminīpariṇaya* and  *Pārvatīpariṇaya.*

**title (and author)** various *stotras* by Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita

**date (and provenance)** 2nd half of 17th century(Madurai [?])

**edition(s)** Nīlakaṇṭha 1967: Oeuvres poétiques de Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita. I. Texte, traduction et notes, by Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie). [10 of his poetical works, with introduction] **OIL** **544.78 Nil**[*Raghuvīrastava* at pp. 177-91 plus notes on pp. 318‑24 **scanned**]

Nīlakaṇṭha 1988: *Mantra Rāmāyanam. mantrarahasyaprakāśikāvyākhyā yutam Nīlakaṇṭhasya kṛtiḥ*, sampādaka evaṃ hindī anuvādaka Rāma Kumāra Rāya ; prastāvanā, Lakṣmī Nārāyaṇa Tivārī / *Mantra Ramayan, compiled by the great commentator Nilakantha with his own Sanskrit commentary,* with a foreword by Lakshmi Narayan Tewari, Hindi translation by Ram Kumar Rai (Tantra Granthamālā, 15) (Vārāṇasī: Prācya Prakāśana). 31, 104 pp. **Ind. Inst. 7 A 174; looked at**

Nīlakaṇṭha [1998]: *Śrīnīlakaṇṭhacaturdharakṛtaṃ mantrarāmāyaṇam,* sampādaka evaṃ hindī anuvādaka ḍŏ. prabhunātha dvivedī (Lakhnau: Uttara-pradeśa-saṃskṛta-saṃsthānam). **download**

Nīlakaṇṭha 2001: Nīlakaṇṭha, *Mantra Ramayanam,* trans. into English and Hindi by Shantilal Nagar (Delhi: B.R. PC).

**translation(s)** [as above]

**studies** (also on Appayya Dīkṣita, cf. below)

Bronner, Yigal 2011: “A text with a thesis: the Rāmāyaṇa from Appayya Dīkṣita's receptive end”, in Bronner, Yigal and others 2011: 45-63. **download**

Minkowski, Christopher 2002: “Nīlakaṇṭha Caturdhara’s *Mantrakāśīkhaṇḍa*”, *JAOS* 122:   
329-44. **printout**

Minkowski, Christopher Z. (forthcoming): “Nīlakaṇṭha Caturdhara and the Genre of Mantrarahasyaprakāśikā”, to appear in *Proceedings of the Second International Vedic Workshop,* ed. by Y. Ikari (Kyoto: ) **printout**

Rao, Ajay K. 2014: “The Vaiṣṇava writings of a Śaiva intellectual”, *JIPh* 44: 41-65. **download**

**notes see** Lienhard 1984: 144, Gonda, *Stotra Literature,* pp. 264-5 and Sternbach, *Subhāṣita, Gnomic and Didactic Literature,* pp. 65-66; cf. Bühnemann 1983: 77-78 — ‘An interpretation of the RR has been given by Nīlakaṇṭha Caturdhara (2nd half of the 17th cent.), who is known as the commentator on the Mahābhārata, in his “commentary” on the RR (Rāmarakṣāvyākhyāna) called Mantra-Rāmāyaṇa (= MR). This is a selection of Vedic quotations which he interprets in his “Mantrarahasya-prakāśikā”.’

**download** of another text of *Mantra Rāmāyaṇa* in texts and translations downloaded; after an invocatory verse and five introductory verses, it quotes a series of verses from the *Ṛgveda* (10.66.1-5, 6.73.5-9, 10.54.1, 5.45.7, 10.1.2, etc.)

Filliozat’s edn contains *Raghuvīrastava* at pp. 177-91 (plus notes on pp. 318‑24, which simply explain N.D.’s references to the VR); the poem consists of 33 *vasantatilaka* verses (cf. intro. pp. 47-48).

N.D.’s great uncle, Appayya Dīkṣita (1520-92), who was basically a Śaiva Advaitin, wrote a *Rāmāyaṇatātparyasārasaṃgrahastotra,* primarily on Vibhīṣaṇa’s coming to Rāma, in which he refutes the Śrīvaiṣṇava claim that Vibhīṣaṇa’s surrender is the Rāmāyaṇa’s main lesson (*pradhāna*), seeing in it simply his desire to get the rākṣasa kingdom instead of Rāvaṇa. N.D. was also a Śaiva and his *Rāmāyaṇasārasaṃgraha-raghuvīrastava* is along similar lines.

[*Ānandalaharī Śivamahimakalikāstutiḥ Śivakarṇāmr̥tam Śrīrāmāyaṇatātpuryasārasaṅgrahastotram Bhāratasārasaṅgrahastotramañca,* by Appayya Dīkṣita (Haidarabād: Śrīmadappayyadīkṣitendra Granthāvaliprakaśana Samitiḥ, 1989).  **(IND) 7 C 489]**

However, Appayya Dīkṣita’s son Raghunātha Dīkṣita and grandson Veṅkaṭādhvarin were Vaiṣṇavas.

**title (and author)** *Jānakīpariṇaya* and *stotras* to Rāma by Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita

**date (and provenance)** late 17th century (Tamilnād)

**edition(s)** [edn of *Rāmacāpastava* and *Rāmabāṇastava* in Kāvyamālā series **downloaded**]

Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita 1982:  *Śrīrāmacāpastavaḥ rāmabhadrācāryapraṇītaḥ svāmirāmeśvarānandācārya kṛtaḥ*, Jagadguruśrītridaṇḍigranthamālā 10 (Poravandara: Paścimāmnāyaśrīrānandapīṭha, 2039). **(IND) 5 Ramabh. 2**

Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita 1906:  *Janakiparinaya of Ramabhadra Dikshita,* for B.A. degree examination, ed. by M. Lakshmana Sastriar (Poornachandrodaya Press, 1906).

Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita 1866:  *Jānakīpariṇayanāṭaka saptāṅkī,* ed. by Gaṇeśa Śāstrī Lele Tryambakakara (Mumbaī: Gaṇapata Kṛṣṇājī 1866). **(IND) 5 Ramabh. 1**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Sastri, T. S. Kuppuswamy. 1904. "Ramabhadra Dikshita and the Southern Poets of his Time", *Indian Antiquary* 33: 126-42 + 176-96.

Thiruvengadathan, A. 2002:  *Ramabhadra Dikshita and his works – a study* (Chennai: Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute). **(IND)**

**notes** Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita was a student and protégé of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita and received patronage from Shāhjī of Tanjore (1684-1711); he is best known as a grammarian.

The *Jānakīpariṇaya* is a 7-act play in which two sets of characters, one genuine and the other disguised, are brought together, resulting in much comic confusion.

from Moorty 1992: 22 – In Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita’s Jānakīpariṇaya, we have Mārīca and Vidyudjihva possessing the bodies of Daśaratha, Kaikeyī and Mandharā to send Rāma to the forest.

cf. Moorty 1992:24 – The mischief of Śūrpaṇakhā, in creating illusory Sītā, it seems, has got a remote source in Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita’s Jānakī Pariṇaya, in which even before the marriage of Rāma and Sītā, the demons (Mārīca and Vidyudjihva) create an illusion of Sītā leaping into the fire so as to deceive Rāma and make him also jump into the fire.

[This contradicts Moorty’s own dating of the *Janakajānanda* to shortly before 1565 A.D., so **preceding** the *Jānakīpariṇaya*]

**title (and author)** *Śrīharicarita* of Padmanābha

**date (and provenance)** between 16th and 18th centuries (Andhra)

**edition(s)** Padmanābha1972:  *The Śriharicarita-mahākāvya of Śrīhari Padmanābhaśāstrin (the complete* Rāmāyaṇa *in the āryā metre),* ed. by T. Venkatacharya, Adyar Library Series, 102 (Madras: Adyar Library). **Ind. Inst. 4.4.10. 1; pp. xiv-xvii + xxxii-xxxvii photocopied**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** a *mahākāvya* in 16 *sargas and* 2,284 *āryagīti* stanzas (+ *pṛthvī* for final verse of each *sarga*), composed in a generally simple style, though with considerable use of alliteration; edition based on 2 palm-leaf mss in Telugu script.

Warder (Foreword, p. viii):Padmanābha’s *Śrīharicarita* is so far undated and may belong anywhere between the 16th and 18th centuries. It seems to have been written in some principality of Andhra during that period of political ferment and perhaps not circulated outside. Though an epic, it is also a *citrakāvya.*

Venkatacharya (Introduction p. xiii fin.):This *Śrīharicarita* ... ... deals with the entire story of the *Rāmāyaṇa,* including that of the Uttarakāṇḍa, in 16 cantos. There are in the poem [continues on pp. xiv-xvii – **photocopied**]

**title (and author)** *Rāmāyaṇaprabandha* ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭattiri of Melputtūr

**date (and provenance)** early 17th century (Kerala) with later additions

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Śliwczyńska, Bożena 2018: “The *Rāmāyaṇa* story in the Cākyā Kūttu format”, paper presented at 25th ECSAS (Paris, July 2018).

**notes** The extant text is a *campū kāvya* (ie mixed verse and prose) in Sanskrit but including 2 Prakrit stanzas, which is ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭattiri, who did compose some works on Rāmāyaṇa episodes (*Śurpaṇakhāpralāpa* or *Ninanunāsika* from its absence of nasals, *Rākṣasotpatt, Tārakavadha, Ahalyāmokṣa, Bālakāṇḍa*), but is rather a compilation by the Nampyārs and Cākyārs who perform the Cākyā Kūttu dramas at the Vaṭakkunātha temple in Trichur. It includes verses from Bhoja’s *Rāmāyaṇacampū* and the *Hanumannāṭaka.*

A ms of his *Ahalyāmokṣa* is in the Oriental Manuscript Library, Trivandrum, as are single mss of an *Uttararāmāyaṇacampū* (16th century ?) by Mahiṣamaṅgala Nārāyaṇan and a *Hanumadapadāna* of unknown authorship (in 3 *vilasitas,* 17th century?).

**title (and author)** *Rāghavābhyudaya* of Bhagavantarāyamakhin

**date (and provenance)** end of 17th to beginning of 18th century

**edition(s)** Bhagavantarāyamakhin 1985: *Śrīrāghavābhyudaya of Bhagavanta Rāya Makhī,* ed. by P.M. Padmanabha Sarma, Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Series 226 (Thanjavur: Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji’s Sarasvati Mahal Library). **scan (parts)**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** *nāṭaka* in 7 acts, edited from 1 palm-leaf ms. in the T.M.S.S.M. Library (D. No. 4492/B. 5257); the author's father, Gaṅgādhara Makhin, was a minister of Ekoji/Venkoji, ruler of Tanjavur (1676-83), and he praises Shahji II (r. 1684-1711) at the beginning of his play he praises Shahji II (r. 1684-1711), of whom his brother Tryambakarāya Makhin was a minister. The re-ordering of events preserves Kaikeyī’s reputation by eliminating the two boons, while equally Rāma kills Vālin in open fight.

summary (from *kathāsaṃgrahaḥ,* pp. xxiii-xxxviii [**scan**])

**1st act** Daśaratha thinks about installing R. and getting him married. Meanwhile Janaka’s *purohita* Śatānanda announces that Sītā is to be *vīryaśulkā.* Many kings try but fail to string (*āropayitum*) Śiva’s bow. Vasiṣṭha (*kanyāyā asyāḥ ākṛtirekhāvinyāsān dṛṣṭvā*) speaks of it. R. hears Vasiṣṭha's description of S. and is attracted, but his companion/*vidūṣaka* Aṣṭāvakra scoffs. Vasiṣṭha predicts that R. will marry S., declaring that they are incarnations of Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī. Śatānanda is pleased and plans to go to Mithilā. Meanwhile Viśvāmitra asks Daśaratha for R. and L.’s help to guard his sacrifice against Mārīca and Subāhu, sent by Rāvaṇa, and he sends them. Śatānanda along with Aṣṭāvakra set off for Mithilā. Viśvāmitra leads R. + L. to Siddhāśrama.

**2nd act**  Conversation between Gautama’s pupil Dālbhyāyana and Śatānanda’s pupil Nāṭāyana, disclosing that, when Rāma went with Viśvāmitra towards Siddhāśrama, Tāṭakā along with Śūrpaṇakhā obstruct their path, so Rāma kills Tāṭakā and Lakṣmaṇa mutilates Śūrpaṇakhā by cutting off her ears and nose. After Viśvāmitra reached Siddhāśrama and wanted to perform his sacrifice, Mārīca, Subāhu and other rākṣasas intervene; Rāma kills Subāhu with a single arrow and makes Mārīca fall into the sea*,* while Lakṣmaṇa deals with the others. Viśvāmitra with R + L. proceed towards Mithilā. Ahalyā, turned to stone by the curse, is freed by the dust on Rāma’s foot. Dālbhyāyana says that he is going to tell this news to Śatānanda and Nāṭāyana says that he is going to greet Viśvāmitra, now arrived in Mithilā uninvited with R + L. to witness Janaka's sacrifice. R. + L. with Viśvāmitra reach Mithilā. Jānakī, standing on top of the palace with her companion Candralekhā, surveys the scene but is dissatisfied, thinking of Rāma's qualities described by Aṣṭāvakra. She falls in love with Rāma on seeing him enter a garden. A reflection (*pratibimba*) of Sītā on top of the palace is visible and Rāma is consumed by separation/longing (*virahataptaḥ*). Sītā, on the palace top, drives away her agitation caused through separation/longing (*viraha*) by drawing a picture of Rāma; by chance it is blown into the air and reaches Rāma’s hand; on seeing this Sītā is abashed (*tathaiva sītāpi prāsādasthitā satī citre rāmaṃ vilikhya virahakātaratāṃ vyapohati* | *akasmāt sītācitritaṃ citra. ākāśe uḍḍīya rāmahastaṃ prāpnoti* | *tad dṛṣṭvā sītā lajjate* | ). Then Sītā is called by her mother to see Viśvāmitra, while Rāma goes with Aṣṭāvakra to Viśvāmitra's presence.

**3rd act**  Śuka and Sāraṇa are sent by Rāvaṇa to spy on Janaka's plans about Sītā’s *vīryaśulkā,* which Rāvaṇa refuses to attend, being unwilling to dishonour Śiva’s bow. Ś. + S. plot Sītā’s subsequent abduction: Mārīca is to disguise himself as the golden deer so that Rāvaṇa, in *bhikṣu* clothing, can abduct Sītā. Candralekhā’s attitude seems cold (*tatsakhī candralekhāpi śaityopacāraṃ kurvatī āsīt*).Śuka, disguised as a parrot (*śuka*) approaches S., pretending to be her parrot caged by Candralekhā, and so is able to listen to the conversation between S. and Candralekhā about R.'s chances of bending the bow. S., eager to see R. face-to-face, wants to go to the sacrificial enclosure. Seeing R., S. is abashed and clings to Candralekhā, who says that she is agitated in R.’s presence and asks why she is abashed, urging her to get on with it. Meanwhile Mārīca disguised as a wonderful deer leaping about runs in front of S. She wants to catch it and R. runs after it. When R. has gone a long way away, L. follows, saying “On Viśvāmitra’s instructions Janaka has brought out Śiva’s bow and Kauśika is waiting for you to string it.” R. replies “This seems no ordinary deer; after stringing Śiva’s bow and putting an arrow to it, I will kill that deer. You stay with S., since she is alone in the garden with Candralekhā, while I pursue that deer. ” L. does so. Meanwhile Mārīca, hit by R.’s arrow, cries out “Ah S., ah L.” and dies. Hearing that cry of anguish Jānakī thinks that R. has had a mishap and hurries L. <to go after R.>. Greatly angered by the breaking of Śiva’s bow, Jāmadagnya, the destroyer of the kṣatriya lineage, urged on by Rāvaṇa, comes to fight with R.. Hearing his angry words, Sītā is apprehensive and sends Candralekhā to find out what it means. Śuka reports these events to Rāvaṇa, who dons an ascetic’s clothes and comes where S. is alone. S., taking him to be a *bhikṣu* wishes to go to the sacrificial enclosure to attend him. Rāvaṇa abducts S.

**4th act**  Atri, delighted by R.’s prowess, sends his pupil Śākaṭāyana to Viśvāmitra in Mithilā to ask him to protect the *munis* in Janasthāna who are being harmed by Rāvaṇa. On his way he sees the very dejected Aṣṭāvakra, who explains that S. has been abducted, Kauśika has declared that Rāvaṇa must be defeated and S. recovered, R. has entered Janasthāna, and he has been told “Send L. to Sāketa to tell his father and mother”. Śākaṭāyana gives up his journey. But Aṣṭāvakra on the basis that S. was abducted at the *muhūrta* named Bindu is sure that R. will recover her.  
 L. nevertheless, after sending a letter to urge Bharata to return from his uncle’s, follows R. into Janasthāna. Seeing and hearing in various places the killing of Khara and Dūṣaṇa and R.’s extraordinary bravery, he reaches R.. He is distressed to see R. exhausted by the journey, S.’s abduction and repeated battles with rākṣasas. R. laments to L. about his misfortune and his inability to protect his beloved. L. reminds him of Ahalyā’s release from the stone, the breaking of Śiva’s bow and Jāmadagnya’s submission to him. More laments by R.. L. notices Agastya’s pupil Maitrāyaṇa and asks Agastya’s whereabouts; they both go to him. Agastya gives R. the Nārāyaṇīya bow given by Mahendra, a pair of quivers filled with inexhaustible arrows and a sword, and reassures him that he will kill Rāvaṇa and obtain his wife.  
 R. + L., searching, find broken bow, shattered armour, wrecked chariot and slaughtered donkeys. Then Jaṭāyu calls out identifying Rāvaṇa as the culprit, expires and is cremated. R. kills Kabandha, who becomes a Gandharva when placed in a hole/grave and offers his help: “Atri’s wife Anasūyā has sent to S. through Hanumān a pair of *dukūla* (very fine bark-cloth) garments and when wearing them no one can touch her. Cursed by Nalakūbara, Rāvaṇa will not touch an unwilling woman. Go to the Śabarī at Pampāsaras. There I will send Hanumān and by his mouth/agency everything will turn out right.” With these words he disappears. R., after sending the Śabarī to heaven, reached Pampā.

**5th act**  The vānara armies are sent by Sugrīva to search for Sītā. Hanumān<alone> is able to leap over the ocean ; he overcomes Laṅkā, the guardian deity of Laṅkā, and enters Laṅkā. Laṅkā, eager to go to Brahmaloka, questions one of Rāvaṇa’s spies, who declares that Vālin had been defeated by their master Rāvaṇa but R., in order to give the vānara kingdom to his ally Sugrīva, has killed Vālin and made Sugrīva king; in return Sugrīva has sent leading vānaras, headed by Jāmbavān and Aṅgada, to search for S.; a certain vānāra, named Hanumān, has killed Siṃhikā, got past Surasā, overcome Maināka and reached Laṅkā; he has been unable to find him and is going to report to Rāvaṇa. Laṅkā says that this vānara has overcome her and will destroy Rāvaṇa; she then goes to Brahmaloka. Hanumān searches for S. by night and finally reaches the *aśokavanikā.* Up a *śiṃśupā* tree he sees S. with a companion; uncertain, he hears Trijaṭā reassuring S. and is sure.

Meanwhile, two *vidyādharas,* sent by Danu, put on a *rūpaka* for Sītā after putting a magic powder round the *aśokavanikā* to prevent anyone hostile to Rāma seeing it. The play gives the story of the Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa in order to reassure her that Rāma is taking steps to find her; this includes Rāma’s *unmāda,* Hanumān being sent by Sugrīva to meet Rāma (which alarms Guha), first Guha and then Hanumān greeting Rāma, Rāma learning the news from Guha of Daśaratha’s death from grief, Bharata anointing Rāma’s sandals and ruling from Nandigrāma, then Guha being sent back to Sāketa, Hanumān being asked why he has come and explaining Sugrīva’s fear, Rāma kicking Dundubhi and piercing the 7 *sāls* with a single arrow, Sugrīva fighting Vālin and Rāma’s killing of Vālin. Sugrīva’s installation, his sending vānaras to search for Sītā, Rāma giving his ring to Hanumān, Hanumān having now entered Laṅkā. Whereat Hanumān descends from the tree, reveals himself as Rāma’s messenger and hands over Rāma’s ring. Sītā, declaring that she cannot live much longer, sends him off with her *cūḍāmaṇi.* Meanwhile Rāvaṇa arrives and Hanumān gets back into the tree. Rāvaṇa asks Sītā to become his wife and, enraged by her refusal, draws his sword on her but Hanumān stops him and announces himself as Rāma’s envoy. When Rāvaṇa prepares to have him killed, Vibhīṣaṇa says that as an envoy he should not be killed, so Rāvaṇa orders Prahasta, Akṣa and others to bind him. but Hanumān kills them. However, Meghanāda binds Hanumān with the Brahmāstra and sets his tail alight; at Sītā’s request/prayer the fire becomes cool. Hanumān sets Laṅkā alight and then leaves the city. Learning from a *vidyādhara* that Hanumān was not burnt, offers obeisance to her family guru.

**6th act**  Rāvaṇa, enraged by the burning of Laṅkā, builds a wall round the *śiṃśupā* tree and confines Sītā alone within it. Śacī, sent by Indra to reassure Sītā, sees Laṅkā burnt, apart from the houses of Vibhīṣaṇa and other good people, and approaches Sītā. Seeing her, Sītā shows her joy and asks whether Hanumān has reached Rāma. Śacī gives Sītā a divine ointment by which she can see everything on earth directly.  
 Rāma hears Hanumān’s news, sees the *cūḍāmaṇi* and grieves deeply. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, accompanied by the vānara army, reach the sea; here Vibhīṣaṇa comes to Rāma for refuge. Requested/implored by Rāma, Ocean advises Nala’s building of the causeway and they all reach Laṅkā. Śuka and Sāraṇa show Rāvaṇa the vānara forces. Sugrīva humiliates Rāvaṇa by snatching his crown. Much fighting ensues; Atikāya, Kumbhakarṇa and other generals are killed; Indrajit tries to sacrifice at Nikumbhilā but is interrupted by Vibhīṣaṇa, Lakṣmaṇa, Hanumān etc. and summoned to battle. Lakṣmaṇa kills Indrajit. Rāvaṇa enters the battle; mounting the chariot sent by Indra, Rāma prepares to fight Rāvaṇa. When Rāvaṇa’s severed heads repeatedly regrow, Rāma is prompted by Mātali to cut them off with the Brahmāstra and succeeds; Indra and the other gods rejoice; Śacī and Sītā exult. Jānakī is summoned by Hanumān to see Rāma and, thinking herself impure, enters the fire lit by Hanumān to reassure the people. Rāma receives her back joyfully from Pāvaka. The gods led by Vidhātṛ (= Brahmā) and Mahendra, praise Rāma. Daśaratha, seated with Mahendra, appears and prepares to set out for Ayodhyā to observe Rāma and Sītā’s marriage and <Rāma’s> installation. They all mount Puṣpaka and return to Sāketa.

**7th act** Daśaratha, surrounded by his sons (all 4 named). erects a *kalyāṇamaṇḍapa;* Sīradhvaja, king of Mithilā, and his younger brother Kuśadhvaja get the marriages of Sītā, Urmilā, Māṇḍavī and Śrutakīrti performed by Śatānanda. Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra pronounce blessings. Mahendra etc. observe from heaven and rain down flowers. Viśvāmitra duly performs Rāma’s installation, amid general rejoicing. General distribution of ornaments; Sītā takes the necklace from her own neck and gives it to Hanumān. Pavana offers a necklace to honour Rāma which flies from the sky to adorn Rāma’s neck. Rāmarājya description.

**title (and author)** *Sītārāghava* and *Rāghavīya* of Rāma Pāṇivāda

**date (and provenance)** 18th century, prob. 1756 and pre 1746 (Travancore)

**edition(s)** Rāma Pāṇivāda 1942: *Rāghavīya,* ed. by L.A. Ravi Varma, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 146 (Trivandrum: Supt., Govt. Press).  
 **(IND) Sansk. ser. B 1/57; typed summary of text in “Further Notes (verbal/general)”**

Rāma Pāṇivāda 1958: *Sītārāghava of Rāma Pāṇivāda,* ed. by Suranad Kunjan Pillai, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 192 (Trivandrum: Suranat Kunjan Pillai).  
 **download; introduction (pp. 1-7) photocopied**

**translation(s)**

**studies**

**notes** *Sītārāghava,* drama in 7 acts by Rāma Pāṇivāda, who was associated with the court of Mārtāṇḍa Varma of Travancore (1729-58). It was probably written for the Murajapam festival in the Padmanābhasvāmi temple in 1756. Rāma Pāṇivāda also wrote a *mahākāvya* entitled *Rāghavīya* (ed. by L.A. Ravi Varma, **see** above)

cf. also Lienhard 1984: 210-11

**title (and author)** *Sītākalyāṇavīthī* and *Vīrarāghavavyāyoga* of Veṅkāmātya

**date (and provenance)** 18th century (Karṇātaka)

**edition(s)** *Sītākalyāṇavīthi* *of Veṅkāmātya,* ed. by R. Raghavendra Rao, Oriental Research Institute Series, 171 (Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1989). **Ind. Inst. 5 Venkam. 1**

*Vīrarāghavavyāyoga of* *Veṅkāmātya,* ed. by B.A. Dodamani, Oriental Research Institute Series, 167 (Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, 1988). **Ind. Inst. 5 Venkam. 3**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Sastry, M.P.L. 1940-41: “Pradhāna Venkappaiah – poet and playwright”, *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* 31: 36-52. **(IND)**

**notes** Veṅkāmātya (also known as Pradhāna Veṅkappaiya / Pradhānavaṅkabhūpati / Veṅkaṭabhūpati / Veṅka Sūri) was also the author of a Kannaḍa *Rāmāyaṇa.*

Sastry 1940-41: 36 – “Venkappaiah was a minister of Mysore serving nominally under the Mysore Kings, Kṛṣṇarāja Wodeyar II, Nanjarāja Wodeyar and Beṭṭada Chāmarāja Wodeya, but actually under Haidar Ali from about 1763 A.D. till 1780 A.D. His activities, however, were not confined to matters of administration and court politics only. He was an eminent scholar in Sanskrit and Kannada and the many works that he has written bear evidence to his abilities as a writer of wide interests and catholic outlook.”

*Sītākalyāṇavīthī* is a one-act play. Nārada and a pupil observe the armies camped on the outskirts of Mithilā of princes come to attend Sītā’s *svayaṃvara*, i.e. contest to bend Śiva’s bow. Nārada states that if it can be done it will only be by Rāma Dāśaratha, giving the background of his arrival along with Viśvāmitra. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa with Viśvāmitra also see the camps before entering the already prepared wedding pavilion. Śatānanda is pleased to see R + L when they are introduced by Viśvāmitra. Rāma succeeds after others fail and is garlanded by Sītā. Paraśurāma enters in a rage and is humbled by Rāma but pacified. Lakṣmaṇa is married to Urmilā. All return joyfully to Ayodhyā. [Sastry 1940-41: 44 cursorily describes this play]

*Vīrarāghavavyāyoga* is a type of *rūpaka,* a military spectacle, in one act. There are no female characters, with *vīra* as the predominant *rasa.* The main action is the fight between Rāma and Khara, supported by his brothers Dūṣaṇa and Triśiras. Rāma easily defeats and kills them with Mātali’s help (Mātali sent now by Indra). Jaṭāyu also appears. Two minor deities, Citraratha and Cāmaragrāhī, describe the actual battle.

Sastry M.P.L. 1940-41: 41-42 – “This is a one act play describing the prowess of Srī Rāma and the defeat of the two powerful demons Khara and Vidūṣa who were causing great trouble to the sages of the Daṇḍaka forest . . . The characters that appear in the drama are, Khara, Vidūṣaṇa, Citraratha, Mātali, Mahēndra, Jaṭāyu, Lakṣmaṇa, Sītā and Rāma. . . . | . . .  
 There is a slight innovation in the drama. In the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* we find that Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa meet Jaṭāyu when they go to Pañcavaṭi. Khara becomes enraged at the insult done to Śūrpaṇakhī by Rāma and proposes to wage war with him. Here in the drama, Jaṭāyu is made to come to Rāma and instigate the war with Khara and Vidūṣaṇa to save the sages the trouble.  
 The play ends with the defeat of Khara and Vidūṣaṇa, and the happy return of Rāma to the hermitage, causing great relief to all the sages in the Daṇḍaka forest.”

**various further notes**

Texts called *Rāmāyaṇa* are also recorded (in *NCC* vol. 25) by Mallikārjuna, Rāmagulam Trivedin, Rāmānanda Mayūra, Viśvanātha Siṃha (Darbhaṅga, 1729) and Śivarāma Mahīśa; also a *(Viśeṣana)Rāmāyaṇa* by Vīrarāghava, son of Vīṇāveṅkaṭapati.

*Rāmāyaṇaśloka / Cirañjīvirāmāyaṇa,* a short poem on the Rāmāyaṇa story printed in *Stotrārṇava* pp. 266-67 (source: *NCC* vol. 25)

*Rāmacaritābdhiratna* by Nityānanda Śāstrī is a 20th-century rendering  
[*Śrīrāmacaritābdhiratna of Nityananda Shastri,*ed. and trans. by Satyavrat Sastri (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2005). **SOAS KC294.5922 /991016**  
modern *citrakāvya* telling the story of Rāma conceived as the ocean, *udadhi*; in 14 cantos, from the number of jewels, *ratna*, arising from churning; dated by Nagar (1999: I, 82-85) to 8th century but in fact 20th century (first published Bombay: Venkateshwar Steam Press, 1933; author Nityananda Shastri born 1889, last appointment mentioned in 1938 — from Satyavrat Shastri, intro, pp. ix-xii)]

*Rāmarahasya/Rāmacarita* of Mohanasvāmī, IOL cat. 3917 (ms. 978, written in 1750 A.D.; cf. Nagar 1999: I, 94-95)

*Rāmacarita* by Kāśīnātha Śarman in 13 *sargas,* IOL cat. 3921 (ms. 1184b)

*Rāmāṣṭapadī* by Rāmakavi (great-grandson of Govinda Dīkṣita, minister of Acyuta and Raghunātha, early Nāyakas of Tañjāvur) – “In *Rāmāṣṭapadī,* the whole *Rāmāyaṇa* is presented in a brief compass, highlighting the chief episodes. The author is naturally reminded often of Vālmīki’s own text in the corresponding contexts and he uses Vālmiki’s own words frequently, even at the risk of the cadence and flow of the lines being affected.” (Raghavan 2009: 177)

Raghuvaryatīrtha 1985: *Raghunāthavijayam of Śrī Raghuvaryatīrtha,* ed. by Shankarganapathi Pathak, University of Mysore Oriental Research Institute Series 152 (Mysore: Oriental Research Institute). **own copy**

Nārāyaṇakavi (1868-1935): *Pādukāpaṭṭābhiṣekaṃ nārāyaṇakaviviracitam,* ed. Kopalle Sriramamurti. Tirupati: Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute, 1973 [*on the meeting of Bharata with Rāma and return with the sandals*].