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**general notes**

fromDesai 1970: 5

Rāma story: three routes to E and SE Asia:

1 northern by land via Panjab and Kashmir to Tibet, China and E. Turkestan

2 southern by sea from Gujarat and S India to Java, Sumatra, Malaya

3 eastern **by land** from Bengal to Burma, Thailand and Laos ?? is this valid?

with Vietnam and Cambodia getting it partly from Java and partly from India by the eastern route.]

Ohno (1999: 43, 66) divides SE Asian *Rms* thus:

a Yunnan, Myanmar, Laos Muongsing version

b Java, *HSR*, Thai, Khmer

Ohno (1995a: 16) divides SE Asian *Rms* thus:

1 *Kakawin,* Khmer

2 *HSR,* Thai

3 Myanmar, Lao Muongsing, Yunnan *Lanka Xihe*

**Motifs not found in SE Asian Rāma story:**

**Ahalyā**

*Ajatadevi, Ajna, Dewi Indra, Ganga Devi, Kala Adjana, Khai Ap, Khay, Khaysi, Rontah*

*motif: seduction by masking as woman’s husband: T, TB: K 1311*

**Kaikeyī**

*motif: conception from eating mango: T, TB: T 511.1.3*

**Kaikeyī’s father**

*Kokaraja*

*motif: betrayal of husband’s secret by wife: T, TB: K 2213.4*

**Kausalyā** [*Rama’s mother*]

*motif: conception from eating mango: T, TB: T 511.1.3*

**Mārīca**

*Maharik, Malit, Mareet*

*motif Th A955.10 islands from transformed object or person*

**Rāma**

*motif: lawsuit between owl and kite: T, TB: 270.1*

**Sītā**

*Bach-Tinh, Potre Malaila Ganding, Potre Malano Tihaia, Sida, Sinta, Soite, Xila*

*motif: T, TB: A153 food of the gods:*

*motif: lucky marks on body: T, TB: N 135.4*

*motif: little girl moves enormous bow which nobody could ever carry before: T, TB: F 624.9*

*motif: voice from heaven testifies to innocence of accused: T: H 216.2*

**Śrāvaṇa**

*motif: cruel daughter-in-law: T, TB: S 54*

**Sumitrā**

*motif: conception from eating mango: T, TB: T 511.1.3*

**Vālmīki**

*Balamiga, Dipbahcakkhu, Hayam Canggong, Vajjamrik, Watchamaruk*

*motif: murderer becomes ascetic: T, TB: V 462.0.4*

**Viśvāmitra**

*Bisvamitr, Bodaw, Sron, Swamit;*

*Kotampa* [*Gunti’s guru, conflated with Viśvāmitra*]

*motif: curse by anchorite / brāhman: T, TB: M 411.14.2 / 411.14.3*

*motif: substitution of low-caste boy for promised child detected when he picks long route instead of short one through jungle: T, TB: H 38.2.5*

*motif: prince chooses shorter but more dangerous route: T, TB: H 1561.9*

*motif: magic knowledge of saints and holy men: T: D 1810.0.3*

**title (and author)** inscription (C. 173) of Prakāśadharman at Trà-kiẹ̆u

**date (and provenance)** second half of 7th century, Vietnam (? 657 A.D.)

**studies** Goodall, Dominic, and Arlo Griffiths 2013: “Études du corpus des inscriptions du Campā. V. The short foundation inscription of Prakāśadharman-Vikrāntavarman, king of Campā”, *IIJ* 56: 419-40. [**see** esp. pp. 436-7] **download**

Mus, Paul 1928: “L’inscription à Vālmīki de Prakāçadharma (Trà-kiẹ̀u)”, *BEFEO* 28: 147-52. Vietnamese: Mus 1928 **download; analysed**

Tran Ky Phuong 2000: “The wedding of Sita: a theme from the Ramayana represented on the Tra Kieu pedestal [a masterpiece of Cham sculpture]”, in Klokke 2000: 51-58.  
 **scan; analysed**

**notes** Prakāśadharman (Po Kia Pho Pa Mo, as transcribed from the Chinese) ruled Campā from 653 AD to c. 687. The inscription on the pedestal (h. 54 cm × w. 54 × d. 12) runs over two lines along two of the four vertical faces of the object; the sequence is face A (“left”, two lines), face B (“right”, two lines). It was found by J.Y. Claeys at Trà‑kiẹ̆u (the ancient Siṃhapura and early capital) in 1927 and will appear in the *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Campā* as C. 173 (cf. Goodal and Griffiths 2013: 434-37). In another inscription (Mỹ Sơn stele inscription of 656 A.D.), Prakāśadharman compares himself to Rāma, son of king Daśaratha.

The inscription shows close acquaintance with the *Bālakāṇḍa*: Brahmā blessing the first appearance of poesy from Vālmīki’s sorrow, Vālmīki as a great sage and *ādikavi,* Rāma (in gen.) described as *viṣṇoḥ puṃsaḥ purāṇasya mānuṣasyātmarūpiṇaḥ*; it also mentions “Dalipa, Māndhātṛ, Droṇa, Asvatthāman, Daśartha [sic], Rāma, etc.” (Chhabra 1965: 83) **See also** pp. 178-81 (+ 185-6 for notes) from Ghosh’s article in Saklani (ed.) 2006.

transcription from Corpus of the Inscriptions of Campā website (https://isaw.nyu.edu/publications/inscriptions/campa/inscriptions/C0173.html):

**Face A.**

(1) ((siddham))

I *Anuṣṭubh*

yasya śokāt samutpannaṁ ślokaṁ brahmābhipū(jati)

[vi](ṣṇoḥ) puṅsaḥ purāṇasya manu(jasyā)tmarūpiṇaḥ

II *Anuṣṭubh*

(2) [rāmasya] (ca)ritaṁ kṛts[n]aṁ kṛtaṁ (yenābhisādhanaṁ)

kaver ādyasya maharṣṣer vv(ā)lmīkeś cāvaner iha

**Face B.**

III *Anuṣṭubh*

(1) (pūjāsthānaṁ) punas tasya kṛta ⎼ Cy ⏓ ⏑ ⎼ ⏑ ⎼

prakāśadharmmanṛpatis sarvvārigaṇasūdanaḥ

IV *Anuṣṭubh*

(2) vidyāśaktikṣamālakṣ(m)īkīrttidhairyya[guṇā]n(v)i(taḥ)

(jaya)ty eṣa jagatkāntaś śārade ntarite [v]i[dhau]

Gerard Moussay (Moussay 1976) suggests that the *Rāmāyaṇa* may have been known in Campā before 7C, but no evidence; it is possible that it was introduced by king Prakāśadharma from Khmer sources in 7C.

Mỹ Sơn is a cluster of abandoned and partly ruined Hindu temples constructed between the 4th and the 14th century A.D. by the kings of Campā (Chiêm Thành in Vietnamese). The temples are dedicated to worship of Śiva under various local names, esp. Bhadreśvara. Mỹ Sơn is located near the village of Duy Phú (Duy Xuyên district, Quảng Nam province, Central Vietnam), 69 km SW of Da Nang, and approximately 10 km from Trà Kiẹ̆u (Siṃhapura). The temples are in a valley roughly 2 km wide, surrounded by two mountain ranges, which from the 4th to the 13th century AD was a site of religious ceremony for kings of the ruling dynasties of Champā, as well as a burial place for Cham royalty and national heroes.

**cf. on Cham literature**

Goss 2016: 37-38 – ‘With respect to Cham literature, one of the five poems that represents popular cultural heritage is the Cham version of the Rama story, *Pram Dit Pram Lak* (the story of Rama and Lakshmana). The existing texts of this work come from Panduranga, the ancient capital of the southernmost state of Champa, along with another work entitled *Damnuy Po Keidai Mukerasih* (the tale of the ascetic king, Dasaratha, father of Rama). Gerard Moussay, who has studied these texts, found similarities with the Malay *Hikayat Sri Rama*, although the title appears to have some connection with the Khmer or Lao versions. Since there are no written texts remaining from that period, Geoffrey Marrison concludes by stating: “We have in fact what appears to be a folk tradition rather than an established literary one: perhaps we should look to the Cambodian dance-drama...as the source of the Cham work.”’ [citing Marrison, Geoffrey E. 1985: “The Chams and their literature”, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the RAS* 58.2 (249): 49 (**see download**)]

**other inscriptional evidence**

Guy 2011 mentions earlier (but not Rāmāyaṇa related) inscriptions:

a Skt inscr. in Tamil Grantha script of c. 450 A.D. of Pūrṇavarman at Ciaruteun, near Bogor, W Java, who calls himself king of Tarumanagara and a devotee of Viṣṇu (pp. 243-4)

seven steles from Kutei, E. Borneo, “attributed on palaeographic grounds to the late fourth century” (p.245), installed by king Mūlavarman, recording animal sacrifice and gift-giving rituals performed by brāhmans on his behalf (pp. 245-6).

Vo Canh stele, found near the coastal city of Nha Trang, central Vietnam, in Cham territory, “close in date to the Kutei *yūpa* steles but written in a cruder Sanskrit”.

3 inscr. from Mỹ Sơn, “a major religious centre from the early northern Cham kingdoms, are all associated with the oldest recorded Cham ruler, Bhadravarman I, who employed the honorific title ‘Dharmamaharaja’. They are attributed to *c.* CE 400, and have been interpreted as referring to sacrifices to Shiva as Bhadesvara [sic].” (p.249)

There are also roughly contemporary inscriptions to Jaimini (*om jaiminaye svāhā*) at Sambor Prei Kuk (Īśānapura, capital of Chenla; K.609 on an offering receptacle, early 7th century, at Prasat Yeai Poeun/Yeah Puon) and about the erection of a statue of Vālmīki at Prasat Phnom Bayang (K.851).

Possibly even earlier epigraphic evidence can be found at two other places: the 5th-century *yūpa* inscriptions of king Mūlavarman from Kutei, East Kalimantan, Borneo, if one verse does echo *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* (CE) 5.41.6 (Chhabra 1945: 14-15), and the Canggal inscr. from Central Java (dated *śaka* 654 = 732 A.D.).

Canggal inscription is a record of king Sañjaya, “who, like Raghu, subdued the neighbouring princes and maintained peace and order so ably that his subjects felt perfectly secure.” (Chhabra 1965: 45), The Kuñjara (*kuñjarakuñjadeśa*) mentioned in it can perhaps be identified with the location of Ayastya’s *āśrama* visited by exiles in *VR*  (Chihara 1996: 132), which is made somewhat more probable by the apparent echo in verse 7 of *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* (CE) 4.39.28-30*.* [Candi Canggal (also known as Candi Gunung Wukir) is located at Canggal village, Salam, Magelang.]cf. Chihara 1996: 132 “It has been demonstrated on the basis of the Canggal inscription of 732, the oldest dated inscription from central Java, that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was already known at this time in central Java, even if it was in a form somewhat different from the original work by Vālmīki.”

inscr. (1 of 3) of Mūlavarman from Kutei, East Borneo: Chhabra 1965: 89 – “The opening words of the inscription echo the first *pāda* of the following stanza in Vālmīki’s *Rāmāyaṇa*:

jayaty=atibalo Rāmo Lakṣmaṇaś=ca mahābalaḥ

rājā jayati Sugrīvo Rāghaveṇ=ābhipālitaḥ (*Sundarakāṇḍa,* XLII, 33)”

A 7th-century Vietnamese inscription mentions the *krauñca* episode (Mus 1928: 147, 150; cf. Filliozat 1983: 193).

Pre Rup, Angkor area:stele in situ with Sanskrit inscription, dated 883 –   
Rāma’s banishment; abduction of Sītā by enemy (Cœdès 1937: I, 83, 296; K.806.51)

Siyonn 2005: 103-4 “A ninth-century inscription found to the northeast of Thnal Baray at Angkor, relates:  
 La bouche de rois racontait sa gloire, et leurs femmes la chantaient: Rāghava n’a eu pour chantre que son propre fils, célébrant sa gloire telle qu’il avait entendu raconter par Vālmīki (Bergaigne 1893: 290, K. 281, face C, stanza XXVII).

This inscription states that Vālmīki is the narrator of the Rāmāyaṇa and also teaches Rāma’s son(s) the story of Rāma as described in the Uttarakāṇḍa and the Bālakāṇḍa of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa. A vestigial 10th-century inscription on a terrace at Angkor Thom, reads “Le Guru, le fils de Bhṛgu, Vālmīki .... (Coedès 1942: 185, K. 491, st. I).”

Phnom Bayang (now at Phnom Penh):inscription on stele**,** end 9 C -  
Rāvaṇa has 10 heads; Rāvaṇa hurt by Śiva’s foot while moving Kailāsa, roars; Śiva presses down foot to stop Rāvaṇa moving Kailāsa (Cœdès 1937: I, 256-58, 300, K.853; Giteau 1967-68: 594-95).

Pre Rup, Angkor area: inscription of Rājendravarman (K. 806, mid 10th century) alludes implicitly *inter alia* to *Rahuvaṃśa* and *Rāmāyaṇa,* the latter (at stanza 207) being to Mārīca as afraid of syllables beginning with *ra* (Filliozat 1983: 194-95).

later Cambodian inscriptions mentioning the Rāmāyaṇa are found at Prāsāt Trapān Run (dated 1006 A.D., K 598), Prāsāt Barmei (c. *śaka* 1000 = 1078 A.D., K 744) and one from a Yogīśvara paṇḍita (end of 11th century). [Filliozat 1983: 196]

Prāsāt Cruṅ (NE of Aṅkor Thom; end 12th century) – stele inscr. (K. 287) verse 39:   
*rāme svayaṃ vairivadhāya yāte viddho 'disat paddhatim amvurāśiḥ  
 yasyācalasyāpi sa sañjahāra sainyair yuyutsūn yavanendravīrān*

Râma étant parti en personne pour tuer ses ennemis, l'Océan percé [par ses flèches] lui livra passage; mais, sans que ce roi eût à bouger, [l'Océan] détruisit les chefs du roi des Yavana, avides de combattre, avec leurs guerriers.  
[from p. 26 of Jacques, Claude 2005: “Deux problèmes posés par l'inscription de la stèle de Praḥ Khan K. 908”, *Aséanie* 15: 11-31]

There is also a roughly contemporary statue of Vālmīki at Phnom Bayang. [source: Roveda 2003: 55, citing Dagens, *Les Khmers* (Les Belles Lettres, 2003): 218; cf. Mus 1928: 149]

Christie 1983: 34-35 [on Java]

. . . . . . There is no doubt that the *Rāmāyana*, the tale of the ideal king Rama, was very popular from the ninth century onwards. While the version surviving in the present theatrical tradition is thought to date to the eleventh or twelfth centuries, there is mention in an early tenth century inscription of a *sīma* ceremony which involved, among other things, a recitation of the *Rāmāyana* and of part of the *Mahābhārata.* This **|** particular inscription is interesting for the detailed description given of the performances accompanying the *sīma* ceremony:

. . . afterwards was caused to be desired a performance: the *sang tankil hyang* [he who calls upon the divine] si Nalu sang, relating the story of Bhīmma Kumāra [young Bhīma], si Jaluk danced in *kīcaka* style, relating the story of the *Rāmāyana,* the *pirus* and *bañol* clowns, si Mungmuk and si Galigi, performed, [and] a *wayang* [shadow puppet?] performance was given for the gods, relating the story of Bhīmma Kumāra.43

Here a series of drama was enacted, not only for the people present at the ceremony, but also for the gods. The theater was then, as it is now, a medium of communication not only among groups of people, but also between the human sphere and the divine. . . . . . .

43. Sangsang, A.D. 907 (Sarkar 1971: LXXII.2b.9-10). [Sarkar, H.B. 1971: *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java,* 2 vols (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay)]

**cf. literary evidence**

Dhar 2019b: 360 [citing Maspero 2002 (Eng. tr.): Chapter 2, The Origins of the Cham Kings, pp. 24–25 and noting that the Việts were located to the north of the people of Campā] – “The Việt chronicles also record a geographical transposition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Campā. They speak of the kingdom of Diệu Nghiêm, whose king Tràng Minh (Rāvaṇa) was the king of demons, Daśānana (with ten-heads). North of this was the country of Hồ Tôn Tình (Ayodhyā?), where King Daśaratha reigned. The crown prince, Chương Tư (Rāma) was married to princess Bạch Tĩnh (Sītā). Tràng Minh invaded Hồ Tôn Tình and captured Bạch Tĩnh. Chương Tư led an army of monkeys who bridged the sea with mountains they had pulled out, conquered Diệu Nghiêm, killed Tràng Minh and brought Bạch Tĩnh back to Hồ Tôn Tình. This conveys that the ancient Việts perceived the kingdom of Rāvaṇa, a ten-headed enemy king, as being across the sea and to the south of the country of the people of Campā. This is analogous to the location of Daśaratha’s kingdom, Ayodhyā, in relation to Daśānana’s (or Rāvaṇa’s) kingdom, Laṅkā, as mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and hence gives an important insight into the geographical trans-position of the *Rāmāyaṇa* narrative in Campā. The Việts believed the people of Hồ Tôn Tình to be of simian race and the “Cams” to be their descendants.”
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Saran, Malini 2021: “The discourse on governance and ethics as a leitmotif in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa or Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin”, in Dhar 2021a: 176-92. **own copy (vol.)**

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan 1980: “The migration of the Rāmāyaṇa story to Indonesia and some problems connected with the structure and contents of the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa”, in Raghavan 1980: 103-21. **own copy**

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan 1983: “The Ramayana in South-east Asia: a general survey”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 206-20. **own copy**

Supomo, S. 2000: “Kama in the Old Javanese kakawin”, in Lokesh Chandra 2000: 263-81.

Supomo, S. unpublished: “The rendering of the *Mahābhārata*  and the *Rāmāyaṇa* into Old Javanese” [*text of lecture*] **printout; checked**

Uhlenbeck, E.M. 1975: “De interpretatie van de Oud-Javaanse Ramayana-kakawin”, *BKI* 131.2/3: 195-213. **download**

Uhlenbeck, E.M. 1989: “The problem of interpolation in the old Javanese Ramayana Kakawin”, *BKI* 145.2-3: 324-35. [*on Kakawin 3.53-85*] **download; notes**

Wieringa, Edwin P. 2018: “The illustrated Asṭabrata [sic] in Pakualaman manuscript art”, in Ming and van der Molen 2018: 180-215. **download**

Wirjosuparto, Sutjipto and Raden Mas 1969: *Rama stories in Indonesia* (Djakarta: Bhratara).  
55 pp. **Toyo Bunko nIX-7-E-23**

Zoetmulder, P.J. 1974: *Kalangwan: a survey of old Javanese literature,* Kon. Inst. voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Translation Series 16 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).  
 **Bod. (Nuneham) 24712 d. 233/16; scan of pp. 83-87 and 217-33**

**notes** text formerly attributed to Yogīśvara (not in fact a proper name but a title for a scholar)**;** Khanna and Saran 1993 explore various Indian sources for Kakawin in addition to Bhaṭṭi (cf. Saran and Khanna 2004: 93-95); the author is clearly indebted to Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa*. Among the metres used are *śārdūlavikrīḍita* and *sragdharā.* Unlike subsequent epic *kakawins* it is not prefaced by an invocation (perhaps an indication that it was composed before that conventions was established). It is referred to within the Uttarakāṇḍa as a *kidung,* ‘song’ (Zoetmulder 1974: 144).

*MB* — Fairly standard plot outline. Few conversations, but some lengthy nature descriptions. Some extended narrative, but often a brief summary / skeleton relying on audience’s knowledge / ? reciter’s improvisation for detail: e.g. no mention of Mantharā’s role, except that Kaikeyī is said (3.7) to rely too much ‘on the words of a suitor’; no mention of visit by Rāma to Bharadvāja, but the sage’s miraculous entertainment of Bharata’s army is narrated (3.37-39). This feature is less apparent in the second half of the text.

Editions by Kern, Santoso and Poerbatjaraka all based on mss from Bali and the courts of Central Java; however a complete ms. and eight fragments/excerpts in the Merapi Merbabu Collection now in the Perpustakaan Nasional are known and originated from the Merapi Merbabu area of Central Java show that familiarity with it was more widely diffused (van der Molen 2012).

Robson 1980 argues that the OJ *kakawin* celebrated the victory of central Java’s Śaiva rulers over the Buddhist Śailendra dynasty, which ruled in the 8th and early 9th centuries. He also derives the Prambanan reliefs not from *Kakawin* but from *proto-HSR* (Robson 1980: 12-13 (unlike Panataran reliefs, which do represent *Kakawin*, so it had by that time become the predominant version).

**Raghavan 1975: 92-93** –   
“The following peculiarities show that Bhaṭṭi is not the only source of the OJR:  
 (i) Regarding Śabarī, the woman-ascetic whom Rāma meets, a *fantastic story is given* of how in Viṣṇu’s incarnation as the Boar (Varāha), Viṣṇu swallowed her garland and consequently died; she in turn, ate his corpse and became dark in her face. When Rāma came, he made her face clear again.  
 (ii) Svayamprabhā is related to the demons and she deceives the monkeys.  
 . . . . . .  
 (xiii) In Sītā’s fire-ordeal, *Fire is changed into a golden lotus.*1  
 1. A golden lotus is introduced here in Thai, as we have seen, in a different way*.*

**notes from/about Santoso, *Ramayana Kakawin***:   
particularly relevant: pp. vii-x, 12-12, 17-18, 24-25, 28-32 and 838-44;

Janaka first mentioned at II.49 and Sītā clearly his natural daughter at II.51

“The common view on the date of the Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin at present is that it was written at the period of King Balituṅ’s reign (898-930 A.D.), ending the controversy existing for more than half a century. However, the present author is not entirely satisfied with it, because the scholars concerned overlook one thing, that is the fact that the Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin is a product of continuous reshaping and remodelling.” (p. 17)

Santoso affirms (p. 18) that the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* “had been followed by the Javanese author right to the end” against the view of Hooykaas (followed by Zoetmulder and Uhlenbeck) and claims that Bulcke in conversation agreed.

“some part of the RK must have been younger than the Rāmāyaṇa proper, and that those parts are the result of rewriting and reshaping which took place from the time of Balituṅ’s reign to the end of Hayam-Wuruk’s reign (900-1400 A.D.)” (p. 24)

He argues (pp. 24-26) that Yogīśvara is a title rather than a name and so the author is unknown.

**notes from Ghosh 1936:**

Ghosh shows that cantos 1-5 of the Kakawin follow the Bhaṭṭikāvya very closely (but argues that its cantos 6-19 do not). His final paragraph (on p.117) is:

“Thus we can conclude finally that the old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* is partially a translation and partially an adaptation of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* and has nothing to do with the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki or its conjectured extinct translation in the old Javanese.” [*referring to suggestion by H.B. Sarkar (1934: 174)*].

Uhlenbeck 1989 regards OJ Kakawin 3.53-85 (Rāma’s lecture to Bharata on statecraft) as interpolated since the passage comes between 3.52 and 3.86 (the final verse of the *sarga*), both in *mālinī* metre and fitting well together. [The first three *sargas* are all otherwise in one metre, apart from a change of metre for the last one or two verses.] He mentions Aichele 1967 as trying “to prove that 8.205 as well as the corresponding passages in *sarga* 11 are interpolations” (where Sītā gives Hanumān a jewel as well as a letter to hand over to Rāma). Hooykaas (1955: 32) had already suggested that the statecraft lecture was a later interpolation. **JLB**

Uhlenbeck 1989: 329: “The Old Javanese poet used the Bhaṭṭikāvya as a starting-point and a source of inspiration, perhaps also as a sort of aide mémoire, rather than as a text which he set out to render faithfully into another idiom. The Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin* is neither a translation nor an adaptation of the Sanskrit text, but first and foremost a largely independent creation of literary art” [*therefore the so-called interpolations may well be original to the OJRm*]  
[*on OJRm 3.53-89:* (Bharataaccepts sandals reluctantly on Rāma’s orders; Rāma gives lengthy precepts on ruling) *could be identified as an interpolation on narrative grounds, but metrical and lexical evidence is inconclusive; the passage is highly popular in Java*] **MB**

Aichele 1969 stresses closeness of language between OJ *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *kakawin* verses of the Śivagṛha inscr. of 856 A.D. and sees references to the *pikatan* bird in OJR 24-25 as oblique references to king Rakai Pikatan (d. 855), so dates the poem to the mid 9th century: (p. 163) “So führen gerade jene Textabschnitte des Gedichts, in denen Kern, Juynboll und Poerbatjaraka wegen der reichlichen Verwendung der verschiedenen Verskünste spätere Einschübe gesehen hatten, zu dem Schluß, daß das altjavanische *Rāmāyaṇa* in seiner Originalgestalt etwa um die Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. abgeschlossen war, mithin etwa 70 Jahre früher als Poerbatjaraka aus linguistischen Erwägungen angenommen hatte.”

**notes from Wirjosuparto, *Rama stories in Indonesia***

Although parts of this book are more or less academic in nature, nonetheless it should still be useful for foreign tourists as it provides a deeper understanding of contemporary Indonesian culture. An appendix has been added especially for the use of tourists to enable them to follow the story of the Rama reliefs on the ballustrades of the Çiwa-temple at Prambanan. [p.v §2 (introduction)]

5. Appendix

The Râma-story depicted on the walls of the ballustrade of the Çiwa-temple at Prambanan.   
 **see notes on Kats**

Wirjosuparto identifies relief 2 as:

The hermit Wishwâmitra visits king Daçaratha in Ayodhyâ who happens to be in the palace-garden together with the 4 princes (Râma, Bharata, Lakşmaa and Çatrughna) and one of the queens [instead of Kats’ "daughter"]

episode of crow similar to Kats' description

The OJ *Kakawin* is one source for the Thai *Rāmakīen*

**Nooten 1973-74** argues that *OJR* 21.134-47 (sages praise Viṣṇu as R. + L. + vānaras are ensnared in *nāgapāśa*) is based on *BhG* 10.20-38 (Kṛṣṇa explaining his nature to Arjuna), though with much fragmentation and transposition.

Khanna and Saran 1993 (**printout**): Primary source for *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin* is Bhaṭṭi, *Rāvaṇavadha* (**own copy**), but also drew on *VR* and other Sanskrit classics including *BhG,* Kālidāsa’s *Meghadūta*, Manu, and own creativity. They dispute contention that *RKak* abandons *BhK* as source for last third, identifying detailed verbal correspondences.  
[*for summary of views on relationship betwen Bhaṭṭikāvya and Kakawin see Saran and Khanna 2004: 93-95*]

Saran and Khanna 2004 and others make the point that although Rāma is consistently presented as an avatāra of Viṣṇu throughout the Javanese versions, there is little sign of a cult of Rāma and none of a Hanumān cult in the island. ‘Admired not worshipped.’ An indication of the dates post and ante of penetration — 1st millennium A.D. largely. (MB)

Saran and Khanna 2004:

pp.2-3: [trace SE Asian idea that Sītā is Rāvaṇa’s daughter back via Jain *Vasudevahiṇḍi* to some *VR* mss of Vedavatī, where she is reborn from a lotus, taken to Laṅkā by Rāvaṇa, where she is predicted to cause his death, flung into sea, drifts to Janaka.]

p.3 [criticise Vaidya for editing crow episode out of *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*]

p.6 [OJ debt to *Bhaṭṭikāvya*]

p.34 [important place of Agastya; believed to have brought Brahmanism to Java]

p.79 [popularity of Kumbhakarṇa in Indonesia; omission of Sītā’s purification by fire]

pp.93-97 *RKak* sources cf. Khanna and Saran 1993 [notes above]

p.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. The RK, on the other hand, is full of drama, of tension, of confrontations adroitly managed, of racy dialogue, of characters vibrantly alive. Rama’s near dementia at the abduction of Sita, the electrifying debate between Rawana and Kumbhakarna, the touching leave-taking by the demon soldiers as they bid goodbye to their families before marching into battle — episode after episode acquires a life and intensity, colour and feeling, which is missing in Bhatti.

p.99 “The liveliness and raciness of the RK may be partially attributable to the fact that it is a work designed more to be heard than read.”

p.101 “Some startling variations from Bhatti, and indeed from the entire Valmikian heritage, can perhaps be attributed to this process [*incorporation from elements from oral tradition*]. Take for instance what Wishwamitra has to say to Rama about the contest for Sita’s hand. ‘When Sita was born [formerly], her afterbirth was [in the form of] an excellent bow. If there is someone who is able to or has the strength to draw it, he will be the husband of the daughter of King Janaka, no one else’ (II, 51). In this rather unique reference to Sita’s ‘afterbirth’ we hear the echoes of many Javanese tales of remarkable placentas.” [*Who is the mother ??? MB*]

p.104 “One of the most impressive innovations of the Old Javanese poet is the manner in which he presents Trijata, the daughter of Wibhishana ...

The Trijata of the RK surpasses all her Indian forebears. She emerges as an important, fully-fashioned character who greatly enhances the dramatic content of the scenes in which she appears. ... One of the most spectacular interventions of the *kakawin’s* Trijata comes in *sarga* XXXIV when she publicly denounces Rama for casting doubt on Sita’s chastity.”

p.105 “Bhatti, having an entirely distinct objective, skirts around the moral issues involved in the epic drama. The Old Javanese poet, on the other hand, is profoundly interested in highlighting the moral principles and beliefs underlying the behaviour of his characters or at stake in the situations confronting them. ...

In this, the Old Javanese poem once again is truer to the original Valmikian epic.”

p.197 Islamicisation ‘from 15 C onwards’

**Ramayana (I Gusti Madi Widia)** – contents list of babs [all in capitals in original]

1. Kerajaan Kosala

2. Resi Wiswamitra

3. Raja Trisangku

4. Rama meninggalkan rumah

5. Rama membunuh raksasaraksasa

6. Dewi Sita

7. Bhagaratha dan sejarah sungai Gangga

8. Ahalya

9. Rama memperoleh dewi Sita

10. Kekalahan resi Parasurama

11. Persiapan yang meriah untuk penobatan

12. Nasihat jahat seorang pelayan bernama Manthara

13. Kaikeyi menyerah

14. Isteri atau setan

15. Melihat kenjaiban

16. Angin ribut dan angin reda

17. Ketetapan hati dewi Sita

18. Pergi Kedalam Hutan

19. Rama meninggalkan pengikut-pengikutnya

20. Hutan Citrakuta

21. Kesedihan seorang ibu

22. Kesukaan yang membawa mala petaka yang buruk

23. Saat-saat terakhir

24. Bharata tiba

25. Perbuatan kongkalikong yang gakal

26. Bharata dicurigai

27. Pertemuan Rama dengan Bharata

28. Bharata menjadi wakil kuasa Rama

29. Terbunuhnya Viratha

30. Sepuluh tahun telah lewat

31. Rama bertemu dengan raksasi Supranakha

32. Kara dan angkatan perangnya hancur lebur

33. Menuju ke jalan keruntuhan

34. Kidang berbulu emas

35. Burung Jatayu yang baik

36. Penjagaan yang ketat

37. Rama berputus asa

38. Ayah kedua meninggal

39. Kelopak mata kiri bergetar

40. Rama melihat perhiasan milik Sita

41. Keragu-raguan Sugriwa lenyap

42. Kematian Subali

43. Kesedihan Tara, isteri Subali

44. Kedarahan dan kerukunan kembali

45. Pencarian Sita dimulai

46. Putera dewa Bayu

47. Penyelidikan di Langka

48. Sita ditaman asoka

49. Lamaran Rawan

50. Yang terbaik diantara yang pandai

51. Sita terhibur hatinya

52. Sita dan Hanuman

53. Mengundang peperangan

54. Duta yang hebat

55. Hanuman diikat

56. Langka menjadi lautan api

57. Merayakan kemenangan

58. Hanuman menyampaikan berita

59. Angkatan perang wanara bergerak maju

60. Kecemasan terjadi di Langka

61. Rawana mengadakan sidang lagi

62. Wibisana

63. Wanara-wanara ragu-ragu

64. Hukum bagi orang yang menyerah dan pengampunan

65. Jembatan raksasa

66. Peperangan mulai meletus

67. Dewi Sita bersuka cita

68. Senjata ular naga

69. Kekalahan Rawana

70. Raksasa Kumbakarna bangkit

71. Apakah ini Narayana sendiri

72. Kematian Indrajit

73. Akhir hidup Rawana

74. Terakhir

**[generally on Javanese versions]**

Saran and Khanna 2004: 200 “The presence of mourning women in the battlefield is another Javanese touch. ... The Prambanan Ramayana ... dedicates several reliefs to this subject when Kumbhakarna and Ravana die. The mourning of Dasharatha’s death by his widow Kaushalya is also shown, even though he did not die in battle.

p.201 There are other Indonesian variations of local origin which give a distinct flavour: for instance, the strange tale of Sita’s afterbirth, of Sabari’s complexion, the story of the discovery of Mandodari from a bamboo clump as a sign of divine favour, Hanuman eating with Rama from the same leaf before leaving on his arduous journey to Lanka — the list is huge.

... What emerges is a fresh texture enriched with local parallels seen from a local perspective.”

... In Indonesia, if there was ever any Rama cult it does not seem to have been a prominent or long-lasting phenomenon. Rather than reflecting a specific religious hue, the character of Rama and the tales spun around his deeds underwent a process of secularization in Java, giving them their peculiarly Indonesian character and an ethical emphasis that was acceptable to people of any faith. ... Already in the *Ramayana kakawin*, Rama, though an *avatara* of Wishnu, is projected as an exceptional human hero, to be admired for his god-like qualities, but not worshipped as a god. ... Even in Bali where the RK continued to be sacred in a Hindu milieu, Rama is not worshipped as a god.”

pp.203-4 “[Hanuman] grew in popularity in Indonesia as much as in India. But unlike in India, in Indonesia he was a ‘secular’ hero, **|** honoured for his bravery and loyalty and martial skills. He is also hailed as the diplomat par excellence ... a source of inspiration and entertainment, never a religious icon to be worshipped. ...

Some characters who were relatively minor in India have acquired a greatly magnified presence in Indonesia [*e.g. Arjuna Kārtavirya, his wife Citrawati, also Trijaṭā,*]”

p.205 “A great favourite ... is the story of Kumbhakarna. He is portrayed as a noble character, who sacrifices his life for his country, though he opposes the evil deeds of his brother, the king.”

**title (and author)** Javanese *Uttara Kāṇḍa* (in prose)

**date (and provenance)** c. 1000 A.D., during reign of Dharmawangśa (r. 990-1016)

**edition(s)** Phalgunadi, I. Gusti Putu (ed. and trans.) 1999: *Indonesian Rāmāyaṇa, the Uttarakanda,* *trans. from the original Kawi text* (New Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan).  
  **Ind. Inst. 4.4.5. 3;**  *John checked; Mary analysed; for contents see photocopy*

**translation(s)** [see under edn]

**studies** Hunter, Thomas 2018: “Commentary and text-building in the Old Javanese Uttarakāṇḍa”, paper presented at 17th WSC, Vancouver (July 2018) **handout**

Supomo, S. 1971: The dating of the Old Javanese Uttarakāṇḍa”, *Journal of the Oriental Society of Australia* 8: 59-67. **scan; checked**

Zoetmulder, P.J. 1974: *Kalangwan: a survey of old Javanese literature,* Kon. Inst. voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Translation Series 16 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).  
 **Bod. (Nuneham) 24712 d. 233/16; pp. 83-87 (photocopied)**

**notes** from Phalgunadi’s intro.:  
“The classical Indonesian *Uttarakāṇḍa* opens with a homage to Maharṣi Vālmīki and then salutation is offered to king Dharmavanśa-tĕuh-Anantavikramottuṅgadeva, the king of East Java. He ruled Java from 996-1016 A.D. We have no clue to the authorship of the classical Indonesian *Uttarakāṇḍa.*  However, this much is known that it was composed under the patronage of the aforesaid king.” (p.5)

**Publisher’s blurb:**

“The classical Indonesian Ramayana: Uttarakanda was composed sometime during the period A.D. 991 to A.D. 1016. It was written in Kawi, the official language of then Indonesian society. Dr. I. Gusti Putu Phalgunadi presents its English translation, the first of its kind in any European language, to popularise this work of literary value among those English-reading people of the world who are unable to read it in its original form.

"King Dharmavansa-teguh-Anantavikramottungadeva was the most powerful, ruler of the Isana dynasty. It was under the reign of King Dharmavansa-teguh-Anantavikramottungadeva that the famous Adiparva, Sabhaparva, Virataparva, Udyogaparva and Bhismaparva of the Mahabharata were composed in Kawi language. He laid down ideals in every sphere of life and under his rule East Jawa rose to dizzy heights.

"The Sanskrit Ramayana composed by Adikavi Maharsi Balmiki consists of seven kandas or books, namely Balakanda, Ayodhyakanda, Aranyakakanda, Kiskindhakanda, Sundarakanda, Yuddhakanda and Uttarakanda. The classical Indonesian Ramayana (Kakawin), however contains only six kandas. The Uttarakanda figures as a separate work having an independent identity of its own. The salient feature of the classical Indonesian Uttarakanda is the way in which the classical Indonesian Uttarakanda is divided. It consists of chapters (sargah) and the end of each chapter is stated in Sanskrit the title denoting the content and the serial number of the chapter. Besides, the quotations of the Sanskrit slokas in the classical Indonesian Uttarakanda are faithfully taken from the text of the Balmiki's Ramayana. The main plot of this work is based on the Balmiki's Uttarakanda. However, it is not a translation of the Sanskrit work.

"This English translation of the Indonesian Ramayana: Uttarakanda original has been done for the first time. Its corresponding Kawi text is given in opposite pages to enable researchers to understand in depth studies. This work will be of use to students of the Indian epic, Indonesian literature, cultural anthropology, performing arts, linguistic and allied disciplines." (jacket)

Phalgunadi 1999: 7 – Plot almost identical with *VR*; rendered ‘in an original and creative style, changing the simple narrative into a charmingly coherent one.’ Selective, compact, avoids repetitions.

from Thomas Hunter’s abstract (17th WSC, Vancouver, 2018):  
“I look at the question of ‘translation,’ making the claim that we should think in terms of a tradition of commentary originally developed for texts of the theological literature in OJ and of the way that pratīka references to verses or phrases in the Sanskrit original are used to structure the Old Javanese narrative. I look especially at the “tale of Nimi” in the *OJ Uttarakāṇḍa* as an example of an episode excluded from the critical edition (Mehta et al: 1960-75) that is given a thorough treatment in the *OJ Uttarakāṇḍa* . While the date of the *OJ Uttarakāṇḍa* in the late 10th century cannot give definitive proof that the tale of Nimi was an original part of the Sanskrit *Uttarakāṇḍa*, and not a later interpolation, the careful reading of the original that is evident in the Old Javanese translation into a prose form suggests transmission by way of preceptors learned in the Sanskrit tradition who made use of a commentary or commentaries in their efforts to give a Javanese form to the Sanskrit original. This paper is aimed at elucidating the relationship of the *OJ Uttarakāṇḍa* to its Sanskrit original by assuming that the Parwa literature, like the theological literature in Old Javanese, represents a pedagogical tradition and a tradition of “bilingual commentary” based on Sanskrit models of the commentary.”

Hunter’s paper included a precise dating of this prose work to 996 A.D. and the statement that in form it is part gloss and part narrative. He also noted that a work in press by Bronner and Creese assesses the OJ dependence on and use of the Sanskrit *kāvyaśāstra.* He also suggested that the shift to E Java might have been a consequence of the volcanic eruption of 826 A.D. (evidenced by the Belitung shipwreck).

e-mail exchange with Amrit Gomperts:

To: J.L.Brockington@ed.ac.uk

From: Amrit Gomperts

Date: Tue, 4 May 1999 23:41:01 +0200

Dear Dr Brockington,

1. I do not know where the author of the Old Javanese Uttarakanda got the number of 20.000 verses. The text actually mentions in Old Javanese "the number of sloka-s in the kavya (i.e. Balmiki's Ramayana) is twenty thousand...". The term sloka does not appear in the Sanskrit Uttarakanda but in books 1, 4 and 6. As your analysis in your book of the Crit. Ed. shows one has to have a fairly complete text of all 7 books in order to count all verses one by one for the number 20.000. All OJ versions of several parvan-s, one kanda and one (Brahmanada) purana text are in prose. In all these texts the predominant metre is the epical sloka. Macdonnel explains the metre (Skt Gram Students) which is rather free. Sanskrit has that natural distiction between short and long vowels. However, the opposition between short and long syllables does not exist in OJ and Austronesian languages in general. The vrtta metres were adopted in OJ and these uniquely prescribe patterns of short and long syllables which were artificially introduced in OJ. The OJ authors either had the choice to adopt vrtta metres or render the epical sloka texts in prose. In my view they choose the latter because the metrics of vrtta demands much more than only metre: alamkara, character of the metre etc. which may effect the accuracy of the retold narrative.

2. My main interest in this OJ Uttarakanda arose from the Sanskrit musical terminology in Old Javanese texts on which I presented a paper in December. My previous conclusion was that the Old Javanese author of Uttarakanda took the passage from 1.4.7-10. However, the same kind of terminology is alluded to in the Old Javanese version of the Virataparvan. Comparing both fragments shows that the Old Javanese author displays knowledge of intricate Sanskrit terminology from early Indian musical theory that does not appear in the Sanskrit version. Apparently the same happened in the Old Javanese Uttarakanda. However, if the Old Javanese author could have done this Sanskrit authors were equally capable of this. That -is what in my view- also happened with the rephrasing of 7.84-85 into the later added 1.4.7-10. Moreover, the ending phrase tantri.laya.samanvitam appearing in 1.4.7.b occurs twice in 7.84.14.b and five verses later in 7.85.3.b. Another peculiar aspect is the song caryA which is mentioned in 7.85.2.b. This type of prabandha song does not appear in any of the Sanskrit musical texts before AD 900. From another Old Javanese source (11-13th century) we know that the OJ parvan texts were sung. This could well be in line with RY 1.4.7-10.

3. In ancient Javanese inscriptions (900-1500) we also find quite often -b- instead of -v-. At least two astrological texts were used: Varahamihira's Brhatsamhita and the rare Atharvanajyotisa. The epigraphical terminology quite accurately followed the orthography of the Sanskrit sources. Moreover, the -v- change to -b- effects the Sanskrit sandhi rules which were also known in ancient Java.

**title (and author)** *Sumanasāntaka* of Mpu Monaguṇa

**date (and provenance)** 12th or early 13th century (Java)

**edition(s)** Worsley, Peter and others (ed., trans.) 2013: *Mpu Monaguṇa’s Sumanasāntaka: an Old Javanese epic poem, its Indian source and Balinese illustrations,* edited, translated and annotated by Peter Worsley, S. Supomo, Thomas M. Hunter, and Margaret Fletcher, Bibliotheca Indonesica 36 (Leiden: Brill). **download; notes; analysed**

**translation(s)** cf. edn

**studies** Hunter, Thomas M. 2013: ‘Kālidāsa’s *Raghuvaṃśa* and the *Kakawin Sumanasāntaka*’, in Worsley and others 2013: 531-97. **notes**

Worsley, Peter 2012: “Journeys, palaces and landscapes in the Javanese imaginary: some preliminary comments based on the *Kakawin Sumanasāntaka*”, *Archipel* 83: 147-71. **download**

**notes** The story of Aja and Indumatī.

A *kakawin* of 12/early 13 C, produced in “the eastern Javanese period of Javanese literary history” ... subsequently lost from Java; popularity maintained in Bali. [MB: *Highly erotic and explicit account of wedding night may have made it unacceptable in Java during the Islamic period; it was a new work, unlike the well-established Rāma story which could only be ineffectually bowdlerised.*]

Hunter 2013: 532 — Source: *Raghuvaṃśa* 5.36—8.98. Stated by author in Epilogue to be based on “Book of Raghu”.

Elaborated and localised. “... while he followed his Indian model closely in thematic terms, he brought it within the context of his own time and society. ... a shift of focus from Aja, princely hero and heir to the lineage of Raghu, to Indumatī ...”

At her *svayaṃvara*, Indumatī is introduced successively to 7 kings and Prince Aja, rejects all kings, selects Aja: Monaguṇa*, Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 109

Aja is son of Raghu: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 108

Aja is grandson of Dilīpa: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 108

King Pratīpa is son of Arjuna Kārtavīrya, who defeated and imprisoned Rāvaṇa: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 84

wedding procession ambushed by 7 disappointed kings; kings stunned by Aja’s arrow: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 145-53

Raghu retires to forest: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 159

Aja succeeds Raghu: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 162

Aja is father of Daśaratha: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 162

Indumatī remembers former life as wife of Aja, dies, returns to heaven when Śiva revokes curse: Monaguṇa, *Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 168-73

Aja grieves, dies, reunited in heaven with Indumatī: Monaguṇa*, Sumanasāntaka*: Worsley 2013: 174-82

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)]

**title (and author)** *Arjunawijaya* of Mpu Tantular

**date (and provenance)** 1378 A.D. (Java)

**edition(s)** Supomo, S. (ed., trans.) 1977: *Arjunawijaya: a kakawin of Mpu Tantular*, Bibliotheca Indonesica 14-15, 2 vols (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff). **Bod Malay d.74/14  
 checked; analysed; download (vol. 1); pp. 10-11, 14-35 photocopied**

**translation(s)** cf. edn (vol. 2)

**studies**

**notes** *see also* Saran and Khanna 2004: 120-22 esp. 122 fin, and 147 §9 **checked**

Pigeaud 1967: 188: 30.125 *Arjuna Wijaya* (major *kakawin*) ...  
“In the reign of King Hayam Wuruk of Majapahit, beside the Nagara Kĕrtāgama some other *kakawins* were written. They are of the usual narrative epic kind. Their au­thor is called Tantular, probably a pen-name, like Tanakuŋ and Prapanca. Mpu Tantular was interested in Buddhist literature. Whether he belonged to a prominent eccle­siastic family, like his contemporary Prapañca, is unknown.  
 The Old Javanese Arjuna Wijaya by mpu Tantular was much appreciated by Ja­vanese authors. In the Pasisir period it was incorporated in the Sĕrat Kaṇḍa compendiums of tales.”

Phalgunadi 1999: 6: “composed in 1378 AD”.

for its drawing on OJ *Uttarakāṇḍa* **see** Creese in Acri and others 2011: 101 (§§3-4)

Friederich’s report – first notice of *Arjunawijaya* – was written in 1849 but only published in translation in 1959; Nag. = *Nāgarakṛtāgama* of Prapañca (1365), another *kakawin*

Supomo 1977: 83: “The extant MSS. represents [*sic*] two distinct traditions, viz. the Balinese and the Javanese (cf. Pigeaud 1967: 188). ... ... these two traditions are clearly distinguished by the fact that the Javanese has two more cantos than the Balinese tradition, resulting from interpolation (see Variae Lectiones and Notes 63,8).”

and 326: “*63.8* In canto 63 we find the most significant difference between the Balinese and the Javanese versions of the present *kakawin.* In the Javanese version (y), canto 63 ends with 63,7 and then begins with a new canto which has no counterpart in the Balinese version.” He regards these as interpolated into the Javanese, not omitted from the Balinese, numbering them Canto A and Canto B in his Variae Lectiones and his Notes to the Translation, arguing that (p.327) “they are only a ‘repetition’ of what will be told in canto 64.”

from review (L.F. Brakel in *Asian Studies* 1.2 (1977):85-88 [**download**]): “The second chapter is devoted to the origin of the text, which is based on the last book of the Ramayana epic: the Uttarakanda (and more specifically on the Old-Javanese prose summary of the same name) and which describes the struggle between king Arjuna Sahasrabāhu, also called Kārtavīrya, the king of Māhismatī, and Rāvaṇa, ending in the defeat of the of the latter [sic]. While the arguments of the author on the direct relationship between *kakawin* and *parwa* are convincing, his dismissal of Bhaumaka's Sanskrit poem, *Rāvanārjunīya*, as possible source, seems rather cavalier; after all, there is nothing at all unusual in a poet taking his inspiration from more than one model.”

on a somewhat similar *Rāmawijaya* (on conflict between Rāma Bhārgawa and Arjuna Sahasrabāhu), perhaps of late 13th-century East Javanese origin, **see** Creese in Acri and others 2011: 112-13.

**title (and author)** *Hariśraya*

**date (and provenance)** 1574 A.D. (Bali, Java)

**edition(s)** Wulandari, Retno Asih 2001: *Hariśraya (A): a Balinese kakawin* (Canberra: Australian National University thesis). [text: pp. 29-78] **download**

**translation(s)** *see* edition (pp. 79-130)

**studies** *see* introduction to edition (pp. 2-27)

*see also* Supomo, S. (ed. trans.) 1977: *Arjunawijaya: a kakawin of Mpu Tantular*, Bibliotheca Indonesica 14 (The Hague: Nijhoff), pp. 10-11 and 14 **photocopy; analysed**

Saran and Khanna 2004: 120 **own copy checked**

Pigeaud 1967 **notes**

Creese 1996: 144 **download**

Creese 2011: 105-6 **own copy**

**notes** based on *Uttarakāṇḍa* 5-8 (gods approaching Viṣṇu for aid against *rākṣasas*), hence the title “Hari’s protection”; exists in two versions, designated A and B already in 1903 by Brandes (Wulandari 2001: 2); summary at Wulandari 2001: 3-7. A date of composition is only found in *Hariśraya* B, namely *śaka* 1496 = 1574 A.D. and *Hariśyaya* A is probably later (Wulandari 2001: 9).

Pigeaud 1967: 190-91 (30.145) — 30.145 “*Hari Śraya* ... The tale of the Hari Śraya is borrowed from the Uttara Kāṇḍa, the last Rāmāyaṇa book. Wiṣṇu vanquishes Malyawan and his brothers; only Sumali makes his escape. ...

The Hari Wijaya contains the well-known myth of the churning of the ocean and Wiṣṇu’s victory over the demon Ratmaja. It is found in the Ādiparwa; it was a popular tale in Javanese-Balinese literature.”

Phalgunadi 1999: 6 — “fight between Lord Viṣṇu and the demons. This story was quite popular around the fifteenth century A.D. in the Majapahit kingdom of East Java.”

Wulandari 2001: 11 — “Close examination of the *Hariśraya* A and the Old Javanese *Uttarakāṇḍa* shows no identical words and phrases in the corresponding passages of these two works. As Tantular did in the second part of the *Arjunawijaya,* the author of the *Hariśraya* A apparently only used sarga 5-8 of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* as the frame of his work. This finding is corroborated by the existence of a significant difference which occurs at the beginning of the narrative. In the *Hariśraya* A, when the demons cause disturbance in heaven, Indra and the gods discuss the situation with the seven sages, and on the advice of Wṛhaspati they seek help from God Siwa (1.2-2.9). In the Old Javanese *Uttarakāṇḍa,* as in its Sanskrit original, there is no mention of Wṛhaspati - the gods directly approach Śiwa (Zoetmulder, 1958: 13.23-24).”

**title (and author)** *Serāt Kāṇḍa* (= “book of tales”, a universal history)

**date (and provenance)** 17th century – Mataram period (Java)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Stutterheim 1925: 66-80 [*Serāt Kāṇḍa* summary] **photocopy**

Saran and Khanna 2004: 138-40: **analysed**

Ghosh 2006: 180 **photocopy; analysed**

Yock Fang, Liaw 2013: *A history of classical Malay literature* (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing).  
[ch. 2 , pp. 49-112, “The Indian epics and the wayang in Malay literature” **downloaded**]

**notes** Stutterheim, W.F. 1925: 65 – “eine treffende Ähnlichkeit mit den malayischen hikajats” [Malay *Serat kanda* is similar]. Analogies with *HSR*, but significant differences; Muslim influence less apparent than in *HSR,* e.g. Lakṣmaṇa is incarnation of Vāsuki; reincarnation of main characters envisaged (Saran and Khanna 2004: 138-39).

Detailed account of love-making by Rāma and Sītā before return to Rāma’s capital [*after final reconciliation*]: Saran and Khanna 2004: 139

Adam, Noah and Satan appear, but only until Viṣṇu’s birth: Ghosh 2006: 180 **photocopy**

RR pp. 288-9: However, a rather different version of the Rāma story is contained in the *Serāt Kāṇḍa* and the *Rāma Kling.* The more important of the two, the *Serāt Kāṇḍa*, has incorporated much Islamic material, in the same way as the Malay *Ḥikāyat Serī Rāma*, with which it also agrees in making Rāvaṇa’s wife Mandodarī originally the wife of Daśaratha and the mother of Sītā; from these and other similarities we may infer that both go back to a similar if not identical Indian source, if indeed the *Serāt Kāṇḍa* does not derive from the Malay version. The *Serāt Kāṇḍa* also has in common with several other Southeast Asian versions the episodes of Rāma’s abduction to the |underworld, Sītā’s banishment for drawing Rāvaṇa’s portrait, the birth of one son to Sītā and the miraculous creation of the other, and conflict between Rāma and his sons.

Summaries of the *Serāt Kāṇḍa* and the *Rāma Kling* at Yock Fang 2013: 57-59 (cf. Juynboll 1911: II, 56-68).

**from an e-mail from Willem van der Molen (9 Oct 2010)**There has been very little research on the later renderings of the story in Java including the Serat Kanda. Manuscripts (in Javanese) have been collected and are available, but that is it! The manuscript catalogues being the only sources of information apart from the manuscripts themselves touch their contents only slightly. The most extensive one is in Dr H.H. Juynboll's supplementary catogue of the Javanese manuscripts in Leiden, vol. II, pp. 57-61. I did not find references to the Benjakai episode in these pages. Theoretically, this need not rule out the possibility of its being there, however, in this or another manuscript, or in one of the other versions of the story, which are all described in a less detailed way than the manuscript of pp. 57-61 of Juynboll's catalogue. Theoretically: because I think it would have attracted his attention.

**from an e-mail from Roy Jordaan**(16 Sept 2010)  
Since your question about the Serat Kanda also holds my interest I had already contacted Willem van der Molen myself about it. Over the telephone he just told me that the Serat Kanda is available in some manuscripts kept in Leiden University Library. He was not aware of any such manuscripts in the National Archives of Indonesia in Jakarta. Regarding the Leiden manuscripts, it seems that the late Prof. Ras had made/ordered the transcription of one or more manuscripts in Latin script but that so far nobody has attempted a translation in Dutch, English or even Indonesian. . . . . . .  
The present inaccessibility of the Serat Kanda is rather disappointing news, but Willem told me of another Rama text kept in Leiden that might be interest to your research.

**general notes on Indonesian variants**

Saran and Khanna 2004:

p.201 There are other Indonesian variations of local origin which give a distinct flavour: for instance, the strange tale of Sita’s afterbirth, of Sabari’s complexion, the story of the discovery of Mandodari from a bamboo clump as a sign of divine favour, Hanuman eating with Rama from the same leaf before leaving on his arduous journey to Lanka — the list is huge.

... What emerges is a fresh texture enriched with local parallels seen from a local perspective.”

... In Indonesia, if there was ever any Rama cult it does not seem to have been a prominent or long-lasting phenomenon. Rather than reflecting a specific religious hue, the character of Rama and the tales spun around his deeds underwent a process of secularization in Java, giving them their peculiarly Indonesian character and an ethical emphasis that was acceptable to people of any faith. ... Already in the *Ramayana kakawin*, Rama, though an *avatara* of Wishnu, is projected as an exceptional human hero, to be admired for his god-like qualities, but not worshipped as a god. ... Even in Bali where the RK continued to be sacred in a Hindu milieu, Rama is not worshipped as a god.”

p.203 “[Hanuman] grew in popularity in Indonesia as much as in India. But unlike in India, in Indonesia he was a ‘secular’ hero,

p.204 honoured for his bravery and loyalty and martial skills. He is also hailed as the diplomat par excellence ... a source of inspiration and entertainment, never a religious icon to be worshipped. ...

Some characters who were relatively minor in India have acquired a greatly magnified presence in Indonesia [*e.g. Arjuna Kārtavirya, his wife Citrawati, also Trijaṭā,*]”

p.205 “A great favourite ... is the story of Kumbhakarna. He is portrayed as a noble character, who sacrifices his life for his country, though he opposes the evil deeds of his brother, the king.”

**title (and author)** *Phra Lak Phra Lam* of Phutthaphochan [+ some other Lao]

**date (and provenance)** 1850 A.D.(Vientiane region of Laos)

**edition(s)** Sahai, Sachchidanand (ed.) 1973: *The Phra Lak Phra Lam or The Phra Lam Sadok: a Lao version of the story of Rāma,* 2 vols(New Delhi: Indian Council for Cultural Relations). **(= Lao 2)** **Bod. Indo-Chin. d.971; photocopy of p.XLIII; handwritten notes**  
[*Phutthaphō̄chān’s adaptation of Rāmāyaṇa; critical edition of original ms (1850 A.D.) preserved on palm leaves in monastery of Ban Naxon Tai, Laos (40 kms. from Vientiane*)]  
[review by John Hartmann in *Crossroads* 13.1 (1999): 150-53 (**download**)]

**translation(s)** Lafont, Pierre-Bernard 1957: [*P’ra Lak-P’ra Lam (version lao du Ramayana)*](http://copac.ac.uk/wzgw?id=9544355&field=ti&terms=P'ra+Lak-P'ra+Lam+(version+lao+du+Ramayana)+)*: P’ommachak (version ‘tay lu du Ramayana),* EFEO Bibliothèque de diffusion 6 (Saigon: EFEO). **(= Lao 1)**

Vo, Thu Tịnh 1971: “Phra Lak — Phra Lam, version lao du Ramayana indien et les fresques murales du Vat Oup Moung, Vientiane”, par Vo Thu Tinh, clichés de Raymond Guerin, *Bulletin des Amis du Royaume Lao* 6: 1-94; repr. 1972 as *Phra Lak Phra Lam: le Ramayana Lao*, Collection Littérature Lao 1 (Vientiane: Vithagna; 3rd edn 1985*,* Paris: Sudestasie) [with clearer photos but same pagination]. **Indo-Chin. e.1207**  
 [full summary of Vat Kang Tha = Vientiane version **(= Lao 2)** on pp. 19-62,   
with 34 photos of mural frescos at Vat Oup Moung **(= Lao 5)**;  
 brief summary of Luang Prabang version (ed. Bibl. Nat. Vientiane 1971) **(= Lao 3)**on pp. 76-86 (photocopied);  
 brief summary of Muongsing version, *‘P’ommachak’* **(= Lao 1)**,summary of ms of Vat Xieng Chay **(= Lao 1)** taken from P.B. Lafont in “P’alak-P’alam, P’ommachak” (EFEO, 1957) on pp. 86-93 (handwritten notes)]  
 **French summaries of 3 versions; notes; pp.10-62 scanned; 76-86 photocopied**

Vo, Thu Tịnh 1972: *The Phra Lak-Phra Lam (the Lao version of the Ramayana): abridged translation of the manuscript of Vat Kang Tha*, with the photographs of the mural paintings of Vat Up Mung by Raymond Guerin (Vientiane: Cultural Survey of Laos). **download**  
**[***English summary of introduction to Vo 1971/1972 ; photos as in Vo 1971; English paraphrase of Wat Kang Tha version* [= Lao 2] *in Vo 1971/1972 ONLY, not of other two***]**

Phralak Phralam 2002: *Botfōn Phra Lak Phra Rām: tōn Phra Rām tām kwāng Thotsakan lak Nāng Sīdā* = Royal ballet Phralak Phraram (Lao version of the Ramayana): episodes The golden deer and the abduction of Sita = Ballet royal Phralak Phraram (version lao du Ramayana): episodes Le cerf d’or et l’enlèvement de Sitā, ed. Sāiphet Khamphāsit and Manīvong Khattinyarāt (Vīangčhan [Vientiane], National Culture Hall).  
[phū khonkhwā læ hīaphīang, Sāiphet Khamphāsit, Manīvong Khattinyarāt: phū sōi hīaphīang pæ læ chattham, Thumphan Rattanavong, Somsanuk Mīsai, Dārunī Rattanavong]. Vīangchan: Khana fūnfū bæpfōn Phra Lak Phra Rām Lūangphrabāng, Sathāban Khonkhwā Vatthanatham, Samākhom Nakkhāo Lāo]. [= **Lao 6**] **notes**

\* Lafont, Pierre-Bernard (trans.) 2003: *Phommachak: Rāmāyana tay lœ̄ de Muang Sing (Haut Mékong)*, présentation et traduction du tay lōe par Pierre-Bernard Lafont (Paris: Centre d’Histoire et Civilisations de la Péninsule Indochinoise). **(= Lao 1)**  
[xlv, 219 pp., map.] **Bod. stack M05.E01141; summary, notes**   
 **photocopy/scan: xii-xvii, xxxiv-xlv, 50-53, 114-15, 122-23, 126-29, 211-19**

**studies** Deydier, Henri 1947-50: “Les origines et la naissance de Rāvaṇa dans la Rāmāyaṇa laotian”, *BEFEO* 44: 141-46. **download**

Deydier, Henri 1952: “Le Râmâyana au Laos”, *France-Asie* 78: 871-73. [Eng. trans.: “Rāmāyaṇa in Laos”, *JORM* 22 (1952-53): 64-66 (**download of vol.**)]. **ignore**

Deydier, Henri 1954: “Le Rāmāyaṇa au Laos”, *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 98.2: 130-35. **download**

Dhani Nivat Kromamun Bidyalabh 1943: “The Svayamvara of Sita”, *Journal of the Thailand Research Society* 34.1: 69-72. **download**

Dhani Nivat Kromamun Bidyalabh 1946: “The Rama Jataka: a Lao version of the story of Rama”, *JSS* 36.1: 1-22. **(on version 2**)**;** **photocopy + download**

Dhani Nivat Kromamun Bidyalabh 1965: “Hide Figures of the Ramakien at the Leder-Museum in Offenbach, Germany”, *JSS* 53: 61-66. **download**

Finot, Louis 1917: “Recherches sur la littérature laotienne: contes”, *BEFEO* 17.5: 84-115.  
[= **Lao 5**] **download**

Holt, John Clifford: *Spirits of the place: Buddhism and Lao religious culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2009). **parts downloaded  
[**App. 1. Transformations of the *Ramayana* pp. 259-69, on *Phra Lak Phra Lam*, based on Sahai 1996, and on C20 murals in Luang Prabang]

Laosunthon, Niyada 2007: “*Phra Ram Chadok* as the *Attalaksana* literature of Laotian people”, *Manusya, Journal of Humanities* 10.2: 15-23. **download**

Ohno, Toru 2001: “The Peculiar Features of ‘Phrommacak’ Ramayana”, in *The Ramayana and the New Challenges,* ed. by L. P. Vyas (New Delhi: B.R. PC): 113-25. **photocopy**

Ratnam, Kamala 1974: “The Ramayana in Laos”, *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* 3:179-242 [*on wall paintings in Vat Pa Ke temple, Luang Prabang, Laos, built and painted 1803*] **Ind. Inst. Or. ser. F 1/95(3) (probably same as Ratnam 1982) captions of pls 3-11, 13-16** (Vat Pa Ke, Luang Prabang)  
 **and 20-40** (Vat Mai, Luang Prabang) – below

Ratnam, Kamala 1977: “The Ramayana in Laos (Vientiane version)”, *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture (New Delhi)* 5: 183-204, repr. in Raghavan 1980: 256-81. **own copy**

Ratnam, Kamala 1982: “The Ramayana in Laos”, in *Laos and its culture*, ed. by Perala Ratnam (India: Tulsi Publishing House / Bangkok: White Lotus).  **BL; CUL (difficult access)**

Ratnam, Kamala 1983: “Socio-cultural and anthropological background of the Ramayana in Laos”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 230-51. **own copy**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 1971: “Study on the sources of the Lao Ramayana tradition”, *Bulletin des Amis du Royaume Lao* 6: 219-32. **photocopy + download**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 1972: “Sources of the Lao *Ramayana* tradition”, *Indian Horizons* 21.2-3: 70-81. [seen in Ind. Inst.: good, but does not add to his books]

Sahai, Sachchidanand (ed.) 1980b: “The Phra Lak Phra Lam and the Laotian cultural tradition”, in Sahai 1981a: 67-84. [cf. intro. to his 1973 edn of *Phra Lak Phra Lam*] **scan**

Sahai, Sachchidanand (ed.) 1981: *Rāmāyaṇa in South East Asia* (Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies). [= *South East* *Asian Review* 5.2 (Dec. 1980)] **BL, Cambridge**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 1983: “Indo-Chinese geography as described in the *Phra Lak Phra Lam*: a Laotian version of the Ramayana”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 221-29. **own copy**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 1996: *The Rama Jataka in Laos: a Study in the Phra Lak Phra Lam,* 2 vols (Delhi: B.R. PC). [includes translation **(= Lao 2)**] **EUL BL 1139.25 Sah  
 photocopied: I,27-31; II,v, 17-47, 64-71, 168-69, 270**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 2011: “Localisation of Indian influences as reflected in the Laotian versions of the *Ramayana*”, in Manguin and others 2011: 443-59. **download**

Wilson, Constance M. 2009: “The *Jataka* in Laos II: the *Phra Lak Phra Lam*”, in: Wilson, Constance M., ed. *Middle Mekong River Basin: studies in Tai history and culture.* DeKalb, Ill.: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, 139-99. **photocopy**

**notes:**

**Lao I: Lafont 2003: summary, scan, notes: analysed  
 *also* Lafont 1957: notes; analysed  
 Ohno 2001: xerox studied  
 Sahai 1993-94: [*IT*] 289-93 own copy studied  
 Sahai 1996 (trans.) analysed**

**Lao II: Sahai 1996 (trans.) EUL analysed *in conjunction with* Vo 1971: full summary: scan: *and* Sahai 1973: photocopy of p.XLIII; handwritten notes *and* Dhani 1946 xerox**

**Lao III: Vo 1971: brief summary: xerox: analysed**

**Lao IV: Sahai 1976: own copy; analysed**

***Phralak Phralam* 2002: typed notes analysed**

***Pañcatantra,* Finot 1917: 101, nos 9, 10: xerox analysed**

**Lao 1: *Phommachak***

Muongsing version, ms owned by Chansly Khongam  
Lafont 2003: **summary, photocopies, scan; analysed**

Vat Xieng Chay ms.  
Vo 1971: 86-93:brief summary taken from Lafont 1957   
[*lacks Lava’s marriage, otherwise similar to Lafont 2003*]MB **checked**

*Jātaka* form (Lafont 2003: 1-5, 203-7): Rāvaṇa reborn as Devadatta; Śūrpaṇakhā and all other major characters given new identities located in Buddha’s life-story at rebirth (Lafont 2003: 203-7). *Dasaratha jātaka* popular in monasteries of Myanmar (Lafont 2003: xiii).

Buddhist ethos and atmosphere throughout; distasteful episodes eliminated / modified.   
But not wholly in tune with Buddhist ideals: was *RM* Buddhicised after arrival in Laos? (Lafont 2003: xiv). Rāma does not always practise what as Buddha he preaches (Lafont 2003: xxxvi**).**

Rāma does not direct action, merely reacts to chief character, Rāvaṇa (so Lafont 2003: xxxviii but questionable). Lafont considers Rāvaṇa to be heroic figure and points to discrepancy over whether Rāvaṇa is human or *yak* = *rākṣasa* (Lafont 2003: xxxix- xli).

Sītā’s sons are violent, do not practise Buddhist principles (Lafont 2003: xlv).

Hanumān celibate; Benjakai’s impersonation of dead Sītā present only in attenuated form with no consequences.

After recognition of Lava and Kuśa the narrative is continued, not with revenge / second generation battles, but with:

unsuccessful search for suitable bride for Hanumān

successful hunts for brides for Lava (long, detailed romance culminating in lengthy battle) and Kuśa (1 sentence).

Relatively close to *VR* compared with highly divergent Lao 2: why the difference?

**Lao 2: *Phra Lak Phra Lam***or***Phra Lam Sadok***  (see Sahai 1996)

*Jātaka* framework; Buddhist doctrines throughout, esp. I,64-66. Buddha identifies a large number of characters, including:

Rāma = Buddha

Sītā = Buddha’s wife [*but she is Indra’s wife Sujātā, incarnated to wreak vengeance on Rāvaṇa for deceiving her; anomaly unexplained, unresolved*]

Rāma’s parents = Buddha’s parents

Sītā’s son 1 = Buddha’s son

Rāvaṇa = Devadatta

Salacious tone to whole work; Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, and many other characters, have numerous amorous adventures (far more so than Thai).

Many aetiological and foundation myths and legends, e.g. part of Rāvaṇa’s penance for abducting Śāntā (repeated as part of bride-price for subsequently marrying her) is to build road along river bank between his first city and Vientiane = Ayodhyā. Many locations identifiable, reflecting Lao/Khmer political enmity.

Lao conventions allowing polygamy and re-marriage reflected: Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa have many wives; Sītā theratens Rāvaṇa that she will seek many husbands and towards the end of the narrative she refers to Rāvaṇa as her ‘former husband’ although her heat has prevented him ever approaching her closely.

Important theme is need to respect marriage protocol and status as older/younger = senior/junior [*Rāvaṇa should not marry Śāntā; as daughter of his senior uncle, she is his senior (?? reason for abduction, leading to further offence of taking her without proper negotiations and bride-price)*].

Basis of narrative is inter-cousin rivalry and father/son relationships; brotherly love largely unexplored. Lakṣmaṇa is Rāma’s constant companion but plays a reduced role of little emotional value. Bharata and Śatrughna absent, so succession not an issue in Rāma’s generation (no exile; but separate kingdoms all created for sons, and Daśaratha passed over in favour of younger brother). Rāvaṇa’s only 2 brothers oppose him and are thrown out of kingdom; do not fight for him or have their deaths mourned. Vālin and Sugrīva are brothers however. Both protagonists supported by numerous sons, but conflict between buffalo father and son prominent.

So why choose to adapt this particular narrative to exemplify this theme, when the *MBh* was available? (Rāvaṇa’s original city called Indraprastha).

At some stage in development, teller had access to older/longer *Rm* and replicated elements missing from his adaptation, particularly in the preliminary abduction and recovery of Śāntā, where many traditional motifs are inverted:

departure of Daśaratha from father’s kingdom at head of many followers is reminiscent of Rāma’s departure into exile (Rāma’s exile absent) Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,47-48

Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are able to recover Śāntā without at this point a direct confrontation with her abductor becuase Rāvaṇa is ill (natural causes) and has been unconscious and delirious for the past 3 months (Kumbhakarṇa and his sleep absent) Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,147-48

Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa grieve for the wives they have married informally and left: Lao 2: Sahai 1996

Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa travel a long arduous forest journey to reach Rāvaṇa’s city: Lao 2: Sahai 1996

Indra’s magic horse leaps into city, sees Rāvaṇa unconscious in palace, hears Śāntā voice her fear that she will be recoverd: Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,148

Rāvaṇa grieves at loss of Śāntā, pursues captors, leading to climatic battle aided by animal helpers: Lao 2: Sahai 1996

Rāma threatens to kill Śāntā and take her head back to his father as proof if she will not accompany them voluntarily: Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,149-50

Śāntā grieves at loss of beloved husband, begs unconscious Rāvaṇa to follow and rescue her: Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,149-50

Rāma captures Rāvaṇa by engulfing him in lotus-fibre net he has fired from his bow: Lao 2: Sahai 1996: I,190

**from edn** (Sahai 1973):

edn based on 6 mss (A-F) from Roi Et (NE Thailand), Vat Pra Keo (Vientiane) Vat Kang Tha (Ban Bo O), Ban Naxon Tai, Ban Hom and Vat Nong Bon, but basically follows ms D (from Ban Naxon Tai, 40 km from Vientiane) which was copied in 1934 A.D. acc. to colophons of parts 1 + 2; final, 4th colophon states that the *Phra Lamma Muman* was written by Phutthaphochan on a date equivalent to 22nd May 1850 A.D. – presumably the author and the date when the original composition was completed. Sahai also argues that Phutthaphochan (Buddabocan) is an error for Buddahgocan (= Buddhaghoṣācārya), the name of several individuals and indeed used in the modern Cambodian saṅgha hierarchy for a high-ranking monk in the Mahānikāya.

“It appears that the present text was developed in 1850 from a smaller nucleus, either from a written text composed in an earlier period, or directly from oral tradition. In fact, the actual Rama story occupies only a small portion of the text. The description of Lao place-names, customs, and beliefs has assumed a far greater prominence. The relationship between these two distinct elements in the text obviously implies the superimposition of a mass of details concerning Lao culture on an existing Rama-story core. It is not at present possible to determine, however, whether that Rama-story core existed in an oral form or in a written form.” (p.XXXVII)

“The manuscripts of the Rama story found in the region of Vientiane are popularly known as Phra Lak Phra Lam. The author **|** has intended, however, to present the story in the form of a Jataka. The term “Phra Lam Sadok” occurs twice in the text, once at the beginning and once at the end. Hence, Prince Dhani Nivat judiciously refers to manuscript A as the “Rama Jataka”, although on the covering leaf only the title “Phra Lam” occurs.38 To avoid the misleading implication that there exist two different works, I have preferred to use the clarifying title, the Phra Lam Sadok.” (pp. XXXVIII-XXXIX).

38 Prince Dhani Nivat, The Rama Jataka, collected articles published by the Siam Society, 1969: p. 73.  
 [further handwritten extracts in A4 ring binder]

**See** also Sahai 1996: I,25-31 “The elder sister of Rāma” andII,17-47 “The Laotian Rāmakatha: a comparative analysis” (*on other shared narrative elements*; both **photocopied**) and Laosunthon 2007 (**download**)

**Lao 3: Luang Prabang version** (Bibl. Nat., Vientiane)as presented in brief summary (Vo 1971: 76-86):

Eclectic, inconsistent; apparently represents 2 different versions (e.g. Sugrīva and Vālin reversed in first half, standard roles in second).

Vo 1971: **see scan**

**p.11** Quant à la version de LuangPrabang, elle vient d’etre publiée par la Bibiothèque Nationale à Vientiane ... Cet ouvrage provient des manuscrits trouvés récemment dans la région de LuangPrabang.

Ses 223 premiers vers retracent l’histoire de la fondation du royaume d’Ayuthya par Phra In, ce qui m’a donné l’impression qu’il est en quelque sorte une adaptation condensée du Ramakien, version siamoise du Ramayana indien ...

**p.12** Le reste de l’ouvrage (vers 224 à 1823) rejoint dans ses grandes lignes la version de Vientiane.

Ratnam, Kamala 1974: captions of pls 3-11, 13-16 (Vat Pa Ke, Luang Prabang)  
and 20-40(Vat Mai, Luang Prabang)

paintings at Vat Pa Ke, Luang Prabang

**pl.3** City of Nonthok who is reborn as Thossokontho king of Langka

**pl.4** The city of Śrī Ayodhyā

**pl.5** *Upper part:* The city of Khitkin. *Lower part:* The entourage of Phra Phrot (Bharata going out to find Rāma)

**pl.6**  The city of Mithilā

**pl.7** Rama lifts the iron-bow in order to marry Sītā. The upper part of the picture shows other kings trying to lift the bow

**pl.8**  The marriage of Rāma and Sītā

**pl.9**  Pha Lak (Lakṣmaṇa) picks up the sword of Phoumphakal. Actually this is the sword of Pha In (Indra) which he has thrown for Kumbhakat (Kumbhakarṇa). Kumbhakat did not pick it up because it must be handed to him and not thrown. There is a fight between Pha Lak and Kumbhakat. The latter is defeated and Pha Lak presents the sword to his brother Pha Lam. While all this is going on Sītā is seated behind in her cottage.

**pl.10**  Thossokontho has cut the tongue of Phaya Siouha who was protecting Langka in his absence

**pl.11** Nang Sammanka (Śūrpaṇakhā) widow of Phaya Siouhan transforms herself into a young girl

**pl.13** Rāma pursuing the golden deer of Phaya Malit (Mārīca)

**pl.14**  Rāma finds Hanumān and Sangkhip *details indistinct*

**pl.15**  The death of Thosaroth, Rāma’s father at Śrī Ayodhyā

**pl.16** *Upper part:* Phaly tells Sanghkip that he is going to fight Thorapi in the cave.   
*Lower part:* The entourage of Phra Phrot who has come to ask Rāma to return to Ayuthya.

paintings at Vat Mai, Luang Prabang

**pl.20**  Indra has sent Phra Narai who has changed himself into a boar, to punish Hiranta yak. Hiranta yak has enveloped the earth in his arms

**pl.21** Nonthok has the duty to wash the feet of all the devas. As a reward he receives a magic finger which kills the person at whom it is pointed. Accordingly Nonthok has killed all the devas and Indra has to ask Phra Narai to punish him. Phra Narai takes the form of a young girl Nang Appasone (apsarā). The appasone asks Nonthok to dance with her and cunningly makes him point his finger at his heart. Nonthok dies and Phra Narai predicts that he will be born in another form with 20 arms (in return of one finger) with magic power. His name will be Rāvaṇa and he will be king of Lankā.

**pl.22**  Nang Atchana (Añjanā) the wife of Rishi Khodom has given birth to two sons Vālin and Sugrīva adulterously through Indra and Agni. Her daughter Savaha has informed her father the Rishi of her mother’s infidelity. Savaha is then commanded by her mother to be tied to a mountain and stand on only one foot day and night. Indra takes pity on her and sends Phra Phai (Vāyu) god of the wind to impregnate her through the mouth. Of this a son Hanumān is born and Savaha goes to heaven after his birth.

**pl.23**  Virounahok lives in Pātāla Lok. He is a yakṣa. He comes seven times a year to pray to Indra. This time when he came up he met a lizard. Mocked by his sound, he throws a part of his magic collar at it and kills it. The strength of the blow shakes Mount Meru and shakes the abode of the gods. Part of the lizard’s body is in the next picture.

**pl.24**  Rāvaṇa has put back mount Meru on its base and steadied the dwelling of Indra who as a reward gives him Nang Montho wife of Vālin. Vālin however has seen the reflection of his wife in the arms of Rāvaṇa, he goes after him, defeats Rāvaṇa and brings back his wife.

**pl.25**  Rāvaṇa by magic transforms himself into a giant crab for killing the young Ongkhot (Aṅgada) adulterous son of his wife and the monkey Vālin. He is surprised by Vālin and attacked.

**pl.26** Rāvaṇa, elder brother of Kou Pen (Kumbhakarṇa) *or Kubera ??? MB*  
meets him and forces him to give him the crystal (magic) chariot. Earlier Kou-pen has gone to Indra (seen on his three-headed elephant) and Indra gives him the chariot.

**pl.27**  Kou-pen goes to heaven in the crystal chariot which Indra has given him for his services.

**pl.28**  Indra riding on his elephant in heaven. He is leading an attack on Rāvaṇa for taking away the crystal chariot from his brother Kou-pen.

**pl.29**  Rishi in the forest. Indrajit has gone to the Rishi (Khoubot) for learning magic.

**pl.30**  After the victory over Hiranta yak, Phra Narai descends to rest on the King of the Nagas (Śeṣanāga) when Phra Inh sends the devas to him. Phra Narai being beseeched by the gods to incarnate himself as Rāma for fighting the yak Nonthok who has been incarnated as Rāvaṇa.

**pl.31**  Sītā asks Rāma to go and get the golden deer for her.

**pl.32**  Rāvaṇa fights the bird Jaṭāyu.

**pl.33**  Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa look for Sītā in the forest.

**pl.34**  Lakṣmaṇa keeps vigil while Rāma sleeps.

**pl.35**  Vālin and Sugrīva fight each other. Thoraphi lies dead at the mouth of the cave.

**pl.36** Rāma kaments for Sītā. He is attended by Lakṣmaṇa and a monkey.

**pl.37**  Sugrīva order Hanumān to go and find Sītā.

**pl.38**  Planning to build the causeway.

**pl.39**  Rāvaṇa seated with Mandodarī talks to the monkeys in his court.

**pl.40** Rāvaṇa beseeches Sītā to marry him.

**Vo Thu Tinh, *Phra Lak – Phra Lam: Version Lao du Ramayana indien***

**p. 3** Je m’étais, depuis un certain temps, intéressé à la légende de PhraLak-PhraLam dont j’avai trouvé un texte manuscrit à la pagode de Vat Kang Tha, Tassèng de Bo-O, Muong de Sayfong, à 8 km. au sud de Vientiane et dont j’avai entrepris même de traduire une vingtaine de chapitres, lorsqu’un jour la chance me mit entre les mains un ouvrage de H. DEYDIER où, dès 1952, l’auter signalait l’existence, au Vat Oup Moung à Vientiane-Ville, de fresques murales illustrant les divers épisodes de cette version lao du Râmâyana indien (Cf. Introduction à la Connaissance du Laos, Saigon 1952, pp. 100-101).

... ... je me suis rendu à ce Vat, situé au Km. 2 en bordure gauche de la route menant à l’aéroport de Vattay ... ...

**p.4** Les murs intérieurs sont divisés en 4 bandes horizontales, bandes que je dénomme pour la commoditeéde la description, A, B, C, et D. [A at top, D at bottom]

C’est sur les bandes B et C du milieu qu’on trouve, se succédant les unes aux autres sans lignes de démarcation, les fresques illustrant les divers épisodes de Phra Lak - Phra Lam. ... ...

**[***A total of 34 sequences, provided with sub-titles in modern Lao, done by a modern artist Thit Panh (born in 1916) who accepted an invitation in August 1938 to paint them from the superior of the pagoda, the venerable Phra Achan Si, and completed them in a fortnight.***]**

***Hamba Sebut Paduka*** – contents pages:

BAB KESATU : RAMAPARASU DAN HARJUNA SASRABAHU

1. Maka lahirlah Ramaparasu [all this section

2. Sumpah Ramaparasu seems to form a

3. Ramaparasu mencari Wisnu separate narrative]

4. Harjuna Sasrabahu

5. Harjuna Sasrabahu bertemu Ramaparasu

6. Tangan Wisnu

BAB KEPUA : RAHWANA DAN DASARATA

1. Sukesi dan Resi Wisrawa

2. Rahwana menggempur Kahyangan

3. Puteri Kusalya

4. Rahwana terkecoh

5. Musyawarah para dewa

BAB KETIGA : SAYEMBARA MANTILI

1. Putera-putera Dasarata

2. Tugas pertama

3. Sayembara Mantili

4. Brahmana Kala

5. Memenangkan sayembara

6. Penghadangan

BAB KEEMPAT : ASTHABRATA

1. Penobatan yang gagal

2. Terbuang

3. Bharata tak ingin tahta

4. Di atas Gunung Citrakuta

5. Pedomon Raja

BAB KELIMA : DALAM PENGEMBARAN

1. Sarpakenaka yang malang

2. Rencana Marica

3. Kijang emas

4. Garuda Jatayu

5. Kesidihan yang meresahkan

6. Menemukan jejak Sinta

BAB KEENAM : BALATENTARA KERA

1. Hanuman putera Anjani

2. Cupu Manik Astagina

3. Maesasura dan Lembu Asura

4. Aji Pancasona

5. Hanuman menghadap Rama

6. Pertempuran yang menentukan

7. Pesan Subali

BAB KETUJUH : PENYELIDIKAN

1. Lata Maosadi

2. Senggana duta pertama

3. Perangkap Sayempraba

4. Budi luhur Garuda Sempati

5. Melintasi samudera

6. Luas istana Rahwana

7. Sinta dan Trijata

BAB KEDELAPAN : MENGUJI KETANGGUHAN LAWAN

1. Cincin tambatan hati

2. Hancurnya Taman Argasoka

3. Hanuman tertangkap

4. Alengka jadi lautan api

5. Kembali ke Maliawan

6. Surat Sinta

7. Rama menyatakan perang

BAB KESEMBILAN : PERANG

1. Wibisana

2. Membendung samudera

3. Muslihat Rahwana

4. Anggada duta kedua

5. Perang mulai berkecamuk

6. Sarpakenaka tewas

7. Panah Nagapasa

8. Wisnu terbangun

BAB KESEPULUH : MENUMPAS RAHWANA

1. Mahapatih Prahasta

2. Kumbakarna Si Penidur

3. Kumbakarna tewas

4. Bius Indrajit

5. Indrajit tewas

6. Rahwana maju ke madan laga

7. Maka tumbanglah angkara murka

8. Dewa Agni membuktikan kesucian Sinta

**Lao 4** (*Gvāy Dvóṟaḥbī*) see separately below

**Lao 5: Finot 1917: 101**

Lao 5: *Pañcatantra, Maṇḍūkapakaraṇa* (The serpent and the frogs):  
9: The Story of Daśaratha: Finot 1917: 101  
10: The Story of Rāma: Finot 1917: 101

Snippets; exempla, so context not needed, but longer version assumed to be known to teller and almost certainly to audience (*which version is assumed? NOT the Dasarathajātaka*)

Finot 1917: 84

*Le Pancatantra laotien*

Suivant les lettrés de Luang Prabang, il existe ‘une collection de cinq ouvrages portant tous le nom de ‘pakon’. [...]

Les quatre premiers *pakon* (*pakaraṇa,* ‘ouvrage, traité’) sont:  
 *Nantapakon = Nandapakaraṇa,* le [bœuf] Nanda.  
 *Mandapakon = Maṇḍūpakaraṇa,* les Grenouilles.  
 *Pisapakon = Pisācapakaraṇa,* les Démons.  
 *Sakunapakon = Sakuṇapakaraṇa,* les Oiseaux.

Ces quatre ouvrages constituent la recension laotienne du Pañcatantra.

On sait que ce célèbre recueil de contes a eu une brillante fortune hors de son pays d’origine: on le trouve notamment à Java et au Siam. [...]

**p.85** Le titre de *Mulla-Tantai* est inconnu à Luang Prabang. Il existe bien un ouvrage connu sous ce nom, mais c’est un recueil de contes judiciaires qui n’a rien de commun avec le nôtre. Il semble donc que l’attribution de ce titre aux quatre pakaraṇa résulte d’une confusion. Toutefois une autre hypothèse est possible. [...]

**p.86** Le plan de ces compilations est uniforme: un sujet étant en discussion, chacun des personnages qui prend part au débat formule son avis et l’appuie d’un récit. On reconnaÎt ici la forme ordinaire des contes indiens. De même l’énoncé de la thèse sous la forme d’un vers, la démonstration du principe abstrait au moyen d’un apologue, l’ ‘emboÎtement’ des récits, tous ces traits caractéristiques du Pañcatantra et des recueils similaires se retrouvent dans les nôtres: seule une certaine maladresse dans l’agencement et les transitions, ainsi qu’une immense infériorité de style, les éloignent de leurs modèles.

**p.97** *Maṇḍūpakaraṇa*

*Cadre général.*

Dans le royaume d’Ujjenī est un étang habité par un peuple de grenouilles (*kop khiet*) dont le roi est Mahatibot. Un serpent affamé s’efforce de les atteindre, mais il ne trouve aucun endroit praticable, les grenouilles ayant soigneusement fortifié les bords de leur étang. Alors il s’adresse au roi des grenouilles et lui demande la permission de descendre boire, car il vient d’une région désolée par la sécheresse. Le roi Mahatibot refuse; car, dit-il, les serpents sont les ennemis naturels des grenouilles. Toutefois, sur les instances du suppliant, il convoque une assemblée générale de son peuple. La discussion s’ouvre et chaque orateur raconte une histoire démonstrative. La grenouille Vasubhāgya déclare qu’il faut se ranger à l’avis du roi: ceux qui méprisent les conseils de leurs chefs vont à la ruine.

**p.101** [...] La grenouille Mahatthakkhi dit qu’il est mauvais d’agir sans réflexion.

9. *Histoire de Dasaratha*

Le roi Dasaratha étant à la chasse rencontre un ermitage, où vivent un ermite avec sa femme, tous deux avaugles, et leur fils qui les nourrit. Le roi s’informe des désirs de l’ermite, et celui-ci se plaint des éléphants qui viennent constamment saccager et souiller l’étang voisin. Le roi se met à l’affût sur un arbre, d’où il tire nuit et jour sur les éléphants. Une nuit, s’étant endormi, il est brusquement réveillé par un bruit de pas sous son arbre: il décoche une flèche et tue le fils de l’ermite qui allait puiser de l’eau. Le roi, désolé de son erreur, essaie de consoler les deux vieillards; mais ils meurent de chagrin.

Dasaratha, affligé de ne pas avoir de fils, supplie le ciel de lui en accorder un: il en obtient quatre. La première reine Kosayadevī enfante Rāmarājakumāra; la seconde reine Kekayadevī, Bharatarājakumāra; la troisième reine Sumātā a deux fils, Lakkhaṇarājakumāra et Sataghnarājakumāra. Le roi, après avoir choisi comme successeur Bharata, s’en va dans la forêt avec la reine Sumātā et son fils Lakkhaṇa: ils y meurent.

Le serpent reproche aux grenouilles de ne pas suivre l’exemple du roi Rāma, qui fit bon accueil à un suppliant.

10. *Histoire de Rāma*

Lorsque Rāvaṇa eut enlevé et conduit à Laṅkā la princesse Sītā, il eut une violente querelle avec son frère Piphek (Vibhīṣaṇa), qui s’enfuit et se réfugia auprès de Rāma. Celui-ci le reçut bien et, après sa victoire, le mit sur le trône à la place de Rāvaṇa. [...]

**p.102** 13. *Histoire de Duryodhana* [MS. Tulayodhana]

Le roi Duryodhana avait cent frères, dont le dernier, Sakuṇi-Sīrājaputta était un habile joueur de dés. Convoitant le royaume du roi Dhammaputta, il envoya Sakuni jouer aux dés avec lui: Dhammaputta perdit et dut céder son royaume ainsi que ses quatre frères cadets.

Pour se débarrasser d’eux, Duryodhana fit construire à leur usage un pavillon (*kratip*) où on mit le feu: mais ils réussirent à s’échapper. Sur ces entrefaites le Praya Naray vint faire des remontrances au roi sur son avidité; il fut appuyé par les trois *acan* de la cour: Kaṇṇa, Doṇa, Bhisma, qui prièrent le roi de rendre à Dhammaputta une partie de son royaume: mais Duryodhana ne voulut rien entendre et cette obstination fut cause de sa ruine complète.

Le roi des grenouilles, ébranlé par ces exemples, incline à laisser passer le serpent; mais la grenouille Bahussuta s’y oppose. [...]

**p.104** Cette longue histoire met fin à la délibération. Le roi des grenouilles permet au serpent de descendre et fait faire un chemin pour lui. Le serpent, une fois entré, mange d’abord les petites grenouilles, puis les grosses, enfin le roi lui-même.

Conclusion: La reine Tantay recommande à sa servante Kulatthi, aux tao praya, mahâmanti, senâpati, purohita, d’agir avec réflexion, pour éviter qu’il leur arrive malheur, comme aux grenouilles.

**Lao 6 (Phralak Phralam ballet 2002**):

*Botfōn Phra Lak Phra Rām: tōn Phra Rām tām kwāng Thotsakan lak Nāng Sīdā*, ed. Sāiphet Khamphāsit and Manīvong Khattinyarāt (Vīangčhan [Vientiane], National Culture Hall, 2002). **60 pp.**

on cover: Royal Ballet Phralak Phraram (Lao version of the Ramayana)  
 Vientiane, National Culture Hall  
 20-21-22 / 10 / 2002

p. 43 (cf. p. 23 for French version)

INTRODUCTION

It was in 1986 that the idea of reviving and conserving the Phralak Phraram dance and Ipok puppet theater, two art forms specific to Luang Prabang, came to this province’s Cultural Service and to the Institute for Cultural Research of the Ministry of Information and Culture. Not many were then left of the masters and veteran artists. Those still alive, already at an elder age, were scattered. Out of concern, the then Governor of Luang Prabang, Mr. Chansi Phosikham, assigned the province’s cultural service the task to form a Nang Keo dance unit, which was accomplished in the difficult conditions of that period of time. On the other hand, the Ban Visoun neighbourhood created its own Nang Keo troop within the village’s limited capacities, which calls for praises.

p. 47 (cf. French p. 31)

It was introduced in Laos in the 15th century under King Phothisarath and translated into Lao and adapted to the local environment under the title of Phralak Phraram. The characters were given Lao names: Rama became Phraram, Lakshana [sic] became Phralak, Sita became Sida. Ravana, the ogre king of Lanka, became Thotsakan. Jatayu, the bird king and friend of Rama, became Sadaya, while Hanuman, leader of the army of monkeys, retained his original name.

The ballet was perfected throughout the centuries and the nine episodes were successively performed in turn at the court of Luang Prabang under different reigns. A storyteller, generally an elder master artist, sings the text and dialogues while musicians and dancers illustrate the song with music and dance.

Somsanouk Mixay  
Vice President  
Lao Journalists Vice-President [Fr.: Association des Journalistes Lao]

p. 48

... ... Malit, Thotsakan’s younger brother, will take the appearance of a golden deer ... ...

... ... Khohavari ... ...

Before leaving, with the help of a magical arrow, Phralak draws a line around Sida to prevent her to leave the circle. Once Phralak left, it was easy for Thotsakan to intervene. Using his magical powers, he utters formulas and blows in Sida’s direction to loosen her vigilance. Then, taking the form of a hermit, he appears before Sida. ... ...

p. 50

... ... On the verge of taking Sida away from the Nyak, he shouts: “Thotsakan! No one in this world has ever vanquished Sadayu. I fear no one, except Phra Isuan and Phra Narai. Only the Thammahong ring of Phra Isuan can overcome me!” Hearing these words, Thotsakan remembers that the Thammahong ring of Phra Isuan is precisely on Sida’s little finger [Fr. p.34 has l’auriculaire]. He takes the ring and throws it on Sadayu who, his wings broken, falls to the ground.

**title (and author)** *Gvāy dvóraḥbī* [= Lao 4]

**date (and provenance)** ? (Xieng-Mai / northern Laos)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s) \*** Sahai, Sachchidanand 1976: *Rāmāyaṇa in Laos: a study in the Gvāy dvóraḥbī,* foreword by Suniti Kumar Chatterji (New Delhi: D.K. Publishers; re-issued 2004 titled *Lao Rāmāyaṇa: Gvāy dvóraḥbī, rendering into English from ‘Lāv’ language: a comparative study,* Delhi: B.R. PC). **own copy**

**studies** Sahai, Sachchidanand 1977: “The Khvay Thuraphi: an unpublished Laotian version of the Ramayana”, *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal* 15.1: 33-51.  
 **Ind Inst Per 10 d 14; checked**

Sahai, Sachchidanand 1980: “The Khvay Thuaraphi”, in Raghavan 1980: 232-300. **own copy**

Phattrachai, Sukanya 1987: “Rama and Northeastern Mural Paintings”, *Muang Boran (Bangkok)* 13.1: 51-56. **Bodleian (Nuneham); p.51 photocopied**

**notes** Reproduced from original ms in Yuan script and dialect, spoken in Xieng-Mai and northern Laos; Sahai’s edn includes text of the *Khwāi Thūaraphī,* with English trans., from a ms. preserved in the Royal Palace, Luang Prabang, Laos.

notes from Sahai 1976 (*Gvāy Dvóṟaḥbī*):

Brief, incomplete, confused, eclectic; anomalies result from attempts to fuse several incompatible narrative elements.

Buddhist adaptation:

largely secular after opening Buddhist invocation [*no jātaka framework*]: 34

infant Sītā lives in palace created for her by Viśvakarman on Indra’s instructions, separate from hermit foster-father: 38

Lakṣmaṇa does not refuse to search for Rāma (no deceptive cry from Mārīca = Indra) so Sītā does not accuse him of improper designs: 45

golden deer (Indra) disappears, not killed: 45

abduction takes place on way back to Ayodhyā, so no court intrigues or banishment:   
 45-46

brother / sister incest: Vālin marries sister: 35, 47

father / daughter incest (same woman): conception of Hanumān: 50

few sages, no sacrifices, little killing

no *aśvamedha* or horse in recognition of Rāma’s sons: 70-71

No ally test

Title reflects importance of buffalo episode in popular imagination, but narrative no more prominent than in other versions.

No parallelism of suffering with Sugrīva: Rāma has not lost his kingdom, Sugrīva has not lost his wife.

Sahai 1976: 17 §5 for *Skanda Purāṇa* analogue of demon tricked into pointing finger at self.

from website of SEA dept, Berkeley:

In northeastern Thailand there is a version of the Ramayana entitled Phra Lak Phra Lam which is the same story and title found in Laos. The people of these regions speak the same language, have similar customs, and enjoy the same literature. There are three versions of the Phra Lak Phra Lam and local legend has it that two of them were told by Buddha himself.

In Laos, it is believed that the story of Rama was recited by Buddha to his monks. It became a Jataka tale and is considered to be a story of one of the previous lives of Buddha. To the people Rama represents the ideals of righteousness and his life is depicted in dance, music, art, narrative, oral, and folkloric tradition throughout Laos. Two popular versions of the Ramayana are Phra Lak Phra Lam and Gvay Dvorahbi and are told for instructive and entertaining purposes.

There are two literary adaptations of Phra Lak Phra Lam. One is from Luang Phrabang and the other is from Vientiane, and both are written in Lao. Both are very similar to the Thai Ramakien. The Gvay Dvorahbi version was written in Yuan and the original palm-leaf manuscript is preserved in the royal palace of Luang Prabang.

Vat Oup Moung, a Buddhist monastery in Vientiane has mural paintings of thirty-three episodes from the Lao version of Rama. They were painted by Thit Panh in 1938 with very colorful modern house paint.

**title (and author)** *Rāmakerti*

**date (and provenance)** 16th-17th century onwards (Khmer)

**edition(s)** *Rīoeṅ Rāmakerti* 1937: *Rīoeṅ Rāmakerti* (Phnompenh: Institut Bouddhique).

Pou, Saveros (ed.) 1979: *Rāmakerti (XVIe-XVIIe siècles), texte khmer* (Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient). **Bod. Indo-Chin. d.571**

**translation(s) \*** Pou, Saveros (trans.)1977a: *Rāmakerti (XVIe-XVIIe siècles), traduit et commenté* (Paris: EFEO); 2nd edn: *Rāmakerti I “La Gloire de Rāma”: Drame épique médieval du Cambodge,* trans. by Saveros Pou and Grégory Mikaelian (L’Harmattan, Paris, 2007).  
 **own copy** (2nd edn)

Martini, François (trans.) and Ginette Martini (introd. and notes) 1978: *La Gloire de Rama: Rāmāyaṇa Cambodgien*, Collection ‘Le Monde indien’ 3 (Paris: Belles lettres).  
[xliii, 243 pp.; 20 cm.] **Toyo Bunko nIX-3-E-11; see typed notes**

Pou, Saveros (ed. and trans.) 1982: *Rāmakerti II (Deuxième version du Rāmāyaṇ khmer)* (Paris: EFEO). **own copy**

Jacob, Judith M. and Kuoch Haksrea (trans.) 1986: *Reamker (Rāmakerti): the Cambodian version of the Rāmāyaṇa,* Oriental Translation Fund n.s. 45 (London: RAS). **Bod. stack Or. e.3 (45); summary, pp. xxi-xxxii: photocopy** [*unfavourable comments by Saveros Pou* (1987: 200)]

Khing, Hoc Dy (trans.) 1995: *Un Épisode du Rāmāyaṇa Khmer: Rāma endormi par les maléfices de Vaiy Rabṇ,* Collection “Recherches Asiatiques” (Paris: L’Harmattan). **own copy**

**studies** Bizot, F. 1973: *Histoire du Reamker* (Phnom Penh: Trai Rathana Publishing).

Bizot, F. 1983: “The Reamker”, in Srinivasa Iyengar (ed.) 1983: 263-75. **own copy**

Daravuth, Ly and Ingrid Muan (eds) 2002: *Rup tuaqanga knun ryan Ramkerit / gur toy lok Chet Can ; [nibandh toy Li Daravudh, Qamngrit Muq‚n] = The Reamker ; painted by Chet Chan* (Phnom Penh: Raiyam).

Khing, Hoc Dy 1990: *Contribution à l'histoire de la littérature khmère,* by Khing Hoc Dy, vol. 1. Littérature de l'époque "classique" (XVe-XIXe siècles) (Paris: L'Harmattan).  
 **BOD Nuneham Indo-Chin. d.859 (v. 1); checked**

Majumdar, R.C. 1953: *Inscriptions of Kambuja* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society). **(IND) 81 D 40**

Marrison, G.E. 1989: “ ‘Reamker (Rāmakerti)’, the Cambodian version of the ‘Rāmāyaṇa, translated by Judith Jacob’: a review article”, *JRAS*: 122-29. **download** [*mainly a summary*]

Martini, François 1938: “En Marge du Ramayana Cambodgien [I]” *BEFEO* 38 pp. 285-95. [continued in Martini 1950] **photocopy**(repr. as *En Marge du Ramayana Cambodgien* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1950) [??? *both articles* ??].

Martini, François 1950: “En marge du Ramayana Cambodgien [II]”, *JA* 238: 81-90 [*continuation of Martini 1938*]. **photocopy**

Martini, François 1952: “Note sur l’empreinte du bouddhisme dans la version cambodgienne du Ramayana”, *JA* ??: 67-70. **photocopy**

Martini, François 1961: “Quelques notes sur le Rāmker”, *AA* 24: 351-62. **download**

Mehta, Julie B. 2004: “The *Rāmāyaṇa* in the Arts of Thailand and Cambodia”, in Bose 2004: 323-34. **own copy**

Pou, Saveros 1975a: “Note sur la date du poème d’Angkor Vat”, *JA* 263: 119-24.  
[dates text to 1620 (error for 1720)] **photocopy**

Pou, Saveros 1975b: “Les traits bouddhiques du *Rāmakerti*”, *BEFEO* 62: 355-68. **download**

Pou, Saveros 1977b: *Études sur le Rāmakerti (XVIe-XVIIe siècles)* (Paris: École Française d’Extrême Orient). **pp. 39-40, 58-60, 143-66 photocopied**

Pou, Saveros 1980: “Some proper names in the Khmer Rāmakerti”, *South East Asian Review (Gaya)* 5.2: 19-29. **offprint**

Pou, Saveros 1983: “Ramakertian Studies”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 252-62. **own copy**

Pou, Saveros 1986: *“Rāmakerti*: the Khmer (or Cambodian) *Rāmāyaṇa”,* in Morgenroth 1986: 203-11 [repr. in Pou 2003: 239-47]. **offprint**

Pou, Saveros 1987: “Études sur le Rāmāyaṇa en Asie (1980-86)”, *JA* 275: 193-201. **offprint**

Pou, Saveros 1989: “Portrait of Rama in Cambodian (Khmer) Tradition”, in *Ramayana Traditions and National Cultures in Asia,* ed. by D.P. Sinha and S. Sahai: 1-7 (Lucknow: Directorate of Cultural Affairs). **photocopy**

Pou, Saveros 1992: “Indigenization of Rāmāyaṇa in Cambodia”, *AFS* 51: 89-102. **download**[repr. in Pou 2003: 327-53; *virtually identical reprint as* “Ramayana in Cambodia”, in Vyas 1992: 76-89.]

Pou, Saveros 1993-94: “From Vālmīki to Theravāda Buddhism: the example of the Khmer classical *Rāmakerti”, IT* 19-20: 267-84 [repr. in Pou 2003: 413-35]. **own copy**

Pou, Saveros 2003: *Choix d’articles de Khmerologie / Selected Papers on Khmerology* (Phnom Penh: Reyum). **own copy**

Pou, Saveros 2005: “The concept of *avatāra* in the Rāmāyaṇa tradition of Cambodia”, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 31: 123-35 [also in Vyas 1997: 79-92]. **offprint**

Pou, Saveros, Lan Sunnary et Kuoch Haksrea 1981: “Inventaire des œuvres sur le Rāmāyaṇa Khmer (Rāmakerti)”, *Seksa Khmer* 3-4: 111-26. **photocopy**

Sarin, San 1995: “Gratefulness (*ṭiṅ guṇ*) in Cambodian Behaviour”, in Pollet 1995: 221-28.  
 **typescript in Leuven folder (Rāmāyaṇa conferences box)** –*disregard*

Singaravelu, S. 1982c: “The Rāma story in Kampuchea tradition”, *Seksa Khmer* 5: 17-31.  
[general survey: inscr., reliefs, *Rāmakerti,* shadow-play, dance] **Per. 24626 e.36**.

Ślączka, Anna 2011: “Temple consecration rituals in the Hindu tradition of South and South-East Asia: a study of the textual and archaeological evidence”, in *Art, Myths and Visual Culture of South Asia,* ed. by Piotr Balcerowicz in collaboration with Jerzy Malinowski (Delhi: Manohar Publishers): 167-81. **photocopy**

Siyonn, Sophearith 2005: “The life of the Rāmāyaṇa in ancient Cambodia: a story of the political, religious and ethical roles of an epic tale in real time (I)”, *Udaya, Journal of Khmer Studies* 6: 93-149. **download + photocopy**

Siyonn, Sophearith 2006: “The life of the Rāmāyaṇa in ancient Cambodia: a story of the political, religious and ethical roles of an epic tale in real time (II)”, *Udaya, Journal of Khmer Studies* 7: 45-72. **download + photocopy**

Thierry, Solange 1998: “Romance and Epic in Cambodian Tradition”, *Diogenes* 181 (46/1): 43-56. **download**

**notes** The earliest evidence for acquaintance with the Rāmāyaṇa in Cambodia is found in the Veal Kantel inscription (K.359, undated, reign of Bhavavarman, end of 6th century or 7th) which mentions that a brahmin donated copies of the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, and a Purāṇa to a Śaiva temple for recitation every day (**see** Barth, Auguste 1885: *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale): 28-31; Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge,* vol. IV, p. 380, n. 105). This Indian brāhman married the sister of Bhavavarman I, first king of Chenla (580-98 A.D.) and they donated the texts to a temple on the Mekong river (Majumdar 1953: 18-19, no. 13).

Pravarasena and *Setubandha* referred to in a Thnal Baray stele inscription of Yaśovarman of Kambuja (889-910 A.D.) **see** Sharan, Mahesh Kumar 1974: *Studies in Sanskrit inscriptions of ancient Cambodia* (Delhi: Abhinav): 48-49. [Thnal Baray = East Baray]

Pre Rūp stele inscription of Rājendravarman (944-968 A.D.); engraved on 2 sides of a stele, each having 66 lines; in Sanskrit and totalling 298 verses; Majumdar 1953: 233 —   
“It testifies to an intimate knowledge of Sanskrit literature on the part of the author. For apart from allusion to Epic and Puranic legends and mythology there are evident references to *Atharvaveda* (v. 64), *Rāmāyaṇa* (v. 207), *Mahābhārata* (v. 83), *Pāṇini* (vv. 48, 209, 214, 218, 219, 258) and *Raghuvaṁśa* (vv. 164, 199, 211, 290).” (**see** Majumdar 1953: 232-68, no. 97)

Sūryavarman I of Kambuja (1002-49 A.D.) is described in Prasat Sankhah inscription as listening to recitations of the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, and the Purāṇas (Majumdar 1953: 615-20, no. 149A).

***Rāmakerti I***

*Rāmakerti I* emerged in the Middle Period (15th-17th centuries) as the libretto of a mimed dance-drama called *lkhon khol,* composed as individual scenes by several poets in the 16th-17th centuries and co-ordinated by the last of them into the long poem we have. *Rāmakerti I* can be viewed as a condensed and selective version of the *VR* with little interference from popular imagination or foreign cultures but subsequent *Rāmakertis* show the increasing impact of these two factors. These tableaux do not include the beginning or the end. (cf. summary at JLB 1985: 290-94)

Pou 1977: 32: author of *Rāmakerti I* was “grand bouddhiste fervent, il était encore bien marqué par l’héritage brahmanique ancien.”

Pou 1977: 51 – “Ce poème de 5,034 strophes établi gràce à l’existence des trois textes separées mentionnés plus haut, est une epopée à la gloire de Rām, incarnation de Biṣṇu our Nārāy sur terre, et paré de caracteristiques bouddhiques. On se heurte immédiatement à un problème fondamental de classification littéraire. En effet, cet oeuvre que nos appelons “épopée” est essentiellement un récitatif ou un livret the théâtre; . . . . . .

Pou 1977b: 52 – “Comme on pourra le voir, la composition du texte n’a rien de comparable à celle de l’épopée indienne, car elle est soumise, avant tout, aux exigences dramatiques. C’est pourquoi le text se présente comme une longue succession de tableaux dont les actions sont annoncées par la récitant à l’aide de la formule “*Ṭaṅ noḥ*”, lit. “cette fois-ci”, qu’on peut rendre par: “Et maintenant, voilà, alors . . .”. On comprendra aussi pourquoi le poète n’a pas cru bien de remonter à la genèse de l’épopée. . . . . . . Donc, le d´but abrupt du récit nest motivé que par les exigences du théâtre.”   
[Tableaux do not include either beginning or end]

Pou 1975b points out the inconsistencies in the portrayal of Rāma in *Rāmakerti I —* not seen as a problem to Khmers.

‘C’est autour de Rām — le Buddha — que s’articule le fond de l’épopée khmère Rāmakerti I, car, répétons-le, elle n’est pas une simple reproduction du Rāmāyaṇa, ni un divertissement héroïque. Elle est, pour ainsi dire, une version entièrement révisée du Rāmāyaṇa défait en pièces par des poètes qui, fidèles à l’enseignement du Buddha, donnent à l’épopée indienne une nouvelle structure. Les faits sont expliqués, coordonnés selon des principes fermement établis d’une vision du monde, la conception de l’individu et de son existence.’ Pou 1977b: 89

stemma Pou 1986: 206

Rāma as Buddha / not Buddha Pou 1986: 207.2.4

monkeys Pou 1992: 95-98

***MB****:*

Many lyrical passages; poem opens with lyrical description of Viśvāmitra’s hermitage.

Much flyting.

Some of narrative very close to Vālmīki, merely superficially modified to suit Buddhist context. Text sometimes reminiscent of *VRm* text e.g. 11.1605. BUT not always.

Structure of tableaux sometimes demands knowledge of story; many unexplained allusions to longer text; the tableaux do not include beginning or end.

Whole account of Dundubhi, his father, Vālin and Sugrīva and their enmity put into Rāma’s mouth — incongruous and a-chronological: ch.12.

Many duplications / differing accounts from incompatible sources with only limited attempt at reconciliation:   
meeting of Sugrīva and Rāma x 2: ch.13  
*nāgapāśa*: Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa both enmeshed by feet / only Lakṣmaṇa enmeshed

**Bizot 1983: 263**

danger of reciting / representing death of Rāvaṇa in Cambodia

Martini and Martini 1978 —

posthumous work – parts are summarised by Ginette M. from less finished sections of François M.’s translation; based on 1937 edn of Bibliothèque Royale de Phnom-Penh

there are in fact **no** notes, just a glossary on pp. 231-243, presumably compiled by G.M.

In her introduction G.M. emphasises the Buddhist element of the narrative and also the similarities with the reliefs at Angkor Vat: “On voit combien les littératures indigènes d’Asie du sud-est sont interessantes et comme elles éclairent les œuvres d’art locales si belles et nombreuses en ces régions.” (p. xxxviii)

pp. xvi-xvii –– Sītā’s birth or rather discovery floating on a lotus is compared to the Indonesian version, then continues (p. xvii): “... ... Il faut noter d’ailleurs que, dans les manuscrits du Rāmker, la fillette miraculeuse ne s’appelle pas «Sītā», Sillon, mais «Setā», la Blanche, nom qui s’accorde beaucoup mieux avec son origine aquatique. Malheureusement, l’éditeur du Rāmker, sans doute pour faciliter la lecture de l’ouvrage, a pris l’initiative de rajeunir l’orthographie et de normaliser certains noms. Peut-être a-t-il considéré la transformation de Sītā en Setā comme une erreur de copiste. ... ...”

***Rāmakerti II***

Pou (ed. and trans.) 1982 **=** Khmer, *Ramakerti II:* Pou 1982:

date of composition 18C: Pou 1982: 12

ms. probably 19C: Pou 1982: 1

libretto for mime/dance drama: Pou 1982: 4-5

summary from JLB 1985: 294 – *Rāmakerti II* recounts the events of the Uttara kāṇḍa and includes several features which are standard in the Southeast Asian versions. Thus, in Rām’s absence Sītā is inveigled by a servant (one of Rāb’s family in disguise) into drawing a portrait of Rāb, which is hidden under Rām’s bed on his return and causes him such discomfort that in anger he commands Laks to execute Sītā, but Laks cannot do it and leaves her in the forest (1–215). Sītā then reaches Vajjamrik’s (= Vālmīki) hermitage and there gives birth to one son, the other being created by the sage through a fire-sacrifice; they are named Rāmalaks and Japalaks (216–346). Rām releases a stallion to roam before sacrifice, under the care of his brothers Bhirut and Sutrut and of Hanumān. Rāmalaks and Hanumān engage in combat in which Hanumān is worsted, but in the subsequent encounter with the boys Rāmalaks is captured (458–753).

Japalaks then goes to rescue his brother and with various supernatural help succeeds (754–952). Rām pursues them and discovers their true identity, but, despite repeated urgings, Sītā refuses to resume married life (953–1596). When she is tricked into coming back by Rāma’s supposed death, on discovering the deception she calls on the Earth to take her to its bosom, where she is hospitably received by Biruṇ (= Varuṇa. 1597–1774). Though ending with the Uttarakāṇḍa episode of the appeal to the Earth, this gives a totally new slant to Sītā’s behaviour.

Incomplete: ends after Sītā escapes to *pātāla*, Rāma decides to consult Vibhīṣaṇa.

Long, detailed descriptions [*cf. kāvya*]; considerable emphasis on feelings and on explaining and excusing characters’ behaviour.

Liver of magic deer saves Lakṣmaṇa from Rāma’s anger but convinces Rāma of Sītā’s guilt; cf. magic deer that brought about abduction.

Refers to incidents at end of war in Laṅkā (not death of Rāvaṇa) and to renewed warfare after return to Ayodhyā (not in extant *Ramakerti I*); see Pou 1982: 7 Khmer, *Ramakerti II:* Pou 1982: 3.451-52

Some gentle humour in scene of attempted reconciliation: Vālmīki’s good-humoured but tactful grumbling; Rāma complains that Kausalyā has been nagging him incessantly for the last 10 years for ordering execution.

*aśvamedha*: Le rite khmer n’est pas motivé par la consolidation de la prospérité et du pouvoir royaux. Le cheval de la couronne, coursier sacré, est le médium qu’on fait agir pour découvrir un personnage qui touche cette couronne. Les contes khmers relatent souvent des vacances du trône; le conseil de la couronne lâche alors le coursier royal pour dépister un successeur digne du dernier roi. Dans R.II, Rām charge son coursier de découvrir l’ennemi en puissance du royaume. Dans tous les cas, le scénario se déroule de la même façon, non différent de celui de l’*aśvamedha*: bénédiction du cheval, sa libre randonnée. Mais dans les rites khmers, la conclusion, comme le motif, est d’une autre nature: lorsque le coursier a fini sa mission, on le ramène aux écuries au lieu de l’immoler.

Pou 1982: 19.1656: Allusion to a Rāvaṇa/Śiva/Umā episode indicates that it was widely known to its audience.

**other Khmer**

**Lpoek aṅgar vatt** ‘Poem of Aṅgkor Vat’ (*Lpoek Aṅgar Vatt*, **see** st. 203–374).   
Khing 1990: 122-28 discusses and summarises the *Lpoek aṅgar vatt,* referring often to Pou 1977b; he identifies its author as Brah Sugandh, elevated in 1855 to the status of Samtec Brah Sugandh Pàn, so it is datable to 19th century. However Saveros Pou dates it to *śaka* 1542 = 1620 A.D. (Pou 1975a) and names its composer as ‘Pan’ (Pou 1977b: 40), who is probably just the writer of the preamble. Possibly the version given in Khing 1990 is a reworking of an earlier version (cf. Roveda 2015: 224). Asserts that Aṅgkor Vat was not built by humans but by the gods (by Preah Pisnukar [= Viśvakarman] for Indra).

Pou, Saveros 1975a: “Note sur la date du poème d’Angkor Vat”, *JA* 263: 119-24. **photocopy**

Pou, Saveros 1977 (2): Études sur le Rāmakerti (XVIe-XVIIe siècles) (Paris: École Française d’Extrême Orient). **photocopies 39-40, 58-60, 143-66** [*extract of translation of Lpoek Aṅgar Vatt*]

*Lpoek Angkor Vat (Poème d’Angkor Vat),* trans. by Khing Hoc Dy (Choisy-le-roy: Association Culturelle ‘Pierres d’Angkor’, 1985). **copy in Humboldt UL, Berlin**

Nhim, Sotheavin 2019-20: “A commentary on *Lpoek Aṅgar Vat* (Poem of Angkor Wat)”, *Renaissance Culturelle du Cambodge* 31: 107-43. [includes Khmer text] **download**

Fanciful description of reliefs in [*apparent*] frieze at Aṅkor Wat, closely based on text of *Rāmakerti I*,cf. *RR* pp. 289-94.

[*Purports to be description of carvings at Angkor Wat, but patently is not; rather it summarises Ramakerti I quite closely. Why did the author make this claim? Would the audience be able to check it? Was the temple accessible? Were the public admitted to the relevant areas? Why was it assumed that it was the Rāma story carved on the walls?* ***see*** *correspondence with Bruno Dagens under Angkor Wat in “visual SE Asia”. MB*]

*Correspondence with Bruno Dagens:*

Dear Bruno

I have been reading Saveros Pou’s translations of *Ramakerti I* and the extract from *Lpoek Angar Vatt* in her *Études sur le Rāmakerti (XVIe-XVIIe siècles)* 1977: 155-66, and noting that (as she says) although the author of the *LAV* claims to be describing carved friezes at Angkor Vat, he is in fact doing nothing of the sort, but summarising *Ramakerti I* quite closely.

What I am wondering is why he should make this claim, and especially how he was able to make it. Would the audience be able to check? In 1720 (date of composition, according to Saveros), was the temple accessible / in use / overgrown / dilapidated? If the temple was in use, were the public admitted to the relevant areas? In particular, why was it assumed that it was the Rāma story carved on the walls, rather than any other? Was there just a vague folk memory of some weird carvings that could be made to legitimate the author’s story without fear of contradiction?

Dear Mary,

Angkor Vat has never been abandoned, overgrown or even delapidated and it was (and is up to now) an active worship place continuously since its building (first half of 12th century). The main accident was a shift from Brahmanical creed (Visnu) to Buddhism (Theravada) sometime in the 14th c., or most probably in the 15th c. century.

It was visited at the end of 16th century by Spanish and Portuguese fathers (when Angkor was again for some decades the capital of Cambodian Kingdom) and have described it in full activity glory. Later on in the 17th century a Japanese pilgrim made a precise and well documented plan of Angkor Vat (it is the one reproduced in my little book on Angkor).

Important works were done on the monument in the 16th century: especially the completion of bas reliefs of the North-East part of the Gallery between 1546 and 1566 AD, but also various other works in several places such as the top storey).

As for the access of public: when Angkor Vat became a Buddhist temple, the centre of worship shifted from the top storey sanctum (of which the four doors were closed and remain thus up to beginning of 20th century) to the 1st storey (that of Bas-reliefs gallery) in the western cruciform gallery in a place called now “Thousand Buddhas” (even if most of the Buddha statues collected there have disappeared at the Khmers Rouges period. This place as well as the whole bas-reliefs gallery and most probably the whole of the temple were open to lay devotees. In any case Theravada Buddhist temples were not (and are not) closed and devotees can go everywhere (apart the monks living quarters but in Angkor vat they were (and are) outside the temple itself to the South (now that part is destroyed) and to the North.

2. As for the Râma story; it has been shown by F. Martini (either in *Journal Asiatique* 1950 or more probably in the *Festschrift G. Coedès* that is to say *Artibus Asiae* Vol. 24 (fasc. 3-4) 1961, I have no more precise references here) that the sculptors of bas-reliefs in the 12th century were already following a Cambodian version of Ramayana, dissenting on some points of Valmiki’s vulgate (in fact a kind of pre-Ramakerti). Thus it was easy to refer to bas-reliefs which since the start were partly at least of proper Cambodian tradition!

**Trai Bhet**

Bernon, Olivier de 1994: “Le Trai Bhet: une autre version de la légende de Rāma”, in *Recherches nouvelles sur le Cambodge,* ed. by F. Bizot, 79-95 (Paris: EFEO).   
 **Bod.; scan**

The Trai Bhet (the name derives from Tri Veda, the three Vedas/knowledges, possibly a reference to the Brahmanical texts) begins with a cosmogony, describing the genesis of the personified elements from primordial chaos, and develops into a version of the Rāma story. Cœdès and de Bernon date the *Trai Bhet* to C17-18.

*see* **photocopy** *for details of 1 ms* (AVS, p.80 §2) of the 2 extant; see p.90 §3 for extent of contents, cf. p.81 n.6

*for date see* p.80 §2

cf. Pou 1989: 4-5 (**photocopy**), Khing 1990: 47-57, and Roveda 2015: 222-6

**Rāma endormi par le maléfice de Vaiy Rabṇ**  
Khing, Hoc Dy (trans.) 1995: *Un Épisode du Rāmāyaṇa Khmer: Rāma endormi par les maléfices de Vaiy Rabṇ,* Collection “Recherches Asiatiques” (Paris: L’Harmattan). **own copy**

cf. entry in Inventaire provisoire des manuscrits khmers de la Société Asiatique (**download**) within B. 39. 4: épisode où Rama, endormi par le maléfice de Vey Reap, tombe au pouvoir de ce monstre, “relu en octobre 93, manuscrit mal écrit mais intéressant”, avec de nombreuses annotations au crayon de la main d’Aymonier, 60 p.

Apparently an independent episode, not part of *Rāmakerti I* (cf. summary at its start)

**oral narrative**

The *Shek Thom* shadow theatre narrative may go back to the 15th century, although the oral transmission that this would involved has left no trace.

Bizot, F. 1973: *Histoire du Reamker* (Phnom Penh: Trai Rathana Publishing).

Bizot, F. 1989: *Rāmaker ou l’amour symbolique de Rām et Setā,* Recherches sur le Bouddhisme khmer 5,Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient 155 (Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient). [148 pp.; 166 pp. of plates; abridged trans. of his 1973 work]  
 **Bod. M92.C00395**

version narrated (chanted) by Mi Chak (1897-1971) and recorded by Bizot over several days in 1969; Bizot compared Mi Chak’s narrative with the murals of the Silver Pagoda, Phnom Penh [incomplete set of 166 b+w photos at end], and considered that he describes them reasonably well (1973: 35); influenced also by the *Trai Bhet* and the Thai *Rāmakīen* (Roveda 2015: 233).

**see also** Roveda 2015: 230-36

**title (and author)** *Rāmakīen* (Thai *Rāmāyaṇa*), ascribed to Rāma I

**date (and provenance)** end of 18th century

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)** Karpelès, Suzanne 1925: “Un épisode du Rāmāyaṇa siamois”, in *Études asiatiques publiées à l’occasion du vingt-cinquième anniversaire de l’École française d'Extrême-Orient par ses membres et ses collaborateurs.*  EFEO 19*,* 2 vols, I, 315-42 (Paris: G. van Oest). [*detailed translation into French of Benjakai episode*] **Sackler A Eco; checked**

Puri, Swami Satyananda and Charoen Sarahiran (trans.) 1940: *The Ramakirti (Ramakien) or the Thai version of the Ramayana*, Birla Oriental Series (Bangkok: Dharmashrama); 3rd edn: Indian Studies Centre, Thammasat University, Bangkok, 1998 [**own copy**].  
 [*brief retelling /paraphrase, some elements re-arranged; not a translation*] **Ind. Inst. 62 B 14; checked**

Velder, Christian 1962: *Der Kampf der Götter und Dämonen,* aus dem thailändischen Ramakien übertragen und mit einem Nachwort versehen (Schweinfurt: Verlag Neues Forum).  
[basically a German translation; Nachwort = pp. 303-6]  
 **BL; SOAS** **[contents pages scanned; notes from summary**]

[Rāma I] 1967: *Ramayana: masterpiece of Thai literature retold from the original version written by King Rama I of Siam* (2nd edn, Bangkok: Chalermnit Bookshop; 3rd edn 1977).   
[2nd edn, 101 pp.; 3rd edn, 98 pp.; 4th edn in SOAS]  
[Eng. trans. of version by Phutthayō̜tfā Čhulālōk = Rama I, King of Siam, 1737-1809]  
[popularising summary/retelling] (= [Chalermnit *Ramakien*] 1967)  
 **Ind. Inst. 62 B 16 (3rd edn); John checked**; *see* **handwritten notes**

\*Olsson, Ray A. (trans.) 1968: *The Ramakien: a prose translation of the Thai Ramayana* (Bangkok: Praepittaya Co.). [trans. largely based on Velder, *Der Kampf der Götter und Dämonen*]  
[**n.b.**review by Gabaude, *BEFEO* 59 (1972): 330-31] **Ind. Inst. 62 E 16** **photocopy: contents, 26-27, 38-41, 54-59, 88-91, 121, 161-64,   
 168-71, 180-93, 253-56, 330-33, 340-41; analysed [=** Olsson 1968]

Chagsuchinda, Pensak (trans.) 1973:*Nang Loi, the floating maiden: a recitation from an episode of the Ramakien, a Thai version of the Indian epic Ramayana,* by Rama II, King of Thailand (1809-1824), Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, Monograph series 18 (Lund: Studentlitteratur). [68 pp. : ill.] [illustrations taken from *Ramakien* by King Rama I]  
 **BL; SOAS; CUL**

Phuong, Lanand Matthias Stiefel 1977: *Ramakien: der Kampf der Gotter, Helden und Damonen* (Bern: Hallwag). [77 pp.: chiefly ill.]

Diskul, Prince Subhadradis and Charles S. Rice 1981: *Chittrakam faphanang ru’ang Ramakian ro’p phra rabiang Wat Phra Sri Rattanasatsadaram /* *The Ramakian (Ramayana) mural paintings along the galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha,* descriptions in Thai and English by Prince Subhadradis Diskul and Charles S. Rice (Bangkok: Goverment Lottery Office of Thailand). [li, 362pp., chiefly ill.]

Cadet, J.M. 1982: *The Ramakien: the stone rubbings of the Thai epic*, illustrated with the bas-reliefs of Wat Phra Jetubon, Bangkok (pbk. edn Tokyo: Kodansha International / Bangkok: Central Department Store, 1st edn. 1971, new edn 1975).  
[Paperback edition: 1982]. 256 pp.; 24 cm. **typed extracts**  
[*A retelling of the Thai version of Vālmīki’s* *Rāmāyana*] **also in BL**

Ramakien 1995: *Chittakam faphanang ru’ang Ramakian rop phrarabiang Wat Phra Srirattanasatsadaram / The Ramakian (Ramayana) mural paintings along the galleries of the temple of the Emerald Buddha / Les peintures murales illustrant le Ramakian (Ramayana) sur les galeries pourtournantes du temple du Bouddha d’emeraude*, Thailand, Samnakngan Salak Kinbang Ratthaban (Krungthep [Bangkok]: Government Lottery Office).  
[c. 250 p.v. : ill.; in Thai]

Maha Chakri Sirindhorn, Princess and Prince Naris Saranuvattivongs (2000 [2543]): *Khonsoet ru’ang Ramakian ton Nang Loi ban ton* (Krung Thep [Bangkok]: Munnithi Naritsaranuwattiwong). [1 CD: Lyrics by HRH Prince Narisaranuvattiwongse.-- Principal vocalist : HRH Princess Maha Chjakri Sirindhorn. – Thai classical music concert: *Nang Loi - the floating lady*, part 1. -- Traditional instrumental music. Contents: *Bot phraniphon Somdet Phrachaoboromwongthoe Chaofa Krom Phra Naritsaranuwattiwong -- Somdet Phra Theprattana Ratchasuda ... Sayam Boromratkumari song khaprong pen ton siang*.] **SOAS**

*The Story of Ramakian, from the mural paintings along the galleries of the temple of the Emerald Buddha.* Bangkok: Sangdad Pueandek Publishing Co., n.d. **own copy**

**studies** Attagara, Kingkeo 1961: “The Ramayana Epic in Thailand and Southeast Asia”, *Journal of the Assam Research Society* 15 (Kaliram Medhi commem. volume): 3-21. **scan**

Bofman, Theodora Helene 1984: *The poetics of the Ramakian,* Monograph series on Southeast Asia, special report 21 (De Kalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University, Center for Southeast Asian Studies). **pp. 3-5 photocopied; rest not relevant**  
[*based on thesis, 1978, University of Michigan, Department of Linguistics*] **Ind. Inst. 4.4.9. 1**

Bora, Tanuja and Dhrubajyoti Nath 2014: “The figure of Rama in India and Thailand: a comparative study”, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19.4: 38-43.  
 **download; too general**

Desai, Santosh Nagpaul 1983: *Hindu elements in Thai culture* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms International). **various extracts scanned** [Microfilm printout of Ph.D. thesis, 1968, St. John’s University, New York]

Dhani Nivat Kromamun Bidyalabh 1955: “The Reconstruction of Rāma I of the Chakri dynasty”, *Journal of Siam Society*, 43.1 (Aug 1955): 21-47. **Per Thai gen d 1**[general survey of Rāma I’s reign; only pp. 31-32 on *Rāmakīen*]

Diskul, M.C. Subhadradis 1992: “The differences between Valmiki’s Ramayana and the Thai version of Ramayana (Ramakirti) of King Rama I of Thailand (1782-1809)”, *SPAFA* 2.2:   
27-34. [*effectively identical to next (Diskul 1993-94)*]

Diskul, Subhadradis 1993-94: “The difference between Vālmīki *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Thai version of *Rāmāyaṇa (Rāmakīrti)* of king Rāma I of Thailand (1783-1809)”, *IT* 19-20: 113-26. [*effectively same as Diskul 1992*] **own copy**

Jumsai, Chalermkwan 1967: *Ramayana: Masterpiece of Thai Literature,* 2nd edn (Bangkok: Chalermnit Bookshop). [from bibliography in Kam 2000]

Miyashita, Mari Scott 2001: “The Ramakien: the Thai Ramayana”, *Sawaddi (Bangkok)* 47.3: 14-19.

Poolthupya, Srisurang 1979: *The Indian influence on Thai culture in the Thai Ramayana* (Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute). **BL / SOAS**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 1992: “The Character of Ram in Thai Ramayana”, in Vyas 1992:   
26-30. **photocopy; disregard**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 1995a: “Brotherly Love in the *Ramayana”,* in Pollet 1995: 215-19. **typescript in Leuven folder; abstract in grey box file**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 1995b: “The law of karma in the Ramakien”, (?unpublished) paper presented at the 12th International Ramayana conference, Leiden. **own copy; disregard**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 2004: “The Influence of the Rāmāyaṇa on Thai Arts”, *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* 47: 21-38.

Poolthupya, Srisurang 2006: “The influence of the Ramayana on Thai Culture: kingship, literature, fine arts and performing arts”, *Journal of the Royal Institute of Thailand* 31.1: 269-77. **download**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 2009: “How the Ramakian heritage survives in Thailand”, *Journal of the Royal Institute of Thailand* 1: 38-48. **download**

Poolthupya, Srisurang 2012: “King Rama VI’s promotion of *khon* and drama in general”, *Journal of the Royal Institute of Thailand* 4: 96-110. **download**

Prapandvidya, Chirapat 1995: “The Jātaka Elements in the Rāmāyaṇa”, paper presented at the 12th International Rāmāyaṇa conference, Leiden. **copy in Leiden folder**

Prapandvidya, Chirapat 2009: “Some of the major differences between the Thai Rāmakīrti and the Indian versions of the Rāmāyaṇa”, presented at Int. Rāmāyaṇa Seminar, Szentendre, Hungary, July 2009. **download**

Prapandvidya, Chirapat 2021: “Thai Rāmakīen: its close links with South India”, in Dhar 2021a: 193-203. **own copy (vol.)**

Reynolds, Frank E. 1991: “*Rāmāyaṇa, Rāma Jātaka,* and *Ramakien:* A Comparative Study of Hindu and Buddhist Traditions”, in Richman 1991: 50-63. **own copy**

Sarapadnuke, Chamlong 1980: “Rāmāyaṇa in Thai Theatre”, in Raghavan 1980: 245-55.  
 **own copy**

Schweisguth, P. 1951:  *Étude sur la littérature siamoise* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale)  
 **Bod. (Nuneham) Indo-Chin. d.212 – pp. 65-78 + 173-75 photocopied**

Shastri, S.V. 1995: “The Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa and the Thai Ramakien: a Study in Comparison”, *JAS Bombay* 70: 134-44.

Shastri, Satya Vrat 2018: *Some typical non-Rāmāyaṇic episodes in Ramakien — their Indian connections and some Rāmāyaṇa characters in Ramakien mould* (Delhi: Vijaya Books).  
 **scan downloaded**

Shastri, Satya Vrat 2021: *Rāmāyaṇa in Southeast Asia, volume I, Rāmakien (Thai Rāmāyaṇa)* (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi). **scan downloaded**

Singaravelu, S. 1980a: “Tulasī-dāsa’s Rāmacaritamānasa in Hindi and its relationship to the Sanskrit version of Vālmīki, the Tamil version of Kamban, and the Thai version of King Rāma I”, in Raghavan 1980: 455-74. **own copy**

Singaravelu, S. 1981b: “The Rāma Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition” *South East Asian Review* 5.2: 31-47 [= *The Rāmāyaṇa in Southeast Asia,* ed. S. Sahai; ? = Sahai 1982 (2)]. **download**

Singaravelu, S. 1982b: “The Rama Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition”, *JSS* 70.1-2: 50-70. **photocopy + download; checked**

Singaravelu, S. 1985-86: “The episode of Maiyarāb in the Thai Rāmakīen and its possible relationship to Tamil folklore”, *IT* 13: 297-312, also *Asian Folklore Studies* 44 (1985): 269-79 and *JSS* 74 (1986). [reprint at Singaravelu 2012: 149-62] **own copy** (*IT*) **+ download** (*AFS*)

Varma, Satya Vrat 2010: “Rāmāyaṇa characters in the Thai mould”, *Sambodhi* 33: 1-10.[based on Satya Vrat Shastri’s *Śrīrāmakīrtimahākāvya*!] **Ind. Inst. Per 11 d 118**

Velder, Christian 1968: “Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand”, *JSS* 56.1: 33-46.  
 **handwritten extracts + download**

**notes** handwritten summary based on Velder’s summary + extracts from Velder 1968; another summary at Shastri 2021: 29-40.

Dhani Nivat 1943: 71 – “The story of Rama, however, has been well-known in this country for many hundreds of years. In the 14th century [sic], voluminous references to it are to be found in the *Yuan Phai,* a contemporary heroic poem.”

[*Yuan Phai*, "the Defeat of the Yuan", is a poem about the rivalry between Ayuthaya and Lanna. The Yuan are the people of Lanna, then an independent kingdom in the upper reaches of the Chao Phraya river basin with its capital at Chiang Mai. The poem was written to celebrate the King Boromma Trailokanat of Ayutthaya (r. 1448-1488), the victor, and was probably written soon after the battle. One of the few surviving works of Thai literature from the beginning of the Ayutthaya era, it may still be in its original form. The poem is an important source of historical information as a repository of early Ayutthayan Thai. A definitive edition was published by the Royal Institute of Thailand in 2001 and a translation by Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit in 2017 (Bangkok: River Books).]

Any written records there may have been were lost when the Burmese sacked Ayuthaya in 1767. Thai rule was re-established 2 years later when General Taksin proclaimed himself king and ruled at Thonburi until 1782, becoming increasingly despotic and possibly deranged until he was deposed and executed by General Chakri. Chakri then ruled from Bangkok as king Buddha Yodfa Chulaloke / Phuttha Yot Fa Chula Lok (now known as Rama I) from 1782-1809, to be succeeded by Buddha Loetia Nabhalai (Rama II), 1809-24. Rama VI (also known as Vajiravudh, 1910-25) started the tradition of designating the kings ‘Rama’.

**Taksin** (1769-82) wrote 4 episodes for a *lakhon* or dance-drama in 2012 verses (in 1770, Schweisguth 1951: 173-74; c.1775, Cadet 1982: 32).

**‘Rama I’** (1782-1809) commissioned and supervised the production of the *Rāmakīen,* the only complete version in 52,086 *klŏn* verses (Reynolds 1991: 55-56; English rendering by Olsson 1968, based on Velder 1962; popularising summary/retelling [Chalermnit *Ramakien*] 1967).

**‘Rama II’** (1809-29) had certain scenes rearranged for the stage around 1815, in 14,300 verses (*RR:* 301; see Chagsuchinda 1973; brief summary at Shastri 2021: 41) and subsequent rulers added further episodes (Poolthupya 2012).

Plot entirely ‘Hindu’: Rāma is Phra Narai = Nārāyaṇa (and conscious of the fact) throughout; NOT Bodhisattva

BUT adapted to suit Buddhist ethos:   
no sacrifices   
few sages (chiefly Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra who are companions): no visits to sages at beginning of exile means that Sītā spends almost 14 years in Rāvaṇa’s captivity   
 happy ending, no suicides, no succession; Rāma and Sītā do not go back to heaven warfare conducted largely by increasingly fantastic magic, not superhuman prowess

Rāvaṇa (Thotsakan/Tosakaṇṭh) tries to KILL gods by burning their images

Śiva (Phra Isuan) prominent as authority figure, partly because Nārāyaṇa is absent

Rama’s whole purpose is to kill demons (not only Rāvaṇa); Daśaratha’s integrity not an issue

Fewer battles from *VR* 6, but many new allies summoned and posthumous avengers including next generation: repetitive

Sexuality: romantic episode of Rāma and Sītā’s wedding night (also love at first sight by eyes meeting before *svayaṃvara*)

Hanumān: numerous conquests

Rāma harsh, especially in [*Uttarakāṇḍa*]

Sītā, not Rāma, at fault for abduction

Sītā in [*Uttarakāṇḍa*] strong, resentful; Rāma shown in bad light

Much enhanced role for Hanumān (born *white* so known as White Monkey, while Nin Non is the black monkey); he is actually responsible for death of Rāvaṇa by crushing his heart after Rāma has shot him

Raghavan 1975: 149 – “Regarding the new and additional expoits of Hanumān, which found in South-East Asia a congenial soil for fresh and fantastic multiplication, we have the Sanskrit version known as the *Mai Rāvaṇa Caritra*2 or the stories of *Pātāla Laṅkā* and *Pātāla Rāvaṇa.* The last mentioned has much to do with the Thai and other versions in which the episode of Mai Rāvaṇa of Pātāla and Hanumān vanquishing him are given.  
 2. Mss. of this are available in the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library; popular Tamil renderings of the ‘Ahi-Mahi-Rāvaṇa’ story are also available.

Benjakai episode: **see** MB 2012 (“The Ladies’ Monkey: hanumān in Boston”)

The *Ramakien* seems to be nearer to Tamil version(s) than to the *Vālmīki* *Rāmāyaṇa,* incl. a relatively sympathetic portrayal of Rāvaṇa (as tragic hero rather than just villain) and some names (Kalaikōṭ from Tam. name for Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, Kukhan from Tam. form of Guha). cf. Prapandvidya 2021.

The episode [pp. 98-102] of Rāmāsur’s attempt to rob Maṇīmekhalā of a jewel is found also in some Khmer versions and is presumably based on some South Indian tradition; cf. Lévi 1931.

**Dhani Nivat 1948 –**[in section of notes on recent issues of JRAS – this one on Godakumbura 1946] notes that the interchange of names/roles between Vālin (Siamese P’ālī) and Sugrīva (Siamese Sukrib) has a parallel in the Lao version, *Rāma Jātaka* (cf. above).

**from Puri and Sarahiran 1940**

**p. 7 §2** (near end of intro.)**:** “So the only object in view of this book is to furnish our readers with a clear narration of the Ramakirti without curtailing any of its pecularities that may guide us to the original home of these additional anecdotes.”

CONTENTS

I Birth of Anomatan, First King of Ayudhya

II Birth of Rama and his brothers

III Creation of Lanka

IV Antecedents of Dasakantha

V Dasakantha’s marriage with Mando

VI Origins of Bali and Sugrib

VII Birth of Hanuman: His meeting with Bali

VIII Birth of Angad

XI Dasakantha’s immortality

X Birth of Sita [from Mando; abandoned; found by Janaka]

XI Rama’s encounter with Kakanasura [= Tāṭakā]

XII Marriage of Rama and Sita

XIII Fight between Rama and Ramasura

XIV Exile of Rama

XV Installation of Rama’s Sandal

XVI Rama’s arrival at the Godavari

XVII Rama and Lakshana’s encounter with Sammanakkha and her horde

XVIII Carrying off of Sita

XIX Rama’s search for Sita. His meeting with Hanuman

XX Rama’s meeting with Sugrib

XXI Overthrow of Bali

XXII Preparations for War

XXIII Hanuman’s journey to Lanka. His adventures

XXIV Hanuman’s meeting with Sita: Burning of Lanka

XXV Dasakantha’s dream. Bibhek’s homage to Rama

XXVI Construction of bridge. Siege of Lanka

XXVII Carrying off of Rama. Overthrow of Maiyarab

XXVIII Overthrow of Kumbhakarna

XXIX Lakshana’s encounters with Indrajit

XXX Overthrow of Indrajit

XXXI Encounters with Dasakantha and his allies

XXXII Judgment of Malivaggbrahma

XXXIII Kapilabad, the great spear

XXXIV Elixir of Life

XXXV Receptacle of Soul

XXXVI Fall of Dasakantha

XXXVII Sita’s Ordeal by Fire

XXXVIII Rama’s return to Ayudhya

XXXIX Insurrection in Lanka

XL Banishment of Sita

XLI Birth of Mankut and Laba

XLII Rama’s horse sacrifice: fight between father and sons

XLIII Sita’s entry into Patal

XLIV Rama’s sojourn in the forest

XLV Rama and Sita reconciled

fn. on p.142 [end of ch. XLV]: “The story is then continued to narrate the adventures of Mankut and Laba, who, at the request of King Kaiyakesha, went to his country to vanquish the demons who attacked his kingdom.”
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Shellabear, W.G. 1917: “Hikayat Sri Rama: introduction to the text of the MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford”, *JStraits Branch* 70 (Apr 1917): 181-207. **download**[in vol. 71 Shellabear gives the complete text of MS Laud Or. 291, Bodleian Library]

Singaravelu, S. 1981a: “The Rama story in Malay tradition”, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch, RAS (Kuala Lumpur)* 54.2: 131-47. **checked in ACM library; now download**

Singaravelu, S. 1983: “The Literary Version of the Rama story in Malay”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 276-95, repr. in Krishnamoorthy, Mukhopadhyaya and Nath 1991-93: II. lxxiii-xciii (**scanned**). [cf. Singaravelu 1981b and Singaravelu 2012: 211-38] **own copy**

Stutterheim, W.F. 1925: *Rāma-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien*, 2 vols (München: Georg Müller). [Eng. trans. *Rāma-legends and Rāma-reliefs in Indonesia,* trans. by C.D. Paliwal and R.P. Jain (New Delhi: IGNCA and Abhinav, 1989) in BL, SOAS, V&A]  
 **Ind. Inst. 20 F 80; pp. 66-80 photocopied**

Sweeney, P.L. Amin 1972: *The Ramayana and the Malay shadow-play* (Kuala Lumpur: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia / National University of Malaysia Press). [Originally presented as author’s Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of London, 1970, titled, *The Rama tree in the Wayang Siam.*] **Bod. Malay d.87; Mary checked**

Sweeney, P.L. Amin 1973: “The Ramayana in the Malay world”, *Ching Feng (Hong Kong)* 15.1: 33-39. **cannot locate**

Sweeney, Amin 1975: “The *Rāmāyaṇa* in the Malay World – some observations on sources and development”, *Proceedings of the First International Sanskrit Conference,* ed. by V. Raghavan, II.1: 362-69 (New Delhi: Min. of Education and Social Welfare). **own copy**

Sweeney, Amin 1991a: “Literacy and the Epic in the Malay World”, in Flueckiger and Sears 1991: 17‑29. **download (vol.)**

Sweeney, Amin 1991b: “Epic Purpose in Malay Oral Tradition and the Effects of Literacy”, in Flueckiger and Sears 1991: 141-61. **download (vol.)**

Sweeney, Amin 2004: “Demise and reemergence of *Hikayat Seri Rama* – the epic adventures of a non epic”, in *Epic adventures: heroic narrative in the oral performance traditions of four continents,* ed. by Jan Jansen and Henk M.J. Maier (Münster: Lit): 140-70. **BL**

Wessing, Robert 2020: “The maiden in the forest: reflections on some Southeast Asian tales”, *Archipel* 99: 75-105. [pp.85-88 on *HSR* mainly based on Burch] **download**

Winstedt, R.O. 1944: “An undescribed Malay version of the Ramayana”, *JRAS*: 62-73. **download**

Winstedt, Richard 1961:  *A history of classical Malay literature,* 2nd edn (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society; repr. Kuala Lumpur: OUP, 1969).  
[“The Indian Epics” pp. 34-46] **Bod. Malay e.108**

Yock Fang, Liaw 2013: *A History of Classical Malay Literature* (Singapore: ISEAS Publishing).  
 **ch. 2 downloaded**

Yousof, Ghulam-Sarwar 1983: “Ramayana Branch Stories in the Wayang Siam Shadow Play in Malaysia”, in Srinivasa Iyengar 1983: 296-323. **seen**

Yousof, Ghulam Sarwar 1992a: “Sita Dewi in Malay Wayang Kulit Siam”, in Vyas 1992:   
31-40. **photocopy;** *disregard*

**notes** TheShellabear ms is the earlier ms (ff.2v-3r illustrated in Formigatti 2019: 174-5), but later recension than Roorda; Barrett 1963: 543 – Sh. tradition is later than ms Raffles and ms Ro (though ms Sh is older than ms Ro); **see** table below and listings of the narrative elements in the two mss in “Further Notes (verbal/general)” (*Ḥikāyat Serī Rāma* — development). Handwritten notes (from several sources) and photocopy of Burch 1963: 179-88 (summary of contents) in grey box file.

base text: Zieseniss 1928; *see also* Saran and Khanna 2004: 136-37, 218-23. Narrative opens with Rāvaṇa’s youthful exploits; *pāyasa* is either grains of rice or bezoar stones, according to ms.

Muslim influence: occasional appearance of Nabi Adam etc.  
 Barrett 1963: 531, 540-41, 543; Saran and Khanna 2004: 218, 220; cf. Singaravelu 1983: 279-81

Muslim colophon: Winstedt 1944: 65

Muslim copyists have made attempts, not always successful, to eliminate concept of reincarnation / *avatāra*.

“comparatively strong Jainist strain with certain traces of Indonesian influence” Zieseniss / Burch 1963: 182

rationalisation Zieseniss / Burch 1963: 183

“probably originated in Indonesia by way of oral tradition ... reached Indonesia from various parts of India in three streams of oral tradition” Zieseniss / Burch 1963: 185; Barrett 1963: 543

less magic: illusory heads are real, purporting to be those of R + L: Saran and Khanna 2004: 221

no divine intervention in fire ordeal Saran and Khanna 2004: 222

*aśvamedha* recognition remodelled: “Rama wounds a gazelle which is finally brought down by one of the boys. Uncle Laksemana has also ridden in pursuit and, when both claim the animal, a fight ensues. The boys overpower Laksemana and bring him before Maharisi Kali who recognizes him and effects a mutual introduction. This eventually leads to Rama’s re-unification [*sic*] with Sita.” Saran and Khanna 2004: 223

*svayaṃvara* Saran and Khanna 2004: 219

*The siglum Ro / Sh does not imply that the whole chapter is in both mss; for chapter contents see Contents Pages* **photocopies**

chapter Burch pp.

1 Sh 9-12

2 Ro/Sh 13-18

3 Ro/Sh 19-25

4 Ro 26-27

5 Ro/Sh 28-31

6 Ro/Sh 32-33

7 Ro 34-37

8 Ro 38-40

9 Ro/Sh 41-42

10 Ro 43

11 Ro/Sh 44-45

12 Ro/Sh 46-47

13 Ro/Sh 48-49

14 Ro/Sh 50

15 Ro/Sh 51

16 Ro 52

17 Ro/Sh 53-54

18 Ro/Sh 55

19 Ro/Sh 56

20 Ro/Sh 57

21 Ro/Sh 58-61

22 Ro/Sh 62-64

23 Ro/Sh 65-71

24 Ro/Sh 72-73

25 Ro/Sh 74-86

26 Ro/Sh 87-93

27 Ro/Sh 94-96

28 Ro/Sh 97-102

ONLY in Ro:  
Exclusion  
Rāvaṇa and Vālin (ch.7)  
Gautama (ch.8)  
battle with *rākṣasas* (ch.10)  
Hanumān’s meeting with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa (ch.16)  
Hanumān and Sugrīva enlist aid of Samburana / Jāmbavān and Nīla (ch.21)

ONLY in Sh:  
Rāvaṇa’s youth (ch.1)  
non-return to Ayodhyā  
monkey transformation  
conception of Hanumān

ch.17 Sugrīva meets Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa:

river of tears (Ro)

moved by affection of brothers (Sh)

Sweeney 1972: 84 n.15 — *errors noted in Zieseniss 1928*:

p.31 (15) buffalo kills male offspring, not cows

p.34 (19) areca palm, not coconut, smeared on Sugrīva’s anus as distinguishing mark

p.41 the water does not gush forth twice. After Rāma’s prayer, causeway appears

p.47 Hanumān becomes small as a mustard seed, not a bird; fish king *is* named (Manik) in Shellabear ms. [*noted on photocopy*]

from Raghavan 1975 —

In the sacrifice performed for Daśaratha for the sake of progeny Gāgak sāra (Kākāsura) who watches the ceremony, steals one of the balls of consecrated rice and takes it to Rāvaṇa. Purosta Maharisi (Purohita Vasiṣṭha) pronounces a curse that because of this theft Rāvaṇa will be killed by a son of Daśaratha and that that son will marry the daughter born to Rāvaṇa through that stolen rice-ball. Rāvaṇa himself eats that ball of rice. It may be seen that the version compounds the roles of Vasiṣṭha and Ṛśyaśṛṅga.

Besides the four sons, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa by Mandu dārī and Bharata and Śatrughna by Balya dārī, Daśaratha has also by the latter, a daughter Kikewi Devi. It may be pointed out here that in a Bengali *Rāmāyaṇa,* written by a popular East Bengal poetess Candrāvatī of the 16th century, a daughter of Kaikeyī by name Kukuā, is introduced and she is made the instrument of Sītā’s banishment. p. 118

. . . One day, Lakṣmaṇa, in his daily rounds in the forests, cuts the bamboo and accidentally slays also Śūrpaṇakhā’s son in austerities there. The Jain account in the *Vāsudevahiṇḍī* of Saṅghadāsa (7th cent A.D.) assigns this same cause for Śūrpaṇakhā’s action. Enraged at this, Śūrpaṇakhā goes to her cousin Darkālah sīna (Khara-Dūṣaṇa)2 and represents falsely that Lakṣmaṇa made love to her and when she did not respond, Lakṣmaṇa killed her son. . . . . . . whereupon she returns to Rāma and abuses Sītā. Rāma sends her with a letter to Lakṣmaṇa3, asking the latter to cut off her nose and one hand.

2. ‘Khara-dūṣaṇa’ represents one individual and not two as in Vālmīki; in *Vāsudevahiṇḍī,* it is one individual only.  
 3. Such a letter from Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa is mentioned in the *Narasiṃhapurāṇa*; see my ‘The Greater Rāmāyaṇa’, p. 61. p.121

. . . Rāvaṇa then takes the two demons and makes them tempt Sītā in the form of two deer, one of silver and another of gold. Rāvaṇa himself here imitates Rāma’s voice and cries. Surprisingly close to Vālmīki here, the account mentions Sītā’s unbecoming words to Lakṣmaṇa and Lakṣmaṇa’s departure. Before Lakṣmaṇa leaves, he draws a circle round Sītā and asks Earth to hold fast the feet of any one who tries to cross the circle.

Rāvaṇa’s battle with Jaṭāyus is said to take seven days. Jaṭāyus is deceived into revealing that the secret of its life is in its wings which Rāvaṇa then chops off. Sītā drops a ring into the beak of the bird, which it later gives to Rāma. p. 123

. . . Hanumān disguises himself as a Brahman and sitting near a well, learns Sītā’s whereabouts from women who carry water to her. In one of the pots of water being taken to Sītā, he puts Rāma’s ring. Sītā finds out thereby the arrival of a messenger and calls him. On knowing that the messenger Hanumān was Rāma’s son, mother’s milk drips from Sītā’s breasts. Hanumān learns of a favourite mango-grove of Rāvaṇa, and eats all its fruits. The guards bind Hanumān and bring him to Rāvaṇa before whom Hanumān coils up his lengthening tail and sits thereon at a height greater than that of Rāvaṇa, a popular idea current in Indian traditions. Hanumān growing in size (Viśvarūpa) is referred to. pp. 125-6

Sītā is kept in a garden of seven palaces with a strong guard under the command of Vihīṣaṇa’s daughter Devi Srī Jāta (corresponding to Trijaṭā). . . . . . . p. 126

It is after this crossing [of the causeway] that Rāvaṇa consults Vibhīṣaṇa and on the latter’s advice to surrender Sītā, banishes him; and Vibhīṣaṇa comes over to Rāma, not with four followers but with his wife and sons. pp. 126-7

Rāvaṇa then [after Indrajit’s death] calls up some of the remaining allies and reserve forces. The reserve force called ‘Mūla-bala’ in Vālmīki is given, as in Thai, as a single formidable fighter; we have his name here as ‘Mūla patāni’ or ‘Mūla matāni’, his form as possessing 500 heads and 2000 arms and his abode as Pātāla. He is also killed.

Rāma’s fight with Rāvaṇa starts and whatever head of Rāvaṇa is severed, grows again. Curiously Rāma sends Hanumān to Sītā to find out where Rāvaṇa’s life-spot is; Sītā reveals that it is in a small head of Rāvaṇa concealed beneath his ear. . . . . . . p. 128

The late Indian story born of the advanced Rāmabhakti tradition that, when presented with a necklace by Rāma, Hanumān chewed and destroyed it and said it was not as enjoyable as being a servant of Rāma, is found here. pp. 129-30

Sweeney, Amin 1991a (“Literacy and the Epic in the Malay World”): 26 —

If ... it be proposed that the *Hikayat Seri Rama* and *Hikayat Pandawa* deserve the appellation “epic” because they are translations of the Hindu epics, one must respond that they are neither translations, Hindu, nor poems. Thus, for example, the *Hikayat Seri Rama* in its extant form is a Muslim work. This is not merely a matter of vocabulary and script; the work is the product of a Muslim, aimed at a Muslim audience or one postulated to be receptive to Islam, that concerns the breaking of a contract mediated by the prophet Adam between a Muslim king, Rawana, and the Muslim God. The argument that the majority of motifs originate from India is irrelevant and ignores the fact that traditional Malay composition is schematic. As with all material of foreign provenance, if there were to be effective communication with a Malay audience, such works had to be geared to the mental set of that audience. It is this requirement which accounts for the fact that so many Malay works originating from foreign sources are adaptations (*saduran*) rather than direct translations.

**on Maxwell 1886,** Sweeney, Amin 1991b: 142 **— “**The British knew little about the form of the tale in oral tradition. At their behest, it was put into literary prose by Malay scribes who, in effect, produced a *hikayat*, which, it may be noted, found oblivion in print even more rapidly than the traditional literary version. Perhaps a tale in which Sita willingly elopes with Ravana did not seem overly promising to the seeker of epic.”

from Berkeley SE Asia website:  
The Hikayat Seri Rama exists in both written and oral form, and the Wayang Kulit Siam is a shadow play from Kelantan on the border of Malaysia and Thailand (Siam). The Ramayana in Malaysia is used more for entertainment and social education rather than for spiritual or religious purposes. Kelantan is strongly Islamic, but it is also the main base for the Malay shadow puppet theatre. The main purpose of the Hikayat Seri Rama is to show the ideals of righteousness, love, loyalty, and selfless devotion. This Malay version has combined elements of the Indian Sanskrit Ramayana with local traditions and beliefs. In Malaysia, the Ramayana episodes are divided into two categories, those that concern the fundamental plot, pokok, (base, trunk) and those non-fundamental episodes, rantings (twigs), which consist of Rama's adventures and those of the other main characters. These extensive ranting stories are performed by local puppeteers (dalang) or performers. In one of these rantings entitled *Sita Dewi Dihalau* some events associated with Sita differ greatly from Valmiki's Sanskrit Ramayana. At one point, after she has been rescued, Sita admits she painted a picture of her abductor Maharaja Rawana (Ravana). Seri Rama then beats her and kicks her violently until she is near death. At the end of the story Seri Rama wants Sita Dewi to return, but she indicates that Seri Rama must comply with several of her demands which he eventually fulfills.

[the cerita *Kusi Serawi* is another cerita-cerita ranting; **see** Khan, Hatta Azad 2010:  *Awakening in the Voice: the Dalang in Kosi and Serawi – two main stories of the Malay Wayang* (Selangor: Universiti Teknologi Mara): 7 and 9.]

**title (and author)** “King of the Demons” (recorded in many versions)

**date (and provenance)** not earlier than C18 (Annam = mod. Vietnam)

**edition(s)** Huber, Edouard 1905: “Etudes Indochinoises I. – La légende de Rāma en Annam”, *BEFEO* 5: 168. **download; analysed** Annamite, *King of the Demons*: Huber 1905

**translation(s)**

**studies** Marrison, Geoffrey E. 1985: “The Chams and their literature”, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the RAS* 58.2 (249): 45-70. **Soc. Indo-Chin. d.211; download**

Moussay, Gérard 1976a: *Pram Dit Pram Lak: la geste de Rāma chez les Cam* (Paris, École pratique des hautes études). **not seen**

Moussay, Gérard 1976b: “Pram Dit Pram Lak (la geste de Rāma chez les Cam)”, in *Actes du XXIXe Congrès international des Orientalistes, Paris, 1973: Asie du Sud-est continentale,* section organisée par Pierre-Bernard Lafont, 3 vols: II, 131-35 (Paris: L’Asiatheque).   
 **scan; studied**

**notes** Recorded in many versions, not earlier than 18th century. Brief story, including only abduction and rescue, killing of Rāvaṇa. Ayodhyā localised in Champa, to north of Laṅkā, beyond Annam; inhabitants monkey-like.

Plot: Rāvaṇa has 10 heads; sees crown-prince’s beautiful wife, falls for her, invades Ayodhyā with army, abducts her; Rāma angry, leads army of monkeys; they fill sea with torn-up mountains to make causeway, conquer Laṅkā and kill Rāvaṇa; take Sītā back to Ayodhyā; present-day Chams are descended from *vānaras*.

“Elle est racontée en quelques lignes, sous le titre de ..., «Le Roi des Démons», dans une collection de légendes historiques annamite, le *Lĩnh nam trích quái ... .*  La dernière rédaction de [*‘King of Demons’*] ne paraît guère remonter au-delà de l’avant-dernier siècle ... Le narrateur annamite localise la légende au Campā.” (Huber 1905: 168)

**from Moussay 1976:**

*Rāmāyaṇa* may have been known in Campa before 7C, but no evidence; possible it was introduced by king Prakāśadharma from Khmer sources in 7C.

2 versions studied: *Dalikal Pram dit Pram Lak* (‘Tale of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa’) and *Damnuy Po Keitai Muherasih* (‘Story of Po Keidai Muherasih’).

Some Malay / Islamic influence

Ohno 2003; 78-79 —

**IV. TRUYEN DA THOA VUONG, a Vietnamese Rama story** [= Truyện Da Thoa Vương]

Truyen Da Thoa Vuong (denoting the King of Demons) seems to have originally been a traditional folktale of Cham people. The Vietnamese people were entirely ignorant of Rama story. This tale was originally contained in a collection of historical legends of Annam, entitled “Linh Nam Trich Quai” in Vietnamese. The tale was translated into French by M. Edouard Huber in 1905.

The following are the prominent features of Vietnamese Rama story. (1) Ravana is called the King of Ten Heads. Dasaratha the King of Ten Carts. (2) As Ravaṇa is enamoured with Sita, the consort of the Crown Prince of Dasaratha, he attacked the kingdom, captured her and carried away to his kingdom. (3) The Crown Prince became the king of monkeys and ordered **|** monkeys to construct the causeway over the sea. (4) The Crown Prince attacked the kingdom of the Ten Heads, killed him and took back Sita to his kingdom. (5) The inhabitants of the king of Ten Carts bear close resemblance to monkeys and their descendants are the Cham people. (6) Neither Kaikeyi nor Manthara appear. (7) Neither Surpanakha nor Marica are mentioned. (8) There is no description of Vali, Sugriva and Hanuman. (9) The account of Lava and Kusa cannot be found.

**title (and author)** Malay folk versions(“Fairy tale”; Maharaja Ravana; Patani)

**date (and provenance)**

**edition(s)** Maxwell, William E. (ed.) 1886: “Sri Rama, a Fairy Tale told by a Malay Rhapsodist”, *JStraits Branch* 17: ([unpaged] text), 87-115 (Preface/summary). **BOD***repr.* 1910: *JStraits Branch* 55: 1-24 (Preface/summary), 24-99 (text, romanised by R.O. Winstedt). **photocopy**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Francisco, Juan R. 1962: “The Rama story in the Post-Muslim Malay literature of South-east Asia”, *Sarawak Museum Journal* 10 (19-20): 468-85. **scan**

Overbeck, H. 1933: “Hikayat Maharaja Ravana”, *Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 11.2: 111-32. **Bod.; photocopy**

Winstedt, Richard O. 1929: “A Patani Version of the Ramayana”, in *Feestbundel uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootshap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen bij gelegenheid van zijn 150 jarig bestaan, 1778-1928,* 2 vols. (Weltevreden: G. Kolff), II. 422-34. **printout; analysed**

**notes**

**Mir Hassan telling:** Maxwell 1910:

not earlier than 16C Francisco 1980: 176

Muslim influence Francisco 1962: 481

Late oral telling from Perak with Muslim overtones; collected by Maxwell in late 19C.

Very few narrative elements original; almost all can be traced to other tellings (Sanskrit or SE Asian), re-arranged and transferred to other characters (kaleidoscopic effect) to an extent not appreciated by Francisco.

Fascinating.

L.F. Brakel, *Literaturen,* Handbuch der Orientalistik, 3.3.1 (Leiden: Brill, 1976): 121-22 —

A typical example of a Malay folk-romance is an oral version of the story of Rama which was written down by W. E. Maxwell, late in the 19th century, in Perak, from a well-known *penglipor lara* of the past, Mir Hassan.8 [= Maxwell 1910] This oral tale of Rama undoubtedly shows cultural borrowing, but in structure and in inspiration, it belongs to the Malay folk tradition. Thus it even differs from the written version, the *Hikayat Seri Rama* which keeps close to the original general plots of the great Indian epic. The Malay written version of the Rama epic is undoubtedly a product of the court culture for it conveys the essence of the social order prevailing **|** at the time, that is a feudal society, in which sense of loyalty, patriotism, heroism, the warrior code and other moral dictums were cherished. The Mir Hassan’s version, on the other hand, is not exactly the story of Rama. The few plots which can be recognised as those found in the *Ramayana* are interpolated so as to accommodate the style of a Malay folk-romance. In this folk version, the hero is not Rama but rather his son who assumes the shape of a monkey. Undoubtedly, the hero is reminiscent of Hanuman, the monkey warrior of the *Ramayana.* Driven out of his father’s kingdom, lest he brings shame to his parents because of his monkey form, the hero starts on his adventure which includes some of the familiar plots in the *Ramayana,* such as the hero helping his father Rama to rescue Sita from Rawana and the burning of Rawana’s castle. In the main, however, the plots of the tale fit into the scheme of a Malay folk-romance. For example, it is during the adventure that he first meets a princess who finally becomes his bride when he later assumes the human form. And as in a typical Malay folk-romance, the hero then becomes a king and lives happily ever after with this queen.

The names of the characters, for example are a hotch-potch of various literary traditions as such names would suggest: *Tuan Puteri Sa-Kuntum Bunga* is a local rendering of Sita and *Shah Numan* is obviously of Persian derivation. But *Seri Rama, Rawana,* and *Raja Laksamana* are obviously drawn from the *Ramayana. ... ...*

Maxwell’s folk version: Rāma is ruler of Tanjung Bunga; L. is older not younger brother of R.; R. + S. transformed into monkeys on bathing in forbidden lake and later monkey son born (= Hanumān) and banished to forest. Maharaja Duwana (= Rāvaṇa), ruler of island Kacapuri, appears in form of golden goat to decoy R. away. Rāvaṇa later discovers from genealogical records that S. is his daughter. Hanumān defeats Rāvaṇa in battle and carries S. back to R.; another battle when Rāvaṇa follows them but H. again victorious; H. acknowledged by R. + S. as their son, married to a princess, assumes human form and succeeds to father-in-law’s kingdom.

***Hikayat Maharaja Ravana*:**

Episodes preserved but chronology much re-arranged e.g. visit by Bharata and Śatrughna and Rāma’s refusal to return with them transposed to after victory and relocated to Laṅkā (Overbeck 1933: 130)

No-one dies (permanently) except Jaṭāyus; Rāvaṇa imprisoned, still potential threat; warriors revived by Vibhīṣaṇa; Vālin resurrected temporarily.

**Patani version:**

**see** Winstedt 1929

Elaborate, confused / confusing version with affinities to Thai and Malay *HSR* versions; collected, copied c.1911 in Thai / Malaysia border area

Only items analysed are: Rāvaṇa at *svayaṃvara;* 7 trees on dragon’s back at *svayaṃvara;*  magic circle; Rāvaṇa is deer

Summary at Yock Fang 2013: 66-68.

**title (and author)** *Maharadia Lawana*

**date (and provenance)** mid 17th to early 19th centuries(Philippines)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s) use** Francisco 1994 [below, under studies]

**studies** Francisco, Juan R. 1969: *Maharadia Lawana,* text edited and translated with the collaboration of Nagasura T. Madale, Philippine Folklore Society Reprint 1(Quezon City: Philippine Folklore Society).   
[repr. from *Asian Studies* (*University of Philippines, Quezon City*) 7,2 (1969): 186-249 (**download**); excellent study, including comparison with Malay versions]  
 **SOAS; BL** [reprinted without endnotes in Francisco 1994 (**photocopy**)]

Francisco, Juan R. 1971: “Reflexions on the migration theory vis-a-vis the coming of Indian influences in the Philippines”, *Asian Studies* (*University of Philippines, Quezon City*) 9.3:   
307-14. **download**

Francisco, Juan R. 1975: “Sanskrit in Philippine language and literature”, in *Proceedings of the First International Sanskrit Conference*, 2.1: 398-432 (Delhi: Ministry of Education and Social Welfare). **mainly on Maharadia Lawana – own copy; notes**

Francisco, Juan R. 1980: “The Ramayana in the Philippines”, in Raghavan 1980: 155-77. **own copy**

Francisco, Juan R. 1989: “The indigenization of the Rama story in the Philippines”, *Philippine Studies (Quezon City)* 37: 101-11. **download**

\* Francisco, Juan R. 1994: *From Ayodhya to Pulu Agamaniog: Rama’s Journey to the Philippines* (Quezon City: Asian Center, University of the Philippines).  
 **Ind. Inst.4.4.71; pp. 139-61 photocopied; analysed**[*includes translation and study of Maharadia Lawana = Francisco 1969, minus footnotes;*review by Susan P. Evangelists in *Philippine Studies* 45.1: 142-44 (**download**)]

Francisco, Juan R. 1997-2000: “Rāma’s relevance in contemporary Philippine society”, *JORM* 68-70: 37-46. **photocopy**

Lahiri, Ratna 2007: “A comparative note on the two Maranao versions of the Rama story in the Philippines”, *South East Asian Review* (Bihar) 32.1-2: 13-31. **photocopy**

**notes** see *RR* p.305 § 4 andFrancisco 1994; dating (mid C17 to early C19) given at Francisco 1980: 175

Raghavan 1975: 134 — The existence of a version in one of the numerous languages of Philippines was brought to light by ... Jan R. Francisco ... It is found in the language called Maranaw, belonging to the Western portions of the volcanic highlands of Mindanao, marked by the largest fresh water lake Lanao. This area too, like others forming part of Philippines, had received Indian influences, indirectly, through the Indonesian and Malay world, to which linguistically Maranaw also belongs. ... ... the version may be placed in the period 17th – 19th centuries. ...  
 The account in Maranaw is called *Maharadia Lawana,* i.e. *Mahārāja Rāvaṇa* and is related to the Malayan version entitled *Hikayat Mahārāja Rāvaṇa* and the fairy tale version published by Maxwell2 ...

2. “Sri Rama, A Fairy Tale told by a Malay Rhapsodist”, *JRAS SB* XVII. May, 1886.

*carabao* is a Philippino water-buffalo

**from Francisco 1994:**

MUSLIM influence:

no birth story, *avatāra*; Rāvaṇa’s crimes are inciting mischief p.139

Rāvaṇa performs *tapas* to Allah, released by angel Gabriel

abduction during return from wedding, so no expulsion, court intrigues; deer with golden horns is Rāvaṇa

Sītā’s purity maintained by fire publicly throughout capture; no rejection in *Yuddha*

no *Uttara*

in first part many elements found in international traditional tales

*see also* Francisco 1980: 174

suitor test: kick *sipa* into Sītā’s room; kill dragon

Kings called Sultan but names retain Indian identity: Maharadia Lawana, Radia Mangandiri, Radia Manganwarna

Highest [only] God; his messenger is angel Gabriel (Diabarail)

‘God created us to be superior to the beasts’: 53

‘early afternoon prayer’: 59

wedding priest is Imam

Rāma is not incarnation; no birth story of Rāma or Sītā; no sacrifices

Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa leave home despite parents’ misgivings at their insistence to seek Sītā, famed for her beauty (it still takes them 10 years to reach Mithilā!): no Viśvāmitra or court intrigues

Janaka is only a king, not a sage

parents of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa and of Sītā accorded equal authority [cultural rather than religious development?]: 10-11, 51, 80

deer is Rāvaṇa; Rāma does not kill it, it fights back, causing Rāma himself to call for help (having previously instructed Lakṣmaṇa to ignore any calls for help); Lakṣmaṇa eventually leaves of own accord without abuse from Sītā; no magic circle / entrusting to forest spirits / Earth, just tells Sītā to close window and not open door; abduction not narrated; deer divides into two, each brother pursuing 1 deer and not meeting till after Lakṣmaṇa (only) has returned to house and found Sītā missing

Rāma fathers Hanumān remotely in dream after loss of Sītā; the mother specifically denies adultery: 63-66

no Vālin, no Vibhīṣaṇa

fire separates Sītā from Rāvaṇa during her captivity; chastity not questioned

Lakṣmaṇa kills Rāvaṇa when Rāma tires

**Lahiri 2007**: 13-14[Another telling of same tale with only minor differences by same teller, Bai Pamoki, 1940 (Francisco’s version recorded in early 1960s)]

**p.17** [Located within the context of local tradition; Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and island home identified with well-known fictional characters/place] Mangandiri and Mangawarna are ... well known persona in Maranao folklore. There are other stories related to them in Maranao folklore, and to Agama Niog [birthplace] as well.

... The young lads are shipwrecked ... and they are found senseless on the shore of Pulu Nabandai by Kabaiyan, again, a typical Maranao legendary character.

**title (and author)** Burmese version(s)

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

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)** Ohno, Toru 1999b: *A Study of Burmese Rama Story, with an English Translation from a duplicate Printing of the Original Palm Leaf Manuscript written in Burmese Language in 1233 year of Burmese Era (1871 A.D.)* (Osaka: Osaka University of Foreign Studies). **own copy**[reprint with title *Burmese Ramayana* (Delhi: B.R. Pub. Corp., 2022)]

Rooney, Dawn F. (ed.) 2017: *The Thiri Rama: Finding* Ramayana *in Myanmar* (New Delhi: Routledge India). [main contents: trans. by Tin Maung Kyi of *Rama Pyazat Daw-Gyi*(= *Ramayana Court Drama*) as chapters 6-8] **download**

**studies** Aung Thwin, U 2003: “Myanmar Ramayana text and presentation”, in *Texts and contexts in Southeast Asia*: proceedings of the Texts and Contexts in Southeast Asia Conference, 12-14 December 2001, 3 vols (Yangon: Universities Historical Research Centre, 2003): Pt 3, 132-60. **scan**

Connor, J.P. 1925: “The Rāmāyaṇa in Burma”, *Journal of Burma Research Society* 15: 80-81. **checked**

Ohno, Toru 1994: “The Burmese versions of the Rama story and their peculiarities”, in *Tradition and modernity in Myanmar: proceedings of an international conference held in Berlin from May 7th to May 9th, 1993*, ed. by Uta Gartner and Jens Lorenz, 2 vols (Münster: Lit): II, 305‑26. **Ind. Inst. Burma 5 d 112; photocopy; checked**

Ohno, Toru 1996b: “A Comparative Study of Lanka Xihe, the Tai version of Rama story in Yunnan Provice, China”, unpublished paper (?) delivered at 13th International Rāmāyaṇa Conference, Shenzhen University, China, April 1996.

Ohno, Toru 1997b: “Burmese, Laosian and Yunnan Versions of Rama Story”, in *Ramayana around the world,* ed. by L.P. Vyas (Delhi: BR Pub. Corp.): 31-48. **photocopy; checked**

Ohno, Toru 1999a: “Was Myanmar Ramayana translated from Thai Ramayana?” in *Studies in Myanmar history, vol. 1: Essays given to Than Tun on his 75th birthday*: 121-42 (Yangon: U Kyi Win). **Ind. Inst. Burma 5 d 161; photocopy; checked**

Rooney, Dawn F. (ed.) 2017: *The Thiri Rama: Finding Ramayana in Myanmar* (New Delhi: Routledge India). **Bod. (online only)**

Singer, Noel F. 1989: “The Ramayana at the Burmese court”, *Arts of Asia (Hong Kong)* 19.6: 90‑103. [p.91 – *identification correct? see Bagan website for Māra’s warriors*] **scan**

Thaw Kaung, U 2002a: “The *Ramayana* drama in Myanmar”, in *JSS* 90.1-2: 137-48 [repr. in *Selected Writings of U Thaw Kaung (*Yangon: Myanmar Historical Commission, 2004): 55-82]. **download**

Thaw Kaung, U 2002b: “Ramayana in Myanmar literature and performing arts”, *Myanmar Historical Research Journal* 9: 73-99. **download of typescript**

Thein Han, U 1973: “The Ramayana in Burma”, *Studies in Indo-Asian art and culture* 2: 71-83. [*on Rama Thagyin*] **photocopy; analysed 73§3—76**

Thein Han, U and Khin Zaw, U 1976: “Ramayana in Burmese literature and arts”, *Journal of the Burma Research Society* 59: 137-54. **download**  
[repr. (except musical notations) in Raghavan 1980: 301-14; **own copy; checked**]

Tin Thway, U 1981: “Notes on Rāmāyaṇa in Burmese Literature”, *South East Asian Review* 5.2: 85-94 [= *The Rāmāyaṇa in South East Asia,* ed. S Sahai].

**notes** The oral tradition of the Ramayana story in Burma is believed to date as far back as the reign of Anawrahta (1044-77), founder of the first Burmese empire at Pagan and conqueror of the Mon kingdom Thaton; it could therefore have been transmitted either directly from India or through the Mons. Documented in Ava by the end of the 13th century, the Rama story – known as Rama Zatdaw in Burmese – continued to be transmitted orally up to the 16th century.

*Rama Vatthu* (*Yama Wuthtu*) earliest surviving text, composed in C17 (Ohno 1999a: iii, 11), perhaps translated from a lost Thai text earlier than the surviving one (Ohno 1999a: 44, 66; cf. Thaw Kaung 2002: 138). Follows *VR* fairly closely with much abbreviation; many Buddhist features, much less violence, and Buddhist terminology throughout.

*RR* p. 304 (on *Rama Thagyin* of U Aung Phyo): “Hanumān is first introduced as a small monkey, before regaining his original size and strength at Rāma’s touch (cf. the Chinese ‘*Jātaka* of an Unnamed King’).”

Stadtner 2005: 38 — “The Hindu epics so important to other Southeast Asian countries, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa,* are not in evidence in ancient Pagan. The *Rāmāyaṇa* became somewhat more popular by the Konbaung period (1752-1885), perhaps influenced by Thailand, but it never attained the popularity it still enjoys in other countries.”

from Thein Han 1973 (summary of U Aung Phyo’s version on pp. 73-76 [**check** against Ohno’s trans.], then briefer remarks on *Rama Yagan* (1784) and later versions):

Earliest written Burmese version is a ballad in *thagyin* rhyme, called *Rama Thagyin* by U Aung Phyo, in 1775 (1137 Burmese era) at Innwa (Ava). Earlier archaeological evidence of story: Nat Klaung Kyaung temple, thought to have been built by king Anawrahta (1044-77), has images of 6 *avatāras* in exterior niches, including as the last on the north wall Rāma with his bow. King Kyanzittha (1084-1113) claimed in inscriptions in Pagan and in Thaton district to have been born in the family of Rama of Ayodhapur. There is a reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa* in a Burmese *pyo* (Jātaka poem) based on the *Suvaṇṇasāma Jātaka* by Shin Agga Thamadi of 1527 (889 B.E.).

*Rama Yagan* by U Toe (administrator of Royal Treasury) composed 1784 (1146 Burmese era). Royal commission set up in 1789 to translate into Burmese stories from “the Gyum (Krom) capital of the kingdom of Ayuthia and the Yan capital of the kingdom of Haripunja”, which produced the Rāmāyaṇa drama (= *Thiri Rāmāyaṇa*; Thein Han 1973: 76).

On Nat Klaung Kyaung cf. also Stadtner 2005: 142-43 (**scan**).

On a Burmese Rāmāyaṇa **see** *Newsletter* of India Office Library & BM Or. Mss. No. 37-38 (March 1987) **with** accompanying bibliography. **n.b.** also doc. in folder “BL Rām in SE Asia” within “SE Asia material”.

Raghavan 1975: 140 — “... In 1767, the Burmese King Hsinyushim defeated Siam and among things he brought back from the enemy’s capital Ayuthia was a troupe of the actors of the Rāma-play of Siam. ...  
 The story in the Rāma-play in Burma is naturally the same as that of Siam from which country the Rāma play came; but in course of time additions and alterations were made to assimilate the story to the Burmese milieu.”

8 other texts (besides *Rama Vatthu*):

1 *Rama Thagyin* 1775 – *no Uttara*

2 *Rama Yagan* 1784 – *incomplete*

3 *Alaung Rama Thagyin* – *date unknown*

4–8 19-20 CC (including *Rama Pyazat Daw-Gyi* probably 1st half of C19)

**title (and author)** *Loik Samoing Ram* **(**Mon version)

**date (and provenance)** 1834 A.D.

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Bumroong, Kham-ek 2008: “Rāmāyaṇa as reflected in Samin Rem Palm Leaf Manuscript in Mon”, *Sanskrit Studies Centre Journal* 4: 138-45. **scan; checked**

Ohno, Toru 1995a: “An Epitome of the Mon version of Rama story”, unpublished (?) paper delivered at Leiden Rāmāyaṇa Conference. **own copy**

Ohno, Toru 1995b: “Some features of the Mon Rama story”, in *Silver Jubilee Special Lectures*, ed. by R. Vijayalakshmy, 234-50 (Madras: International Institute of Tamil Studies). **photocopy; studied**

Ohno, Toru 1996a: “A significant role of Ramakien playing in the formation of Mon Rama story”, *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Thai Studies, Chiang Mai*, 8vols: IV, 313-23. Mon: Ohno 1996:  
[*adds little to 1995a) and 1995b*] **photocopy;** *disregard*

Ohno, Toru 大野徹 1996c: "モン語版ラーマーヤナ「ロイク・サモイン・ラーム」の特徴 Salient Features of the Mon Version of the Rama Story" 東南アジア研究 *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 34.2: 370-386. **Japanese, English summary on pp. 370-71 (printout)**

**notes** *Ohno 1995a and 1995b are largely identical, partly rearranged, except that:  
a contains detailed synopsis of Mon Rm absent from b), and  
b contains background information on Mon history and culture absent from a)*

**where possible cite 1995b**

On a Mon version (dated 1196 in Burmese era = 1834 AD) **see** paper by Toru Ohno at 12th Int. Rāmāyaṇa Conf., Leiden, 1995.

Mon: Ohno 1996: 323: ‘It would seem reasonable to conclude, consequently, that the compilation of the Mon version of Rama story has been carried out by a Mon Buddhist monk called Uttamu in 1834, primarily on the basis of the Burmese Rama story and secondly of Thai Rama story as its essential and indispensable reference.’

*Copy written in 1834 by Uttamu, a Buddhist monk, who claims to have translated it directly from a Myanmar version. Loik Samoing Ram has many affinities to Myanmar Rama Vatthu and Thagyin, but also to Thai , and some to HSR and Javanese; and some apparently new features* [CHECK carefully Ohno 1996c: 371], *indicating ?existence in early 19C of Burmese-language tradition combining all.*

*Some conflation with MBh: Ayodhyā is conflated with Dvāravatī; Ahalyā summons Sun to be her lover with mantra.*

**n.b.** e-mail from Christian Bauer (“Mon Rama story” in “Further Notes (verbal/general)”)

**title (and author)** *Serāt Rām* by Radèn Ngabèhi Yasadipura **disregard**

**date (and provenance)** late 18th century / early 19th century (Java)

**edition(s)** Kats, J., ed. 1925: *Serat Rama,* 3 vols, serie no. 696 (Djakarta: Balé Postaka). **text/trans ? SOAS only**

**translation(s)**

**studies** McDonald, Barbara 1981: “The *Serat Rama* of Yasadipura: some structural determinants in *tembang macapat*”, *Indonesia Circle (London)* 26 (Nov 1981): 25-32. **download**

McDonald, Barbara 1986: *Old Javanese literature in eighteenth-century Java: a consideration of the processes of transmission* (Clayton: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University). **Bod. M91.C04017**

van der Molen, Willem 2023: “On the wrong side of history: episodes in the *Sĕrat Rama* and the *Panji Paniba*” in *Storied Island: new explorations in Javanese literature,* ed. by Ronit Ricci (Leiden: Brill): 235-54. **download**

**notes** from McDonald 1981:

“A comparative analysis of the Old Javanese *kakawins Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Bhāratayuddha* and the Modern Javanese equivalents, the *Serat Rama* and the *Bratayuddha,* both ascribed to Yasadipura, reveals a reasonably close relationship between the *kakawin* and *macapat* texts. This relationship seems to hinge upon the modern Javanese texts adhering to the *kakawin* tradition of the epic rather than to a *wayang* tradition, *wayang* being used in the loose sense of “theatrical” or “dramatic” to cover those art-forms which made use of the familiar epic material.” (p.25 §5)

So, based on OJ Rām. but a selective reworking: “The dependence on the *kakawins* should not lead one to the conclusion that the Modern Javanese texts in this genre are mere translations.”

“The contrast between exemplary ruler and tyrant is drawn more swiftly and explicitly in the *Serat Rama.* The first thirteen stanzas deviate from the Old Javanese text in that they are devoted to the demon, Rawana, rather than to Rama’s father.” (p. 28 §2)

*S.R.* has more emphasis on narrative, tending to omit descriptive passages (especially those the OJ Rām. added to its *Bhaṭṭikāvya* basis), replacing them with “sections of a more practical nature which preserved the ongoing sense of action and narrative.” (p.29)

“Throughout the *Serat Rama,* there is a marked attempt to expand on minor figures in the *Rama* tale. As Sinta, Rama, and Rawana stood as epitomes of fidelity, virtue, and baseness respectively, there was perhaps little scope to expand upon these **|** personalities without extending into new incidents.” (pp. 30-31)

**title (and author)** *Lanka Xihe* **(**Yunnanese version)

**date (and provenance)** ? (Yunnan, SW China)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Ohno, Toru 1996b: “A Comparative Study of Lanka Xihe, the Tai version of Rama story in Yunnan Provice, China”, unpublished paper (?) delivered at 13th International Rāmāyaṇa Conference, Shenzhen University, China, April 1996.

Ohno, Toru 1999a: “Was Myanmar Ramayana translated from Thai Ramayana?” in *Studies in Myanmar history, vol. 1: Essays given to Than Tun on his 75th birthday*: 121-42 (Yangon: U Kyi Win). **Ind. Inst. Burma 5 d 161; photocopy; checked**

Ohno, Toru 2003: “The main versions of Ramayana from the whole area of Southeast Asia”, in *Texts and contexts in Southeast Asia*: proceedings of the Texts and Contexts in Southeast Asia Conference, 12-14 December 2001, 2 vols (Yangon: Universities Historical Research Centre, 2003): Pt 3, 65-96. **parts scanned**

Zhang Xing 2010: “The Advent and Study of *Ramayana* in China”, in *Ramayana in Focus: visual and performing arts of Asia,* ed. by Gauri Parimoo Krishnan, 39-45 (Singapore: Asian Civilisations Museum). **own copy (vol.)**

Zhang Xing 2016: “Rāmāyaṇa in China: the spread and modern studies”, in Shashibala (ed.) 2016: 122-30. [largely repeats (with diacritics) Zhang Xing 2010]

**notes analysed** from Ohno 1999a: 33, 43, 66;also mentioned in Zhang 2010: 41.   
In 20 chapters

*Lanka Xihe,* ‘Ten-Heads of Laṅkā’,from Yunnan (SW China) in the Tai-Lu language, shares episodes with the Burmese and Lao Muongsing versions (Ohno 1999b: 33-43; Ohno 2003: 87-90; Zhang 2010:41). Langma (Rāma) spends 12 years in exile unlike the 14 years in the *VR.*

In context of Hindu temple in Quanzhou with Hanumān relief, Zhang 2010: 43/45 n.14 cites Hara (Hara 1983: 348-49) for raising possibility of Rāma story being brought to Japan by a Hindu.

**title (and author)** The sons of Rama and Rawana

**date (and provenance)** 16th century or earlier (western Java)

**edition(s)**

**translation(s)**

**studies** Noorduyn, J. 1971: “Traces of an Old Sundanese Ramayana Tradition”, *Indonesia* 12: 151-57. **download; checked**

Noorduyn, J., and A. Teeuw (ed. and trans.) 2006: *Three Old Sundanese Poems,* Bibliotheca Indonesica 29 (Leiden: KITLV). **download;** *pp. 113-128 analysed; rest checked*

Saran and Khanna 2004: 140-41, 169 **checked**

**notes** uses many motifs from other versions (Thai, *VR*) but applies them to different situations. The end of the ms is missing. It introduces the story of Mandodarī giving birth to Manabaya, a posthumous son of Rāvaṇa. Manabaya brings his brother and his father’s warriors back to life and launches an attack on the city of Rāma. It also makes Sītā Rāvaṇa’s daughter and her children cousins of their enemies.

**Buddhist influence/features**

*study* Reynolds 1991

*Jātaka*

non-Thai vernacular, *Phrommacak*: Ohno 2001: 116

Rāma is Bodhisattva with *jātaka* frame-story:

*Dasarathajātaka*

*Dasarathajātaka* was very popular in SE Asia, but cannot be the source of *Rm* adaptations. Buddhist elements have been grafted on: Reynolds 1991 and MB 2002

[Existence of *Śyāmajātaka* tradition does not preclude continuance of ‘Śrāvaṇa’ episode.]

Lao (II, Vientiane), NE Thai *Rāmajātaka*: Ohno 1999:

Rāma is Bodhisattva with NO *jātaka* frame-story:

*Rama Vatthu,* Myanmar version 3, Mon, Yunnan *Lanka Xihe*: Ohno 1999: 7, 47, 81-83; cf. 106

acknowledged by Paraśurāma: Ohno 1999: 83, 91, 94

acknowledged by Rāvaṇa: Ohno 1999: 157

Lao IV: but R+L’s education is to learn the 3 *vedas* Sahai 1976: 41

*see also* Reynolds 1991: 61n.14: “the story *is* presented as a sermon of the Buddha, but it does *not* (at least explicitly) take the form of a *jātaka* story.”

Rama is NOT Bodhisattva:

Philippine

Malay *HSR*

Rāma is *deva*:

Lao (Muongsing and other mss): Ohno 1999:

Rāma is Nārāyaṇa / Viṣṇu:

*OJ Kakawin, Serat Kanda,* Thai, Khmer, Lao (Luang Prabang version): Ohno 1999:

Thai: NOT Bodhisattva, but see Reynolds 1991: 56, 59

Lao III [*Rāma is Narai reborn*]*:* Vo 1971: 77-78

Rāvaṇa is invincible against all except Buddha, Bodhisattva, giant monkeys Lao I: Lafont 2003

Indra prophesies that Rāvaṇa will become invincible to all except Bodhisattva Lao II: Vo 1971: 22

Indra invites a dying Bodhisattva to return to earth to deal with the increasingly depraved Rāvaṇa Lao I: Lafont 2003

*on Lao and Thai versions see* Reynolds 1991

Precepts of conduct: Ohno 1999: *passim*

Daśaratha’s admonition to Rāma: Ohno 1999: 96-97

Rituals eliminated:

birth sacrifices:  
 Thai: Ohno 1999: 51

NO birth sacrifice:

*Rama Vatthu*: Daśaratha consults sage, conception from fruit: Ohno 1999: 51, 81-84

Birth of Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa and Vibhīṣaṇa when Brahmā strokes their ascetic mother’s stomach, linked to mango conception (variant):  
 *Rama Vatthu* Ohno 1999: 6, 46, 69-70

Myanmar versions 1, 3, 4; Yunnan *Lanka Xihe*: Ohno 1999: 20, 34

Lao I: Lafont 2003: Phuk 1

(fusion):

*Rama Vatthu*: Janaka intends to perform birth sacrifice for son, instead finds Sītā by pseudo-natural means: Ohno 1999: 85

Rāvaṇa’s invulnerability the result of a prediction, not his own *tapas* Lao II: Vo 1971: 22

horse is *aśvamedha* horse:

*Rama Vatthu,* Thai: Ohno 1999: 10, 31, 65, 168-71 Lao III: Vo 1971: 82

*aśvaṃedha* remodelled; wandering horse retained, but purpose different:   
 Lao I: Lafont 2003: Phuk 10

Yunnan *Lanka Xihe* (fusion of episodes): Ohno 1999: 42

NO *aśvamedha*:

Lao II: Vo 1971: 60

Lao IV: Sahai 1976 69-71

*aśvamedha* eliminated but horse retained:  
 Yunnan, *Lanka Xihe*: Ohno 1999: 42

Morality  
baby Sītā is discovered floating, then beached on sandbank, but she is not Rāvaṇa’s daughter so the issue of incest does not arise:

Lao I: Lafont 2003: Phuk 3

after abduction, Rāvaṇa cannot touch Sītā because she is surrounded by fire [*no Rambhā*]:   
Lao II: Vo 1971: 36

brother / sister marriage: Sītā is daughter of Daśaratha and 4th wife, expelled from Ayodhyā at birth as result of astrologers’ gloomy prediction, thrown into sea and adopted by hermit [*avoidance of father/daughter incest with Rāvaṇa involves brother/half-sister incest — more easily tolerated?*] Lao III: Vo 1971: 79

Sītā is not Rāvaṇa’s daughter or Rāma’s sister:Yunnan, *Lanka Xihe*: Ohno 1999: 36

Rāvaṇa’s lechery moderated (*nāginīs* etc. are his wives):

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 74

Rāvaṇa initially virtuous, falls into bad ways by neglecting 10 Precepts; subordinates then follow his bad example:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 75

Order to execute Hanumān excused: he is a mere robber, not an official envoy:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 137

Śūrpaṇakkhā mutilated:

Thai: Ohno 1999: 57

Śūrpaṇakhā NOT mutilated:

*Rama Vatthu,*Lao I: Ohno 1999: 26, 48, 118

Śūrpaṇakhā does not proposition Rāma, not mutilated:  
Yunnan, *Lanka Xihe*Ohno 1999: 37

Less killing; distasteful episodes eliminated:  
Viśvāmitra pestered by crow [*not Mārīca*], wishes to be rid of it without killing, crow loses eye [*conflated with Sītā’s crow*]:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 86, 88-89

Rāma does not kill Mārīca + Subāhu / crow but frightens them away by twanging his bowstring; they promise not to repeat the offence: Lao I: Lafont 2003: Phuk 3

Rāvaṇa’s decision to abduct Sītā results from *svayaṃvara*, avoiding need for Śūrpaṇakhā / Khara episode and court intrigues: Lao II: Vo 1971: 34  
 [*both present in* Lao III: Vo 1971: 79]  
No court intrigues or Śūrpaṇakhā /Khara Lao IV: Sahai 1976: 44

In *HSR* “Indrajita’s arrow changes into a floral wreath around Rāma’s neck.” “According to the *Lalitavistara*, the weapon hurled against the Bodhisattva by Mara’s army change into festoons of flowers hovering above his head. Cf. A. Zieseniss [1928:] 166.” Singaravelu 1983: 287 (30) *and* 294n.55

Sugrīva chooses single combat against Vālin to avoid loss of innocent life:

*Rama Vatthu* Ohno 1999: 122

No fire-ordeal; happy reunion: Lao II: Vo 1971: 5 Lao III: Vo 1971: 81

Forbearance

Rāvaṇa kicks Vibhīṣaṇa during quarrel: cf. Mādhava Kandalī (Assamese): Nagar 2000: II, 57

Vibhīṣaṇa, kicked by Rāvaṇa in face, does not anger but maintains ‘forbearance’; withdraws gracefully: Old Javanese, *Kakawin*: Santoso 1980: 14.60-70

Rāvaṇa kicks Vibhīṣaṇa on head:

*Rama Vatthu* [little ‘forbearance’]: Ohno 1999: 147

Curse avoided  
‘Śrāvaṇa’s’ father predicts Daśaratha will suffer consequences of his own misdeed  
 Lao I: Lafont 2003: 51 [*scan*]

Daśaratha not cursed; nurses hermit boy, who recovers and advises Daśaratha how to obtain sons:Yunnan, *Lanka Xihe*: Ohno 1999: 35

Rāvaṇa repents, asks Rāma’s forgiveness, recognises him as Bodhisattva when Rāma is about to kill him. No response from Rāma. Kills him:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 157

Fire ordeal: gods do not appear:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 160

Sītā persuaded to return to Ayodhyā, does not enter Earth:

*Rama Vatthu*, Lao (Muongsing version): Ohno 1999: 10, 43, 175-77

Rāma dies of old age, does not commit suicide / return to heaven:

*Rama Vatthu*: Ohno 1999: 177

**Conversely:**

*Lalita Vistara* has story of Śakyamuni demonstrating his strength and mastery of weapons, defeating other contestants in front of both fathers in Kapilavastu *inter alia* by lifting and stringing bow (noise frightens citizens), shooting through 7 *tālas* and iron figure of boar (cf. Arjuna in MBh 1,125.23), arrow disappearing into earth, and winning bride Gōpā; at beginning of contest Śakyamuni has thrown elephant corpse a great distance (Foucaux 1884: 124-42, **photocopy**).

similar story carved on relief panel at Borobudur

Klokke and Scheurleer 1994: 3 (Introduction):

As far as we know, Hinduism did not undertake the same missionary activities as Buddhism. It seems to have spread to Southeast Asia on a quite different basis, being used by local rulers to invest themselves with more authority, and from the very beginning integrating more with local culture.

*Is there evidence for this or its consequences apparent in the texts?*