A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SANSKRIT, TAMIL, THAI AND MALAY VERSIONS OF THE STORY OF RĀMA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PROCESS OF ACCULTURATION IN THE SOUTHEAST ASIAN VERSIONS*

by

S. Singaravelu

University of Malaya

Many popular novelists of these days may claim that their books are read from one end of the globe to the other at any one particular period of time.   This would indeed be a wide circulation; but probably a much wider circulation through an infinitely longer period of time has been achieved by many old popular tales whose authors, unlike the modern novelists, will probably be never known by name.[1]

The popular story of Rāma, which is the subject of this paper, is perhaps one of these widely diffused tales in the south and southeast Asian regions of the world, and this story is valuable as an illustration of the great difficulties which baffle, and perhaps will never cease to baffle the students of popular tales, especially in regard

---

1) In the case of even literary versions as against the oral versions, the authorship of many popular tales (some having found their way into epics as well) is still a matter of much uncertainty, controversy and dispute. Even the traditional names of compilers of popular tales are sometimes believed to be mythical. For example, it has been pointed out that the traditional name Vyāsa, who is supposed to have been the final redactor of the Indian epic *Mahābhārata*, simply means 'the arranger'. See Macdonell, A.A., Rāmāyaṇa, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* ed. J. Hastings, vol 10 Edinburgh 1918 p 574.

to the problem of accounting for its wide diffusion, acculturation and its continuing popularity since early centuries B.C.[2]

The fundamental idea behind this popular story may be stated thus: A prince, assigned to succeed his aged father, is banished in consequence of a court intrigue, his step-mother claiming the throne for her own son. When the banished prince is wandering in the woods together with his consort, a giant king of an island kingdom carries off the prince's consort in revenge of his sister being spurned by the prince. The prince then sets out to rescue his wife, and he could only succeed with the assistance of the king of the monkeys who builds a causeway across the waters reaching up to the island kingdom. After a violent battle, the prince slays the giant king and recovers his consort, and later his right to the throne of his former kingdom.

Now, this basic notion or plot of the story is known to have branched out into a vast variety of shapes. The story itself has many different 'openings' and various endings in different places.[3] It has

2) Stories of this kind have been ever popular with eager listeners whose yearning for information and amusement were satisfied by the tellers of the tales. Whether it has been for religious edification, incitement to heroic deeds or release from the monotony of the peoples' lives, the peasant and the warrior, the priest and the scholar have joined in their love of the story and their honour for the man, whether he be a bard, a poet, a priest or the skilled operator of the leather puppets, who can be relied upon to tell the story well. The court poets entertained the rulers with the marvels of adventurous heroes. The royal preceptor had a ready source of traditional ceremonies in the story. The priests illustrated their sermons by anecdotes from the stories. The *wayang* performer recited from interminable chivalric romances of heroes to the peasants and warriors who whiled away their evenings with tales of wonder and adventure. It may also be of interest to note that the story in epic and literary form could have been meant to be used as a fitting heroic and artistic shape in which to accommodate indigenous customs and household legends in addition to its being a storehouse of the royal traditions and ceremonies in the regions concerned.

3) To cite only a few instances, the four versions that form the subject of this study themselves have different openings and endings. For example, in the case of the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālnīki, its first canto, Bāla kāṇḍa, though regarded as a later addition, begins by narrating the circumstances leading to the incarnation of Viṣṇu on earth as Rāma, as also in the case of the Tamil version of Kamban. But the Southeast Asian versions concerned are different in this respect: The Malay version and the Thai versions seem to give precedence to the story of Rāvaṇa's youth and his early deeds and achievements over that of Rāma.

various forms of narrative, numerous incidents, different kinds of characters,[4] and remarkable details of the whole connected series of events, some beginning with the creation of the world-order itself, others with the birth of the chief characters or cultural heroes, progressing through their growth, training, and acquisition of various powers, their achievements, their marital affairs, exile, abduction, wars and conquest—all these, or most of these, occurring in diverse, yet meaningful sequence, to be found in oral and literary forms extraordinarily popular among the most diverse peoples inhabiting diverse environments. The Annamese have the tale, the Balinese have it, the Bengalis, the Burmese, the Cambodians, the Chinese, the Gujarathis, the Javanese, the Kashmiris, the Khotanese, the Laotians, the Malaysians, the Marathis, the Oriyas, the Sinhalese, the Tamils, the Telugus, the Thais and the Tibetans have it.[5]

4) An interesting attempt is known to have been made by King Rāma VI (King Mahā Vajiravudh) of Thailand to classify the various characters of the Rāma story as represented in the Thai dance-drama *Khōn* on the basis of whether they are of celestial, human, or animal origin, with such sub-categories as princes, princesses, sages, warriors, titans, horses, and birds, each character being also symbolically identified with a particular colour. See King Mahā Vajiravudh, 'Notes on the Siamese Theatre,' with a brief introduction by H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat *Journal of the Siam Society* vol 55 pt 1 pp 1-30.

5) The following works, listed in the Roman alphabetical order of the names of the peoples who are known to have the story, may be mentioned in this connection : Huber, M.É., 'Études Indochinoises: La Legende du Rama en Annam,' *Bulletin de l'École Française de Extrême Orient* vol 5, 1905 p 168.; Gelgel, G.A.P., *Guguritan Utara-kanda* (a modern Balinese poem based on the last canto of Rāmāyaṇa) mimeographed, Denpasar, Bali 1958; Dineshchandra Sen, R.S., *The Bengali Rāmāyaṇas* Calcutta 1920; *Rama ya-kan* (a Burmese poem by Maung To on the Indian legend of Rāma) ed. U Lu Pe Win, Rangoon 1933; *Ream Ker* (a Cambodian version of the Rāmāyaṇa) ed. S. Karpeles, Phnom Penh 1937; Yamamoto, C. and Raghu Vira, *The Rāmāyaṇa in China* Lahore 1938; Watanabe, K., 'The oldest record of the Rāmāyaṇa in a Chinese Buddhist writing,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1907 pp 99-103; Giridhara, *Rāmāyaṇa* a rendering in Gujarati verse, Ahmadabad 1949; Hooykaas, C., 'The Old-Javanese Rāmāyaṇa Kakawin, with special reference to the problem of interpolation in Kakawins,' *Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* vol 16,

If the various versions of the story were the same, one may account for its diffusion by supposing it to be the common heritage of all those people who are known to have these versions. But when the various elements relating to the plot and *motifs* are peculiar to some versions and are not to be found in all versions, or when the coincident plot or *motif* is not at all the same between two given versions, the hypothesis of translation from an older source becomes inadequate.

It may also be difficult to argue that the source of a tale *as a whole* is the country where it is known to have been first found in a literary shape, for the various *motifs* that became interwoven in the story as a whole might have been current in popular mouth in different and distant regions before they had won their way into literary forms in a particular country.   Wherever man, woman or child could go, there a tale might have gone and found a new home.   Such processes of transmission, the folklorists tell us, have been going on practically ever since man was man.   Thus it is even more difficult to limit the possibilities of transmission than the chances of coincidence.   Yet, chances of coincidence may also be numerous.   The ideas and situations of popular tales are afloat everywhere in the imagination of men through the ages.   Who can tell how often they might casually unite in similar wholes independently combined?

1955 pp 1-64; *Rāmāyana. Oudjavaansch* Heldengedicht.   Uitgegeven door H. Kern, 's-Gravenhage 1900; Juynboll, H.H., *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Glossarium op het Oudjavaansche Ramayana* The Hague 1902; Divakara Prakasa Bhatta, *Kashmiri Rāmāyana* Srinagar 1913.; Bailey, H.W., 'The Rama story in Khotanese,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* vol 59, 1939 pp 460-68; Deydier, H., 'Le Rāmāyana au Laos,' *France-Asie* vol 8 no 78 Saigon 1952 pp 871-73; Shellabear, W.G., 'Hikāyat Sĕri Rāma,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 70 pp 181-207; *Ibid.* vol 71 pp 1-285; Zieseniss, A., *The Rāma Saga in Malaysia* trans. P.W. Burch, Singapore 1963; Madhava Svami, *Sloka-baddha Rāmāyana* (a Marathi version of the Rāmāyana) ed. P.D. Joshi, Tanjore 1951; Sarala-Dasa, *Bilanka Rāmāyana* (The fifteenth century Oriya metrical version) 2 vols, Cuttack 1958; Godakumbura, C.E., 'The Rāmāyana.   A version of Rāma's story from Ceylon,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1946 pp 14-22; *Kamparāmāyanam* (Tamil version) ed. V.M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar, Madras 1955; Molla, *Rāmāyanam* (an adaptation in Telugu verse and prose) Madras 1913; *Rāmakian* (Thai version) by King Rāma I of Thailand, Bangkok 1951; Thomas, F.W., 'A Rāmāyana story in Tibetan from Chinese Turkestan,' *Indian Studies, Lanmann Commemoration Volume* 1929 pp 193-212.

Furthermore, even granting the existence of the basic idea of the tale, almost any incidents out of the popular fancy may be employed to enrich and complicate the plot.   Various incidents may be introduced according to the taste and fancy of the narrators around central or subsidiary ideas, and heroes or villains.   Depending on the more or less universal nature of the theme, the number of possible combinations resulting in a story, such as that of Rāma, would seem to be infinite.   All incidents of such popular tales, like the bits of glass in a kaleidoscope, may be shaken into a practically limitless number of combinations.   This is particularly so with isolated incidents in popular tales where they may recur in infinitely varied combinations.   In addition, common incidents may be variously coloured.   As Sir Walter Scott is said to have observed, a narrator could never repeat a story without giving a new hat or stick; liberality on the part of the imaginative story-teller bestows new embellishments and emendations.   These are of course generalizations on popular tales, but they would seem to be equally applicable to the story of Rāma and its various versions.   The differences in the details and in the conduct of the various versions of the story are indeed immense.

But the problem is to determine, first, which of the various versions or any one of the given versions is the original type; secondly, whether others have adapted that 'first' form or any other later forms,

---

The story of Rāma as found in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki and a few other Indian versions have also been translated into such languages as English, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Latin, Persian, Russian, Spanish, and Swedish.

Besides literary representation the story has also found an ideal, imperishable medium in sculpture and bas-reliefs in temples, notably in Ceylon, Cambodia, India, Indonesia and Thailand: see Stutterheim, W., *Rāma-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien* 2 vols, Munchen 1925, Coedès, G., 'Les bas-reliefs d'Angkor-Vat' *Bulletin de la Commission archeologique l'Indochine* 1911 and Przyluski, J., 'La legende de Rama dans les bas-reliefs d'Angkor-Vat,' *Arts et Archéologie khmers* vol 1, 1921-1923 pp319-30. For a general survey of the influence of the story in the literature, drama and art of South and Southeast Asia, see Singaravelu, S., 'The Rāmāyaṇa and its influence in the literature, drama, and art of South and Southeast Asia,' *Tamil Culture* vol 12 no 4, 1966 pp 303-14.

The dramatic representation of the Rāma story through the mask play (known as *Khōn* in Thailand and *Wayang Wong* in Indonesia) and the puppet shadow play (known as *Nāng* in Thailand and *Wayang Kulit* in Malaysia and Indonesia) is well known in Southeast Asia as is its pictorial representation in paintings, for example, in the Emerald Buddha temple in Bangkok.

borrowing little but the main conception and enriching their own versions with greater embellishments and emendations; thirdly whether the processes of adaptation have been the result of diffusion by way of oral traditions and popular fancy, or of literary handling, transmission and acculturation, or of both; fourthly, whether the various *motifs* or even the idea of the story itself might not have occurred independently to the minds of their authors in different ages and countries; and finally, what evidence the name-forms and place-forms occurring in these versions provide on the questions of diffusion and acculturation.

It is of course easy to ask these questions; and it is desirable to bear them in mind so that we may never lose sight of the complexity of the problem, but it is practically impossible to answer them once and for all.

Nevertheless, in order at least to illustrate how widely some versions of the story of Rāma vary or agree, and how difficult it is to answer the above questions with any certainty, an attempt is made in this paper to examine at least four literary versions of the story, three of them existing in the form of verse and the fourth in the form of prose: the Sanskrit epic, *Rāmāyana* (the Career of Rāma) of Vālmīki, the Tamil poetic version, *Rāmāvatāram* (Rāma's Incarnation) of Kamban,[6] the Thai poetic version, *Rāmakīrti* (Rāma's Glory) or

---

6) During the last decade or two it has been open to discussion whether certain deviations of the Thai *Rāmakian* from the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmīki and the corresponding similarities between the Thai version and certain other Indian versions are attributable to the South Indian, and particularly the Tamil literary version of Kamban.   Occasional references to Tamil elements are to be found in: Swami Satyananda Puri and Charoen Sarahiran, *The Rāmakīrti (or Rāmakian)* 2nd ed Bangkok 1949; H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat, 'Mairāb the Magician,' *The Standard* no 53 June 7, 1947 Bangkok pp 15-21; Phya Anuman Rajadhon, 'Thai Literature and Swasdi Raksa', *Thailand Culture Series* no 3 Bangkok 1953; Thani Nayagam, X.S., 'Tamil Cultural Influences in South East Asia,' *Tamil Culture* vol 4 no 3 1955 pp 203-20.

As for the various deviations of the Tamil version from the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmīki, these have been commented upon by Tamil scholars from time to time, and some of these significant divergences occurring in the cantos of the *Rāmāvatāram* of Kamban are summarised in the Introductory Notes and Commentaries to be found in the editions published by the Annamalai University and also in the volumes (1-6) edited by V.M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar.   See also : Ramalingam, Namakkal V., *Kamparum Vālmīkiyum* Madras.

Rāmakian (as it is known in the Thai language) of King Rāma I of Thailand,[7] and the Malay narrative prose version, *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma* (the Annals of Srī Rāma) of an unknown author.[8]

Chronologically, the two Indian versions concerned are separated from each other by approximately eight centuries, whereas the Thai and the Malay versions would seem to have come into being,

7) The story of Rama in Thailand would seem to have been originally an oral one; the manipulators of the puppet shadow play (See H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat, 'The Nāng', *Thailand Culture Series* no 12 Bangkok 1954; Simmonds, E.H.S., 'New Evidence on Thai Shadow-Play Invocations,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* vol 24 no 3, 1961 pp 542-59) and later the players of the Mask Play (See H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat and Dhanit Yupho, 'The Khōn' *Thailand Culture Series* no 11 Bangkok) knew possibly several episodes of the story from various versions. Such episodes in the past are known to have contained interpolations by way of much elaboration, and possibly new episodes of indigenous origin were also added. Finally, the story of Rāma, known as *Rāmkirti or Rāmakian* was composed and edited in literary verse form by King Rāma I (reign 1782-1809), the founder of the present Cakri dynasty of Thailand. King Rama II (reign 1809-1824) produced another edition of the *Rāmakian* in the form of a dramatic version.   There is no doubt that the Kings of Thailand had shown keen interest in the story and its representation in literary and artistic productions in Thailand. King Rama VI (King Mahā Vajiravudh) has written on the origins of the *Rāmakian* (*Bo Koet Haeng Rāmakian* Bangkok 1960).   See also H.H. Prince Prem Purachatra, *Introduction to Thai Literature* Bangkok 1964 and Schweissguth, P., *Étude sur le litterature Siamoise* Paris 1959.

8) H.H. Juynboll in 1899 ('Eeen episode uit het oudindische Rāmāyana vergeleken met de Javaansch en Maleische bewerkingen,' *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* vol 50, 1889 pp 59-66) and in 1902 ('Indonesische en Achterindische tooneelvoorstellingen uit het Rāmāyana,' *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* vol 54, 1902 pp 501-65) and Ph.S. van Ronkel in 1919 ('Aanteekeningen op een ouden Maleischen Rāmājana-tekst,' *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* vol 75, 1919 pp 379-83) suggested the possible source of the Malay *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma* to be a Southern Indian version of the Rāma story by reason of certain name-forms which they considered Southern Indian, particularly Tamil.
     With regard to the deviations of the Malay *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma* from the *Rāmāyana* of Vālmīki, W.F. Stutterheim in his Ph.D. thesis *Rama-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien* 2 vols München 1925, produced evidence to show that the deviations of the Malay version from the Sanskrit version belong for the most part to the popular sagas of India and that the Malay version originated in Indonesia from the mixed influence of predominantly oral tradition agreeing in general with the Indonesian tales.   This major work was followed by a detailed comparative study of the parallels and deviations of the Malay version from the Sanskrit epic by Alexander Zieseniss (*Die Rāma-Saga bei den Malaien, ihre Herkunft und Gestaltung* Hamburg 1928), an english translation of which, by P.W. Burch, with a

at least in the form in which they have reached us, approximately eight centuries after the Tamil version of Kamban. The details concerning the probable dates of these works may be set out briefly as follows:

In regard to the Sanskrit epic there are two main theories concerning its probable date of composition : one ascribing

foreword by C. Hooykaas, was published by the Malaysian Sociological Research Institute (Singapore) in 1963 as *The Rāma Saga in Malaysia, its origin and development.*

Among the scholars who were instrumental in introducing the various manuscript versions of the Malay version are : Eysinga van Roorda, P.P., *Geschiedenis van Sri Rāma, beroemd Indisch Heroisch Dichtstuk, oorspronkelijk van Valmic en naar eene Maleische vertaling daarvan.* . . Amsterdam 1843; Maxwell, Sir W.E.,'Sri Rāma, a fairy tale told by a Malay rhapsodist,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 27 May 1886 pp 87-115; 'Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma (Romanized by Sir R.O. Winstedt),' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 55, 1910 pp 1-99; Shellabear, W.G., 'Hikāyat Sĕrī Rama : Introduction to the text of the MSS in the Bodleian Library at Oxford,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 70, 1915 pp 181-207; and 'Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma (in Jawi text),' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 71, 1915 pp 1-285; Winstedt, Sir R.O., ' An undescribed Malay version of the Rāmāyana,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1944 pp 62-73; Barrett, E.C.G., 'Further light on Sir Richard Winstedt's Undescribed Malay version of the Rāmāyana,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* vol 26 no 3, 1963 pp 531-43; for recent comparative studies involving the Malay version(s) see Francisco, Juan R., 'The Rāma story in the post-Muslim Malay literature of South-East Asia,' *Sarawak Museum Journal* vol 10 no 19-20 July-Dec 1962 pp 468-85; Singaravelu, S., *A comparative study of the Rāma story in South India and Southeast Asia* (presented at the International Conference-Seminar of Tamil Studies, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, April 1966, Kuala Lumpur 1966).

With regard to the Old-Javanese Ramayana and its vital connections with Indian literary sources and traditions, Hooykaas's contributions (more than ten learned papers) can be read with great profit and enlightenment; the chief among these works being 'The Old-Javanese Rāmāyana Kakawin with special reference to the problem of interpolation in Kakawins,' *Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde* vol 16 's-Gravenhage 1955 and 'The Old-Javanese Rāmāyana, an exemplary kakawin as to form and content,' *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks* vol 65 no 1 Amsterdam 1958. The following scholars also have contributed to fruitful studies in this field : Manomohan Ghosh, 'On the source of the Old-Javanese Rāmāyana Kakawin,' *Journal of Greater India Society* vol 3, 1936 pp 113-17; Juynboll, H.H., *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Glossarium op het Oudjavaansche Rāmāyana* The Hague 1902; Kern, H., *Rāmāyana Kakawin Oudjavaansche Heldendicht* The Hague 1900; Poerbatjaraka, R. Ng. 'Het Oud-Javaansche Rāmāyana,' *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde, uitgegeven door het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* vol 72, 1932 pp 151-214.

the main portions of the work to the pre-Buddhist period,[9] and the second theory attributing the original part of the epic (i.e., the cantos 2 to 6 of the present work) to the middle of the fourth century B.C. (the cantos 1 and 7 of the present work being considered as additions of a later period), the final version attaining its present extent by the end of either the second century B.C.[10] or the second century A.D.[11]

The Tamil version of Kamban is usually ascribed to the end of the twelfth century A.D. There is, however, another theory which advocates A.D. 978 as the most probable of the various dates; this latter view also cannot be dismissed lightly.[12]

The Thai version, *Rāmakian,* is known to have been composed and edited by King Rama I of Thailand during his reign between 1782 and 1809; the royal poet is also supposed to have based his work on the existing oral and probably literary versions of the story belonging to an earlier period.[13]

The oldest surviving manuscript of the *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma,* whose authorship unfortunately is not yet known, dates from the beginning of the seventeenth century, but is held to be certainly a comparatively late recension.[14]

Let us now consider briefly the first part of the problem posed above; namely, which of the various versions, or whether any one of the given versions, can be regarded as the original type.

---

9) Jacobi, H., *Das Rāmāyana: Geschichte und Inhalt, nebst, Concordanz der Gedrukten Recensionen* Bonn 1893.

10) Keith, A.B., 'The date of Rāmāyana,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1915 p 328.

11) Macdonell, A.A., 'The Rāmāyana,' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* ed. J. Hastings, vol 10, 1918 p 576.

12) Silver Jubilee Edition of Cuntara Kāntam of *Kamban's Rāmāyanam,* Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 2nd edition 1963 p xii.

13) See note 7 above : according to H.H. Prince Dhani Nivat, the composition of the *Rāmakian* was commenced by King Rāma I in 1798; see *Journal of the Siam Society* vol 34 pt 1, 1943 p 71.

14) Barrett, E.C.G., 'Further light on Sir Richard Winstedt's Undescribed Malay version of the Rāmāyana,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* vol 26 no 3, 1963 pp 531-43.

In the case of the story of Rāma there has been a general tend-
ency to trace the various versions of the story to the Sanskrit epic
Rāmāyaṇa, of Vālmīki, often because it is believed to have been the
first literary version of the story and therefore could well be the source
of all other versions that followed.   Though this general view may
well apply to some of the later versions, the authors of which are
known to have based their works on previous sources including the
Rāmāyaṇa of the poetic sage Vālmīki (who incidentally has provided
a convenient author's label for the librarians to catalogue the various
versions of the story), it would seem that nothing could be further
from the objective view than to state that all versions of the story of
Rāma have as their source the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki merely because
his version was one of the earliest literary versions.

This is of course not to deny the fact that several authors of
later versions of the story may well have looked to the epic as the
source of several episodes and many elements of their own versions;
but the reason for which they may have done so must not be misun-
derstood to mean that they have merely tried to translate Vālmīki's
ideas in their languages, or that their works are mere translations of
the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki.   Such an interpretation could prove
misleading.

The main purpose for which acknowledgements were made by
the authors of various later versions to the effect that they had based
their works on such and such earlier works was probably to appeal to
the traditional and, therefore, trustworthy nature of the material of
their own versions.   Though modern writers may well strive
for originality of plot and treatment, the tellers of popular tales
are noted to have always been proud of their ability to hand on that
which they had received from the past generation with whatever
embellishments they themselves might have added.   Just as this
traditional aspect of popular tales was considered so important that
even in Europe writers like Chaucer are said to have carefully quoted
authorities for their plots, sometimes even to the point of inventing
originals to prove that their stories are not anything new,[15] so also
the authors of later versions of the story of Rāma may have tried to

15) Thompson, S., *The Folk Tale* New York 1946 pp 3-4.

depend upon such a stamp of authority by acknowledging such and such works on which they based their versions, in spite of the fact that the individual genius of such authors would appear clearly enough in their own works.   This is so, for instance, with the author of the Tamil version, Kamban, to whom some prefatory verses have been attributed.   In one of these verses he mentions Vālmīki's epic together with two other versions which obviously served as his basic literary sources.[16]   However, in the absence of such clear-cut evidence one cannot attribute any particular version to an earlier literary version unless one can find other kinds of evidence.

Somewhat related to this problem of the original type is the question as to how long the story is known to have existed, at least as seen in some fragmentary references to certain events or *motifs* of the story in earlier literary works.   Though this question cannot be answered with any certainty, nevertheless it is evident that very old forms of certain episodes of the story, originally no doubt in popular form, have won their way into various literary traditions of the peoples in South and Southeast Asia.[17]

In northern India, for example, though there does not seem to be any evidence to show that the story of Rāma existed before the end of the Vedic period (circa 800 B.C.) the story is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* as an episode of Rāma (Rāmopākhyānam), which of course presupposes the existence of the extended *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Again, a certain section of the tale (namely the one relating to the prince, Rāma, and his banishment as a result of a court intrigue

---

16) T.P. Meenakshisundaram, in his article entitled 'Tātaka in other literatures,' *Tamil Culture* vol 4 no 3, 1955 pp 221-26, points out that the authors of the Telugu Rāmāyaṇas do not seem to have any 'inclination to follow Kamban of the Tamil land, probably because of their reverence for the great rishi, Vālmīki, the author of the *ādi-kāvya*, from whom they probably cannot differ.'   The authors of the Telugu Rāmāyaṇas were probably looking for the traditional appeal of a greater antiquity and authenticity in Vālmīki than in Kamban.

17) C. Bulcke, S.J. in his Ph. D. thesis entitled *Rāma-kathā, utpatti aur vikāsa* (The origin and development of the story of Rāma) Allahabad University, Allahabad 1950, refers to the existence of various (about 300 ?) versions of the story in India.

and his subsequent return to the throne after a twelve year period,[18] but without mentioning the abduction of the prince's consort by the giant king, Rāvaṇa, and the consequences of that action) is believed to have been 'incorporated' by Buddhism. Indeed Buddhism is said to have 'annexed' most tales of the ancient times by the simple process of making the Buddha the hero or the narrator of one of his previous births.[19] According to the concluding part of the story of Rāma as it is known to have occurred in the *Daśaratha Jātaka*, 'in his previous birth Śuddhodhana was Daśaratha, Mahāmāya was the mother of Rāma, Sītā was Rāhula's mother, Bharata was Ānanda, and Lakṣmaṇa was Sariputta. The people devoted to Rāma were those who have followed me in this life, and I was Rāma.'[20]

---

18) In the Sanskrit, Tamil and Thai versions, the period of exile is mentioned as fourteen years.

19) Weber, A., 'On the Rāmāyaṇa,' *The Indian Antiquary* 1872 pp 239-53. However, N.B. Utgikar ('The story of Daśaratha Jātaka and the the Rāmā-yaṇa,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Centenary Supplement* 1924 pp 203-11) is not inclined to accept the view that the *Daśaratha Jātaka* was of older date than the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki. A.B. Keith ('The date of the Rāmāyaṇa,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1915 p 323) in fact earlier pointed out that the *Daśaratha Jātaka* was an attempt to turn the Rāma story to pious purposes and that 'it cannot be held to be an older version or source of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. On the other hand, the diversity of the verses (in the *Daśaratha Jātaka*) and the variants of the epic verse point to both using an older verse of the same traditional type.'

20) *Jātaka*, IV. *Ekadash Nipataka* ed. V. Fausboll p 130.
   In this context, mention also may be made of the devotees of Viṣṇu, who have on their part included the Buddha as the ninth and last historical incarnation of Viṣṇu (Rāma himself being the seventh such manifestation) 'in order to assimilate the heterodox elements into the Vaiṣṇavite fold. Until quite recently the temple of the Buddha at Gayā was in the hands of Hindus, and the teacher was there worshipped by Hindus as a Hindu god . . .' Basham, A.L., *The Wonder That Was India* London 1961 p 306.
   It may also be of some interest to note in this connection that the Kings of Thailand belonging to the Cakri dynasty, some of whom having been known by titles including that of the Buddha, were bestowed the title of Rāma by King Maha Vajiravudh (reign 1910-1925) posthumously beginning from His Majesty Phrabaat Somdet Phraphutthayotfaa Culaalōk, or King Rāma I (reign 1782-1809) who is the royal author of the *Rāmakian*, and King Maha Vajiravudh himself being known as King Rāma VI. This tradition has been continued to this day.

That this is by no means the only mention of the Rāma story in Buddhist literature is attested by Watanabe in his account of Yuan Chwang's Chinese version of the Mahāvibhāṣā commentary (on the Jñānaprasthāna of Kātyāyaniputra) in which the Chinese scholar is said to have commented : 'As a book called the *Rāmāyaṇa* there are 12,000 ślokas; they explain only two topics, namely, (a) Rāvaṇa carries Sitā off by violence, and (b) Rāma recovers Sitā and returns; the Buddhist scriptures are not so simple.   Their forms of composition and meanings are respectively immeasurable and infinite.'[21]

The antiquity of at least some *motifs* which helped to mould the story of Rāma as narrated in literary versions, though in modified forms, can also be a fascinating subject of study. For instance, Jean Przyluski in 1939 made an expert analysis of one such *motif* relating to the Rāma legend : the birth of Sitā, as encountered in at least six different versions of the tale. He pointed out how differently Sitā is represented in (a) the *Daśaratha Jātaka* as the daughter of Daśaratha and thus as both sister and wife of Rāma; (b) in the Malay *Hikāyat Seri Rāma* as Rāvaṇa's daughter and as later adopted by King Kali, subsequently becoming the consort of Rāma and in the process being the cause of the downfall of her own father, Rāvaṇa; (c) in a Tibetan version, also as Rāvaṇa's daughter, but adopted by peasants; (d) in the Khotanese version, as Rāvaṇa's daughter, but adopted by a sage; (e) in the Cambodian version (as, indeed, in the Thai version) as Rāvaṇa's daughter, but adopted by the King of Mithila; and (f) in the Sanskrit version of Vālmīki, as born out of the furrow (*Sitā* also means 'furrow') when King Janaka of Mithila was ploughing the field.

Przyluski interpreted the *motif* as occurring in the *Daśaratha Jātaka* as of probably earlier origin then the others. Later, however, this was changed in view of the incongruity of the alleged married relationship of brother and sister, i.e. Rāma and Sitā, to one in which Sitā was made to be born in another family; the fusion of the two separate legends of Rāma and of Rāvaṇa dictating that the other family

---

21) Watanabe, K., 'The oldest record of the Rāmāyaṇa in a Chinese Buddhist writing,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (London)* 1907 pp 99-103.

be that of Rāvaṇa. Subsequently this was changed, in view of the irreconcilable nature of Rāvaṇa's demonic and of Sītā's divine character, to yet another *motif* in which Sītā was made to appear from the furrow of the mother earth, the great goddess and mother of all gods since the earliest times. Significantly, the distinguished author pointed out that the wide diffusion of the episode of the Rāma story and the different ways in which the theme was interpreted are so many signs of its antiquity.[22]

Besides the isolated or single episodes which would seem to have received varied treatment and interpretation at different hands in different places and ages, there are also certain traditions relating to some characters in the story which would appear to have had a greater hold on people's popular fancy and admiration and thus survived from very early times. This is particularly so in regard to such characters as Rāvaṇa, the giant king of the island kingdom, who is represented as the villain in most versions of the story, with varying emphasis on the vileness as well as certain merits of his character, and also Hanuman (or Anuman), the monkey chieftain, who is portrayed often as the faithful ally of Rāma in almost all versions, in addition to being a great romantic hero in some, notably in the Thai and Malay versions.

Although there is no clear and direct evidence of the existence of such traditions in the early periods when characters like Rāvaṇa were held in high esteem of the people in certain parts of South and Southeast Asia, it would seem nevertheless that some of these traditions surviving from one generation to the other through popular memory have found their way into, and indeed concrete expression in, later literary versions, particularly in areas south of Deccan in India and also in some parts of Southeast Asia. This is the case with the southern Jaina legend of Rāma, as narrated by the Jaina scholar and saint Hemachandra Acharya (A.D. 1089-1172), in which the character of Rāvaṇa is known to have been depicted as noble and grand.[23] As has been pointed out by the Bengali scholar, Dineshchandra Sen, the precedence given in the narrative sequence of the story by the

---

22) Przyluski, J., 'Epic studies : Rājavaṃsa and Rāmāyaṇa,' *Indian Historical Quarterly* vol 15, 1939 pp 289-99.
23) Hemachandra Acharya, *Jaina Rāmāyaṇa* ed. Jagannatha Sukla, Calcutta 1873.

poetic sage Hemachandra Achary (and, incidentally, also by the authors of certain other versions such as the Thai and the Malay) to the description of the births and early life of Rāvana and Hanuman over that of Rama's birth and early achievements might perhaps indicate that the legends of Rāvana and Hanuman were previously and widely well-known among the people of the southern regions of India and in parts of Southeast Asia and that the northern legend of Rāma might well have been introduced later as a supplementary tale, subsequently giving rise to the fusion of the two traditions to make a single story.[24]

It may also be of some interest to note in this context that whereas the *Dasaratha Jātaka* does not mention Rāvana as a character of the Rāma story, *the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* of the second or third century A.D. is known to refer to Rāvana as a person of unmatched learning, noted for his grasp of theological problems, and as having a discourse with the Buddha himself.   Dineshchandra Sen who draws attention to this fact,[25] argues that this position of honour bestowed by the Buddhists (of the Mahāyāna school) on Rāvana may have had something to do with the growth of the brāhmanical tradition describing Rāvana as being hostile to all religions.   Although such attempts to 'misrepresent' the character of one who might well have been a kind of cultural hero of the people who had previously adored him might have increased through subsequent centuries, it is also a fact that in some old verses and aphorisms current among the people of Bengal, Rāvana is described as a saint and, further, Rāvana still enjoys a significant place of importance in the esteem of the people in South India in respect of his great devotion to Śiva, his learning and, above all, his notable skill as a musician and, thus, even a poet.

Again, in regard to the delineation of those characters who take the role of the villain in popular tales such as that of Rāma, there is another noteworthy tendency on the part of the narrators to leave the nature of the titanic, or the so-called *rākṣasa* beings, rather vague-

24) Dineshchandra Sen, *The Bengali Rāmāyaṇas* Calcutta 1920.
25) Cf. also Overbeck, H., 'Hikayat Mahārāja Rawāna,' (a Malay version of the Rāvana story), *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Malayan Branch* vol 11, 1933 pp 111-32.

sometimes these have human form, sometimes these are frightful beings. Though this may be partly due to the possibility that the people who told the tales were not always clear in their conception of the supernatural beings their heroes had to meet in combat (just what these forces looked like was never clearly stated except being imagined by a combination of different concepts), it may also be that the narrators could not conceive of the villain of their tales in anything but approximating to human form, though of course endowed with certain superhuman powers. The outward appearance of such 'villainous' characters (possessing several heads, hands and so forth) might have been made familiar to the people through the centuries by writers or story-tellers, and artists.

Be that as it may, it would seem clear that several popular elements or *motifs* relating to the story have made their way into oral and literary traditions of the peoples in South and Southeast Asia since early times, either in the context of religious legends or even in connection with purely literary similes and metaphors. With regard to the latter, for example, in a verse (378) of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* anthology of the earliest surviving Tamil poetry of the Caṅkam Period, the happy smiles of those who received gifts from a local chieftain (Iḷaṅcēṭcenni) are compared to the smiles of female monkeys adorning themselves with the ornaments that fell during the struggle put up by Sītā when she was being carried away forcefully by Rāvaṇa.[26] Again, when Jayavarman VII (1181-1215) of Cambodia left his wife, the charming Jayarājadevi, the inscription of Phimeanakas tells us of her asceticism, her virtuous conduct, her tears, in short, her similarity to Sītā in the story of Rāma.[27]

From what has been said so far on the question of the antiquity of particular *motifs*, of some early traditions of certain characters in the story of Rāma and their continuing popularity among various groups of people through the ages, it would seem difficult to judge a particular version as the original type solely on the basis of the fact of its literary appearance at an earlier period of time. The various *motifs* and characters that were to become interwoven in the story as a whole

---

26) See also *Akanāṉūṟu*, 70:15; *Maṇimēkalai* vol 27 pp 53-54.
27) Briggs, L.P., *The Ancient Khmer Empire* Philadelphia 1951 p 171.

might already have been current in oral or popular traditions before they had won their way into a literary version, though in modified forms.

As for the second part of the problem, namely, the question of adaptation or diffusion and the related process of acculturation, it would be perhaps desirable to see first what a comparative study of the four versions, the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, the *Rāmāvatāram* of Kamban, the *Rāmakian* of King Rāma I, and the *Hikāyat Sěrī Rāma*, has to offer by way of material evidence relating to the various episodes, incidents or *motifs* of the story.   Before considering the data, a few words may be said about the scheme of presentation of the comparison and the textual sources utilized.

To accommodate the mass of material in reasonably condensed form, the major episodes, incidents or *motifs chosen* for purposes of comparison are made into summarised lists which are marked by the letters of the Roman alphabet and arranged under brief descriptive headings.   It must be noted that *no attempt* is made in this paper to present *all* the episodes, incidents or *motifs* of each version concerned; such a huge task will have to wait until there is compiled a comprehensive and possibly comparative *motif index* of the various versions of the Rāma story, perhaps through the collaboration of several interested workers in this field.   For the purpose of facilitating quick comparison, the lists of such episodes or *motifs* as are presented in this paper and which would seem to vary from one version to another are arranged under the subheading, DIVERGENCES; whereas the lists of *motifs* which agree between one version and the other are placed under the subheading, PARALLELS.   The DIVERGENCES between the *Rāmā-yaṇa* of Vālmīki and the *Rāmāvatāram* of Kamban are summed up first. This is followed by the list of DIVERGENCES between the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki and the Thai *Rāmakian* on the one hand, and between the Tamil version of Kamban and the Thai *Rāmakian* on the other.   The final list of DIVERGENCES is of those between the *Hikāyat Sěrī Rāma* and the other versions concerned.   This is followed by the lists of PARALLELS between the Tamil version and the Thai version and/or the Malay version on the one hand, and between the Thai version and the Malay version on the other.   The four versions concerned are to

be noted henceforth by the following abbreviations: V.R. for the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki; K.R. for the *Rāmāvatāram* of the Tamil poet Kamban; T.R. for the Thai *Rāmakian*; and H.S.R. for the Malay *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma*.   The names of characters and of places in the form in which they are known to occur in each version concerned appear in their approximate romanized forms and in capitals followed by their Sanskrit equivalents given within brackets so that they may be easily recognised for purposes of identification and comparison.

The following are the main textual sources that were used for this study:

(a) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki* 3 vols, trans. Hari Prasad Sastri, London 1952-1959—hereafter cited as *HPS*.

(b) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki* 5 vols, trans. R.T.H. Griffith, London 1870-1874; Benares 1915.

(c) *Kambarāmāyaṇam* 6 vols, ed. V.M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar, Madras 1935-1955.

(d) *Kaviccakkaravartti Kambar iyaṟṟiya Rāmāyaṇam* ed. R.P. Sethuppillai *et al* (Annamalainagar 1957-1964):
    Pāla kāṇtam, 2 parts (1957-1958);
    Ayōttiyā kāṇtam, 2 parts (1959-1960);
    Cuntara kāṇtam, 2 parts (1955); 2nd edition (1963);
    Āraṇiya kāṇtam, 2 parts (1963-1964).
    (In progress)

(e) *Rāmakian* 4 vols, by King Rāma I of Thailand, Bangkok B.E. 2494, A.D. 1951.

(f) *The Rāmakīrti (Rāmakian) or the Thai version of the Rāmayaṇa* (summary translation) trans. and ed. Swami Satyananda Puri and Charoen Sarahiran, Bangkok 1949.

(g) Shellabear, W.G. 'Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma,' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch* vol 70, 1915 pp 181-207; vol 71, 1915 pp 1-285—hereafter cited as *Sh.*

(h) Zieseniss, A. *The Rāma Saga in Malaysia* trans. P.W. Burch, Singapore 1963—hereafter cited as *Zies.*

Details of other books, papers and articles that have been valuable to this study can be found in the selected bibliographical notes provided as footnotes to this paper.

Finally, a few words remain to be said on the bibliographical and textual citations given.   The references to the numbers of the relevant Cantos, Books, Chapters, Verses, or Pages of the respective textual sources from which evidence is cited are given just below each corresponding major descriptive heading under which the lists of comparative data are arranged.

The evidence from V.R. (the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki) to be found in the English translation of that work by Hari Prasad Sastri is referred to by Volume, Book (Canto), Chapter and Page, in that sequence.

As for the evidence from K.R. (the *Rāmāvatāram* of Kamban) the references are to Volume (Canto), Chapter (*paṭalam*) and, wherever necessary, of the Verses to be found in *Kambarāmāyaṇam,* ed. V.M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar.

The evidence from T.R. (the *Rāmakian* of King Rāma I of Thailand) to be found in the English summary translation of that work by Swami Satyananda Puri and Charoen Sarahiran is referred to by Chapters and Pages, in that order.   Where necessary, references to the Thai text of the *Rāmakian* are also made by Volume, Book (section) and Pages of the edition concerned.

With regard to the evidence from H.S.R. (the *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma*) the relevant page numbers of Shellabear's and Zieseniss' works are cited following the abbreviations *Sh* and *Zies,* respectively.

1. BIRTH OF RĀMA AND HIS BROTHERS

V.R.: *HPS.* 1. I. 9-18 : 24-45; K.R.I. 5 : T.R. II. 14-15;
H.S.R. : *Sh* 51-62, *Zies* 13-18.

DIVERGENCES

I : *V.R.//K.R.* (a) King DAŚARATHA tells his Prime Minister, SUMANTRA, of his desire to obtain an heir to the throne.//

King TACARATAN (Daśaratha) tells his preceptor, VACIṬṬAN (Vasiṣṭha) of his misfortune of not having an heir to the throne. (b) SUMANTRA suggests to King DAŚARATHA to approach RIṢYASRINGA to officiate at a sacrifice for obtaining a son.// VACIṬṬAN suggests to King TACARATAN (Daśaratha) to invite KALAIKKŌṬṬU MUNI[28] (the sage Riṣyasringa) to officiate at the sacrificial ceremony. (c) Though there is reference to RĀMA being the incarnation of Viṣṇu, there is no mention of the regalia of Viṣṇu also being born as the other sons of King DAŚARATHA.// TIRU-MĀL (Viṣṇu) is said to promise that he, together with his regalia of the conch, discus and the serpent shall be born as the sons of King TACARATAN (Daśaratha).[29] (d) The sacrificial meal consists of a fluid known as *payasa.*// The sacrificial meal is said to consist of cooked rice-balls.

II: *V.R.//T.R.* (a) Same as I (a).// King THOSOROT (Daśaratha) seeks the assistance of four sages, namely, SITTHA (Vasiṣṭha), SVĀMITRA (Viśvāmitra), VACHAK (?) and PHĀRA-THVACH MUNI (Bharadvāja muni) for the holding of a sacrifice. (b) Same as I (b).// The sages advise that the assistance of the sage KALAIKŌT (Riṣyasringa) be sought for the purpose of officiating at the sacrifice. (c) Same as I (c).// Phra NĀRĀY (Lord Nārāyaṇa, or Viṣṇu) promises that he shall incarnate as Phra RĀM (Lord Rāma) provided that his regalia also shall be born as the other sons of King Thosorot : his serpent and conch as LAK (Lakṣmaṇa), his discus as PHAROT (Bharata) and his mace as SATRUT (Satrughna). (d) Same as I (c).// The sacrificial meal consists of cooked rice. (e) In T.R. a titan, KĀKNĀSŪN, in the form of a crow sweeps down and flies off with a portion of the sacrificial meal, while there is no mention of this episode in V.R.

III: *V.R.//H.S.R.* (a) Same as I (a).// King DAŚARATA MAHĀRĀJA requests the help of PUROSTA MAHARĪSĪ (but there is no mention of the story of MAHARĪSĪ, or the story of MAHĀ

---

28) Kamban, *Rāmāvatāram* vol 1 chap 5 pp 32-33.
29) *Ibid.*, pp 22-23.

BISNŪ's, i.e. Viṣṇu's incarnation).   (b) Same as I (d).//   The sacrificial meal consists of six consecrated balls of cooked rice.   (c) In H.S.R. GĀGAK SWĀRA, a relative of MAHARĀJA RAWĀNA (Rāvaṇa) who attends the sacrifice in the form of a crow robs one of the rice balls and flies away to give it to MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA who eats it; there is no mention of this episode in V.R. (d) Only four sons are born to King DAŚARATHA.//   In H.S.R. five children are born to MAHĀRĀJA DASARATA: SERI RAMA and LAKSAMĀNA (Lakṣmaṇa) by MANDŪDĀRĪ (Maṇdodari), BARADĀN (Bharata), CITRĀDĀN (Satrughna ?) and KĪKEWĪDEWĪ (Kukuā ?) a daughter, by BALYĀDĀRĪ.

IV: K.R.//T.R. and H.S.R.   (a) In K.R. there is no mention of the episode in which part of the sacrificial meal is robbed by a titan in the guise of a crow.

PARALLELS

V: K.R. = T.R.   (a) King TACARATAN (THOSOROT in T.R.) tells VACITTAN (SITTHA in T.R.) first.   (b) VACITTAN suggests KALAIKKŌTTU MUNI (KALAIKŌT in T.R.) to officiate at the sacrifice.   (c) TIRUMĀL (Phra NĀRĀY in T.R.) incarnates as IRĀMAN (Phra RĀM in T.R.), TIRUMĀL's regalia, namely, the serpent, conch, and discus as his brothers : ILAKKUMAṆAN (Phra LAK in T.R.), PARATAN (PHAROT in T.R.) and CATTURUKKA-NAN (SATRUT in T.R.) . (d) The sacrificial meal consists of cooked rice.

VI: K.R. = H.S.R. (a) The sacrificial meal consists of rice-balls.   (b) The name-form of PARATAN in K.R. is BARADĀN in H.S.R. and there would appear to be slight resemblance in the name-form of CATTURUKKANAN in K.R. and that of CITRĀDĀN in H.S.R. (?)

VII :   T.R. = H.S.R. (a) The sacrificial meal consists of cooked rice-balls. (b) A crow (KĀKNĀSŪN in T.R. and GĀGAK SWĀRA in H.S.R.) sweeps down and flies off with a portion of the meal.

SUMMARY

(a)   In regard to *motifs*, the divergences of K.R. from V.R. at *four* points are also T.R.'s variations from V.R. Indeed, corresponding

to these variations, the *motifs* of K.R. and T.R. are found to be parallel.

    (b)   With regard to name-forms, there is striking similarity in the name of KALAIKŌṬṬU MUNI in K.R. and KALAIKŌṬ in T.R.: The name-form, KALAIKKŌṬṬU MUNI in Tamil is in fact a form of loan-translation of the Sanskrit term ṚIṢYASṚIṄGA, meaning a 'sage with the horns of deer'.

    PARATAN in K.R. is similar to BARADĀN in H.S.R. Though the name-form of CITRĀDĀN seems to have no direct equivalent in K.R., it does seem to be a Tamil name-form from its termination, for 'an' is the Tamil masculine, singular termination or suffix, added to words and names of foreign origin to derive name-forms. Thus Bharata in Sanskrit is Paratan in Tamil; and Rāma is Irāman (in this case a prothetic vowel 'i' also being added to the initial 'r' which does not begin a word).

2. BIRTH OF SĪTĀ AND HER MARRIAGE WITH RĀMA

V.R.: *HPS.* 1. I. 66-67: 126-145; K.R.I. 12-22; T.R.X. 32-33, XII. 35; H.S.R.: *Sh* 51-52; *Zies* 15-18.

DIVERGENCES

    I: V.R.//K.R. (a) There is no mention of RĀMA AND SĪTĀ seeing each other before the archery contest.// IRĀMAN's eyes meet with those of CĪTAI (Sītā) and they fall in love at first sight.[30]

    II: V.R.//T.R. (a) The plough reveals SĪTĀ who emerges from the furrow of the earth.// SĪDĀ is born first as the daughter of THOTSAKAN (Dasakaṇtha 'the ten-necked one' i.e. Rāvaṇa); she is later found by CHONOK CAKRAVARTI (King Janaka of Mithila) who, however, buries her within lotus petals and recovers her after sixteen years with the help of a plough. (b) Same as I (a).// Phra RĀM's eyes meet with SĪDĀ's while the former passes by under the window of the royal mansion in MITHILA.

---

30) *Ibid.*, vol 1 chap 10 p 35; a similar motif is to be found in Raghunandana's *Rāmarasāyaṇa*, a Bengali version of the Rāma story, belonging to the eighteenth century A.D.

III. V.R.//H.S.R. (a) Same as II (a).//   SITĀDEWĪ is born as the daughter of MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA.

IV. K.R.//T.R. and H.S.R. (a) Cītai (Sītā) is revealed by the plough of King CANAKAN (Janaka).//   SĪDĀ in T.R. (SITĀDEWĪ in H.S.R.) is first born as the daughter of THOTSAKAN in T.R. (MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA in H.S.R.).

PARALLELS

V : K.R.=T.R. (a) IRĀMAN's (Phra RĀM's in T.R.) eyes meet with the eyes of CĪTAI (SĪDĀ in T.R.) and they fall in love at first sight. (b) The bow of King CANAKAN (CHONOK CAKRAVARTI in T.R.) is said to have been used once by CIVAN (Śiva; ISWAN in T.R.) to destroy TIRIPURAM (Tripura; TRIPURAM in T.R.).

SUMMARY

(a) In regard to the *motifs* encountered in this section, one striking *motif*, namely, that of Rāma and Sītā seeing each other for the first time is to be found in K.R. and T.R. but not in V.R. This *motif* is further discussed later in this paper in the context of diffusion and acculturation; see also Comparative Data, section 8. I (c).

(b) With regard to the name-form, in K.R. TIRIPURAM (Skt. Tripura 'three cities') corresponds with TRIPURAM in T.R., the latter form appearing, however, without the anaptyxis or *svarabhakti* 'i' between t and r as in the case of the Tamil name-form; the termination 'am' is used to derive nouns of neuter singular form in Tamil.

3. THE BANISHMENT OF RĀMA

V.R.: *HPS.* 1. II. 7-64: 164-303; K.R. II. 1-5; T.R. XIV. 37-38;
H.S.R. : *Zies* 26-27.

DIVERGENCES

I : V.R.//K.R. (a) There is no reference to RĀMA's childhood prank in maltreating MANTHARA, the hunch-backed maid of KAI-KEYI.//   MANTARAI (Manthara) or KŪNI ('the hunch-backed one')

is said to recall IRĀMAN's (Rāma's) maltreatment of her when he was young and practising archery.[31] (b) RĀMA is said to be appointed merely as an heir-apparent to the throne.//   King Tacaratan (Daśaratha) decides to install IRĀMAN (Rāma) as King.[32]

II : V.R.//T.R. (a) Same as I (a).//   Phra RĀM's youthful prank is held as the reason for KUCCI's (Manthara or Kubija, 'the hunch-back' maid) antagonism to Phra RĀM being made King. (b) Same as I (b).//   Phra RĀM is to be installed as King, not merely as an heir-apparent to the throne.

PARALLELS

III: K.R. = T.R. (a) The maltreatment of MANTARAI or KŪNI (KUCCI in T.R.) by IRĀMAN is remembered by the hunch-backed maid when she hurries to instigate KAIKĒYI or KAIKĒCI (KAIYA-KECI in T.R.) to ask for her own son's succession to the throne and for the banishment of IRĀMAN to the forest for fourteen years. (b) King TACARATAN (King Thosorot in T.R.) decides to install IRĀMAN as King.

IV : K.R. = H.S.R. (a) KAIKĒYI (BALYĀDĀRĪ in H.S.R.) herself informs IRĀMAN (Sĕrī Rāma in H.S.R.) of King TACARA-TAN's decision to banish IRĀMAN.

V : T.R. = H.S.R. (a) The maltreatment of the hunch-backed maid by SĔRĪ RĀMA (Phra RĀM in T.R.) and LAKSAMĀNA (Phra LAK in T.R.).

SUMMARY

(a) In regard to *motif*, the maltreatment of the hunch-backed maid by Rāma, whose favourite pastime was archery when he was young, would seem to have been a popular *motif* in K.R., T.R. and H.S.R., but is not to be found in V.R.

(b) Name-form : *Kucci* in T.R. appears to be of uncertain origin. However, mention may be made of the Tamil word, cūḷcci,

---

31) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 2 p 41.
32) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 1 pp 73 & 89.

'conspiracy, secret plan or design', which also stood as a metaphor for Mantarai or Kūni in K.R. in connection with her evil designs which result in the banishment of Rāma. The following Tamil words or derivations, the meanings of which would seem to have some reference either to the crooked body or the crooked character of the maid, may also be considered : *kucci*, 'stick, peg, *hairpin* of crescent shape, sickle-leaf'; *kuccikai* < ? Skt. *kubjika*, 'a kind of curved lute'; *kuccitam* <kutsita, 'contemptibleness'; Cf also Skt. *kubja, kubjita*, 'hump-backed, crooked'.

4. INSTALLATION OF RĀMA'S SANDALS

V.R. : *HPS*. 1. II. 50-113 : 266-399; K.R. II. 6-12; T.R. XV. 39-40; H.S.R. : *Sh* 74-79, *Zies* 27-31/57.

DIVERGENCES

I : V.R.//K.R. (a) GUHA, the boatman, does not accompany Rāma across the river Ganges.// KUKAN (Guha) accompanies IRĀMAN on the barge paddled by himself.[33] (b) There is no mention of KAIKEYI being present with the other queens who accompany RĀMA after King DAŚARATHA's death.// All the three widowed queens accompany PARATAN (Bharata) who also introduces them to KUKAN (Guha).[34] (c) BHARATA initiates the funeral ceremonies for his dead father on the request of VASIṢṬHA.// VACIṬṬAN (Vasiṣṭha) forbids PARATAN (Bharata) to carry out the obsequies for his dead father, citing the instruction of the dead ruler himself.[35] (d) BHARATA requests merely imprints of RĀMA's feet on the sandals brought by him to serve as symbols of RĀMA's sovereignty during the period of his exile.// IRĀMAN himself hands over his own sandals to PARATAN (Bharata) as symbols of his sovereignty.[36]

II : V.R.// T.R. (a) Same as I (a).// KHUKHAN (Guha) himself rows the boat carrying Phra RĀM across the river KHON-

---

33) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 6 pp 59-60.
34) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 11 p 63.
35) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 9 pp 128-29.
36) *Ibid.*, vol 2 chap 12 p 136.

KHA (Ganga 'the Ganges').　(b) Same as I (b).//　When PHOROT (Bharata) goes after Phra RĀM he is accompanied by all the three widowed consorts of King THOSOROT (Daśaratha).　(c) Same as I (c).//　PHOROT (Bharata) is barred from performing obsequies for King THOSOROT (Daśaratha).　(d) Same as I (d).//　PHOROT (Bharata) asks for and obtains Phra RĀM's own sandals for installation as symbols of his sovereignty.

III: V.R.//　H.S.R. (a) The name-form of the boatman is GUHA.//　The name-form in H.S.R. is KIKUKAN. (b) BARADĀN (Bharata) receives SĔRĪ RĀMA's sandals (PADUKA) and wears them on his head as a diadem.

PARALLELS

IV: K.R. = T.R. (a) IRĀMAN and KUKAN (Phra RĀM and KHUKHAN in T.R.) cross the river Ganges on the same barge (b) All the three widowed consorts of King Tacaratan (Thosorot in T.R.) accompany PARATAN (PHOROT in T.R.) when he goes in search of his brother. (c) PARATAN (PHOROT in T.R.) is prevented from performing the obsequies due to his dead father on the instruction conveyed by VACIṬṬAN (SITTHA in T.R.). (d) IRĀMAN (Phra RĀM in T.R.) bestows his sandals on the request of PARATAN to serve as symbols of his sovereignty.

V: K.R. and T.R. = H.S.R. (a) The name-form of the boatman is KUKAN in K.R., KHUKHAN in T.R., and KIKUKAN in H.S.R. (for GUHA in Skt.). (b) PARADAN (PHOROT in T.R. and BARA-DĀN in H.S.R.) wears IRĀMAN's sandals on his head as a crown.

SUMMARY

(a) In regard to the *motifs*, the four variations of K.R. from V.R. are also the four parallels between K.R. and T.R.

(b) Name-form: Kukan in K.R., Khukhan in T.R. and Kikukan in H.S.R. are significantly similar, though derived from Skt. Guha.

5. RĀMA'S JOURNEY IN THE FOREST

V.R.: *HPS.* 2. III. 1-13 : 3-31; K.R. III. 1-3; T.R. XVI. 41-42;
H.S.R. : *Sh* 74-79; *Zies* 28-29.

Generally, there does not seem to be any outstanding deviation in regard to the incidents in this section.

In regard to certain name-forms, however, two of them occurring in the H.S.R., namely, WEDAM (Veda) and INDRA PAWANAM (Indra pavana?) would appear to be Tamil name-forms, as seen from their termination of 'am', which is the suffix added in Tamil in connection with the derivation of abstract nouns.   When abstract nouns are adopted, the neuter nominative form of a word generally ending in 'am' is preferred.   It may also be noted that the Sanskrit masculines, with the exception of those which denote rational beings, are made to terminate in 'am', being treated as neuter.   All beings, whether animate or inanimate, if they are devoid of reasoning power are placed in the class of 'neuter' in the Tamil language.

6. RĀMA'S ENCOUNTER WITH ŚŪRPAṆAKHĀ

V.R.: *HPS.* 2. III. 17-41 : 38-86; K.R. III. 5-7; T.R. XVII. 43-45;
H.S.R. : *Sh* 80-82, *Zies* 41-42.

DIVERGENCES

I : V.R.//K.R. (a) ŚŪRPAṆAKHĀ remains in her own form of a female titan when she tries to entice RĀMA.// CŪRPPANAKAI assumes the form of a beautiful maiden before approaching IRĀMAN.[37]

II : V.R.//T.R.   (a) Same as I (a).

III : V.R.//H.S.R.   (a) Same as I (a).

PARALLELS

IV : K.R. = T.R. and H.S.R.   (a) CŪRPPANAKAI (SAMANAKHA in T.R. and SŪRA PANDĀKĪ in H.S.R.) in the guise of

---

37) *Ibid.,* vol 3 chap 5 p 30.

a beautiful maiden approaches IRĀMAN (Phra RĀM in T.R. and
SERĪ RĀMA in H.S.R.).

SUMMARY

In regard to *motif*, the one variation from V.R. is common to
K.R., T.R. and H.S.R.

7. ABDUCTION OF SĪTĀ

V.R.: *HPS.* 2. III. 42-54 : 86-115; K.R. III. 7-8; T.R. XVIII. 46-47;
H.S.R.: *Sh* 82-85, *Zies* 44-45.

DIVERGENCES

I : V.R.//K.R. (a) When SĪTĀ asks RĀVAŅA to tell her
who he is, he at once introduces himself as RĀVAŅA, King of
LAŃKĀ.// IRĀVAŅAN (Rāvana) does not reveal his true identity
immediately. (b) SĪTĀ is abducted forcibly by RĀVAŅA.//
IRĀVAŅAN does not use force; he instead uproots the entire ground
on which CĪTAI's hermitage is situated and flies off in his chariot
together with the uprooted ground and the hermitage with CĪTAI.[38]
(c) SĪTĀ, after her abduction by RĀVAŅA, is first housed in
RĀVAŅA's palace.// CĪTAI (Sītā) is taken away by IRĀVAŅAN
directly to the acōka grove in ILAŃKAI (Laṅkā) and is imprisoned
there.

II : V.R.//T.R. (a) Same as I (a).// THOTSAKAN (Rāvana)
does not reveal his identity immediately. (b) There is no mention
of RĀVAŅA flinging SĪTĀ's ring in an attempt to kill JAŢĀYU.//
SAŢĀYU (Jaţāyu) receives SĪDĀ's ring at the end of the battle
between the giant king, THOTSAKAN, and the king of birds when
the former flings it in order to kill SAŢĀYU. (c) Same as I (c).//
SĪDĀ (Sītā) is imprisoned in the pleasure garden of Thotsakan
immediately after her abduction by the giant king.

---

38) *Ibid.*, vol 3 chap 8 pp 74-75.

III. K.R.//T.R. (a) IRĀVAṆAN (THOTSAKAN in T.R.) does not use force in the abduction of CĪTAI.//   SĪDĀ is forcibly taken away by THOTSAKAN.

IV. H.S.R.// V.R., K.R. and T.R. (a) Two gazelles (not one as in the other versions) attract the attention of SITĀDEWĪ. (b) LAKSAMĀNA (Lakṣmaṇa) draws a circle around SITĀDEWĪ's cottage before proceeding in search of his brother SERĪ RĀMA.// This is not mentioned in the other versions. (c) SITĀDEWĪ drops her ring into the beak of CATĀYU (Jaṭāyu) to be used later as an indication of her abduction by MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA.// Though this *motif* is not to be found in V.R. and K.R., there is reference to such a *motif* in T.R. with slight variation :   See II (b) above.

PARALLELS

V. K.R. = T.R.   (a) IRĀVAṆAN (THOTSAKAN in T.R). does not reveal his identity to CĪTAI (SĪDĀ in T.R.) immediately; instead he remains disguised as a hermit for some time.   (b) CĪTAI is imprisoned in the garden in ILAṄKAI (LAṄKĀ in T.R.) soon after her abduction by the giant king.

SUMMARY

(a) In regard to *motifs* there would appear to be more divergences than parallels between one version and the other; however, there are two notable points of similarity between K.R. and T.R. and one point of similarity with but slight modification between T.R. and H.S.R.

(b) In regard to name-form, SATĀYU in T.R. and CATĀYU in H.S.R. would seem to be similar to CATĀYU in K.R., corresponding to JAṬĀYU in V.R. With regard to the similarity in form, it may be noted that in Tamil the unaspirated and voiced consonant 'j' in borrowings is changed into unvoiced palatal 'c', sometimes even answering to the dental sibilant 's'.   In regard to Malay

CATĀYU, there is also another form, namely, JĔNTAYU, in which 'a' becomes 'ĕ' and there is also 'spontaneous nasalization' by the insertion of 'n' between 'ĕ' and 't'.

8. RĀMA'S MEETING WITH HANUMAN AND SUGRĪVA, AND HANUMAN'S JOURNEY TO LAṄKĀ

V.R.: *HPS.* 2. IV. 2-37 : 171-267; K.R. IV. 2-12; T.R. XIX. 48-50; H.S.R.: *Sh* 88-102, *Zies* 51-56.

V.R.: *HPS.* 2. V. 1-65 : 327-498; K.R. IV. 12-17, V. 1-5; T.R. XXIII. 58-61; H.S.R.: *Sh* 106-117, *Zies* 58-64.

DIVERGENCES

I: V.R.//K.R., T.R. and H.S.R. (a) SUGRĪVA himself relates to RĀMA the story of his enmity with his elder brother VĀLI.// In the other versions concerned, it is ANUMAN (HANU-MĀN in T.R. and MAHĀRĀJA HANŪMAN in H.S.R.) the commander of CUKKIRĪVAN (SUKHRĪP in T.R. and MAHĀRĀJA SUGRĪWA in H.S.R.) who relates the story of his enmity with his brother VĀLI (PHĀLĪ in T.R. and BALYĀ or BALIRĀJA in H.S.R.). (b) In K.R. and T.R., when IRĀMAN (Phra RĀM in T.R.) unjustly kills VĀLI (PHĀLĪ in T.R.) during the latter's battle with his brother, CUKKIRĪVAN (SUKHRĪP in T.R.), VĀLI, before he dies, rebukes IRĀMAN for his unethical conduct.[39] (c) In K.R. and T.R. (but not in H.S.R.), just before ANUMAN (HANUMĀN in T.R.) leaves for ILAṄKAI (LAṄKĀ in T.R.), IRĀMAN (Phra RĀM in T.R.) reveals to him a secret known only to himself and CĪTAI (SĪDA in T.R.) namely, that his eyes and her eyes met while he was on his way to the palace of the King of Mithila and they fell in love;[40] IRĀMAN reveals this secret to ANUMAN so that the latter can make use of it as evidence of his trustworthiness as IRĀMAN's emissary to CĪTAI. (d) In K.R. and T.R. CĪTAI is said to hang

39) *Ibid.*, vol 4 chap 7 pp 76-91.
40) *Ibid.*, vol 4 chap 13 p 67.

herself in despair, but she is rescued from the tightening grip of the noose around her neck in the nick of time by ANUMAN.[41]   Neither of these details (c and d) are to be found in V.R. .

II. H.S.R//V.R., K.R. and T.R. (a) In H.S.R. MAHĀRĀJA HANŪMAN is first BALYĀ or BALĪRĀJA's retainer, not MAHĀRĀJA SUGRĪWA's as in the other versions.   (b) MAHĀRĀJA HANŪMAN drops the ring into one of the pitchers carried by the women in LAṄKĀ taking water for SITĀDEWĪ to bathe, so that SITĀDEWĪ may recognise his presence in the city as SERĪ RĀMA's emissary.//   This *motif* is not found in the other versions.

PARALLELS

III. K.R. = T.R. (a) — (d) Same as I(a) — I(d).

SUMMARY

(a) In regard to *motifs*, The K.R. and T.R. have similar *motifs* at four points, which also happen to be their variations from V.R.

(b) The corresponding name-forms are : SUGRĪVA, VĀLIN, HANUMAN in V.R.; CUKKIRĪVAN, VĀLI and ANUMAN in K.R.; SUKHRĪP, PHĀLĪ and HANUMĀN in T.R.; and MAHĀRĀJA SUGRĪWA, BALYĀ or BALĪRAJA and MAHĀRĀJA HANŪMAN in H.S.R.

9. THE BATTLE OF LAṄKĀ

V.R. : *HPS.* 3. VI.9-91 : 21-266; K.R.VI.2-27; T.R.XXVIII.77-82, XXIX, 83-86, XXX.87-90; H.S.R. : *Sh* 155-218, *Zies* 72-86.

V.R. : *HPS.* 3. VI. 97-111 : 281-318; K.R. VI. 30-36; T.R. XXXI. 91-95, XXXII. 96-97; XXXIII. 98-101, XXXIV-XXXVI. 102-114; H.S.R. : *Sh* 218-243, *Zies* 87-93.

DIVERGENCES

I : V.R.//K.R. and T.R. (a) In V.R., RĀMA and LAKṢMAṆA are struck down by the serpentine darts of INDRAJITA even before

---

41) *Ibid.*, vol 5 chap 4 p 23, vol 5 chap 14 p 75.

the combat and fall of KUMBHAKARNA, and SĪTĀ is brought to the battlefield during the first phase of the battle itself to witness her fallen relatives.// In K.R. and T.R., however, KUMBAKARNAN (KUMPHAKAN in T.R.) enters the combat before INTIRACITTU (Indrajita); only after KUMBAKARNAN is killed does the command of the army fall on INTIRACITTU, and it is during the second phase of the battle that CĪTAI (SĪTĀ) is brought to the battlefield to witness IRĀMAN and ILAKKUMANAN (Lakṣmaṇa) lying on the ground as if they were dead as a result of the hard-hitting INTIRACITTU's (Indrajita's) *brahmāstra* (a magic weapon).

II: H.S.R.//V.R.,K.R. and T.R. (a) In H.S.R. MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA does not die in the battle of Laṅkā, unlike the other versions concerned.

SUMMARY

(a) *Motif* : The sequence of events during the battle of Laṅkā, as outlined above under I(a), are common to K.R. and T.R. and differs significantly from V.R.

The variation in H.S.R. concerning MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA (Rāvana) who does not die in the battle, though defeated by his adversaries, is also interesting, for it would seem to be linked with the popular belief that while heroes may cease to exist physically, their ideals live on forever. Probably to stress this point, he is made to live on physically.

(b) *Name-forms* : The name-forms of major interest in this section are (i) AKAMPANA in V.R., AKAMPAN in K.R. and KAMPAN in T.R.; (ii) MŪLABALAM in K.R. and in T.R.; and the following four in H.S.R., namely, (iii) BĪBUSANAM, (iv) NANDA PARWATAM, (v) PATĀLA MAHARĀYAN and (vi) TRISULAM.

In regard to (i) KAMPAN in T.R. might be due to the elision of both the initial 'a' and the final inherent vowel 'a' in AKAMPANA of V.R. or it might have been from Tamil AKAMPAN in K.R.; for it is interesting to find the latter form as AKAMPAN instead of AKAMPANAN as it should be if the form is a derivation from Skt. AKAMPANA, when the Tamil termination 'an' would have been added.

With reference to (ii), MŪLABALAM would seem to be a Tamil name-form derived from Skt. *mūlabala* 'foremost or basic power or force' by the addition of suffix 'am'.   However, it should be noted that the term as used in T.R. refers to a titan, whereas in K.R. it refers either to the 'reserve' troops (of RĀVAṆA) or to the members of his armed forces whose ancestors had fought on the side of his ancestors for many generations in the past.   In the Tamil context, the term *mūlabalam* is also said to refer to six kinds of troops, namely, troops stationed in developed areas like towns and cities, troops of 'guerrilla' type, auxiliary troops, enemy troops, mercenary troops, and troops for basic self-defence.

With regard to (iii), BĪBUSANAM in H.S.R. may also be regarded as a Tamil name-form, though derived from Skt. *bibūṣaṇa;* it would seem however that the second part of the name-form, namely, *būṣaṇa* has been probably misconstrued to be the same as 'bīṣana' in BIBĪṢAṆA or VIBĪṢAṆA, which is the name of RĀVAṆA's brother in the story.

With regard to (iv) and (v), namely, NANDA PARWATAM and TRISULAM, these may also be interpreted to be Tamil name-forms, derived from Skt. *nanda parvata* and *trisūla*, respectively, by the addition of the suffix 'am'.

Finally, (vi) PATĀLA MAHARĀYAN in H.S.R. is another Tamil name-form, curiously enough existing side-by-side with other titles like MAHĀRĀJA; for the form MAHARĀYAN itself is a variant of the form, *mahārāja* or *mahārājan,* the voiced palatal 'j' sound being changed to either the semi-vowel 'y' (as in this case), or palatal unvoiced 'c'.

10. SĪTĀ'S ORDEAL BY FIRE AND
HER RETURN TO AYODHYĀ

V.R.: *HPS.* 3. VI. 116-130 : 332-372; K.R. VI. 37-39; T.R. XXXVII.115-117, XXXVIII.118-121; H.S.R.: *Sh* 243-257, Zies 94-96.

DIVERGENCES

I: V.R.//T.R. (a) LAKṢMAṆA is said to prepare the pyre for SĪTĀ's ordeal by fire.// SUKHRĪP (Sugrīva) makes the pyre.

(b) There is no mention of the kingdom being divided.//   Phra RĀM
(Rāma) divides his vast kingdom among his allies and helpers and also
builds new cities to serve as capitals of the new kingdoms.

II: K.R.//T.R. (a) ILAKKUMAṆAN (Lakṣmaṇa) makes the
pyre for CĪTAI.// SUKHRĪP (Sugrīva) makes the pyre. (b) IRĀMAN
only distributes gifts of precious jewellery etc., to his allies and
helpers.//   Phra RĀM divides his kingdom among his allies and
constructs new cities for this purpose.

III: H.S.R.//V.R., K.R. and T.R. (a) SĔRĪ RĀMA stays on in
LAṄKĀ for a longer period of time before founding a new city known
as DURYAPURI NĔGARA and taking up his residence there.   (b)
HANŪMAN erects the fire for SITĀDEWĪ's ordeal.

SUMMARY

(a) Though there is no significant parallel between one version
and another in this section, the divergences seem interesting,
particularly the *motif* concerning the division of the vast kingdom
and founding of new cities, for this would seem to be an innovation
relating to local conditions in the countries concerned. Kingdoms won
through the help of allies were to be divided among allies at least for
the purpose of administering vast areas.   The designations conferred
on the rulers of various principalities of the vast kingdom, as found in
the Thai version for example, would seem to be related closely to the
nomenclature of provincial overlordships in the actual governmental
system.

As for the founding of new cities, this *motif* again would seem
to be common in the context of Southeast Asian popular tales, and is
also to be found in T.R. and H.S.R. Though it would seem to have
been a general practice and policy for rulers during the ancient and
medieval periods to clear new areas and to found their new capitals
in the newly developed regions, this would seem to be particularly so
with Southeast Asian kingdoms.   It may be of interest to note in this
connection that in the case of Thailand, before Bangkok or KRUNG
THĔP, as the present capital is officially known, there have been other
capitals, namely, Thonburi, Ayuthaya (named after AYODHYĀ of
the Rāma story), Sukhothai, and even Chiengmai (itself meaning
'new city').

Now, to sum up the divergences and parallels under the ten major headings in the preceding pages :   For the *twenty points of variation* of the Tamil version and the Thai version from the Sanskrit version of Vālmīki, there are no less than *nineteen corresponding parallel motifs* to be found in the Tamil and Thai versions. (1. V.a,b,c,d; 2. V.a; 3. III.a,b; 4. IV.a,b,c,d; 6. IV.a; 7. V.a,b; 8, III.a,b, c,d; and 9. I.a.)

The main points of variation of the Tamil version from the Thai version are noticeable in regard to six *motifs* (1. IV.a; 2. IV.a; 7. II.b; 7. III.a; 10. II.a,b), five of which (exception being 7. III.a) are not to be found in the Sanskrit version either.

Therefore, the possible source of the five *motifs* (concerning conception and birth of Sītā, Rāvaṇa's attempt to kill Jaṭāyu by flinging Sītā's ring or Sītā throwing her ring into the beak of Jaṭāyu, Sītā's ordeal by fire, particularly the question of who erects the fire, and, finally, the division of the kingdom by Phra RĀM after victory over THOTSAKAN or Rāvaṇa) is to be sought possibly in other versions of the story, but not in the Sanskrit version of Vālmīki.   The question is whether the Malay version could provide any clues in this respect.

Indeed it would seem that the Malay version, *Hikāyat Sěrī Rāma,* has some interesting evidence which may throw some light on this problem.   Although the corresponding *motifs* to be found in H.S.R. are not exact parallels of the above-mentioned five *motifs* of the Thai version, there would nevertheless seem to be clear connections between the two versions, especially in regard to the five *motifs* concerned.   To show how closely the *motifs* appear to be similar, these may be mentioned in brief outline form : (a) In T.R. a titan in the form of a crow (the name-form is KĀKANĀSŪN) sweeps down and flies off with a portion of the sacrificial meal which is then eaten by MANDO, wife of THOTSAKAN, and she gives birth to a girl (later to be known as SĪDĀ), who is quickly cast away, because of evil premonitions, later to be rescued and adopted by King CHONOK (Janaka) of Mithila.   In H.S.R. GĀGAK SWĀRA, a

relative of MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA, in the form of a crow robs one
of the six rice balls and flies away to give it to MAHĀRĀJA
RAWĀNA who eats it; when MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA's wife MAN-
DŪDĀRI brings forth a beautiful daughter and it is feared that the
child will cause the death of her own father, she is cast away in the
waters to be rescued later by King MAHARĪSĪ KALĪ.   (b) In T.R.
King CHONOK recovers SĪDĀ after sixteen years with the help of a
plough.   In H.S.R. MAHARĪSĪ KALĪ finds the casket containing
the child when he is engaged in morning worship. (c) When SATĀYU
(Jaṭāyu) boasts that he can be killed only with SĪDĀ's ring as a
weapon, THOTSAKAN (Rāvaṇa) removes SĪDĀ's ring and flings it
at SATĀYU. SITĀDEWĪ herself drops her ring into the beak of
CATĀYU to serve as a sign of her forceful abduction by MAHĀ-
RĀJA RAWĀNA.   (d) In T.R. SUKHRĪP (Sugrīva) is said to make
the pyre for SĪDĀ's ordeal.   In H.S.R. it ts HANŪMAN who
erects the fire.   (e) In T.R. Phra RĀM is said to divide his vast
kingdom among his allies, at the same time conferring titles denoting
overlordships of the various principalities of the kingdom. In
H.S.R. though there does not seem to be specific reference to the
division of the newly enlarged kingdom, there are indications to
suggest that in addition to bestowing rich treasures on his allies who
refuse to return to their homes because of the affection they bear for
him, SĒRĪ RĀMA does acknowledge the assistance he has received
from his allies by such gestures as bestowing a throne of equal height
on JĀMA MANTRĪ (the chief counsellor of MAHĀRĀJA RAWĀNA)ʼ
assigning posts to the courtiers in accordance with their lineage,
making LAKSAMĀNA heir to the throne and HANŪMAN his com-
mander-in-chief. Thus, as seen in the near-similarities of the *motifs*,
the Thai version and the Malay version would seem to have had
notable connections with each other.

Finally, in this section of comparative material relating to the
four versions of the Rāma story, the points of similarity in regard to
certain name-forms may be summed up as follows : KALAIKKŌṬṬU
MUNI in the Tamil version and KALAIKŌṬ in the Thai version;

TIRIPURAM in the Tamil version and TRIPURAM in the Thai version; MŪLABALAM in the Tamil version and MŪLABALAM in the Thai version; KUKAN in the Tamil version, KHUKHAN in the Thai version and KIKUKAN in the Malay version; CATĀYU in the Tamil version, SAṬĀYU in the Thai version, and Catāyu in the Malay version; PARADAN in the Tamil version and BARADĀN in in the Malay version would seem to show connections of Tamil name-forms.

Lets us now turn to the problem of adaptation or diffusion[42] and acculturation[43] in the Southeast Asian literary versions of the story. The question before us is how far could we consider that the parallel *motifs* encountered in, say, the Tamil and the Thai versions, might have been the result of adaptation or diffusion from an earlier version and subsequent acculturation in a later version.

In an attempt to throw some light on this rather complicated question, an episode is chosen from the Tamil and the Thai versions and the *motifs* as represented in the selected passages are compared in the following pages.   The episode concerned is one to which a brief reference was made in section 2 of the comparative data above, namely, the one which describes how Rāma and Sītā happened to see each other for the first time and fell in love at first sight.   First let us look at the Tamil passage, translated into English, followed by the translation of the passage containing the corresponding episode in the Thai version :

42) A.L. Kroeber ('Diffusionism,' *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* vol 5, 1931 pp 139-42) defines 'diffusion' as a 'process by which elements or systems of' culture are spread, by which an invention or a new institution adopted in one place is adopted in neighbouring areas . . . in some cases . . . until it may spread over the whole world.'

43) According to the definition published by the Sub-Committee of the Social Science Research Council in : Redfield, R., Linton, R. and Herskovits, M.J., 'A memorandum for the study of acculturation' *American Anthropologist* vol 38, 1935 pp 149-52, an outline of which is reproduced as an appendix to Herskovits, M.J., *Acculturation* Gloucester, Mass. 1958 pp 131-36, *acculturation* comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups.

RĀMĀVATĀRAM : I. Pāla-kāṇṭam, 10. Mitilai-k-kāṭci-p-paṭalam

(The Sights in the City of Mithila)

Verse 1.

Now that the goddess of wealth (Śri), leaving her erstwhile
abode of the spotless lotus-flower, has come down to reside in
the city (of Mithila) in fulfilment of a reward for the city's
past penance, the flags fluttered from sturdy poles as though
the fortified city extended her arms and was bidding welcome
to the red-lotus-eyed lord (Rāma) with the message, 'Come
Thou quickly, Come Thou quickly !'

V. 2.

They saw those pretty flags and streamers adorning the multi-
sculptured mansions, and the flags fluttered as they were
dancing like angels in the heavenly space, rejoicing that the god
of virtue himself, seeing that there was no other being fit
enough except Rāma to wed the maiden of boundless beauty,
had gone as emissary to escort him hither, and here he comes.

V. 3.

They saw the elephants with white tusks, hard as diamond, and
with eyes emitting sparks of fire, fighting with one another
furiously, like huge mountains heaving against each other.

V. 5.

Rāma and others entered the city of Mithila, the golden walls
of the city shining like red lotus-flower because the beautiful
Sītā was dwelling there.

V. 6.

They proceeded along the long stretch of the royal avenue of
mansions where young maidens with crescent-like foreheads
had flung away their golden ornaments because of their dislike
for them when they were in the company of their young men.

V. 7.

The avenue had become muddy and dusty because of the effusion of must of rutting elephants and of the froth of the speeding horses' mouth, and of the ceaseless movements of chariots on its path.

V. 9.

There were theatrical stages along the avenue where young maidens with slender waists were dancing to the tune of the *makara vīṇa.*

V. 11.

There were long stretches of shops with a variety of goods including gems, gold, pearls, yak's tail, agaru wood, peacock feathers, and ivory, along streets meandering like the river *Kāviri.*

V. 13.

The horses were ceaselessly in motion with great speed, like the revolving potter's wheel and the everlasting friendship of great men.   Yet one could not see one horse from the other because of their great speed, just as to the discerning sages variously changing phenomena of the earth appear to be the same.

(The royal visitors stop at the courtyard below the upper-storey of the royal ladies chambers)

V. 14.

The windows of the upper-storeys of the royal mansions shone with young maidens whose eyes were sharp like the spear; their eyebrows resembled the bow of the god of love.   Their hair was dark as the beatles; their lips were red.   They appeared at the window like so many moons.

V. 22.

The visitors saw the moat which surrounded the golden palace of King Janaka.   It was as deep as the Ganges river, and it showed the splendour of the Nāga land (or the heavenly land) by reflecting in its waters the rows of mansions that were fit enough for the gods to stay.

V. 23.

They saw the courtyard where the swans walked majestically, by the side of the upper-storey of the mansions where Sītā of golden splendour, flowery fragrance, honey-like sweetness and song-like happiness was to be seen.

V. 24.

Now that the peerless goddess of wealth (Śri) herself is here as Sītā there is none to choose and to compare with Sītā.

V. 35.

The young maiden of unimaginable charm, standing by the window of the lofty mansion, and the lord standing below, he looked and she also looked; their eyes ate into each other; their hearts were united.

V. 36.

Her spear-like eyes penetrating the sturdy shoulders of Rāma, Rāma's red lotus-like eyes too made a deep impression on the goddess-like Sītā.

V. 37.

They were bound to each other by their looks, their hearts drawing each other together, they entered each other's heart.

V. 38.

Sītā with an invisible waist and faultless Rāma became one soul, though of two bodies. There is no need to say much about their love after their reunion now since their parting at their abode on the dark sea with the great serpent as their bed.

V. 39.

Sītā was standing like a painted picture for she looked at Rāma without winking her eyes even once. Rāma soon moved on with the sage, with his mind full of thoughts of the beautiful Sītā.

V. 40.

As Rāma vanished out of sight, Sītā felt helpless and unable to control her passion for Rāma, like any other maiden who is in love; her mind now sought after Rāma.

V. 42.

Sītā suffered from love-sickness.   Not being able to confide in anybody else, she sobbed within her own heart.

V. 51.

Her maids-in-waiting asked what caused this illness, but they were not able to know.

V. 53.

Sītā began to moan and lament, remembering the image of Rāma, his appearance, his hair, his pillar-like arms, his red lotus-like eyes; his resemblance to the cloud with the bow of Indra (rain-bow).

V. 60.

During this sickness of love, Sītā would utter words that made no sense.   She would prattle to herself, 'here he is; alas, he is gone now.'

V. 61.

The sun, the source of ancient heat, withdrew his long arms of rays towards himself and being unable to bear the heat of Sītā's passion sank beneath the ocean.

V. 62.

As the evening descended it brought no relief to Sītā.   Her love-sickness grew worse; the fire of the passion now raged with great intensity.

RĀMAKIAN : Book 14 (in Vol.I) pp. 381-382.

'Phra Rām (together with Phra Lak and the sage) crossed, over the stream and proceeded winding along the meadow in their journey through the great forest and arrived at the mighty city of Mithila, and directly entered the city's gates.

Thus Phra Rām looked intently at the city of Mithila which was gay like the joyful heavenly land. There were edifices, mansions and shops situated neatly along the avenues. There were gay and noisy crowds of citizens, both men and women.

There were also stables for elephants and horses. There were arenas too in which the mighty elephants tested their strength.

There were rows of flags (hoisted upon) the poles and/or of the tiered royal umbrellas; the flags were waving and shining forth as though they were beckoning the royal visitor (with the words), 'we beseech Your Majesty to be gracious enough to make haste and proceed; Your Majesty will have the gracious maiden, Sīdā (Sītā).'

Bewildered and being in a doubtful frame of mind as to what was in store for him, the royal visitor walked on, at the same time casting his glance to look at the royal palace which was like the mansion of Indra. Its five towers of crystal combined with gold shone with the gabled roofs and golden images on four directions, supported by the figures of *nāga* motif standing upright.

Phra Rām admired the golden crystal gem at the royal window, unforgettably beautiful like the goddess. Phra Rām's eyes met with those of Sīdā; glamorous charms combined to bind their hearts tightly together.

Thus, the youthful Sīdā, on the upper-storey of the mansion, rejoicing and glancing furtively through the aperture of the latticed window while being hidden, triumphantly met her royal eyes with those of the four-armed Phra Rām. Love, till then restrained, gushed forth, as Sīdā was indeed accustomed to be seated at the feet of her lord in her previous existence.

Boundless love and longings sprang forth in the heart of the young and beautiful maiden just now.

Thus, Phra Rām conferred his blessing of boundless love on the auspicious maiden, like fire touching her heart. Phra

Rām could not stop to gaze intently, but looked only for a moment and at the same time not seeming to look, before Phra Lak could call him to attention; he turned and walked, at the same time having a glance at the balcony window with longing and love, and proceeded along with the sage until they arrived at the hall of ceremonies.

Thus, elegant Sīdā fell in love at the very first sight of the Ruler with the Wheel (Cakri), upon whom she had not placed her eyes directly, but only glanced sideways through the corner of her eyes, looking furtively. She now suffered much from great pangs of love; she disliked everything; she moaned and groaned. She did not see Phra Rām returning the same way (again). The youthful maiden was sorrowful and longed for him.

When she was questioned by someone who wanted to know (what was wrong with her) she felt bashful and could not utter any words. Countless memories of the earthly lord came into her mind. Love bound them both together.'

COMPARISON OF MOTIFS

The chief characters of attraction in this episode as described by the authors of both versions are obviously RĀMA and SĪTĀ. The motifs employed by the Tamil poet, Kamban, to convey the images of the two characters are the following: (a) Rāma had lotus-like eyes. (The relationship of lotus blooms with the godhead, Viṣṇu or Tirumāl as in Tamil, whose 'seventh' manifestation Rāma was supposed to be, is further stressed in a subsequent reference to the goddess of wealth, that is, Śri or Lakṣmi, or Tirumakal in Tamil, the consort of Viṣṇu, leaving the lotus flower to dwell in the city of Mithila as Sītā). (b) Sītā is described as a young maiden of boundless beauty, of golden splendour and of so slender a waist as to be invisible. (c) The city of Mithila is made to appear as a busy and gay capital city of a powerful kingdom; it was fortified with walls that glowed and shone as though by reflection of the golden splendour of the royal resident of divine origin.   (d) The moat which surrounded the royal mansion

seemed to reflect the multi-sculptured mansions around, which looked like the abodes of the gods in the *nāga* land or in the heavens. (e) The flags and festoons were seen fluttering from poles as though they were bidding welcome with the actual words of 'Come Thou quickly' addressed to the royal visitor.   The various sights in the royal avenue along which the visitors were passing attracted their attention: (f) the great mansions from the windows of which young maidens were watching the sights below; (g) the shops where a variety of goods could be obtained; (h) the royal sporting arenas for the elephants and horses to prove their prowess; (i) the wayside theatrical stages where dancers were performing; (j) the ceaseless movements of chariots raising a cloud of dust. (k) As the visitors were thus on their way to the palace of the king of Mithila, Rāma stopped for a moment in the courtyard right below the window of the upper-storey of the royal ladies' chamber; (l) his eyes encountered the eyes of Sītā who adornedthe window as a goddess of light. (m) That very moment their hearts were united; though of two bodies, they became of one soul.   (n) It was indeed a reunion of Tirumāl (Viṣṇu) and Tirumakal (Śri or Lakṣmi) whose manifestations they were in the present birth. (o) As Rāma moved on with his companions and his mind full of thoughts of beautiful Sītā, she herself became hopelessly ill with love and longing for Rāma. (p) She groaned and lamented over the absence of Rāma.   (q) She could not answer the questions of her anxious lady companions who wanted to know the reason for her illness.   (r) Sītā, delirious with love, seemed to imagine that Rāma was still around and so she would prattle such words as 'Now here he is; alas he is gone now!'   (s) She sun-set brought no relief, in fact it was more agonising to Sītā who was in love with Rāma, and in his absence she loathed everything else.

King Rāma I, the royal author of the Thai *Rāmakian*, has chosen to present the episode with the following *motifs :* (a) Rāma who was a manifestation of Nārāyaṇa, entered the mighty city of Mithila with his younger brother (Lakṣmaṇa) and the sage (Viśvāmi-tra). (b) The powerful city looked gay like the heavenly land, (c) with mansions such as those of Indra, (d) with shops, (e) stables for

elephants and horses, situated neatly (f) along the royal avenue, which was thronged (g) with noisy and gay crowds of men and women; (h) there were also arenas where the elephants fought to prove their strength. (i) Then, there were the flags, hoisted upon the poles and tiered umbrellas, fluttering as though they were welcoming the divine and royal visitor with the words 'May it please Thy Majesty to hurry and proceed to receive the princess Sītā'. (j) The mansions, such as those of Indra, with five towers and gabled roofs with *nāga* or *makara motifs*, were fine structures of architecture admired by the royal visitor. (k) At the latticed window of the royal mansion there stood a golden, crystal gem, Sītā. (l) It was then that Rāma's eyes met with the furtive glance of Sītā, unleashing countless charms which combined to bind their hearts together, (m) for after all, she was already accustomed to be seated at her lord's (Nārayaṇa's) feet in her former existence as Śri or Lakṣmi. (n) Sītā's heart was aglow with love as though it had been touched by fire as indeed it was by the rays of the divine Rāma. (o) She suffered much from longing for Rāma, who however did not seem to return to pass by the same way again. (p) Again she was too bashful to say anything to her lady companions who wanted to know what had caused her illness (of love). (q) Her heart and mind were full of countless impressions and remembrances of the lord with whom she had fallen in love at the very first sight.[44]

Now, in comparing the *motifs* occurring in the above two passages, it would seem that though similar *motifs* have been used in

---

different combinations both passages have also some different *motifs* of their own.   Among the *motifs* that appear to be similar is at least one which is more striking then the others, namely, the *motif* referring to the flags fluttering from poles (and the tiered umbrellas) as though they were welcoming the royal and divine visitor to the city of Mithila to receive Sītā.   Though this *motif* is so strikingly similar, it would nevertheless seem to have received an added refinement at the hand of the royal poet King Rāma I, to the effect that the image conveyed is one of flags fluttering from the tiered royal umbrellas in addition to the ordinary flag-masts.   The additional refinement is understandable in view of the fact that, though the white umbrella has been a common emblem of royalty in South and South-east Asia since early times, the *tiered* royal umbrella is particularly a noteworthy feature of the Thai royal regalia.   (The multi-tiered royal umbrella is believed to have been a development from the traditional practice of kings symbolically adding their own umbrellas on top of those of former rulers).[45]

Again, to cite another *motif* in the Thai version, the description of the royal mansion as having gabled roofs decorated with the *nāga* or *makara motif* is obviously in consonance with a style of architecture which has been typical of the Thai tradition.

From these two instances it would seem that in literary acculturation as indeed in artistic or even linguistic acculturation, the final treatment often rests with the people who choose to adopt elements from other sources.

Now, as for the *motif* of a man and a woman falling in love at first sight.   This is probably one of the oldest *motifs* in the cultural traditions of the world's peoples, and especially so in the Tamil literary tradition and probably in the Thai literary tradition as well. It is also of some interest to note that this *motif* would in fact seem to be in contradistinction to an opposite *motif*, which we may come across elsewhere, namely, the prohibition against seeing the prospective bride or the bridegroom, which is known to be enforced even by supernatural sanction of punishment for infringing such a taboo.   In

45) See Quaritch Wales, H.G., *Siamese State Ceremonies* London 1931 pp 93-95.

view of the fact that such a taboo is known to have existed in the northern parts of India,[46] can we surmise that the possible existence of such a taboo probably prevented the inclusion of its opposite *motif* (namely, that of the prospective bride and groom seeing each other before marriage) in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki who seems to have confined himself merely to the narration of how Rāma won the hand of Sītā at an archery contest which was a special form of the *svayamvara* ('self-choice') type of *gāndharva* marriage, though concluded subsequently by the performance of the rites of religious marriage? Be that as it may, it is nevertheless a noteworthy feature that both the Tamil and Thai versions have seen fit to include such a popular *motif* in keeping with their ancient traditions.

The problem of adaptation or diffusion and acculturation is indeed beset with many complexities, and it is not at all easy to pin-point the diffused elements and the manner of their acculturation. It has been argued by folklorists that, given a similar state of taste, fancy, similar beliefs, similar circumstances, a 'similar' tale might conceivably be evolved in regions remote from each other. Just as similar patterns of art have been independently evolved, so similar cosmic myths, similar fables, riddles, proverbs, customs, and institutions may have been independently evolved.

However, where the similar incidents, similar *motifs,* and similar details are more numerous (as we have seen is the case in the foregoing pages of this paper), independent invention may be difficult to argue but some form of diffusion may be considered possible. When the chain and sequence of events or *motifs* keeps close to a given type, one may regard such elements of the story as probably borrowed or transmitted. In the chain of such sequence of *motifs* one may see borrowing or transmission of the elements concerned so far as one cannot reason from possible coincidence.

But, whatever be the agreement (or variation) in regard to given *motifs* or sequence of events in the various versions of the story concerned, we cannot be indifferent to the individual literary merits of the works concerned and to the constructive art which is bound to

---

46) See Basham, A.L., *The Wonder That Was India* London 1961 pp 165-70.

be displayed in the composition of these works.   In other words, though there may be numerous similar elements diffused among several versions, one cannot argue that the works possessing the same or similar *motifs* are the same, for the combination of *motifs* and incidents may indeed take almost any form.   Even if the same plot and *motifs* are used in two given literary works we may still be able to observe and appreciate the original qualities of combination of those elements in different guises.   Various *motifs* may appear in various combinations and these may undergo kaleidoscopic change.   The incidents or *motifs* would be the bits of coloured gems; shaken, they would fall into a variety of attractive forms.

There is also another feature of diffusion and acculturation which is worthy of note.   Though incidents or *motifs* of the common store may be interwoven in any form, at the same time certain forms or combinations may in the course of time gain currency as the fittest, and these may be retained and more widely spread than the others.   In other words, some form of the *motifs* may be judged by the skilled narrators or composers as the fittest, and they would survive.   The story-tellers are known to have always been making varied combinations, the best and the most dramatic of which often survive: a good type of *motif,* once hit upon, is diffused widely, though we cannot be so fortunate as to be aware of the name and home of the combiner or the date of the combination.

Again, with all the many variations to be found in several versions of a popular tale, it is remarkable that the tale should retain a definite enough quality to be considered a real entity.   This is perhaps because the characteristic incidents or *motifs* of the story, though varied, are still so constant that it is not difficult to recognise their type in spite of the almost kaleidoscopic variations they have assumed.   It is also of interest to note that the variations deal with materials handled in different fashion; sometimes appearing as part of local environment, legend, and traditions, and at other times receiving local literary treatment.

As Stith Thompson has observed so aptly, the telling of tales is not uniform in various parts of the world.   Like other elements of culture, tales are not mere creatures of chance; they exist in time and space, and are affected by the nature of the land where they have been

current, by linguistic and social contacts of its people, by lapse of years and their accompanying historic changes. [47]

Finally, we may conclude this paper with a few observations on the name-forms in the context of diffusion of a tale and its *motifs*. As far as popular tales in oral traditions are concerned, the characters in such tales are usually anonymous; similarly the places are vague and often nameless. However, this very fact that the tales are first told of 'somebody' later enables people in various regions to add names to such characters and places. The characters thus may have new names attached to them and obtain a new local habitation wherever they may 'wander'; often the stories consisting of such characters crystallise around a famous name, human, heroic, or divine.

The characters of literary versions, on the other hand, would seem to be named more often than not; indeed they are usually identified as national or regional cultural heroes. Similarly the events are localized. (Even if the events should occur in distant parts, the narrators have their own ways of placing emphasis on the immediate environment in relation to the distant regions.) Therefore we may not be far wrong to say that in literary versions of popular tales such as that of Rāma, the names and places, particularly their forms, may well be and often are the latest and not the original feature. This would probably explain the diverse name-forms to be found in the various versions concerned. At the same time if certain name-forms occur in similar form, it would be reasonable to surmise that the similarity may be due to diffusion or transmission from an earlier literary work.

47) Thompson, S., *The Folktale* New York 1946 pp 13-14.
48) This study is restricted to the story of Rāma from his birth to his return to Ayodhyā. It must be mentioned however that in the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, the Thai Rāmakian and the Malay *Hikāyat Sĕrī Rāma* the story is continued further to include the birth of Rāma's sons, Lava and Kuśa, the descent of Sītā into the earth and the ascent of Rāma to heaven. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* this extension is contained in the seventh canto ('uttara kāṇḍa, 'the last section') and is regarded as a later addition to the original work. In Tamil language there exists also a work by the name of *Uttara-kāṇṭam*, attributed to a poet by the name of Oṭṭakkūttar, which narrates the story of Rāma after his return to Ayodhyā and until his ascent to heaven.