#### CHAPTER 5

#### THE RĀMA SAGA AS DEPICTED BY THE ĀĻVĀRS

#### 5.0 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter was a study of the Rāmāyaṇa incidents in the hymns of individual ālvārs. The data thus collected are here compiled to discuss their treatment in comparison to the Rāma saga in Sanskrit and Tamil. The arrangement of these incidents follows that of the cantos (kāṇdas) of Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa, which being the older work is used as the basis for comparison. Events which are different from the Sanskrit epic or are not found in it are identified. They are also examined to determine if they had a different source or sources other than Vālmīki and also the influence of the ālvārs on the Rāmāyaṇam of Kampar. It is generally accepted by scholars that the Rāmāyaṇam of Kampar is the result of the flood of devotion started and nourished by the ālvārs and ācāriyas. The influence of the hymns of the ālvārs, who belong to an earlier period, on Kampar is evident in his epic. The thread of devotion which runs through it is unmistakable. This has given rise to the popular tradition of considering him also as an ālvār so that he is sometimes referred to as Kampanāṭṭālvār.<sup>2</sup>

The Kamparāmāyaṇam which is accepted as the Tamil Rāmāyaṇa contains only the first six cantos. Scholars generally agree that the last canto, Uttara Kāṇdam was not written by Kampar, and attribute it to Oṭṭakkūttar. This point has been discussed in Chapter 2.<sup>3</sup> So the Uttara Kāṇdam which was omitted by Kampar but sung separately by Oṭṭakkūttar is utilised in this chapter. As such

incidents from Vālmīki's *Uttara Kāṇḍa* sung by the *ālvārs* are compared to parallel incidents in the work of Ottakkūttar.

#### 5.1 BALA KANDAM

In the hymns of the alvars, four incidents from the Bala Kandam are mentioned.

#### 5.1.1 Aiming at Künis Hunchback

Only three <u>alvārs</u> have referred to this boyish act of Rāma in four different verses.<sup>4</sup> In his boyhood Rāma played with his catapult and in mischief aimed a pellet at the hunched back of Mantarai, the maid and confidente of Kaikēyi. This helped to straighten the hunch. Tirumalicaiy<u>ālvār</u> who dwells on this incident with devotion mentions this twice.<sup>5</sup>

The same playful act of Tirumāl during His incarnation as Rāma and the benefit that Mantarai received are also sung by Tirumańkaiyālvār<sup>6</sup> and Nammālvār<sup>7</sup> in one hymn each.

This is not found in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki. But Kampar states that the pellet from the *kaivil* or the toy-bow that need pebbles instead of arrows, removed the hunch of Mantarai who is commonly known as Kūṇi.<sup>8</sup> This certainly shows Kampar's indebtedness to the *ālvārs*.

The ālvārs have used this incident to illustrate Rāma's benevolence and acts of compassion which may seem cruel. Such acts are known as marakkaruṇai

meaning compassion shown through acts of anger or valour. These may cause hurt or pain initially, but the end is beneficial to the devotees. In this incident the pain when the pellet hit the back is unpleasant but the result is the Kūni's ability to become upright in her gait. The soul that experiences such acts of grace is often angry or hurt because it lacks the knowledge to understand the true nature of God's acts. But true devotees like the *ālvārs* are appreciative of them.

N. Subbureddyar in his **Cila Nōkkil Nālāyiram** states that this incident has not been dealt with by Vālmīki and neither is the hunch-backed character Mantarai to be found in the *Ādi-kāvya*. It may be noted that though this particular incident is not found in the work of Vālmīki, the hunched Mantarai is mentioned in the Ayodhya Kanda. 10

#### 5.1.2 Killing Tatakai and the Asuras to Protect Sage Visvāmitra's Yāga

This occurrence has been sung by four alvars in seven different hymns.11

Tirumankaiyalvar in two of his verses sings of Tirumal killing the asuri named Tatakai and thus protecting the sacrificial ritual performed by the sage<sup>12</sup> while he mentions the killing of the asuri in another hymn.<sup>13</sup>

Kulacēkarālvār uses this event twice. In one of them he presents slightly more details. Rāma split the chest of Tāṭakai who opposed him on the way and killed her. He also slew the other asuras like Cupāku who obstructed the yāga. Thus he protected the rituals of the sage. In another verse, this ālvār, too, like Tirumaṅkaiyālvār merely speaks of the slaying of the asuri.

Besides, in one hymn Tontaratippotiyalvar says that Rāma helped the Sage to complete the  $y\bar{a}ga$ . This refers merely to the protection offered and there is no mention of the killing of Tātakai. <sup>16</sup>

On the other hand, Periyālvār describes how the epic hero aimed his strong bow and ended the life of the *asuri*.<sup>17</sup> This is his only reference to this event in the life of young Rāma but the purpose for the killing, which is to protect Visvāmitra's *yāga* is not explained.

The epics of both Vālmiki and Kampar contain this incident. <sup>18</sup> Their treatment of the occurrence is similar to that of the ālvārs.

While this incident may be said to be proof for Rāma's valour and heroism, to the alvārs it is much more. To them it is one of the great acts of compassion and justice performed by God and the very reason for this incarnation. Here he kills Tāṭakai and the other asuras who oppose or disturb the sacrificial rites. Thus Rāma kills those who oppose good deeds. In other words he protects good or dharma and destroys those who are wicked or adharmic. Worship and vēdic rituals benefit the persons who perform them as well as all beings.

#### 5.1.3 Breaking the Bow of Shiva to Marry Sītā

This epic event has been described by three  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  in eight instances.<sup>19</sup>

Periyālvār sings of this incident in three of his hymns. In one he mentions that Rāma broke the bow which was in the possession of Janaka and brought Sǐtā

(to Ayodhya as his wife).<sup>20</sup> Another verse contains the information that the bow was broken in the presence of a large assembly<sup>21</sup> while the third hymn states the name of the bow Rāma broke before marrying Sītā. It is the *Shiva-tanu*.<sup>22</sup>

Tirumańkaiyalvār also refers to this event thrice in his hymns. He sings of the strong, firm bow named *Shiva Tanu* that Rāma broke in order to marry Sīta.<sup>23</sup> The bow had appeared with her when she was found by Janaka, though it is said to have been born with her."<sup>24</sup> One of the verses merely mentions that he broke the bow and married her.<sup>25</sup>

The same even is dealt with more briefly in two verses by Kulacekaralvar. In both he states that Rāma broke the *Shiva-tanu* to marry Sītā. <sup>26</sup> In one of them he explains that it was Shiva's bow. <sup>27</sup>

The epics of Valmiki and Kampar, both describe that the bow broke when Rāma strung the bow with the arrow.<sup>28</sup> There seems to be no difference in the opinion of the *ālvars* either.

The <u>ālvārs</u> have used this incident to praise the great power and ability of Rāma. While no one could even lift it, Rāma not only bent it but broke the bow. This is proof of his prowess. Besides, by saying that he did so to marry Sītā, the <u>ālvārs</u> seem to imply that since Rāma is an incarnation of Tirumāl the incident is significant. It helps him to be united with Sītā who is the embodiment of Mother Earth, one of his *saktis*.

#### 5.1.4 Subduing the Power of Paracurāma

Three of the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  have sung in five verses of Rama's encounter with Paracurama.

Periyālvār who is overwhelmed with the great power and heroism of Rāma mentions this incident in two of his hymns. He says that Rāma took away from Paracurāma the Bow of Vishnu which the latter held in his hand and also destroyed all the powers that Paracurāma had accumulated through penance.<sup>30</sup>

A hymn by Kulacekaralvar also contains the same information and speaks of it as an occurrence that took place some time during the past. Another of his verses while repeating what took place when these two heroes met, adds that Paracurama held the axe (malu) and that he was an enemy of Kings. With this incident this enmity and power which Paracurama had were destroyed by Rama. 2

Tirumalicaiyalvar merely refers to this incident in one of this hymns by saying that the "red-eyed Māl (as Rāma) took away the bow that once vanquished Shiva" meaning the Bow of Vishnu which Paracurāma held.<sup>33</sup>

The <u>ālvārs</u> have thus treated this incident in the same manner as Vālmīki.<sup>34</sup>
Kampar too has used it in the same way.<sup>35</sup>

This incident serves as a means for the <u>alvars</u> to sing the great prowess of Rāma. Paracurāma is said to have strength and valour feared by the three worlds. The bow he held had defeated even Shiva. But the <u>alvars</u> celebrate Rāma who was

able to subdue that Paracurāma. This shows that however strong or courageous one may be, if he were to act with pride or egoism, he will lose before God and become powerless and useless. Thus the incident illustrates God's *vīrya* or strength and bravery which is considered to be one of His auspicious characteristics.<sup>36</sup>

#### 5.2 AYODHYA KANDAM

The <u>alvars</u> refer to only three events that occur in the *Ayodhya Kandam* of the Rāmāyaṇa.

#### 5.2.1 Rama Going to the Forest and His Stay There

Only three <u>alvars</u> refer to this incident but it is found in twenty two separate instances.<sup>37</sup>

Kulacēkarālvār is touched by this incident in the life of Rāma. He speaks of it from various points of view — as a mother who sings a lullaby and as Dasaratha who laments after sending the son to the forest. Placing himself in various situations this ālvār mentions this incident in thirteen different verses with slightly different details. One of the verses indicates that Rāma, accepting the words of his step-mother Kaikēyi went to the forest followed by his relatives. In another verse Rāma is said to have given up his ancient royal rights and position because of Kaikēyi's words. According to two verses he left for the forest with his wife and younger brother. The reason for doing so is the same — i.e. his step-mother's command. Two verses show Dasaratha lamenting his son's departure to the forest. He feels that heeding the words of Kaikēyi he has become a sinner (pāvi)

who sent Rāma away.<sup>41</sup> To these bits of information another stanza adds the fact that it was Kūṇi who instigated Kaikēyi.<sup>42</sup> But there are verses to show that Rāma accepted Kaikēyi's wish and had no hard feelings. In two different hymns the ālvār sings that the eldest son of Dasaratha went in order to uphold the word of honour given by his father.<sup>43</sup> Another verse mentions that Rāma appointed Bharata as the king and left with another brother Lakshmaṇa who was totally devoted to Rāma.<sup>44</sup> Three other poems contain general information like his arriving at the forest or living there.<sup>45</sup>

Periyālvār refers to this happening in five verses. In one he mentions that Rāma went to the forest accepting the words of Mantarai, the hunch-back<sup>46</sup> but in another adds the necessary information to clarify what is said in the previous instance. Rāma actually heard the behest of Kaikēyi who had listened to the illadvice of Mantarai.<sup>47</sup> The other three verses just say that he went after listening to Kaikēyi, his step-mother.<sup>48</sup> This ālvār also sings of this with sorrow. However, he does not mention Sītā or Lakshmana following him.

The same information is given by Tirumankaiyalvar in four verses. According to him Rāma accepted his father's instruction, gave up his right to rule the country and left for the forest. Sitā followed him. 49 Another verse mentions the Lakshmana also went with them. 50 The cause for this change of Rāma's fortunes is said to be the cruel advice of Kūni. 51 One of his hymns just mentions that he crossed the forest area. 52

Vălmiki and Kampar certainly utilise this incident for it is essential to the epic. 53 Their treatment of this important event is not only similar but also seems to be similar to that of the *ālvārs*.

The <u>ālvārs</u>, by using this incident, try to illustrate the fact that though Rāma is an incarnation of Tirumāl, he was born as a human being. He could be a prince but he still has to undergo the normal experiences of joy and sorrow which are part and parcel of human life. But Rāma, by accepting the command as his father's word without any ill-feelings, is also shown as an ideal man to be followed.

According to Kampar, Rāma himself explains this from the point of view of cause and effect. The childish prank of Rāma which caused physical pain to Mantarai had angered her. So she took her revenge by instigating Kaikēyi. Thus the author explains that those who are strong or powerful should not disregard or cause hardship to others. Any such act would cause great harm later on in life.<sup>54</sup>

#### 5.2.2 Friendship with Guha and Crossing the Ganges

This incident has been mentioned once each by three of the alvars.55

In one of his hymns Tirumańkaiyalvar deals with the meeting of Rāma and Guha the hunter-boatman, at which both of them are united in friendship. Rāma, though of royal birth accepted Guha as his friend and brother. He also introduced his wife as another friend to the hunter and Lakshmana as a brother. This gracious simplicity of Rāma overwhelms the alvar who cites this and asks for the divine grace of Tirumal to whom differences in wealth, birth or occupation do not

matter. But this verse does not mention Rāma crossing River Ganges with Guha's help.

Periyālvār merely mentions their meeting on the banks of the river and their ensuing friendship<sup>57</sup> but he too does not speak of Rāma crossing the river.

However, Kulacēkarālvār refers to Guha as a great devotee of Rāma and that the latter crossed over to the opposite bank with the hunter's help. He also speaks of the bond of friendship that was formed during this first meeting between the two.<sup>58</sup>

Both the epic authors mention this event. <sup>59</sup> But Vālmīki does not dwell on it as Tirumankaiyālvār does. However, Kampar uses the same details found in the ālvār's hymn in a later canto of the epic. When Sītā was held captive in Lanka surrounded by the asura women she recollects many pleasant incidents that took place when she was with her husband. One such is their arrival at the bank of the Ganges and their meeting Guha. This reminds her of the simple and loving nature of Rāma. <sup>60</sup> It is clear that the hymns of the ālvārs have been the source from which Kampar drew this poignant incident.

Through this event the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  bring out the great compassion of Rāma who accepts the love and devotion of all devotees irrespective of their social or economic differences. This characteristic is referred to as  $saus\bar{i}lya^{61}$  or excellent disposition towards others and goodness of character. This is one of the facts of life expounded by the Rāma incarnation. If each person were to show affection

considering everyone else equal it would give rise to friendship and universal goodwill.

### 5.2.3 The Arrival of Bharata and the Granting of the *Pāduka* and Kingship These two incidents are found in six different hymns of two of the *ālvārs*. 62

Periyālvār with his unending devotion to Rāma who possessed endless compassion for all beings sings this event in four of his verses. In one verse he says that the epic hero gave his sandals to Bharata who followed him (to the forest). In another hymn he adds that the sandals were given as a worthy pledge of Rāma's return. This ālvār in one verse mentions only the arrival of Bharata at Citrakūta Hill where he met and paid homage to Rāma in exile. Here, there is no mention of anything else that transpired between the brothers. It is also said that Rāma gave the kingship to Bharata before leaving for the forest.

The other <u>alvar</u> who uses this incident in his hymns is Kulacekaralvar. He too sings that Rama who had crossed the Ganges and entered the forest gave his sandals and kingship to Bharata.<sup>67</sup> But another verse says that he left for the forest with Lakshmana, after appointing Bharata as King.<sup>68</sup>

Thus both the <u>alvars</u> have, in one hymn each, put the granting of the kingship, before Rāma's departure to the forest. While this may seem contradictory, it really is not so, because before leaving Ayodhya he had accepted the command bidding him to go away for 14 years leaving the kingdom of Kōsala to be ruled by Bharata. This acceptance is equivalent to the appointment of

Bharata as King. When Bharata, going to the forest, begged his older brother to come back, he was given the sandals as an assurance and Rāma told him in person to rule the land till his return. So the sequence of incidents is not changed but both the incidents are dealt with to convey the same idea – that Rāma kept to his word under any circumstance.

The epics of Valmiki and Kampar also treat these incidents in the same manner. There are no differences in the depiction of these events in the two epics or the hymns of the  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$ .<sup>69</sup>

These incidents are used by the alvars to bring out Bharata's respect, love and loyalty to his brother and to the tradition of their family that the first born becomes king. Sudden wealth and power do not change these but make him go to Rāma and beg him to return. Rāma standing firm by his father's words and determined to carry them out shows his wisdom in this incident. He understands Bharata's feelings and he appoints him as a regent with the sandals as a symbol of Rāma. Such a decision suitable to both the brothers illustrates Rāma's compassion and qualities of royalty and leadership. As an incarnation of Tirumāl, he displays divinity and a love of all beings.

#### 5.3 ARANYA KANDAM

The Nālāyirat Tivyap Pirapantam refers to eleven incidents found in the Aranya Kandam of the Rāma Saga.

#### 5.3.1 Plucking Out the Eyes of Kākācuran

There are only two instances in which this act of  $R\overline{a}ma$  is mentioned and both are by  $Periy\overline{a}lv\overline{a}r$ .

When Rāma was alone with Sītā at the Citrakūṭa Hill, Cayantan in the form of a crow pecked at Sītā. Seeing this Rāma used his missile of Brahma and plucked out one of the eyes of the crow. Periyālvār sings of this in two verse.<sup>72</sup> The information in these verses are identical.

Both Vālmīki and Kampar use this incident.<sup>73</sup> The Sanskrit epic lists this as one of the incidents mentioned by Sīta to Hanuman as proof that she is really the wife of Rāma. But in the Tamil epic Sītā is shown to be lost in thoughts about her husband's handsome form, his qualities and his valour. This is one of the incidents that come to her mind.

Through this, the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}r$  points out that the souls which are unable to control their senses have to face the consequences. But at the same time, those who take refuge at Rāma's feet may be saved from sin. This is the concept of caranakati.<sup>74</sup>

#### 5.3.2 The Slaying of Viratan

This event is sung by two  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$  in one verse each.<sup>75</sup>

While singing the story of Lord Rāma at Tillai, Kulacēkarālvār relates how Rāma killed the *asura* named Virātan, who carried Sītā away.<sup>76</sup>

Tirumankaiyalvar also mentions this incident. He describes Viratan as holding various weapons in his strong hands and having fierce eyes and great strength. But Rama bent his bow and discharged an arrow that killed the asura. 77

Valmiki as well as Kampar have sung this incident. The manner in which they have referred to it is similar to its treatment by the  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$ .

Through this event, the <u>alvars</u> try to point out the compassion of Rama. God, in order to remove the evil deeds of a soul and grant it salvation sometimes resorts to harsh means suitable to chastise the evil doer. This is called <u>marakkarunai</u> or compassion that uses harsh means.

#### 5.3.3 Receiving the Bow from Sage Agastya

Only one ālvār, namely Kulacēkarālvār, has sung this incident in one of his hymns.<sup>79</sup>

In the same hymn in which he speaks of the slaying of Virātan, the ālvār mentions that Rāma received a bow that was presented to him by the sage Agastya who is associated with Tamil.

This too is found in both the Sanskrit and Tamil epics and their treatment as well as that of Kulacekarālvār are identical.<sup>80</sup>

This presentation of the bow by a sage illustrates that the sages through their power of prayer and penance help Rāma in his duty of upholding *dharma*.

#### 5.3.4 Cutting off the Limbs of Surpanakha

Five different alvars have sung this incident in 15 hymns.81

Tirumankaiyālvār when exhorting his foolish heart to worship Tirumāl who is manifest at Tillai, says that as Rāma, the Lord had cut away the ear and nose of Sūrpaṇakha though she cried out. He mentions this incident in three hymns. <sup>82</sup> In two other verses he refers only to the cutting off of her nose. <sup>83</sup>

Periyalvar also refers to this incident. Three of his verses speak of Rama severing the nose of Ravana's sister 44 and one more states that her ear and nose were cut off. 85

The same incident is used by Nammālvār. In one of his hymns the cutting off of both the limbs, nose and broad ear, is mentioned<sup>86</sup> while another sings of only the nose being severed.<sup>87</sup>

Kulacēkarālvār<sup>88</sup> and Āntāl<sup>89</sup> refer only to the cutting of the nose in one hymn each.

Though both the epic poets refer to his event<sup>90</sup> there are also certain variations. According to Vālmīki and Kampar, it was Lakshmaṇa who disfigured Sūrpaṇakha at the behest of Rāma. The ālvārs do not deal with this detail but attribute the act itself to Rāma. Kampar is explicit that Lakshmaṇa did it for Rāma. Kampar further adds that besides the nose and ear her breasts were also severed, though this is not found in the hymns of the ālvārs. It is possible that Kampar

included this to show that she had stepped beyond the bounds of feminine decorum. This is supported by the **Tirukkural**,

The desire of the unlearned to speak (in an assembly Is like a woman without breasts seeking (the joys of) womanhood.<sup>91</sup>

It may be concluded that the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  used this incident to show that Rāma chastised all acts that were indecent or immoral.

#### 5.3.5 The Killing of Karan and Tutanan

Three  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$  have sung this incident in four hymns.<sup>92</sup>

This act of Tirumāl during the Rāma incarnation is mentioned by Tirumańkaiyālvār in two hymns. 93 In both he says that the Lord killed Karan, the older brother of Sūrpanakha with his arrows.

Tirumalicaiyālvār sings that Rāma who held various weapons in his hands severed and broke into pieces, the head of Karan. 94 But no mention is made of the particular weapon used to do so.

One of the hymns by Kulacekarālvār mentions together the killing of Karan and Tutanan by Rāma. 95

While the death of these asuras at the hands of Rāma is found in the Rāmāyaṇas of Vālmīki and Kampar, <sup>96</sup> there are some small differences. The ālvārs mention only two asuras – Karan and Tūṭaṇan but the epics mention Tiriciran as well. In the epics the chronological order of their death is different.

According to Vālmīki Tūṭaṇaṇ was killed first, followed by Tiriciraṇ and Karaṇ. But Kampar speaks of Tiriciraṇ's death first, then Tūṭaṇaṇ and finally that of Karan.

Since all these three are relatives of Sūrpaṇakha and were supportive of her actions, their killing illustrates that the Lord destroys such evil support when chastising immorality.

#### 5.3.6 The Appearance and Death of Marica

Seven ālvārs have used this incident in ten different hymns. 97

Tirumankaiyalvar has mentioned this the most, but with a varying amount of information. In two verses he states that Rāma killed with an arrow Mārīca who frisked and played in the form of a deer near the hermit-hut in which Rāma and Sītā stayed. One of the verses speaks of Rāma following the illusory deer which he saw before his eyes in the forest and aiming a sharp arrow at it. Another hymn merely says that the hero followed Mārīca who came as a shiny golden deer.

A hymn by Poykaiyālvār mentions that long ago Rāma had discharged the arrow to kill Mārīca. 101

Pūtattalvār adds further details to this happening. He says that Lord Vishnu, born as Rāma followed the illusory deer for Sītā's sake. Doing so he

entered the deep forest and was separated from his wife. But this <u>alvar</u> does not mention the death of Marica.

However, Pēyālvār presents all the above details – the Rāma incarnation, chasing the deer for Sītā's sake, aiming the arrow and killing the deer in one of his verses. 103

Kulacēkarā<br/>lvār merely mentions the killing of the deer by discharging an<br/>  $$\rm arrow.^{104}$$ 

A gold-coloured deer entered the premises of the hermitage where Rāma stayed with Sītā and Lakshmaṇa. It played about happily. Since Sītā liked it, Rāma out of his love for her, took his bow and followed it to catch it. This caused Lakshmaṇa also to be separated from her. Thus Periyālvār relates many related events and emotions connected with the killing of Mārīca, but he does not mention the killing as such.

Nammālvār also sings that once, long ago, Rāma followed Mārīca who appeared before him as an illusory deer and killed it. $^{106}$ 

This incident found in Vālmīki's as well as Kampar's Rāmāyaṇa 107 is treated in the same manner by these epic writers and the devoted alvars.

At the human level, this incident is useful as a warning that when one is led by emotions it can lead to danger. Careful consideration of the situation and its

implications is necessary. If Rāma had thought of the possibility of finding such a deer on earth he could have behaved otherwise. But he followed his heart.

Yet as an incarnation of Vishnu, he did the inevitable as pre-ordained. It also shows that the Lord in His kindness to others is prepared to suffer Himself.

Besides, a mere arrow from Rāma seems enough to remove illusion and grant knowledge about the truth of things. This is illustratative of Rāma's compassion for souls<sup>108</sup> and his power to remove illusion.

#### 5.3.7 Lakshmana Going away Leaving Sita Alone

This incident being a result and continuation of the appearance of the deer is related only by Periyalvar in one line of a hymn. 109

Valmiki and Kampar have used this incident<sup>110</sup> which is important to the story. But their treatment varies. According to Valmiki when Marica cried out for help Sītā was upset, thinking it was Rāma's call for help. But Lakshmaṇa, confident of his brother's ability, keeps quiet. Noticing this, Sītā becoming emotional, tells him that she would not live if Rāma dies but kill herself. She lists the various modes of suicide – falling into River Godāvari, hanging, jumping from the hill-top, swallowing poison or burning herself. Kampar does not deal with such details. Sītā is said to have run saying that she would jump into the forest fire. Perhaps two considerations may be cited for Kampar's alteration. Action is more effective than words and Sītā running from their hermitage became the cause for Lakshmaṇa's departure inspite of Rāma's request to stay back and protect Sītā.

Another variation is that in the Sanskrit epic, Lakshmana prays to the gods (devas) and asks them to protect Sita. But the Kamparāmāyanam shows him as beseeching the devas and Jadāyu, the King of the Eagles, to guard her.

This incident shows that human ignorance and emotions cloud one's judgements and also prevent one from listening to the advice or arguments presented by others. Emotional outbursts lead to hasty actions which bring danger and sorrow. The harsh words of Sitā, uttered because of her anxiety for Rāma made Lakshmaṇa leave her even though he was confident of Rāma's ability to save himself.

#### 5.3.8 Ravana's Desire of Sita

Only Tirumankaiyālvār deals with this incident in two consecutive verse. 111

Both these verses use the word *kātal* to describe the emotion Rāvaṇa had for Sītā. The first mentions that he came dressed in ochre robes. While the other describes him as an *asura* with a sword, referring to the sword given to him by Shiva.

This incident finds mention in the Sanskrit as well as the Tamil epic. 112

Both show Ravana dressed as a sanyāsin when he approached Sita. But Vālmīki says that when the asura king saw her beauty, he praised her lovely form openly. Kampar, however, includes a similar description as Rāvaṇa's thought at seeing her. This seems more suitable to the situation for coming disguised as a religious mendicant such a description would surely give him away.

This incident shows that when desire takes hold of a man's thoughts and feelings, all thoughts of virtue (aram) and salvation are forgotten. Desiring another's wife is condemned as a sin by all the sacred texts. Here Rāvaṇa is shown as committing another sin of using the holy form of a religious person to achieve his unlawful desires. Hence outward appearances can be deceiving.

#### 5.3.9 Abduction and Imprisonment of Sita by Ravana

Two alvars sing these happenings in four different verses. 113

Tirumankaiyālvār depicts the defeated asuras wail, saying that their misfortune was brought about by the evil-doing of their king. They mention his abduction of Sītā in three verses. While only one of them relates that Rāvaṇa who usually wears a tall golden crown brought Sītā and held her captive in the fragrant park, 114 the other two verses mention this partially. One verse speaks of the unjust Rāvaṇa abducting her 115 and the other speaks of her being kept in captivity (cirai). 116

The hymn of Nammalvar states that Sita was kept captive in a cool park. 117

Vālmīki and Kampar, naturally use this incident which is the basis for the Rāma-Rāvaṇa war. But their treatment is different. The Sanskrit epic says that Rāvaṇa lifted her from the hut she stayed in, put her into his chariot and took her away. Initially he kept her in his palace and persuaded her to be his Queen. Her repeated refusals angered him and so kept her under the guard of the asura women in the asōkavaṇa. According to Kampar, Rāvana was afraid to touch her because

of a curse inflicted on him by Brahma and others. So he lifted her with the hut she stayed in and brought her directly to the *asōkavaṇa* where she was placed under a *ciñcupa* tree.

All the four hymns that mention this event cite this as the cause for Rāvaṇa's downfall and the destruction of Lanka. Thus lust and unlawful desires are shown to veil man's good thoughts and virtue. If he is not careful enough to think and choose wisely, he will lose everything, may be his life too.

#### 5.3.10 The Death of Jadayu

The death of Jadāyu, the King of the Eagles is mentioned only once in all the 4000 hymns.

Even then, Kulacēkarālvār mentions it indirectly. While singing the praises of Rāma he lists many praiseworthy deeds of Rāma. After he was separated from Sītā, he performed the funeral rites for Jadāyu enabling the King of Eagles to reach Vishnu's heaven. There is no direct mention of his death or the cause for it.

The epics of Vālmīki and Kampar also contain this event. There seems to be no difference in its treatment in either of them or by Kulacēkarālvār.

Through this, the <u>ālvār</u> may be said to stress the virtue of gratitude. Jadāyu had died while trying to protect Sītā and as her husband Rāma owed his gratitude to the Eagle King. Again, Jadāyu and Dasaratha were friends. Since Rāma could not perform the final rites for his father, performing it for Jadāyu was like a

consolation. Besides doing such rites for those who had no one to perform them is considered an act of charity.<sup>122</sup>

#### 5.3.11 The Killing of Kavantan

This act is sung by two alvars in three hymns. 123

During His Rāma-incarnation, Tirumāl killed the *asura* named Kavantan by discharging an arrow. Tirumankaiyālvār merely mentions this in two of his hymns. 124

Tirumalicaiyalvar lists four asuras who were killed by Māyan who holds many weapons. Māyan is another name for Tirumal in His Krishna incarnation. According to the hymn the head of the fierce Kavantan, Vakkaran, Karan and Muran were severed from their bodies. It may be noted that Vakkaran (also known as Tanta-vakkaran) and Muran were killed by Tirumal in His Krishna incarnation.

Both the epic writers refer to this incident but mention the asura's hands being cut off. According to Valmiki, Rama and Lakshmana severed his right and left hands respectively. But Kampar merely states that both the brothers cut the two shoulders of Kavantan with their swords so that his arms came off.

This incident is used to show the compassion of the Lord who removes the *karma* of the souls and grants them salvation. The hands here may be considered the tools of action or *karma*.

#### 5.4 KISHKINDHA KANDAM

Among the incidents ascribable to the Kishkindha Kandam, only four are found in the Nālāyirat Tivyap Pirapantam.

#### 5.4.1 Friendship with Sugriva

This is mentioned only by Kulacekarālvar in a single line of a hymn. 127

Rāma though saddened by his separation from Sītā, continued to carry out certain duties. One such deed is to form a friendship with the Monkey King Sugrīva. The hymn does not present any other detail regarding this mutual affection.

Both the epics speak of this incident.<sup>128</sup> But Vālmīki makes this official and ritualistic. According to him Hanuman started a fire with two logs, worshipped them with flowers and kept them between the two. Then Rāma, standing before the fire and citing it as the witness said to Sugrīva "We are one in joy and sorrow". This sealed their friendship. But Kampar does not mention the fire at all. His epic shows that Rāma assures him that he would, as a true friend share the joys and sorrows of Sugrīva. He also adds, "You are my friend, as dear as life."

This incident is used to show Rāma's great qualities like his political and diplomatic leadership and the value he places on true friendship. Though he was blessed with physical strength and courage, he was without the manpower to search for Sītā's whereabouts and save her from Rāvaṇa. So he realised the need

to be friend Sugriva so that there was mutual benefit. But their friendship lasts even after their individual aims are achieved. Rāma considered the *Vāṇara* king and his subjects as his own kin. Thus he knew how to win the right kind of allies and to keep them.

#### 5.4.2 Aiming a Single Arrow through Seven Marā Trees

Six ālvārs have sung this incident in thirteen different hymns. 129

Nammālvār refers to this skill of Rāma in five verses. In two verses he praises the hero saying that he aimed through seven *marā* trees.<sup>130</sup> In another he states that the seven trees were connected (*puṇarā ninra*)<sup>131</sup> and in another he stresses Rāma's skill by saying that he aimed through the seven trees with a single arrow.<sup>132</sup> In the same verse and in his **Periya Tiruvantāti** he simply mentions seven trees without the name.<sup>133</sup>

This incident is explained a little further by Tirumalicaiyalvar. According to him, Lord Tirumal came as Rama to help the younger brother of Vali and shot a single arrow through the seven trees that were close together. One of his verses mentions that long ago the Lord drilled a hole through the trees.

Two hymns of Periyalvar refer to this incident while he praises Rama as the God who shot through the *marā* tree(s) with the bow and arrow; <sup>136</sup> in another verse he mentions that Tirumal in his Rama-incarnation felled the *marā* trees. <sup>137</sup>

Glorifying this skillful act, Tirumankaiyālvār also speaks of the victorious bow that shot the arrow. He describes it as the bow that was well-bound and hence taut enough to aim fast arrows. 139

Poykaiyālvār singing the victories of the hand in which the Lord holds the conch, says that in the incarnation as Rāma, it destroyed the seven *marā* trees with his bow.<sup>140</sup>

This event is mentioned briefly by Pēyālvar who says that as Rāma the Lord aimed through those trees. <sup>141</sup>

Vālmīki and Kampar have sung this event in greater detail. But both mention other objects pierced by this arrow of Rāma. The Sanskrit epic says that it shot through seven sāl trees, a hill and the earth before it returned to the quiver. The Tamil epic describes that after piercing through seven large marā trees on the hill, the seven nether worlds below the earth and not finding anything in groups of seven beyond that returned to the quiver.

This incident is utilised by the <u>alvars</u> while singing the capabilities of Rāma. This shows him as a valiant archer. Besides, those who suspect the capabilities of the omnipotent God are sometimes shown His powers so that they may realise it and benefit by it.

#### 5.4.3 The Slaying of Vāli

Three ālvārs have sung this event in nine hymns. 143

Tirumalicaiyālvār, in devoted admiration of Rāma's heroism sings this incident directly and indirectly. He makes this a sequel to the previous incident (5.4.2) saying that once, Rāma the Lord of the Celectial world aimed an arrow that drilled holes in the trees and later destroyed the strength of Vāli. While one verse refers to Vāli as an animal (*vilanku*)<sup>145</sup> another describes him further. He was the king of the *Vānaras*, very angry and able. But Rāma destroyed his strength by killing him. In one verse this *ālvār* says that the Lord came as Rāma to help the younger brother of Vāli who died. There is no direct mention of Rāma killing him but only helping Sugrīva. 147

Two verses of Tirumankaiyālvār sing how Rāma bending his bow, discharged the arrow which struck Vāli's chest. Another states that he aimed in such a way that it hit the chest of Vāli who came out in anger towards Rāma. 49

Kulacēkarālvār merely sings in one hymn that the Lord killed Vāli in his incarnation as Rāma and gave the kingdom to the younger  $v\bar{a}nara$ . In another he sings that Rāma killed Vāli because of his affection for Sugrīva.

This incident is mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki and Kampar. 152
Both writers show that Rāma aimed at Vali during his fight with Sugrīva.
However, according to Vālmīki Vāli fell to the ground when Rāma's arrow struck him. But Kampar sings that Vāli plucked out the arrow and seeing Rāma's name on it was shocked and asks why he had aimed from hiding. Lakshmaṇa explains that since Rāma had already given his word to Sugrīva, he avoided facing Vāli for fear that if Vāli were to ask for refuge (caraṇam) Rāma would be in a dilemma.

The matchless ability of Rāma is brought out by the alvārs through this incident. He is a great hero who utilises his ability and other necessary means or stratagem to chastise enemies or wrong-doers.

#### 5.4.4 Appointing Sugrīva as King

This incident which is the result of the former one (5.4.3) is sung as such by two  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  in one hymn each.<sup>153</sup>

Kulacēkarālvār merely mentions that Rāma who is a descendent of Kākuttan killed Vāli and gave the kingship to the younger *Vāṇara*, <sup>154</sup> while Tirumaṅkaiyālvār presents further details. He says that Sugrīva had intended to get the bright crown and the pleasures that go with it. <sup>155</sup>

Though this incident is found in Vālmīki's and Kampar's epics, <sup>156</sup> there are certain variations in their details. Vālmīki sings that Sugrīva, according to Rāma's orders went to Kishkinta and held his coronation. The ālvārs only speak of giving Sugrīva the kingship or right to rule and wear the crown. They do not mention a coronation. But Kampar adds further details not found in the Sanskrit epic. According to him Rāma performed Sugrīva's coronation through Lakshmaṇa and after the ceremony advised him on the duties of a king.

This incident helps to illustrate the idea of *pirapatti* or taking refuge in God. Since Sugrīva had asked for help, Rāma gave him the necessary assistance, even though the *vānara* seemed doubtful about the Lord's abilities.

#### 5.5 CUNTARA KANDAM

The  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  have referred to only three incidents that are found in the Cuntara Kandam

#### 5.5.1 Hanuman As a Messenger and the Proofs of Identity He Gives Sita

Hanuman also known as *Rāmadūta* reached Lanka with two different types of messages. One is a political one sent to Rāvaṇa to free Sīta or meet Rāma in battle. The other is a personal one sent to Sītā.

Only Periyālvār has dealt with the personal message and uses it to mention a number of incidents that took place before Sītā was abducted. Rāma breaking the bow in the royal court of Janaka, his encounter with Paracurāma, leaving for the forest with Lakshmaṇa and Sītā at his father's command, his friendship with Guha, the arrival of Bharata to the forest, Ramā chastising Cayantan who as a crow pecked at Sītā and his following Mārīca are mentioned in a decade that deals with the message Hanuman brought to Sītā. He also refers to a more intimate incident in which she ties her husband with a garland of jasmines. The new information it bears is that Rāma has forged an alliance with Sugrīva with whose help he would be able to free her. Finally he presents Rāma's ring to her. 157

Both the epics relate Hanuman's role as a messenger to Sitā. To identify himself as the *Rāmadūta* and not someone pretending to be so, he relates certain incidents and hands her Rāma's ring. The treatment of this incident by Vālmīki and Kampar and by Periyālvār is identical but that of the jasmine garland the *ālvār* 

mentions as part of the message is not found in either Vālmīki's or Kampar's epic.

The source for this incident is not known.

Periyālvār uses this decade of the message to highlight some of the gracious and heroic acts of Rāma through the lips of a great devotee – Hanuman. He also brings out the pure devotion and loyalty this vāṇara had for Rāma. Besides, the humility of a messenger is also shown through this incident.

#### 5.5.2 Hanuman's Acts of Anger and Destruction

Hanuman also went as a messenger to Rāvaṇa. Only Tirumankaiyālvār refers to this in two hymns. In the first he merely says that the Lord sent a message through a monkey and killed the asura king. This suggests that the message was for Rāvaṇa. In the other the ālvār states clearly that Hanuman came crossing the ocean, destroyed the park (asōkavaṇa) which was well-protected, killed the loving sons and relatives of Rāvaṇa and burnt Lanka.

Vālmiki and Kampar too sing this incident in greater detail. Both mention that Hanuman killed many soldiers and army chiefs and then Atcakumāran. 160

This incident shows the meek and submissive messenger to Sītā, as a brave and angry messenger to Rāvana.

#### 5.5.3 Hanuman Burning Lanka

Two alvars refers to this incident in four hymns. 161

Of them, Tirumankaiyalvar sings of it in three of his verses. In one of them he says that Tirumal in his Rama incarnation set fire to Lanka surrounded by the ocean. In another by adding that all that happened because Ravana refused to release Sita, it is implied that Hanuman acted on behalf of Rama. This act resulted in the confusion of the people of Lanka and the destruction of Ravana's wealth.

Kulacēkarālvār mentions clearly that Rāma, through Hanuman (also known as Māruti), burnt Lanka so that the anger and pride of it's king was subdued. 165

This burning of Lanka is also mentioned in both the epics but with greater details and explanations about Hanuman and his heroic deeds. The two writers however, differ in some of the details.

Vālmīki relates that when Hanuman's tail was set on fire he was taken along the streets of Lanka with the burning tail. The vānara messenger went along familiarising himself with the place. Then he rose to the sky with a roar, stood on the arched, decorated entrance to the city and loosened the ropes that bound him. Picking up an iron rod he rotated it and killed the guards. After that he entered Lanka with the tail still on fire and began to ponder on his future course of action. Kampar describes that Hanuman was bound and dragged through the streets by thousands of asuras. He finally rose to the sky with a huge form and loosened the ropes that bound him. All the asuras holding the ropes hung to them and falling to the ground, died. Then he stretched his tail into the city and also jumped from mansion to mansion killing the asuras with the fiery tail.

Moreover, according to Vālmīki, Hanuman sought the house of each asura leader and set fire to it so that their wealth was ruined. The fire spread and blazed reducing the mansions to ashes. The frightened asuras got together and said, "The power of Tirumāl has come as a monkey to destroy." The cries of despair rose and Lanka was destroyed as if by a curse. Thus burning the city, he sat for a while and thought of Rāma. The devas rejoiced. These details are not found in the Kamparāmāyaṇam. But it describes the different sights in the city when it burnt and explains various rules of righteous conduct based on these scenes. While the city burnt, Rāvaṇa flew away in his Puspaka-vimāna. Then there was a war between Hanuman and the asuras. These details are not found in Vālmīki's work.

The burning of Lanka by Hanuman is compared by Vālmīki to the burning of Tiripura by Rudra. But Kampar goes further to say that without anyone's help the *vānara* manipulated his tail in such a manner that the houses of the *asuras* were burnt. Thus the poet feels Shiva and all those who came to his aid 167 when he set out to destroy Tiripura would have felt ashamed of themselves. Besides, since Hanuman is an aspect of Shiva, Kampar sings that perhaps this Lord's pick-axe held in the right hand had manifest itself in that tail on fire to destroy the *asuras* and their city. This concept is further strengthened by a verse by Paṭṭinattār "The fire set before was at Tiripura; That set later was at Lanka in the south."

Later, when Lanka was burnt by the fire set by Hanuman, he was afraid that perhaps Sita would have been affected by it. But he consoled himself thinking that if his own tail has not been burnt by the fire then surely she too could not have been hurt. Then he heard the *cāraṇars* (a class of *devas*) saying to one another that

the Lady did not suffer any mishap due to the fire. Relieved, he thought of paying his homage to her before returning. Kampar also says that the fire did not enter the park where she stayed. Hanuman came to hear of it from the conversation of the devas.

Through this event the <u>alvars</u> show that though Hanuman had the form of a monkey he was blessed with great strength. Hence a person's appearance is no indication of his abilities. This idea is also found in the **Tirukkural**. <sup>169</sup>

This also shows that all the grandeur and wealth of Lanka, built through cruel, adharmic means could easily be destroyed because it was not based on virtue. The haughty Rāvaṇa became immoral and contemptuous of others. He would not listen to good advice. This resulted in the destruction of his capital.

## 5.6 YUTTA KANDAM

The Nālāyirat Tivyap Pirapantam refers to ten incidents found in the Yuddha Kanta of the Rāmāyaņa.

# 5.6.1 Vibhīshaņa's Advice to Rāvana

Tirumańkaiyālvār alone refers to this incident that took place in Rāvaṇa's court.

keeping Sītā captive would destroy their race. Hence she was like poison to them.

But since their king did not heed the advice, they were ruined. 170

Vālmīki and Kampar have mentioned this incident in their epics.<sup>171</sup> The reference by Tirumankaiyālvār seems to be similar to what is found in both the epics.

Through this, the  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}r$  shows that those who do not listen to wise words of advice be they from someone old or young, finally face destruction or downfall. When a king or leader behaves thus, then he drags down all those who follow him with him.

#### 5.6.2 Rāma Aiming His Arrow, Disturbing the Ocean and Building a Bridge

This is one of the events from the Rāma saga that seems to have captured the hearts of the  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$ . This act of heroism that subdues the Ocean God is mentioned by eight  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$  in a total of 29 verses.<sup>172</sup>

Tirumankaiyalvar refers to it in ten different verses. He sings all these three events together in two hymns. Rama is said to have used his sharp arrow that spits fire to build the bridge across the sea. In another verse he says that the epic hero bent his beautiful bow to discharge deadly arrows and built the bridge across the wave-filled sea using hills. One of his hymns merely mentions him as the hero who bent his cruel bow to shoot fiery arrows that set the wavy ocean on fire. Here the bridge is not mentioned but another verse sings that he built it with the help of the monkey hordes and this disturbed the ocean. Further he

mentions the building of the bridge across the ocean in another verse<sup>177</sup> and the use of the  $v\bar{a}naras$  to do so in two more verses.<sup>178</sup> Three more verses merely say that Rāma built the dam-like bridge in the ocean.<sup>179</sup>

These events are mentioned by Tirumalicaiyalvar in seven verses. But all the three events are not mentioned together. One of the hymns praises Rāma as the famous, victorious and angry hero who bent his bow to discharge the arrow that caused the sea to dry up. 180 The fact that this facilitated the building of the bridge is only inferred here. Another verse says, with poetic beauty, that long ago the skilled archer sent arrows that made the black sea with foamy white waves burn red (with the fire). 181 The other hymns of this alvar do not mention the arrows but contain references to the bridge and the effect it had on the sea. One sings that he covered up (a part of the sea) by building the bridge, 182 two only refer to the bridge that Tirumal built in his Rāma-incarnation 183 and one verse explains that it was built across the roaring sea by the monkey hordes. According to another verse, hills were used to build the bridge with which to cross over to the shores of Lanka. Thus he mentions the bridge in five separate hymns.

Periyālvār refers to these in four verses, but not all the three events together. One verse speaks of the bridge that Rāma built, <sup>186</sup> and two more say that he did so with the help of the *vāṇaras*. <sup>187</sup> This *ālvār* also sings that Rāma shot his arrow and agitated the sea; <sup>188</sup> thus he has combined two of the events.

The reference to Rāma building the bridge is found in two of the hymns sung by Kulacēkarālvār. 189 In another it is mentioned that this act agitated the ocean. 190

Āṇṭāl mentions briefly the bridge which cut across the sea, referring to the strait between south India and Lanka. In one hymn she says that he built it by forgoing his food and sleep (uṇṇātu urankātu). This could be a reference to Rāma's fast to appease Varuṇa the Sea-god.

Tontaratippotiyalvar sings of Rama aiming his unique bow (named Kotantam) to block the sea, 193 so that a bridge may be built.

Like this  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}r$  Poykaiy $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}r$  also makes only one reference to this. He too speaks of blocking the ocean which is a reference to the bridge named  $C\bar{e}tu$ .

In a short phrase, aṭaittāy mākaṭalai<sup>195</sup>Pēyālvār conveys the building of the dam-like bridge across the strait.

Both Vālmīki and Kampar have discussed these three events. <sup>196</sup> But there are some variations in the other events related to these like Rāma asking Varuṇa to make way for him to go over to Lanka, aiming the arrow into the sea, the appearance of Varuṇa before the hero and some details regarding the construction of the bridge. <sup>197</sup>

This incident also helps to convey the heroism and great power of Rāma. It shows that even the elements of nature – earth, water, fire, wind and ether – help him to achieve his ends. Besides, even though bound by the laws of nature, the Sea-god is willing to suggest ways and means to overcome them without harm to other innocent beings.

# 5.6.3 The Squirrels' Assistance in Bridge-building

This incident is mentioned only once in the hymns, by Tontaratippotiyālvār. 198

He compares himself to the small but sincere squirrels which also helped Rāma out of love for him. They wet their bodies in the sea, rolled on the sand and washed it at the site where the bridge was being built.

This does not find mention in either of the epics. It stands out as an incident found only in this hymn.

Through this the <u>alvar</u> expresses his sincere devotion to God and like any true devotee thinks himself lowly in front of God. It also indicates that service to God is judged by one's ability and means. If those who are able can help more like the monkeys bringing hills, those who cannot can help little, like the squirrels bringing grains of sand. All these receive their benefit based on the love with which service is performed.

### 5.6.4 The Slaying of Kumbakarnan

This event is mentioned by three <u>alvars</u> in one hymn each. 199

While dwelling on the attractive, lustrous form of Rāma, Tirumalicaiyālvār says that he killed Kumbakarnan, whose eye-brows were one *kātam* (about 10 miles) apart, using a single arrow.<sup>200</sup>

Āṇṭāl sings that once, long ago the Lord killed Kumbakarṇan who was famous for sleeping. 201

Through the defeated asuras, Tirumankaiyālvār states that Kumbakarnan and others did not take refuge with Rāma. Hence they were struck and killed by his arrows.<sup>202</sup>

While Vālmīki and Kampar mention this slaying, 203 the latter furnishes more details of events prior to it. Rāma sends Vibhīshana to speak to Kumbakarṇaṇ and bring him over if he was agreeable. But inspite of Vibhīshana's reasons as to why it was better to join Rāma, Kumbakarṇaṇ refused. He argued that it would not be proper to desert Rāvaṇa at such an hour of need and that he preferred to die for his king and elder brother. In that way he could at least settle the debt he owed Rāvaṇa for the care and food the latter had provided. Perhaps this is what Tirumankaiyālvār meant when he sings that Kumbakarṇaṇ died because he did not take refuge with Rāma.

Another event that Kampar relates is also not found in Valmiki's epic.

According to Kampar Lakshmana seated on Hanuman's shoulders, attacked Kumbakarnan and succeeded in destroying the asura's chariot.

Further Vālmīki speaks of Kumbakarnan's request to Rāma, according to which the Lord severed the *asura*'s head with a single arrow. His body fell and drowned in the sea while his head that fell in Lanka damaged many houses and roads in the city. But Kampar only mentions that Rama put the severed head of the *asura* into the sea.

The events as depicted by Kampar show Rāma's political wisdom of winning over the allies of the enemies. But the <u>alvārs</u> seem to stress the fact that even the most wicked may be saved if they take refuge with God or else they would perish.

## 5.6.5 The Slaying of Kumban and Nikumban

This is sung by Tirumańkaiyalvar alone in one hymn. 204

Kumban and Nikumban who were the sons of Kumbakarnan were killed by the *vānara* heroes, Sugrīvan and Hanuman. This *ālvār* states through the *asuras* who wailed their fall, that these two kinsmen died because Rāvana took Sītā captive.

While their death is mentioned in both the epics, their chronology in relation to a couple of events is different.<sup>205</sup> Vālmīki places this after the event of

the  $N\bar{a}ga$ - $p\bar{a}sa$  and the burning of Lanka by the monkey hordes. Kampar however places it before those incidents.

Through this the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}r$  stresses that the cruel deeds of the head of a family or country brings sorrow and destruction to all those under his care or rule. Hence the need for those in responsible positions to be mindful of their acts. Again whoever sides *adharma* will have to face the consequences.

#### 5.6.6 Killing of Indrajit

This too is sung only once by Tirumankaiyālvār in one hymn.

The <u>alvar</u> mentions Indrajit along with Kumbakarnan as having died because he would not take refuge with Rama.<sup>206</sup>

Vālmīki and Kampar relate this incident<sup>207</sup> but some details found in Kampar's epic are not found in Valmīki's. The Tamil work relates that at the beginning of the war Indrajit fought against Lakshmana and was wounded severely. When he returned to Lanka he spoke to his father Rāvaṇa with wonderous praise of Lakshmana's capabilities and added that it would be better for them to send Sīta back to her husband. Angered at this, the father derided the son saying that such words showed his cowardice and inability to fight. He also said that Indrajit could withdraw from the war and that he himself would go to the battle-field. Seeing this, Indrajit asked for forgiveness and left for the war in his indestructible, divine chariot. This is not mentioned by Vālmīki.

Besides, according to Valmiki Lakshmana who cut off the head of Indrajit, came to Rāma accompanied by Hanuman and Vibhīshana and worhsipped him. But Kampar, presents some new information. He says that Ankatan carried Indrajit's severed head in his hands. He was followed by Hanuman carrying Lakshmana on his shoulders. Indra seeing Ankatan carrying Indrajit's head, was pleased and praised them.

The victorious Lakshmaṇa, however, was wounded. Vālmīki relates that Rāma, seeing the wounds summoned Suṭēṇaṇ who was an expert in medicine and asked him to treat the brother. Suṭēṇaṇ made Lakshmaṇa inhale some medicinal herbs and the wounds dried up and the scars too disappeared. This piece of information has been left out by Kampar. Instead he sings that Rāma embraced his victorious but wounded brother repeatedly and this made the wounds and scars disappear.

The defeat of Indrajit shows that even those who are mighty and brave can fall if they do not heed *dharma*. This son of Rāvana was called thus because he defeated Indra. But this bravery and fighting-skill could not save him when he came face to face with God or His powers. Here the act of Lakshmana is mentioned as that of Rāma because the former is a representative of the latter.

### 5.6.7 The Slaying of Ravana

This incident which is the climax and the very purpose of the Rāma incarnation has received the most attention of the  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$ . All the eleven  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}rs$  who worshipped Tirumāl in their hymns have sung this event in a total of 50 verses.<sup>208</sup>

This incident which stands out as the final proof of Rāma's power and ability is referred to with piety and poetic beauty by Tirumankaiyālvār in 18 different verses. Two consecutive hymns sing that Rāma set the arrow to his bow so that Rāvaṇa would perish. One verse mentions that the deadly arrow shot during the fight destroyed the firm body of the King of Lanka. Another verse says that Rāma showed his anger with his arrow so that the husband of Mandōtari attained heaven. Seven different hymns say that the arrow was aimed so skillfully that all the ten heads of Rāvaṇa rolled on the ground. Four verses mention that Rāma killed Rāvaṇa for Sītā's sake. In fact in another the ālvār describes that the strong hands and heads of the asura king cut off by Rāma's arrow, rolled on the ground and that Rāma did so for Sītā. To express the great prowess brought out by this incident, Tirumankaiyalvār repeats the word arral (arral mikunta ārralan) as if he is unable to find another suitable word. In order to cross over to Lanka and accomplish this task Rāma used the bears of the forest and the species of monkey known as mucu as his army.

Periyālvār refers to this in nine hymns. In two different verses he mentions together the cutting off of Rāvaṇa's heads and shoulders. Another three only refer to the heads being cut off. Three hymns merely say that Rāma killed or destroyed Rāvaṇa. This ālvār also points out that Rāma killed the asura king for Sīta's sake.

The great prowess of Rāma as shown by this incident is praised by Nammālvār in seven instances. He sings that Rāma severed the twenty shoulders and ten heads of Rāvaṇa.<sup>221</sup> In another verse he mentions the severing of the *asura* 

king's heads that were bright and strong like hills. Rāma used his bow which also resembled a hill. He took away the life of the cruel Rāvaṇa, who had done harm for a long while, by causing the asura king great pain. In another verse this ālvār says that Rāma ended the life of Rāvaṇa who was like the hard core (murutu) of the assura race inhabiting Lanka To achieve this Rāma bent his bow and became the poison which killed the king of Lanka.

Five of the hymns by Tirumalicaiyālvār speak of this incident. He says that long ago Rāma entered Lanka and killed Rāvaṇa and caused his heads to fall to the ground. He did so by shooting continuous arrows so that the heads scattered. Thus the asura king who possessed the sword that Shiva gave died. The use of arrows to destroy Rāvaṇa and with him his kingdom of Lanka are also mentioned.

Āṇṭāḷ who sings that Rama caused Rāvaṇa's heads to fall off, by discharging an arrow, merely mentions in two verses that Tirumāl (as Rāma) killed the asura. 234

Pūtattālvār refers to this important incidence twice. He sings that Rāma went to Lanka and out of anger killed Rāvaṇa<sup>235</sup> by discharging arrows that caused Rāvaṇa's twenty shoulders, ten heads and two feet to fall off.<sup>236</sup>

In two separate verses Kulacekarālvar relates that Rāma reached Lanka and killed its king 237 so that the ten heads of that king scattered. 238

A hymn by Poykaiyālvār states that once before, Tirumāl (as Rāma) took the bow in his lovely hands in order to destroy the arrogance and hostility of Rāvaṇa who held Sītā captive.<sup>239</sup>

Pēyālvār also mentions that Tirumāl as Rāma aimed his arrow so that Rāvaṇa died.  $^{240}$ 

Tiruppāṇālvār describes how the sea-coloured Lord sent a cruel arrow that scattered the ten heads of the King of Lanka surrounded by square walls.<sup>241</sup>

According to Tontaratippotiyalvar the Lord at Tiruvarankam had with his unique bow killed the King of the asuras so that the world may be saved.<sup>242</sup>

Certainly Vālmīki and Kampar have sung this event.<sup>243</sup> Both of them describe that Rāvaṇa's heads kept coming back each time they were cut off till Rāma finally used the *Brahmāstram*. Only then Rāvaṇa died. However, Vālmīki states that Rāma was worried as to how Rāvaṇa may be killed. Seeing this and noticing that the *asura* king had also arrived, Sage Agastya taught Rāma the *aditya-hṛdaya mantra* which he recited and gained the grace of the Sun-god. This is not mentioned by Kampar.

Neither does Kampar mention the duration of the battle between Rāma and Rāvana, which according to Valmīki continued for seven days and seven nights.

The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki narrates that when Vibhīshaṇa saw Rāvaṇa lying lifeless, he lamented with sorrow. But Rāma consoled him and advised him to look into what had to be done. Vibhīshaṇa related to Rāma the good points about Rāvaṇa and with Rāma's consent completed the final rites for his brother. Kampar however shows Vibhīshaṇa falling over his brother's body and lamenting the evil deeds that brought Rāvaṇa to that state. Cāmpavāṇ consoled him so that he performed the final rites for Rāvaṇa and his wife Maṇdōtari.

Besides, the account of Mandotari after Ravana's death is also different in the two epics. Vālmīki shows her as falling over her husband's body, crying and lamenting out of sorrow. When she fainted the co-wives consoled her. But Kampar says that crying she embraced her husband's body and gave up her life. 244

This death of Rāvaṇa at the hands of Rāma may be cited as an example for Krishna's advice to Arjuna just before the Bhārata War. In the **Bhagavad Gītā** he says, "For the protection of the good, for the destruction of the wicked and for the establishment of *dharma* I am born from age to age." Thus Tirumāl, born as Rāma protected *dharma* and those who follow it by destroying evil. So this incident is the purpose and culmination of the Rāma-incarnation.

Again, arrogance and the indifference to the feelings of others are the enemies of each individual. Rāvaṇa, though a great devotee of Shiva, became arrogant due to the boons he had received from Him. Added to that was his lust for women, especially for Sītā, who was the wife of another. These caused his downfall and dishonourable death.

### 5.6.8 The Invasion and Destruction of Lanka

Nine alvars have mentioned this event in 39 different hymns.246

"The Lord in His incarnation as Rāma invaded Lanka and reduced it to ashes with his bow," says Tirumańkaiyālvār. Three of his hymns sing that as Rama the Lord reduced Lanka to dust and four more say that he did so using arrows. In two instances this ālvār says that the Lanka Rāma destroyed was surrounded by fortifying walls. This act of his removed the anxiety and sorrow of the devas but destroyed the whole group of the asuras. Thus Tirumańkaiyālvār refers to these two events in 13 separate hymns.

Nammālvār mentions them in eight different verses. In two of them he sings that during his incarnation of Rāma, Tirumāl invaded and destroyed Lanka<sup>253</sup> and in three more, he speaks of the burning of the city.<sup>254</sup> The large mansions found there in great numbers are said to have been broken down,<sup>255</sup> thereby completing the destruction. Lanka in the south thus became a battleground<sup>256</sup> and the place was set on fire to avenge the captivity of Sīta.<sup>257</sup>

Four hymns of Tirumalicaiyālvār refer to this annihilation of Rāvaṇa's stronghold. A verse says that long ago Rāma went to Lanka and reduced it to ashes<sup>258</sup> and another mentions that he destroyed the defences of the place by shooting arrows at it.<sup>259</sup> Two other verses also mention that Lanka's defences and strength were destroyed by Rāma but do not mention how.<sup>260</sup>

Periyālvār refers to Lanka being destroyed by Rāma's bow.<sup>261</sup> Another verse speaks of the invasion without the effect it had on Lanka.<sup>262</sup> His famous Tiruppallāntu merely refers to Tirumāl as having ruined Lanka, the abode of the rākṣasas.<sup>263</sup>

In two consecutive verses Kulacēkarālvār sings of Rāma ruining fortressed Lanka. Of them the latter also states that he did so with his bent bow. One of his hymns however speaks only of Rāma landing on the sea-shore and then killing the *asuras* and their king. Here no mention is made of the destruction of Lanka but is implied. Also

Āṇṭāļ makes brief references to the two events. She speaks of Tirumāl, as Rāma going to Lanka and destroying it.<sup>266</sup> In one verse she says that the place became a battle-field<sup>267</sup> and was ruined by his arrow.<sup>268</sup>

To Tontaratippotiyālvār the Lord of Srīrangam is the God who annihilated Lanka with his bow. 269 By doing so he destroyed the asuras living there. 270

Only one hymn of Pūtattālvār refers to this saying that the Lord destroyed the place by reducing it to ashes by aiming an arrow.<sup>271</sup>

Pēyālvār refers to it in somewhat the same way. Instead of saying that it was reduced to ashes, he says that it was burnt.<sup>272</sup>

This incident is dealt with in detail by both the epics.<sup>273</sup> It covers all the events that took place from the time Rāma shot his arrow into the sea up to the

slaying of Rāvaṇa. Thus this incident referred to by the ālvārs covers 39 slōkas (verses) of Vālmīki. Kampar uses 31 chapters (paṭalams) to elaborate on this event.

The <u>ālvars</u> use this to sing the divine nature of Rāma which makes him the destroyer of evil and the protector of good. This also illustrates the ability and heroism of Rāma that removes the distress of the virtuous people who ask for help.

## 5.6.9 Granting the Kingdom of Lanka to Vibhishana

Four alvars have sung this gracious act of Rama in nine separate hymns. 274

Though Tirumankaiyālvār refers to this deed of Rāma in four different verses, three of them say it in the same way; which is that Rāma gave the kingdom to Rāvaṇa's younger brother. In the fourth instance he sings that Rāma was good to Vibhishaṇa. Here the granting of kingship is not explicit, but implied. 276

Periyālvār also mentions that the right to rule was given to Vibhīshana after the ten-headed Ravana was killed.<sup>277</sup> When giving it, Rāma is supposed to have said that Vibhīshana could rule it as long as Rāma's name lasted on earth.<sup>278</sup> Another verse mentions that Rāma looked towards the walled city implying that it was for Vibhīshana for a long time to come.<sup>279</sup>

The fact that kingship was given to Vibhishana after his older brother was killed is also expressed by Tirumalicaiyālvār. 280

The same incident is mentioned in the same order by Kulacēkarālvār as well.  $^{281}$ 

Vālmīki and Kampar deal with this event<sup>282</sup> and say that Lakshmaṇa performed the coronation ceremony. But in Vālmīki's account, Lakshmaṇa, following Rāma's instruction, made the *vāṇaras* bring water from the sea and held the *abhisheka* surrounded by the *asuras* and the *devas*. Kampar, however, does not include the *asuras*. According to him Lakshmaṇa utilised the help of the *vāṇaras* and the *devas*. The latter brought the necessary things like holy water and also blessed Vibhīshaṇa by sprinkling flowers on him.

This incident illustrates the concept of caraṇāgati which is important in Vaishnavism. Even the most sinful person is accepted and all wrongs forgiven if he repents sincerely. Vibhishana though an asura was also discerning. He knew how to differentiate right from wrong and judge impartially. So his choice of dharma won him Rāma's love and a kingdom.

## 5.6.10 Sharing a Meal with Hanuman

This event not found in either Vālmīki's or Kampar's epic is sung by Tirumankaiyālvār alone in one of his hymns. On their way back to Ayōdhya, Rāma and his retinue stopped at Sage Bharatvāja's hermitage. There, out of love and gratitude for what Hanuman had done for him, Rāma shared the leaf out of which he was eating, with Hanuman.

Other works, including the Malay version of the Rāmāyaṇa composed later relate this event, which has been discussed in detail earlier in this study.<sup>284</sup>

#### 5.7 Uttara Kandam

Among the Rāmāyaṇa events sung by the alvārs, only two belong to the Uttara Kandam.

### 5.7.1 Rama Hearing His Biography through Lava and Kusa

Only Kulacēkarālvār has referred to this incident in one of his hymns. Here he says that Rāma heard his own story from the coral-red lips of the boys of Sīta, the Princess of Mithila. Their birth was to save the universe.<sup>285</sup>

Both Valmiki and Ottakküttar have mentioned this in their epics<sup>286</sup> but with some variations. The Sanskrit epic states that Valmiki himself took the princes to the place where the sages attending Rama's asvamedha yāga stayed. He also instructed them to sing sweetly and please the audience if requested by Rāma to sing. Their song was also to contain the advice that one should not have any kind of desire. But Ottakküttar sings that the sage, remained in his hermitage but sent Lava and Kusa to sing at the asvamedha yāga. They too, paying homage to the sage and their mother Sītā, took leave and left for Ayodhya. No mention is made of the sage's presence at the yāga or the instruction he gave to the two princes.

Besides, according to Vālmīki, Rāma overheard the two boys singing the Rāmāyaṇa verses and was surprised. Later he made them sing in the presence of many poets. They sang the 20 sargas of the text to the wonder of all. Then Rāma

asked one of his brothers to give 18,000 gold (coins) and everything else they wanted. But the princes refused to accept anything saying that there was no need for such things because they lived in the forest. Ottakkūttar does not mention that the two sang in an assembly of poets. However, he has increased the amount of gold that Rāma wished the princess to receive. Instead of 18,000 he made it 180 million (or 18 koti).

This  $\bar{a}\underline{l}v\bar{a}r$  (and perhaps the epic poets too) have used this incident to show the purity and greatness of  $S\bar{l}t\bar{a}$ . Rāma heard his own story through the boys who had a striking resemblance to him. Their physical appearance and the truth that they were born of  $S\bar{l}t\bar{a}$  suggests very subtely her chasteness. This incident is important to convince the general public of  $S\bar{l}t\bar{a}$ 's purity.

# 5.7.2 Rama Being Separated from Lakshmana

This too has been sung only once and that too by the same alvar, Kulacekaralvar<sup>287</sup> in the consecutive verse. But he merely sings that Rama was separated from Lakshmana because of a request from a sage. No other details are offered.

Valmiki and Ottakküttar touch on this incident.<sup>288</sup> One day, after many years of kingship, Yama instigated by Brahma visits Rāma in the guise of a sage and blesses him. Rāma receives him with the respect due to a sage and enquires about the purpose of the visit. Yama replies that he had been sent by a great sage and if the king wished to hear the message no one should be around. If any one were to overhear their conversation or come in while they were still talking, Rama

should order the death of that person. Rama agreed to this condition and informing Lakshmana the details of the condition appoints him to guard the door. But before the two could finish their talks, sage Durvāsa comes to the entrance and demands to see Rama immediately. Even when Lakshmana pays him homage and begs to be allowed to fulfill the sage's needs, he gets very angry. He insists that Rāma be informed of his arrival at once. Otherwise he would curse that the city, the family and the whole Ikshuvāku line be destroyed. Hearing this Lakshmana decides that it would be better for him to die instead. So he goes in and informs Rāma of Durvāsa at the door. The king sends Yama away and receiving the sage asks about his arrival. The latter says that he has come after 1000 years of penance and wants food to satisfy his immense hunger. Rāma feeds him as desired and the sage giving his blessings, leaves. Then, to keep the word he has given to Yama who had come in the form of a sage earlier, he tells the brother, "O Lakshmana! For the noble, abandonment and torture are the same. I therefore abandon you. Do not stand before me. Go away." Lakshmana, with tears in his eyes, goes to the River Sarāyu, bathes, controls his breath in pranāyāma and attains moksha. This narrative is found in the Uttara Rāmāyana. 289

## 5.8 Reasons for the Frequent Use of Rāmāyana Incidents

V. Raghavan, in his Ramayana in Greater India, says "The Rāmāyaṇa is the Ādi-kāvya and the model and fountainhead of all Sanskrit poetry and drama and inspires all the literatures in all Indian languages." Yet most instances show Krishna avatāra taking first place and the Rāma avatāra being second in importance. It must be remembered that the intention of the ālvārs was not to sing the story of Rāma. Their aim was to sing the gracious acts of Tirumāl. It is

known as caulappiyam while the latter illustrates the kindly disposition and friendship he showed to his friends as well as to those who approached him for favours or for refuge. This is known as caucilyam or caucanniyam. Hence the alvars were greatly attracted by the playful acts of Kannan or Krishna as a child and also as a man. These made the identification of Krishna with Tirumal easier and hence the Krishna incarnation takes precedence over all the others. Yet Tirumal's acts as a man and king in the Rama avatara sung with devotion and reverence take the next place of importance.

Besides, a message said through an incident well-known to the common man or has affected him in any way reaches him easily and creates as greater impact. The <u>ālvārs</u> seem to have used the Rāmāyaṇa incidents as a vehicle to convey to the people, their ideas and concept of a loving God. This must be a reason for their abundant use of these incidents.

It may also be argued that their frequent reference to the Rāmāyaṇa incidents is due to the influence the epic had on the ālvārs themselves. The epic by showing Rāma as a gracious descent of Tirumāl as a human being, enables all men to relate to him easily. For as Rāma, he too goes through the various aspects of human life such as the likes and dislikes, relationships of husband-wife, father or mother-son, brother, friend, master and king, praiseworthy qualities, characteristics to be set aside or shunned and actions to be emulated or avoided.

During the ages before the <u>alvars</u>, the only written version of the Rāmāyaṇa was that of Valmīki. It is believed that this work belongs to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. Yet, in the Jātaka Tales composed before this period in the Prākṛt language with the intention of spreading the Buddha faith, the story of Rāma is already found.<sup>293</sup>

Apart from these written versions, there must have been many others prevalent among the people, passed around and to the descendents as oral tradition. Later, they could have been modified to suit geographical and cultural situations. Dr. C. Bulke S.J. in his Ph.D. thesis entitled "Rāma-Kātha" (1950) submitted to the University of Allahabad has succeeded in dealing with 300 versions of the story of Rāma in Sanskrit and various vernaculars. All these versions of the story go back to the "floating literature" from which the Brahmans, the Buddhists and the Jains adopted what was useful for the illustration of their beliefs and teachings. The ālvārs of the Tamil country too must have drawn from these oral versions, apart from Vālmīki and changed or modified them to suit their purpose as well as the cultural environment. This is suggested by four incidents they have sung but not found in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. They are:-

- Rāma aiming his catapult at Kūni.
- 2. Sītā tying Rāma with a jasmine garland.
- 3. The squirrels helping in bridge-building.
- 4. Răma sharing his meal with Hanuman using the same leaf.

These four incidents stand out as special ones found only in the hymns of the  $\bar{a}lv\bar{a}rs$  and their identification is one of the results of this study. They could have

been in circulation either before or after the period of Vālmīki. Of these, only the first mentioned incident is sung by Kampar.

Though Kampar, who belongs to a later period in history than the ālvārs, has composed his epic following Vālmīki, he certainly has made many modifications on the basis of tradition. He has included certain details that were popularly found among the Tamils as well as some not found in the hymns of the ālvārs. It may be said that the transformation of Rāma depicted as a man by Vālmīki into an avatāra of Tirumāl in Kampar's work is due to the impact of these hymns. Thus the influence of the hymns on Kampar is more in the realm of religion and devotion and not so much in the incidents mentioned. This is because Kampar has followed Vālmīki to a great extent.

Yet it would not be correct to ascribe this transition solely to the influence of these hymns. The Cilappatikāram, which is placed about five hundred years before the earliest ālvārs, speaks clearly of Rāma as an incarnation of Tirumāl. It also suggests that this idea had gained strength even during the Sangam period and the years following it. The Perumpāṇārruppaṭai and the Purattiṇai Iyal of the Tolkāppiyam refer to the Chola king as Tirumāl himself.<sup>298</sup> Thus the idea that Rāma is Tirumāl incarnate seems to have existed since the Sangam period. But the ālvārs helped to spread and popularize it.

While there is great similarity between the two epic poets in the incidents mentioned there are also minor differences. This chapter discusses only such difference in instances relevant to this study.

This study also shows that the ālvārs have not mentioned all the events of the Rāmāyaṇa found in Välmīki's or Kampar's works. The Rāma saga depicted in the hymns of the ālvārs seems to be a random summary of important events found in the narration of the Rāmāyaṇa. Yet some events which occupy an important place in the epics, like the story of Akalya and of Sītā entering the fire to prove her purity do not seem to have found a place in the Nālāyirat Tivyap Pirapantam. This is certainly noteworthy for the earlier incident shows the greatness of Rāma, the dust of whose feet was enough to free Akalya from a curse while the latter shows Sītā's divine purity.

Table 1: The Rama Saga As Depicted by the Alvārs

ינמו	01		2	2		15	4	10		2	4		3			13	6	2
let					_		_			'							<u> </u>	
, smn	ms M		Constant and the second of the			2									410000000000000000000000000000000000000	3		
' wewn	miT		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-		7	7	4		2	3		2			7	3	-
.	JnA					-												
уз	ins4		2			4		_	-							7		
, 931	Kula			1	1	1	-					1			-		2	1
.et	Ton																	
ilsm	miT						1									2	4	
. uedd	miT															1		
aj.	Ьеу							1										
. Jai	huq							-								1		
ykai .	$^{ m bo}$							1										
Alvārs (Instance)	Incidents	3 Aranya Kandam:			- 1		5.3.5 The Killing of Karan and Tūṭaṇan	5.3.6 The Appearance and Death of Mārica	5.3.7 Lakshmana Going Away Leaving Sitā Alone	5.3.8 Ravaņa's Desire for Sītā	5.3.9 Abduction and Imprisonment of Sita by Rāvaņa	5.3.10 The Death of Jadāyu	5.3.11 The Killing of Kavantan	4 Kishkinta Kandam:	5.4.1 Friendship with Sugrīva	5.4.2 Aiming a Single Arrow through Seven <i>Marā</i> Trees	5.4.3 The Slaying of Vali	5.4.4 Appointing Sugriva as King
	Inc	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	1	25		5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4

Imol		2	2	4			28		3	_	- (	20	39	6	_
, smmsN lstoT					AND THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN					+	-	7	∞		
			2	3			10					18	13	4	
. nsmuriT			.,	-				+		-	+				
, JnA							2		-		-	3	3		
. вуітэЧ		2		-			4				,	6	4	3	
Kulace.							3					2	3	1	
, stnoT							1	_				-	2		
ilsmuriT							7		1			5		1	
,neqquriT												_	4		
Реуај.												_	1		
Putat,												7	_		
Poykai.	,						-	7				-			
Ajvārs (Instance)   Incidents	5.5 Cuntara Kandam:	5.5.1 Hanuman as a Messenger and the Proofs of Identity He Gives Sita*	5.5.2 Hanuman's Acts of Anger and Destruction	5.5.3 Hanuman Burning Lanka	5.6 Yutta Kandam:	5 6 1 Vibhíshana's Advise to Ravana	1	and Building a Bridge	5.6.4 The Slaving of Kumbakaman		1		1		
In	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	25		i,	0 0	5	5	v	iv	iv	100

		т		
Total		-	-	269
. smmsV				
. nemniT				
, JnA				
Periya ,				
Kulace .		1	-	
, sinoT				
, ilsmuriT				
. n.eqqvniT				
Peyal				
Putat.				
Poykai,				
$ar{A}ar{l}var{a}rs$ (Instance)	5.7 Uttara Kandam:	5.7.1 Rāma Hearing his Biography through Lava and Kusa	5.7.2 Rama Being Separated from Lakshmana	

\*These incidents are found only in the hymns of the alvars.

#### Endnotes

- 1. Subbureddiyar, N. 1983. Cila Nökkil Näläyiram. Chennai: Pari Nilaiyam, p. 317.
- 2. <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 334.
- 3. See, 2.7.2 of Chapter Two.
- 4. Tirumali, Tiruccan.: 34 and 49; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-6-2; Namma., Tiruvay.: 1-5-5.
- 5. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan</u>.: 30 and 49.
- 6. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-6-2.
- 7. Namma., <u>Tiruvay</u>.: 1-5-5.
- 8. <u>RK.</u>, II, 2: 41.
- 9. Subbureddiyar, N. 1983. Cila Nökkil Nalayiram, p. 331.
- 10. RV., II, 7: RV (HPS)., I, p. 173.
- 11. <u>Tonta.</u>, <u>Tiruppalli.</u>: 4; Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru.</u>: 8-2 and 10-2; Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru.</u>: 3-9-2; Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru.</u>: 8-6-3 and 9-8-4, <u>Peri. Tiruma.</u>: Lines 146-147.
- 12. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 8-6-3. Peri. Tiruma.: Lines 146-147.
- 13. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 9-8-4.
- 14. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-2.
- 15. <u>Ibid.</u>, 8-2.
- 16. Tonta., Tiruppalli.: 4.
- 17. Periya, Periya, Tiru.: 3-9-2.
- 18. RV., I, 29-31: RV (HPS)., I, pp. 65-69; RK., I, 7: 72-73 and 8: 41-52.
- 19. Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru.</u>: 9-4 and 10-3; Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru.</u>: 2-3-7, 3-10-1 and 9; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-1-8 and 10-6-8. <u>Tirunetu.</u>: 13.
- 20. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-1.
- 21. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-10-9.
- 22. <u>Ibid.</u>, 2-3-7.
- 23. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-1-8.
- 24. <u>Ibid.</u>, 10-6-8.
- 25. Tiruman., <u>Tirunetu</u>.: 13.
- 26. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 9-4.
- 27. Ibid., 10-3.

- 28. RV., I, 66-67: RV (HPS)., I, pp. 131-134; RK., I, 12: 1-3 and 25-35.
- 29. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 8; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 9-9 and 10-3; Periya., Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-9-2 and 3-10-1.
- 30. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-9-2 and 3-10-1.
- 31. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 9-9.
- 32. Ibid., 10-3.
- 33. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 8.
- 34. RV., I, 75-76: RV (HPS)., I, pp. 148-151.
- 35. RK., I, 22:7-39.
- Ramanujam, K. 1994. <u>Vainava Antāti Kattum Camayaneri</u>. Madurai: Muthu Patippakam, pp. 33-34.
- 37. Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru.</u>: 8-5 and 6, 9-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, 10-4; Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru.</u>: 2-1-8, 3-9-4 and 8, 3-10-3, 4-8-4, Tiruman, <u>Peri. Tiru.</u>: 1-5-1, 3-1-6 and 5-6-10, Peri. Tiruma.: Lines 46-51.
- 38. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-6.
- 39. <u>Ibid.</u>, 10-4.
- 40. Ibid., 9-2 and 8.
- 41. <u>Ibid.</u>, 9-1 and 5.
- 42. <u>Ibid.</u>, 9-10.
- 43. <u>Ibid.</u>, 9-9 and 11.
- 44. <u>Ibid.</u>, 8-5.
- 45. <u>Ibid.</u>, 9-3, 4 and 7.
- 46. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-1-8.
- 47. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-8-4.
- 48. Ibid., 3-9-4 and 8, 3-10-3.
- 49. Tiruman., Peri. Tiruma.: Lines 49-53.
- 50. Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru</u>.: 5-10-6.
- 51. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-1-6.
- 52. <u>Ibid.</u>, 1-5-1.
- 53. RV., II, 11-14, 18-19, 21-31 and 40-50: RV (HPS)., I, pp. 186-197, 207-210, 216-242 and 262-284; RK., II, 2: 81-82, 3: 14, 4: 235 and 5: 10-16, 46-48 and 53.
- 54. In childhood, Rāma once aimed a pellet from his catapult which hit the hunch-back of the maid-servant Mantarai. She felt hurt physically and emotionally. So she waited for the opportune moment and through Kaikēyi and the boons King Dasaratha promised her, sent

him to the forest for twelve years. After the coronation of Sugrīva, Rāma advises him on his duties. One such advice is not to ignore those who are weaker in strength or hurt them in anyway. He adds that he has suffered greatly because he did so by hurting Kūni. Please see, RK, IV, 8: 12.

- 55. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-4; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-4; Tiruman, Peri. Tiru.: 5-8-1.
- 56. Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru</u>.: 5-8-1.
- 57. Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru</u>.: 3-10-4.
- 58. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-4.
- 59. <u>RV</u>., II, 18-19, 21-23, 27-30 and 40-52: <u>RV</u> (<u>HPS</u>)., I, pp. 207-210, 216-224, 233-242 and 262-293.
- 60. RK., V, 3:23.
- Ramabathiran, A. 1997. <u>Vainavam Tanta Valam</u>. Chennai: Ganga Puttaka Nilayam, p. 129.
- 62. Kulace., Peru. Tiru., 8-5 and 10-4; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-1-8, 3-9-6, 3-10-5 and 4-9-1.
- Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru</u>.: 3-9-6.
- 64. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-9-1.
- 65. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-10-5.
- 66. <u>Ibid.</u>, 2-1-8.
- 67. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-4.
- 68. Ibid., 8-5.
- 69. <u>RV</u>., II, 98, 101-102, 106-107 and 112-115: <u>RV</u> (<u>HPS</u>)., I, pp. 390, 398-401, 409-413 and 422-429. <u>RK</u>., II, 12: 53, 117-118, 133 and 136.
- 70. <u>RK.</u>, II, 12, pp. 411-412.
- 71. Periya., Periya, Tiru.: 2-6-7 and 3-10-6.
- 72. <u>Ibid</u>.
- 73. <u>RV., V, 38: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 426-428; RK., V, 3: 28.</u>
- 74. Rajagopalachari. 1973. Rāmāyaṇam. Chennai: Vanathi Patippakam, pp. 519-521.
- 75. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 3-4-6.
- 76. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5.
- 77. Tiruman., Peri, Tiru.: 3-4-6.
- 78. <u>RV.</u>, III, 2-4: <u>RV</u> (<u>HPS</u>)., II, pp. 4-10; <u>RK.</u>, III, 1: 5-46.
- 79. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5.
- 80. <u>RV</u>., III, 12-13: <u>RV</u> (<u>HPS</u>)., II, pp. 27-31; <u>RK</u>., III, 3: 36-58.

- 81. Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru</u>.: 10-5; Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru</u>.: 2-7-5, 3-9-8, 4-2-2 and 4-7-1; Ant., <u>Nac. Tiru</u>.: 10-4; Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru</u>.: 1-5-5, 3-7-3, 3-9-4, 7-4-3 and 10-6-9, <u>Ciri. Tiruma</u>.: Lines 39-40, <u>Peri. Tiruma</u>.: Lines 144-146; Namma., <u>Peri. Tiruva</u>.: 63, <u>Tiruva</u>.: 2-3-6.
- 82. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 3-9-4 and 7-4-3, Ciri. Tiruma.: Lines 39-40.
- 83. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-5-5, 3-7-3 and 3-9-4, Peri. Tiruma.: Lines 144-146.
- 84. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-7-5, 4-2-2 and 4-7-1.
- 85. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-9-8.
- 86. Namma., Peri. Tiruva.: 63.
- 87. Namma., Tiruvay.: 2-3-6.
- 88. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5.
- 89. Ant., Nac. Tiru.: 10-4.
- 90. RV., III, 17-18: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 38-42; RK., III, 5: 92-94.
- 91. Tirukkural: 402.
- 92. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan</u>.: 104; Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru</u>.: 10-5; Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru</u>.: 2-10-5, <u>Ciri. Tiruma</u>.: Lines 40-41.
- 93. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 2-10-5, Ciri. Tiruma.: Lines 40-41.
- 94. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 104.
- 95. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5.
- 96. RV., III, 22-30: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 47-65; RK., III, 6:18-20, 75-115 and 127-185.
- 97. Poykai., 1st Tiru.: 82; Putat., 2nd Tiru.: 15; Peyal., 3rd Tiru: 52; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-7; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-4-2, 2-5-6, 6-7-3 and 11-4-7; Namma., Peri. Tiruva.: 52.
- 98. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 6-7-3 and 11-4-7.
- 99. Ibid., 1-4-2.
- 100. Ibid., 2-5-6.
- 101. Poykai., 1st Tiru.: 82.
- 102. Putat., 2<sup>nd</sup> Tiru.: 15.
- 103. Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 52.
- 104. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-5.
- 105. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-7.
- 106. Namma., Peri. Tiruva.: 52.
- 107. RV., III, 35-44: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 73-92; RK., III, 7: 170-248.
- 108. Ramanujam, A. 1994. Vainava Antāti Kattum Camaya Neri, p. 99.

- 109. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-7.
- 110. <u>RV.</u>, III, 45: <u>RV (HPS)</u>., II, pp. 93-95; <u>RK.</u>, III, 8: 4-19.
- 111. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 2-2-1 and 2.
- 112. RV., III, 46: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 95-97; RK., III, 8: 20-32.
- 113. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-2-3, 5 and 8; Namma., Tiruvay.: 4-8-5.
- 114. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-2-5.
- 115. <u>Ibid.</u>, 10-2-3.
- 116. Ibid., 10-2-8.
- 117. Namma., Tiruvay.: 4-8-5.
- 118. <u>RV.</u>, III, 46-49 and 54-56: <u>RV (HPS)</u>., II, pp. 98-104 and 114-120; <u>RK.</u>, III, 8: 65-75 and 146.
- 119. Sita tells Hanuman, 'The curse pronounced by Brahma that the (asura) king's crowned heads will split and spill, if he touched women who did not desire him, has saved my life", (Cuntara Kānṭam: 627). Once, Rāvaṇa violated Puncikastalai, a woman of the waterworld, who was on her way to pay homage to Brahma. Angered by this, Brahma pronounced this curse on Rāvaṇa, (RK., V, 5:21). Apart from him, Vēdavati, Naļakūparan and his beloved Rambha also cursed him thus. Please see, RK., III, 8: 72.
- 120. Kulace, Peru. Tiru.: 10-6.
- 121. RV., III, 68: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 142-144; RK., III, 8: 214-215 and 220-224.
- 122. RK., III, 8, pp. 246.
- 123. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 2-10-5 and 3-4-6; Tirumali., Tiruccan. 104.
- 124. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 2-10-5 and 3-4-6.
- 125. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 104.
- 126. RV., III, 70: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 147-148; RK., III, 10: 38.
- 127. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-6.
- 128. RV., IV, 5: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 177-179; RK., IV, 3: 16-27.
- 129. Poykai., 1<sup>st</sup> Tiru.: 27; Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 52; Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 73 and 81; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-4-2 and 4-1-3; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 5-5-2 and 10-6-9; Namma., Tiruvay.: 1-5-6, 2-5-7, 6-10-5 and 9-1-2, Peri. Tiruva.: 64.
- 130. Namma., Tiruvay.: 1-5-6.
- 131. Ibid., 2-5-7.
- 132. <u>Ibid.</u>, 6-10-5.
- 133. <u>Ibid.</u>, 9-1-2, <u>Peri. Tiruva</u>.: 64.
- 134. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan</u>.: 81.

- 135. Ibid., 73.
- 136. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 4-1-3.
- 137. Ibid., 2-4-2.
- 138. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 5-5-2.
- 139. Ibid., 10-6-9.
- 140. Poykai., 1st Tiru.: 27.
- 141. Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 52.
- 142. RV., IV, 12: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 195-196; RK., IV, 4: 2-17.
- 143. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 28 and 85, Tiruccan.: 73 and 81; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-7 and 10-6; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-4-2, 3-4-6 and 4-6-3.
- 144. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 73.
- 145. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 28.
- 146. <u>Ibid.</u>, 85.
- 147. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 81.
- 148. Tiruman, Peri. Tiru.: 1-4-2 and 3-4-6.
- 149. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-6-3.
- 150. Kulace., Peri. Tiru.: 8-7.
- 151. <u>Ibid</u>., 10-6.
- 152. RV., IV, 16-17: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 204-206; RK., IV, 7: 66-82.
- 153. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-7; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-6-3.
- 154. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-7.
- 155. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-6-3.
- 156. RV., IV, 26: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 231-234; RK., IV, 8:2-5.
- 157. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 3-10-8 and 3-10-2.
- 158. <u>RV.</u>, IV, 2, 15 and 33-35: <u>RV (HPS)</u>., II, pp. 338-341, 372-375 and 409-418; <u>RK.</u>, V, 4: 23-64.
- 159. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru., 2-2-3 and 10-2-6.
- 160. RV., V, 41-47: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 435-449; RK., V, 6-10.
- 161. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-6; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 6-4-6 and 10-2-6, Tirunetu.: 20.
- 162. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 6-4-6.
- 163. Ibid., 10-2-6.

- 164. Tiruman., Tirunetu.: 20.
- 165. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-6.
- 166. RV., V, 54-55: RV (HPS)., II, pp. 464-469; RK., V, 12: 135-40 and 13: 1-64.
- The objects that came to Shiva's aid when he set out to burn Tiripura are the snake Atisesha as the bow-string, Tirumāl as the arrow and earth as the base of His chariot. Please see, RK., V, 12: 135.
- 168. "The fire set before was at Tiripura; That set later was at Lanka in the South". Please see, Cittar Padalgal. 1987. Chennai: Manivasagar Nulagam, p. 126.
- 169. Tirukkural: 667.
- 170. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-2-4.
- 171. RV., VI, 9-10: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 21-24; RK., VI, 2: 98-99.
- 172. Poykai., 1st. Tiru.: 2; Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 28, Tiruccan.: 28, 31, 32, 39, 50 and 92; Tonta, Tiruma.: 11; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-1 and 8, 10-7; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 1-6-7 and 8, 2-6-8 and 3-9-10; Ant., Nac. Tiru.: 2-6 and 11-7; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-2-2, 3-2-6, 4-2-1, 5-7-7, 8-5-6 and 7, 10-2-7 and 10-6-7; Tirunetu.: 29, Peri. Tiruma.: Line 97.
- 173. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 3-2-6.
- 174. Ibid., 5-7-7.
- 175. <u>Ibid.</u>, 8-5-6.
- 176. <u>Ibid.</u>, 1-2-2.
- 177. Tiruman., Tirunetu.: 29.
- 178. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-6-7, Peri. Tiruma.: Line 97.
- 179. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-2-1, 8-5-7 and 10-2-7.
- 180. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 31.
- 181. <u>Ibid.</u>, 50.
- 182. <u>Ibid.</u>, 28.
- 183. <u>Ibid.</u>, 92, <u>Nan. Tiru.</u>: 28.
- 184. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan</u>.: 32.
- 185. <u>Ibid.</u>, 39.
- 186. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-6-8.
- 187. <u>Ibid.</u>, 1-6-8 and 3-9-10.
- 188. <u>Ibid.</u>, 1-6-7.
- 189. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-1 and 8.
- 190. <u>Ibid.</u>, 10-7.

- 191. Ant., Nac. Tiru.: 2-6.
- 192. Ibid., 11-7.
- 193. Tonta., Tiruma.: 11.
- 194. Poikai., 1st Tiru.: 2.
- 195. Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 53.
- 196. <u>RV.</u>, VI, 19 and 21-23: <u>RV (HPS)</u>., III, pp. 45-46, 48-55 and 57; <u>RK.</u>, VI, 6: 59-76 and 82-84, 7: 5-9 and 65.
- 197. (1) Välmiki sings that Rāma observed a fast in honour of Varuna and slept on darbha grass for three days. But Kampar states that he fasted for seven days to appease Varuna, the God of the seven seas.
  - (2) According to Vālmīki, Rāma bent his bow, the *Kotantam* to summon Varuna, but Lakshmana who was with him held the bow to prevent the brother, saying that Varuna could be subdued even without the bow. The *devas* and the sages also felt the same. Kampar does not mention this.
  - When he shot the arrows into the sea, Rāma used one bow to shoot the Brahmāstra and a different one for the other arrows. Kampar differs from this account of Vālmīki and says that Rāma used the same bow for the Brahmāstra as well.
  - (4) When the Brahmāstra was shot, Varuṇa rose from the midst of the sea like Sūrya rising from the Udayagiri. He wore gold ornaments studded with various gems, fragrant garlands and a string of pearls to which the Kauntubha gem was attached. This is Vālmīki's description. But Kampar paints a different picture. According to him Varuṇa, scorched by the fire and smoke in the sea, came repentent. He came like a blind man, not knowing his way. No adornments are mentioned.
  - Vālmīki says that Varuņa approached Rāma who stood with bow and arrow in his hands, uttering polite words of praise and presented his request. Kampar shows Varuṇa approaching the hero, lamenting "Refuge, refuge" and praising the divine status of Rāma. Then placing a chain of bright gems at his feet, fell to the ground and asked for forgiveness. Varuṇa also explained the cause for his delay in obliging Rāma. He had to be away at the seventh sea to avoid a fight between the fishes there.
  - When asked to make way for Rāma and his army, Varuṇa, according to Vālmīki, had said firmly that the sea cannot be dried up by devotion or fear to the Sea-god. Neither could the water be hardened because of the fish and other creatures living in the sea. Kampar shows Varuṇa as being more humble. He explains to Rāma that since the breadth and depth of the ocean is immeasurable it would take a very long time for the water to dry up. This will slacken Rāma's army. Therefore drying up the sea is not a suitable way. Hardening the water like stone would destroy the creatures of the sea, and therefore unsuitable too. So he suggests that it would be better to build a bridge.
  - (7) Since he had already fixed the Brahmāstra to the bow, Rāma asked for a target for the arrow. Vālmīki says that Varuņa mentioned the place named Turumakulyam inhabited by many wicked people who caused troubles to others and drank up his sea-water. So Rāma discharged the arrow which killed all of them. But due to a boon granted by Rāma, the place became good, fertile and famous. It came to be known as Marukāntāram. Kampar does not mention the old name of that place. He only uses the name Marukāntāram but presents further information. The

- people who lived there were known as avuņar and they were 100  $k\bar{o}ti$  in number (1  $k\bar{o}ti$  = 10 millions).
- (8) Vālmīki Ramāyaņa says that Varuņa pointed to the son of Visvakarman saying "This Naļa is suitable" to build the bridge and disappeared. This is slightly different in Kamparāmāyaņam. Here Sugrīva is said to have considered the matter with other knowledgeable persons and finding Naļa most suitable, invited him to perform the task.
- (9) Valmiki lists the names of the trees uprooted by the *vānaras* and says that the monkeys brought the trees with the help of machines. Kampar who describes the building of the bridge in 36 verses (10-45) does not mention this.
- (10) According to Valmiki, the period taken to complete the bridge was 5 days but according to Kampar it took only 3 days. Please see, RV., VI, 19 and 21-23: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 45-46, 48-55 and 57; RK., VI, 6: pp. 564-566; 7: pp. 653-654.
- 198. Tonta., Tiruma.: 27.
- 199. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 29; Ant., Tiruppa. 10; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-3-2.
- 200. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 29.
- 201. Ant., Tiruppa.: 10.
- 202. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-3-2.
- 203. RV., VI, 67-68: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 183-189; RK., VI, 15:309-362.
- 204. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-2-5.
- 205. RV., VI, 76-79: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 224-231; RK., VI, 17: 237-247 and 250-251.
- 206. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-3-2.
- 207. RV., VI, 91: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 261-266; RK., VI, 27: 40-51.
- 208. Poykai., 1st. Tiru.: 59; Putat., 2nd. Tiru.: 25 and 43; Peyal., 3rd Tiru.: 52; Tiruppan, Amala.: 4; Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 28, Tiruccan.: 33, 51, 56 and 116; Tonta., Tiruma.: 11; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-1 and 10-7; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-6-8 and 9, 2-7-5, 3-9-10, 4-2-2, 4-3-8, 4-7-1, 4-8-5 and 10; Ant., Tiruppa. 12 and 13, Nac. Tiru.: 5-3; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-5-1, 2-2-2, 3-1-7, 4-2-1, 4-6-4, 5-4-5, 6-8-5, 6-10-6, 7-5-3, 7-8-7, 8-6-3, 9-1-7, 9-6-4 and 10-2-2. Tirunetu.: 28 and 29, Ciri. Tiruma.: Lines 41-42, Peri. Tiruma.: Lines 98-99; Namma., Tiruvay.: 1-6-7, 2-7-10, 3-8-2 and 4-3-1, Peri. Tiruva.: 11, 17 and 66.
- 209. Tiruman., Tirunetu.: 28 and 29.
- 210. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 6-8-5.
- 211. <u>Ibid.</u>, 6-10-6.
- 212. <u>Ibid.</u>, 5-4-5.
- 213. Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiruma</u>.: Lines 98-99. <u>Peri. Tiru</u>.: 1-5-1, 4-2-1, 4-6-4, 7-5-3, 9-1-7 and 9-6-4.
- 214. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 8-6-3.
- 215. <u>Ibid.</u>, 2-2-2, 3-1-7 and 10-2-2. <u>Ciri. Tiruma</u>.: Lines 41-42.

- 216. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 7-8-7.
- 217. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-6-9 and 4-2-2.
- 218. <u>Ibid.</u>, 2-6-8, 3-9-10 and 2-7-5.
- 219. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-3-8, 4-8-5 and 10.
- 220. Ibid., 4-7-1.
- 221. Namma., Tiruvay.: 1-6-7.
- 222. Namma., Peri. Tiruva.: 17.
- 223. <u>Ibid.</u>, 11.
- 224. <u>Ibid.</u>, 66.
- 225. <u>Namma.</u>, <u>Tiruvay</u>.: 2-7-10.
- 226. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-3-1.
- 227. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-8-2.
- 228. Tiruma., Tiruccan.: 56.
- 229. Ibid., 51.
- 230. <u>Ibid.</u>, 116.
- 231. <u>Ibid.</u>, 33.
- 232. Tirumali., Nan. Tiru.: 28.
- 233. Ant., Nac. Tiru.: 5-3.
- 234. Ant., Tiruppa.: 12 and 13.
- 235. Putat., 2<sup>nd</sup> Tiru.: 25.
- 236. Ibid., 43.
- 237. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-7.
- 238. <u>Ibid.</u>, 8-1.
- 239. Poykai., 1st Tiru.: 59.
- 240. Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 52.
- 241. Tiruppan., Amala.: 4.
- 242. Tonta., <u>Tiruma</u>.: 11.
- 243. RV., VI, 110: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 314-316; RK., VI, 36: 148-152, 162-168, 171 and 182-198.
- This death of Mandōtari in <u>Kamparāmāyanam</u> is comparable to that of the Pandya Queen in the <u>Cilappatikāram</u>. Please see, 20: 78-81. <u>The Cilappatikāram</u>. 1978. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Prof. V.R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, M.A. With Foreward by

Jules Bloch and Prof. K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar. Madurai: The South Indian Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, Tirunelvelly. Ltd., pp. 290-291.

- 245. Bhagavad Gita: 4: 8.
- Putat., 2<sup>nd</sup> Tiru.: 29; Peyal., 3<sup>rd</sup> Tiru.: 51; Tirumali, Nan. Tiru.: 28, Tiruccan.: 39, 54 and 116; Tonta., Tiruma.: 7, Tiruppalli.: 4; Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-8 and 9, 10-7; Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 1-6-8, 2-1-10 and 3-9-10, Tiruppal.: 3; Ant., Tiruppa.: 24, Nac. Tiru.: 2-6 and 3-3; Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-2-2, 2-2-3, 3-9-5, 4-8-5, 6-5-3, 7-4-4, 9-4-5, 10-2-10 and 11-4-10, Tirukkuru.: 2; Tirunetu.: 28, Tiruvelu.: Line 4, Ciri. Tiruma.: Line 26; Namma., Tiruviru.: 36, 77 and 92, Tiruvay: 2-1-3, 3-6-2, 4-8-5, 6-1-10 and 7-3-7.
- 247. Tiruman., Tiruvelu.: Line 4.
- 248. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 1-2-2 and 2-2-3, Ciri. Tiruma.: Line 26.
- 249. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 3-9-5, 7-4-4, 9-4-5 and 11-4-10.
- 250. Tiruman., Tirukkuru.: 2, Tirunetu.: 28.
- 251. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 10-2-10.
- 252. Ibid., 4-8-5 and 6-5-3.
- 253. Namma., Tiruvay.: 7-3-7 and 6-1-10.
- 254. <u>Ibid.</u>, 2-1-3 and 3-6-2, <u>Tiruviru</u>.: 92.
- 255. Namma., Tiruviru.: 36.
- 256. <u>Ibid.</u>, 77.
- 257. Namma., Tiruvay.: 4-8-5.
- 258. Tirumali., Tiruccan.: 116.
- 259. Ibid., 54.
- 260. <u>Ibid.</u>, 39, <u>Nan. Tiru.</u>: 28.
- 261. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-1-10.
- 262. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-9-10.
- 263. Periya., Tiruppal.: 3.
- 264. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 8-8 and 9.
- 265. Ibid., 10-7.
- 266. Ant., Tiruppa.: 24,
- 267. Nac. Tiru.: 2-6,
- 268. <u>Ibid.</u>, 3-3.
- 269. Tonta., Tiruma.: 7.
- 270. Tonta., Tiruppalli.: 4
- 271. Putat., 2<sup>nd</sup> Tiru.: 29.

- 272. Peyal., 3rd Tiru.: 51.
- 273. RV., VI, 22-110: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 51-316; RK., VI, 6-36.
- 274. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan.</u>: 33; Kulace., <u>Peru. Tiru.</u>: 10-7; Periya., <u>Periya. Tiru.</u>: 2-6-9, 3-9-10 and 4-9-2; Tiruman., <u>Peri. Tiru.</u>: 4-2-1, 4-6-4, 6-8-5 and 8-6-7.
- 275. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 4-2-1, 4-6-4 and 8-6-7.
- 276. Ibid., 6-8-5.
- 277. Periya., Periya. Tiru.: 2-6-9.
- 278. Ibid., 3-9-10.
- 279. <u>Ibid.</u>, 4-9-2.
- 280. Tirumali., <u>Tiruccan</u>.: 33.
- 281. Kulace., Peri. Tiru.: 10-7.
- 282. RV., VI, 114: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 328-329; RK., VI, 37: 2-6 and 8.
- 283. Tiruman., Peri. Tiru.: 5-8-2.
- 284. See E.n. 340 (a) and (b)of Chapter Four.
- 285. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-8.
- 286. RV., VII, 94: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 611-613; UKO., 15: 156-261.
- 287. Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-9.
- 288. RV., VII, 105-106: RV (HPS)., III, pp. 627-631; UKO., 17: 54-61, 69-78 and 84-88.
- Kulace., Peru. Tiru.: 10-9. 1930. See, Annangarachariyarin Tivyartta Tipikai Urai, pp. 145-146.
- 290. Raghavan, V. 1975. <u>The Ramayana in Greater India</u>. Surat: South Gujarat University. Introduction.
- 291. Ramanujam, K. 1994. Vainava Antāti Kāttum Camayaneri, p. 99.
- 292. Ramabathiran, A. 1997. Vainavam Tanta Valam, pp. 129-130.
- 293. For further details, refer Chapter 2: 2.7, pp. 28-29.
- 294. Alexander Zieseniss. 1963. <u>The Rama Saga in Malaysia, It's Origin and Development.</u> Singapore: MSRI. See, foreward.
- 295. Ananda Guruge. 1960. <u>The Society of The Ramayana</u>. Ceylon: Saman Press, Maharagama. Introduction, p. 12.
- Nyanasambanthan., A.S. 1984. <u>Kampan Putiya Pārvai</u>. Chennai: Kampan Kalaka Veliyitu, pp. 16-17.
- 297. This conclusion is arrived at through the study (see Chapter 5).
- 298. Nyanasambanthan, A.S. 1984. Kampan Putiya Pārvai, pp. 8-10.