

Juxtaposing Sama's *Bhimsenko Antya* with Shakespeare's *Richard II****Rupak Shrestha**

Researcher

Shakespeare Institute, University of Birmingham, UK

*rupakshrestha@hotmail.co.uk***Abstract**

The works of William Shakespeare (1564-1616) have occasioned such a history of being altered to fit new historical periods, new cultures and new media that they have dominated literary studies related to the term 'adaptation'. Adaptation of a main source into different trans-genres, such as graphic novels, movies, performances on different kinds of stages, and indeed translations, are the study area of Adaptation Theory. The goal of an adaptation is to transfer works from one culture and language to make them usable for another culture and society. This research paper offers a comparative approach to two different plays produced in two different cultures, which have to date been regarded as wholly independent. As I will show, of the two, the source play, or 'hypotext', is William Shakespeare's historical tragedy King Richard II (text 'A'), while I will juxtapose Balakrishna Sama's play Bhimsenko Antya [The Doom of Bhimsen] as a hypertext (text 'B'), which I will analyse in the light of Adaptation Theory. The paper shows that the plots and characters of the two plays are closely interrelated. Fourteen major incidents correspond closely between the main source and the adapted version, along with broad similarities in settings, even where characterisations of the principal characters suggest a diverging relationship with the hypotext. Sama's The Doom of Bhimsen, in short, is an appropriation of Shakespeare's King Richard II, newly contextualised to Nepalese history and culture while being produced as a completely new Nepalese product. As this aspect of Sama's play has never previously been explored; this research paper brings a breakthrough in the study of Nepalese literary history, and at the same time, makes a fresh contribution widening the area of adaptation theory.

Keywords: Adaptation, appropriation, grafting, contextualisation, transposition.

* Received: February 13, 2020
Peer Reviewed: June 16, 2020
Accepted: September 2, 2020

Adaptation: A Worldwide Phenomenon

Adaptation is a potential alteration in the process of reproduction. Sanders accepts adaptation as “make texts ‘relevant’ or easily comprehensible to new audiences and readerships via the process of proximation and updating” (23). Genette finds it as a “transgeneric practice” (Sanders 24). Weimann accepts adaptation as a process of reproduction. For him, an act of adaptation means to ‘reproductive dimension of appropriation’ (Sanders 2). Further, Sanders gives an extensive lexicon terms to adaptation as proximation, supplement, increment, improvisation, prequel, sequel, continuation, afterlife, addition, paratext, hypertext, palimpsest, graft, rewriting, reworking, refashioning, re-vision, re-evaluation (5) further more as ‘version, variation, interpretation, continuation, transformation, imitation, pastiche, parody, forgery, travesty, transposition, revaluation, revision, rewriting, echo (22) in addition to Adrian Poole’s wide spreading list of ‘borrowing, stealing, appropriating, inheriting, assimilating, being influenced, inspired, dependent, indebted, haunted, possessed, homage, mimicry, allusion, and intertextuality (Sanders 2).

A Theory of Adaptation is a study of adaptations as adaptations; that is, not only as autonomous works rather they are examined as deliberate, announced, and extended revisitations of prior works; and the word adaptation refers both as a product and a process of creation (Hutcheon xvi). Therefore, adaptation study covers the areas what Sanders views as “a transpositional practice, casting a specific genre into another generic mode, an act of re-vision in itself. It can parallel editorial practice in some respects, indulging in the exercise of trimming and pruning yet it can also be an amplificatory modify procedure engaged in addition, expansion, accretion and interpolation” (Sanders 22-23).

The act of adaptation is simply to make texts ‘relevant’ or easily comprehensible to new audiences and readerships via the processes of proximation and updating (Sanders 23). But, many adaptations, of novels and other generic forms, contain further layers of transposition, relocating their source texts not just generically but in cultural, geographic and temporal terms (Sanders 25). For this, she appropriately points at Baz Luhrmann’s 1996 *William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet* where he updates Shakespeare’s early modern Veronese tragedy to a contemporary North American setting. Luhrmann retains the play-text’s sense of urban gang feuding but accords it a troublingly immediate and topical resonance (25) which Genette finds as ‘movement of proximation’ (304).

Appropriation is one of the processes of adaptation that frequently effects a more decisive journey away from the informing text into a wholly new cultural product and domain. Therefore, appropriation requires comparative approaches by juxtaposing one text against another, since appropriations tend to have a more complicated, intricate and sometimes embedded relationship to their intertexts than simple transpositions or translations. The

relationship between the text A and text B can therefore seem “more sideways or deflected, further along the spectrum of distance than a straightforward generic transposition” (Cartmell and Whelehan 24 -25). Hence, it is appropriate to apply a comparative approach juxtaposing Sama’s *The Doom of Bhimsen* with Shakespeare’s *King Richard II* in order to justify whether or not *The Doom of Bhimsen* has an embedded relationship with Shakespeare’s *King Richard II*.

Sama’s *The Doom of Bhimsen* quite clearly gives an echo of Shakespeare’s *King Richard II* throughout its pages as Dobson and Rivier-Arnaud opine that while reading a work of rewriting, we often think of reading another text, because of the echo which resonates through the pages” (3). As they highlight Genette for his idea that hypertextuality implies a union between two texts: the first (A) is the hypotext, the second (B) is the hypertext. ‘B’ results from ‘A’, even though the latter may not be mentioned. The ‘B’ is kind of metamorphosed ‘A’ and could not exist without it, which he finds architecturally indicating a silent relationship between the text and its taxonomic origin. Therefore, the very act of writing ‘on top of’ another text is just because the text ‘A’ is source of inspiration for the text ‘B’ (3). In this paper, have investigated how *Richard II* serves as the text ‘A’ for *The Doom of Bhimsen*, text ‘B’, that is a metamorphosis of the text ‘A’.

Most of the plays of Shakespeare have been adapted into various versions across the Indian subcontinent since the 1840s, making them useful and accessible in a variety of contexts and cultures. Vishal Bhardwaj’s adaptations of Shakespeare into mainstream Bollywood film, viz. *Macbeth* into *Maqbool* (2003), *Othello* into *Omkara* (2006) and *Hamlet* into *Haider* (2014), are all appropriations made suitable for Hindi-speaking Indian society. Similarly, Jayaraaj has adapted *Macbeth* into *Veeram* (2016) and *Othello* into *Kaliyattam* (2013) in Malayalam films. In these films, both Bhardwaj and Jayaraaj have transposed Shakespeare into Indian characters and settings contextualizing to their local cultures and languages. Similarly, Shakespeare has been fitted into Chinese Operas, Xiqu and modern theatres with Chinese costumes, masks and culture in China. To name some of the Chinese Shakespeare are *Blood Stained Hand (Macbeth)* 1986, *Eternity (Romeo and Juliet)* 1986 and *The Blessed Girl (The Merchant of Venice)* 1983. In the same way, Shakespeare is being enjoyed in Bengali spices in Bangladesh and in Japanese attire in Japan through translation, performance, graphic novel, film and so on. Thus, while Shakespeare adaptation is being a phenomenon widely across the cultures; a curiosity emerges if any adaptation of Shakespeare has taken place to fit them into Nepalese culture. Therefore, this paper further delves into adaptation of Shakespeare in Nepal.

Problems, Objectives and Methodology

The Doom of Bhimsen by Sama is a milestone in the history of Nepalese drama. Regarding Sama and his plays, critics so far concede that Sama was influenced by Shakespeare

so that he imitated Shakespeare in writing his plays. But, in spite of the statements of Sama, “I wrote tragedy being distinctly inspired from Shakespeare but intended to make the plots Nepalese” (176) and “I always remember Shakespeare for my characters while writing plays, for example ... I was thinking of distressed *Richard II* while writing *The Doom of Bhimsen*. As I was ending *The Doom of Bhimsen*, I had heart-breaking *Richard II* in my mind” (in Sharma 111), the play has not yet been analysed in the light of adaptation theory.

There is a brief but significant signal of adapting Shakespeare in Nepal through translation, performance and appropriation, but no research has yet taken place about this history which situates it within adaptation theory. In the bulk of this essay have demonstrated that *The Doom of Bhimsen*, is indeed an adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, yielding best to exploration in terms of adaptation theory. To meet this objective the study is guided by following research questions:

- How closely does Sama’s *The Doom of Bhimsen* follow, or how far does it diverge from, Shakespeare’s *King Richard II*?
- What patterns are visible in the alteration made by Sama?

This research is engaged in comparative study methodology between the selected texts ‘A’ and ‘B’ along with critically theorising the process of adaptation. Serious consideration is laid on any exercise of trimming and pruning or amplificatory procedures or any attempt to make the texts relevant or easily comprehensible (Sanders 23) to Nepalese readers and audiences in the process of transposing *Richard II* into *The Doom of Bhimsen* by Sama. Alteration patterns and resemblance in story, characterization, scenes and settings, and writing style are comparatively analysed. Further, critical analysis takes place theorising the various established terminologies of adaptation present in the new version before arriving to a conclusion.

Review of Literature: Locating Shakespeare in Nepal

While researching Shakespeare and his adaptation in connection to Nepal, there is no trace of movies produced on Shakespeare plays yet. However, there are a few translations of Shakespeare into Nepalese language which dates from 1943 with the initial translation of *Julius Caesar* by Upadhyaya. *The Merchant of Venice* seems to be popular being translated in different titles by three different translators viz. Pushpa Lal Sivakoty in 1965, Ramchandra Upadhyay in 1976 and Tankanath Upadhyaya in 1992. Uddip Singh Thapa translated *Twelfth Night or What you will* as *Bahraun Raat* in 1963 and *King Lear* as *Raja Lear* in 1972. Pushkar Shamsher J. B. Rana translated *Othello* in 1961, and Laxmi Prasad Devkota translated *Macbeth* in 1969. Thus, so far, five different plays of Shakespeare have been found translated into plays version in Nepalese language to date.

In addition to those translations from plays to plays, thirty five plays of Shakespeare exist being transposed into story genre in Nepalese language. To name some of the translators into transgenre are Narayan Sharma Ghimire, Ramhari Bandjara, Jaleshwar Pandeya, Vinita Paudel, Januka K. C., Netra Acharya, Saphal Ghimire and Shiva Rijal. Though there are possible adaptations of Shakespeare into these translations, this paper extends beyond translations of Shakespeare and discusses how the notion, as a whole, have been adapted for appropriation of a source text through imitation, grafting, transposition, and/or contextualisation for fitting into Nepalese society and producing specifically Nepalese meaning.

Balakrishna Sama as a Playwright

Balakrishna Sama (1902 – 1981) is the most celebrated Nepalese playwright. He is marked as the first playwright to use verse in plays and for introducing tragedy in Nepalese tradition of play. Sama's plays are on social, historical and mythical subjects. Leaving aside his poetry and essays, he has authored 18 full acts and uncertain un/published one act plays. Sama's *The Doom of Bhimsen* (1956) is one of the most popular historical plays, which had achieved the Sajha Prize in 1972 (Adhikari, Kshetrpratap 51).

Kishan Thapa 'Adhir', in his essay, *Playwright Sama's Nature of Tragedy (Naatakakaar Samakaa Dukhaanta Natyaprabriti)* writes that Balakrishna Sama (1902-1981), in the first phase of writing (1929-1937), was influenced by the western dramatists Sophocles and Euripides, in the second phase (1938-1951) by Achilles and Moliere and in the third phase (1952-1976) by Hobsman, Gorky, Ibsen, and Strindberg; but he was most influenced throughout his career by William Shakespeare. Therefore, it is not unusual to feel that his plays give western flavour. The presence of romantic and poeticized dialogues in his plays is due to the influence of Shakespeare (10-15). Though he provides different names that Sama was influenced by, he has not mentioned how his works present the evidence of influence of those western writers.

Unlike 'Adhir', Dahal finds Sama to be influenced by both the eastern and the western plays as he has applied writing style of Bhavabhuti and Kalidas of the east in addition to Ibsen and Shakespeare of the west. He claims that Sama is the first Nepalese playwright applying blank verse and introducing tragedy against the eastern thought that did not accept tragedy to be a play (35). Theatre in Nepal was following Bharat Muni's *Natyashastram [Theory of Drama]*, which asserted that tragedy is not a play. Sama, being influenced by Shakespeare's tragedies, published *Mutuko Byatha [Heartache]* (1929), a tragedy (Malla 106 -17) against the concept of *Natyashastram*. Chandra Kanta Adhikari pleads that Sama applied the eastern Anushtup metre to substitute the blank verse into his plays (35-43). Hence, Thapa, Dahal, Malla and Adhikari agree that Sama was influenced by Shakespeare's writing style; so he imitated his blank verse

and introduced tragedy in Nepal. However, these comments do not trace to any comparative analysis between the original sources that Sama was impressed from and the plays he authored.

Adhir, Adhikari, and Dahal agree that Shakespeare and Sama hold similarity in characterization. Both of their principal characters belong to the Royal family, high class and the rest from the middle class and lower class. Both playwrights design some ideal characters for delivering their messages. Further, Devi Prasad Subedi points out resemblance of supernatural characters such as Ariel in *Tempest* of Shakespeare and Lord Narayan in *Dhruba* and Lord Vishnu in *Prahlad* of Sama (92).

Though the critics place general discussion that Sama was impressed by Shakespeare and imitated his technique of writing verse drama and tragedy, this area has never been studied from adaptation perspective. Therefore, this research critically analyses *The Doom of Bhimsen* under the light of Adaptation Theory. For this, the focus will be laid on the plots of *King Richard II* and *The Doom of Bhimsen* then compared thoroughly. Further, the characterization and settings of the main source and the adapted version will be analysed.

Juxtaposing the Hypotext with the Hypertext

Adaptation theory demands the juxtaposition of the hypotext and hypertext on the process of study and analysis. The hypotext (the source text or text A) in this research is *King Richard II* by Shakespeare and the hypertext (text B) is *The Doom of Bhimsen* by Sama. Here the text A and the text B are juxtaposed and analysed if the text B echoes Text A. In this study, the synopsis of the plots and the characterization of the text A and B are analysed and brought to the conclusion if the hypertext is the metamorphosis of the hypotext.

Synopsis of the Shakespeare's Play *King Richard II*

The text of *King Richard II*, used for extracting this synopsis is from the *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, edited by Craig. The Act I (381-387) of *King Richard II* opens in the court of the king. Henry Bolingbroke, son of the Duke of Lancaster, cousin of the king, accuses Thomas Mowbray, the Duke of Norfolk, for misusing the funds that the king had offered for military purpose and for the murder of the king's uncle, Thomas of Woodstock, the Duke of Gloucester (which is sensed that happened in King's command). As the accusation unresolved the king orders for vanishment.

In Act II (387-394), John of Gaunt, Henry's father gets distraught due to exile of his son and ultimately dies. Richard, then seizes his property against the protest of Dukes of York and Northumberland. In the absence of the King, Henry returns to England with support of the noblemen who were opposing Richard for his poor governance and selfish practice. Act III (394-399), commences with Henry executing Sir John Bushy and Sir Henry Green, supporters

of Richard. As Richard lands at Wales from Ireland, Henry captures him and imprisons him at Flint Castle.

Act IV (399–403), begins at Westminster Hall, London. Richard yields his crown to Henry and declares him King Henry IV. Then, Henry, the new king imprisons Richard, in Pomfret Castle, a remote place. In Act V (403–408), Aumerle and Bishop of Carlisle plot to poison Henry but fails. Sir Pierce of Exton murders Richard in Pomfret prison, acting on a vague suggestion of the king Henry IV. The King exiles Exton and plans to travel to Jerusalem intending to cleanse himself for the indirect involvement he had in Richard's death.

Synopsis of *The Doom of Bhimsen*

This synopsis is extracted from the play *The Doom of Bhimsen* published by Sajha in 1971. The Act I (1–29) commences at the setting of the Hanuman Dhoka palace court of the king Rajendra Bikram Shah. At this occasion of weaning ceremony of the youngest prince Devendra Bikram Shah, the second queen Rajyalaxmi Devi felicitates Prime-minister Bhimsen Thapa with a shawl. On the other hand, with suggestion of the senior queen Samarajyalaxmi Devi; the King declares that the seized property of late Damodar Panday is released to his sons Ranajang and Kulraj Panday. In the Act II (30–45), the young prince gets sick and the king commands Bhimsen to call the royal physicians Ekdev and Bhajuman.

The Act III (46–65), shows sudden death of the sick prince. The Act IV (66–86) develops with a rumour that the death of the sick prince was caused due to the poison physicians fed instead of medicine under the direction of Bhimsen. For this, Bhimsen and Ekdev were sent to prison, whereas Bhajuman got executed. After two years, Bhimsen was released. Ranajang and Kularaj, again plotted conspiracy against Bhimsen with more forged evidences of poisoning. They blamed Bhimsen for preparing the poison for the first Queen but for some reason fed the baby.

In Act V (87–104), Bhimsen is again arrested. The Act VI (105–136), develops to the trial at the royal court of Hanuman Dhoka. Ranajang and Kulraj accuse Bhimsen of poisoning the king's mother, who had died 21 years ago and the past king as well. Bhimsen defences that the papers they presented are forgery if not they would have presented at the court during his first trial. The king finds himself unable to give his verdict, so he adjourns the court intending to see the case thoroughly.

In Act VII (137–151), Ranajang sends Kulraj to Bhimsen with wrong message that the King has decided to stripe-off his wife in public. Being unbearable he manages to get a sharp piece of glass by breaking a window and he slashes own throat to kill himself. In Act VIII (152–164), the king goes to see Bhimsen, which is the ninth day of Bhimsen's throat cut. The king expresses his view and speaks kindly. He comes to know that the conspiracy was plotted

by Pandays. As Bhimsen finds himself unable to speak the reality due to his cut-throat, he pulls off the stitches of his wound and dies. The king repents for his indirect role on his murder.

Comparing the Plots of *Richard II* and *The Doom of Bhimsen*

King Richard II and *The Doom of Bhimsen*, both are historical tragedies. Shakespeare's main character, Richard II was the king of England from 1377 to 1399, whereas Bhimsen Thapa was the prime-minister, the de facto ruler with existence of titular king from 1804 to 1837. Therefore, both Richard II and Bhimsen are the ruling figures. Shakespeare begins his *Richard II*, at the setting of the royal court introducing two different rival parties. So does Sama in his *The Doom of Bhimsen*.

Richard II (Act I) commences with appearance of a nobleman Henry Bolingbroke, son of the Duke of Lancaster accusing the other nobleman Thomas Mowbray, the Duke of Norfolk for murder of the Duke of Gloucester and for misuse of money. *The Doom of Bhimsen* (Act I) also commences with appearance of the two groups of noblemen, prime-minister Bhimsen Thapa, and Ranajang Panday with his brother Kulraj, sons of late Prime Minister Damdodar Panday. Thus, both, the plays make emotionally fearful and chaotic beginning with blames and doubts introducing two powerful parties.

Shakespeare's Henry and Sama's Ranajang both lose their politically powerful fathers, due to political conspiracy. Both Henry and Ranajang's property have been seized after the death of their noble fathers. Both Bolingbroke and Panday are exiled. As Henry treasures hatred towards the king for sending him to banishment and seizing all his property, Ranajang also treasures hatred towards Bhimsen Thapa for executing his father and seizing his property. Both Henry and Ranajang determine to take revenge of their father's death. Henry succeeds to ascend the throne of king and Ranajang also succeeds to ascend the throne of the Prime Minister. Henry imprisons the king Richard II and Ranajang also imprisons the Prime Minister Bhimsen.

King Henry IV now, imprisons Richard II in a remote castle in North of England and Ranajang imprisons Bhimsen in his own home away from the Hanumandhoka Palace. Henry executes Bushy and Green, supporters of Richard II and Prime-minister Ranajang executes Bhajuman and imprisons Ekadev, both supporters of Bhimsen. Here, Sama contextualizes the plot to the Nepalese culture of cast system, where Brahmins could not be executed by law so that Sama creating Ekdev, a Brahmin physician shows him given imprisonment but to the other character Bhajuman, a Newar by cast, is shown given a capital punishment. Here, Sama raises the problem of social and legal discrimination just because of the cast even though for committing the same crime. Moreover, the principal characters Richard II and Bhimsen, both are murdered in prison. At the end of the play, Henry plans to travel to Jerusalem to cleanse his

sin having indirect involvement he had in Richard's death. Similarly, Sama's king Rajendra, repents on his indirect involvement in the death of innocent Bhimsen.

Assonance of Characters of *King Richard II* in *The Doom of Bhimsen*

The principal characters of Sama are not only imitation but rather transposition of characters of Shakespeare. Both king Richard II and king Rajendra are young and immature personalities. Difference between the two kings are though Richard was a real ruler, Rajendra was merely a titular king. Albeit, being the Prime Minister, Bhimsen was the de facto ruler of Nepal. Thus, Sama characterises Bhimsen as a sovereign figure in the form of the Prime Minister and the king himself, equally powerful to king Richard II.

The other major character in *Richard II* is Henry Bolingbroke. The revengeful, power seeking Henry Bolingbroke has been replaced by Ranajang Panday, who is also revengeful, power seeking and determined to get his power and property back. Within the entry of Henry in *Richard II* and Ranajang in *The Doom of Bhimsen*, these two characters emerge to be the central characters and lead the plays. Other characters in *Richard II* belong to high class society such as the Dukes of Lancaster, Norfolk, Aumerle, Exton, Surrey, and York, Earls, Dutches, and Bishop. Similarly, Sama's characters are Queens, sons and relatives of the past Prime Minister.

Both Henry and Ranajang, once fall to be victims of the power. Henry, victim of Richard II, is exiled and gets his father's property seized and father dies, similarly, Ranajang, is also exiled, property seized, and father killed, being victims of Bhimsen. Both Henry and Ranajang grow extreme hatred towards their opponents and conspire to overthrow them and regain the position and property. Henry succeeds to his aim and declares himself as King Henry IV, the new king of England, whereas, Ranajang also succeeds to overthrow Bhimsen and ascends to the throne of the Prime Minister of Nepal. Both Henry and Ranajang order for execution of their opponents' supporters. Both Richard II and Bhimsen are murdered in prison. Both Henry II and king Rajendra gain power but repent on murder of their own victims. Thus, all these principal characters and the incidents that echo prove that Sama contextualizing *King Richard II* of Shakespeare into Nepalese history and culture. Being *King Richard II* written in the 16th century and *The Doom of Bhimsen* in the 20th century, the later one is a metamorphosed of the former one.

The Settings and Contextualization in *The Doom of Bhimsen*: A Dejavu

As the tragedy of *Richard II* is from English political history, the setting is in royal palace courts and castles in England, whereas Sama's tragedy of Bhimsen is from Nepalese political history with the settings in Hanuman Dhoka royal palace, courts, house of Bhimsen himself in Nepal which is perfectly contextualized into Nepalese culture so that if a reader has already

read Shakespeare's *King Richard II* then reads Sama's *The Doom of Bhimsen* it gives feeling of reading Shakespeare's *King Richard II* again giving a striking effect of a dejavu.

Conclusion

The critical comparison and analysis carried out from the perspective of adaptation theory, on the plots of Shakespeare's *King Richard II* and Sama's *The Doom of Bhimsen*, fourteen similar incidents echo in a chronological order from the beginning to the end of the plays. All the chief characters are from the Royal family, Prime Ministers, Dukes, and Noblemen, in both main source and in the adapted version with total transposition of their characteristics onto the later one. Though the plot and characters are historical, Sama has created necessary additional minor stories and characters and contextualized the play into Nepalese culture. The settings also very closely relate to each other, viz., the royal palace, court, prison in castle, with an effect of a dejavu. Shakespeare's chief character King Richard II and Sama's equivalent character Bhimsen are murdered. The main source by Shakespeare and the adaptation by Sama, both are tragedy. In imitation of the blank verse of Shakespeare, Sama applies popular Anushtup metre to contextualise to Nepalese culture.

The essence of adaptation is for modifying and making a text fit to a new context. Sama, in the process of adapting *King Richard II* of Shakespeare into Nepalese context, has closely been associated with certain patterns of adaptation process, viz. adoption, imitation, appropriation, and contextualisation. As a process of adaptation Sama has adopted the writing style of Sama in verse and tragedy, imitating the characterisation, appropriating and contextualizing the incidents of the last two years of the reign of king Richard II (1397-1399) to the story of the last two years of Bhimsen Thapa's reign (1837-1839) from Nepalese political history. *The Doom of Bhimsen*, a Nepalese version of *King Richard II* has taken a decisive journey away in the process of making it suitable to the Nepalese culture but leaving adequate signals of diverged relation with the main source, text 'A'. Hence, Sama's *The Doom of Bhimsen* is a metamorphosis of Shakespeare's *King Richard II* newly contextualized to Nepalese history and culture that stands as a Nepalese product.

Works Cited

- Adhikari, Chandrakanta. "U Mareki Chhaina: Chhalaphal." ["Sama's Play 'She is not Dead Yet: A Discourse'"] *Garima*. Sama Special Edition, vol. 21, issue 3, 2002, pp. 58-69.
- Adhikari, Kshetrpratap. "Samajimaa Samarpit Samjhanaa." ["Reminiscence on Mr Sama".] *Garima*. Sama Special Edition, vol. 21, issue 3, 2002, p. 51.
- Adhir, Kishan Thapa. "Naatakakaar Samakaa Dukhaanta Natyaprabriti" ["Playwright Sama's Nature of Tragedy"] *Garima*. Sama Special Edition, vol. 21, issue 3, 2002, pp. 10-15.
- Bryson, Bill. *Shakespeare*. Harper Press, 2007.

- Cartmell, Deborah, and Whelehan, Imelda, eds. *Adaptations: From Text to Screen, Screen to Text*. Routledge, 1999.
- Craig, W. J., ed. *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. Magpie Books, 1993.
- Cohn, Robin. *Modern Shakespeare Offshoots*. Princeton UP, 1976.
- Dahal, Krishnaprasad. "Samako Amar Naatak Amar Singh: Ek Adhyayan." ["Sama's Living Play 'Amarsinha': A Study"] *Garima*. Sama Special Edition, vol. 21, issue 3, 2002, pp. 35-43.
- Devkota, Laxmi Prasad. *Macbeth*. Nepal Sanskritik Sangh, 1969.
- Dobson, Michael. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship*. Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Dobson, Michael, and Rivier-Hernand, E., eds. *Rewriting Shakespeare's Plays for and by the Contemporary Stage*. Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2017.
- Gautam, Narhari Upadhyay. *Theatre*. Kashthamandap Book House, 2011.
- _____. *Naatak Samaalochanaa Bhaag 1 [Criticism of Plays Part 1]*. Rojina Offset Press, 2012.
- _____. *Naatak Samaalochanaa Bhaag 2 [Criticism of Plays Part 2]*. Rojina Offset Press, 2012.
- Genette, Gerard. *Palimpsestes, La littérature au second degré*. Editions du Seuil, coll. Points, 1982.
- Gurung, Buddhi Bahadur. *Historical Introduction of Narayanhiti Palace Museum and Shah Rulers of Nepal*, translated by Poonam R L Rana. Mrs. Sarada Kumari Gurung, 2014.
- Nair, Jayaraaj Rajasekharan, director. *Veeram*, produced by Chandramohan D. Pillai and Pradeep Rajan, 15 May, 2020, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Veeram_\(2016_film\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Veeram_(2016_film))
- _____, director. *Kaliyattam*. produced by K. Radhakrishnan, 15 May, 2020, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaliyattam>
- Bhardwaj, Vishal, director. *Maqbool*, produced by Bobby Bedi, 14 May, 2020, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maqbool>
- Ning, Zhu. "The Adaptation of Shakespeare into Chinese Xiqu" *CS/Sc Newsletter*, issue no 18, 14 June, 2020, <http://www.critical-stages.org/18/the-adaptation-of-shakespeare-into-chinese-xiqu/>
- Huang, Alexa, and Elizabeth Rivlin. *Shakespeare and the Ethics of Appropriation*. St. Martin's Press, 2014.
- Hutcheon, Linda with O'Flynn Siobhan. *A Theory of Adaptation*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2013.
- Malla, Prachand. "Nepali Sahityaka Vibhuti" ["Legend of Nepalese Literature"] *Garima* Sama Special Edition, vol. 21, no. 3, issue 243, 2002, pp. 106-17.
- Piercy, Joseph. *Shakespeare*. Rydon Publishing, 2016.
- Pokharel, Ramchandra. *Aitihaasik Naatak Ra Natakakaar Balakrishna Sama [Historical Play and Playwright Balakrishna Sama]*. Bhundipuram Publication, 2008.
- Poole, Adrian. *Shakespeare and the Victorians*. Thomson Learning/Arden Shakespeare, 2004.

-
- Rana, Pushkar Shamsher J. B. *Othello*. Nepal Academy, 1961.
- Roper, Margaret. P. *Shakespeare and Contemporary Adaptation: The Graphic Novel*. PhD Thesis. The Shakespeare Institute, 2011.
- Sama, Balakrishna. *Bhimsenka Antya* (The Doom of Bhimsen). 3rd ed. Sanjivani Press, 1991.
- _____. *Mero Kavitako Aaraadhan [My Prayers to Poetry]*. Sajha Publication, 1997.
- Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. 2nd ed. Routledge, 2016.
- Sharma, Swayamprakash. “Ma Junsukai Rupamaa Shakespearelai Samjhiraheko Hunchhu.” [“I Keep Thinking of Shakespeare in Every Form”] *Garima*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2001, pp 111.
- Thapa, Uddip Singh. *Raajaa Lear [King Lear]*. Royal Nepal Academy, 1972..
- _____. *Bahraun Raat [Twelfth Night or What You Will]*. Royal Nepal Academy, 1963.
- Trewin, J.C. *The Shakespeare Companion*, revised by Stanley Wells. Octopus Publishing Group, 2017.
- Upadhyay, Tankanath. *Venisako Saudaagar [The Merchant of Venice]*. Nepali Sahitya Parishad, 1992.
- Weimann, Robert. *Appropriation and Modern History in Renaissance Prose Narrative*. New Literary History, 1983.