

SANSKRIT EPIC TRADITION

I. EPIC AND EPITOME (RĀMĀYAṆA AND RĀMOPĀKHYĀNA)

There has been over a century of controversy about the inter-relation of the two epics, ever since the time of Albrecht Weber<sup>1</sup>. It is undoubtedly too sanguine to expect that further contributions will settle the question finally, but they may perhaps help to clarify the issues involved. The present article starts from the view that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as Sukthankar long ago demonstrated<sup>2</sup>, although there have been dissentient voices since<sup>3</sup>. Its aim is firstly to corroborate Sukthankar's conclusions by adding further examples in order to show how closely the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and secondly to define more precisely from which version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* it is derived<sup>4</sup>.

---

1. ALBRECHT WEBER, *Über das Rāmāyaṇa*, « Sitzungsberichte d. Ak. d. Wissensch. », Berlin, 1870. This is the first of three articles in which I plan to explore the inter-relation of the epics.

2. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, *The Rāma Episode (Rāmopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyaṇa*, in « A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane », Poona, 1941, pp. 472-87.

3. Most notably P. L. Vaidya (*Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddhakāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. L. V., Baroda, 1971, pp. XXXI-XXXVI) argues that the *Rāmopākhyāna* as an integral part of the *Mahābhārata* « is much older than the poem of Vālmiki ». This view would scarcely warrant mention, had it not prompted or at least stimulated two more recent contributions. V. Raghavan has broadly reaffirmed Sukthankar's view in his *The Greater Ramayana*, Varanasi, 1973, pp. 11-25. J. A. B. van Buitenen has to some extent accepted Vaidya's stance by arguing that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is « a brief, tersely stated compendium that the storyteller would know by heart and on the basis of which he could elaborate and improvise the full narrative » and « So if *Rāma* and *Rām.*, show variations the probabilities are that *Rāma* is closer to its archetype than *Rām.* is to its own. *Rāma* cannot be a summary of *Rām.* as we have it now » (*The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, translated and edited by J. A. B. van B., Chicago, 1975, pp. 207-214, esp. 210-11).

4. In the same way G. C. Jhala has given further precision to one of Sukthankar's articles in « *The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa* » A Footnote, « Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute », 48-49, 1968, pp. 295-8, and come to similar conclusions to the present article.

To start with some figures, Jacobi noted twelve parallels between the two, which Sluszkiewicz increased to possibly 57, while Sukthankar, through his work on the *Āraṇyakaparvan* for the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata*, was able to produce a list of 86 correspondences; if one adds a few others pointed out for example by Raghavan, then rather over one hundred had previously been identified<sup>5</sup>. The lists appended contain 305 such correspondences, amounting to over 400 *pādas*. Since the *Rāmopākhyāna* is just over 700 śloka long, this means that one *pāda* in seven is paralleled in the *Rāmāyaṇa*<sup>6</sup>. Also, they are distributed very evenly — the smallest number occurs in the shortest *adhyāya* and the largest in the longest one — which demonstrates the uniformity of the *Rāmopākhyāna* in this regard. However, it may be remarked that the ends of the *adhyāyas* of the *Rāmopākhyāna* do not correspond at all closely to the division of the *Rāmāyaṇa* into *kāṇḍas*, which implies that one or both divisions are later than the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna*.

The list of correspondences occurring in sequence in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (second table, part I) is more than twice as long as the list of those found at random. In reality the disparity is even more pronounced, for listed with those in random order are the parallels to the *Rāmopākhyāna* summary (adhy. 258) and its genealogy of Rāvaṇa (adhy. 259), as well as a considerable number of stereotyped *pādas*, on all of which I shall have further comment to make. As will soon become apparent, the closeness of order in the parallels suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is drawn from something like the existing *Rāmāyaṇa*, although perhaps the greater randomness of the parallels with the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* preceded them; in fact the *Rāmopākhyāna* is completely ignorant of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* and quite clearly ends its account at the close of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*. Indeed the *Rāmopākhyāna*, by devoting greater space to the events of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, tends to emphasise the martial aspect of the story at the expense of other elements in Rāma's character stressed in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, his filial obedience, his attachment to Sītā and his concern for *dharma*.

It is abundantly evident from the lists of parallels that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is in general closer to the Northern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. If the *Rāmopākhyāna* were earlier, this would mean that the Northern recension is in fact the more conservative, on such points at least, but to form such a conclusion is to fly in the face of all the evidence of the

5. H. JACOBI, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn, 1893, pp. 72-3; E. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *Przyczynki do badan nad dziejami redakcyj Rāmāyanu*, Kraków, 1938, pp. 13-32; SUKTHANKAR, *op. cit.*; RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 and 20.

6. I have excluded from this calculation *Mbh.* 3.276, which is part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* so far as the *Mahābhārata* is concerned but in fact consists of Mārkaṇḍeya driving home the moral to Yudhiṣṭhira. The precise figures are 409 *pādas* parallel in 704 stanzas, raised to 713 by allowing for 3-line stanzas, with a further 13 *pādas* of \* passage parallel.

*Rāmāyaṇa* itself. The more likely, indeed the only sensible, solution is that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is later. Thus, the Northern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with its innovations was well established before the fixing of the text of the *Mahābhārata*, of which after all the *Rāmopākhyāna* forms a part. For, from the number and the nature of the parallels, it is clear that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is *not* based on the Southern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, even in an earlier form. Two other possibilities remain: that it was based on the N recension in an earlier form, before its divergence into NE and NW, or that it is based on a form of the *Rāmāyaṇa* prior to the emergence of separate recensions. The problem with the first view is that there are a significant number of agreements with the S recension but on balance this is the view that I would favour, for there is the even bigger problem with the other view that the S recension, which in the case of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is usually, and I think rightly, held to be the more conservative, would be shown to have innovated or even worse dropped significant material more or less throughout the text.

It is unfortunate that Sukthankar found Sluszkiewicz's arrangement « rather complicated and confusing »<sup>7</sup>, for it resulted in his missing the majority of the correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bengal recension and their significance. Sluszkiewicz's list is in three parts: in the first section he lists twelve correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bombay recension, in the second 25 correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bengal recension, while in the third he gives 20 passages of the *Rāmopākhyāna* which are as distant from either recension. There is therefore some difference of status between the sections: the first two correspond closely to what Jacobi began previously and Sukthankar extended subsequently, whereas the third section is in reality quite similar to van Buitenen's annotation of his translation of the *Rāmopākhyāna* with the source sections of the *Rāmāyaṇa*<sup>8</sup>. However, to return to the first two parts of Sluszkiewicz's list, it is significant that he found twice as many correspondences with the Bengal recension, and Sluszkiewicz himself drew attention to the fact, while also pointing out that the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* could not have relied exclusively on that recension. He goes on rather hesitantly to suggest that the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* may have drawn on a third recension which might in fact be the archetype of our present versions<sup>9</sup>.

7. *Op. cit.*, p. 476, commenting on Sluszkiewicz, loc. cit.

8. J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, *tr.*, *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, pp. 727-60; van Buitenen himself, as noted earlier, would not regard the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the source of the *Rāmopākhyāna*, while accepting none the less that « It is also exceedingly close to *Rām* ». His opinion seems based essentially on the view that variations in the order of narration rule out direct borrowing but seems to me to ignore the requirements of an abbreviated treatment.

9. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-38.

A sixth of the parallels in the *Rāmopākhyāna* to passages in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are not supported by the bulk of the manuscript evidence; some of these are noted in the lists as variant readings, others as \* passages. By chance the number of such passages is just 50 and it is therefore easy to express in percentage terms their affiliations. 42% of these passages are found in all or most N mss., 26% in S mss., 16% in both N and S mss., and 16% in NE mss. alone or, in two cases, with slight support elsewhere. To regroup these figures differently, if we set aside those passages found in both recensions (16%), more than twice as many of the rest are from the N recension in some form as from the S recension (58% against 26%). Even more interesting is the fact that to the 16% found in the NE recension can be added a further 8% where NE agrees with S in the reading (half the number of passages where any N and S mss. agree), especially when we note that there are no such passages attested solely or mainly in the NW or W recensions. Thus it is clear that the primary affiliation of the *Rāmopākhyāna* is with the N recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in particular with NE.

However, the matter cannot be left there. First, we may note the absence of parallels to the NW or W recensions. This may suggest that these recensions are secondary at least in this regard. In the introduction to the *Bālakāṇḍa*, G. H. Bhatt seems to suggest that NW and W tend to go with S against NE; he states this specifically of the W recension a little further on<sup>10</sup>. Perhaps more accurately they should be regarded as evolving later and thus as having somewhat less value for constituting the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* than the Critical Edition assigned them. Incidentally, this would put in a rather different light the question of whether NW and W are separate recensions, an issue on which Bhatt changed his mind<sup>11</sup>. Alternatively, it could be held that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is definitely drawing from two recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, following normally the NE but also consulting S, but did not know or possess NW or W.

If we are willing to think in terms of the existing recensions or something very like them, then such a view might be feasible; but I would suggest that the problem is more complex. There are a significant number of instances where for one *Rāmopākhyāna* śloka the parallels are found partly in the Northern recension and partly in the Southern. Two examples quite close together are Mbh.3.264.66 and 265.11. In the first of these, the first line has a fairly close resemblance to the Southern insert 5.614\* 1-2 but the second line is virtually identical to the Northern insert 5.617\* 1; the *Rāmopākhyāna* continues in 67 with the four mini-

---

10. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa*, critically edited by G. H. Bhatt, Baroda, 1960, pp. XXX and iv.

11. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Aranyakāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. C. Divanji, Baroda, 1963, pp. XXIII-XXV (the introduction is by G. H. Bhatt).



sters mentioned at 5.614\* 6 (but Ck regards the intervening lines as interpolated) and 5.617\* 2. Unless we regard this as an instance of the *Rāmāyaṇa* borrowing from the *Rāmopākhyāna*, which seems implausible here, we must either say that the *Rāmopākhyāna* reproduces something like the original from which the *Rāmāyaṇa* recensions diverged or consider that the *Rāmopākhyāna* welded together the two lines found in the separate recensions recognising the appropriateness of repeating *śveta*. Sluszkiewicz noted this example as an instance where the *Rāmopākhyāna* was closer to the Bengal recension (i.e. N). He also gave the second example as a case where both recensions were equally distant from the *Rāmopākhyāna*. Certainly, neither recension corresponds exactly to the *Rāmopākhyāna*, but 265.11ab is closer to the Southern recension represented by the text of 3.53.14ab, while the third *pāda* is closer to the Northern recension at 3.1056\* 4 pr. Again divergence from an original close to the present *Rāmopākhyāna* seems the best explanation.

However, there is one passage in the older books which may possibly provide an instance of reverse borrowing. Mbh.3.261.17cd + 18 is paralleled in Rām.2.133\* 1, 8.3ab and 135\*; the first is attested by the majority of the N mss. (and M4), the second is read by all mss. except B4 (by omission), but 135\* has more scattered support among N mss. and is not found in the oldest of them. It may be therefore that 135\* has been copied from the *Rāmopākhyāna*. There is also a remote possibility that such is the case with the other two, since the opening of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* shows strong signs of reworking at the end of the second stage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s growth, the time also of the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*' composition. More complex is the case of Mbh.3.275.33 which in general is closer to the text of Rām.7.26.44 but shares the unusual root  $\sqrt{\text{phal}}$  with 7.548\*, the version of the N recension (and T3.4), for here reverse borrowing is likely.

Now let me add some examples which do not appear in the lists of verbal correspondences. Mbh.3.273.28b follows the v.l. of NE mss. at 6.80.51 in naming Avindhya not Supārśva as Rāvaṇa's pacifier, as Raghavan has also pointed out<sup>12</sup>. Mbh.3.274.15 has Rāma suspect that Mātali come with Indra's chariot is another of Rāvaṇa's magical deceptions. The basis for this, as both Sluszkiewicz and Raghavan have pointed out<sup>13</sup>, is to be found in the passages 6.2087\* and 2088\* occurring in the NE recension, but the incident is absent from the S recension and only hinted at in the NW recension in 6.2086\*. Elsewhere the *Rāmopākhyāna* follows the order of narration of one recension but the wording of the other, for example 263.39c appears at the same point as 3.1289\* 4 / 1290\* but is closer in wording to 3.71.25a, which is in fact uttered by a different speaker.

12. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

13. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-4 and RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

One example of a *Rāmopākhyāna* parallel occurring in the NE recension is particularly interesting; this is 2.260\* 2 = 261.25ab, for this is read in addition by one W manuscript and by M4. It is this last that may well be significant, for this manuscript often agrees with the Northern recension but is also perhaps the oldest Malayalam manuscript of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The editor of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, P. L. Vaidya, tended to regard it as an instance of contamination between the recensions. But more recently U. P. Shah, General Editor and editor of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, has established the possibility of « an older M version » differing in some respects from the standard S tradition represented so uniformly in T G and M mss.<sup>14</sup> However, Vaidya had already noted of M4 that « when it goes with N, it is invariably associated with the NE version » and declared that « The large number of \* passages exclusive to the manuscript suggests that it represents a new version, and its agreement with NE support this point of view »<sup>15</sup>.

In theory at least we can divide the stereotyped expressions of the epics into three groups: those found equally in both epics (and so presumably belonging to the traditional stock drawn on by the authors of both), those found in the *Mahābhārata* but not in the *Rāmāyaṇa* or only in its later portions, and conversely those occurring in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and lacking in the *Mahābhārata* or only in late passages. For our present concerns the first group is clearly of least evidential value, but we may note that there are eleven or twelve such items on the list of verbal parallels, both set phrases such as *śataśo 'tha sahasraśaḥ* (8 times in *Rām.*, 94 in *Mbh.*) and standardised long compounds such as *sarvābharaṇabhūṣita* (10 times in *Rām.*, 12 in *Mbh.*). However, the distribution of the stereotyped phrases characteristic of the *Mahābhārata* is significant, for three or four occur in sequence but twelve at random — clear evidence that here the *Rāmāyaṇa* is borrowing from the *Mahābhārata* in general, and not from the *Rāmopākhyāna*, while the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* has used such phrases naturally. One instance is not quite clearcut, which is the reason for the way I have given the figures; this is *pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu* which is a frequent *pāda* in the *Mahābhārata* (including 3.259.20a) but in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is confined to the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*. I would consider that these two books are drawing on the *Mahābhārata* repertoire of standard phrases.

By contrast, the distribution of the *Rāmāyaṇa* stock *pādas*, the largest of the three groups with 20 items, shows the bulk of them occurring in sequence against eight occurring at random. The major part of this group consists of personal epithets, which are naturally specific to

14. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa*, critically edited by U. P. Shah, Baroda, 1975, introduction pp. 5-6.

15. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. L. Vaidya, Baroda, 1962, pp. XXII and XXI. Other instances of this manuscript going with the Northern recension in passages paralleled in the *Rāmopākhyāna* are 2.133\* 2 (cf. 261.18cd), 1715\* 5 pr. (cf. 261.31c) and 1744\* 3 (cf. 261.33ab).

the narrative; these are *bhrātarau rāmalakṣmaṇau, rāmaḥ saumitriṇā saha, rāmaḥ śastrabhṛtām varaḥ, rāmo raktāntalocanaḥ, rāmenākliṣṭa-karmaṇā* (and genitive), *vaidehī janakātmajā, lakṣmaṇaḥ paravīrahā, saumitriḥ mitranandanāḥ, lakṣmaṇasya ca dhīmataḥ, rāvaṇo rākṣas-eśvaraḥ, rāvaṇasya durātmanaḥ, rākṣasāḥ kāmārūpiṇaḥ, vānarānām mahātmanām* and *vasiṣṭho vāmadevaś ca*. The last of these does occur once elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata* (5.81.27a). So too does *rāmasyākliṣṭa-karmaṇaḥ*, but this also is obviously taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for it occurs at 3.147.34b, in Hanumān's brief narration to Bhīma of the Rāma story. Similar are *rājā daśarathas tadā* and the two long compounds, *kausalyānandavardhana* (also *Mbh.1.105.25b*) and *sumitranandavardhana*. Most of the standardised *pādas* connected with speeches are common to both epics, but *vākyajñō vākyakovidam* is specific to the *Rāmāyaṇa* apart from its one occurrence in the *Rāmopākhyāna* (262.2d). Finally, there is the numerical *pāda caturdaśa sahasrāṇi*, which is really the only way of expressing this number and so probably not of great significance. But in general this group of phrases provides strong evidence of the direction of borrowing, especially in their distribution.

What are the divergences next which might suggest that the *Rāmopākhyāna* was independent of the *Rāmāyaṇa*? Professor Raghavan has noted and commented on many of these<sup>16</sup>; I will therefore only mention those where I wish to comment further. Several of them are instances of the addition of detail which is almost certainly secondary, although the possibility cannot be entirely excluded that they are drawn from another version of the Rāma story. I will leave aside for the present items occurring in *adhyāyas* 259 and 260.

The *Rāmopākhyāna* has Kaikeyī ornament herself and use beguiling words to get her way with Daśaratha (261.19-20) whereas the *Rāmāyaṇa* has her retire to her boudoir, if I may use that word in its original sense of a room to sulk in (2.9.42); this is a clear discrepancy. However, Daśaratha's reply is virtually identical in both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Rāmopākhyāna* (2.10.10 and 261.22c-23b), so the discrepancy over Kaikeyī must presumably be seen as artistic licence. Similarly, in the *Rāmopākhyāna* (262.39) Sītā reenters the hermitage which she has never left in the *Rāmāyaṇa* version of Rāvaṇa's arrival and seizure of her.

An example of more developed details in the *Rāmopākhyāna* is the specification of Gokarṇa as the place to which Rāvaṇa goes to find Mārīca (261.54); this has very probably been elaborated out of the mention in *Rām.3.591\** (read by most N mss. and M2) of Gokarṇa as the site of Rāvaṇa's penance. A further elaboration then occurs in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* (7.9.37 + 159\*). Dr. U. P. Shah has already shown that there are other points at which the *Rāmopākhyāna* shows a more deve-

16. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-25, with a direct quotation below of p. 17. For a different evaluation, see *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, translated and edited by J. A. B. van Buitenen, Chicago, 1975, pp. 210-13.

loped geography than the *Rāmāyaṇa*<sup>17</sup>. Such details well support the suggested chronology.

Insertions or transpositions of names of minor characters are not infrequent and in most cases not particularly significant. Thus the *Rāmopākhyāna* adds to the *Rāmāyaṇa* account of Kabandha's curse and punishment his former name, Viśvāvasu (263.38ab), and also has him cursed by Brahmā (38c) rather than by an ascetic as in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (3.67.3). In the next *adhyāya*, the *Rāmopākhyāna* names Sugrīva's ministers as Mainda, Dvividā, Hanūmān and Jāmbavān (264.23); the *Rāmāyaṇa* at the equivalent point has, as Raghavan accurately but misleadingly indicates, a « list which is completely different from that given in the *Rāmopākhyāna* ». In fact the *Rāmopākhyāna* takes these names from a longer list occurring in other contexts (*Rām*.4.25.32 etc.) and so what we actually have is an instance of transposition which demonstrates the closeness of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and not the converse. One list which is almost entirely new in the *Rāmopākhyāna* is that at 269.2 of eight *rākṣasas* and *piśācas*, but Vibhīṣaṇa does not kill any of them (as Raghavan says), he only destroys their invisibility and it is the *vānaras* who then kill them. Thus Vibhīṣaṇa remains largely non-combatant, as he is in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and another of the divergences admitted by Raghavan disappears.

However, this last instance of addition of names does also point to the fact that the *Rāmopākhyāna* has elaborated on the battle scenes considerably within its basically shorter compass. It is worth noting that the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* has its equivalent in *adhyāyas* 267-275 (apart from 267.1-14, which transposes to the start of battle the material of *Rām*.4.38), for this is not far short of half the *Rāmopākhyāna*. Yet the *Rāmopākhyāna* has also abbreviated the material of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* quite extensively; for example, it has nothing corresponding to the material of *Rām*.6.18-30 but moves straight from Rāvaṇa's sending of spies to Rāma's army besieging Laṅkā. Some of its elaboration consists of additions of names, such as we have just seen. Some consists of details of strategy after the manner of the *arthaśāstra*, such as Rāma setting up a formation of forces named after Uśanas to which Rāvaṇa opposes one named after Bṛhaspati (269.5-6). Some is developed out of slight hints in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, such as the water which enables Rāma and his allies to see the invisible *rākṣasas* (273.8-14, cf. 6.36.29 + 762\*). Some arises out of the *Rāmopākhyāna*'s rearrangement of the order of incidents for the sake of concision, which has involved at times some telescoping of individual incidents.

To place against such divergences, none of which is of major significance, there are occasions on which the *Rāmopākhyāna* is scarcely intelligible without a prior knowledge of the story. Raghavan draws attention to the extreme brevity of its narrative of Bharata meeting

17. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa*, introduction pp. 31-37.

Rāma and receiving the sandals. There are also occasions when the actual wording of the *Rāmopākhyāna* is more explicable in the light of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. As a minor point, I might instance 267.4c where, in line with the *Mahābhārata* pattern of frequent epenthetic vocatives, the *Rāmopākhyāna* has changed *mahārājaḥ* as one of a string of names in the nominative to such a vocative. More substantially, the use of the simile *śakraprahādayor iva* at 273.18d seems to reflect *balavṛtrāv iva tau* at *Rām.6.75.31a* but to have emended it for the same reason as do some *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts and its commentators, that is to make the simile more logical.

Even where he has rearranged the incidents, the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* keeps closely to the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; for example, the material of 6.35-40 is delayed to the end of *adhyāya* 272 and the start of *adhyāya* 273, and the second half of the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, including the search parties, is narrated in *adhyāya* 266, after some of the material from the *Sundarakāṇḍa* — a better order for a précis. Equally, briefer parallels of one or two *pādas* tend to be grouped, even when divorced from their *Rāmāyaṇa* context, as though the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* had been thumbing through his copy of the *Rāmāyaṇa* for suitable phrases outside the immediate context (we should probably by this time be thinking of texts of the epic and no longer solely of recitations). For instance, 271.21ab and 25cd draw from incidents of fighting in the *Aranyakāṇḍa* to add to the main battle scenes. One may also note the extent to which the *Rāmopākhyāna* has drawn for its own summary in *adhyāya* 258 on the older parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; such borrowings have been assigned to the random part of the table of correspondences in *Rāmāyaṇa* order but in reality tend to confirm the closeness of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to the core of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

If one considers simply the volume and position of the evidence, then one might consider that the *Bālakāṇḍa* was in existence by the time of the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna* but not the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, since the *Rāmopākhyāna* has material in *adhyāyas* 258 and 260 corresponding to the *Bālakāṇḍa* but nothing at the end of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, only *adhyāya* 259 at the beginning. However, an alternative, and equally possible, explanation is that the need for such a prologue was first felt by the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* and that his example was followed by the redactors of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. For, in reality, the evidence of the *Rāmopākhyāna* supports only one section each in the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*, namely 1.14-17 (Rāma's genealogy and divine origin) and 7.2-3 and 9-10 (Rāvaṇa's genealogy and acquisition of near invincibility). The symmetry is striking, as is their juxtaposition in the *Rāmopākhyāna*, to the extent that *adhyāya* 258 contains both genealogies, *adhyāya* 259 narrates inter alia Brahmā's boon to Rāvaṇa, and *adhyāya* 260 narrates Brahmā's declaration of Viṣṇu's descent as Rāma. When to this is added their occurrence near the beginnings of the *kāṇḍas* concerned, the conclusion is irresistible that, far from the *Rāmopākhyāna* support-

ing their genuineness, it is the source whence the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* have been expanded.

Examination of the tables of correspondences further suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* has pieced together its account of Rāvaṇa's activities from stray indications in the earlier parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for there is a striking lack of verbal similarity to *Uttara* 11-34. The fact that the *Rāmopākhyāna* equivalent of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* occurs at the beginning also indicates that it is not necessarily organic, a point which van Buitenen has recently stressed<sup>18</sup>, when commenting on Jacobi's views<sup>19</sup>. However, both he and Raghavan, in a similar context<sup>20</sup>, do less than justice to Jacobi who, when claiming that the *Uttarakāṇḍa* was in existence by the time of the *Rāmopākhyāna*, adds the important qualification « wenigstens die Rāvaṇeīs », recognising that therefore as the only real point of agreement between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the *Uttarakāṇḍa*.

Jacobi also argued from the resemblance between *Mbh.*3.262.38 and *Rām.*3.45.40 that the *Rāmopākhyāna* knew a form of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in which the sargas closed with verses in longer metres<sup>21</sup>. However, this particular section of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has obviously been expanded from a simpler original<sup>22</sup>, with quite possibly a change of metre in the process, and thus there is at least a possibility that here the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on an older form of the text than that extant. In general, there is no definite evidence that the *Rāmopākhyāna* was acquainted with the verses in longer metres.

Nor can we be certain how far the *Rāmopākhyāna* was familiar with the passages expanded or interpolated in the second stage of growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. That it shows correspondences to expanded passages but not to pure interpolated episodes is indicative of its own nature as a summary rather than of any real distinction between the two types. Indeed, to the extent that expansion first occurs at major turning points in the story, the *Rāmopākhyāna* is more likely to have material corresponding to such parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; the limitation is that its nature as a summary prevents us knowing just what stage the text had reached. For example, the *Rāmopākhyāna* mentions at 261.29 Daśaratha's death after Rāma's departure for the forest, narrated in *Rām.* 2.58, but it lacks Daśaratha's narration of his former misdeed and the resultant curse developed at length in *Rām.* 2.57-58. This material may either have been lacking in the *Rāmāyaṇa* version followed by the

18. *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, tr. by van Buitenen, p. 209.

19. JACOBI, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn, 1893, pp. 73-4.

20. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

21. JACOBI, *loc. cit.* Further discussion in E. W. HOPKINS, *The Great Epic of India*, New York, 1901, p. 63, SUKTHANKAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 473-4, and VAN BUITENEN, *tr.*, *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, pp. 208-9.

22. See my article *Stereotyped Expressions in the Rāmāyaṇa*, « Journal of the American Oriental Society », 90, 1970, pp. 210-227, esp. p. 223.

*Rāmopākhyāna* or have been dropped as extraneous to the main story. In the same way, the *Rāmopākhyāna* gives at 264.35-38 Vālin's slaying by Rāma's arrow narrated at *Rām.* 4.17 but, except perhaps obliquely in 38a (*garhayitvā sa kākutsthāṃ*), not the elaborate ethical justification in that and the next sarga included in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as Rāma's moral perfection came to be stressed<sup>23</sup>. Examples of interpolated episodes completely lacking in the *Rāmopākhyāna* are Bharadvāja's entertainment of Bharata's army (*Rām.* 2.85) and Agastya's welcome to Rāma and presentation of divine weapons (*Rām.* 3.11).

As a more general point, there is the fact that the major part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* still sees Rāma as human, but as an exemplary figure; again this is the position reached by the middle of the second stage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s growth. The only exception is the short *adhyāya* 260 where Viṣṇu incarnates as Rāma, while the other gods, led by Sakra, beget heroic sons on monkeys and bears. Elsewhere, Rāma and Rāvaṇa are both compared to Indra. In particular, at *Mbh.* 3.275.38c Rāma is merely compared to Indra, where in the *Rāmāyaṇa* his divinity is revealed at 6.105-8<sup>24</sup>.

We may therefore assign the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to a period subsequent to most of this second stage, though prior to the composition of the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*. Possibly then the order of composition was: firstly, the main body of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its earlier additions, followed by the main part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* (*adhyāyas* 261-275), to which was added its preamble (*adhyāyas* 258-260), subsequently expanded into the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. At any rate, presumably Rāvaṇa's genealogy was included in the *Rāmopākhyāna* earlier than in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, since otherwise more of the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* would have been included (this is after all an inclusion for the sake of completeness), and the *Rāmāyaṇa* then included and expanded the material as the *Uttarakāṇḍa*.

Is the reality of the situation then more complex than any of Weber's fourfold alternatives? Not only is there evidence that each has been the source of the other by turns, but the possibility cannot be totally excluded that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based not only on Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* (or more exactly on one particular version of it, as suggested above) but also on another independent form of the Rāma story. As van Buitenen suggests, although he puts the argument differently<sup>25</sup>, this

23. On both passages in the *Rāmāyaṇa* see my article *Religious Attitudes in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa*, « Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society », 1976, no. 2. Van Buitenen sees the second as the *Rāmopākhyāna* being « more straightforward » and thus older than the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*tr.*, *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, p. 211). It may well be more allusive and so later, despite his arguments at p. 210.

24. See my article *Rāmo dharmabhṛtām varaḥ* in « Indologica Taurinensia », V, p. 57.

25. *The Mahābhārata*, *tr.*, vol. 2, pp. 209-14, esp. p. 213.

might explain how for example Rāvaṇa's wooing and Avindhya's / Trijaṭā's dream show an older form in the *Rāmopākhyāna* but are elaborated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*; but alternative explanations are equally plausible, as Raghavan demonstrates<sup>26</sup>.

However, outside the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*, reverse borrowing is most exceptional, if indeed it occurs at all. The various types of stereotyped expression amply confirm the direction of borrowing established by the general lists of parallels, for those characteristic of the *Mahābhārata* occur more at random while those characteristic of the *Rāmāyaṇa* occur in the *Rāmopākhyāna* mostly in sequence with the narration of the story. It has even been possible to demonstrate that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is closest to the extant NE recension but with some links also with the Southern Recension. The obvious conclusion, reinforced by consideration of the manuscript M4, is that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on an older form of the Northern recension (better represented now in NE than in NW or W) which had not yet diverged as far from the Southern as now. Again we may note that the differences between the Northern and Southern recensions in the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* are less than in the five older books. Supposed divergences of subject matter are not particularly significant, although there has been some shift of emphasis with the fuller treatment of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*.

Altogether it is quite clear that Sukthankar's conclusions were entirely valid and can indeed be taken further. Not only is the *Rāmopākhyāna* based on the *Rāmāyaṇa* but in general it is closer to the NE recension. And its composition can be assigned, in terms of the stages of growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, to the latter part of the second stage.

---

26. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.



258.2abc	āśramād rākṣasendreṇa rāvaṇena vihāyasā / māyām āsthāya tarasā sā hṛtā rākṣasendreṇa rāvaṇena vihāyasā / māyām āsthāya vipulām hatvā gṛhtraṃ jaṭāyuṣam	cf. 3.64.9abc = 4.6.3d cf. 1.1.42d [Su]
2d		
3c	baddhvā setuṃ samudrasya	cf. 6.101.9d
4b	kūṃvīryaḥ kiṃparākramaḥ	3.32.2b [Su] id. (N v.l.) = 2.66.26d etc. [Su]
5d	rāmasyākliṣṭakarmanāḥ	cf. 1.17.10ab
7ab	abhavaṃ tasya catvāraḥ putrā dharmārthakovidāḥ rājāṭaḥ putrā mahatmanas catvāro jajñire pṛthak	= 3.48.25d [Su] 7.2.4d
9d	rāmasya mahiṣiṇ priyām	cf. 5.21.6cd
11b	sākṣād devaḥ prajāpatiḥ	7.2.4bc
12ab	pulastyo nāma tasyāśiṇ mānaso dayitaḥ sutaḥ mānaso brahmaṇaḥ putraḥ pulastyo nāma brahmaṃṣiḥ prajāpatisutaḥ prabhuḥ / pulastyo nāma brahmaṃṣiḥ	7.3.7c 7.10.13a 4.50.17b 1.71.7c
12c	tasya vaiśravaṇo nāma	cf. 1.17.14ab [Su]
15a	pitāmahas tu prītātmā	1.72.21b
259.4d	nṛtagitaviśārādāḥ	cf. 7.10.10bcd
6c	lokapālopamān putrān	a) also = 1.45.6a etc.
13ab	sarve vedavidāḥ śūrāḥ sarve sucaritavratāḥ sarve vedavidāḥ śūrāḥ sarve lokahite ratāḥ sarve sucaritavratāḥ	cf. 7.10.21 = 7.10.29b
20abc	... daśānaḥ / pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu śiras cāgnau juhāva saḥ	cf. 7.167* [J.]
23	yad agnau hutam sarvaṃ śiras te mahadipsayā tathaiva tāni te dehe bhaviṣyanti yathepsitam hutāni yāni śirṣāṇi pūrvaṃ agnau tvayānagha punas tāni bhaviṣyanti tathaiva tava rākṣasa vibhiṣṇam uvāca ha	
29b	paramāpadgatasyāpi nādharme me matir bhavet	
30	asīkṣitaṃ ca bhagavan brahmāstraṃ pratibhātu me paramāpadgatasyāpi dharme mama matir bhavet asīkṣitaṃ ca brahmāstraṃ bhagavan pratibhātu me	

31	vasmāḍ rāksasayonau te jātasyāmītrakarāṣana nādharme ramate buddhir amaratvaṃ dadāmi te vimanāṃ puṣpakam tasya jahārākramya rāvanaḥ puṣpakam tasya jagraha vimānaṃ jayalakṣaṇam vimānaṃ puṣpakam tasya kāmagaṃ vai jahāra yaḥ vibhīṣanaḥ tu dharmātmā satāṃ dharmam anusmaran vibhīṣaṇas tu dharmātmā nityaṃ dharmaparaḥ śuciḥ daśagrīvo mahābalaḥ avadhyo varadānena kṛto bhagavatā purā tvayā tasmai varo dattiaḥ pṛitena bhagavan purā viṣṇoḥ sahayān iḥṣiṣu kāmarūpabalānvitān	= 7.10.30 [J.] (with N v.l.) cf. 7.15.29cd 3.30.14cd cf. 7.10.6ab [Su] = 5.16.3d cf. 1.14.7ab 1.16.2c 1.16.13d (N v.l.) [Su] = 3.31.7b etc. 1.39.4a etc. 3.24.27d = 1.504* 1 post., 6.57.13b 1.16.3b = 1.69.30f etc. cf.
34ab		
36ab		
260.2b		
2cd		
7a		
7d		
8b		
10a		
12b		
13b		
13d		
261.2b		
1243*		
6b		
9bc		
9d		
10d		
11a		
13b		
15c		
17cd		

vāyuvegasamā jave  
bhṛtārau rāmalakṣmanau  
vṛṣṭir jayanto vijayaḥ siddhārtho rāṣṭravardhanaḥ  
aśoko dharmapālās ca sumantrās cāṣṭamo 'bhavat  
dhrīṣṭir jayanto vijayaḥ siddhārtho arthasādhakaḥ aśoko  
mantrapālās ca sumantrās cāṣṭamo 'bhavat  
ramayāṃ āsa hi prajāḥ  
mattamātāṅgagāminam / dirghabāhuṃ mahorasakam  
dirghabāhuṃ mahāsattvaṃ mattamātāṅgagāminam  
nīlakuñcitamūrhdhajaṃ  
= Mbh.3.264.49d  
: bhāspatisamo matau  
: nityānuraktaprakṛtiḥ  
: sambhārāḥ sambhriyantām me  
: sambhārāḥ sambhriyantām te  
āśviṣas tvāṃ sapkruddhās caṇḍo daśati durbhage  
āśviṣas tvāṃ daśatu mūḍhe paṇḍitamānini

1.7.2 [Mbh. CE]  
1.532\* 5 [SI]  
cf. 2.3.11cd [Su]  
= 6.106.2d  
2.1.32b  
2.20\* 6 pr. [R.]  
= 1.72.17b  
1.11.3c,11c [Su]  
cf. 2.133\* 1 [SI]

18	subhagā khalu kausalyā yasyāḥ putro 'bhiṣekṣyate kuto hi tava saubhāgyam yasyāḥ putro na rājabhāk	= 2.8.3ab and 135* [Su]
19b	sarvābharanabhūṣitā	2.9.39b
22cd	avadyo vadhyatām ko 'dya vadhyāḥ ko 'dya vimucyatām avadyo vadhyatām ko vā vadhyāḥ ko vā vimucyatām	cf.
1245* 1	pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi cāturvarṇyasya rakṣitā cf. pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi samrāt sarvamahikṣitām	2.10.10ab [J.] = 5.33.11b
25ab	ābhīṣecanikaṃ yat te rāmārtham upakalpitam	= 2.195* 1 [SI]
25d	vanam gacchatu rāghavaḥ	= 2.260* 2 [SI] (2nd pāda (dravyam in a))
28d	vaidehī janakātmajā	= 2.8.22b (v.l.)
29b	rājā daśarathas tadā	= 5.31.17d [Su]
31a	gato daśarathaḥ svargam	= 2.92.8b etc.
31c	gṛhāna rājam vipulam	= 2.4.3b etc.
33ab	ayaśaḥ pātayivā me mūrdhni tvaṃ kulapānsane mama cāpy ayaśo mūrdhni pātitaṃ lubdhayā tvayā	= 2.73.2a
35ab	kausalyām ca sumitrām ca kaikeyīm ca suduḥkhitaḥ kaikeyī ca sumitrā ca kausalyā ca yaśasvini	= 2.1713* 5 pr. cf.
35d	śatrughnasahito yayau	2.1744* 3 [SI]
36d	rāmānyanakāṅkṣayā	2.77.6ab
38cd	nandigrāme 'karod rājam puraskṛtyāsa pāduke nandigrāmaṃ yayau tūrṇam śirasya ādhāya pāduke	= 2.64.22d 2.77.6c
39d	śarabhaṅgāstramaṃ prati	2.107.12cd
40b	daṇḍakāraṇyam āśritaḥ	= 3.4.16d [Su]
40c	nadiṃ godāvarīm ramyaṃ	= 2.10.28b
41d	janasthānanivāsina	= 3.60.2c [Su]
42b	rāghavo dharmavatsalah	cf. 3.15.2d
42cd	caturdaśa sahasrāṇi jaghāna bhuvī rakṣasām caturdaśa sahasrāṇi rakṣasām bhīmakarmanām / hatāni	= 1.1.36b = 3.29.1b
43a	dūṣapaṃ ca kharapaṃ caiva	cf. 3.25.22abc 5.35.16ab [Su] = 3.30.2a



8ab	sā dadarśa giriprasṭhe pañca vānarapungavān dadarśa giriśṛṅgasthān pañca vānarapungavān	cf.	3.52.1cd [Su]
1260* 4 pr.	praviveśa puriṇ laṅkāṃ	=	3.52.11c
11ab	katham utsījya vaiḍehiṃ vane rākṣasasevite vihāya sitāṃ vijane vane rākṣasasevite	cf.	3.55.14cd [Su]
13c	api jīvati vaiḍehi		3.56.9a
15cd	sa dadarśa tadā gr̥dhrām niḥatam parvatopamam tataḥ parvatakūṭābhāṃ... / dadarśa patitam bhūmau	cf.	3.63.9a+c 3.58.7b [Su]
22b	vyapaviddhabyśighatam	=	3.7.11b etc.
24b	rāmaḥ saumitrīṇā saha		4.36.14a
25c	meghaparvatasamikāśaṃ		3.1266* 3 [SI]
27c	viṣaṇṇaś cābravid rāmam		3.1266* 8 [SI]
29cd	drakṣyāmi pṛthivirājye pitṛpaitāmabe sthitam pratīlabhya ca kākutstha pitṛpaitāmāḥ mahīm	cf.	1.1.23d etc. 3.67.19a [Su]
1263* post.	sumitrānandavardhana	=	3.71.25a
39a	rāvaṇena hṛtā sitā	cf.	(NE vv.II) 4.1.43a+d [Su]
39c	sugrīvam abhigacchvasa		3.68.12cd [J.]
40ab	eśā paṃpā śivajalā haṃsakāraṇḍavāyūtā paśya paṃpāṃ śubhajalāṃ... haṃsakāraṇḍavāyūtām	=	4.14.15b
41ab	saṃvasaty atra sugrīvaś caturbhiḥ sacivaiḥ saha nivasaty ātmavān vīraś caturbhiḥ saha vānaraḥ	cf.	3.1298* [SI]
41d	vāliṇo hemamālīnaḥ		4.25.14d
42b+d	... draśṭāsi jānakīm / ... vidito rāvanālayaḥ gamiṣyati varōhāṃ nirmalāṃ rāvaṇālaye	=	4.29.5d [Su]
264.1b	prabhūtakamalotpallāṃ		4.22.2b
2d	jagāma manasā priyām		4.20.1d
13b	sugrīvam plavagēśvaram		4.16.1ab
18b	tārāṃ tārādhipānanām		= 4.39.9b etc.
20b	tārā tārādhipaprabhā		
21b	rāmo daśarathātmajaḥ	cf.	4.25.32cd [Su]
23ab	maindaś ca dvividaś caiva hanūmāpś cānilātmajaḥ maindaś ca dvividaś caiva hanūmāñ jāmbavāñ nalaḥ	=	6.28.1c
23c	jāmbavāñ ṛkṣarājāś ca	=	4.331* 2 [Su]
27d	kā tvarā maraṇe pumaḥ		

30d	śālatāśālīyadhau	:	śālatāśālīyadhāḥ	3.24.27d
31a	ubhau jagmatur anyonyam	:	jaghnatuh samare 'nyonyam	4.12.18c
32d	puspitav iva kimśukau			= 6.35.9d [Su]
34ab	sa mālayā tadā vīraḥ śuśubhe kaṇṭhasaktayā			cf. 4.12.37ab [SI]
37ab	sa bhinmamābhīhato vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman sa vāliputrābhīhato vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman	:	asokavamikāmadhye	4.47.19ab [Su]
41c	asokavamikābhyāśe	:	tāpasiveśadhāriṇi	5.12.11c etc.
42b	tāpasiveśadhāriṇi	:	tāpasiveśadhāriṇim	5.415* 3 [Su]
49a	āryāḥ khādāta mām śighraṃ	:	kāmap khādāta mām sarvāḥ	5.22.7c [SI]
52a	tasyās tad vacanam śrutvā			= 5.32.1a etc.
53b	trijāṭā nāma rākṣasī			5.25.4c
54d	śṛṇu cedan vaco mama			= 7.11.12d, 47.9d
55ab	avindhyo nāma medhāvī vṛddho rākṣasapungavaḥ avindhyo nāma medhāvī vidvān rākṣasapungavaḥ	:	rākṣasī trijāṭā vṛddhā = Mbh.3.275.22d,29d	cf. 5.35.12ab [SI]
61ab	svapnā hi sumahāghorā dṛṣṭā me 'niṣṭadarśanāḥ svapno hy adya mayā dī-ṣṭo dāruṇo romaharṣanaḥ			cf. 5.25.6ab = 3.47.27b
63b	kālopahatacetanaḥ			5.25.19a [SI]
64cd	asakṛt kharayukte tu rathe nṛtyann iva sthitaḥ rathena kharayuktena			5.25.25a [SI]
65a	kumbhakarnaḍayas ceme			5.25.19b [SI]
65d	raktamālyānulepanāḥ	:	raktamālyānulepanaḥ	= 5.25.19b [SI]
66	śvetatapatraḥ soṣṇisāḥ śuklamālyavibhūṣanaḥ śvetaparvatam āruḍha eka eva vibhūṣanaḥ ... śvetacchatro vibhūṣanaḥ / śuklamālyāmbaradharah śvetaparvatam āruḍhas tv eka eva vibhūṣanaḥ			cf. 5.614* 1-2 [SI] 5.617* 1 [SI] 1.13.13d = 5.520* 1 post.
265.4b	sumiṣṭamanikuṇḍalāḥ	:	sumiṣṭamanikuṇḍalāḥ	cf. 5.520* [SI]
4d	vasanta iva mūrtimān			= 5.472*
5acd	sa kalpavṛkṣasadrīṣo... / śmaśānacaityadrumavad bhūṣito 'pi bhayaṃkaraḥ sa kalpavṛkṣapratimo... / śmaśānacaityapratimo bh. 'pi bh.			cf. 5.520* [SI] = 5.472*
8ab	sīte parvāptam etāvāt kṛto bhartur anugrahaḥ sīte parvāptam etāvād bhairiṣneho nidarśitaḥ			cf. 5.22.16ab [Su]



58ab	tatra sitā mayā dṛṣṭā rāvaṇāntahpуре satī tatra dṛṣṭā mayā sitā rāvaṇāntahpуре satī	cf.	5.63.10ab [Su] 6.17.12a
61c	sarvasākhāmigrendrena	=	(cf. 6.19.28c)
67c	kṣiptām iṣikām kākasya	=	5.38.4c and 1361* 2 pr. [Su]
67d	citrakūte mahāgirau	=	2.84.21b [Su]
267.1d	sugrivavacanāt tadā	cf.	4.7.15b
2ab	vṛtaḥ koṭisahasreṇa vānarāṇām tarasvinām vṛtaḥ koṭisahasreṇa vānarāṇām tarasvinām	cf.	4.38.18cd etc. [Su]
4cd	vṛtaḥ koṭisahasreṇa vānarāṇām adṛṣyata golāṅgulo mahārājo gavākṣo bhimadarśanaḥ golāṅgulo mahārājo gavākṣo bhimavikramah golāṅgulo mahākāyo gavākṣo bhimadarśanaḥ	cf.	4.38.18ab [Su] 6.32.21ab [Su] 4.38.20b
6a	panaso nāma medhāvī	cf.	4.724* 3
8cd	koṭisatasahasreṇa jāmbavān pratyadṛṣyata vṛtaḥ śatasahasraṇis ca jāmbavān pratyadṛṣyata	=	4.38.32c
9a	ete cānye ca bahavo	=	4.13.4d
9b	hariyūthapayūthapāḥ	=	2.95.34d
10b	siṃhānām iva nardatām	=	6.57.35c
11c	śaradbhrapratikāsāḥ	=	6.4.25c
12a	utpatantaḥ patantaś ca	=	7.83.7b
15d	sugrivasaḥitaś tadā	=	6.3.6b etc.
16b	hanūmān mārutātmajaḥ	=	1.21.8a
17a	baddhagodhāṅgulitṛṇau	=	(cf. 2.20.30a)
18b	sālatāśilāyudham	=	3.24.27d
20b	bahumūlaphaleṣu ca	=	6.15.31d
21d	kṣārodam aṭha sāgaram	=	4.39.38b
22c	velāvanam samāsāḍya	=	6.4.75a
22d	nivāsam akarot tadā	=	6.4.71d
35ab	brūhi kiṃ te karomy atra sāhāyaṃ puruṣarṣabha avāsyam tava sāhāyaṃ mayā kāryam viśeṣataḥ	cf.	6.280* 1 [Su]
37c	śaraṇis tvām śoṣayīṣyāmi	=	6.238* pr.



40	yadi dāsyāmi te mārgaṃ saumyasya vrajato 'jñāyā anye 'py ājñāpāyisanti mām evaṃ dhanuṣo balāt anye 'pi balavanto mām daṇḍam udyamya rāghava gatvartham iha mārgaṃ ca dāpāyisanti tejasā asti tv atra nalo nāma vānaraḥ śilpisaṃmataḥ tvaṣṭur devasya tanayo balavān viśvakarmaṇaḥ ayaṃ saumya nalo nāma tanujo viśvakarmaṇaḥ pitṛā dattavaraḥ śrīmān pratimo viśvakarmaṇaḥ sarvaṃ tad dhārayiṣyāmi : tam ahaṃ dhārayiṣyāmi daśayojanavistāram āyataṃ śatayojanam daśayojanavistīrṇaṃ śatayojanam āyatam nalasetur iti khyātaḥ caturbhiḥ sactivaḥ saha : caturbhiḥ saha rākṣasaiḥ	cf. 6.258* 8-9 [SI]
42c 44cd	6.15.8 6.15.9c = N vv.ll. of 6.15.20ab [Su] = 6.306* 6 pr. 6.10.12d and 11.5b [SI] 6.13.9b [Su] = 6.16.9b,22b [Su]	cf. 6.15.8 6.15.9c = N vv.ll. of 6.15.20ab [Su] = 6.306* 6 pr. 6.10.12d and 11.5b [SI] 6.13.9b [Su] = 6.16.9b,22b [Su]
45a 46d	6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]
49b 52b 53ab	5.19.10cd [Su] 6.31.68a [SI] 6.31.56ab [J.] 6.31.71ab 6.17.5b etc. [Su] 6.31.73cd [Su] 6.31.50c 4.38.13ab	cf. 5.19.10cd [Su] 6.31.68a [SI] 6.31.56ab [J.] 6.31.71ab 6.17.5b etc. [Su] 6.31.73cd [Su] 6.31.50c 4.38.13ab
54c 268.2d	prācchannau yadā rūpaṃ rākṣasaṃ tau niśācarau praśayāṃ āsa dautiyena dṛḍhaprākātoranā : dṛḍhaprākārapikhāṃ āha tvāṃ rāghavo rājan : āha tvāṃ rāghavo rāmaḥ kosalendro mahāyāsāḥ : dūto 'haṃ kosalendrasya akṛtātmānam āśādyā rājānam anaye ratam vinaśyanti anayāviṣṭā deśā ca nagarāṇi ca samiṛddhāni vinaśyanti rāṣṭrāpi nagarāṇi ca hanātsmi tvāṃ sahāmātyaṃ arākṣasam imaṃ lokam kartāsmi niśitaiḥ śaraiḥ iti tasya bruvāṇasya dūtasya paruṣaṃ vacaḥ ity evaṃ paruṣaṃ vākyaṃ bruvāṇe haripuṅgave rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrchitah catvāro rajanīcarāḥ / caturṣv angeṣu jagrhuḥ jagrhus taṃ tato ghorāś catvāro rajanīcarāḥ lanḡhāyitvā puriṃ lanīkam taruṇādityasadrśaiḥ śaragauraiś ca vānaraiḥ taruṇādityavarṇaiś ca śāśigauraiś ca vānaraiḥ	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]
10a 10b 11	prācchannau yadā rūpaṃ rākṣasaṃ tau niśācarau praśayāṃ āsa dautiyena dṛḍhaprākātoranā : dṛḍhaprākārapikhāṃ āha tvāṃ rāghavo rājan : āha tvāṃ rāghavo rāmaḥ kosalendro mahāyāsāḥ : dūto 'haṃ kosalendrasya akṛtātmānam āśādyā rājānam anaye ratam vinaśyanti anayāviṣṭā deśā ca nagarāṇi ca samiṛddhāni vinaśyanti rāṣṭrāpi nagarāṇi ca hanātsmi tvāṃ sahāmātyaṃ arākṣasam imaṃ lokam kartāsmi niśitaiḥ śaraiḥ iti tasya bruvāṇasya dūtasya paruṣaṃ vacaḥ ity evaṃ paruṣaṃ vākyaṃ bruvāṇe haripuṅgave rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrchitah catvāro rajanīcarāḥ / caturṣv angeṣu jagrhuḥ jagrhus taṃ tato ghorāś catvāro rajanīcarāḥ lanḡhāyitvā puriṃ lanīkam taruṇādityasadrśaiḥ śaragauraiś ca vānaraiḥ taruṇādityavarṇaiś ca śāśigauraiś ca vānaraiḥ	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]
15a 16cd 17ab	prācchannau yadā rūpaṃ rākṣasaṃ tau niśācarau praśayāṃ āsa dautiyena dṛḍhaprākātoranā : dṛḍhaprākārapikhāṃ āha tvāṃ rāghavo rājan : āha tvāṃ rāghavo rāmaḥ kosalendro mahāyāsāḥ : dūto 'haṃ kosalendrasya akṛtātmānam āśādyā rājānam anaye ratam vinaśyanti anayāviṣṭā deśā ca nagarāṇi ca samiṛddhāni vinaśyanti rāṣṭrāpi nagarāṇi ca hanātsmi tvāṃ sahāmātyaṃ arākṣasam imaṃ lokam kartāsmi niśitaiḥ śaraiḥ iti tasya bruvāṇasya dūtasya paruṣaṃ vacaḥ ity evaṃ paruṣaṃ vākyaṃ bruvāṇe haripuṅgave rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrchitah catvāro rajanīcarāḥ / caturṣv angeṣu jagrhuḥ jagrhus taṃ tato ghorāś catvāro rajanīcarāḥ lanḡhāyitvā puriṃ lanīkam taruṇādityasadrśaiḥ śaragauraiś ca vānaraiḥ taruṇādityavarṇaiś ca śāśigauraiś ca vānaraiḥ	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]
17d 18bc	prācchannau yadā rūpaṃ rākṣasaṃ tau niśācarau praśayāṃ āsa dautiyena dṛḍhaprākātoranā : dṛḍhaprākārapikhāṃ āha tvāṃ rāghavo rājan : āha tvāṃ rāghavo rāmaḥ kosalendro mahāyāsāḥ : dūto 'haṃ kosalendrasya akṛtātmānam āśādyā rājānam anaye ratam vinaśyanti anayāviṣṭā deśā ca nagarāṇi ca samiṛddhāni vinaśyanti rāṣṭrāpi nagarāṇi ca hanātsmi tvāṃ sahāmātyaṃ arākṣasam imaṃ lokam kartāsmi niśitaiḥ śaraiḥ iti tasya bruvāṇasya dūtasya paruṣaṃ vacaḥ ity evaṃ paruṣaṃ vākyaṃ bruvāṇe haripuṅgave rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrchitah catvāro rajanīcarāḥ / caturṣv angeṣu jagrhuḥ jagrhus taṃ tato ghorāś catvāro rajanīcarāḥ lanḡhāyitvā puriṃ lanīkam taruṇādityasadrśaiḥ śaragauraiś ca vānaraiḥ taruṇādityavarṇaiś ca śāśigauraiś ca vānaraiḥ	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]
21c 27cd	prācchannau yadā rūpaṃ rākṣasaṃ tau niśācarau praśayāṃ āsa dautiyena dṛḍhaprākātoranā : dṛḍhaprākārapikhāṃ āha tvāṃ rāghavo rājan : āha tvāṃ rāghavo rāmaḥ kosalendro mahāyāsāḥ : dūto 'haṃ kosalendrasya akṛtātmānam āśādyā rājānam anaye ratam vinaśyanti anayāviṣṭā deśā ca nagarāṇi ca samiṛddhāni vinaśyanti rāṣṭrāpi nagarāṇi ca hanātsmi tvāṃ sahāmātyaṃ arākṣasam imaṃ lokam kartāsmi niśitaiḥ śaraiḥ iti tasya bruvāṇasya dūtasya paruṣaṃ vacaḥ ity evaṃ paruṣaṃ vākyaṃ bruvāṇe haripuṅgave rāvaṇaḥ krodhamūrchitah catvāro rajanīcarāḥ / caturṣv angeṣu jagrhuḥ jagrhus taṃ tato ghorāś catvāro rajanīcarāḥ lanḡhāyitvā puriṃ lanīkam taruṇādityasadrśaiḥ śaragauraiś ca vānaraiḥ taruṇādityavarṇaiś ca śāśigauraiś ca vānaraiḥ	cf. 6.330* 5 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a 5.19.10ab [Su]

32b	rākṣasāḥ kāmarūpiṇaḥ	:	māṣārāśipratikāśam	=	5.18.4b etc.
34a	sa māṣārāśiśatśāḥ	:	nakhair dantiś ca vīraṇām	=	5.8.26a [R.]
36c	tatra vānararākṣasāḥ	:	tadā vānararākṣasām	=	6.32.29d [Su]
269.5b	rāvāno miryayau atha	:	miryayau rāvapo mohād	=	6.34.1b,2d
9d	svabāhubalam āśritāḥ	:	sa saṃprahāras tumulo	=	6.83.37c
10a	sa saṃprahāro vavīrdhe	:	yathā devāsure purā	=	2.993* 1 post.
10d	purā devāsure yathā	:	saktiśtilaparāsvadhaiḥ	=	6.32.32a
11b	śaktiśūlāsviṣṭibhiḥ	:	yai lokāḥ sacarācarāḥ	=	6.32.27d etc.
14d	gadayā bhīmavegayā	:	hṛtottamāṅgaṃ saumitre	=	6.32.28b
270.2b	hṛtottamaṅgo dadṛṣe	:		=	6.88.53b
4c	taṃ dṛṣtvā nihataṃ saṃkhye	:		=	6.42.34b v.l.
5a	cf. taṃ dṛṣtvā nihataṃ bhūmau	:		=	6.75.22c
9ab	tataḥ śabdo mahān āsit tumulo lomahaṣṣaṇaḥ	:		=	6.44.30a
9d	tatrāsit sumahad yuddhaṃ tumulaṃ lomahaṣṣaṇam	:		cf.	6.33.16ab
13d	anyonyam abhidhāvātām	:	= Mbh.3.271.26d	=	6.33.5b
14d	saskandhaviṭṭapair drumaiḥ	:	= Mbh.3.271.24b	=	6.42.29d [Su]
15ab	hanūmān mārutātmajaḥ (cf. 11d)	:	tatas taṃ nihataṃ dṛṣtvā dhūmrākṣaṃ rākṣasottāmam	=	6.42.29b etc. [Su]
		:	dhūmrākṣaṃ nihataṃ dṛṣtvā	cf.	
		:	dhūmrākṣo rākṣasarābhāḥ	=	6.42.36a and
17b	hataśeṣā niśācarāḥ	:		=	6.42.17b
20cd	śayānam atinidhrāluṃ kumbhakarṇaṃ abodhayat	:		cf.	6.42.36b [Su]
21f	nidrāvasasamāviṣṭāḥ kumbhakarṇaṃ vibodhyatām	:		=	6.48.11cd
22cd	kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalam	:		=	6.48.12d,53.28d
	ya imaṃ dāruṇaṃ kālam na jāniṣe mahābhayam	:		cf.	
24ab	sukhinas tvam na jāniṣe mama rāmakṛtaṃ bhayam	:		=	6.50.12cd [S]
271.2b	mayā hy apahr̥tā bhāryā sītā...	:	mayā hy apahr̥tā bhāryā sītā...	=	6.1099* 3 post.
4b	parivārya samantataḥ	:		=	4.59.1d
5b	bhākṣayām āsa vānarān	:		=	6.55.74d [Su]
10b	kumbhakarṇasya rakṣasāḥ	:		=	6.48.34b
10d	kumbhakarṇena rakṣasā	:		=	6.54.26b
11d	saumitriṃ mitranandanāḥ	:		=	6.72.31b etc.
	lakṣmaṇaḥ paravirahā	:	= Mbh.3.1293* 1 post.	=	6.59.66d etc.

12d	rudhireṇa samukṣitāḥ								6.75.17b (cf. 52.25b)
21ab	tataḥ sutumulaṃ yuddham abhaval lomahaṣaṇam cf. tad babbhūvādbhutaṃ yuddhaṃ tumulaṃ romahaṣaṇam	a)							4.12.17a 3.24.28ab [J.] 3.70.6d etc.
21d	lakṣmaṇasya ca dhimataḥ							cf.	3.25.14d
25cd	pramāthīnam abhidrutya pramamātha mahābalaḥ pramamātha pramāthīnam							cf.	6.56.2ab [Su]
272.1ab	tataḥ śrutvā hataṃ saṃkhye kumbhakarṇaṃ saḥānugam śrutvā vinihataṃ saṃkhye kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalaṃ								6.9.6b 6.67.37b 3.27.12d 6.4.11d etc. 6.46.18b 6.68.4b etc. [Su] 6.35.16a
2d	sugrivaṃ ca salakṣmaṇam							cf.	6.36.3abc
9d	lakṣmaṇaṃ śubhalakṣaṇam								6.39.31d v.l. [Su]
10d	siṃhaḥ kṣudramiṅgaṃ yatha								6.36.2cd
23d	śataśo 'tha sahasraśaḥ								6.75.28cd
24d	pragrhya mahatiḥ śilāḥ								6.75.31a 6.75.1b [Su]
26b	bhṛatarau rāmalakṣmaṇau								6.75.3d v.l., 76.5b v.l., etc. [Su]
273.2ab	tau virau śarajālena baddhau... suṣeṇamainadivividaiḥ kumudenaṅgadena ca / hanūmannilatāraś ca								1.50.16d
4abc	niḥadvividamaindāś ca suṣeṇasumukhāṅgadāḥ / tūrṇaṃ hanumatā sārdham							cf.	
5ab	tatas taṃ deśam āgamyā kṛtakarmā vibhiṣaṇaḥ cf. ājagāmātha taṃ deśam sasugrivo vibhiṣaṇaḥ	b)							
18ab	tayoḥ samabhavad yuddhaṃ tadānyonyaṃ jīgiṣataḥ vimardaś tumulo yuddhe paraspāravadhaiṣiṇoḥ								
18d	śakraprahādayor iva								
20b	ravaṇiḥ krodhamūrchitaḥ								
20d	śarān āśīviṣopamān								
21d	tan me nigadataḥ śṛṇu								
26	sa putram nihataṃ dīṣtvā trāsāt sambhṛāntalocanaḥ rāvaṇaḥ śokamoḥarto vaidehiṃ hantum udyataḥ sa putravadhāsaṃptataḥ śūraḥ krodhavaśam gataḥ samīkṣya rāvaṇo buddhya śītāṃ hantum vyavasyata								6.80.29 6.37.12c 5.12.41b 6.80.34c
27a	aśokavanikāsthāṃ tām								
27b	rāmadaśanalālasām								
27c	khadgam ādāya duṣtātṃā								

khadgam ādāya duṣtātṃā : samkruddhaḥ khadgam ādāya

31b	sākṣād api śatakratuḥ	:	sākṣād api puraṇdarah	5.49.32b and 6.80.26d
274.1a	tataḥ kruddho daśagrīvāḥ	:		6.83.40a
2b	vividhāyudhapāṇibhiḥ	:	vividhāyudhahastāś ca	6.41.24a
4d	daśagrīvasya paśyataḥ	=	<i>Mbh.</i> 3.275.49d	6.31.77d
5d	rāvaṇo rākṣaseśvaraḥ			6.93.26b etc. [Su]
12b	rathenādityavarcaśā			6.59.15d v.l.
12d	mātaliḥ śakraśārathīḥ			6.100.5b [Su]
16b	rāvaṇasya durātmanah			6.97.17d etc.
1298*	daśakandhararājasūnvoḥ		tathā yuddham abhūn mahat	
1299*	alabdhopamam anyatra tayor eva		tathābhavat	
	gandharvāpsarasām saṅghā		diṣṭvā yuddham anūpamam	
	gaganam gaganākaram śāgarah		sāgaropamaḥ	
	rāmarāvaṇayor yuddham		rāmarāvaṇayor iva	
	evam bruvananto dadṛṣus tad		yuddham rāmarāvaṇam	
20b	ciccheda nīṣitaiḥ śaraiḥ			6.3064* 3-6 [L.]
21d	śastrām vividhāni ca			6.63.32d
26d	devagandharvakimnarāḥ	:	devagandharvadānavāḥ	6.92.29b [Su]
29d	rāmeṇākliṣṭakarmaṇā			6.100.1b etc.
275.1d	rāmaḥ saumitriṇā saha	=	50b and 58b (+263.24b)	6.31.62b etc.
3a	devāḥ sarṣipurogamāḥ	:	devāḥ sarṣigaṇāś tadā	6.32.20b etc.
9a	rāmaṃ kamalapatrākṣam			6.3064* 1 post.
14d	tām diṣṭvā cārusarvāṅgim			6.102.1c v.l.
17d	nikṛttā kadali yathā	:	pravāte kadaḷi yathā	6.1541* pr.
19a	darśayām āsa rāghavam			2.109.18d etc.
19cd	rājā daśarathaś caiva	:	rājā daśaratho mīṭhaḥ	7.82.4d
	vimānena mahārheṇa		hamsayuktēna bhāśvatā	6.114.5d
	yayau tena vimānena		hamsayuktēna bhāśvatā	
25d	vānarāṇām mahātmanām			6.110.23ab
31a	avadhyaḥ sarvabhūtānām			6.16.6d etc. [Su]
32b	hṛtā sitā durātmanā	:	hṛtā bhāryā durātmanā	7.1.21c
32cd	malakūbarasāpeṇa rakṣā...	:	malakūbaranirmuktaṃ śāpam...	6.29.4d 7.551* 2

cf.

cf.

33	yadi hy akāmām āsevet striyam anyām api dhruvam śatadhāsyā phaled deha ity uktaḥ so 'bhavat purā yadā tv akāmām kāmāto dharsaviṣati yoṣitam mūrdhā tu saptadhā tasya śakalibhavitā tadā pitā daśaratho 'smi te rāma raktāntalocana tam uvāca tato brahmā sadevāsुरagandharvāḥ yakṣarākṣasapannagāḥ kathayiṣyanti lokās tvām yāvad bhūmir dharīṣyati sadevāḥ kathayiṣyanti yāvad bhūmir dharīṣyati rāmaṃ śastrabhṛtām varam puṣpakena vimānena khecarena virājatā		
35b		cf.	7.26.44 [S1]
37d		=	6.107.7b
40a		=	3.19.12b (acc.) etc.
48a		=	1.62.21a
48b		=	4.31.19c, 7.61.21a
48cd		cf.	6.48.7b
49b		=	6.88.53cd [Su]
52a		=	2.92.10d, 3.3.14d
52b		=	6.114.44c
59a	ayodhyām sa samāsādhyā nandigrāmam upāgamat sa tatra maladigdhāngam rāghavaḥ sahaśaumitriḥ vasiṣṭho vāmadevaś ca daśāvamedhān ājahre		vv.ll. for 6.110.23ab [S1]
60d		=	6.113.1a
61a		=	6.115.12d
62c		=	6.113.27a
65c		=	5.33.41c
69c		=	6.116.55a [Su] 6.116.82c [Su]

PARALLELS BETWEEN THE RĀMĀYAṆA AND THE RĀMOPAKHYANA  
(RĀMĀYAṆA ORDER)

*I. In sequence*

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1.1.42d	: 258.2d	part of <i>RU</i> summary ( <i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 4.6.3d)
14.7ab	cf. 260.2cd	
16.2c	: 7a	
3b	= 13d	
13d v.l.	= 7d	
504* 1 post.	= 13b	<i>Rām.</i> v.l. of NE mss. 504* is S insert; <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (also <i>Rām.</i> 6.57.13b)
17.10ab	cf. 258.7ab	1st <i>pāda</i> several times in <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> in <i>Bāla</i> , <i>Uttara</i> and <i>Mbh.</i> also at <i>Rām.</i> 1.39.4a etc. <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
14ab	: 259.13ab	
45.6a etc.	= 20a	
64.13a	= 260.10a	
69.30f etc.	= 261.2b etc.	
72.17b	= 13b	
2.1.32b	= 10d	
20* 6 pr.	: 11a	
3.11cd	: 9bc	
4.3b etc.	= 29b	
133* 1	cf. 17cd	20* mostly lacking in NW (i.e. NE+S) <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> 504* is S insert; <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (also <i>Rām.</i> 6.57.13b)
8.3ab	= 18ab	135* insert of some N mss. (NE, NW and W)
135*	= cd	
22b v.l.	= 25d	
9.39b	= 19b	v.l. of some S mss.; also = <i>Rām.</i> 5.31.17d cf. <i>vanam gacchatu rāmaś ca 2.208* 1 pr.</i> (N ins.)
10.10ab	= 22cd	stock long compound also general similarity of 10.10cd and 261.23ab
195* 1	: 1245* 1	both N inserts ( <i>RU</i> 2nd <i>pāda</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 5.33.11b)
28b	= 40b	260* insert of some NE mss., one W, also M4
260* 2	= 25ab	
64.22d	= 35d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
1715* 5 pr.	: 31c	
1744* 3	cf. 33ab	
73.2a	= 31a	
77.6ab+c	: 35ab+36d	
92.8b etc.	= 28d	
107.12cd	cf. 38cd	
3.4.16d	= 39d	
15.2d	: 40c	
25.22ab	: 42cd	
29.1b	= 42b	<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 3.60.2c <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pādas</i> ; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 5.35.16ab
30.2a	= 43a	645* is S insert = <i>Rām.</i> 3.749* 1 pr. (S insert) cf. also 761* (N subst. for 1ab)
645* 4 pr.	: 262.3b	
38.17a	= 12c	
40.1	cf. 14	

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
12cd	cf. 16cd	
42.18ab	: 22cd	<i>Rām.</i> text = S; N subst. 818* not so close
43.34b v.l.	: 27d	v.l. of most N mss.
847*	cf. 30ab	847* is N subst. for 3.44.2ab
44.9a	= c	= <i>Rām.</i> 4.17.24c
45.22c+25ab	: 33bcd	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 3.46.2c+10ab
27d v.l.	= 34c	v.l. of all N mss.
40cd [l.v.]	cf. 38	
47.8c	: 32b	
50.12ab	: 41c	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed to simplify
48.3d	= 263.1c	+ <i>Rāmopākhyāna</i> order
984* 1-2	: 4bc	984* is NE subst. for 3.49.33 (cf. 956* 1 pr.)
52.1cd	: 8ab	
11c	= 1260* 4 pr.	<i>RU</i> insert of some N mss. (and G3)
55.14cd	: 11ab	
56.9a	: 13c	
58.7b	: 22b	
63.9a+c	cf. 15cd	
1266* 3,8	cf. 27c,29cd	1266* is S insert after 3.65.23
67.19a	= 39a	
68.12cd	: 41ab	
1298*	cf. 42b+d	1298* is S insert after 3.68.21
71.25a	: 39c	<i>Rām.</i> text = S; cf. 1289* 4 (NE) and 1290* (NW)
4.1.43a+d v.l.	: 40ab	vv.ll. of NE mss.
2.1b etc.	: 264.8d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (1.69.30f etc.)
12.18c	: 31a	
37ab	: 34ab	
16.1ab/20.1d	: 18b/20b	
331* 2 post.	= 27d	331* is NE insert after 4.16.14
22.2b	: 13b	
25.14d	= 1b	
32cd	: 23ab	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 4.49.6ab
29.5d	= 2d	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed
27.1c	= 266.1c	+
29.6a,2ab	: 1d,2ab	The subject matter of <i>Rām.</i> 4.29-36
48d	cf. 10c	is postponed in the <i>Rāmopākhyāna</i>
34.3ab	: 16ab	
35.3d	: 15b	
36.37b etc.	= 13d	
38.18ab	: 267.4cd	The description of the mustering of
cd	: 2ab	the search parties ( <i>Rām.</i> 4.38) used
20b	: 6a	in <i>RU</i> for departure for Lankā
724* 3	: 8cd	724* is N subst. for 38.27cd
32c	= 9a	
39.38b	: 21d	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed
9b etc.	= 264.21b	+

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
47.19ab	: 37ab	<i>RU</i> continues the basic story in <i>adhyāya</i> 264
55.2a	: 266.48a	
1166*	: 52ab	N insert after 55.17/20
57.7ab	: 49cd	Sampāti's intervention delayed in
58.7b	= 38b	<i>RU</i> until Hanumān's narration
5.12.11c etc.	: 264.41c	
415* 3 post.	= 42b	NE insert after 5.13.37
19.3ab	: 265.17cd	cf. 3.54.1cd
6a	: 21a	Sitā's harassment postponed slightly in <i>RU</i>
472*/520*	: 4d-5d	N and S versions
22.16ab	: 8ab	+
23.9cd	: 25cd	+ order modified for clarity
22.7c	cf. 264.49a	+
25.4c	: 53b	
6ab	cf. 61ab	
19ab	: 64c+65d	
614* 1-2	}	S insert
617* 1		N insert
25a	= 65a	
32.1a etc.	= 52a	stock <i>pāda</i>
35.12ab	: 55ab	
47b	: 266.44c	
38.4c	= 67c	also = <i>Rām.</i> 5.1361* 2 pr. (NE+NW insert)
21b	= 61b	stock <i>pāda</i> (= <i>Rām.</i> 1.69.30f etc.)
59.11b	: 26b	
60.3acd	: 28bcd	
63.8b	: 57e	<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 5.28.33c
10ab	= 58ab	
6.3.6b etc.	= 267.16b	
4.25c	: 12a	
71d	: 22d	
75a	: c	
11.5b v.l.	= 46d	N v.l.; cf. 10.12d and text of 11.5b
13.9b	= 49b	
238* pr.	: 37c	238* is S insert at 6.14.12, also similar
258* 8-9	cf. 267.40	258* is N insert after 6.15.5/6
15.8	cf. 41	
9c	: 42c	
280* 1	cf. 35ab	280* is N insert after 6.15.13
20ab v.l.	= 44cd	vv.ll. of most N mss. (and some S in a)
306* 6 pr.	= 45a	306* is N insert/subst. at 6.15.22/26
31d	: 20b	
16.9b,22b	= 52b	
330* 5	cf. 53ab	330* is NE and S insert after 6.16.17
17.5b etc.	= 268.17d	
31.50c	= 21c	
56ab	= 16cd	



<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
66a	: 10b	
67a	: a	
68a	= 15a	
71ab	cf. 17ab	
73cd	: 18bc	
32.29d	: 36c	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order modified to clarify <i>RU</i>
33.4d etc.	= 32b	+ order
34.1b,2d	: 37b	+
32.27d	= 269.10d	+
28b	: 11b	+
32a	: 10a	+
33.5b	= 270.9d	+ also = 271.26d
16ab	: ab	+
42.17b	: 15b	
29b	= 14d	= 271.24b
d	= 13d	
34b v.l.	= 2b	v.l. of some S mss. (but text is close to <i>RU</i> )
36a	: 15a	
b	= 17b	
44.30a	: 5a	<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 7.27.42a
48.11cd	: 20cd	
12d etc.	= 21f	
50.12cd	cf. 22cd	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order modified
1099* 3	: 24ab	+ 1099* is insert of all N mss. and G1
48.34b	= 271.5b	+
52.25b	= 12d	stock <i>pāda</i>
54.26b	= 10b	
55.63b etc.	= 24b	= 270.14d
74d	= 4b	
59.66d etc.	= 11d	+ <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
56.2ab	: 272.1ab	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed with previous item
67.37b	= 9d	
68.4b etc.	= 26b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (= 1.69.30f etc.)
75.1b	= 273.20b	also = 6.1719* 4 post. (NE insert)
3d v.l.	= d	v.l. of all N mss. + M1.2; a stock simile
28cd	: 18ab	cf. 6.76.29 and 78.21ab
31a	cf. d	cf. 6.78.27
80.26d	: 31b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
29	: 26	
34c	: 27c	
51b etc.	= 274.5d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
83.40a	= 1a	
87.47b etc.	= 29d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
92.29b	= 21d	
96.14b etc.	= 6b	stock <i>pāda</i> (= <i>RU</i> 272.23d, <i>Rām.</i> 6.4.11d etc.)

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
3064* 3-6	: 1298* } 1299* }	3064* is insert of many mss. (N+S) at 96.19 1298*+1299* are inserts of some mss. (N+S)
97.17d	= 16b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
100.1b	: 26d	stock long compounds
5b	= 12d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> ; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 6.90.8cd
3064* 1 post.	: 275.2b	+ <i>Rām.</i> item postponed to simplify <i>RU</i> order
102.1c v.l.	= 3a	v.l. of D9-11 (S mss.)
107.7b	: 35b	
108.17b	= 1d,50b,58b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (= 3.7.11b etc.)
110.23ab	: 19cd	
113.1a	: 59a	
27a	: 61a	
114.5d	: 19a	cf. also 6.3249* 1 pr. (N insert)
44c	= 52a,56c	
115.12d	= 60d	
116.55a etc.	= 65c	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
82c	: 69c	<i>RU</i> = <i>Mbh.</i> 2 App. 21.547 pr. and 7.9.61a; various N mss. of <i>Rām.</i> make 82d similar to 69d

## II. Random

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1.1.23d etc.	= 1263* post.	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (1263* is S insert in <i>RU</i> )
36b	= 261.41d	
7.2	: 1243*	1243* is insert of D1 only
11.3c,11c	: 15c	
13.13d	= 265.4b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound
532* 5 post.	: 261.6b	532* is insert of NE mss. (+ 2 NW and 1 S)
21.8a	= 267.17a	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 2.20.30a and <i>RU</i> 262.19b
50.16d	= 273.21d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
62.21a	= 275.40a	
64.21b	= 266.30d	
71.7c	: 259.6c	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa (genealogy and past exploits)
72.21b	= 13b	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
2.28.5d	= 262.2d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
993* 1 post.	= 269.9d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> ; 993* is S insert
66.26d etc.	= 258.5d etc.	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> ( <i>adhy.</i> 258 is <i>RU</i> summary)
84.21b	= 266.67d	= <i>Rām.</i> 1 App. I.1.69 post.
92.10d etc.	= 275.49b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
95.34d	= 267.10b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile
109.18d	: 275.14d	stock simile
3.12.9c	= 262.2c	stock <i>pāda</i>
19.12b etc.	= 275.37d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
24.27d etc.	= 260.12b etc.	stock <i>pāda</i>
28ab	: 271.21ab	<i>RU</i> 1st <i>pāda</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 4.12.17a
25.14d	: 25cd	
27.12d	: 272.10d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile
32.2b v.l.	= 258.4b	v.l. of N mss. at 32.2b; <i>adhy.</i> 258 is <i>RU</i> summary
47.27b	= 264.63b	
48.25d etc.	= 258.9d	<i>RU</i> summary
53.14ab } 1056* 4 }	: 265.11	1056* is NE subst.
64.9abc	: 258.2abc	<i>RU</i> summary
70.6d etc.	= 271.21d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
4.7.15b	: 267.1d	
13.4d	= 9b	
14.15b	= 263.41d	
26.14d	= 262.30d	also = <i>Mbh.</i> 4.64.6d
36.14a	= 263.25c	
38.13ab	: 268.27cd	
50.17b	= 259.4d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound; <i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
59.1d	= 271.2b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
5.8.26a	: 268.34a	cf. RAGHAVAN, <i>The Greater Rāmāyaṇa</i> , p. 20
12.41b	= 273.27b	long compound also at <i>Rām.</i> 5.55.27d

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
16.3d	= 260.2b	
19.10	= 268.11	
24.4d etc.	: 266.35d	stock <i>pāda</i>
33.41c	= 275.62c	variant of stock <i>pāda</i>
6.9.6b	= 272.2d	
16.6d etc.	= 275.25d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
17.12a	= 266.61c	
19.22d	= 261.9d	= 6.106.2d and <i>RU</i> 264.49d (stock long compound)
28.1c	= 264.23c	
29.4d	: 275.32b	
31.77d	= 274.4d	
35.9d	= 264.32d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile, also at <i>Rām.</i> 6.1717* 2 post.
16a	: 273.2ab	The <i>RU</i> transposes a complete section
36.2cd	: 5ab	cf. 6.39.31d (v.l. of N mss.)
3abc	: 4abc	
37.12c	= 27a	
41.24a	: 274.2b	
46.18b	= 272.24d	
48.7b	= 275.48b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound, also at <i>Rām.</i> 7.17.9b
55.70d	= 263.4f	<i>Rām.</i> stock simile
57.35c	: 267.11c	
59.15d v.l.	= 274.12b, 275.49d	v.l. of N mss. and some S mss.
63.32d	= 20b	stock <i>pāda</i>
1541* pr.	= 275.9a	1541* is insert of NE and S mss.
72.31b	= 271.10d	stock <i>pāda</i>
75.22c	: 270.4c	partially stereotyped (long compound in <i>Mbh.</i> )
83.37c	: 269.5b	
88.53b	: 14d v.l.	<i>RU</i> v.l. of S mss.
cd	: 275.48cd	
101.9d	: 258.3c	<i>RU</i> summary
7.1.21c	= 275.31a	
2.4bcd	: 258.11b+12ab	<i>RU</i> summary
3.7c	: 12c	<i>RU</i> summary
5.26a	: 268.2d	
10.6ab	: 259.36ab	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa (genealogy and past exploits)
10bcd	: 20abc	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 1.45.6a
13a	: 258.15a	<i>RU</i> summary
21	: 259.23	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
167*	= 30	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; (167* insert of several mss., N and S, not NW)
29b	= 29b	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
30 v.l.	= 31	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; v.l. of several mss., N+S
11.12d, 47.9d	= 264.54d, etc.	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
20c	= 267.54c	
15.29cd	: 259.34ab	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; cf. <i>Rām.</i> 3.30.14cd
26.44	: 275.33	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 7.548* (N mss. + T3.4)
551* 2	: 32cd	551* is S insert
61.21a	= 48a	also = <i>Rām.</i> 4.31.19c (stock long compound)
82.4d	= 17d	
83.7b	= 267.15d	also = <i>Rām.</i> 1.110* 4 post.
94.18d	= 266.55d	

### *Explanation of signs*

All references to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and to the *Mahābhārata* are given according to the standard system of their Critical Editions; any figure carried forward from the previous line has usually been left blank.

- = In the first table (*Rāmopākhyāna* order), this sign indicates complete identity (or with minor variations as specified); in the second table (*Rāmāyaṇa* order), it indicates identity or virtual identity (e.g. difference of case only in a stereotyped expression).
- : In the first table, this sign is used between single *pādas* to indicate lesser agreement of all kinds; in the second table, it indicates substantial identity but without full agreement of wording.
- cf. In the first table, this sign is used between longer items with the same meaning as the preceding sign; in the second table, it indicates more general similarity, sufficient to establish borrowing of at least the idea expressed.
- + Placed against those points in the second table where the strict order of the *Rāmāyaṇa* references is modified.
- [J.] [SI] [Su] [R.] These signs indicate that the parallel against which they are set was first noted by H. Jacobi, E. Sluszkiewicz, V. S. Sukthankar or V. Raghavan respectively (used in the first table only).
- v.l. Denotes a variant reading recorded in the Critical Apparatus.