



INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA

THE JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES

Founded by Oscar Botto

Edited by Comitato AIT

Scientific Committee

John Brockington, *Edinburgh, U.K. (President)*; Nalini Balbir, *Paris, France*; Giuliano Boccali, *Milano, Italy*; Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, *Paris, France*; Minoru Hara, *Tokyo, Japan*; Oskar von Hinüber, *Freiburg, Germany*; Romano Lazzeroni, *Pisa, Italy*; Georges-Jean Pinault, *Paris, France (Treasurer IASS)*; Irma Piovano, *Torino, Italy*; Saverio Sani, *Pisa, Italy*; V. Kutumba Sastry, *Delhi, India (President IASS)*; Jayandra Soni, *Innsbruck, Austria (Secretary General IASS)*; Raffaele Torella, *Roma, Italy*

Editorial Board

Gabriella Olivero, Irma Piovano, Stefano Turina

Indologica Taurinensia was founded in 1973 by the eminent scholar Oscar Botto; it publishes articles, reviews and research communications concerning India, Central Asia and South-East Asia.

In 1976 the International Association of Sanskrit Studies selected it as its Official Organ (then Journal) on the occasion of the 30th International Congress of Human Sciences of Asia and Northern Africa (Mexico City, August 3rd-8th, 1976). It publishes also the report of the World Sanskrit Conferences and the minutes of the meetings of the I.A.S.S. (International Association of Sanskrit Studies). In 1996 it was acknowledged as a "Journal of High Cultural Value" by the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities.

It is edited by the non-profit Editorial Board "Comitato AIT", that in the year 2016 was awarded the prize "Ikkuo Hirayama" Prize by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres of the Institut de France, Paris, for its publishing activity.

INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA

THE JOURNAL OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES

VOLUME XLV

2019

EDIZIONI AIT

Publisher:
Comitato AIT
corso Trento 13
10129 Torino (Italy)
Email: pv@asiainstitutetorino.it; indologica@asiainstitutetorino.it
www.asiainstitutetorino.it
Printer: Edizioni ETS, Pisa (Italy)
Annual Subscription (1 issue): € 40,00
Desktop publishing: Tiziana Franchi
Electronic version: www.asiainstitutetorino.it/indologica.html
Sole Agents: Comitato AIT

Copyright © 2019 Comitato AIT per la promozione degli Studi sull'India e sul Sud-Est Asiatico
Satya Vrat Shastri (Honorary President) - Irma Piovano (President) - Saverio Sani (Vice President) - Victor Agostini (Secretary)
Corso Trento 13 - 10129 Torino (Italy)
C.F. 97651370013 - R.E.A. Torino, n. 1048465 - R.O.C., n. 14802

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Torino N. 4703 del 21/7/1994
I.S.N.N. 1023-3881

The printing of this volume of *Indologica Taurinensia* has been realized thanks to the contribution of the Embassy of India in Rome.

CONTENTS

Articles

- JOHN BROCKINGTON
Bīr Singh's Rāmāyaṇa: a note on the text..... p. 9
- OSCAR FIGUEROA
*The Secular and the Religious in Kṣemendra's
Samayamāṭṛkā* p. 39
- ARUN VINAYAK JATEGAONKAR
VASANTI ARUN JATEGAONKAR
*Draupadī's Hair, her Path, and the Phrase
Padavīm √gam* p. 63
- CHIARA POLICARDI
*Theriocephalic Yoginīs in Śaiva Tantric Traditions:
an Animal Mask?* p. 87
- R. N. PRASHER
*Ṛgvedic Paṇis and Phoenicians: Trade and
Cross-Cultural Diffusion*..... p. 127
- R.K.K. RAJARAJAN
*Caṇḍikeśvara in Myth and Iconography: Violence
and Reconciliation* p. 157
- List of contributors** p. 197
- The International Association of Sanskrit Studies
(I.A.S.S.)**
*Meetings of the I.A.S.S. during the 17th World Sanskrit
Conference held in Vancouver*..... p. 199

Reviews	p.	217
PRADIP BHATTACHARYA and SEKHAR KUMAR SEN (trans.), <i>The Jaiminīya Mahābhārata: Mairāvaṇacaritam & Sahasramukharāvaṇacaritam, A Critical Edition with English Translation from the Grantha Script, Vol. I & II, published by National Mission for Manuscripts and New Bharatiya Book Corporation, New Delhi, 2017</i>		
(Indrajit Bandyopadhyay)	p.	219
KĀLIDĀSA, <i>La storia di Śiva e Pārvatī (Kumārasambhava)</i> , a cura di Giuliano Boccali, Marsilio, Venezia, 2018		
(Cinzia Pieruccini)	p.	231
Announcements	p.	235

JOHN BROCKINGTON

BĪR SINGH'S *RĀMĀYAṆA*: A NOTE ON THE TEXT

The earliest illustrated *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript is undoubtedly the set of damaged folios which are sometimes designated the “burnt” *Rāmāyaṇa* and are generally – and no doubt correctly – ascribed to the patronage of Bīr Singh Dev (Vīrasimhadeva), the ruler of Orchā and Datia in Bundelkhand. It is my intention in this article to demonstrate that not merely is it accompanied on the versos of the paintings by continuous passages of text from the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* but that there is also a possibility that the text was intended to be complete – a manuscript in the fullest sense.

The extent to which the concept of this set is dependent on the group of illustrated manuscripts of the Persian translation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* commissioned by Akbar makes it clear that it is the first illustrated set to incorporate text from the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, while the presence of folios assignable on artistic grounds to artists formerly employed in the imperial Mughal atelier (Jagajīvana, Makara, Lohanka, Khemana and Bhora, as indicated in Seyller 2001: 62-63), though with influences also from Rājput painting styles, confirms both their dating to the period 1600-1610 and their patron as the notable courtier, Bīr Singh Bundela. The vertical format of Mughal paintings is followed, in marked contrast to the horizontal *poṭhī* format of most Hindu, Buddhist and Jain manuscripts, but the paintings occupy the whole of one side of the folios, which were kept as separate leaves rather than bound into a volume in the Islamic style. However, there is a major difference from its Mughal models: they follow the standard practice derived from Persian

painting traditions of including text emboxed within the painting, whereas the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa reverts to Indian models of keeping painting and text strictly separate, normally on obverse and reverse of the folio.¹

There are several indications that Bīr Singh Bundela was indeed the person who commissioned this series of paintings, none of them conclusive in themselves but together making it almost certain. The most obvious but least secure is that several of the folios have on the verso a stamp in purple ink of the Datia Palace Library (*tasvīr khānā datiyā śeṭ*) and sometimes a number (e.g. on Met. Mus. 2002.504: *naṃbha* and a handwritten 48); these stamps evidently date from the colonial period and so there remains a possibility that the folios entered the collection at a later date than when they were made. Closer at least in date to the paintings themselves are the occasional Hindi captions added below the Sanskrit text, which are in the Bundeli dialect (Seyller 2001: 62-63, Sardar 2016: 68). Most nearly decisive is the use of artists formerly in the imperial atelier for this could only have been feasible for a major Hindu courtier such as Bīr Singh was from the beginning of Jahāngīr's reign (he is notorious for the murder of Abu'l Faḏl in 1602 on behalf of Jahāngīr, when he was still Prince Salīm and rebelling against Akbar). Bīr Singh is known on other counts as a patron of both Vaiṣṇavism and the arts: the builder of the Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa temple decorated with frescoes in Orchā itself, the sponsor of temples in Mathurā and elsewhere in the Braj region, and the patron of the Brajbhāṣā poet Keśavdās, author among several other works of the *Rāmacandracandrikā* (probably written for his then patron, Bīr Singh's brother Indrajīt, a devotee of Rāma) and of the *Vīrsimhdevcarit*, which duly traces his new patron's ancestry back to Rāma via the Gāhaḍavālas.

¹ Even early illustrated manuscripts on palmleaf (such as those of the Early Western Indian and Pāla styles) keep text and picture clearly separate in the blocks into which they often sub-divide the surface of the leaf. Interestingly, by contrast a somewhat later manuscript in a provincial Mughal style of the *Rāmcāritmānas* of Tulsīdās, possibly dated 1646, does have the text written alongside, below or around the illustrations and so in this respect is closer to the imperial Mughal style, though much cruder in other respects (Brockington 2018).

Although the choice of the Rāmāyaṇa as the subject for this prestige set of paintings was no doubt influenced by the precedent set by Akbar, it was not inevitable,² but it would have coincided with Bīr Singh's own Vaiṣṇava leanings. The prestige aspect is made clear not only by the style of the paintings and the painters employed but also by the choice of the Sanskrit *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* as the text to be written on the versos. It has been suggested in the past that the text was added later, in the 18th century (Jeremiah Losty in Poovaya-Smith and others 1989: 28). However, on all but one of the folios examined the text has suffered the same losses as the paintings and it is generally thought that the fire damage occurred quite soon after the series was completed; this was first suggested by Terence McNerney on the basis that "the restored areas, filling the irregular edges of some of them, are fairly close in style to the original work" (McNerney 1982: 26). So, if not contemporary with the paintings, the text is not much later.

It is not known how many folios the set originally comprised.³ The completeness of the text on the illustrated manuscripts of the Persian translation which it is emulating may suggest that it would have been on a similarly large scale. The spread of known folios does indeed indicate that it was an

² After all, another of the major translations commissioned by and elaborately illustrated for Akbar was that of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Razmnāma*, of which Akbar's imperial copy, like that of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is now in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, Jaipur (MS. AG. 1683-1850).

³ There are now 19 miniatures in the National Museum, New Delhi (Parlier 1985; sets 56.93 containing 6 folios and 56.114 containing 13 folios) of which most come from a group of 24 offered for sale in 1956; two more were bought by the Prince of Wales Museum in Mumbai and five by the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan (Chandra 1957-59). Others were acquired at various times by the Metropolitan Museum, New York (four; acc. nos 2002.503-506), the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (two; M.82.6.5 and M.82.6.6), the Cleveland Museum of Art (2013.306), the Minneapolis Institute of Arts (2010.6.2), the Philadelphia Museum of Art (2004-149-15), the San Diego Museum of Art (1990.290), the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco (two; 2003.3-4), the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (68.8.56), the National Gallery of Canada (23553), the Howard Hodgkin collection (Topsfield and Beach 1991: 26-27), the Edwin Binney III collection, the Ehrenfeld collection (Ehnbom 1985: 48-49, no. 15), the Ducrot collection (Ducrot 2009, MG 1), the Polsky collection, the Fischer collection (Britschgi and Fischer 2008, no. 80), the Birla Academy of Art and Culture, the State Museum, Lucknow, the J.P. Goenka collection, Mumbai (Goswamy 1999: 46-47), the Kiran Nadar Museum of Art, New Delhi, the Pan-Asian collection (Seyller 1999: 34) and other private collections. The total number of the folios that I have so far been able to identify as belonging to this manuscript is 67 (see the listing on our Oxford Research Archive material).

extensive set but whether it was intended to include all significant episodes is unclear. The nature of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* text written on the versos provides one clue to this, as well as being of interest in other respects. The illustrated *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* text next in date to the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa is that commissioned by Jagat Singh of Mewar, which still comprises over 400 paintings distributed across around 700 folios containing a substantial proportion of what must once have been the complete text.⁴ In the case of the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa there is no trace of any text-only folios and we cannot know whether any were ever produced;⁵ the extant number of paintings is only about a sixth of that for the Mewar Rāmāyaṇa, which may suggest that this set was not intended to be as comprehensive and that the text on its versos was only intended as an extended caption. This assumption clearly underlies such descriptions of it as “an extensive unbound series of upright individual leaves with selected verses written on the reverse” (Seyller 2001: 62), which have been widely echoed.⁶ However the reality is somewhat more complex.

⁴ The bulk of this manuscript set is now in London. Most of it was given by Rāṇā Bhīm Singh of Mewar to Colonel James Tod, who was from 1818 the first British Political Agent to the Western Rajput courts, and by Tod at some point after his return to England in 1823 to the Duke of Sussex, from whom they were bought by the British Museum in 1844 (BL. Add. MS. 15296-97). It is not clear how the remains of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* (IO San 3621) left India, or indeed what happened to the rest of it until it was acquired by the then India Office Library in 1912. Nor is it known when the *Bālakāṇḍa* (now mostly in Mumbai) left the Royal Library in Udaipur; its history is obscure before it was offered for sale in Mumbai in the early 1950s. The *Aranyakāṇḍa* remained in the Royal Library in Udaipur until transferred to the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute in 1962. The artistic aspects of this manuscript have been well covered on the British Library website, “The Mewar Ramayana: a digital reunification” (<http://www.bl.uk/ramayana>).

⁵ In the past such text-only folios have often been discarded by art dealers and collectors in favour of the paintings. As an example of this, whereas the well-preserved *kāṇḍas* of the Mewar Rāmāyaṇa bought by the British Library in 1844 include many text-only pages in these essentially complete manuscripts, of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* bought in 1912 by the India Office Library and now in the British Library there remain just 18 folios, all with paintings on the rectos. For the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa it is all the more likely that text-only folios would be discarded, if they were as damaged as the extant folios are.

⁶ For example, Marika Sardar even more emphatically states that “the text on the reverse of each painting is highly excerpted, including the Sanskrit along with a summary in a dialect of Hindi spoken in Bundelkhand” (Sardar 2016: 68).

I have so far been able to examine in detail, transcribe and identify the text on the versos of thirteen folios only.⁷ This is quite a small proportion of the extant folios (between a fifth and a quarter) but nevertheless it is sufficient to draw certain definite conclusions. Contrary to the general assumption that the Sanskrit text consists of selections, the passages examined appear in the majority of cases to be broadly continuous. Moreover they were written by several – perhaps four – different hands, which implies that the project was at least envisaged as being larger than is apparent from the number of extant folios, since more often a single scribe would have been responsible for a considerable body of text; for example, at what is probably the other end of the scale one scribe alone, Mahātmā Hīrāṇanda, copied the entire text of the Mewar Rāmāyaṇa (between 1649 and 1653). On the other hand, there is a total absence of the colophons at the end of *sargas* that might be expected in a complete manuscript; this is the case with the first two versos transcribed. A colophon might have been expected on Met. 2002.506, since 2.58.57 is a longer verse concluding the *sarga*, but the text continues with two verses which are a substitute for 2.59.7-9, and similarly the text on the folio in the Ehrenfeld collection spans 2.90 and 91, though forming an

⁷ I am grateful to the National Gallery of Canada (Dr Christopher Etheridge), the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Dr Stephen Markel), The Metropolitan Museum, New York, the San Diego Museum of Art (Cory Woodall), the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (Dr John Henry Rice), all of which either include reproductions of the relevant versos on their websites or responded to my request for one, and to Professor Daniel Ehnbohm for including a black and white reproduction of the verso of the folio in the Ehrenfeld collection in his catalogue. Regrettably the Indian museums either failed to respond or, in one case, demanded an unrealistic fee.

In addition to those that I have examined myself, cataloguing information about some others gives an indication of the text on the verso. One folio showing Daśaratha with his ministers, offered for sale by David Carritt, is noted by McInerney as containing text from the vulgate 2.2 = CE 2.2 (McInerney 1982: 26). One in the Howard Hodgkin collection (the exiles at Pañcavaṭī) has text from vulgate 3.15. One in the Cynthia Hazen Polsky collection (Atikāya's arrival on the battlefield) by inference has on the verso text from the equivalent of CE 6.59 ("The name of Atikaya appears in the text on the reverse" ... "The text mentions Atikaya as having two immensely powerful, broad and long swords", NHH in *Topsfield* 2004: 358-9, no. 158).

effectively continuous text.⁸ But in the remaining instances the text comes from within a single *sarga* and so a colophon would not be expected.

In more detail, one group among the versos transcribed consists of Virginia 68.8.56, LACMA M.62.6.5 + 6 and San Francisco 2003.3, in which the scribe followed a text with readings allied to the Northeastern (NE) recension; the writing style has a somewhat uneven top line and some characteristic letter forms, such as an angular *ta*.⁹ Another group consists of Cleveland 2013.306 (NE readings) and Met. Mus. 2002.504 (N, not clearly either NE or NW); its letter forms are mostly similar to those in the first group, except that there is little trace of the wavy top line. A third group consists of Met. Mus. 503 + 506 and Nat. Gallery of Canada 23553, in which the scribe followed a text with readings allied to the Northwestern (NW) recension; the writing is neat, with a strong thick/thin contrast and a tendency to a serif at the lower end of the vertical line. Also to this group probably belongs the folio in the Ehrenfeld collection (Ehnbom no. 15), except that the writing is thicker and so lacking much thick/thin contrast, which could well be simply the result of using a thicker pen. A fourth group consists of San Francisco 2003.4 (N, not clearly either NE or NW) and San Diego 1990.290;¹⁰ the writing again shows a strong thick/thin contrast but characteristically uses a small circle for the dots in *anusvāra* and *visarga*. In addition, one verso (Met. Mus. 2002.505) was clearly a replacement, written subsequently to the damage and pasted over something else (so exceptionally

⁸ It does omit 2.90.20-25, the end of that *sarga*, but so does the manuscript D5, while D4 omits 90.20-22ab.

⁹ Transcriptions of these 13 versos, together with identifications of the text in relation to the readings of the Critical Edition, are included in the appendix to this article. One unidentified verse occurs in the middle of San Diego 1990.290 and in the middle of Cleveland 2013.306 a couple of *akṣaras* that are surrounded by gaps remain unidentified (between 3.49.11c and 960*). The abbreviations used from now on for recensions and manuscripts are those of the Critical Edition.

¹⁰ Although there are several occasions where San Diego 1990.290 has readings in common only with D13 (a NE ms), there are other instances where it clearly diverges, though with some overall bias towards NE readings. The writing is also somewhat variable in size and between the text and the vernacular caption there are faint sketches of male figures.

the text is well within the margins of the folio); its readings tend to align with Ś1 D1-3 (NW/W) and it is also the only text to include numerals. It is puzzling that these groupings do not correlate at all with the obvious sequence of the folios shown in both the paintings and the related text. In particular, three folios where the text comes from a relatively limited span towards the middle of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* (N inserts after 6.47.6 on San Francisco 2003.4v, 6.48.16-86 with N * passages and variants on Met. Mus. 2002.504v, and 6.53.11-54.11 on San Francisco 2003.3v) show the handwriting of different scribes.

In the majority of cases examined the painting on the recto and the text on the verso correlate closely. But there are three significant exceptions. The first, titled “Court of Rāvaṇa” by the Metropolitan Museum (Met. Mus. 2002.505, the second in terms of narrative sequence), shows an eight-headed Rāvaṇa clasping the hand of a moustachioed courtier while others remain outside but is accompanied by the narrative of Śūrpaṇakhā describing to Rāvaṇa first Rāma and then Sītā (3.32.1-17 with minor gaps); however, the text is a later replacement, as already noted, and has possibly been placed incorrectly. The second has been titled “Rama and Lakshmana Meet Sugriva at Matanga's Hermitage” by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (M.82.6.6, the fifth in sequence) but the precise identification is unclear, since the recto shows three *vānaras* all with tiaras seated among rocks at the upper left, an ascetic in front of his hut at the top right and across the middle to lower part of the picture the most prominent of the three *vānaras* greeting Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. Sugrīva, who is indeed the *vānara* shown greeting Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, explains that he lives near Mataṅga's hermitage as a sanctuary from his hostile brother, Vālin, who has been cursed by Mataṅga, in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* at 4.11.41-45. However, the text on the verso consists of 4.2.1-20 (with NE * passages but no real gaps), in which Sugrīva is alarmed on seeing Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, and consults his companions but Hanumān reassures him. Pratapaditya Pal was puzzled by this painting and includes the comment “Chapter 13 of the Book of Kishkindha describes the hermitage of Saptajanas as being occupied by several ascetics,

but here only one is shown” (Pal 1993: 290),¹¹ amplifying his earlier remark that “The exact identification of this illustration is uncertain, as the text for it would have been on the previous page” (Pal 1993: 290). But, since the text on the verso in fact forms the start of the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* in the whole Northern recension, Pal’s suggestion seems a little doubtful and it is more likely that the artist has included content from the first few *sargas* in these multiple scenes, whereas the scribe has only written the very beginning. In the case of the third exception (LACMA M.82.6.5, the sixth in sequence), if displacement of text relative to painting were the explanation, it would be in the opposite direction. Here the recto shows Rāma gesturing in reproof towards the dying Vālin, shown with Rāma’s arrow protruding from his chest, while the verso contains 4.16.1-26, in which Tārā tries to dissuade Vālin from fighting Sugrīva the second time, but Vālin’s accusation of Rāma and his reply come in the following two *sargas*, 4.17–18.

In all other instances the text was written on the verso of the painting to which it refers, as is standardly the case then in subsequent manuscripts. The first verso in narrative sequence (Met. Mus. 2002.506) contains 2.58.52-57 (with N/NW * passages and variants), comprising the end of Daśaratha’s lament and his actual death, along with two verses that form part of a substitute for 2.59.7-9 (2.1508(A)* 9-12 read only by D4.5.7) in which the women lament, and the painting on the recto shows the sorrowful women clustered round the dead or dying king. In the third instance (Cleveland 2013.306) the verso contains 3.49.4-16 (including NE * passages but with no real gaps), comprising a description of the fight between Rāvaṇa and Jaṭāyus, incl. Jaṭāyus killing the horses and smashing the chariot, while the recto shows Jaṭāyus fighting Rāvaṇa, while below Sītā sits in the smashed chariot. The fourth verso (Virginia 68.8.56) contains 3.57.1-19 (with NE * passages and variants but no gaps) in which Lakṣmaṇa explains himself to Rāma as they return to the empty *āśrama* and the recto shows

¹¹ In fact they pass this mysterious hermitage, from which the seven sages have already ascended to heaven, as Sugrīva leads them towards Kiṣkindhā (4.13.12-27).

the moment when the two brothers approach each other; the painting shows what is most effective visually and the text fills out the story.

The remaining folios – half of the total – all belong to the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*.¹² The seventh verso (San Francisco 2003.4) contains 6.951*4 + App.30.1-40 (with some gaps; these passages are inserted by the N recension after 6.47.6), describing how Mandodarī enters Rāvaṇa's *sabhā* and seeks to dissuade him from further warfare and the corresponding recto shows Mandodarī with a female servant just outside the pavilion in which Rāvaṇa is seated, although there is no sign of the councillors (*mantrins*) mentioned in the text. The next two both relate to Kumbhakarṇa. On Met. Mus. 2002.504 the recto shows *rākṣasas* gathering round the sleeping giant and the text on the verso (6.48.16-86 with N * passages and variants, also some sizable gaps) describes how the *rākṣasas* set about waking him. On San Francisco 2003.3 the recto shows Kumbhakarṇa fighting *vānaras* and the text on the verso (6.53.11-54.11 with minor gaps) recounts how Rāvaṇa sends Kumbhakarṇa out to fight and he wreaks havoc among the *vānaras*. The tenth folio (San Diego 1990.290) shows on the recto Rāma supporting the wounded Lakṣmaṇa as anxious *vānaras* cluster round, while in the text on the verso (6 App.56.28-328 + 2050* + App.60.16-30, with substantial gaps; all NE inserts after 6.89.12 or 4) Sugrīva suggests sending for Suṣeṇa to heal Lakṣmaṇa, then sends Hanumān for the healing herb on Mt Gandhamādana but, not identifying it, Hanumān uproots the whole mountain and brings it back.

The last two passages of text are essentially complete, in line with their narrative significance. The text on National Gallery of Canada 23553 (6.105.6-22 + transposition as in N) declares how Brahmā reveals to Rāma his true identity as deity, while the recto shows all the actors in this scene: Rāma seated in the centre, with Lakṣmaṇa behind him, facing Brahmā, Viṣṇu

¹² The predominance of episodes from the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* is also very marked among all the known folios from the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa, not just among those where the text has been identified.

and Śiva on the left, with a cluster of leading *vānaras* shown on the lower right. In the text on Met. Mus. 2002.503 (6.116.69ab + 74cd-76 plus N/NW * passages) Rāma gives jewels to *vānaras* and dismisses them, and then honours and dismisses Vibhīṣaṇa, while the painting on the recto shows Rāma enthroned in the centre gesturing towards Sugrīva and Jāmbavān on the left, with a *chaurī*-bearing attendant on the right and other *vānaras* and courtiers below; it is possible that one of the courtiers is intended to be Vibhīṣaṇa but it seems more likely that the artist has concentrated on the first part of the passage that the scribe has then copied onto the verso.

To sum up, the extent to which this set depends conceptually on the illustrated manuscripts of the Persian translation of the Rāmāyaṇa done for Akbar shows that it is the first set to incorporate text from the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, while other evidence confirms both its dating to the period 1600-1610 and its patron as the notable Mughal courtier, Bīr Singh Bundela. The vertical format of Mughal paintings is followed but the Bīr Singh Rāmāyaṇa reverts to Indian models of keeping painting and text strictly separate; in addition, the folios were kept as separate leaves rather than bound into a volume in the Islamic style. With three exceptions the painting on the recto and the text on the verso correlate closely, as is standardly the case then in subsequent Rāmāyaṇa manuscripts. On all but one of the folios examined the text has suffered the same losses as the paintings. Since it is generally thought that the fire damage occurred quite soon after the series was completed, the text, if not contemporary with the paintings, is certainly not much later.

The spread of episodes illustrated across all known folios suggests that this was once an extensive set but whether it was intended to include all significant episodes is less clear from the evidence. The passages of text on the versos examined are broadly continuous and were written by several different hands. The number of scribes ties in with the varied alignment of the text being copied between the NE and NW recensions (the alignment cannot always be determined exactly but is always with the Northern recension). All this implies that the project

was at least envisaged as being larger than is apparent from the number of extant folios; however, there is no trace of any text-only folios.

That Bīr Singh's Rāmāyaṇa was a prestige project is obvious not only in the style of the paintings and the painters employed but also in the choice of the Sanskrit *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* as the text to be written on the versos. This choice was no doubt influenced by the precedent set by Akbar, although it would also have coincided with Bīr Singh's own Vaiṣṇava leanings. In its turn, it has set a precedent for subsequent illustrated manuscripts of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*.

Bibliography

- Britschgi, Jorrit, und Eberhard Fischer 2008: *Rama und Sita: Das Ramayana in der Malerei Indiens* (Zürich: Museum Rietberg).
- Brockington, John 2018: “Miniature paintings of the Rāma story”, *Aziatische Kunst* (Publication of the Asian Art Society in the Netherlands) 48.1: 70-79.
- Brockington, John and Mary, *Development and spread of the Rāma narrative (pre-modern)*, on Oxford Research Archive at <http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:8df9647a-8002-45ff-b37e-7effb669768b> [last updated February 2018].
- Chandra, Pramod 1957-59: “A series of Rāmāyaṇa paintings of the popular Mughal school”, *Prince of Wales Museum Bulletin* 6: 64-70.
- Ducrot, Vicky 2009: *Four Centuries of Rajput Painting: Mewar, Marwar, and Dhundhar Indian miniatures from the collection of Isabella and Vicky Ducrot* (Milan: Skira).
- Ehnbom, Daniel J. 1985: *Indian Miniatures: the Ehrenfeld collection* (New York: Hudson Hills).
- McInerney, Terence 1982: *Indian painting, 1525-1825: an exhibition* (London: David Carritt).
- Goswamy, B.N. 1999: *Painted visions: the Goenka collection of Indian paintings* (New Delhi: Lalit Kala Akademi).
- Pal, Pratapaditya 1993: *Indian Painting: a catalogue of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art Collection: vol. I, 1000-1700* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art).
- Parlier, Edith 1985: “Étude comparative de quelques miniatures mogholes et rajpoutes du Rāmāyaṇa”, *BEI* 3: 145-65.
- Poovaya-Smith, Nima, J.P. Losty and Jane Bevan 1989: *Manuscript Paintings from the Ramayana: a catalogue produced for the exhibition The Ramayana at Cartwright Hall (9 Sept. – 3 Dec. 1989)* (Bradford: Bradford Art Galleries and Museums).
- Sardar, Marika 2016: “The Ramayana and other tales of Rama”, in *Epic Tales from Ancient India: paintings from the San Diego Museum of Art*, ed. by Marika Sardar (San Diego Museum of Art. San Diego, California): 66-95.
- Seyller, John William 1999: *Workshop and patron in Mughal India: the Freer Rāmāyaṇa and other illustrated manuscripts of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm,*

- AA, Supplementum 42 (Zürich: Artibus Asiae Publishers; Washington, D.C.: Freer Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution).
- Seyller, John 2001: catalogue entry on cat. no. 16 in *Intimate Worlds: Indian Paintings from the Alvin O. Bellak Collection*, ed. by Darielle Mason (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001): 62-63.
- Topsfield, Andrew, and Milo Cleveland Beach 1991: *Indian Painting and Drawings from the collection of Howard Hodgkin* (New York, Thames and Hudson).
- Topsfield, Andrew (ed.) 2004: *In the realm of gods and kings: arts of India* (London: Philip Wilson).
- Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* 1960-75: *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki*, critically edited by G.H. Bhatt and U.P. Shah, 7 vols (Baroda: Oriental Institute). [CE]

Appendix: transcription of versos

Bold type has been used to indicate the red ink of the original; red double daṇḍas are used on all versos, except where noted.

Met. Mus. 2002.506

dhanyā drakṣyaṃti rāmasya tārādhipanibhaṃ mukhaṃ ||
śaraccandrasya sadṛśaṃ phullasya kamala
 2.58.52cd–53ab (53a as Ś1 D4-7)

dhanyā drakṣyaṃti taṃ mukhaṃ || iti rāmaṃ smarann eva
śayanīyatale nṛpaḥ || śanair atha jaga 58.53d + 1493* 1
 (1493* insert of Ś1 D4-7 after 53, of other N after 1492*)

ye || hā rāma hā putra iti vruvann eva śanair nṛpaḥ || tatyāja supriyān
prāṇān āyuso ṃt<e>
 unidentified final syllable, 1497* 1-2 post.(mid)
 (1 pr. as Ś1 D2.4-7; 1497* N subst. for 58.56)

sa dīnaḥ kathayan narādhipaḥ priyasya putrasya vivāsasaṃkathāṃ ||
gate rdharātre śayanīya 58.57a-c(mid.) with N vv.II.

jīvitam ātmanas tadā || atha budhyāgataprāṇaṃ sarvaiś cihnair
narādhipaṃ taṃ nareṃdraṃ mahiṣya
 58.57d(fin.) as N + 2.1508(A)* 9-10 (subst. in D4.5.7 for 1508*3-8)

śuḥ || tataḥ pramumucuḥ kaṃṭhād vāspasaṃghāś ca tāḥ striyaḥ || hā
bhartar iti duḥkhārtā ni<p>e 2.1508(A)* 10 fin.-12 post.(part)

Ehrenfeld [see Ehnbohm 1985: 48-49, no. 15]

atha rāme tadāsīne bharate cābhigachat<i> || tasya s<ai>nyasya
mahato raudraś cāsīn mahā
 2.2092* (1.2 post. as D2.4.5.7; 2092* is N subst. for 2.90.1)

rddhatāṃ prativodhitāḥ || guhāṃ saṃtatyajur vyāghrā nilīyur
vilavāsinaḥ || ṛkṣāś ca 2.2093*1 mid.-2 fin., 4 init.
 (1 post. as D3-5, 2 pr. as V1 B1 4, 2 post. as D1-5.7 M4;
 2093* is N subst. for 2.90.2-4)

petur harayo guhāḥ || svām upetuḥ khagās trastā mṛgayūthā
vidudruvuḥ || dāvāgnibhayavitrast 2.2093*4 fin., 3, 5 init.
 (3-4 transposed as D2.4.5.7, 4 pr. as D2-5.7, 5 as V1 D1-5.7 M4)

vyajrṃbhaṃta mahāsīmḥā mahiṣāś ca vyalokayan || vilāṃś ca vipīśur
vyālāḥ svasti jepur dvi 2.2093*6-7 (7 pr. unique v.1.)

*dharāḥ svam utpetuḥ kiṃnarā bhejire nadīḥ || tam abhyāsam
 anuprāptaṃ tasyoddeśasya lakṣmaṇaḥ || sainyasya
 2.2093*8-10 init. (uniquely svam for sam- and nadīḥ for darīḥ in 8)
 ti rāme nyavedayan || tam uvācāvyayo rāmaḥ sumitrā suprajā tvayā ||
 mahī svanati gambhīraṃ tat tvāṃ vi
 2.2093*10 post. + 2096*1-2 pr. (1 pr. as D2 M4, 2 as Ñ B D1.4.5.7)
 sa lakṣmaṇaḥ sa tvaritaḥ śālam āruhyapuṣpitaṃ || diśaḥ krameṇa
 samprekṣya prācīm diśam avaiḥṣata
 2.90.7 (a as D3; b as V1 B Dg1 Dt1 Dm1; cd as all N + M4)
 samprekṣya dadarśa mahatīm camūṃ || rathāśvagajasamkīrṇāṃ yat
 taiḥ pūrṇāṃ padātibhiḥ || sa rāmāya nara 90.8a(mid.)-d
 + 2098* init. (8a as most N; b as B3; 2098* is N subst. for 9ab)
 paravīrahā || śaśamsa sainyam āpātāṃ vacanaṃ cedam avravīt ||
 agnīn samyamayatvārthaḥ sītāṃ ca viśa 2098* (N + M4 subst.
 for 90.9ab) + 9c-10b(mid.) (novel v.l. in 9a; 10b ≈ Ś1 Ñ1 D2.4-7)
 jje ca dhanuṣī kavacaṃ dhārayasva ca || nāgāśvarathasampūrṇāṃ
 tāṃ camūṃ sa niśāmya ca || rāmaḥ papra
 2099* (N + M4 subst. for 10cd; pr. as D2-5.7) + 2100*1-2 pr.
 (N + M4 subst. for 11)
 māṃ manyase camūṃ || rājā vā rājaputro vā vane smin mṛgayām
 gataḥ || manyase ca yathāmtattvaṃ tathā saṃśasva
 2100*2 (fin.) + 2096*3-4 (4 post. as V1 D2-5.7)
 tha rāmeṇa lakṣmaṇo vākyam avravīt || didhakṣann iva kopena ruṣitaḥ
 pāvako yathā || a 90.12a(mid.)-d (a+c as N + M4) + 2102*(init.)?
 (D1-5.7 subst. 2012* for 13ab)
 prāpya manye bhiṣecanaṃ || āvāṃ haṃtum ihābhyeti bharataḥ
 kaikeyīsutaḥ || eṣo sya sumahān 2102* post. + 90.13c-14a(init.)
 (13d as Ś1 Ñ V1 B Dd1 Dm1 D6; 14a as D3-5.7)
 prakāśate || virājayan valasyāgraṃ kovidāro rathe dhvajāḥ || athavā
 tvāṃ giriguhāṃ sa
 90.14b-d (c ≈ D3; d as D7) + 2103*2 pr. (N + M4 subst. for 16a-d)
 api me vaśam āgachet kovidāradhvajo raṇe || vāhvora yad ucitaṃ
 sarvaṃ tat kariṣyāmi rāgha
 90.16ef (e as V1 B2-4 D1.2.4.5.7 M4) + 2107*1 (insert of Ś1 D4.6.7)
 śyāmi tatpreṣyasyocitaṃ yathā || adya matkārmukotsṛṣṭāḥ śarāḥ
 kanakabhūṣaṇāḥ || 2107*2(most)-3*

ṇām hṛdayād acirād iva || ete bhrājamti samhr̥ṣṭā hayān āruhya
sādinah || samaṃtāt paripa
 2107* 4(fin.) + 90.15cd (d as Ś1 Ñ V1 D1-7 M4) + 2106* pr.
lam apāśrayān || api paśyema bharaṭam yatkr̥te vyasanaṃ mahat ||
tvām rāghavedaṃ sampraptaṃ duḥkhaṃ copa 2106* post.
 (unique v.l.) + 90.17ab (a as Ñ1 D1.2.4.5.7) + 2108*2 (as D4.7)
mittaṃ cyuto rājyād bhavān dharmabhṛtām vara || samprāto yam ariḥ
pāpo bharaṭo vāṇagocaraṃ || bharaṭa
 90.18a(mid.)-d (a as D2.3.5; b as D5; cd as Ñ V1 B D1.5.7 M4)
haṃ paśyāmi rāghava || pūrvāpakāriṇaṃ hanyād dharmo hy api
vidhīyate || pūrvāpakārī bharaṭas tyakta 90.19b-d
 (cd as Ś1 V1 D1-4.6.7) + 2110* (insert of S + some N after 19cd)
tasmin vinihate tv adya anuśādhi vasuṃdharām || saumitrim
abhijalpaṃtam akruddha krodhamūrchitaḥ <||>
 90.19ef (e ≈ Ś1 D5-7) + 91.1 (a as D2-5.7; b as D2.3.5)
edaṃ vacana dharmasamhitaṃ || nāpriyaṃ kṛtapūrvam me bharaṭe na
kadā ca kiṃ || kīdr̥śaṃ vā bhayaṃ tubhyaṃ bharaṭā
 91.1d + 4(part) (1d as D2.4.5.7; 4 read after 1cd as N + M4;
 minor v.l. in 4b; 4cd as D2.4.5.7)
ā kāryam asina vā^{tha} carmaṇā || maheśvāse mahāprājñe bharaṭe
svayam āgate || ?am
 91.2a(fin.)-d (a as D2 G3) + first syllable of 3a
ti || asmāsu manasā hy eṣa nāhitaṃ karttum ācara
 91.3b(final syllable)-d (d as Ś1 Ñ2 B D2.4-6)
 upper middle section only of next line remaining
 (not sufficient to read)

Met. Mus. 2002.505

tataḥ sūrppanakhā dīnām vadaṃtī paruṣaṃ vacaḥ | amātyamadhye
samkruddhaḥ paripa-
 3.32.1a-d(mid) (anusvāra omitted from *sūrppanakhām*)
pracha rāvaṇaḥ | kasya rāmaḥ kuto rāmaḥ kiṃvīryaḥ kiṃparākramaḥ
| āyudhaṃ 32.2ab + 3a(init.)
kiṃ ca rāmeṇa nihata yena rākṣasaḥ | kharaś ca nihato yena dūṣaṇas
triśi- 32.3a(rest)-d
rās tathā || rāmam asmaī yathātatvam ākhyātum upacakrame ||
dīrghabāhuṃ vi- 32.3d(fin.) + 4cd-5a (4c as Ś1 D1-3)

śālākṣaṃ cīrakṛṣṇajināmvaraḥ || *rakṣasām māmavīryānām sahasrāṇi*
ca 32.5ab + 9ab (9a as Ś1 D2)
turdaśa | *nihatāni śarais tīkṣnais tenaikena mahātmanā* ||| 83 || ||
 32.9b(fin.)-d (d as Ś1 D1-3)
sītā nāma varārohā vedīpratimamadhyamā | *naiva devī na gadharvī*
nāsu- 32.14c-15b (14d as N; 15b as Ś1 Ñ1 D2.3)
rī na ca rākṣasī || *tavānurūpā bhāryāsya tvaṃ ca tasyās tathā patih* ||
 || 32.15b(fin. as N) + 17cd (error in c)
rāmād api ca marttavyam marttavyaṃ rāvaṇād api | *ubhayor yadi* ||
 [83 erased] || || 3.762*1-2 pr.(part)
 (insert of Ś1 Ñ D1-3 at various points before start of *sarga* 40)
marttavyaṃ varaṃ rāmo na rāvaṇaḥ || 59 || [83 erased] || ||
 3.762* 2 (most)

Cleveland 2013.306v

grdhrarākṣasayor atha || *sapakṣayor bhṛśam tatra mahāparvatayo-*
 3.49.4b-d with NE vv.II.
-ais tīkṣnais cāpi vikarṇibhiḥ || *abhyavarṣan mahāvegai-*
 49.5a(fin.)-c with NE vv.II.
-tāni śarajālāni grdhraḥ patrarathesvaraḥ || *jaṭāyuh pra-*
 49.6a-c(mid.)
-ṇ<i> saṃyuge || *tataḥ sa krodhasaṃraddho vikīrṇa iva parvataḥ* ||
 49.6e(fin.) + 957* 1 (NE),
 with °*saṃraddho* for °*saṃrabdho*, cf. °*saṃbaddho* of B3
nakhais ca vicakarṣatam || *tasya tīkṣṇanakhābhyaṃ tu cara<ṇ>-*
 957* 2 post. + 49.7a-b(mid.)
rudhiraṃ gātraṃ kṣaṇāt patrarathesvaraḥ || *tataḥ sa rāvaṇaḥ kru-*
 49.7c(as Ñ2 D5.7)-d(as NE) + 958* 1 pr.
 (subst. for 49.8 in Ñ2 D5.7)
-magaiḥ || *vibheda samare ghorair grdhrarājānam āsugaiḥ* || *atha*
 958* 1(fin.)-3(init.)
jagrāha rathamārgagān || *mṛtyudaṃḍo paramān dhorān śatru-*
 958* 3 post. (°*margagān* unique v.l. for °*margaṇān*) + 4
 (*dhorān* scribal error for *ghorān*)
-r vāṇair mahāvīryaṃ svarṇapumkhair mahāvalaḥ ||
nirvi[evasure]bheda sut<ī>- 959* 1(as D5.7) –2 pr. (as Ñ2 D5.7);
 959* is NE subst. for 49.9

- tr<in> ... *aciṃtayitvā tān vāṇān rāvaṇaṃ sanadudruvan* ||
959* 2 post. (as Ñ2 D5.7) + 49.10cd
pakṣāv udyamya mūrddhani || *pakṣābhyām abhisamrabdhas tāḍayām*
962* 1 post.–2 post. (mid)
-śaraṃ cāpaṃ muktāmaṇibibhūṣitaṃ || *caranābhyām mahāte-*
49.11a(mid)–c
-rava- ... <sa rā>*vaṇavimuktāṃs tu śarān vai patageśvaraḥ* || *tato*
vaha- unidentified, then 960* (ins. after 12 by Ñ2 D5.7)
+ 965* 1(init.); 965* is NE insert after 49.12 / 960*
k<i> .. hā..laḥ || *jāmbūnadamayāṃ divyaṃ sarvaratnopaśobhitaṃ* || ..
965* 1(fin.)–2
..... *nabhastale* || *aśobhata patat tat tu sūryyamaṃḍala<s>*
965* 3(fin.)–4
-dān hatvā piśācavadanān kharān || *vikṛṣya taras<ā>*
49.13a(mid)–c(mid) with NE vv.II.
-t || *kāmagam tu mahāghoraṃ cakrakūvarabhūṣaṇaṃ* || *mani-*
49. 13d(fin.)–14abc all as NE
ca mahārathaṃ || *samāśliṣya rathāt tasmāt sārathim pat-*
49.14d(fin.) + 968*1 (968* is insert of Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
-yitvā yad asrjat || *sa bhagnadhanvā viratho* 968* 2 post. + 49.15a
-dehūṃ papāta bhuvi rāvaṇaḥ || *drṣtvā nīpati-* 49.15c(mid)d–16a(init.)
-dhv iti bhūtāni grdhrarājam apūjayat || 49.16c(mid)–d
-maramukheṣv anirjitaṃ || *parājitaṃ pata-*
966* 2(fin.)–3(init.) (966* NE insert after 14cd/16)
-lokya taṃ || *tato 'stuv ? patagavaraṃ divau-* 966* 4(fin.)–5
-ṃsitaḥ sa vihagarājasattamo vyava- 966* 7(as Ñ2 D5.7)–8

Virginia 68.5.56

- tam aṃtarā raghunaṃdanah* || *paripapracha saumitriṃ rāmo*
daśarathātmaḥ || 3.57.1b-d (d as Ñ2 D5.7)
sān maithilī rahite śubhā || *nyāsadharmān mayā dattā vane rākṣasa*
57.2d (as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7) + 1110*1(most)
[1110* subst. in Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 for 2ab, read after 2cd)
va tāṃ samutsrjya matsamīpam upāgataḥ || *tavaivāgamanān medya*
sītāṃ saṃ 1110*2(most) + 57.3ab (as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
ṇa || *saṃkamānaṃ mahat pāpaṃ yat satyaṃ vyathitaṃ manah* ||
spaṃdate nayanam savyam
57.3b(fin.)–d + 4a (as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)

ca me || dṛṣṭvā lakṣmaṇa dūrāt tvām sītāvirahitaṃ vane || evam
ukta[deletion]s tu 57.4a(end)-5a(init.) (4c as N, d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
kṣmaṇaḥ śubhalakṣaṇaḥ || duḥkhaśokasamāviṣṭo rāghavaṃ vākyam
avravī 57.5b + 1111* (subst. in Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 for 5cd)
yaṃ kāmākāraṇe sītāṃ ^{tya}ktvāham āgataḥ || pracoditas tayaivāhaṃ
tatas tvām 57.6a(most)-d(part)
 (b as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7; cd as Ñ2 B1.3.4 D5.7)
aḥ || āryyeṇa hi vikruṣṭaṃ tu lakṣmaṇeti suvisvaram || paritrāhīty asa
 57.7a-c(part) (a as Ñ2 D5.7; b as Ñ V1 D5-7 M3 Ct;
 c as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
lyās tachrutim gataṃ || sā tam ārttasvaram śrutvā bhartṛsnehena
maithilī || ga 57.7d(end)-8c(init.) (8b as N)
mām āha rudatī bhayaviklavā || pracodyamānena mayā gacheti
vahuśa 57.8c(end)-9ab (-viklavā as in many mss for -vihvalā)
tyuktvā maithilī vākyam mayā tvatpriyakāmyayā || na tam paśyāmy
ahaṃ loke 57.9c-10a (9a as Ñ2 B3.4; d as as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
nayam ānayet || nivṛtā bhava nāsty etac chaṃke kenāpy udāhṛtaṃ ||
vigarhitam 57.10b(end)-11a (init.)
 (10b as Ñ2 V1 B1.3 Dm1 D4.5.7.8 G M2; 10d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3 D5.7)
katham āryyo bhidāsyati || trāyasyeti vacaḥ sīte yas trātā tridaśā
 57.11b-d(most) (c as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7; d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D1.5.7)
nimittaṃ tu kenāpi bhrātur alaṃvya me svaram || visvaram [erasure]
vyāhṛtaṃ vākyam 57.12a(most)-c
āhi mām iti || na bhavatyā vyathā kāryya kunārījanasevita || alaṃ
 57.12d(most)-13a
āgatya svasthā bhava śucismite || na so sti triśu lokeśu pumān yo
rāgha 57.13a(end)-d(most)
 (a as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7; c as Ś1 Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 T1.2 G3)
to vāpi janiśyo vā saṃgrāme taṃ parābhavet || evam uktā tu vaidehī
 57.13e(most)-14a (13ef both as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
etanā || uvācāśrūṇi muṃcaṃtī tadā māṃ paruṣaṃ vacaḥ || bhāvo mayi
 57.14b(end)-15a(part) (14d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
i lakṣmaṇa || vināsaṃ trātari prāpte tatraiva samavāpsyasi
 57.15b(end)-d
 (b + d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 (d not B3); c as these + D4.8 G M1.2)

gachasi || *krośamānaṃ tathā hi tvaṃ nainam abhyupapa*
 16b(end)-d(most) (c as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7; d as Ñ2 V1 B3.4 D5.7)
vatsyati maithilī || *na cāham āśāṃ kuryyaṃ te*
 1116* 1 post–2 pr. (insert of Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 after 16)
nnarūpas tvaṃ rāmaṃ samanugachasi || *rāghava*
 57.17ab (as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)– c(init.)
evam uktas tu vaide[hī deleted]*hyā saṃravdho raktalo* 57.18a-b(most)
ḥ sṛto ham athāśramāt || *evaṃ* [erasure] *vruvānaṃ*
 57.18d-19a (init.) (18d as Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7)
d<u>ṣkṛtaṃ saumya ^{ya}*t tvayā gatam āśramāt*
 57.19cd (with d cf. Ñ2 B3 D7)

n.b. Ñ2 V1 B1.3.4 D5.7 are all NE mss [NE usually also includes Ñ1 and B2 (missing here)]

LACMA M.82.6.6

tau tu dṛṣṭvā mahātmānau bhrātarau rāmalakṣmaṇau || *sugrīvaḥ*
pa^{ra}*modvignaḥ sarvair anucaraiḥ* || 4.2.1ab + 4cd
 (erroneous final *daṇḍas*; NE mss read 4cd after 1ab)
saha || *ciṃtayābhiparītātmā niścitya girilaṃghanaṃ* ||
varāyudhadharau vīrau sugrī
 2.4d(fin.) + 73* (NE insert after 4cd) + 1c-d(init.)
vaḥ plavagādhipaḥ || *na sa cakre manaḥ sthātuṃ vīkṣyamāno*³
mahābalau || *udvignahr̥da* 2.1d (as all N) + 3ab
 (as NE except B2-3) + 2a(init.) [NE transpose 2 and 3ab]
yaḥ sarvā diśaḥ samavalokayan || *vyavātiṣṭhata naikasmin deśe*
vānarapu 2.2a(mid.)-d (most) (c as NE except V1.2)
ṅgavaḥ || *sa ciṃta*[yitvā deleted]*yām āsa vibhur vimṛṣya ca punaḥ*
punaḥ tyaktukāmo gi 2.4ab + 71* pr.
 (4b as N; 71* NE ins. after 4ab/NW subst. for 4cd)
reḥ śṛṅgaṃ yātrāsīt samavasthitaḥ || *ciṃtayann eva dharmātmā*
hanūmatpramukha ha
 4.71*(most) + 72* (NE + D3 cont. after 71*)
rīn || *maṃtraniśca*[itya deleted]*vyatatvajñān samīpasthān vyalokayat* ||
tataḥ sa sa 4.72*1(fin.)-2 + 4.5a(init.)
civebhyas tu sugrīvaḥ plavagādhipaḥ || *śāśaṃsa paramodvignau*
bhrātarau rāmala
 4.5a(mid)-d (-vignau for -vigno in c, d as N except V2)

kṣmaṇau || *etau vanam idam durgam vālipranihitau carau* ||
chadmanā cīrivasanau 4.5d(fin.)-6c (6b as NE except V2)
manuṣyāv āgatāv iti || *tataḥ sugrīvasacivā dr̥ṣṭvā tau varadhanvinau* ||
ja 4.6d + 76*(init.) (6d as NE except V3)
gmus te girisikharam tasmād anyat plavaṅgamāḥ || *te kṣipram*
abhisamgamya yūtha 4.76*(most; subst. of V1.2 B for 7cd)
+ 4.8a-b(init.) (8a as NE except V3)
pā yūthaparśabham || *harayo vānaraśreṣṭham parivaryyāvatasthire* ||
tataḥ sākhāmṛ 4.8b(mid)-d + 10a(init.)
gāḥ sarve plavamānā mahāvalāḥ || *vabhañjuh pādapāms tatra*
puṣpītāṃś ca vanadru 4.10a(mid)-d(most) (cd as NE except V1)
mān || *tataḥ sugrīvasacivāḥ parvatemdraṃ samāśritāḥ* || *saṅgamya*
kapimukhyena 4.10(fin.) + 12abc
sthitāḥ prāṃjalayas tadā || *tatas taṃ bhayasambhrāṃtaṃ*
vālikilviṣaśamkitāṃ || *uvāca*
4.12d-13c(init.) (12 as N; 13a as Ñ2 V2 B2-4 D7, i.e. most NE)
hanumān prājñāḥ sugrīvaṃ vākyam a[vra deleted]rthavit || *kasmād*
udvignacetās tvaṃ pradruto ha 4.13c-14b(part)
(13d as most N; 14a as Ñ2 V2 B D7 plus G1)
ripuṅgava || *taṃ ghoradarśanaṃ ghoram neha paśyāmi vālinam* ||
yasmāt tava bhayaṃ nityaṃ pūrva 4.14b(fin.)-15b(init.)
(14c as V2.3 B D7; 15a as Ñ2 V2.3 B D3.7.11)
<ka>*rmaṇaḥ* || *sa neha vālī duṣṭātmā na te paśyāmy ahaṃ bhayaṃ* ||
sugrīvas tu su 4.15b(fin.)-d + 18a(init.)
nūmataḥ || *tataḥ śubhataram vākyam hanūmaṃtam uvāca ha* || *etau*
dr̥ṣṭvā 4.18b(fin.)-d + 83*1(init.)
(83* subst. for 19 in Ś1 Ñ2 V2 B D3.7.12)
au<ja>sau || *vālip<ra>ñī<h>i<t>āvautau śamke haṃ*
<puru>*ṣo<tam>au* 4.83*1(fin.) + 20ab
[only upper part of this line extant, so vowels more certain]

LACMA M.82.6.5

tā rāṃ tārādhipatinibhānanām || *vālī nirbhartsayām āsa*
vākyam etad uvāca 4.16.1a-d(most)
(6 syllables obscured in a, d up to 7th syllable, d as Ñ2 V B D7)
ha || *garjato 'sya suviśrabdham satror nnotyātātāyinaḥ* ||
marṣayiṣyāmi taṃ śabdaṃ [*śabdaṃ* deleted]
16.1d (end)-2c (ab as Ñ2 V B D7, c as Ñ2 D7)

- jātakrodha^h katham priye || adharsitānām śūrānām samyugeṣv
anivarttinām || dharsaṇāma*
16.2d-3c(mid) (2d as Ñ2 V B D7, 3b as Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7)
*ṣaṇam kāmte maraṇād atiricye || soḍhum na ca samartha haṃ
yoddhukāmasya samyuge || tataḥ*
16.3c(mid)-4b (3c as N) + 10a(init.)
*svasyayanam kṛtvā maṃtravid vijayaiśiṇīm || amtaḥpuram saha
strībhiḥ praviveśa sumadhya*
16.10a(mid)-d(most) (10d as Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7)
*mā || praviṣṭāyām tu tārāyām saha strībhiḥ svam ālayam || niścakrāma
tato vālī ma*
16.10d(fin.)-11d(init.) (11c as Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7)
*hāsarpa i[superscript insertion mark] śvasan || sa niḥsrtya mahāvegaḥ
krodhaparyākulekṣaṇaḥ || sa dadrśa ta*
16.11d(most)-12b + 13a(init.) (11d + 12a as Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7)
*to dūrāt sugrīvam hemamālinam || tasya cābhimukhaṃ cāpi yayau
yoddhum ativaran*
16.13a(mid)-b + 328* (insert of Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7 after 13ab, with
reading of Ñ2 D7)
*susannaddham yoddhukāmaṃ rāmāśrayagarvvitam || sa ca dr̥ṣṭvā
mahāvīryaḥ sugrī*
329* (subst in Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7 for 13cd) + 14ab (a as Ñ2 D7)
*vaṃ samupasthitam || gādham sannahanaṃ cakre kariṣyan karma
duṣkaram || uvāca cāti* 16.14b (as Ś1 Ñ2 D2.4.7.12)
+ 330* (subst. in Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7 for 14cd) + 331*1(init.)
*tāmrākṣaḥ sugrīvam ro[deleted syllable]samūrchitaḥ durvuddhe pāpa
sugrīvakā tvarā maraṇe pun*
331*1(mid)-2 (continuation in Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7 after 330*)
*eṣa muṣṭir mayā vaddhas tvadvadhārthaṃ samudyataḥ || yas te
mūrdhni vinirmuktaḥ prāṇa*
16.18a-c(init.) (b as Ñ2 B1-3; cd as Ñ2 V B D7)
*n apahariṣyati || evam uktā tu sugrīvo hṛdaye tena tāḍitaḥ ||
saṃkruddhas tāḍita* 16.18d + 333*
(subst. in Ñ2 V1 B1-3 D7 for 19) + 20a (as Ñ2 V B D7)
*s tena samabhiplutya vegitaḥ || abhavac choṇitodgārī sāpīḍa iva
parvataḥ |* 16.20a(fin.)-d (b as B1-3 D7; d as most N)

sugrīvena tu niḥśamkaṃ śālam utpāṭya tejasā || hṛdaye nihato vālī
vajre 16.21a-d(init.) (a as Ñ2 V1 B1-3.4 D7-10;
 b as Ñ V2.3 B D2.3.6.7.11; c as Ñ2 V B D7)
ṇeva mahāgiriḥ || sa tu vālī raṇagataḥ śālatādanavīhvalaḥ ||
gurubhāra 16.21d(fin.)–22c(init.)
 (22a as Ñ2 V B D7; 22b as Ñ V B D2.4.6.7.13)
samākṛāntaś cacāla ca jaghūrṇa ca || tau bhīmavalavikrāntau
suparṇagativegi 16.22c(fin.)–23b(most)
 (22c as Ś1 Ñ V1 B D1.2.4.6.7.12.13; 22d and 23b[-V2] as Ñ2 V B
 D7)
tau || prayuddhau ghorarūpau tau svasthau pāpagrahāv iva || vālinā
bhagnadarpe tu sugr<ī>
 16.23b(fin.) + 336* (Ś1 Ñ V1 B D1-4.7.11-13 subst. for 23cd) +
 24ab(init.) (a as Ś1 Ñ V1.2 B D1-4.7.11.13)
ve maṃdatejasi || vālī sāmarsahṛdayaś cukrodhātīva rāghavaḥ || tataḥ
samdhāya 16.24b(fin.)–25a(init.) (24b as Ñ2 V2.3 B D7;
 c as Ñ2 V2 B1.3.4 D7; d as Ñ2 V B D7; 25a as N)
eṇa śaram āśīviṣopamaṃ || nihato hṛdaye vālī hemamālī mahāvalaḥ ||
 16.25a(fin.)-d (cd as Ñ2 V B D7)
 <ī> *hṛdaye vālī nihato nipapāta ha || hā hato smīti*
 16.26a(mid)-b (as Ñ2 V B D7)
 + 344*init. (insert of Ñ2 V B D7 after 26)
vā[deletion]^{spa} sam^{ru} ddhakaṅtho tha drṣṭvā rāmam avasthi
 345*1 (N continuation after 343*/344*; reading as Ñ2 V B D7)
 [only 4 syllables at end of last line partially visible]

San Francisco 2003.4

tum echad atikruddhaḥ sarvasainyena samvṛtaḥ || samgrāmam
abhikāmkṣamtaṃ rāvaṇaṃ śrutya bhāginī || tatrotthā
 6.951*4 (pr. start unique) + 6 App.30.1-2(init.) (2 as V3 D4.13)
 [951* is N insert after 6.47.6, followed by App.30]
 <nā>*mnā maṃdodarī tathā || praviśya ca sabhāṃ divyāṃ prabhayā*
dyotamānayā || drṣṭuṃ vai rāvaṇo sā tu mayasya duhi
 App.30.2 post. (as V3 B4)
 + 13 (pr. as V2.3 B1.2.4 D2 T2.3)-14 post. (mid)
devīm tato rājā priyāṃ maṃdodarīm tadā || drṣṭvā sasambhramas
tūrṇaṃ pariśvajya dasānanaḥ || avravīd vi
 App.30.15(most)–16 (*sasambhramas* for *sasambhramaṃ*) + ?

gaṃbhīranisvanah || kim āgamanakṛtyam te devi śīghram tad ucyatām
 || *evam ukte tu vacane devīvacanam avravīt |*
 App30.26 post.(most)–27 + 30
 ? *rājyemdra yāce tvāham kṛtāmjalih || nāparādhas ca kartavyo*
vadatyā mama mānada || śrutā me naga App.30.31(most;
 1st syllable perhaps śya as V3; rājyemdra for rājemdra)–32 (init.)
ā me rākṣasā hatāḥ || dhūmrākṣasahitā vīrāḥ prahastena sahaiva tu ||
bhavāṇ vai yuddhakāma App.30.33 post.(most)–35 pr.(most)
niścayah || iti samcitya rājyemdra mamāgamanakāraṇam || nanv
ayuktaṃ pramukhataḥ sthātum tas App.30.35(fin.)–37(most)
 (rājyemdra for rājemdra; nanv ayuktaṃ for na ca yuktaṃ)
masya sumahābhāga yasya bhāryā hṛtā tvayā || na ca mānuṣamātro
sau rāmo daśarathātmaja App.30.38(most) + 40(most)

Met. Mus. 2002.504

-muḥ paramasambhrāntāḥ kuṃbhakarṇaniveśanam || āsādya
bhavana<ṃ> tasya vivīśus te n<ṛ>pā
 6.48.16cd + 1034* (N insert)
praviśya mahadvāraṃ sarvvato yojananāyutaṃ || vitrasayamtaṃ
niśvāsai śayānam piśitāśanam || bhīmaprā- 1036* 1
 (N subst. for 48.18) + 1040* (N subst. for 22cd) + 23a (as N)
laṃ bhīmaṃ pātālavipulā^{na}naṃ || kuṃbhakarṇam mahānidram
vodhanāya pracakrire || jaladā iva u 48.23a(fin.)b
 + 1043* (N ins. after 48.28ab) + 48.29c(init.)
duḥ jātudhānās tatas tataḥ || uṣṭrā<na del.>n kharān hayān nāgān
jaghnatur daṃdakaśāmkuśaiḥ || yadā tu tai 48.28d (as N+)
 + 38ab + 32a(init., as N)
saṃninnadair mahātmā na kuṃbhakarṇe vuvudhe prasuptaḥ || tadā
bhuśumḍīmuśalāni caiva rakṣoga- 48.32a(mid)–d(init. as N)
s te jagṛhur gadās ca || sukhaṃ pra^{su}ptaṃ bhūvi kuṃbhakarṇam
rakṣāmsy udagrāṇi tadā nijaghnuḥ || kuṃbhakarṇ-
 48.32d(fin.) + 33cd + 1050*(init.; N subst. for 44ef)
dā supto naiva sampratyavudhata || tato gajasahasraṃ tu śarīre
sampradhāvati || gītavāditraśabde 1050* + 47ab (with N vv.II.)
 + 1055* 15(init.; 1055* N ins. after 47ab)
svareṇa madhureṇa ca || divyenaiva ca gaṃdhena sparśeṇa vividhena
ca || vivuddhaḥ kuṃbhakarṇo sau
 1055* 15 post.–16 + 1058* pr. (1058* N subst. for 47cd)

mo bhīmaparākramaḥ || vijṛṃbhamāno tibalaḥ pratyavudhata
rākṣasaḥ || so gaḁṣan bhavanaṃ 1058* post. (as Ś Ń2 D2.3.12)
 + 48.51ab (as Ś V3 B4 D3.12) + 48.84a (as N but *kṣa* for *ccha*)
jñō rakṣoganaṣamanvitaḥ || kuṃbhakarṇapadanyāṣaiḥ kaṃpayann iva
medinīm || vanaukasaḥ prekṣa 48.84a(fin.)-d + 87c (init.)
vṛddham adbhutaṃ bhayārditā dudruvire (after corr.) *samaṃ tataḥ ||*
kecicharaṇyaṃ śaraṇaṃ ca rāmaṃ vrajaṃti kecid vya
 48.87cd (d as N) + 86a(ca for *sma*)-b(mid)
tāḥ pataṃti || kecid diṣaṃ satvaritāḥ prayāṃti kecid bhayārtta bhuvī
śerate sma || 48.86b(fin.)-d (as N)

n.b. sequence of stanzas 48.21-87 in N mss differs greatly from that in CE text

towards bottom, on right: purple stamp, *tasvīr khānā datiyā ṣṭeṭ,*
naṃbha + written 48

San Francisco 2003.3

<*gacha*> *śa^{tru}vadhāya tvaṃ kuṃbhakarṇa jayāya ca || asahāyasya*
gamaṇaṃ mama vuddhyā na rocate || tasmāt pa
 6.53.11cd + 1142* (N insert after 53.16) + 18a (init.)
nyaiḥ parivṛto vraja || athāsanāt samutthāya maṇiṃ
sūryasamaṃprabhaṃ || āvavaṃdha maha
 53.18b + 19abc (a as G3; b as N)
kuṃbhakarṇasya mastake || aṃgadāṇy aṃgulīveṣṭhān kavacaṃ ca
mahādhanam || hāraṃ ca śāśi
 53.19d (as Ś D2.8.12)-20abc(init.) (b as N)
dha mahātmanaḥ || gātreṣu yojayāmāsa kuṃḁalaṃ ca mahābhujam ||
kuṃbhakarṇo mahāvahur
 53.20d(fin.) + 21cd (as N) + 22c (as N)
tma ivāvabhau || śronīṣūtreṇa mahatā kāmcanena virājatā || sa
puradvā^{ra}m āśri^{tya} rākṣaso 53.22d(fin.)-23ab (as N)
 + 1145* (N insert after 53.32; *āśritya* for *āsādyā*)
naḥ || niḥpapāata mahātejāḥ kuṃbhakarṇaḥ pratāpavān ||
kuṃbhakarṇo mahāvakraḥ prahasana vā
 [? -*naḥ* for <*ghoradarśa*>*naṃ* as N, i.e. 53.33b(fin.)]
 + 53.33cd + 35cd (most, as N)

- vraṅvīt* || *purarodhasya mūlaṃ tu rāghavaḥ sahalakṣmaṇaḥ* || *hate*
tasmīn ahaṭaṃ sarvaṃ taṃ haniṣyāmi
 53.35d(fin.) + 38a-d (d as Ś B1.4 D1.2.8.12.13)
- yuge* || *sa niḥkramya puradvārāt kuṃbhakarṇō mahāvalaḥ* || *te dr̥ṣṭvā*
vānaraśreṣṭhāḥ rākṣasaṃ pa<r>vva
 53.38d(fin.) + 46ab (as N) + 47ab (as N)
- pamaṃ* || *vāyukṣiptā tathā meghā yayuḥ sarvā diśas tadā* || *tāms tu*
vidravato dr̥ṣṭvā rājaputre 53.47b(fin.)–d (as N)
 + 54.3ab (as N +) [n.b. N mss repeat 53.47(-49) after 54.2]
- do vraṅvīt* || *kva gachata bhayatrastā prākṛtā harayo yathā* || *sarve*
saumyā nivartadhvaṃ kiṃ pra 54.3b(fin.) + 4cd-5b(init.)
- n parirakṣatha* || *kṛchreṇa mahatāśvastāśaṃ stabhya ca parasparaṃ* ||
śilāpādapahastā
 54.5b(fin.) + 1156*1-2 pr. (N subst. for 54.7; 1.1 garbled)
- sthuḥ saṃgrāmamūrdhani* || *mamaṃtha paramāyasto vanāny agnir*
ivotthitaḥ || *lohitakta*
 1156*2 post. + 54.10cd (as N)– 11a(init.) (as Ñ2)
- havaḥ śerate vānararṣabhāḥ* || *aṃgadaḥ kumudo nīlo gavākṣaś*
caṃdano hariḥ || *maimdo tha dvi*
 54.11b(mid.) + 1171*5-6 pr. (1171* is N insert after 55.4)
- ś caiva jāṃvavān vi[erasure]natas tadā* || *jugapa[erasure]d vyahanat*
sarve kuṃbhakarṇaṃ mahāvalāḥ || 1171*6 pr.(mid.)-post.
 (tadā for tathā)–7 (-valāḥ in post. as Ś1 Ñ2 D1-4.8.12)

San Diego 1990.290

- <ma>*ṇaṃ patitaṃ dr̥ṣṭvā sarve pi haripuṃgavaḥ* || *sugrīvaś*
cāṃgadaś caiva kumudaḥ keśarī tathā || *nīlo nalaś-*
 6 App.56.28–30 pr. (28 post. as B2; 29 pr as D13)
 (6 App.56 inserted by Ñ V B D7.13 after 6.89.12 or 4)
- ? *sumālī gaṃdhamādanaḥ* || *vīravāhuḥ suvāhuḥ ca gavākṣaḥ śarabhas*
tathā vibhīsaṇapurogās ca App.56.30 post.–32 pr.
- nam upāga[deletion]tāḥ* || *etasmīn aṃtare rājā sugrīvaḥ prāñjalir*
vacah || *vabhāṣe sumahāprājñāṃ rāmaṃ śo-*
 App.56.32 post.(mid)–34 post. (mid.)
 (33 pr. as Ñ2 D7.13; 34 pr. nearly as D13)
- lutaṃ* || *mā viṣīda mahāvāho sukheṇo n²ma nāmataḥ* || *pratyavekṣatu*
saumittim lakṣaṇaiḥ puṇyala<kṣa> App.56.34(fin.)
 + 35 pr. + 37 post. (35 pr. + omission of 1.36 as Ñ2 D7) + 38

- ? || *yadi jīvati saumītrir bhrātā te bhrātrvatsalah* || *sugrīvasya vacaḥ śrutvā rāghavo vākyam avravīt* App.56 39-40 (40 post. as D13)
ghram ānaya taṃ vaidyaṃ suṣeṇaṃ karmasiddhaye || *evam uktaḥ sa sugrīvaḥ suṣeṇārtham mahātmanā* || *vānarān preṣa* App.56 41-43 pr. (41 pr. as D13)
- ??*sa sīghram ānīyatām iti* || *tataḥ suṣeṇa āgatya prāṃjalir vākyam avravīt* || *kiṃ karomi ma* App.56.43 post.–45 pr.(init.)
 -*ho kim ājñāpayasi prabho* || *rāghaveṇa samājñāpto lakṣmaṇaḥ prekṣyatām iti* || *suṣe[ḥ] deleted[no lakṣma*
 App.56.45 pr.(fin.)–46 (46 post. as Ñ2 D7.13) + 49 post. (init.)
- dṛṣṭvā rāghavaṃ vākyam avravīt* || *viśādaṃ mā kṛthāḥ vīra saprāṇo yam arimdamah* || *oṣadhyānayanane <yu>* App.56.53 pr.(mid)-post. + 89.11cd (with unique [?] transposition) + App.56.59 pr.
 <*kri*>*yatām gaṃdhamādane* || *suṣeṇasya vacaḥ śrutvā rāghavo vākyam avravīt* || *sugrīva preṣayasveha hanumaṃtaṃ ma*
 App.56.59 post. + 68-69 post.(mid) (69 as D13)
balam || *tataḥ sugrīvavacanād dhanumān udatiṣṭhata* || *jiyāsutam atho rāmaḥ sagauravaṃ abhāṣata* ||
 App.56.69 post.(fin.) + unidentified
- gacha vīra mahāprājña parvataṃ gaṃdhamādanaṃ* || *evam astu iti kṛtvā sa prayayau vā[hu deleted]^{yu}naṃdanaḥ* || *āruro*
 App.56.70 (cf. 85 pr.) + 117 +265(init.)
- ??*gam divyaṃ nānādhātuvicitritaṃ* || *saṃcacāra nagaṃ divyaṃ oṣadhīm prati vānaraḥ* || *mārgamānas tu saṃravdhas ta*
 App.56.265 + 291-292 pr. (291 post. as NE; *tu* for *su*- in 292)
- m apaśyaṃ[śca deleted]auśadhīm* || *ciṃtayitveti hanumān avatīrya mahītalaṃ* || *giriṃ nānādrumalata na* App.56. post. + 2040*
 (subst. in Ñ2 V B for 89.20ab) + App.56.293 pr.
- ?*puṣyopaśobhitam* || *līlayā harimukhyo sau vāhubhyā udapātayat* || *utpādyamā*
 App.56.293 post. + 301 + 307 (pr.)
 [cf. 302 pr., so possible haplography]
- naḥ sahasāvibhunā vāyusūnūnā* || *nānāsatvaravoghuṣṭaṃ giriṃ ādāya satvaraḥ* || *utpapā* App.56.307-9(init.)
- tāśu vegena hanumān vāyuvikramaḥ* || *tataś ca hanumān vīro rāmasainyam apaśyata* || *a* App.56.309 pr.(mid)-post. + App.56.97*10 (Ñ1 D13 subst. for 319-25; reading close to D13)

*bhyāśe nyapatacchūṅgaṃ tadā^{dā}ya girer mahat || tatas tu hanumān
vīro vāyutulyaparākramaḥ || ni*
App.56.324 (*chūṅgaṃ* for *chrṅgaṃ*)–326(init.)
*kṣīpya parvataṃ ramaṃ nānādhātuvicitritaṃ || vinītaḥ prāñjalir
bhūtvā upasṛtya samā* App.56.326(most)–327(most)
*sthitaḥ || vijñāpayata sugrīvaṃ rāmaṃ ca savibhīśaṇaṃ ||
nādhyagacham ahaṃ tasminn ośadhīm gamdha*
App.56.327(fin.)–328 (as B4) + 2050*1
(subst. in Ñ2 V B for 89.21; V3 line 1 only)
*mādane || tato yaṃ śikharāḥ kṛtsno gires tasya mayā hataḥ || suṣenaṃ
cāvraṇīc cātha sugrī?* 2050*1(fin.)-2 (*hataḥ* for *hṛtaḥ*)
+ App.60.16 (App.60 insert of Ñ2 V B13 after 2050*)
*?mahāyaśāḥ || dehi śīghra mahābhāga lakṣmaṇāya mahauśadhīm ||
a²ruhya tvarayā caiva* App.60.16(fin.)-17 (as V3), 30 pr.
? auśadhīm || dr̥ṣṭvā cotpātayamāsa viśalyakaraṇīm śubhām || la
App.60.30(fin.) + 89.22cd (as Ñ2 V B)
½ of line illegible || *viśalyaṃḥ tām samā* ½ of line illegible
for middle ½ cf. 89.24

National Gallery of Canada 23553

*-s tvam padmanābho bhavāṃtakṛt || saraṇyaṃ śaraṇaṃ ca tvām āduḥ
seṃdrā maharṣayaḥ || ṛksāmaśrṅgovedā<tmā>*
6.105.16a(fin.)-d (b as D2; *āduḥ* for *āhuh*;
seṃdrā as Ś B1 D1-3.8.9.12 in d) + 17a (as N)
*bhaḥ || tvam yajus tvam vaśatkāras tvam omkāraḥ paraṃtapaḥ ||
ṛtadhāmā vasuḥ pūrvaṃ vasūnām ca prajāpatiḥ || trayānā<m>*
105.17b(fin.)-d (unique [?]) *yajus* for *yajñas* in c) + 6a-c
(init. with transposition as N) [n.b. N mss read 6-8b after 17]
*ām ādikartā svayaṃprabhūḥ || vasūnām aṣṭamaḥ sādhyāḥ sādhyānām
api paṃcamaḥ || aśvinau cāpi karṇau ca caṃdra*
105.6d–7d(mid) (7a as V1 B2-4)
*cakṣuṣī || aṃte cādau ca madhye ca dr̥ṣyate tvam paraṃtapa ||
prabhavaṃ nidhanaṃ cāpi na vidmaḥ ko bhavān iti || dr̥ṣyase sa*
105.7d(fin.)–8b (8a as Ś B1 D1-3.5.8-12) + 18a-c(init.) (a as most N)
*ṣu goṣu ca vrahmaṇeṣu ca || dikṣu sarvāsu gagane parvateṣu vaneṣu
ca || sahasracaraṇaḥ śrīmām chataśīrṣaḥ sahasrapāt*
105.18d-19b (18d transposed as N; 19b as D1.2.9)

rayasi bhūtāni vasudhām caiva parvatān || aṃte pṛthivyāḥ salile
drśyase tvaṃ mahoragaḥ || trīn lokān dhārayan rāma devagaṃ
 105.19c(mid)-d (as D2) + 20a-d(mid)
rmaḍānavān || ahaṃ te hṛdayaṃ rāma jihvā devī sarasvatī || devā
romāṇi gātreṣu nirmītās te svamāyayā || nimiṣas
 105.20d(fin.)–22a(init.)
 (21c as N; 21d as Ś B1 D1-3.8.9.12; 22a as B1 D2)
to rātrir unmeṣo divasas tathā || saṃskārās te bhavad vedām na tad
asti vinā tvayā || 105.22a(mid)-d (a as B1 D9-11;
 b as most N; *bhavad-* for *'bhavan* in c)

Met. Mus. 2002.503

harīṇām cābhīmukhyāya śubhāny ābharaṇāni ca || sarvān kāmagaṇān
hārān pradadau vasudhādhipaḥ || sarvavānaravṛddha
 6.116.69ab (a as Ś2 D1-4.8.9.12) + 74cd (c as Ś2 D2.8.9.12) + 75a
ye cānye vānareśvarāḥ || sarvebhyaḥ pradadau rāmo bhūṣaṇāni
yathocitaṃ || vāsobhir bhūṣaṇaiś caiva yathārham atipuṣkalaiḥ
 <||> 116.74b-d (d as D1-4.8.9.12)
prahr̥ṣṭamanasaḥ prītā jagmuś caiva yathāgatam || hr̥ṣṭāḥ sarve
yathātmā vai te sarve vānaraśabhāḥ || viśṣṭāḥ pāṛthiveṃdreṇa
kiṃ 116.76cd (as B3 D1-4) + 3686* 2 (as Ś2 D1.2)–3
kiṃdām punarāgatāḥ || vibhīṣaṇopi rāmeṇa pūjitaḥ satkr̥taḥ prabhuh
|| kr̥tānujño vidhijñena prahr̥ṣṭaḥ svām purīm ya
 3686* 3 (cont.) + 4 pr. + expansion + 4 post.
yau || 3686* 4 post. (fin.)
 (3686* is insert of N + G2.3 M3.5 after 116.76)

