

John Brockington

**ILLUSTRATED
RĀMĀYAᅇA MANUSCRIPTS**

Among the many extant manuscripts of the *Rāmāyaᅇa* are a limited number of extensively illustrated manuscripts. Their text is usually that of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaᅇa* but there are a number which are of the *Rāmcaritmānas* by Tulsīdās or of other vernacular versions. The most studied as an artistic production is the manuscript commissioned by maharaja Jagat Singh of Mewar in the middle of the 17th century. This was clearly a prestige product but how far does this apply to other examples? This contribution surveys the extant examples, examines where they were written and illustrated, and considers the motives underlying their production.

Keywords: manuscripts, miniature painting, *Vālmīki Rāmāyaᅇa*, *Rāmcaritmānas*.

Textual scholars are usually more interested in a manuscript's wording than in any accompanying illustrations, whereas art historians are interested in the paintings but tend to be indifferent to their context within a manuscript (which they are often ill equipped to read). As a result illustrated manuscripts have rarely been studied as a whole and much that is of interest or significance has been missed. The many manuscripts of the various *Rāmāyaṇas* include a much smaller number of illustrated manuscripts, besides the frequent sets or series illustrating the Rāma story (often termed manuscripts, though lacking text). These are not the focus of my enquiry, which concentrates on those where I can state something about the text.¹ The text of these illustrated manuscripts is most often that of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* but many are of the *Rāmcaritmānas* by Tulsīdās or of other vernacular versions.

Surprisingly, at first sight, the earliest extant *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript paintings come from the Mughal court, a product of Akbar's efforts to gain greater understanding of his subjects' culture. Three lavishly illustrated copies of the translation he commissioned in the 1580s are preserved. Akbar's own copy, completed in November 1588 according to its colophon and now in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum in Jaipur,² contains among its 365 folios 176 full-page paintings, thirteen of which are double-page compositions (Das 1994). A second copy, dated 1594, evidently belonged to Akbar's mother, Hamīda Bānū Begum, and contained 56 paintings (Leach 1998: 40-49).³ A third copy was made for one of Akbar's most important courtiers, 'Abd al-Raḥīm Khān-i khānān; a note at the start of the manuscript records that it contained 135 paintings, was begun in 1587-88 and completed in 1598-99 but the dates on individual paintings show that it was not completed

¹ An earlier version of this survey was presented at the 15th World Sanskrit Conference, Bangkok, 2015. It is a great pleasure to contribute it now to this volume for my long-standing friend and colleague, Yaroslav Vassilkov.

² John Seyller suggests that one painting is dated AH 1000 (= 1591-92 A.D.); if so, the paintings were not completed for at least three years after the colophon date (Seyller 1994: 87 and 100). The manuscript remained in the imperial library at least until 1661 but had reached Jaipur by 1750 in unknown circumstances.

³ One of the leaves now in the Museum of Islamic Art, Doha, is signed by the painter Nur Muhammad (who not long afterwards moved to Bikaner), the only one so far known to be signed. Full details of the various locations of the extant folios — and of other manuscripts mentioned below — may be found in the relevant section of our research materials deposited in the Oxford Research Archive (John and Mary Brockington 2018).

until at least 1604-05 (Seyller 1999: 75-76).⁴ However, there clearly was an earlier tradition of illustrating the *Rāmāyaṇa* for Mughal artists to imitate, since many details in the first imperial Mughal version such as the crowns and dress of Rāma and his brothers are derived from earlier Indian exemplars. Indeed, occasional earlier paintings of incidents from the Rāma story occur in illustrations to other texts, such as manuscripts of Bilvamaṅgala's *Bālagopālastuti*, from the middle of the 15th century onwards.

Very little later — it is variously dated between c. 1595 and c. 1610 — a manuscript of the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* itself was illustrated in a sub-imperial Mughal style, evidently for a Hindu courtier, who was almost certainly Bir Singh Deo, ruler of Orcha and Datia in Bundelkhand (1605-27).⁵ Stylistic continuities between pages of this manuscript and works produced in the imperial Mughal atelier suggest that Bir Singh Deo employed some of the same artists. All its widely dispersed folios are considerably damaged and some have been repaired, probably at a fairly early date; this manuscript contains *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* text on the reverse in *devanāgarī* along with a Bundeli Hindi picture caption, although Jerry Losty has suggested that the text was added later, in the 18th century (Poovaya-Smith and others 1989: 28).

A little later comes a group of ten or more leaves from a manuscript of the *Laṅkākāṇḍa* of the *Rāmcaritmānas* in a provincial Mughal or folk Rajasthani style, which is claimed to be dated 1646. Apart from size (all are c. 15 x 27 cm.), their common feature is that the text is written alongside, below or round the illustrations in a way reminiscent of Mughal treatment of text but in a horizontal format and a painting style more typical of Rajput painting (John Brockington 2018).⁶

Soon Rajput courts were producing illustrated *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts in indigenous painting styles, perhaps in part stimulated by the Mughal example. Possibly the earliest Pahārī *Rāmāyaṇa* series

⁴ This manuscript is now in the Freer Gallery of Art, Washington. Akbar had ordered that his leading nobles make copies of both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* translations and some folios from another manuscript assigned to around 1595 are widely dispersed.

⁵ All the folios have suffered considerable damage (it is sometimes therefore dubbed "the burnt *Rāmāyaṇa*"). Several folios have stamped impressions of the Datia Palace collection seal (*tasvirkhānā datiyā*) on the reverse.

⁶ One leaf (location now unknown), seen by Jagdish Mittal, contained a colophon giving date and place as 1646 and Vārāṇasī (Seyller and Mittal 2013: 30-39). I am greatly indebted to Danuta Stasik for kindly identifying in detail the text on the folio held by the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.

was produced at Mandi around 1630-45 (the end of Hari Sen's reign and the start of Suraj Sen's) but only five folios are known and it is not clear whether there is text on the reverse (Glynn 1983: 52-54). Also early is one made for Hīrā Rāṇī, wife of Pahār Singh of Orcha (r. 1641-53), according to a later note on the first leaf, and so assignable to around 1642-45.

When Jagat Singh (r. 1628-52) set about restocking the Mewar royal library, destroyed in 1568 during the Mughal sack of Chittaur, the highlight was the well known Jagat Singh or Mewar *Rāmāyaṇa*, now mounted on the web in a joint project of the British Library and the Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Vastu Sangrahalaya, Mumbai.⁷ The main artists who worked on it were Manohar (*Bāla* and probably *Uttara kāṇḍas*) and Sāhib Dīn (*Ayodhyā* and *Yuddha kāṇḍas*), while the *Aranya* to *Kiṣkindhā kāṇḍas* are in a mixed Mewar-Deccani style.⁸ Out of roughly 700 surviving folios 145 are held in four collections in India and the bulk are in the British Library. It is impossible to estimate the total number of paintings originally made given their uneven distribution through the manuscript, but of the 413 known, 304 are in Britain and 109 are in the Indian collections.

For his pioneering but incomplete edition of the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* A.W. von Schlegel used the volumes of the Jagat Singh *Rāmāyaṇa* (in which he included the 1712 *Bālakāṇḍā*, noted below, all then owned by James Tod), yet all he had to say about the miniatures was that it had so many that there is one on nearly every other verso (*ornatus picturis miniatis, tam magno numero, ut alternis fere vicibus folii partem aversam pictura occupet*, Schlegel 1829: XLI). Even the 1902 British Museum catalogue by Cecil Bendall, though noting the existence of illustrations to the various *kāṇḍas* (it refers to those in the later

⁷ Most of the Mewar *Rāmāyaṇa* now in London was originally given by Rāṇā Bhīm Singh of Mewar (r. 1778–1828) to Colonel James Tod (1782–1835), who was from 1818 the first British Political Agent to the Western Rajput courts. It is not clear how the remains of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* left India, or indeed what has happened to the rest of it. Nor is it not known when the *Bālakāṇḍa* (now mostly in Mumbai) left the Royal Library in Udaipur. The *Aranyakāṇḍa* remained in the Royal Library in Udaipur (and is recorded in the catalogue of that collection published in 1943) until the contents of the Saraswati Bhandar were transferred to the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute in 1962.

⁸ The artistic aspects of this manuscript have been well covered in various publications (especially Losty 2008) and in the material on the British Library website "The Mewar Ramayana: a digital reunification" (<http://www.bl.uk/ramayana>), so I will not discuss them further here.

Bālakāṇḍa as “excellent examples of Indian miniature-work” and makes some brief remarks about later *kāṇḍas*, including identifying Sāhib Dīn as one of the artists), hardly does them justice.

The entire text was written by a Jain scribe, Mahātmā Hirāṇanda, and the colophons contain dates ranging from 1649 to 1653. I examined the whole text in connection with its digitisation. Hirāṇanda wrote the text in a good-sized, neat *devanāgarī*, copying the manuscript before him; significantly this was not the same throughout and for several of the *kāṇḍas* the exemplar was sometimes defective, since he occasionally puts dashes in place of syllables that he was unable to read. The *Bālakāṇḍa* text is mostly aligned with the NW and W recensions as a whole but on occasion with just a few within the NW manuscripts used for the Critical Edition and more rarely it includes readings that are aligned with the NE recension. Neither here nor in any other *kāṇḍa* is Hirāṇanda’s text aligned only with manuscripts identified as W (copied in Rajasthan or Gujarat), despite his working in the premier kingdom of Rajasthan. The first part of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* is broadly aligned with the NW and W recensions but quite often shows variant readings up to whole lines added or omitted which are shared only with a subgroup of two manuscripts in the Critical Edition, Ś1 and D6. However, the later two-thirds are aligned with the NE recension and several times with a subgroup within it of Ñ2 and B. The *Aranyakāṇḍa* starts by showing the same alignment with the NE recension as the later part of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, but only for a couple of folios. Thereafter in a complete change the text basically agrees with the NW recension (or the combined NW and W), although it occasionally has readings not found there. The *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* text is aligned broadly with the NW (or NW and W) recension but there are a few places where its text is that of the NE recension. The sadly incomplete *Sundarakāṇḍa* normally agrees with the NW and W recensions as a whole but has some readings shared with only one of the Critical Edition’s manuscripts (D2, a NW ms dated *saṃvat* 1716 = A.D. 1660). The *Yuddhakāṇḍa* broadly follows the N recension as a whole but with some bias towards readings characteristic of the NE recension and containing several readings shared primarily with the Maithilī-script manuscripts (V1-3). The *Uttarakāṇḍa* is aligned at first with the NW (or the N as a whole) but later with the NE recension, showing almost no agreement with the Śāradā-script manuscripts that define the NW recension.

A later successor of Jagat Singh, Saṅgrām Singh II (1710-34 A.D.), also commissioned many illustrated manuscripts, among which is a *Bālakāṇḍa* manuscript with 202 paintings, completed in 1712, given to James Tod at the same time as several *kāṇḍas* of the Jagat Singh *Rāmāyaṇa* and now in the British Library. Its paintings seem unrelated to those in the Jagat Singh *Bālakāṇḍa* and it has been suggested that it could have been made as a replacement, if that had already left the royal collection (Topsfield 2002: 142). It follows an exemplar of mixed affiliation (Schlegel 1829: XLII).

Also in the first quarter of the 18th century comes the most monumental of Pahārī illustrated *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts. One part is the “small Guler *Rāmāyaṇa*” of around 1720, which is the only major series of paintings ascribed to Paṇḍit Seu;⁹ extant folios illustrate episodes from the *Araṇya* and *Sundara kāṇḍas*. The text on several folios from the *Sundarakāṇḍa*, now in the Rietberg Museum, Zürich,¹⁰ follows the N recension and indeed mainly the NE recension, despite where it was produced, further showing the limitations of these designations for the recensions, since clearly the place where the scribe was writing is basically the same as that of the production of the paintings. On some folios the amount of text is fairly brief but on one it had to be continued in the right margin to accommodate what was needed to correspond with the painting on the recto. Although all except the last of these versos end with what looks like a colophon but is in reality a caption to the painting (as well as the number of the painting), the text was clearly planned to be continuous. They span almost the whole of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* in the Northern recension. The text on folios 2 and 3 is quite short and looks rather like extracts intended just to explain the picture on the obverse but even so it is from contiguous *sargas* (the fact that both are from the end of the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* merely reflects the different end and starting point between the N and S recensions). Since 4.66 is the last *sarga* of the

⁹ Jutta Jain-Neubauer listed 35 folios — out of perhaps forty or more originally — with their subjects and locations (Jain-Neubauer 1981: 29-36); its folios, like those of the *Siege of Laṅkā* series, are now in several different collections with the majority divided between the Lahore and Chandigarh museums.

¹⁰ I am most grateful to Jorrit Britschgi for providing digital photographs not only of the versos of these nine folios but also of one of the folios from the “*Siege of Laṅkā*” series to be discussed shortly. For a fuller description of the paintings and comments on the present location of other paintings in the series see Goswamy 1981.

Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa, folio 4 follows on immediately, as the numbering suggests that it should (the irregular sequence of its verses is matched — though not precisely — in the NE mss). Similarly the text on folio 39 follows on directly from 38. By contrast with the brevity of the text on folios 2–3 and 24 and with the layout of folio 4 with line ends corresponding with verse ends (2 ślokas to the line), the text on folio 39 is very full, with part continued sideways in the right margin, and it ends with a *sarga* end, although the numbering does not correspond at all.¹¹

The *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* comprises another series in a very similar format, datable between 1710 and 1725, that has been called the “Mankot *Rāmāyaṇa*” (Goswamy and Fischer 2011); it is not known where exactly it was painted but it was not in Paṇḍit Seu’s own workshop. This series also has *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* text on the versos (Britschgi and Fischer 2008: 14).

However, the most spectacular part, in terms of size (standardly c. 60×83 cm), is the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, the “Siege of Laṅkā” series by Mānaku, a son of Paṇḍit Seu, produced probably around 1725 but abandoned with most of its forty folios left just as preliminary drawings.¹² Only the first four folios have text on the reverse. The first folio has an incipit (in red): *atha laṅkākaṇḍacitraṃ likhyate* || “here/next the painting of the *Laṅkākaṇḍa* (OR the pictorial *Laṅkākaṇḍa*) is written”; this unusual form of words suggests the deliberate combining of text and illustration. The text that follows (6.16.1–12) is the start of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* in the Northern recension (and closest to the NW recension) and continues on the next three versos up to 6.22.4cd.¹³ After my identification of the precise affiliation of the text on these early folios, Mary Brockington was able to reassess the identifications of the subsequent paintings and drawings and show that they form

¹¹ For the complete text on the versos of these folios and a comparison with the Critical Edition text see the Appendix to this article.

¹² Out of these 40 folios, the first eight are finished paintings, four more are part finished, and the rest are just drawings. The reason for its incompleteness is unknown; the best suggestion that I have seen is that Mānaku abandoned it in favour of a new commission, to paint a *Gītagovinda* series, around 1730 (Goswamy and Fischer 1992: 243).

¹³ It is worth adding that linking these three series still leaves the Bāla and Ayodhyā kāṇḍas unaccounted for, but it seems improbable that they were omitted from such a plan, so are we to assume that all paintings from them have subsequently been lost? On the other hand, the absence of anything from the often deliberately omitted Uttara-kāṇḍa is no surprise.

a continuous sequence up to the point when the project was abandoned and not, as previously thought, a series with several gaps in it (Mary Brockington and John Brockington 2013).¹⁴ Such a reassessment illustrates the value of an integrated approach.

Why were such extensive series of *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* paintings undertaken? We can rule out Stuart Cary Welch's suggestion about the first Siege of Laṅkā painting: "The account of the episode from Valmiki's *Ramayana* is written on the back of the painting, which still bears marks left by the fingers of the storytellers who held it up to their courtly audiences" (Welch 1985: 399). Although the size of these folios is comparable to that of the *paṭṭ*s used by itinerant storytellers, no storyteller — even for a court audience — would use the Sanskrit of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* as his prompt; virtually nobody in his audience would understand him. More probably their production is connected with the self-image of the Rajput dynasties who commissioned them. For example, Jerry Losty suggests that the reason for the lavishness of the Mewar *Rāmāyaṇa* was the Śiśodiyas' status as the foremost lineage claiming to belong to the solar dynasty and so to have Rāma as an ancestor (Losty 1994: 102), quite apart from the general understanding of Rāma as the ideal king. The patron of the small Guler *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Siege of Laṅkā series is not named but the fact that both Seu and Mānaku were natives of Guler and that the Siege of Laṅkā paintings were still owned by the then raja of Guler early last century makes it almost certain. Presumably Dalip Singh of Guler (1695-1741) was as keen as Jagat Singh of Mewar to proclaim his own and his dynasty's standing. Prestige no doubt also dictated the choice of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* for the text on the reverse, rather than any regional version.

Less notable manuscripts continued to be created. A *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript with oval illustrations in the centre of the leaf was produced in the late provincial Mughal style of Oudh around 1790. An illustrated *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript in scroll form (of the type in vogue during the second half of the 19th century) is known from

¹⁴ Roy Craven, author of the major study of the "Siege of Laṅkā" series perforce worked from a translation based on the Southern Recension and so was unable to identify correctly some incidents found only in the Northern recension (Craven 1990). It should also be noted that all its 40 folios were owned by Rāja Raghunāth Singh of Guler at the point when they were put up for sale early in the 20th century, so losses or dispersal before then are unlikely.

around 1860; its text is in Sanskrit and is apparently that of the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa*.

However, the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* was not the only text illustrated. I list first some examples of later Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇas*. An illustrated copy of the *Jogbāsiṣṭh*, a Persian translation of the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* made for Akbar by Farmulī, dated in its colophon to December 1602, now in the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, contains 41 miniatures among its 323 folios (Franke 2011). Four late-18th-century provincial miniatures from a *Yogavāsiṣṭha* translation survive, possibly copied from a now lost 17th-century volume (Leach 1995). Some paintings based on the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* by the artist Guman in a Jaipur-Datia mixed style are in the National Museum, New Delhi, but the information given does not state whether the text is included (Daljeet and Mathur 2013). An *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* illustrated in Patna style was commissioned by Charles Boddam at Chapra in Bihar in 1803-0. Orissan artists, including Sarathi Madala Patnaik, illustrated texts of an Orissan translation of the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* in the 19th century (Williams 1996). Text from one of these Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇas* is found on the reverse of at least one folio of the “Nadāun” *Rāmāyaṇa* in Kāṅgrā style produced around 1820 for Sansar Chand (r. 1775–1823).

In addition, a significant number of illustrated manuscripts of vernacular *Rāmāyaṇas* are known, not usually in the more refined court styles but in more popular forms. One notable exception is the large-sized illustrated manuscript of the *Rāmcaritmānas* in 91 folios produced at Jodhpur around 1775 in Vijay Singh’s reign (1752-93) which has a more devotional aspect than earlier court productions (Diamond and others 2009: 118-35). Another from the same period was the manuscript, called the *Citrarāmāyaṇ*, commissioned on his accession by Udit Narayan Singh, raja of Banaras (1783–1835), where the special factor is no doubt the association of Tulsidās with Vārāṇasī seen also in Udit Narayan Singh’s enhancement of the local *Rāmlīlā* performance cycle (Lutgendorf 1991: 136). A third is again an illustrated *Rāmcaritmānas* produced for Sawai Ram Singh II of Jaipur (1835-80) at Varanasi between 1857 and 1864; it contains over 500 pages in vertical format with 23 lines of *devanāgarī* text per page and 134 paintings (mostly half-page but 35 full-page).

Possibly the earliest vernacular example is a palm-leaf *Citrarāmāyaṇa* in Trivandrum dated 1453 A.D., with incised line drawings of the main scenes and characters accompanied by more or less extensive captions,

at first in Malayāḷam and then in Sanskrit but still in Malayāḷam script; the version followed is that of the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* (Jones 1963; Vijayan 1997). Paintings in a Hindi *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript are attributed to Rikhaji around 1745 at Kishangarh, though not in the usual Kishangarh style (Rikhaji, son of Karam Chand, was probably a Marwar artist working in Kishangarh). Another Hindi *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript, elaborately written with interspersed black, red and occasional gold lines of *devanāgarī* text and containing 16 paintings, was produced in Kashmir in the 18th century. There is also an illustrated manuscript of an unidentified version in Urdu script from Bikaner of early-18th-century date.

Before I note more recent manuscripts of various vernacular versions, let me list other illustrated manuscripts of the *Rāmcaritmānas*, besides those already mentioned. 23 folios from a late-18th-century manuscript illustrated in a Pahārī style closer to Basohli than Kāṅgrā are in Baroda (Parimoo 2010). A manuscript in the Asutosh Museum, University of Calcutta (T.448), virtually complete at 343 folios with 153 illustrations surviving,¹⁵ was written in bold *nāgarī* by Ichārāmamiśra at Kamalapura (Mahisādal Pargana) for rāṇī Jānakī (widow of Āandalāl Upādhyāya, who held the zamindari of Mahisādal, 1765-1804); it is dated in colophons in *saṃvat*, *śaka* and *vilāyatī sāla* to the equivalents of 1773, 1774 and 1775 A.D. (Goswami 1983). A manuscript in 349 folios, copied in VS 1843 (= 1785 A.D.) in Patna by Vaiṣṇava Dās, who calls himself a servant of Rāma, and profusely illustrated with large paintings and vignettes (sometimes 2 or 3 on a page) in a style derived from the Western Indian style, is in the British Library (Poovaya-Smith and others 1989). An illustrated manuscript dated *saṃvat* 1794 is kept in the Uttar Pradesh State Archives, as well as another undated one. Five pages from an early-19th-century manuscript illustrated in Kāṅgrā style and attributed to the family of Purkhu are in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. A manuscript of the *Uttarkāṇḍ*, dated VS 1869 (= 1812 A.D.), in 67 folios contains seven full-page paintings in a Pahārī style, possibly from Chambā (Husaini Arts). The Wellcome collection has an illustrated copy dated VS 1874 (= 1817 A.D.) which may have been commissioned by the Maharaja of Benares (Friedlander 1996: cat. no. 395).

¹⁵ Some illustrations are full page, while others are placed in the upper, middle, or lower section of the page. The painting style is similar to contemporary Orissan mss, with some Mughal features, but is broadly in a folk style; no artist is named.

Illustrated manuscripts of several other vernacular versions were also produced in the 19th century. A complete manuscript of 294 folios written in *ṭākrī* script with 16 paintings was produced in Jammu around 1820. At least 56 folios are extant from a 19th-century manuscript of an unidentified Hindi version elaborately illustrated in Kishangarh or Mewar style. Several folios from a manuscript, again of an unidentified Hindi version, from Marwar c. 1820-40 are also known. Narottama Adhvaryu wrote a manuscript of the Ayodhyā and Araṇya kāṇḍas from Giradhara's Gujarati version (in *devanāgarī* script) in 1838 with 48 paintings by an unnamed artist (Wadekar 2012). An illuminated manuscript of Mādhavasvāmī's Marāṭhī version was produced at Tanjore in the middle of the 19th century (Losty 1982: 141).¹⁶ Jerry Losty notes that "Under the patronage of the Mysore Rājas, lavishly gilded manuscripts in Kannada of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and similar texts were prepared in the 19th century" (Losty 1982: 119). A manuscript of the Jain Keśarāja's *Rāmayaśorasāyana* illustrated with 213 paintings in Jaipur style was produced in the middle of the 19th century (now in Sri Dev Kumar Jain Oriental Library, Bihar; Jain and others 1990). Upendra Bhañja's *Vaidehīśavilāsa* was illustrated on palm-leaf by several Orissan artists in the 19th century; a notable example is one by the artist Śatrughna at Baripada in 1833 (Williams 1996). Other examples are one from the 19th century now in the Victoria and Albert Museum and one from around 1920 in the British Library.

The total number of illustrated manuscripts of vernacular versions noted here substantially exceeds those of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, even though that is the most frequent single text. It even exceeds the total of those of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, its Persian translation and the later Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇas* together. But one major difference is that they tend to be later in date (although there are exceptions in both categories). Another, probably linked, difference is that almost all were produced from devotional motives, in contrast to the prestige motive for most of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts. Among them the *Rāmcaritmānas* has, not surprisingly, the largest number; indeed, if

¹⁶ Somewhat earlier, in the Nāyak period, a *citrarāmāyaṇa* in the form of 3 painted sheets, 1 each to the Bāla, Ayodhyā and Araṇya kāṇḍas, with captions in Telugu following Mādhavasvāmī's text, was produced (Krishna 1994): this is therefore somewhere between a true manuscript and a set of paintings. Mādhavasvāmī, 1676-1713, was a descendant of Rāmdās.

many of those where the Hindi text is not identified are also of the *Rāmcaritmānas*, there would be more than of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*. But a considerable spread of other versions is represented: one in Urdu script, another in *ṭākrī* script, the Gujarati version of Giradhara, the Marāṭhī version of Mādhasvāmī, Kannaḍa versions, Oriya versions and even a Jain adaptation. This spread of versions is also a geographical spread: whereas the Mughal and Rajput manuscripts belong to the western part of North India, these were produced across the whole of India.

Illustrated manuscripts thus form an important, if relatively small, category within the much larger totals of *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts and of sets of paintings of the Rāma story that are known. The relationship of text to illustration has as yet been far too little studied but can reveal a significant amount about the patrons, the scribes, the illuminators and the society of the period in which such manuscripts were produced. They deserve the combined attention of textual scholars and art historians.

Appendix

Text readings on the versos of the “small Guler Rāmāyaṇa” folios in the Museum Rietberg, Zürich.

no. 2 (RVI 846)

tad etat suviniścītya vuddhyā sarve va(supra lin.: nau)kasaḥ
 [= 4.1338*3, NE ins. after 4.64.31] || yan naḥ kṣamaṃ kṛtṭyatamaṃ
 drutaṃ tad vaktum arhatha [= 1338*4 || vānarapṛitijananam udāraṃ
 vākyakovidāḥ [= 1342*2, NE ins. after 64.33ab] || jāmvavān uttaraṃ
 vākyam avravīd vāliṇaḥ sutaṃ [= 4.64.33cd, d as most N] || setsyate
 vīra kāryārtho kiṃcit parihāsyate [= 64.34ab, as most N] || ahaṃ
 saṃcodayāmy enaṃ yaḥ kāryaṃ sādhaiṣyati [= 64.34cd v.l.] || tvam
 hi vāyusutas tāta varlavān kapikuṃjaraḥ [= 65.28cd, d as most N] ||
 tad vijṛmbhasva vikrāṃte pla(supra lin.: va)tāṃ pravaro hy asi [=
 65.33ab, a as D7, b as NE] || 2 || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṃḍe
 aṃgadaṃ prati jāṃvavadvākyam ||**

no. 3 (RVI 847)

ihaiva māṃ pratikṣadhvaṃ sarve vāṇarapuṃgavāḥ [= 4.1389*8, N
 ins. after 66.19] || aham etad gamiṣyāmi yojanānāṃ śataṃ drutaṃ [=
 1389*9, cf. 4.64.19b] || etāvad uktvā vacanaṃ pratītaḥ priyaṃ

kapīmdrasya ca raghavasya [= 4.1401*7-8, N ins. after 66.30] ||
 āmamtrya sarvān api vānarāms tān sa lamghanārthaṃ girim āruroha
 [≈ 1401*9-10] || 3 || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṇḍe vānarāṇaṃ
 parvatārohaṇam ||**

no. 4 (RVI 842)

sa sāgaram anādhṛṣyaṃ madhyena varuṇālayaṃ [= 5.1.157ab, as
 B1.2 D1.2.11] || jagāmākāśam āviśya vegena garuḍo yathā [= 5.1.157cd,
 d as most N] || evam uktvā tu sā devī daivatair abhisatkr̥tā 1.134.ab,
 as B1.2 D3 M1; n.b. sequence in N mss] || samudramadhye tarasā
 dhārayad rākṣasīm tanuṃ [= 1.134cd, d as Ñ2 B D6] || plava mānaṃ
 hanūmantam kham āvṛtyedam avravīt [= 1.135cd, d as Ñ2 B D6] ||
 mama bhakṣyaḥ pradiṣṭas tvam pravīśedam mamānanam [= 1.136a+d,
 N v.l.] || avravīt kuru tad vaktraṃ yena mām bhakṣayīṣyasi [= 1.143cd,
 c as Ñ B2.4] || cakāra surasā vaktraṃ śatayojanam āyataṃ [= 1.149.
 cd; n.b. similarity of 145cd, 146cd, 147cd, 148cd] || sa saṃkṣipyātmanaḥ
 kāyaṃ jīmūta iva mārutiḥ || tasmin mūhūrte hanumān vabhu-
 vāṃguṣṭamātrakaḥ [= 1.151] || so bhīpatya mahāvaktre niṣpatya ca
 mahājavaḥ || aṃtarikṣe sthitaḥ śrīmān itaṃ vacanam avravīt [= 1.152,
 a as B2.4 D6] || sa tam ākāsagaṃ bhīmam ākāśe samavasthitaṃ [= 1.97ab,
 a as most N + unique v.l.] || hr̥ṣṭaḥ prītiyutaṃ vākyaṃ avravīt
 parvataḥ kapim̐ [= 97cd, c as Ñ2 B D6] || ity uktaḥ śailarājena
 hanumān mārūtātmajaḥ [= 1.116ab as Ñ2 B D6] || avravīt kṛtakṛtyo
 smi viśrāntaś ca nagottamaḥ [= 5.55* ins. of Ñ2 B D6 after 116ab] ||
 ity uktvā pāṇinā śailam ālabhya haripuṃgavaḥ [= 1.118ab] || pītuḥ
 paṃthānam āsthāya jagāma prahasann iva [= 1.120cd as Ñ2 B D6]
 || 4 || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṇḍe hanūmato samudralaṃgherne
 [sic] surasāsamāgamaḥ ||**

no. 24 (RVI 848)

athāgatya tato vrahmā mārūtātmajam avravīt [= 5.1018*4, ins. of
 some N after 46.34/35ab] || nānṛtaṃ tad vacaḥ kārṣir grahaṇam gaccha
 vānaraḥ [= 1018.5 v.l.] || evam uktas tathety uktvā vaddhaḥ
 kapivarātmajaḥ [= 1018*6 as D2] || vavandha yudhi vikrāṃto
 mārūtātmajam iṃdrajit [= 46.35cd, c as most N] || sa tato
 vrahmaṇastreṇa vaddhaḥ kapivarātmajaḥ [= 1019*, NE subst. for 36ab]
 || abhavan nirviceṣṭasya papāta dharanītale [= 46.36cd v.l.] || (erasure)
 24 || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṇḍe vrahmāgamaṇam
 hanumadvaṃdhanam ||**

no. 33 (RVI 841)

5.1114* 2-3 [only; transposition in 2 pr. as in Ñ2 V1 B D6, v.l. in 2 post. as in B D3.6, v.l. in 3 post, as in Ñ2 V1 B D6], 5.54.9 [N v.l. in c, v.l. approx. as D10 in d], 14-17 [various vv.ll.] || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṃḍe siṃdhulamghanārtham ariṣṭaparvatārohaṇam || 33 ||**

no. 34 (RVI 840)

5.54.18 [vv.ll. as most N mss], 55.1-3, 8-9, 5ab, 1124* [unique v.l. in 1st pāda], 5cd, 1125*, 6-7 || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṃḍe ākāśe hanumadāgamanam || 34 ||**

no. 38 (RVI 845)

5.1298* [as Ñ2 V B1-4], 60.14cd [NE v.l. in c; N v.l. in d], 15ab [as Ñ2 V B D4], 1299* [N], [15cd-18ab omitted] 18cd [as Ñ2 V B D6], 19-21 [as NE], [22 omitted, as in many mss] 23-26 [as N, esp. NE; unique *te* for *taṃ* in 24a], 59.22 [as Ñ2 V B D6] || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṃḍe dadhimukhādivānarāṇāṃ parasparayuddham || 38 ||**

n.b. Crit. App. note (at 5.60.11): “Ñ2 V1 B1.2.4 D6 read 11^{cd} (preceded by 1293*) and 13-26 (including om. and star passages) after 5.59.19 (followed by colophon).”

no. 39 (RVI 844)

tato mūrdhnā nipatitaṃ vānaraṃ sa hariśvaraḥ || dṛṣṭhau vo vid vignahṛdayo vākyaṃ etad uvāca ha [= 5.61.1, as NE in b] || uttiṣṭhottiṣṭha kasmā tvaṃ pādayoḥ patito mama || abhayaṃ te dadāniha tatvam evābhidhīyatāṃ [= 61.2, cd as B1.4] || kiṃ saṃbhramād vicakṣus tvaṃ vrūhi yan manasechasi || kaccin madhuvane svasti śrotum ichāmi vānaraḥ [= 1305* 1-2, ins. after 61.2 with NE v.l.] || sa tu viśvāsitas tena sugrīveṇa mahātmanā || utthāyedaṃ mahāprāṇo vākyaṃ dadhimukho vṛavīt [= 61.3 with NE v.l.] || yadrkṣapatinā tāta na tvayā vālināpi vā || vanaṃ prasṛṣṭapūraṃ hi vānarais tad vināṣitaṃ [= 61.4 with NE/N vv.ll.] || aṃgadaḥ sahitaīḥ sarvair hetumat pramukhair api || dṛṣṭvā madhūny apāśyaiva sarvān asmān abhakṣayat [= 1307* (NE subst. for 61.5) with misreading *hetumat* for *hanumat*] || mayā caitaiḥ sametena vānarair vānarādhipa || pratiśiddhā hy anādrṭya bhakṣayaṃti sma vānarāḥ [= 1308* (NE ins. after 1307*)] || ahaṃ tu saṃravdhataraḥ tathā tair nāśite vane [= 61.7ab v.l.] || vārayāmi sma vāhubhyāṃ saha tair vanagocaraiḥ [= 1312*, N subst. for 61.7cd] || tatas ter vahubhir vānarair vānarair aṃgadena ca || saṃraktanayanaiḥ krodhād aham

utpatya tāditaḥ [= 61.8 with N vv.ll.] || daṃtaiḥ khādaṃti keci ca bhartsayaṃti sma cāpare || asphurann apare roṣād bhakṣayaṃś cāpy tarpyayan [= 1311*, NE subst. for 61.6 after 8; misreading in d] || jānubhyāṃ nihataḥ keci kecin muṣṭibhir āhataḥ || akṛṣṭāḥ yūthapāḥ kāmaṃ devamārgaṃ ca darśitaḥ [= 61.9; ab as Ñ2 B D6; c as Ñ2 D6] || ity evam abhisamkruddhasamprahāram akurvataḥ [= 1314*, NE ins. after 9; *abhi-* for *ati-*] || taiḥ sarvaiḥ paramakruddhair vanapālās ca māmakāḥ [= 1315*, N ins.] || eva tair nihataḥ sūrais tvayi tiṣṭhati bhartari [= 61.10ab as Ñ2 D6] || evaṃ vijñāpyamānaṃ taṃ sugrīvaṃ vānaraarṣabhaṃ || aṛchata mahāprājño lakṣmaṇaḥ paravīrahā [= 61.11] || kim ayaṃ vānaro rājan vavapāla samāgataḥ || kaṃ vārtham abhinirdīśya duḥkhito vākyam avravīt [= 61.12; b ≈ NE] || dadhipūrvamukho nāmnā hariḥ prakhyātavikramaḥ [= 61.21cd as NE] || anādṛtya praviṣṭas ca yathā madhuvanaṃ mama || aṃgado vānaraiḥ sarvai hanumatpramukhaiḥ saha [= 1318*1-2, subst. for 20, as NE] || drṣṭvā manye tathā devi sumitrānaṃdavarddhana [= 61.22ab as NE] || idaṃ dadhimukhaṃ vākyam sugrīvo mudito vravīt [= 61.25c+f as N/NE] || prīto smi mā bhūn manyus te kṛta [cont. sideways in r. margin] karmā sa vānaraḥ || marṣaṇīyaṃ ca me tasya ceṣṭitaṃ kṛtakarmmaṇaḥ [= 61.26; ab as NE, c as NE +] || gacha śīghraṃ madhuvanaṃ samrakṣa tvam yathocitaṃ || tāṃś ca preṣaya sarvāṃś tam hanumatpramukhān kapīn [= 1323*, N + ins. after 26] || ichāmi sarvān hanumatpradhānān śākhāmṛgāṃś tān mṛgarājadarpan || draṣṭuṃ kṛtārthān saha rāghavābhyāṃ śrotaṃ ca sītādhinaṃ pravṛttim [= 61.27[l.v.]; a as Ñ2, d as NE +; last verse of 5.61] ||

[below main text] || **ity ārṣe rāmāyaṇe suṃdarakāṇḍe madhuvanavidhaṃśanaṃ dadhimukhasugrīvalakṣmaṇavākyaṃ** || 39 ||

no. 41 (?) (RVI 843)

5.62.36a-38b [°pramurṣā in 37a, sarve samprahrṣṭamukhās tadā in 37ab as most N, kapī° in 37c as Ñ2 V D3.6, pādayo in 37d as some N], 1350* as NE, 38c-40d [sugrīvaḥ as most N in 39b, ca paraṃ hrṣṭo as NE in 39c, hanūmantam as NE in 39d, 40a as Ś1 Ñ1 D7.9.10, rāmaś ca as V2 B1.4 D6 in 40b], [omits colophon to 5.62 and 5.63.1] 63.2a-c, 63.2d illegible [? reading of Ñ2 V B D6 written over or under reading of CE text], 63.3a-4b [3c as Ñ2 D6, 4a as Ñ2 V B D6.11, 4b as D6]; then is scrawled: *miśa vidyādhara kī kaḍe dī murta* (cf. *miśra vidyārdha kā kaḍe dī murta* scrawled in top margin of RVI 844v, the preceding folio)

[folio number: a probable 41 in the right margin and a clear but deleted 41 in the left margin, with 45 or 47 in the middle of the lower margin; no caption or colophon; the painting shows Hanumān giving Sītā's jewel to Rāma]

References

- 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* 48.1: 70-79.
- Brockington, John and Mary Brockington. 2018: Development and spread of the Rāma narrative (pre-modern). At <http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:8df9647a-8002-45ff-b37e-7effb669768b> (last updated February 2018).
- Brockington, Mary and John Brockington. 2013. Mānaku's *Siege of Lankā* series: words and picture, *Artibus Asiae* 73.1: 231-58.
- Craven, Roy C., Jr. 1990: The Reign of Raja Dalip Singh (1695-1741) and the Siege of Lanka Series of Guler. In: *Ramayana Pahari Paintings*, ed. by Roy C. Craven (Bombay: Marg Publications, 1990): 2-22.
- Daljeet and Mathur, V.K. 2013. *Ramayana: Indian miniature art from the National Museum, New Delhi*. Brussels: Royal Museums of Art and History.
- Das, Asok Kumar 1994. Akbar's Imperial Ramayana: a Mughal Persian manuscript. In Dehejia 1994: 73-84.
- Dehejia, Vidya. 1994. (ed.) *The Legend of Rama: artistic visions*. Bombay: Marg Publications. [enlarged version of *Marg* 45.3 (1994)]
- Diamond, Debra and others. 2009. *Garden & Cosmos: the royal paintings of Jodhpur*. London: British Museum Press.
- Franke, Heike. 2011. Akbar's *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in the Chester Beatty Library. *ZDMG* 161.2: 359-75.
- Friedlander, Peter. 1996: *A descriptive catalogue of the Hindi manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*. London: Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 1996.
- Glynn, Catherine. 1983. Early Painting in Mandi. *Artibus Asiae* 44.1: 21-64.
- Goswami, Niranjan. 1983. An illustrated copy of the Rāmacaritamānasa. In *Aspects of Indian Art and Culture: S.K. Sarasvati Commemoration Volume*, ed. by Jayanta Chakrabarty and D.C. Bhattacharyya (Calcutta: Rddhi-India): 143-53.
- Goswamy, B.N. 1981. Leaves from an Early Pahari Ramayana Series: Notes on a Group of Nine Paintings in the Rietberg Museum, Zurich. *Artibus Asiae* 43: 153-64.
- Goswamy, B.N., and Eberhard Fischer. 1992. *Pahari Masters: court painters of northern India*. Zürich: Artibus Asiae Publishers.

- . 2011. Manaku. In: Beach, Milo C., Eberhard Fischer, B.N. Goswamy, eds: *Masters of Indian Painting*, 2 vols, Supplementum 481/11. Zürich: Artibus Asiae Publishers: 641-58.
- Husaini Arts: The Last Book of the Ramcharitmanas of Tulsi Das*. Online at <http://www.husainiarts.com/uttarkand-of-ramcharitmanas-pahari-manuscript-dated-vs-1869-or-ad-1812.html> (last accessed 14th December 2015).
- Jain, Jyoti Prasad, Muni Samdarshi and others. 1990. (eds): *The Illustrated Manuscript of Jaina Ramayana: Muni Keśarāja kṛta sacitra Rāma-yaśo-rasāyana-rāsa Jaina Rāmāyaṇa*. Arrah, Bihar: Shri Dev Kumar Jain Oriental Library.
- Jain-Neubauer, Jutta. 1981. *The Rāmāyaṇa in Pahari miniature painting*, L.D. series 80 (Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology).
- Jones, C.R. 1963. An illustrated Rāmāyaṇa manuscript and kathakaḷi āhāryam. *Journal of the Kerala University Manuscripts Library* 12.1-2: 17-26.
- Krishna, Nanditha. 1994. *Painted manuscripts of the Sarasvati Mahal Library*. Thanjavur: Thanjavur Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahal Library.
- Leach, Linda York. 1995. *Mughal and other Indian paintings from the Chester Beatty Library*, 2 vols. London: Scorpion Cavendish.
- . 1998. *Paintings from India: the Nasser D. Khalili collection of Islamic art*, vol. 8. London: Nour Foundation.
- Losty, Jeremiah P. 1982. *The Art of the Book in India*. London: British Library.
- . 1994. Sahib Din's Book of Battles: Jagat Singh's Yuddhakanda. In: Dehejia 1994: 101-16.
- . 2008. *The Ramayana: love and valour in India's great epic*. London: British Library.
- Lutgendorf, Philip. 1991. *The Life of a Text: performing the Rāmcaritmānas of Tulsidas*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parimoo, Ratan. 2010. A rare set of Pahari paintings based on the *Ramacharita Manasa* in the Baroda Museum and Picture Gallery, India. In: *Ramayana in focus: visual and performing arts of Asia*, ed. by Gauri Parimoo Krishnan. Singapore: Asian Civilisations Museum: 92-101.
- Poovaya-Smith and others. 1989. *Manuscript Paintings from the Ramayana: a catalogue produced for the exhibition The Ramayana at Cartwright Hall (9 Sept – 3 Dec 1989)*, by Nima Poovaya-Smith, J.P. Losty and Jane Bevan. Bradford: Bradford Art Galleries and Museums.
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm von. 1829-38. (ed. and trans.) *Ramayana, id est carmen epicum de Ramae rebus gestis poetae antiquissimi Valmiciis opus*, ed. by Augustus Guillemus a Schlegel, 3 vols. Bonn: sumtibus editoris, repr. 1846 Bonn: Eduard Weber.
- Seyller, John. 1994. A sub-imperial Mughal manuscript: the Ramayana of Abd al-Rahim Khankhanan. In: Dehejia 1994: 85-100.

- . 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.
- Sotheby's 2012. *Modern and Contemporary South Asian Art including Indian Miniature Paintings*, London sale on 8th June 2012 (London: Sotheby's).
- Topsfield, Andrew. 2002. *Court painting at Udaipur: art under the patronage of the Maharanas of Mewar*, Artibus Asiae Supplementum 44. Zürich: Artibus Asiae.
- Vijayan, K. 1997. (ed.) *Rāmāyaṇa in Palm Leaf Pictures: Citrarāmāyaṇa*. Trivandrum: Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library.
- Wadekar, M.L. 2012. The illustrated *Giradhara-Ramayana* manuscript from Vadodara. *Kriti Rakshana* 7.5-6: 24-26.
- Welch, Stuart Cary. 1985. *India: Art and Culture, 1300-1900*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Williams, Joanna Gottfried. 1996. *The Two-Headed Deer: illustrations of the Rāmāyaṇa in Orissa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.