



INDOLOGICAL STUDIES

Literary and Performing Arts
Prakrit and Apabhramśa Studies

H.C. BHAYANI

Present work, a collection of 33 papers and articles on various aspects of Indology by Shri H.C. Bhayani, a great Indologist, covers a wide range of subjects. Right from the problems of Poetics, Dramaturgy, Drama. Jaina literature to the Prakrit and Apabhramśa studies; the author has very ably presented some glaring and hitherto unknown aspects in their respective areas. In support to his viewpoint, Mr. Bhayani has quoted lines from Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramśa and the old Gujarati. Present work decidedly exhibits the writer's critical acumen of evaluating the literary works and as such this work is equally useful to the researchers and readers of Indology in general.

Rs. 250

Indological Studies

INDOLOGICAL STUDIES

**LITERARY AND PERFORMING ARTS
PRAKRIT AND APABHRAṂŚA STUDIES**

H.C. BHAYANI

**PARSHVA PRAKASHAN
AHMEDABAD**

INDOLOGICAL STUDIES
Collection of Research Papers on Indological Subjects
by
HARIVALLABH BHAYANI

© H. C. Bhayani

First Edition : 1993

Price : Rs. 250-00

Sole Distributor :

PARIMAL PUBLICATIONS

27/28 Shakti Nagar

Delhi-110007

Publisher :

PARSHVA PRAKASHAN

Nisha Pole Naka, Jhaverivad, Relief Road,
Ahmedabad—380 001

Phone : 355 909

Printer :

Harjibhai N. Patel

Krishna Printers

966, Old Naranpura Village
Ahmedabad—380 013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

vii

PART I : LITERARY AND PERFORMING ARTS

(1)

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Paryāyabandha and Saṁghāta | 3 |
| 2. The Ṣaṭprajñaka - gāthā and Hṛdayavati | 10 |
| 3. Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka | 20 |
| 4. Some Specimens of the Carcarī Song | 34 |
| 5. On Chatra and Calli | 54 |

(2)

- | | |
|---|----|
| 6. The Characterizing Function of Verse in Sanskrit Drama | 61 |
| 7. The Dhruvās ia Kālidāsa's Vikramorvaśya | 68 |
| 8. Bhavāi and the Folk Elements in the Classical Drama | 75 |

(3)

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 9. The Character of Ākṣiptikā | 80 |
| 10. The Dhavala Songs | 85 |
| 11. The Tarāṇā Mode of Singing : Its Origin | 95 |
| 12. Some Earliest Literary References to the Sāraṅgi | 100 |
| 13. Some Early Literary References to the Rāvaṇahasta | 103 |

(4)

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 14. Jain Literature and Performing Arts | 111 |
|---|-----|

PART II : PRAKRIT AND APABHRMŚA STUDIES

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Some Prakrit Verses of Pādalīpta and the
Authenticity of the Taramgalolā | 129 |
| 2. Gāthā-muktāvali : A Newly Discovered
Recension of Hāla's Sapta-śataka | 139 |
| 3. The Prakrit Poets Harivṛddha, Sātavāhana
and Āḍhyarāja | 162 |

4. Bhairavānanda	179
5. The Prakrit and Apabhramśa Rāmāyaṇas	182
6. The Apabhramśa Poet Caturmukha	195
7. The Childhood Exploits of Kṛṣṇa According to Some Pre-eleventh Century Prakrit and Apabhramśa Texts	209
8. Pāṇ, Dhanyā and Cārukeśi : Three of the Earliest Mentioned Kṛṣṇa's Sweethearts	223
9. The Evolution of Sanatkumāra-Carita	230
10. The Śudravatsa-kathā	235
11. The Br̥hatkathā, the Vasudevahim̐dī and the Sources of two Purāṇic Kṛṣṇa-carita Episodes	257
12. Apabhramśa Verses Composed by the Paramāra King Muñja	263
13. Vardhamāna-sūri's Apabhramśa Metres	267
14. The Apabhramśa Passages from Abhinavagupta's Tantrasāra and Parātrimśūrā-vṛtti	276
15. The Prakrit and Deśabhāṣā Passages in Someśvara's Mānasollāsa	297
16. On the Prakrit Sources of Certain Indian Tale-types and Tale-motifs	310
17. The Magic Bird-heart	321
18. The Tale of the Royal Monk Yava	342
19. Some Versions of the Tale of Vyāghramāri	354
Information about the Previous Publication of the Papers Errata	357

PREFACE

I have collected here my Indological papers and articles relating to the areas of (1) Literary and Performing Arts and (2) Prakrit and Apabhramśa Studies which were previously published in various journals, Felicitation Volumes etc. during the last four decades or so, and many of which were not within easy reach of the scholars.

I am very grateful to Babubhai Shah of the Parshva Prakashan who has readily ventured to undertake the burden of this publication. I hope to publish a second collection also in due course.

Vijayā Daśamī

V. S. 2047

17 October 1991

H. C. Bhayani

1. PARYĀYABANDHA AND SAMGHĀTA

1. The *Vrajyā*, *Paryā* and *Paryāyabandha*

While describing the various types of literary compositions or genres Viśvanātha has defined *Kośa* as a collection of verses that are contextually independent from each other, and that *Kośa* which is arranged in *Vrajyās* is, according to him, specially attractive.¹ *Vrajyā* here designates any collection of homogeneous verses, the homogeneity consisting in the sameness of topic. We have several well-known instances of Sanskrit and Prakrit anthologies of stray verses arranged topic-wise into sections called *Vrajyā*. Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnakōśa*² (c. 1100 A. D.) consists of fifty *Vrajyās* which include *Vasanta-vrajyā*, *Māninī-vrajyā*, *Asatī-vrajyā*, *Kavistuti-vrajyā*, etc. Similarly the Prakrit anthology *Vajjālagga*³ (after eighth century A. D.) and *Sādhāraṇadeva's* recension of *Hāla's Saptasatāka* (about fourteenth century A. D.) have Sk. *vrajyā* or Pk. *vajjā* as the section name. Now *Vrajyā* is indeed "a rare word for 'section'."⁴ It is otherwise known only in the meaning of 'the act of going or moving.' The connection between the two meanings of *vrajyā* is anything but obvious. The fact is, *vrajyā* in the sense of 'a topical section of a verse anthology' is not a genuine Sanskrit word. As defined by Viśvanātha and as known from Sanskrit verse anthologies, it is nothing but a Sanskritization of the Prakrit term *vajjā*. Prakrit *vajjā* with the meaning *adhikāra* 'topic, section' is recorded by Hemacandra, significantly as a Deśi word in his *Deśināmamālā* (7, 32). Again the *Vajjālagga* equates *vajjā* with *paddhai*, Sk. *paddhati*, and defines it as a group of *Gāthās* pertaining to the same subject-matter or topic.⁵ Thus according to the *Vajjālagga*, the meaning and function of the term *vajjā* are the same as those of the term *paddhati* used in Sanskrit anthologies like *Bhartṛhari's Nīṭisatāka*, *Jalhana's Sūktimuktāvali*, *Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣitāvali*, etc. The meaning *adhikāra* for *vajjā* given by Hemacandra is obviously based on such usage as he

found in Prakrit (and Sanskrit) anthologies. But still the question remains : what is the etymological origin of this *vajjā* and how did it come to have the meaning *adhikāra* or *paddhati* ? Outside of the usage of the anthologies, these meanings remain unattested from the rest of Prakrit and Sanskrit literatures. Luckily a remark of Hemacandra helps to solve the problem.

In his commentary on *Deśināma-mālā* 6,1 Hemacandra has observed that of the three Prakrit words having the same phonological shape *pajjā*, only the one meaning 'ladder' is Deśya. The other two with the meanings '*adhikāra*' and '*mārga*' derive respectively from Sanskrit *paryāya* 'a type of composition' and *padyā* 'track'. Now Prakrit *pajjā* and *vajjā* both meaning *adhikāra* cannot be different words. Sanskrit *p*, when medial and intervocal, corresponds to Prakrit *v*. When *pajjā* formed the latter member of a compound as in *vasaṃta-pajjā*, *asaṃ-pajjā* etc., its *p* could be treated as medial and so be changed to *v*. Thus *pajjā* and *vajjā* both meaning *adhikāra* 'topic, section' derive from Sanskrit *paryāya* through the intermediate form *pajjāa* : *paryāya* > *pajjāa* > *vajjā*. *Vrajjā* is nothing but false Sanskritization or a sort of back formation devised by Sanskritists who lost sight of the connection between Sanskrit *paryāya* and Prakrit *vajjā*. Feeling some insecurity about the coinage *vrajjā*, Ratnadeva has offered *padyā* (= *paddhati*, *saraṇi*) as an alternative explanation of Pk. *vajjā* and sought some justification for it from the *Amarakośa*. Hemacandra clearly states that *paryāya*, the source of Prakrit *pajjā*, had the meaning of *prabandhabhedā* 'a type of literary composition'. Ānandavardhana is the earliest authority to refer to the *paryāya* type as *paryāya-bandhā*. The *Locana* defines it as a verse composition consisting of independent units given to describing a single subject like the spring season⁶. This definition is borrowed by Hemacandra and the *Agnipurāṇa*, but they have *paryā* and *paryābandha* in the place of *paryāya* and *paryāyabandha*. *Paryā* is just a syllable-to-syllable Sanskritization of the later Prakrit form *pajjā*. The various Sanskrit and Prakrit forms of the name of the genre *Paryāyabandha* are to be correlated as under :

Sk. *paryāya* > Pk. *pajjāa*; *pajjā* > Pk. *vajjā*

Pk. *pajjā* > Sk. *paryā*, *padyā*

Pk. *vajjā* > Sk. *vrajyā*

We may note in passing that the strange developments undergone by the term *paryāya* find a striking parallel in what happened to the term designating the divisions of the Pāṣāṇī *Bṛhatkathā*.⁷ From original *lambha* (meaning 'acquisition, attainment'), it became *lambhaka* through pleonastic extension. Due to ignorance or phonological change these were turned into *lamba* and *lambaka*, were adopted in Sanskrit and were reinterpreted or else they were replaced by the acceptable Sanskrit synonym *lābha*. Thus misunderstanding of a Prakrit term, Sanskritization and reinterpretation are the common features in the history of the terms *lambha* and *paryāya*.

The appropriateness of the designation Paryāyabandha is quite obvious. It is a composition in which the same topic is described in its various aspects (*paryāya*); or variations (*paryāya*) are worked out on the same theme. The aptness of the term *paryāya* is in glaring contrast with the forced and artificial interpretation of the manufactured term *vrajyā*.

The identification of the Paryāyabandha with the Vrajyā readily solves a mystery : How was it that even though authorities like Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta thought it worthwhile to take note of the type Paryāyabandha, so far we had not been able to identify even a single actual work of that type ? It now becomes clear that in the Vrajyās or Vajjās of the Subhāṣita anthologies we have as many examples of the Paryāyabandha as we would wish to have. Hemacandra has stated this clearly : Paryās are seen in abundance in the Kośas. This is echoed by Viśvanātha in the definition we cited previously. The same characteristic of the Paryāyabandha which is specified by Abhinavagupta with the expression *ekavarṇanīyoddeśya* is expressed by others with different wordings, e. g. *eka-praghaṭṭakopanibandha* (Hemacandra, *Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi* on *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, VIII 12),⁸ *sajātiyānām-ekatra sanniveśaḥ* (Viśvanātha).

Now prior to Ānandavardhana we do not get any treatment of the Paryāyabandha as a literary genre⁹. Instead we find a very similar type called Saṁghāta. But this point requires to be discussed separately.

2. The Paryāyabandha and the Saṁghāta

Under the Anibaddha class of literary compositions, the authorities on Sanskrit poetics generally mention Mukṭaka, Saṁdānitaka (=Yugalaka), Viśeṣaka, Kalāpaka, Kulaka, Kośa, Saṁghāta and/or Paryāyabandha, besides a few others.¹⁰ Daṇḍin and Bhoja do not mention the Paryāyabandha. Similarly Ānandavardhana is silent about the Saṁghāta. Hemacandra and Viśvanātha have both, the Paryāyabandha and the Saṁghāta. Some difficulty seems to have been felt about formulating the principles of distinction for a few of these literary types and there was probably some confusion and uncertainty about classifying the middle-length compositions as can be seen from their conflicting treatments. Abhinavagupta defines the Paryāyabandha as follows :

*avāntara-kriyā-samāptāṁ api vasanta-varṇanādy-eka-
varṇaniyoddeśyena pravṛttaḥ paryāyabandhaḥ.*

(Locana on Dhvanyāloka, III 7)

This means that the verse composition called Paryāyabandha consisted not of one but several self-contained syntactic-semantic units and it aimed at describing one single subject like the spring season. Compare with this what Bhoja has to say about the Saṁghāta :

*eka-praghaṭṭopānibaddhānām subhāṣitānām samūhaḥ
Saṁghātaḥ. Aneka-praghaṭṭakopānibaddhānām tu kośaḥ.*

(Raghavan, *Bhoja's Srṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 630)

This means that the Saṁghāta is a collection of independent verses on one single theme, while the Kośa is a collection of verses on various themes.

This would make the Paryāyabandha and the Saṁghāta as one and the same type. And the same conclusion would follow from Ratnaśrījñāna's definition of the Saṁghāta, which is as follows :

*nānā-bhittayo bhinna-kriyāḥ svatantrāḥ ślokāḥ kośavat
sthāpitāḥ kośaḥ. Ekāṁ bhittiṁ prāvṛṇādikāṁ
varṇayitum samudāyena pravṛtā bhinnakriyāḥ ślokāḥ
Saṁghātaḥ.*

(*Kāvyalakṣaṇa*, 1 13, commentary)

This means that the Kośa is a treasury of self-contained verses syntactically independent and pertaining to various themes, while the Saṁghāta is a group of verses syntactically independent but purporting to describe one single theme like the rainy season.

Accordingly one would suspect that what was called Saṁghāta earlier came to be called Paryāyabandha later. But in the definition of the Saṁghāta given by Bhoja at another place one additional detail occurs :

*eka-praghaṭṭake yas tv eka-kṛto bhavati sūkti-samudāyah
saṁghātaḥ sa nigaditaḥ Vṛndāvana-Meghadūtādi.*

(Raghavan, op. cit., p. 808)

This means that Saṁghāta is a group of self-contained verses pertaining to a single theme and of single authorship, like the *Vṛndāvana* and the *Meghadūta*.

Hemacandra seems to have made a clever use of this for providing separate niches for the Saṁghāta and the Paryāyabandha types. According to him Paryā is a group of Muktakas pertaining to the same theme, and this definition he takes to be substantially the same as given by Abhinavagupta, which also he reproduces. Further he defines Kośa as consisting of a number of Paryās. And as for the Saṁghāta, he reproduces Bhoja's definition.¹¹ Thus the distinction between the Saṁghāta and the Paryāyabandha would rest solely on the fact of authorship : if the work is an

anthology of stray verses of *different authors* on the same theme it would be called Paryāyabandha; but the same type of work of *one author* would be called Saṁghāta. In actual practice we find the term *vrajyā*, a fourth reincarnation of the term *Paryāya*, frequently used in the anthologies. But the term *saṁghāta* seems to have gone out of vogue quite early, and so when Bhoja mentions the *Meghadūta* as an example of the Saṁghāta type, one justifiably feels skeptical about there being a sound earlier tradition in this regard.¹²

Notes

1. *koṣaḥ śloka-samūhas tu syādanyonyānapekṣakah/*
vrajyā-krameṇa racitaḥ sa evātimanoramah//
sajātīyānāmekatra sanniveśo vrajyā, yathā Mukṭāvalyādi.
(*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 6, 329).
2. *Subhāṣitaratnakōṣa*, ed. D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale (1957), Introduction p. XXX.
3. *Vajjālaggaṁ*, ed. M. V. Patwardhan (1969), Introduction p. X.
4. Kosambi, Introduction to the *Subhāṣitaratnakōṣa*, p. XXX.
5. *ekkatthe patthāve jattha paḍhijjānti paura-gāhāo/*
taṁ khalu vajjālaggaṁ vajja tti paddhaṭ bhaṇiyā//
(*Vajjālagga*, 4)
6. 'avāntarakriyāsamāptāv api vasantavarṇanādyekavarṇanī-
yoddeśyena pravṛttaḥ paryāyabandhaḥ.' (*Locana on Dhvanyāloka*,
III. 7)
7. For a discussion, see Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*
(1963), pp. 844-6.
8. Besides Hemacandra has also reproduced Abhinavagupta's
definition.
9. See Raghavan, op. cit., pp. 611, 631.

10. See for example Hemacandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* VIII 10, commentary. For a general and comparative survey, see Raghavan, op. cit., ch. XXI.
11. 'muktakānām eka-praghaṭṭakopanibandhaḥ Paryā. avāntaravākya-samāptāv api vasantādyekavarṇanīyoddeśena muktakānām' upanibandhaḥ Paryā. sā koṣeṣu pracuraṁ dṛśyate yathā Saptasatakādiḥ. Ekapraghaṭṭake ekakavikṛtaḥ.' sūktisamudāyo Vṛndāvana-Meghadūtādiḥ saṁghātaḥ. (Alaṅkāracūḍāmaṇi on Kāvyaṇuśāsana, VIII 12-13)
12. Compare Raghavan's reaction, op. cit., p. 629.

2. THE ŚAṬPRAJÑAKA-GĀTHĀ AND HṚDAYAVATĪ

In a passage pointing out the presence, in some form or other, of Dhvani in all poetic compositions, Ānandavardhana has illustratively mentioned 'Hṛdayavati' as a special class within the type of Gāthā compositions like the Śaṭprajña Gāthā¹. The *Locana* offers some clarification of the terms 'Hṛdayavati' and 'Śaṭprajña' and cites two stanzas of Bhāttendurāja as instances of the Hṛdayavati Gāthā. According to Abhinavagupta the Hṛdayavati is well-known in the Goṣṭhis of Prakrit poets. He also gives its Prakrit name which the manuscripts have preserved as *hialaliā* or *aalia*. And the Śaṭprajñas, according to him, are those who have a special knowledge of means and ends relating to Dharma, Artha and Kāma.

Further clarifications of the two terms under discussion offered in various modern editions of the *Dhvanyāloka* are more or less speculative or fanciful. But Raghavan has thrown some light on the term Śaṭprajña² and Upadhye, with the help of fresh materials has tackled several aspects of the problem of clarifying the character, form and function of the Śaṭprajñaka-Gāthās.³ The present discussion uses some new materials and seeks to obtain a clearer understanding of the terms *śaṭprajñaka-gāthā* and *hṛdayavati*.

The known occurrences of the word *śaṭprajña* are all later than Ānandavardhana. It is used by some Jain Sanskrit writers like Somadeva⁴ and Dhanapāla⁵ and has been recorded by a few late lexicons like the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* and the *Kalpadrakośa*. The *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* defines it as follows :

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु लोकतत्त्वार्थयोरपि ।

षट्सु प्रज्ञास्ति यस्योच्चैः षट्प्रज्ञ इति संस्मृतः ॥

Abhinavagupta's explanation of *śaṭprajña* noted above is akin to this. Similarly in the marginal Sanskrit gloss in the Jesalmer

MS. (dated 1168-69 A.D.) of Śāntisūri's *Puhavicaṃḍa-cariya* the Prakrit word *chappannaya* is explained⁶ as.

विद्वांसः । षट्स्वर्थेषु प्रज्ञा प्रकृष्टविज्ञानं येषां ते षट्प्रज्ञा विदग्धाः ।

and the following definition has been cited in support :

धम्मे अत्थे कामे मोक्खे लोए य लोयजत्तासु ।

छासु इमेसु जेसिं पन्ना ते हुंति छप्पन्ना ॥

Obviously this is a Prakrit version of the definition given in the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*.

Pk. *chappannaya* seems to be earlier than Sk. *ṣaṭprajña(ka)*. The latter appears to be a late Sanskritization of the former, and is explained according to this derivation. The is also indicated by the other attempts at Sanskritization of *chappannaya* : *ṣaṭparṇaka*, *ṣaṭkarnaka*, *saṭpañcāśat*.⁷

Significantly Hemacandra has not recorded *ṣaṭprajñaka* in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* despite its use⁸ by Somadeva and Dhanapāla. On the contrary he has given *chappannaya* as a Deśya word along with *chaila* and *chaliya* in the sense of *vidagdha* (*Deśināmamālā*, 3, 24 and the commentary thereon). This meaning is confirmed by (1) Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā* (composed in 779 A.D.), which paraphrases विद्युद्बुद्धिपरिकल्पय (p. 174) with छप्पण्यबुद्धिवियप्पिय (p. 177), and (2) the *Vajjālagga*, which has a separate section of Gāthās on the Vidagdha, who is referred to as *cheya* (Sk. *cheka*), *chaila* and *chappannaya*. Sanskrit *vidagdha*, *cheka* and *ṣaṭprajña* and Pk. *viyaḍḍha* (or *viaddha*), *cheya*, *chappannaya* and *chaila* appear to have gained currency chronologically in that order.

Vidagdhas were persons of cultivated taste and refinement, characteristically adept in the art of love and polished conversation, and their talent in composing and appreciating subtle, clever verse, mostly erotic, was highly admired. The *Vajjālagga* passage (vv. 270-284) brings this out clearly. Numerous references are found in the Classical Sanskrit and Prakrit literature—especially in the literature pertaining to Kāvya and Alamkāra, to *vidagdha-bhaṇiti* and *chekokti* which were equated with *vakrokti*.

gatherings poets presented their new poems before connoisseurs of literature and there were contests in the art of extempore composition. These literary clubs were variously called Kavigoṣṭhī,

Onwards from at least the beginning centuries of the Christian era there used to be gatherings of poets and critics, usually under the patronage of kings, ministers or rich merchants. In these Vidagdhagoṣṭhī⁹ or simply Goṣṭhī. In these Vidagdhagoṣṭhīs Prakrit poetry was equally favoured as Sanskrit poetry. Many of the short Prakrit poems consisting of a single self-standing verse i.e. the poems of the Mukṭaka type such as we find e.g. in the anthologies like the *Saptaśataka* of Hāla (who, significantly, was famous as 'kavi-vatsala') and the *Vajjālagga*, were probably composed or first published in a Vidagdha-goṣṭhī.

The type and style of Prakrit poetry represented by the Gāthās of the *Saptaśataka* indicate a marked preference for the theme of love—clandestine love, to be more specific. It provided ample scope for conveying hidden meanings and subtle undertones. This was also necessitated by the one-verse range of the Mukṭaka and the increasing sophistication, formality and technique-dependence of Sanskrit and Prakrit literatures in general. As a result of these factors, we get two different kinds of Prakrit poems characteristically associated with the Vidagdhas : highly suggestive erotic verses, and entertaining verses, displaying verbal skill and used for diversion or playing literary games. The first kind is typically illustrated by the two verses of Bhaṭṭendurāja cited by Abhinavagupta as instances of the Hṛdayavati Gāthā of the Śatprajñās. Their theme is clandestine love and their charm depends upon the Vācya characterized by subordinated Vyañgya. The verses of the second kind fall under the category of Citra-kāvya. They are based on such Śabdālamkāras as are usually treated under the names of Prahelikā, Gūḍha, Cyuta, Praśnottara, Vākovākya etc. Many of them are known to the Ālamkārikas beginning with the predecessors of Bhāmaha, and several rhetoricians like Rudraṭa, Bhoja¹⁰ and Hemacandra who have treated them at varying length. Daṇḍin (and Bhoja, Hemacandra etc. after him) states that this type of verses

were useful for playing games, for diversion in the Goṣṭhī, for exchanging secret messages and for confounding others (*Kāvyalakṣaṇa*, 3, 97).

Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā* offers us a fair specimen of this kind of Vidagdha-gāthās (see pp. 174-177). As an enlightened pastime, the newly-wed hero and heroine have been depicted in that work as engaging themselves in the literary game of composing and solving verse riddles.¹¹ These are said to be like those usually devised by the *chappannayas* or *vidagdhās* for diversion. Uddyotana presents us with the following list of the chief varieties : Prahelikā, Gūḍha¹², Antimākṣara, Bindumati, Aṣṭapiṭaka, Praśnottara, Prṣṭārtha, Akṣaracyutaka, Mātrācyutaka, Binducyutaka, Gūḍha-caturtha-pāda, Bhaṇitavya, Hṛdaya, Paksman (? PK. Pomha), Samvidhānaka, Gāthārdha, Gāthā-rākṣasaka, Prathamākṣara-viracita. Most of these¹³ he has defined and illustrated.

In Jayasimhasūri's *Dharmopadeśamālā-vivaraṇa* in Prakrit (composed in 858-59 A.D.), in two different tales the hero and heroine are similarly described as engaged in the pleasant pastime of composing varieties of Praśnottara (pp. 42 and 90). These illustrations given by Uddyotana and Jayasimha can be taken as typical of the playful kind of the Vidagdha-gāthās. In the earlier tradition the *Kāmasūtra* mentions Prahelikā, Bāṇa knows the use of Akṣaracyutaka, Mātrācyutaka, Bindumati, Gūḍha-caturthapāda and Prahelikā for diversion and Gūḍhacaturtha-goṣṭhī is referred to by Haribhadra.¹⁴

The broad characterization of the Vidagdha-gāthās touched upon above finds strong corroboration from the following vivid picture of the Kāvya-goṣṭhī given in Dhanapāla's *Tilakamañjarī* (p. 108, lines-3-11)¹⁵ :

यथास्थानमुपविष्टैश्च तैः सह प्रस्तुतविचित्रकथालापस्य चित्रपदभङ्गसूचितानेकसुन्दरो-
दारार्था प्रवृत्ता कथञ्चित् तस्य चित्रालङ्कारभूयिष्ठा काव्यगोष्ठी । तत्र च पठ्यमानासु
विद्वत्समालम्ब्ययातिषु प्रहेलिकाजातिषु, चिन्त्यमानेषु मन्दमतिजनितनिर्वेदेषु प्रश्नोत्तर-
प्रभेदेषु, भाव्यमानासु प्रसन्नगम्भीरभावार्थासु षट्प्रज्ञकगाथासु, विमृश्यमानेषु बोधानुपद-

संपादितोत्सेकेषु बिन्दुमात्राक्षरच्युतकलोकेषु, हस्यमानेषु दीर्घकालानुभूतनिष्फलबिन्ता-
मौनेषु प्राज्ञमन्येषु, प्रकाश्यमानेषु साधुवादविधिना बुधानां बाधरभसे विजम्भमाणे
निर्भरं शिष्याणां कौतुकरसे.....।

Herein the *Kāvya-gōṣṭhī* is said to be abounding in *Citrālaṃkāras*. Elaborating this, *Dhanapāla* refers to *Praheḷikās*, *Praśnottaras*, *Ṣaṭprajñagāthās* and *Cyutakas* (the last of the *Bindu*, *Mātrā* and *Akṣara* type). It is also indicated that high intellectual calibre and literary sophistication were pre-requisites for actively participating in the *Gōṣṭhī*, which afforded cultural entertainment and aesthetic pleasure. It should be marked that the *Ṣaṭprajñāka Gāthās* are here characterized as having a deep and lucid purport.

There are two other important references to *Chappannaya* in the *Kuvalayamālā*. Once it is said that *Chappannayas*, the eminent poets, cannot be adequately praised as they were the measuring rod for all who write verses rich with nuances (p. 3, 1.25). In another reference *Pādalipta*, *Sātavāhana* and *Chappannayas* are mentioned as most eminent among the poets (p. 3, 1.18). From these two references it is quite clear that *Uddyotana* has here some specific poets in view. Combined with *Ānandavardhana*'s mention of *Ṣaṭprajñā-Gāthās* this can be taken to imply existence of some collection containing the *Gāthās* written by *Chappannayas*, as is suggested by *Upadhye*.¹⁶ That it is a fact and not merely a possibility is shown by one actual reference to such a work. In the tale of *Śīlasundarī* in *Śāntisūri's Puhavicaṃdacariya* (composed in 1104-5 A.D.), four young boys are described (p. 117, line 30) as trying to catch the attention of a beautiful girl in various ways; one of these ways was to recite *Chappannaya-gāhās* with sweet, charming voice. Here *Ratnaprabha's Saṃketa* (to be dated possibly in the fourteenth century) explains *Chappannaya-gāhāo* as शृंगारगाथाकोशविशेषः. This reference certifies that there was a *Gāthā-kośa*, an anthology of *Gāthās*, of erotic character and known as *Chappannaya-gāhāo*. It seems very likely that in *Ānandavardhana's* expression *Ṣaṭprajñādigāthāsu* there is a reference to this specific

anthology entitled *Chappannaya-gāhāo* in Prakrit and *Śaṭprajñaka-gāthāḥ* in Sanskrit. Dhanapāla too may have this in view.

Of course other Gāthās too similar in form and content to the verses of the *Chappannaya-gāhāo* were also referred to as Vidagdha-gāthās.

Among the different varieties of the Vidagdha-vinoda verses described in the *Kuvalayamālā*, one is called *Hiyaya*. The designation *Hiyaya-gāhā* (Sk. Hṛdayagāthā) is quite close to *Sahṛdaya-Gāthā* (Abhinavagupta) or *Hṛdayavatī Gāthā* (Ānandavardhana). And what is more the illustration¹⁷ given in the *Kuvalayamālā* (p. 176, 1.16) has a family-likeness to the Gāthās of Bhaṭṭendurāja cited by Abhinavagupta. We may therefore suggest that the corrupt *hialali* or *aali* of the manuscripts stands for *hiaāliā* (made up of *hīaā*+possessive suffix *-āla*+feminine suffix *-iā*) which is translated in Sanskrit as *hṛdayavatī*. Such Gāthās formed, it seems, a substantial part of the *Chappannaya-gāhā-koso* known to Uddyotana, Ānandavardhana and Ratnaprabha.

Now Upadhye has discovered and published a few years back a work called *Chappannaya-gāhāo*. But this cannot be the original work known to Uddyotana and others. The latter was a collection of erotic Gāthā verses, as is clear from direct (Ratnaprabha's characterization) and indirect (the tone of the illustrative Gāthās given by Uddyotana and Abhinavagupta, and the characteristic context in the *Puhavīcamdacariya*) evidences, while the former is exclusively didactic and has an admixture of numerous Apabhraṃśa verses in a variety of metres. Upadhye too considers the work to be a highly inflated Jain recension of the original.¹⁸ More probably it is a different work altogether.

Lastly, while defining the metres of certain popular song-types in Apabhraṃśa like the *Utsāha*, the *Dhavalā*, the *Maṅgalā* etc., Svayambhū in his *Svayambhūcchandas* treats also of two types of verse compositions called *Paheli* and *Hiāliā*. *Paheli* is the same as *Praheḷikā*. *Hiāliā*¹⁹ even though it is homonymous with the word given by Abhinavagupta for *Hṛdayavatī*, refers to a different

thing. Svayambhū's Hīālīā is the same as the Bindumatī of the *Kuvalayamālā*,²⁰ while the Hīālīā mentioned by Abhinavagupta is, as already pointed out, the Hiyaya (= Hṛdaya) variety of the *Kuvalayamālā*.²¹

Postscript : In the story of Guṇavarman and Kanakavati occurring in the biography of Svayambhū Vāsudeva and Bhadra Baladeva (See Śīlāṅka's *Caupannamahāpurisacariya* ed. by A. M. Bhojak, PTS, 3. 1961, pp. 117-127), the hero and heroine are described as diverting themselves with verse riddles. Praśnottara, Bindumatī, Prahelikā, Hṛdayavatī (*Hiyāliyā*), and Gūḍhacaturthaka figure there in this connection. The two illustrations of Hiyāliyā are as under :

जइ सिक्खविओ सीसो 'जईण रयणीए जुज्झइ ण गंतु' ।

ता कीस भणइ अज्जो 'मा कुप्पसु दो वि सरिसाई' ।

(The solution : दिव्वणाणो खु सो)

जइ सा सहीहिं भणिया दइओ ते दोसमग्गणसयण्हो ।

ता कीस मुद्धइमुही अहिययरं गव्वमुव्वहइ ॥

(The solution : जेण वल्ल ति)

It will be easily seen that these Hiyāliyās differ from those of the *Kuvalayamālā* and of Bhaṭṭendurāja cited in note 17. Both of them (and especially the second one) bear a family-likeness with the Abhiprāyagūḍḥa illustration of the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* cited here in note 21. The date of the *Caupannamahāpurisacariya* is 869 A.D. It seems that regarding the Hṛdayavatī type Uddyotana and Abhinavagupta had the same tradition and source before them and they were different from those that were commonly shared by Śīlāṅka and Bhoja, the last one of these being responsible for once more changing its classification and nomenclature.

Notes

1. यदा तु...हृदयवतीषु च षट्प्रज्ञादिगाथासु कासुचिद् व्यङ्ग्यविशिष्टवाच्ये प्राधान्यं तदपि गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यस्य ध्वनिनिष्पन्न-दभूतत्वमेव । *Dhvanyāloka*, N. S. edition, p. 222; Chowkhamba Series edition, pp. 553-54. Some editions have सप्रज्ञक or संप्रज्ञक for षट्प्रज्ञ.

2. Raghavan, V. : 'Gleanings from Somadevasūri's Yaśastilakacampū', *Ganganatha Jha Research Institute Journal*, 1, 3, 1944, pp. 370-372.
3. Upadhye, A. N. : 'Chappannaya-gāhāo or the Gāthakośa', *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, 9, 4, 1962, pp. 385-402.
4. *Yaśastilakacampū* (composed in 959 A.D.), ch. 3, p. 441. Noted by Raghavan, op. cit., and by Hindiqui, K. K., *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, 1949, p. 62, footnote 1.
5. *Tilakamañjarī*, N. S. Press, Second edition, 1938, p. 108. The date of the *Tilakamañjarī* is 972-73 A.D.
6. See Ramnikvijay's edition, 1972, p. 89, footnote 3.
7. Upadhye, op. cit, p. 386.

The rendering *ṣaṭpañcāśat* found in the *Avantisundarikathā* has misled V. V. Mirashi into believing existence of fifty-six Prakrit poets writing in unison. See 'Some Ancient Prakrit Poets', *Bharatiya Vidya*, 10, 1949, pp. 42-48 (= *Studies in Indology*, I, 1960, pp. 89-95). Besides these the renderings *saprajñaka* and *samprajñaka* are found in some editions of the *Dhvanyāloka*. It is not clear how far any one of these had got established. We may also note that *sakarna* meaning 'a learned person' is attested from literature at least twice : Once from Muniratnasūri's *Amamacaritra* (Composed in 1168-69 A.D.), in a passage cited at M. D. Desai, *Jain Sāhitya-no Saṁkṣipta Itihāsa* (1933), p. 200; second time, in the Prakrit form *sakanna*, as noted in the *Pāiasaddhamdhaṇṇavo* on the basis of two passages from the *Surasuṇḍarikahā* (composed in 1038-39 A.D.).

8. For quite interesting later semantic development of the word *ṣaṭprajñaka* see Upadhye, op. cit., p. 388.
9. For example :

यस्तु पर्यनुयोगस्य निभेदः क्रियते पदैः ।

विदग्धगोष्ठ्यां वाक्यैर्वा तं हि प्रश्नोत्तरं विदुः ॥

Sarasvatikanṭhābharana, 2, 136.

Svayambhū says at *Svayambhūcchandas*, 8, 26 that Rāsābandha is like an elixir in the Goṣṭhis.

10. *Sarasvatikanṭhābharāṇa*, 2, 133–137. See also, Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963, pp. 354, 368–9.
11. Upadhye, *Kuvalayamālā*, Part 2, Introduction, p. 48–49; Notes, p. 147.
12. So to be read for the textual *vūdha*. Upadhye has suggested this doubtfully, but it is clear from Rudraṭa, Bhoja and Hemacandra.
13. Some are quite new, not mentioned in any standard Alam-kāra work.
14. Upadhye, *Kuvalayamālā*, Part 2, Notes, p. 147.
15. I am grateful to my friend Dr. N. M. Kansara for drawing my attention to this important passage.
16. Upadhye, *Kuvalayamālā*, part 2, Introduction, p. 76; also 'Chappannayagāhāo', p. 388.
17. गोसे च्चिय हलियवद्द पढमं चिय णिग्गया घरद्दारं ।
दद्दुं कलंबकुसुमं दुहिया रोटुं समाढत्ता ॥

Sk. chāyā : प्रभात एव हालिकवधूः प्रथममेव निर्गता गृहद्वारम् ।
दृष्ट्वा कदम्बकुसुमं दुःखिता रोदितुं समारब्धा ॥

The two Gāthās of Bhaṭṭendurāja are as follows :

लंघिअगअणा फलहीलआओ होंतु त्ति वड्डुं तीअ ।
हलिअस्स आसिसं पाडिवेसवहुआ वि णिट्ठुविआ ॥
गोलाकच्छकुडंगे भरेण जंबूसु पच्चमाणसु ।
हलिअवहुआ णियंसइ जंबूसरत्तअं सिसअं ॥

(*Locana on Dhvanyāloka*, 3, 42)

18. 'Chappannaya-gāhāo', p. 389.
19. सुण्णाइं अक्खराइं णाणाछंदेषु जत्थ बज्झंति ।
हिअए वि वसइ अत्थो हिआलिआ भण्णए एसा ॥

(*Svayambhūcchandas*, 4, 15)

20. This Bindumatī, however, is different from that of Bhoja.
21. Bhoja's Abhiprāyagūḍha variety of Gūḍha would in a way correspond to it if the statement-form is substituted for the question-form. The relevant illustrative Gāthā is as follows :

जइ देअरेण भणिआ खग्गं घेतूण राउलं वच्च ।
ता किं सेवअवहुए हसिऊणं पलोइअं सअणं ॥

(*Sarasvatikanṭhābharāṇa*, 2, 370).

Numerous Gāthās from the *Saptaśataka* can easily qualify as Hṛdayavati alias Hīlāiā.

3. DOMBIKĀ AND ŚIDGAKA*

I. The Language and Metre of the Dombikā.

1. Our knowledge about the class of works known as Uparūpakas (also called Geya Rūpakas or Padārthābhinayas) in classical Sanskrit Literature is very meagre, because no actual specimens of this category of works are preserved to us. Besides the information also about them found in various works of Sanskrit poetics is mostly vague and sketchy. Making use of the latter V. Raghavan has given us a critical account of the Uparūpakas¹ and among the modern treatment of the subject his is the most informative. The aim of the present paper is to supplement Raghavan's account of two of the Uparūpakas, viz. the Dombikā and the Śidgaka² with some new facts derived from the available data on the subject.

2. In the case of the Dombikā³ we are fortunate to have the titles of two actual works along with a few citations from them. The *Abhinavabhāratī*⁴ (= ABH.) while discussing the basis of distinction between the Nṛtta and the Nāṭya mentions occasionally several characteristics of the Dombikā (pp. 170-182), and cites a few passages from two Dombikās named *Cūḍāmaṇi*⁵ and *Guṇamālā*, both of which are lost to us. Hemacandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*⁶ (= KA.) reproduces a substantial portion of the ABH. passages referring to the Dombikā (pp. 446-449).

The citations from the Dombikās as found in the ABH. are in a highly garbled and mutilated condition, and consequently

* Paper presented at the Classical Sanskrit section of the XXIV session of the All India Oriental Conference held at Banaras on the 12th, 13th and 14th October, 1968. Published with courtesy to the All India Oriental Conference.

hardly anything can be made out of them. But here, as elsewhere, the great Hemacandra comes to our rescue. In his reproduction we find most of these citations in a considerably less corrupt form, and from them we can know something definite about their contents, language and metre. Further, and this is more important, we can draw some tentative conclusions in general about the language and metrical form of the Dombikā.

Among the Dombikā citations given in the ABH. (and mostly also in the KA.) some three citations are from the *Cūdāmaṇi* and one from the *Guṇamālā*. I reproduce below the text of the citations in the forms in which they are found in the ABH. and the KA. The text according to the KA. is given first as it is better preserved and hence somewhat intelligible. Below it is given the text according to the ABH. (with recorded variants, if any). As already said the latter is hopelessly corrupt. In order to facilitate comparison and profit by the variants, the ABH. text is so arranged as to match syllable for syllable with the corresponding KA. text.

Of the four citation given below, No. 2 is found only in ABH. For No. 4, the editors of the KA. have given one version in the body of the text and an improved version of the same in the appendix. I reproduce here both of them.

Citations from the Cūdāmaṇi Dombikā

1. (i) हेट्टे वि डोम्बी णव्वमिसहिइ होमि हउं ।

[— वि दुगु णव्वमिसहिइ होदि व —]

चोरियमिहुणहं वम्महसार कहेमि तउ ॥

[चो—अमिहुण—धम्महसार कःने तेउ]

(KA., 447, 513; ABH., 171)

- (ii) हेट्टे वि डोम्बी ।

(KA., 448, 513)

[विडम्बि डोम्बी]

(ABH., 175)

2. वव(स)मचूडामणिआ ।

(ABH., 171)

3. पाआलअले सेसाहिणि हु जय लच्छिवत्थलमलिआ

(KA., 447)

[पाआलअलो ससाहिणि हु जय जय लच्छिमच्चमलिआ
v. 1. वाआगआल सेसहिणि च जप्र जअ लच्छिमच्चदलमलिआ]

(ABH., 175)

Citation from the *Guṇamālā Dombikā*

4. जामि ता राअ तुडिअ अणुणव्वीससि । (HA., 508)
जामि तारा अनुडिअ पुणु णव्वीसमि । (KA., 448)
[जामि हरा धातुंगिअ पु-ण्णचिसमि] (ABH., 175)

Taking the KA. text as basis, a few obvious textual emendations can be suggested as below :

1. Read णच्चमि for णव्वमि. (No. 1, line 2)
2. Separate सहिइ (No. 1, line 2) from what precedes.
3. Read णच्चिसमि for णव्वीसमि. (No. 4)
(cf. णच्चिसमि of the ABH.).
4. Read मिहुणड' for मिहुणह'. (No. 1, line 2)
5. Read ०चूडामणिअ for ०चूडामणिआ. (No. 2)
6. Metrically, as will be shown below, the second line in No. 1 is short by one Mātrā, and so one syllable is missing probably after सहिइ.

Now the forms हड' (1), मिहुणह' (or मिहुणड') (1), ०सार (1), तड (1), पुणु (4) and णच्चिसमि (4) are specifically Apabhramśa forms. Direct singular of *a*-bases ending in *-u* (सार), genitive in *-ham* (or extended neuter direct singular in *-aum*) (मिहुणह' or मिहुणड'), pronominal forms हड' and तड, future stemformative *-is-* (णच्चिसमि), (4) and the adverb पुणु (as against the Prakrit form पुणो) are typically Apabhramśa forms. And the remaining forms in citations No. 1, 2 and 4, so far as they are intelligible and identifiable, are common to Prakrit and Apabhramśa. Accordingly the language of the citations No. 1 and 4 is definitely Apabhramśa and the same seems to be the case for citation No. 2, which is textually quite meagre.

3. This conclusion finds a strong support from the characteristic metre of citations No. 1, 2 and 4. The second line of citation No. 1 is the most intelligible. It can be translated as: 'I narrate to you clandestine intercourse, that is the essence of love'. It scans as under :

चोरिअभिहुणहूँ (or उँ) वम्महसारु कहेमि तउ⁷
 — ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ ◡ — ◡ — ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡

Thus the line has 21 Mātrās. The last five Mātrās have the form — ◡ ◡ ◡. There is a caesura after the 12th Mātrā. The 21 Mātrās are divisible in five Gaṇas as 6+4+4+4+◡◡◡. These characteristics identify the metre as Rāsaka. Rāsaka is a well-known and quite popular Apabhramśa metre. All the Apabhramśa metrical authorities like Svayambhū, Hemacandra, the *Kavidarpaṇa* and Ratnaśekhara have defined⁸ it. It was a Mātrā-metre of the Sarvasamā Catuṣpadī type—i.e., every stanza having four lines of equal length, the first line rhyming with the second, and the third with the fourth. Every line contained 21 Mātrās divided as 6+4+4+4+◡◡◡; the form ◡— was forbidden for the second and the fourth Gaṇa. There was a caesura after the 14th Mātrā, but later a new variety of the Rāsaka developed with the caesura after the 11th or 12th Mātrā. In one tradition, this new variety was called Rāsāvalaya, while others called it by the same old name Rāsaka or by altogether a new name, Ābhāṇaka. The variety with the caesura after the 14th Mātrā became obsolete and in the available Apabhramśa literature we find mostly the Rāsaka with the caesura after the 11th or 12th Mātrā. Rāsaka was the typical metre of the Apabhramśa literary genre called Rāsābandha. It was used to build up its main body. See for instance the *Samdeśarāsaka* of Abdala Rahamāna (13th century A.D.). For some seven hundred years the metre was in much vogue for composing Apabhramśa lyrics and songs of moderate length. Though in the long metrical tradition of Apabhramśa literature several metres of different structures came to be called Rāsaka, the one characterized above was the typical and standard Rāsaka.

Like the second line of citation No. 1, the first line also is a regular Rāsaka-line except that, as indicated earlier, a syllable is missing, possibly before or after सहिइ. The line scans as under :

हेहे वि डोम्मी णच्चमि सहिइ × होमि हउं
 - - - - -

The two lines in citation No. 1 are rhyming (-mi hau/-mi tau), which again is a distinguishing characteristic of Apabhramśa metres.

Similarly, if we take the fragment we have in citation No. 2 (also from the *Cūḍāmaṇi Dombikā*) to be the end portion of a metrical line, then it regularly scans as the post-caesura segment of a Rāsaka line, consisting of ten Mātrās :

वधस(or म) चूडामणिअ
 - - - - -

Thus it appears that not only the first but the other two citations also from the *Cūḍāmaṇi Dombika* are in the Rāsaka Metre.

If we now scan the fragment cited from the *Guṇamālā Dombikā* (i.e., citation No. 4), we find that it also has the structure of the Rāsaka metre. But it is not a full Rāsaka line; the portion to the extent of four Mātrās is wanting initially. In other words, the cited line is that part of a Rāsaka line which comes after the first four Mātrās, as can be seen from below (For the text, ह of the ABH. is preferred over ता of the KA., as indicative of the presence of a one-Mātrā syllable in that place.) :

(4 Mātrās+) जामिह राअ तुडिअ पुणु णच्चिसमि
 - - - - -

The caesura falls here after the 11th Mātrā. Any one with the ear for metrical rhythm cannot miss the typical Rāsaka rhythm of the above;given citation.

Thus our analysis and examination of the metrical structure of citations No. 1, 2 and 4 have definitely shown us that the they were composed in the Rāsaka metre.⁹

Of the three citations discussed so far, the first seems to be from the opening portion of the *Cūḍāmāṇi* Dombikā,¹⁰ while the fourth comes from the concluding portion of the musical section of the *Guṇamālā* Dombikā.¹⁰ From these texts we can infer that the song-part of the Dombika was composed typically in Apabhramśa language and in the Rāsaka metre. But it seems that it contained some Prakrit verses also, as we have to understand from citation No. 3. It seems to be in Prakrit language and Gāthā metre. With a proper selection of the readings, the text can be scanned as under :

पाआलअले सेसहि, णिहु जअ जअलच्छवच्छथलमलिआ
 _

This is a regular *pūrva-dala* of the Gāthā. And from the context in which this line is cited in the ABH., it appears that the line occurred in some Dombikā in its later part at the time of some further dance sequence (after an *apasāra*?). But in the absence of a detailed and clear picture of the structure of the Dombikā, it would be fruitless to speculate about this.

From the present discussion of the citations from the Dombikās called *Cūḍāmāṇi* and *Guṇamālā* we have tried to establish that

(i) The song-part of the Dombikās was composed typically in the Rāsaka metre, which was quite characteristically an Apabhramśa metre.

(ii) the language of the musical texts of the Dombikās was typically Apabhramśa.

In this connection it is very significant to note a few points about two other Uparūpakas, viz., Rāsaka and Nāṭya-rāsaka (the latter also known as Carcarī).¹² These Uparūpakas probably contained much of pure rhythmic dance, besides a few songs.¹³ Now there were also Apabhramśa literary compositions bearing the same names, Rāsaka and Carcarī. And eventhough the operatic and ballet-like Rāsaka and Carcarī have to be distin-

guished from the literary and lyrical Apabhramśa works with the same class-designation, the identity of designation may not be quite without significance. And in the case of the literary Rāsaka and Carcarī we find Apabhramśa to have been their typical language and the Rāsaka their typical metre.¹⁴ From this it may not be unsafe to infer that the Uparūpakas Rāsaka and Nāṭyarāsaka (=Carcarī) too, like the Dombikā, had songs in Apabhramśa language and Rāsaka metre.

This evidence for the use of Apabhramśa for some of the Uparūpakas significantly extends the hitherto known range of Apabhramśa literature.

II. Dombikā and Durmilikā.

4. The earliest definition of the Dombikā cited from some ancient source in the ABH. (p 181) is as follows :

छन्नानुरागगर्भाभिरुक्तिभिर्यत्र भूपतेः ।

आवज्यते मनः सा तु मसृणा डोम्बिका मता ॥

The two main characteristics of the Dombikā mentioned here, viz., dealing with clandestine love and seeking royal gifts by singing eulogies, etc. are referred to several times in the ABH.¹⁵

Now in Bhoja's *S'ṛṅgārarakāśa* the Dombikā, inspite of the fact that it is actually mentioned in it as 'Dombalikā' in some other context,¹⁶ does not seem to figure in its list of the twelve Uparūpakas, which is as under¹⁷ :

Śṛṅgadita, Durmilikā, Prasthāna, Kāvya, Bhāṇaka, Bhāṇikā, Goṣṭhī, Hallisaka, Nartanaka, Prekṣaṇaka, Rāsaka and Nāṭya-Rāsaka.

And if such were the case, there was no other way to explain it except as a plain lapse on Bhoja's part, and so it is assumed by Raghavan.¹⁸ Of course it would be just another way of saying that such an omission was very strange and quite unaccountable.

However the fact is, I think, that Bhoja *has* included the Dombikā in his list and treatment of the Uparūpakas, but under a different name. The name of the second Uparūpaka in Bhoja's list is 'Durmilikā', and this 'Durmilikā' is nothing but 'Dombikā' in a Sanskritized garb. The *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* defines the *Durmilikā* as under¹⁸ :

चौर्यस्तप्रतिभेदं युनोऽनुरागवर्णनं वापि ।

यत्र ग्राम्यकथामिः कुर्वते किल दूतिका रहसि ॥

मन्त्रयति च तद्विषयं न्यजति त्वेन याचते च वसु ।

लब्ध्वापि लब्धुमिच्छति दुर्मिलिता नाम तदभवति ॥

This is nothing but an expanded version of the definition of the Dombikā as found in the ABH., and all the additional details can be accounted for by what is said about the character of the Dombikā in the above-mentioned discussion in the ABH. In fact the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* definition incorporates the wording and substance of the following passage of the ABH., which is textually better preserved in the KA. (See ABH., p. 175; KA., p. 448) :

सैव डोम्बिका नरपतिपरितोषकार्थमिधायिवचननिष्ठेन गीतेन वाद्येन नृत्येन च राजानमनुरञ्जयितुं गृहीतोद्यमा वक्त्रीत्वेन (१ ABH. मन्त्रित्वेन; cf. मन्त्रयति in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* definition) पूर्वस्थिता मध्ये काचिदीदृशी चौर्यकामुककेलिलालसमानसा काचित् पुनरेव विधां कश्चिदेवंभूतश्चौर्यकामुकः, कोऽप्येवंभूतस्तत्र काचिदेवं प्रौढदूतीत्येवमादे राजपुत्रहृदयानुप्रवेशयोग्यं तत्प्रसादेन धनाद्यर्जनोपायमभिदधती तमेव राजपुत्रं परत्वेन तथैव वा समुद्दिश्य अन्यदपि चेष्टितमभिधायान्ते डोम्बिकाकृत्य-मेवोपसंहरति ।

There can be hardly any doubt about the identity of the types thus characterized in the ABH. and the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.

Bhoja's *Durmilikā* or *Durmilitā* (later, also *Durmallikā*) clearly stands for the earlier *Dombilikā*.

Possibly Bhoja himself was responsible for the form *Durmilikā* (or *Ṡtā*)²⁰. The later writers have it from him. It is found neither in the ABH. nor in the KA. The same tendency to Sanskritize

names of Prakritic or popular origin is evidenced, as we shall see, in the case of the name of another Uparūpaka also, which is found as *S'rigadita* in Bhoja, but as *Sidgaka* (or *Siṅgaka*) in earlier sources.

5. In Prakrit we find *ḍomba* or *ḍumba* as the name of a low caste. There seems to have been a measure of free variation in Prakrit in the case of pre-cluster *e* and *o*, which we find spelt varyingly as *e*, *i* and *o*, *u* respectively.

We also find *ḍombilaga* (*Paṇhāvāgarāṇa*, I-4) and *ḍombilaya* (*Samarāiccakahā*, Jacobi's edition, p. 286), which are diminutives of *ḍomba* formed with the suffix *-la-ga-* (*-la-ya*). We find another diminutive also, *ḍumbaḍaa* (*Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*, 15, 20. Prakrit Text Series, No. 5, 1962). The feminine bases corresponding to the masculine bases *ḍomba*, extended *ḍombaya* and the diminutives *ḍombila*, *ḍombilaya* are *ḍombī*, *ḍombiyā*, *ḍombilī* and *ḍombiliyā* (variant forms *ḍumbiliyā*, etc.). Hence the name of the Uparūpaka in which the *Ḍombī* (or *Ḍombiliyā*, etc.) i.e., a *Ḍomba* girl was the central figure.

In Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhātkathākośa* (931-932 A.D.) we find the form *ḍumbilī* for the *ḍombilikā* of other sources. This (or *ḍumbiliyā*) might have been the immediate basis of the Sanskritized form *durmilitā* (or *durmilikā*). *Ḍumbilī* or *Ḍombilī* was perhaps felt to be unrefined or low-brow. So pedantically *durmilikā* (or *durmilitā*) was substituted for it, and now the designation became etymologically transparent and directly meaningful: The theme being some clandestine love affair, it involved difficulties of rendezvousing for the lovers (*durmilana*). So *durmilika* or *durmilita* was felt to be quite appropriate. The pedantic urge to establish somehow inherent significance of the name has been responsible for creating the Sanskritized form *durmilikā* (or *durmilitā*), as also *S'rigadita*, for which, see further below.

III. *Sidgaka* and *S'rigadita*.

6. Among the eight Uparūpakas defined in the verses cited

in the ABH. (p. 181), the fourth is Śiḍgaka. These definitions were borrowed by Hemacandra also, and he seems to have before him the reading *śiṅgaka* in the place of *śiḍgaka* (KA., p. 446, verse 62). In the *Viveka* on the KA., however, Hemacandra uses the form *śiṅgataka* (p. 446).

Now there is no mention of Śiḍgaka (or S'ṅgaka) among the Uparūpakas treated in the *S'ṅgārāprakāśa*. But there occurs one S'rīgadita and Raghavan has rightly suggested that Bhoja's S'rīgadita may be the same as the Śiḍgaka of the earlier authorities.²¹ Bhoja's definition is nothing but a slight elaboration of the definition cited in the ABH.²² *S'rīgadita* was just a Sanskritic and respectable-looking substitute for the un-Sanskritic and pedestrian *Śiḍgaka* which is found in various strange forms such as *Śiṅgaka*, *Śilpaka* (possibly originating in a corrupt reading), *Śiṅgataka* and *Signataka*. And part of the first stanza in Bhoja's definition :

तत्र श्रीरिव दानवशत्रोर्यस्मिन् कुलाङ्गना पत्युः ।
वर्णयति शौर्यैर्धैर्यप्रभृतिगुणान्.....॥

which adds something new to the earlier definition, clearly betrays the effort to validate etymologically the new name *S'rīgadita* (= *śriyā gaditam*). This Sanskritization of *Śiḍgaka* as *S'rīgadita* stands on par with the Sanskritization of *Dombilikā* as *Durmilikā* as it has been already suggested.²³

But strangely enough Hemacandra seems to have been a victim of this change of name and he defines S'ṅgaka and S'rīgadita separately as two different types of Uparūpakas ! For the former he reproduces the definition cited in the ABH. and for the latter he uses Bhoja, compressing his definition into a single stanza.²⁴ The fact that in later times we find a tendency to set up new types of Uparūpakas merely on the basis of corrupt readings or alternative names is suggestive of obsolescence of some of the types, as also of the break in the tradition.

7. The designations Śiḍgaka and S'ṅgaka remind us of the word *śiḍga* which is found in various forms such as *śiḍga*, *khidga*,

ṣiṭga, *ṣiṅga* and *khiṅga*. The form *khiṅga* is found in Subandhu's *Vasavadattā* (307) and in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (p. 97., l. 12), *ṣiṅga* occurs in Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāramañjarī-kathā* (pp. 17-18) and Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* (331). *Ṣiḍga* is found in the *Śiṣupālavadha* (5,34), Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṅgraha* (2,40) and *Dvyāśraya* (i,110), etc. Commentators and lexicographers give it as a synonym of *viṭa*, *pallavaka*, *kāmuka*, *vidagdha* etc., and this meaning of 'a voluptuary', 'a gallant', 'a person fond of women' is supported by the actual usage in literature.

Consequently a semi-dramatic composition revolving round some affair of such a voluptuary, i.e., a *Ṣiḍga* (*Ṣiṅga*) and performed with music and dance can be well designated as *ṣiḍgaka* (*ṣiḍgaka*) or *ṣiṅgaka* (*ṣiṅgaka*). And the characterization of the *Ṣiḍgaka* and *S'rīgadita* given in the works on dramaturgy bears this out. Its theme involves reproach or censure expressed by a lady in respect of her husband who, eventhough accomplished, has proved unfaithful to her. It is significant that among the regional words mentioned by Hemacandra in the *Deśināmamālā* (I, 4, commentary) there is a word *hiṅga* in the sense of *jāra* and this *hiṅga* is the same as our *ṣiṅga*.

References

1. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's S'rṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963 (545-574).
2. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 567-568.
3. The name has several forms : *ḍombī*, *ḍombikā* and *ḍombalikā*. *ḍombalikā* of the *S'rṅgāraprakāśa* is a corruption of *ḍombilikā*. In the portion reproduced from the *Abhinavabharatī* in the *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* (see further in the paper), we find at one place (p. 447, l. 14) *ḍombilikā* for the *ḍombikā* of the former. In Hariṣeṇa's *Brhatkathākośa* (931-932 A.D.) (ed. A. N. Upadhye, 1943), we find at 57,105 one more variation, *ḍumbilī*. It is mentioned along with *Signaṭaka*, *Bhānī*, *Chatra* and *Rāsa* as the five wellknown Nāṭaka types danced by artistes and treated

by Bharata. As shown by the form *bhāni* for the usual *bhāṇi*, the names in the *Bṛhatkathākośa* have more or less a corrupt form.

4. *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata* (with *Abhinavabhāratī*), Vol. I, GOS. No. 36, 1956 edition.
5. ABH., pp. 171, 175.
6. Hemacandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, ed. by Parikh and Kulkarni, 1964 edition.
7. Cf. the definition of the Dombikā cited in the ABH. (pp. 181) from some old source :

छन्नानुरागगर्भाभिरुक्तिभिर्यत्र भूपतेः ।

आवर्ज्यते मनः सा तु मसृणा डोम्बिका मता ॥

8. For a critical account of the structure of the Rāsaka metre see *Samdeśarāsaka* (ed. Jinavijaya Muni and H. C. Bhayani, Singhi Jain Series, No. 22, 1945), Introduction, pp. 53-56 and the various sources referred to there.
9. There are a few more non-Sanskritic citations in the ABH. in the same context in which we find the citations discussed in this paper, e.g. होश' दणषक हमहुमाइषक । (ABH., 177) is cited from some Nṛttakāvya, but it seems to be hopelessly corrupt. Another citation, जळणिहियुलुइ माइमा । (ABH., 195) seems to be in Apabhramśa, but in the absence of any definite indication of its source or context it is of little use.

(ABH., p. 175)

10. Cf. अत एव चूडामणिडोम्बिकायां प्रतिज्ञातम् । (ABH., p. 171).
11. Cf. डोम्बिकाकृत्यमेवोपस'हरति गुणमालायां 'जामि हरार्घातु' गिअपुण'चिसमि' इत्यादौ । (ABH., p. 175)

12. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 563.

13. Raghavan, op. cit., p. 569.

14. The language of the *Carcari* (by Jinadattasūri, 12th cent. A.D.) published in the *Apabhramśakāvyatrayī* (ed. L. B. Gandhi, 1927) is Apabhramśa. It is in the Rāsaka metre.

ABH., p. 175);

15. प्रच्छन्नरागं रहस्योपदेशं..... (ABH., p. 172);

चौर्यकामुककेलीलालसमानसा (KA., p. 448, for the corrupt text at ABH., p. 175);

नरपतिपरितोषार्थाभिधायिवचननिष्ठेन गीतेन नृत्तेन वाद्येन च राजानमनुरञ्जयितुं...

एवमादिराजपुत्रहृदयानुप्रवेशयोग्यं तत्प्रसादेन धनार्जनोपायमभिदधती

(ABH., p. 175);

डोम्बिकासु नरपतिचाटुकारप्राधान्येन प्रवृत्तासु सुकुमारमेव शुद्धरूपम् ।

(ABH., p. 177).

डोम्बिकादेर्दृष्टोद्देशेन राजपुत्रादिप्रीतये यद्यपि प्रवृत्तिः (ABH., p. 177);

These passages are reproduced in the KA. (p. 445-448).

See also Raghavan, op. cit., p. 568.

16. प्रेक्षानिमित्तं वाचिकाद्यभिनयरहितमाङ्गिकैकनिर्वर्त्यं प्रस्थानडोम्बिलिकादिवाक्यं प्रेक्ष्यम् ।

Raghavan, op. cit., p. 567.

17. Raghavan, op. cit., pp. 534, 546, 568.

18. Op. cit., p. 567.

19. Raghavan, op. cit., p. 547.

20. The form found in the definition which is reproduced in the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* is *durmilitā*. The *Bhāvaprakāśa* gives it as *durmallikā*. See Raghavan, op. cit., p. 547.

21. Raghavan, op. cit., pp. 547, 569.

22. सख्याः समक्षं भर्तुर्यदुद्धतं वृत्तमुच्यते ।

मसृणं च क्वचिद्वर्तचरितं विदग्धस्तु सः ॥ (ABH., p. 181),

तत्र श्रीरिव दानवशत्रोर्यस्मिन् कुलाङ्गना पत्युः ।

वर्णयति शौर्यधैर्यप्रभृतिगुणानग्रतस्सख्याः ॥

पत्या च त्रिप्रलब्धा गातव्ये तं क्रमादुपालभते ।

श्रीगदितमिति मनीषिभिरुदाहृतोऽसौ पदामिनयः ॥ (*Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 546).

We can compare in the two definitions the following expressions :

सख्याः समक्षं and अग्रतस्सख्याः, भर्तुः and पत्युः, उद्धतं वृत्तम् and शौर्यैर्यप्रसूतिगुणान्, उच्यते and वर्णयति, मद्यणं भर्तुर्भूतचरितं and पत्न्या विप्रलब्ध्या तमुपालभते.

22. Goṇḍali, the Hunter's Dance (cf. Apabhraṃśa *gondala* 'confused uproar' and the Marathi folk performance called *gundhal*) was Sanskritized as Kuṇḍali and associated with Kuṇḍalinī. See *Nṛitaratnāvalī* of Jāya-Senāpati, edited by V. Raghavan (1965), Introduction, pp. 134-136. I am thankful to Dr. Raghavan for drawing my attention to this reference. He also kindly informed me that such Sanskritizations of the names of various popular types and the later error of taking the alternatives as two distinct types are quite common. This finds support in Jāya's treatment of Carcarī and Nāṭya-Rāsaka as two distinct forms.

23. यस्मिन्कुलाङ्गना पत्युः सख्यग्रो वर्णयेद् गुणान् ।

उपालम्भं च कुरुते गेये श्रीगदितं तु तत् ॥ (KA., p. 449).

24. These *ṣiṅga*, *śiṅga*, *hiṅga* etc. are probably connected etymologically with Sk. *śṛṅgāra*.

P. S. In the Old Gujarati *Śrīpāla-rāsa* of Vinayavijaya (1682 A. D.), there is a short description of a troupe of Dumbas, singing and dancing before a king in the royal assembly and being rewarded for their performance (Khaṇḍa 3, Dhāl 4, Stanza 4; p. 149 of the edition published by B. R. Vora, 1937). There a beautiful miniature depicting this episode in a Ms. of the poem dated 1829. See U. P. Shah, *Treasures of Jain Bhaṇḍāras*, 1978, colour plate J.

4. SOME SPECIMENS OF THE 'CARCARI' SONG

A type of verse composition in Sanskrit, Prakrit,
Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati

1. Onwards from about the seventh century, we find in Sanskrit and Prakrit works numerous references to *Carcari* or *Carcarikā* (Prakrit forms *caccari*, *caccariā*; Early New Indo-Aryan forms *cāmcari*, *cācari* etc.) as a type of dance associated with the Spring Festival. The dancing parties which, on these occasions, were taken out in procession, or which performed in the public park, were also called *Carcari*. The dance was accompanied by music and song. We find numerous references to *Carcari* in above-noted senses in classical works e.g. Kalidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya*, Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī*, Haribhadra's *Samarāṅgacakahā*, Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*, Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* and other works including several Apabhramśa and Early New Indo-Aryan poems.

2. Further, we find the terms *Carcari*, *Carcarikā*, *Cācari* etc. used also in one of the following meanings :

- (1) A type of musical composition (used in the *Carcari* dance).
- (2) Different types of metres (mostly Apabhramśa).
- (3) A type of *Laya* or *Tāla*
- (4) Different types of literary compositions

Obviously these meanings are interconnected. In fact the history of the character, form and structure of *Carcari* over the long period stretching from about the sixth to the sixteenth century has multifarious aspects, and it requires to be worked out from very widely scattered bits of information that are mostly to be gleaned from vague descriptions and casual references.

3. The present paper, however, has quite a limited aim. It seeks to give some idea of the form and character of *Carcari* songs on the basis of a few actual specimens traced in Prakrit,

Apabhramśa and Sanskrit works. One considerably complicating factor in this matter is the fact that *Carcarī* seems to be closely allied to some other *Uparūpaka* types like *Rāsaka*, *Hallisaka* and *Nāṭyarāsaka*. All these had quite obviously several features in common, so much so that at times one of the types is said by some of the *Alaṃkāra* authorities to be the same as some other one : *Rāsaka* is identified with *Hallisaka* or *Carcarī*, *Carcarī* is identified with *Nāṭyarāsaka*, etc. In fact there has been considerable confusion and uncertainty about the shared and exclusive features of these types—especially in later writings, which had no direct contact with a living tradition. This state of affairs appears more or less irremediable, because there is very little that is available by way of actual specimens of these literary types.

4. Now we shall examine the following passages from some Prakrit and Sanskrit works for the light they can throw on the form and features of *Carcarī* :

- (1) The *Carcarī* song at¹ §9, p. 4, 1.27 to p. 5, 1.7.
- (2) The *Carcarī* song at *Kuvalayamālā*, §235, p. 145, 1. 7-8.
- (3) The *Carcarī* song at *Caupannamahāpurisacariya*.² p. I. 91.
- (4) The *Rāsa* song at *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcākathā*,³ pp. 272-273.
- (5) The *Rāsa* song at *Prabhāvakaacarita*,⁴ p. 60, ll. 11-15 and *Prabandhakośa*,⁵ p. 16.
- (6) The *Carcarī* description at *Karpūramañjarī*,⁶ iv. vv. 16-19.

(1) The *Carcarī* song at *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 4-5.

5. At *Kuvalayamālā* §9 (pp. 4-5) Uddyotana narrates how Sudharmasvāmin enlightened five hundred robbers by performing before them a *Rāsa* dance during which he sang an instructive *Carcarī* song.⁷ Fortunately for us, Uddyotana has also given this song.⁸ It consists of four stanzas (*Vastuka*) and a refrain (*Dhruvaka*). It begins with the *Dhruvaka* which is repeated after each of the *Vastukas*. If we symbolize the *Dhruvaka* by D and the *Vastuka* by V, the arrangement is like this : D V₁ D V₂ D V₃ D V₄ D.

6. The metre of the *Dhruvaka* is to be identified as *Māgadhi* or *Māgadhiḱā*,⁹ in spite of slight difficulty in the third and the

fourth *Pāda*. It is a *Mātrā* metre with the scheme $4 + 4 + \cup - \cup -$ (14 *Mātrās*) for the odd *Pādas*, and $6 + 4 + \cup - \cup -$ (16 *Mātrās*) for the even *Pādas*. The rhyme scheme is a, b; c, d. The text of the third and the fourth *Pāda* seems to be defective, as it is short by one *Mātrā* in the later part. The metre of the *Vastukas* is *Mañjarī*.¹⁰ It is a Prakrit metre of the *Khañjaka* class with the scheme $3 + 3 + 4 + 4 + 4 + \cup -$ (21 *Mātrās*) for each of its four *Pādas*.

7. From the typical pattern of arrangement of the *Dhruvaka* and the *Vastukas* in this *Carcari* of the *Kuvalayamālā*, we can easily identify its structure as *Dvipadī*. A *Dvipadī* according to Virahāṅka consists of four *Vastukas* each of which is followed by a *Gītikā*. Between a *Vastuka* and a *Gītikā* we can interpolate, if we choose, any one of the following four : a *Vidāri*, a *Dvipathaka* an *Ekaka*, a *Vistāritaka*. But when the intervening *Vidāri* is a *Dhruvaka*, i.e. it is used as a refrain to be repeated after each *Vastuka*, the following *Gītikā* was to be omitted. This means that in the latter case the *Dvipadī* consisted of four *Vastukas* each of which was followed by the *Dhruvaka*. This structure of *Dvipadī* is given by Virahāṅka on the authority of reputed prosodists Kambala and Aśvatara, Sātavāhana and Harivṛddha.¹¹

The *Jānāśrayī*¹², composed towards the end of the sixth century A.D., defines *Dvipadī* as a complex of a *Bhaṅga-dvipadī* and a *Gītikā* in that order. At times a *Vidāri* was interpolated between the two. Each one of the four lines of a *Bhaṅga-dvipadī* stanza consisted of three to seven *Gaṇas* of either the *Caturmātra* or the *Pañcamātra* type. Each one of the four lines of a *Vidāri* stanza contained fourteen *Mātrās*. The commentary on *Jānāśrayī* 5-44 says that *Dvipadī* was among that class of metres which was in vogue with the common people.

8. Moreover there is also some other significant information that we gather from Virahāṅka. According to VJS. IV 50 one class of the *Rāsaka* type of Prakrit compositions was characteristically made up of *Dvipadīs* that had *Vastukas* followed by *Vistāritakas*.

or *Vidārīs*. The *Carcarī* songs at *Kuvalayamālā* §9 closely resembles this class of *Rāsakas* composed in *Dvipadīs*. The difference between them was possibly that as against the longer *Rāsaka*, the *Carcarī* song was made up of only one *Dvipadī* that contained four complex units. The *Jānāśrayī* too has treated the *Rāsaka*¹³ along with the *Dvipadī*.

9. The form of the *Carcarī* at *Kuvalayamālā* §9 perfectly fits in the scheme of Virahāṅka's *Dvipadī*. In the absence of definite illustrations the precise character of the latter has remained considerably obscure. The metrical form of this *Kuvalayamālā* *Carcarī* provides us with a clear instance of the *Dvipadī* and this fact enhances its importance.

10. We may digress here a bit and note that at *Caupannamahāpurīṣacariya* p. 186, st. 90-97, for the description of the leave-taking of warriors prior to a march, Śīlāṅka has employed a *Dvipadī*. The eight verses in the passage are made up of four metrically identical units, each of which has two constituents, viz. a stanza in *Mañjarī* (or *Khañjaka*) followed by a stanza in *Gītikā*. Similarly we have on pp. 190-191 (st. 137, 139) of the same work two instances of the *Mañjarī-Gītika* combination and it is significant that here the subject of description is Spring Season. As already noted, the *Jānāśrayī* defines *Dvipadī* as made up of a *Bhaṅga-Dvipadī* followed by a *Gītikā*.

11. Thus our examination of the *Carcarī* song at *Kuvalayamālā* §9 has yielded the following facts about the form and function of *Carcarī* :—

1. *Carcarī* was a song in Prakrit sung while performing the *Rāsa* dance.
2. It could be in the form of a *Dvipadī* which consisted of four *Vastukas* accompanied by *Dhruvaka*; this type of *Dvipadī* has been described by Virahāṅka on the basis of an earlier prosodic tradition.
3. One class of the *Rāsaka* type of Prakrit poems closely resembled the *Carcarī* in form.

4. The four-partite *Dvipadī* is not treated by some well-known prosodic authorities like Svayambhū and Hemacandra. But they do treat its basic units under the *Dvibhaṅgikā* and *Tribhaṅgikā* in the *Śīrṣaka* class of metres. Actually their scheme of metrical classification has a different basis, while the VJS prosodic tradition appears to be based on a type of Prakrit poems that went out of vogue during the later times. The *Caupannamahāpurisacariya* has specimens of both the uses of *Dvipadī*.

(2) The *Carcarī* song at *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 145

12. At *Kuvalayamālā* § 235, p. 145, 1. 7-8 we have another specimen of a *Carcarī* song¹⁴. Prince Dappaphaliha, who was drugged and was out of his mind, is described there as dancing a *Carcarikā*, the verbal text of which did not have any connected meaning or acceptable grammar. This nonsensical *Carcarikā* song is in slightly Prakritized Sanskrit and it is made up of a rhymed stanza in the *Chittaka* or *Toṭaka* metre¹⁵. (Each line has four *Sa-gaṇas* i.e. $\cup \cup \text{—} \times 4$). Unlike the *Carcarī* at *Kuvalayamālā* § 9, this instance has no connection with the Spring Festival. The language of the song is modified Sanskrit and not Prakrit. The song has only one stanza and its metre is such as is common to Sanskrit and Prakrit.

(3) The song at *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcāsthā*, pp. 272-273.

13. King Ripudāraṇa is described at *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcāsthā*, pp. 272-273 as forced to dance a *trī-tālaka Rāsa* and the accompanying song¹⁶ is given in st. 438-442. From the two *Carcarīs* of the *Kuvalayamālā* discussed above we know that the song accompanying the *Rāsa* dance was called *Carcarī*. So even though the song in the above-given context of the *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcāsthā* is not actually called *Carcarī*, we may take it as the same functionally. And a formal analysis of this song justifies our assumption. The song consists of four *Vastukas*, each of which is followed by *Dhruvaka*. But here the *Vastukas* and the *Dhruvaka* are in the same metre, while the prosodists seem to prescribe different metres

(4) The Song at Prabhāvakacarita, p. 60, and Prabandhakośa, p. 16.

The second song is also in Old Gujarati. It is in a different metre : Each of its four Pādas have 15 Mātrās (4 + 4 + 4 + —) with rhymes *a, b, c, d*. It is commonly used in Medieval Gujarati Narrative poetry and is called Copāī.

(5) The Carcarī description at Caupannamahāpurisacariya, p. 191.

15. So far we have considered some passages which either contain a *Carcarī* song so specified or a song that was used in the *Rāsaka* dance. Besides these, we have to note a few passages which indirectly throw some light on the character of the *Carcarī* songs. These passages purport to describe the performance of a *Carcarī* dance or simply a *Carcarī* at a spring festival, but the mode of description seems to have implications that are useful for our present purpose.

16. First we take up the description of *Carcarī* occurring at *Caupannamahāpurisacariya*, p. 191 (st. 143 and 144). This forms a part of the description of the Spring Festival for which purpose the author has commonly used the *Gāthā* metre, but as a significant variation, twice (in st. 137 and 139) he has used *Dvipadi*²¹ and in the two stanzas under discussion, he has used a special *Sama-Catuṣpadi* metre of twenty-four *Mātrās* per line. The language of these stanzas is mixed with Apabhramśa. From the available works on Apabhramśa metre I have not been able to identify this metre. But it seems to be a variation of the *Rāsaka* with two *Mātrās* added in the beginning and with the final syllable lengthened. The general structure and rhythm is very close to those of the *Rāsāvalaya* (21 *Mātrās* per line divided as 6 + 4 + 6 + — — —) with some variations, which was the standard metre of the Apabhramśa *Rāsābandha* and which is also used by Jinadattasūri for his *Jinavallabhasūri-Carcarī* in Old Gujarati, composed in the beginning of the twelfth century.

(6) The Carcarī description at Karpūramañjarī, IV, 16-19

17. Similarly in the vivid and detailed description of *Carcarī* given by the *Vidūṣaka* in the fourth act of the *Karpūramañjarī* (vv. 10-19), we find that the metre for the first six stanzas is *Upajāti* of *Indravajrā* and *Upendravajrā* while that for the remaining four stanzas is *Syāgatā*. The latter is defined as *Ra + Na + Bha + Ga + Ga* i.e. — — — — — — — — — —. As a *Varṇavṛtta* it resembles

the metre employed in the *Rāsa* song of the *Upamitibhavaprapāṇ-cākathā* in that if we cut down the last four syllables of the later and treat the eleventh syllable (now final) as long we get *Svāgatā*. Looked upon as a *Mātrā* metre its structure and rhythm are those of the very widely used Apabhramśa metre *Vadanaka* (scheme $6 + 4 + 4 + 2$, the last four *Mātrās* having the form — ◡ ◡ or — —).

18. Thus our examination of the Sanskrit and Prakrit passages from various texts having some direct or indirect bearing on determining the formal character of *Carcarī* songs has shown that in the earlier period *Dvipadī* was used for composing these songs, but other metres also like *Chittaka* and perhaps *Rāsāvalaya* and *Vadanaka* were employed for this purpose.

Later Developments in the Form of Carcarī

19. *Carcarī* became established in later Apabhramśa and Early Vernacular literatures as a literary type or genre. And here also we can see how the Prakrit studies are quite indispensable for a thorough understanding and assessment of Early New Indo-Aryan literatures. In many a matter of language and literature there has been a continuous tradition without break from Prakrit through Apabhramśa to Early New Indo-Aryan, and much of the last cannot be even properly understood without help from the other two.

Carcarī in Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati

20. We know about two *Carcarī* poems from the Apabhramśa literature. One is the *Caccarī* composed in the twelfth century by Jinadattasūri to eulogize Jinavallabhasūri²². It consists of fortyseven stanzas in the *Rāsāvalaya* metre. It is the same metre in which the Apabhramśa poem *Samdeśarāsaka* is principally composed²³.

The other *Caccarī* is known to us only by its name. While giving his personal account Vīra, the author of the Apabhramśa poem *Jambūsāmīcariya* (11th cent.) informs us that one of the four poems composed by his father was *Sāntināhacaccarī*²⁴ i.e. a *Carcarī* about the Jain *Tirthaṅkara* Śāntinātha. Nothing more is known about it.

21. Some six *Caccarīs* or *Cācarīs* are known to us from Early Gujarāṭi literature. They were composed in the 14th Century. Some details about them are given below²⁵ :

Title	Author	Form and extent	Subject
<i>Carcarikā</i>	Solaṇa	38 <i>Dohās</i>	Pilgrimage to Mount Girnar.
<i>Caccarī</i>	Anonymous	30 „	„
<i>Dharma-Caccarī</i>	„	20 „	Jain religious practices and vows.

Besides, *Jinacandrasūri-carcarī* by Hemabhūṣaṇa (25 *Dohās* about the greatness of *Guru*), *Jinaprabodhasūri-carcarī* by Somamūrti (a eulogy in 16 *Dohās*) and a *Caccarī* by Jinaprabhasūri are still in the manuscript form.

22. These *Carcarīs* in Apabhraṃśa and Early Gujarāṭi were didactic works composed by Jain authors on the model of contemporary popular and purely literary compositions. They indicate that during its long course of evolution *Carcarī* got transformed from a short festive lyrical song to a substantial poem with some narrative and descriptive content. The connection with the festival and dance also altered substantially and the original metrical form and structure too changed beyond recognition.

23. These general observations about *Carcarī* with some inevitable elements of surmise can be verified only when huge gaps in our information are filled up, and that depends upon finding out actual specimens of *Carcarī* from classical texts belonging to the period between the sixth to the thirteenth century. It was also a part of the purpose of the present paper to show that a close scrutiny of published Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa works is likely to be rewarding in such matters.

Postscript

1. In the narrative of Nāgadatta in the *Kathā-kośa-prakaraṇa*, a snake-charmer is described as employing a snake-charm to cure

Prince Megharatha bitten by a cobra. The ritual involves among other things a rhythmic performance of *Carcari* dance by sixteen dancers with the singing of the following snake-charm :

जइ पइहरियउ ओदियउ, पीयलउ जि पइदुउ ।

उद्विय नच्चहि पुत्रडा, किं अच्छहि मुदुउ ॥

(There are same variant reading) (p. 13, ll. 6-7)

The language is Apabhramśa and the metre is probably Dohā, although the text is corrupt in several places. The meaning of the first half is partially obscure, but the general sense is clear : 'Enethough the yellow dragon has struck you in its pride, Oh son, rise up and dance; why are you lying unconscious ?'

2. The sixteenth chapter of the fourth *Vimśati* (i.e. seventy-sixth chapter according to the continuous numbering) of *Mānasollāsa* (1113 A.D.), devoted to the description of the pastime of music (*Gīta-vinoda*), describes among other things, the metres which were usually used for the songtexts that serves the musical Prabandhas. At *Mānasollāsa* IV 16, 302 the metre of the *Carcari* Prabandha is treated and illustrated with a verse Passage in Apabhramśa. The text is badly preserved. The reconstructed version is as under²⁶ :

मधु-रितु मन्मथ-नायकु पहुतउ, सहार-किसलय-लक्ष्मिउ निरुतउ ।

विचकिल-परिमल-लगउ, धुम्मइ अलिकुलु झंकारइ बहु-कुसुमइ ।

कोइल कलरउ करइ सुहावउ, णावइ (?) कुसुमसरह हकारउ ।

हालिहिं नरवइ-कवु पडिज्जइ, तालिहिं छ'देहिं' गाइज्जइ ।

कुंकुम-सलिले तणु रंजिज्जइ, तरुणियणिहिं महरुउ नच्चिज्जइ ।

वरु हिंदोलउ वडि खेलिज्जइ, जुवतिहिं चरणहिं दइदु पेलिज्जइ ।

चंदणि अच्छण लेवणु किज्जइ, मल्लिय-मंजरि सिरि बंधिज्जइ ।

सिह धूविज्जइ अयरु डहिज्जइ, मोत्ताहल-नव-सरु पहिरिज्जइ ।

कपूर-संनिहु ससि सेविज्जइ, रागि वसंति पियउ गाइज्जइ ।

हंस तुलाइसु दो (?) सोविज्जइ, पिउ घुल्लंतउ वणि माणिज्जइ ॥

The metre can be identified as Vadanaka. Each of its verse-line has 16 Mātrās (6 + 4 + 4 + ◡ ◡).

At *Chandonuśāsana*, VII 47 (following Svayambhūcchands VI 165) is defined an Apabhramśa metre of the Dvipadī type, called Caccarī. It has 37 Mātrās (6, 4 × 7, 3; Caesuras after 14, 8) Its illustration is as follows :

चच्चरि चारु चवर्हि अच्चर कि-वि, रासउ खेळहि, कि-वि कि-वि गायहि वर धवल ।
रयहि रयण-सत्थिअ कि-वि दहि- अक्खय गिणहि, कि-वि जम्मूसवि तुह जिण-धवल ॥

Hemacandra's illustration indicates that *Caccarī* could be recited also, that it need not be necessarily accompanied by a dance performance and that it can be used as a hymn at a religious festival.²⁷

Now in the first act of the *Ratnāvalī* there is a reference to the sounds and notes of the *Caccarī*, that was being performed by the city folk in the main street. It was accompanied by sweet vocal and instrumental music. When Vidūṣaka refers to it as Caccarī, the maid Madanikā rebukes him with the remark, 'Oh fool, it is not Caccarī. It is Duvadī-khaṇḍa'. Thereby Madanikā points out that the song accompanying the dance is in the metre called Duvadī-khaṇḍa (i.e. Dvipadī-khaṇḍa) and not in Caccarī metre.

At *Kuvalayamālā* p. 52, ll. 11-14 and p. 116, ll. 18-19 we come across two occurrences of song in this metre, designated by Uddyotana-sūri as Duvai-khaṇḍalaya. Of these the first song is sung by Māna-bhaṭa while swinging on a swing as a part of the celebration of the Spring Festival. The second song is sung by a Yakṣa maiden as a hymn to the Jina idol. The two songs differ in language and metrical structure. The first is in Prakrit and is a strophic metre of the Dvibhaṅgī type. It is made up of two syntactically connected units. The first unit is a Dvipadī (four lines of 28 Mātrās each) and the second a Gīti two lines of 30 Mātrās each). On the other hand, the second song is in Sanskrit and is made up of only a Dvipadī.

In this connection it is also relevant to point out that Uddyotana has specifically stated in his introduction to the *Kuvalayamālā* (p. 4, l. 8) that some of the passages in his work he has composed in Dvipadī joined with Gītikā, some in Dvibhaṅgī and Tribhaṅgī and some in the Bhinnaka metre. Besides the above two songs Dvipadī is used several times in the *Kuvalayamālā*.²⁸

3. From the quite limited data presented here and from numerous references to Carcarī in Prakrit and Sanskrit literature, it is clear that the Carcarī dance was not confined to the spring festival or the Holi festival). It was the general name of a type of festive, common people's dance performed publicly in the village streets and city squares (Sk. *catvara*, Pk. *caccara*) by troupes consisting of dancers, singers and instrument-players. Of course by association the term *Caccarī*, *Carcarī* came to be used for the accompanying song, its characteristically used metre (or metres), the tāla etc.

4. In the fourth act of Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśīya* Carcarī or Carcarikā occurs frequently as a stage direction. Velankar has discussed in detail the occurrences of these terms in that drama and his critical observations and conclusions are greatly enlightening in this regard. I will quote him rather at length :

'As regards the exact meaning of the word *carcarī*, we saw above that the stanzas associated with *carcarī* are not composed in one particular metre and this shows that the word does not signify a metre at least in our drama. It is true that sometimes *carcarī* involved the recitation of some composition, as is seen from the solitary, but definite reference to the *pāṭha* in I 3. I. Its usual association with a Prākṛit, or in a few cases, a Sanskrit stanza, shows that it mostly accompanied the singing of the Prākṛit or the recitation of the Sanskrit stanza, if such a one is provided by the author; but otherwise it may accompany the singing or the recitation of any common song, or may even be without any one. This is also borne out by the description of a *carcarī* in the *Karpūramañjarī*, IV. 10-18, where reference is mostly made to dance to instrumental music, and to vocal music only in one case.

A reference to *carcari dhvani* is found also in *Ratnāvalī* of Śrīharṣa. All this would show that (1) *carcari* is not the name of any one particular metre; (2) that it could be presented to the accompaniment of either a Sanskrit (though this was very rare) or (more generally) a Prākṛit stanza, or sometimes even in the absence of any particular stanza; (3) that the recitation of a common song or any particular stanza did not form any essential part of a *carcari*; and (4) that its main attraction lay in its dance and instrumental music which accompanied it. References to *carcari* in older literature confirm these conclusions'.

*

APPENDIX

1. *Kuvalāyamālā* § p. 4, 25-5, 4.

जहा तेण केवलिणा अरण्णं पविसिऊण पंच चोर-सयाइं रास-णच्चण-च्छलेण
महामोह-गह-गहियाइं अक्खिविऊण इमाए चच्चरीए संबोहियाइं । अवि य —

संबुज्झह किं ण बुज्झह, एत्तिए वि मा किंचि मुज्झह ।

कीरउ जं करियव्वयं, पुण ठुक्कइ तं मरियव्वयं ॥ इति ध्रुवयं ।

कसिण-कमल-दल-लोयण-चल-रेहंतओ

पीण-पिहुल-थण-कडियल-भार-किलंतओ ।

ताल-चलिर-वलयालि-कलयल-सद्धओ

रासयम्मि जइ लब्भइ जुवई-सत्थओ ॥ संबुज्झह०

असुइ-मुत्त-मल-रुहिर-पवाह-विरुवयं ।

वंत-पित्त-दुग्गधि-सहाव-विलीणयं 29 ।

मेय-मज्ज-वस-फोप्फस-हड्ड-करंकयं

चम्म-मेत्त-पच्छायण-जुवई-सत्थयं ॥ संबुज्झह०

कमल-चंद-णीलुप्पल-कंति-समाणयं

मूढएहि उवमिज्जइ जुवई-अंगयं ।

थोवयं पि भण कत्थइ जइ रमणिज्जयं

असुइयं तु सव्वं चिय इय पच्चक्खयं ॥ संबुज्झह०

जाणिऊण एयं चिय एत्थ असारए

असुइ-मेत्त-रमणूसव-कय-वावारए ।

कामयस्मि मा लग्गह भव-सय-कारए
विरम विरम मा हिंडह भव-संसारए ॥ संबुज्झह०

2. *Caupannamahāpurisacariya*, p. 186, ll. 15-27.

तओ ढक्कारवमायणिऊण पडिबुद्धो सयलो वि सामंत-तलवग्ग-संदोहो ति ।
तओ य किं काडं पयत्ता ? अवि य—
सिडिलिऊण दइयं पियं गुदलसालयं, कोइ सिहिणधणफलहरवच्छविसालयं ।
णंदणं व विरहुग्गयतावपणासयं, सामिकजिज बहु मण्णइ णवर पवासयं ॥ ९०
अण्णाए कंठवलइयं, मोइज्जइ कह वि ओसुहेल्लयं पि ।
सुहंडेण सामिकज्जए, दइयालइयसिणेहपासयं व ॥ ९२
विलुलियसिडिलकेसचट्टलीकयचंचलवालयं, संठवेसु देवतरणुतरलयवालयं ।
भणइ कोइ मह सुन्दरि ! सुय माणल्लयं, वयणयं च मा वुब्भउ बाहजलोल्लयं ॥ ९१
उप्पंतीए कवयं, कीए वि रक्खासहं ति दइयस्स ।
आलिंजिज्ज बहुसो, गुणाण रज्जइ जणो ण रुवस्स ॥ ९३
जंतदइयमवयच्छिय कीए विसालयं, उण्णवेवि मुहमुब्भडजणियविओलयं ।
दुणिमित्तसंकाए विसायवसुब्भए, बाहओ प्होलिज्जइ लोयणमज्झए ॥ ९४
सुपडित्थिरपरिसप्पयं, को वि समारुहइ संसए वि मिलियाण ।
ववसायं पिव तुरिययं, सहाययं आवईए संसियाण ॥ ९५
को वि गलियकरडयडपलोड्डियदाणयं, गुरुविपक्खभेयक्खमवीहविसाणयं ।
णिययपुरिसयारं पिव परभडभंजयं, आरुहेइ गुरुमयगलमइदप्पुज्जयं ॥ ९६
कीए वि गओ ति दइयओ, विरहभयाहित्थवेविरंगयाइं ।
अविलंबियाइ तुरिययं, वयंसियाए व्व णवर मुच्छयाए ॥ ९७

3. *Ibid*, p. 190, ll. 25-28.

अवि य—

सुरहिपरिमल्लुद्दामपलोड्डियदाणओ, चूयमंजरीजालविणितविसाणओ ।
गयवतीण वित्थारियविरहुदुहासओ, वारणो व्व पवियम्भइ माहवमासओ ॥ १३७
कयगुरुविरहुव्वेययं, भमंतभसलालियासमीवयस्मि ।
पहिएहिं संभमाउलं, पलोइया कुवियकालसंकलो व्व ॥ १३८

Ibid, p. 194 last line, p. 191, ll. 1-3.

एत्थं तरम्मि य पढियं बंदिणा—

उच्छलं तकलचच्चरिणं जियरसणओ, धवलमल्लिउम्मिलियदीहरदसणओ ।

चडुलपल्लवुवेल्लिरतरलियजीहओ महुणिहाइ, पवियम्भइ माहवसीहओ ॥ १३९

जह जह दाहिणपवणओ णराण परिमुसइ मासल गयाइ ।

मयणगिणा समहियं तह तह संतावियाइं हिययाइं ॥ १४०

4. *Kuvalayamālā*, § 235, p. 145, ll. 5-8.

कइया वि कहिं पि परिमममाणो इमं असंबद्धक्खरालावरइयं चरिचयं
णच्चमाणो । अवि य —

यदि कश्चि विपश्चि न जातु सखे, यदि सर्कर सर्करला न भवेत् ।

यदि चन्द्र-मुनीन्द्रमनङ्ग चितः, यदि सोऽस्ति नमोऽस्तु नमोऽस्तु ततः ॥

5. *Upamitibhavaprapaṇcākathā*, p. 272-273, vv. 439-442.

प्रवृत्तास्ते तालारवं कर्तुम् । समवतारितोऽहं रासमध्ये । ततो मां नाटयन्तः
प्रारब्धास्ते मनुष्यास्त्रितालकं रासं दातुम्, कथम् ? ।

यो हि गर्वमविवेकभरेण करिष्यते, बाधकं च जगतामनृतं च वदिष्यते ।

नूनमत्र भव एव स तीव्रविडम्बनां, प्राप्नुवीत निजपापभरेण भूशं जनः ॥ ध्रुवकः ॥

* * *

पश्यतेह भव एव जनः कुतूहलं, शैलराजवरमित्रविलासकृतं फलम् ।

यः पुरैष गुरुदेवगणानपि नो नतः, सोऽद्य दासचरणेषु नतो रिपुदारणः ॥ यो हि गर्वः

* * *

शैलराजवशवर्तितया निखिले जने, हिण्डितोऽहमनृतेन वृथा क्लिप्तपण्डितः ।

मरिता च जननी हि तथा नरमुन्दरी, तेन पापचरितस्य ममात्र विडम्बनम् ॥ यो हि गर्वः

योऽत्र जन्ममतिदायिगुरुनवमन्यते, सोऽत्र दासचरणाधतलैरपि हन्यते ।

यस्त्वलीकवचनेन जनानपतापयेत्, तस्य तपनवृष इत्युचितानि विधापयेत् ॥ यो हि गर्वः

नो नतोऽसि पितृदेवगणं न च मातरं, किं हतोऽसि रिपुदारणं पश्यसि कातरम् ।

नृत्य नृत्य विहिताहति देवपुरोऽधुना, निपत निपत चरणेषु च सर्वमहीभुजाम् ॥ यो हि गर्वः

6. *Prabhāvakacarita* p. 60, ll. 11-15.

सूरयस्तत्सदभ्यस्तगीतहुं बडकैस्तदा । भ्रान्त्वा भ्रान्त्वा ददानाश्च तालमेलेन तालिकाः ॥
 प्राकृतोपनिबन्धेन सद्यः सम्पाद्य रासकम् । ऊचुस्तत्प्रतिबोधार्थं तादृशमीदृगौचिती ॥
 तथा हि—

नवि मारिअइ नवि चोरिअइ पर-दारह अत्थु (V. L. गमणु) निवारिअइ ।
 थोवाह वि थोवडं दाइअइ तउ सगि[हि] टुगुदटुगु जाइअइ ॥

The texts of the song as given in the *Prabhāvakacarita* and the *Prabandhakośa* (p. 16, l. 8) slightly differ from each other. The context of the event is differently given in the latter. There the line preceding the song is as follows :

ततो वृद्धवादी कालज्ञः कच्छां दृढं बध्धवा । घीन्दिणिच्छन्दसा क्रीडति ।

Prabandhakośa, p. 16, ll. 11-13

पुनः पठति नृत्यति च—

कालउ कंवळु अनु नीचाटु (?), छासिहिं खालडु भरिउ नि वाटु ।
 (v. l. छासिहिं भरिउ दइअडु पाटु)
 अडवड पडियउ नीलइ झाडि, अवर किं सग्गह सिंगु निलाडि ॥

7. *Caupannamahāpurisacariya*, p. 191, ll. 15-19.

वासुदेवो वि पासपरिट्टयिरिट्टणेमी णिग्गओ पेच्छइ य चच्चरिं ।
 सा य केरिसा ? —

अलिउलचलपम्हउडवियासियमुमणदले
 उम्भडमहुमासो वि वियम्भइ भूसियभुवणयलो ।
 उडिभण्णचूयणवपल्लवकिसलयसइलए
 ‘को पिउ वउजेवि वच्चइ ?’ कूविउ कोइलए ॥१४३॥
 जइ दइयविओए विवज्जइ ता कहे दुच्चरिउ
 इय चितए तो कलयंठिए ‘तुह तुह’ उच्चरिओ ।
 इय एव वियंभियमणहरवहुविहचच्चरिओ
 णिमुणंतु जणइणे लीलए वियरइ सच्चरिओ ॥१४४॥

8. *Karpūramāñjarī*, IV, vv. 16-18.

का-वि वाइअकरालहुडुक्का, रम्ममहल्लवेण मअच्छी ।
 देल्लआहिं परिवाडिचल्लहिं, चल्लिकम्मकरणम्मि पअट्टा ॥१६॥

किंकिणीकअङ्गणज्झणमण्णा, कण्ठगीइलअजंतिअतालं ।
 जोइणी व लअणच्चणलीलं, तारणेअररवं विरअंति ॥१७॥
 कोउहल्लवसजगमवेसा, वेणुवाअणपरा अवराओ ।
 कालवेसवसहासिअलोआ, ओसरंति पणमंति हसंति ॥१८॥

Notes

1. Date of composition, 878 A.D.
2. Date of composition, 869 A.D.
3. Date of composition, 906 A.D.
4. Date of composition, 1278 A.D.
5. Date of composition, 1349 A.D.
6. Date of composition, first quarter of the 11 th Cent.
7. A. N. Upadhye has suggested that the source of this episode is an almost identical incident given by Nemicandra in his commentary on the eighth chapter of the *Uttarajjhāyā* which is attributed to Kapila. The later is said to have converted five hundred robbers by dancing before them and singing a song which was the same as *Uttarajjhāyā* VIII.
8. For the text of the song see the Appendix.
9. Ch. 3, 62; KD. 2, 18.
10. See Ch. 4, 61; KD. 2. 22 Commentary. A. N. Upadhye, the learned editor of the *Kuvalayamālā*, identifies the metre of the Vastukas as Galitaka (with the Gaṇa scheme 5+5+4+3=21 Mātrās). But Yamaka, one of the defining characteristics of the Galitaka, is absent from the Vastukas under discussion.

In this connection it may be noted that the metre of the verse expressly associated with Carcarī dance at *Vikramorvaṣīya* IV. 11 (Sahitya Akademi edition) is Mañjarī, though the initial 6 Mātrās of the fourth Pāda are not divisible as 3 + 3.

Further we may also note that the Tribhaṅgī illustration at Ch. 4, 89.1 has Mañjarī as its first unit.

11. See VJS. 2, 4-8.
12. *Jānāśrayī*, 5. 60-68.
13. *Jānāśrayī*, 5, 69-72.
14. For the text see Appendix.
15. For the text of the *Carcari* see Appendix.
16. In this connection we may note that the metre of *Vikramorvaśīya* IV, 14 is also *Chittaka*. In the stage direction that precedes it, the associated *Laya* or the specific *Tāla* characterizing the rhythmic dance movement is termed *Bhinnaka*. VJS IV, 54 treats the *Chittaka*, and the metre treated next, with the form — ◡ ◡ × 3 + — —, is called *Bhittaka*, which may well stand for *bhinnaka*.
17. For the text of the songs see Appendix.
18. Ch. 2, 256; Jayakīrti's *Chandonuśāsana*, 2, 191.
19. The word *Ghīṁḍiṇī* (v. l. *Ghinnana*) occurs as the name of the song that accompanies the Rāsa dance in the Old Gujarati poem *Śāntināthabolikā* of Jineśvara-sūri (13th cent), written in Śrīmāla (Rajasthan):
 ता धिदिणि देविणु, रासु रमेविणु, बीवी लिउ नचवति ।
Prācina Gūjara Kāvya Sañcaya, p. 115, stanza 3 a.
20. For the text of the song see Appendix.
21. See Ch. 5, 26; *Samdeśarāsaka*, Introduction pp. 53-55 and the sources indicated there.
22. See *Apabhraṁśakāvyaṭrayī*, ed. by L. B. Gandhi, pp. 1-27.
23. The commentator of the *Caccari* has wrongly identified the metre as Kunda. (*Apabhraṁśakāvyaṭrayī*, p. 2). According to Ch. 5, 6 the Gaṇa-scheme of Kunda is 4 + 5 + 5 + ◡ — ◡ + — — and this is different from the Gaṇa-scheme of the Rāsāvalaya (Ch. 5, 26), viz. 6 + 4 + 6 + 5 (the last three Mātrās to be all short).
24. 'Caccariabam̐dhi viraiu sarasu, gāijjai Saṁtiu tārajasu,' *Jambūsāmicariya*. I, 4, 5.

25. Of these the first two are published in the *Prācīn Gūrjar Kāvya Saṁgrah*. The third is published in the *Prācīna Gūrjara Kāvya Saṁcaya*.
26. See, H. C. Bhayani, 'The Prakrit and Deśa-bhāṣā passages in Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa*', K. K. Handiqui Felicitation Volume, p. 167 ff.
27. A Sanskrit metre variously called Pañcacāmara, Vasantacāmara, Vasantacatvara etc. is defined in metrical manuals (Velankar, *Chandonuśāsana*, p. 293, no. 12.5). One of the last two names of the metre seems to be originating from scribal error.
28. Incidentally, we may note that there is considerable variation in nomenclatures we find in different metrical traditions and practices as reflected in metrical manuals, and this tends to create some confusion. Hemacandra's Dvipadī-khaṇḍa is quite different (*Chandonuśāsana* IV 85). He has cited as illustration *Ratnāvali*. The combination of Dvipadī + Gīti, which is called Duvai-khaṇḍalaya at *Kuvalayamālā* p. 52. ll. 12-15, is termed Dvibhaṅgī by Svayambhū (*Svayambhūcchandas*. p. 2-1). But according to the *Chandonuśāsana* IV 86, Dvibhaṅgī is Dvipadī + Gīti. However in his illustration of Dvibhaṅgī we find Dvipadī + Lalitā (*Chandonuśāsana*. IV 10). This Lalitā is called Gītikā in the *Janāśrayī* and it is different from Gīti (*Chandonuśāsana* IV 6). Further eventhough Uddyotana has called the song at *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 116. ll. 18-19 Duvai-khaṇḍalaya, it is just a Dvipadī without the following Gīti. One more occurrence of the combination of Dvipadī + Gīti we find at *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 94, ll. 8-10. References at *Kuvalayamālā*, Part II, p. 85.
29. The word is recorded in the form चिलीण्य as well as विलीण्य. The former seems to be the correct form. See H. C. Bhayani, 'Studies in Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*' 1966, p. 13, s. v. चिलिचिह्न (= *Studies in Deśya Prakrit*, 1988, p. 11-12); R. N. Shriyan, *A Critical Study of Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpa-danta*, 1969, no. 955.

REFERENCES

- Apabhramśakāvyatrayī, ed. by L. B. Gandhi, 1927.
- Upamitibhavaprapaṇcākathā of Siddharṣi, ed. by Chandrashekharvijay
Part 1, 1968; ed. by Peter Peterson, 1899 (pp. 721-722).
- Kathākoṣa-prakaraṇa of Jineśvara-sūri, ed. Jinavijaya Muni, 1949.
- Karpūramanjari of Rājaśakhara, ed. by S. Konow, 1963 reprint.
- Kavidarpaṇa (=KD.), H. D. Velankar, 1962.
- Kuvalayamālā of Uddyotana, ed. by A. N. Upadhye, Part I,
1959, Part II, 1970.
- Caupannamahāpurisacariya of Śilāṅka, ed. by A. M. Bhojak, 1961.
- Chandonuśāsana of Hemacandra (=Ch.), ed. H. D. Velankar, 1962.
- Chandonuśāsana of Jayakīrti, ed. H. D. Velankar, in Jayadāman, 1949.
- Jambūsāmicariya of Vira, ed. by V. P. Jaina, 1968.
- Jānāśrayī (=Appendix to Chandonuśāsana of Hemacandra), ed. by
H. D. Velankar, 1951.
- Prabandhakoṣa of Rājaśekhara, ed. by Jinavijaya Muni, 1935.
- Prabhāvakacarita of Prabhācandra, ed. by Jinavijaya Muni, 1940.
- Prācīna Gūjara Kāvya Saṁcaya, ed. by H. C. Bhayani, Agarchand
Nahta, 1975.
- Prācīn Gūjara Kāvya Saṁgrah, ed. by C. D. Dalal, 1920.
- Manasollāsa or Abhilaṣitārtha-cintāmaṇi of Someśvara, ed. bp G. K.
Shrigondekar, 1961.
- Vikramorvaṣīya of Kālidāsa, ed. by H. D. Velankar, 1961.
- Vṛttajātisamuccaya of Virahāṅka (=VJS), ed. H. D. Velankar, 1962.
- Saṁdeśarāsaka of Abdala Rahamāna, ed. by Jinavijaya Muni,
Introduction by H. C. Bhayani, 1945.
- Svayambhūcchandas of Svayambhū, ed. by H. D. Velankar, 1962.

5. ON CHATRA AND CALLI

1. Chatra : a Type of Uparūpaka ?

In the fifty seventh Kathānaka in Hariṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathā-kośa* (written in 931-932 A.D. in Vardhamāna (i.e. modern Vadhvān in Saurāṣṭra), called Aśoka-Rohini, the queen Rohiṇī while sitting in the palace-balcony in company of her husband, child and a nurse, happens to see on the road below a group of women giving customary public expression to the grief of somebody's death in their family. They had formed a circle and moving round, they were rhythmically beating their breasts and uttering wailing notes. Rohiṇī, who was quite lacking in any personal experience of sorrow, fails to really understand what the women were doing. She takes it to be some sort of dance or musical performance. She was well-versed in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata : Hence she observes : 'which type of dance performance is this ? It does not confirm to any of the five types, viz. Signatāka, Bhānī, Chatra, Rāsa and Dumbilī described by Bharata and usually performed by the expert dancers'.¹ The learned editor of the *Bṛhatkathā-kośa* the late, Dr. A. N. Upadhye has observed in his Notes (p. 383) that the readings giving the names of the five types are corrupt and he takes them to stand respectively for Sidgaka, Bhaṇikā, Citra, Rāsaka and Dombikā, on the basis of a text passage cited on p. 544 of M. Krisnamachariar's *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*. Here the identifications do not pose any problem, excepting that of Chatra with Citra. In various treatments² of the Uparūpakas known to us from works on Dramaturgy and Poetics we have no mention of a type called Chatra and hence Upadhye's understandable assumption that it was possibly the same as Citra. Unexpectedly, however, I came across a reference to Chatra in a Prakrit narrative work of about the seventh century AD., which fact vouches for the authenticity of the name Chatra.

In Dharmasena-gaṇi's *Vasudevahiṇḍī-Madhyama Khaṇḍa*,³ in the fifteenth Lambha, called Kanakavati-lambha, we have an elaborate description of the residential palace of Princess Kanakavati. Therein it is said that in the fifth hall of the palace a group of delicate maid-servants, all of the same age and beauty of form, putting on the same type of the dress, ornaments etc. were busy making the rehearsal of the Chatraka performance :

सरिसालंकार-वय-वत्य-लायण्णाणं छत्तय-प्पयोग-वावडाणं सुकुमालाणं चेदीणं वंदं ।
(p. 224).⁴

Regarding the form and character of the Chatra or Chatraka we have no information except the implication of the above-noted allusion that it was obviously a group dance. But its mention in the *Bṛhat-kathā-kośa* along with Dombikā etc., all of which are known to be Uparūpakas makes it likely that Chatra too was an Uparūpaka.

2. Calli : a Mode of Popular Dance

In the section on the Uparūpakas, while discussing Rāsaka and Nāṭyarāsaka, Raghavan deals at length with the passage in Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* (IV, vv. 11-18) wherein the Vidūṣaka describes in detail the troupes of danseuses and revellers performing on the occasion of Spring Festival. Besides the Daṇḍa-rāsaka, Rājaśekhara has referred there to the performance of a dance called Calli. Raghavan's passage⁵ on Calli I reproduce below :

Next, Rājaśekhara describes a dance called Calli which seems to be a division of the Nartakīs in two rows facing each other.

समंस-सीसा सम-बाहु-हत्या, रेहा-विमुद्धं अवराड दे'ति
पंतीहिं दोहिं लअ-ताल-बंधं, परोप्परं साहिमुहीड चलिं⁶ (१२)

Again,

का-वि बाइअ-कराल-हुडुका, रम्म-मदल-रवेण मअच्छी
दोल्लाहिं परिवाडि-चलाहिं, चलि-कम्म-करणम्म पअट्टा (१६)

We have in the *Abhinavabhāratī* the *Dombikā*, along *Calli* or *Calli* as occurring in the *Dombikā*, along with the playing on *Huḍukkā*. The *Huḍukkā-vādana* is associated with *Calli* by *Rājaśekhara* also.

‘कवचिन् नृत्त-प्राधान्यं यथा डोम्बिका-प्रयोगानन्तरं हुडुक्कावाद्यावसरः अत एव तत्र लोक-भाषया चिल्लि(चलिल)-मार्ग इति प्रसिद्धिः ।’

(अभिनवभारती, p. 168-169)

Cilli or *Calli* is thus a dance, *Nṛtta*, with the *Nartakī* playing on the *Huḍukkā-vādyā*, a drum.’

Raghavan has also noted from the dance chapter of the *Saṅgītaratnākara* *Cāli* and *Cālivāḍa* as two of the ten *Deśi* *Āṅgas* of the *Lāsyā* dance-type.⁷ He has further remarked that in his *Saṅgītasamayāsāra* *Pārsvadeva* has observed that the use of regional terminology with authorities like *Bhoja* and *Someśvara*, was based on the *Bhāṇḍika* (or *Bhāṇḍīra*) *Bhāṣā*. The *Saṅgītaratnākara* characterizes *Cāli* and *Cālivāḍa* as types of folk dances in which there were simultaneous movements of hands, legs, thighs and waist in the medium tempo.

In the *Apabhraṁśa* poem *Samdeśa-rāsaka* of *Abdala Raha-māna*⁸, written in about 1200 A.D. while describing the affluence, cultural richness and beauty of *Mūlasthāna* (i.e. modern *Multan*), the poet says : Somewhere were played flutes, *Viṇā*, tabours and drums; somewhere were heard the notes of songs in harmony with words and sounds. Elsewhere attractive and trained dancers, with plump and high breasts, moved performing *Calli*’ (v. 45). The actual reading there is *calla*, which, in the light of the above-noted occurrences should be *calli*. The *Sanskrit Commentaries*, ignorant of the meaning of *calli*, wrongly paraphrase the phrase *calla* (*calli*) *karamītiya* as *cala-cala śabdāṁ kurvantyah*.

Thus *Calli* was a popular dance-type, performed by women with rhythmic movements in accompaniment with the playing of the *Huḍukkā* drum, and in vogue in several regions from, say, 11th to 13th century A. D.

Notes

1. अम्ब सिग्नटकं भानी छत्रं रासोऽपि दुम्बिली ।
 एतान् पञ्चापि नृत्यन्ति नाटकान् नृत्यकोविदाः ॥
 एतान् पञ्चापि सन्तज्य नाटकान् भरतोदितान् ।
 नाटको भीरुभिः कोऽयं नृत्यते सादिकुट्टनः ॥
 (५७, १०५-१०३)

In 57, 103 the ritually wailing women are said to perform a Rāsaka (*rāsakam kurvatih*), probably in view of their circular, rhythmic movement.

2. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 545 ff.
3. Part I, ed. by H. C. Bhayani and R. M. Shah, 1987.
4. At the time of editing the text, the *Bṛhatkathākośa* reference to Chatra had not come to our notice. Hence we gave *chattaya* in the passage with a question-mark indicating our doubt about the correctness of the reading.
5. op. cit., p. 566.
6. I have given the original Prakrit verses in the place of the Sanskrit *chāyā* given by Raghavan.
7. op. cit., p. 590.
8. Edited by Jinavijaya Muni, 1945.



6. THE CHARACTERIZING FUNCTION OF VERSE IN SANSKRIT DRAMA

(1)

The use of prose and verse in the Sanskrit drama has received less discriminating attention as compared to its other aspects. The earlier category mistake of assessing Sanskrit drama by Western dramatic models has been corrected since long, and it has been recognized that the aims and objectives, and the consequent structure of the Sanskrit drama were basically different from those of the Western drama. The former was primarily and essentially poetic and this fact governed its use of prose and verse generally and with respect to each other.

Simple, conversational prose was used for the ordinary dialogue¹ but at times we also find descriptive passages in the highly ornate style of a prose Kāvya, though this is more frequent in the case of monologues. Verses are interspersed in the prose dialogue to such an extent that the medium of Sanskrit drama can be properly described as prose-cum-verse. The verse in Sanskrit drama is a basic constituent of the structure. Far from being decorative or adventitious (or even a harmful legacy of the epic source—as some would have it), it has got its definite and exclusive functions, for which ordinary prose just could not do.

We can broadly distinguish three functions of the verse in Sanskrit drama—besides of course, the conventional use of verse for the introductory Nāndī and the concluding Bharatavākya. (1) Verse is used to describe time, place and certain types of situations. (2) It is used to describe the mood, emotional impact or reaction of a character with regard to some happenings or the actions of other characters in the play. (3) It is used to describe from the viewpoint of some character present on the stage another character as it enters or is seen involved in some action or situation etc. Or else it may contain the self-introduction of a newly

1 But dialogue in verse was not unknown.

entering character. It should be stressed at once that these verse descriptions are never naturalistic, matter-of-fact descriptions. They are always poetic. It is true that the verses of the first category impart necessary information to the audience and serve as verbal substitutes for some of the present-day stage-properties and accessories. But the verses of this type as also of the other two types essentially build up the emotional tone and atmosphere of the dramatic action, and contribute substantially to the sentiments of the drama. Only a systematic and detailed examination of Sanskrit dramatic works from this point of view can reveal the full range of the functions of the dramatic verse and the high significance of its multiple roles. Here we have only a very modest aim of presenting a few observations mainly on the third and occasionally on the second type of the verse functions mentioned above, on the basis of a few Sanskrit plays.

(2)

For this purpose I have collected data from some of the plays attributed to Bhāsa, and from the *Mahāvīracarita*, the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Mudrārākṣasa*. In the following list I give drama-wise details of the characterizing verses.

Pratimā :

- | | | |
|----|-------|---|
| IV | 8 | Lakṣmaṇa's description of Bharata. |
| V | 16,17 | Rāvaṇa's description of his own power and exploits. |
| VI | 6 | Kāncukīya's description of Bharata. |

Abhiṣeka :

- | | | |
|-----|-----|--|
| I | 11 | Vāli's description of his own powers. |
| | 13 | Rāma's description of the fighting Vāli. |
| | 14 | Lakṣmaṇa's „ „ Sugrīva. |
| | 16 | „ „ „ the fallen Vāli. |
| II | 7,8 | Hanumat's description of Sītā. |
| | 9 | „ „ „ Rāvaṇa. |
| III | 2 | The gardner's description of Rāvaṇa. |

IV	6	Sugrīva's description of Vibhīṣaṇa descending from the sky.
	15	Lakṣmaṇa's description of Varuṇa.
VI	6	Vidyādhara's description of the fighting Rāvaṇa.
	7,10,11	„ „ „ „ „ Rāma.

Pañcarātra :

I	20	Bhīṣma's description of Duryodhana.
II	32	Brhannalā's „ „ Yudhiṣṭhira.
	33	Abhimanyu's „ „ Bhīṣma (in disguise)
	44	Abhimanyu's „ „ Arjuna (in disguise)

Madhyama :

I	4	The Brāhmaṇa's description of Ghaṭotkaca.
	5	The first son's „ „ „
	6	The second son's „ „ „
	7	The third son's „ „ „
	26	Bhīma's description of Ghaṭotkacha (unknowingly)
	27	Ghaṭotkaca's „ „ Bhīma (unknowingly)
	32	The Brāhmaṇa's description of Ghaṭotakaca before Bhīma.

Dūtavākya :

I	3	Kāñcukīya's description of Duryodhana.
	7,10,12	Descriptions of Draupadī, Yudhiṣṭhira, Arjuna, Nakula, Sahadeva and Śakuni as seen in the painting of Draupadī-vastra-haraṇa,
	42	Sudarśana's self-introduction
	47	„ description of Śārṅga.
	48	„ „ „ Kaumodakī
	49	„ „ „ Pāñcajanya.
	50	„ „ „ the Nandaka sword.
	51,52	„ description of the weapons collectively.

Dūta-Ghaṭotkaca :

I	35	Ghaṭotkaca's description of Dhṛtarāṣṭra.
	41	Ghaṭotkaca's description of Kṛṣṇa's heroism.

Kaṇabhāra :

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| I | 4 | The warrior's description of the armed Kaṇa. |
| | 9 | Kaṇa's description of Paraśurāma (reminiscence). |
| | 23 | Kaṇa's description of Śakra. |

Ūrubhaṅga :

- | | | |
|---|-------|---|
| I | 16-24 | Description of the combat between Bhīma and Duryodhana. |
| | 26 | The warrior's description of Balarāma. |
| | 29 | Balarāma's description of Duryodhana, lying mortally wounded. |
| | 36 | Balarāma's description of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. |
| | 40 | „ „ „ Gānhārī. |
| | 56 | „ „ „ Aśvatthāman's voice behind the curtain. |
| | 59 | Aśvatthāman's description of the wounded Duryodhana. |

Bālacarita :

- | | | |
|-----|-------|---|
| I | 3-4 | Nārada's self-introduction. |
| | 5 | „ description of Devakī. |
| | 6 | „ „ „ Kṛṣṇa. |
| | 21 | Garuḍa's self-introduction. |
| | 22-26 | Cakra's, Śārṅga's, Kaumodakī's, Pāñcājanya's Nandaka's self-introductions. |
| II | 4 | Kaṁsa's description of Curse (personified). |
| | 5 | Curse's self-introduction. |
| | 20 | Kārtiāyani's self-introduction. |
| | 22-24 | Self-introductions by Kārtiāyani's servants Kuṇḍodara, Śūla, Nīla and Manojava. |
| III | 2 | Dāmodara's description of the cowherd-maiden. |
| | 3 | Samkarṣaṇa's description of the cowherd-boy. |
| | 4 | Dāmodara's „ „ „ bull Ariṣṭa. |
| | 5-6 | Ariṣṭa's self-introduction. |
| | 15 | Dāmodara's description of Ariṣṭa killed in the fight. |
| IV | 2 | Dāmodara's self-introduction. |

	3	Samkarṣaṇa's description of the subdued Kālīya.
	5	„ „ „ Kṛṣṇa on Kālīya's head.
V	3	Kaṁsa's messenger's description of Kṛṣṇa.
	4-5	Cāṇūra's and Muṣṭika's self-introduction.
	8	Kaṁsa's description of Dāmodara.
	9	„ „ „ Samkarṣaṇa.
	11	Kṛṣṇa's „ „ the fallen Kaṁsa.

Mahāvīracarita :

I	16, 17, 18	Kuśadhvaja's description of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.
	35	Lakṣmaṇa's description of Tātakā.
	39	„ „ „ „ (wounded)
	43	„ „ „ the divine missiles.
II	16, 17	Jāmadagnya's self-introduction.
	19	Rāma's description.
	20	Description of Paraśurāma (offstage).
	23-26	Rāma's description of Paraśurāma.
	32	Paraśurāma's description of Rāma.
	36	Rāma's compliments to Paraśurāma.
	39-41	Paraśurāma's compliments to Rāma.
V	1-2	Sampāti's description of Jaṭāyu.
	3-4	Jaṭāyu's self-introduction.
	5	Jaṭāyu's description of Sampāti.
	20-21	Lakṣmaṇa's description of Rāma.
	33	Lakṣmaṇa's description of Danu.
	44	Śramaṇā's description of Vālī.
	45	Vālī's self-introduction.

Mṛcchakaṭika :

IV	4	Śarvilaka's description of Madanikā.
VII	4	Cārudatta's description of Āryaka.
IX	4	Ādhikaraṇika's description of Cārudatta.

Mudrārākṣasa :

II	12	The Snake-charmer's description of Rākṣasa.
----	----	---

III	3	The Kāñcukin's description of Candragupta.
	17	„ „ „ „ Cāṇakya.
	30	Candragupta's description of the indignant Cāṇakya.
V	13	Rākṣasa's description of Malayaketu.

Data can be collected on these lines from other dramas also.

(3)

An examination of these verses reveals their different types and characteristics. We can broadly distinguish the following categories. By means of such a verse (or verses)

- (1) a character already present on the stage describes another character which is just making an entry;
- (2) a character which has just made its entry describes some character already present on the stage;
- (3) a character making entry gives self-introduction;
- (4) a character on the stage describes either another character under particular circumstances or in a particular situation, on the stage or off the stage.

These different categories serve a number of dramatic functions :

- (1) The first and the third categories serve to identify the new character for the spectators.
- (2) The first and the second categories serve to indicate one character's impression and reaction with regard to another character, thereby preparing the spectators for the subsequent course of action as also for the attitudes taken by the characters, with regard to each other. They may also serve to indicate in what light the character is intended by the dramatist to be taken.
- (3) In a number of cases the situation is such that the character already present on the stage is a stranger to the entering character, and it describes the powerful impression the latter makes on itself. This serves to intensify dramatic surprise created by the subsequent recognition or identification.

- (4) The self-introductory verse indicates to the spectator what the character thinks of itself, what is its importance and how it may behave in the subsequent action.
- (5) The verse reporting the impression about another character or the account of some situation involving in the current happening on the stage (or off the stage) help the spectators to grasp the implications and to visualize the character or situation fully and vividly. That is why the descriptions in the characterizing verses are generally picturesque and poetic. Many of these verses possess a great literary charm, and even independently of their context, they present instances of beautiful poetry.

(4)

One more significant fact emerges from the limited data presented above. It is evident that the dramas ascribed to Bhāsa betray a strong tendency to use characterizing verses. We find a similar tendency in the *Mahāvīracarita* also. This suggests that dramas with heroic characters and heroic sentiment are more congenial to characterizing verses.

*

7. THE DHRUVĀS IN KĀLIDĀSA'S VIKRAMORVAŚĪYA

The thirtysecond chapter of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* (NS.) deals with Dhruvās. It defines and describes various types of Dhruvās, their characteristics as songs in the drama, their metres, contents and functions. It defines a very large number of metres in which Dhruvās were composed and gives illustrations for all of them. There are in NS. about one hundred and fifteen illustrations of Dhruvās. Their language is Śauraseni Prakrit. The text of these illustrations is badly preserved. It contains numerous errors, and requires to be reconstructed.

The general function of Dhruvās in the drama is to contribute at certain key-points to the emotional effect rather than the dramatic action. A highly striking feature linked with this fact is that the Dhruvā always refers to the state or action of a character on the stage. This reference is in the third person and the mode of expression is not direct but symbolic i. e. it is Anyokti or Anyāpadeśa in the parlance of Sanskrit rhetorics. The Dhruvā conveys to the audience, the observation or report of somebody off the stage, about the condition of some character that is present on the stage and that is in a critical or interesting situation. As such the Dhruvā is outside the dramatic representation (*prayoga-anāṅgatva* as observed by Abhinavagupta). As Raghavan says, the Dhruvās were inserted 'wherever the emotion or idea reached a degree of pointedness and needed effective expression.' He also says that 'Dhruvās were sung by musicians from behind the curtain'.

Bharata has given very detailed rules and elaborate conventions as to when, for whom and how Dhruvās are to be introduced and sung. He lays down (i) status, type, class, age and condition of the character, (ii) time, place and season relating to the situation, and (iii) the prevalent sentiment and emotion as the groups of criteria for selecting a particular type of Dhruvā for a dramatic situation.

NS. (GOS. edition) XXXII 352-373 describe the symbolic objects i.e. Āśrayas that were to be used for the Anyoktis expressed in the Dhruvās. This indicates their appropriateness according to the type and mood of the character concerned. The information is tabulated below :

Character Class	Symbol
(Superior : Male)	
gods, kings	sun, moon, wind.
demons, goblins	cloud, mountain, ocean.
violent beings	buffalo, lion, carnivora.
Siddhas, Gandharvas, Yakṣas	planets, constellations, bull.
ascetics	fire.
(Female)	lightning, meteor, ray.
	night, nectar, moon-light, lotus-plant, cow-elephant, river.
(Middling : Male)	swan, peacock, crane, stork,
	lotus-pond etc.
(Female)	step-well, creeper, female crane,
	peahen, doe.
(Inferior Male)	cuckoo, black bee, crow, owl,
	pigeon etc.
(Female)	female bee, female crow, female cuckoo etc.

Among the actual illustrations of Dhruvās given in NS. we find Anyoktis with the symbols like elephant, wind, male and female swan, peacock, cloud, moon, mountain, creeper, river, female crane, male and female bee, fire, sky, lotus-pond, night, sun, owl etc.

(2)

The fourth act of Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaṣīya* (Vik.), according to one of its two recensions,¹ is remarkable for having numerous Dhruvās in the NS. tradition. In the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature available to us there is no other work com-

parable to Vik. in this point. Velankar has shown² that there are twenty verses in Vik. IV, which are to be recognized as Dhruvās. Nineteen of them are in Prakrit (or Apabhramśa), and only one (Vik. IV 56) is in Sanskrit. All these verses are Anyoktis. As Dhruvās they can be analysed as follows :

occurrence (verse number)	language	type of Dhruvā	character	symbol
1.	Prakrit	Prāveśikī	Sahajanyā & Citralekhā	pair of female swans.
2.	„	Antarā	„	„
3.	„	„	„	„
4.	„	Naiṣkrāmikī	„	female swan
5.	„	Prāveśikī	Purūravas	elephant
6.	„	Antarā ³	„	young swan
12.	Prakrit mixed with Apabhramśa	„	„	Kalpataru
14.	Prakrit	„	„	elephant
19.	„	„	„	„
23.	„	„	„	„
28.	„	„	„	„
29.	Prakrit mixed with Apabhramśa	„	„	„
35.	Prakrit	„	„	„
41.	„	„	„	young swan
43.	„	„	„	elephant
48.	Apabhramśa	„	„	hog
54.	Prakrit mixed with Apabhramśa	„	„	ocean
56.	Sanskrit	„	„	Airāvata
63.	Prakrit	„	„	elephant
75.	„	Naiṣkrāmikī	„	young swan

Now NS. XXII 383-384 give the conventions about the languages to be used in the Dhruvā songs. As a rule Śaurasenī is to be used. But if the metre is Narkuṭa, the language should be Māghadhī. In the case of divine characters, which include gods and kings, Sanskrit could be used. In the case of human characters the language could be Ardha-Sanskrit, which meant mixed Sanskrit, according to one view, but general Prakrit, according to another. The actual illustrations given by NS. are all in⁴ Śaurasenī. On the other hand the Prakrit of most of the Dhruvās of Vik. is Mahārāṣṭrī. This fact combined with the fact that the Dhruvās in Vik. have most of the other characteristics required by NS. indicates that here we have essentially a continuation of the dramatic tradition that served as basis for Bharata's rules, although the use of Mahārāṣṭrī (and even of Apabhramśa in a few cases), instead of Śaurasenī, and of Mātrā-vṛttas instead of Varṇavṛttas can be looked upon as a change in the earlier conventions about the language and metres of the Dhruvā.

As noted previously, the language of Vik. IV 48 is Apabhramśa, and that of Vik. IV 12, 29 and 54 is Prakrit, mixed with Apabhramśa. Hence it seems relevant to inquire about the use of Apabhramśa in songs (or otherwise) in the dramatic and musical traditions.

In the fourth act of Vik. there are twelve Apabhramśa verses which form a part of Purūravas's speech. The fact that Apabhramśa also was used in drama in the subsequent tradition—especially in the Uparūpakas, which are chiefly based on song and dance, is borne out by a few Apabhramśa citations in the *Abhinavabhāratī* from some Uparūpakas of the Dombikā and Śiḍgaka types.⁵

The fact is that for songs accompanying dance, whether in drama or elsewhere, popular dialects were usually preferred from the earliest period. Earlier, the languages of such songs were Śaurasenī and occasionally Māghadhī. Later on Mahārāṣṭrī, Apabhramśa, post-Apabhramśa regional dialects, and the Dravidian languages like Kannada came to be used. In musicological texts

like the *Brahaddesi* and the music chapter of the *Mānasollāsa* of Someśvara, we find prescriptions (and in some cases illustrations also) for songs in numerous non-Sanskrit languages.

In this connection we may further note that in Bhoja's *Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa* (SK.), the illustrations of Ākṣiptikā and Dhruvā,⁶ two of the basic types of Śravya Kāvya, are in Apabhramśa (SK. under II 157.) Moreover the illustrations for the four out of the six varieties of Prekṣya, viz. Lāsya, Tāṇḍava, Śampā (of Śamyā) and Chalika are in Apabhramśa, and those for the remaining two varieties, viz. Hallisaka and Rāsa are in Prakrit (SK. under II 159). All these were songs accompanying dramatic or dance performances.

There is some indication in a ninth century text on Prakrit prosody that Dhruvās in Apabhramśa were in vogue round about that period also. In the *Svayambhūcchandas*⁸ of Svayambhū (c. 880 A. D.), the illustration of Antarasamā Catuspadī Dhruvā⁹ called Rāvaṇahastaka is a Gajānyokti. It is as follows :

pia-virahio, kaṇṇatāla-haa-mahuarao /
dubbhamtao, bhamai vaṇe vaṇa-kumjaro //
(VI 13 1)

(Sk. Chāyā :

Priya-virahitaḥ, karṇa-tāla-hata-madhukaraḥ /
durbhrāntaḥ, bharmati vane vana-kuñjaraḥ. //

With this we can compare Vik. IV 43.

So also, the illustration of Makarandikā is a Cakravākānyokti. It is as follows :

nisi-āgame, ṇia-sahaari-viraha-vasaṁgao /
dhuva-pakkhao, kamalāare bhamai rahaṁgao //
(VI 17 1)

Sk. Chāyā :

niśagame, nija-sahacari-viraha-vaśaṁgataḥ.
dhuta-pakṣaḥ, kamalākare bhramati rathāṅgaḥ.

With this we can compare Vik. IV 4.

Moreover the illustration of Māgadha-narkuṭi metre, a type of Khañjaka, is a Varāhānyotki (Sc p.) I 5 (1). That of Viślokā is a Bhramarānpokti (SC. (P), IV 4 (1). *Svayambhūcchandas* VI 37 is possibly a Varahānyokti and IV 5, 1 a Karabhānyokti, Music and dance were integral parts of the Classical Sanskrit drama. Dhruvās contributed significantly to the emotional and aesthetic effect of the drama.¹⁰ They played a central role in producing the emotional and lyrical intensity in the fourth act of the *Vikramorvaṣīya*.

Notes

1. The recension with Prakrit verses is accepted as original by Raṅganātha, Koṇeśvara, Bollensen, Pischel and Velankar.
2. H. D. Velankar, *Vikramorvaṣīya*, 1961, editor's Introduction, pp. LXIV-LXVII. Velankar has discussed in detail various problems connected with the Dhruvās of Vik. The references to Vik. here are to his edition. For the general character, nature and functions of the Dhruvā see V. Raghavan's article. 'Music in ancient Indian drama', The Journal of the Musical Academy, Madras, Vol. 23, pp. 84-89.
3. Velankar thinks this and the following are Akṣepikī Dhruvās, but in view of Bharata's definition that the Antarā Dhruvā is sung when one is in deep grief, or in swoon or out of his mind we can call them Antarā. 'Ākṣepikī is the Dhruvā for the switch-over to a changed mood or situation'.
4. Except the first three : which are in the shortest metres (every line of two or three syllables) and are in Sanskrit. They are more for the completeness of the treatment, and could have been hardly functional.
5. See 'Dombikā and Ṣiḍgaka', in the present collection, pp. 20-33.
6. It is interesting to note that this SK. Dhruvā is an Anyokti using Vyādha (hunter) as its symbol. The purport of the verse is that when the lion had left his den in search of some prey

like deer, the hunter got an opportunity and took away the pearls from the den. The veiled reference is to Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā, when Rāma had gone in search of the golden deer.

7. The references are to Anundoram Barooah's edition (1969 reprint).
8. H. D. Velankar, *Svayambhūcchandas*, 1962.
9. This term Dhruvā is somewhat different from the Dhruvā of the drama. In the Apabhramśa epic the verse which occurred in the very beginning of a Canto (Saṁdhi), and which also occurred usually in the same metre at the end of every section (Kāvavaka) of that Canto was called Dhruvā, Dhruvaka or Ghattā.
10. The form and function of the Dhruvā in later dramatic practice (e.g. in *Anargharāghava*, *Devicandragupta*, the dramas of Rājasekhara, the account in *Kuṭṭanīmata*) require a separate treatment.



8. BHAVĀI AND THE FOLK ELEMENTS IN THE CLASSICAL DRAMA

(1)

If we rely upon the legendary account of the origin of Bhavāi, the traditional folk drama of Gujarat, it cannot be dated earlier than the fourteenth century. The evidence of language, metre and the themes of the various 'Roles' (*veśa*) of the Bhavāi also support a date thereabout. But the term *bhavāi* itself was in vogue much earlier, though its meaning then was 'show' or 'spectacle' in general.

The earliest use of the word *bhavāi* is known from Lakṣmīcandra's *Sāvaya-dhamma-dohā*, an Apabhraṃśa verse composition describing religious conduct for the Jain lay follower. It is datable about the thirteenth century. Verse 77 of that work contains the following line (obviously it is a proverb) :

*'nirukkhai eraṇḍa-vaṇi kim na bhavāi hoi'**

'In a treeless tract, would not even a bunch of Eraṇḍas make a glamorous show ?'

Thus it is obvious that restriction of the meaning of *bhavāi* to a kind of dramatic performance was a later development. In an old Gujarati verse tale written in 1528 A. D., we find a mention of *bhavāiā* i. e. the professional performers of Bhavāi. And in a sixteenth century work on Sanskrit lexicography *bhavāiā* is given as the meaning of the Sanskrit word *bhrūkusa* (also spelt *bhrukūṃsa* etc.), which is further explained as 'male actor doing a female role'. We also find in works written round about the fifteenth century several occurrences of the verb *bhavāḍi* in the sense of 'to put up a good show', 'to show with pomp and eclat.'

* In modern Gujarati the corresponding proverb is '*ujjad gām-mām eraṇḍo pradhān*'. 'In a deserted village, the Eraṇḍa tree rules as the headman'.

Origins of the Bhavāī as such are shrouded in complete obscurity, but we can plausibly discern some significant resemblances and affinities to a few of its characteristic features and elements in the popular traits embedded in certain Classical and post-Classical Sanskrit dramatic and balletic forms. The elements of burlesque, farce and social satire found in some of the 'roles' (*veśa*) of the Bhavāī were also characteristic of the Sanskrit dramatic types Prahāsana and Bhāṇa. But for our purpose the Uparūpaka types of the Classical Sanskrit drama are more relevant than the Rūpakas. The Uparūpakas were predominantly balletic or operatic, and many of them had usually only one actor. In their form, subject-matter, characterization and language many of these types bear quite clear marks of earlier popular origin. Unfortunately the information available in old works of drama, the names, number, structure and characteristics of the Uparūpaka types is scanty, vague and contradictory, and all the early examples are lost. Moreover there seems to have been periodic changes in their forms and vogue. There are indications that some of the Uparūpakas made use of speech besides dance, singing and acting. Some new forms that developed in the post-Classical period were treated in medieval musicological works.

For the dance-based Uparūpakas like the Hellisaka, Goṣṭhī, Nartanaka and Rāsaka, song too was indispensable, and similarly for the song-based types like the Rāga-kāvya, Bhāṇa and Carcari (also known in some sources as Rāsakāṇaka or Nāṭya-rāsaka), dance also was absolutely necessary. The theme of the songs used in these types related the episodes from the early life of Kṛṣṇa or else it described the joys of the Spring season. In the type called Dombikā, a woman of the Domba caste accompanied by a party of singers performed before a king to win rewards by singing his eulogies. Its characteristic song had as its contents a request made to a prince by a Dūtī on behalf of her mistress, who was longing for a clandestine love-affair with him.

The type called Sidgaka had as its theme the heroine's reproach to the hero for once playing false to her.

The subject of Prasthāna was Pravāsa-vipralambha, and hence its characteristic song related to Prathamānurāga, departure of the hero and the descriptions of the Spring and the Rains by the Virahotkaṇṭhitā heroine.

Bhāṇa, Bhāṇikā and Preraṇa made symbolic use of the nature, traits and behaviour of animals to serve as instructive examples.

Preksaṇaka presented spectacles like Śiva's burning of Kāma, which was performed by a troupe of actors at some street-corner, public square or temple premises.

In several Uparūpakas, the language of the song that served as the text for the dance was not Sanskrit or Prakrit but Apabhraṁśa—a strong evidence of the popular or folk origin of these dramatic types.

(3)

The song constituent of the Uparūpakas is treated in musical works like the *Samgītaratnākara* and the *Sangīta samaya sāra*, while the dance constituent is handled by the works like the *Nṛttaratnāvali*.

Under the section on the country dances (*deśi-nṛtta*), Jāya Senapati's *Nṛttaratnāvali* (1253-54 A. D.) describes, over and above the dances Rāsaka, Carcarī, Nāṭyarāsaka and Prekṣaṇa, a few others named Peraṇī, Goṁḍalī, Bhāṇḍika and Bahurūpa. These latter types have arisen later than the former ones and they have survived in some form or other, in the folk traditions upto the present day. For example the Bahurūpa of the *Nṛttaratnāvali* continues to live today in the performances of the folk artist known as *bahurūpi* or *bahurūpiyā*. The Bhāṇḍika is still kept alive by the Bhāṇḍa community. The Goṁḍalī is found today in Mahārāṣṭra in the form of *gomḍhaḷ*, which consists of singing Povāḍās, Lāvṇīs etc. on festive occasions like marriage. It is also celebrated as a religious festival in honor of a goddess.

This Goṁḍalī has very interesting history. According to the *Mānasollāsa* (composed in 1131 A. D.), King Someśvara witnessed

the dance and musical performance of some dancer in the role of a Bhilla damsel at a Bhūta-mātrkā festival in Kalyāṇa, and he formalized it as a new dance type. He named it as Goṇḍalī because (so it is reported) the Bhilī was called Goṇḍalī in Manārāṣṭra.

Here ignorance and confusion seem to have played a part. The fact is that the word *goṇḍala* was current in Prakrit and Apabhramśa since at least the ninth century in the senses of 'uproar', 'tumult', 'noisy and confused crowd' etc., usually in the context of singing and music in festivals. Thereafter it came to denote such a festival, and shortly, mythical origins were invented for it. Jāya Senāpati informs us that originally the Goṇḍalī dance along with the music was taught by Pārvatī to an Apsaras named kuṇḍalī and hence that type of dance came to be known as the Kuṇḍalī dance. The *Saṅgīta-muktāvalī* goes one better. According to it the dance is called Kuṇḍalī after that designation of the dancer, who derives it from her affinity with the Kuṇḍalinī Śakti. These accounts give us some idea of how divine origins were invented for popular forms of dance and drama when they received acceptance of the elite and the consequent Śāstric codification.

Lastly we consider the account of the type called Peraṇa or Peraṇai. Peraṇa finds casual mentions in the *Abhinavabharatī*, but it is only in later works like the *Saṅgīta-ratnākara*, *Nṛttaratnāvalī* etc. that we find it described in detail. In the Peraṇa at the very beginning enters on the stage an actor with its grotesque costume and make-up, making ludicrous gestures. Being shaven headed, he was called *aṭṭa-boḍaka*. Next enters the chief actor called Peraṇī. His head also is shaven, excepting the Śikhā. He was besmeared all over with white ashes and small bells were tied round his ealves. In the fourth section or act of the Peraṇī dance, called Vikāṣa, this main actor performs a grotesque dance assuming the roles of a monkey, goblin etc., making wild and distorted gestures with his face, hands, belly and legs. Here it is obvious that the character of Peraṇī is modelled on a Śaiva devotee and his grotesque make-up and facial distortions remind us of the Gaṇas of god Śiva. But

the element of lampooning in the Peraṇi can be perhaps compared with the same in the Veśa (role) of Aḍavā in the Bhavāi. In this connection we may also note that the Telugu work *Basavapurāṇa* written by Somanātha tells as that the Peraṇi dance originally came from Saurāṣṭra.

Even this casual examination of certain Uparūpakas and allied forms with regard to the popular traits goes to suggest that our regional folk dramas with their varied forms and contents are made up of elements that in many cases reach back to the medieval and classical periods.

REFERENCES :

- V. Raghavan, Bhoja's *Srṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963, pp. 533-576.
- V. Raghavan, *Nṛttaratnāvalī* of Jāya Senāpati, 1965, Introduction, pp. 134-153.
- H. C. Bhayani, *Vāgvyāpar* (in Gujarati) 1954 (the note on 'Gomdhaḷ', p. 272-274)
- H. C. Bhayani, 'Dombikā and Śiḍgaka'. See the present collection, pp. 20 ff.
- H. C. Bhayani, 'Bhavāi-nā aḍavā-no vaḍavo' (in Gujarati), *Sanskṛti*, 1969, pp. 473-474.
- H. C. Bhayani, *Śabda-Parīṣilan* (in Gujarati), 1973 (the note on *bhavāḍvũ*, *bhavāi*, *bhavāiyo*, pp. 69-76).

9. THE CHARACTER OF ĀKṢIPTIKĀ

1. In the beginning of the Praveśaka of the fourth Act of Kālidasa's *Vikramorvaśīya* before the actual entrance of Sahajanyā and Citralekhā on the stage, there is a verse (पिञ्ज-सहि-विओञ etc.) which heralds the entrance of the characters and which is to be sung backstage. Technically this verse is Prāveśikī Dhruvā.¹ The stage directions following this verse are as follows :

सहजन्या-चित्रलेखयोः प्रावेशिकी आक्षिप्तिका ।

ततः प्रविशति सहजन्या चित्रलेखा च ।

Similarly after the Praveśaka and before the entrance of Purūravas, we have the Prāveśikī Dhruvā of Purūravas (गहणे गङ्गदणाहो etc.) followed by the following stage directions :

पुरूरवसः प्रावेशिकी आक्षिप्तिका । ततः प्रविशत्याकाशे बद्ध-लक्ष्यः सोन्मादो राजा ।

The problem is why these Prāveśikī Dhruvās are called Ākṣiptikā? What is the meaning of that term?

2. Koṇeśvara in his commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* explains Ākṣiptikā as follows :—

सहजन्या चित्रलेखयोः प्रावेशिकीमाक्षिपतीत्यर्थः । तथा च एवमाकारेण ते प्रवेशं करिष्यत इति सूचितम् ।

Similarly later : पुरूरवसः प्रवेशकालीनां रूपसंपत्तिमाक्षिपतीत्यर्थः । प्रवेशे भवा प्रावेशिकी । (p. 284).

From these explanations we gather that the entrance Dhruvās in the above two cases are called Ākṣiptikā because they indicate (*ākṣip*) the appearance, manner etc. of the character just to enter.

3. Raṅganātha, in his commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* characterizes Ākṣiptikā as a kind of song (*giti*) and cites its definition from Bharata as follows² :

चञ्चत् पुटादितालेन मार्ग-त्रय-विभूषिता ।
आक्षिप्तिकां स्वर-पद-प्रथिता कथिता बुधैः ॥

From these two accounts we understand that a Dhruvā is called Ākṣiptikā if it describes the appearance of a character and is sung in a particular manner with a particular Tāla.

Bhoja gives Ākṣiptikā as one of the six varieties of the Śabd-ālamkāra called Śravya. He defines it as follows :

अभिधित्सित-रागविशेष-प्रयोग-मात्र-फलं वचनमाक्षिप्तिका ।

(*Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* under II. 140-141)

This means that in an Ākṣiptikā song the words have no more function than to serve as a base for the particular Rāga that is to be sung. What is aimed at is a musical composition and not a poetic composition. Bhoja has given a verse as an illustration of Ākṣiptikā. It is an Apabhramśa verse which prays to the goddess Mahālakṣmī, describing the beauty of her features, her power and her blessedness.

Now several facts are noteworthy in Bhoja's treatment of Ākṣiptikā. He does not connect or confine it to the drama. The illustration given by him is a Stuti of Mahalakṣmī. Moreover, he mentions and defines Ākṣiptikā and Dhruvā separately as two of the six varieties of Śravya.

On the basis of the above given data Raghavan has attempted to ascertain the precise nature, and character of Ākṣiptikā. Bhoja's six varieties of Śravya are Āśiṣ, Namaskriyā, Vastunirdeśa, Nāndī, Ākṣiptikā and Dhruvā. Raghavan thinks that these kinds of Śravya Śabdālamkāra pertain to drama only and have little to do with poetry. Nāndī and Dhruvā are clearly associated with drama and the same may apply to the other varieties. Moreover, Ākṣiptikā, from its only two known occurrences in the *Vikramorvaśīya*, is actually seen to be connected with the Prāveśikī Dhruvā in the drama.

But this view of Raghavan has to face several difficulties. Raghavan finds it rather difficult to account for the illustration

of Ākṣiptikā given by Bhoja. Moreover Bhoja clearly says that these varieties of Śravya are Śabdālankāras because in their case the verbal text is primarily neither for visually presenting and seeing, nor for reciting and listening; but it is basically for singing and musically responding. Neither Koṇeśvara, nor Raṅganātha, nor Bhoja confine the Śravya to the drama. Consequently Raghavan is constrained to think that Bhoja's Ākṣiptikā was different from Raṅganātha's.

It seems that Ākṣiptikā was a musical piece. Its verbal text indicated some features of the person which was its subject (hence the name Ākṣiptikā) and it was sung in a particular musical mode with a particular Tāla. It could be used in drama or poetry. In *Vikramorvaśīya* Act IV two Prāveśikī Dhruvās are called Ākṣiptikā because the verse contains description of the entering character.

In Uddyotanasūri's Prakrit Kathā-work *Kuvalayamālā* (779 A. D.) there is a passage giving vivid poetic description of the characteristic atmosphere and activities of the evening in a city.³ At one place therein are described diverse modes of the offering of prayer and worship in the temples, shrines and sanctums of different deities and in the quarters of pious men; Cracking sounds of offerings and sacrificial wood being burnt in sacrificial pandals; of sombre Vedic chants in the Brāhmaṇaśālās; of charming *Akṣiptikā* songs (*manahara-akṣhittiyāgeyām*) in the temples of Rudra; of bells and Damarus from the residences of Kāpālikas; of beating of puffed up cheeks in the ascetic cloisters; of tabours and hootings in the street sanctums of Śiva; of the recitation of the *Bhagavadgita* in the Āvasathas; of hymns and prayers in the Jain temples; of the recitation of sayings suffused with compassion in the Buddhist Vihāras; the ding-dong of huge bells rung in the Durgā temples; the cries and cackles of peacocks, cocks and sparrows in the Kārttikeya temples; and the notes of women's songs and beating of drums in (other) lofty temples.⁴

Here Ākṣiptikā is referred to as beautiful musical compositions (*geya*) sung during the evening prayer offered in the Śiva temples.

We have also a second reference to Ākṣiptikā in the *Kuvalayamālā*. A Yakṣa girl is described as singing Ākṣiptikā during her worship of the image of Arhat Rṣabha (i. e. the first Jaina Tirtha-mkara) (*Kuvalayamālā*, p. 116, l. 11)⁵. It also gives the actual verse that was sung. The verse describes the holy feet of the Jina. (ll. 18-19).

These eighth century references are important for showing that Ākṣiptikā was used for prayers (Stutis and Stotras) by Śaivas and Jains. We saw that Bhoja's illustration of Ākṣiptikā is a prayer to Mahālakṣmī.

If we can find some more literary references to Ākṣiptikā, they may shed further light on its character.

Notes

1. See Raghavan, 1963, pp. 370-371; 604-606.
2. Raghavan, 1963, p. 606. Raghavan says that the definition is not from the text of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* as it is known to us to-day.
3. *Kuvalayamālā*, pp. 82. 31 to 83. 2)
4. डङ्गिर-तिल-पय-समिहा-तडत्तडा-सद्दं जन्न-मं डवेसु, गंभीर-वेय-पढण-रवडं वंभण-सालासु, मणहर-अस्खत्तिया-गेयडं रुद्ध-भवणेसु, गल्ल-फोडण-रवडं धम्मिय-मढेसु, घंटा-डमरुय-सद्दं कावालय-घरेसु, तोडहिया-पुक्करियडं चच्चर-सिवेसु, भगवणीया-गुणन-धणीओ आवसहा(हे)सु, सब्भूय-गुण-रडयडं थुड-थोत्तडं जिणहरेसु, एयंत-करुणा-णिबद्धत्थडं वयणडं बुद्ध-विहारेसु, चालिर-महत्तल-घंटा-खड्डहओ कोट्टज्जा-घरेसु, सिहि-कुक्कुड-चडय-रवडं छम्मुहालएसु, मणहर-कामिणी-गीय-मुरव-रवडं तुंग-देव-धरेसु ति ।
4. The edited text calls the verse Duvai-khaṇḍalaya. (Dvipadī-khaṇḍaka), but the Ms. P, reads *akkhittiyā* i. e. Ākṣiptikā) in its place. Duvai (Dvipadī) characterizes the metre of the verse, while Ākṣiptikā indicates its specific musical mode of singing.

Reference Works

Kālidāsa, *Vikramorvaśīya*, ed. H. D. Velankar, 1961.

Koṇeśvara, *Koṇeśvari* ed. H. D. Velankar, Annals of B.O.R.I; XPXVIII, iii-iv, 1957 (1958), 225-29.

Raghavan, V; *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963.

Uddyotana-sūri, *Kuvalayamālā*, Part-I. ed. A. N. Upadhye, 1959.

Postscript :

Śārngadhara's *Saṅgītaratnākara*, chapter 2, has treated numerous Ākṣiptikās, giving their illustrations and D. R. Widdess has discussed these in his Ph. D. Theses 'Early Indian Musical Forms, A Study of Examples in Notation from Sources c. 600-1350 (Cambridge, 1980), chapter V, entitled 'Ākṣiptikā songs from the *Saṅgītaratnākara*'. I am thankful to Dr. Widdess for making available to me that chapter.

9. THE DHAYALA SONGS

In Prakrit Apabhramśa and Post-apabhramśa Traditions

1. The Earlier Prakrit Dhavalas.

There is some evidence to trace back the beginning of the Prakrit Dhavala songs to the first century of the Christian era on account of some references found in manuals of prosody. According to Sch. VIII 18 (end of the 9th cent.), Sālāhṇa i.e. Sātavāhana had composed in quantity many types of Dhavalas. Under Ch. II 32 Hemacandra also remarks that one can get examples of various types of Dhavalas from the epigrammatic compositions (*ukti*) of Sātavāhana. He further states that he himself has aimed at giving just some idea of the Dhavala, not an exhaustive treatment. If we take this Sātavāhana to be the same as the author of the famous Prakrit poetic anthology *Gāhākosa* or *Saptaśataka*, who is assigned to the first or second century A. D., his Dhavalas could be only in the Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit. It is true that Svayambhū and Hemacandra have treated the Dhavala under the section on Apabhramśa metres and their remarks about Sātavāhana's Dhavalas appear as a concluding observation of their definition and illustration of the Dhavala. But Apabhramśa arose a few centuries after Sātavāhana. We can possibly reconcile this situation by assuming that the Apabhramśa Dhavala in its metrical form was a continuation of the earlier Prakrit Dhavala. It is significant to note here that in VJS. II 8-9 Virahāṅka (c. 8th cent.) mentions Sālāhṇa as a recognised authority on the treatment of the Dvipadī and the Dhavala.

Like Helā, Āvalī, Mañjarī, Vilāsini, Dvipadī and a few other metres, Dhavala was used in Prakrit as well as in Apabhramśa poetry. We have, however, no actual specimen of the early Prakrit Dhavala. If it served as a model for the Apabhramśa Dhavala, we can assume that it also was a type of short popular lyric—a festive song or a panegyric.

2. Dhavalas in the Apabhramśa prosodic tradition.

Several manuals of Prakrit prosody have defined, described and illustrated Dhavala.¹ The information they give obviously derives from a common source, granting that there is some difference in details. All the manuals treat Dhavala under the Apabhramśa section and all the illustrations of the Dhavala are in Apabhramśa. This indicates that these Prakrit prosodists knew Dhavala as a characteristically Apabhramśa composition-type. The following account is based on Sch., Chs., Ch., Chk. and KD.

The Dhavala composition is so called because it characteristically describes some eminent person under the guise of or in terms of *dhavala*, i.e. "a white bull of excellent breed". This means that Dhavalas are *Anyoktis* (symbols of the person who is described, metaphorical poems) in respect of their thematic structure.

Secondly a Dhavala can be eight-lined, six-lined or four-lined. The structure and names of the varieties are as follows :

The eight-lined Dhavala

Structure	Source	Name
(1) a, c : 4 + 4 + 4 + 2 Mātrās	Sch. IV 17 Ch. V 34	
b, d, f, h : 4 + 4 + 4		
e, g, : 4 + 4 + 3		
(or f, h : 4 + 4 + 2)	Chs. 22 Ch. V 34	Yaśodhavalā
(2) a, c, e, g, : 4 + 4 + 4 + 2	Ch. V 33	Śrīdhavala
b, d, f, h : 4 + 4 + 4	(borrowed at	
(odd lines rhyming	Chk. II 34)	
with even lines)		

The six-lined Dhavala

Structure	Source	Name
(1) a, d : 6 + 6 + 6	Sch. IV 18	
b, e : 6 + 6		
c, f : 6 + 6 + 4 or 5		

a, d : 6 + 6 + 2	Ch. V 35	Kīrtidhavalā
b, e : 4 + 4	Chś 23	
c, f : 6 + 6 + 4 or 5	Chk II 32	„
(a rhymes with c and d rhymes with f)		

The four-lined Dhavala

Structure	Source	Name
(1) a, c : 6 + 4 + 3	Sch. IV 19	
b, d : 6 + 4	Chś. 25	Bhramaradhavalā
(2) a, c : 6 + 4 + 4	Ch. V 37	„
b, d : 6 + 4 + 4 + 2 or 3	Chś. 24	
	Ch. V 36	Guṇadhavalā
(3) a, c : 6 + 4 + 3	Ch. V 38	Amaradhavalā
b, d : 6 + 4 + 4		

It appears from the above that the distribution of varieties for each of the three types in our three sources is as follows :

Svayambhū :	1, 1, 1
Rājaśekhara :	1, 1, 2
Hemacandra :	2, 1, 3

Svayambhū does not name the varieties. Rājaśekhara names one variety as Bhramaradhavalā. Hemacandra gives a name for each of the six varieties he treats. In this matter KḌ. follows Hemacandra. Hemacandra has illustrated all the varieties with his own compositions. Of the two illustrations given by KḌ., one is borrowed from Ch. and the other is patterned after the corresponding illustration in Ch.

All the metrical authorities tell us that besides the specific metres of eight, six and four lines (as described above), other metres were also used to compose Dhavala. Sch. IV 21 says that Dhavala and Maṅgala compositions were named after whatever metre in which they were composed. The anonymous Sanskrit quotations given by Chś. Ch. and KḌ. tell us that Dhavalas

composed in metres like *Utsāha*, *Helā*, *Vadanaka*, *Aḍilā* etc. are known as *Utsāha-dhavalā*, *Helā-dhavalā* etc. KD. following Chk. adds *Rāsāvalaya-dhavalā* and *Dohaka-dhavalā* to the list.

Of the six Dhavalas composed by Hemacandra as illustrations, only two, viz. V 35. 1 and V 36. 1 are *Dhavalānyoktis*—i.e. their mode of description is to praise a servant of unflinching devotion to his master and of indomitable spirit, under the guise of a strong white bull, who successfully pulls a huge load over a difficult track. The rest of the illustrations describe the great fame, glory and favour of a king. The Dhavalā illustration at KD. II. 32.1 describes the fame of Yaśoghoṣa-sūri. This suggests that besides being in the form of a *Dhavalānyokti*, a Dhavalā can be straightaway a panegyric for some eminent person.

To sum up the information we get from the Prakrit prosodists : Dhavalā was a short one-stanza poem. Its language was usually Apabhramśa, but earlier Prakrit Dhavalas were also known. It was eight-lined, six-lined or four-lined. These typical (and probably earlier) Dhavalas had specific, exactly defined *Mātrā* structures prescribed for each of the three types. But there were other kinds of Dhavalas for which various popular *Mātrā* metres were used. This rules out the use of some specific metre or metres as a defining characteristic of Dhavalā. The name and the definitions based thereon point to a thematic criterion : Dhavalas praise some great person under the guise of a white bull of good breed. This means that characteristically, Dhavalas are *Anyoktis*. But the prosodists have given such illustrations of Dhavalas also which praise a person without using the symbol of a white bull. The numerous and varied Dhavalas written by Sātavāhana were famous as models.

3. Dhavalas in the Prakrit-Apabhramśa poetic tradition.

In several Prakrit and Apabhramśa texts we come across a few actual examples of the Dhavalā.

In the tale of *Sthāṇu* and *Māyāditṭya* illustrating the evil consequences of practising deceit (*māyā*), inserted in Uddyotana's

Kuvalayamālā (779 A. D.), a Campū in Prakrit, Sthāṇu is described as hearing a Dhavala-Duvahaya sung by a Gūjara wayfarer while he was spending the night in a temple.

The verse runs as follows :

jo navi vihure vibhajjanau, dhavalau kaḍḍhai bhāru,
so goṭṭhaṅgaṇa-maṇḍaṇau, sesau vva jaṁ sāru (p. 59, 1.5).²

“That white bull who does not break down in a catastrophic situation, but pulls the burden through, is the ornament of the herd-station. The rest of the bulls are worthless”.

This verse consoled Sthāṇu who was down with the grief of his friend's disappearance. It is in Apabhramśa in the form of a Dhavalānyokti. The metre is Dohā. Uddyotana designates it as *Dhavala-Duvahaya* (p. 59, 1.4), which is almost identical with the designation Dohā-Dhavala as laid down by the Prakrit prosodists. It is also significant that the Dhavala-Duvahaya was sung by a Gūjara wayfarer i.e. a native of the then Gūjara-deśa in Western Rājasthāna.

In the Prakrit anthology *Vajjālagga*³ to be dated possibly in c. 10th century A. D., a whole section (no. 18) relates to Dhavala. It is called *Dhavala-vajjā*. It contains seven Gāthās (no. 179 to 185). All of them are Dhavalānyoktis. They praise the native dependability of the white bull to successfully pull the burden against all odds and even at the cost of his life. This shows that there was a tradition of composing Dhavalas in Prakrit in the Gāthā metre.

Vīra's *Jambūsāmicariu*, an Apabhramśa Sandhibandha on the life of Jambū written in 1020 A.D., has seven Dhavalas.⁴ All of them are Prakrit Gāthās (*Jambūsāmicariu* VII 6 1-7). Of these the first is similar to *Vajjālagga* 182. So it is quite likely that some of the rest may have been borrowed from earlier sources. Most of these verses contrast the great merits of the white bull with the worthlessness of a lazy bull. The sixth verse is the source of one of the two Apabhramśa Dhavalas cited by Hemacandra in his Grammar (see below).

In Hemacandra's Grammar⁵ we find that two Dohās cited as illustrations are Dhavalānyoktis. Hemacandra IV 340 (2) is an Apabhramśa rendering of *Jambūsāmicariu* VII 6 6. IV 421 contrasts the strength of the white bull with the laziness of bad bulls.

These examples show that from the eighth to the twelfth century there was a continuous tradition of composing Dhavalānyoktis in Prakrit and Apabhramśa, and for these Dhavalas the metres that were used were the Gāthā (in Prakrit) and Dohā (in Apabhramśa).

4. Dhavalas in the post-Apabhramśa literatures.

There is hardly any Apabhramśa poem which does not refer to the singing of Dhavala and Maṅgala songs in its description of festive occasions like marriage, birth of a son, triumphal return of a prince, the Dikṣā ceremony of a Jain monk or the ceremonial welcome accorded to him etc.

This literary convention continues throughout the period of the Old Gujarati literature, in which the stock descriptions of such occasions invariably mention the singing of Dhavalas and Maṅgalas.

Some Sanskrit narratives written in Gujarat and other regions of Western India during the centuries around 1000 A.D., also refer to the singing of Dhavala and Maṅgala on festive occasions like marriage. Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, while describing Rṣabhadeva's wedding, mentions singing of Dhavalas and Maṅgalas along with other ceremonies and customs which evidently reflected the then prevalent popular traditions of Gujarat. Hemacandra has given there two actual Dhavala songs. One was sung at the time of the reception of the groom at the gate of the marriage *pandal* (I 2, 835-840). More interestingly another one, a special variety of Vivāha-dhavala called Kautuka-dhavala (I. 2, 854-862) was sung for lampooning the best man, and mocking at his greediness for sweets etc.

Quite obviously these songs were Sanskrit versions of some actual marriage songs current in the contemporary popular dialect. The refrain of this Kautuka-dhavala is a tell-tale evidence for this. This kautuka-dhavala is the earliest precursor of the *phaṭāṇa* songs sung currently during traditional wedding in Gujarat. Women on the side of the bride's and the bridegroom's party compete in humorous lampooning of the opposite side by means of traditional and improvised songs, which sometimes do not shun even coarse or bawdy expressions.

The account of the Dhavala in the literatures of the Indian regional languages is a vast subject and I can do here little more than touching a few broad points and features. Further, my observations are confined to the Gujarati and Rajasthani literatures. The rich tradition of the Marathi Dhavalas deserves a separate treatment.

The Dhavala in the traditional Gujarati and Rajasthani⁶ literatures is a song, a panegyric, in praise of a person for whom some ceremonial occasion is being celebrated. Wedding songs constitute a special class of Dhavalas, and the Dhoḷs sung in the Vallabhaite Vaiṣṇava sect make up another class. Frequently the Dhavalas occur as wedding songs within a narrative poem⁷, but there are independent compositions also called Dhavala. The type of poems known as Vivāhala in Old Gujarati⁸ describes the wedding of the hero, and either these poems contain a Dhavala song or they are synonymous with the latter. At times the marriage described is not real but allegorical : a hero going to the battle front⁹ or someone to be initiated as a monk in the Jain order is praised in terms of a bridegroom in the Dhavala song¹⁰. The Vaiṣṇava Dhoḷs¹¹ are in praise of Kṛṣṇa, or of some Vallabhaite Ācārya, or even of a sacred place personified e.g. the Yamunā river. In the later tradition, which continues till today, the term Dhoḷ came to be loosely used even for poems about some episode in the life-account of a Purāṇic character or for those preaching worldly renunciation.

In his paper referred to earlier (see n. 6), Agarchand Nahta has given information about the general characteristics and function

of the Jain Dhavalas in Gujarati and Rajasthani literatures. Besides reproducing Hemacandra's definitions and illustrations of various types of Dhavalas, he has noted several Old Gujarati-Rajasthani Dhavalas composed from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, e. g. *Jinapati-sūri-dhavalā*, *Antaraṅga-vivāha-dha*⁰, *Kayavannā-dha*⁰, *Neminātha-dha*⁰, *Ārdra-kumāra-dha*⁰, *Rṣabhadeva-dhavalā-bandha-vivāhalo*, *Sāntinātha-vivāhalo*. He has also noted Dhavals like those relating to Uṣā and Sāvitrī currently sung on ceremonial occasions among the the Śrīmālī Brahmin community of Rajasthan. We may add that there are numerous other Early Gujarati Dhavala poems not noted by Nahta.

In several of his writings, K. Paramar has given an account of the various aspects of the Dhoḷ as it is current today in the general culture and folk-traditions of Gujarat, and he has published several collections of Dhoḷs especially from the Saurashtra region¹². The scope of the application of the term Dhoḷ (as compared with the earlier Dhavala) has become considerably extended so as to include Purāṇic and even social themes, and the lines of distinction between Pad, Bhajan, Garbī and Dhoḷ have become blurred*.

Abbreviations

- Ch. = Hemacandra, *Chando'nuśāsana*, ed. H. D. Velankar, Bombay, 1961 (SJS 49).
 Chk. = *Chandaḥkandalī* (known only from references in KD., q.v.).
 Chś. = Rājaśekhara, *Chandaśekhara*, in *Svayambhūcchandās*, ed. H. D. Velankar, Bombay, 1962, pp. 129-139.
 KD. = *Kavidarpaṇa*, ed. H. D. Velankar, Jodhpur, 1962
 Sch. = *Svayambhū, Svayambhūcchandās*, ed. H. D. Velankar, Jodhpur, 1962.
 VJS = *Virahāṅka, Vṛttajātisamuccaya*, ed. H. D. Velankar, Jodhpur, 1962.

* Paper read in the "Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes IVeme Section" at the invitation of Prof. Ch. Vaudeville (10. 05. 88).

Notes

1. See Sch. IV 16, 21; VIII 18; Chk. as cited under KD. II 32-1; Ch. V 32-40; KD. II 32, 34; Chs. 22-24 present Sanskrit translation of Sch. IV 16-19. Ch. V 32 1. and v. 81 under KD. II 32 reproduce Sch. IV 16. The two Sanskrit verses giving the thematic characterization and the mode of naming of Dhavala, which are given anonymously at Chs. 27-28 are also found cited at Ch. V 40 1-2 and at KD. 82-83 (under II 32-1).
2. Uddyotana Sūri's *Kuvalayamālā*, ed. A. N. Upadhye. Part I. Bombay 1959. (SJS 45).
3. Jayavallabha, *Vajjālaggaṃ*, ed. M. V. Patwardhan, Ahmedabad, 1969 (Prakrit Text Society Series, 14).
4. Vira. *Jambūsāmicariu*, ed. V. P. Jain, Delhi : Bhāratiya Jñāna-pīṭha, 1968.
5. *Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen* (Siddhahemacandram Adhyāya VIII) . . herausgegeben von R. Pischel. Leipzig, 1877-1880. Reprint Osnabrück, 1969.
6. See A. Nahta, "Dhavala-saṃjñak Jain Racanāem". *Bihar Thietar* (referred to in his paper mentioned next). Nahta has discussed Dhavala in some of his other writings also. See for example "Prācin Bhāṣā kāvyo kī Vividh Saṃjñāem". *Nāgarī-pracārīṇi-pratrikā*, 58, 4 (V. S. 2011 = 1955 A. D.), p. 426. Sk. Pk. *dhavala* changes to *dhaula*, *dhula* and then to *dhola* in Gujarati and to *dhaul* in Rajasthani.
7. For example, four Dhulas in Karmaṇa's *Sitāharaṇa*, published in H. H. Dhruva, *Paṇḍar-mā Śatak-nām Prācin Gurjar kāvyā*, Ahmedabad, 1927.
8. Nahta, Kapadia and others have discussed Vivāhalo. See A. Nahta's works cited in note 6; also A. Nahta's and H. Kapadia's articles in *Jain Satyaprakāśa*, Vol. 11, 12, 13, 14; A. Nahta in *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference*, Ahmedabad, 1953; M. R. Majmudar, *Gujarātī Sāhitya-nām Sarūpo: Padya-Vibhāṅ*, Vadodara. 1954. pp. 364-374.

9. For example the Sarasvatī-dhauḷa in *Bharateśvara-Bāhubalī-rāsa*, st. 142, 144, 146, 148, 150, 152.
10. For example the *Antaraṅga-dhavalā* referred to by Nahta in his paper on Dhavalā (note 6).
11. See F. Mallison, "Les chants *Dhola* au Gujarāt et leur usage pour la devotion Vallabhāite", *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 75. 1986. 79-103.
12. See especially K. Paramar (ed.), *Dholamāṅga*, Ahmedabad, 1974.

10. THE TARĀNĀ MODE OF SINGING : ITS ORIGIN

1. The mode or style of singing known as Tarānā in the tradition of the North Indian Classical music is generally supposed to be of late origin. This view is based on such accounts as we find in the *Āini-Akabarī*, which gives credit to Amir Khusarau for introducing the Tarānā type of *deśī* songs. It seems, however, that the students of the history of Indian Classical music have paid little attention to this problem. There is more than enough evidence to show that the Tarānā is quite indigenous, and its roots, like those of many other aspects and elements of our current Classical music, go probably as far back as the early centuries of the Christian era.

2. We begin with a cursory account of what is said in the old texts about Tenaka, Tenna or Tennā. A number of musicological texts in Sanskrit refer several times to a Gīti or Prabandh-āṅga variously called Tenna, Tennā, Tenā, Tenaka etc. Thus

- (i) Maṭaṅga's *Bṛhaddeśī* refers to *tenna* (VI 407) and *tenaka* (VI 417, 506). In VI 406, 43, 507, 509 and probably in VI 414 also we have to emend *tentaka* or *tenata* of the text as *tennaka*.¹
- (ii) There are numerous references to Tennaka (Tenna, Tena) in Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa*, written in 113 A. D. See for example, IV, XVii 339, 369, 390, 395, 398, 400, 402, 404, 556.
- (iii) *Saṅgītaratnākara* has defined Tena or Tenaka at IV 12-13, 17-18 as one of the six structural constituents or limbs (*āṅga*) of a musical Prabandha. *Tena* is also referred to at IV 182, 246, 266, 272, 277, 278 and 285 as an *āṅga* occurring in the recital of particular Prabandhas.

1. The Trivandrum text of the *Bṛhaddeśī* is corrupt at numerous places. It requires to be carefully reedited.

- (iv) In his *Bharatakośa*, M. Ramakrishna Kavi has cited definitions and explanation of Tenna from the musicological manuals of Haripāla, Raghunātha and Someśvara.
- (v) Śubhaṅkara has enumerated in his *Saṅgitadāmodara* twenty varieties of Pure Song, each of which is said to have six Aṅgas. One of the Aṅgas is called *tendaka*, for which a variant reading *tennā* is recorded.
- (vi) Koṇeśvara in his commentary on Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvāṣīya* explains Tenā giti with the help of some earlier authorities.

3. The *Bharatakośa* explains Tenna as a Prabandhāṅga. From the definitions given from Haripāla and others we gather that

- (i) It was a mode of singing Sanskrit and Prakrit songs.
- (ii) In that mode a Rāga was sung using only its characteristic Svaras and the word *tenna* or *tenā*.
- (iii) The use of the syllables *tena* was auspicious and conducive to welfare, because *tat* (as in the famous Mahāvākya *tattvamasi*) was equivalent to Brahman or alternatively, to Hara, Hari and Brahmā. Consequently using the syllables *tenna* (*tennakāra*) in singing and *tatta* (*tattakāra*) in the performance of a Tāla were bestower of prosperity.

The *Saṅgitaratnākara* and its commentaries too connect *tena* with the *tat* of the Mahāvākyas like *Om tat sat* and *tat tvam asi*, and emphasize its auspicious character.

4. According to the Sahitya Akademi edition of Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvāṣīya* (edited by H. D. Velankar), the 12th verse (i. e. *gaṇḍhummāia* etc.) of the fourth act is, as per the stage-direction, a Carcarī song. At the end of the verse the stage direction reads: *tena nartitvā*. The obvious meaning is that Purūravas performs here a dance expressive of the meaning and sentiment of the preceding Carcarī song. But there is slight difficulty. Grammatically we expect here the form *tayā* referring to Carcarī (feminine) instead of *tena* (masculine/neuter). The commentator Koṇeśvara has offered quite a novel interpretation of this stage-direction. He seems to read *tenna* instead of *tena*, because he explains the stage-direction

thus: 'Having performed a dance based on the Tena mode of singing (*tena-gītīl-nartanam vidhāya*). He then explains and defines the Tena as follows, citing several authorities in dramaturgy:

- (i) Tena is a particular mode of singing using just the two syllables *te* and *na*.
- (ii) Matrgupta says that by employing the Tena mode of singing on the dramatic stage, one reaches the abode of Viṣṇu. The Gods Vāyu, Brahmā, Hara and Ananta are also propitiated, because in the syllables *tena* the sound *t* represents Vāyu, *e* Brahmā, *n* Śiva and *a* Viṣṇu.
- (iv) The commentary of Sāhasāṅga (? Sāhasāṅka) says that the Tena is to be used along with the Dhruvā.
- (v) Because it has an auspicious character, the Tena is to be usually performed in the beginning of the Nāndī, but it is seen to have been also used along with the Dhruvā in many other places in the drama.

5. The 48th Canto (Saṁdhi) of the *Paumacariya*, an Apabhramśa epic on the Jain version of the Rāmāyaṇa narrative that was written by Svayambhū in the ninth century A. D., describes how Hanumat defeated successively Āśālī, Vajrāyudha and Laṅkāśundarī, who guarded the fort of Laṅkā. Each of the fifteen sections (Kaṭavaka) of that Canto opens with a fourlined Dhruvaka in the Jambheṭṭiyā metre, and at the end of every second and fourth line of the Dhruvaka (each of which is again divided into two equal parts), there is given *tena tena tena cittem* as the refrain. This obviously indicates that the opening stanza of all the fifteen Kaṭavakas was to be sung also in the Tena mode.

6. From all this it is quite clear that in the Tena-gīti, the particular Rāga was to be sung without using any other verbal text except the repeated syllables *tena*, *tenā* or *tennā*. Now we know that in the Tarānā style *tana*, *tenā*, *terenā*, *derenā* etc. are among the most customary syllables used. The above-given description and characteristics of the Tenā force us to conclude that basically it had the same form and function as the Tarānā. As

the *Bṛhaddeśi* shows, the Tenā mode was in vogue for various musical Prabandhas and this finds support also from Śubhaṅkara's manual referred to earlier. In the later dramatic practice, a convention developed according to which the Tenā mode was to be used for singing the Dhruvā in the opening Nāndī of the drama, but from Kṛṣṇeśvara's remark it is clear that the Tenā was used at other places also in the drama. It is but natural that over the centuries some minor changes and variations might have been developed in the Tenā style (e. g. use of various other syllables besides *te* and *na*).

7. The form *tennā*, with interpolation of *r* in the first syllable would give the form *trennā*. In Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa some words came to be pronounced with an *r* interpolated in the initial syllable. Hemacandra has noted it for Apabhraṁśa (*Siddhahema*, VIII iv 399; *abhūto'pi kvacit*). Hindi, Gujarati and other New Indo-Aryan languages also have some words with an interpolated *r* in the first syllable. Note for example Sanskrit *koṭi*, Prakrit *koḍi*, Hindi, Gujarati *karoḍ* 'crore'; Sk. *śāpa*, Hindi *sarāp*, Guj. *śrāp*; Sk. *śāṇa*, Pk. *sāṇa*, Guj. *sarāṇ*, etc. *trennā*, thus derived from *tennā*, later changed to *tarenā*, or *tarāna*. South Indian *thillanā* also derives from the same source.

8. Lastly I may draw attention to an occurrence of Tennā in a very interesting context. In the third Kaḍavaka of the 34th Saṁdhi of Svayambhū's *Paumacariya* (referred to above), in the description of Indra's extraordinary pomp and glory, it is said that Hahā, Huhu, Tumburu, Nārada, Tejjā and Tennā served Indra as his court musicians. Thus it seems that by the ninth century, Tennā was believed to have been a divine female singer in a troupe which performed at the celestial court of Indra and which included such esteemed mythical figures as Hāhā, Huhu, Tumburu and Nārada. Regarding the remaining member Tejjā, we are completely in the dark. But the pair of Tejjā and Tennā reminds us of the legendary singers Tānā and Riri, the two sisters supposed to have flourished at Vadnagar in Gujarat and helped Tānasena in a critical situation.

To conclude, the evidence presented here shows that the Tarānā is unquestionably of indigenous origin and throughout the long history of our Classical music, it has been a current and well-known mode of singing.

References

- Matāṅga, *Bṛhaddeśi*, ed. by K. Sambasiva Sastri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. 94.
- Someśvara, *Manasollāsa*, ed. by G. R. Shrigondekar, GOS. No. 138, 1961.
- Śārṅgadeva, *Saṅgītaratnākara*, II, ed. Subrabmanya Sastri and V. Krishnamācārya, Adyar Library Series No. 43, 1959.
- M. Ramakrishna. Kavi, *Bharatakośa*, Venkateśvara Oriental Series No. 30, 1951.
- Subhaṅkara, *Saṅgītaḍāmodara*, ed. by G. N. Sastri and G. G. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. 11, 1960.
- Koṇeśvara, *Vikramorvaśi-toṭaka-Viveka*, ed. by H. D. Velanker (under the title 'Vikramorvaśiya-Koṇeśvari'), Annals (B. O. R. Institute), 38, 3-4, 256-298, 1958.
- Kālidāsa, *Vikramorvaśiya*, ed. by H. D. Velankar, 1961.
- Svayambhūdeva, *Paumacariya*, ed. by H. C. Bhayani, Singhi Jain Series No. 34, 36, 1953, 1960.

12. SOME EARLIEST LITERARY REFERENCES TO THE SĀRAṅGĪ

It appears that the *Saṅgītaratnākara* of Śaraṅgadeva, composed in the first half of the thirteenth century A.D., is the earliest musicological work to mention the Sāraṅgī as a type of stringed instrument. The Sāraṅgī figures here in a list of some twenty-one stringed instruments beginning with the *Vīṇā*.¹ The relevant line is as follows :

सारङ्गयाद्यावन्नीत्यादेस्ततवाद्यस्य वादकाः ।

(*Saṅgītaratnākara*, III. 215)

Two Prakrit works of Jain Kathā (religious narrative) literature contain incidental references to the Sāraṅgī, and these are important in that those works are earlier than the *Saṅgītaratnākara*. One of these works is Lakṣmaṇagaṇi's *Supāsaṅgāhaṇcariya*, composed in 1145 A. D. (1199 V. S.). It contains three references to the Sāraṅgī. In the tale of Maṇisimha, two Vidyādhariś are described as singing in a Jain temple, with Sāraṅgī accompaniment. The relevant verse is as follows :

पूड्य जिणयडिमाओ भत्तीए वंदिऊण विहिसारं ।
सारंगीगयगेयज्झुणीए गायंति गीयाइं ॥५७॥

(p. 132, v. 57)

[‘Having worshipped the Jina images with devotion and performing *vandana* with proper ceremony, they were singing songs accompanied by the musical notes of the Sāraṅgī’.]

Further in the same narrative, the musical notes of the Sāraṅgī are said to be drowned in the bustle created by the crowd of Vidyādhara-s rushing in for worship :

तो तेण कलयलेणं सारंगिश्रम्मि अवलविज्ज ते ।
पउमावईय भवणे सन्दणं ताड गायंति ॥६०॥

(v. 60)

[‘As that bustle was drowning the notes of the Sāraṅgī, they moved to the shrine of Padmāvatī and continued to sing there’.]

In the third reference, it is said that when the two *Vidyādhari*-s saw the extremely handsome *Vidyādhara* princess, Sena and Viṣṇa, they were so wonderstruck that the Sāraṅgī-s dropped from their hands.³

ताओ-वि ताण रुवं पिच्छंतीओ तहाहया तेण ।

सारंगीओ कराओ पडियाउ-वि जह न चेयंति ॥६४॥ (v. 64)

[‘They, too, gazing at their handsome form were so struck by it that they were not even conscious of the Sāraṅgī-s dropping from their hands.’]

Another similar work of Jain religious tales takes the Sāraṅgī still a century earlier. There are two references to the Sāraṅgī in Jineśvarasūri’s *Kathākoṣaparakaraṇa*, composed in 1052 A. D. (1108 V. S.).

The first reference occurs in a passage describing a dance performance in the tale of Sūrasena, illustrating the religious merits of Jina worship. The relevant verse is as follows :

वीणा-तिसरिय-सारंगियाइसंमीसकागलीगीयं ।

गिज्जइ वेणुरवो-वि हु उच्छलइ तदंतरालेसु ॥

(*Kathākoṣaparakaraṇa*, p. 30, 1-30)

[‘Kākalī song, blended with the notes of the *Viṇā*, *Trisarikā*, Sāraṅgī etc., was sung. The notes of flute, too, shot up intermittently through these notes’.]

The second reference occurs in the tale of *Simhakumāra*, illustrating the religious merits of singing a hymn to the Jina. The concerned passage⁴ is otherwise also quite important in the context of the history of the science of music.

While classifying various types of music, the Sāraṅgī is mentioned among the stringed instruments as follows :

तिसमुट्ठाणं गंधर्वं । तं जहा-तंति-समुत्थं, वेणु-समुत्थं, मणुय-समुत्थं च ।

तत्थ तंति-समुत्थं वीण-तिसरी-सारंगियाइ अण्णेमविहं ।

[‘Gāndharva (melodic music) originates from three sources as follows : from a string, from a bamboo, from a human being.

Of these, that which originates from a string is of several types, for instance produced by the Viṇā, Trisarī, Sāraṅgī, etc.]

Foot-notes :

1. The *Saṅgitaratnākara* gives a detailed description of various musical instruments in Chapter Six, but the *Sāraṅgī* finds no mention there. The afore-mentioned reference to the *Sāraṅgī* is duly given in the Index to Vol. II.
2. Attention to this was drawn by me in the *‘Quartely Journal of the National Centre for the Performing Arts*, X. I. 1981, pp. 49-50.
3. The *Pāia-saddamahāṇavo* has noted the word under this reference.
4. This passage is historically important as it touches upon some well-known topics in the theory of music. It is reproduced in Sanskrit verse by Munisundarasūri in his *Jayānanda-kevalicarita* (composed in c. 1430 A. D.). Its prose recast was made by Padmavijaya in 1802 A.D.

✱

Reference Works

- Saṅgitaratnākara* of Śārṅgadeva, Vol. II, edited by S. Subrahmanya Sastri and V. Krishnanacharya, Adyar Literary Series, 43, 1959.
- Supāsaṇāhacariya* of Lakṣmaṇagaṇi, edited by H. T. Sheth, 1919.
- Kāthākoṣaprakaraṇa* of Jineśrvarasūri, edited by Muni Jinavijaya, Singhi Jain Series, 11, 1949.
- Jayānanda-kevalicarita* of Munisundarasūri, 1938 (1933 V. S.)
-

13. SOME EARLY LITERARY REFERENCES TO THE RĀVAṆAHASTA

The following few notes are meant to supplement the historical information about the stringed musical instrument called Rāvaṇa-hasta given by Joep Bor.¹ Incidentally they also will suggest some modification of Bor's observations on the subject.

In the Jain version of the Rāmāyaṇa, Vāli, a Vidyādhara ascetic, substitutes Lord Śiva in the episode of the lifting of Mount Kailāsa by Rāvaṇa. According to Vimalasūri's *Paumacariya*, the earliest available Jain Rāmāyaṇa, the chastened Rāvaṇa apologized to Vāli and went to the near-by temples to offer worship to the Jinas. He cut open his arm, drew out the sinews which he used as strings for the Viṇā he fashioned and played upon to accompany the hymn he started to sing in praise of the Jinas (*Paumacariya*, IX, 87-89). The date of the *Paumacariya* is a matter of controversy, but it cannot be later than the sixth century. Accordingly it presents a version which is earlier than that we find in the poems of the Southern Śaivaite saints.² Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa*, a Sanskrit recast of Vimalasūri's poem dated 677 A. D., and Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*, dated 12th cent. A. D., refer to the Viṇā fashioned by Rāvaṇa on this occasion as *bhuja-viṇā*.³

Svayambhū's *Paumacariya* is an Apabhraṃśa epic having Raviṣeṇa's poem as one of its sources. It is assigned to the fourth quarter of the ninth century. In its version of the episode of Rāvaṇa's chastisement by Vāli, it describes the worship of the Jinas performed by Rāvaṇa with the following details of Rāvaṇa's musical performance on the occasion :

After offering the worship Rāvaṇa began to sing sweet, enchanting music which had the seven notes, Ṣaḍja, Ṛṣabha, Gandhāra,

Madhyama, Pañcama, Dhaivata and Niṣāda; which was marked by Mūrchanā, Krama, Kampa and the three Grāmas; which had the accompaniment of the Rāvaṇahastaka; which had Alamkāras, sweetness of notes, aesthetic charm and sophistication; which had the ascending scale, the descending scale, Sthāyin and Sañcārin; which was characterized by Tilaka (melody), lower and upper octaves, Tānas and smooth melodiousness; which was like a bow in that it was endowed with *jīva* (i.e. 1. bowstring. 2. the dominant note).⁴

Two things are noteworthy in this account. Firstly, the instrument providing accompaniment to Rāvaṇa's vocal recital, which was called Viṇā in the earlier sources (which have been also followed in this matter by some later accounts), is called Rāvaṇahastaka. The name obviously derives from the myth of the instrument's creation. Secondly the music offered is not some sort of folk music. It is rather highly cultured and sophisticated music, the same type that has been codified in musicological texts. This means that this Rāvaṇahastaka of the ninth century had already secured a place in the elitist music.⁵

In another passage of the same text, describing similarly Rāvaṇa worshipping the Jina, the former is described as singing a Maṅgala song⁶ while playing on the Rāvaṇahastaka (LXXI, vi. 18). In this description of the festival of Jina-worship, the following traditional list of musical instruments is given: Mukunda, Nandi, Mardala, Huḍukkā, Dhakkā, Kāhalā, Ruñjā, Bherī, Jhallarī, Daḍikkā, Pāṇi-kartarī, Dardura, Tāla, Śaṅkha, Daundā, Ḍakka, Taṭṭarī, Jhuṇakka, Bhambhā, Jhimkiri, Vavvīsa, Vamśa, Kāṁsyikā, Trisarī, Viṇā and Pāvikā.

Svayambhū (and following him, Rājasekhara and Hemacandra) have defined in their manuals of prosody an Apabhramśa metre called Rāvaṇahastaka. It is of the Antarasamā Catuspadī type, with each of its half containing 7+13 Mātrās. The metre was generally used for the Ghattā (i.e. the concluding piece) of a Kaḍavaka (i.e. a verse paragraph) of an Apabhramśa Sandhibandha

(i.e. an epic poem).⁷ From the illustration of the Rāvaṇahastaka metre given by Svayambhū, it however appears that the metre was also used for the Dhruvās in the drama. The fact that a particular Apabhramśa metre is called Rāvaṇahatthaya presupposes possibly two things : (1) The legend of Rāvaṇa's lifting up of Mount Kailāsa (or Aṣṭāpada for the Jainas) and his fashioning of the peculiar chordophone. (2) An Apabhramśa poetic composition that used for the first time to describe that episode in a metre that had 7 + 13 Mātrās in each half.

The verse-example given in the *Chandonuśāsana* to illustrate the Rāvaṇahastaka metre can be translated as follows :— 'Taking Viṇā and holding Rāvaṇahastaka in their hands, the gods performed the Samahasta (hand-pose in dancing) on the occasion of the ceremonial bathing of the Jina.' Apparently the theme of the verse derives from the description of Rāvaṇa's Jina-worship referred to above.

In the Paryāya Commentary on this verse of the *Chandonuśāsana*, the word *Rāvaṇahatthaya* is explained as follows :

रावणहस्तकः आतोय', यत् पुरा दशस्येनाष्टापदे जिनेन्द्राणामग्रे स्वहस्त-
नसामुत्पाद्य वादितं त्रितन्त्रीरूपं वृद्धपंकं (१) वाद्यम् ।

This means, 'Rāvaṇahastaka is a musical instrument, which after first plucking out sinews from his own arm, was played by Rāvaṇa, on the Aṣṭāpada in front of the Lords of the Jinas. *It has three chords and is.....(?)*.'

The second characterizing adjective in the original text, viz. वृद्धपंकं is obscure. Most probably the text here is corrupt. We are not sure if we can emend it as बद्धतुंब' ('provided with a gourd') or something similar. The date of the Paryāya commentary is unknown. The manuscript is dated 1659 V. S. i.e. 1603 A.D.

Regarding the early references to Sāraṅgī in the Prakrit literature of the Jainas, Bor observes :⁸ 'Apparently the Sāraṅgī played an important role in Jain religious music during the 11th and 12th centuries, and like its modern counterpart, it was used to accompany singing. The fact that it is first mentioned in popular narra-

tives which were written in Prakrit, the language of the masses, seems to indicate that the Sāraṅgī was primarily an instrument of folk and religious music.

Here we should point out that the Prakrit works of Jineśvara-sūri and Lakṣmaṇagaṇi wherein the earliest reference to Sāraṅgī occur, as also the Apabhraṁśa epic of Svayambhū which is the earliest work mentioning the Rāvaṇahasta, are written in a language which is considerably ornate and stylized. In the matter of sophistication these works cannot be distinguished from the Sanskrit works of their age. The literary Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa used in these works had long ceased to be the 'language of the masses'. The occurrence of Sāraṅgī and Rāvaṇahasta in these text cannot be taken as indicating primarily the folk character of those instruments, and we have already pointed out the elitist character of the Jain religious music in which they have been mentioned as figuring. It seems that, although originally they were folk instruments, they later on secured a place in elitist musical performance.

Notes

1. The Voice of the Sarangi, pp. 40-47.
2. The Voice of the Sarangi, p. 43.
3. *Padmapurāṇa*, IX, 176; *Triṣaṣṭi* VII, ii. 267. See also Bulcke, pp. 643-644.
4. Svayambhū, *Paumacariya*, XIII, ix. 8-10; X, 1-3.
5. In the account given, however, in the *Triṣaṣṭi* Rāvaṇa's singing on the occasion is said to be *grāmarāgaramya* 'charming due to the use of the folk melodies', to which he provided accompaniment with the *bhuja-viṇā*. (VII, ii, 268).
6. For the Maṅgala songs see *Svayambhūcchandas*, IV, 20-21; VIII, 30; *Chandonuśāsana*, V, 40.
7. See *Svayamcūcchandas*, VI, 13; *Chandaḥśekhara*, V. 47; *Chandonuśāsana*, VI, 19.6.
8. The Voice of the Sarangi, p. 51.

Reference Works

Camil Bulcke, *Rām-kathā* (in Hindi)², 1962.

Joep Bor, 'The Voice of the Sarangi,' *Quarterly Journal of the National Centre for the Performing Arts*, 15, 3-4; 16, 1, 1986-87.

Hemacandra, *Chandouśāsana*, Singhi Jain Series, No. 49, 1961.

Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*, The Jain Dharmaprasāraśabhā edition.

Rajaśekhara, *Chandaḥkośa* (given at the end of the *Svayambhūcchandas*).

Svayambhū, *Paumcariya*, Singhi Jain Series, No. 36, 1960.

Svayambhū, *Svayambhūcchandas*, Rajasthān Purātan Granthamālā, No. 37, 1962.

Vimalasūri, *Paumcariya*, Prakrit Text Series, No. 6, 1962, No. 12, 1968.

IV

14. JAIN LITERATURE AND PERFORMING ARTS

Preliminary Observations

Jain literature is a matter of continuous literary activity of some twenty-five hundred years, embracing eight or nine different languages. Apart from its staggering voluminousness, its variety and richness are quite imposing. Other significant facts about it are that much of it (especially the innumerable tales and narratives) relates to the middle and lower strata of society, the subject-matter has usually been drawn from the ordinary life of people and frequently the treatment is considerably realistic. Quite obviously, therefore, Jain literature can serve as a highly fruitful source of information for all the periods and aspects of Traditional Indian Culture¹.

Even for our present limited purpose, it is a very vast field, demanding a book of several volumes for a systematic account and as such, far beyond the scope of a seminar paper. I will, therefore, delimit the enquiry by excluding technical literature (e.g. works on dramaturgy or musicology) or dramatic works in the main tradition by Jain authors, and will confine my observations to three areas, viz., (1) audio-visual presentation of narratives, (2) dramatic types, and (3) songs and music. And there, too, no attempt would be made at any sort of survey². My endeavour aims only at drawing attention to certain pieces of information gleaned from a few Classical texts, mostly in Prakrit, and showing their importance for the history of performing arts in the Indian Tradition. It will be seen from what follows that the value of the Jain data lies for the most part in supplementing or filling up information gaps in non-Jain sources.

1. Audio-visual Presentation of Narratives

We have had a very long tradition, extending over some twenty-five hundred years, of presenting religious narratives in accompaniment with showing of corresponding pictures.³

The earliest evidence for this is provided by the Jain canonical literature. Several texts like the *Viyāhapaṇṇatti*, *Nāyādhammakahā* and *Ovavāiya* refer to *maṅkha*, a class of wandering beggars, who earned their daily food by showing picture-boards (*maṅkhaphalaya*) to the people⁴. From later texts like Viśākhadatta's *Mudrārākṣasa* and Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* we know that such picture-boards or picture-scrolls (*yamaṭa*) depicted punishments in hells suffered by various sinners. The showman also sang verses that narrated the pictorial scenes. If we are to trust the canonical account, the father of Gośāla, who was an ascetic associate of Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, was a Maṅkha. This would suggest that the practice was as old as the sixth century B.C.

In a Jain religious tale written in Prakrit in 779 A.D., we find an elaborate poetic description of two such picture scrolls. Uddyotanasūri's *Kuvalayamālā* narrates an episode figuring a teacher who exhibits and describes to a prince two scrolls which he himself had painted. The first scroll depicted the cycle of births and deaths (*saṃsāra-cakra*)⁵, which consisted of countless scenes relating to living beings with their struggles, momentary joys and endless sufferings in the three divisions of the universe, viz., the earth, heavens and hells. The description extends over more than one hundred and fifty verses. What we find here is a poetic elaboration of the prevalent practice of showing the *yamaṭas*.

The other picture scroll⁶, described in the *Kuvalayamālā*, relates to a different theme. It is a religious tale having the identical purpose of edifying and inculcating the spirit of renunciation. In a passage of more than a hundred verses are described the scenes of struggles and travails of two brothers, extending over their three successive births⁷.

From another Jain work we know that the picture-scrolls were also used to make more spectacular the narration of popular tales. In a Jain religious work *Vaḍḍārādhane*, written in Kannada in circa tenth century A.D., there is a tale about a picture-showman,

who used to show to rice-dealers scrolls depicting scenes from three popular tales⁸. The showman thus kept the dealers absorbed in the show and this gave a free hand to his two abettors to steal rice from the shops !

The Jain texts throw light also on the mode of presentation and the actual method of showing the pictures. According to Saṃghadāsa's commentary on the *Bṛhatkalpa-sūtra*, the picture showman, while pointing at the various scenes on the picture board or scroll, sang story-verses and explained the purport in plain prose.

From the Buddhist text *Aśokāvadāna*, we know that the showman held in his left hand the scroll which was fixed between two bamboo sticks, and pointed at pictures with a pointer held in his right hand. The Jain texts *Kuvalayamālā* and *Līlāvatīsāra* also record the same method of making audio-visual presentation⁹.

2. Dramatic Types

The Classical Indian dramaturgy recognised and described many dramatic types : Ten major types variously designated as Pāṭhya-Prekṣya, Vākyaṛthābhinaya or Rūpaka, and numerous minor types known as Geya-Prekṣya, Padāṛthābhinaya or Uparūpaka.

In one Jain text we find the earliest specimen of the Rūpaka called Utsrṣṭikāṅka and in another, there is a reference to the types Dima and Vithi.

(a) Utsrṣṭikāṅka or Aṅka

In his Prakṛit work *Caupannamahāpurisa-cariya*, giving the life-account of the fifty-four Great Men in the Universal History according to Jainism, Śīlāṅkācārya has given a dramatic composition which forms a part of the biography of Rṣabhasvāmin, the first Tīrthaṅkara¹⁰. In the account of the fourth previous birth of Rṣabha as king Mahābala, the minister Vimalamati is described as staging a drama before the king with a view to induce him to renounce the world. The drama is called *Vibudhānanda*. It consists

of one act only. It has a tragic end. Śīlāṅka calls this drama 'Aṅka'. Nilanjana Shah has shown¹¹ that the dramatic characteristics of the *Vibudhānanda* clearly establishes it as an instance of the type called Utsṛṣṭikāṅka or Aṅka, which was counted among the ten major types and was defined by Bharata and others.

The importance of the *Vibudhānanda* lies in the fact that it is the one and only specimen of Utsṛṣṭikāṅka preserved in the whole range of classical literature and it is fairly early. The *Vibudhānanda* also shares with Bhāsa's *Karṇabhāra* and *Urūbhanga* the credit of being one of the few dramas having a tragic end.

(b) Dīma and Vithī

Bharata has divided the dramatic types into two classes : robust or forceful (*āviddha*) and delicate or graceful (*sukumāra*). Dīma belonged to the former class and Vithī to the latter¹². In a passage in Dhanapāla's *Tilakamañjarī*, a Kathā in Sanskrit prose written in the first half of the eleventh century, it is said that performers ignorant of the tradition of Daśarūpaka (the ten major dramatic types) destroyed the basic quality of a Vithī by staging it in a violent and forceful style (appropriate for the presentation of Vira and Raudra sentiments) as in a Dīma, instead of the tender and graceful style (appropriate to the presentation of Śṛṅgāra)¹³. Dhanapāla's remark can be appreciated if we keep in view the real character of the Vithī: "Vithī was a love-comedy, a mixture of Nāṭikā with features of Prahasana grafted on it."¹⁴

(c) Some other types

The Uparūpakas were an ill-defined, open class, with no specimens preserved for us. Dramaturgical literature has handed down a collection of descriptive statements about them, which give the impression of a tradition that was no longer living. The reason for this probably lies in the fact that these dramatic types were mostly dominated by song and dance. The use of verbal text was marginal. Most of them were in Prakrit or its later regional modifications¹⁵.

From Jain narrative works we get a few references to some of these types, suggesting that they were still in vogue at a particular period. Besides, some texts have preserved a few specimens of songs that were used in these dramatic types¹⁶.

In Uddyotanasūri's *Kuvalayamālā*, a Kathā-work in Prakrit completed in 779 A.D., the hero Kuvalayacandra is described as visiting a residential school (*maṭha*) in the Southern city of Vijayāpurī, where students from the regions of Lāṭa, Kaṛṇāṭa, Mālava, Kāṇyakubja, Golla, Mahārāṣṭra, Saurāṣṭra, Śrīkaṇṭha and Saimdhava were learning various Śāstras, Vijñānas and Kalās. The long list of subjects taught there included Bhāṇaya, Dombiliyā and Siggada among others¹⁷. These three are grouped with painting and music. Now from Abhinavagupta and other dramaturgists we know that Bhāṇaka, Dombilikā and Śiḍgaka were three well-known types of Uparūpakas¹⁸. The *Kuvalayamālā* reference to them is the earliest¹⁹ known so far. It precedes Abhinavagupta by more than two centuries. Similarly another Jain Sanskrit text, viz., *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Hariṣeṇa, completed in 931-32 A.D., refers in one of its illustrative tales²⁰ to five types of dance-dramas called Signaṭaka, Bhāṇī, Chatra, Rāsaka and Dumbillī, expounded by Bharata. All of these except Chatra are well-known as Uparūpakas. Chatra has been quite unknown so far. But recently I spotted an early reference to it in a Jain Prakrit text, viz., *Vasudevahimḍī* (*Madhyama-khaṇḍa*), written by Dharmasena-gaṇi in the seventh or eighth century A.D.²¹

We get a third reference to some of the Uparūpakas in Jineśvarasūri's *Kathākośaprakaraṇa*. It is in Prakrit. The work was completed in 1052 A.D. In the tale of Simhakumāra, in an interesting passage on musicology, it is said that the Āgama type of songs (as against the Deśya type) consists of seven types of Siggadās, seven Bhāṇikās, Bhāṇakas and Dumbiliyās²². Such varieties of these Uparūpakas are not known from any other source. This reference is of the same period as that of Abhinavagupta. It should be noted that Bhāṇaka, Dombika and Śiḍgaka are common to all the above given references.

Lastly, we may note from Jain works a few references to Viśākhila and Dattila who were reputed ancient authorities on music, dance and minor 'dramatic' types²³. In the *Kuvalayamālā-kathā*, already referred to above, a king's royal assembly is described as attended, among others, by experts in Bharata's *Nāṭya-śāstra* and as also in the tradition of Viśākhila²⁴. Elsewhere in the same work there is an episode of a royal parrot, who in the course of narrating his autobiography, says that he quickly learnt the theory of Nāṭya and mastered Viśākhila (i.e. the musicological work of Viśākhila)²⁵. Similarly, in the introductory portion of his great Apabhramśa epic poem *Mahāpurāṇa*, completed in 965 A.D., Puṣpadanta, following the poetic convention of expressing humility, gives a list of subjects and works about which he says he was quite ignorant. The list includes the works of Dattila and Viśākhila²⁶. These references, too, are notable as pre-Abhinavagupta references.

3. Song Used in the Musical Prabandhas

In many of the Classical works on musicology, the section on the musical Prabandhas define and describe a number of Prabandhas. The names of many of the Prabandhas are the same as the names of many well-known Prakrit and Apabhramśa metres. As has been already pointed out, the same term was used to designate the song, dance, poem and metre in the complex of a performance. Accordingly, the description of metres bearing the same designation as borne by the Prabandhas, throws light on the several aspects of the latter. Works like *Bṛhaddeśī*, *Mānasollāsa*, *Saṃgītaratnākara*, *Saṃgītacūḍāmaṇi* etc. treat Prabandhas like Āryā or Gāthā, Kanda, Catuspadī, Carcarī, Jhambāḍa, Tribhaṅgī, Dvipathaka, Dvipadī, Dhavala, Maṅgala, Mātṛkā, Rāsaka, Vadana, Vastu, Ṣaṭpadī and others, and we find these either treated as metres in the prosodical treatises of Svayambhū and Hemacandra or as types of poetical compositions current in Prakrit, Apabhramśa and early regional literatures. It may be significant in this connection to note that I derived the greatest help from metrical manuals for restoring the corrupt passages that are given

as illustrations of the song-texts for the Prabandhas in Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa*.²⁷

(a) *The Dhruvā Song*

Various types of Dhruvā songs were used in Sanskrit drama²⁸. Conventions about the use of various languages (Prakrits like Śaurasenī and Māgadhi, Sanskrit, etc.) in the Dhruvā are given in the thirty-second chapter of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. But all the illustrations of the Dhruvā given there are in Śaurasenī only. The Dhruvās in the *Vikramorvaśīya* are either in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit or Apabhramśa. This shows that language conventions for the Dhruvā changed in course of time.

From Bharata's description and illustrations, as also from the later tradition it is quite clear that thematically the Dhruvās were symbolic i.e. they were generally Anyoktis. They referred to a dramatic character under the guise of some animal, natural object etc.

There are some indications in a ninth century Jain work on Prakrit prosody that Dhruvās in Apabhramśa were in vogue around that period. In the *Svayambhūcchandas* of Svayambhū (c. 880 A.D.) the illustration of the Antarasamā Catuspadī Dhruvā²⁹ called Rāvaṇahastaka (VI 13, 1) is a Gaja-Anyokti. It is comparable to *Vikramorvaśīya*, IV 43. The illustration of *Makarandikā* (VI 17, 1) is a Cakravāka-Anyokti. This is comparable to *Vikramorvaśīya* IV. 4. So also *Svayambhūcchandas*, VI 37, 1 is possibly a Varāha-Anyokti and IV 15, 1. a Karabha-Anyokti.

(b) *The Ākṣiptikā Song*

From the description given by Bhoja and Raṅganātha, we know that Ākṣiptikā was a type of song. We have two references to the singing of Ākṣiptikās from the *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana-sūri³⁰. From these we come to know that this type of songs was popularly sung in the temples of Rudra, Rṣabha etc. by Śaivas and Jainas. An Ākṣiptikā song is actually given in that text.

(c) *The Carcarī Song*³¹

We know that in Sanskrit drama, music, dance and 'drama' in the Western sense were closely interlaced. The former two elements were predominant in the minor dramatic types. From Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī* and other sources, Carcarī is known to us as a type of dance connected with the spring festival. On the other hand Bhoja says it was an alternative name of Nāṭyarāsaka which was a type of Uparūpaka. In fact from numerous references in Sanskrit and Prakrit literature it is clear that Carcarī signified in different contexts (1) a kind of song, (2) a kind of dance, (3) a kind of Tāla, (4) a kind of metre, and (5) a troupe singing and dancing. These meanings are evidently interrelated.

Carcarī as a type of musical or dance performance seems to be closely allied to some other Uparūpakas like Rāsaka, Hallīśaka and Nāṭyarāsaka. All of them had, quite palpably, several features in common, so much so that the Alamkāra authorities at times have identified any one of them with any other. In fact there has been considerable confusion about the shared and exclusive features of these types—especially in later writings, which had no direct contact with a living tradition.

Reference to Carcarī and Rāsaka as musical and dance performances connected with the festive celebrations at the advent of the spring season are found in numerous Prakrit, Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati narrative and poetical works. Besides this, some actual Carcarī or Rāsa³² songs are given in several Jain works in Prakrit or Sanskrit. Further, we know some short poems called Carcarī from Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati literatures.

From an examination of the relevant passages we can conclude that during its long course of evolution Carcarī got transformed from a short musical piece accompanying dance to a substantial poem with some narrative and descriptive content. The connection with the festival and dance also altered substantially, and the original metrical form and structure too changed beyond recognition. The Rāsaka types also had the same history.

(d) *The Dhavala Song*³⁵

Dhavala as a type of song has a continuous life of some two thousand years—from the beginning of the Christian era till to-day. Svayambhū, and following him, Hemacandra, the two leading authorities on Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa prosody, have noted a tradition according to which king Hāla Sātavāhana, the famous poet and compiler of the Prakrit verse anthology called *Saptaśataka* (or *Gāthā-kośa*), had composed many Dhavala songs. In later Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa works like the *Kuvalayamālā*, *Vajjālagga*, *Jambūsāmi-cariya*, *Siddhahema* etc. we find many instances of the Dhavala. Medieval Gujarati, Rajasthani, Hindi and Marathi literatures were rich in the Dhavala (Dhaura) and Maṅgala types of musical poems written by Jain and non-Jain poets; and up to the present day Dhoḷs are sung in Gujarat as marriage songs and as songs praising Kṛṣṇa or other deities and sacred persons in the Vaiṣṇavaite and Jain religious traditions.

4. Musicological Data

In several Jain texts we find scraps of information that throw light on such musicological subjects as the history of the Tarāṇā³⁶, modes and classification of the Rāgas, musical instruments like Sāraṅgi³⁷ and Rāvaṇahastaka, etc. which I have noted elsewhere.

Notes

1. It may be observed in this connection that many important Jain Classical texts still remain unedited and unpublished, lying buried in manuscript collections and even for many of those which have been published, no translation is available in any modern language. These facts prove to be great handicaps for many who want to utilize them as sources.
2. Kapadia, 1973 gives detailed information about Music, Dance and Drama from Jain Canonical literature, its commentaries and some other works. Kapadia, 1980 similarly presents data

on musical instruments from similar sources. The latter was reviewed in Bhayani, 1981.

3. This is besides the tradition of presenting epic, Purāṇic or folk-tale narratives in sculpture and painting (Hindu, Buddhist, Jain). One of the earliest evidences is supplied by the Jaina Ācārya Pādalipta's *Taraṃgavai*, a romantic tale in Prakrit, written probably in the second century A. D. The original is lost, but we have its two faithful abridgements (not later than tenth century A.D.). In one of the episodes, we are told about a merchant's daughter (the heroine) who, during the Kaumudī Mahotsava, puts forth her canvasses for public display. The picture portrayed scenes from her past birth which were preserved in her revived memory. This motif is frequently found later in the Jain and non-Jain Kathās also e.g. in the story of Lalitāṅga, in the Nīlayaśā Lambha of the *Vasudevahimṇī* and in Asāita's *Harisāuli* in Old Gujarati.
4. *Pāiasaddamaṇṇavo*, s. v. *maṃkha*; Basham, p. 35. For a detailed discussion of this and other references given further, see Bhayani, 1983.
5. *Kuvalayamālā*, I pp. 185-190.
6. *Kuvalayamālā*, I pp. 190-194.
7. The Buddhist text *Divyāvadāna* records the practice of narrating Gautama Buddha's life with reference to corresponding pictures. The *Kuvalayamālā* presents here a poetic elaboration of the same.
8. Khadabadi, pp. 25-28; Bhayani, 1980, p. 180.
9. Hemacandra's *Kāvyaṇuśāsana* defines a narrative genre, called Ākhyāna. It was a composition deriving its theme from epics or Purāṇas and it was presented by a narrator (*grānthika*, *Kathaka*), through a combination of recitation, singing and acting. But this information Hemacandra has derived from Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, wherein it is called Ākhyānaka and three such Ākhyānaka works are named: *Govindākhyāna*, *Sāmbākhyāna* and *Mārākhyāna*. The tradition of the perform-

ance of narrative poems is preserved in several regions of India till today. See Raghavan, Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 619-620, 812-813.

10. *Caupannamahāpurisacariya*, pp. 17-27.
11. Shah, 1982.
12. Raghavan, 1963, p. 585.
13. Kansara, 1970, pp. 552-553.
14. Raghavan, 1963, p. 889.
15. Raghavan, 1963, pp. 545 ff.
16. Raghavan has given information only from the *Rājaprasāniya*, which refers to dance types only. See Raghavan, 1963, pp. 572-74.
17. *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 150.
18. Raghavan, 1963, pp. 546, 547, ff. 566-572, Bhayani, 1969.
19. Kohala is of course known to have been the earliest authority on the minor dramatic types, and quotations from his work occur in dramaturgical literature, but that work is lost. See Raghavan, 1963, pp. 535-536.
20. *Bṛhatkathākośa*, 57, vv. 105-106.
21. Bhayani, 1985; Bhayani and Shah, 1987, p. 224 (where the female attendants of Princess Kanakavati are described as engaged in the rehearsal of the Chatraka performance : *chat-taya-payoga-gaṇaṇa-vāvaḍa*).
22. *Kathākośaprakaraṇa*, p. 41.
23. Krisnamachariar, pp. 820-822; Raghavan, 1963, p. 586.
24. *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 16. The editor has misunderstood this as a reference to some authority on warfare. He has also noted Viśākhila as an author.
25. *Kuvalayamālā*, p. 123.
26. *Mahāpurāṇa*, I i 9.
27. Bhayani, 1983 (B).

28. See Raghavan, 1954, 19; 1963, pp. 370-371; 604-606; Bhayani, 1986. Here some relevant points from the last-mentioned paper are briefly given.
29. This term Dhruvā is somewhat different from the Dhruvā of the drama. In the Apabhramśa epic the verse which occurred in the beginning of a Canto (Saṁdhi) and that which occurred (usually in the same metre) at the end of all the sections (Kaḍavaka) of that canto was called Dhruvā, Dhruvaka or Ghattā.
30. Bhayani, 1987; Raghavan, 1963, pp. 370-371, 604-606; *Kuvalayamālā*, I, pp. 82-83, 116.
31. In Bhayani, 1972, I have discussed in detail the character, function and evolution of the Carcarī song, and described specimens of these songs so far as I could trace them in Prakrit, Sanskrit, Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati works of the Jain writers. In the present paper, therefore, I have treated the topic briefly. For some other discussions of Carcarī see Velankar, 1961, Introduction, pp. 81-85; Sandesara and Thakar, 1962, pp. 132, 133, 134; Jāya Senāpati and Raghavan, 1965, pp. 145-146 (text, pp. 218-219); Shah U.P., pp. 28-48; Tarlekar, 1983 1984), pp. 65-66, 73-74.
32. As a type of poetic composition Rāsaka was quite well-known in Prakrit and Apabhramśa literatures, and there are hundreds of Rāsas in Old Gujarati. But this Rāsa was different from the Uparūpaka type of the same name.
33. Similarly in Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī*, a Carcarī dance is described partly in Svāgatā metre, which in structure and rhythm closely resembles the well-known Mātrā metre called Vadanaka.
34. The information about the metrical structure of Dvipadī given in my paper on the Carcarī will supplement observations and discussion in Raghavan, 1963, pp. 560-561.
35. See Bhayani, 1975, pp. 69-71.
36. Bhayani, Forthcoming (1).

37. See Bhayani, 1982.
 38. See Bhayani, 1986(1987).

Reference Works

- Basham, A.L.,
 The Ājivakas, 1951
- Bhayani H.C.,
 'On the Uparūpakas called Dombikā and Śiḍgaka', *Vidya*, 1969, pp. 1-14. Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 20-33.
 'On some Specimens of Carcarī', *Sambodhi*, 2, 1972, pp. 12-35 (Also published in the *Journal of the University of Bombay*, 1973). Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 34-53
 'The Prakrit Poets Harivṛddha, Sātavāhana and Ādhyarāja', *Sanskrit and Indological Studies* (V. Raghvan Felicitation Volume), 1975, pp. 61-76. Reprinted in the present collection, Part II.
- Review of Kapadia, 1980, *Quarterly Journal of NCPA*, 10, Dec. 1981, 55-56.
- Review of Khadabadi, 1979, *Sambodhi*, 8, 1979-80, p. 180.
- 'Some Earliest Literary References to Sāraṅgi', *Quarterly Journal of NCPA*, 11, Mar. 1982, pp. 37-38.
- 'Citrapaṭ par Ādhārit Kathā-Kathan' (in Gujarati), *Gujarat* (Dīpotsavi Number), 1983 (A) (V.S. 2039), pp. 6-9.
- 'The Prakrit and Deśabhāṣā Passages in Someśvara's *Māna-sollāsa*', *K. K. Handiqui Felicitation Volume*, 1983 (B), pp. 167-77. Reprinted in the present collection, Part II.
- 'Uparūpak Chatra ane Nṛtta-prakār Calli' (in Gujarati), *Sāṃpiya*, Oct.-Dec., 1985, pp. 166, 123. Translated in the present collection, pp. 54-57.
- 'About the Dhruvās in Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaṣiya*'. *Bulletin of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan*, 1986, pp. 1-5. Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 68-74.

- 'The Character of Ākṣiptikā', *Bulletin of the Chumilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan*, 1987 (A); pp. 22-25. Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 80-84.
- 'Fresh Light on the Tarānā Mode of Singing', *Pandit Dalsukh Malvania Felicitation Volume* (Forthcoming). Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 95-99.
- 'Some Early Literary References to Rāvaṇahasta', *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda. 36, 1-4, 1986 (1987 issue), 111-114. Reprinted in the present collection, pp. 103-107.
- Bhayani H. C. and Shah R. M. (Eds.),
Vasudevahiṇḍī (Madhyama Khaṇḍa), 1987.
- Bhojak, A. M. (Ed.),
Caupannamahāpurisacariya, 1961.
- Chaturvijaya Muni and Punyavijaya Muni (eds.),
Bṛhatkalpasūtra-bhāṣya, 1936.
- Dharmasena-gaṇi, *Vasudevahiṇḍī (Madhyama-khaṇḍa)*.
See Bhayani and Shah, 1987.
- Hariṣeṇa. *Bṛhatkathākośa*. see Upadhye, 1943.
- Jain. Jyotindra,
'The Painted scrolls of the Garoḍā Picture Showmen of Gujarat', *Journal of NCPA*, 9 Sep. 1980, pp. 2-23.
- Jāya Senāpati, *Nṛttaratnāvalī*, See Raghavan, 1965.
- Jinavijaya, Muni (Ed.),
Kathākośa-prakaraṇa, 1949.
- Jinesvarasūri,
Kathākośaprakaraṇa, 1949, See Jinavijaya Muni.
- Kansara, N. M.,
Tilakamañjarī— a Critical Study, Ph.D. thesis, Gujarat University), 1970.
- Kapadia, H. R.,
Saṅgīt, Nṛtya ane Nāṭya Saṁbandhi Jain Ullekho ane Grantho (in Gujarati) (English Title: The Jain Records and Works about Music, Dance and Drama), 1973.

'The Jain Data about Musical Instruments', *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, pp. 263-276, 3, 1954, pp. 186-195, 4, 1955, pp. 372-392.

(Reprinted in 'Three Monographs on Music', Indian Musicological Society, 1980, pp. 25-58).

Khadabadi, B. K.,

Vaḍḍārādhane : a study, 1970.

Krishnamachariar, M.,

History of Classical Sanskrit Literature,³, 1974.

Puṣpadanta,

Mahāpurāṇa. See Vidya, 1937.

Raghavan V.,

'Music in Ancient Indian Drama', *Arts and Letters*, 28, 1, 1954 pp. 3 ff.; (also *Journal of the Music Academy*, Madras, 255, pp. 79-92).

Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 1963.

(Ed.), *Nṛttaratnāvalī*, 1965.

'Music in Sanskrit Literature', *Quarterly Journal of NCPA*, 8, March, 1979, pp. 1-11.

Sanḥadāsagaṇi,

Bṛhatkalpasūtra-bhāṣya, See Chaturvijaya Muni.

Sandesara, B. J. and Thakar, J. P.,

Lexicographical Studies in Jain Sanskrit, 1962 (A book-form reprint of articles serially published in the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, Vol. 8-12, 1959-1963).

Shah, Nilanjana,

'*Caupannamahāpurisacariyāntargata-Vibudhānanda-Nāṭak Par Ek Najar*' (in Gujarati), *Pharbas Gujarati Sabha Traimasik*, 1982, 65-72.

Shah, U. P.,

'*Cācar, Carcarī—Ek Adhyayan*' (in Gujarati), *Svādhyāya*, II, 1963, pp. 28-48.

Sheth H. T.,

*Pāśasaddamahāṇavo*², 1963.

Śīlāṅkācārya

Caupannamahāpurisacariya, see Bhojaka, 1961.

Tarlekar, G. H.,

'Music and Dance in *Vikramorvaṣīya* Act. IV', *Annals of the B. O. R. I.*, 1983 (1984), pp. 59-75.

Uddytonasūri,

Kuvalayamālā, see Upadhye, 1959.

Upadhye, A. N. (Ed.),

Bṛhatkathākośa, 1943.

Kuvalayamālā, Part-I, 1959; Part-II (Study), 1970.

Vaidya, P. L. (Ed.),

Mahāpurāṇa, Part-I, 1937.

Velankar, H. D. (ed.),

Vikramorvaṣīya, 1961.

PART II

1. SOME PRAKRIT VERSES OF PĀDALIPTA AND THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE *TARAṂGALOLĀ*

1. *Gāthā* 75 of the first Śataka of Hāla's *Saptaśaaka*¹ (also called *Gāthāsaptasatī*) is as follows :

ua pommarāa-maragaa-saṁvaliā ṇahaalāu oarai /
ṇaha-siri-kaṇṭha-bbhaṭṭha-vva kaṇṭhiā kira-rimcholi //

According to Weber, the name of the author of this *Gāthā* is missing in Pitāmbara's commentary, while Bhuvanapāla's commentary gives it as Vāsudeva. But in the *Svayambhūcchandas* of Svayambhūdeva, the above given *Gāthā* is ascribed to Pālitta² (Sk. Pādalīpta). Svayambhū's ascription of authorship to the verses cited by him has been found reliable, and the text of the Pūrvabhāga of the *Svayambhūcchandas* in which the *Gāthā* occurs is based on an old palm-leaf MS. from Tibet. So we can safely accept Pādalīpta as the author of the *Gāthā*.

2. There is moreover one definitive piece of evidence which places Svayambhū's above-mentioned ascription beyond doubt. Svayambhū has cited two more *Gāthās* under the name of Pālitta at *Svayāmbhūcchandas*, Pūrvabhāga, 5. 3 and 5. 4. The latter of these is as follows :

āśa-talāe ṇimalammi paphulla-caṁda-kamalammi /
mīa-mahuara-caraṇa-vihaḍiassa va joṇḥā-rao phurai //

Translation : In the limpid sky-lake, the moon-light-pollen sparkles on the full-blown moon-lotus, ruffled by the feet of the Deer-bee'.

This *Gāthā* could be identified from the *Saṁkhitta-taraṁgavaikahā* (also known as (*Taraṁgalolā*), the abridgement of Pādalīpta's lost romance *Taraṁgavaī*. The abridgement³ was prepared by one Jasa (?), a disciple of Nemicandragani of the *Hāiyapuriya*

Gaccha. The author of the abridgement has made it clear that he has made selection from the *Gāthās* composed by Pādalīpta and that his tempering with the text of the original is confined to simplifying the obscure *Deśya* expressions.⁴ This clearly implies that an overwhelming majority of the original *Gāthās* have been preserved intact in the abridgement, so that we can take them as the genuine and authentic work of Pādalīpta himself. The value of such a conclusion can be appreciated when it is recalled that the original *Taraṅgavāī* is lost.

It is no. 543. The text is as follows :

*āyāsa-talāe nimmalammi papphulla-caṁḍa-paumassa /
maya-bhasala-calaṇa-papphaṁḍiyassa jonhārao paḍai //*

The identity of TL. 543 with *Svayambhūcchandas*, Pūrvabhāga, 5. 4 is quite obvious, despite the variants *pauma-* for *kamala-*, *bhasala-* for *mahuara-*, *papphaṁḍia-* for *vihaḍia-* and *paḍai* for *phurai*. Thus a *Gāthā* ascribed by Svayambhū to Pādalīpta is actually found in TL. which claims to be a faithful digest of Pādalīpta's *Taraṅgavāī*.

3. In the beginning of our discussion we saw that *Gāthā* 1.75 of the *Saptaśataka* (henceforth abbreviated as *SS.*) is according to the commentators either anonymous or by some Vāsudeva, but it is not ascribed by any of them to Pādalīpta. Now if we look up for the author's name for the *Gāthā* that just precedes, viz. 1.74, we find that it is either Pālittaka (according to Bhuvanpāla) or Paulinya (according to Pitāmbara). *paulinya* can be readily explained as a scribal corruption of *pālitta* : *pālitta* misread as *pālīnna*, which, with a preceding *daṇḍa* mis-interpreted as *paḍimātrā*, would yield *polinma*, which was Sanskritized as *paulinya*. It is not unlikely that due to some confusion, in some cases there crept in an error of one in the tradition of author-ascription as found in some MSS. of the commentaries of the *SS.* We find a similar discrepancy between Pitāmbara and Bhuvanpāla regarding the author-names for the first few *Gāthās* of the *SS.*

4. Here we may point out one more famous *Gāthā* which is quite reliably ascribed to Pādalīpta. Under *Siddhahema* 1.187 and

3.142 we find *gajjante khe mehā* cited among the illustrations. The complete *Gāthā* of which these words form the beginning is given in MS. B used by Vaidya for his edition of the Prakrit portion of the *Siddhahema*.⁵ It is as follows :

gajjante khe mehā phullā nivā paṇatthi(sic.)rā morā /
naṭṭho caṇdujjoo vāsāratto halā patto //

This *Gāthā* is also found cited anonymously at Bhoja's *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharana* 3.153 (with the variant *paṇatṭhirā*).

Now the self-same *Gāthā* is cited in the anonymous commentary on *Kavidarpaṇa* 2.8.7 as an example of the *Brāhmī* type (which has maximum permissible number of heavy syllables), and what is relevant for us here, it is cited as a *Gāthā* by Pādalīptasūri.⁶

5. The bunch of five *Gāthās* at TL. 1022-1026 constitute, according to TL. 1021, a song sung by some soldiers. The theme of the song is that one should not lose heart and initiative even in the face of severest calamities. The second *Gāthā* in this group (i.e. TL. 1023) is the same as SS. 1.42. with slight difference in the case of a few readings. The TL. text is metrically and grammatically defective in some places. The two texts of the *Gāthā* (with suggested emendations for the defective readings in the TL.) are as follows :

āraṁbhamāṇassa(bhāmtassa) phuḍam lacchī maraṇam vā(va) hoi
purisassa /
tamaṇāraṁbha(bhe) vi hoi [maraṇam] ṇiyayam ṇa uṇa lacchī //
(TL. 1023)

**āmbhāmtassa dhuam lacchī maraṇam va hoi purisassa /*
taṁ maraṇamaṇāraṁbhe vi hoi lacchī uṇa ṇa hoi // (SS. 1.42)

As the above-cited *Gāthā* from the TL. forms part of a group with thematic unity, it is less likely to have been an addition of the epitomizer, and we can accept it as belonging to the original poem.⁷

6. In this connection I feel the fourth *Gāthā* of the SS. has a particular significance. The *Gāthā* is as follows :

*ua ṇiccala-nipphaṇḍā bhīṣiṇivattammi rehai valāā /
ṇimmala-maragaa-bhāṇa-pariṭṭhīa saṁkha-sutti-vva //*

The *Gāthā* is quite well-known in the *Alaṁkāra* literature. The name of the author is given as Vodisa (Kulanātha), Yodita (Pitāmbara), Poṭṭisa (Bhuvanapāla). The last mentioned is the correct form.⁸ In the *Lilāvai-kahā* of Koūhala and elsewhere Poṭṭisa is said to have been the chief minister of King Hāla Sātavāhana. Now the Jaina Prabandhas closely associate Pādaliptasūri also with the same king. Poṭṭisa and Pādalipta were probably among the poets that formed the far-famed literary circle at the royal court of Pratiṣṭhāna during Hāla's period. It was quite natural for some of these poets to have commonly shared the style and modes of literary expression prevalent in their period. With the above-cited *Gāthā* we can compare *Gāthā* 63 from the TL, which is as follows :

*sohāṁti cakkavāyā pomaṇi-pattesu saṁṭhiyā kei /
kareṇu-kusuma-niyare vva hariya-maṇi-kutṭimesu ṭhiyā //*

This can be translated as, 'Some *cakravakas*, settled on lotus leaves. appeared as beautiful as heaps of *karnikāra* flowers lying on emerald pavements.' The close affinity between the two *Gāthās* is quite obvious.

7. Archaic Prakrit. In the language of TL. there are numerous words, forms and phrases which are characteristically associated with Early Prakrit, especially of the Jain variety. (the numbers refer to the TL. *Gāthās*.)

1. I Verbal Forms : (1) Present I sing. in *-aṇ* : पस्सं (261, 1400), पासं (1492), पेच्छं (252, 264, (876, 1252), सव (277), जीय (501), उप्पेक्ख (748), अच्छ (736, 818, 1013, 1442), डउझ (356, 763), इच्छ (786, 1507), गच्छ (1073), सोय (1002), धाय (1090), सुण (1135), समणुगच्छ (1200), पेक्ख (1491).

(2) I plur. in *-mu* : गच्छामु (1094), पुच्छामु (1316), दाहामु (1073).

(3) Aorist forms in -सीय, -गच्छीय, -हीय or -ईय : कासीय 105, 221, 639, 1045), अईसीय (622), विष्णवेसीय (730), दच्छीय (949, 1608), रोच्छीय (1132), गहेच्छीय (1248), घच्छीय (1636); दाहीय (611), नाहीय (754), भाहीय (1042); आसीय (46, 305, 1377), भाणीय (169, 278, 643, 1178, 1381, 1596, 1600, 1604), साहीय (593, 1131), गच्छीय (800), वाहीय (867), नेईय (993), बंधीय (994), चिंतीय (1106), लज्जोय (1164), अच्छीय (1184); also कासि (1312). Forms in -इत्या : मा कासि (796, 935), मा भाहीय (1042).

With मा in an imperative (II sing.) sense : पडिजगित्था (1157); imper. मा भाइत्या (1067); Forms in -इंसु (III plur.) : परोइंसु (1235), बिहरिंसु (1624).

(4) Forms of अस् : (with the past passive participle) : I sing. मि (119, 177, 185, 206, 283, 603, 680, 682, 755, 1012, 1135, 1148, 1255, 1269 etc); I plur. मे 1055, 1056, 1086, 1157, 1226 etc); II plur. त्थः (मे) त्थ परितुट्ठा (1077).

(5) Ātmanepada-forms (I sing.) : सवे (49), कहे (80), संभरे (84), वणे (84).

(6) उ' absolutive as with जे : जाणिड' जे (75; and similarly in 150, 194, 408, 1081, 1290, 1473, 1479, 1509, 1534 etc.)

(7) Absolutives in -इत्ताण' : करित्ताण' (130), निवेयइत्ताण' (762), परियइत्ताण' (1043).

(8) Infinitives in -उ' (with सक्का) : 1026, 1030, 1075 etc.)

2. Pronominal Forms : Frequent use of जे (I plur. and मे (II plur.).

(9) Pleonastic suffix -आगं (-आय') : मुहुत्तागं (864, 1469), सचेइयागं (1492), उहरायं (1384), पुव्वत्तरायं (1464), बहुत्तरायं (1481).

Noteworthy words : किणो (79), मणे (157, 950), बलियं (173), ओरुजिय (535), उत्तुयमाणी (604), वोक्कसेमाणा (640), अइच्छमाण (841), आभट्ट (864), निहम्मिय (1173) साहट्ट (1182), इहइ' (44), तत्तोच्चय (12), पासणिओ

(95), चिंचेल्लिय (1196), विहेडग (1312), विहणू (100, 423, 1378), खिणिक्खिणिया (109), फडक्कय (109), चंगोड (142, 145), लच्छिघर (168), उप्फाल (188), कोसियार (196), बोज्झक (212), मोहणाघर (235, 1116), कामपाल (238), रिभिय (242, 1488), वोमिस्स (243), चिल्लिया (254), महाल (255), दोहलिणी (292), पंगुत्ति (296), नेड्डालिया (310), पडमेल्लुय (341), मालुय (343), वीहणय (362), दोदिय (300, 697), घोट्ट (327), अवंगुय (464, 859, 1252), वरवरिया (470), किमिच्छग (471), लेण (474), पोराणिय (492), गोसगिय (519), पडिजगण (552), वंद (553), अडयण (556), कट्ट (589), मगसय (683), चुप्पालय (689), परज्ज (966), अणाह (696), मिज (697), सुहमक्कडिया (707), संचकार (770), आवल्लय (861), मख (863), सिरिघर (934), दुयग्गा (942, 949 etc), मल्लहडि (945), पिरिलि (945), उवकुट्टी (965), मत्तल्लओ (1003), पडालि (1004, 1040), सोल्ल (1004, 1393), अवओडय (1012), पत्तली (1046), निप्फेडा (1049), निच्चट्ट (1057), वक्खेव (1091), बोदही (1095), पारग (1103), चेडव (1103), गोस (1158), जोगवक्खेम (1169), पाउहारी (1175), अंतिवासी (1188, 1189), कविलास (1189), वरिसघर (1201), चुडुली (1218), छायग्घ (1236, 1271), आचिक्खणक (1246), गागर (1333), मंगुल (1338), वल्लूर (1374), नेव्व (1375), पिल्लय (1383), थत्ति (1431), रिछोली (1468), गिधु (1482), अच्छेप्प (1548), दवदवस्स (1561), नीइ (201, 437), नीमो (1151), नीहंति (176), परीति (1348), अइंती (548, 1201), अत्तीमि (1621), परेंत (322, 353), उइरंति (450), उच्चूसइ (513), उप्फडंति (549, 700), बेइ (412, 533), वेति (62), अवयक्खंतो (729), निवज्जामि (813), निघोट्टंतो (1454) etc.

These traits of Archaic Prakrit are the same as those which Alsdorf has pointed out from the language of the *Vasudevahindī*.⁹ He has observed that this type of Prakrit belonged to that period when Jain Māhārāṣṭrī was still connected with Ardhamagadhī and wherein colloquial forms were in vogue as against the stylized later forms. As he assigns the *Vasudevahindī* to the fourth century A.D. or places it even earlier, TL. also, in view of the shared traits of Archaic Prakrit, can be assigned to the beginning centuries of the Christian era. It should not also be forgotten that the number of archaic linguistic traits noted above from TL. must have been much larger in the original *Taraṅgavai*.

8. The stylistic traits of the TL. also are quite remarkable. They amply testify to imaginative power and literary skill characteristic of an accomplished poet. The theme of the tale is original and highly romantic. It has been handled perceptively. The descriptive modes and rhetorical devices are indicative of a vigorous Kāvya tradition.¹⁰ The author seems to have been fond of *anup-rāsa* and *yamaka*,¹¹ which are employed quite effectively in a number of cases. The exquisite *rūpakas* and *utprekṣās* of the TL. deserve a special study.

9. A work of such poetic excellence is bound to have influenced some of the later works, especially the Prakrit romances. No doubt such a supposition would require to be substantiated through a regular inquiry. But some significant indication we do get from a few passages from two famous romances, viz., the *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana¹² and the *Lilāvai* of Kōūhala.¹³

The following descriptions of the city of Kauśāmbī in the TL. and the *Kuvalayamālā* have clear verbal resemblance :

sā majjha-desa-lacchi uvamāṇaṁ aṇṇa-rāyanayarāṇaṁ /
(TL. 90)
aṇṇa-nayarīṇa taṁ ciya ṇisāmaṇṇaṁ havai savvaṁ //
(*Kuvalayamālā*, p. 31, 1.25)

The *vyājastuti* mode employed for describing the excellence of a city in the *Kuvalayamālā* and the *Lilāvai* seems to have derived from the TL. Compare :

ekko ttha navari doso .. (TL. 1491)
aha ekko cciya doso .. (*Kuvalayamālā*, p. 8 1.16)
aha ṇavara tattha doso .. (*Lilāvai*, 62-63)

The description of Mahānumatī and Kuvalayāvali in the *Lilāvai* is matched by similar descriptions in some passages of the TL. Compare :

imdo acchi-sahasseṇa pecchamāṇo na tippejja / (TL., 975)
sakayattho ṇayaṇa-sahassa-pecchiro etthā sura-ṇāho /
(*Lilāvai*, 251)

mahiya-siṃdhussuṭṭhiyaṃ va pheṇotthayaṃ lacchīm |

TL., 39)

tākkāla-mañṭhanuttiṇṇa-siṃdhu-pheṇotthayā ṇirāharaṇā |
sa ekkacceya siri (Lilāvaī, 254)¹⁴

All the above considerations leave no doubt about the authentic preservation of much of the original *Taraṃgavaī* of Pādalipta in its available abridgement, the *Taraṃgalolā*.

Foot Notes

1. The following editions have been consulted here : A. Weber's *Saptaśatakam des Hāla* (The 1966 reprint of the 1881 edition) ; the Nirṇayasāgara Press edition of 1933; S. A. Joglekar's *Gāthāsaptasatī* (1956). For Bhuvanapāla's commentary I have consulted a MS. from the Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Saṃskṛiti Vidyamandir of Ahmedabad, for which I am thankful to its Director.
2. *Svayāmbhūcchandās*, ed. by H. D. Valankar, 1962. Pūrvabhāga 1.4. The variants in the *Svayāmbhūcchandās* are : *ṇahaalāhi* and *ovarai*. The editor has rightly pointed out that *ṇahaalāhi* is an incorrect reading for *ṇahaalāo*.
3. *Samkhitta-taraṃgavaī-kahā* (= *Taraṃgaloāl*), ed. by Kastūrvijaya-gaṇi, 1944. It was translated into German by E. Leumann (published under the title *Die Nonne*, 1921; this was translated into Gujarati by N. I. Patel and published in 1924). It has been reedited by me and published with Gujarati transtation and epilogue. See *Samkhitta-Taraṃgavaī-kahā*, L. D. Series No. 75, 1979. Further here it will be referred to as TL.
4. *to ucceṇaṃ gāhāo pālittaṇa raiāo |*
deṣi-payāi mottum saṃkhittayari kayā esā || (TL. 8)
5. *Prakrit Grammar* of Hemacandra, ed. by P. L. Vaidya, rev. ed. 1958, p. 456. n. 8.

6. *Kavidarpaṇa*, ed. by H. D. Velankar, 1962. For the *paṇaṭṭhirā* of the *Siddhahema* MS., and *paṇaṭṭhirā* of the *Sarasvatīkanthābharaṇa*, the *Kavidarpaṇa* commentary reads *paṇacciyā*, which points to a probable *paṇaccirā*. Also it has wrongly *camḍulloo*. for *camḍujjoo*.
7. Pītāmbara and Bhuvanapāla both give Vallabha as the name of the author of this *Gāthā*. Among the author names traditionally recorded by some commentators (see, for example, Appendix no. 3 in Joglekar's edition) we find Pālitta (variants : Pālittaka, Pālita etc.) in the case of several *Gāthās* according to this or that source. See *Gāthās* no. 63, 74, 217, 254, 256, 257, 262, 393, 394, 417, 425, 432, 433, 434, 545, 578, 609, 623, 706, 720. Some of these *Gāthās* (e.g. no. 63, 217, 262, 394, 434, 578, 623) are noteworthy for their striking image or telling description, and their kinship with some of the descriptive *Gāthās* of the TL. cannot be easily dismissed as accidental. But for accepting any of them as Pādalīpta's some independent support is necessary.
8. *Gāthās* no. 89, 173, 293, 403 etc. also are attributed to Poṭṭisa by various commentaries.
9. L. Als Dorf, 'The *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, a specimen of Archaic Jain Māhāraṣṭri', BSOS, 8, 1936, p. 319-333.
10. For a detailed appreciation, See TL., pp. 283-285.
11. See for example TL, *Gāthās* no. 10, 12, 17, 21, 31, 34, 36, 40, 89, 94, 175, 185, 189, 490, 542, 548, 586, 647, 711, 770, 863, 888, 892, 896, 942, 1064, 1067, 1072, 1095, 1155, 1300, 1358, 1386 etc.
12. Ed. by A. N. Upadhye, 1959. On pp. 86-87 of *Kuvalayamālā* pt. 2 (1970), Upadhye has pointed out certain general resemblances in ideas and narrative points between the TL. and the *Kuvalayamālā*. He thinks that, 'as the original T[arāṃgavati] is no more available, verbal agreements here and there carry no special significance.'
13. Ed. by A. N. Upadhye, 2nd ed., 1966.

14. Verbal agreements or close parallelism in ideas with the TL. can be pointed out from some other works also. At TL. 296 and 970 a damsel is described as a river by means of the figure *rūpaka*. The same idea is elaborated in the illustrative stanza at *Svayambhūcchandas*, 1. 26.1 (Note *cakkavāya-thaṇa-juyalā* of the TL. and *paohara-rahāṅgiā* of the other work). *Vikramorvaśya* 4.52 also is relevant in this context (The garment of foam and the girdle of aquatic birds find correspondence in the TL). The description of the moon as a goose (*sasihaṁso*) of the sky-lake (*gayaṇa-sara*) finds correspondence in a late *Gāthā* known only through its defective Sanskrit *chāyā* : See Weber's edition of the ŚŚ. *Gāthā* 719 (with the comparable expressions *gagana-taṭāka* and *mṛgāṅko marālaiva*). But it may not be plausible to see in these agreements more than a general sharing of a stylistic tradition.
-

2. GĀTHĀ-MUKTĀVALĪ

A NEWLY DISCOVERED RECENSION OF HALA'S S'APTA-SATAKA

A. Weber¹ distinguished six different recensions of Hāla's *Sapta-Śataka* (popularly also called *Gāthā-Saptaśatī*) which he designated as : (1) the Vulgate, (2) X, (3) R, (4) S (=Sādhāraṇa-deva's *Muktāvalī*), (5) T = The first Telinga recension), (6) W (= the second Telinga recension). Of these the recensions S and T basically depart from the other recensions in the arrangement of Gāthās. They arrange the Gāthās in subjectwise groups called Vrajyā (S) or Paddhati (T). We are indeed familiar with this type of grouping and designation from several anthologies of Saṁskṛta and Prākṛta Subhāṣitas.

In the MSS. collection of the L. D. Institute of Indology exists a manuscript of a work called *Gāthā-muktāvalī* (GM.) (No. 7812), which turns out to be one more recension of the *Sapṭa-śataka*, different indeed from the aforementioned six recensions set up by Weber. GM is similar to Sādhāraṇa-deva's *Muktāvalī* and the first Telinga recension in that it also groups the Gāthās under different Paddhatis. Since its grouping is similar to that of the *Muktāvalī*, it differs from T, which first divides the Gāthās into Śatakas or Centuries, and then subdivides each one of the Centuries according to the subjects. Obviously, though influenced by S, GM shows considerable independence in the number and sequence of the group as well as the number and sequence of Gāthās within the groups.

The manuscript is incomplete. Only first 14 out of a total of 45 folios (reported in the list of contents for which see further) are preserved. The obverse of the first folio is blank. The manuscript folios measure 23 × 8 cm. Each side has ten lines and each line has forty letters on an average. The handwriting is bold and clear. The *paḍimātrā* (*prṣṭhamātrā*) is used. The Ms. is carefully

copied ; there are therefore very few copying mistakes. No continuous serial numbering for the verses is given, but the verses within each group (Paddhati) are serially numbered. The Ms. breaks off after the word लङ्गहत्तणञ् in the fourth verse of the स्त्रीरूपवर्णनपद्धति.

Over and above the fourteen folios of the text, we find two extra folios, one of which contains a complete list of contents of the whole manuscript. This folio, though unnumbered, seems to be in the same hand as the folios of the text proper. The list is reproduced below with the serial number added to the Paddhatis.

Accordingly, out of a total of 58 Paddhatis and 850 verses, we have in the preserved portion 14 Paddhatis (the 14th being incomplete) and 249 verses² (the last verse being incomplete).

The second extra folio has its portion at the right hand upper corner missing; hence the numbering on the back side is lost. On examination it turns out to be a folio belonging to another Ms. of GM. The obverse side begins with हिंसि बराइ which exactly corresponds with the beginning of the 10th folio of our Ms., and the five letters are the final letters of verse no. 8 of the *Varṣāpaddhati*. But in the stray folio the verse is numbered as the 14th. The remaining verses of the group in this folio, from the 15th to the 17th, exactly correspond to the *Varṣāpaddhati* verses no. 16 to 28 in our Ms. This fact indicates that the different Mss. of the GM. recension varied in matter of the arrangement of verses within a group.

Although the number of Paddhatis contained in S and GM (60 and 58 respectively) is roughly the same, only 30 titles are common between the two recensions. Our guide in drawing this conclusion is the GM. list of contents. Also, the number of verses, their selection and ordering within the groups that are common, show so much variation between the two recensions (judging, of course, from the available portion of the GM.) that we must recognise them as two distinct recensions. Although GM. had S before it, it shows a high degree of independence in its classification as well as in its selection and ordering for each group. Of the 249 verses

of the extant portion of GM., only 170 are common with S, and only the सुजन, दुर्जन, राजचाट्ट, दान and parts of the षड्भुवन and स्त्रीरूपवर्णन Paddhatis of GM. have substantial correspondence insofar as the selection (but not the number and sequence) of the verses is concerned. For the rest of the groups there are many omissions and several additions. Regarding the new verses we find GM. to be in substantial agreement with the R recension. Besides the numerous verses which are absent in the Vulgate but which GM. commonly shares with S and R, there are 15 verses in GM. which are absent in S but available in R. Moreover, there are 7 verses in GM. which are exclusively found in the T recension, 3 verses which are not found in any recension, but which Weber has noted as citations in the *Alaṃkāra* literature, 2 verses which, although found in the Vulgate, are absent in S, and 15 which are not found in any recension and indeed not noted by Weber.

A most remarkable oddity to be noted about GM. in this connection is that it has included several verses which are not in the Gāthā metre. The prominently glaring case is that of 29 verses in Skandhaka metre, all borrowed from the tenth Āśvāsaka of the *Setubandha*. The *Sūryāstamana*, *Sandhyā*, *Timira* and *Candrodaya-paddhatis* are constituted exclusively with these verses (excepting the last verse in the *Candrodaya-paddhati*). Besides this, I 2, I 8, II 6, III 14 are Skandhakas. Of these III 14 is the same as *Setubandha* III 10. 14 and XII 12 are Gītis, the former being the same as the second Cūlikā Paisāci verse cited by Hemacandra under *Siddhahema* VIII iv 326 (the first verse, known to be the Maṅgala verse of the lost *Bṛhatkathā* and cited by Hemadandra under that Sūtra as also by Bhoja in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* is also found in GM. as I 3), and the latter is identical with the fourth verse in the *Prastāvanā* of the *Abhijñāna-śākuntala*. Lastly, VI 16 in the Aparavaktra metre is also taken from the *Śākuntala*. It appears there as the opening verse of the fifth act.

One more fact to be noted about GM. is that some of the verses it exclusively shares with S and/or R are also found in

Bhuvanapāla's text of the *Gāthakośa*³ (the *Chekokti-vicāra-līlā*), which also shares with GM. a very large number of variants that are different from G.'s readings.

These comparisons and facts show that, besides using S as its principal source, GM. derived some material from S and T (which, together with Bhuvanapāla, had before them a text-tradition for some individual verses that was different from G.'S), and for the rest it eclectically selected from a few other sources, not caring to restrict itself to the Gāthā verses.

II

CONCORDANCE OF GM. WITH S. AND G.

GM	S	G	Some other recension or source
1. हरपद्धति			
1	1. (1. नमस्कारव्रज्या)	1	
2	—	—	
3	—	—	
4	—	—	
5	238 (12. अनुरागव्र°)	69	
6	2 (नम°)	455	
7	—	—	
8	—	—	
2. कृष्णप°			
1	3 (नम°)	151	
2	—	—	T. 11; W. 816
3	644 (कृष्णचरित्रव्र°)	89	
4	642 „	112	
5	245 (12. अनुरागव्र°)	114	
6	—	—	
3. सुजनप°			
1	664 (56. सुजनव्र°)	94	
2	673 „	250	

3	674	„	265	
4	672	„	224	
5	679	„	319	
6	677	„	272	
7	680	„	321	
8	670	„	320	
9	—		—	R. 452; W. 753
10	669 (सुज°)		282	
11	678	„	285	
12	666	„	280	
13	671	„	113	
14	—		—	
4. दुर्जनप°				
1	684 (58. दुर्जनत्र°)		248	
2	685	„	253	
3	686	„	135	
4	687	„	537	
5	689	„	688	
5. मनस्विप°				
1	588 (31. मनस्वित्र°)		284	
2	—		—	R. 450; W. 752
3	—		—	W. 978
6. राजचाटवः				
1	225 11. चाटुव°		364	
2	228	„	471	
3	213	„	—	R. 607; X. 613; W. 726
4	227	„	467	
7. नीतिप°				
1	600 (24. साहसत्र°)		42	
2	128 (7. स्वरूपास्यानत्र°)		251	
3	126 („)		243	
4	116 (6. जातित्र°)		68	
5	109 (5. दृष्टान्तत्र°)		217	

6	127 (स्वरु°)	255	
7	599 (साह°)	245	
8	601 (35. विद्ग्धत्र°)	286	
9	111 (दृष्टा°)	310	
10	132 (स्वरु°)	191	
8. दानप°			
1	602 (36. कृपणत्र°)	136	
2	662 (55 त्यागत्र°)	230	
3	660 („)	76	
9. अन्यापदेशप°			
(1) हस्ती			
1	95 (4 अन्यापदेशत्र°)	383	
2	103 („)	45	
3	104 („)	527	
4	—	—	R. 668; W. 787
5	—	—	R. 669; W. 788
6	—	—	R. 670; W. 789
7	—	—	R. 671; W. 790
8	—	—	R. 672; W. 791
9	—	—	R. 673; T. 72; W. 792
(2) गोप°			
1	597 (33. सौभाग्यत्र°)	460	
2	—	639	
3	—	640	
4	—	—	R. 587; W. 795
(3) हरिणप°			
1	285 (13. प्रेसत्र°)	287	
2	571 (28. हरिणत्र°)	589	
3	—	620	
4	—	—	R. 597; W. 763
5	571 (हरिणत्र°)	595	

(4) शुनकप०

1	598 (33. सौभाग्यत्र०)	689
2	690 (59. देवरत्र०)	690
3	507 (22. असतीत्र०)	664

(5) कपिप०

1	119 (6. जातित्र०)	532
2	117 „	533
3	113 „	171

(6) भ्रमरप०

1	569 (27. मधुकरत्र०)	92
2	37 (2. वसन्तत्र०)	331
3	593 (32. गुणत्र०)	139
4	96 (4. अन्यापदेशत्र०)	387
5	561 (मधु०)	442
6	562 („)	444
7	—	—
8	—	—
9	564 (मधु०)	615
10	563 („)	—
11	565 („)	591
12	566 („)	592
13	—	—
14	568 (मधु०)	643
15	—	—
16	—	—

R. 484; W. 754

R. 501; W. 755

R. 587; W. 161

T. 53; W. 819

(7) नम०दाप०

1	594 (32. गुणत्र०)	579
2	497 (22. असतीत्र०)	—
3	98 (4. अन्यापदेशत्र०)	549

R. 574; W. 760

(8) अशोकप०

1	40 (2. वसन्तत्र०)	7
2	93 (4. अन्यापदेशत्र०)	279

3 172 (10. उच्चावचत्र^०) 404

4 51 (वस^०) 405

(9) पाटलाप^०

1 102 (4. अन्यापदेशत्र^०) 468

2 694 (59. देवत्र^०) 469

3 567 (27. मधुकरत्र^०) 621

(10) प्रकीर्णक

1 636 (46. मल्लिकात्र^०) 281

2 121 (6. (जातित्र^०) 392

3 105 (4. अन्यापदेशत्र^०) — R. 624; W. 768

4 12 (2. शरद्वत्र^०) 535

5 626 (43. इक्षुत्र^०) — S. 626; W. 740

6 112 (जाति^०) 424

7 688 (58. दुर्जनत्र^०) — R. 594; W. 762

8 — — W. 982

9 99 (अन्या^०) 172

10 658 (54. (सुभटत्र^०) 402

11 627 (इक्षु^०) — R. 654; W. 776

12 12 (जाति^०) 414

10. षड्भक्तुवर्णनप^०

(1) वसन्तप^०

1 42 (2. वसन्तत्र^०) 543

2 43 „ 544

3 406 (19. रोदनत्र^०) 586

4 39 (वस^०) 396

5 47 („) 499

6 50 („) — R. 664; W. 783

7 321 (14. मानिनी^०त्र) — R. 658; W. 778

8 45 (वस^०) — R. 659; W. 779

9 44 („) — R. 657; W. 777

10	397 (रोद ^०)	443	
11	—	—	
12	41 (वस ^०)	497	
13	32 „	128	
14	46 „	—	R. 660; W. 780
15	48 „	—	R. 663; W. 782
16	33 „	575	
17	49 „	—	R. 662; W. 781
18	35 „	311	
19	34 „	308	
20	31 „	219	
21	371 (16. विरहिणीत्र ^०)	412	
22	39 (वस ^०)	322	

(2) ग्रीष्मप^०

1	54 (2. ग्रीष्मत्र ^०)	288	
2	402 (19. रोदनत्र ^०)	399	
3	—	—	
4	450 (21. सखीसमारवासनत्र ^०)	70	
5	56 (ग्रीष्म ^०)	494	
6	82 (3. उत्प्रेक्षात्र ^०)	—	R. 547; W. 758
7	—	—	
8	53 (ग्रीष्म ^०)	299	
9	195 (10. उच्चावचत्र ^०)	473	
10	198 („)	559	
11	—	—	T. 267; W. 845
12	—	—	

(3) वर्षाप^०

1	63 (वर्षात्र ^०)	539
2	351 (16. विरहिणीत्र ^०)	336
3	612 (40. अप्रगल्भत्र ^०)	170
4	66 (वर्षा ^०)	315
5	70 (वर्षा ^०)	584

6	75 (वर्षा ⁰)	584	
7	368 (विर ⁰)	29	
8	370 (, ,)	386	
9	67 (वर्षा ⁰)	567	
10	64 , ,	538	
11	400 (रोद ⁰)	696	
12	403 (, ,)	566	
13	62 (वर्षा ⁰)	436	
14	72 (, ,)	541	
15	73 (, ,)	623	
16	76 (, ,)	324	
17	237 (12. अनुराग्र ⁰)	67	
18	380 (विर ⁰)	—	R. 615; W. 766
19	506 (22. असतीव्र ⁰)	—	R. 616; W. 767
20	65 (वर्षा ⁰)	—	Y. 420; W. 711
21	61 (, ,)	177	
22	560 (27. मधुकरव्र ⁰)	37	
23	—	638	R. 684
24	—	560	R. 608
25	88 (3. उत्प्रेक्षाव्र ⁰)	394	
26	68 (वर्षा ⁰)	578	
27	87 (उत्प्रे ⁰)	564	
28	118 (6. जातिव्र ⁰)	102	
(4) शरत्प ⁰			
1	—	—	
2	11 (2. शरद्व्र ⁰)	434	
3	13 , ,	624	
4	9 , ,	186	
5	92 (3. उत्प्रेक्षाव्र ⁰)	563	
6	79 (3. उत्प्रेक्षाव्र ⁰)	75	
7	86 (, ,)	263	
8	17 (शर ⁰)	692	

9	147 (वर्णनात्र०)	692	
10	500 (असतीत्र०)	693	
11	—	—	T. 90; W. 821
12	488 (अस०)	9	
13	22 (शर०)	695	
14	23 (2. हेमन्तत्र०)	—	R. 640; W. 769
15	574 (29. हालिकत्र०)	568	
16	575 („)	569	
17	645 (50. प्रत्यूषत्र०)	606	
18	10 (शर०)	562	
19	14 („)	625	
20	15 („)	681	
21	16 („)	684	
(5) हेमनाप०			
1	30 (2. हेमन्तत्र०)	77	
2	18 („)	109	
3	20 „	329	
4	21 „	330	
5	24 „	—	S. 641; W. 770
6	691 (59. देवरत्र०)	—	R. 642; W. 771
7	25 (हेम०)	—	R. 643; W. 772
8	26 „	—	R. 644; W. 773
9	27 „	—	R. 645; W. 730
10	28 „	—	R. 646; W. 745
11	29 „	—	R. 647; W. 774
12	— „	—	T. 229; W. 834
13	66 (22. असतीत्र०)	66	
(6) शिशिरप०			
1	487 (22. असतीत्र०)	8	
2	19 (2. हेमन्तत्र०)	238	
3	193 (10. उच्चावचत्र०)	458	
4	—	—	T. 556; W. 925
5	—	—	

11. सूर्यास्तमनप०

1	—	—	Setubandha	10.6
2	—	—	„	10.8
3	—	—	„	10.97
4	—	—	„	10.10
5	—	—	„	10.11
6	—	—	„	10.14

12. सन्ध्याप०

1	—	—	„	10.16
2	—	—	„	10.20
3	—	—	„	10.23
4	—	—	„	10.24

13. तिमिरप०

1	—	—	„	10.27
2	—	—	„	10.28
3	—	—	„	10.29
4	—	—	„	10.30

14. चन्द्रोदयप०

1	—	—	„	10.31
2	—	—	„	10.34
3	—	—	„	10.38
4	—	—	„	10.40
5	—	—	„	10.41
6	—	—	„	10.42
7	—	—	„	10.43
8	—	—	„	10.44
9	—	—	„	10.45
10	—	—	„	10.46
11	—	—	„	10.47
12	—	—	„	10.50
13	—	—	„	10.51
14	—	—	„	10.52
17	—	—	„	10.73
16	219 (11. चाटुव०)	300		

15. स्त्रीरूपवर्णनप०

1	153	(8. वर्णनाम्न०)	234
2	136	„	271
3	—	„	303
4	—	—	—

W. 969

III

GM. VERSES NOT FOUND IN WEBER'S EDITION OF
THE SAPTAŚATAKA

The verses are given according to the Paddhati and the serial number therein. We have supplied the Sanskrit chāyā also.

1. जा थेरं व हसंती कइ-वअणं बुरुह-वद्ध-विणिवेसा ।
दावेइ भुवण-मण्डलमण्णं चिअ जअइ सा वाणी ॥

(The Māṅgala Gāthā)

[या स्थकिरमिव हसंती कवि-वदनाऽबुरुह-वद्ध-विनिवेशा ।
दृश्यति भुवन-मण्डलमन्यमेव जयति सा वाणी ॥]

2. संज्ञा-पणाम-वडिओ गिरि-तणआ-विहुअ-वाम-हत्थ-विहडिओ ।
हसिऊण मुक्क-सलिलो एक-करेण णिअमंजली जेण कओ ॥

(12)

[सन्ध्या-प्रणाम-वटितो गिरि-तनया-विधुत-वाम-हस्त-विषटितो ।
हसित्वा मुक्त-सलिलो एक-करेण नियमाञ्जलियेन कृतः ॥]

3. पनमत पनअ-प्पकुपित-केली-चलनग-लग-पटिबिबं ।
तससु नख-तप्पनेसु एकातस-तनु-थलं रुद्धं ॥

(13)

[प्रणमत प्रणय-प्रकुपित-गौरी-वरणाग्र-लग्न-प्रतिविम्बम् ।
दशसु नख-दर्पणेषु एकादश-तनुधरं रुद्धम् ॥]

4. नच्चंतस्स य लीला-पाउक्खेवेन कं पिता वसुधा ।
उच्छलन्ति समुद्राः सइला निपतन्ति तं हलं नमत ॥]

(14)

[नर्ततश्च लीला-पादोत्क्षेपेन कम्पिता वसुधा ।
उच्छलन्ति समुद्राः शैला निपतन्ति तं हरं नमत ॥]

5. ससिहंढ-मंढणाणं समोहनासाण सुरअण-पिआणं ।
गिरिस-गिरिंद-सुआणं संधाढो वो सुहं देउ ॥]

(17)

[शशि-खण्ड(स-शिखण्ड)-मण्डनयोः स-मोह-नाश(स-मोहनाश)योः
सुरजन(सुरत्न)-प्रिययोः ।
गिरिश-गिरीन्द्रसुतयोः संधाटी वः सुखं (शुभं) ददतु ॥]

6. ओंकार-वक्क-धणुणो पढम-पुलिंदस्स णमह पुण्णे चलणे ।
ण मुअंति चडुल-जीहा पासल्लं जाण सारमेया देया (वा ?) ॥

(18)

[ओंकार-वक्क-धनुषः प्रथम-पुलिन्दस्य नमत पुण्ये चरणे ।
न मुञ्चन्ति चटुल-जिह्वाः पार्श्वं ययोः सारमेयाः देवाः(?) ॥]

7. दण्डं द-रुहिर-लित्तो सहइ ऊविं देा णह-प्पहावलि-अरुणो ।
संज्ञा, बहु-अवऊढो णव-वारिहरु व्व विज्जुला-पडिभिन्नो ॥

(II 6)

[दनुजेन्द्र-रुधिर-लित्तः शोभते उपेन्द्रो नख-प्रभावत्यरुणः ।
सन्ध्या-वध्ववगूढो नव-वारिधर इव विद्युत्प्रतिभिन्नः ॥]

8. ते विरला सप्पुरिसा जे अभणंता घडंति कज्जालावे ।
थोअ च्चिअ ते वि दुमा जे अभणिअ-कुसुम-णिग्गमा देंति फलं ॥

(III 14)

[ति विरलाः सत्पुरुषा ये अवदन्तो घटयन्ति कार्यालापान् ।
स्तोका एव तेऽपि द्रुमा ये अज्ञात-कुसुम-निर्गमा ददति फलम् ॥]

9. मडहुल्लाए किं तुह इमीअ किं वा दलेहिं तलिणेहिं ।
आमोए महुअर माल्ईअ जाणिहिसि माहण्णं ॥

(VI 15)

[लघुतया किं तव अस्याः किं वा दलैः तलिनैः ।

आमोदे मधुकर मालत्याः ज्ञास्यसि माहात्म्यम् ॥]

10. अहिणव-महु-लव-भाविअं तह परिचुं बिअ चूद-मंजरिं ।
कमल-वसहि-मित्त-णिब्बुदो महुअर विसुमरिदो सि णं कहं ॥

(VI 16)

[अभिनव-मधु-लव-भावितां तथा परिचुम्ब्य चूत-मञ्जरीम् ।

कमल-वसति-मात्र-निवृत्तो मधुकर विस्मृतोऽसि तां कथम् ॥

11. एककु च्चिअ दुव्विसहो विरहो मारेइ गअवई सीमो । *
किं पुण गहिअ-सिलीमुह-समाहवे फग्गुणे पत्ते ॥

(XI 11)

[एक एव दुर्विषहो विरहो (विरथो) मारयति गत-पतिकाः (गज-पतीन्) सीमः ।

किं पुनर्गृहीत-शिलीमुख-समाधवे फाल्गुने प्राप्ते ॥]

12. डहिल्लण गिरवसेसं ससावअं सुक्क-रुक्खमारुढो ।
किं सेसं ति दवग्गी पुणो वि रण्णं पुलोवेइ ॥

(XII 7)

[दग्ध्वा निरवशेषं स-श्वापदं शुष्क-वृक्षमारुढः ।

किं शेषमिति दवाग्निः पुनरपि अरण्यं प्रलोकयति ॥]

13. इसि (ईसीसि) चुं बिआइं भसलेहिं सुकुमार-केसर-सिहाइं ।
ओदंसअंति दसमाणा पमदाओ सिरास-कुसुमाइं ॥

(XII 12)

[ईषवीषन्नुम्बितानि भ्रमरैः सुकुमार-केशर-शिखानि ।

अवतंसयन्ति दयमानाः प्रमदाः शिरीष-कुसुमानि ॥]

14. चंद-णिमिएक्क-चलणा णह-भमिर-मराल-णिमिअ-बीअ-पआ ।
कमल-वण-दिण्ण-हत्था सरअ-सिरी भुवणमोअरइ ॥

(XIV 1)

[चन्द्र-न्यस्तैक-चरणा नभोभ्रमन्मराल-न्यस्त-द्वितीय-पदा ।

कमल-वन-दत्त-हस्ता शरच्छ्रुवनमवतरति ॥]

15. सा माह-मास-गोसग्ग-मज्जिरी तं पि दिन्न-पुण्णग्गी ।
मिलिआ गोला-तूहे दुवे वि तुम्हे धम्मिद्दा ॥

(XVI 5)

[सा मांघ-मास-प्रातर्मज्जनस्त्रीला त्वमपि दत्त-पुण्याग्निः ।
मिलितौ गोदा-तटे द्वावपि युवां खलु धर्मिष्ठौ ॥]

Besides these there are twenty-nine verses taken from *Setubandha*
X. The GM. variants are noted under V below.

IV

GM. VARIANTS FOR THE GĀTHĀS GIVEN IN W.

(B. stands for Bhuvanapāla's text of the *Saptasataka*)

W.		GM.		Variants
7	IX	viii	1	पाअप्पहरं.
37	X	iii	22	०भभाइण० (B); ०वुड्डुवुइणिवुइ० (B).
42	VII		1	धुवं. जं सि ण विणिदा (B).
66	X	v	13	चिरगइअ० (B).
67	X	iii	17	०मलसं पए तुह विइणं (B). कंठइज्जंतमम्हमंगं किणो हससि (B).
68	VI		4	०वहाए अ (B), ०विरसो अ (B).
76	VII		3	आसंथिअ० (B); पणइज्जो.
77	X	v	1	०सएणं व (B).
92	IX	vi	1	वद्धफलगरुई मालइ ति (B).
102	X	iii	28	तहसंठिअणेइक्कं तपेळ० (B).

112	II	4	णिउणं.
113	III	13	अणुदिअहं वड्ढतो.
114	II	5	णोविआअ (B).
135	IV	3	सणेहदाणेण (B).
136	VIII	1	दाणरहिअस्स (B); वच्छस्स (B).
139	IX	vi	महइ पाणलोहिहो (B).
151	II	1	सूरविवे व्व.
170	X	iii	ओत्तिणिए (B); ओलोडु (B); दिअहे (B); मुदा (B).
171	IX	v	उल्लइ; कोक्खए इ.
172	IX	x	मयसेरिहि (B); हुंइहि.
177	X	iii	दुमैति; ममं (B).
186	X	iv	महद्रहाणं; ओसीआई (B).
191	VII	10	विरिडिं; गारवग्गविआ; सेण्णारो; खंघेण.
217	VII	5	जं मित्तं वसणदेसआलम्मि (B); वाउल्लअं व (B).
219	X	i	असज्झं (B); मणम्मि असइत्तणं पत्ता (B).
230	VIII	2	खण्णओ झडिअपत्तो (B); मा (B).
238	X	vi	पारिअं (B).
245	VII	7	वालुअपडलं (B); ण एइ (B).
248	IV	1	भाअणो.
250	III	2	मंगुलं (B); लज्जिरो
251	VII	2	रुवं (B).
253	IV	2	अकुलीणो (B)
255	VII	6	देअ अक्काइं; णिव्वविअ ^० , जमणिव्वविअं.
263	X	iv	पत्तफलसारिच्छे (B); ओवंदम्मि (B).
265	III	3	अप्पव्वसेो वि सुअणो (B); आहिजाईए.
279	IX	viii	पुण भणामो, कंकेल्लिपल्लवा पल्लवाण हु हुंति (B).
281	IX	x	मालिआए णोमालिआइ; फुट्टिहिइ (B); मासलो (B).
284	V	1	अत्थमअम्मि.
285	III	1	पोट्टं भरेति सउणी (B); विहलुद्धरणभरसहा (B).
286	VII	8	जाणओ.
287	IX	iii	सव्वअं (B); मईण वि.

299	X	ii	8	ठवेइ उरे पइणो (B); गलंतउप्फं (B).
310	VII		9	गुणेहि (B); नेळ्ळंति पुलिदा मोत्तिआइं (B).
311	X	i	18	०मासम्मि (B); आवीय० (B).
315	X	iii	4	रोत्तूण (B); जोएइ गअवईउ (B).
320	III		8	ण वि तह दूमिज्जइ (B); परेहिं (B).
321	III		7	वि ण विणिग्गयाइं (B).
322	X	i	22	फिट्ठो.
324	X	iii	16	सुडिए (B).
329	X	v	3	दूमिज्जइ (B); पविरलअ०.
331	IX	vi	2	णक्ख०; पिव (B).
336	X	iii	2	०णीसहिं पिव.
364	VI		1	को तरइ समुत्थरिउं वित्थिण्णं णिम्मलं समुत्तुंगं (B); च पओहरो.
386	X	iii	8	णेसा (B); गज्जिरुभंत०.
387	IX	vi	4	विच्छड्ढो कुसुमरसो होइ (B).
392	IX	x	2	०दरवेविआइं (B); वेद्रहीउ.
396	X	i	4	सासइ ससंको (B) अंबाण वणं.
402	IX	x	10	मुंढी कउजेण विणा वि.
404	IX	viii	3	एएणं चिअ.
405	IX	viii	4	०कमलाहएण जं.
412	X	i	21	ण देह सुत्तुं सुवह.
414	IX	x	12	वाअंतवहल० (B).
424	IX	x	6	चावं जइ वि विसुद्धं (B); सरो (B); विहडंता; व; केच्चिरं.
436	X	iii	13	अविरअ-पडंत-जलहर-धारा-रअरज्जु-घडिय-वंधेहि । (B); अवअंतो च्चिअ हक्कइ महिअलं पाउसो उअह ॥
442	IX	vi	5	पक्खा० (B); विअसाविज्जइ (B); कुंदअकलिआ (B).
443	X	i	10	विव; दूमिज्जइ (B); दक्खिण०.
444	IX	vi	6	ईसिं पि माल्ईमउलं (B); आरुहणपाण० (B).
454	IX	i	2	परित्तो जूरइ (B); णिअलाइआ.
458	X	vi	3	मयणंमुलीइ मयणवडरोहणं० (B); ०वड०.
460	IX	ii	1	सअलगोठ्ठ० (B).

467	VI	4	आवन्नाइ.
468	IX ix	1	णिककंड ^० ; पाडलं; कआ इह गामे (B).
494	X ii	5	चीरिविरुएहि.
497	X i	12	वारैह णं घरा णेति (B); जा मआ सा मअ च्चिअ.
499	X i	5	इह गामे (B); तस्सेअ (B).
527	IX i	3	^० रइअ-अमण(?)—देहो; णवरि गइंदो च्चिअ (B); गरुअमाइ (B).
532	IX v	1	फोफा ^० ; समल्लिअइ (B).
535	IX x	4	जुण्णअं अइअं (B).
537	IV	4	ठट्ठेण.
538	X iii	10	एंते पहिए घरं णिएऊण (B).
541	X iii	14	णेव्वंतर ^० (B).
543	X i	1	एंतं; उक्कंठओ.
549	IX vii	3	^० मद्दणसआइ.
560	X iii	24	सहइ; परिग्गह आणं व.
563	X iv	5	पूसआण (B).
564	X iii	27	^० वेढएसु (B).
566	X iii	12	पंथकलंबाण (B); आसस (B); मा चरिणिमुहं ण (B).
567	X iii	9	अवरिं (B); मा तं.
568	X iv	15	छिरेक्क ^० (B); दिन्न-उन्नअपएण (B).
569	X iv	16	^० काले; तुसारेहिं (B).
575	X i	16	रणझणइ.
576	X iii	26	फट्ठि पेल्लिओ (B).
579	JX vii	1	अण्णणईसु (B).
584	X iii	5	^० पवणगलत्थल्लण ^० (B); धुककुद्धुकेइ (B); हिअअ व विज्जुला.
585	X iii	6	पेच्छह (B); उरम्मि.
586	X i	3	विओला पहिआ (B); उप्पंक (B); ^० भल्लि (B).
589	IX iii	2	^० अविरल-पसरिअ.
591	IX vi	11	^० मअरंद-परिमल-सुहाए (B).
592	IX vi	12	कुंदकलिआए; अहिलिज्जइ (B).

595	IX	iii	55	आऊणं आअडिढअ-भल्ल-मम्माहआअ.
606	X	iv	17	पच्चह ^० , परिमासं.
620	IX	iii	3	दीविअमईए (B); तह लालिओ (B).
621	IX	ix	3	कमलेसु भमइ परिमलइ सत्तलिं (B). मुअइ (B).
623	X	iii	15	उच्छेवअं (B); ^० जाआ (B).
625	X	iv	19	अवरिं.
638	X	iii	23	^० घर ^० (B); वोच्चरकलअल ^० ; मणोहरा इह गिरि- गामा (B).
639	IX	ii	2	पि जह उल्लेइ.
640	IX	ii	3	तुह (B).
664	IX	iv	3	जह अहिणंदइ; वुक्कइ.
681	X	iv	20	सिअसैघव ^० (B); धूलिपुंज ^० ; वसुआअंति व मुक्को ^० (B).
684	X	iv	21	वासम्मि; सरसचिच्चिलं (B); तस्स सीमं ^० .
688	IV	iv	5	चाडुअस्स कुसलाण.
689	IX	iv	1	वाससअं (B).
690	IX	iv	2	तं तह (B)
691	X	iv	8	^० सास ^० .
692	X	iv	9	पउमालेहडा ^० (B); ^० वल्लणेण; सोत्त.
695	X	iv	13	वंठाण (B); सरए सहस्स मग्गे (B).
696	X	iii	11	संकीलिओ व्व णज्जइ; वासाअमम्मि पंथो; मणेण.
711	X	iii	20	सुअं (B); जीवेण.
726	VI		3	अमअमअं (B); चंदमुह (B); ^० डहणो.
730	X	v	9	चरिएण.
740	IX	x	5	रसासाओ (B); सुविण्णल्लणं पंडुउल्लूणं; भमासाणं (B).
745	X	v	10	पइणा.
753	III		9	सुहअरो चंदो (B).
755	IX	vi	8	महुअरेहिं (B); संभरंतेहिं (B).
758	X	ii	6	तिसिओ; समूसरइ.
760	IX	vii	2	वेडिसलआधरंतेल्लि मइलिआ (B).
761	IX	vi	10	जीअम्मिव; ^० कलिअं.

762	IX	x	7	किं भण्णइ.
763	IX	iii	4	मइअत्ति मओ मईवि तिसिओ मओ त्ति कलिऊणं ^० ; ण पिअइ.
767	X	iii	19	उत्थंघियाए; सेओ.
768	IX	x	3	कल्लं व फुट्ठिहिसि (B).
769	X	iv	14	०दंतुकत्त ^० .
770	X	v	5	ओहार संघासालुआण वइमूलमल्लिअंताणं (B); किलिचअ (B); वलइ,
771	X	v	6	कुण परिहासं दे दिअर; णहोरणा वराईअं; पुणो पिअं कुणसु तं छाअं.
772	X	v	7	पावरेणं; वासभवणेण (B); जस्स उरम्मि णिसम्मइ (B).
774	X	v	11	उअ अस ^० .
777	X	i	9	पवणो; पत्तं.
778	X	i	7	घरिङ्गिजहिइ (B); ०पल्लवाणं जो.
780	X	i	14	सज्जेह देह तूरं (B); कुणह विच्छित्ति (B); पुहविवइस्स (B); जह हलहलओ (B).
781	X	i	17	वणअव ^० ; वसंतमासे; पुणो वि.
782	X	i	15	दूरं; ०परिमल ^० ; विव.
783	X	i	6	०जणस्स (B).
787	IX	i	4	०संठिआरक्खं (B); जीहमेत्तमहुरं कलमलेत्तं.
788	IX	i	5	वणसालिणो (B); होही.
790	IX	i	7	विसमाह अपडहवेढणाविउलं (B); जाणइ णिब्बाहेउं.
791	IX	i	8	ओमुगगकबोलेण गयमएण पत्ते; दसावसाणम्मि (B); तए (B).
795	IX	ii	4	०सुरपीढपेल्लणदलंतपत्थर ^० (B); अवलोआरिअपंथे.
816	II		2	०ए लच्छी.
819	IX	vi	13	गमेसु; वासअ ^० .
821	X	iv	11	अंवे; जाणंता विअ.
834	X	vi	12	बोलीणो.
845	X	ii	11	राईउ; जह इर.

925	X	vi	4	दीहा वि सम्पइ; कह ण ते.
969	XV		4	लडहत्तअअ.
978	V		3	°वअंस°.
982	IX	x	8	जह गंमीरो जह; सो सरसवाणिओ ण कओ.

V

Variant readings of the *Setubandha* verses found in GM. as compared with the texts according to the *Setutattvacandrikā* (R. G. Basak's edition) (S), Goldschmidt's edition (G) and the *Kāvyamālā* edition (K).

Setu.		GM.		
X	6	XI	1	रइणो (GK).
„	8	„	2	रइ° (,,)
„	9	„	3	दिसाभोआ; °वेदं (GK).
„	10	„	4	दिवसे.
„	11	„	5	दिवस°, विरमे (S); गमिआ°; °किल्लिआइ° (GK). °प्फुसिअ°.
„	14	„	6	दिअहेण, °होमुद° (S °होसुद); रइणो.
„	16	XII	1	°रोअग्गाइ°.
„	20	„	2	दीसइ; °सद° (GK); कुमुअ° GK.
„	23	„	3	स्थइअ°; °भाअ°; णिव्वंति (S).
„	24	„	4	°राअ° (GK).
„	27	XIII	1	तिमिरविलिब्भंतमइलमुद *.
„	28	„	2	मउलाविअ°; वडण° (GK).
„	29	„	3	उक्खड°; °उत्तंभि°; लंविअ व्वसइो; घेत्तव्व.
„	30	„	4	अ; उवरि° (GK).
„	31	XIV	5	कसिण°.
„	34	„	2	°विवं; °सुउमालं°.

* In Basak's edition धुव्वन्ततिमिर is to be read for धुव्वन्त in XI 38.

„	40	„	4	विस्थिणं (GK); तदुज्जुअ ^० ; खाऊण;
				उक्खित्तं (S).
„	41	„	5	वहलम्मि वि तम ^० (GK); णिब्बाविऊण;
				अणुवज्झति.
„	42	„	6	परिमासण ^० ; अवडिच्छि ^० (GK); पाडँति दिणअर.
„	43	„	7	फुसिओ; विरइओ.
„	44	„	8	अराइं; थोअ ^० (GK); पअडंति (GK).
„	45	„	9	उवउत्त ^० .
„	46	„	10	णिराअपलंवो; पडिओ.
„	47	„	11	मइंद धवलससि ^० .
„	50	„	12	ओअत्ते ^० .
„	51	„	13	वल्लिआ (S) भमंति.
„	52	„	14	च्छंदण ^० .
„	53	„	15	विच्छूदब्ब ससिअरं; अविभा ^० (GK).

3. THE PRAKRIT POETS HARIVṚDDHA, SĀTAVĀHANA AND ĀDHYARĀJA

1. As a comparative and critical survey of the whole range of subjects and topics coming under Alamkāra in its broadest sense, Raghavan's study of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* has an incomparable value. But it is equally valuable as a rich storehouse of interesting literary-historical information and of exhumed references and citations relating to lost works and authors of past.

The purpose of the present paper is to supplement the information about a few of the forgotten Prakrit authors, out of a sizeable number discussed by Raghavan.

1. Harivṛddha

2. On the basis of a quotation in Bhoja's *Sarasvatikanthābharaṇa*, Raghavan has drawn our attention to a Prakrit poet named Harivṛddha,¹ who, though possibly quite important, has been so far practically unknown to us.

To illustrate the Doṣa-guṇa called Gūḍhārtha, Bhoja quotes anonymously a Prakrit vrese,² wherein a modest poet says : 'There are poets and poets. The same term *Kavi* applies to nobodies like us as also to big poetic geniuses like Harivṛddha and Śāli, just as the term *hari* applies to mere frogs and monkeys as also to fierce serpents and lions'. Here the names of Harivṛddha and Śāli stand for eminence in the field of Prakrit poetry. There is slight uncertainty about the text of the verse, but the commentator Ratneśvara takes Harivṛddha as one name and not as two (i.e. Hari and Vṛddha), and Raghavan is rightly inclined to the same view. We may also note that the commentator characterizes Harivṛddha and Śāli as poets of uncommon genius—*lokottara-pratibhā-śālinal*. Moreover, Raghavan has suggested that Śāli here may be the same as the famous poet Śālivāhana or Hāla.³

3. Further Raghavan draws our attention to a Prakrit verse of some Hari cited by Namisādhū on Rudraṭa's *Kāvya-lankāra* II 19. It enumerates eight modes of literary expression⁴ (equivalent to *Anuprāsavṛtti-s*) : Madhura, Paruṣa, Komala, Ojasvin, Niṣṭhura, Lalita, Gambhīra and Sāmānya. But Raghavan leaves it at that, as there is nothing more to suggest the identification of this Hari with Harivṛddha of the Sk. illustration.

4. Now there are at least two references to Harivṛddha prior to the one noted from Bhoja. One is from Virahāṅka before eighth century (?) and another is from Rājaśekhara (c. 880-920). Virahāṅka's manual of Prakrit prosody called *Vṛttajātisamuccaya*⁵ (=VS) indirectly gives us some further valuable information about the poet Harivṛddha. Virahāṅka characteristically treats the structure of the Dvipadī. In the second chapter of VS., he first defines the characters and functions of various constituents like Vastuka, Gitika, Vidārī, Ekaka, Dvipathaka, Vistāritaka and Dhruvaka which build up the structure of the Dvipadī. In the end he states, on the authority of several eminent Prakrit prosodists, a rule about the employment of Gitika in the Dvipadī, and concludes the chapter with the enumeration of fiftytwo types of Dvipadīs after the same authorities. The two stanzas of the VS. giving the names of these metrical authorities are as under :

Bhuaāhiva-Sālāhana-Vuḍḍhakai-ṇirūviam imam daie /
ṇihana-ṇirūvia-dhuvammī vatthue giūa natthi //
Bhuaāhiva-Sālāhana-vuḍḍhakai-ṇirūviāna duvaiṇa /
ṇāmāim jāim sāhemi tujjha tāmpia kameṇa //

—VS. II. 8. 9

These can be translated as :

'O Dear, in the treatments of Bhujagādhipa, Sātavāhana and Vṛddhakavi there is no scope for a Gitika after a Vastuka, if the latter ends in a Dhruvaka.

I will now tell you, according to their order, the names of the Dvipadīs which have been treated by Bhujagādhipa, Sātavāhana and Vṛddhakavi.'

The commentator Gopāla on VS. II. 8, identifies Bhujagādhīpa as two persons called Kambala and Aśvatara and Satavāhana as a king. Regarding Vṛddhakavi, he says that according to some he was the same as Harivṛddha.⁶ If we accept this last identification, then it follows that Harivṛddha, also known as Vṛddhakavi, was, along with the two Bhujagādhīpas and Sātavāhana, a recognized authority on Prakrit metrics and especially on its section on the Dvipadī. In this connection we may attach some significance to the fact that as Harivṛddha and Śāli figure together in the SK. I. 99 illustration, so also Sātavāhana and Vṛddhakavi figure together in VS. II. 8 and 9.

5. We may also mention here in passing that the expression *Vuḍḍhakai-ṇirūviaṃ* from VS. II. 8 is anonymously quoted by Hemacandra, in the form *Viddhakai-nirūviaṃ* under *Siddhahema*, 8-2-40 as a counter-instance of *-ddh-* changing into *-ḍḍh-*. That the example is in fact drawn from the VS. is shown beyond doubt by the fact that the whole of the first part of VS. I. 13 (*īarāiṃ jāṇa lahu-akkharāiṃ pāṃtimella-sahiāna*) is reproduced under *Siddhahema*, VIII. iii. 134 (with the variant *pāyamtimilla* for *pāyamtimella*) to illustrate the use of a genitive form for the ablative. Hemacandra's using of Virahāṅka's metrical manual to obtain illustrative matter for his grammar implies a good measure of respectability and traditional authority for the latter. And the same conclusion is to be drawn from Virahāṅka's acknowledgement that Vṛddhakavi was one of his sources and authorities.

6. We come across one more reference to Harivṛddha in Rājasekhara's *Karpūramañjarī*. In the first Javanikā of the *Karpūramañjarī* during the squabble with the maid Vicakṣaṇā, the Vidūṣaka reacts angrily to the King's praise of the former and says, 'Then why don't you say straightway : this our servant-girl is a poet surpassing even Harivṛddha, Nandivṛddha, Poṭṭisa, Hāla and such others ?'—*tā ujjuaṃ jeva kiṃ ṇa bhaṇiadi amhāṇaṃ ceḍiā Harivṛddha-Nandivṛddha-Poṭṭisa-Hālapahudiṇaṃ pi purado sukai tti ?* Here Harivṛddha figures as one of the famous and foremost

Prakrit poets. As in the two references previously considered, here too he is found in Hāla's company.

7. The other two, Nandivṛddha and Poṭṭisa, also must have been renowned Prakrit poets. One Namdiyaḍḍha (Sk. Nanditāḍhya) is known to us as the author of a small work on Prakrit metres called *Gāthālakṣaṇa*.⁸ The form in which the *Gāthālakṣaṇa* is at present before us is the work of a Jain author. But Velankar has serious doubts about the genuineness of certain parts of the *Gāthālakṣaṇa*. There are clear borrowings from works like *Svayambhūcchandasa*.⁹ Again we find the definition of an Apabhramśa metre cited elsewhere under the name of poet Namdaḍḍha (*kai Namdaḍḍha*)¹⁰, but it is not found in the *Gāthālakṣaṇa*. The present *Gāthālakṣaṇa* seems to be a mutilated and interpolated version or recast of the metrical manual composed by a poet Namdiyaḍḍha which treated Prakrit and Apabhramśa metres. And that Namdiyaḍḍha may be the same as the Namdiuḍḍha of the *Karpūramañjarī*. Some of the commentaries on Hāla's *Gāthā-sattasāi* ascribe the authorship of Gāthā IV. 92 (N. S. Edition) to Namdiuḍḍha. The Gāthā seems to be an old one. A portion of this Gāthā is quoted under *Siddhahema* VIII. ii. 80 to illustrate the fact that Deśya words like *vodraha* 'youngman' invariably preserve an *r*-cluster (instead of optionally assimilating it). As against the form *voḍaḥio* of the *Gāthā-sattasāi* mss., the *Siddhahema* offers us *vodraḥio* which preserves the original phonology.

8. Now we consider Poṭṭisa whom Rājaśekhara has mentioned along with Hariuḍḍha, Namdiuḍḍha and Hāla. Poṭṭisa figures as the chief minister of Hāla-Sātavāhana in the *Lilāvāikahā* of Kōuhala¹¹ (c. 800 A.D.). There at times he is respectfully referred to as Poṭṭisa-miśra and Śrī-poṭṭisa. Four Gāthās (viz., I. 89, II. 73, III. 93, V. 3) from Hāla's *Gāthāsattasāi* are attributed to Poṭṭisa.¹² One more, viz., I.4 also is to be added to these: In the N. S. edition of the *Gāthāsattasāi* the name of its author is given as Vodisa, but Bhuvanapāla's commentary gives the name as Poṭṭisa and in one MS. of that commentary (that which is in the MSS. collection of the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad) the

marginal gloss on the authorship-label 'poṭṭisassa' reads : *Hāla-mantrī tu poṭṭisaḥ*. This confirms the tradition we find in the *Lilāvai*.

9. As in the case of Nandīuḍḍha and Poṭṭisa, so also in the case of Hariuḍḍha we find in Hāla's *Gāhā-sattasai* a Gāthā or two attributed to him. III. 88 is given under the name of Hariuḍḍha, and the name Haritau under which II. 100 is given may be a corruption of *Hariuḍḍha* misread as *Hariuta*. As Virahāṅka is plausibly assigned to a period prior to the eighth century A.D.¹³, Hariuḍḍha is to be placed between Hāla and Virahāṅka.

10. Thus Hariuḍḍha alias Vṛddhakavi was an acknowledged early authority on Prakrit prosody. His eminent achievements as a Prakrit poet are indicated by his sobriquet Viddhakai or Vuḍḍhakai (Vṛddha-kavi) and by the *Karpūramanījari* and *Sarāśvatikanṭh-ābharana* allusions. If he is the same as the Hari quoted by Namisādhū, he should be also credited with some notable contribution to poetics. In the literary tradition current during the period 800-1000 A.D., his name figured in association with the names of important Prakrit poets and authors like Hāla, Nandīuḍḍha, Poṭṭisa and Bhujagādhipa-s.

2. Sātavāhana

11. The following facts about Sātavāhana are quite well-known. Onwards from the sixth century A.D., we have a powerful literary and legendary tradition which considers Pk. Hāla, Sālāhāṇa, Sālāvāhāṇa, Sk. Śātsvāhana, Śālīvāhana, Śālāvāhana etc. as different forms of the same name¹⁵ which belonged to a famous king of Pratiṣṭhāna. This Hāla-Sātavāhana had become a great legendary figure credited with many glorious deeds and achievements. There are numerous references to his patronage of learning and partiality for Prakrit language and literature. He is famous as the compiler of the anthology of Prakrit verse variously called *Gāhākoso*, *Kosa*, *Gāhā-satta-sai*, *Gāthā-saptaśati* etc. He is also credited with the authorship of (1) numerous

Gāthās in the same collection and of (2) the introductory section (*kathā-pīṭha*) of the lost *Brhatkathā* which was composed by Guṇādhyā in the Paisāci Prakrit.¹⁶ But Hāla-Sātavāhana's reputation as a great Prakrit poet and author would naturally suggest that his literary achievements might not have been confined to just this much. He might have written extensively. And in fact from a few references scattered here and there we do get some positive information about several other writings of Hāla-Sātavāhana.

12. From Virahāṅka's references discussed earlier, we have already inferred that Hāla-Sātavāhana had composed a manual of Prakrit prosody, which was considered authoritative. We have no information about its general scope or contents, but this much is definite that it treated at length the form and structure of the Prakrit Dvipadī.

13. Besides being a Prakrit metrician, Hāla-Sātavāhana was also a Prakrit lexicographer. He had composed a lexicon of Deśya words from which five actual quotations are given in Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā*. At all the five places Hemacandra cites Sātavāhana to record a difference of opinion about the meaning of a particular Deśya word. This implies that Hāla-Sātavāhana's authority as a Deśikāra was such that Hemacandra deemed it necessary to give the former's view where it diverged from one which he himself had adopted.

The quotations given by Hemacandra are as under :

1. 'jambulam madya-bhājanam' iti Sātavāhanah—(*Deśināmālā*, under II. 41, p. 146)
2. 'tīvvaṁ atyratham' iti Sātavāhanah (ibid, under V. II, p. 187)
3. 'purohaḍam pacchokaḍam (?)' itī tu Sātavāhanah (ibid, under VI. 15, p. 215)
4. 'paḍis amītam astamitam' itī tu Sātavāhanah, (ibid, under VI. 18, p. 217)
5. 'paḍihattho vacanam' itī tu Sātavāhanah (ibid, under VI. 19, p. 217)

These quotations suggest the following points about the character and value of Hāla's Deśya lexicon :

(1) Hemacandra cites Sātavāhana only so far as the latter differs from the position acceptable to him. Nowhere has he cited him in his support on a controversial point, unlike most of the other early authorities on Deśya which Hemacandra cites (at times agreeing, at times disagreeing with his own position.)¹⁷. This suggests that Sātavāhana's work might have been of a limited scope. But the fact that Hemacandra quotes him several times is indicative of the traditional authority acquired by the work.

(2) Sātavāhana's lexicon gave Sanskrit meaning equivalents for Deśya items.

(3) Unlike most of the known lexicons which have been composed in Gāthā, Sātavāhana's work seems to have been composed in Anuṣṭubh. Of course, one cannot be quite definite about this in view of the very meagre material available, but the rhythm of the fragments cited is felt more like that of the Anuṣṭubh.

(4) The work may have been in the form of just a glossary i.e. a collection of selected words with only meaning equivalents and without illustrations.

14. If Hāla-Sātavāhana has composed a work on Prakrit metres, it is reasonable to believe that he might have written several Prakrit poems also besides those Muktakas in Gāthā that are preserved in his *Gāthā-kośa*. And fortunately we can point out something actual to support such a belief. The Apabhramśa poet Svayambhū has quoted in his *Svayambhū-cchandā* two illustrative stanzas, one under the name of Sālāhaṇa and another under the name of Hāla. He has illustrated the metre Udgīti with a verse of Sālāhaṇa,¹⁸ and for the Varṇavṛtta Śārdūlavikṛīta he has quoted two examples, one of which is said to be from Hāla.¹⁹ This second quotation signifies that Hāla had used some Varṇavṛttas also in his Prakrit compositions.

15. Further, from two other references we come to know that Sālāhaṇa had acquired lasting reputation as a composer of a particular type of Prakrit lyrics called Dhavala. In the Apabhraṃśa section of Hemacandra's metrical treatise, the *Chandonuśāsana*, we find at the end of the Utsāha subsection the description of a class of metres called Dhavala. Hemacandra defines and illustrates several varieties of the Dhavala. But at the very beginning of his treatment, and just after describing the general form and character of the Dhavala, he remarks that he would be illustrating only a few of the varieties, but for a fuller picture one should consult the 'utterances' (*ukti*) of Sātavāhana—*dhavalāṇi Sātavāhanoktiṣu drṣṭavyāṇi, digmātrām tūdāharisyate*.²⁰

16. What is exactly the meaning of the words 'the *ukti*-s of Sātavāhana' in Hemacandra's allusion? Were they some *sadukti*-s or *sūkti*-s composed by Sātavāhana in different varieties of the Dhavala metre or were they possibly his descriptive statements about the same in his metrical treatise? The required clarification on this point can be found from a similar statement of the Apabhraṃśa poet Svayambhū. And it is quite likely that Svayambhū's remarks, discussed below, was the source of Hemacandra's statement. In his famous manual of Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa metres, the *Svayambhūcchandas*, Svayambhū has described in the last chapter the general metrical organization of some outstanding Apabhraṃśa literary genres like the Sandhibandha, the Rāsābandha etc. First he defines different types of Chaḍḍaṇīā, Ghattā and Padhaḍīā which built up the Sandhi, and thereafter he seems to specify the kinds of metres used in the composition of Gīti-s which were probably short Prakrit or Apabhraṃśa lyrics. He refers in this connection to various types of Ghattā, Chaḍḍaṇī and Vidārikā, different from those he had described earlier and adds that over and above these there were various types of Dhavalas such as those composed in quantity by Sātavāhana :—*Sālāhaṇeṇa dhavalāṇi jāṇi viraiṇi aṇeṇi bahu-vihāṇi*.²¹ Here Sālāhaṇa i.e. Sātavāhana is said to have composed (*viraiṇi*) a number of diverse types of Dhavala songs.

17. Thus from these references it clearly follows that Sātavāhana's Dhavala songs were very famous and were considered quite typical.²² Though both Svayambhū and Hemacandra treat, and the latter also illustrates, separately Dhavala as an Apabhramśa metre, this need not necessarily imply that Sātavāhana's Dhavalas were in Apabhramśa. Many of the typically Apabhramśa metres were also used for composing in Prakrit, and at times even in Sanskrit.²³

Sātavāhana's Dhavalas must have been short lyrics having eight, six or four lines describing some eminent person under the guise of a *dhavala* (i.e. a white bull of the best breed). In other words they must have been Dhavalānyokti-s, a few examples of which we come across in some Apabhramśa works. For example, we have seven Dhavalānyokti-s in the seven Gāthās of the *Jambūsāmicariu* of Vīra (VII. 6) (composed in 1020 A.D.).²⁴ Again among the illustrations cited by Hemacandra in the Apabhramśa section of the *Siddhahema* we find two Dhavalānyokti-s (VIII. iv. 340/2; 421), one of which (iv 340/2) is clearly based on *Jambūsāmicariu* VII. 6, lines 26-27. Although these stanzas are either in Gāthā or Dohā metre, while the Dhavalas defined by Hemacandra and Svayambhū have altogether different metrical structures, still the former were also called Dhavalas, as both the above-named metrical authorities make it clear that besides the songs of specific metrical forms, other songs also in metres like Utsāha, Helā, Vedana etc. were also called Dhavalas, if they described the hero under the guise of a *dhavala*.²⁵ This second category of Dhavalas was named after their metre, e.g. Utsāhadhavalā, Helādhavalā etc. We cannot say whether Sātavāhana had also written Dhavalas coming under this second category.

18. Hemacandra's *Deśināmamālā* has recorded several names by which Hāla-Sātavāhana was known to the tradition :²⁶ Kuntala (DN. II. 36), Pūsa (VI. 80) and Cauracimḍha (III. 7). There has been a persistent tradition taking Sātavāhana as a king of the Kuntala country with his capital at Pratiṣṭhāna. But from the following reference in the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana it appears that

Kuntala was also an alternative name of king Sātavāhana himself : *Kartaryā Kuntalaḥ Śātakarṇiḥ Sātavāhano mahādevīm Malayavatīm (jaghāna)*. Hemacandra might have followed this tradition²⁷ in giving Kuntala as a Deśya word signifying Hāla-Sātavāhana.

Pūsa would correspond to Sk. *pūṣya*. As a Deśya item it also means 'a parrot', Why Sātavāhana was called Pūsa and what was its significance—these things are totally in the dark.

The third alternative name of Hāla-Sātavāhana noted above is Cauraciṃdha, which corresponds to Sk. Caturacihna. One way of interpreting this is to take it as equivalent to Sk. *Vidagdha-śiromaṇi*. And it can very well fit the personality of Hāla-Sātavāhana as it is known from legends. But another interpretation is also plausible. *Catura-cinha* is the same as *Caturāṅka*, i.e. one whose *aṅka* or pen-name was *Catura*. The *Śrīḡārakpraāśa* has classified and illustrated various types of *aṅkas*.²⁸ An *aṅka* was some special marking word used by a poet at the close of each section of his literary work, as a sort of signature. Instead of *aṅka*, its synonyms *cinha* and *lāñchana* were used occasionally. We have the pen-names of ancient poets like Abhimānāṅka, Parākramāṅka, Sāhasāṅka,²⁹ Virahāṅka,³⁰ etc. Similarly we have Dakṣiṇṇaiṃdha³¹ [i.e. Dākṣiṇyacihna], Abhimānacihna,³² Avalevacinha³³ [i.e. Avalepacihna,], Jasaindha³⁴ (i.e. Yaśāscihna), etc. Thirdly we may note Sadbhāvalāñchana³⁵, Virahalāñchana,³⁶ Dākṣiṇyalāñchana,³⁷ etc. Accordingly Sk. *Catura* or Pk. *Caura* would be the *aṅka* i.e. identifying mark of Sātavāhana employed in the concluding verses of the sections of his narrative poems. Of course, this remains merely a speculation until we can verify it, and that would be possible only when luck favoured us with the recovery of some sustained composition of Sātavāhana.

Finally we should note that in the closing verse of each Śataka of the *Gāthā-Saptaśatī*, Hāla-Sātavāhana is called *kaivacchala* (Sk. *kavi-vatsala*) 'a loving patron of poets'. This seems to be rather a *biruda* than a pen-name.

3. Āḍhyarāja

19. The tradition that identifies Sātavāhana with Hāla is old, persistent and vigorous. The same cannot be said of the tradition which identifies Sātavāhana with Āḍhyarāja. Rājaśekhara and Bhoja have noted that tradition. As pointed out by Raghavan,³⁸ Rājaśekhara has recorded in his *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* (p. 50) a legend according to which Sātavāhana, the king of Kuntala, had ordered his harem to make exclusive use of Prakrit, and similarly Sāhasāṅka, the king of Ujjayinī had prescribed exclusive use of Sanskrit.³⁹ Bhoja, in *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana*, II. 15 refers to the same traditional legend when he says that everybody used Prakrit under the regime of Āḍhyarāja, while under the regime of Sāhasāṅka everybody used Sanskrit.⁴⁰ Here we see that Bhoja's Āḍhyarāja corresponds to Rājaśekhara's Sātavāhana of Kuntala. And Ratneśvara's commentary too on the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* identifies Āḍhyarāja with Śālivāhana, and Sāhasāṅka with Vikramāditya. So the fact that there was such a tradition cannot be denied.

20. In this connection Mirashi and Raghavan have drawn our attention to Bāṇa's reference to Āḍhyarāja in his *Harṣacarita*. In the introductory verses of the *Harṣacarita* Bāṇa, in the course of eulogising eminent poets that preceded him, says that with the excellence of Āḍhyarāja's Utsāha compositions before them, other poets found no heart to write poetry :

Āḍhyarāja-kṛtoṣāhaiḥ hr̥dayasthaiḥ smṛtair api /
jīhvāntaḥ kṛṣyamāṇeva na kavīte pravartate ||⁴¹

Now it looks certain that according to Bāṇa this Āḍhyarāja on one hand and Sātavāhana, the compiler of *Gāthā-kośa* on the other, were different persons, because each of the eight introductory verses of the *Harṣacarita*, beginning from the 11th and ending with the 18th, pays tribute to some one famous poet or work in the following order : *Vāsavadattā* (11), Bhaṭṭāra Haricandra (12) Sātavāhana (13), Pravarasena (14), Bhāsa (15), Kālidāsa (16), *Bṛhatkathā* (17) and Āḍhyarāja (18). So the tradition that identified Āḍhyarāja with Hāla-Sātavāhana was a later development.

21. Ādhyarāja's literary compositions which Bāṇa has so highly admired have been referred to by him as 'Utsāha-s.' The term 'Utsāha' has intrigued the scholars and they have made various conjectures⁴² about its meaning. But Utsāha here is not a general designation for the chapter-divisions of an Ākhyāyikā like Āśvāsa, etc. The commentator Śaṅkara has recorded two earlier interpretations as he himself had no idea as to what was exactly meant by Utsāha. According to one view it was primarily the name of a particular type of Tāla in dance, and secondarily it applied to poems which were used as song-text to accompany the dance.⁴³ According to another view it was a prose-cum-verse composition with a definite pattern : The introductory stanza presented the theme in substance, which was further enlarged upon in prose interspersed with verse, and the whole formed a self-contained unit.⁴⁴

22. Prakrit prosody enlightens us on this point and it supports in substance the first of the above two interpretations. Utsāha was a well-known Prakrit metre. Both the leading Prakrit prosodists, Svayambhū and Hemacandra, have defined it.⁴⁵ In their scheme of treatment the Utsāha metre headed the first sub-section of the Apabhraṁśa section and hence that sub-section was usually called Utsāhādiprakaraṇa.⁴⁶ Utsāha was a metre of 24 Mātrās, made up of 6 Caturmātras, the third and fifth Caturmātra having the form u—u or u, uuu. The fact that Utsāha is treated as an Apabhraṁśa metre does not mean that it could not be employed in Prakrit compositions. As pointed out earlier, the prosodists have explicitly stated that the metres treated under the Apabhraṁśa section are generally but not exclusively⁴⁷ used in Apabhraṁśa poems. Conversely several metres of the Khaṇḍaka category, described under the Prakrit section are found in actual practice to have been used in Apabhraṁśa poems.

Further the Prakrit prosodists tell us that the Utsāha metre was also used to compose certain types of songs called Dhavala, Maṅgala and Phullaṭaka which were mostly in Apabhraṁśa.⁴⁸ Thus from the information we gather about the Utsāha metre

from the manuals of prosody, it is clear that in early Prakrit and Apabhramśa literatures there must have been in vogue an important class of short lyrics in the Utsāha metre. In Bāṇa's times Āḍhyarāja's poems in Utsāha were judged to have been superb.

23. Raghavan has drawn our attention to one more fact about Āḍhyarāja's writings which he gleans from the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.⁴⁹ While illustrating the various conventional modes of marking the closing verse of each canto in the Sargabandha etc. the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* says that in Āḍhyarāja's work the end of each section was specifically marked by his favourite word *dhairya* : *abhiprāyāṅkatā yathā dhairyam Āḍhyarājasya*.⁵⁰ This implies that Āḍhyarāja had also written some Prabandhakāvya — may be a Mahākāvya. Looking to his reported love of Prakrit, we can suppose that it was a Prakrit Kāvya, like Sarvasena's *Harivijaya* which was Utsāhāṅka or Pravarasena's *Setubaddha* which is *anurāgāṅka*, but of course we cannot be definite about this point.

Notes

1. His 'Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*' (1963), p. 835.
2. *amhārisā vi kaiṇo Harivuḍḍha-Sāli-pamuhā vi / maṇḍukka-makkadā vi hu hoṃti hari sappa-sihā vi //*
— *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa* (Sk.), Nirṇaya Sagar edition, I.99 (133). As in the case of so many other Prakrit passages of the SK. the text of this verse is also faulty. The printed text reads *halibudḍha* and *harisappasimhā*. For the former it also records a variant *hariamda*.

Śṛṅgāraprakāśa ed. by Yatiraja Swamy and G. R. Josyer (Vol : II, 1963) also has got this verse. At p. 348 it is in a very corrupt form (like most of the other Prakrit and Apabhramśa passages in that edition) : the end portion of the first line reads *marimuḍḍhaelavamuhāi*. At the end of the volume this verse is reproduced editorially and is provided with Sanskrit

chāyā. Here the corresponding portion reads *haliandahālāpa-muhāvi*.

3. Śāli is otherwise not known as an abridgement of Śālivāhana. Moreover among the traditional names of the authors of various Gāthās of Hāla's *Gāthāsattasāi*, we find the name Sālia in the case of a few Gāthās, e.g. II. 29. But in view of the fact that in other references too, discussed further in this paper, Harivṛddha is found associated with Hāla, identification of Śāli of the SK. verse with Śālivāhana seems highly plausible.

4. *Tathā hy aṣṭau Hariṇoktā yathā :*

*mahuraṁ pharusam komalam-ojassim nitṭhuraṁ ca laliyam ca /
gambhīram sāmannaṁ ea aṭṭha bhaṇitū nāyavvā //*

—Namisādhū on Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālamkāra*, II. 19.

Again the printed text is faulty. It meaninglessly reads *addha bhaṇitū unāyaccā*.

5. Edited by H. D. Velankar, Rajasthan Puratana Granthamala, No. 61, 1962.
6. *Bhujagādhipau Kambalāśvatarau Sātavāhano rājā. Vṛddhakavir Harivṛdha iti kecit.* (Com. on VS. II. 8). Usually *bhujagādhipa* is taken to be synonymous with *nāgarāja* and is identified with Piṅgalanāga or Piṅgala, the famous authority on prosody. For example in the opening verse of Śūra's manual of prosody cited in the commentary on *Kavidarpaṇa* (ed. by H. D. Velankar, 1962), I. 1, Piṅgala is characterized as *nāganātha* : *Śambhum natvā giramanu tataḥ Piṅgalaṁ nāganātham*. But Gopāla seems to have followed Jayakīrti, who in his *Chandon-uśāsanu* (ed. by H. D. Velankar, *Jayadāman*, 1949), I. 13 mentions Piṅgala and Kambala among those Muni-s who favoured the Yati (metrical pause), and Aśvatarā among those who were against it. So according to Gopāla, *Bhujagādhipa* at VS. II. 8 and 9, and Visahara (i.e. Viśadhara—which he paraphrases as *nāga*) at VS. II. 7 signify two persons named Kambala and Aśvatarā and these were according to him quite different from Piṅgala. In the Maṅgala at the beginning of his commentary, he salutes separately Piṅgala, Saitava, Kātyāyana, Bharata and Kambala-cum-Aśvatarā. On VS. I. 1 too he qualifies Piṅgala simply as a *Chandaḥśāstrācārya*.

7. A. N. Upadhye (in his edition of the *Līlāvai* of Koūhala, 1949, Introduction p. 56, footnote 3) and N. G. Suru (in his edition of the *Karpūramāñjarī*, 1960, Introduction, p. civ) have drawn our attention to the passage of the *Karpūramāñjarī* discussed here. See also J. C. Jain, *Prākṛt Sāhitya kā Itihāsa* (1961), p. 573, footnote 1.
8. Ed. by H. D. Velankar, in Appendix I to his edition of *Kavidarpaṇa*, 1962.
9. *Gāthālakṣaṇa*, 26-29 considered by Velankar as quite out of place and hence interpolations, are in fact reproduced from the *Svayambhūcchandas* (Pūrvabhāga) I. 3.2, 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2. So also verse 77 is borrowed from *Vṛttajātisamuccaya* I. 7 as pointed out by Velankar in his introduction to the latter, p. XXX. Verse 83 is again identical with *Svayambhūcchandas* IV. 5-1 and verse 16 is the same as *Pṛākṛtapiṅga* I. 54.
10. See *Samdeśarāsaka* (ed. by Muni Jinavijaya and H. C. Bhayani, 1945), Introduction, p. 102. The commentary on verse 19 quotes a definition of the metre Raḍḍā in which the words *kai Namdaḍḍha bhaṇanti* occur in the end. It also quotes at various other places verses which we find as verse no. 16, 74, 78 and 80 in Velankar's edition of the *Gāthālakṣaṇa*. It may be noted that for the form *namdiyaḍḍha* some MSS. of the *Karpūramāñjarī* read *namdiyaḍḍha*.
11. Ed. by A. N. Upadhye. See the references to Poṭṭisa in the word-index.
12. See the references in note no. 7.
13. *Vṛttajātisamuccaya*, Introduction, p. XXV.
14. See especially Upadhye, op. cit., Introduction, pp. 46-58 and the references in the footnotes on these pages.
15. *Hāla* originally a Prakrit form had later become current in Sanskrit also as we can see from Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* (712), from the references of Abhinanda and Soḍḍhala, etc. See Upadhye, op. cit., pp. 47, 54-55. Śālivāhana too is a Sanskritization. We may note here another instance also of the same process. *Pālitṭa* was the Prakrit form of *Pādalipta*,

the name of the author of the lost *Taraṅgavatī* Kathā. It appears in a newly Sanskritized form as Śrīpālita in Abhinanda's *Rāmaccrita*, xxii, 100; see also Upadhye, op. cit., Introduction, p. 55.

15. See Upadhye, op. cit., pp. 47, 54-55.
16. *Kathāsaritasāgara*, VIII. 37. Sātavāhana is said to have composed the Kathāpiṭha with the help of Guṇāḍhya's pupils, Guṇadeva and Nandideva. See also Raghavan, op. cit., p. 854.
17. *Deśināmamālā*, edited by R. Pischel, second edition by P. V. Ramanujaswami, Introduction I, p. 12-14. Ramanujaswami says that from Hemacandra's references to Sātavāhana in his *Deśināmamālā*, he could not gather definite evidence for saying that Sātavāhana had composed a Deśi Kośa. But what Hemacandra has given under Sātavāhana's name are clearly quotations, and each one gives a Sanskrit meaning-equivalent for a Deśya word. These facts leave no doubt about the existence of a Deśya lexicon of Sātavāhana. Ramanujaswami observes that Hemacandra has quoted Sātavāhana seven times. I have been able to locate only five quotations.

18. *Uggī Sālāhaṇassa :*

thaṇa-dohaḍie bharai va bālā lāṇṇa-salilohaṃ /
ramaṇālavāla-ṇiggaa-romāvali-vallari vva siṃcei //

—*Svayambhūcchandas* (Pūrvabhāga), I. 4.2

19. *ahavā Hālassa :*

kāmaṃ puppha-dhaṇuṃ sa-kosuma-saraṃ tuṇṇaṃ tiacchāhaṃ
souṃ jaṃ juvai-jaṇo ṇa kuvio taṃ atthi se kāraṇaṃ /
helā-sajjha-jaṃ samattam-iṇamo pāṃtarālīkaṃ
kesākesi-ṇibamdhanaṃ cia jīṃ ettaṃha ko mallao //

—*Svayambhūcchandas*, I. 47.2.

4. BHAIRAVĀNANDA

In the introduction (pp. LXII-LXV) to his edition¹ of Rājasekhara's Pk. play *Karpūramañjarī* Ghosh has sought to re-interpret the character of Bhairavānanda, the Kaula priest figuring in that play. Konow and Lanman take the words of Bhairavānanda in Act I at their face value and accordingly consider him to be depicted as a low priest leading a licentious life and a charlatan. Ghosh criticizes this view of the character of Bhairavānanda and tries to show that the apparently vulgar and immoral words of Bhairavānanda possess an inner meaning which sets his character in quite a good light. But if we strictly confine ourselves to the words of the text and their natural tone, it would be difficult for us to accept Ghosh's view. And there is some evidence to show that as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century A. C. Bhairavānanda's character was understood, as by Konow and Lanman, to be drawn in anything but flattering colours.

Certain passages in Puṣpadanta's *Jasaharacariu* are express interpolations² made by one Gandharva in the year 1308 A.D. One of these interpolated passages (*Jas.* I. 5.3 to I. 8.17) concerns itself with Kaulācārya Bhairavānanda's visit to king Māridatta. The portrait of the Bhairavānanda of this passage is obviously drawn with a view to present a typical Ācārya of the Vāmamārga—boastful, licentious, given to magic lore. Now it appears probable that for this passage as for another passage (*Jas.* IV. 22. 17 b—IV. 30-15), the material was taken by Gandharva from the work of an earlier poet called Vatsarāja, regarding whom or whose work

-
1. Manomohan Ghosh, *Karpūramañjarī*, University of Calcutta, 1939.
 2. P. L. Vaidya, *Jasaharacariu* (K. J. S. I), 1931, Introduction pp. 17-18.

we know no more. But Gandharva appears to have availed of another work also. As pointed out below there is such a close resemblance in certain statements and characteristic traits of the Bhairavānanda of the interpolated passage of the *Jasaharacariu* and those of the Bhairavānanda of the *Karpūramañjarī* that we cannot but think that while composing the *Jasaharacariu* passage in question, Gandharva must have the *Karpūramañjarī* before him. Of course there is some difference in the distribution of emphasis with regard to the depiction of the various traits of the character, Gandharva stressing its braggart side while Rājaśekhara bringing its dissolute way of living into prominent relief. But otherwise the similarity between the two portraitures is strikingly far-reaching. The points of resemblance—verbal or otherwise—are :

- (1) Bhairavānanda is a Kaula priest.

कुलमग्न-लगा *Karpū.* p. I3, l. 5.

कोलो धम्मो ,, p. I3, l. 10.

कुलमग्न-चारि *Jasa* I 6 25

कउलायरिउ ,, I 5 2

- (2) Rumours about his miraculous powers reach the ears of the king.

किं सो जौ जण-वअणादो अच्चम्मूद-सिद्धि सुणीअदि । *Karpū.* p. I2, l. I3.

‘सव्वउ विज्जउ महु विप्फुरन्ति

बहु तन्त-मन्त अग्गइ सरन्ति’ ।

इय जम्पन्तहो तहो जाय वत्त

सा मारिदत्त-कण्णन्तु पत्त ॥ *Jasa.* I 6 15-16.

- (3) He subsists on begging alms.

भिक्षा भोज्ज’ *Karpū.* p. I3, l. 9.

भिक्षवरु *Jasa.* I 6 2.

- (4) He freely partakes of wine and meat.

मज्ज’ मंस’ पिज्जए खज्जए-अ *Karpū.* p. I3, l. 8.

सव्व-गासि *Jasa* I 6 I.

- (5) He leads a life completely submerged in sensual pleasures.

Stanzas 21, 22, 23, *Karpū. Act. I.*

इन्द्रियसुहु मह पुज्जइ *Jasa. I. 6 28*

- (6) He is self-praising.

तं णत्थि भूमिवलए मह जं न सिद्धं etc. *Karpū. I. 24.*

अप्पि अप्पहो भाहप्पु दप्पु

अणउञ्छिउ जप्पइ थुणइ अप्पु *Jasa. I 6 8*

- (7) He claims to have control over the sun and moon.

दंसेमि तं पि ससिणं वसुहावइण्णं

थम्ममि तस्स-वि रविस्स रहं णहद्धे । *Karpū. p. 14, l. 1-2.*

हउं थम्ममि रविहि विमाणु जन्तु

चन्दस्स जोणह छायमि तुरन्तु । *Jasa. I 6 15.*

Note the almost identical wordings of the second and the third line.

- (8) In fact he claims to be all-powerful.

तं णत्थि भूमि-वलए मह जं न सज्जं ।

ता मण, किं कीरदु । *Karpū. p. 14. l. 5-6..*

महु सयल सिद्धि

विष्णुरइ; खणन्तरि विज्ज-सिद्धि ।

हउं हरण-करण-कारण-समत्थु

x x

x x

जं जं तुहुं मग्गहि किं-पि वत्थु

तं तं हउं देमि महा-पसत्थु । *Jasa. I 7 1-3.*

- (9) He instantly complies with the king's request.

विश्वकः—तहिं मए एककं कण्णा-रअणं दिट्ठं ।

तं इह आणीअदु ।

(This is supported by the king :

राजा—अवदारिज्जदु पुण्णिमाहरिणङ्को धरणीअलम्म ।)

अरदानन्दः—आणीअदि । *Karpū. p. 14, l. 9-11*

ता चवइ राउ

‘महु खेचरतु करि × ×’

‘तुह खेचरतु हउँ करमि बप्प’ । *Jasa. I 7 4-5*

Such a close resemblance between ideas and certain expressions of the above-quoted passages cannot be accidental. Gandharva, in all likelihood, has modelled his Bhairavānanda—directly or through Vatsarāja—after the Bhairavānanda of the *Karpūramañjarī* and both of these sketches are drawn in colours which are far from complimentary.

5. THE PRAKRIT AND APABHRAMSA RĀMĀYAṆAS

(1) Introductory

We know that in all the centuries subsequent to Vyāsa's *Mahābhārata* and Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* numberless adaptations, reworkings and translations (of the whole or of particular parts) of those two epics have been produced in numerous Indian and non-Indian languages down to the present day. As literary media Prakrits were in use side by side with Sanskrit over more than fifteen centuries. So it can be naturally presumed that there must have appeared several compositions on the narrative of Rāma in Prakrit paralleling those in Sanskrit, in both the traditions, Brahminical and Jainistic. In fact such a presumption is borne out so far as the Jainistic tradition is concerned : We have with us several full or abridged versions of Jaina Rāmāyaṇas in Prakrit. Nothing has been known, however, about the Rāmāyaṇa compositions in Prakrit in the Brahminical tradition. Nothing has been preserved and so nobody has noted so far any references to such works, if they were at all written.¹

(2) The Brahminical tradition

This utterly hopeless situation is now slightly relieved through an unexpected source. From a few references available in a ninth century work on Prakrit prosody, we come to know for the first time something definite about Brahminical Rāmāyaṇas in Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa. The *Svayambhūcchandas* of Svayambhūdeva gives numerous citations from earlier Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa works to illustrate various metres it defines. This gives us a glimpse into the extensive and rich literature of high excellence that is unfortunately all but lost. Among these citations there are a few in the Prakrit section and slightly more than that in the Apabhraṃśa Section, which pertain to the theme of Rāmāyaṇa. So far as these

-
1. This remark is with regard to works dealing with the complete Rāmāyaṇa narrative. Prakrit poems—Mahākāvya—in the Vedic-Brahmaṇic tradition, based on particular episodes (e.g. the *Setubandha*, the lost *Rāvaṇavijaya*) are of course well known.

Prakrit citations are concerned we are quite in the dark regarding the exact nature (whether a regular Rāmāyaṇa or otherwise) and character (whether Jain or non-Jain) of their source works. The citation from Kanhadatta (Sk. Kṛṣṇadatta), illustrating the mixture of Gīti and Skandhaka metres, relates to the message delivered to Rāvaṇa (either by Aṅgada or by Hanumat) advising him to return Sītā before Rāma's arrows destroy him (*Svayambhūcchandas* I, 103.3). The citation from Vadhamitta (Sk. Vṛddhamitra), illustrating the Ugra variety of the Galitaka metre is considerably obscure, but there is no doubt about the fact that it contains an exhortation to Rāvaṇa by somebody desiring him to negotiate peace with Rāma (*Sva*⁰, I, 2-3-1). The third citation, from Nāgaha, illustrating the Toḷaka metre (*Sva*⁰, I, 16.1), describes Rāvaṇa's army discharging volleys of arrows at the monkey hordes. We may speculate that of these, the name Kṛṣṇadatta possibly implies that he was a non-Jain.

(3) Caturmukha's Rāmāyaṇa

Fortunately we are somewhat more informed regarding Svayambhūdeva's citations from an earlier Apabhramśa Rāmāyaṇa by a poet named Caumuha (Sk. Caturmukha). From bits of information scattered in diverse sources, we can piece together the following account of Caturmukha and his works. He may have flourished in the eighth or seventh century. Acknowledged by the subsequent centuries as a major Apabhramśa poet, he had three extensive epics to his credit. One of these was a Rāmāyaṇa, another a Bhārata and the third one was called *Abdhimathana*, which had obviously as its theme the Purāṇic episode of the churning of the ocean by gods and demons. All the three epics were in the Sandhibandha form. The Sandhibandha was the characteristic form of the Apabhramśa epic. The poem was divided into Sandhis, each of which was subdivided into Kaṭavakas typically made up of eight rhyming couplets with a closing piece. These epics contained in the final verse of each section the *nāmāṅka* or *nāmamudrā* of the author. Bhoja informs us that in the case of Caturmukha's poems, the author's name was identical with the name of his *iṣṭa-devatā*.

This means that Caturmukha (i.e. Brahman) was the deity our poet worshipped. Caturmukha was a pioneer in evolving the Sandhibandha and Svayambhūdeva's Rāmāyaṇa epic (*Panmacariya*) was considerably influenced in its form, organization and treatment by the former's Rāma epic. From the citations found in the *Svayambūcchandasa* and in the *Siddhahema*, one can form some idea of the great literary worth of Caturmukha's Rāmāyaṇa, although we have no idea of its extent, contents and organization.

(4) The Jain Tradition

Works based on the Jainistic versions of the narrative of Rāma are numerous and extensive. They are spread over some seventeen centuries and encompass more than eight languages. Adequate study of this vast amount of material would demand extensive and intensive labours of several scholars. Even so, the work actually done so far in the subject is not inconsiderable. There have been several studies—some quite elaborate, others of a limited nature—dealing with the comparative-historical problems.¹

As to the Jain versions of the Rāmāyaṇa in Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa we have several works with us. They are listed below—

Paumacariya of Vimala (Pk.). 4th or 5th Century.

The *Vasudevahiṇḍī* version of Saṅghadāsa (Pk.). 5th Century.

The *Caupannamahāpurisacariya* version of Śīlāṅka (Pk.). 868 A.D.

The *Kahāvali* version of Bhadreśvara (Pk.). 11th Century.

Panmacariya of Svayambhūdeva (Ap.). 9th Century.

The version in Puṣpadanta's *Mahāpurāṇa* (Ap.). 965-972 A.D.

The present account is intended to be more informative than critical, and is confined to the general and comparative-historical aspects of the subject. There was therefore little for me to do than to paraphrase the findings and conclusions already arrived at in the previous studies.

(5) Alterations and Variations

As the works of Caturmukha and others of the Brahmanical

tradition are lost, nothing can be said about their departures, if any, from Vālmiki's version. The Jain versions of the Rāmāyaṇa do not have an all-acceptable common narrative. They follow several traditions.

We have to distinguish no less than three considerably different versions, with a few sub-versions or minor variants. One of the three main versions is a direct descendent of the Standard or Vālmiki version (VR), while the other two, even through deriving from the same, have undergone some basic alterations—one can rather say, 'transformations'—which make them characteristically distinct and peculiarly Jainistic.

Vimala has a special Jain version which is followed by Svayambhādeva and Śilāṅka. Saṅghadāsa mainly follows the Digambara version found with Guṇabhadra, it being a mixture of Vālmiki and Buddhist Daśaratha Jātaka version with some peculiar Jain features added. The detailed comparison and tabulation of departures from Vālmiki are available in specialized studies and we need not go into them, we are concerned here primarily with the implications of the changes and variation in the narrative of Rāma.

It should be noted that the Rāmāyaṇas in Prakrit and Apabhramśa do not share a common tradition or character. The same applies to the Rāmāyaṇas in Sanskrit. Differences in the narrative of Rāma follow the religious rather than the linguistic lines, and even in the former case there is anything but uniformity. Leaving aside minor differences, we shall consider the major changes in the Rāma narrative made by the principal and peculiar Jain tradition and make a few observations about the motivating factors. The remarks have relevance for most of the Jain versions (with some important reservations), irrespective of the works.

(6) Vimalasūri's *Paumacariya*

The version we find in Vimalasūri's *Paumacariya* (VPc) is the earliest available Jain version, and most characteristic. It is in Prakrit and probably not later than fifth cent. A.D. Earlier than

that there might have been current some *Samgraha-gāthās*—traditional mnemonic verses—possibly stringing together the names of chief characters and cryptic references to main incidents of the Rāma-story. Vimala's work seems to be the first full-fledged literary composition on this theme. The Jain canonical literature, though conversant with several episodes of the Kṛṣṇa-carita, lacks any explicit reference to any character or incident of the Rāmā-carita.² The general outline and pattern of the narrative in VPc., with chief landmarks and their sequence, are basically the same as we find in VR. Rāma's parentage, birth, marriage with Sītā and exile to the forest along with Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā; Sītā's abduction by Rāvaṇa; Hanūmat's messengership; Rāma's alliance with Sugrīva; invasion of Lankā; Rāvaṇa's defeat and death; scandal about Sītā and her rejection; birth of Lava and Kuśa; Sītā's ordeal : these are basic also in VPc. But the divergences too between VPc and VR are far-reaching and quite numerous. One can compile a huge catalogue of them. But such a catalogue by itself would fail to convey the full significance of the divergences. The additions, omissions and alterations affected by Vimala (or any of his predecessor) in his source-narrative can be understood only if we relate them to the aims and objectives that motivated his effort. The concern of the Jain tradition was to prepare and provide for its followers a version of the quite popular and important Rāma-narrative, which would be acceptable as truly and authentically Jainistic. To achieve this end the overall frame, orientation and atmosphere of the Rāma-story of the Vedic-Brahmanic tradition was to be altered and replaced.

In its earlier form the Rāma-story may have been just a heroic legend, but in VR as preserved to us it is already linked up with the Avatāra doctrine. The Rāma of the Bāla and Uttara Kāṇḍas is an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Moreover there is a substan-

-
2. Only *Samavāyāṅga*, the fourth aṅga of the Jain Canon, mentions at Sūtra 54, in a general way 24 Tīrthaṅkaras, 12 Cakrarvartins, 9 Baladevanas and 9 Vāsudevas.

tial admixture of Purāṇic myths and legends that are pervaded with Vedic-Brahmanic spirit and atmosphere. Rāmācarita, it is true, has not become integral with the Purāṇic tradition to the same extent as Kṛṣṇacarita. Even then its close kinship with the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata is quite patent.

Jain Rāmāyaṇa too shares this Purāṇic character. Some of the works are actually designated as *Purāṇa* (e.g. *Padmapurāṇa*, *Rāmāyaṇapurāṇa*.). It has also some dynastic lists and legends and numerous side-episodes. But naturally the spirit and atmosphere are Jainistic. All the characters in VPc including Daśaratha, Janaka, Rāvaṇa, Sugrīva, Hanūmat and their families are devout Jainas : Jain ascetics loom large on the whole course of the narrative, and throughout opportunities have been frequently provided for preaching principles of Jainism and inculcating Jain doctrines.

(7) Rāma as a Mahāparaṣa

The Jain conception of the Supreme Divinity is basically different from the Vedic-Brahmanic conception. Jainism has no place for a divine creator and Lord of the creation. Jain theology has no Supreme God presiding over the destinies of the Universe. The highest state of being in Jainism is that of the Siddhas or Muktas. Siddhas have no dealings with the transmigratory world. Hence there is no scope in Jainism for the Avatāra doctrine, and the Jain Rāma can be no more than an illustrious human hero. Further the Jainas too have worked up the Rāma-narrative into an overall mythology and the Jain legendary Universal History is much more systematized and thoroughgoing. The mythological and hagiological literature of the Jainas has as its core works called *Mahāpurāṇa* and *Purāṇa*. A *Mahāpurāṇa* gives biographies of 63 Great Men, known as Mahāpuruṣa, Uttama-puruṣa or Śalākāpuruṣa. They comprise 24 Tīrthaṅkaras, 12 Cakravartins, 9 Baladevas, 9 Vāsudevas and 9 Prativāsudevas.³ Each aeon is characterized by the appearance of this fixed number of Mahāpuruṣas. In the current

3. Sometime the Prativāsudevas are excluded, and the number is given as fiftyfour.

aeon appeared Tirthankaras beginning with Rṣabha and ending with Vardhamāna Mahāvira. The Tirthankaras are human beings who have attained spiritual perfection (absolute knowledge) and who preach and teach the Right Path to all the living beings. So far as their function of establishing, upholding and spreading of Dharma, and counteracting Adharma is concerned, they correspond to the Avatāras of Vedic Hinduism, though among themselves the Tirthankaras have no connection. They are not manifestations of the same essence. In addition to the Tirthankaras, there have appeared in the current aeon twelve Cakravartins or Universal Monarchs, beginning with Bharata and ending with Brahmadata. The Cakravartins establish their sovereignty over all the six divisions of the Bhāratavarṣa through the power of their fourteen Ratnas (objects and agencies endowed with marvellous magic powers) and nine Treasures. Their worldly power, pomp, pleasures and glory are the highest among the earthly beings.

Vāsudevas have half the status and power of the Cakravartins, so they are also called Ardhacakrins. In alliance with their elder brothers, Baladevas, they overpower and kill their opposites, the Prativāsudevas, and establish their sway over three divisions of Bhāratavarṣa, through the power of their seven Ratnas. In the current aeon there appeared nine sets of Vāsudeva, Baladeva and Prativāsudeva. Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Rāvaṇa made up the eighth set, while Baladeva, Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha formed the ninth set. Baladevas are of gentle and sobre temperament, while Vāsudevas are violent and impetuous. So the former immediately or mediately attain liberation, while the latter have to suffer in hell prior to their liberation. Here too some semblance to the Avatāra doctrine is created by the cyclic character of the emergence of Baladevas, Vāsudevas and Prativāsudevas, though again they too have no connection among themselves.

Consistent with this conception, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa enjoy all the power and glory due to their status. Like any great monarch both of them are highly polygamous. Rāma, like all Baladevas, had eight thousand wives with Sītā, Prabhāvatī, Ratnibhā

and Śrīdāmā as the chief queens. Lakṣmaṇa, like all Vāsudevas, had sixteen thousand.

(c) Rationalizations

The monkeys and monsters typified by Sugrīva, Hanūmat, Rāvaṇa and their followers are basically mythical elements of the original legend which underlay VR. From the familiar human world of the first two Kāṇḍas of VR, we suddenly enter quite a strange world of humanized beasts and monsters of the latter Kāṇḍas. These mythical elements did not fit in with the Jain view of the world which has a strong rationalistic strain. And from a commonsense point of view too, defeating of powerful man-eating monsters by crude beasts and mere humans was quite absurd, unless one conceived it on a purely mythical or divine plane. So the Jain tradition introduced numerous changes in the source-version to make it acceptable to rationality and commonsense, even at the unrealized cost of losing some of its imaginative and weird appeal. The Vānaras and Rākṣasas were turned by the Jainas into Vidyādhara. These latter were human beings that had acquired, through austerities and mortification, superhuman or magical powers, which enabled them to fly in the sky, to assume various forms, to create and use magic missiles etc. The Vidyādhara dynasty which flourished in the Vānara-dvīpa ('Moukey Island') and which adopted the monkey as a dynastic emblem was known as the Vānaras, while the Vidyādhara who established a kingdom in the Rākṣasa-dvīpa came to be known as Rākṣasas. Far from there being any beastliness or cannibalism about them, they were rather highly intelligent and developed humans. And the Jain tradition has systematically used this device to rationalize the Rāma-story. Thus Sugrīva, Hanūmat and Rāvaṇa are all Vidyādhara kings. As the crossing of the ocean was no problem for the Vidyādhara, the incident of laying a bridge over the ocean finds no place in the Jain account. But instead we find there Samudra and Setu as two Vidyādhara Chiefs, loyal to Rāvaṇa and hostile to Rāma, ruling at Velandhara city in the midst of the ocean. They attack the forces of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa which

were on their way to invading Lāṅkā. They are defeated by Nala and Nīla. Similarly Jainas found it unacceptable that Rāvaṇa, even with all his power could overpower Indra and other Lokapālas like Yama, Varuṇa etc. Gods of Jain mythology are infinitely superior in power to any human, be he even a Vidyādhara. So Indra, Yama, Varuṇa etc. whom Rāvaṇa is credited to have vanquished were according to the Jain tradition no more than just names of different Vidyādhara chiefs. A powerful Vidyādhara King created all his paraphernalia in imitation of the celestial Indra, because he claimed the status of terrestrial Indra. So he adopted the name Indra, called his elephant Airāvata, designated his various feudatories as Yama, Varuṇa etc. and so on. It was this Vidyādhara king parading as Indra, and not the celestial one that was defeated along with his subordinates by Rāvaṇa.

Most of the other traits too of Rāvaṇa are changed. The Rāvaṇa of VPc is not a ten-headed monster of hideous appearance. As a powerful Vidyādhara king he is endowed with most attractive physical and mental qualities. His designations Daśamukha, Daśagrīva etc. are in fact to be taken metaphorically and not literally, and according to the Jain tradition there hangs a story about it. As a child Rāvaṇa was precociously strong and adventurous. Still just a newly-born babe, he once rolled out of his bed and caught hold of a wonder necklace. The necklace, handed down in the family line since generations, was guarded by one thousand Nāgas and it could not be worn so far by any Vidyādhara king. As the mother put the wonder necklace around the child's neck, there were produced nine reflections of his face in the nine gems of the necklace. And hence he came to be called Daśamukha, etc.

And it is on these very grounds that Vimala criticizes in VPc, the orthodox version of the Rāma story. He declares it to be falsified and full of absurdities on the following grounds : How could Rākṣasas, who were pious Jainas descended from noble Vidyādhara families and who possessed enormous power through their mastery of Vidyās, be killed by mere monkeys ? Again it

is height of absurdity to represent Rāvaṇa, whose prowess was comparable to Indra's, as a blood-drinking monster, or to describe Kumbhakarṇa, who was learned in all the Śāstras, as sleeping continuously for six months unperturbed even if elephants pushed him and pots of oil were poured in his ears, and when awakened swallowing buffaloes, elephants, human beings, one and all that he could lay his hands on. How again could Rāvaṇa be represented as conquering Indra, who is powerful enough to uproot the whole of Jambūdvīpa and to reduce his opponent to ashes at the mere thought of him. It is also false to depict Rāma, who was highly pious, as killing a golden deer or as deceitfully killing Vālin for the sake of Sugrīva and Tārā. Further it runs counter to reason to believe that monkeys could build a bridge over the ocean. The popular version of the Rāmācarita was thus according to Vimala full of absurdities, falsifications, misrepresentations and elements contrary to sense.

(9) Changes in Characterization

And this outlook has changed Rāvaṇa from a sinful, wicked, tyrannical monster to a noble, pious and powerful Vidyādhara king, whose conduct had no other blemish except abducting Sītā.

Several other characters also have undergone a similar transformation. It is not any Mantharā-inspired intrigue which leads Kaikeyī to ask throne for Bharata and exile for Rāma. According to the VPc version, Bharata expressed a strong desire to renounce the world and become a monk in the footsteps of Daśaratha, and it was with a view to forestall this step of Bharata that Kaikeyī contrived to saddle him with the responsibility of kingship. As to Rāma's exile to the forest, it was Rāma's voluntary decision, out of his love for Bharata.

So too the Vālin of VPc is quite different from the Vālin of VR. According to the Jain tradition Vālin was an exceptionally powerful Vidyādhara king, who humbled the pride of Rāvaṇa in an encounter, and thereafter renounced the world. Practising austerities he attained liberation. It was another Vidyādhara called

Sāhasagati who, enamoured of Tārā, assumed, through magic power, the form of Sugrīva, ousted the real Sugrīva and usurped his queen and kingdom. Rāma killed this phoney Sugrīva. This orientation absolves both Vālin and Rāma from all guilt. Rāma has also nothing to do with killing Śambūka. According to VPC, Śambūka was a son of Rāvaṇa's sister Candraṇakhā (same as the Śūrpaṇakhā of VR). He was practising austerities for acquiring the magic sword Sūryahāsa, when he was quite accidentally killed by Lakṣmaṇa.

The few typical and basic alterations described above would suffice to give some idea of the general orientation of the Jain Rāmācarita. As to the spirit and atmosphere pervading the Jain versions, following points are easily noted: Omission of the typically Brahmanic episodes like the legends of Vaśiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, Agastya etc.; addition of anti-Brahmanical legends pertaining to the origin of sacrifice and Rāvaṇa's destruction of Marutta's sacrifice; addition of episodes implying devotion to and veneration for Jain religion: interspersing the narrative with sermons of Jain monks; depicting numerous characters as devout Jains, as renouncing the world and becoming Jain monks, as worshipping at Jain shrines and holy places; describing past and future births of the characters wherein functioning of the law of Karma is given Jainistic prominence; the emphasis throughout on the doctrine of Ahimsā—all these create a characteristically Jain atmosphere.

(10) Other Jain Version.

My observations so far have kept in view only Vimala's version of the Rāmācarita. It is the principal and most important Jain version and is followed generally and for the most part by the *Padmapurāṇa* of Raviṣeṇa (678 A.D.) and *Triṣaṣṭi-Salākāpuruṣacarita* of Hemacandra (1060-72 A.D.) in Sanskrit, *Paumacariu* of Svayambhū in Apabhramśa (9th cent. A.D.), and *Kahāvali* of Bhadrēśvara (11th or 12th cent. A.D.) in Prakrit.

Another Jain version of the Rāma story is contained in the *Uttarapurāṇa* of Guṇabhadra (878 A.D.) in Sanskrit, which is fol-

lowed by Puṣpadanta in his *Mahapurāṇa* (965 A.D.) in Apabhramśa. The version found in the *Vasudevahiṇḍī* of Saṅghadāsa (c. 6th cent.) is closest to Vālmiki's and one found in the *Caupannamahāpurisacariya* (868 A.D.) follows this with a few elements imported from the Vimala tradition. Obviously, the force of the popular tradition of Rāmāyaṇa proved irresistible and overwhelming. Guṇabhadra's version is abbreviated, and in several points deviates from both Vālmiki and Vimala. According to it Rāma was a son of Daśaratha's queen Subalā and Lakṣmaṇa of Kaikeyī. Bharata and Śatrughna were born of 'some other' queens. There is no reference to the difference or dispute as to who should succeed Daśaratha, nor to Rāma's exile. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa once went to the earlier State Capital Vārāṇasī, when Rāvaṇa, assuming the form of Rāma abducted Sītā from the city park. It was Nārada who had incited him to this act by pointing out to him the fact that the most beautiful Sītā was given to Rāma and he (Rāvaṇa) was totally ignored. We have here after Vālmiki the incident of Mārīca assuming the form of golden deer. Like Vālmiki's version too, Rāvaṇa has here a wicked, violent, voluptuous and oppressive character. Vālin also is here moulded following Vālmiki rather than Vimala. The Jain versions are divided with respect to Rāvaṇa's character. Some depict him as virtuous, some as wicked. These conflicting conceptions lie also at the basis of the wavering Jain tradition about the inclusion of Prativāsudevas among the Śalākāpuruṣas and the resulting total of fifty-four or sixty-three. Regarding Sītā's birth and origin too there are basic differences. In the VPC she is born to Janaka in a natural manner. But according to the *Vasudevahiṇḍī*, *Uttarapurāṇa* etc. Sītā was a daughter of Rāvaṇa and Mandodarī. She was abandoned because her birth portended destruction to whole of her family including Rāvaṇa. She was found and reared by Janaka.

There are numerous other differences of details which it is not necessary here to touch upon or describe.

In concluding, it may be observed that the differences found in the Jain versions have the same significance as those found in

the Vedic-Brahmanic versions. If a legend or narrative has to preserve its living and inspiring appeal and influence over centuries, it has got to be dynamic and responsive to the changes in the ideals, tastes, norms of behaviour, mores and traditions of the people. Most of the numerous significant developments in the Rāma-narrative throughout the more than two thousand years of its existence would find adequate explanation in the sociological, religious, cultural and ethical changes extending over that period.

References

- Harivaṃśapurāṇa*—L. Alsdorf, 1936.
The Rāmāyaṇa version of Saṅghadāsa as Found in the Vasudevahiṇḍī (Jour. Or. Ins. Baroda, 2, 2, 1952, 128-138)—V. M. Kulkarni.
The Rāmāyaṇa of Bhadreśvara as found in his Kahāvalī (JOIB 2, 4, 1953, 332-338)—V. M. Kulkarni.
Caupannamahāparisacariya—Klaus Brühn, 1954.
The Rāmāyaṇa Version of Śīlācārya (ABORI, 36, 1-2, 1955, 46-53)—V. M. Kulkarni.
Rāmāyaṇa in Jain Literature—(unpublished Ph. D. thesis)—V. M. Kulkarni.
The Origin and Development of the Rāma Story in Jain Literature (JOIB, 9, 2, 1959, 189-204; 9, 3, 284-304)—V. M. Kulkarni.
Caupannamahāpurisacariyam (=Prakrit Text Society Series, No. 3)—ed. A. M. Bhojak, Introduction by Klaus Brühn, 1961.
A Critical Study of the Paumacariya of Vimalasūri—(unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Bombay, 1962)—P. M. Upadhye.
Paumacariyam—Part I (=Prakrit Text Society Series, No. 6)—ed. Mūni Punyavijaya, Introduction by V. M. Kulkarni, 1962.
Rama-kathā (in Hindi)—Camil Bulcke, 1962.

6. THE APABHRAṂŚA POET CATURMUKHA

I. The few facts we gather about a poet called Caturmukha from *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* of Bhoja are as follows¹ : 1. Caturmukha was an Apabhraṁśa poet. 2. His poetic work, *Abdhimathana*, was a *Sandhibandha* i.e. an Apabhraṁśa kāvya in mātrā meters and having divisions called *sandhi*. 3. Caturmukha, like Govinda and Candraśekhara, had introduced his name as his special mark (*aṅka*) in the concluding verse of each of the divisions or Sandhis of his poems. This name-mark conveyed punningly the name of his favourite deity also viz., Caturmukha (i.e. Brahmā). 4. Caturmukha's stanzas are found as citations in Svayambhū's work on Prakrit prosody. From these facts it follows that Caturmukha was a Brahmanical poet and his work *Abhimathana* had the well-known Purāṇic episode of ocean-churning as its theme. The *Abdhimathana* has been similarly mentioned by Hemacandra² and Vāgbhaṭa³ as an example of Apabhraṁśa poem divided in Sandhis.

2. If we refer to the preserved portions of Svayambhū's *Svayambhūcchandas*⁴ we in fact find in its Apabhraṁśa section several illustrative verse passages cited under the name of a poet Caumuha i.e. Caturmukha. Caumuha quoted by Svayambhū and Caturmukha, the author of the Apabhraṁśa epic *Abdhimathana* seem to have been one and the same person.

3. Since Bhoja as well as Hemacandra give the *Abdhimathana* as a typical example of the Apabhraṁśa epic in the Sandhi form, Caturmukha must have been regarded in their times as a prominent poet. This surmise finds a strong confirmation from what Svayambhū states in the second introductory Kaṭavaka of his epic *Ritṭhaṇemicariu* or *Harivaṁsa*.⁵ There while acknowledging obligations to his great predecessors in the fields of literature and learning, he expresses his indebtedness to Caturmukha for the 'Paddhaḍiyā studded with Chaddaṇi, Duvai and Dhuvaya'. Paddh-

aḍiyā etc. mentioned here are wellknown structural units that play a basic role in the construction of the Apabhramśa Sandhibandha.⁶ The obvious conclusion is, Caturmukha was the pioneer in evolving the Sandhi form and his works served as models for Svayambhū's epics.

4. Additional support for this comes from another direction too. In the Apabhramśa section of the *Svayambhūcchandas* (further here abbreviated as Sc.) the chapter dealing with the metres of the Sandhibandha gives illustrative citations exclusively from Caturmukha, aside from the anonymous ones which include passages from Svayambhū's own work. This could have not been the case if Caturmukha had been mediocre or one among several.

5. Such a pioneer and prominent poet could not but have several extensive compositions to his credit. As we have already seen, the *Abdhimathana* was a well-known Apabhramśa epic from Caturmukha's pen. But regarding its form and contents we have not one jot more information than what has been noted above.⁷

6. Regarding another epic of Caturmukha, which occupied itself with the narrative of Rāma, we are slightly more fortunate. Evidence for Caturmukha's Apabhramśa Rāmāyaṇa is quite conclusive. In the opening Kaḍavaka of the sixtyninth Sandhi of his *Mahāpurāṇa* with which begins the Rāma-story, Puṣpadanta pays his compliments⁸ to Caturmukha and Svayambhū. As Svayambhū has actually a Rāma-epic, the *Paūmacariu*, to his credit, Caturmukha too is to be supposed to have composed one. Otherwise there would be no point in Puṣpadanta's remembering and eulogizing Caturmukha in that context. Similarly in the introductory portion of his *Bāhubalacarita* or *Vāhuvalicaria* (1398) in Apabhramśa, Dhanapāla mentions Caturmukha, Droṇa, Svayambhū and Vīra as authors of works narrating the life-history of Padma (*i.e.* Rama).⁹ From among the several citations given in the Sc. under the name of Caumuha only VI 54.1 has a positive reference to the Rāma-story. And even this loses most of its value because in this ascription of authorship, the Manuscript turns out to be quite wrong. Actu-

ally the stanza in question has been taken from Svayambhū's own epic. Sc. VI. 54.1 is identical with the opening Dhruvaka of the seventyseventh Sandhi of his *Paumacariu*.¹⁰

7. Of the other citations from Caturmukha Sc. VI. 63.1 can plausibly be taken to relate to an incident in the narrative of Rāma.¹¹

Its original text is

ṇaṁ pavaru palāsu vaṇasaṁcārīma phullīā /
te coddaha lakḥha ṇimisaddheṁ sara-sallīā //

Now the published text of the Sc. is based on a sixteenth century manuscript which is palpably incorrect in numerous places from several points of view. The stanza under discussion is correct in so far as it is considered metrically. It is given as an example of Koilarimcholi and accordingly it has (6 + - - =) 10 mātrās in the old pādas and (6 + 4 + ∪ - =) 13 mātrās in the even ones. But grammatically it is unsatisfactory in several points. *pavaru palāsu* of the first pāda, being in the singular, cannot be a proper *upamāna* for an *upameya* in the third pāda, which consists of plural (fourteen) entities. Obviously *pavaru palāsu* is corrupt for *pavara palāsa*. One familiar with Apabhramśa manuscripts can quote numberless examples of unjustified addition and omission of -u in the word-finals in late Apabhramśa manuscripts. Secondly *vaṇasaṁcārīma* is unsatisfactory as a compound and if *vaṇa* is separated, it cannot construe. It appears to be corrupt for *vaṇe*. Lastly from the fourth pāda it is clear that the stanza describes a situation in battle wherein warriors have been pierced with arrows and their number is given in the third pāda. As it stands the third pāda means 'those fourteen lakhs'. Now to say that in a particular encounter in a battle fourteen lakh warriors were pierced with arrows within a trice is rather a tall order even for the epics! *lakḥha* in all likelihood is a corruption of *rakḥha*¹² 'demons', and accordingly the emended text of Sc. VI 63.1 and its translation would be as follows :

naṁ pavara palāsa vaṇe saṁcārīma phullīā /
te coddaha rakkha ṇimisaddheṁ sara-sallīā //

‘Like excellent Palāśas in motion that had bloomed forth in the forest, those fourteen Rākṣasas were within a trice pierced with arrows.’

It now becomes obvious that the situation described is one wherein Rāma destroys the fourteen attacking Rākṣasas sent by Khara on Śūrpaṇakhā’s incitement. In Vālmiki’s parallel description¹³ the fourteen Rākṣasas, pierced and blood drenched, fall like trees when their roots are cut off’ (*chinnamūlā iva drumāḥ*).

8. Several other illustrative citations, but all anonymous, in the Apabhramśa section of the *Svayambhūcchandas*, have clear reference to some character or incident in the Rāma narrative. Since as many as ten of the anonymous illustrations of the Sc. could be identified from Svayambhū’s *Paumacariu*¹⁴ it was but natural to assume that the rest of such illustrations were from one or another work of Svayambhū himself.¹⁵ But there were several snags in such a solution. Sc. VI 50.1 (reference to Rāvaṇa and Nīla), 52.1 (ref. to Aṅgada and Rāvaṇa) and 68.1 (ref. to Vālī’s son *i.e.* Aṅgada) doubtless pertain to the theme of Rāmāyaṇa, they have been cited anonymously, and yet they are not identifiable from Svayambhū’s *Paumacariu*. Similarly Sc. VI 35.1 (ref. to Bhārata, Karṇa and Arjuna), 44.1 (ref. to Arjuna and Droṇa), 75.1 (ref. to Hari *i.e.* Kṛṣṇa and Mathurā), 78.1 (ref. to Dhanañjaya *i.e.* Arjuna), 122.1 (ref. to Kṛpa, Karṇa, Kaliṅgarāja, Jayadratha and Kṛṣṇa), 124.1 (ref. to Sātyaki, Hanumat-banner and the *śakaṭa-vyūha*); VIII 1.1 (ref. to Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Duḥśāsana), 5.1 (ref. to Kurupati *i.e.* Duryodhana and the Vyāsa lake) and 10.1 (ref. to Karṇa), even though anonymous and pertaining to the narrative of the Pāṇḍavas and Kṛṣṇa, are not identifiable from Svayambhū’s *Riṭṭhanemicariu*.¹⁶ Moreover Sc. VIII 14.1, although given anonymously, cannot be from the pen of Svayambhū who was a devout Jain, whereas the stanza in question refers to the story of Vāmana incarnation and the demon-king Bali¹⁷ so well-known in Brah-

manical mythology. These facts go to establish that only a part of the anonymous citations in the Sc. derive from Svayambhū's works. The other part was taken from an author or authors whose names are omitted by the manuscript of Sc. due to a defective transmission tradition. That in the matter of indicating sources of its citations Sc. does not always preserve the original state of affairs faithfully is proved beyond doubt in at least three cases. As already mentioned, though Sc. VI 54.1 is reproduced from Svayambhū's *Paumaccariu* (77. 1. 1), the manuscript ascribes it to Caturmukha. Similarly though Sc. I 74.1 and 74.2 are respectively the same as *Paumacariu* 73. 3. 5-8 and 72. 15. 5-6, the manuscript gives them respectively under the names of Maūradeva and Rajjautta. The alternative of verbatim borrowing in the *Paumacariu* from others is highly implausible, if we attach any weight to the position of these passages in the *Paumacariu* (one is the opening stanza of the 77th Sandhi, while the other two figure in the midst of a Kaḍavaka), and to high calibre of Svayambhū as an epic poet. In this connection it is also significant that in two cases the gloss in the manuscript of the Sc. disagrees with the ascriptions of the MS. For Sc. I 3.1 cited under the name of Vijjā, the gloss gives the name of Divāara and for Sc. I 38.1 ascribed to Suddhakaḥ, the gloss gives Niṇṇa.

9. These considerations, coupled with the fact that Caturmukha has been acknowledged by Svayambhū as a pioneer in the field of Apabhramśa epic makes it very likely that Sc. VI. 50.1, 52.1 and 68.1 are derived from Caturmukha's Apabhramśa Rāmāyaṇa.

10. There is one more stanza quoted in another work which appears in all likelihood to be taken from Caturmukha's Rāmāyaṇa. To illustrate a rule of Apabhramśa grammar, Hemacandra cites under *Siddhahema* 8 4 331 the following stanza :

Dahamuhu bhuvāṇa-bhayaṇkaru, tosiya-Saṇkaru,
ṇiggau raha-vari caḍiau /

Caumuhu Chammuhu jhāivi, ekkahi lāivi,
nāvai daivem ghaḍiau //

Translation : 'Having propitiated Śaṅkara, Rāvaṇa mounted an excellent chariot and started—a terror to the world : It appeared that Fate had concentrated its mind on the conceptions of the four-faced Brahmā and the six-faced Kārttikeya, amalgamated them and created the ten-faced Rāvaṇa !' From the reference in the stanza to Rāvaṇa worshiping Śaṅkara, it follows that it is taken from some Brahmanical epic on the life-history of Rāma. With what the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* tells us about Caturmukha's practice of punningly marking his poems with his own name as well as the name of Brahmā, it is quite tempting to read the name of the poet Caturmukha in the beginning of the second half of this stanza. This would mean that the stanza formed the Ghattā or the concluding piece of the final Kaḍavaka of one of the Sandhis of Caturmukha's Rāmāyaṇa. This finds an indirect but definite corroboration, if we look up the same context in Svayambhū's *Paumacariu* and compare the wording there with the wording of the stanza quoted in the *Siddhahema*. *Paumacariu* 73 6 describes Rāvaṇa, who having mastered the magic power Bahurūpiṇī, was preparing for a final showdown with Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. He equipped his great elephant-chariot (*gainda-mahā-rahu* Pc. 73 6 2) and mounted it amidst shouts of 'Victory' 'Victory' (*jaya-jaya-saddem caḍiu Dasāṇaṇu*, Pc. 73 6 5a). With his ten faces Daśamukha appeared terrific (*dahahiṁ muhehiṁ bhayaṅkaru Dahamuhu*, Pc 73 6 6a). It appeared that Fate had concentrated its mind on the conceptions of the ten Guardians of the world and had brought out Rāvaṇa. (*dasaviha loya-pāla maṇe jhāevi daivem mukku ṇāi uppāevi*, Pc. 73 6 8). Who would not look upon him as a terror to the world ? (*bhuvanabhayaṅkaru kaho vi ṇa bhāvai*, Pc. 73 6 9a). The common expressions *Dahamuhu*, *bhuvana-bhayaṅkaru raha-varu* (*mahā-rahu*), *jhāevi daivem* etc. and the parallelism in the ideas are quite striking. It does not seem to much to assume that here the passage in the *Paumacariu* contains echoes from Caturmukha's description of a similar situation. Some more cases of such verbal influence of Caturmukha's poems on Svayambhū's compositions have been pointed out below.

11. *Paumacariu* 7I 1 1-2 is as follows :

kaṭṭhai aṅṅāraya-saṁkāsau, rehai tamviru phulla-palāsau /
ṇaṁ dāvāṇalu āu gavesau, ko maim daddhu ṇa daddhu paesau//

‘At one place a Palāśa in full bloom, as scarlet as live charcoals, appeared charming : It looked as if it were the forest fire (itself) trying to find out what region it succeeded in burning down and what escaped it !’

This appears to be modelled on the anonymous Ghattā given at Sc. VI 19.1 which runs as follows :

ṇava-phagguṇe, giri-siharovari phulla-palāsu /
ko daddhu me, ko ṇa daddhu joai va-huāsu //

Translation : ‘In early Phālguna the blooming Palāśa on the mountainpeak (appeared) as if it were (forest)fire trying to find out whom it succeeded in burning down and who escaped !’

Paumacariu 80 11 Ghattā also mentions *phagguṇe phulla-palāsu* *girivare*. ‘The blooming Palāśa in Phālguna on the beautiful mountain,’ But as the passages contain no clue to any narrative theme, we cannot decide anything about the attribution of Sc. VI 24. And the possibility for such descriptive passages having been taken from some unknown work of Svayambhū himself cannot be ruled out.

12. The third work with which Caturmukha is to be credited was an epic about the narrative of Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas. We have several references to this work direct or indirect. Dhavala, who was a Jain poet, states in the second introductory Ghattā of his *Harivaṁsa* that he is composing the popular narrative of Hari and the sons of Pāṇḍu after the manner of Caturmukha and Vyāsa, so that the sacred tradition may not be lost.¹⁸ The implication here perhaps is that to counteract the popularity of the false version of the Bhārata-story, Dhavala undertook to present the true version in accordance with the sacred Jain tradition, which perhaps faced during his times some danger of being obscured by the rival version.

13. Another reference to Caturmukha's Bhārata is contained in a laudatory stanza, probably composed by Svayambhū's son Tribhuvana, that is found in the opening of the *Paumacariu* in one of its manuscripts.¹⁹ There Caturmukha's *go-graha-kuthā*, like Svayambhū's description of the water-sports, is praised as a performance unexcelled in the whole range of Apabhramśa literature. This *go-graha-kathā* is obviously the cattle-lifting attempted by Duryodhana and party, when the disguised Pāṇḍavas were completing their thirteenth year at Virāṭa. Like the *jala-kriḍā-varṇana* which figures in the fourteenth Sandhi of Svayambhū's *Paumacariu*, Caturmukha's *go-grahu-kathā* too was possibly not an independent work, but formed a part of his Bhārata epic.

14. Moreover, Sc. IV 2.1, cited under the name of Caturmukha, contains a reference to Arjuna and Sc. VI 87.1 also with the meaningless *doha ṇa* taken to be metathetically standing for the original *donaha*, refers to Droṇa's appointment as the commander-in-chief in the Bhārata war. Accordingly Svayambhū's complimentary reference to Caturmukha in the introductory portion of his *Harivaṃsa* or *Riṭṭhaṇemicariu*²⁰ can be looked upon as respects paid to a distinguished predecessor that had tackled the same epic subject.

15. As indicated previously, of the numerous anonymous citations pertaining to the Bhārata-story that we find in the Apabhramśa section of the *Svayambhūcchandas* not a single one is traceable to Svayambhū's *Riṭṭhaṇemicariu*. Like the Rāmāyaṇa quotations in the Sc. untraceable to Svayambhū's *Paūmacariu*, these too were in all likelihood taken from a work of Caturmukha, in this case treating the Bhārata-narrative.

16. Some additional support for this inference comes from the fact that even on the basis of the meagre material at our disposal several lines from Svayambhū's extant poems can be shown to contain clear echoes from Caturmukha's verses. One such case from Svayambhū's *Paumacariu* has been already considered above. Sc. IV 2.1 is a parallel though more definite case. The text is
haum Ajjunu, tumha, eu raṇu

This can be translated as—

‘Here am I, Arjuna; there are you; and this is the battle.’ If *tumha* is counted as two *mātrā* (for this there is enough sanction of standard Prakrit and Apabhramśa prosodists),²¹ this would be a *pāda* of 13 *mātrās*. Now with this compare the Ghattā of Svayambhū’s *Harivaṃśa* 67 11.

Kuru paccāriu Ajjuṇeṇa, te tumhaiṃ so haum eu raṇu /

rakkhaho sisu Jayaddahaho, lai dharahu savva maiṃ ekku khaṇu //

which can be translated as ‘Arjuna challenged the Kuru king : There are you; here am I: this is the battle. Try to save Jayadratha’s head, if you can; come on ! Let you all try to hold me, even for one moment !’ The resemblance between Sc. IV 3a and the second *pāda* of this Ghattā is unmistakable. It is not without some significance that metrically the Ghattā has 13 *mātrās* in the odd *pādas* and 15 in the even ones.

17. Again Sc. VI 44.1 relating to the Bhārata narrative and given anonymously is to be considered on the same lines. It reads :

ekka(? u) ji Ajjuṇu, saggammi kahiṃ(? ep)piṇu /

Doṇu su-dukkeṇa, dara ruai puṇuppuṇu //

Translation : ‘Arjuna was the only one (who could have accomplished this:) but he is now in heaven : uttering such words Droṇa was gently weeping, again and again, in deep grief’. If we consult Svayambhū’s *Harivaṃśa*, we find that the situation described in Sc. VI 58 relates to the Svayamvara of Draupadī, when one after another the famous princes, failing to string the bow as stipulated, return crest-fallen to their seats and then disguised Arjuna steps forth, strings the bow and prepares to pierce the target. This spectacle immediately stirs up in Droṇa’s heart sorrowful memories of Arjuna, who could have easily performed that feat of archery but who had reportedly perished in fire at Vāraṇāvata along with his brothers and mother. The wording at one place in Svayambhū’s passage closely resemble that of Sc. VI 44.1 *Harivaṃśa* 21 8 8b reads :

ṇiya-sīsu sarantau ruvai guru /

Translation : 'Remembering his pupil²² (Droṇa-) guru was weeping'.

18. One more passage of Svayambhū's *Harivaṃsa* bears very close resemblance to an anonymously quoted passage in the *Svayambhūcchandas*. But as it describes shooting of arrows in general terms and contains no clue to any epic character or situation, no useful surmise can be made regarding the ascription of the Sc. passage. The two passages in question are as follows :

vāālā pharusā vindhaṇā, guṇehiṃ vimukkā pāṇa-harā /
jīha dujjaṇu(?a) sajjāṇa-uvari, tiha pasaru ṇa lahanti sarā //
 Sc. VI 121.1

dummuha sa-loha vaṇṇujjalā, vindhaṇasilā pāṇa-harā /
guṇa-mukkā dhamma-vivajjiya, to vi mukkha(?u) pāvanti sarā //
 Rīṭṭhaṇemicariu, 64 11 Ghattā

A comparison of the wordings, basic ideas and metres of these stanzas makes inevitable the assumption of a close connection between the two.

19. From the remaining anonymous citations in the Apabhraṃśa section of Sc., the Dhruvaka illustrated at VI 37.1 is noteworthy for containing the word *Cauvaṇṇa* (i.e. *Caturvadana* = *Caturmukha*) :

indindirao(?u), ruṇaruṇāi kusuma!ṃ parihavāi /
Cauvaṇṇa-ruha(?u), Nārāṇa-ṇāhi-kamala(?u) bharaī //

Translation : 'The bee hums on and avoids flowers (because) he remembers the lotus from Nārāyaṇa's navel from which the four-faced one (Brahmā) arose'. But in the absence of any epic reference in the stanza, we cannot decide whether the expression *cauvaṇṇa-ruha* overtly mentions *Caturmukha* and accordingly the stanza is from that poet, or whether it has only a plain meaning.

20. We do not know if over and above these three epic poems *Caturmukha* had composed any other works. Tribhuvana's statement that he composed his wonderful *Paṃcamicariya* without

allowing himself to be influenced by the diction and meaningfulness of Caturmukha and Svayambhū,²³ does not necessarily imply that Caturmukha and Svayambhū also had written each a *Pañcamīcarita*. In view of what has been said in one of the opening laudatory stanzas in the manuscript of the *Paumacariu*, about the unsurpassable excellence of Caturmukha's diction (*sadda*) and Svayambhū's language (*jihā*), or alternatively, both word and sense,²⁴ this can also mean that Tribhuvana composed his work uninfluenced by the poetic compositions in general of Caturmukha and Svayambhū.

21. No wonder, the name of such a pioneer and eminent Apabhramśa poet continued to be respected and praised for many succeeding centuries. Svayambhū's and Tribhuvana's high appreciation of Caturmukha has been already referred to above.

It was a convention with Apabhramśa poets, onwards from Svayambhū, to include in the prologue to their compositions a list of eminent poets, scholars and authors that preceded them. The list, varying with the poet, usually contains such names as Vyāsa, Bharata, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Śrī-harṣa, Piṅgala, Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Raviṣeṇa, Jinasena, Caturmukha, Svayambhū and Puṣpadanta with a few additions and omissions. Caturmukha (mostly in Company of Svayambhū and Puṣpadanta) has been remembered in this fashion²⁵ in such Apabhramśa work as the *Dhammaparikkha*²⁶ (987) of Hariṣeṇa, *Harivaṃsapurāṇa*²⁷ of Dhavala (c. 11th cent.), *Sakalavidhinidhāna*²⁸ (11th cent.) of Nayanandin, *Jambūsāmīcariu*²⁹ (1020) of Vīra, *Rayanakaraṇḍu*³⁰ (1064) of Śricandra, *Jinadattacariu*³¹ (1218) of Lākḥū alias Lakḥaṇa, *Suloyaṇācariu*³² of Devasena (12th or 13th cent.), *Vāhuvalīcariu*³³ (1398) of Dhanapāla. We have seen that some of these authors speak about Caturmukha in superlatives. If luck favours us some day with the discovery of any manuscripts of Caturmukha's works, it will be indeed a great day in the history of Apabhramśa studies.

Notes

1. Raghavan, V., 'Prākṛta works known from Bhoja's *Sṛṅgār-aprakāśa*', *Siddha-Bhārati*, Part II, 1950, 206; Ramkrishna

Kavi, M., Bharatakośa, 1951, s. v. *Sandhibandaḥ*. The text of the relevant passages of the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* is as under :

- (1) yo' pabhramśanibandho mātrāchandobhirabhimato'lpadhiyām /
vācyah saḥ sandhibandhaś Caturmukhoktābdbhimathanādiḥ //
(Kavi's remarks : Sandhiriti paricchedasya nāma. Caturmu-
khakṛtapadyāni Svayambhūnā prākṛtachandasyudāhṛtāni.)
- (2) Svanāmāṅkatā yathā svaprabandheṣu Govinda-Caturmukh-
ādinām.... Caturmukha-Govinda-Candraśekhara-iṣṭadevatā-
nāmāṅkatā ca pūrvokteṣu pūrvoktānām.

2. *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, K. M. edition, 337.

3. Raghavan, V., op. cit., §12.

4. Velankar, H. D., *Svayambhūcchandas*, 1962.

5. Premi, N., *Jain Sāhitya aur Itihās*, 1942, 392; Bhayani H., *Paūmacnriu*, Part I, 1953, 51 and 125 (passage 57); Kochhad, H., *Apabhramśa-Sāhitya* 1957, 68. The Ms. of the *Riṭṭhaṇemiciariu*, in the MSS. collection at the Ailak Pannālāl Digambar Jain Sarasvati Bhavan, Bomhay has also been consulted.

6. *Svayambhūcchandas* V 1, VIII 7. 30-35; Chandonuśāsana of Hemacandra 1912, 38a, I.13-I6; *Paūmacariu*, I. 74, 75, 78, 93.

7. It may be noted that in the *Vikramorvaśīya*, *Kālidāsa* refers fictiously to a dramatization of the episode of 'Lakṣmīsvayamvara' and this means that the Purāṇic myth of the churning of the ocean was considered by him quite worthy of literary treatment.

8. *Kaīrāu Sayambhu mahāyariu*, so *sayāṇa-sahāsaḥim pariyariu*/
Caumuhahu cayāri muhāim jahim, su-kaittaṇu sisau kāim tahirim//
Mahāpurāṇa II (ed. P.L. Vaidya, 1940), 69, 1, 6-8.

9. *vara-Paumacariu kiu su-kai-seḍhi* /
iya avara jāya dhara-valaya-viḍhi //

Ghattā : *Caumuhu Doṇu Sayambhu-kai*

Pupphayantu puṇu Vīru bhaṇu /

Vāhuvalicariu I, 8, 20-21 cited by Kaslival, K., *Praśasti-Saṁgrah*, 1950, 142; also in *Apabhramśa-Sāhitya*, 236.

Vāhuvalicariu I 8 is apparently based on Dhavala's *Harivarmśa-Purāṇa* (probably before 11th cent.) I.3 : See *Apabhramśa-Sāhitya*, 103-104.

10. Paumacariu I, 23. The Sc. references there are to Velankar's earlier edition.
11. For my previous discussion of this point vide Paumacariu I 17, n. 5. There the editorial emendation of Sc. VI 83 (which is reconsidered here) has been shown to be improbable.
12. The word is twice used in Svayambhū's Paumacariu. See Index to Vol. I, s. v.
13. Rāmāyaṇa (N. S. Edition), 3. 20. 19-21.
14. Paumacariu I, 23.
15. Paumacariu I, 23 and the references to the view of M.C. Modi and Nathuram Premi cited there.
16. Paumacariu I, 24.
17. *Vāmaṇa-rūa kareppiṇu Māhau*, Veu paḍhamta parāiu sāhau / tiṇṇi-paāim kareppiṇu sāmāu, dāṇau bandhiu so *Bali-nāmau*//
18. Jain Sāhitya aur Itihās, 372; Paumacariu I, 18; Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 104.
19. Paumacariu I, 121; Text I.
20. See footnote 5.
21. Svayambhūcchandas Pūrvabhāga, 1.6; Chando'nusāsana, 1b, ll. 12 ff; Kavidarpaṇa, I 6 and the commentary thereon; Chandaḥkośa (=Appendix II to Kavidarpaṇa), v. 3.
22. As an illustration of the text suitable to performing the Tāṇḍava, the *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja (K. M. edition, 2 379) quotes the following Apabhramśa stanza (Probable emendations for orthographic or memorial corruptions are suggested within brackets) :

sua-vaha-vaiara(?u) nisunīa(?u) dāruṇu /
 rosa-visaṭṭa(?u) pahara-ruhirāruṇu //
 jaliu jāṇai (?ṇāi) ṇaru riu-samṭāvaṇu /
 aṇala-sariccha(?u) jai(?ji) hoi mahā-raṇu //

'Hearing the terrible news of his son having been killed, Arjuna, bursting with anger and crimson with bloody wounds, (though himself) a cause of burning to the enemies, felt a burning sensation; (now) the war will rage like a fire'.

The occasion is obviously that of Abhimanyu's treacherous

death in the Bhārata battle. But in the absence of any definite clue, we cannot say whether it is from Caturmukha's epic.

23. Paūmacariu I, 28, 121, text I.
24. Ibid. The view expressed at Paumacariu I, 28 has been revised here.
25. Cf. Paumacariu I, 30
26. Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 344; Praśasti-Saṁgraha, 101.
27. See f. n. 18.
28. Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 175; Praśasti-Saṁgraha, 287.
29. Premī-Abhinandana-Grantha, 439.
30. Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 351; Praśasti-Saṁgraha, 165.
31. Ibid, 229.
32. Jain, P., 'Sulocanācaritra aur Devasena, 'Anekānta, 7, 1945, 161; Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 216-217.
33. Apabhramśa-Sāhitya, 236; Praśasti-Saṁgraha, 142.

7. THE CHILDHOOD EXPLOITS OF KṚṢṆA ACCORDING TO SOME PRE-ELEVENTH CENTURY PRAKRIT AND APABHRAṂŚA TEXTS

Originally this paper was planned to contain two sections : the first section to give information about a few little known Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa texts relating to the early life of Kṛṣṇa in Gokula, Vṛndāvana and Mathurā and especially those dealing with the love-sports of Kṛṣṇa with Rādhā and the other cowherd girls. The second section was to touch upon the regional aspect of the Kṛṣṇa-literature and Kṛṣṇa-bhakti prior to the eleventh century. As it was however felt that in that case the paper would be unreasonably lengthy, the present attempt is confined to the first of the two above-mentioned themes.

The tradition of presenting and representing Kṛṣṇa's childhood in literature and art extends over more than two thousand years. So it is bound to have numerous variations of episodes, individual details and motifs. These variations tie up with chronology, religious sect and region. The importance of the Kṛṣṇa literature of different periods for interpreting some of the aspects of the art of those periods depicting Kṛṣṇa's life is self-evident. So far mostly the Sanskrit and Hindu sources have been explored for this purpose. The Prakrit, Apabhraṁśa and Jaina sources remain neglected for the most part. No doubt some specialized work on the Jain Kṛṣṇa-kathā has been done by a few scholars. But this, as also some relevant Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa works remain more or less inaccessible to the students of the history of Indian Art.

The great impact of Jayadeva's *Gītagavinda* (12th Cent. A.D.) on the subsequent art and literature is well-known. *Līlāsūkā Bilvamangala* (possibly 11th Cent. in one view) preceded Jayadeva in the characteristic type of Kṛṣṇa-bhakti which had the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* c. 850 A.D.)¹ as its fountain-head.

There is a gap of some three centuries between the *Bhāgavata* and the two lyricists. Which predecessors, if any, did inspire or influence the latter ? Where does Rādhā, absent in the early Purāṇic sources, come from ? These questions have not been satisfactorily answered.²

A glance at the few Prakrit and Apabhramśa works preserved from the extensive literature produced during the post-Gupta period shows that Kṛṣṇa's childhood exploits and his love-sports with Rādhā and other Gopīs were for the poets themes of perennial interest. Onwards from the fifth century, there was a tradition with the Prakrit poets to include for homage Kṛṣṇa also in the deity-list figuring in the opening section (*maṅgalācaraṇa*) of their poems.

Thus Pravarasena's *Setubandha* (5th Cent. A. D.) refers to the killing of Ariṣṭa, the Bull-demon (I 3), and to the robbing of Pārijāta from Indra's paradise³ (I 4).

The Maṅgalācaraṇa in Vākpāṭirāja's *Gauḍavaha* (731-735 A.D.), while praising various incarnations of Viṣṇu refers to Kṛṣṇa's garland of wild flowers (v. 20), his yellow garment and dark skin (v. 27), his lotus-face kissed by Yaśodā (v. 21) and his chaste bearing the nail-marks of Rādhā⁴ (v. 22)

Kouhala's *Lilāvai-kahā* (c. 800 A.D.), besides referring en bloc to Kṛṣṇa's exploits like breaking the pair of the Arjuna trees, killing Ariṣṭa, Keśin and Kamsa and lifting the Govardhana (v. 6), describes separately Ariṣṭa-vadha etc. as follows :

- (1) Kṛṣṇa's powerful dark arm, like Yama's noose, encircled Ariṣṭa's throat (v. 4).
- (2) Kṛṣṇa's one arm clutched Keśin's neck, and the elbow of the other arm blocked the demon's mouth (v. 7).
- (3) As the infant Kṛṣṇa tried to cross the threshold but could not, his leg hanged in the air and the scene was being witnessed by Balabhadra with suppressed laughter (v. 3).

There is no doubt that numerous poetic and dramatic works dealing wholly or partly with Kṛṣṇa's life continued to be written

in Prakrit in the subsequent centuries, though most of them are now lost to us. The Jain tradition is largely dependent upon the Vedic-Brahmanic tradition for the Kṛṣṇa-carita and for the Mahābhārata narrative, of which the former formed a part. But it treats Kṛṣṇa as a royal hero of extraordinary prowess, and not as a supreme divine being that had assumed the human form⁵. One of the sources of the Apabhramśa poet Svayambhū was Jinasena's *Harivaṁśapurāṇa* (784 A. D.) in Sanskrit. Cantos 4 to 8 of Svayambhū's *Ritthaṇṇemicariya* in Apabhramśa deal with Kṛṣṇa's early life (from his birth to the founding of Dvārāvati). In the fifth canto are narrated various childhood exploits of Kṛṣṇa (killing etc. of Putanā, Śakaṭa, Yamalārjuna, Keśin etc.). The first four sections (Kaḍavaka) of the sixth canto give a highly poetic description of Kālīya-mardana. Svayanbhū is assignable to the last quarter of the ninth century.⁵

Ratan Parimoo has shown⁶ that description and representation of Kṛṣṇa as leading the subdued Kālīya by a nose-cord that pierced the latter's nose was a North Indian tradition, as against the South Indian tradition preserved in Jain literature. Some four hundred years earlier Jinasena's *Harivaṁśa-purāṇa* refers to *Kāḷindyaṁ nāga-nāthanam* (I 91), and about a hundred years thereafter Svayambhū's *Harivaṁśapurāṇa* gives the same version of Kālīyadamana : *Harivaṁśapurāṇa* VI 3 9 refers to Kṛṣṇa piercing Kālīya's nose with a cord and then whirling him by holding that cord.

Puṣpadanta's *Mahāpurāṇa* (completed in 972 A.D.) is an Apabhramśa epic dealing with the lives of 63 Great Men of the Jain tradition. Its 85th and 89th cantos narrate Kṛṣṇa's early life. Following the Jain tradition (as represented by Jinasena's *Harivaṁśapurāṇa*), Puṣpadanta has poetically described various well-known exploits of Kṛṣṇa as also his pranks and his sports with the Gopis. As Alsdorf has pointed out,⁷ Puṣpadanta too refers to Kṛṣṇa's piercing Kālīya's nose with a cord '*natthiya-bhuyāṁgu*', 89 20 3).

Among the numerous Prakrit and Apabhramśa poets cited by Svayambhū (about most of whom we come to know only from him), there were three poets whose works had partly or wholly

Kṛṣṇacarita as their theme. The citations from the poet Govinda (c. 800 A. D.) indicate that he must have written a long poem in Apabhramśa about Kṛṣṇa's early life. Out of the six verses cited from Govinda one pertains to the Kāliya-damana episode, and two to the amorous sports of Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs. *Svyambhūcchandas*⁸ (=SC.) IV 10(1) refers to Kāṁsa's order to Nanda to bring for him lotuses from the fatal pool of the Yamunā that was the abode of the Serpent Kāliya⁹. IV 10(2) refers to Kṛṣṇa's deep love for Rādhā above all the other Gopīs. IV 11(1) describes love-lorn condition of Pālī, one of Kṛṣṇa's sweethearts.

As Govinda's verse given at SC. IV 10(2) is also cited anonymously by Hemacandra in the Apabhramśa section of his *Siddhahema grammar* (VII 4 422/5), we may make a surmise that another Apabhramśa citation also in the same work (VIII 4 420/2), describing how Kṛṣṇa was made to dance by Rādhā in her courtyard, derived from the same poem of Govinda.

Both the Prakrit citations in SC., which are relevant to our present purpose, are from the poet Śuddhasvabhāva (Pk. *Suddhasvabhāva*). One of these is highly interesting for the light it can throw on the trend of Kṛṣṇabhakti that is typified by the poems of Līlāśuka Bilvamaṅgala and Jayadeva. SC. I 75(1) describes in the *Simhavikrānta* variety of the Daṇḍaka metre Kṛṣṇa and Gopīs playing the game of Blindman's Buff. In the autumn night, in the game played with the Gopīs, Rādhā covered with her beautiful, delicate hands the eyes of Kṛṣṇa, who stood with the hollow of his joined hands filled with dust, and led him to the place of rendezvous : as she removed her hands from his eyes, Kṛṣṇa saw before him the extremely beautiful girl, who kissed him, embraced him and passionately engaged him in love-sports.

This at once reminds us of the opening verse of the *Gītāgovinda*. The theme of Kṛṣṇa's clandestine love sports with Rādhā was, it seems, favourite with the poets since at least eighth century, if not earlier—i.e. some three-hundred years prior to Jayadeva. It is significant to remember here that the metres of the *Gītāgov-*

inda are not Sanskrit Varnavṛttas. They are peculiarly by Apabhraṁśa metres.

The second Prakrit citation, relevant for our purpose is an illustration of the metre Jayā from the same poet Śuddhasvabhāva (Sc. I 12/1). It refers to Rādhā who, seeing approaching Kṛṣṇa reflected in the bright necklace on her breasts, naively thought it was Baladeva's reflection and felt shy, and how thereupon Kṛṣṇa gave her a hearty embrace.¹⁰

It should be noted that the above three poets cited in the *Svayambhūcchandas* flourished just about fifty years or so before the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, and quite possibly they hailed from the Western region.

Most of the rich Kṛṣṇa poetry, however, produced during the last few centuries of the first millennium has disappeared. Besides the *Svayambhūcchandas*, we have some Prakrit anthologies in which a few stray verses on the themes of Kṛṣṇacarita are preserved.

One of the verses (I 89) of Hāla's *Saptaśataka* or *Gāhākosa*¹¹ (2nd to 5th cent) refers to Kṛṣṇa's blowing away with his mouth the dust particle fallen in Rādhā's eye, the action making the other Gopīs envious. Another Verse (I 12) describes the Gopīs listening with suppressed laughter Yaśodā's naive remark that Kṛṣṇa was still a mere boy.

*Vajjālagga*¹² (c. 10th cent.) contains a whole section on Kṛṣṇa. Of the sixteen verses in that section, eight verses are related to Kṛṣṇa's love for Gopīs, or a particular Gopī's attachment to and craving for Kṛṣṇa. Four verses have Kṛṣṇa's love for Rādhā as its theme. The remaining four verses deal with Kṛṣṇa's partiality for a Gopī called Viśākhā. This last group is indicative of fresh development in the theme of Kṛṣṇa's love-sports. From later literature we are familiar with the names of other Gopīs (like Viśākhā, Lalitā, Candrāvalī etc.), besides Rādhā.

In Jineśvara-sūri's *Gāhārayana-kosa*¹³ there are nine verses, given under the section called *Kṛṣṇa-kṛīḍā* (Kṛṣṇa's sports). Alth-

ough the anthology is dated 1195 A. D., many verses are demonstrably taken from earlier anthologies or independent works. Of the nine Kṛṣṇa verses, three relate to Viṣṇu. Two about Viśākhā are taken from the *Vajjālagga*. Two describe Kṛṣṇa's love for Rādhā, and one for the Gopīs. The remaining one is about Kāliya-mardana.

There are numerous citations in Prakrit and Sanskrit in Bhoja's *Sarasvatikanthābharana* and *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (11th cent.), which have various episodes from Kṛṣṇa-bālacatita as their theme. Many of them can be reasonably regarded as derived from earlier literature. But they deserve a separate treatment.¹⁴

The sixteenth chapter of the fourth Viṃśati (i.e. seventysixth chapter according to continuous numbering) of *Mānasollāsa* (or *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi*), the encyclopaedic work written in 1143 A.D. by Someśvara, the Western Cālukya king of Kalyāṇi, is devoted to the description of the pastime of music. Therein Someśvara has illustrated various metres and musical Prabandhas with his own verse-compositions. Most of these illustrations are in praise of Kṛṣṇa or various incarnations of Viṣṇu. Verses 327, 330, 340, 370, 384, 451, 457, 462, 468, 482, 501 (and verses 6, 20, 28 in the Ms. D) wholly or partly refer to various exploits of Kṛṣṇa. Of these, verse 330 (illustration of Śukasārikā), verse 6 in Ms. D (illustration of Muktāvali) and verse 20 in D. (illustration of Ovi), are specially noteworthy as they describe loves of Kṛṣṇa and Gopīs in post-Apabhramśa regional dialects. So also verse 340 describing the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu (after Jayadeva) is in a mixture of a post-Apabhramśa dialect and Old Kannada. Someśvara must have modelled his compositions after the lyrical tradition known to him, which suggests existence of vernacular poems on Kṛṣṇa-carita in the eleventh century A.D.

Lastly we have to draw attention to a dramatic work dealing with the loves of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. Among the Uparūpaka types of dramatic works, Rāsaka, Nāṭyarāsaka and Rāsakāṅka are described by the works on dramaturgy. No specimens, however, of these types are preserved. Only in the case of Rāsakāṅka we

get a passage, quoted by Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (11th century) and another by Abhinavagupta in his *Abhinava-bhārati* (12th century), from a work called *Rādhā-vipralambha* by Bhejjala¹⁶. From Bhoja's citation we know that that dramatic work must have at least four characters, viz, Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā, the Pratināyikā called Pālitakā and Vidūṣaka. Abhinavagupta observes that the work freely uses the Apabhramśa dialect. This is a very valuable evidence of a tradition of dramatic works composed on the themes derived from the early life of Kṛṣṇa.¹⁷

Appendix

(Text of the verses referred to)

- (1) पीणत्तण-दुग्गेज्झं जस्स सुआ-अंत-णिदुद्धर-परिगह्मिअं ।
रिदुस्स विसम-वल्लिअं कंठं दुक्खेण जीविअं वेलीणं ॥
(सेतुबंघ १-२)
- (2) ओआहिअ-महिवेदो जेण परूढ-गुण-मूल-लद्ध-त्थामो ।
उम्मूलंतेण दुमं पारोहो व्व खुडिओ महेदस्य जसो ॥
(सेतुबंघ, १-४)
- (3) सो जअइ जामइत्ताअमाण-मुहलालि-वल्ल-परिआलं ।
लच्छि-णिवेसंतेउर-वइं व जो वहइ वणमालं ॥
(गउडवह, २०)
- (4) बालत्तणम्मि हरिणो जअइ जसोआए लुम्बिअं वअणं ।
पडिसिद्ध-णाहि-मग्गुद्ध-णिग्गअं पुण्डरीअं व ॥
(गउडवह, २१)
- (5) णह-रेहा कारणाओ करुणं हरंतु वो सरसा ।
क्खत्थलम्मि कोत्थुह-किरणाअंतीओ कणहरस ॥
(गउडवह, २२)
- (6) तं णमह पीअ-वसणं जो वहइ सहाव-सामलच्छाअं ।
दिअस-णिसा-लअ-णिग्गम-विहाअं सबलं पिव सरीरं ॥
(गउडवह, २७)

- (7) तस्सेय पुणो पणमह णिहुयं हलिणा हसिज्जमाणस्स ।
अपहुत्त-देहली-लंघणद्ध-वह-संठियं वलणं ॥
(लीलावई, ३)
- (8) सो जयउ जस्स पत्तो कंठे रिद्धासुरस्स घण-कसणो ।
उप्पाय-पवड्ढिय-काल-वास-करणी भुय-प्फलिहो ॥
(लीलावई, ४)
- (9) हरिणो जमलज्जुण-रिट्ठ-केसि-कंसासुरिद-सेलाण ।
भंजण-वलण-वियारण-कड्ढण-धरणे भुए णमह ॥
(लीलावई, ६)
- (10) कक्कस-भुय-कोप्पर-पुरियाणणो कटिण-कर-कयावेसो ।
केसि-किसोर-कयत्थणे-कउज्जमो जयइ महुमहणो ॥
(लीलावई ७)
- (11) णत्थेप्पिणु महुमहणेण, कालिउ णहयले भामियउ ।
भीसावणु कंसहो, णाइं काल-दंडु उग्गामियउ ॥
(रिट्ठणेमि-चरिय, ६-३-९)
- (12) एहु विसमउ सुट्ठु आएसु
पाणंतिउ माणुसहो दिट्ठी-विसु सप्पु कालिअउ ।
कंसु वि मारेइ धुउ कहिं गम्मउ काइं किउजउ ॥
(स्वयम्भूच्छन्दसू, ४-१०.९)
- (13) सब्ब-गोविउ जइ-वि जोएइ
हरि सुट्ठु-वि आअरेण देइ दिट्ठी जहिं कहिं वि राही ।
को सक्कइ संवरेवि डड्ढ णअण णेहे पलेइहा ॥
(स्वयम्भूच्छन्दसू, ४-१०-२)
- (14) देइ पाली थणहं पम्भारे
तोत्थेप्पिणु णलिणि-दलु हरि-विओअ-संतावे तत्ती ।
फलु अण्णहे पावियउ करउ दइअ जं किपि रुच्चइ ॥
(स्वयम्भूच्छन्दसू, ४-)
- (15) हरि नच्चाविउ पंगणइ विम्हइ पाडिउ लोउ ।
एम्बहिं राह-पओहरहं जं भावइ तं हेउ ॥
(सिद्धहेम, ८-४-४२०.२)

(16) उअ सरअ-णिसाए रमंतेा समं वाल गोवीहिं राहाइ कण्हो करे पुंजिअं धुलि-पुंजं ।
 ललिअ-उहअ-हृत्येण पच्छाइल्लणच्छि-वत्ताइं णीओ सअं जाव संकेअ-केली-पएसं ॥
 विहलिअ-कर-रोहो पलोएइ जा ता पुरो पुण्णिमा-चंद-बोदी णवेदीवरच्छी किसंणी
 विहसिअ सविलासं पुणो नीअ सो गाढमालिगिओ छाअरं चुंबिओ णिब्भरं रामिओ अ ॥
 (स्वयम्भूच्छन्दस्, १-७५.१)

(17) मेघैर्मेदुरमम्बरं वनभुवः श्यामास्तमालद्रुमैर्
 नक्तं मीरुथं त्वमेव तदिमं राधे गृहं प्रापय ।
 इत्थं नन्दनिदेशतश्चलितयोः प्रत्यग्रकुञ्जद्रुमं
 राधामाधवयोर्ययन्ति यमुनातीरे रहःकेलयः ॥

(गीतगोविन्द, १)

(18) राहाए तार-हारे थणे पडिबिबिअं
 कण्हं बालाइ दट्टुं बलो-त्ति पलज्जिअं ।
 णाउं रिट्ठारिणा वि णिआ इअ मुद्धिआ
 गाढं घेतूण कंठे उणो उवगूहिआ ॥

(स्वयम्भूच्छन्दस्, १-१२.१)

(19) सुह-मारुण तं कण्ह गोरअं राहिआए अवणेतो ।
 एआण वल्लवीणं अण्णाण वि गोरअं हरसि ॥

(गाहाकेस, १-८९)

(20) कुसलं राहे सुहिओ सि कंस कंसो कहिं कहिं राहा ।
 इय बा(पा?)लियाइ भणिए त्रिलक्ख-हसिरं हरिं नमह ।

(बज्जालग, ५९०)

(21) कण्हो जयइ जुवाणो राहा उम्मत्त-जोव्वणा जयइ ।
 जउणा बहुल-तरंगा ते दिवहा तेत्तिय च्चेव ॥

(बज्जालग, ५८२)

(22) केसि-वियारण-रुहिरुल्लन्कुप्परुधसण-लंछणग्धवियं ।
 न सुएइ कण्हं जुण्णं पि कंबुयं अज्ज-वि विसाहा ॥

(बज्जालग, ५९५)

(23) राइइ कवोल-तलुच्छलंत-जोण्हा-णिवाय-धवलंगो ।
 रइ-रहस-वावडाए धवलो आलिगिओ कण्हो ॥

(बज्जालग, ५९५)

- (24) सच्चं चेय भुयंगी विसाहिया कण्ह तण्हहा होइ ।
संते वि विणय-तणए जीए घुम्माविओ तं सि ॥
(वज्जालग, २९८)
- (25) केसव पुराण-पुरिसे। सच्चं चिय तं सि जं जणो भणइ ।
जेणं विसाहियाए भमसि सया हत्थ-लगाए ॥
(वज्जालग, ५९९)
- (26) किसिओ सि कीस केसव किं न कओ धन्न-संगहो मूढ ।
कतो मण-परिओसे। विसाहियं भुंजमाणस्स ॥
(वज्जालग, ६००)
- (27) उय ऊढ-भुवण-भारो वि केसवो सिहि-भरेण राहाए ।
कुवलय-दलो व तुलिओ हलुइज्जइ को न पिम्मेण ॥
(गाहारयणकोस, ५४)
- (28) सो सग्गो सा लच्छी ताइं वत्थाइं ते अलंकारा ।
राहा-पलोय-हीणा हरिणो हियए खुडुक्खुडइ ॥
(गाहारयणकोस, ६०)
- (29) The few lines of Lāṭī dialect identifiable in [the corrupt text of the illustration of Śukasārikā are restored by me as follows (they form a dialogue between the Gopī and her mother) :
हउं न जाणउं माए तोरी तासा (?) छांडु छांडु ।
× × ×
मइं जाएवउं गोविंद-सहु खेलणह ।
× × ×
तो आम्हणि काहां भ्णसि वाउलिया
नारायणु जगह केरा गोसांवी ॥
(मानसोल्लास, ४-१६-३३०)
- (30) The lines pertaining to the Kṛṣṇa incarnation of Viṣṇu are restored by me as follows :
नंद-गोउले जायउ कन्हु
जो गोवी-जणे पडिहे नयणे जोविया ।

महणाधर आवि-ना म्हणि हक्कारिया
कन्हउ भडारा सउ अम्हाणा चितिया देउ ॥

(मानसोल्लास, ४-१६-३४०)

- (31) The partially and tentatively restored text of the illustration of Muktvāvali is as follows :

अव्वे डेंगर-कडणिए वाजिया नादु सुम्मइ
हीसइ काला हरण वेधे धूमवि(?) सींग-नादु ।
.....छं दे बहु-परि वाजइ, गोवद्धण-गिरि-कंदरु गाजइ ॥
देवई-नंदण कन्हउ.....
रूपे सलोणा सांवलिया, गोउलि बालियां पडिहे नयणा ।
रन्निहि करइ वाउलिया ॥

(मानसोल्लास, Vol. III p. 42, v. 6)

- (32) The restored text of the illustration of Ovi is as follows :

गोउले गोलानि म्हणिअ, वलु वलु तो मझ पडिहे ।
कन्हउ सांवळ, ओविए ॥

(मानसोल्लास, Vol. III, p. 43, v. 20)

Notes

1. See Friedhelm Hardy, *Viraha-bhakti*, 1983.
2. Earlier, S. L. Katre has collected references to Rādhā from pre-twelfth century Sanskrit works like the *Pañcatantra*, *Veṇiśamhāra*, *Dhvanyāloka*, *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, *Nala-campū*, *Yaśas-tilaka-campū*, *Vakrokti-jīvita*, *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana*, *Kāvyaṇu-śāsana*, *Naiṣadhiya* and *Āryā-saptaśatī*, and the Prakrit text *Gāthā-saptaśatī*. See his paper 'Kṛṣṇa, Gopas, Gopīs and Rādhā : P. K. Gode Commemoration Volume. S. P. Tewari has drawn our attention to two early inscriptional references to Rādhā : one in the Paramāra king Muṇja's copper-plate inscriptions dated 974, 980 and 986 A. D., and another in a fragmentary inscription from Mandor (Rajasthan), datable in the early 9th cent. A. D. See his paper 'Early Inscriptional

References to Rādhā,' *Krishna in Art, Bulletin of Museums and Archaeology in U. P.* Nos. 21-24, 1978-79, published in 1980, pp. 83-84. R.C. Agrawala has referred to (1) Two terracotta plaques from the Rangamahā temple in Rajasthan, depicting the Govardhanadharāṇa and Dānalīlā scenes, and to (2) two Mandor pillars depicting Govardhanadharāṇa and several other Bāla-līlā scenes. See his paper 'Kṛṣṇa-Līlā Scenes in Early Rājasthāni Sculptures', *Krishna in Art*, pp. 27-31. In the same volume Doris Srinivasan has sketched the development of Kṛṣṇa-Līlā scenes in early art with relevant bibliographic references. See her paper 'Early Kṛṣṇa Icons : the case of Mathura', pp. 1-16. Śrīdharadāsa's *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (1205 A. D.) has sixty verses relating to Bālakṛṣṇa. Many of these verse quite probably derive from earlier sources.

3. The textual citations are given in an Appendix at the end of this paper. Sarvasena's *Harivijaya* (4th Cent. A.D.), now lost, was the earliest known Prakrit Mahākāvya based on the episode of Pārijāta-harāṇa. See Kulkarni, V. M., 'The Harivijaya of Sarvasena', *Annals of the BORI, Diamond Jubilee Volume*, 1977-78, p. p. 691-710, now also published in his *Studies in Sanskrit Sāhitya-Śāstra*, 1983, pp. 162-191.
4. Vākpatirāja is known to have written another Prakrit Mahākāvya called *Mahumaha-vijaya* (*Madhumatha-vijaya*). but we have no information about its subject-matter or contents. *Mahumaha* or *Mahumahaṇa* was a favourite Prakrit name of Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu in the post-Gupta period.
5. For a survey of the Jain tradition on Kṛṣṇa's life as a whole, and for variations within that tradition see Alsdorf L., *Hariv-amśapurāṇa*, 1938, pp. 52 ff; Bhayani H.C., 'Apabhramśa Sāhitya meṁ Kṛṣṇa-kāvya', in *Bharatīya Bhaṣāṁ meṁ Kṛṣṇakāvya*, ed. B. Mishra, 1979, Part 1, pp. 139-151.
6. Ratan Parimoo, 'Kālīya Damāna ceiling from Gujarat Temples' *Kalakshetra*, 1981, pp. 6-7.
7. Alsdorf, op. cit., p. 57. The whole canto 85 of the *Mahāpurāṇa*, containing 25 Kaḍavakas, is devoted to describing the childhood

- exploits of Kṛṣṇa. In this Puṣpadanta is considerably influenced by Svayambhū.
8. Edited by H. D. Velankar, 1962.
9. Puṣpadanta perhaps knew Govinda's poem. *Mahāpurāṇa*, 86 1 8-11 seem to echo SC. IV 10(1).
10. *Vajjālagga* 595 is comparable to this verse.
11. Edited by A. Weber, 1960 (reprint); by M. V. Patwardhan, 1980.
12. Edited by M. V. Patwardhan, 1969.
13. Edited by A. M. Bhojak and N. J. Shah, 1974.
14. While defining various literary genres, Bhoja describes Ākhyānaka as the Upākhyāna composition capable of being recited, sung and enacted by a single narrator before an audience. As an illustration he names *Govindākhyānaka*, which quite obviously had the Kṛṣṇa-carita as its theme. In view of the continuation of this type of Ākhyāna in Old Gujarati, it is quite likely that there were Ākhyāna works in Apabhraṃśa also.
15. Edited by G. K. Shrigondekar (Vol. III, 1961). Most of these illustrations are textually corrupt and I have tried to reconstruct and interpret them in my paper 'The Prakrit and Deśabhāṣā passages in Someśvara's Mānasollāsa', K. K. Handiqui Commemoration Volume, 1983, pp. 167-177.
16. See V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963, pp. 889-891. According to the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, the Goṣṭhī type of Uparūpaka deals with the childhood exploits of Kṛṣṇa like killing of the demon Ariṣṭa (p. 468). The Nandimālī Bhāṇa describes Haricarita (p. 467; Raghavan, p. 553). There is also a reference to a Sanskrit Mahākāvya called *Kṛṣṇacarita* (p. 474). These are indications of the Kṛṣṇa literature lost to us.
17. The *Bālacarita*, attributed to Bhāsa, is of course quite well-known. But there is the unsolved problem of its authenticity.

- P. S. Some of the Prakrit sources and a few of the Apabhramśa sources noted here are also noticed and discussed by Friedhelm Hardy in his *Viraha Bhakti* (1983). But there are several other important sources pointed out here, which are absent in Hardy's discussion. Some of the implications of the Prakrit and Apabhramśa passages Hardy point out seem to me debatable. For Kṛṣṇa poetry in Apabhramśa see my earlier paper 'Apabhramśa sāhitya meṁ Kṛṣṇa-kāvya', referred to in fn. 5. Earlier K. K. Shastri had drawn our attention to several of the above given references in his Gujarati book *Narastmha Maheto* (1971), pp. 36-41.

8. PĀLĪ, DHANYĀ AND CĀRUKESĪ THREE OF THE EARLIEST MENTIONED KṚṢṆA'S SWEETHEARTS

In the later Kṛṣṇa-bhakti tradition, we increasingly come across the names of *gopīs* like Viśākhā, Lalitā, Candrāvalī and several more, some of whom were also Kṛṣṇa's favourites besides Rādhā. In the late Purāṇic literature represented by the considerably later sections of the works like the *Padma-purāṇa*, and the *Gargasamhitā*, the name-list has been considerably extended. The problem is to locate and date the beginning of the tradition of naming Rādhā's companions who occasionally and intermittently shared Kṛṣṇa's loving attention, and as such started figuring in the erotic and religious poetry. Leaving aside for the moment Viśākhā and Candrāvalī, who also seem to be among the names to appear early in literature, I present here the information I could gather about three *gopīs*, each of whom figures in poetry as Rādhā's rival. The sources are not later (some may be even earlier) than the 9th-10th century A. D. The names of the three *gopīs* were Pālī, Dhanyā and Cārukeśī. Different poets have described Kṛṣṇa as enjoying in the company of one of them, in temporary disregard of Rādhā.

Pālī, Pālikā/Pālītā, Pālitakā

The earliest milkmaid known from the poetic tradition as Rādhā's rival for Kṛṣṇa's love is variously called Pālī, Pālikā/Pālītā (Pk. Pāliyā) or Pālitakā. From the references or citations made by four writers we gather that several poetic works in Apabhraṃśa, Prakrit and Sanskrit, assignable roughly to the period between the eighth and tenth century A. D., contained episodes involving Kṛṣṇa, Rādhā and Pālī.

The sources of this information are discussed below :

1. Govinda's Apabhraṃśa poem on Kṛṣṇacarita (Not later than the latter half of the 9th century A. D.).

Several verses from this lost work are cited by Svayambhū (latter half of the 9th cent.) in his *Svayambhūcchandas* (SC.). The citation given under SC. IV 11 as an illustration of the Bahurūpā variety of the Apabhramśa metre called Mātrā is as follows :—

देइ पाली थणहं पम्भारे

तोडेप्पिणु गलिणिदलु, हरि-विओअ-संतावे तत्ती ।

फलु अण्णेहि पावि(य)उ, करउ दइउ जं किंपि रुच्चइ ॥

'Pālī, burning with pain due to separation from Hari, plucks a lotus leaf and places it on the slope of her breasts. The poor fool(?) got her due ! Let the fate (now) do whatever it choses to.'

Like Velankar, I also earlier interpreted *Pālī* as *gopālikā* i.e. a *gopī* in general. But in the light of the occurrences noted below, I now take it to be a personal name. We must note that another verse from the same poem (SC. IV 10.2) describes Rādhā as Hari's most favourite Gopī and several other verses of Govinda (SC. IV 9.1., 9.2, 9.4) depict the mood of a love-lorn girl.¹

2. Bhejjala's *Rādhā-vipralambha* (prior to the 11th cent. A. D.).

Rāsakāṅka was one of the types of *uparūpakas* described, discussed or referred to by several Sanskrit dramaturgists and other writers. Bhoja and Abhinavagupta knew of an actual instance of *Rāsakāṅka*, namely the *Rādhā-vipralambha*, composed by Bhejjala.² They refer to a few incidents and characters in that dramatic work and also give a few citations from it. Besides Kṛṣṇa as the hero, Candrāyaṇa as the Vidūṣaka and Rādhā as the heroine, the play had one more female character named Pālitaḥ, who was one of Kṛṣṇa's paramours and Rādhā's rival. Kṛṣṇa is depicted as once favouring Pālitaḥ on a moon-lit night, which makes the pining Rādhā go out in search of Kṛṣṇa.³ Abhinavagupta, too, mentions Pālitaḥ.

3. Jayavallabha's anthology of Prakrit *subhāṣitas* has sixteen verses in its section on Kṛṣṇa (vv. 590-605), which are pertinent to our purpose, because there are several references to Kṛṣṇa's

other sweethearts besides Rādhā, The very first verse in that section is as follows :

‘कुशलं राधेः’ ‘सुहिओ सि कंस’ ‘कंसो कहिं’ ‘कहिं राहा ।’
इय बालियाइ भणिए विलक्ख-हसिरं हरिं नमह ॥

(*Vajjāllaga*, 590).

Patwardhan thus translates it :

‘Oh Rādhā, is it all right, with you ?

‘Oh Kamsa, are you happy ?’ ‘Where is Kamsa ?’

‘Where is Rādhā (either) ?’ When the young damsel had said thus, Hari (Kṛṣṇa) smiled with embarrassment. Pay your homage to him !’

The text reads बालियाइ (Sk. बालिकया) in the second line of the verse, and Ratneśvara’s Sanskrit commentary explains the word as कयाचन and काचन गोपबालिका.

I think, however, the बालियाइ was not the original, genuine reading. Through scribal error or misunderstanding the original पालियाइ was changed to बालियाइ. In that case this becomes a dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and his paramour named Pālikā, and not between Kṛṣṇa and some unspecified Gopī.

This view finds support from the Sanskrit version or translation of the above Gāthā cited in Bhoja’s *Sarasvatikanthābharana* (Sk.), discussed hereunder.

4. While treating the figure of sound called Vākovākya, Bhoja has cited in SK. the following verse as an illustration of Naimittiki Vaiyātyokti, which is one of the several sub-varieties of the Vākovākya :

कुशलं राधे ? सुखितो सि कंस ? कंसः क्व नु ? क्व नु सा राधा ? ।
इति पारी-प्रतिवचनैर्विलक्ष-हासी हरिर्जयति ॥

(Under सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण, 2, 132)

All the editions of SK. read पारी in the second line. But पारी ‘milking pot’ cannot fit here. Obviously it is a corruption of

पाली. Accordingly the बालियाए in the above-cited *Vajjālagga* verse is to be emended as पालियाए.

In this context it is also significant that the verse राधाभोहन-मन्दिरादुपगतश्चन्द्रावलीमूचिवान् etc. which is found in some of the Northern mss. of Bilvamaṅgala's *Kṛṣṇakarnāmrta* and which is just an elaboration of the *Vajjālagga* verse, has Candrāvalī (instead of Pālī), and not a certain (nameless) *gopi* as one of the interlocutors.

5. An anonymous verse cited by Bhoja in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (first half of the 11th cent. A. D.)

As an illustration of the type of Nāyaka who is Dhīralalita, Sādhāraṇa, Śaṭha and Uttama, Bhoja has cited in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* the following verse :

निर्मग्नेन मयाऽभसि स्मर-भरात् पाली समालिङ्गिता
केनालीकमिदं तवाय कथितं राधे मुधा ताभ्यसि ।
इत्युत्स्वप्न-परम्परासु शयने श्रुत्वा गिरं शार्ङ्गिणः
सव्याजं शिथिलीकृतः कमलया कण्ठग्रहः पातु वः ॥

(ŚP., p. 600)

'Who gave you today the false report that while diving in water, I, fired by passion, gave an embrace to Pālī? Rādhā, you are unnecessarily distressed' :—Hearing in the bed these words uttered by Śārṅgīn in sleep, Kamalā meaningfully loosened her clasp on his neck. May that protect you'.

In this instance too the rivalry between Rādhā and Pālī is clearly explicit.

Dhanyā, Dhanikā

1. In three of the four verses in the Kaṇha-vajjā (*Kṛṣṇa-paryāya*) of the *Vajjālagga* which relate to Kṛṣṇa's sweetheart called Viśākhā,⁵ the word *visāhiyā*, a diminutive form of *visāhā* (Sk. *Viśākhā*) is used with *double entendre*. One of these verses is as follows :

किसिओ-सि कीस कस्व ? किं न कओ धन्न-संगहो मूढ ? ।

कतो मण-परिओसो विसाहियं भुजमाणस्स ? ॥

(*Vajjālagga*, 600)

‘Oh Keśava, why have you become emaciated ? Oh fool, why did you not store food-grains ? How can one get mental satisfaction, feeding himself (just) on whatever he obtains ? (or, on what is highly poisonous ?)’. Alternatively, ‘Oh fool, why did you not stick to Dhanyā ? Is it ever possible for one enjoying himself in the company of Viśākhā to get real satisfaction ?’ Pk. *dhanna* (Sk. *dhanyā*) is understood by Patwardhan as ‘beautiful women’. But like Viśākhā, Dhanyā here is the personal name of a particular *gopi* who once enjoyed Kṛṣṇa’s favour. This interpretation finds support from two verses cited in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.

2. The following verse is cited twice in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. Once it is cited as an illustration of *Samākhyābhidhānikī Vyapekṣā*, wherein the signification of a designation is brought out by means of a sentence. At another place it is cited as an illustration of a designation that is construed meaningfully to convey the relationship of love :

सच्चं धण्णा धण्णा, जा तइया केसवेण गिरि-धरणे ।

गुरु-भार-वावहेण वि, उज्जुअ-अच्छं चिरं दिट्ठो ॥

(*Śp.*, pp. 269, 888)

‘Dhanyā is indeed *dhanyā* (blessed), who was looked at directly and lingeringly by Keśava, even when he was weighed down with a heavy load due to holding the mountain (i. e. Govardhana) aloft’.

3. The following verse is cited by Bhoja as an illustration of the type of Nāyaka who is Dhīralalita, Sādhāraṇa and Madhyama.

दूरे गोकुलनाथ गोकुलमितस्संचार-शून्या दिश-

स्त्यक्त्वा मां धनिकादयो पि हि गता भारातिखेदालसाः ।

विस्तीर्णा वनराजिकेयमपरा जाता पुरो निर्गमाच्च

खिन्नाऽस्मि प्रतिपालयेत्यभिहितो गोप्या हरिः पातु वः ॥

(*Śp.*, p. 611)

‘Oh Lord of Gokula, Gokula is far away from here. Dhanikā and other (companions), feeling exhausted and languid under their load have gone away already, leaving me alone. This vast woodland has become strange to me (as it were), before I can get out of it (?) and I am (extremely) tired. Please protect me. May Hari, addressed thus by the Gopī, protect you’.

Here Dhanikā is the name of one of the *gopīs*. It is quite close to Dhaṇṇā (Sk. Dhanyā) of the *Vaijālagga* verse.

Cārukeśi

As an illustration of the Dhiroddhata-asādhāraṇa-dhr̥ṣṭa type of hero, Bhoja has cited in ŚP. the following verse.

‘शौरे कस्माद् विधत्से दशनपदमिदं चारुकेश्याहितं ते’
 ‘चारुत्वं कीदृगस्य श्रित-पशु-वपुषा केशिना निर्मितस्य ?’ ।
 ‘नैवं धृष्ट ब्रवीमि ब्रजयुवतिमहं’ ‘बाढमेष ब्रजामी-’
 त्येवं गोप्याऽवताद वः क्ष(क ?)पट-धरण-प्रीणितः कैटमारिः ॥

(ŚP., p. 602)

‘O Śauri, why do you display this tooth-mark impressed on you (i.e. on your lip) by Cārukeśi (*Cārukeśi-āhitam*)’ ?

‘How can it be beautiful (*cāru*), produced as it is by Keśin (*keśi*), who had assumed the bodily form of a beast ?’

‘You brazenly unfaithful ! I don’t mean that. I am talking of the milkmaid (*vraja-yuvatim*)’.

‘Very well, here I am wooing (*vrajāmi*) a young girl’.

May the enemy of Kaiṭabha, thus resorting to chicanery, and delighted by the milkmaid (?) protect you’.

The Gopī of this dialogue is possibly Rādhā, who creates a scene with Kṛṣṇa, who has just returned after spending a night with Cārukeśi. Kṛṣṇa tries to save himself by resorting to Śleṣa on the words *cārukeśyāhitam* and *vrajayuvatim* used by Rādhā. We can compare with this the *Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta* verse (*rādhā-mohan-mandirād* etc.) referred to above.

A closely similar repartee between Kṛṣṇa and one of his sweethearts is instanced by the verse *vāsaly samprati kośaya kya bhayato* etc. cited on p. 607 of ŚP.

Notes

1. I have slightly emended Velankar's text orthographically, and my translation differs from his in several points.
2. See V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, (1963), pp. 567, 887, 891, where the references and citations are noted and their implications are fully brought out. G. R. Josyer's edition of the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* silently omits the Prakrit passage given by Raghavan.
3. Raghavan, *ibid.*, p. 890 : कृतापराधमपि चन्द्रातपहता प्रियतममनिससार राधा, यत्र पालितका गता ।
(= *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, text, p. 491, 11. 4-5).

4. An anonymous verse given in Jayavallabha's *Vajjālagga* (possibly about the 10th cent. A. D.).

5. These are the earliest known verses referring to Viśākhā, who is known in the Kṛṣṇa-carita tradition as one of the Gopīs which are mentioned as Kṛṣṇa's favourites and Rādhā's friends and rivals.

The Pātāla-khaṇḍa of the *Padma-purāṇa* (ch. 70, vv. 4-7) gives the following list (which includes Dhanyā) of the eight main beloveds of Kṛṣṇa : Rādhikā, Lalitā, Syāmalā, Dhanyā, Haripriyā, Viśākhā, Padmā and Candrāvalī.

It may be also noted that the Gujarati folk-songs know only two names, viz., Candarāveṇī or Candarāval (i.e. Candrāvalī) and (very rarely) Dhanāī (i.e. Dhanyā, Dhanikā) as Kṛṣṇa's beloveds, besides, of course, Rādhā.

References

- Bhoja : *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana*, ed. K. Mishra, 1976. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, ed. G. R. Josyer, 1955.
- Bilvamaṅgala : *Kṛṣṇakarnāmrta*, ed. F. Wilson, 1975.
- Jayavallabha : *Vajjālagga*, ed. M. V. Patwardhan, 1969.
- V. Raghavan : *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963.
- Svayambhū : *Svayambhūcchandas*, ed. H. D. Velankar, 1962.

9. THE EVOLUTION OF SANATKUMĀRA-CARITA*

Evolution of Indian religious myths and legends is a vast and intricate field of study. Jain myths and legends form an important part of this field and at its centre we find the Universal History. The Jain Universal History usually enumerate sixtythree Great Men (*Uttam/mahā/Śalākā-puruṣa*). Of the twelve Universal Monarchs (Cakravartin) included in the list, the fourth is Sanatkumāra, the previous three being Bharata, Sagara and Maghavan. The life-story of Sanatkumara Cakravartin has been the subject of numerous works in Prakrit, Apabhramśa, Sanskrit and other Indian languages. Like the treatment of the stories of the other Śalākāpuruṣas, the treatment of Sanatkumāra-carita (Sc.) too has passed through four stages. Initially it is found as an isolated narrative more or less sketchy. Next it is found as a part of full-fledged systematic works dealing with the account of all the sixty-three Great Men. Thereafter the individual *caritas* occur as *dṛṣṭānta-kathās*, embedded in some commentary, didactic *prakaraṇa* or tale-collection (*kathākośa*, *kathāvali*). Lastly we have independent works on some one Śalākāpuruṣa, in the form of a regular *mahākāvya* in verse, prose or a mixture of both. The table below presents most of the important Sanatkumāra-caritas according to the above-indicated fourfold categorization (The abbreviation of the title of a work is given in adjacent parantheses).

Title	Author	Date	Abbreviation
वसुदेवहिंडी	सङ्खदास	c. 5th cent.	VH
उपदेशमाला-विवरण	जयसिंह	9th cent.	UV
धर्मोपदेशमाला-विवरण	,,	859 A.D.	DV
चउप्पन्न-महापुरिस-चरिय	शीलाङ्क	869 A.D.	CM
उत्तरपुराण	गुणभद्र	ante 897 A.D.	UP
बृहत्कथाकोश	हरिषेण	932 A.D.	BK
महापुराण	पुष्पदन्त	965-972 A.D.	MP

कहकोस	श्रीचन्द्र	1070 A.D.	KK
उत्तराध्ययन-वृत्ति	देवेन्द्र	1073 A.D.	UVD
आख्यानक-मणि-कोशवृत्ति	आम्रदेव	1134 A.D.	AKV
मल्लिनाह-चरिय	हरिभद्र	ante 1160 A.D.	MC
नेमिनाह-चरिय	हरिभद्र	1160 A.D.	NC
त्रिषष्टि-शलाकापुरुष-चरित	हेमचन्द्र	c. 1165 A.D.	TŚ

Broadly speaking, the Digambara versions of the Sc. as we find in UP, MP, BK and KK constitute a sub-group and along with VH version they form a group set apart from rest of the Sc. Versions by the fact that their account is confined to Sanatkumara's renunciation and philosophical suffering of diseases. In the fully developed version that we find, say, for example, in TŚ, this part of Sanatkumara's life-story forms the third section. We may call it section C.C seems to be the earliest part of the Sc, because the earliest works like VH and UP know only that much of the legend. The fact that in BK, DV, UVD and AKV the Sc. is given to illustrate how one should suffer with equanimity the consequences of the past deeds also supports such a conclusion. The account in the UP is the shortest, and the MP version is based thereon. The VH and UP versions differ in a few details, and so far as we can judge from the outline given in DV, UV appears indebted to VH for this part of its Sanatkumāra-carita. The same remark applies to the Sanatkumāra-carita in CM except that we have now a systematized list of diseases that afflicted Sanatkumāra as a monk. But BK develops for the first time some points of the narrative (e.g. the incident at the court of Saudharmendra which occasioned the visit from two gods; Sanatkumara's perceiving of the decaying character of his bodily lustre, the particular incident that was the direct cause of the diseases; the second visit from the same two gods to test Sanatkumāra etc.). KK mostly follows BK. The new elements that we find for the first time in BK are incorporated in all the subsequent Sanatkumāra-caritas of the Śvetāmbara tradition also (e.g. UVD, MC, NC and TŚ). But otherwise the Sc. in UVD is just lifted from CM. AKV seems to be fami-

liar with the Sc. of DV, CM, BK and UVD as is clear from parallels in minor details, but as a whole it abridges the narrative in some points and adds on its own the sections on the *puruṣa-lakṣaṇa*, *strīlakṣaṇa* and *rogalakṣaṇa*. The MC version of the Sc., is little more than a verse recast of the CM version, and the NC version is poetic reworking of the same. The TŚ account in its C section is based on the UVD version (and through that on the CM version). The story of Sanatkumāra from his birth to the point when he attained the status of a Cakravartin constitutes section B of the Sc., in its full form. This section is absent from VH, as also from UP and the most of the Digambara versions. It appears for the first time, so far as we know, in UV and this is also a surmise made on the basis of what we find in the DV outline, as UV is lost to us. Our earliest available source for a detailed account of section B is CM. UVD takes this over in toto, adding to it a few details from some other source. It is drastically abridged by AKV. MC gives us a verse recast of the CM version and uses it in NC for a poetic working over. TŚ uses CM and also some other sources. Consistent with its uniform plan it shifts to the beginning the account of the previous lives of Sanatkumāra which in UV figured in the midst of Section B. We may note here one quite significant detail that throws light on the relationship and mutual influence of various Sanatkumāra-carita versions. The name of Sanatkumara's father was Anantavīrya according to UP, Aśvasena (Āsaseṇa) according to VH, UVD, MC, NC and and TŚ and Viśvasena (Viśaseṇa) according to BK, CM, AKV and UD. In this matter (and similarly in several other details) the Śvetāmbara and Digambara versions of the Sc., cross each other.

The remaining section of the Sc., the Section A, seems to be the latest addition. It deals with the previous births of Sanatkumāra. The account is absent from VH, UP, MP, BK and KK. It seems to have appeared for the first time in UV. But CM just touches it in a couple of verses. The earliest available detailed treatment is in UVD. In keeping with its casual approach to the narrative content of the Sanatkumāra-carita, AKV altogether omits

the account of previous births. TŚ and UD versions follow UVD (or its source version).

Thus we see that the Sanatkumāra-carita has evolved in three stages. Originally it consisted of the story about Sanatkumāra's renunciation and severe austerities (section C). The romantic account of the earlier life was added later (Section B). Finally appeared the section containing the stories about the previous lives (section A). Section C has two versions. One, perhaps the earlier, is represented in UP and MP, while another in VH which found acceptance in the rest of Śvetāmbara and Digambara versions. The innovations in VH version of C, which we first find in BK became a common heritage for later versions. The other two sections are peculiar to the Śvetāmbara tradition and they appear for the first time in UV. Thereafter they figure in most of the Śvetāmbara versions of the Sanatkumāra-carita. Thus regarding the Sanatkumāra-carita, on the one hand we have clear cut Śvetāmbara and Digambara traditions relating to the legend as a whole, but on the other hand there is some definite influence and borrowing of details across the two traditions.

Notes

1. See L. Alsdorf, *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, 1936, Introduction; Claus Brühn, 1954; A.M. Bhojak, *Cauppanna-mahāpurisa-cariya*, 1961 (Introduction by, Claus Brühn). A.N. Upadhye, *Brhatkathakośa*, Introduction. The number sixtythree varies. At times it is given as fiftyfour (with the exclusion of the Prativasudevas) or Seventytwo (with the addition of of nine Nāradas).
2. See A.M. Bhojak, *Cauppanna-mahāpurisa-cariya*, 1961, Hindi Introduction, p. 42.
3. Dhavala's *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (about 12th cent.) and Dhanapāla's *Bāhubalicarita* (1398 A.D.) refer to a Sanatkumāra-carita, probably in Apabhraṃśa, composed by a Śvetāmbara Jain poet named Govinda. See K. Kasliwal, *Praśastisaṅgraha*,

1950, p. 142; H. Kochad, *Apabhramśa-sāhitya*, 1957, pp. 103, 236; P.J. Shastri, *Jain-grantha-praśasti-saṃgrah*, part 2, 1993, Introduction, p. 65; text, p. 12, 35. Moreover, Svayambhū's *Riṭṭhaṇemicariya* (about ninth century), Nayanandin's *Sayala-vihivihāṇakavva* (about 1044 A.D.), Devasena's *Suloyaṇā-cariya* (1075 A.D.) mention one Govinda along with Rudra, Daṇḍin, Bāṇa, Hālika etc., in the list of famous poets. See Kasliwal, op. cit., p. 287; Kochad, op. cit. pp. 175, 216; P.J. Shastri, op. cit., Introduction, pp. 47, 51, 72, text pp. 19, 25. Svayambhū quotes six stanzas from some Apabhramśa poem of Govinda, which seems to have Kṛṣṇacarita as its theme and was composed in different varieties of the Mātrā metre. See H.D. Velankar, *Svayambhūcchandās*, 1962, 4, 9; 1, 3, 5; 10. 1, 2; 11. 1; p. 156. It is not certain whether these references pertain to the same or different poets.

For a more detailed comparison of various versions of the SC. treated here see my Introduction to Haribhadra's *Sanātukumāracariya* (1974).

10. THE SUDRAVATSA-KATHĀ

1. The twenty-eighth chapter of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* treats the topic of sending of love-messengers as a part of the treatment of Purvānūrāga, the first variety of Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. Messengers are classified on the various types of their characteristics. Functionally distinguished messengers include Gardner, Vidūṣaka, Viṭa, Piṭhamarda etc. As an instance of Piṭhamarda, serving as a love-messenger, Bhoja mentions Dantaka, who is said to serve Śūdravatsa in a work called *Kāmasenā-vipralambha*.¹ Raghavan's note on this is as follows :

‘The examination of the *Kathāsāritsāgara*, the *Bṛhat-kalhām-añjarī* and the *Kathākośa* have (sic) not produced any fruits in the matter of identifying at least some version of a story with the heroine called Kāmasenā and a hero called Śūdravatsa (?) with a Piṭhamarda-ain named Dantaka’².

Now, we come across several casual literary allusions from the beginning of the eleventh century onwards, to an Apabhraṁśa romantic tale which relates to the adventures of a prince called Suddaya, i.e. Śūdraka. Moreover, we have several literary compositions in Old Gujarati and Rajasthani, which present different versions of that tale. There is also a Sanskrit recast of the earliest known Gujarati version. The tale continues to live to the present day in folk-literary traditions of Gujarat and Rajasthan. In what follows, I shall first note the early references to the story of Suddavaccha and give information about the literary versions of the tale available in Old Gujarati and Rajasthani. This will be followed by a brief summary of the story as we find it in Bhīma's *Sadayavatsa-vīra-prabandha*.

2. Vīra, an Apabhraṁśa poet of Malwa, enumerates in the *Jambūsāmicariya* (completed in 1020 A.D.) the following four works of his father, the poet Devadatta³.

Varāṅga-cariya (in Paddhaḍī metre); *Suddaya-vira-kaha*; *Samti-ṇāha-caccari*; *Ambādevi-rāsaya*.

None of these works has been recovered so far. Most probably all the four were in Apabhramśa. The themes of these works, except that of the second one, are well-known in the Jain literary tradition. We know of numerous works in Prakrit, Apabhramśa, Sanskrit and Old Gujarat (either in any one of these or in several languages) pertaining to the lives of Varāṅga, Śāntinātha and Ambādevī. But the *Suddaya-vira-kaha*, qualified by Vira as 'praised by learned critics for its poetic qualities', is obscure⁴.

3. *Samdeśarāsaka* of Abdala Rahamāna (composed probably in the thirteenth century), while describing the city of Mūlasthāna (i.e. present-day Multan in Eastern Punjab), refers to the public recitation of the epics, epic tales and popular tales along with performances of dance and opera. Along with the *Bhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Nalacarita*, we find there mention⁵ of *Sudavaccha*, which is explained in the Sanskrit *Tippanaka* on the *Samdeśarāsaka* as *Sudayavaccha-kathā* 'the tale of Sudayavaccha'. In the Index to the *Samdeśarāsaka* I had suggested that this tale of Sudayavaccha was the same as the popular tale of Sadevaṃta and Sāvaliṃgā well-known in the oral tradition and early literature of Gujarat and Rajasthan. The *Samdeśarāsaka* reference establishes its currency in the Punjab region. Further, *Padumavata* of Jāyasi (17th Century) refers to a tale of Sadaivaccha and Mugudhāvati. If this tale was the same as (or a version of) the *Sudavaccha*, its currency in other regions also is indicated.

4. Another reference to the tale of Suddaya or Sudavaccha sheds some light on the general character of that tale. In the Apabhramśa poem *Sudamsaṇaeariya* completed in 1044 A.D., Nayanandin extols the biography of Sudarśana in the following terms :

*Rāmo Sīya-vioya-soya-vihuraṃ sampattu Rāmāyaṇe
jādā Paṇḍava Dhāyaraṭṭha sadadam gottamkalī Bhārahe
deḍā-koḍiya-cora-rajja-ṇiradā āhāsīdā suddhae
ṇo ekam pi Sudamsaṇassa caride dosam samubbhāsīdam*⁶

The text of the third line here seems to be corrupt in a few places, and its interpretation presents difficulties. But the meaning of the rest is quite clear. The poet says : The Rāmāyaṇa story is not enjoyable because of the sufferings of Sītā due to separation. The Bhārata story is marred by the constant family-feud of the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas. As against these narratives, the life-story of Sudāmsaṇa cannot be alleged to have a single fault.

In the case of the third line, we have several variant readings : *teṇṭā* for *deḍā*; *koliya* for *koḍiya*; *suddae* for *suddhae*. Helped by them and in the light of the plot of the tale as known to us from the *Sadayavatsa-vīra-prabandha* of Bhīma (see below) we can restore the line as follows :

teṇṭā-koliya-cora-rajjū(?)-niradā āhāsīdā Suddhae

‘In the Śūdraka (narrative) the story deals with (disreputable places and episodes involving) gambling dens, Kolis, thieves and police-guards’.

Teṇṭā = *dyūtaśthāna* : see R. N. Shriyan, *A Critical study of Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta*. (Ahmedabad, 1969) where various occurrences of *teṇṭā* are noted and discussed (entries 999 and 1000); *koliya* = *kaulika*, “a person of that caste of lower social rank”; *cora-rajjū* = *coroddharanika* : *corarajjuka* is used by Kauṭilya in the sense of ‘a police-officer’.

The author of the *ṭippaṇa* on this verse in the *Sudāmsaṇacariya*, faced with wrong readings, has offered fanciful interpretations. He reads *gomūkala* for *gotraṁkali* in the second line and explains it as *rājyabhrastāh*. The third line is construed with the second line and so, *deḍākoḍiya* is explained in Gujarati as *dheḍhavāḍā nī koḍī havi Bhārata* : ‘In the *Mahābhārata* there was the climax of (quarrelling), characteristic of a settlement of untouchables (*dheḍha*). The gloss on *suddhae* is also confused : *vacchasudaye śāstre*. It should be *suddayavaeche* and it was not a *śāstra*. Jain, the editor of the *Sudāmsaṇacariu*, wrongly thought that the name of the work was *Suddhaya*. Paramanand Jain Shastri too failed to make out the name and has vaguely rendered *suddaya* as *lokāśāstra*⁷.

In the verse cited above, Nayanandin points out that the life of Sudarśana is free from the blemishes that mark the three very famous and popular narratives and hence that it is superior to all of them.

5. In the *Sayala-vihi-vihāṇa-kavva*, another Apabhramśa poem by Nayanandin, we get another important reference to the story of Śūdravatsa. In the opening portion of the poem, while describing the circumstances under which the poet was urged to undertake its writing, he incidentally touches upon the historical glory of the city of Dhārā where the poet carried out his literary activity. He mentions great kings of yore who ruled over Dhārā :

*jahiṃ Vaccharāu puṇu Puhaivatthu,
huṃtau puhaṣaru Sūdavatthu,
hoeppiṇu Vatthae(? pacchae) Harimadeu (?)
maṇḍaliu Vikkamāiccu jāu.*

Here, *Puhulvatthu*, *Sūdavatthu*, and *Harimadeu* are respectively to be corrected as *Puhaivacchu*, *Suddavacchu*, and *Harisadeu*. The kings mentioned are Vatsarāja, Pṛthvivatsa, Śūdravatsa, Harṣadeva and Vikramāditya.

Here Pṛthvivatsa and Śūdravatsa are mentioned as famous past rulers of Dhārā. In the Old Gujarati version of the tale, the names of the hero and his father are given in various forms, but *Suddavaccha* and *Pahuvaccha* (i.e. Śūdravatsa and Prabhuvatsa) are the earliest. This point is discussed further below. Secondly, *Suddavaccha* in that poem marries a princess of Dhārā and later on becomes the ruler of that city.

6. Thus two Apabhramśa poets of the eleventh century, who lived in Dhārā, are quite familiar with the story of Śūdravatsa and one of them actually wrote a narrative poem having a plot based on that story. They flourished in the time of king Bhoja, who alludes in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* to some characters of that story. All these references point to the great popularity of this tale in the Mālwa region in the tenth and eleventh century, and this is

self-explanatory, in view of the fact (as we shall see) that the hero was a prince of Ujjayinī and Dhārā. The characters alluded to in Bhoja's reference noted at the beginning of this paper, viz. Dantaka (?), Śūdravatsa and Kāmasenā, actually figure in the *Sadayavatsavira-prabandha* of Bhīma⁸. and the episode itself mentioned in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* can be exactly identified in that work.

7. The *Sadayavatsa-vira-prabandha* (further here referred to as SVP) was composed c. 1400 A.D.⁹. Regarding the text there is considerable variation among the manuscripts. The work has round about seven hundred verses (730, if we go by the printed text). The work is mostly composed in the Caupāi and Duḥā metres, but numerous other metres also are used for variation, etc. Besides there are some thirty-four Gāthās in Prakrit. It is obvious that at least some of these Gāthās were borrowed from some early Prakrit version of the tale, as mostly they repeat in short what is said in the preceding Old Gujarati verses¹⁰.

The tale narrates the loves and adventures of Sudavaccha, who was a Prince of Ujjayinī and son-in-law of Śālivāhana, the ruler of Pratiṣṭhāna. Rescuing a mast elephant, machinations of a minister, exile, wanderings in strange countries, princesses pining for the hero, omens, helpful robbers, goddesses, hunchbacks, courtesans, battles, wrestlers, goblins, witches, cemeteries, deserted cities and all the rest of the hot romantic stuff, and numerous well-known motifs fill up the tale.

8. The following is a brief outline of the story according to Bhīma.

Sudayavatsa (S.) was the son of king Prabhuvatsa and queen Mahālakṣmī, ruling at Ujjayinī. He was a gambling addict. Once he rescued a pregnant Brahmin girl from the clutches of the Royal elephant which had gone mad, by killing it. The king appointed him as heir-apparent in appreciation of this act of bravery. But the minister of the king, fearing to lose the favour of the prince because he had earlier restrained him from spending liberally at the time of his marriage with Sāvalīṃgā, the princess of Pratiṣṭhāna,

succeeded in turning the king against S., whom he (the king) ordered to leave the kingdom. Sāvalimṅā accompanied S. in exile.

Passing through a dreary tract, S. procured water for the thirsty Sāvalimṅā by offering his blood in exchange. But this turned out to be just a test devised by Harisiddhi, the presiding divinity of Ujjayinī. Mightily pleased with his fortitude, she gifted him miraculous dice and cowries and a steel-knife, which made him invincible in gambling games and battles.

Resuming their journey, they came to a temple of Śiva where Līlāvati, the daughter of king Dharavīra ruling at Dhārā, was practising penance to obtain S. as her husband. S. accepted her. The marriage was celebrated. S. stayed at Dhārā for a few days. Then he left for Pratiṣṭhāna to deposit Sāvalimṅā at her father's house. He promised to take Līlavati with him on the return journey.

While passing through a dense forest, S. met a band of five thieves in a den. In a challenge game of gambling they lost against him. S. declined their offer of magic gifts. So the thieves clandestinely inserted in his shield jewelled bodice worth a million and promised to go to his help when remembered in a critical situation. S. and Sāvalimṅā left that place. Proceeding further they came across a deserted city, where the presiding deity of the buried treasures of king Nanda of yore appeared before S. and offered him the treasures. But unwilling to take possession of the treasures without offering ceremonial worship. S. moved on and reached the precincts of Pratiṣṭhāna. He left Sāvalimṅā in charge of a bard there, and proceeded towards Pratiṣṭhāna to procure funds through gambling.

As he entered the city-gate he chanced to see a fellow with hands, nose and ears maimed. He took this to be an evil omen, but that Thumṭhā introduced himself as the prince of Sīmhalā. He lost all his money at gambling during his visit to Pratiṣṭhāna and having failed to pay dues, he was maimed by the gamblers. S. accepted him as his trusted companion.

The pair arrived at the temple of the Sun-god, where a dispute raged between the Royal Courtesan Kāmasenā and a city merchant. Kāmasenā was demanding five hundred gold coins from the merchant's son Somadatta as the charge for cohabiting with her in her dream ! The disputing parties appointed S. as the arbiter. He resolved the dispute by offering to the courtesan's mother the mirror-image of the demanded amount. The amount was piled in front of a mirror. Kāmasenā, receiving report of the arrival of an attractive noble young man, came to the temple. She was love-stricken at the first sight. She gave a dance-performance at the temple with such intensity that she collapsed with exhaustion. The royal physician diagnosed her ailment as love-affliction. Kāmasenā invited S. to stay with her. When S. sought Ṭhumṭhā's advice in this matter, the latter warned him about the viles of prostitutes. But Kāmasenā won Ṭhumṭhā by offering him the services of her younger sister. So they accepted Kāmasenā's proposal which solved S.'s boarding problem. Next day, S. went to the gambling house and won huge sums from expert gamblers. He presented a part of the win to Kāmasenā, distributed another part in charity to all and sundry, and with the rest he purchased costliest garments and toiletries for Sāvaliṃgā.

On the fifth day, S. prepared to leave Kāmasenā's residence, to keep his promise to Sāvaliṃgā. Kāmasenā, madly in love with him, tried to detain him by pulling his shield. The jewelled bodice that was smuggled in the shield-cover by the thieves dropped down. Kāmasenā kept it as a parting gift. Shortly, wearing it she started to attend upon the king. On her way, she was seen by the city mayor, who, identifying her bodice as one which was stolen from his house some time back, lodged a complaint with the king. On being questioned by the king, Kāmasenā refused to reveal the identity of the person who had gifted her the bodice. She was ordered to be executed, and taken to the execution ground. Her mother traced S. at the gambling house. S. rushed to Kāmasenā's help, freed her and put to rout the city guards. Hearing about this Somadatta reached there. S. requested him to take his message to Sāvaliṃgā. Soma-

datta secured from the king S. 's release by pledging himself as the hostage. S. visited Sāvaliṃgā, who on failure of S. 's return by the promised fifth day, was on the point of immolating herself on a burning pyre. S. presented her with clothes and toiletries. Next morning he returned to the execution ground. S. boasted of having committed many thefts. The king discovered S. 's identity by examining a sword bearing the latter's signature—the sword was procured from the courtesan. But to test S.'s prowess the king sent an army to attack S. A band of fifty two crack heroes mounted an attack. The five thieves informed by Nārada rushed to S.'s help and overpowered the attackers. The king acknowledged his defeat. He warmly welcomed his son-in-law and daughter.

Shortly, S. struck up friendship with a Brahmin, a Vaiśya and a Kṣatriya. The four were looking out for adventures. Hearing about a mystery of the corpse of a merchant's father in the city of Tumbā that kept returning every day from the cemetery, the four friends went to the merchant, who was prepared to offer two lakhs to anyone who would accomplish cremation of the corpse. They undertook the task. Incidentally S. exorcized a Brahmin's daughter possessed by a Śākinī.

The four friends carried the corpse to the cremation ground and decided to guard it by turn. When the Brahmin was on duty in the first watch of the night, a woman requested him for help to reach the food brought by her to her husband, who was hanged but life was still lingering in. The Brahmin bent down and the woman mounted on his back. Eventually she was caught gobbling raw flesh from the hanging body. The Brahmin cut off the witch's hand before she escaped. During the second watch, the Vaiśya saw a bunch of ghosts cooking their dinner. Nearby twenty-two princes were kept bound for being served as dessert. He assailed the ghosts and released the princes. During the third watch, the Kṣatriya saw a Rākṣasa abducting a princess. He killed him and freed the princess. During the fourth watch, the corpse, occupied by a Vetāla stood up and challenged S. to a gambling match. Extending his arm, he got the game from the royal palace. He was defeated at

the game by S. who then cremated the corpse. S. produced four proofs of their carrying out the assigned task successfully to claim the stipulated reward. Incidentally the witch was identified as the queen of that city. S.'s three friends were married to the three girls saved or offered as reward. The four friends returned to Pratiṣṭhāna.

Thereafter S. left Pratiṣṭhāna, reached the deserted city, which he rehabilitated and governed. Sāvaliṃgā and Līlāvati were called there from Pratiṣṭhāna and Dhārā. In course of time each of them gave birth to a son, both of whom grew up as accomplished young men. On receiving news that Ujjayinī was surrounded by enemy forces, S. commissioned his sons for its defence. They put the hostile forces to rout. The poem ends with the happy reunion of Prabhuvatsa and Sadayavatsa.

9. From this summary, it will be seen that the episode and characters alluded to in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* reference cited above, actually occur in this story (see Appendix; especially vv. 460-475; 484-500).

In the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* reference the name of the Piṭhamarda is given as Dantaka. It is a wrong reading resulting from some scribe misreading *ṭuṃṭaka* as *daṃṭaka*. *Ṭuṃṭa* is noted by Hemacandra at *Deśināmamālā* IV. 3 in the sense of 'having the hands cut off' (*chinha-hasta*) (For New Indo-Aryan derivatives see R. L. Turner *A Comparative Dictionary of Indo-Aryan Languages*, entry no. 5698). In Bhīma's text he is called *Ṭhūṃṭhā*, because Gujarati has the base form *ṭhūṃṭhā* corresponding to the Pk. form *ṭuṃṭa* (For *ṭhūṭṭha*-, *ṭhūṇṭha* etc. see Turner's dictionary, entry no. 5506). The Siṃhala prince is nicknamed *Ṭuṃṭaka* because the gamblers had cut off his hands for not paying them the gambling dues (*Sadayavatsavīra-prabandha*, vv. 436, 442).

10. The name of the hero appears in various forms in SVP : *Sadayavatsa*, *Sudayavatsa*, *Sadayavaccha*, *Sudayavaccha*, *Sadaya*, *Sudaya*, *Sūdau* (*Sūdā*) and *Suddha*. *Sūdau* (*Sūdā*) occurs quite

frequently. The form *Sudda* (*Suddaya*) is historically earlier than the others. It is found in some of the Prakrit Gāthās and Vastu stanzas in the SVP. *Suddhayavīra* (or *Ṡvaccha*) changed to *Suddayavīra* and finally became *Sadayavīra* (or *Sadayavatsa*). As noted earlier, in the *Samdeśarāsaka* (v. 44) the tale is referred to as *Sudavaccha* (v. 1. *Sudayavaccha*).

11. As noted previously (§§ 3-4), Devadatta's poem was called *Suddaya-vīra-kaha*. Similarly the title of Bhīma's poem is *Sadaya-vatsavīra-prabandha*. As will be seen from the summary given above, it is patently a tale of adventures and heroism. And in SVP, itself, the princess Līlāvati introduces herself as the daughter of Dharavīra, sister's daughter of Naravīra and desirous of marrying Sadayavatsa-vīra. It is first expressed in the following, possibly borrowed Prakrit gāthā :

*Dharavīra-rāu(? ya)-dhūā, muhusāle mujjha rāu nara-vīro
varavīra-Sadayavaccho(ccham), vaṃcham śiva pujiya(āyi) sahie (?)*
(SVP vs. 244)

The same idea is repeated in a Dohā further in the text :

*vīra mahārau māulau, tāta vaditau vīra
vīra maṇi Sūdau varūm, kai davi dahūm śarīra*
(SVP vs. 249)

12. There is also a Sanskrit version of the tale in prose and verse called *Sadayavatsa-kathā*, prepared by Harṣavardhana gaṇi in 1471. It is a Jain recast of SVP, with several new tales emboxed and hundreds of Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati Subhāṣitas, taken from the traditional store-house, scattered all over the text. The work is unpublished so far.

Later on the tale of Sadayavatsa and Sāvaliṃgā underwent such development and alteration as to become altogether a different tale. This new version of the tale is represented in the *Sadayavatsa-Sāvaliṃgā-Caupai* of Keśava Muni alias Kirtivardhana, which was completed in 1623 A.D.

Another such work of unknown authorship and date, but linguistically assignable to the seventeenth century is called

Sadayavaccha-Sāvalingī-Pāṇigrahaṇa-Caupai. Both these works have been given in the appendix by Manjula Majumdar in his edition of Bhīma's poem. Agarchand Nahta has given us a survey of different early and late versions of the tale current in Rajasthan and Gujarat¹¹.

13. There is one more reference to the tale of Suddaya, once again from an Apabhraṃśa poet. And if this tale is the same as the one we are considering here then the date of the earliest literary composition about the adventures of Suddaya can be shifted back by a century. The reference concerns the great Apabhraṃśa poet Svayambhūdeva, the author of the epics *Paumacariya* and the *Ritthanemicariya*. In the latter work, which has been partly published so far, we find the following verse, which expresses exhaustion on the part of the poet after continuous life-long literary activity.¹²

*kāūṇa Pomacariyam Suddhayacariyam ca guṇa-gaṇ'agghaviyam
Harivaṃsa-moha-haraṇe Sarassai suḍhiya-deha-vva*

The poet here says that after having composed the *Paumacariya* and the *Suddayacariya* full of literary merits, his Sarasvatī (literary powers) seems to have become exhausted in the present task of clearing delusions regarding the Harivaṃśa narrative.¹³ Here it is quite likely that Svayambhū's *Suddayacariya* was a poem dealing with the tale of Suddayavīra. Of course we cannot be definite about this as Pk. Ap. *Suddaya* stands also for Sk. *Śūdraka* and we have references to several *Śūdraka-kathās* composed in Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa¹⁴.

But it should be noted that Svayambhū has composed works on *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* and his third work *Suddayacariya* might have handled the popular tale of Suddaya. We have already taken note of two Apabhraṃśa poets, Nayanandin and Abdala Rahamāna, talking about the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* and the Suddaya tale in the same breath.

14. The sources and precedents of the *Śūdravatsa* tale remain to be investigated. We may point out here some significant parallels to a few of its episodes and motifs. The episode of a courtesan

demanding fee from a merchant's son for dream enjoyment occurs in the *Puṇyavanta-jātaka* which is given in the *Mahāvastu* (ed. Senart, 1897, third part, p. 33-41). That story occurs elsewhere also in Buddhist and later non-Buddhist literatures. In the *Jātaka* version the courtesan's claim is more plausible in that it was made on the basis of the dream of the merchant's son and not of the courtesan herself. The dispute is resolved by a similar stratagem¹⁵.

The motif of accusation of theft due to a stolen costly article found in possession of the innocent hero (Śūdravatsa accused of theft of the jewelled bodice), is found in the story of Śrīdatta and Mrgāṅkavatī in the eighth tarāṅga of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, wherein Śrīdatta has to face execution for possessing a stolen necklace which he had found tied at the end of an upper garment he accidentally got from a lake, where it was thrown by some thieves.

The episode of undertaking to burn a dead body and a witch caught while she was deceitfully gobbling lumps of flesh torn from a hanging man occurs in the interesting tale of Bhāvaṭṭikā, in the embossed story of Amaradatta and Mitrānanda that was narrated by Bhāvaṭṭikā in the third watch of the night¹⁶.

Corresponding to the four incidents that occur during the four watches of the night to each of the four friends keeping a guard on the dead body in the SVP narrative, we have in the story of Amaradatta and Mitrānanda four fabricated episodes connected with the four watches of the night (attack from a hoard of jackals, from a band of Piśācas, from a group of Dākinīs and from the goddess of pestilence, narrated by Mitrānanda. The last of these latter episodes presents a close parallel to the incident of the fourth watch in SVP)¹⁷.

The earliest known version of that motif is found in the story of Nitambavatī occurring in the sixth Ucchvāsa of Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*. We get another version in the first tale of the *Veṭālapaṇcaviṃśati* included in the Kashmirian version of the *Bṛhatkathā* and existing also as an independent collection in Sans-

krit with renderings and adaptations in regional languages of India. Penzer has noted various western versions of the motif deriving from the *Arabian Nights* which itself is based on the version that occurs in *Seven Vazirs*, the Arabic version of the *Book of Sindibād*¹⁸.

15. The text in which Śūdravatsa, and Ṭuṇṭaka are said to figure is mentioned by Bhoja as *Kāmasenā-vipralambha*. But the references and the works we have discussed consistently refer to the tale by the name of the hero : *Suddavaccha-vīra-cariya*, *Sadayavatsa-vīra-prabandha*, *Suddavaccha*, *Suddaya* etc. So it seems that the work referred to by Bhoja was possibly a composition based on the love-affair between Śūdravatsa and Kāmasenā. Bhoja has referred to another similarly titled work : *Irṣyālu-vipralambha*.¹⁹ Moreover a work cited by Bhoja as a *Rāsakāṅka* is identified by Raghavan as the *Rādhā-vipralambha* of Bhejjala, on the basis of Abhinavagupta's references²⁰. This fact makes it likely that *Kāmasenā-vipralambha* was the title of the full work, possibly a dramatic type. On the other hand, from the ŚP. references like *Karpūrikalābha*, *Kalīngasenālābha* etc. which are names of sections of the *Bṛhatkathā* version known to Bhoja²¹, and not titles of complete works, we see that Bhoja sometimes gave reference to a section only of a work wherein the episode, character etc. he wanted to illustrate figures. In that case *Kāmasenā-vipralambha* can be taken to refer to a particular section or episode in the *Śūdravatsa-kathā*, known to Bhoja.

Notes

This is a revised and expanded version of my paper entitled 'Suddayacariyā, a lost romantic tale in Apabhraṁśa' which was published in the *Proceedings of the Seminar on Prakṛit Studies* (1973), ed. by K. R. Chandra, Ahmedabad, 1978 (L. D. Series 70), 24-27.

1. 1978, 'pūṭhamardah dantaka Śūdravatsasya Kāmasenā-vipralambhe' (*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 999).
2. Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 826.

3. *Jambūsāmicarīya* of Virakavi, edited by V. P. Jain, 1968, Saṁdhi 1, Kaṭavaka 4; also Introductions pp. 11, 14.
4. Hence Kochad (*Apabhramśa-sāhitya*, 1956, p. 148), has missed it. Paramanand Jain Shastri (*Jain-Grantha-Praśasti-Saṁgraha*, Part-2, 1963, Introduction, p. 59, text p. 6, Index, p. 165) has misunderstood it as Vira-kahā, V. P. Jain has either simply mentioned it (loc., cit. Index, p. 386) without any comment or has rendered it incorrectly and with a query as '*Suddhaya-vira-kathā* ?'.
5. *Samdeśarāsaka*, edited by Jinavijaya Muni and H. C. Bhayani, 1946, verse 43-44,
6. *Suclaiṣaṇacariya* of Nayanandin, edited by Hiralal Jain, 1970, Saṁdhi 2, verse 2 in the opening.
7. *Jain-Grantha-Praśasti-Saṁgraha*, Part 2. Delhi, 1963, Introduction, p. 48.
8. *Jain-Grantha-Praśasti-Saṁgraha*, text, p. 26.
9. *Sadayavatsa-vira-prabhandha* (= SVP) edited by Manjūlal Majumdar, Bikaner, 1960.
10. It may be also noted in this connection that the Gāthās at vv. 180 and 181 are the same as *Vajjālagga* 54 and 51 respectively with a few variants.
11. '*Sadayavatsa-sāvaliṅgā-kī prem-kathā*', *Rājasthāna-bhārati*, 3, 1. See also H. C. Bhayani, *Anusamdhān* (in Gujarāṭi), 1972, pp. 241-243.
12. *Paumacariya* of Svayambhū, edited by H. C. Bhayani : Part I. Bombay, 1952, Introduction, pp. 28, 43-45. 125 (v. 65).
13. The poet expired sometimes after he wrote this. The remaining portion of the epic was completed by his son Tribhuvana. See *Paumacariya*, Part I, Introduction pp. 44-45.
14. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963, pp. 624, 819, 820. H. C. Bhayani, 'About the Language of the Śūdrakakathā'. *JOIB* 18, 1969, p. 316.

15. In Cāritraratna-gaṇi's *Dānapradīpa* (1443 A. D.), we have another version of this episode (in the story of Siddhidatta and Dhanadatta figuring as a part of the account of the previous incarnation of king Ratnapāla), in which the trickster is a merchant and the victim is a courtesan. See H. C. Bhayani, *Śodh ane Svādhyāy* (in Gujarati), 1965, pp. 224-230.
16. Muni Punyavijay (ed.), *Akhyānaka-maṇikośa-vṛtti* by Āmradeva-sūri (1134 A. D.), *Bhāvattikā-Ākhyāna*, pp. 193-218; for the episode referred to above see verses 408-439.
17. There are numerous versions of the story of Amaradatta and Mitrānanda in Prakrit, Old Gujarati etc.
18. Tawny and Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*. Reprint, Delhi, 1968. Vol. II, 251-261.
19. Raghavan, *op. cit.*, 827.
20. Raghavan, *op. cit.*, 889-891.
21. Raghavan, *op. cit.*, 839ff.



Appendix

Sadayavatsa-vīra-prabandha (Bikaner, 1960) vv. 444-503.

[कामसेना-गणिका-जूठ-प्रसंग]

३वे जण पाटण-मज्झि पहुत्त, दीठउं देउलि लोक बहुत ।

‘कहि भाई ! कोलाहल किसिउ ? ए अण-खाधइ पाणी-रिसउ’ ४४४

‘कामसेना जे नाचिणि नाम, लिइ पंच सइं सोना-द्राम ।

सुहणइ सोमदत्त माणिउ, ते इहां ऊहडी नइ आणीउ ॥ ४४५

गणिकानी मा अतिहि रढील, विवहारीउ मनाविउ मिल ।

डोकरी मंडिउ गाढउ डोह, अर्थ आपतइ न छूटइ छोह” ॥ ४४६

[सद्यवत्स-वचन]

सद्यवच्छ बोलइ : ‘सुणि मित्र !, ए खोट अति करइ अखत्र ।’

[टुंठा-वचन]

‘देव ! अनेरउ नथी अन्याउ, माती रांडइ कींटिउ वाउ ॥ ४४७

एक भांडणिया ऊठी भाड, वीजउ महिं मूकिउ साढी ।

बीजी राउल-वाई रांड, ३इणि कारण टलीइ मांड’ ॥ ४४८

ते जोवा पुहुतु प्रासादि, डेकरि बीठी वढती वादि ।

‘नर नवयौवन छइ नवरंगि, ए बोलिस्यड अम्हारइ ‘अंगि’ ॥ ४४९

एकदंति बोलइ : ‘सुणि साह !, अग्नि परठवा छइ राउत आह ।’

सेठि-कुमर ऊचरइ सुजाण, ‘आपण बिहु जण एह प्रमाण’ ॥ ४५०

तव तीणइ बिहु कारण कही, राउति वात विमासी सही ।

सद्यवच्छि विचि लीधा साद, तेह-नउ निरवालयु वाद ॥ ४५१

[सद्यवत्स-कृत चतुर न्याय]

एक सेठि हकारिउ ताम, ‘आणि विच्छेदिइ दर्पण द्राम’ ।

सेठिइ जे जण बोलाविउ, अरथ आरीसउ लेई आवीउ ॥ ४५२

धन रेढी ओडिउ आरीस, एकदंति तव दिइ आसीस ।

आघी थई लेवानइ अर्थ, ‘दरपण-माहि गिणी लिउ गर्थ’ ॥ ४५३

[गणिका-कपट-उपहास]

हाथि ताली देई हसिउ लोक : ‘रांडइ लीधा टंका रोक’ ।

अंतरि तेढावी डोकरी, काढी बाहरि बाहि घरी ॥ ४५४

१. ‘इतनी अति आडली रढील’ आ. २. ‘सद्य भणइ सुणि टुंठा मित्र’ आ.

३. ‘ए मुंह’ अ. ४. ‘भंगि’ आ.

इकि छांणिइ, इकि छांटइ छारि, इकि खीजवइ^१ अनेरइ खारि ।

एकदंति तव^१ ओपी इसी, राय राजा छवि राणी जिसी ॥ ४५५ ॥

तेह-तणइ छोकरि नहीं छेह, डोकरी देखी हरखी तेह ।

वादिइ^१ विवहारीइ हरावी, टंका ठीक रेक लेइ धरि आवी ४५६ ॥

[गणिकाप्रति कुलस्त्रीजन-वृणा]

आपापणा धवलहर धसी, अबला सवे आवी उदसी ।

‘कहउ, किसी-परि जीतउ वाद^१,’ बोली न सकइ बईठउ साद ॥ ४५७ ॥

जीणइ घणा घासव्या ति घाठी, कला बहुत्तरि-सिउं बुद्धि नाठी ।

त्रिणि दिवस जि लांघणइ लांघी, घणे घावू ए कीधी घांघी ॥ ४५८ ॥

परल्या पाखइ पुरुष वीससी, नयर-मांहि नर सघलइ हसी ।

‘काई रे छोडी ! पूछइ काज, हारिउ वाद^२ विगूती आज’ ॥ ४५९ ॥

[सद्यवत्स प्रति कामसेना-आकर्षण]

कामसेनि स^१भलिउं स्वरूप, ते राउत-नू^३ जोईइ रूप ।

तेडिउ सघलउ स^१परदाउ, चातुरि चतुर जोएवा जोउ ॥ ४६० ॥

पुहती मंडपि^४ मधि-आदित, वाजिउ^५ गजर सधुडिउं गीत ।

वंशकारि सातइ सुर सारि, आलति कीधी आलतिकारि ॥ ४६१ ॥

उडीमान उडवीउ ताल, ^६झणझुण करइ मृदंग रसाल ।

धुरी धूआनी धूरली आदि, रही रेख^७ रविनः प्रासादि ॥ ४६२ ॥

नयण^८ वयण मन मस्तक नास, हावभाव^९ कटि-तणा कलास ।

उर कर चरण लगइ चालवइ, इम जूजूआ अंग जालवइ ॥ ४६३ ॥

१. ‘देखो’ आ. २. ‘विगोई’ आ. ३. ‘जोय’ आ. ३. ‘जोवा नइ तिहां’ आ. ४. ‘मूंधा दीती’ अ. ५. ‘गुहर सुद्ध संगीत’ आ. ६. ‘रणझिण’ आ. ७. ‘देवनइ’ आ. ८. ‘मयण’ आ. ९. ‘करइ’ आ.

[कामसेना-विह्वलता]

उत्तर ऊजेणी-पति दिट्ठ, बईठउ मत्तवारणइ बलिट्ठ ।

कामसेनि ^१थई काम-विकाम, माणस कोइ न जाणइ साम ॥ ४६४

^२तेउ चलावी भणी अवास, त्रूटी नाडि, न ^३सलकइ सास ।

नयर-^४नरेसर बाहर करइ, इसिउं पात्र अण-खटइ मरइ ॥ ४६५

[उपचार]

राजबैद जई जोई नाडि, एउ विकार नहीं अम्ह पाडि ।

देस-विदेसी बीजा बट्ठ, राजा-^५आयसि आविउं सह ॥ ४६६

एकि भणइ: 'ऊतारउ ^६आंच,' एकि सेक दिवरावइ पांच ।

एकि भणइ: 'आलस छांडीइ,' एकि ^७भणइ: 'मंडल मांडीइ' ॥ ४६७

एकि भणइ: 'अम्ह हलउ हाथ,' ^८एकि भणइ: 'दिइ कइउ क्वाथ' ।

आपापणी कला सवि कहइं, ^९गुणीया नइं वईद गहगहइं ॥ ४६८

[गूर्जर वैद्य-निदान । अनंग-रांग]

गूर्जर वैद्य तिहारइ हसिउ, जाणे धरणि-धनंतरी जिसिउ ।

दीठइं रूपि सरूप ओलखइ, वैद अनेरूं रा आगलि झखइ: ॥ ४६९

'एहनइं अंगि अगलउ अनंग, नरवर! को दीठउ नवरंग ।

महूरति एकि मूर्छा भाजसिइ, मिलिउ लोक देखी लाजसिइ' ॥ ४७०

तास वचनि कालमुहा थाइ, बलिउं चेत. ^{१०}वेद ऊठया जाइ! ।

बाहरि वरतइ मीडामीड, प्रमदा पंचवाणनी पीड ॥ ४७१

१. 'ट्ठइ कामिनी काम' आ. २. 'लेई' आ. ३. 'लाभइ' आ. ४. 'नरेश न' आ. ५. 'इसि ते' अ. ६. 'लांच' अ. ७. 'कहइ' आ. ८. 'एक बाइ छत्रीमु काथ' आ. ९. 'गुणीआ नीकारकि' आ. १०. 'वेगि ऊठी' आ.

[राजपुत्र-आनयन-उपाय]

नाचिणि १जस नायिकीदे नाम, ते तेडीनइ कहिउं काम ।
‘तुं’ २डाही डांखरी म जेडि, रवि-३मंदिंरि जई राउत तेडी ॥ ४७२

उत्तरि बईठउ ऊंचो पाटि, भड जे पाखलि वींठिउ भाटि ।
केकि-कला सिरि झांठि झमाल, आगलि आडण अनइ करमाल ॥ ४७३

[वृद्धा एकदंति विरोध-दर्शन]

एकदंति तीणि बोलिइं बली, ४रीसिइं पुरुष एक ऊछली ।
‘जिणि ५हलई कीधी आज, ते टींउत तेडिइ ६कुण काज ? ॥ ४७४

राय राणा ७भूतलि ८जेतला, विवहारीया कहूं केतला ? ।
करइं साद कोडिसर केडि, केहा गुण तुं राउत तेडि ? ॥ ४७५

[गणिका-द्रव्यहरण-नैपुण्य]

पारखि-सिउं जउ कीजइ प्रेम, पाडी दिइ पीयारू हेम ।
ओछी बानी तउ घणउ विराम, सारी लीडसूं ९सारा द्राम ॥ ४७६

दोसी १०कोर कापडां दियइ, लूगड-मांहि ति बिमणूं लीयइ ।
काज सुरहीउ सारइ घणूं, आपइ सदा सुरहू धूपणू ॥ ४७७

सोनी काजि ११किह्वारइं १२वाहि, सूध चउथ लिइं सूना-मांहि ।
पहिन्नु घाट घडीनइ हाटि, घरि आवइ घडामण माटि ॥ ४७८

बांभण-सिउं बहु नेह म करइ, मास पक्ष पूठिइं परिहरइ ।
भाट भलउ हुइ दीह बिन्च्यारि, जां जूवटइ न थालइ हारि ॥ ४७९

१. ‘जे’ आ. २. ‘गाढी’ आ. ३. ‘मंडपि’ आ. ४. ‘दीसइ’ आ. ५. ‘हूं’
हाल’ अ. ६. ‘शू’ आ. ७. ‘भूपति’ अ. ८. ‘जे भला’ आ. ९. ‘आसा’
अ. १०. ‘कापड वारू’ आ. ११. ‘जिह्वारइ’ आ. १२. ‘वाहि’ अ.

तंबोलीनी थोडी तीम, जिहनइ पान पांचनी सीम ।
टोंटा देखी टाले ट्रेटि. साहमी जईनइ मनावे सेठि ॥४८०॥

माली आपइ ^१सुरहां फल, जे वारू नइ अति बहुमूल ।
मोटा झोटा अनइ छड छेक, तेह-नइ दीजइ वहिलु छेक ॥४८१॥

फूटरसी नइ ^२फरफट कूंच, हाथ किह्वारइ न मेल्हइ मूछ ।
ते उलगू-नइ म देसि अडाउ, कूडी ^३करगर लाउ नसाउ ॥४८२॥

[धनवान परीक्षण]

नाणावटि नाणूं ^४निरखीइ, तिम आपणइ पुरुष परखीइ ।
'जिहां जिहां देसइ द्रव्य जेतलउ, तिहां आदर कीजइ तेतलउ' ॥४८३॥

[कामसेना-वचन]

कामसेना नइ चडिउ कोप, नायकदे प्रति दीघ निरोप ।
'ए बूढी-तणा बोल म विमासि, राउत तेडी आणि आवासि' ॥४८४॥
गई रामा ^५रवि-मंडप भणी, व्याधि ते कामिणि-तणी ।

[सद्यवत्स-प्रति वचन]

'सुणि सावज्जल साची बात, कामसेना तूं-राती रात ॥४८५॥
हूं पाठवी तीणइ तूंअ पासि, ^६पसाउ करी अम्ह आवि आवासि ।
अरथ अनेथि अछइ ^७अम्ह वणउ, ते वनिता ^८विभ्रम तूंअ-तणाउ ॥४८६॥
बार म लाउ, वहिलउ थइ देव !, टाला-तणी ^९टली छइ टेव ।
मरइ अखूटइ मोटूं पात्र, तइ दीठइ दुःख फीटइ गात्र' ॥४८७॥

[टूंठा-प्रति सूदा-वचन]

सुद्द भणइ. 'सुणि टूंठा मित्र !, इणि मांडिउं एवडूं चरित्र ।
^{११}इम तेडइ ^{१२}तिम कारण कहइ, एहू वात विमासण ब्हइ' ॥४८८॥

-
1. 'सरस्यू नेह मन' आ. 2. 'फाफट' आ. 3. 'कइ घस लाउ' आ. 4. 'पर-
खीइ' आ. 5. 'जेहनउ भाव दीसइ' आ. 6. 'रवि' आ. 7. 'मया' आ.
8. 'अति' आ. 9. 'विक्रम' आ. 10. 'म करिसिउ' था. 11. 'तिम अ.
12. 'अति' आ.

[ढूँठा-वचन]

ढूँठु भणइ : ^१‘नवि जाणितु भेद, खारि रांड-तणइ मनि खेद ।
^२‘देहरा-मांहि दूहवी जेअ, डंस वीसरइ न डोकरि तेह ॥४८९॥
 इणि वीसासी वाह्या वीर, इणि ^३खाइ पाड्या घर-वीर
^४इणि वेसाइं विगोया भला; इणि रोल्या राउत केतला ॥४९०॥
 वेसा-तणउ म करि वीसास, वेसा-वयण ते मुहि गली पास ।
^५‘मच्छ जेम मांस-नइ घरइ, जीव-तणउ जीवी अपहरइ’ ॥४९१॥

[सूदा-वचन]

सूद भणइ : ‘ढूँअ जाणूं सहू, वेसा-तणी वात छइ बहू ।
 जउ भाई ! भय कीजइ एह, जयल्लपणानउ आविउ छेह’ ॥४९२॥

[ढूँठा-वचन]

‘एह अनेरउ नहीं उगाउ, एहनइ विषय-तणउ विवसाउ ।
 इहनइ मनि माटीनी आस, इहनइ लहइ विदेसी वास’ ॥४९३॥

[परिचारिका-निवेदन]

परिचारिकि जे ‘पूठिइं वही, तीणाइ घरि जईनइ कारण कही ।
 ‘ते धीरउ आवेवउं करइ, पणि ढूँठीउ ‘कूटाइ करइ’ ॥४९४॥
 तउ वीजी बोलावो बाल : ‘जई चालवि ढूँठउ चंडाल ।
 मानी लांच लोभवि घणूं, कामिणि काज करे आपणूं’ ॥४९५॥
^१‘तउ तीणइ खिलकी-नइ खुंट, हूयावी बोलाविउ ढूँठ ।
 लांच-तणउ देखाडिउ लोभ, कांइ ए क्षित्री-कारणि शोभ ?’ ॥४९६॥

[ढूँठाने लांचनुं प्रमोभन]

^१‘लांच आंच नवि ढूँठउ सहइ, कांई कथन अपूरव कहइ ।

[ढूँठा-वचन]

‘कामसेनि-लहुडी चित्रलेख, तेह ऊपरि माहरी अभिलेख ॥४९७॥
 ते जउ रातिइं मइ-सिउं रमइ, तउ ए गेहि तम्हारइ गमइ ।
 बीजू ^{१०}कांइ म बोलि आल, ^{११}ढूँठइ-सरिस न चालइ चाल’ ॥४९८॥

1. ‘मइ’ आ. 2. ‘हारिउ वाद विगोइ जेह, ए वीसरइ’ आ. 3. ‘या छइ’ अ.
4. ‘इणइ व्यास विगोया घणा’ आ. 5. ‘माणस जेम मञ्जिनइ’ आ. 6. ‘वहसी’ आ.
7. ‘पूछो रही’ आ. 8. ‘हुपाई’ अ. 9. ‘वाटे करीनइ खलकी खूट’ आ.
10. ‘वेशा-वचन’ आ. 11. ‘बहु’ आ, ‘इस्यु’ भणिई ढूँठु चंडाल’ आ.

मनि आपणइ आलोचीय साच, वेशा ठूठइ लीवी वाच ।

चतुरा राउ ऊठाडयउ तेहि, आणिउ गयगामिणि नइं गेहि' ॥४९९॥

[कामसेना-आवासे सदा-गमन]

नाचिणि नर आवंतउ देखि, आपणपू संवरी सुवेलि ।

कणय-कलस भरि निर्मल नीर, दिइ आचमण विच्छेदिइं वीर ॥५००॥

[संकार]

आदर-सिउं अवास भझारि, ¹‘आणी आवरजइ वर नारि ।

भोजन भगति युगति जूजूई, मिलियां राति सुरंगी हुई ॥५०१॥

वडइ भलकि जागिउ जूआर, दांतण करिवा काजि कूंवर

कामसेनि आयस उह्वासि, दांतण लेईनइ आवी दासि ॥५०२॥

‘दांतण सारिइं,’ ऊग्यू सूर, आविउ ठूठ : म करउ असूर^२ ।’

बीडू आपी बोलइ बोल, ‘राउत ! रखे करउ^३ विगोल’ ॥५०३॥

*

1. ते आवर्जन करइ अपारि आ. 2. ‘समरइ’ अ. 3. ‘अति काल’ अ.

11. THE BRĤATIKATHĀ, THE VASUDEVAHIMDĪ AND THE SOURCES OF TWO PURĀNIC KṚṢṆA-CARITA EPISODES

1. We know that in the Purāṇic life-story of Kṛṣṇa the episodes of Vastraharaṇa i. e. stealing of Gopī's clothes is not found in the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, but occurs for the first time in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

In his paper 'Kṛṣṇa's Stealing of the Herdsmaidens' Clothes' (1986), Sheth has noted that 'This episode has its parallels in the folk-literature of all the continents' (p. 174), for which he has given reference to Ruben's study on Kṛṣṇa (1944, pp. 98-99). Further, on the basis of Hardy's study of the Ālvār Literature (*Viraha-bhakti*, 1983; pp. 512-516), Sheth has remarked that 'The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, however, following the lead of the Ālvārs, has invested the tale with a religious significance by putting it in the context of *bhakti*' (p. 174).

The eminent Indologist, M. B. Emeneau has again taken up this subject for a detailed discussion in his paper 'Kṛṣṇa steals the Gopīs' Clothes : A Folktale Motif' (1989). He has considered the Vastraharaṇa episode as a motif in the folktale tradition, and drawn our attention to its occurrence in the famous eleventh century Sanskrit work, Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*. To quote, 'To these versions of motif and tale-types, drawn from the collections of little more than the last century, we may add time-depth by referring to the two occurrences of the motif that are found in Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*' (p. 524). The two passages discussed by Emeneau are : (1) *Kathāsaritsāgara* 108 (otherwise 14.4), vv. 64-72 (translation in, Penzer 1927, p. 58 f), and (2) 121 (otherwise 18.2), vv. 109-111 (translation in Penzer 1928, p. 20).

By way of conclusion Emeneau observes, '....we need feel no doubt that the source of the *Vastraharaṇa* episode in the Kṛṣṇa

cycle is the motif....K 1335 that we have been examining. It is a floating motif of sexual fantasy, of ancient date, as attested both by its wider spread throughout India and by its occurrence in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and of some popularity in South India. It has been seized upon as a fitting episode in the depiction of mystic love by Kṛṣṇa bhakti movement of South India, first in early Tamil bhakti Literature (attested in the earlier epic), and then by the composer of the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* in the 9th-10th Century—even though the episode can hardly be said to be a closely-knit element in the story line.'

2. Now thanks to Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (11th Cent. A.D.), we come to know that the motif under discussion, as attested in the second of the two passages that Emeneau has referred to, most probably already occurred in the *Vaḍḍakahā* (i.e. *Bṛahatkathā*), the Paiśāci treasure-house of stories written by Guṇāḍhya, which is lost and which was the ultimate source of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The Paiśāci passage cited in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* relates to the very incident which we find in *Kathāsaritsāgara* 121 (=18.2), vv. 109-114. The passage occurs on p. 937 in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. Raghavan has discussed it (p. 850) and shown its great significance. The peculiar name of the gambler (the hero of the story) is also tell-tale.¹

Of the three variants of that name, *Thiṇṭhākarāla*, *Geṇṭākarāla* and *Teṇṭākarāla*, the last one is correct. *teṇṭā* (or *tiṇṭā*) is non-Sanskritic and occurs frequently in Apabhramśa texts and is glossed as *dyūta-sthāna* 'a gambling house or gambling den'. Hence *teṇṭākarāla* means 'the terror of the gambling house', a designation quite appropriate for the inveterate, diehard gambler.

Thus we can date the earliest occurrence of the motif of Cīraharāṇa in the Indian literature in the first or second century A. D., the probable date of the *Vaḍḍakahā*. In the light of this evidence, the view that the Vastraharāṇa motif is based on a

1. For the slightly emended and restored text of the passage see Bhayani and Shah, 1987, Introduction, p. 75.

popular theme in Tamil poetry that originated in the custom of presenting girls with a leaf-frock at puberty (Entwhistle, 1987, p. 36, fn. 69), first advanced by Hardy and corroborated by Emeneau requires reconsideration.

3. The absence of the episode of Vastraharaṇa in the pre-*Bhāgavata* Purāṇic Kṛṣṇa myths and its occurrence in the *Vaḍḍakahā* and the *Bhāgavata* provides us with some food for speculation. On the basis of archaeological evidence we know that the Gaṅga king Durvinita, assigned to the sixth century A. D., had prepared a Sanskrit version of the *Vaḍḍakahā*. (Raghavan, 1963, p. 844). The stealing of clothes figuring in the Teṇṭākarāḷa story which was quite likely present in that early Southern Sanskrit recast was possibly the immediate source of the Vastraharaṇa episode of the *Bhāgavata*. This inference finds a support from another interesting episode we find in the Kṛṣṇacarita of the *Bhāgavata*.

4. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 5, 13, 31-42 describe how Kṛṣṇa disappeared just when the Rāsa dance was to start and how the agitated Gopīs wandering in the woodland in search of Kṛṣṇa came to notice the latter's footprints. They pursued the track and from the condition of these footprints, and of the other smaller ones by their side, the Gopīs made precise inferences about some favourite Gopī that accompanied Kṛṣṇa : Kṛṣṇa had plucked a bunch of flowers and adorned her with it. She felt proud. Kṛṣṇa repulsed her and went away leaving her pining. This *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* episode we find much more developed in the *Bhāgavata*, where there is a meticulous description of the process of deductions. From various signs, the Gopīs make surmises about Kṛṣṇa carrying her sweetheart, adorning her with flowers and making love to her. The Gopīs continuing their pursuit arrived at the place where they found Kṛṣṇa's once favourite lamenting her fate. (*Bhāgavata*, 10, 30 : *Kṛṣṇānveśaṇa*).

Now this episode has a very close parallel to an episode in the autobiographical account of Cārudatta, occurring in the Gandharvadattā Lambha of the *Vasudevāhimā* (pp. 135-138). There Cārudatta and his friends picnicing on the bank of a river notice

some foot-prints on the sandy beach. From, the shapes and from the conditions and surroundings of the footprints which they follow they cleverly make several very detailed deductions : The footprints were those of a Vidyādhara, who carried her human sweetheart in his arms; the latter had requested her lover to pluck for her a bunch of flowers of the Saptaparna tree on their way; the woman was offended by the Vidyādhara, who then won her over and carried her to a creeper bower, where they made love.

We cannot miss the very close resemblance between these episodes from the *Bhagavata* and the *Vasudevahimṇī*.

Now the *Vasudevahimṇī* is a Jain recast of some version of the *Bṛhatkathā*. The fact that the story of Cārudatta occurs also in Budhasvāmin's *Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṃgraha* (9, 8-46 : the story of Sānudāsa), the earliest available Sanskrit version of the *Bṛhatkathā*, assures us about the occurrence of that story in the early *Bṛhatkathā* tradition. It seems to me that the Bhāgavatakāra moulded the episode of Kṛṣṇānveṣaṇa on the incident we find in the story of Sānudāsa (Cārudatta) in the *Bṛhatkathā* and he possibly utilized the Southern Sanskrit version of Durvinita.

5. The motif of intelligently arriving at correct deductions (in a modern detective-like fashion) through sharp observation of trifling marks and objects is greatly popular in all the folktale traditions. According to Thompson's Motif Index, it is motif no. J. 1661.1. To note only a few occurrences from Classical Indian literature : (1) The Pāli Jātaka tale No. 432 : *Pada-kusala-māṇava-jātaka*. (2) The illustration of that type of trained intelligence (*vainayikī-buddhi*) which one acquires by studying *nimitta* (i.e. making deductions from telltale marks, etc.), as we find in the commentarial literature on the *Āvaśyaka-sūtra* of the Jain Canon (e.g. in the *tippana* (12th Century) of Śrīcandra on Haribhadra's commentary on the Nandī-Sūtra, verse 64). This tale has found a place in Arabian tale collections and spread to various regions.

Incidentally we should emphasize the fact that high literature, popular literature and oral texts have to be taken as convenient categories only. They are not mutually exclusive. There has been continuous and considerable give and take at all the three levels, much more so in the Indian tradition.

References

- Antti Arne and S. Thompson. *The Types of the Folktale*, 1961.
- H. C. Bhayani and R. M. Shah. *Vasudevahimṇī*-Madhyama Khaṇḍa, Part 1, 1987.
- Budhasvāmin, *Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṅgraha*.
- M. B. Emeneau, 'Kṛṣṇa Steals the Gopīs' Clothes : A Folktale Motif'. JAOS, 109.4 (1989), 521-526.
- A. W. Entwistle, *Braj : Centre of Krishna Pilgrimage*. Groningen, 1987.
- Friedhelm Hardy. *Viraha-Bhakti : The Early History of Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India*. Delhi. 1983.
- G. R. Joryer. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. Vol. IV. 1975.
- N. M. Penzer. *The Ocean of Story*. Vol. 8,9. 1927, 1928.
- V. Raghavan. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 1963.
- Walter Ruben. *Krishna : Konkordanz und Kommentar der Motive seines Heldenlebens*. Istanbul. 1944.
- Saṅghadāsa-gaṇi. *Vasudevahimṇī*. Ed. Caturvijaya and Punyavijaya. 1930.
- Noel Sheth, 'Kṛṣṇa's Stealing of the Herdsmaidens' Clothes' (Paper presented at the VII th World Sanskrit Conference, Philadelphia, Oct. 13-20, 1984). ABORI, LXVI, 1986.
- Somadeva. *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Ed. Durgaprasad and Parab. 1903.
- S. Thompson. *Motif Index of Folk Literature*. 1932-36.

12. APABHRAṂSA VERSES COMPOSED BY THE PARAMĀRA KING MUÑJA

1. As an instance of the Saṁkīrṇa type of the Catuspadī Dhruvā used in the Apabhraṁśa Sandhibandha, Hemacandra has cited under *Chandonuśāsana*¹ 6, 22 the following of verse that illustrates an admixture of two different varieties of Catuspadī :

चूडल्लउ बाहोह-जल, नयणा कंचुअ विसम-थण ।
इअ मुंजि रइआ दूहडा, पंच-वि कामहु पंच सर ॥

‘चूडल्लउ, बाहोह-जल, नयणा, कंचुअ and विसम थण—these five Dohās, comparable to the five arrows of Kāma (the Love God) were composed by Muñja’.

This verse has a unique historical importance in that it records the authorship of some stray verses in the Dohā metre : they were composed by Muñja, the famous Paramāra king of Mālava, who flourished during 975-995 A. D. He enjoyed great fame in legend and history for his romance, heroism, literary talent and patronage to literature. The cited laudatory verse mentions five characteristic words, one from each of the five verses of Muñja which had become famous among literary circles due to their poetic excellence. This was a traditional device² to record in a fool-proof manner the authorship of isolated, stray verses (Muktakas), which otherwise would become anonymous (as has actually happened in the case of thousands of Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṁśa and early regional verses)

2. Now the problem is to trace or identify these Muñja verses from the available Apabhraṁśa literature. Fortunately Hemacandra happens to have preserved them for the posterity. The *Cūḍullau* and the *bāhoha-jalu* verses are given in the *Chandonuśāsana* at the same place as the commemorative verse noted above i.e. under VI 22. The *cūḍullau* verse occurs also in the *Siddhahema* under

VIII 4, 395 with slight variation in the third pāda. The text according to the *Chandonuśāsana* is as follows :

चूडल्लउ चुणीहोइसई, मुद्धि कओलि निहित्तउ ।
निद्धउ सासानलिण, बाह-सलिल-संसित्तउ ॥

The *Siddhahema* has कओलि for कओलि and सासानलजाल-झलक्किअउ for the third pāda. The verse can be translated as follows :

‘Oh simple girl, your bracelet, positioned as it is under your cheek (which rests thereon) will be reduced to powder, having been (first) heated by your fiery sighs and (then) sprinkled with the water of your tears’.

The second, *bāhoha-julu* verse is as follows :

तं तेत्तिउ बाहोह-जलु, सिहिणंतरि वि न पत्तु ।
छिमिछिमिछिमिवि गंढत्थलिहिं, सिमिसिमिवि सिमिवि समत्तु ॥

Translation :

‘That huge flood of tears did not reach even up to the inter-space of her breasts—it boiled up on her cheeks, emitting *chimi-chimi* sounds and disappeared emitting *simi-simi* sounds.’

The remaining three Muṇja verses can be identified from the illustrative citations given in the Apabhramsa section of the *Siddhahema*. There is some uncertainty about the identification of the *nayanā*-verse. Probably it is the same as cited under VIII. 4, 414 to illustrate the word *prāimva*. It is as follows :

असुजले प्राइम्ब गोरिअहे, सहि उव्वत्ता नयण-सर ।
ते सम्मुह संपेसिआ, देति तिरिच्छी घत्त पर ॥

Translation :

‘It seems that the arrows of glances of the fair damsel are deflected due to the stream of tears—hence eventhough charged straight, they strike sideways’.

The fourth verse, i.e. the *kamcua* verse, is the same as cited under *Siddhahema* VIII 4, 437. It is as follows :

पहिआ दिट्ठी गोरढी, दिट्ठी मग्गु निअंत ।
अंससासेहि कंचुआ, तितुव्वाण करंत ॥

Translation :

‘Oh wayfarer, did you meet any fair lady ?’ ‘Oh yes, I saw her gazing at the road (of you return) and alternately drenching and drying her blouse with her tears and sigh.’

Lastly, the *visama-thana* verse is the same as cited under VIII 4, 350 (as also under 362). Its text and translation follow.

फोडेति जे हिअडउं अप्पणउं, ताहं पराई कवण घण ।
रक्खेज्जहु लोअहो अप्पणा, बालहे जाया विसम थण ॥

‘Those who burst their own heart—what compassion can they have for others ? Men, be on your guards : the breasts of the young girl have become terrific.’

3. Apart from the evidence of the *Chandonuśāsana*, some further evidence, eventhough indirect, is now available in support of Muñja’s authorship of the above given verses. The Apabhramśa poem *Jambūsāmicariya* was completed by Vīra in V.S. 1076 (=1020 A.D.). Vīra was connected with the places Simduvarisī and Gulakheda in the Mālava country,⁴ which was ruled by king Bhoja from 1010 to 1055 A.D. Bhoja was preceded by Sindhurāja (995–1010 A.D.) and the latter by Muñja (975–995 A.D.). Thus the *Jambūcariya* was written some twentyfive years after the death of Muñja. From the *Jambūcariya* it is evident that Vīra was not only familiar with important literary works of his times, including the Apabhramśa works of Puṣpadanta (c. 930–980 A.D.) and Svayambhū (later half of the 9th cent.), but he was also considerably influenced by them. The *Jambūcariya* reveals numerous borrowings in ideas and expressions, from earlier wellknown Apabhramśa, Prakrit and Sanskrit works. Hence Vīra cannot but be familiar with the Apabhramśa poems of the royal poet Muñja, who was also famous for his literary patronage—so much so that later legends extolled him in such glowing terms as

गते मुञ्जे यशःपुञ्जे निरालम्बा सरस्वती⁵ ।

‘With the departure of the glorious Muñja, the Goddess of learning has become a homeless wanderer’.

Now one passage of the *Jambūsāmicariya*, viz., IV 11, 1-3, describing the love-lorn condition of the women of Rājagṛha on seeing Jambūsvāmin contains echoes from two of the Muñja verses noted above. The passage is as follows :

काहि वि विरहाणलु संपलित्तु, अंसुजलोहलिउ कबोले खित्तु ।
पल्लइ हत्थु करंतु सुणु, दंतिमु चूडुल्लउ चुणु चुणु ।
काहि वि हरियंदण-रसु रमेइ, लगंतु अंगे छमज्जमछमेइ ।

‘In the case of some one woman the fire of separation so flared up that it reduced to powder the ivory bracelet that was drenched with tears due to its contact with the cheek, thus rendering her hand bare; in the case of another woman, the ‘sandal-paste applied to her body emitted sizzling sounds’. The poet had obviously here before him the *cūdullau* and the *bāhohajalu* verses of Muñja. Moreover the sequence of images in both the occurrences correspond to each other. This fact suggests that the five verses of Muñja alluded to in the listing verse cited by Hemacandra must have formed a closely associated group.

4. References to Muñja are found in the illustrative verses cited under *Siddhahema* VIII 4 439 (3) and (4). In the first of these the speaker is Muñja’s sweetheart. The lovers have quarrelled. Muñja, wrenching his arm from her beloved’s clutch is leaving her, when she says, ‘What is the harm if you leave me physically ? But if you can disappear from my heart, then only I would feel you are really angry with me.’

The second verse describes Muñja’s beloved as striving to preserve her life in Muñja’s absence by kissing the two palms which had drank the water reflecting Muñja’s image without disturbing that image.

Similarly in the Muñja Prabandha of the *Prabandha-cintāmaṇi* numerous Apabhramśa verses are cited pertaining to some key incidents in Muñja’s romantic and heroic biography and some of

them are in the form of Muñja's speech. In all these cases it seems probable that they are not verses composed by Muñja, but some other poet (or poets), whose works on Muñja's biography are now lost.⁶

Notes

1. Velankar's edition, Singhi Jain Series No. 49, 1961, p. 209.
2. For this traditional listing device see H. C. Bhayani, *Tārāyaṇa*, 1987, Introduction, p. 11-13.
3. Edited by V. P. Jain, 1968.
4. It is also to be noted according to his own statement Vīra was closely associated with the state business. See *Jambūsāmi-cariya*, Praśasti, verse 5.
5. *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, ed. Jinavijaya Muni, 1933, p. 25, l. 2.
6. Utpalarāja was another name of king Muñja and various Sanskrit anthologies (Subhāṣṭia-kośas) we find some verses under that name. But it was also a name of some other persons. So there is uncertainty about the authorship of those verses.

13. VARDHAMĀNA-SŪRI'S APABHRAṂSA METERS

Introductory

A noteworthy feature of the religious-didactic narrative literature in Prakrit produced mostly by the Jains of Gujarat from about the tenth century onwards was the increasing use of Apabhraṁśa. One or more complete stories, episodes etc., long or short descriptive passages and individual stanzas in Apabhraṁśa were scattered throughout the work. We have biographies of Tirthaṅkaras, religious narratives, didactic Prakaraṇas giving stories to illustrate principles of religious conduct and 'treasuries of tales' (*kathākośa*) characterized by this stylistic pattern. *Upadeśamālāvṛtti* of Ratnaprabha (1082 A.D.), *Maṇoramā-kahā* (1084 A.D.) and *Jugāi-jīṇṇḍacariya* (1104 A.D.) of Vardhamāna, *Sthānaka-vṛtti* of Devendra (1090 A.D.), *Ākhyānaka-maṇi-kośa-vṛtti* of Āmradeva (1134 A.D.), *Mallīṇāhacariya* of Haribhadra (c. 1160 A.D.), *Kumārāpālpratibodha* of Somaprabha (1185 A.D.) may be mentioned out of a host of works of this type.

L. Alsdorf's *Der Kumārāpālpratibodha* (1928) was a pioneering study of the Apabhraṁśa portions of such a work. It was admirably systematic and thorough. No other similar study has appeared thereafter.

As a modest effort in that direction, I have attempted in what follows to describe the metres used in the Apabhraṁśa passages of Vardhamānasūri's *Maṇoramā-kahā* (= MK.) and *Jugāi-jīṇṇḍacariya* (= JC.).

There are about 160 Apabhraṁśa stanzas in MK. and about 460 such stanzas in JC. There are several irregularities in the numbering of verses in both the texts. In some places the two halves of a four-lined stanza are numbered separately. Elsewhere a single number is given to a passage containing two or more stanzas. The following tables give information in the case of both the texts about (a) the name and type of the metres that are identified, (b) the number of Mātrās per line, (c) the place of occurrence and (d) the total number of stanzas occurring for each metre. For the description of the metres one can refer to the standard manuals like the *Svayambhūcchanda*, the *Chandonuśāsana* and modern works on the Apabhraṁśa prosody.

Table I
Metres of the Apabhramśa Passages in MK.

Sr. No.	Name & Type	Description	Place of Occurrence	Total no. of stanzas
<i>Samā Catuspadī</i>				
1.	Vadanaka	16 Mātrās per line	I 213 (three stanzas), 219 (C); II 97, 509; III. 163	7
2.	Paddhaḍi	" "	I 786-797	12
3.	Pāḍakulaka	" "	I 361	2
4.	Laghū-catuspadika	15 Mātrās per line	I 219 (A.B.)	2
5.	Madanāvātāra	20 "	II 284 (two st.) III. 111-118 (four st.),	6
6.	Rāsāvalaya	21 "	I 182 (two st.), 193 (A) (two st.), 268, 269, 270, 272 (two st.), 273 (three st.), 274; II. 93-94 (one st.), 95-96. (one stanza), 135-136 (one st.) 325; III 144, 160, 161, 165-169, 512-521.	36
7.	Vastuvadanaka	24 "	I 326; II 89-90 (one st.), 137-138 (one st.); III 159, 162, 879-880 (one st.)	6
8.	Dvipadī	28 "	III 929-930 (one st.)	

9. Dohā	13+11 Mātrās in each half	191, 213, 221, 275, 276, 278, 329, 344, 511, 678, 694; II 194; 195, 236, 456, 457, 458, 461; III 104, 511, 522, 537, 568, 838-855, 1017.	42
10. Cūḍāla-Dohā	13+16 Mātrās in each half	I 193 (B), 202.	2
11. Ṣaṭpadi	10+8+13 Mātrās in each half	I 798.	1
<i>The Short Dvipadi</i>			
12. Manthāna Dvibhaṅgi	10 Mātrās per line	III. 786-791 (14 distichs)	14
13. Mātrā + Dohā	15+12 (or 11) +15+19 (or 11)+13 + 11+13 + 11	I 266-267 (1 st.), 519-526, 746; III 925-26 (1 st.), 927-28 (1 st.)	12

Critical Remarks

- No. 1.** I 218 and 219. The fourth Pāda of the first stanza under 218 is defective. The episode of the Dispute Between the Seasons has clear indications of having a folk-tale origin. Hence these verses bear clear dialectal traits. The second stanza under 219 is made up of Vadanaka and Laghu-Catuspadikā. The latter has been very frequently used for Old Gujarati verse narrative (see for example Bhayani and Nahta, 1975, Introduction, p. 15; text, pp. 95-97) and for epigrammatic poetry, and it also holds sway in traditional and folk poetry, e.g. in the summing-up verse of a prose tale and in nursery rhymes. At II 97 Vadanka functions as the concluding piece (*Ghattā*) of a verse passage (*Kaḍavaka*). At II. 97 and II 509 it is used to describe the condition of love in separation (*viraha*). III 163 is a gnomic verse cited from some earlier source.
- No. 2.** Paddhaḍi is used for the main body of the Kaḍavaka at I 786-797. That Kaḍavaka is a hymn to the twentyfour Tirthaṅkaras. For a similar use of Paddhaḍi see Svayambhū, 1962, pp. 96-99; for the use of Vadanaka, Pāraṇaka and Paddhaḍi for the main body of the Kaḍavaka, see Bhayani, 1952, Introduction, pp. 94-97.
- No. 3.** The language of I 361 shows some dialectal ('Proto-Hindi') traits.
- No. 4.** See remarks under 1 above.
- No. 5.** In II 284, the fourth Pāda of the first stanza and the second and the fourth Pāda of the second stanza are textually defective. The passage under III 111-118 also has some inaccuracies. The language of such descriptive Madanāvatāra verse is usually Prakritized. It has been conventionally used to describe wealth of wild flora. See for example Svayambhū's *Paumacariya* III 1, Vijayasena-sūri's, *Revantagirirāsu*, second Kaḍavaka (wherein as in

MK. III 111-118 Mount Girnar is described in a Dvibh-aṅgī type of metre, one of its constituent being Madanāvātāra).

- No. 6. The Rāsāvalyas seem to be used mostly in passages describing emotional condition of a character or tense moments in a narrative. This characterization applies to I 182, 193; to the verses II 93 96 (with 97 as the summing-up verse in Vadanaka) and I 135-138. The verses from the story of Candanabālā (I 268-272; 273-274) give the impression of a composition partly executed as a Rāsaka. II 325 is a citation. III 144 is a summing-up verse. III 160-169 is a sermon on chastity. III 512-522 is a hymn to the Tīrthaṅkara Śāntinātha.

Rāsāvalaya was the standard metre of the Apabhramśa poetic genre Rāsābandha or Rāsaka. The MK. Rāsāvalaya passages are valuable in view of the fact that the rich Rāsaka literature of Apabhramśa is totally lost except a single late specimen, viz, the *Samdeśa-rāsaka*.

- No. 7. Vastuvadanka is used in MK. for the summing-up verse of a story at I, 326. Elsewhere it is used for variation. In the later regional traditions, Vastuvadanaka forming the first constituent of a two-unit strophic metre called Ṣaṭpada (or Kāvya or Sārdha Chandas) became very popular, especially for gnomic verses.
- No. 8. Dvipadī, which has been frequently used in Apabhramśa Sandhibandhas, either as a Kaṭavaka-opening piece or for variation, seems to have declined in popularity after the eleventh century.
- No. 9. Dohā is frequently used for sentential sayings, proverbs and bons mots. Many of the Dohā verses in MK. are apt illustrations of the figure Arthāntaranyāsa. Sometimes it is used to highlight some important moment or the conclusion in a narrative. At III, 522 Dohā occurs in the

Ghattā. III, 838-855 is a hymn to Pārsvanātha composed in Dohās. The total does not include the figure of Dohās occurring as the second unit in the strophic metre Raḍḍā.

- No. 10.** Actually Cūḍāla-Dohā, as the name signifies is a 'Crested Dohā' because in it each half of the Dohā is extended by five Mātrās. This seems to be a later development. The instances we find in MK., JC. and the *Mūlasuddhivṛtti* (p. 164, v 168) are the earliest known occurrences of this metre. Later on we find one instance cited in the *Siddha-hema* (VIII 4, 419 : 6th illustration) and two instances in the *Samdeśarāsaka* (vv. 112, 114). The Cūḍāla-Dohā is defined and illustrated by the *Kavidarpaṇa* (II 17), *Chanda-ahkośa* (26) and *Prākṛta-paṭṅgala* (I 167 168). See also Bhayani, 1945, pp. 64-65.
- No. 11.** The short Dvipadīs have been conventionally used as variation metres in the Sandhibandha and usually they are used to describe a festive occasion, a battle-scene or similar episodes.
- No. 12.** At I 519-526 Raḍḍā is used for a hymn to the Tirthaṅkara Candraprabha. I 746 is a gnomic verse. Elsewhere it is used narratively.

The passages I 519-529, I 785-798, III 512-522 and III 838-855 are hymns sung before the images of Tirthaṅkaras and as such are self-sufficient poems. Of these the second and the third constitute a regular Kaḍavaka that ends with a Ghattā.

Table II
Metres of the Apabhraṃśa Passages in JC.

Sr. No.	Name and Type	Description	Place of Occurrence	Total No. of stanzas
<i>Samā Catuṣpadi</i>				
1.	Vadanaka	See Table I,	38, 39, 96-98, 657, 1419-1420, 2296-2299, 2495-2505 (in a Kadavaka). 1721-1729	23
2.	Paddhaḍi	"	988-989	9½
3.	Paḍakulaka	"		2
4.	Rāsāvalaya	"	138, 443, 1070, 1335-1336 (one st.) 1417-1418 (one st), 1719 1720 (one st.), 1730-53 (12 st.) 1758-1759 (one st.), 2648, 2649, 26-54-2684. 2692-2699, 3081-3086 (3 st.). 31, 873-874 (one st.) 869-870 (one st.).	63
5.	Vastuvadanaka	"		2
6.	Dvipadi	"		1
7.	Dohā	See Table	448, 1715, 1760, 1761, 2269 (p. 205), 2507.	6
8.	Cūḍāla-Dohā	"	36	1
9.	Ṣatpadi	"	2506 (as a Ghattā)	1
<i>Dvibhaṅgi</i>				
10.	Raḍḍa	"	1375-1384, 1401-1415, 2350-2495, 2517-2553, 2557-2647, 3537-3560.	320
11.	Dohā + Vastuudanaka	See individual descriptions	1067-1069 (one st.)	1
<i>Dandaka</i>				
12.	Anaṅgaśekhara	u-23 times	2554-2556 (one st.)	1

Critical Remarks

The observations made above about the functions of various metres in MK. hold good in the case of JC. also. Some special remarks follow.

- No. 1.** vv. 2495-2506 make up a Kaḍavaka. It is a hymn to Rṣabha.
- No. 2.** Paddhaḍi is used at vv. 1721-1729 for variation with the Rāsāvalaya.
- No. 4.** We have three long passages in Rāsāvalaya. vv. 1730-1753 describe female beauty, vv. 2659-2684 describe seasons, vv. 2692-2699 describe Bharata's repentant mood and Rṣabha's observations.
- No. 10.** Raḍḍā is extensively used in JC. We have a total of 320 vv. 1375-1384 describe the eight Prāthāryas, vv. 1401-1415 describe Marudevi's worries about Rṣabha's plight and Bharata's consolation. vv. 2350-2495 and 2517-2553 describe the episode of the battle between Bharata and Bāhubali. vv. 3537-3560 contain a hymn to the twentyfour Tirthaṅkaras. Vardhamāna-sūri's extensive use of Raḍḍā for the narrative purpose probably set a model for Hari-bhadrāsūri who later on composed his *Nemināhacariya* entirely in Raḍḍās. Ratnaprabha also described in his commentary on the *Upadeśamālā* the battle between Bharata and Bāhubali in the Raḍḍā metre (folios 65-68, vv. 85-108).

Reference Works

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Alsdorf L. (ed.) | <i>Der Kumārapūlapratibodha</i> , 1928. |
| Bhayani H. C. | <i>Introduction to the Saṁdeśarāsaka</i> , 1945.
(See under Muni Jinavijaya) |
| Bhayani H. C. (ed.) | <i>Paumacariya</i> of Svayambhādeva, Part I,
1952. |
| Bhayani H. C. and
Modi M. C. (ed.) | <i>Nemināhacariya</i> of Haribhadra, Vol. I,
1970; Vol. II, 1971. |

- Bhayani H. C. and Nahta Agarchand (ed.) *Prācīna Gurjara Kāvya Saṁcaya*, L.D. Series. 40, 1975.
- Bhojak Amritlal (ed.) *Mūlaśuddhi-prakaraṇa* of Pradyumna-sūri with commentary by Devacandra-sūri, Prakrit Text Society Series 15, 1971.
- Dalal C. D. (ed.) *Revantagiri-rāsu* of Vijayasena-sūri (in *Prācīn Gujara Kāvya-saṁgraha*, 1920).
- Haribhadra See under Bhayani and Modi, 1970-1971.
- Hemasāgara-sūri (ed.) *Upadeśamālā* (with Ratnaprabha-sūri's commentary), 1958.
- Muni Jinavijaya (ed.) *Saṁdeśarāsaka* of Abdala Rahamāna, Singhi Jain Series 22, 1945.
- Pagariya Rupendrakumar (ed.) *Maṇoramā-kahā* of Vardhamāna-sūri, L. D. Series 93, 1983.
- Pagariya Rupendrakumar (ed.) *Jugāi-jīṇḍa-cariya* of Vardhamāna-sūri, L. D. Series 104, 1987.
- Ratnaprabha-sūri See under Hemasāgara-sūri, 1958.
- Svayambhū See under Bhayani, 1952.
- Vardhamana-sūri See under Pagariya, 1983, 1987
- Velankar H. D. (ed.) *Chandonuśāsana* of Hemaandra, 1961.
- Velankar H. D. (ed.) *Svayambhūcchandas* of Svayambhū, 1662.
- Velankar H. D. (ed.) *Kavidarpaṇa*, 1962.
- Velankar H. D. (ed.) *Chandaḥkośa* of Ratnaśekhara-sūri (= Appendix II to *Kavidarpaṇa*), 1982.
- Vijayasena-sūri See under Dalal, 1920.
- Vyas B. S. (ed.) *Prākṛta-paiṅgala* Vol. II, 1959.

14. THE APABHRAṂŚA PASSAGES FROM ABHINAVAGUPTA'S TANTRASĀRA AND PARĀTRIMŚIKĀ-VṚTTI

(1)

Among the original texts of Kashmir Śaivism, there are a few, which, even though composed in Sanskrit, contain also a few verse passages in Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa. Abhinavagupta's *Tantrasāra* and *Parātrimśikā-vṛtti*, composed in the first half of the eleventh century A. D., contain a number of such passages. There are thirty-two passages in the *Tantrasāra* and seven in the *Parātrimśikā-vṛtti*. It has been Abhinavagupta's practice in these texts to give *Samgraha* verses in Sanskrit as well as Apabhraṁśa (or Prakrit) at the end of every chapter or some similar convenient interval. They were intended to present the gist (*tātparyārtha*, *saṁkṣepārtha*) of the topics discussed in the body of the chapter. The importance and value of these Apabhraṁśa passages, especially in view of extreme paucity of the Apabhraṁśa texts belonging to the Vedic-Brahmanical tradition, are quite obvious. But unfortunately the text of the Apabhraṁśa verses in Abhinavagupta's above-mentioned works, so far as it is available in the printed edition¹ (and probably also in most of the available manuscripts), is full of serious corruptions and errors. Some of the *Tantrasāra* passages are comparatively less corrupt, but its other passages and all the Apabhraṁśa passages in the *Parātrimśikā-vṛtti* are quite hopeless. They have been given in the printed edition as chaotic jumble of letters from which it seems near-impossible to make out any connected verbal structure or palpable meaning.

If the passages would have been handled by one with some knowledge of Apabhraṁśa, some at least of the textual errors could have been avoided. But about 1918 when the above texts were published little Apabhraṁśa literature had come to light and there were very few at that time who could claim adequate know-

ledge of Apabhraṃśa grammar and metres. So ignorance of Apabhraṃśa combined with defective text transmission seems to have produced the sorry state in which we find the Apabhraṃśa passages in the texts of Kashmir Śaivism.

The faults and errors in the Apabhraṃśa and Prakrit passages that are being discussed here derive mostly from the following four causes :

- (1) Misreading of the letters of the original writing (either by the editor or by the scribes of the Manuscripts).
- (2) Textual omissions
- (3) Incorrect word division
- (4) Incorrect line division.

The present attempt mostly deals with the textual faults of the passages due to the last two causes. The faults due to the first two causes are considered only occasionally. Further, the present paper primarily aims at identifying the metres of the Apabhraṃśa and Prakrit verses of the *Tantrasāra* and *Parātrimśikā-vṛtti*². Secondly it attempts to ascertain the general character of the Apabhraṃśa of these verses on the basis of their identifiable grammatical features. Those among us who had some occasion to deal with highly corrupt and obscure verse passages in Apabhraṃśa know that identification of the metre of a passage helps considerably in making out its word and line divisions and revealing thereby its general purport, if not its detailed verbal meaning. Similarly grammatical characteristics ascertained from one segment of the passage can serve to distinguish words and forms from among the confused assemblage of letters in the other segments. These two criteria combined with the criterion of context could play quite a useful part in establishing the correct text at least tentatively, in precisely demarcating the corrupt segments, as also in suggesting emendations. It is of course greatly desirable that these passages are now re-edited with the help of all available manuscripts. But in the absence of such an effort, it would be somewhat useful to make out whatever meaning and form we can from the muddled texts.

(2)

The chapter-final Apabhraṃśa and Prakrit passages of the *Tantrasāra* comprise thirty-two verses in all, that are distributed over twenty-two chapters (āhnikas), each chapter having one to three of these verses.

If we correct some obvious blunders in word division and line division of the text of the verses as given in the KSTS edition of the *Tantrasāra*, we succeed in a large majority of cases in identifying the metrical rhythm as well as several words and forms of the passages. Moreover, it has been found that a number of textual corruptions has resulted from misreading रू ङ स ऊ or झ, ङ as त, म as स, इ as द, ल as स, य as व, ण as न, ए as प etc., from confusing single and double letters, from failing to correctly decipher the post-consonantal *u*-hook in the script and from Sanskritizations. If we make necessary orthographical adjustments as also readjustments of word and line-divisions, we find that from the shapeless mass of letters, there emerge verse structures with identifiable metrical forms, and word structures with ascertainable grammatical forms and meanings.

Below I reproduce the KSTS text of each of the thirty-two Apabhraṃśa and Prakrit passage of the *Tantrasāra* followed respectively by their partly corrected or 'restored' text and the corresponding Sanskrit chhāyā. (The latter two would be quite obviously only tentative and with numerous lacunas and question-marks.)

I

संवेअण निम्मल दप्पणस्सि सअलं फुरत्त निअसारं ।
 आमरिसण रस सरहस विमट्ठरूअं सइं भाइ ॥ (3.1)
 संवेअण-निम्मल-दप्पणस्सि सअलं फुरत्त-निअ-सारं ।
 आमरिसण-रस-सरहस-विमट्ठ-रूअं सइं भाइ ॥
 [संवेदन-निर्मल-दर्पणे सकलं स्फुरन्निज-सारम् ।
 आदर्शन-रस-सरभस-विमृष्ट-रूपं स्वयं भाति ॥]

II

इस सुणअ विमलमेणं निअ अप्पाणं समत्थवत्थमअम् ।
जो जोअय सो परभैरइ बोधव परणिब्बइं ल्हइ ॥ (3-2)
इय सुणिअ विमलमेणं निअ-अप्पाणं समत्थ-वत्थुमअं ।
जो जोअइ सो पर-भइरवो व्व पर-णिब्बुइं ल्हइ ॥
[इति श्रुत्वा विमलमेनं निजात्मानं समस्त-वस्तुमयं ।
यः पश्यति स पर-भैरवः इव परनिर्वृतिं लभते ॥]

III

जं अनु अन्धि विसेसं घेतूण जडन्ति मन्तमुच्चरइ ।
इच्छासत्तिप्पाणो तं तं मन्तो करेइ फुडम् ॥ (15-1)
जं अणुसंधि-विसेसं घेतूण झडन्ति मंतमुच्चरइ ।
इच्छा-सत्ति-प्पाणो तं तं मंतो करेइ फुडं ॥
[यमनुसंधि-विशेषं गृहीत्वा झटिति मन्त्रमुच्चरति ।
इच्छा-शक्ति-प्राणः तं तं मन्त्रो करोति स्फुटम् ॥]

IV

परम्म सिवतम्म अत्तणप्पडिअंसच्छन्दभान ।
परमत्थं जो आविसत्ताऽसदिकखइ पराकख एवं पिसिस्सगणं ॥ (16-1)
परम-सिवतमं-अत्तण-पडिं ल सच्छंद-भान-परमत्थं ।
जो आवेसंतो सो दिक्खइ परोक्खे-रूवं पि सिस्स-गणं ॥
[परम-शिवतमं आत्म-पतितं स्वच्छन्द-भान-परमार्थम्
यः आवेशयन् स दीक्षयति परोक्षरूपमपि शिष्यगणम्]

V

जिस्स ददपसिद्धिघडिए ववहारे सोइ अस्मि णीसंको ।
तह होहि जहुत्तिण पसिद्धिरुडिए परमसिवो ॥ (21-1)
जह दद-पसिद्धि-घडिए ववहारे लोउ अत्थि णीसंको ।
तह होइ जणुत्तिण-प्पसिद्धि-रुडिए परम-सिवो ॥
[यथा दद-प्रसिद्धि-घटिते व्यवहारे लोकः अस्ति निःशङ्कः ।
तथा भवति जनोत्तीर्ण-प्रसिद्धि-रूढया परम-शिवः ॥]

VI

एहु पआसऊउ अत्ताणत सच्छन्दउ दक्कइ णिअऊउ ।
 पूण पअढइ झट्टि अह कमवस्व एहत परमत्थिण शिवरसु ॥ (1.1)
 एहु पआस-रूउ अत्ताणउ सच्छन्दउ दक्कइ णिअ-रू[अ]उ ।
 पुणु[वि] पअढइ झत्ति अह कम-वसु एहुउ परमत्थिण ×× शिव-रसु ॥
 [एषः प्रकाश-रूपः आत्मा स्वच्छन्दं छादयति निज-रूपम् ।
 पुनरपि प्रकटयति झटिति अथ क्रमवशः एषः परमार्थेन ×× शिव-रसः ॥]

VII

जहि जहि फुरण फुरइ सो सअलउ परमेसरु भासइ मइ अमलउ ।
 अत्ता नत सो श्रिय परमत्थिण इअ जानअ कज्ज परमत्थि ण ॥ (2.1)
 जहि जहि फुरणु फुरइ सो सअलउ परमेसरु भासइ महु अमलउ ।
 अत्ताणउ सो च्चिय परमत्थिण इउ जाणहु कज्जु परमत्थि ण ॥
 [यत्र यत्र स्फुरणं स्फुरति स सकलः परमेश्वरः भासते मह्यम् अमलः ।
 आत्मा स एव परमार्थेण इदं जानीत कार्यं परं अस्ति न ॥]

VIII

बाहोरि सत्तिदेहिणि अदेह इजामलि पाणबुद्धिगुरुबोधइ ।
 जो अणुसंविदि सन्धि अरोह इसो पर इक्कउ लद्धणि सोहइ ॥ (22.1)
 बाहोरि सत्ति दोहिणि अ(?) दोहइ जामलि पाण-बुद्धि गुरु बोहइ ।
 जो अणुसंविदि संघिअ रोहइ सो पर इक्कु कुलद्धणि सोहइ ॥
 [× × × × × × × × यामले प्राण-बुद्धीः गुरुः बोधयति
 यः अणुसंविदि संघाय रोहते सः परं एकः कुलाध्वनि शोभते ॥]

IX

सुण्णउ रविससि दहन सउ उस्सउ एहु सवीर ।
 उहि अच्छन्तउ परमपउ पावइ अचिरे वीर ॥ (5.1)
 सुण्णउ रवि-ससि-दहण-सउ उस्सुउ एहु स-वीर ।
 तहि अच्छन्तउ परम-पउ पावइ अचिरे धीर ॥
 [शून्यं रवि-शशि-दहन-समं उत्सुकः(?) एषः सवीर्यः ।
 तत्र(?) सन् परम-पदं प्राप्नोति अचिरेण धीरः ॥]

X, XI, XII

पहिण उभाहरभावकलपुणुअब्भन्तरि एह ।

सच्चिवपसम इपुणुजअल रग्भिहिनिदकलेह ।

संवेअण पअरूढ इउभावकलाउसमग्गु

भरिअदसुस्सुहुपुणुभरिउ ॥ १ ॥

तुरिआणन्तरलग्गु घडुबोहिणहंउजोअसिएह ।

वितत्त समत्थफुरणकमेण कमेणलिहालमिमाणमिपञ्चावतु ॥ २ ॥ (9.1, 2, 3)

(X) पहिलउ बाहिर-भाव-कल पुणु अब्भन्तरि एह ।

स च्चिय पसमइ पुणु सअल इग्भिहि(?) निद कलेह ॥

[प्रथमं बाह्य-भाव-कला पुनः अभ्यन्तरे एषा ।

सा एव प्रथमति पुनः सकला × × × कलयत]

(XI) संवेअण-पअ-रूढ इउ भाव-कलाउ समग्गु ।

भरिअइ सम्मुहु (?) पुणु भरिउ तुरिआणन्तर लग्गु ॥

[संवेदन-पद-रूढः अयम् भाव-कलापः समग्रः ।

भ्रियते संमुखं (?) पुनः भृतः तुरियानन्तरं लग्नः ॥]

(XII) घडु बोहिण हंउ जोअमि एहु वि तत्तु समत्थु ।

फुरण-कमेण णिहालमि माणमि पंचावत्तु ॥

[×× बोधेन अहम् पश्यामि एतत् तत्त्वम् समस्तम् ।

स्फुरण-क्रमेण निभालयाभि मानयामि पञ्चावर्तम् ॥]

XIII

जह निअर्झउ महेसरु अच्छवि संविरवितहू ।

पसरु अत्ति विपर पसरु अच्छ इविमल सरूइ ॥ (11.1)

जह निअ-रूउ महेसरउ अच्छइ संवरिवि (?) ।

तह पुणु पअडिवि पर-पसरु अच्छइ विमल-सरूइ ॥

[यथा निज-रूपम् महेश्वरः आस्ते संवृत्य ।

तथा पुनः प्रकटयित्वा पर-प्रसरः आस्ते विमल-स्वरूपे ॥]

XIV

परमानन्दनिमज्जणु इउपरमस्थिण ह्माणु ।
 तहिं आविड्ठरत्ति दिणु जाणइ पर अप्पाणु ॥ (12.1)
 परमाणंद-निमज्जणउं इउ परमस्थिण न्हाणु ।
 तहिं आविड्ठउ (?) रत्तिदिणु जाणइ पर-अप्पाणु ॥
 [परमानन्द-निमज्जनम् इदं परमार्थेन स्नानम् ।
 तत्र आविष्टः(?) रात्रिदिवं जानाति परमात्मानम् ॥]

XV

सिवणाहु सच्छन्दु तत्त्वकोणविअप्प इच्छ ।
 चरि आमिस्ति णज्जिजण हुक्किअ भवरोअ चिइच्छ ॥ (20.1)
 सिव-णाउ सच्छंदु उहु(?) को णवि अप्प इच्छ(?) ।
 चरिआ-मिस्तिण जिण जणहु किअ भव-रोअ-चिइच्छ ॥
 [शिवनादः स्वच्छन्दः पश्यत(?) कः नापि अल्पा इच्छा(?) ।
 चर्यामात्रेण येन जनस्य कृता भव-रोग-चिकित्सा ॥]

XVI

जह जह जस्सु जहिं चिव पप्फुरइ अज्जवसाउ ।
 तह तह तस्सु तहिं चिव तारिसु होइ पहाउ ॥ (4.1)
 जह जह जस्सु जहिं चिय पप्फुरइ अज्जवसाउ ।
 तह तह तस्सु तहिं चिय तारिसु होइ पहाउ ॥
 [यथा यथा यस्य यत्र एव प्रस्फुरति अध्यवसायः ।
 तथा तथा तस्य तत्र एव तादृशः भवति प्रभावः ॥]

XVII

हतं मलिणउ हतं पसु हतं आ अह सअलभावपडलवत्तिरित्तउ ।
 इअ द्दढनिच्छअ णिअ लिअहिअअह फुरइ णाम कह जिस्स परतत्त्वउ ॥ (4.2)
 हउं मलिणउ हउं पसु हउं आअह(?) सअल-भाव-पडल-वइरित्तउ ।
 इअ दढ-णिच्छअ-णिअलिअ-हिअअह फुरइ णामु कह जसु पर-तत्त्वउ ॥
 [अहम् मलिनः अहम् पशुः अहम् अस्य(?) सकल-भाव-पटल-व्यतिरिक्तः ।
 इति दृढ-निश्चय-निगडित-हृदयस्य स्फुरति नाम कथं यस्य पर-तत्त्वम् ॥]

XVIII

जह उल्लसह जह विणिगुरुजइ पवनसत्ति तह एहु महेसर ।
 सिद्धिपलअं इसइ ज निमज्जइ सो अत्ता णउ चित्तहसाअरु ॥ (6.2)
 जह उल्लसइ जह(?) वि निरुज्जइ पवण-सत्ति तह एहु महेसर ।
 सिद्धि-पलअ दंसइ अ निमज्जइ सो अत्ताणउ चित्तह साअरु ॥
 [यथा उल्लसति यथापि निरुध्यते पवन-शक्तिः तथा एषः महेश्वरः ।
 सृष्टि-प्रलयान् दर्शयति च निमज्जयति स आत्मा चित्रस्य सागरः ॥]

XIX

एहु सरीरु सअल अह भवसर इच्छामित्तणजेण विचित्ति उ ।
 सोश्चिअ सोकखदेयि परमेसरु इअजानन्त उरुद्धिपवित्ति उ ॥ (19.1)
 एहु सरीरु सअल अह भवसर(?) इच्छा-मित्तण जेण वि चित्तिउ ।
 सो च्चिअ सोकखु देइ परमेसरु इअ जोणंतउ रूद्धि-पवित्तिउ ॥
 [एतद् शरीरम् सकलम् अथ भव-सरः(?) इच्छामोत्रेण येन अपि चिन्तितम् ।
 स एव सौख्यम् ददाति परमेश्वरः इति जानन् रूद्धि-पवित्तिः ॥]

XX

पसवअणुं जोत्तमसासणुल इविणुपणुपरमेसपसाइण ।
 पथइ सद्गुरु बोहपसाहणु सो दिक्खइ लिङ्गोद्धारिणि ॥ (17.1)
 पसव-जणहं(?) जो उत्तम-सासणु लइविणु पुणु परमेस-पसाइण ।
 पथइ सद्गुरु-बोह-पसाहणु सो दिक्खइ लिङ्गोद्धारिणि(?) ॥
 [पशु-जनानाम्(?) यः उत्तम-शासनम् प्राप्य पुनः परमेश-प्रसादेन ।
 प्रार्थयते सद्गुरु-बोध-प्रसाधनं स दीक्ष्यते लिङ्गोद्धरणेण (?) ॥]

XXI

सअल प्रआस रूउ संवेअण फंदतरङ्ग कलण तहु पाणुर ।
 पाणब्भन्तरम्मि परिणिट्टउ सअलउ कलिपसरु परिआणु ॥ (6.1)
 सअल-प्रआस-रूअ संवेअण फंदतरंग-कलण तहु पाणु ।
 पाणब्भन्तरम्मि परिणिट्टउ सअलउ काल-पसरु परिआणु ॥
 [सकल-प्रकाश-रूपा संवेदना स्पंद-तरङ्ग-कलना तस्याः प्राणः ।
 प्राणाभ्यन्तरे परिनिष्ठितः सकलः काल-प्रसरः परिजानीहि ॥]

XXII

परमेसरसासणसुणिरुइउ सुणिविमभलअद्धानउ ।
 झहुज्जतिसरीरिपवणि संदेअ णिअपेक्खन्तउ पहरइ परिउण्णु ॥ (7.1)
 परमेसर-सासण-सुणिरुइउ सुणिवि सअल-अद्धानउ पुण्णु(?) ।
 अत्ति सरीरि पवणि संवेअणि पेक्खंतउ पफुरइ परिउण्णु ॥
 [परमेश्वर-शासन-सुनिरूपितः श्रुत्वा सकलाध्वा पुण्यः(?) ।
 अटिति शरीरे पवने संवेदने प्रेक्षमाणः प्रस्फुरति परिपूर्णः ॥]

XXIII

जे सहु एकीभाउलये विणु अच्छइ एहु विबोह समुद् ।
 सो पशु भइरवु हो इलये विणु अन्तर्नावजिउ अस असमुद्हु ॥ (14.1)
 जें सहु एकीभाउ लएविणु अच्छइ एह विबोह-समुद्दि ।
 सो पसु भइरवु होइ लएविणु उत्ताणउ जिउ अमअ-समुद्दि ॥
 [येन सह एकीभावम् प्राप्य आस्ते एषः विबोध-समुद्रे ।
 सः पशुः भैरवः भवति प्राप्य आत्मानम् यथा अमृत-समुद्रे ॥]

XXIV

जो परि उण्ण सत्थसं अणु तस्स अणुग्गहमेतु पवित्ति ।
 कामणाइ जो पुणुसो साह उतइ उपा अरुहुरइ णहु चित्ति ॥ (18.1)
 जो परिउण्ण-सत्थ-संपण्णउ तस्स अणुग्गह-मेत्त पवित्ति ।
 कामणाइ जो पुणु सो साहउ तह उपाअ पफुरइ(?) णहु चित्ति ॥
 [यः परिपूर्ण-शास्त्र-संपन्नः तस्य अनुग्रह-मात्रं पवित्रे ।
 × × × यः पुनः स साधयतु तथा उपायः प्रस्फुरति न खलु चित्ते ॥]

XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX

भुवनजालसअलउ परिसरसहअवसीसइतत्ताहंसकूउ ।
 तत्तम्भाउकलणा इविमरिसहसीसइपच्चकलाहंसरूउ ॥
 पञ्चकलामउएहु महेसरुकुणइविउज्झइ ।
 इच्छइसुहमउ भरिहविबोधतरङ्गमहासरु ॥
 सोच्चिअभासइ भवतरुविसरउ ।
 सअलउअद्दजालु निअअणिपरिमरिमेहहरो ॥

चेअणुभरिअभरिउ अप्पहमणिसच्चिअपाणिमणु ।
 माणसपाणपवण धीसामसुपूरितजजिखणु ॥
 तंजिघडाइ निहलु परभइरवणाहहुहोइतणु ।
 मत्तिदाणुआवाहणु प्रअणुसणिहाणुइउ अहिणअउड्डु ॥
 सव्विहअद्धकलण निव्वाहाराएतिलडेचिअएहईत्तत्त्व ॥ (10. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.)

- (XXV) भुवण-जालु सअलउ परिमरिसह अह सीसइ तत्ताहं सरूउ ।
 तत्त-भाउ कलणोइ विमरिसह सीसइ पंच कलाहं सरूउ ॥
- (XXVI) पंच-कलामउ एहु महेसर कुणइ विउत्तइ इच्छइ सुहमउ ।
 भण्डि विवोह-तरंग महासर सो चिअ भासइ भव-तरु-विसरउ ॥
- (XXVII) असलउ अद्ध-जालु निअ-धअणि(?) परिमरिसेह हरो (?)
 चेअणु भरिअ-भरिउ अप्पह मणि सो च्चिअ पाणि मणु ॥
- (XXVIII) माणस-पाण-पवण-धी-साम- सु-पूरिउ जं जि खणु ।
 तं जि घडाइनिहलु पर-भइरव णाइहु होइ तणु ॥
- (XXIX) मंत-दाणु आवाहणु असणु(?) सणिहाणु जउ अहिणव-उत्तु ।
 छव्विह-अद्ध-कलण-निव्वाहर (?) एत्तिरुड्डु चिअ एहउ तत्तु ॥
- [(XXV) भुवन-जालं सकलं परिमर्शयत अथ कथ्यते तत्त्वानां स्वरूपम् ।
 तत्त्व-भावं कलनया विमर्शयत कथ्यते पञ्च-कलानां स्वरूपम् ।
- (XXVI) पञ्च-कलामयः एषः महेश्वरः कगेति विबुध्यते इच्छया सुखमयम् ।
 भूतं विवोध-तरङ्ग-महासरः स एव भासते भव-तरु-विसरः ।
- (XXVII) सकलमध्व-जालं निज-××× परिमर्शयत × × ।
 चेतनं भूत्वा भूत्वा आत्मनः मनसि स एव × × × × ॥
- (XXVIII) मानस-प्राण-पवन-धी-शाम-सुपूरितं यदेव क्षणम् ।
 तदेव × × × × पर-भैरव-नाथस्य भवति तनूः ॥
- (XXIX) मन्त्र-दानमावाहनं ××× संनिधानमेतदभिनवोक्तम् ।
 षड्विधाध्व-कलना-××× एतावदेव एतद् सत्त्वम् ॥]

XXX, XXXI

सअलभा अपरि उण्णउ परभैरउ अत्ताणु

जाइवि अगहणि सण्णउ जोअभिमी सत्ताणु ।

एहस समयदिक्ख परभइरव जलणि हि मज्जणिण
इत्थति लज्जहवन बहुपभवहोइउवाउजिण ॥ (13.1,2)

सअल-भाव-परिउण्णउ पर-भइरउ अत्ताणु ।
जाइवि अग्ग-णिसण्णउ जोअभि(?) सीस-त्ताणु ॥

एह स-समय-दिक्ख पर-भइरव जल.णहि-मज्जणिण ।
इत्थ तिलज्जहवन(?) बहु-परिभव होइ उवाउ जि ण ॥

[सकल-भाव-परिपूर्णः पर-भैरव आत्मा ।

× × × अङ्ग-निषण्णः × × × × × × ॥

एषा स्व-समय-दीक्षा पर-भैरव-जलनिधि-मज्जनेन ।

अत्र × × × × बहु-परिभवः भवति उपायः एव न ॥]

XXXII

सअलतत्तपरिउण्णउ सअलतत्तउत्तिण्णउ ।
परिआणहअत्ताणउ परमसिवेण समाणउ³ ॥ (8.1)

सअल-तत्त-परिउण्णउ सअल-तत्त-उत्तिण्णउ ।
परिआणह अत्ताणउ परम-सिवेण समाणउ ॥

[सकल-तत्त्व-परिपूर्णम् सकल-तत्त्वोत्तीर्णम् ।

परिजानीत आत्मानम् परम-शिवेन समानम् ॥]

(3)

The Metres of the above passages can be identified as follows:

Name of the metre	Occurrence	Type of the metre	Metrical scheme (number of mātrās per line and the Gaṇastructure)
-------------------	------------	-------------------	---

1	2	3	4
Gathā	3.1,3.2,15.1, 16.1,31.1	Viṣamā Catuspadi	30(=4+4+4+4+4 +u,ūūu+4+ -)+ 27(=4+4+4+4+4+n+ 4+ -)
	(total 5)		
Vadanaka	1.1,2.1,22.1 (total 3)	Sarvasamā Catuspadi	16(=6+4+ūū - +uu) (rhyme : a, b, c, d)

1	2	3	4
Dohā	5.1,9.1,9.2,11.1, 12.1,20.1. (total 6)	Antarasamā Catuṣpadī	13(=6+4+ <i>uuu</i>)+11 (6+ <i>uu</i> - + <i>u</i>)
Upadohaka	4.1,9.3,13.1, (total 3)	Antarasamā Catuṣpadī	12(=6+4= <i>uu</i>)+11 (6+ <i>uu</i> - + <i>u</i>)
Ragaḍā- Dhruvaka	4.2,6.2,10.2, 17.1,19.1, (total 5)	Sarvasamā Catuṣpadī	16(4+4+4+4) (rhyme b, d)
Śaṣibimbīta(?)	6.1,7.1,10.1, 10.5,14.1,18.1, (total 6)	Antarasamā Catuṣpadī	16(=4+4+4+4)+ 15(=4+4+4+ - <i>u</i>)
Chadḍaṇīā- (III)	10.3,10.4,13.2 (total 3)	Antarasamā Catuṣpadī	16(=4+4+4+4)+ 9(=4+ - <i>uuu</i>)
Mahānu- bhāvā (?)	8.1 (total 1)	Sarvasamā Catuṣpadī	12(=4+4+4)

(4)

Abhinavagupta's Sanskrit commentary on the *Parātrīṃśikā* has seven Apabhraṃśa verse passages, functioning as Saṃgraha-śloka. They are to be found on page numbers 16, 18, 65, 93, 112, 216-217 and 272 of the printed edition. Each of the passages on pp. 16, 18, 112, and 272 consists of a single stanza. The passage on p. 65 is made up of two stanzas. That on p. 93 seems to consist of four stanzas. The long passage on pp. 216-217 still remains mostly impenetrable. I have not succeeded in arranging it in any sort of satisfactory metrical shape. Even then on the basis of a few meagre clues, it seems to me to be containing ten stanzas. The passages with their original text, their metrically arranged and partly corrected text and the corresponding Sanskrit *chāyā* (wherever feasible) are given below.

I

जाहणकुणहजहिं शिहपहिलउ उशिअसब्बो
 विअलिअरोविअम्बइजाणिब्ब उका
 अब्बईणजोअन्तिहि मज्झिअभेदस्फुरन्तु
 कामेण आसरिसेइणओअव
 इसोच्चिअरेच्चभेरेणमतुउजिमणि
 अवत्थवहिअणुसंधेइखनेन ॥ (p. 16)

जाणह कुणह जहिं सिव-पहि लउ

उज्झिअ सव्वो वि अलिअ मेउ विअंभइ जाणिब्बउ !
 काअव्वउ ण जोअंतिहि मज्झिअ मेअ फुरंतु कामेण ॥
 आमरिसेउण जोअवइ सो ज्चिअ रेच्चभणेण (?)
 मत्तउ जिम णिअवत्थ बहि अणुसंधेइ खणेण ॥
 [ज्ञेयस्य कार्यस्य यत्र शिव-पथे लयः

× × सर्वमपि विगलितभेदम् विजृम्भते ज्ञातव्यम् ।
 कर्तव्यम् न पश्यन्त्याम् मध्यायाम् भेदाः स्फुरन्तु कामेन ॥
 आनर्श्यं योजयति स एव × × × ×
 मत्तः यथा निजावस्थाम् बहिः अनुसंदधाति क्षणेन]

II

जहि जहि धावइ जंकुण तहि तहि बिअविअकाउ ।
 अच्छन्त उपरिउणबिअपाय इहलइफळसिवणाओ ॥ (p. 18)
 जहि जहि धावइ जं कुण[इ] × × × तहिं तहिं विअलिअ-काउ ।
 अच्छंतउ परिउणविअ पावा(?) इहु लइ फळु सिव-णाउ ॥
 [यत्र यत्र धावति यत् करोति × × तत्र तत्र विगलित-कायम् ।
 आसीनः ×× ×× एतद् गृहाण फलम् शिव-नादम् ॥]

III

पफिलउ फुरइ फुरण अवि आरिणा होइपरावर
 अवरविहइण देवि विसरिम इऊ उ ।
 सासच्चिअ परिसरि सेइसऊअउदेउ
 विलेमइ मैरव ऊअउ उत्तर एहु अणुतु ॥ (p. 65)

पहिलउ ऊरइ फुरणु अविआरिण
होइ परावर-अवर-विहाइण
देवि विमरिसइ रूउ ।

(सा) स चिअ परिमरिसैइं सरूअउ
देउ विलोअइ भईरव-रूअउ
उत्तर एहु अणरूउ(?) ॥

[प्रथमं स्फुरति स्फुरणम् अविकारेण
भवति पराङ्गपरा-विभागेन देवी विमर्शयति रूपम् ।

सा एव परिमर्शयति स्वरूपम्
देवम् विलोकते भैरव-रूपम् उत्तर एषः अनुरूपः ॥]

IV

सअल बहुसंवेअणफुरितमत्त उजहित हिंचि अजत्तो हित्तउपफुर ।
इज कुट्टि उअ अलभाव संवेअणरअणणिहाणुइउ ॥

परिआणहुएत्तिअणुतुरुछत्तुहजसठउसम्मूढतुणिअच्छहत्तुहअत्तासिअऊउऊउसुबाहिरवितु-
रहुबन्धुणमोक्खतउइरिअवहुविकुणसिबिसग्गुणिसमिद्रउपुणसंहरसिज्जितिपविण्णुविरिञ्चरुद्रमअल-
क्खहिमसरणिरोहचिन्तइमलक्खएक्कवाअपरिआणहुअत्ताणउपरमत्थअण्णुणकोइबिआसुबहुइउअ-
अलउअत्थत्थ । (p. 93)

सअल-वत्थु-संवेअण फुरिअ-मत्त जहि

xx xx xx

तहिं चिअ जत्तोहुंतिउ पफुरइ ज कुट्टिउ (?) ।

सअल-भाव-संवेअण-रअण-णिहाणु इउ

परिआणहु एत्तिअणुतुरुछत्तुहजसठउ ॥ (१)

सम्मूढतुणि अच्छह तुह अत्तामिउ रूउ

रूउ सुबाहिर वितुरहु(?) बंधु ण मोक्खु तउ ।

xx इरिअवहु वि कुणसि विसग्गु(?)

णिमिसद्धउ पुणु संहरसि(ज्जिति) ॥ (२)

पविण्डु विरिच-रुद-सअ-लकल हिम-सर-णिरोहु चितइ सलकल । (३)

एक-वाअ परिआणहु (?) अत्ताणउ परमत्थु ।

अण्ण ण कोई विआसु बहु इउ सअलउ सत्थत्थु ॥ (४)

V

सइपरिउण्णपमरुउत्ताण उत्तहुगहिअबुणभज्जिइ ।

अजाणिअविहइअज्जाण उज्जम्पुसुअच्छइपूरिअकज्ज ॥ (p. 112)

सइ-परिउण्ण-पसर अत्ताणउ तहु गहिअव्वु ण भज्जिअ णिज्जु (?) ।

इअ जइणिअ विहइअ अण्णाणउ जम्मु सु अच्छइ पूरिअ-कज्जु ॥

[सदा-परिपूर्ण-प्रसरः आत्मा तस्य गृहीतव्यं न × × × ×

इति ज्ञात्वा विषटते अज्ञानं जन्म सः(?) भवति पूरित-कार्यः ॥

VI

परसंवेअणाभासमऊणऊरअरमहसोआइमऊणसइभासइम अलाहि शरणिअपसरहु
परिसरिसन जतुहसो पश्चअप हिलुअवर्ण परिगाहरु इर वसत्तिपधमहस्म ओहभितुर कद-
सुख विसरिपि असिद्धि घराइम उस अल विपरिसि अभासइ वाहिरविहरिणी एहि
विसर्गाभू मि अनार्दहुत्तइ लर्थ ईण पवि मिणं दहुअमलाहं विहरिणी कुइलित्थत अणुत्तर
परपइ जश्चि अभवि अतत तच्चमप्पइ भस्मइवि बिन्दुविसरि सुताए हुप आसत्त तअह
सत्तमल हिंपुविसि विभेत विहंसः तमालि निमाइ अअह सुततस्मह भोअममण अइल्ले
मरु निभुंऊ अपारहमरल पदुद्यो प्रन्तीप सारइमात द्रय भासि वलिअनु सोअिअं असि
तमर्थ अहिंसा अइपविमन्ती अलसइरसा मच्छेअरि परिदेवितरंगणि प्रफऊअसुह सारंगिणि
रितत्तस्म कीलालसा तुहि मत्तिदिविरह एणि हानुण पिज्जति जतस्माइ लालणमहो संम-
अलालसा । (p. 216-217)

The word divisions in the above passage, faithfully reproduced from the printed edition are absolutely arbitrary and meaningless. Some of the gross errors that have resulted from misreading of letters are obvious. But it has not been possible to make out the verbal structure of most of the passage, and hence I have reproduced it here mechanically without suggesting any corrections. Even so on the basis of a few clues we may hazard some guess about its metrical structure. The text up to उस अल in the third line may be rearranged with slight corrections as under :

पर-संवेअण-भास-सरूइण ।
 ऊरअरमईसो (?) आई-सरूइण ॥
 सइ भासइ सअला ॥

Such an arrangement allows us to identify the metre as a Tripadī having 16, 16 and 10 Mātrās respectively in the three Pādas in which *a* rhymes with *b*. Distribution of some suspected rhymes (e.g. लालस in the last two lines) suggests that the passage has possibly five pairs of such Tripadīs. The third lines of each pair of Tripadīs are mutually connected by rhyme.⁴

VII

फुइ फुरणम अलह काअव्वह पर देउ सोहि अउस
 मगाह सव्य काल नीसंकसउ सहजा जाणु पूजस पज्ज ई इ उ उ ह ॥ (p. 272)
 फुइ फुरणु सअलह काअव्वह पर[म]-देउ सो हिअउ समगह ।
 सव्व-काल-नीसंक-सरूअह जा जणु पुज्ज-सपज्जई इउ उह (?) ॥
 [स्फुरति स्फुरणं सकलस्य कर्तव्यस्य परम-देवः स हृदयं समग्रस्य ।
 सर्व-काल-निःशंक-स्वरूपस्य यावत् जनः पूजा-सपर्याप्त्याम् × × ×]

(5)

The metres of the above passages can be identified as follows :

<i>Name of the metre</i>	<i>Occurrence</i>	<i>Type of the metre</i>	<i>Metrical Scheme (Number mātrās per line and the Gaṇastructure)</i>
Vadanaka	p. 272 (VII)	Sarvasamā Catuspadi	16(=6+4+ $\bar{u}\bar{u}$ - + <i>uu</i>) (rhyme : a, b, c, d)
Paddhaḍi	p. 93 (IV, 3) (Two lines)	„	16(4+4+4+ <i>u</i> - <i>u</i>) (rhyme : a, b, c, d)
Rāsaka	p.93 (No. IV 1-2(two stanzas)	„	21(=6+4+4+4+ <i>uuu</i>) (rhyme : a, b, c, d)

Dohā	p. 93; (No. IV-4)	Antarasamā Catuṣpadī	13(=6+4+vvv)+ 11(6=4+n) (rhyme : b, d)
Saṣibimbīta	p. 112 (No. V) p. 18 (No. II)	„ „	16(=4+4+4+4)+ 11(=6+4+4+u) (rhyme : b, d)
Tripadī	(i) p. 65 (No. III (two stanzas); (ii) p. 216-217 (No. VI) (ten stanzas)		16(=6+4+ūū+uu) twice+12 (rhyme : a, b, c of 1 with c of 2) 16 twice+10 (rhyme scheme as adove)
Raḍḍā	p. 16 (I)	Dvibhaṅgī of Mātrā and Dohā	Mātrā (15+11+15+ 11+15)+Dohā (13+11)

(6)

Except in the case of two or three stanzas (and of the last passage of the *Parātrīṃśika-Vṛtti*), our identifications of metres are fairly certain. Now let us see what general conclusions, if any, can be drawn from the use of Apabhraṃśa metres as attested in the two works of Abhinavagupta examined here.

Firstly we may observe that Abhinavagupta's use of Prakrit Gāthā for the Saṃgraha verse is in conformity with long-established tradition, as evidenced so amply by the Jain religious literature (Prakaraṇas and Commentaries).

Secondly, among the Apabhraṃśa metres used, Vadanaka, Paddhaḍī, Rāsaka, Dohā, Upadopaka and Raḍḍā on the one hand and most of the remaining Antarasamā and Sarvasamā Catuṣpadīs on the other, are the most frequent and familiar metres and in this matter Abhinavagupta faithfully continues the earlier Apabhraṃśa metrical practice. But there are two or three points here which possess a spécial significance. Firstly the Antarasamā and Sarvasamā Catuṣpadīs of the 16+16, 16+15, 16+11; 16+9 and 16+12—

all varieties, which have been known to us mostly from their function as Dhruvā or Ghattā, the concluding piece of the Kaṭavaka in a Saṁdhibandha, are seen here employed for summing up a serious philosophic, religious or ritualistic discussion or exposition, while concluding a chapter. In this matter too, Abhinavagupta carried on the earlier practice. For, both the eminent authorities on Apabhraṃśa metres, viz. Svayambhū and Hemacandra, have stated specifically that one of the functions of the Dhruvā or Dhruvaka is *śiṃhāvalokana* (i.e. taking a retrospect)⁵

Thirdly we find some new metrical forms, representing new developments in the metrical practice. These innovations we find gaining wide currency subsequently. The Tripadis with the measures 16+16+12 and 16+16+10 employed for the two stanzas on p. 65 and possibly for the ten stanzas on pp. 216–217 of the *Parā-triṃśkā-vṛtti* are not treated in any of the works on Apabhraṃśa metres. We do not find them in Virahāṅka, Svayambahū, Hemacandra or any other early authority. But quite similar Tripadis are used in two earliest Old Gujarati poems viz. *Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-Ghora* composed in C. 1170), and *Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-rāsa*⁶ (composed in 1185 A.D.), and the practice continued in several later Old Gujarati poems. Metres closely allied to this Tripadi in structure are to be found used first by Kṣemendra⁷ in one of his Sanskrit compositions. Their base was of course in the Apabhraṃśa literary tradition. In this connection some further evidence indicative of emergent trends in the metrical practice is provided by the fact that some of the types like 16+11 have become standard and typical narrative verse forms in the subsequent vernacular poetry.

One important outcome of the readjustment and restoration of the Apabhraṃśa passages attempted here is the fact that because we can now make out and interpret numerous forms and sentences, we are in a position to form a definite and positive impression about the grammatical character of the Apabhraṃśa found in these passages. And one significant thing we can confidently state in this connection is that there is nothing specifically *dialectal* or *regional* or 'Kashmirian' about Abhinavagupta's Apabhraṃśa. It is the same

good standard Apabhraṃśa treated in the grammatical tradition represented by Hemacandra. The minor grammatical variations in literary Apabhraṃśa found regionally and chronologically had very little significance for the early grammarians whose sole concern was to sanction rules for 'generating' literary Apabhraṃśa from Sanskrit. And Apabhraṃśa literature knows only one highly standardized literary Apabhraṃśa. Apabhraṃśa passages of Abhinavagupta also can be seen to bear this out completely. All its forms are typical forms of standard Apabhraṃśa. We find, for example, in the language of these passages, *u* of the Nominative singular of *a*-stems, *-em* and *-iṇa* of the instrumental singular, *-ha* and *hu* of the genitive singular, *-mi* of the present first person singular, *-hu* of the second person plural, *-ia*, *-ivi*, and *-eviṇu* of the absolutive, the pleonastic *-ḍa-* (one instance) and similar other traits of the standard Apabhraṃśa. Thus the fact that the Apabhraṃśa used by Abhinavagupta in the eleventh century in Brahmanical religious works composed in Kashmir is the same as the standard Apabhraṃśa³ current as a literary medium elsewhere all over India, demonstrates that Apabhraṃśa like Sanskrit and Prakrit was a standardized all-India literary medium, and the emergence of regional literary media was definitely a post-Apabhraṃśa development.

Notes

1. *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta, edited by Mukund Ram Shastri, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies (=KSTS) No. 17, 1918. *Parātriṃśikā* with Abhinavagupta's commentary, edited by Mukund Ram Shastri, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. No. 18, 1918.
2. My friend, late Dr. U. P. Shah of the M. S. University of Baroda also was interested in working on the interpretation of these and similar other passages of Kashmir Śaivism texts. I am indebted to him for drawing my attention to these passages. The present paper owes its origin to my initial discussion with Dr. Shah.

3. This stanza is found cited in the *Janmamaraṇavicāra* of Bhaṭṭa Vāmadeva (KSTS Ho. 19, 1918, p. 5.). It is given in the printed text in much more corrupt form, as reproduced below :

सअल उक्त पुरिपुण्ण उ सअल्लउक्त उत्तिण्ण ।
परि आणह अत्ताण उ परि मसिवेण समाण उ ॥

4. Compare the metre of the following 'song' said to be sung by the Gopis in praise of Kṛṣṇa :

ललितविलासिकलासुखखेलन—, ललनालोभनशोभनशोभनयौवन—, मानितनवमदने ॥
अलिकुलकोकिलकुवलयकञ्जल, कालकलिन्दसुताविवलज्जल—, कालियकुलदमने ॥
केशिकिशोरमहासुरमारण—, दारुणगोकुलदुरितविदारण—, गोवर्धनधरणे ॥
कस्य न नयनयुगं रतिसज्जे, मज्जति मनसिजतरलतरङ्गे, वररमणीरमणे ॥

Kṣemendra's *Daśavatāracarita*, st. 173).

Here the form of the metre is 16+16+10 and the stanzas are paired.

5. विष्णवण-संविहाणअ-मंगल-सीहावलोइअत्थम्मि ।
तत्थ णिबुज्झइ ध्रुवअं तस्सोवरि सव्व-दुवईओ ॥

Svayambhūcchandas, 7-1;

सिंहावलोकितार्थेषु विज्ञप्तौ संविधानके ।
सङ्गले च ध्रुवा प्रोक्ता द्विपद्यन्यत्र कीर्यते ॥

Chandonuśāsana, 7, 57.2

6. See for example the following :

पहिलउँ रिसह-जिणिंदु नमेवि, भवियहु निसुणहु रोलु घरेवि,
बाहुबलि-केरउ विजउ ॥
(भरतेश्वर-बाहुबलि-घोर, १)
रिसह-जिणेतार-पय पणमेवी, सरसति-सामिणि मणि समरेवी,
नमवि निरंतर गुरु-चलण ॥
(भरतेश्वर-बाहुबलि रास, १)

The form of the Tripadī here is 16+16+13.

7. See Kṣemendra's *Daśāvatāracarita* (Kāvyamālā, No. 20, 1930), St. 173 (cited here in footnote 4). It consists of units of three Pādas measuring 16+16+10 mātrās. The units are in pairs, as the rhyming show. This feature also seems to be matched by passage no. VI (p.216-217) of the *Parātrimṣikā-vṛtti*.
 8. We may note, however, a slight but rather striking departure from normal Apabhramṣa usage : Abhinavagupta seems to prefer mostly *attāṇau* for the standard *appāṇau*; but Apabhramṣa knows of several other doublets also in which *-tta-* and *-ppa-* alternate.
-

15. THE PRAKRIT AND DEŚA-BHĀṢĀ PASSAGES IN SOMEŚVARA'S MĀNASOLLĀSA

The Sixteenth Chapter of the fourth Viṃśati (i.e., seventy-sixth chapter according to continuous numbering) of Someśvara's *Mānasollāsa* or *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* (Vol. III, GOS, no. 138. 1961) composed in 1163 A.D., is devoted to the description of the pastime of music (*gītavinoda*). After treating the Rāgas, it describes a number of metres (including the Mātrā-metres). because the texts of the songs or musical Prabandhas, in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, Karṇāṭa language and other regional languages, were usually composed in these metres. Unfortunately the illustrations of the metres and compositions for those cases where the languagee was to be other than Sanskrit are very badly preserved in the MSS. Their text is highly corrupt, and consequently the editor of the *Mānasollāsa* has for the most part given it simply as groups or series of letters, without any line or word divisions. An attempt, therefore, is being made here to restore and interpret some of the passages, which are very valuable linguistically, metrically and also as specimens of the twelfth century non-Sanskrit poetry. In the preface to the third volume of the *Mānasollāsa* G. K. Shrigondekar, its editor, has described the three MSS. (A. C. and O) on the basis of which he has constituted the text. Of these he has not found G much helpful, as it agrees with A. Here in the case of all the passages I have given first the reading according to each of the two MSS. A and D, and thereafter the restored text with English translation. I have also consulted the MS. G. (which is now in the MSS. collection of L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, bearing the accession no. 4188).

In all there are thirteen passages which are wholly or partly in Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa or Deśa-bhāṣās. Their list is as follow¹ :

No.	place	metre or the type of composition	language
1. IV	257	Gāthā	Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit
2. "	269	Aḍillā	Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit
3. "	271	Maḍillā	Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit
4. "	296-297	Vastu	Apabhraṃśa
5. "	302	Carcari	Apabhraṃśa
6. "	330	Sukasārikā	Karṇāṭī and Lāṭī
7. "	340	Vicitra	Karṇāṭī, Lāṭī, Gauḍī, Avadhī, Sanskrit.
8. "	354	Caturaṅgaka	Sanskrit, Mahārāṣṭrī, Lāṭī, Māgadhī
9. "	p. 42, v. 7	Muktāvali	Madhyadeśīyā
10. "	p. 43, v. 15	Dhavalā	Apabhraṃśa
11. "	p. 43, v. 20	Ovi	Lāṭī (Old Marathi)
12. IV	380 (=p. 47, v.58)	Caryā	Auḍrī (Old Odisi)
13. IV	421 (=p. 49, v. 77)	Dohaḍa ²	Apabhraṃśa

1. The illustration of Gāthā in Prakrit given at IV 6 257.

The printed text (according to MS. A.) :

यो सुसोरारुद्व(द्ध)ज अलंलच्छीणाहस्सणमहभन्नीये ।
जं सुमरिउण याचइ(पद्र)भोन्खबशिरैः संनिमस्वोविरयो ॥

The text according to MS. D. (given in f.n. 12) :

पोसूसे रारुद्ध जुअलं छोणा हस्सण महश्रीये ।
जं सुमिरिऊण पावइ, मोक्ख-सिरिसतिमुन्खोपि ॥

The restored text :

भो मणुसा(?) पअ-जुअलं, लच्छीणाहस्स णमह भत्तीए ।
जं सुमरिऊण पावइ, मोक्ख-सिरि जाइ(?) मुक्खो वि ॥

‘O Men, bow with devotion to the pair of feet of Lakṣmi’s Lord, calling which to the mind, even a born idiot attains the glory of liberation’.

2. The illustration of Aḍillā at IV 16 269 :

The printed text (according to MS. D) :

सोमणिवं पर पुंडरीकं सेवदं णिस्समेक पुंडरीअं ।
अविसंरणिज्जिअ पुंडरीअ ॥

The text according to MS. A. (given in f.n. 20, 21, 22) :

सोमणिवं परम-पुंडरीकं सेवहरिस्वमेवहणिस्वमेक पुंडरीअ ।
विसंगिरस्तिजिअ^४ पुंडरीअं ॥

The restored text :

सोम-णिवं परम-पुंडरीअं, सेवह णिच्च(?)मेक-पुंडरीअं ।
[.....पुंडरी]अं, वि(?) संगर-णिज्जिअ-पुंडरीअं ॥

‘You should always serve the most excellent king Soma, whose white royal umbrella is unrivalled.....and who has conquered Puṇḍarika in battle’.

3. The illustration of Maḍillā at IV 16 271.

The printed text :

रेहइ फुल्लसरोरुह वयणो णम्मकहासु विसच्चकवयणो ।
लीलाविभ्रमरंजिअरामो सौममहीवै(वइ) संगररामो ॥

The restored text :

रेहइ फुल्ल-सरोरुह-वयणो, णम्म-कहासु वि सच्चय-वयणो ।
लीला-विभ्रम-रंजिय-रामो, सोम-महीवइ संगर-रामो ॥

‘King Soma, who speaks truth even in light conversations, who equals Rāma in battle and who wins over beautiful damsels by his playful, amorous gestures, shines with his face like a full-blown lotus’.

4. The illustration of Vastu at IV 16 296-297.

The printed text (according to MS. A) :

जेच्छतिहणुसयलुनिछिसे हुगम्भीरिं वज्रस्मा परसपलकाल
सश्चहिन विदद्रह ॥ नामाविहसस्वरि ॥

पधुची जोच्चिया गणिजू इसोदाणचक्कुल निदलपुहयण किय आनन्दु ।
वृचुद्वोउक्षिउअ वहरउसदिवपर गोविन्दु ॥

The text according to MS. D. (given in f.n. 7) :

जेच्छति हणुसयलुनिलिसेहु गंभीरिवज्रः सपरसयलसच्चहिनविद्धइ ।
नानाविहसत्परिसरिपक्कंचीतुजोश्चियगणिहयिः सो दाणवकुलनिह-
लणुदुहयणकियआणंदु । बुद्धोदुक्किउ अवहरउसलब्धिपइगोविन्दु ।

The restored text :

जेत्थु तिहुयणु सयल वि निविद्धु(?)
गंभीरिवं जस्स पर, सयल-कालु सम्बहिं नविज्जइ ।
नाणाविह-सप्प(?)रिसरि, एक्कु देउ जो च्चिय गणिज्जइ ।
जो दाणव-कुल-निदलणु, दुहियण किय-आणंदु ।
तुद्धउ दुक्किउ अवहरउ, सु लच्छिवइ गोविंदु ॥

‘May Govinda, the lord of Lakṣmī, favour you and remove your sins—he in whom all the three worlds are situated, whose profoundness is such that all bow down to it all the time, who is one and alone counted as the deity in various, who is the destroyer of the whole dynasties of demons and who gives joy to the unhappy’.

5. The illustration of Carcarī at IV 16 302 :

The printed text according to MS. A. :

मधुरिपुनायकु पधुतरसाहारकिसलयलक्किउः ।
विचकिलपरिभालाग्रोषुम्यौ ।
अलिकुलक्षङ्कारबहुकुसुमैः कोइल कउरउ करइ ।
मुहावउ तरणीह कुसुमसरक्काखारउ हालकै ।
नरवैकचुपविनसितालिहिछं देगारि पुडिज्जइ ।
कुकुडूमसलिले नणुरजइ तरणियणिम्मदुरुणजिज्जयि ।
पठहिदो लउवडि खेलिज्जइ । जुवति हं चरण हं दिउदु-
पेल्लज्जइ । चंदणे अच्च इले वेणु किज्ज इमल्लिय

मंजरि शिरे तुरुं विज्जइसि अधु विश्व । अवरुड
विज्जइनोभाहलनवसरुप हरिज्जइकश्रुरमन्निपुमसिसे
विज्जइ । रागे वसन्ते । पीड गाइज्जइ हंसे तुलायिमुं ॥
देसो विज्जइ । विरुलं तउवाणि नाणिजै ॥

The text according to MS. D. (given in f.n. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) :

मधुरितुमन्मथनायकु । यङ्गतउ २ । साहारकेसलयलखीउ । निरुतउ । विचकि-
लपरिमालमौयुभ्यै । अलिकुलझङ्कारबहुसुमै कोइलकलरउ करइ । सुहावउ तरणीह
कुसुंभसरह ॥ हकारउ । होलह नरवैकचुगवितइ । तालिहिंछंदेगारिज्जहाजयतिहिं
चरणहिंदेदुफलज्जइ । वंदणअवणविवणुकिज्जइ । मल्लिमंजरि शिरेतुरुंविज्जइ सिंहधू-
विज्जइ मोत्राहलनवसरु पहिरिज्जइ । कसूरसन्निमुशशि सेविज्जइ । कपूरसन्निमु शशि
सेविज्जइ ॥ पिरुलंतउवणिमाणिज्जइ ।

The restored text :

मधु-रितु मन्मथ-नायकु पटुतउ, सहार-किसलय-लखितउ निरुतउ ।
विचकिल-परिमल-लगउ घुम्मइ, अलिकुल झंकारइ बहु-कुसमइ ।
कोइल कलरउ करइ सुहावउ, गावइ(?) कुसुमसरह हकारउ ।
हालिहिं नरवइ-कधु पदिज्जइ, तालिहिं छंदेहिं गाइज्जइ ।
कुंकुम-सल्लि तणु रंजिज्जइ, तरुणियणिहिं महुरउ नच्चिज्जइ ।
वरु हिंदोलउ वडि खेलिज्जइ, जुवतिहिं चरणहिं दइदु पेलिज्जइ ॥
चंदणि अच्चण लेवणु किज्जइ, मल्लिय-मंजरि सिरि बंधिज्जइ ।
मिह धूविज्जइ अयरु डहिज्जइ, मोत्ताहल-नव-सरु पहिरिज्जइ ।
कपूर-संनिहु ससि सेविज्जइ, रागि वसंति पियउ गाइज्जइ ।
हंस तुलाइपु दे(?) सोविज्जइ, पिउ घुलंतउ वणि माणिज्जइ ॥

‘The spring season lorded over by the God of Love has arrived, with its characteristic mark of mango shoots. The hoard of black bees bearing the perfume of the Vicakila flowers are humming and wandering from flower to flower. The cuckoo pours out sweet notes, which are like the inviting messengers of the Love-God. The peasants sing the lyrics composed by the King with their appropriate metrical rhythms and timebeats. Bodies are coloured with saffron water sprinkled and damsels are dancing sweetly. Swinging sport is enjoyed on excellent swings tied on the banyan trees, when the young ladies are pushing their beloved with their feet. The sandle-

wood paste is applied to the forehead and is smeared on the body. The Mallikā blossom is tied on the hair. Fumigation is done and Aguru is burnt for incense. The nine-stringed pearl necklace is worn. The camphor-like moonlight is enjoyed. Songs of the sweet-heart are sung in the Vasanta melody. People are sleeping on soft feather mattresses. Strolling in parks, ladies enjoy the love of their lovers'.

6. The illustration of Śukasārikā at IV 16 330.

According to IV 16 328 and 329 Śukasārikā is composed in a mixture of two languages, viz., the Karṇāṭa language and the Lāṛa language. It can be in prose or verse. It is in the form of questions and replies. It makes use of two Tālas. This is illustrated by 330. The text of the illustration given according to MS. A. is as follows.

पले लालीनीते दुतहोल्लि वृत्तं हि दहे
निदेनागेहे लानिल्लु हर पोतुं न जाणइ
माएतोदीनासा । छांडु छांडु मथिजा इखं
वा गोपिदसकुखेलण एने देहम्
नीनीतेदातरिए गोविंदे हे एत गातत तोरांतोहम्हिणि ।
काहांह्यणसि वाउलिपनायणु जगहकेरु गोसावि ।

The text given according to MS. D. is as follows :—

पले लालीनीते दुतहोल्लिबुत होदेहे
निदेन गेलानिल्लु हंटं न जाणउ
माएतोरीना स । छांडु छांडु मइं जाइं
वो गोविंद सहखेलण । एनेदेहो ॥
निनेदात्तरिए गोविन्दने देहे एतगातनंतोशोतोह्यणि
कहामणि कहाम्हसि वाउलिपि नारायणु जगहकेरा गोसावी ॥

Only a few phrases and lines of 'Lāṛī' in this passage can be tentatively restored. The passage seems to be in the form of a dialogue in prose between the young cowherd girl (Gopi) and her mother. The girl insists on going to play with Kṛṣṇa, but the mother tries to dissuade her saying that Kṛṣṇa is not an ordinary

human being : he is the Lord of the Universe. I cannot make out where the speech of one character ends and that of the other begins. Nor it is possible to assign individually the statements in all the cases.

The first line and the first part of the line 2 are in Old Kannada.

The second part of line 2 and the first part of line 3 are to be restored as follows :

हउं न जाणउं माए तोरी तासा(?) छांडु छांडु ।

‘(Mother) : I do not know, O my darling, do give up your senseless insistence’.

The second part of line 3 and the first part of line 4 are to be restored as follows—

मइं जाएवउ गोविंद-सहु खेलणह

‘(Girl) : I want to go to play with Govinda’.

The second part of line 4 and the first part line 5 are in Old Kannada.

The second part of line 5 and the whole of line 6 are to be restored as follows :

तो आम्हणि कहां म्हणसि वाडलिआ ।

नारायणु जगह केरा गोसांत्री ॥

‘(Mother) : What do you tell me, O madcap, Kṛṣṇa is the Lord of the Universe.’

7. The illustration of Vicitra in a mixture of various languages given at IV 16 340.

The passage describes the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu viz. Matsya, Varāha, Nṛsimha, Vāmana, Paraśurāma, (Rāma), Kṛṣṇa, Buddha and Kalki. The portion relating to Rāma seems to be missing. The language of the portions that describe Kūrma, Nṛsimha and Vāmana seems to be Old Kannada (and possibly some other Dravidian language or languages). The lines describing Matsya and Buddha are in Old Marathi. Those describing Varāha and Kṛṣṇa are probably in Madhyadeśiā. Those describing Paraśurāma are in Gaudī. Finally those describing Kalki are in Sanskrit.

Lines 1-2 :

- MS. A. जेणे रसातलउणु मस्सरूपे वेद आणियले मनुशिवक्वाणियले
 MS. D. जेणे' ममूसिवभ्याणियले
 MS. A. तो संसारसायरतारणमोह' तो राषोनारायणु ॥
 MS. D. तणु मह ते राखो

The restored text :

जेणे' रसातल-उणु मच्छ-रूपे' वेद आणियले,
 मनुशि वक्खाणियले,
 तो संसार-सायर-तारणु
 मोह' तो राखो नारायणु ॥

'He, who (assuming) the form of fish brought the Vedas from the nether world (Rasātala) and expounded them among men, may that Nārāyaṇa, that saviour from the ocean of transmigrations, protect me'.

Lines 4-6 :

- MS. A. जो सुवरूपे पायालुपैशिदाण तुहरिणकळ पुच-
 MS. D. सुखरूपेपायलुपै सिदाणउ हरिणकसु
 MS. A. माचषिदाढ गोविन्द घरणि उद्धरियम् सौदेउ
 MS. D. माचर्वि ॥ गोविदं
 MS. A. मन्दरदुहोच्छ उ° । (G. होज्जउ)
 MS. D. महवरदुहोउ ।

The restored text !

जे' सुवर-रूपे' पायालु पैसि दाणउ हरिणकसु मारवि
 दाढे' गोवि'दे' घरणि उद्धरिया,
 सो देउ मह' वरदु होज्जउ ॥

'May that God Govinda, who in the form of a boar, having entered the nether world and having killed the demon Hiraṇyākṣa, raised and rescued the earth with his fang, grant me boons'.

Lines 10-11 :

- MS. A. जे ब्रह्मणेऱकुलेउपजीय्या कात्तवीया
 MS. D. ब्राह्म जिया वीर्या
 MS. A. जेणे (य्याजुणेऱ) बाहुफरमे खांडिया
 MS. D. उज्जणेरा रसै
 MS. A. परसरा मुदे उतो यहामङ्गल करउ
 MS. D. परशु शेमाहरममल

The restored text :

जे ब्रह्मणेऱ कुले उपज्जिया,
 कातवीयज्जुणेऱ बाहु फरसे खांडिया,
 परसुरामु देउ से माहार मंगल करउ ।

‘May that God Paraśurāma, who having been born in a Brahmin’s family, cut off with his battle-axe the arms of Kārtavīrya Arjuna, be auspicious to me’.

Lines 12-14

- MS. A. नन्दगोकुलम् । जायौ कन्हुजो गोवीजणे पडिहे
 MS. D. जायो ने पडिहे
 MS. A. लीटे नयणे जोविया महणाघर आविनाह्यणि
 MS. D. लोटे
 MS. A. हक्कारिया कन्हौभरडासौ अह्योणां चितिया देउ ।

The restored text :

नंदगोउले जायो कन्हु ।
 जो गोवीजणे पडिहे(?) नयणे जोविया,
 महणाघर आवि ना म्हणि हक्कारिया,
 कन्हौ भडारा सौ अम्हाणा चितिया देउ ॥

‘Kṛṣṇa was born in Nanda’s Gokula. May that Lord Kṛṣṇa, who was looked at by the cowherdesses with loving eyes and who was called by them saying “do come here, O holder of the churning rod (?)”, grant our wishes’.

Lines 14-16 :

MS. A. बुद्धरूपे' जो दाणवसुरांव(वंच)इणि(D. पंचउणि)

MS. A. वेददूषण बोल्ड(G. उ)णि माया मोहिया,

MS. A. तो(D. ना) दे उमाशि पासाठ कर ॥

The restored text :

बुद्ध-रूपे' जो दाणव-सुरा वंचउणि,

वेद-दूषण बोल्डउणि, माया-मोहिया;

तो देउ माशि पसाठ कर ॥

‘May that God, who in the form of Buddha deceived and confused, by his delusive power, all the gods and demons (?), propounding the flaws of Vedic teaching, show favours to us.’

8. The illustration of Caturāṅgaka in a mixture of various languages given at IV 16 354 :

MS. A. यः स्रष्टा चतुराननस्य विबुधस्राणैकबद्धस्थितिः

MS. A. पदारविदरसलोकं दोदनीलप्यहे ॥

(MS. D. जोलबी वयणारविदभसल्लोकंदोदनीरप्यहो ॥)

MS. A. जोगोची(पी)जणे गाह(इ)जे बहु परि रूपे निहां ।

(MS. D. जो गोबीजणे गाइजे बहुपरी रूपी तिन्हो)

MS. A. गोमयसैकः शेशनलेसु लघुशशजण भासवंकसे ॥

(MS. D. गामय । शैकश्रेयामलेषुकइपुराजणे पालेदिशवंकशे ॥)

The restored text :

यः स्रष्टा चतुराननस्य विबुध-त्राणैक-बद्ध-स्थितिः ।

जो लच्छी-वयणारविद-भसलो कंदोद-नील-प्यहो ॥

जो गोपीजणि गाइजे बहु-परी रूपि तिन्हो गोमटो(?) ।

शे कंशे शमलेसु लक्षश-जणे मालेदि शवंकशे ॥

‘He, who is the creator of the four-faced god (Brahman), who is committed to the task of saving gods from distress, who is like a bee towards the lotus-face of Lakṣmī, who has dark lustre, who is being praised variously in songs by the cowherdesses, who has a lovely form (?). has killed Kāṁsa and all the other demons in battles’.

9. The illustration of Muktaṭali on p. 42, verse 6 (MS. D.; also found in G.) :

- MS. D. अवडोंगरकडणिये वाजेवानादुसुम्मर्ददीसइ-
 MS. G. अवो वाजिया सुम्मई
 MS. D. कालाहरिणुवेधं । घूसटसींगनादुजतुलं देवहु परिवाजइ ।
 MS. G. वेधे धूमपि जजतुलंशेवहु
 MS. D. गोवर्धनगिरिकंचरु गहिरुणजइ ।
 MS. G. गाजइ ॥
 MS. D. सुरेंद्रहणवाशिखियादेदयिनंदणकन्हरोहोवुकश्रियरूपे
 MS. G. सुरेइहें देवपि खियनुरूपे
 MS. D. सल्लेणां सावलिया गोउलिं बालियां पडिहेनयणां रन्हिकदेउं ऊवाल्या ॥
 MS. G. कवणां पडिहेनयणा रन्निहिन्ह ॥

The partially and tentatively restored text :

अवो डोंगर-कडणिए वाजिया नादु सुम्मइ ।
 दीसइ काला हरिणु ॥ वेधे घूमवि(?) सींग-नादु
छंदे बहु-परि वाजइ ।
 गोवर्धन-गिरि-कंदरु गाजइ ॥
 देवईनंदण कन्हडो.....
 रूपे सलोणा सांवलिया
 गोउलिं बालियां
 पडिहे नयणां रन्निहिं करेइ वाउल्यां ॥

‘Oh wonder ! Tunes being played on the hill slope are heard. A black buck is seen. The notes of the horn being played with abandon and in various modes, resounds and pierces the heart. The valleys of mount Govardhana reverberate. Devaki’s darling, sweet Kānha, lovely with dark beauty, when he happens to be sighted by the cowherd girls of Gokula in the woodlands, makes them restless with longing’.

10. The illustration of Dhavala on p. 43, verse 15 (MS. D.; also found in G.) :

The printed text :

धवलु हिमालउ धवलगायां(गंगा) धवलु एरावणु धवलु ।
चन्द्र धवलु महेसरु । धवलु छत्रु अ(त्र)म्हदेछपसने धवलु जसु ॥

The restored text :

धवलु हिमालउ धवल गंगा, धवलु एरावणु धवलु चंद्र ।
धवलु महेसरु धवलु छत्रु, अम्ह देउ पसन्नु धवलु जसु ॥

‘May white Himalaya, white Gaṅgā, the white moon and white Maheśvara, being pleased with us, grant us a white (royal) umbrella and bright glory.

11. The illustration of Ovi on p. 43, verse 20 (MS. D.; found also in G.) :

MS. D. गोत्रले गोलिनिह्यवि अचलुवलुतो मक्ष पडिहे
MS. G. गोघूलितिहां अवलु
MS. D. कन्तोसाचल्लादि(उ)विए ॥
MS. G. सांवल् दि

The restored text :

गोउले गोलिनि गृणिअ ।
वलु वलु तो मक्ष पडिहे ।
कन्हउ सांवल्, ओविए ॥

‘The cowherd g(rl in Gokula said—“Turn back, turn back, otherwise that dark Kāṇha will be pursuing (?) me.’

12. The illustration of Caryā at IV 16 380(=verse 58 on p. 47).

MS. A. संसारसोपूहदरैः कायहीनं चंडियो ।
MS. D. सारुदत्तरे कायरहितें
MS. A. कोहलोहमाह बहुकेण तरिया ।
MS. D. मोह णा भरिया (G) ।
MS. A. इंदियपयणखरवेगेव हंसि ।
MS. D. इंद्रिदिपवण गवह पि (G. हंथि) ।
MS. A. दुक्ति हलाहणिम नडिन पाचधि ॥
MS. D. दुक्कियलाहरिहणि यत्ति तपावधिः ॥ (G. पावधि)

The restored text :

संसार-सायर-दुत्तरे पडिया
कोह-लोह-मोह-बहुएण भरिया ।
इन्दिय-पवण-खर-वेगेण वहंथि
दुक्किय-लहरि-हणिय तडि न पावंथि ॥

‘Those who have fallen in the unfordable ocean of trans- migratory world, who are loaded with anger, greed and delusion, who are carried away by the force of strong winds of senses, and who are struck by the waves of evil deeds, do not reach the shore

13. The illustration of Dohaḍa at IV 16 421 (=verse 77 on p. 49) :

MS. A. गोरीनयणहं जोरस्वैजो कंसहखयकातु ।
MS. D. गोविनयनह कंसखयकातु ।
MS. A. सो अम्हण दुरिअइ यवहरतकम्हुतरा डावाळ ।
सो अम्ह वहरउ कम्हभराडोवाळ ॥

The restored text :

गोवो-नयणहिं जो रवंइ(?), जो कंसह खय-कातु ।
सो अम्ह-दुरियइ अवहरउ, कम्हु भडारा बाळ ॥

‘May that Boy Kṛṣṇa, the Lord, who plays(?) in the eyes of cowherdesses and who was the destruction of Kāṁsa, remove our sins’.

NOTES

1. Passages 9, 10 and 11 are found only in MS. D.
2. The Dvipathaka defined at IV 258-259 and illustrated at 260 is metrically the same as Dohaḍa or Dohā, wellknown in Apabhrāmśa prosody. Further Rāhaḍi, Jhambaḍa, Ḍollari, Lollī, Danti etc., defined but not illustrated at *Mānasollāsa* IV 419-429 were composed in Deśa-bhāṣās. In the case of some of these, the language to be used is specified, and all of them are called Laukika Prabandhas (550 and ff.).

3. The third Pāda (except the last syllable अ, preserved in MS. A.) is missing in the Mss.

16. ON THE PRAKRIT SOURCES OF CERTAIN INDIAN POPULAR TALE-TYPES AND TALE-MOTIFS

That Classical Indian literature is the richest and most fundamental source for the historical-comparative study of folk-tales is now a matter of common knowledge. Quite valuable work has been done so far in exploring Indian Classical works from this point of view. But scholars have little realized that there is a serious gap in their efforts in this area. As compared to the Sanskrit and Pāli sources on the one hand and the Modern Indian sources on the other, sufficient attention has not been paid to the Prakrit sources, in spite of the fact that the latter are probably the richest, and of immediate relevance to the Indian as well as the comparative folklorist. For many well-known tale-types and tale-motifs current in India and abroad, we find corresponding Prakrit versions that possess some unique historical significance : either they are the earliest known versions (any Sanskrit version being unknown or clearly secondary), or they are closer and more akin in form and content to the Late Medieval and Modern versions as against the earlier Sanskrit versions. Here it is proposed to illustrate this point by discussing just a few of hundreds of interesting instances.

The tales discussed here are as follows :

1. The Magic Bird Heart (Type 567). 2. The Danced-out Shoes (Type 306). 3. What Should I Have Done (Type 1696, Motif J 2461). 4. Cinderella (Type 510). 5. Clever Retribution (Motif J 1160). 6. Candana-Malayāgiri. 7. The Patridge in the Cart (Motif of Clever Retorts : J 1511-17).¹

1. The Magic Bird-Heart (Type 567)

The wide-spread tale of the wanderings and vicissitudes of fortune of two brothers called 'The Magic Bird-Heart' by the

Western folklorists² (=Aarne and Thompson's Tale Type No. 567) is preserved in several closely allied versions in the oral tradition as well as the Medieval literary tradition of Gujarat. Looking to its continuous popularity for some fifteen hundred years, it is bound to be one of the tales of common Indian inheritance.

In its basic outline the tale is about two brothers, whom circumstances force to leave their native place. They travel abroad. Due to some lucky accident or divine favour they happen to eat respectively the head (or heart) and some other part of a magic bird, in consequence of which the elder gets a kingdom and the younger a daily supply of gold coins. The two brothers become separated. The younger passes through several ups and downs, and during his encounter with a cheating bawd he is deprived of his magic possession. He, however, takes revenge on her by turning her into a she-ass by virtue of his newly acquired magic power. Ultimately the two brothers are happily united.³

The earliest known version comes from the Pāli Jātakas. But we have also quite an early version of this tale in the story of the merchant Kāṣṭha given in the *Āvatsyaka* commentaries. It is also known from numerous works on the lifestory of Maṇipati and from several other independent narratives in Sanskrit, Prakrit and Old Gujarati. The tale is widespread also in the West. The Prakrit version found in Ratnaprabha's *Doghattī* commentary (composed in 1182 A.D.) on the *Upadeśamāla* is nearest to the core of modern versions as also of those current abroad, and as such its importance for tracing the ultimate source of the latter is quite obvious.

2. The Danced-out Shoes (Type 306)

Thompson has the following note on this tale-type :

'It is discovered that a princess absents herself at night and always returns with her shoes danced to pieces. She is offered in marriage to the man who can solve the mystery of her conduct. She has succeeded in giving a narcotic to all those who have tried

to follow her, but the hero refuses to drink and accompanies her on a magic underground journey. He possesses the power of making himself invisible and is able to observe her when she dances with the supernatural being whom she visits every night. By means of tokens which he has brought from his subterranean realm, he is able to prove his story and to claim his reward.

This tale . . . seems to be Central European with most frequent appearance in the area from Serbia north of Finland. It does not, so far as is now known, go east of Russia and is represented but once in France and Portugal. A single version is found in Central Africa, and it has not thus far been reported in any other continents. Within its rather narrow geographical range it seems to be fairly popular, since somewhat more than a hundred variants are known.

The heroine in 'The Danced-out Shoes', does not seem to be anxious to be rescued from her otherworld lover.⁴

These observations of Thompson's about the original source, form and area of currency of the Danced-out shoes shall have to be now basically revised in the light of the Prakrit and early vernacular literary versions of the story known from India.

In Śīlāṅka's *Caupannamahāpurīsa-cariya* (879 A.D.)⁵ we find under the account of Svayambhū Vāsudeva and Bhadra Baladeva, the story of Guṇavarman and Kanakavatī. Its outline is as follows :

Princess Kanakavatī while choosing prince Guṇavarman as her husband had made it known to him beforehand that because she was bound by a certain pledge, she would live separately till she becomes free from the binding. After many days of separate life, the prince acquired the power to become invisible in lieu of the services he rendered to a Kāpālīka, and in virtue of that power he managed to smuggle himself into the magic aerial car that one night he found carrying the princess and her two maids secretly to the divine Nandana garden. She was to give a dance performance there in the temple of Rṣabhadeva along with three

princesses who too arrived there from three other quarters. The four princesses were regularly subjected to perform this forced service by a wicked Vidyādhara who had bound them by a pledge. The prince managed to steal a small bell that got loosened from an anklet of his wife during her dance performance. He returned home in the magic car along with the princess.

The next day the prince produced the token of the small bell before the princess. He repeated his performance on the second night, but this time he secured an anklet of the princess that slipped from her foot during the dance. This again was shown to the princess next day. She then guessed that the prince had somehow come to know about her clandestine nightly visits. On the third night the princess excused herself on the ground of indisposition, and sent her maids to the Vidyādhara. As the latter indignantly threatened them to kill, the prince became visible and killed the Vidyādhara in a fight. The princess, thus freed from the slavish bondage, now accepted the prince with unbounded love.

The story continues further and turns into that of the faithless wife, but that seems to be quite obviously a secondary development, being on the same footing as the frame story in which the whole is placed.

A second version of this story is found as the prologue to the Tale of Pañcadaṇḍa-chatra that formed a part of the Vikramāditya cycle.⁶ We have several Medieval Gujarati versions beginning from the 16th century and one Sanskrit version (obviously based on an Old Gujarati version). Vikramāditya was promised Devadamanī, the beautiful daughter of the courtesan on condition that he defeated her at the game of dice. She was invincible at that game because of a divine boon. Vikramāditya also obtains divine favour and invisibly accompanying her finds out about her secret nightly visits for dancing at the court of Indra. Thus he succeeds in confusing and defeating her at the dice game by producing tokens of her clandestine visits and thereby winning her in marriage.

Of the two versions of 'The Danced-out Shoes', the Pañcadaṇḍa version is nearer to the basic Western version. The marriage with Devadamani forms a part of the frame-story of the Pañcadaṇḍa and it remains to be investigated whether it was in the original Pañcadaṇḍa (that served as a source to the Gujarati adaptations) or was a later growth. Eventhough Indian versions do not have the danced-out shoes as the basic clue, the Indian origin of this tale is beyond any doubt.

3. What Should I Have Done (Type 1696, Motif J. 2461)

The stories about the literal-minded fool misapplying his instructions and thus landing himself into troubles and absurdities are widely current in all parts of India. Thompson observes⁷ that the best-known tale of this kind has to do with the mother who tells her son what he should do in various circumstances. The stories usually have a ingenuous chain of foolishly applied instructions. According to Thompson the story is traceable to a Chinese Buddhist source and appears in several Renaissance Jestbooks.

An early Indian version of this type is found in Prakrit in the story of the Village Dolt given in the *Dharmopadeśamālā-vivaraṇa* of Jayasimha-sūri⁴ (Story No. 89, p. 159), composed in 859 A. D. at Nagor in Marwar. The substance of the story is as follows :

When a certain person in the king's service died, his helpless widow left the city and settled in a village, taking her small boy along with her. When the boy came of age he started to join the king's service. His mother tried to dissuade him as he did not know the appropriate ways and manners, but the boy expressed readiness to learn. So the mother gave him the first lesson : When you see a respectable person even from a distance, greet him immediately, saying very loudly the word of salutation. Thus instructed the boy went out and on his way saw a group of hunters hiding and lying in wait for deer. He greeted them from a distance with a wild shout. The deer were scared away. The

hunters scolded the boy and when the latter explained his behaviour, they advised him : When you see persons hiding in this manner, you should approach them quite slowly and noiselessly. Proceeding further the boy saw a group of policemen who were on the trail of a thief and were waiting in a hide-out. The boy began to move very cautiously. They took him for the thief and bound him with a rope. When he explained they advised him to say in like situation, 'May the blight descend'. Further on his way the boy saw a group of farmers starting ploughing operations and he blurted out 'May the blight descend here'. They belaboured him, and when he explained his behaviour, they advised him that in such situations he should say 'May all your carts be filled up.' As the boy moved further, he saw a dead body being carried and he cried, 'May all your carts be filled with dead bodies'. He received a good beating and also the instruction that in a situation like that he should say 'May such an event never take place'. Shortly the boy got an occasion to say these words at a marriage ceremony in progress. Being instructed there to say in a similar situation, 'May this be a permanent feature', he pronounced these words when he saw a chieftain in fetters. There again he was taught to say 'May you be soon freed from these'. At last with many similar misadventures, the boy came to the king and was appointed his personal attendant. Here too he went on bungling. He was instructed by the king that while he was in assembly, whatever the boy had to convey to him was to be done at a proper moment and only in an undertone. The boy followed these instructions quite precisely when he came to the king to convey the news that the house was on fire. And finally, instructed to throw ashes, dust and water whenever he saw smoke issuing from something, he carried this out when once the king's body was being fumigated.

4. Cinderella (Type 510)

As already pointed out by Hiralal Jain⁹ the stories of Sugandhadasāmī and Ārāmaśobhā known from several Jain works in

Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati give us the two earlier versions of the tale that is well-known in the West in hundreds of versions as the story of Cinderella. As I have on hand a detailed study of these classical Indian versions, I shall not discuss them here. But I may draw attention to one point : As Devendra-sūri's *Mūlasuddhi* commentary, composed in 1090 A. D., contains the story of *Ārāmaśobhā*, it is to be accepted as a version earlier than that in the *Sugandhadaśamī* Tale.¹⁰ There is now no reason to assume it as a derivative of the latter, and this accords with the fact of the greater resemblance of Cinderella to *Ārāmaśobhā* than to *Sugandhadaśamī*.

5. Clever Retribution

In *Bengali Household Tales* (1912), Maculloch has recorded two tales of a clever labourer (or Brahmin Youth). He does a number of mischiefs openly and pleads cleverly in the court about his innocence as in every case he had acted in accordance with the very words of the complainants, which, of course, he had taken quite literally. He smashed the oil-pots of an oil-woman because she herself had quoted a proverb : 'Spilling oil extends the life-span'. He wrapped oilsoaked rags around a monkey's tail and set it on fire because a pious old lady wished *not to listen* to but *actually witness* the *Rāmāyaṇa* episode of the burning of *Laṅkā* by Hanumant. He passionately kissed a betel-seller's wife because that fellow remarked to him, 'For your two cowries you can certainly lick the spittle of a betelchewer' !

In another such story from the same collection, the clever youth, while being led to the court for similar mischiefs slaps on the way a passer-by who had remarked that a long journey is shortened by quarrelling.

These stories contain several familiar motifs including one of Literal Pleading (J 1160).

A tale very closely akin to these appears in *Āmradeva-sūri's* commentary (written in 1134 A.D.) on *Nemicandra-gaṇin's Ākhyān-*

*akamaṇikoṣa*¹¹ (1073-1083 A.D.). It occurs as an emboxed story in the Tale of Bandhudatta (verses 14-48; pp. 283-286). Its outline follows.

Tired of his ill-tempered wife, a man of noble family left for the nearby city. Some youthful and boisterous milk-maids too were going to the city and they joined him on the way. Not caring for his depressed mood, they tried to engage him in some frivolous chitchat, so much so that it got upon his nerves. The girls pressed him either to tell a story or even pick up a quarrel with them so that the long journey may be shortened. He immediately grabbed at the chance and put his foot across the legs of one of them. She stumbled and fell over one that was walking in front of her, and all of them thus fell down breaking to pieces their pots full of curds. They cursed the noble man and started quarrelling with him. Soon all of them reached the city, and the nobleman somehow managed to leave the sore milkmaids' company. He went to the courtesans' quarters and got a night's shelter at a Dharmasālā. A bawd approached him and pressed him to narrate to her some episode from the Rāmāyaṇa or the Mahābhārata. He requested her to leave him in peace as he was deadly tired, but she kept on pestering. Enraged, he knocked out her teeth with a blow and set the house on fire by means of the lamp-flame. He was immediately arrested for these acts and produced before the king. The milkmaids had been already there with their complaint. The nobleman pleaded that being harassed beyond tolerance by the two parties he took them at their words. In one case he picked up quarrel as he was advised to do and in the other case he gave the actual demonstration of the two incidents from the Rāmāyaṇa : Hanumat's blow had scattered the pearls from Ravana's diadem : this was matched by knocking out the bawd's teeth; and the burning of Laṅkā was matched by setting the house on fire. The king gave his verdict : 'Not guilty'. The close kinship of this tale with the tales from Bengal referred to above is quite obvious.

6. Candana-Malayāgiri

Some ten versions of this tale are known from the Medieval Gujarati literature.¹² It relates the adverse turns of fortune of a king beginning with the loss of kingdom. In the exile the king Candana, his queen Malayāgiri and their two sons Sāyara and Nīra are separated from one another. They undergo many sufferings and are ultimately reunited happily. In the Hindi speaking region this story is also known from the oral tradition, the names of the four chief characters being Āmbā, Āmili, Sarvar and Nīr. The earliest version of the tale is known so far from a Prakrit work dated 1083 A.D. In the fourth chapter of the *Mahāvīracariya* of Guṇacandra¹³ what is given as the story of King Naravikrama is the same as the later tale of Candana-Malayāgiri. There is sufficient evidence to believe that Guṇacandra derived this story from a popular source.

7. The Partridge in the Cart (Motif J 1511.17)

Thompson and Balys have recorded from Thornburn's *Bannu, or our Afghan Frontier* a tale outlined as follows :¹⁴ Ox bought; buyer also claims load of wood attached. Later deceived man disguises and sells sharper another ox for 'hand of coppers'. He is allowed by court to claim the hand as well.

In Saṅghadāsa's *Vasudevahindī*¹⁵ (c. fifth century A.D.), we find an anecdote of the Partridge in the Cart which seems to be the earliest source for the above noted tale.

A farmer goes to city with a cart-load of grains for sale. There is also a caged partridge on the cart. Some clever merchants ask the farmer : 'Is this partridge in the cart for sale ?' Being told that it can be bought for a Kārṣāpaṇa, the merchants pay the price and carry away the partridge along with the cart. The court accepts the merchant's interpretation of the phrase 'partridge-in-the-cart' and decides the case in their favour. Then tutored by a clever person, the farmer approaches one of the same group of merchants with the offer of his ox for just two measures of barley-

meal, provided they are given 'with her own hand' by the merchant's wife putting on her best dress and all the jewels. The merchant agrees, and the farmer takes possession of the wife along with the barley-meal. The case is decided this time in the farmer's favour.

These are only a few instances out of a great many wherein we can point out quite an early Prakrit original for widely popular tales current in India and outside. A systematic and comprehensive study of the Prakrit stories from this point of view is an urgent necessity. If an encyclopaedia of Middle Indo-Aryan tale-types and tale-motifs can be prepared, it would be certainly an invaluable and lasting contribution to the comparative and historical study of the tales of the world in general and of India in particular.

The few tales discussed here have also another quite important implication. Many of the conclusions of the Western folk-tale students regarding the sources, original form, nomenclature, classification and diffusion of numerous tale-types and tale-motifs stand in need of drastic revision in the light of a huge amount of fresh information, that is available from Prakrit literature. So far the scholars have been able to make very little use of this evidence because of various reasons. A considerable part of Prakrit story literature still lies buried in manuscripts. Many of the works have been published only during the last few decades. Moreover, for most of the stories only the bare text is known. No translation is available in any European or Indian language. It is obvious that until these handicaps are removed there are slender chances for a wider and more fruitful utilisation of Prakrit sources.

Notes

1. For the Type and Motif numbers, see Stith Thompson, *The Folktale*, 1946.
2. *The Folktale*, p. 75.

3. For a detailed study, see the following paper. It was published in *Bharatiya Vidya* Vol. XXIII, 1-4, 1963 pp. 99-104. Earlier Version published as 'Four Old and Medieval Versions of The Magic Bird-Heart', Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Congress of Orientalists, Vol. III, Pt. I edited by R. V. Dandekar, 1970. See also 'Kāṣṭha Śeṭh ni Dṛṣṭānta-Kathā' (in Gujarati), Bhayani H. C., *Anusāṁdhān*, 1972, pp. 34-38. For recent studies, see the postscript in the following paper.
4. *The Folktale*, pp. 34-35.
5. Ed. Bhojak A. M., 1961; see pp. 117-127; also Bhayani H. C., *Anusāṁdhān*, 26-33.
6. For the tale of Pañcadaṇḍa, onwards from the fifteenth century we get nine versions in Sanskrit and nine in Gujarati.
7. *The Folktale*, p. 195.
8. Ed. Gandhi L. B., 1949.
9. Jain Hiralal (Ed), *Sugandhadaśami Kathā*, 1966, Introduction, pp. 16-18.
10. See General Editor's preface to *Mūlaśuddhi Prakaraṇa*, ed. Bhojak A. M., 1971, p. 8. A few oral versions of the tale also has been recently recorded from Gujarat by Prof. Shantilal Acharya. Jayant Kothari, in his *Ārāmaśobhā Rāsmālā* (in Gujarati, 1989, Ahmedabad), has edited six Old Gujarati versions of the story of Ārāmaśobhā, has presented a comparative study of these versions along with three Prakrit and three Sanskrit versions and has given notes on the motifs.
11. Ed. Muni Punyavijay, 1962. For the discussion see Bhayani H. C., *Anusāṁdhān*, pp. 4249.
12. See R. N. Jani, 'The Jain and Non-Jain versions of the popular Tale of Candana-Malayāgiri from Prakrit and other Early Literary Sources', *Mahāvīr Jaina Vidyālaya Golden Jubilee Volume*, I, 1968, pp. 225-232.
13. Ed. Sagarānand-sūri, 1929.
14. Thompson S. and Balys J., *The Oral Tales of India*, 1958, p. 266.
15. Ed. Caturvijay and Punyavijay, 1930, see pp. 57-58.

17. THE MAGIC BIRD-HEART

1. The tale called 'The Magic Bird-Heart' (=Aarne-Thompsons' Tale Type 303¹) has been exhaustively studied by Aarne.² He favours Western Asia ('perhaps Persia'), rather than India, as its most plausible home. Summarizing his findings in this matter Thompson observes :³

'The story of the magic bird-heart has been cited in the older literature as an illustration of a tale which has travelled from India into Europe. Aarne's exhaustive study, however, while indicating an Asiatic origin, concludes that the most plausible home for the story is Western Asia, perhaps Persia. It is well known in Eastern Europe, especially in Russia and around the Baltic, but it is to be found in Western and Southern Europe as well. It is frequently found in North Africa and is reported once from much farther south in that continent.

The French have taken it to Canada, where they still tell it, and from them it has doubtless been learned by the Ojibwas of southern Ontario. Though it is found in the Persian *Tuti-Nameh* of around 1300 A. D., Aarne demonstrates clearly that its life has been primarily oral and practically uninfluenced by literary retellings.'

2. The probable form of the original tale as reconstructed by Aarne after a careful analysis is reproduced below from *The Folktale*⁴.

'Fate has brought into the possession of a poor man a magic bird which lays golden eggs. The man sells the precious eggs and becomes rich. Once he goes on a trip and leaves the bird with his wife to take care of. In his absence the man who has bought the eggs (sometimes another) comes to the wife and engages in a love affair with her and persuades her to prepare and serve the marvellous bird for his meal. The bird possesses a wonderful trait, that whoever shall eat its head will become ruler and whoever

swallows its heart will find gold under his pillow when he has been sleeping. The bird is killed and prepared, but by chance falls into the hands of the two sons of the man who is absent on his journey. Knowing nothing of the wonderful characteristics of the bird, they eat the head and the heart. The lover does not give up his plan, for he knows that a roast which is prepared from the eaters of the bird will have the same effect as the bird itself, and he demands that the boys should be killed, and finally persuades the mother to agree. The boys suspect the plot and flee. The one who has eaten the head arrives in a kingdom where the old ruler has just died and the new one must be chosen. Through some type of marvelous manifestation the young man is chosen ruler. The other boy receives all the gold he wished. In the course of his adventures he is betrayed by a girl and an old woman. He punishes the girl by using his magic power to turn into an ass so that she will be severely beaten. But at last he restores her to her human form. In most versions the boys eventually punish their mother'.

3. Aarne's conclusions about the original source and form of this tale are naturally conditioned by the range of the data then known or available to him. But now we are in a position to significantly enlarge that range on the Indian side, for besides the one version that is known in English since 1897, there are some three more versions (with a few variants) in Early Indian literature that have come to light during recent years. The aims of this paper are to report these versions, and to discuss their relationship mutually and with Aarne's reconstructed version.

4. The four Indian versions of the Magic Bird-Heart we are to discuss here are as under :

S. No.	Title of the Story	Title of the work & place of occurrence	Author (or editor)	Date	Language
I.	Master Banyan (Nigrodha)	Jātaka, No. 445	—	c. 5th Cent.	Pāli

IA.	Good-luck (Siri)	Jātaka, No. 284	—	c. 5th cent.	Pāli
II.	Cheating the Bawd (Kuṭṭani-vañcana)	Śṛṅgāramañjari kathā (seventh story)	Bhoja	10th Cent.	Sanskrit
III.	Lohārgalā	The <i>Doghṭṭi</i> commentary on the <i>Upa-deśamālā</i> of Dharmadāsa-gaṇi (The story narrated by Nāgasenā, the fifth wife of Jambūsvāmin in the life-story of Jambū)	Ratnaprabhasūri	1182	Prakrit
IV.	Haṁsāuli	Independent work	Asāita	mid 14th Cent.	Old Gujarati
IVA.	Candana-Malayāgiri	Vetālapaciśi (8th story)	Śāmala Bhaṭṭa	1745	,,
IVB.	Mānsih and Abhesih	Gujarāt Tathā Kāṭhiāvād Deś-ni Vārtā (Part II) (The Folk-lore of Gujarāt)	F.B.	1874	Modern Gujarati (oral tradition)

5. The substance of the Nigrodha-Jātaka⁵ (No. 445) is as follows :

A great merchant of Rājagṛha got some country merchant's daughter for his son's wife. In order to save herself from the slight and ill-treatment of being barren, she pretended to be pregnant

by means of various clever tricks. After nine months she left for her father's house for delivery. On her way she halted at a place near a banyan tree, where she found a new-born boy abandoned by some poor woman travelling with a foregoing caravan. She at once informed her nurse and attendants that she had brought forth a son. The message was sent to Rājagrha and her husband's parents asked her to return. As the boy was born under a banyan tree, he was named Nigrodha-kumāra, or Master Banyan. That same day, the daughter-in-law of another merchant, on her way home to her father for the birth, brought forth a son beneath the branches of a tree; and him they named Śākha-kumāra, Master Branch. And on the same day, the wife of a tailor in the employ of this merchant bore a son amidst his bits of cloth; and him they called Pottika, or Dollie. The great merchant sent for these two children and brought them up with Master Banyan.

They all grew up together, and by and by went to Takkaśilā to complete their education. Both the merchant's sons had two thousand pieces to give to their teacher for a fee; Master Banyan provided Pottika with an education under his own wing.

When their education was finished, they took leave of their teacher and left him, with intent to learn customs of the country folk, and travelling on and on in time they came to Benares, and lay down to rest in a temple. They slept under a tree. At dawn Pottika awoke, and sitting up began to chafe Banyan's feet. Then a quarrel started among the two cocks roosting upon that tree because the cock on the upper branch let a dropping fall upon the cock on the lower branch. They boasted of their importance. The lower cock declared that whoever ate his flesh would receive a thousand pieces of money that very morning. The upper cock declared that whoever ate his fat would become a king that very morning; he that ate his middle flesh, would become Commander-in-Chief; who ate the flesh about the bones, he would be Treasurer.

Pottika heard them. He caught the upper cock, killed it and cooked it. The fat he gave to Banyan, the middle flesh to Branch

and himself ate the flesh that was about the bones. Thereafter he told them about the outcome. After meal in the city, they rested in the royal park. Now it was then the eighth day since the king of Benares had died childless, and the ceremonial chariot that was to be sent forth at the moment itself rolled in where Banyan and his comrades were resting. The chaplain made sure of the royal marks upon the feet of Banyan and at once he consecrated him as the king. Banyan appointed Branch as his Commander-in-chief.

Once Banyan asked Branch to go to Rajagṛha and bring their parents. Branch refused to go saying it was not his business. Thereupon Banyan told Pottika to do it. Pottika agreed. He approached the parents, but all of them refused to go with him, as they were quite happy where they were. Pottika returned to Benares and being fatigued went to rest to Branch's house. As the latter bore a grudge against Pottika, for giving Banyan the kingdom instead of him, he kicked and belaboured him and threw him out. Sore due to such ungrateful treatment, Pottika went to Banyan. He received and treated him very cordially. In the meanwhile Branch too, afraid of being slandered before the king, came up. But in his very presence Pottika reported to the king about his ill-treatment at the hands of Branch. The king ordered to spear him, but Pottika got him pardoned. The king offered the post of Commander-in-Chief to Pottika, but as the latter declined it he was made Royal Treasurer and the Judge of all the merchant guilds.

5.1. The story is given with the purpose of illustrating ingratitude and treachery to friends.

5.2. The same incident of two quarrelling cocks with the same magic properties is found in *Siri-Jātaka*⁶ (No. 284). The slight variations in the properties possessed by the upper cock are: for a woman queenship is the alternative to becoming Commander-in-Chief, and for a holy man, king's favour is an alternative for becoming royal treasurer. The three parts are the fleshy parts, the

outside and the flesh about the bones. A wood-cutter who happens to hear the words of the cocks, gets the meat of the upper cock ready, but while he is bathing, the meat is washed away by the river and comes in possession of an elephant trainer who was then giving his elephants a bath. On the third day after eating the fleshy parts under the advice of a friendly ascetic the elephant trainer becomes king under the following circumstances: Invaded by a neighbouring king, the king of Benares sends the elephant trainer disguised as king to fight the invader. He himself too puts on a disguise, mingles with the ranks and gets killed in the battle. The elephant trainer manages to defeat and slay the invader, and gets kingship as his reward.

5.3. The tale is given to illustrate how luck at times changes hands.

5.4. The Jātaka tale summarized in 5. is obviously made up of two originally independent parts. The first part based on the simulated pregnancy motif hangs together quite tenuously with the second part. In the second part too the story up to the point where the three companions finish their studies and start to see the world at large is sort of an introduction that need not be an integral part of the original story. Similarly the sequel seems to some degree a later modification that turns the story into one of ungrateful friend. Leaving aside these obviously later accretions and analysing the story that is left, we can distinguish the following points :

- (1) The hero (the son of a great merchant) and his two companions go out to foreign lands.
- (2) On their way, once they spend a night under a tree on which two birds (cocks) with magical properties rested.
- (3) One bird has such properties that whoever eats its fat, becomes a king next day; whoever eats his middle flesh becomes Commander-in-Chief; and whoever eats his flesh about bones becomes the Royal Treasurer. The other bird has such property that whoever eats his flesh gets one thousand gold pieces next morning. This second bird does not play any further part in the story.

- (4) One of the hero's companions happens to learn about these properties as the birds give them out in a mutual quarrel.
- (5) He kills the kingship-bird, gives its fat to the hero, the middle flesh to the other companion, and himself eats the flesh about the bones.
- (6) The next day, the hero is chosen king in place of one that had just died without an heir. To the first companion he gives the post of Commander-in-Chief.
- (7) The remaining companion gets the post of Royal Treasurer after some unpleasant experiences.

5.5. The version I A is clearly secondary as compared to I. The incident of the disputing cocks is practically the same as in I, but the alternatives added to the magic properties of the less important parts of the kingship-cock are later elaborations and are felt as special provisions made for the wood-cutter's wife and the friendly monk. Also the manner of the wood-cutter's becoming a king seems to be an innovation. The sequel is newly added, consistently with the purpose of making the story one of good luck changing hands.

6. The substance of the tale of cheating the Bawd (*Kuṭṭani-vācāna*) from Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāramañjarikathā*⁷ is as follows :

A Brahmin got two sons at an advanced age. They were named Viṣṇudatta and Somadatta. When they came of age, they started to go abroad. For seven days they journeyed in midsummer through the terrific Vindhya forest on their stock of provisions and water was exhausted. Famished and exhausted, they rested under a banyan tree on a lake and at night kept watch in turn to guard against wild animals. At the third watch Somadatta heard a pair of doves (male and female) conversing to the effect that it was their duty to save the Brahmin boys, who happened to be their guests, from dying through hunger. They also made known the magic trait Sage Uttanka had said they possessed : whoever shall eat the male bird will become a ruler and whoever shall eat the female bird will find five hundred gold coins near his bed

every day when he wakes up in the morning. Having said this, the doves immediately threw themselves in the burning fire set up by the Brahmin boys below the tree to scare away animals. Somadatta awakened Viṣṇudatta and narrated what happened. He gave him the male bird to eat and himself ate the female. When Somadatta awoke in the morning, he found five hundred gold coins near him. Convinced of the truth of what the doves said, they resumed their journey. During the course of their travel, one of them became thirsty. He went in search of water and returning lost his way. The two brothers were separated. In course of their separate wanderings, the elder, Viṣṇudatta, became king of Magadha. The younger, Somadatta arrived in Kāñci and enjoyed in the company of the most beautiful courtesan Karpūrikā, the daughter to the bawd Makaradaṃṣṭrā. Under the latter's instruction, Karpūrikā made Somadatta divulge to her the secret of the magic female dove, the source of his inexhaustible wealth. The next day an emetic was mixed up with Somadatta's food. The female dove he vomitted out was grabbed and swallowed up by Makaradaṃṣṭrā. Somadatta, now rendered penniless, was turned out.

Repentant Somadatta got the news of Viṣṇudatta's kingship. He went to Magadha, met his brother, conceived a plan of avenging himself and returned to Kāñci with rich pomp and paraphernalia. He took up residence with a courtesan in Makaradaṃṣṭrā's neighbourhood and started spending lavishly.

Here there is a gap in the narrative due to a lacuna in the text. It covered the incidents of Somadatta inducing Karpūrikā to witness the secretly contrived spectacle of producing right royal service and entertainment just by crowing like a cock. This was pre-arranged by him under a Pipal tree outside the city. When pressed by Karpūrikā, he explained that was due to a magic power he had acquired at Śrīparvata by performing life-risking austerities. She easily fell into the trap and arranged a barter. In exchange for Somadatta's magic power she agreed to give him the deceitfully expropriated magic dove with the whole of her accumulated wealth thrown in. Accordingly Makaradaṃṣṭrā vomitted the female

dove. Somadatta washed it and swallowed. All her wealth also was made over to him. For his part he ceremoniously transferred to Karpurikā the magic charm he was believed to possess. Then he secretly instructed his servants to continue for further five days the got-up show they used to put forth under the Pipal tree consequent upon the so-called magic cock-crow, and himself left for Magadha. For five days Karpūrikā enjoyed the royal service that on crowing appeared as if from nowhere. On the sixth day she wandered under the Pipal crowing and crowing till her throat ached but not a soul turned up. With downcast face she returned to her residence alog with her mother and the maids.

6.1. The tale is narrated by a bawd as a part of instructions to her inexperienced daughter, a top ranking courtesan. Its purpose is to illustrate the cleverness of rogues. The moral is drawn : A discerning courtesan should not fleece the rogues too much, otherwise they would manage to relieve her of all her accumulated earnings. Like many other illustrative tales in the *Śṛṅgāramañjarī*, this one also is obviously borrowed from the storehouse of the then current popular stories.

6.2. We may note the following points from this version :

- (1) Two brother start on a travel to foreign lands to try their luck.
- (2) Once hungry and exhausted on their way, they spend a night under a tree in the thick of a forest. There rested on that tree two doves, a male and a female, possessing magical properties.
- (3) The male dove has such a property that whoever eats it becomes a king. The female dove's property is that whoever eats it finds five hundred gold coins near his bed every morning.
- (4) The merciful doves declare their wonderful properties within the hearing of the younger brother and then throw themselves in fire in self-immolation.
- (5) The younger brother gives the male bird to the elder brother to eat and himself eats the female one. He starts finding five hundred gold coins every marning.

- (6) On their resumed journey, they get separated as they go out in search of water.
- (7) The elder in course of time gets kingship.
- (8) The younger during his wanderings reaches a distant city and stays with a courtesan, whose mother cheats him out of the magic female dove.
- (9) Learning about his elder brother's fortune, he goes to him. Equipping himself with necessary means and materials he returns to the courtesan and through a confidence trick recovers his female dove and relieves her of all her wealth, in exchange for a false magic power he leads her to believe he possesses.

7. The substance of the tale of the two brothers Amarasena and Pravarasena from Ratnaprabha's *Doghāṭṭi* commentary⁸ on the didactic poem *Upadeśamālā* of Dharmadāsa is as follows⁹ :

King Kāñcanaśekhara of Kāñcanapura had two sons, the first called Amarasena, the second, Pravarasena. They used to ride the wonder-elephant Jayakuñjara, a favour from the king, and had a pleasant time. Their envious step-mother, most favourite of the king, coastantly incited him to take back the elephant and present it to her own son. The king did not like to ask back what was presented—and especially when the princes were quite loyal to him and well-behaved, But ultimately giving way under her relentless pressure, he asked the two princes to return Jayakuñjara and accept in lieu ten ordinary elephants. The princes could at once see who was at the back of this development. The loss of honour was one thing they could never bear, and that very night they secretly left their home and their city to try their fate in the wide world.

On their way they landed into a dense jungle. They camped below a huge banyan tree to spend the night. Amarasena, the elder one, was overpowered with sleep. Pravarasena kept the guard. The presiding Yakṣa of that tree, favourably impressed by their noble and fortunate aspect, was moved to oblige them. He appeared before Pravarasena and presented him with two wonder-gems; one for Amarascna, bringing kingship; the other for Pravarasena, yield-

ing wealth and other amenities as desired. The Yakṣa also taught him the rite that should accompany every act of wishing, and then he disappeared. Next day, the two brothers resumed their journey and after crossing the forest reached Pāṭalīpura. While they rested on the bank of a lake, Pravarasena handed over the kingship-gem to Amarasena and instructed him in the essential rite. Both of them duly performed the rite and then asked for boons from their gems. Pravarasena's wish for a sumptuous dinner, dress etc. was immediately fulfilled by eight Apsarases, that appeared from nowhere. They served them with royal dinner, dress etc. and when the brothers finished their meals, those Apsarases and all disappeared. As they retired for rest under a shady tree five 'divine agents' sought out Amarasena and crowned him king of Pāṭalīpura, in place of the former one, who had just died childless. Pravarasena, thinking that Amarasena would be too busy with state-affairs to attend to him, moved away unnoticed, and stayed with the courtesan Māgadhikā. Amarasena's efforts could not trace him. Pravarasena spent lavishly. Once, pressed by her mother Lohārgalā, unwilling Māgadhikā extracted from Pravarasena the secret of his boundless liberality that never refused even exorbitant demands. Lohārgalā, thenceforth always on look-out for a chance, at last succeeded in stealing Pravarasena's wonder-gem, when once, while bathing he had left it unattended. First he thought he had lost it somewhere in the house, and Lohārgalā pretended to help him in the search, but finally he realized that Lohārgalā was the thief. He, therefore, secretly left the place in search of some means to take reprisal. Māgadhikā was sorry for losing Pravarasena. Lohārgalā too became quite disappointed when she found that the gem, unaccompanied by proper ceremonial rites, did not fulfil wishes.

Pravarasena went to a cemetary. He proclaimed to the ghosts his readiness to give his flesh as an offering. An aerial voice directed him to the temple of Durgā. There he attacked and killed a Kāpālīka, who was on the point of beheading an innocent human victim for an offering to the goddess. As a result he came into possession of the magic shoes of the Kāpālīka, that would take him wherever he wanted to go. Using them he used to fetch wealth

from the Isle of Jewel and the Isle of Gold. He also planned to use them for removing Lohārgalā to some far away spot. So once sumptuously dressed, as he was passing near her place, she sighted him and welcomed him so that she can fleece him once again. As this time Māgadhikā refused her to get out of Pravarasena the secret of his never-exhausting wealth, she herself made him to reveal it through blandishment. Consequently she persuaded him to take her by means of the magic shoes to a mid-sea temple of the God of Love, which she pretended she had vowed to visit for his safe return. He took her to the desired temple; taking off the magic shoes he went inside the temple. Lohārgalā grabbed the opportunity and disappeared with the shoes. Pravarasena was repentant. But shortly he got a chance of escape. As he assisted a visiting Vidyādhara in his rites for acquiring magic powers, the latter rewarded him with two magic pills : The tilaka-mark with one of these turned a human being into an ass. The other reversed that effect. The Vidyādhara presented him with a quantity of jewels and gold and dropped him into Pāṭalipura.

Getting news of Pravarasena having returned hail and hearty, Lohārgalā cooked up a plot. Getting her body bandaged all over, she called for Pravarasena through her daughter. When the latter arrived, she narrated her fabricated story—how she had to run away with the magic shoes to save them from a grabbing Vidyādhara, who knocked her down and got away with the shoes. Pretending to believe her story, he offered to effect a miracle cure for her wounds and turn her into a youthful damsel. He asked for the removal of the bandages, against which she trumped up the ruse of unbearable pain. She asked to treat her with the bandages untouched. He put a tilaka-mark on her forehead with one of his magic pills. She was instantly changed into a she-ass. He mounted on her back and lashing heartily drove her on the royal highway. A complaint was made to the king. He guessed the mischief-maker to be none else than his long-lost brother. He went forth and received him. Pravarasena narrated his whole story. Lohārgalā's human form was restored to her by using the other pill, when repayment of all she got by cheating was guaranteed. She made over to

Pravarasena the wonder gem, the magic shoes and Māgadhiḱā. Pravarasena was made heir-apparent.

7.1. The tale is narrated by Jambūsvāmin's queen Nāgasenā, to illustrate how great harm results from too much greed, be it in the matter of earning wealth or earning religious merit. With this she tries to support her point that even as a householder one has sufficient scope for practising religion, and so one need not be quite greedy about it and adopt monkhood. It will be seen that the actual plan and purpose of the tale has in reality hardly any connection with the objective it is pressed here to serve. Like so many illustrative tales in Jain narrative literature, this one also is borrowed from the stream of the then current popular stories and made to fit in an alien frame. The introductory section of the tale here, with the quite familiar motif of the jealous favourite queen driving the step-sons to leave the kingdom is an obviously later addition.

7.2. We may note the following points in this version :

- (1) Two princes, brothers, stung by insult and injustice, leave their house and kingdom and start to go abroad to try their luck.
- (2) On their way in a dense forest, while they are spending night under a banyan tree, the presiding deity of the tree presents the younger brother, who is keeping the watch, two wonder-gems: One, bringing kingship, is for the elder; the other, bringing desired wealth and amenities, is for the younger. The deity teaches him the proper rite that should accompany the act of wishing.
- (3) Afterwards, the brothers reach a city. The younger hands over to the elder the kingship-gem and teaches him the rite.
- (4) They ask boons from the respective gems. Through the power of the wealth-gem they are served with sumptuous meals, dresses etc. by eight heavenly damsels, who disappear after the service.

- (5) Five 'devine agents' select the elder brother for a king in place of the former one, who has just then died childless.
- (6) The younger stays with a courtesan, whose mother once steals his wonder-gem, but she finds it to be useless without the proper rite.
- (7) He kills an ascetic-magician and comes in possession of his magic shoes.
- (8) The courtesan's mother cheats him of his magic shoes.
- (9) He acquires two magic pills through service rendered to a semi-divine being : One has the power to turn a human being into an ass, the other reverses this effect.
- (10) By means of the first pill he turns the bawd into a she-ass, rides on her back and whips her.
- (11) The complaint reaches the king. The brothers are reunited. The bawd is restored to her human form. The magic gem, shoes and the courtesan are returned to the younger brother, who is appointed heir-apparent.

8. Version IV. represented by Asāita's Old Gujarati verse-narrative *Haṃsāuli*,¹⁰ is found as the second part of a composite story. The first part relates to the acquisition of a princess seen in a dream and has several other well-known tale motifs. This part is without any organic connection with the second part. The acquired dream princess (called *Haṃsāuli*) gives birth to twin boys. The king arranges for bringing up and educating them secretly at a place outside the capital. They return as strong young men. One of their step-mothers falls in love with the younger prince, who spurns her request. Like Potipher's wife she accuses him of rape and the princes are handed over to the minister for being secretly executed. The story from this point onwards is summarized below :

8.1. Taking pity on them the minister lets the princes escape and successfully deceives the queen by producing deer's eyes for evidence. The fleeing brothers enter a dense forest. The elder goes in search of water for the sake of the thirsty younger brother. He returns to find him lifeless due to a deadly serpent-bite. Tying his body to a branch overhanging a lake, he goes to a nearby city to get sandalwood for the funeral pyre. In the meanwhile Garuḍa,

the divine bird-king, comes there to drink water. The blast from his wings cures the younger brother. He gets down from the tree and goes in search of the elder.

The elder returning to the lake does not find the younger there. After vainly searching for him he returns to the city, where he is swindled of all his possessions by a vile merchant and accused of theft. He is saved by the childless wife of the police-chief, who adopts him. But the merchant prevails upon the king, and the elder brother is sent to assist the merchant's son on a commercial voyage, during which it can be planned to dispose him of.

The younger brother, guided by an ascetic's prediction, goes to the same city and stays with a woodcutter's family.

The elder along with the merchant's son reaches a distant port. The princess of the city falls in love with the elder and marries him against the king's wish. The king sends wrestlers and a wild horse to get rid of the commoner son-in-law, but he gets better of them. He reveals his story to the princess. Now convinced of his royalty, the king honours him and offers him the crown. But he first wants to find out the whereabouts of his younger brother. So taking the princess with him, he leaves the port along with the merchant's son.

Here the younger is chosen king by the divine cow-elephant, in place of the earlier king who died without an heir.

The merchant's son, with an eye on the princess and rich dowry, pushes the elder brother overboard in the mid-sea. Through the power of a religious charm, he is saved by a fish, who tooks him safely to the shore. He stays with a gardener's family.

The princess is stopped from ending her life by the Voice of the Sea, which forecast her reunion with her husband. The merchant's son returns to his city and passes the princess off as his wife. The elder brother reveals his identity to the princess by way of messages hidden in the flower-basket that the gardner's wife usually carries to the merchant's inner apartments.

The younger brother, now the king of the city, proclaims to give as reward half of his kingdom to whomever that gives him news of his elder brother.

The princess avails herself of this opportunity and narrates the whole story before the royal assembly. The king welcomes his brother and at the latter's instance pardons the wrong-doers. Both march forth in great pomp and meet their parents.

8.2. *Haṁsāulī* is a regular work of narrative literature. Strands of several folk-tales are utilized in the composition of this earliest available Old Gujarati verse narrative of about four hundred fifty stanzas divided into four cantos. The story is composed by the author with the purpose of illustrating the strange and diverse ways in which the courses of lives are shaped under the influence of the deeds of past births.

8.3. The following points are to be noted :

- (1) The two princely brothers have to leave their home for strange lands because of their step-mother's machinations.
- (2) The vital element (characteristically figuring in all other versions) of acquiring two magic objects which shapes differently the course of destiny for the two brothers, seems to be missing.
- (3) It is the younger brother who becomes a king, while the elder wanders through the maze of ups and downs of fortune.
- (4) The part relating to the wandering brother is remodelled under the influence of some another tale type illustrating primarily the strange working of the law of Karman.

9. Version IV A. Śāmala Bhaṭṭa's *Vetāla-pacīsi*¹¹ has the earlier well-known tale of Candana-Malayāgiri as its eighth story. The original account of the two brothers is here changed and brought in line with the account of the two brother as it is known to the Magic Bird-Heart type. But as in the *Haṁsāulī* here too the magic birds are missing, For the rest it follows the *Haṁsāulī*.

10. Version IV B. *Mānsih ane Abhesih* is a much expanded variant of version IV. It is preserved in the bardic oral tradition of Gujarat. It has got one emboxed tale and an admixture of several well-known tale-motifs including that of the Dragon-killer. One significant point is that the wandering brother is given here

a wonder gem : This detail is wanting in the *Hamsāulī*, its basic model.¹²

11. Even from a casual comparison of these versions of the Magic Bird-Heart, several important points emerge.

11.1. Version I is the earliest available. But already it contains several non-original features. The gold giving bird has practically no function in the tale and so it becomes pointless. Instead of using two birds for two functions (one for each), to keep one quite useless and to assign three different functions to the other definitely smacks of secondary elaboration. This is further complicated and distorted in the variant of Version I (i.e. Version I A). There the magic effects of eating the middle flesh and the flesh about the bones are said to have two alternatives according as the eater is man or woman (in the first case) and a wordly man or a monk (in the second case).

11.2. In Version II the tale is given a highly ornate form with very elaborate descriptions in the greatly sophisticated Kāvya style. Here too we have an unmistakable clue for the story having been derived from some earlier source. After the narrative reaches the point where two brothers separate, the author tells us that 'as the story has it, the elder brother gets the kingship of Magadha.' This clearly means that Bhoja here deliberately skips over some portion of his source-tale, it being irrelevant to his purpose.

As compared to Version I the wonder birds here are not cocks, but doves (or pigeons) and they are not killed by one of the brothers, but they sacrifice themselves out of compassion for the 'guest'-brothers. This seems to be a modification of the original feature, introduced because killing of bird by a Brahmin was perhaps by this time felt to be improper. The exact character of the faked marvellous power (*siddhi*) of the younger brother in the counter trick employed by him to avenge himself and regain what he lost is not quite clear, as the text is defective. Quite probably it is the same as the power said to be possessed by the second wonder bird in Version III. There its eater wishes for a dinner

etc. and immediately there appears from nowhere eight heavenly damsels, bathe them, give divine clothes to wear, and serve them with royal dinner.

This was supposed to be one of the much-coveted *siddhis* during the period between 9th and 13th cent. For, a third source also, dated 1083, gives a glowing account of the same *siddhi*. In Guṇacandrasūri's *Mahāvīracariya* (Chapter V, pp. 160-161) the ascetic Vidyāsiddha produces through his Yogic powers sumptuous dinner, precious clothes, a bed and divine damsels.

11.3. It should be noted that Versions I and II do not have the flying shoes and the donkey-transformation pills. They appear for the first time in Version III, which is closest to the basic outline for the Western versions given by Thompson. But in that version, the substitution of magic gems for magic birds is the result of Jainistic reworking, as killing and eating of birds have been always one of the cardinal sins for the Jainas. Similarly fear of being neglected by the elder brother because of the newly got kingship is narratively weaker cause for the two brothers' separation, as compared to the accidental separation in a dense forest in search of water.

11.4. Version IV removes the pivot of the magic objects (birds or gems) altogether, and turns the tale into one of diversity of destinies under the working of the law of Karma. Consequently it has to change the original account of the second brother's adventures and substitute for it a section (or sections) from another convenient tale-type (there was a whole cycle of such tales, with very numerous variants, some of them very much familiar from the epic and Purāṇic literature, e.g. the wanderings and sufferings of Rāma, of the Pāṇḍavas, of Nala, of Hariścandra and such as one finds in the prototype of a tale-type known in the Early Gujarati literature as '*Candana-Malayāgiri*', with which our tale gets actually mixed up in Version IV A).

11.5. Each of these Indian versions (as also the basic outline of the non-Indian versions) has a different introduction based on a different motif and the going abroad of the two brothers also is in each case differently motivated.

11.6. Version I is important in so far as it presents the earliest occurrence of the Magic Bird-Heart¹² motif. Version II is the earliest to bear a family-likeness to the basic outline of the non-Indian versions. But Version III is the closest to the latter in the over-all structure as well as in most of the significant features and details (excepting, of course, the introductory section). The one most striking difference between Version II and Version III is the donkey-transformation figuring only in the latter.

This feature of the tale developed between the tenth cent. (the date of Version II) and the twelfth cent. (the date of Version III). It cannot be an innovation introduced by Ratnaprabha because there is every indication to believe that he was making use of a previously current popular tale. It remains to be investigated whether the tale with the donkey-transformation sequel was taken outside India after the twelfth cent. or a century or so earlier. Version I and II also clearly presuppose earlier popular sources.

But in order to be anywhere nearer the solution of these and similar problems, we are first required to collect all the versions that are available from old Indian literatures and from oral traditions all over India, and work out their complex interrelationships. The versions here reported would now provide very valuable evidence for the theory of the Indian origin of the Magic Bird Heart.

Postscript 1 : There are about a dozen Old Gujaratt Rāsās based on Ratnaprabha's version (i.e. No. III) : *Amarasena-Vayarasena Rāsa* by Kamalaharṣa (1583), by Tejapāla (1687). There are some nine further Rāsās based on *Hamsāuli* (i.e. No. IV) : *Vatsarāja-Hamsarāja Rāsa* by Mānasimha (1618), *Hamsarāja-Vatsarāja-Rāsa* by Jinodaya (1623) and *Virabhāṇa-Udayabhāṇa-Rāsa* by Kulasāgara (or Keśava) (1688).¹³

Further investigation in the subject shows that the earliest Jain version is found in the story of Kāṣṭha-Muni in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi* dated about the fifth cent. A. D. This tale of Kāṣṭha

Sreṣṭhin is known also from its numerous Prakrit, Apabhramśa and Old Gujarati versions.

Postscript 2 : In the 1984 issue (no. 39) of the French Journal 'Communications', titled 'Les avatars d'un Conte' were published fourteen papers dealing with the Magic Bird-Heart. They discuss Indian, Arabic-Iranian and Western versions in the diachronic and synchronic perspectives and some of them take into account the social context also. Nalini Balbir has discussed one Prakrit and three Sanskrit versions datable from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. In the introductory survey Claude Bremond has compared various Eastern and Western versions of the Tale-types 567 and 938 (the latter represented in Gujarati by several versions of the tale of Candana-Malayāgiri) and has shown their interrelationships.¹⁴

Notes

1. Thompson, S. *The Type of the Folk-tale*; Antti Aarne's 'Verzeichnis der Marchentypen' translated and enlarged, Helsinki, 1928.
2. Aarne, A., *Vergleichende Märchenforschungen*, Helsingfors, 1908. (not accessible to me at the time of preparing this paper).
3. Thompson, S., *The Folktale*, New York, 1946, p. 75.
4. *The Folktale*, p. 75.
5. Text ed. V. Fausböll, Vol. IV. 37-43; translated by W. H. D. Rouse (1901, reprinted 1957), IV. 22-27.
6. ed. V. Fausböll. Vol. II, 410-413; translated by W. H. D. Rouse (1957 reprint), Vol. II, 280-282.
7. Edited by K. K. Munshi, Singhi Jain Series, No. 30, 1959; text, pp. 48-56; translation. pp. 53-61.
8. Edited by Hemasāgarasūri, Ānand-Hem-Jain-Granthmālā, No. 6, 1958; the tale covers the pages 169 to 177.
9. A rather extensive summary is being given here as the original is in Prakrit and no translation in any modern language has appeared as yet.

- 9a. Edited by K. K. Shastri, Gujarat Vernacular Society Samśodhan Granthmālā, No. 5, 1945.
 10. Ed. A.S. Patel, Bharatiya Vidya Research Series, No, 20, 1962, pp. 98-112.
 11. *The Folklore of Gujarat*, (=Gujrāt tathā Kāṭhiāvād Deś-ni Vārtā), ed. F. B., Second Series, 1874 : reprinted 1928; the story referred to here appears on pp. 41-104. In modern Gujarati children's story books a similar story is frequently published but quite likely it is influenced by Western versions.
 12. The *Haṁsāuli* and *Vetāla-pacīṣi* versions appear to be representative of Modern Indian regional versions of the Magic Bird-Heart as is shown by their very close likeness to the Bengali version, as reported in the story of Śwet-Basanta, which too is blended with the Dragon-killer. See e.g. *Folktales of Bengal* by L. B. Day, 1912, pp. 89-103.
It should be noted that none of the Indian versions has the bird-heart as the magic limb. It is either the whole bird or flesh from particular parts.
 13. Vaidya, B. I., *Rās Sāhitya* (in Gujarati), 1966;
M. D. Deshai, *Jain Gūrjar Kavio*, I, II, III, 1926-1944.
 14. See H. C. Bhayani, *Lok-kathānām Mūl ane Kul* (in Gujarati), 1990, pp. 58-61.
-

18. THE TALE OF THE ROYAL MONK YAVA

1. It is intended to discuss here certain early Jaina versions of the tale of Yava and stress its basically folk-tale character by pointing out striking parallels with some folk-tales current today.

The illustrative tale of the royal monk Yava belongs to the very early Jaina tradition and in view of the *Jātaka* parallels, its origin is to be assigned to the common heritage of the Jaina Ardhamāgadhī literature and the Buddhist Pali literature.

It is alluded to in the *Bhagavati Ārāḍhanā* of the Digambara tradition¹, and the *Bhatta-parinnā* (*Paṇṇa*) of the Śvetāmbara canon. To stress for the monk the importance of studying the sacred texts the legendary tale of king Yava (or Yama) is referred to make the following point :

Even some random verse, proverbial, anecdotal or just a sort of doggeral, accidentally learnt, may prove so useful as to save one's life; then what to talk of studying the sacred texts ?

2. The outlines of the tale of Yava are given cryptically by Saṅghadāsa in his *Laghu-bhāṣya* on the *Bṛhatkalpa-sūtra*² (v. 1154). The verse tells us that the life of king Yava, the son of Anila, is instructive with regard to the merits of religious studies. Verses 1155-1156 and 1161 give the catch-words for the leading persons and events in the life-story of Yava. Verses 1157-1159 are the ones that played a key role in that story. Verse 1160 gives the moral, and should rather follow v. 1161 as the story's conclusion. This point combined with the facts that (a) vv. 1157-1160 are closely similar to the five verses in the *Mūsika Jātaka* (no. 373) and (b) the metrical structure of these verses is somewhat archaic, shows beyond any doubt that the verses formed the core of the old original tale³, which was adopted later with requisite adaptations by the Jainas and Buddhist for their own purpose.

The tale, given in full by Kṣemakīrti in his commentary on the *Bṛhat-kalpa-sūtra*⁴ (hereinafter *BKS*) is principally as follows :

Anila's son Yava was ruling over Ujjayinī. His son named Gardabha (Pk. *Gaddabha*) was appointed heir-apparent. His daughter named Aḍoliyā (Pk.) was extremely beautiful. Dīrghapṛsthā (Pk. *Dihapaṭṭha*) was his minister. The Prince fell in love with his own sister. Secretary advised by the minister as to how to avoid public scandal he got her kidnapped and confined in an underground cellar. King Yava, disgusted with his son's behaviour, became a monk and left Ujjayinī. Gardabha succeeded him on the throne. The monk Yava, out of love and anxiety for his son, could not commit to memory verses of the sacred texts. He periodically visited Ujjayinī. Once on his way to Ujjayinī, while he rested near a corn-field, he saw the watchman chase a donkey out of the field and heard him utter good-humouredly during this operation an extempore verses⁵ addressed to the donkey and meaning : 'Oh donkey, (*gaddabha*) keeping an eye on me, you are running now this way, now that way; I have caught your design : you are intending to get at Yava ('the corn'). This verse stuck in the memory of the monk as he enjoyed the scene. Nearby some boys were playing the game of tip-cat. During the game, the tip-cat (*aḍoliyā*), struck with the bat, fell into a deep hole (*agaḍa*). The boys searched for it. One of them saw the hole and guessing that the tip-cat had fallen and disappeared there, he uttered an extempore verse⁶, meaning : 'It is possibly here, possibly there—the tip-cat (*aḍoliyā*) being searched, is not traced anywhere. But I for one know that the tip-cat (*aḍoliyā*) is thrown in the hole (*agaḍe*)'. The monk who was watching this scene heard this doggerel and it too stuck in his memory.

Yava moved on and reaching Ujjayinī he put up at the house of a potter. At night a mouse, now approaching now running away scared, was addressed by the potter with an extempore verse⁷, meaning : 'O you delicate fellow ! you idiot ! night-rambler ! To you the danger is not from me, but from Dīrghapṛsthā ('a snake')'. Yava witnessing this scene heard 'the doggerel, and that too he got by his heart.

Now the minister Dīrghapṛsthā, nursing an old grudge against Yava, secretly planted arms in the house of the potter with a view

to frame the latter (i.e. Yava). Getting the king Gardabha suspect that Yava, fed up with the rigours of monkhood had returned with the intention of dislodging him, Dīrghapṛṣṭha convinced the former about this by bringing to his notice those dumped arms. Consequently Gardabha and Dīrghapṛṣṭha went at night to the potter's house, and with a view to kill Yava lay in a lurch.

At that time Yava going over the day's incidents in his mind, remembered the doggerels he had heard uttered by different persons in various situations. He fondly recited in a loud voice each of the verses in order. As Gardabha from his hide-out heard the first verse he took it to mean : 'You are hustling now towards this side, now towards that side; you are keeping an eye on me : I have detected your design : O Gardabha, you are keen to get at 'Yava' (i.e. me)'. So he thought that his father with his clairvoyant and telepathic powers acquired during monkhood, had detected their presence and evil designs.

In the meanwhile Yava uttered the second verse which Gardabha took to mean : 'People think the princess Aḍoliyā may be here, may be there : but when searched for, she is not found. Only I know that Aḍoliyā is thrown in a dungeon (*agaḍe*).'

Gardabha again thought that his father knew about that misdeed also on his part. Immediately he heard him utter a third verse which he understood to mean : 'O you delicate one ! You nightproowler ! To you the danger is not from me, but it is from Dīrghapṛṣṭha (i.e. the minister)'. Thereupon Gardabha concluded that as Yava had given up his kingship and all the worldly pleasures, there was no question of his desire to deprive him of kingship. All those were surely the minister's intrigues. It was he who wanted to kill him. So he cut off the minister's head, and revealing himself to Yava confessed everything and got pardoned.

Yava pondered over these happenings : Even if some playful, and useless doggerel verses learnt just accidentally, can save one's life, how much more fruitful would be the learning of the sacred texts ? Consequently, he returned to his preceptor and devoted himself single-mindedly to the sacred studies.

3. From the structure and motivation of this tale the following points are to be noted :

(a) Someone comes to learn by hearing on different occasions verses composed and recited on the spur of the moment. Each of these verses is related to some key incident in a particular situation, the several separate situations being mutually quite unconnected, but appearing in a chronological sequence. The learner is generally an onlooker and not involved in these situations.

(b) Subsequently in a totally different situation, he happens to utter these remembered verses loudly to himself. By sheer chance, and without the utterer's knowledge, the verses happen to get connected and apply to the new situation—they are so interpreted and considered intentional by someone else present there. This results in warding off unsuspected danger to the utterer's life.

(c) The double application or interpretation of the verses is made possible on the strength of some words having double meaning therein, and especially because a few of these are such that they function as common nouns in the previous situations, but as proper nouns—as personal names, to be more specific—in the subsequent new situation.

4. In his *Ākhyānaka-maṇikośa* (circa last quarter of the 11th Cent. A.D.) Nemicandra has alluded to the example of the monk Yava to illustrate the secular and spiritual merits of performing *sajjhāya*⁸. Besides giving the usual interpretation of *sajjhāya* (*svādhyāya*) as 'reading and learning the sacred texts'. Āmradeva has in his commentary on this verse of Nemicandra given also a narrow interpretation, viz., the regular and repeated recitation of the *namaskāra-mantra*. And the version of Yava's tale he has given, has been provided an additional motivation accordingly. Āmradeva's version⁹ very closely resembles that of Kṣemakīrti (which most probably represents the original version known to Saṅghadāsa). But there are a few significant differences, indicating a different direct source that had altered somewhat the details and motivations of its original. The motivation for kidnapping Adoliyā is changed

to the customary. In the place of Gardabha's kidnapping her to satisfy his incestuous love, she is here secretly kidnapped by the crafty and ambitious minister, because of the astrologer's prediction that whoever becomes her husband, will be a sovereign king.

Moreover, there is an additional character, viz. king Yava's sister's son named Bhaddalaya.¹⁰ As a monk had predicted that Bhaddalaya would be Aḍoliā's husband, Yava wanted to hand over kingship to him, but the monk told him that prior to Bhaddalaya, Gardabha was destined for kingship. Thereupon Yava crowned Gardabha as the king to succeed him, and entrusting the latter along with Aḍoliyā to the care of his minister, he himself became a monk. In the *BKS* commentary version Yava gives up kingship because he becomes disgusted with his son's misbehaviour, but due to deep love, and painful anxiety for his children, he fails in his efforts to memorize the sacred texts. On the other hand, in Āmradeva's version, this failure is attributed simply to his old age. So he has to do with reciting only the *namaskāra* formula. Again according to the *BKS* commentary it is his worry about Gardabha that makes him visit his old seat of kingdom frequently. But in the *AMK* version, Yava's spiritual teacher sends him to his earstwhile capital, with the foreknowledge that it will be beneficial to Gardabha. Further, according to the latter version, incited by the minister who was greatly perturbed at Yava's visit, Gardabya, accompanied by Bhaddalaya, clandestinely approaches Yava in order to kill him, but reading his own sense in the verse recited by the latter, he returns to his palace, imprisons the minister and recovers his sister. He punishes the minister and marries his sister to Bhaddalaya, crowning the latter as the king to take his place. He then renounces the world. The tale is summed up with the observation that as the recitation of the *namaskāra* formula benefited Yava and the others connected with him, so it can be beneficial to all. But this is followed by one more verse. It is given as a citation. It is in *Anuṣṭubha* metre as against the preceding *gāthās*, indicating that it is borrowed from some earlier version of the tale. It means : Even something that seems at random and

quite without relevance, should be learnt. Anything that is learnt is never useless. Once such learning proved so beneficial as to save someone's life.

In the *Bṛhat-kathākośa* version¹⁴ of Yava's tale, representing the Digambara tradition, we find some significant differences as compared to the *BKS* version of Kṣemakīrti. Here the king Yava himself confines his daughter in a dungeon, as he was afraid that, as predicted by a monk, the kingship will pass on to that man who will marry her. His loss of words and humbling of pride of a monk leads him to give up his kingdom and become monk. Feeling humiliation and frustration at his failure to memorize the sacred texts, he goes out to visit holy places. On his way, seeing the donkeys dragging a cart to and fro in their attempt to eat corn from the roadside field Yava utters a verse¹⁵ spontaneously composed (under divine inspiration of Vālmiki !) to describe the situation. Similarly witnessing the boys looking for the lost tip-cat and the frog appearing and running away timidly, the inspired Yava produces two more verses. These verses he uses as texts for his daily religious observances. In the *Bṛhatkathākośa* tale, Yava composes one more verse in this fashion. Enlightened by the waterfetching ladies, he learns that due to recurrent friction with waterpots tiny pits developed even on the stony surface of the steps of a well. So he feels he should not despair of memorizing the sacred texts. He produces the fourth verse with this purport, and returns to his city where his guru was staying for the time being. The rest of the tale is similar to what we find in the *BKS* Commentary, except two details : As he hears the second verse recited by Yava, Gardabha thinks that thereby his father wants to inform him about his sister, and at the end, both Gardabha and Dīrgha get pardoned (but Śricandra gets the minister banished).

6. Most of the differences of the Digambara version from the Śvetāmbara version (as we have it in the *BKS* commentary) can be quite reasonably interpreted as later features. Similarly, the *Mūsika Jātaka* version, which stands far apart from the Jain versions is clearly a secondary reworking of the old material. The

key verses also seem to have been altered to suit the new orientation given to the tale. So it has not been taken up here for consideration.

But in the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*, the tale of 'the world-renowned teacher, the young man, and the king of Benares'¹⁶, we have a new version of the basic motif of the tale of Yava which has persisted in varying forms down to the present day. A dull-witted man, repeating at night a stanza taught him as a charm by his teacher with great difficulty, scares away, later on, the thieves who took the uttered verse as addressed to them. The king of the city who happened to witness this scene on his secret nightly rounds, learns the charm from the man and as he repeats it loudly while he is being shaved, the barbar thinks that the king has detected his murderous design. The barbar confesses and thus the king's life is saved.

An irrelevant, seemingly nonsense verse, memorized and uttered by a dullard, becomes meaningfully applicable in an unsuspected situation so as to save the life of the utterer—this features is commonly shared by this tale and the tale of Yava. But the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* tale represents a basic transformation of the tale of Yava, and so the three key verses of the latter do not figure in it. From these various versions of the tale of Yava we can see that here what we have is a folk-tale set in an alien frame for religious purposes. This impression is further confirmed by the fact that the characteristic motifs similar to this tale are found recurring in several later tales down to the present day.

There is a tale-type known as Doctor Know-All (Aarne-Thompson, 'Types of the Folk-Tale', no. 1641), having more than four hundred variants current all over Europe and Asia¹⁷. In the version which we have in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*¹⁸, the Brāhmaṇa Hariśarman, posing as an astrologer, first-finds a lost horse (which he had previously hidden). Thereafter, placed alone in a chamber in the royal palace to detect the theft of the king's treasure, as he was loudly blaming his tongue (*jihvā*) for his present plight¹⁹, the maid named Jihvā, who had stolen the treasure and who, alarmed by Hariśarman's reputed knowledge, was outside the chamber, close

to the door, trying to find out what was he about, hears the latter's words, and interpreting them to mean that her crime is discovered, she goes to him and confesses. Lastly, he is asked by the king so guess what was there in the covered pitcher placed before him. Thereupon lamenting his fate loudly, he refers to himself by his childhood petname 'Frog' (*maṇḍūka*) and by this lucky coincidence wins the test.

Several variants of this tale are found at present in Gujarat and other regions. In the variant known as *Ṭiḍā Joṣī*²⁰ (The Fake Astrologer) prior to the test of finding out the lost treasure, the pretender finds out through clevernees the lost bullocks and the number of cakes prepared in the kitchen, and passes this off as due to his astrological knowledge. The theft is detected by his calling out to *nimḍarḍī* ('sleep'), because through anxiety he was not getting sleep, and by coincidence *Nimḍarḍī* happened to be the name of the palace maid who had stolen the treasure. In the final test, the king asks *Ṭiḍā*, to guess what he had caught in his fist. Thereupon as the latter blamed himself loudly for the sorry plight, apostrophizing himself by his name *Ṭiḍā*, the king opens his fist to let go the imprisoned grasshopper (*ṭiḍ*) and richly rewards the 'astrologer'. In this version we find :

(1) The use of double-meaning words, which function as common nouns in some situations but as proper nouns in other situations, (2) a casual utterance understood by some overhearer or listener in a meaning quite unintended by the speaker, and (3) these facts accidentally resulting in averting danger to the life of the speaker. These features of *Hariśarman/Ṭiḍā Joṣī* are common with the tale of Yava.

Similarly the tale known as '*Ghaso Lālīā Ghaso*' or '*Gurum-antara*'²¹ current in Gujarat, preserves many of the basic features of the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* tale noted earlier. There is another variant also of this tale current in Gujarat and other regions, offering an amalgam of the two different versions. It is known as "*Khaḍ-baḍ Khaḍ-baḍ Khodat He*"²². A dull-witted Brāhmaṇa is somehow taught by his wife a Sanskrit verse for reciting before

the king to seek favour. He forgets the verse on his way, but seeing some fowls, picking in a refuge dump, is inspired to loudly utter an instantly composed verse-line. The fowls look up with stretched necks and another line comes out. The huddled up fowls inspire a third line and when the scared birds run away, the dullard completes the verse. This absurd doggerel he recites in the King's assembly. It baffles the pundits. The king trying to make out the recondite meaning of the verse recites at midnight in his bed the verse-lines one by one at short intervals. The thieves near his bedroom, overhearing and construing these utterances as referring to them run away. The thieves were palace guards themselves. They own up next day. The Brāhmaṇa is rewarded.

The feature of disconnected lines, spontaneously composed by a dullard, is common between this tale and the *Brhatkathākośa* version of the tale of Yava.

Notes and References

1. *jai dā khaṇḍa-silogeḥi yamo mīraṇādu pheḍḍio rāyā /
patto ya su-sāmaṇṇam kiṃ paṇa jīṇa-vutta-sutteṇa //*
(*Bha. Ārā.*, v. 772 = *Bha. Pa.*, v. 87 with the variants :
kamḍa-silogeḥim javo tā; rakkho). Śrīcandra in his *Kuḥākosu*
explains *Khaṇḍa-śloka* as a verse not connected with the scrip-
tural text or alternatively, 'a verse composed on the spur of
the moment'. But it was probably equivalent to *śloka-khaṇḍa*.
2. Ed. by Chaturvijaya and Punyavijaya, Part 2, Bhavnagar, 1936.
3. See A. Metter, 'Eine Jinistische Parallel zum Mūsika-Jātaka',
K. Brühn and A. Wezler (ed.), *Studien zum Jainismus und
Buddhismus* (Gedenkschrift für L. Alsdorf), Wiesbaden, 1981,
pp. 155-161.
4. *Brhat-kalpa-sūtra*, 2, p. 359-361.
5. *ādhāvasi padhāvasi, mamaṃ va vi nirikkhasi /
lakkho te mayā bhāvo, jamaṃ patthesi gaddabhā //*
(*BKS*, v. 1157).

Variants :

jāsi esi puṇo ceva, pāsesu tṛiṭillasi /
(according to the *Cūrṇi*).

osakkasi ya aisakkasi ya, bahuso ya jam paloesi /
(according to the *Visesa-Cūrṇi*).

6. *io gayā io gayā maggijjānti na disati /*
ahmeyam viyāṇāmi, agaḍe chūḍhā aḍoliyā //
(BKS, v. 1158)

Variants :

bile paḍitā (acc. to the *Cūrṇi*).

7. *sukumāлага bhaddalayā, rattim himḍaṇa-silayā /*
bhayaṁ te natthi mammāto, dīhapaaṭṭhāo te bhayaṁ //
(BKS. v. 1159)

Variants

dīhapaaṭṭhassa bibhehi, natthi te mamato bhayaṁ
(acc. to the *Cūrṇi*).

8. Punyavijaya Muni (ed.), *Ākyānaka-maṇi-kośa*, Varanasi, 1962, v. 19.
9. *AMK*, pp. 146-147.
10. This character has obviously originated from the term of address *bhaddalaya* 'simpleton', found in the doggerel uttered by the potter on sighting a timid mouse. In the text of Āmra-deva's version once the form is given as *bhaddulaya* (v. 19). Similarly, for *aḍoliyā* of BKS, we find there *aṇoliya*, which form occurs also at *AMK*, p. 201, vv. 274, 275. In later versions we have one more variant, *aṇulliyā*. Kṣemakīrti gives *uṇḍoiyā* as its synonym. This again has a variant for *umnaīyā* (*AMK*, p. 147, v. 14, 15; p. 209, v. 540). All these forms appear to be variants of one basic form. Modern Gujarati has *aḍolī*, 'a short stick-like wooden piecetied to the end of a rope used as tether, wound round a churning rod etc'.
11. For the first verse (*vide* note 5) : *Pāda a* : *avaghasasi ghasasi dhuttā*; *b* : *ceva*; *d* : *pecchesi*. Second verse (*vide* note 6) : *b* : *joiijānti*, *c* : *vayaṁ evaṁ viyāṇāmo* *d* : *paḍiyā*. Third verse ; (*vide* note 7) : *c* : *mama, sayāsāo natthi te bhayaṁ*.
12. Ed. by H. B. Sheth, Varanasi, 1911; Yava's tale on p. 144.
13. For the first verse : *a* : *uhāvasi*; *pahāvasi*; *b* : *ceva*; *c* : *te abhippāo*; *d* : *pucchasi*. Second verse : *a* : *ao gayā tao gayā*; *b* : *amhe na ditṭhā*; *d* : *aṇullia*. Third verse : *a* : *sukumālaya*

komala bhaddulayā; b : tumhe rattim; c : amha pāsāo na te bhayam.

14. A. N. Upadhye (ed.) *Bṛhatkathākośa*. Bombay, 1943. Tale no. 61 : *Yamamuni-kathānaka* (pp. 132-134). Most of the tales of the *Bṛhatkathākośa* are Sanskrit versions of some lost Prakrit originals. There are some obvious errors, confusions, misunderstandings and gaps in these renderings. As some other (Ārādhanā) Kathākośas, like that of Śrīcandra, for example, seem to have also used the same Prakrit source, the *Bṛhatakathākośa* tale requires to be checked and supplemented for some details with the help of the related Kathākośas. The word for the 'tipcat' (and so also the name of the princess) is given here as *koṇikā* (oc *kaṇṇikā*). In the Śvetāmbara versions *kaṇiyā* or *kaṇikā* mean the stick with which the 'tipcat' is struck.
15. The *Bṛhatkathākośa* gives rough Sanskrit renderings of the Prakrit verses that played the key role in the tale. The original verses are given by Śrīcandra. See H. L. Jain, *Kahakosu*, Ahmedabad, 1969, *Sandhi* 23, Kadavaka, 3-4, 9-10, 13-14, 19-20. We give here important differences from the text of the first three of these verses as found in the BKS. First verse : a : *āyaḍḍhadha pariyaḍḍhadhi; b : puṇo vi samayaḍḍhadha; d : patthaha*. Second verse : *ādhāvadha paridvāvadha, puṇo vi samadhāvadha/tumhettha mamdabuddhi, chidde passaha koṇiyam//* Third verse : *uppaṇālasīdalamgo, mā himḍasu vīyāle/amhado natthi bhayam, dīhādo dissade bhayam//*.

The text of these verses given partially in the *Kathākośas* of Prabhācandra and Nemīcandra (see *Bṛhatkathākośa*, p. 384, notes on tale no. 61) and in the *Punyāsrava-kathāhośa* (ed. A. N. Upadhye and H. L. Jain, Sholapur, 1964; p. 105) has some more variants. First verse : a : *kaḍḍhasi puṇu ṇikkhevasi re gaddhahā; b : javam patthesi khādidum*. Second verse : a : *aṇṇattha kim palovaha, b : tumhe ettha ṇibuddhiyā* (v. 1 *etthammi ṇibuddhiyā*); d : *chidde acchai koṇiyā*. Third verse : *de dīsade bhayam tumha* (v. 1. *tujja*).

16. H. C. Norman, *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*, I, ii, London, 1909, pp. 250-253; E. W. Burlingame, *Buddhist Legends*, I, *HOS*, 28, 1921, pp. 306-309. The charm is : *ghaṭṭesi, ghaṭṭesi, kimkāraṇā ghaṭṭesi, ahampi tam janāmi*. "You are rubbing, You are rubbing ! Whom are you rubbing ? I know too."
17. See S. Thompson, *The Folktale*, New York, 1946, pp. 144-145.
18. *Kaīhāsaritsāgara*, VI, vv. 92-135; C. H. Tawny and N. M. Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, 1968 reprint, III, 73-73; on pp. 75-76 is given a note on the "Doctor Know-All" motif.
19. Vv. 117 and 135 in the tale of Hariśarman are the key verses of the tale with different meanings for the speaker and the hearer.
20. See G. Badheka, *Bāl-vārtāo*, Part 6, Ahmedabad, 1979, pp. 6-8.
21. S. Acharya of Gujarat Vidyapith (Ahmedabad) has recorded this tale from Central Gujarat. The charm exactly corresponds in meaning to the same in the Pāli tale. It goes like "*ghas ghas kyā kare ? Tārī vāt meṁ jāñī*. 'Why are you rubbing and rubbing? I know what are you after'. I am thankful to Dr. Acharya for this reference.
22. See G. Badheka, *Bāl-vārtāo*, Part 5, Ahmedabad, 1979, pp. 14-18.

19. SOME VERSIONS OF THE TALE OF VYĀGHRAMĀRĪ

The tale of Vyāghramārī (No. 32 and 43 in the *Śukasaptarī*, Textus Simplicior, ed. R. Schmidt, 1893; reprinted. 1959) can be outlined as follows : A quarrelsome woman once picked up a quarrel with her husband and left home taking her two young sons along with her. While passing through a thick forest she saw a tiger about to charge at her. Putting up a bold face she slapped her sons saying, 'Why are you quarrelling to have each of you a whole tiger for the dinner? You share this one for the time. We may shortly chance to get another one.' Hearing these words the tiger thought her to be none else than the legendary Tiger-killer, and scared to death he fled. On the way a jackal tried to convince him that what he believed to be the Tiger-killer was a mere human being. The tiger, not quite trusting the jackal, agreed to go back with the jackal tethered on his neck. As the woman saw the strange pair approaching, she pointed an accusing finger at the jackal and shouted, 'You crook! Previously you supplied me three tigers and hence I trusted you. How is that you have now brought just one?' Hearing these words the tiger took to his heels.

In the version preserved in a Kashmiri folk tale, it is a farmer's wife who posing as a tiger-killer tries this trick, because her husband was forced to promise a cow to the tiger (cheetah) in order to save himself. The scared tiger in his second approach ties up his tail with that of the jackal, who dragged and dashed on the ground by the fleeing tiger meets his death in the end.*

In another version, expanded and mixed with another motif and current in Rajasthan and Gujarat, the animals are three instead of two viz., lion, hyena and monkey and each one is outwitted in turn.

* A very short summary we find in the *Pañcaśatī-prodha-sambandha* of Subhāṣita (Story no. 454 p. 246), ed. Mrugendra Muni, Surat, 1968.

The earliest version of the tale is found in a Vinaya text of the Buddhists, viz., the *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya* of the Ārya-Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādin. The Buddhist Sanskrit text of the tale and its outline in English are reproduced below from Roth's edition of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya*.

इयं स्त्री रात्रौ दारिकां स्कन्वेनादाय गच्छति । सिंहो च पुरतः प्रत्युपस्थितो । सा दानि दारिकां दृष्ट्वा रुदिता । ताय स्त्रियाय दारिकां चपेटया आहता—‘एको ते सिंहो खादितो एतं पि खादितुकामासि’ । सिंहः पश्यति—‘यादृशी एषा स्त्री ध्वाक्षा च मुखरा च खादत्येषा ममायीति । भीतः प्रपालयति । पुरतो मर्कटः आगत्वा सिंहं पृच्छति—‘मृगराज-पुत्र कर्हि गमिष्यसि’ । सिंहो जल्पति—‘भयं मे उपपन्नं’ । वानरः पृच्छति—‘कीदृशं भयं’ । सिंहा विस्तरेणाचिक्षति । सो जल्पति—‘नैवं वक्तव्यं’ । सिंहस्त्वं मृगराज । कस्त्वं प्रहरिष्यति । आगच्छाहि निवर्ताहि’ । स नेच्छति । सिंहो वानरेण केशेहि गृहीतः । ‘आगच्छाहीति’ । सा दारिकां दृष्ट्वा प्ररुदिता । सा स्त्री जल्पति । ‘मा रोदाहि दारिके एषो तव मातुः केनानीतो केशेहि गृहीत्वा इदानीं यन् नं इच्छसि तं से खादाहीति’ । सिंहः पश्यति—‘मा ह्येवं संकेत-कृतं भविष्यति । एवमेवानीयानीय देति एषापि खादति । यत् तावदहं एकं वारं प्रपलानः किं भूयो निवर्तितं’ । सो दानि तस्य मर्कटस्य अवधुनित्वा प्रपलानः ।

“(The Lord) relates the story of a woman who walks at night carrying her child on her shoulder. All of a sudden a lion stands before them. The child starts crying. The woman gives a slap to the child saying : ‘One lion has already been eaten by you, and now you want to eat this one also’. The lion notes how forwardly eloquent and bold the woman is in regard to him. He gets frightened and runs away. A monkey sees the lion fleeing. Astonished, he asks, ‘How it happened that the king of deers is running away’. The lion tells his story. The monkey says this is not the behaviour of a king and asks him to return. He refuses. After this the monkey jumps down and drags the lion by his mane to the place where mother and child are walking. Again the child cries. The woman says, ‘Don’t cry, the lion has been brought back by his mane to your mother; if you want to eat him, now eat him.’ On hearing this, the lion turns the monkey from his neck, and runs away”.

The Sanskrit text of the portion where the woman again consoles the weeping child seems to be slightly corrupt. In the sentence एषो तव मातुः केनानीतो केशेहि गृहीत्वा the words मातुः केनानीतो do not make any sense. In all probability the text is to be emended as मातुलेनानीतो. On sighting the lion being led by the monkey, she brilliantly remarks : 'My child, don't cry. Here comes your uncle dragging the escaped lion by the mane'. Referring to the monkey as the child's maternal uncle absolutely convinces the suspicious lion that the monkey was in league with the woman. In a current version too the jackal which takes the place of the monkey and which approaches the woman after having tied up its tail with that of the lion is similarly referred to. A search for other Prakrit and modern Indian folk versions and a systematic comparison of all the versions are obviously the two aspects that invite further efforts to study this tale.

**INFORMATION ABOUT
THE PREVIOUS PUBLICATION OF PAPERS**

I

1. Paryāyabandha and Saṁghāta.
Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidya-
peetha, Allahabad, 25, 3-4, July-Oct. 1971, pp. 71-78.
2. The Ṣaṭprajñagāthā and Hṛdayavatī.
Vidya, Ahmedabad, A-Humanities, 15, 2, August 1972,
pp. 1-21.
3. Ḍombikā and Ṣiḍgaka.
Vidya, Ahmedabad, A-Humanities, 12, 1, January 1969,
pp. 1-14.
4. Some Specimens of the Carcari Song.
Sambodhi, Ahmedabad, 1, 1, April 1972, pp. 15-27; Papers
Contributed to the Seminar in Prakrit Studies, October,
1971, University of Bombay, Bombay, pp. 34-45.
5. On Chatra and Calli ; English version of the Gujarati article,
'Uparūpaka Chatra ane Nṛttaparakār Calli', Sāmīpya,
Ahmedabad, 1985, pp. 116-123.
6. The Characterizing Function of Verse in Sanskrit Drama.
Bulletin of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan, Surat,
no. 25, August 1981, pp. 1-7.
7. The Dhruvās in Kālidāsa's Vikramorvaśīya.
Bulletin of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan, no. 29,
1985-1986, pp. 1-5.
8. Bhavāī and the Folk Elements in the Classical Drama.
Previously unpublished.
9. The Character of the Ākṣiptikā.
Bulletin of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan, no. 30,
March 1987, pp. 22-25.

10. The Dhavala Songs.
Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes, Paris, no. 6, 1988, pp. 93-103.
11. The Tarāṇā Mode of Singing.
Pt. Dalsukh Malvania Felicitation Volume (Forthcoming).
12. Some Earliest Literary References to the Sāraṅgī.
Quarterly Journal, National Centre for the Performing Arts, 11, 1, 1982, 36-391.
13. Some Early References to the Rāvaṇahasta.
Journal of the Oriental Institute, 36, 1-4, 1986-1987, pp. 111-114.
14. Jain Literature and Performing Arts.
Published in 'Papers of the 1986 Seminar of the National Centre for the Study of Performing Arts', 1990.

II

1. Some Prakrit Verses of Pādalīpta.
Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, 12, 1-2, 1974, pp. 26-32. (Linguistic data added from H. C. Bhayani (ed.), Saṁkṣīta-Taraṅgavai-kahā, L. D. Series, no. 75, 1979, pp. 281-283).
2. Gāthā-muktāvalī.
Aspects of Jainology (Pt. Bechardas Doshi Commemoration volume), Vol. 2, Varanasi, 1987, pp. 16-37.
3. The Prakrit Poets Harivṛddha, Sātavāhana and Āḍhyarāja.
Sanskrit and Indological Studies (=V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume), 1975, pp. 61-76.
4. Bhairavānanda.
Bhāratiya Vidya 8, June 1947, pp. 121-123.
5. The Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa Rāmāyaṇas.
Asian Variations in Ramayana (ed. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar), 1983, pp. 77-82. Combined with 'The Narrative of Rāma in the Jain Tradition,' Bharatiya Vidya, 25, 1965, p.p. 18-25; Rāmāyaṇa Samikṣā, 1967, pp. 1-12.

6. The Apabhramśa Poet Caturmukha.
Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, 7, 3, March 1958, pp. 214-224.
7. The Childhood Exploits of Kṛṣṇa.
Sambodhi, Ahmedabad, 11, 1-4, 1982-1983, pp. 121-132.
Also, Vaiṣṇavism in Indian Arts and Culture (ed. Ratan Parimoo), 1986, pp. 58-64.
8. Pāli, Dhanyā and Cārukeśi.
Aspects of Jainology (Pt. Bechardas Doshi Commemoration Volume), Vol. 2, 1987, pp. 81-85.
9. The Evolution of Sanatkumāra-carita.
Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture (ed. R. C. Dvivedi), 1975, pp. 26-29.
10. The Śudravatsa-kathā.
Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes, no. 6, 1988, pp. 69-91.
(Earlier Version : 'Suddayacariya, a Lost Romantic Tale in Apabhramśa', Proceedings of the Seminar on Prakrit Studies, (1973), Ahmedabad, 1978, pp. 24-27).
11. The Bṛhatkathā, the Vasudevahimṇḍi and the Sources of Two Purāṇic Episodes : Paper read at the First National Prakrit Conference, Bangalore, December 1990.
12. Apabhramśa Verses Composed by the Paramāra King Muṇja.
Agarchada Nahta Abhinandan-grantha, Bikaner, 1977, pp. 90-93.
13. Vardhamāna-Sūri's Apabhramśa Metres.
Sambodhi, Ahmedabad, 13, 1, 4, 1984-1985, pp. 101-109.
14. The Apabhramśa Passages from Abhinavagupta's Tantrasāra and Parātrimśikāvṛtti.
Vidya, Ahmedabad, 14-2, August 1971, pp. 1-18.
15. The Prakrit and Deśabhāṣā Passages in Someśvara's Mānasollāsa.
K. K. Handiqui Felicitation Volume, 1983, pp. 1671-77.

16. On the Prakrit Sources of Certain Popular Tale-types and Tale-motifs.
Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidya-peetha, Allahabad, 29, 1-4, 1973, 145-158.
 17. The Magic Bird-Heart.
Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists; Vol. III, Part 1, 1970, pp. 99-114; also published in Bharatiya Vidya, 23, 1963; pp. 99-114.
 18. The Tale of the Royal Monk Yava.
Amalā Prajña : Aspects of Buddhist Studies (ed. N. A. Santani), 1989, pp. 537-546.
 19. Some Versions of the Tale of Vyāghramāri.
Sambodhi, Ahmedabad, 2, 1, 1973, pp. 47-48.
-

INDEX

- Aarne, Antti 320-321
 Abdhimathana 195, 196
 Abhijñāna-Śākuntala 141
 Abhilaṣitārtha-cintāmaṇi 297
 Abhinavabhāratī 20, 71, 215
 Abhinavagupta 5, 6, 7, 224, 276 ff.
 Acharya, Shantibhai 353
 Abhiṣeka 62
 Aḍillā 299
 Agravala R. C. 220
 Ākhyānaka 120
 Ākhyānaka-manikośa-vṛtti 231, 266, 316-317, 345
 Ākṣiptikā 72, 80 ff., 117
 Alsdorf L. 134, 220, 233, 267
 Aṅka 113
 Arabian Nights 247
 Ārāmaśobhā 315-316
 Archaic Prakrit 132 ff.
 Āryā 116
 Aśokāvadāna 113
 Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi 339
 Āvaśyaka-sūtra 260
 Badheka Gijubhai 353
 Bālacarita 64, 221
 Bhāgavata Purāṇa 257 ff.
 Bhagavati Ārādhana 342
 Bhāṇaka 115
 Bhāṇi 115
 Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-ghora 293
 Bharateśvara-Bāhubali-rāsa 293
 Bhatta-parinnā 342
 Bhavāi 75 ff.
 Bhejjala 215, 224, 247
 Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya 354-355
 Bhoja 6, 30 ff., 81
 Bhuvanapāla 142
 Book of Sindibad 247
 Brémond Claude 340
 Bṛhaddeśi 95, 98, 116
 Bṛhatkalpaśūtra 113, 342
 Bṛhatkathā 247, 255 ff.
 Bṛhatkathākośa 54, 115, 230 ff., 347
 Bṛhatkathā-śloka-saṁgraha 260
 Brühn Claus 233
 Candana-Malayāgiri 318
 Calli 54
 Caṇḍarāveṇi 229
 Candrāvali 229
 Carcarī 34 ff; 116, 118, 300
 Cārukeśi 228
 Caturāṅgaka 306
 Caturmukha 183, 195 ff.
 Catuspadī 116
 Caupannamahāpurisaçariya 16, 40, 113, 193, 230 ff. 312
 Chandonuśāsana 44, 169, 263, -269, 295
 Chappannaya 11 ff.
 Chatra 54 ff.
 Cinderella (Type 510) 315

- Cūḍāla-Dohā 272
 Cūdamāṇi 20
 Danced out Shoes (Type 306)
 311 ff.
 Daśakumāracarita 246
 Daśāvatāracarita 295-296
 Dattila 116
 Deśināmamālā 3, 4, 167,
 170 ff.
 Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā 348
 Dhammaparikkha 205
 Dhanāi 229
 Dhanikā 226 ff.
 Dharmopadeśamālā-vivarāṇa
 13, 230 ff, 314
 Dhavala 85 ff., 116, 119, 169,
 307
 Dhoḷ 92
 Dhruvā 68 ff., 117
 Ḍima 114
 Doctor Know-All (Type 1641)
 348
 Doghaṭṭi-vṛtti 311, 330 ff.
 Dohā 271, 291
 Dohaḍa 309
 Dombikā 20 ff., 115
 Dumbiliyā 115
 Durmilikā 26
 Dūta-ghaṭotkaca 63
 Dūtavākya 63
 Dvibhaṅgi 52
 Dvipadī 116, 163, 271
 Dvipathaka 116, 309
 Emeneau M. B. 257
 (The) Folktale 319 ff.
 Gāhārayāṇa-kosa 213
 Gāhāsattasaī 166
 Gargasamhitā 223
 Gāthā 116
 Gḥimḍiṇi 51
 Gītagovinda 212
 Goṇḍali 77 ff.
 Goṣṭhi 221
 Govindākhyāna 120, 221
 Granthika 120
 Gūḍha 19
 Guṇamālā 20
 Hāla 166 ff.
 Hamsāuli 334 ff.
 Hardy Friedhelm 219, 222,
 257
 Harivaṁsa 195, 201 ff.
 Harivaṁsapurāṇa 205, 211
 Harivijaya 174, 220
 Harṣacarita 112, 172
 Hemacandra 4, 5, 7, 11, 29 ff.,
 85 ff., 177 ff., 195
 Hiālīā 15, 19
 Hrdayavatī Gāthā 10 ff.
 Jambūsāmicariu 89, 119, 205,
 234 ff., 264-265
 Janmamarāṇavicāra 295
 Jāya Senāpati 122
 Jayavallabha 224
 Jhambada 116
 Jīṇadattacariu 205
 Joep Bor 103
 Josyer. G.R. 229
 Jugājjīṇimḍacariya 267
 Kahakosa 231
 Kahāvali 192
 Kaliṅgasenālābha 247

- Kāmasāstra 13
 Kāmasenā-vipralambha 235
 Kanda 116
 Karṇabhāra 64
 Karpūramañjarī 40, 55, 166, 178 ff.
 Karpūrikālābha 247
 Kasliwal K. 233
 Kāśtha-muni 339
 Kathaka 120
 Kathākośaprakaraṇa 42, 101, 115
 Kathāsaritsāgara 234, 256, 348
 Katre S. L. 219
 Kāvyalakṣaṇa 7
 Kāvyañuśāsana 120
 Kāvyaṁīmāṁsā 172
 Koṇeśvara 81
 Krishnamachariay 121
 Kṛṣṇacarita 221
 Kṛṣṇakarṇāmrta 226
 Kṣemendra 293
 Kulkarni V. M. 220
 Kumārapālpratibodha 267
 Kuvalayamālā 13, 14, 35, 38, 44, 82, 89, 112, 113, 115-116, 119
 Laghu-catūṣpadikā 270
 Lambaka 5
 Lambha 5
 Lambhaka 5
 Līlāsūkā Bilvamaṅgala 212
 Līlāvāt-kahā 132, 135, 210
 Līlāvatisāra 113
 Literal Pleading (Motif J. 1160) 316
 MacClulloch 316
 Madanāvatāra 270
 Madhyama 63
 Maḍillā 299
 Magic Bird Heart (Type 567) 310, 321 ff.
 Mahāpurāṇa 116, 211, 230
 Mahāvīracarita 65
 Mahāvīracariya 338
 Mahumahavijaya 220
 Mallināhacariya 231, 266
 Maṁkha 112
 Mānasollāsa 43, 77, 95, 116-117, 214, 296 ff.
 Maṅgala 116, 119
 Maṇoramā-kahā 267 ff.
 Mārākhyāna 120
 Mātṛkā 116
 Mette A. 350
 Mr̥cchakaṭika 65
 Mudrārākṣasa 65, 112
 Mūlaśuddhi-vṛtti 272
 Muñja 219, 262 ff.
 Mūsika-jātaka 347
 Nandisūtra-vṛtti 260
 Naṁdiuḍḍha 166
 Narasiṁha Maheto 222
 Nāṭyaśāstra 69 ff.
 Nemināhacariya 231, 274
 Nigrodha-jātaka 323-325
 Nṛttaratnāvalī 77 ff.
 Ovi 308
 Pada-kusala-māṇava-jātaka 260
 Paddhaḍi 270, 291
 Paddhati 3
 Padmapurāṇa 103, 192, 229

- Pāṇi 223 ff.
 Pālita 223 ff.
 Pañcadaṇḍa-chatra 313
 Pañcarātra 63
 Parātrimśikā-vṛtti 276 ff.
 Paryā 3 ff.
 Paryāya 3 ff.
 Paryāyabandha 3 ff.
 Partridge in the Cart (Motif
 J. 1511-17) 318
 Paumacariya 97, 98, 103, 185,
 192, 198 ff., 270
 Peraṇa 78
 Poṭṭisa 166
 Prabandhacintāmaṇi 265
 Prabandhakośa 39
 Prabhāvakacarita 39
 Pratimā 62
 Puṇyāsrava-kathākośa 352
 Puṇyavanta-jātaka 246
 Raḍḍā 274, 292
 Rādhā 223 ff.
 Rādhā-vipralambha 215, 224,
 247
 Raghavan 6 ff., 56, 81, 162 ff.,
 174, 221
 Rājasekhara 87
 Rāsaka 23 ff., 24-25, 116, 291
 Rāsakāṅka 215, 224
 Rāsāvalaya 23, 271
 Ratnāvali 118
 Ratneśvara 225
 Rāvaṇahastaka(metre) 104-105
 Rayanakaramḍu 205
 Revantagiri-rāsu 270
 Riṭṭhaṇemicariu 195, 211
 Ruben Walter 257
 Sadayavatsa-kathā 244 ff.
 Saduktikarṇāmṛta 220
 Sakalavidhividhāna 205
 Sakarṇa 17
 Sāmbākhyāna 120
 Saṁdeśarāsaka 56, 236
 Saṁghāta 6 ff.
 Saṁgītacūdāmaṇi 116
 Saṁgītaratnākara 84, 95, 100,
 116
 Sanatkumāra 230 ff.
 Saṇatukumaracariu 234
 Saptasāta 3 ff., 12, 19, 129,
 213
 Sarasvatikanṭhābharṇa 72, 81 ff.,
 131, 172, 207, 214, 225
 Śaśibimbīṭā 292
 Śātavāhana 166 ff.
 Śaṭpadi 116
 Śaṭprajña-gāthā 10 ff.
 Śaṭprajñaka 11 ff., 17
 Śāvayadhamma-dohā 75
 Sayalavihivihāna-kavva 238
 Setubandha 141, 210
 Shastri K. K. 222
 Sheth Noel 256
 Siddhahema 119, 131, 200 ff.,
 212, 263
 Śidga 29-30
 Śidgaka 20 ff., 28 ff., 115
 Siggada 115
 Siri-jātaka 325
 Śrigadita 28
 Śṛṅgāramaṇjarikathā 327 ff.
 Śṛṅgāraprakāśa 26 ff., 141, 162,
 174, 194, 214-215, 221,
 229, 233, 259

- Sudamṣaṇacariya 236 ff.
 Sudayavatsa-vira-prabandha 235
 Suddayacariya 245
 Śudravatsakathā 235 ff.
 Śukasārikā 302
 Śukasaptati 354
 Suloyaṇa-cariu 205
 Supāsaṇāha-cariya 100
 Svayambhūcchandas 15, 19,
 72, 87, 117, 129, 182, 194 ff.,
 212 ff., 224, 295
 Tantrasāra 276 ff.
 Tarānā 95 ff.
 Tejjā 98
 Tennā Giti 95 ff.
 Thompson Stith 311 ff.
 Tīḍā Joṣi 349
 Tilakamañjarī 114
 Tribhaṅgi 116
 Tripadī 292
 Upadeśamālā-vivaraṇa 230, 266
 Upamitibhavaprapaṇcā-kathā 38
 Uparūpaka 20 ff., 54 ff., 71,
 76 ff., 114 ff., 221
 Ūrubhaṅga 64
 Utsāha 173
 Utsṛṭikāṅka 113
 Uttarādhyayana-vṛtti 231
 Uttarapurāṇa 192, 231
 Vadanaka 116, 270, 291
 Vaḍḍakahā 258
 Vaḍḍārādhane 112
 Vāhuvāli-cariu 205
 Vajjā 3 ff.
 Vajjālagga 3, 89, 119, 213, 224 ff.
 Vākovākya 225
 Vardhamāna-sūri 266 ff.
 Vastu 116, 299
 Vastuvadanaka 271
 Vasudevahiṇḍī 134, 193, 231 ff.,
 257 ff.
 Vasudevahiṇḍī-(Madhyama-
 khaṇḍa) 55, 115
 Velankar H. D. 73, 221, 224
 Vetālapacīsī 336
 Vetālapaṇcaviṃśati 246
 Vibudhānanda 113-114
 Vicitra 303
 Vidagdha-gāthā 13
 Vidagdhagoṣṭhī 12
 Vikramorvaśīya 45, 68 ff., 96,
 80 ff., 117
 Viraha-bhakti 257
 Virahāṅka 85
 Viśākhila 116
 Viṣṇu Purāṇa 259
 Vithī 114
 Vivāhalo 91
 Vrajyā 3 ff.
 Vṛddhakavi 166
 Vṛttajāṭisamuccaya 163
 Vyāghramāri 354 ff.
 What Should I Have Done
 (Type 1696, Motif J. 1160)
 314-315
 Yamamuni-kathānaka 352
 Yava Rājaraṣi 342 ff.

Sole Distributor :

Parimal Publications

A House of Indological Books

27/28, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110007