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In spite of their unanimously recognized popularity in classical Indian life, riddles are—indeed—"a forgotten chapter in the history of Sanskrit literature."1 Sternbach’s survey is a useful (though not fully adequate) attempt to collect the material, but it does not generally go beyond "Sanskrit literature" in the narrowest sense and, for instance, hardly includes any data coming from Jaina texts. More recently a rather challenging statement has been made by Prof. S. Lienhard. In his History of Classical Poetry he writes: The immense popularity of riddles in Jaina circles is probably connected with the predilection of Jaina scholars for teaching the faith by catechism.2 First, this "popularity" will have to be proved and documented by clear evidence. Secondly, it would not be fair to reduce the use of the riddle-form to an educational means restricted to the teaching of the doctrine (as the only references quoted by Lienhard suggest). True, the Jainas have written since long many works including the words praśna and praśnottara consisting in questions and answers on religious topics.3 But they have also preserved, especially in their prabandha-literature (12th–15th centuries) many instances of samasyā-pūranas, to mention only a famous variety of riddle in which the court poets were extremely proficient.4 Moreover, what applies to other branches of Indian knowledge also applies to the field of riddles: in order to collect hard facts of some antiquity, we should direct our attention to Prakūṭ literature, and especially narrative literature. Reading it involves many hard

3 The oldest instance is the ninth Aṅga of the Jaina Śvetāmbara Canon entitled Panha-vogaranāṁ (Praśnavyōkarana). For later cases see Schubring, Lehrb. § 189 and 196b (quoted by Lienhard). One of the most famous cases is Vimalaśūri’s Praśnottararatnamālā on which see, for example, M. Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, Calcutta, 1933, Vol. II, pp. 559–560; H. D. Velankar, Jinaratnakoka, Poona, 1944, p. 273 ff.; ubi alia.
4 See for instance in Rājaśekharāśūri’s Prabandhakośa (Bombay, 1935, Singhi Jain Series 6) the accounts of the poets Bappabhaṭṭisūri and Amaraśundrasūri; B. J. Sandesara, The literary circle of Mahāmañjula Vastupūlā. Bombay, 1953 (Singhi Jain Series 33).
nuts to crack, but always proves rewarding. As a matter of fact, several passages included in various kathās show that, like other Indians, Jainas too had a real liking for so-to-say profane riddles in verse and regarded them as a pastime suitable for clever young people of taste.

One may distinguish between two entirely different categories. The first one includes riddles consisting in plays on words. Some are graphical plays (e.g. bindumatīs). Others (more numerous) are cases of what the relevant technical Sanskrit literature calls praśnottaras, a type comparable to the western "charades" with many different varieties. It deserves a full-fledged investigation which will be made elsewhere.⁵

In the present paper, I shall confine myself to the second category which I term "riddle poetry", that is to stanzas (āryās) which can be viewed as reasonably nice specimens of muktaka poetry, close to the boundaries where dhvani arises, but which are formulated as questions.⁶ They are all set in a more or less erotic context (śrīgārarasa), and involve the main characters of Indian lyric poetry: the lover, the beloved,⁷ and, if necessary, the beloved’s female friend and the go-between (nāyaka, nāyikā, sakhī, dāti). Since the Jaina authors do not use the same technical designations for all riddles of this category, an attempt to describe more precisely the specific features of the different types they represent seems justified and will be made here.

For this investigation the most useful text has proved to be Uddyotanastūrī’s Kuvalayamālā. This charming and very rich Prakrit novel is replete with various śāstric teachings.⁸ The fact that it is precisely dated (779 A.D.) is important since it provides a safe ground for any interpretation of the material it includes. The topic of literary pastimes (viṇoṣa-kāraṇām, 174.21) is taught by the young Kuvalayacandra to his new spouse Kuvalayamālā in the intimacy of their first night. As a matter of fact tète-à-têtes between

---


⁶ The limits between lyric poetry (e.g. Hāla’s Sattasāi) and riddles are not so hard-and-fast: see P. Dundas, The Sattasāi and its commentators. Torino, 1985, pp. 34-35 (Pubblicazioni di Indologica Taurinensia. Collana di Letture diretta da Oscar Botto XVII).

⁷ Following S. Lienhard, "Typen der nāyikā im indischen kävya", Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 52, 1955, n. 1 p. 386, I translate nāyaka and nāyikā as “lover” and “beloved” rather than as “hero” and “heroine”.

young lovers are the normal place for riddles and such amusements. They symbolize intimacy, enjoyment and love in reunion. The exposé given by Kuvalayacandra proceeds in a rather systematic manner. Each vinoda has a technical name. Each one is illustrated in turn by at least one instance and, in some cases, a definition is also given. Three of them are relevant here, namely the so-called bhanīewayā (§ 1), hiyaya-gāhā (§ 2) and samvihānaya (§ 3).

1. bhanīewayā

Uddyotanasūri does not define the term, but only gives one example.

\[ jai dharmiyena bhanīyam dāre ṭhāṇa "desu bhikkham" tī, tā kīṣa haliya-dhūyā turiyam racchāe\textsuperscript{10} nikkhantā? (KM 176. 14*). \]

"If the mendicant standing at the door said: ‘Please give me alms’, why did the farmer’s daughter quickly go out on the street?"

The two main characters, the mendicant and the farmer’s daughter, are familiar to the readers of Hāla’s Sattasaṅgī. The explanation given by Uddyotanasūri in the following prose line is that while the monk has gone out for alms, the lady has a rendez-vous (with another monk) at the convent and therefore jumps at this chance to meet her lover freely.\textsuperscript{11}

The type of stanza exemplified here is not unique in Jain Prakrit literature. Thus in Silāṅka’s Cauppanṇamahāpurisacarīya (9th cent.), which preserves an interesting collection of riddles, we read a stanza built on exactly the same pattern jai ... bhanīya- ... tā kīṣa ...

\[ jai sā sahiḥ[ṃ]bhanīyā "daio te dosa-maggaṇa-sayanho", tā kīṣa muddhaḍa-muhī ahīrayaraṁ gavam uvvahai? \]

(CMPC 120, vs. 12).

"If her friends said to her: ‘Your beloved is very keen\textsuperscript{12} on finding faults,’ why, then, does the lady with a charming face feel even more pride?"

The reply is: “Because she is the beloved” (jena vallaha tti), or "because he is dear (to many ladies), but loves her more.”\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{9} See Nalini Balbir (forthcoming) for more details.
\textsuperscript{10} To be read – – –.
\textsuperscript{11} This is how I interpret the elliptic sentence of KM 176. 15: bhikkhāvinigga bhāmmiṃ madhe sanketo tti.
\textsuperscript{12} Pk. sa-yānha : Sk. sa-triṣṇa.
\textsuperscript{13} The second interpretation would suppose vallaha = vallahu = vallaho.
It can be compared with a very close one found in Jayavallabha’s Vaijñālagga, a poetic anthology in Prakrit, composed (or compiled) between 750 and 1337 A.D.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{quote}
\textit{jai sā sahīhi bhāniyā “tujiha paśi sunna-deula-samāno,”

\textit{tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī ahiyaraṃ gavvam uvvahai} ? (VL 624)
\end{quote}

“If her friends said to her “Your husband is like an empty temple”, why, then, does the lady with a charming face feel even more pride?”

According to the commentator the lady thinks:

“My husband has been asked by my friends for love and has given the following answer: ‘I am a napuṃsaka’. How happy I am to be one whose husband does not love other ladies!”\textsuperscript{15}

Patwardhan goes a step further in the interpretation of the comparison \textit{sunna-deula-samāno} understood as symbolizing the man’s marital fidelity and his refusal of other ladies’ proposals.\textsuperscript{16} However, the image of the empty temple (as the ideal place of shelter open to all) might as well be understood in a completely different manner: the young man enjoys several ladies, but does not find any to be as perfect as his own beloved. This would perhaps be more in accordance with the general atmosphere of Indian poetry than the puritan interpretation of the Jaina commentator.\textsuperscript{17} In both stanzas, anyway, the reason of the lady’s pride is the same. The man’s behaviour is a sign of his exclusive love or at least his preference for her.

Four other similar stanzas (below (i) to (iv)) are included in Jayavallabha’s Vaijñālagga, and two of them are also quoted in Jineśvarasūri’s Gāhārayaṇākosa, another poetic anthology in Prakrit compiled in sam. 1251 (= 1194 A.D.). Though the Vaijñālagga is well edited, translated and annotated, it might not be out of place to collect here all the relevant verses in order to underline their structural unity.

All of them are characterized by the past participle bhāniya, and exactly built on the pattern described above with the recurring word muddhaḍa-

\textsuperscript{14} See VL: introduction p. xviii and following.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{ābhir mama bhartā rantiṃ yācitāḥ. tatas tāḥ subhagāḥ aham napuṃsako ’smīty uttarayaṃśa. tato dhanyāham yasyā bhartīnyā na kūmaya ṛta iti gavvam uvvahā}, VL p. 171.

\textsuperscript{16} “Like an empty temple i.e. like a temple devoid of the idol or image of God. This expression is meant to convey by suggestion the sense “devoid of the male organ, lacking in virility, impotent”, VL p. 556. No other corroborative evidence of this understanding is given by the translator.

\textsuperscript{17} View suggested and favoured by Prof. C. B. Tripathi (Berlin).
muhī as the designation of the girl. The other protagonists are persons whose close connection with her gives them the right to speak freely and half jokingly of her intimacy. The embarrassment their words provoke induce her to a (probably nervous) giggle and a reaction of shyness. These characters are her female-friends, her husband, her mother-in-law, or, in one case, her young brother-in-law (devara), who, in India, is conventionally allowed a special freedom as far as erotic matters are concerned. Since the various behaviours and reactions of the young and inexperienced girl depend on definite situations which are not explicated in the stanzas themselves, we largely have to rely upon the commentator’s explanations of the Vājjilagga, even if they sometimes appear rather off the mark.

Here are the verses

( i ) jai sā saḥiḥ bhaṇiyā ‘tujhja muham puṇṇa-canda-sāriccham,’
   tā kīṣa muddhaḍa-muhī kareṇa gaṇḍa-tthalam pusai?

( VL 613 = GRK 268 )

“If her friends said to her: ‘Your face looks like the full moon’, why does the lady with a charming face wipe her cheek with her hand?”

What is explicit is the comparison of the lady’s face with the full moon. What is implied and understood by her is that, like the full moon which is blemished by the sign of the deer, her face must be blemished by a black spot of collyrium.

( ii ) jai sā payṇā bhaṇiyā ‘tilayaṁ viraemi attaṇo tujhja’,
   tā kīṣa muddhaḍa-muhī hasiṇa parammuhi ṭhāi?

( VL 615 )

“If the husband said to her ‘I shall myself arrange the tilaka mark for you’, why, then, does the lady with a charming face laugh and stand with her face turned away?”

The explanation of the commentator is somewhat far-fetched. Under the pretext of arranging her wife’s tilaka, he says, the husband wants to kiss her. She tries to avoid him because she is in her courses.

( iii ) jai sāsuyāe bhaṇiyā ‘piya-vasahīm putti dvayaṁ dehi,’
   tā kīṣa muḍḍhaḍa-muhī hasiṇa paḷoyae hiyaṁ?

( VL 623 = GRL 267 )

---

9 See VL notes p. 552 on the formation of this word.
19 phusai, v. i.; reading of GRK.
11 To be read ~ ~ ~.
12 GRK reads: ... pāi-vāsaharammi dvayaṁ desu.
13 GRK reads pōḍha-muhī instead of the usual muḍḍhaḍa-muhī.
14 Annals, BORI (A. M.)
"If the mother-in-law said: 'Dear girl, put up a lamp in the chamber of your dear consort', why, then, does the (girl) with a charming face look at her heart and laugh?" (VL)

Or:

"If the mother-in-law said: 'Give some light in your husband's bedroom (= the nuptial bedroom)', why, then, does the experienced lady (pradhā = Sk. praudha), look at her heart and laugh?" (GRK)

According to the commentator the lady thinks:

"My mother-in-law wants me to give some light in my heart. My lover's bedroom is in my heart. Wondering how she can do that, she looks at her heart."

But the reading of the GRK (pradhā-mahīṭā instead of muddha-da-muhi) might suggest another type of interpretation where the lady would think of some special means to attract her lover (?).

The most popular stanza is undoubtedly VL 622. It is the only one of this type to be quoted (with eventually slightly different wordings) in alamkārasāstras, namely Bhoja's Śrīgāraprakāśa and Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa (11th cent.), as well as Sobhākaramitra's Alamkāraratnākara (12th-13th cent.).

(iv) jai ādevaṇa bhāyānī 'khagam ghettūṇa rāule vacca,'
   tā kīsa muddha-da-muhi hasiūṇa paloe sejjam? (VL 622)

"If her young brother-in-law said to her: 'Take the sword in your hand and go to the king's palace', why, then, does the lady with a charming face look at the bed and laugh?"

The Vajjālagga's commentator and Bhoja (on Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa 2. 370) offer a similar explanation of the situation.

"The young lady looks towards the bed in order to mean: 'He (viz. my brother-in-law) has seen red-dye on my feet and other signs indicating

---

iyam śvaśūr mama hrdaye dīpakaṁ dīpayati. priyasya vāsas tāvan mama hrdaye. tasmīṁ ca dīpakaṁ kathāṁ dyata iti hrdayāvalokanam, VL p. 171.

The different texts are conveniently found in V. M. Kulkarni, Prakrit Verses in Sanskrit Works on Poetics: No. 121 p. 65, No. 56 p. 351, No. 145 p. 573.

rāulam in Bhoja's works; rāulam in the Alamkāra-Ratnakara.

od: tā kīsa muddha-muhi sa naamam niśeśai diśthim in the Alamkāra-Ratnakara and tā kim sevaa-vahu ḫasiūṇa valoiam sanam in Bhoja's Works,
that I have taken the man’s part (during sexual union). Hence he appoints me for a task (which would normally) not be mine.\textsuperscript{28}

In other words, the lady laughs in a puzzled manner because what her brother-in-law says suggests that he has guessed something which should have remained private. He tells her to take the sword and act as a man because he has seen that she has already been able to do so during lovemaking.\textsuperscript{29} At the same time, the conventional complicity between the young brother-in-law and the lady may suggest that his words are in fact a concealed overture which she might not refuse. Hence her discrete glance towards the bed.

Finally, a last stanza, again taken from the \textit{Cauppannamahāpurisacarīya}, represents a case of deviation from the regular pattern.

\begin{quote}
\texttt{jai sikkhavio si so jai űrayanī \textsuperscript{30} jujjai na gantum, tā kīśa bhaṇai “ajjo mā kuppasu do vi sarisāim”?}
\end{quote}

\textit{(CMPC 120, vs. 11)}.

A tentative translation of this problematic verse could be:

“\textquote{If the pupil has been taught: ‘It is not decent for monks to go out in the night’, why, then, does he say: ‘Venerable master, do not be angry. We are both equal’?}\textquote{’}

The reply: “Because he has supernatural knowledge” (\textit{divyā-nāṇī khu so}) is not very helpful. Does the pupil suggest he knows about the secret (love-) affair of his teacher and admits he too is in the same situation?

The usual syntactical pattern is anyway clear. The past participle \textit{bhaṇiya} is here replaced by another verb belonging to the same semantic field and the main protagonist is no more the \textit{nāyikā}.

So much for the corpus of such stanzas which finally amount to seven (\textit{KM: 1}; \textit{CMPC: 1}; \textit{VL: 5}).\textsuperscript{31} Let us now consider their status and technical designations.

Uddyotanasūri in the \textit{Kuvalayamālā} is, to my knowledge, the only author who offers a really precise term which could not adequately refer to

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{atra nirikṣitam anenaśtra pūruṣayita-lakṣma (sic) pūkā-laśṭādikāna, tena niyukte māṁ na karmāṇī abhiḥprāyenā vadhvāḥ sayanāvalokanam ity abhiḥprāya-gūdham: Bhoja, Sarasvatikanṭhābhārana ed. Kāvyamālā 94. Bombay, 1934, p. 302. What is meant by \textit{niyukte māṁ na karmāṇī} is not crystal-clear.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{pūruṣayita (Bhoja); viparīta-rata (VL’s commentary p. 170).}

\textsuperscript{30} To be read $\sim\sim$.

\textsuperscript{31} The last instance mentioned is not considered as regular and is therefore excluded here.
stanzas of other structures. The term *bhanievīyā* used by him is obviously to be connected with the root *bhan-*, "to say, to speak", invariably characterizing all the relevant verses. This hapax legomenon can be analysed as a *kṛtya* adjective with a loose meaning\(^{33}\) (Sanskrit suffix *-tavya + -ka*). The feminine form is probably due to the fact that the substantive *gāhā* is to be supplied. *Bhanievīyā* (*gāhā*-s) are stanzas where the word *bhaniya* is of central importance.

In our other Prakrit sources (*Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacarīya; Vajjālagga, section 64 and Gāhārayanaṅkosa, section 23*) and in the three *alamkārāṣāstras*, the *bhaniya*- stanzas are not recognized as forming a group of their own. They respectively come under the heading *hiyāli / hiyāliyā* and *abhiprāyaṅgūḍha* ("concealed intention"). These two terms basically amount to the same. *Hiyāli* is a purely Prakrit derivative corresponding to Sk. *ḥṛdayavaṭī* (used for instance in the *Dhvanyāloka III. 43*), as the secondary suffix *-āli* shows.\(^{33}\) It is a rather general designation for riddles where one has to discover the real intention in the heart ( *ḥṛdaya*) of a *nāyikā* whose external behaviour may seem strange to an outsider. In the VL the distribution is 5 *bhaniya*-stanzas out of 14 *hiyālis*, in the GRK 2 out of 14.

Thus the material collected here would suggest that there once existed a coherent micro-genre of riddles defined by a specific pattern, and to some extent by a specific vocabulary. The term *bhanievīyā* used in the *Kuvalayamālā* might have been coined by some in order to denote it and distinguish it from other kindred varieties through formal criteria, but was not accepted overall or went out of use so that the genre as such disappeared and was included in larger classes, thus losing its individuality as a category. The straightforwardness of the pattern *jai.tā kīsa* may explain that no such stanza found its way in refined anthologies such as Hāla's *Sattasai* which show more subtlety. The *bhaniya*-stanzas may not be "high" poetry. Yet, they are a remnant of an ephemeral poetry which cultured circles ( *goṣṭhis*) enjoyed and which some writers active between the 8th and the 13th centuries somehow thought worthy of being preserved.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{33}\) On the possible shades of meanings of Sanskrit *kṛtyas* see, for instance, L. Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite* § 160-161. As is well known, they form abstract nouns in the neuter.


\(^{34}\) On the activity of the literary *goṣṭhis*, see, for instance, H. C. Bhayani, p. 3.
2. hiyaya-gāhā

One should not underestimate the part played by formal criteria in the differentiation of types. Both hiyāli and hiyaya-gāhā are etymologically related and include the word “heart” (Sk. hrdaya; see above). In the KM the following instance of hiyaya-gāhā is given.

gose ccīya haliya-vahū paḍhamam ciya ṇiggayā ghara-ddāram, 
datthum kalamba-kusumam dihiyā rottum samādhattā  
(KM 176. 16*).

“Early morning the farmer’s young wife first went out to the door of the house. When she saw the kadamba-flower, the poor lady (duhiyā = duṇ-khitā) started weeping”.

The text explains: “What is really meant is that the rendez-vous is cancelled. The kadamba-flower had been placed there on purpose by the lover”.

Again, it can be shown that the technical term and the illustrative stanza preserved in Uddyotanasūri’s work are not ad hoc creations. Parallels for both can be found in Dharmadāsa’s Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana, the standard Sanskrit treatise on riddle-literature. A part of its 4th chapter is devoted to the discussion of a type called hrdaya (VMM IV. 9ff.). The two Prakrit stanzas adduced for illustration exhibit a pattern similar to the verse quoted above. They are all characterized by the recurring use of a verb meaning “to see”. A particular sight provokes a certain external behaviour, the reason of which is not understandable to the outsider and has to be guessed by him. Moreover, the stanzas are built around a subtle network of significant looks (X looking at Y who is looking at X or Z). Thus:

dara-diṣṭha-cūa-maulam pecchia sahiyāhi[ṃ]³⁵ virahinī-sahiam,  
namio kankelli-tarū, cūo caranāhado katto?³⁹ (VMM IV. 12).

---

³⁵ Sankeya-bhaṅgo daieṇa sāhinīṇānavī kalambaviṭhaviyàn ti hiyayam, KM 176. 17.
³⁶ The edition I could use is Śrī-Dharmadāsaśūri-praṇītaḥ Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana-  
nakāviyan, svopajña-vāyākhya-samalā-hikṛtam idam Paṇāsikaropahva-Laksmaṇat-  
³⁷ The text and translation as given in Sukumar Sen, “Prākṛta and vernacular verses in  
Dharmāśa’s Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana”, Siddha-Bhairati, Rosary of Indology,  
Siddheshwar Varma Presentation Volume, Pt. 1. Hoshiarpur, 1950, 259 (Vishvavaṇanand  
Indological Series 1) are fully satisfactory.
³⁸ Sixth gana of the ṅṛyā of the form: ~ - ~ - ~.
³⁹ Reading of the Berlin manuscript “Ms. or. fol. 1034”. S. Sen’s text (p. 259) would be  
correct if it had tarū (instead of taru).
"Seeing that her friend separated from her lover cast a discrete glance at the mango-tree in bloom, the confidantes bent down the aśoka-tree and kicked the mango-tree, why then?"

The commentator offers an answer because, as he says, "in this case, the essential meaning is not written in the verse. It is in the heart". The sight of the mango-tree in blossom increases the lonely lady's pain. Her friends know it and this is the reason why they kick the mango-tree out of anger. The well-known literary convention is that when kicked the aśoka-tree bears flowers and indicates the lovers' happiness. If the aśoka-tree is bent, it means the lady's lover will come back. The commentator calls this an instance of rāga-dveṣa-hṛdyam.

pecchantam animis' acchām pecchia vahuē ājhati bhikkhaaram, damśia kāyā[m] si se katto do jāi-kusumām? (VMM IV. 13).

"Seeing the beggar staring at (her) with eyes wide open, immediately, the young wife exhibited two jāti-flowers and placed them on (her) head, why then?"

The commentator explains the lady's intention. By showing the jāti-flowers, she indicates that her birth is as pure as they are. There is also a reason for the number two. She means that her family is pure on both paternal and maternal sides. This gesture is thus a sign of her negative reply to the beggar's overtures.

The formal structure of these stanzas is perhaps not so well characterized as it was in the bhañīevvīyās. Yet the common features are enough to allow the recognition of a small class.

3. saṁvihāṇaya

The analysis of this type will show how the boundary between riddle and true poetry of the muktaka-type may disappear. The stanza is no longer formulated as a question.

ai bhañasu tam alajjam paraloya-viruddhayāṁ imam kāum, ghore tamammi nārae gantavvaṁ sambali-vaṇammi (KM 176. 26*).

---

40. On dara (glossed as īṣat in the "auto-commentary" of the VMM), see PSM s. v. = ardha, ādūhā.
41. atra bhāvaḥ śloka-madhye likhito nāsti. kimtu hṛdi vartate, p. 41.
42. To be read - - - .
43. To be read - - - .
44. Other possible representatives of this class would be VMM IV. 11 (in Sanskrit): VL 611 = GRK 265; VL 617 = GRK 270; GRK 273.
45. V. 1. alajja, vocative.
In the following prose, Uddyotanasūri gives the contextual elements which are necessary for the understanding of the different meanings and points out to them in a rather abrupt manner. Yet, to some extent, his ways remind us of Hāla’s commentators:

“Some (nāyaka) has sent a lady-messenger with a request (for rendez-vous). The angry beloved gives the answer: ‘Indeed because of sexual intercourse with the wife of another man, he will be thrown into a hell having the form of a wood of sālmali-trees.’ But on the other hand she has given him a rendez-vous. ‘The other person’ (para-loo), viz. the lady-messenger. Therefore you must go there, to the sālmali-woods. And at what time? At the time of deep darkness. ‘O, man, you (must come). I shall go there.’ So much for the samvihāna.”

The emphasis of Uddyotanasūri’s commentary seems to be on the nāyikā’s rather complex state of feelings. At a superficial level, the feeling of anger prevails. The lady has understood for herself that her messenger has been treacherous. As usual in this case, she expresses this knowledge indirectly. Therefore the stanza first appears as a kind of moral subhāṣīta emphasizing the law of karman: a bad action implies a bad rebirth.

“Dear girl, tell that shameless one: “Something which is against the other world has been done. The place where to go is the hell (narae: Sk: narake) full of sālmali-woods (immersed) in deep darkness.”

The skilful poet has underlined the general character of the verse by using an impersonal verbal form (gantavvaṁ), with no agent explicitly mentioned. The beloved’s anger and reproach directed towards her lover are thus suggested and can be understood only by him. As for the messenger she will understand that the lady refuses the nāyaka’s proposal to meet and will think she can go on having him for herself alone.

On the other hand, the nāyikā materializes her deep feeling of love through the appointment given to her lover in spite of his disloyalty. He will

---

46 kena vi dūi peshyā pattheun. nātyā kuvyā podivayanam deī. kira parāra-gamanena narae kūda-simbali-vane chubbhat tti iō tae puna tassa samkeyam dinnam paralo esa dūi. iminā kuṣjena gantavvaṁ tae eitha sambali-vane. kūe puna velūe? g horrible tamammi. are purisa e tae tti. aham tat ta tucchāmi tti. etti samvihāno tti. KM 176. 27-29.

understand it if he is able to decipher the message hidden in the ambiguity of the word narae, now to be interpreted as nara e (vocative + interjection). Thus:

"You have done something which is against the other world. O man, at the time of deep darkness, you must go to the sālmalī-woods."

Simultaneously, the lady does not forget to tell her lover that she has understood the treacherous relationship he had with the messenger. Para-loo then refers to the dāti as "the other person", the outsider in the couple. Moreover, the potentialities of Prakrit make possible to now understand kāumī as an infinitive of purpose.

Thus:

"In order to do something which is against the messenger's interests, o man, you must go, at the time of deep darkness to the sālmalī-woods."

In this way, the whole stanza conveys the ambivalence of the beloved's heart. The mention of sālmalī-woods (rather than any other type of woods) is probably highly significant and fully in harmony with the whole atmosphere of heroine's heart made of mixed bitterness and love. This tree is thorny and may be poisonous. Moreover, it is found in a certain hell where evildoers may be reborn.48

The term samvihāna(ya) used by Uddyotanāṣūri to denote this type of stanza is unfortunately not defined by him. Its general meaning would be "arrangement, combination" (Sk. samvidhānaka), here a combination of different meanings to be selected by different persons. But I have not been able to trace any other relevant parallel occurrence of the word which could be of some interest here.49

Conclusion

Western eyes are usually baffled by the Indian fondness for classification and terminology which they are often not far from seeing as an almost

49 Sk. samvidhānaka is otherwise used in dramatic literature (Uttararūmacarita, Mrochakatika). See also samvidhānaka-dvayam referring to two stanzas from the Āvūṣyakanirukti in Jinaprabhāsūri's Vividhatirthakalpa (14th cent.), ed. Muni ṇīnavijaya. Bombay, 1943; 73. 4.
strange obsession. Normally the Jainas are not supposed to lag behind in this respect. The investigation of individual cases, however, might show that Indians took formal structures as basic criteria for determining species of similar contents and distinguish them from each other, as we also do. It might prove particularly rewarding for the "archeology" of muktaka-poetry, a vast and still promising area of Indian literature.

Abbreviations

CMPC = Sīlāṅka, Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacarīm, edited by Pt. Amritlal Mohanlal Bhojak, Amedabad, Varanasi, 1961 (Prakrit Text Society Series 3); reference to the page and verse number.

GRK = Jineśvarasūri's Gāhārayaṇakosa, edited by Pandit Amritlal M. Bhojak and Nagin J. Shah, Ahmedabad, 1975 (L. D. Series 52); reference to the verse number.

KM = Uddyotanasūri's Kuvalayamālā (A Unique Campū in Prakrit) and Ratnaprabhasūri's Kuvalayamālākathā (A Stylistic Digest of the above in Sanskrit), Critically edited with various readings by A. N. Upadhye, Part I. Kuvalayamālā. Bombay, 1959 (Singhi Jain Series 45); reference to the page and line of this edition.

VL = Jayavallabha's Vajjilaggaṇi with the Sanskrit commentary of Ratnadeva and introduction. English translation, notes and glossary by Prof. M. V. Patwardhan. Ahmedabad, 1969 (Prakrit Text Society Series 14); reference to the verse number.

VMM = Dharmadāsa’s Vidagdhāmukhamandana (see n. 36); reference to the chapter and verse number.

§§ Annals BORI [A. M.]