

PRAKRIT RIDDLE POETRY

By

NALINI BALBIR

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-pūraṇas*, 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 *Prakrit* literature, and especially *narrative* literature. Reading it involves many hard

¹ Subtitle of L. Sternbach’s book, *Indian Riddles*. Hoshiarpur, 1975 (Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 67).

² S. Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry. Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit* Wiesbaden, 1984, 154.

³ The oldest instance is the ninth Aṅga of the Jaina Śvetāmbara Canon entitled *Panḍa-vāgarāṇīm* (*Praśnavyākaraṇa*). For later cases see Schubring, *Lehrs* § 189 and 196b (quoted by Lienhard). One of the most famous cases is Vimalasūri’s *Praśnottararatnamālā* on which see, for example, M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1933, Vol. II, pp. 559–560 ; H. D. Velankar, *Jinaratnakōśa*, Poona, 1944, p. 273 ff.; *ubi alia*.

⁴ See for instance in Rājasekharaśūri’s *Prabandhakōśa* (Bombay, 1935, Singhi Jain Series 6) the accounts of the poets Bappabhaṭṭisūri and Amaracandrasūri ; B. J. Sandesara, *The literary circle of Mahāmātya Vastupāla*. 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, Jains 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. *bindumatī's*). 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 (*śṛṅgārarasa*), 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, dūtī*). 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 Uddyotanaśūri'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 (*viṇoya-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 *tête-à-têtes* between

⁵ In a paper to be published in *Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes* (Paris, A. F. E. S.) 9. 1991 (Enlarged and revised version of "Riddles in Jaina literature", paper read at the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vienna, August 1990).

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

⁷ Following S. Lienhard, "Typen der nāyikā im indischen kāvyā", *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".

⁸ See, recently, Nalini Balbir, "Scènes d'alchimie dans la littérature jaina". *Journal of the European Ayurvedic Society* (Hamburg) 1. 1990, 149-164, especially §§ 1-7 and n. 2.

young lovers are the normal place for riddles and such amusements.⁹ 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 *bhaṇievviyā* (§ 1), *hiyaya-gāhā* (§ 2) and *saṁvihāṇaya* (§ 3).

1. *bhaṇievviyā*

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

*jai dhammiṇa bhaṇiyaṁ dāre ṭhāṇa “desu bhikkhaṁ” ti,
tā kīsa haliya-dhūyā turiyaṁ racchāe¹⁰ 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 *Sattasaī*. 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.¹¹

The type of stanza exemplified here is not unique in Jaina Prakrit literature. Thus in Sillāṅka’s *Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacariya* (9th cent.), which preserves an interesting collection of riddles, we read a stanza built on exactly the same pattern *jai ... bhaṇiya- ... tā kīsa ...*

*jai sā sahihi[m]bhaṇiyā “daio te dosa-maggāṇa-sayaṇho”,
tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muḥi ahiyayaraṁ gavam uvvahaī?*

(CMPC 120, vs. 12).

“If her friends said to her : “Your beloved is very keen¹² 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.”¹³

⁹ See Nalini Balbir (forthcoming) for more details.

¹⁰ To be read – – .

¹¹ This is how I interpret the elliptic sentence of KM 176. 15 : *bhikkhāvinniggaḥ dhammic madhe sanketo tti*.

¹² Pk. *sa-yaṇha* : Sk. *sa-trṣṇa*.

¹³ The second interpretation would suppose *vallaha* = *vallahu* = *vallaho*.

It can be compared with a very close one found in Jayavallabha's *Vajjālagga*, a poetic anthology in Prakrit, composed (or compiled) between 750 and 1337 A. D.¹⁴

jai sā sahīhi bhaṇiyā “ tujjha paī sunna-deula-samāṇo, ”
tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī ahiyayaram gavvam uvvāhai ? (VL 624)

“ 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 *napuṇisaka* ’. How happy I am to be one whose husband does not love other ladies ! ”.¹⁵

Patwardhan goes a step further in the interpretation of the comparison *sunna-deula-samāṇo* understood as symbolizing the man's marital fidelity and his refusal of other ladies' proposals.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.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 *Vajjālagga*, and two of them are also quoted in Jineśvarasūri's *Gāhārayanakosa*, another poetic anthology in Prakrit compiled in sam. 1251 (= 1194 A. D.). Though the *Vajjālagga* 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 *bhaṇiya*, and exactly built on the pattern described above with the recurring word *muddhaḍa-*

¹⁴ See VL ; introduction p. xviii and following.

¹⁵ *ābhir mama bhartā rantum yācitāḥ. tatas tāḥ subhagāḥ ahaṁ napuṇisako' smīty uttarayāmāsa. tato dhanyāhaṁ yasyā bhartānyā na kāmāyata iti garvam uvāha*, VL p. 171.

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.

¹⁷ View suggested and favoured by Prof. C. B. Tripathi (Berlin).

muhi as the designation of the girl.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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 *Vājjālagga*, even if they sometimes appear rather off the mark.

Here are the verses

- (i) *jai sā sahīhi bhaṇiyā 'tujjha muhaṃ punṇa-canda-sāricchaṃ,'
tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī kareṇa gaṇḍa-tthalaṃ pusai*²⁰ ?

(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 paiṇā bhaṇiyā 'tilayaṃ viraemi attāno tujjha',
tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī hasiṇṇa 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*²¹ *bhaṇiyā 'piya-vasahim putti dīvayaṃ dehi,'*²²
*tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī*²³ *hasiṇṇa paloyae hiyayaṃ* ?

(VL 623 = GRL 267)

¹⁸ See VL notes p. 552 on the formation of this word.

¹⁹ On the *mugdhā nāyikā* see, for instance, S. Lienhard, "Typen der nāyikā im indischen kāvya", WZKM 52, 1955, 389.

²⁰ *phusai*, v. l.; reading of GRK.

²¹ To be read - - -.

²² GRK reads: ... *pai-vāsaharammi dīvayaṃ desu*.

²³ GRK reads *poḍha-mahilā* instead of the usual *muddhaḍa-muhī*.

84 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 (*proḍha* = Sk. *prauḍha*), 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. ”²⁴

But the reading of the GRK (*proḍha-mahilā* instead of *muddhaḍa-muhī*) 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 *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (11th cent.), as well as Sobhākaramitra’s *Alamkāraratnākara* (12th–13th cent.).²⁵

(iv) *jai devareṇa bhaṇiyā ‘ khaggam ghattūṇa rāule²⁶ vacca, ’*
tā kīsa muddhaḍa-muhī hasiūṇa paloae sejjam ?²⁷ (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 *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* 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

²⁴ *iyam śvaśūr mama hrdaye dīpakam dāpayati. priyasya vāsas tāvan mama hrdaye. tasmimś ca dīpakah katham dīyata iti hrdayāvalokanam*, VL p. 171.

²⁵ 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.

²⁶ *rāulam* in Bhoja’s works ; *rāulam* in the *Alamkāra-Ratnākara*.

²⁷ cd : *tā kīsa muddha-muhī saanammi nivesaai ditthim* in the *Alamkāra-Ratnākara* and *tā kim sevaa-vahue hasiūṇa valoiam saanam* 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).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.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 *Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacariya*, represents a case of deviation from the regular pattern.

*jai sikkhavi sīso jaiṇarayaṇīe³⁰ jujjai ṇa gantum,
tā kīsa bhaṇai " ajjo mā kuppasu do vi sarisāim " ?*

(CMPC 120, vs. 11).

A tentative translation of this problematic verse could be :

" 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 ' " ?

The reply : " Because he has supernatural knowledge " (*divva-ṇāṇīkhu 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 *bhaṇiya* is here replaced by another verb belonging to the same semantic field and the main protagonist is no more the *nāyikā*.

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

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

²⁸ *atra nirīkṣitam anenātra puruṣāyita-lakṣma* (sic) *pāda-lakṣṇadikam, tena niyuṅkte mām na karmanīty abhiṣṛāyena vadhvāḥ śayanāvalokanam ity abhi-
prāya-gūḍham* : Bhoja, *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* ed. Kāvya-mālā 94. Bombay, 1934, p. 302. What is meant by *niyuṅkte mām na karmani* is not crystal-clear.

²⁹ *puruṣāyita* (Bhoja) ; *viparīta-rata* (VL's commentary p. 170).

³⁰ To be read √ √ - √.

³¹ The last instance mentioned is not considered as regular and is therefore excluded here.

stanzas of other structures. The term *bhaṇievviyā* used by him is obviously to be connected with the root *bhaṇ-*, “to say, to speak”, invariably characterizing all the relevant verses. This hapax legomenon can be analysed as a *kṛtya* adjective with a loose meaning³² (Sanskrit suffix *-tavya* + *-ka*). The feminine form is probably due to the fact that the substantive *gāhā* is to be supplied. *Bhaṇievviyā* (*gāhā-s*) are stanzas where the word *bhaṇiya* is of central importance.

In our other Prakrit sources (*Cauppaṇṇamahāpurīṣacariya*; *Vajjālagga*, section 64 and *Gāhārayaṇakosa*, section 23) and in the three *alamkāra-sāstras*, the *bhaṇiya*- stanzas are not recognized as forming a group of their own. They respectively come under the heading *hiyālī* / *hiyāliyā* and *abhiprāyagūḍha* (“concealed intention”). These two terms basically amount to the same. *Hiyālī* is a purely Prakrit derivative corresponding to Sk. *hṛdayavati* (used for instance in the *Dhvanyāloka* III. 43), as the secondary suffix *-ālī* shows.³³ It is a rather general designation for riddles where one has to discover the real intention in the heart (*hṛdaya*) of a *nāyikā* whose external behaviour may seem strange to an outsider. In the VL the distribution is 5 *bhaṇiya*-stanzas out of 14 *hiyālīs*, 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 *bhaṇievviyā* used in the *Kuvalaya-mālā* 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 *Sattasāi* which show more subtlety. The *bhaṇiya*-stanzas may not be “high” poetry. Yet, they are a remnant of an ephemeral poetry which cultured circles (*goṣṭhīs*) enjoyed and which some writers active between the 8th and the 13th centuries somehow thought worthy of being preserved.³⁴

³² 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.

³³ VL notes pp. 549-551. All phonetic connection with Sk. *prahelikā* is out of question. Detailed investigation of the term by H. C. Bhayani, “On the *ṣaṭprajñāka-gāthā* and *hṛdayavati* (mentioned under *Dhvanyāloka* III.43)”: *Vidyā*, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, vol. XV, No. 2, August 1972, 1-8.

³⁴ On the activity of the literary *goṣṭhīs*, 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 *hiyālī* and *hiyaya-gāhā* are etymologically related and include the word “heart” (Sk. *hṛdaya*; see above). In the KM the following instance of *hiyaya-gāhā* is given.

*gose cciya haliya-vahū paḍhamam ciya ṇiggayā ghara-ddāram,
daṭṭhum kalamba-kusumam duhiyā rottum samāḍhattā*

(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 ”.³⁵

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 *Vidagdhamukhamanḍana*, the standard Sanskrit treatise on riddle-literature.³⁶ A part of its 4th chapter is devoted to the discussion of a type called *hṛdya* (VMM IV. 9ff.). The two Prakrit stanzas adduced for illustration exhibit a pattern similar to the verse quoted above.³⁷ 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-diṭṭha-cūa-maulam pecchia sahiyāhi[m]³⁸ virahinī-sahiam,
namio kankelli-tarū, cūo caraṇāhado katto³⁹ (VMM IV. 12).*

³⁵ *Saṅkeya-bhaṅgo daiena sāhinṇāṇam kalambam ṭhaviyam ti hiyayam*, KM 176. 17.

³⁶ The edition I could use is Śrī-Dharmadāsasūri-praṇītaṁ *Vidagdhamukhamanḍana-nakāvyam*, svopajā-vyākhyā-samalaṅkṛtam idam Paṇasīkaropāhva-Lakṣmaṇāt-maja-vāsudevaśarmaṇa saṁśodhitam. Bombay, 1905.

³⁷ The text and translation as given in Sukumar Sen, “Prākṛta and vernacular verses in Dharmadāsa’s *Vidagdhamukhamanḍana*”, *Siddha-Bhūratī*, Rosary of Indology, Siddheshwar Varma Presentation Volume. Pt. 1. Hoshiarpur, 1950, 259 (Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 1) are fully satisfactory.

³⁸ Sixth *gana* of the *āryā* 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 glance⁴⁰ 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 ”.⁴¹ 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 aṇimis’acchaṁ pecchia vahuāe⁴² jhatti bhikkhaaram,
damsia kayāi[m]⁴³ sī se katto do jāi-kusumāim ? (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 *bhaṇievvīyās*. Yet the common features are enough to allow the recognition of a small class.⁴⁴

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 bhaṇasu taṁ alajjam⁴⁵ paraloya-viruddhayam imam kāum,
ghore tamammi narae gantavvam sambali-vaṇammi (KM 176. 26*).*

⁴⁰ On *dara* (glossed as *iṣat* in the “ auto-commentary ” of the VMM), see PSM s. v. = *ardha, ādhā*.

⁴¹ *atra bhāvah śloka-madhye likhito nāsti. kimtu hr̥di 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 *śālmālī*-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 *śālmālī*-woods. And at what time ? At the time of deep darkness. ‘ O, man, you (must come). I shall go there.’ So much for the *saṁvihāṇa* ”⁴⁶

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.⁴⁷ Therefore the stanza first appears as a kind of moral *subhāṣita* 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 *śālmālī*-woods (immersed) in deep darkness. ”

The skilful poet has underlined the general character of the verse by using an impersonal verbal form (*gantavvāṁ*), 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 *keṇa vi dūi pesiyā patthecum. nātyā kuviyā paḍivayanam dei. kira parādūra-gamanena narae kūḍa-simbali-vane chubbhai tti io tñe puna tassa samkeyam dinnam paraloo esa dūi. imiññu kujjena gantavvāṁ tae ettha sambali-vane. kñe puna velūe ? ghore tamammi. are purisa e tae tti. aham tatta vaccihāmi tti, ettio saṁvihāṇo tti*, KM 176. 27-29.

⁴⁷ See, for instance, *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry*. Vidyākara's “ Subhāṣitaratnakosa ” translated by Daniel H. H. Ingalls. Cambridge, Mass., 1965 : Harvard Oriental Series 44 : section 25 “ The lady's expression of anger at her messenger.”

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 *śālmālī*-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 *dūtī* 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 *śālmālī*-woods. ”

In this way, the whole stanza conveys the ambivalence of the beloved’s heart. The mention of *śālmālī*-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 evil-doers may be reborn.⁴⁸

The term *saṁvihāṇa(ya)* used by Uddyotanasūri to denote this type of stanza is unfortunately not defined by him. Its general meaning would be “ arrangement, combination ” (Sk. *saṁvidhānaka*), 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

⁴⁸ Cf. Renate Syed, *Die Flora Altindiens in Literatur und Kunst* Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München, 1990, 540 ff.

⁴⁹ Sk. *saṁvidhānaka* is otherwise used in dramatic literature (*Uttararūmacarita*, *Mṛcchakaṭika*). See also *saṁvidhānaka-dvayam* referring to two stanzas from the *Āvaśyakaniryukti* in Jinaprabhasūri’s *Vividhatīrthakalpa* (14th cent.), ed. Muni Jinavijaya. 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 = Sillāṅka, *Cauppaṇṇamahāpurisacariāṃ*, 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 *Vajjālaggaṃ* 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 *Vidagdhamukhamāṇḍana* (see n. 36); reference to the chapter and verse number.