

Explaining Prakrit Poetry in the 18th Century Vrajarāja Dīkṣita's Commentary on Hāla's *Seven Centuries*

Andrew OLLETT

Résumé

Cet article présente la partie disponible (stances 1-14) d'un commentaire inédit sur la Saptasatī, l'ouvrage le plus important de la littérature prākrite, composé par Vrajarāja Dīkṣita de Mathurā au xviii^e siècle. On y trouvera une discussion sur la famille, le style et les sources de Vrajarāja, ainsi que sur les rapports qu'entretient ce commentaire avec d'autres.

Mots-clés : prakrit ; commentaires ; *Saptasatī* ; Vrajarāja Dīkṣita.

Abstract

*This paper presents the available portion (verse 1–14) of a previously unpublished commentary on Hāla's *Seven Centuries*, the most important work of Prakrit literature, by the eighteenth-century scholar Vrajarāja Dīkṣita of Mathurā. It includes a discussion of Vrajarāja's family, style, and sources, and the relationship of his commentary to others.*

Keywords: Prakrit; commentaries; *Seven Centuries* (*Sattasatī*); Vrajarāja Dīkṣita.

Explaining Prakrit Poetry in the 18th Century Vrajarāja Dīkṣita's Commentary on Hāla's *Seven Centuries*

Andrew OLLETT

The *Seven Centuries* (*Sattasaī* in Prakrit, and *Saptaśatī* in Sanskrit) is a collection of seven hundred poems in the Prakrit language. Ascribed to a king of the Sātavāhana dynasty known as “Hāla”, and likely compiled in the first half of the first millennium of the common era – with proposed dates ranging from the second century, which I personally find credible (Ollett 2017: 54–57), to the sixth century (Bhandarkar 1917: 189) – it has since become one of the most popular and influential collections of lyric verse in South Asia. It firmly established Prakrit, a Middle Indic language associated with the Deccan, as a literary language that would be cultivated in many regions for many centuries afterwards.

Each of the poems in the *Seven Centuries* is complete in a single verse, called a *gāthā*, that consists of two lines. Most of the poems are therefore very brief vignettes. They depend on the reader's ability to either find a hidden significance in the statements or images disclosed in the verse, and even more fundamentally, to imagine the discursive context in which the verse might have been spoken: that is, to imagine *who* is speaking, *to whom*, for what purpose, and so on.¹ Hāla's *Seven Centuries* is largely, although not exclusively, concerned with love and sex, and hence very many of its verses can be read as representing the various statements and actions in what the text calls “the drama of sexual life” (*raināḍaa-*, verse 344 in Weber's edition). For some readers, an erotic subtext must be discovered at any cost, and even verses that appear to be innocent descriptions of nature can be seen as oblique forms of communication between lovers. The poems of *Seven Centuries* are very often set in the villages of the Deccan, on the banks of the Godāvārī river: their cast of characters includes the anonymous “him” and “her” around whom the aforementioned drama of sexual life revolves, their parents, in-laws, confidantes and friends. Hāla's *Seven Centuries* thus provided a model for how to read single-verse or *muktaka-* (“isolate”) poems, as they are called in Sanskrit.²

Besides inspiring other similar collections of “isolate” poems, in Prakrit, Sanskrit, and a range of vernacular languages, the *Seven Centuries* attracted

1. The best example of the various different contexts that can be imagined for a single poem is Abhinavagupta's discussion of the verse numbered 886 in Weber's edition (see Ingalls *et al.* 1990: 103–105).

2. Readers are referred to the excellent translations of Hāla's *Seven Centuries* into English (Khoroché & Ticken 2009) and Italian (Boccali *et al.* 1990), both with useful introductions.

a large number of premodern commentaries.³ All of these commentaries were written in Sanskrit and aimed, in part, to provide a readily-understandable Sanskrit gloss of a text of which the language was always rather obscure and probably became increasingly so to later generations of readers. They attest to a long history of reading the text – starting, perhaps, with Bhuvanapāla in the eleventh century (Vasudeva & Chiarucci 2011) – and, accordingly, a wide variety of interpretations and interpretive strategies. The commentaries are thus important not only for understanding the text of the *Seven Centuries*, but also for understanding premodern protocols of reading (see especially Dundas 1985 and Selby 2000: 89–98). Moreover, as we will see in this article, they allow us to see precisely how readers made use of concepts from the domain of poetics (*alaṃkāraśāstra*), through their identification of various figures of speech and forms of suggestion. Commentaries, finally, are important to the textual criticism of Hāla’s *Seven Centuries*, both because they often constitute “recensions” or “versions” by themselves – or at least stabilize the text in a form that can be compared to other such versions – and because they sometimes report variant readings. We are, as yet, very far from a “critical” edition of the *Seven Centuries* as a whole, and in large part that is because the testimony of the commentaries has yet to be fully exploited.⁴

In the introduction to his edition of Vema Bhūpāla’s *Bhāvādīpikā*, a commentary on a hundred selected verses from Hāla’s collection, A.N. Upadhye listed all of the premodern commentaries on the *Seven Centuries* known to him. In 1970, only four of these commentaries had been published: Gaṅgādharma Bhaṭṭa’s *Bhāvāleśaparakāśikā*, probably the most widely circulated (possibly sixteenth century, but see below); Bhuvanapāla’s *Chekotivīcāralīlā* (eleventh century, according to Vasudeva & Chiarucci 2011); Pītāmbara’s *Gāthāsaptasatīprakāśikā* (date unknown); and Vema Bhūpāla’s *Bhāvādīpikā* (early fifteenth century). Upadhye, with some references provided by V. Raghavan, listed another *thirteen* commentaries that were unpublished in 1970. They include those of Ājaḍa, Kumāradeva, Kulanātha, Govindaśarman, Ghanaśyāma (his commentary, however, is known only from a reference in another one of his works, and in all likelihood is lost), Pramukhasukavi, Premarāja, Kulabaladeva, Mādhava Yajva, Vrajarāja Dīkṣita, Sādharaṇadeva, Īśvara, and Jalhaṇadeva. For details see Upadhye (1970: 17–18).

All thirteen of these commentaries remain unpublished today, almost a half-century after Upadhye’s survey. The modest goal of this contribution is to introduce, and present an edition and translation of, the aforementioned commentary of Vrajarāja Dīkṣita. The edition is based on a single incomplete manuscript held at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

3. While no other collections of Prakrit verse (such as *Vajjālaggaṃ*) attempted to approximate Hāla’s organization into seven hundred-verse blocks, collections of isolate poems in other languages were often explicitly modelled on the *Seven Centuries*. Govardhana (12th/13th c.) and Viśveśvara (18th c.), both composed such collections in Sanskrit (called *Āryāsaptasatī*), and Bihārī (early 17th c.) composed one in Braj Bhāṣā (*Satsatī*). See Ācārya (1982) for more on the vernacular *Satsatī* tradition.

4. The *editio princeps* of Weber (1881) remains the edition of reference; Tiekens’s partial re-edition (1983) takes a number of new commentarial traditions into account, including the South Indian text commented upon by Mādhava Yajva Miśra.

in Pune (no. 585 of 1891–1895).⁵ The *Prākṛtasaptaśatī* of Vrajarāja Dīkṣita, represented by a manuscript at the Nathdwara Library in Udaipur according to the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, may be the same text, but I have not been able to consult it. The B.O.R.I. manuscript is a relatively modern paper manuscript, with ten folios and between nine and ten lines per folio. It contains Vrajarāja's commentary on the first fourteen verses of the *Seven Centuries*, the commentary on the fourteenth verse being incomplete. It is in good condition with few mistakes. The copyist has made a number of inter-linear and marginal corrections, which are marked in the edition by angular brackets. Brief as it is, the surviving portions of Vrajarāja's commentary allow us to see how Hāla's *Seven Centuries* was read by an intellectual of the eighteenth century.

Vrajarāja Dīkṣita

P.K. Gode (1929) was one of the first to write about the Dīkṣita family of Mathurā to which Vrajarāja belonged, and S.G. Rajimwale has reviewed the evidence in his 1979 doctoral thesis (131–137). The genealogy of Vrajarāja is quite clear: his father was named Kāmarāja, and his grandfather was named Sāmarāja. He also had a son, named Jivarāja, who wrote a *Gopālacampū* and a commentary on Bhānudatta's *Rasatarāṅgiṇī* (Krishnamachariar 1957: 785). His father, Kāmarāja, wrote a text on poetics called *Kāvyaenduprakāśa* and, according to Krishnamachariar, a poem called *Śṛṅgāarakalikā*. Regarding Vrajarāja's grandfather, there is some doubt as to whether all of the texts attributed to a Sāmarāja can be attributed to him. Gode argued that he was the author of both the *Śrīdāmacarita*, composed in 1681 for the Bundela prince Ānandarāya, and a work on erotics titled *Ratikallolinī*, composed in 1719, which would imply a relatively long career. If his grandfather wrote between 1681 and 1719, we should expect Vrajarāja to have lived in the early eighteenth century. Besides the *Śrīdāmacarita* and *Ratikallolinī*, one Sāmarāja is also known as the author of a short text discussing the nature of *rasa*, called the *Śṛṅgārāmṛtalaharī*, a *prahasana* called *Dhūrtanartaka*, and a collection of 300 *āryā* verses (*Āryātrīśatī*). Rajimwale, who discusses Sāmarāja's literary output, notes that the author of a ritual manual, the *Padārthapradīpikā*, is also named Sāmarāja and, like our author's grandfather, gives his own father's name as Nṛhari; additionally, this Sāmarāja names his grandfather as Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa. Nṛhari and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa are thus likely to be Vrajarāja's great- and great-great grandfather, respectively.

In general, we can say that the Dīkṣitas were a well-established family of the Mathurā region, with a particular expertise in literature, poetics, and erotics. Rajimwale (136–137) sees in the names Nṛhari or Narahari and Sāmarāja a sign that the family was devoted to Viṣṇu in his form as Narasiṃha, and speculates that the family had moved to Mathurā from Maharashtra – a

5. I thank the staff of B.O.R.I., especially Shreenand Bapat, for kindly making this manuscript available to me on a visit in 2013.

stronghold of Narasiṃha worship, where Sāmarāja is common as a name for the deity – in the seventeenth century.

Besides the present commentary, Vrajarāja is known as the author of the following works, according to the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Dash 2013) and Krishnamachariar (1957: 784):

- *Ṣaḍṭuvarṇanakāvya*, printed in vol. 14 of the *gucchaka* series of the *Kāvyaṃālā* (Bombay 1938), pp. 124–131. It describes the six seasons as parts of the army of Kāmadeva – identified as a king – as he attacks Śiva in his meditation.
- *Rasikarañjana*, also known as *Rasikarañjanatrisatī* or *Āryātrisatīmuktaka*, evidently a collection of 300 verses in the *āryā* meter. According to Krishnamachariar (1957: 784), this work was printed in Bombay, but I have not been able to find it, and the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* does not list any printed editions. (Sāmarāja is also said to have composed a similar work.)
- Another *Rasikarañjana*, this one a commentary on Bhānudatta’s *Rasamañjarī*.
- A commentary on Gopāladāsa’s *Vallabhākhyāna*.
- A *Śṛṅgārasataka*, mentioned only by Krishnamachariar.

Commentarial style

For each verse, Vrajarāja first provides an introduction that explains the discursive situation represented by the verse: Who is speaking? Who is spoken to? And what is the object, or purport, of the speech? Such introductions are a standard feature of the commentaries on the *Seven Centuries*. Similar introductions are also, interestingly, found in commentaries on the earlier collections of Tamil poems (the so-called *caṅkam* poems). They identify the speaker and addressee of each poem with one of the stock figures of Tamil love poetry (see Wilden 2014). This similarity perhaps speaks to a shared culture of commentary in the early centuries of the transmission of both the Prakrit and Tamil anthologies, which is perhaps less unlikely than it sounds, given the well-known – but still nebulous and understudied – similarities between Prakrit and Tamil poetry (see Hart 1975, Boccali 1999, and Lienhard 1973: 116). Whatever their origin, these introductions seem to represent the earliest stratum of the commentarial tradition on the *Seven Centuries*. In Vrajarāja’s case, they are usually quite short and vague (e.g., “one woman tells another woman that some man was making fun of some woman while she was cooking”, from verse 12). In providing a brief *mise en scène* for every verse, he was undoubtedly following the procedures of earlier commentators. After the introduction, Vrajarāja reads the text of the verse, followed by a translation of the verse into Sanskrit, signalled by *iti prākṛtārthaḥ*, “this is what the Prakrit text means”. In the manuscript used here, both the text and the translation use a dot (•) to separate words, although not in compounds, and not between a word and an enclitic particle. Vrajarāja then discusses the various suggested meanings of the verse (*iti vyajyate*). These discussions are, in my view, the strongest point of Vrajarāja’s commentary: he is sensitive to subtleties in the

choice of words and how they affect the interpretation of the verse. Depending on whether such meanings are available, and how they function within the poem as a whole, Vrajarāja will then classify the poem as either “high”, “middle”, or “low” (*uttama*, *madhyama*, or *avara*).

Vrajarāja proceeds to make a number of identifications: the ornaments (*alaṃkāras*) used in the verse, the type of leading lady (*nāyikā*) it features, its verbal quality (*guṇa*), its style (*rīti*), its manner of development (*pāka*), and its meter (*chandas*).

Sources

In the preserved portion of the commentary, only one earlier authority is named. That is Piṅgala, the alleged author of the *Prākṛtapīṅgala*, a thirteenth-century handbook of metrical forms in a late variety of Apabhramsha. His name, and quotations from the *Prākṛtapīṅgala*, only appear in marginal additions, and hence it is possible that they were added after Vrajarāja had completed his commentary. (In the edition, I have included these quotations in the main text, less out of a conviction that they are original than out of a relatively diplomatic approach to presenting the text.) Vrajarāja also quotes from Viśvanātha’s *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (fifteenth century), as well as from Hemacandra’s grammar of Prakrit (twelfth century), although without naming either of them.

Apart from these quotations, Vrajarāja draws on a vocabulary of literary analysis that is relatively common among authors of the eighteenth century, including the language of suggestion (*dhvani/vyañjanā*) and the language of ornaments (*alaṃkāras*). He devotes comparatively little attention to the analysis of *rasa*, despite the fact that he probably was quite familiar with it, given that it formed the subject of his grandfather’s *Śṛṅgārāmṛtalahaṛī*. When it comes to ornaments, Vrajarāja’s analysis is closest to the model represented by the *Kuvalayānanda* of the sixteenth-century polymath Appayya Dīkṣita. In the first and fourth verses, for example, Vrajarāja identifies the figure as *uktaviṣayā vastūtprekṣā*. As far as I know, Appayya Dīkṣita’s popular handbook was the first to make *vastūtprekṣā* one of the three main varieties of *utprekṣā*, and in Appayya’s treatment this variety has two further subvarieties, *uktaviṣayā* and *anuktaviṣayā*. The reference, in the same context, to *abhedarūpaka* as one of the two main varieties of *rūpaka* also comes from the *Kuvalayānanda*.⁶ In one case, his discussion of *kāvyaḷiṅga* in the eleventh verse, Vrajarāja uses a *navya*-type expression which he may have picked up from Appayya. A number of identifications, however, are closer to Viśvanātha’s presentation in the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, for example *ārthī upamā* in the twelfth verse. When it comes to suggestion, Vrajarāja’s analysis seems to be based primarily on the *Kāvyaṣṛṅgārāmṛtalahaṛī* of Mammaṭa, whom he paraphrases on many occasions, but his use of Mammaṭa seems to be quite limited and superficial.

6. See *Kuvalayānanda* §12 (v. 32) for *utprekṣā* and §5 (v. 17) for *rūpaka*. My numbering of verses and sections follows that of Bholāśaṅkara Vyāsa’s edition, but the same numeration is to be found in the *Śrīmadappayadīkṣitaḡranthāvalīḡ* edition printed in Hyderabad in 1998.

His discussion of “leading ladies” (*nāyikās*) is probably based on the *Rasamañjarī* of Bhānudatta, which both he and his son, Jīvarāja, commented upon. Most of the types mentioned in Vrajarāja’s commentary are described elsewhere, for example in the aforementioned *Sāhityadarpaṇa*: this applies to the *parodhaparakīyā* (v. 4), *prauḍhā* (v. 5), *madhyā* (vv. 6, 10), *kalahāntarītā* (vv. 10, 13), *māninī* (v. 11), and *mugdhā* (v. 12) types. The *anusāyānā* type (vv. 8, 9), however, I have found only in Bhānudatta’s work, and indeed the brief explanations that Vrajarāja gives in verses 8 and 9 agree exactly with Bhānudatta’s wording (v. 27).

Other aspects of Vrajarāja’s analysis are more idiosyncratic. His types of “development” (*pāka*) include the grape (*drākṣā*), the coconut (*nārikela*), the mango (*rasāla*), and the *jambu*, and I know of no authority that gives these options. Similarly, the styles (*rīti*) are only partly familiar: the *pāñcālī*, *gaudī*, and *vaidarbhī* styles date all the way back to Vāmana, but the *bhairavī* style, mentioned in the commentary to verse 7, is unknown to me.

Relation to other commentaries

Vrajarāja does not refer to any other commentators on the *Seven Centuries* by name. Some sections of his commentary, however, have close parallels in Gaṅgādhara Bhaṭṭa’s *Bhāvaleśaparakāśikā*. The date of Gaṅgādhara is unknown; Dundas (1985: 9) says “possibly sixteenth century” and Selby (2000: 93) says “sixteenth century”. Gaṅgādhara’s commentary, though also relatively brief, gives the impression of being somewhat more developed overall, and a comparison of their commentaries on verse 4 suggests that Gaṅgādhara builds upon an interpretation that was known to Vrajarāja.

Both Vrajarāja and Gaṅgādhara quote Mammaṭa’s interpretation of verse 4, or rather his pair of interpretations. In both, a woman is speaking to her lover; according to the first, the stillness of the heron suggests that no one else is around, and hence it is a suitable place for an encounter; according to the second, the stillness of the heron suggests that the lover has failed to come to the assigned place at the assigned time. What Vrajarāja and Gaṅgādhara share against Mammaṭa are two novel interpretations of the phrase *ñiccalanīpphamdā*: it could be a comparison-compound, meaning “still as a mountain”, or alternatively the first word could be read as a vocative, meaning “motionless”. Vrajarāja’s overall interpretation, however, is identical to Mammaṭa’s, whereas Gaṅgādhara offers an entirely new interpretation, according to which the woman is commanding her lover to be “motionless” in their sexual encounter. It would appear that Vrajarāja was ignorant of Gaṅgādhara’s innovation, despite the fact that Vrajarāja almost certainly lived after Gaṅgādhara. The similarities in their commentary, however, including their shared citation of Mammaṭa’s interpretations, and their shared interpretations of the phrase *ñiccalanīpphamdā*, suggest that they have a common source that is now lost.

Some of Vrajarāja’s reading strategies – for example the interpretation of the first verse as containing at least three implied meanings – are similar

to those of Premarāja, whose *Sāhityabhūmi* commentary on the *Seven Centuries* remains unpublished (B.O.R.I. ms. no. 181 of 1879–1880). I have, however, found nothing to indicate that Premarāja was used by Vrajarāja as a source, and I am at this stage uncertain about Premarāja’s date. Similarly, Vrajarāja’s attention to the “typology of leading ladies” (*nāyikābheda*) is common to Mādhava Yajva Miśra (G.O.M.L. ms. R3378), who includes a long excursus on the subject in his commentary to the ninth verse, but there is nothing to indicate that one commentator read the other. Handiqui (1976: 92) placed Mādhava Yajva, who worked in Kerala, between the twelfth and the sixteenth century.

Regarding the text of the *Seven Centuries* that Vrajarāja used, the first fourteen verses are sufficient to show that it was the “vulgate” version in the terminology of Weber (see 1881: xxxii). More specifically, the order of verses is identical to that of Weber’s manuscripts γ and ψ , and diverges slightly from the other vulgate manuscripts, including the commentaries of Gaṅgādhara and Pītāmbara. Several readings (e.g., *moleṃti* for *maūlamṃti* in verse 5, and *āṇaṇa* for *muha* in verse 6) corroborate the text’s closer affiliation with γ and ψ than with any of the other witnesses of the vulgate. The text is closer to γ than to ψ , as shown by the reading *vaṇiāo* (with γ) rather than *vilaāo* in verse 7 and *jūrasu* (with γ) rather than *jhūrasu* in verse 14. There is, moreover, a reading that does not appear in any other version – *bhohalia* and *dohaliam* for the vulgate’s *ṇohaliam* in verse 6 – but this is likely to be a secondary error.

Symbols and conventions

The text presented here is not a “diplomatic” edition. I have normalized the orthography of the manuscript, as explained below, and made a number of corrections, which are documented in the apparatus. This edition, however, was generated from an XML document that includes the readings of the manuscript alongside my editorial interventions. Hence a diplomatic edition can be generated from this document as well, upon request from the author. Parallel texts are given in the upper register of footnotes. The critical apparatus is given in the lower register. The only relevant siglum is *ms*, which represents the B.O.R.I. manuscript.

The manuscript generally writes *anusvāra* for any syllable-final nasal. I retain this usage for Prakrit, but give *parasavarṇa* for syllable-final nasals within a word in Sanskrit. The manuscript writes an *avagraha* in some cases of vowel coalescence (e.g. *vastūtpreṣā’lamkāraḥ* on f. 2v. l. 4), but not in the standard cases of vowel sandhi; this edition uses *avagraha* for *lopasandhi* and not for vowel coalescence (e.g., *bhaje ’ham* but *utpreṣālamkāraḥ*). Regarding double consonants, the manuscript also writes *bhbh*, and *ghgh*, and *jhjha* where I write *bbh*, *ggh*, and *jjh*, although it rather consistently writes *ddh*. The manuscript doubles consonants after *r*; I do not. I write *tattva* and *sattva* where the manuscript writes *tatva* and *satva*. In the quotations from the *Prākṛtapiṅgala*, I use *m̄* to represent a nasal that is

non-moraic (i.e., according to the metrical template, it must not contribute to the weight of the preceding syllable) but is read in the manuscript as an *anusvāra*. I have not normalized the use of the word-separator (•), since its presence or absence may be of some philological interest.

I have not noted the numerous small corrections and deletions that the copyist himself has made in the margins or between the lines, except when I believe the original reading (*ante correctionem*) is worth reporting. For larger additions or corrections that the copyist has made in the margins, I enclose the added characters in {angle brackets}. All of these additions are written in the same hand as the main text. My own corrections are read in the text, and the original reading is noted in the apparatus. Characters which I have supplied, and which are not read in the manuscript, are enclosed in [floor brackets].

The base text of the *Seven Centuries*, as it is read in the manuscript, is printed in grey background. Folio numbers, and even line numbers, are reported in the right-hand margin. Names of meters, which are not read in the manuscript but supplied for the reader's convenience, are reported close to the right-hand margin in brackets.

This contribution was vastly improved by the careful reading of the reviewers for *BEFEO* and their valuable suggestions.

1	śrī gaṇeśāya namaḥ		f. iv
2	svarge tribindurājer utkr̥ṣṭo bhavati yasya sevanayā	[āryā]	l. 2
3	mūḍho 'pi tan nijāntar bhaje 'ham aruṇāruṇaṃ tejaḥ 1		
4	bindunutaṃ brahmādikadevāsyaśrīmahimakaraṇaṃ	[upagīti]	
5	daityendrasārthadalanāṃ bhajāmi ki[m]cin mahāḥ kṛṣṇaṃ 2		l. 4
6	danujādhināthanāśanapīsunāṃ prahlādanaṃ nṛhareḥ	[upagīti]	
7	bhavyāya bhāvaye 'ntaḥ prādurbhāvaprabhāvam ahaṃ 3		l. 6
8	vibudhagaṇasevyamānaṃ vidyāśrīsobhitasvarūpaṃ ca	[āryā]	
9	śrīnāthasāmarājaṃ (vande) śrīsāmarājam iva 4		
10	jaivātr̥kasamsevyam vibhūtibharaśobhitaṃ caiva	[upagīti]	l. 8
11	śrītātakāmarājaṃ vande śrīkāmarājam iva 5		
12	śrīmadguruprasādāt tātasyānugrahād viśadāḥ	[udgīti]	f. 2r
13	śrīśālīvāhanāryās tanute vrajarājadīkṣitaḥ sukaviḥ 6		l. 2
14	śrīḥ rasikajanamanovinodāya prārīpsitasya granthasya nispratyūhāparisamā-		
15	ptyarthaṃ śrīśālīvāhanaḥ sadāśivasandhyāñjalipraṇatyupadeśarūpaṃ maṅga-		l. 4
16	lam āracayati		

4 bindu] binduṃ *ms*

4 nutaṃ] nuta *ms*. The emendation was suggested to me by Hugo David.

12 hād vi] hāddvi *ms*

14 prārīpsitasya] prārīpsitasya *ms*

16 āracayati] *sic*

17	pasuvañño • rosāruṇapaḍimāsaṃkaṃtagorimuhaaṃdaṃ •	
18	gahiagghapaṃkaam mia • saṃjhāsaliḷaṃjaliṃ • ṇamaḥa • 1	l. 6
19	paśupateḥ • roṣāruṇasaṃkrāntapratimāgurīmukhacandram •	
20	gr̥hītārgḥapaṅkajam iva • sandhyāsaliḷāñjaliṃ • namata • 1	l. 8
21	iti prākṛtārthaḥ	
22	prākṛte pūrvanipātānīyamāt saṃkrāntapratimeti roṣeṇa na tu krodhena	
23	aruṇo na tv āraktaḥ cidi āhlāde ity asmād dhātor niṣpannasya candra-	l. 10
24	śabdasya āhlādakāritvam arthaḥ tathā ca nāyam īṣyājanyo mānaḥ kiṃ	f. 2v
25	tu “preṃṇaḥ kuṭīlagāmitvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇaṃ vinā sa māna” ity ukta-	l. 2
26	lakṣaṇaḥ premamāna eva anyathā candrapadaṃ noktaṃ syāt anyad e-	
27	voktaṃ syāt īṣyājanyamānarūpavipralambhe udvegaḥ saṃcārī premamā-	l. 4
28	narūpavipralambhe harṣaḥ saṃcārī autsukyādayas tūbhayatra samāḥ ata	
29	eva roṣāruṇasyāpi mukhasyāhlādakāritvam upapadyate tathā ca gurīm āla-	
30	mbya prādurbhūtasadāśivaniṣṭharatiprakṛtikavipralambhaṣṅgāro vyajyateti ra-	
31	sadhvaniḥ ardhanārīnaṭasvarūpakaraṇākṣamānyadevāpekṣayā sadāśive sarasa-	l. 8
32	tvenotkarṣaviśeṣād vyatirekāḷaṃkāro vya(jya)ta ity alaṃkāradhvaniḥ grantha-	
33	kṛnniṣṭhabhavanīśaṅkaraviṣayakaratirūpo bhāvo vyajyata iti bhāvadvhaniḥ	f. 3r
34	dhvaner atīśayitacamatkāraḥkāritvena uttamaṃ kāvyam āruṇyena nimittena	l. 2
35	gurīmukhacandrasya gr̥hītārgḥapaṅkajatādātmyasaṃbhāvanayā uktaviṣayā va-	l. 4
36	stūtīprekṣāḷaṃkāraḥ mukhacandram ity atra abhedarūpakam alaṃkāraḥ etā-	
37	bhyāṃ saṃdehasaṃkaraḥ [] mādḥuryaṃ guṇaḥ pāñcālī rītiḥ drākṣāpākaḥ	l. 6
38	gāhā chandaḥ (iyam ca gāhā prathamanaṅaṇatvena) mitrabḥṛtyayor nayaga-	
39	ṇayoś ca sattvena śubhaphaladā trayovimśatīlaghusattvena śūdrā (tathā ca pi-	
40	ṅale	
41	jata kavvagāhadohā muṇahu ṇagaṇa hoi paḍhamakkharahim [chappaa]	
42	tasu riddhi buddhi savvaīm phuraī raṇa rāula duttara taraī	
43	ity uktatvāt	

22 *Bhāvaleśaparakāśika*: pratimayā saṃkrāntaṃ prākṛte pūrvanipātānīyamāt saṃkrāntapratimaṃ vā

25 *Sāhityadarpaṇa* 3.198–199ab: mānaḥ kopah sa tu dvedhā praṇayerṣyāsamudbhavaḥ | dva-yoḥ praṇayamānaḥ syāt pramode sumahaty api | preṃṇaḥ kuṭīlagāmitvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇaṃ vinā |

34 *Kāvyaṇprakāśa* (p. 20): idam uttama atīśayini vyaṅgye vācyād dhvanir budhaiḥ kathitaḥ. 40–43 *Prākṛtapiṅgala* 1.36: jata kavva gāha dohai muṇahu ṇagaṇa hoi paḍhamakkharahi | tasu riddhi buddhi savvaī phurahi raṇa rāula duttara taraī |

17 rosāruṇa] rosāruṇaṃ *ms*. Possibly the copyist mistook a word-separator in the exemplar for an *anusvāra*.

19 pratimā] pratima *ms*

25 vinā] vinā • *ms*

29 upapadyate] upapanīpadyate *ms*

32 viśeṣād] viśeṣāt | *ms*

34 nimittena] nimittetena *ms*

35 paṅka] paka *ms*

38] There are roughly five different marginal additions here; I have reconstructed their probable sequence.

38–39 nayagaṇayoś] nagaṇayoś *ms*

39 vimśatīlaghu] vimśatīr laghu *ms*

41 muṇahu] suṇuhu *ms*

41 akkharahim] akkharahim *ms*

42 riddhi] jhaddhi *ms*

42 savvaīm] savvaīm *ms*

- 44 mitta bhicca thirakajja jujjha nibbhaa jaa dijjai | [chappaa (part)]
 45 ity uktatvāc ca |
 46 sesā suddiṇī hoi | [gāthā (part)]
 47 ity uktatvāc ca |) nāyakadvayasambandhāt samgrahiṇī ceti dik || (tatraiva l. 8
 48 ve ṇāakeṇa hoi samgahiṇī [gāthā (part)]
 49 ity u[ktatvāt] |) 1 ||

*

- 50 prākṛtānabhiññāḥ kevalasamskṛtarasikāḥ kāmattavvicāraṃ kurvantaḥ katham
 51 na lajjanta ity abhiprāyeṇāha |
 52 amīam • pāuakavvaṃ • paḍhiuṃ • souṃ • a • je • ṇa • āṇamti • || f. 3v
 53 kāmassa • tattatattim • kuṇamti • te • kaha • ṇa • lajjamti • | 2 ||
 54 amṛtam • prākṛtakāvyam • paṭhituṃ • śrotuṃ • ca • ye • na • jānanti • | l. 2
 55 kāmasya • tattvacintāṃ • kurvanti • te • katham na • lajjante • | 2 ||
 56 iti prākṛtārthaḥ |
 57 amṛtam ity anenāvibudhānāṃ arasajñānāṃ duṣprāpyatvaṃ vyajyate | ye na jā- l. 4
 58 nanṭīti bahuvacananirdeśena nañā cāsyā kāvyasya paṭhanam śravaṇam ca dvitrā l. 6
 59 eva jānanti arthaḥ | kāmasyeti āradhyārādhakabhāvasambandhe ṣaṣṭhī tena ca
 60 tadārādhanaḥprādurbhūtasvābhinnarasāsvādaniṣpannam vigalitavedyāntaram ā- l. 8
 61 nandam ta eva prāpnvantīti arthaḥ | yad vā rāhoḥ śira itivad abhede ṣaṣṭhī tadā
 62 kāmābhinnarasānandam ta eva prāpnvantīti arthaḥ | tathā ca gāhā chandaḥ | l. 10
 63 2 ||

*

- 64 śrīsālivāhanaḥ svakṛtisūcakakathānakanibandhanapūrvakam svaka- f. 4r
 65 rṭṣkagranthasamkhyāṃ viśinaṣṭi | l. 2
 66 sattasaāi • kaivacchaleṇa • koḍīa majjhaārammi • |
 67 hāleṇa • viraiāim • sālamkāraṇa • gāhānam | 3 ||

43–45 *Prākṛtapiṅgala* 1.37: mitta mitta de riddhi buddhi aru maṅgala dijjai | mitta bhicca thirakajja jujjha nibbhaa jaa kijaṇi | mitta uāse kajjabamḍha nahi puṇi puṇi chijaṇi | mitta hoi jaṇi sattu gottabamḍhava pīdijaṇi | aru bhicca mitta sava kajjaho bhicca bhicca āatti cala, sava bhicca aāse dhaṇu nasaṇi bhicca vaṭṭi hākamḍa phala |

45–47 *Prākṛtapiṅgala* 1.64: teraha lahuā vippi eāisehim khattiṇi bhāṇiā | sattāisā vesī sesā sā suddiṇi hoi |

47–49 *Prākṛtapiṅgala* 1.63: ekke je kulamamti be ṇāakkehim hoi samgahiṇi | ṇāakahīṇā ramḍā vesā bahuṇāakā hoi |

47 uktatvāc ca] uttkāt *ms*

50 vicāraṃ] vicāvicāraṃ *ms*

50 kurvantaḥ] kurvamtaḥ | *ms*

55 kāmasya] kāmyasya *ms*

57 duṣprāpyatvaṃ] duṣprāpyatva *ms*

58 cāsyā] cāsyam *ms*

59 kāma] kāmya *ms*

60–61 m ānandam] m anandam *ms*

64–65 svakarṭṭ] svakarṭṭ *ms*

66 vacchaleṇa] valeṇa *ms*

66 majjha] bhajja *ms*

67 viraiāim] viraioim *ms*

- 68 saptaśatāni • kavivatsalena • koṭe • rmadhye • | l. 4
 69 śālīvāhanena • viracitāni • sālāmkārāṇām • gāthānām | 3 ||
 70 ity prakṛtārthaḥ |
 71 koḍīe ity atra ekāro laghuḥ | tena ca akāraḥ paṭhanīyaḥ | gāhā chandaḥ | 3 ||

*

- 72 kācīcī samketayantī nāyakaṃ praty āha | yad vā kācīcī samkete tvām adṛṣtvā tataḥ l. 6
 73 parāvṛtya samāgato 'ham iti vadantaṃ nāyakaṃ praty āha |
 74 ua • niccalanīpphamdā • bhisaṅgīpatrammi • rehaī • balāā | l. 8
 75 nimmalaragaabhānapariṭṭhiā • samkhasutti vva • | 4 ||
 76 paśya • niścalaniṣpamdā • bisanīpatre • rājate • balākā • | f. 4v
 77 nirmalamarakatabhājanaparisthitā • śaṅkhaśuktir iva • | 4 || l. 2
 78 ity prakṛtārthaḥ |
 79 prakṛte ātmanepadābhāvena rehaī iti | niścalo acalaḥ tadvan niṣpandety arthaḥ |
 80 yad vā niścaleti sambuddhiḥ | tathā ca ābhāsadvaye 'pi na paunaruktyaṃ | l. 4
 81 śaṅkhaśuktiḥ śaṅkhākṛtiḥ śuktiviśeṣa ity arthaḥ | ādye acalavanniṣpandatvena
 82 āśvastatvaṃ tena ca nirjanatvam atas tv idam evocitam āvayoḥ samketa-
 83 sthānam iti vyajyate | dviṭīye niścaleti sambuddhyā nirudyamitvaṃ tena ca
 84 yadi tvayā tatra gataṃ syāt tadā balākīkayoḍḍīnam eva syāt tadabhāvena
 85 tvam mithyā vadasīti vyajyate | iyaṃ ca vyañjītvavyañjanā | krameṇa sam- f. 5r
 86 bhogavipralambhaśṅgārau | dhvaner atīśayitacamatkārīkārītvāna uttamaṃ kā-
 87 vyaṃ | uttamottamaṃ iti kecit | bisinīpatragatanailyabalākāgataśvaityarūpani-
 88 mittena bisinīpatrasambaddhabalākāyāḥ marakatabhājanasthitasamkhaśuktītā- l. 4
 89 dātmyasambhāvanayā uktaṭīśayā vastūtprekṣālamkāraḥ | paroḍhparakṛtyā nā- l. 6
 90 yikā | mādhuryaṃ guṇaḥ | pāñcālī rītiḥ | drākṣāpākaḥ | gāhā chandaḥ | 4 ||

*

- 91 kaścīcī nidhuvanavaidagdhyaagarvaśīlāṃ kāṃcid āha | yad vā kaścīcī ratāntasa- l. 8
 92 maye svamitraṃ praty āha |

79–80 *Bhāvaleśaparakāśikā*: niścalo 'calas tadvan niṣpandā vegavidhāraṇaprayatnavasāt, niścaleti puruṣasambodhanam vā.

81–83 *Bhāvaleśaparakāśikā*: yad vā niṣpandatvenāśvastatvaṃ, tena ca janarahitatvaṃ, tena ca samketasthānam iti kayācīcī kaṃcīcī prati vyajyate; *Kāvyaṭprakāśa* (p. 36): atra niṣpandatvenāśvas- tatvaṃ, tena ca janarahitatvaṃ, ataḥ saṅketasthānam iti kayācīcī kaṃcīcī praty ucyaṭe.

83–85 *Bhāvaleśaparakāśikā*: athavā mithyā vadasi, na tvam āgato 'bhūr iti vyajyate; *Kāvyaṭprakāśa* (p. 37): athavā mithyā vadasi, na tvam āgato 'bhūr iti vyajyate.

86–87 *Kāvyaṭprakāśa* (p. 20): idam uttama atīśayini vyaṅgye vācyād dhvanir budhaiḥ kathitaḥ.

68 koṭe • r] kauṭe • r ms

79 tadvan] tadva ms

80 yad vā] yad vā | ms

80 sambuddhiḥ |] sambuddhiḥ ms

81 śuktiḥ] yuktiḥ ms

81 saṅkhākṛtiḥ] khākṛtiḥ ms. The scribe's

mistake might also be read as *svākṛtiḥ*.

81 acalavan] acalava ms

84 syāt] syāt | ms

84 ḍḍīnam] ḍḍīnam ms

84 tadabhāvena] atadabhāvena ms

89 vastū] vasta ms

93	tāva ccīa raīsamaye mahilāṇaṃ vibbhamā virāṃti •	
94	jāva • ṇa • kuvalaadalasacchāiṃ • moleṃti • ṇaṇāiṃ 5	l. 10
95	tāvad eva • ratisamaye • mahilānāṃ • vibhramāḥ • virājante •	f. 5v
96	yāvan na • kuvalayadalasadṛṣāni • mukulībhavanti • nayanāni • 5	l. 2
97	iti prākṛtārthaḥ	
98	dvitīye ratisamayanetramukulībhāva eva rasādhāyako vibhramāḥ sambhavatīti	l. 4
99	vyaṅgyaṃ guṇībhūtam vyaṅgyāpekṣayā vācyasyaiva camatkāraḥ	
100	dhyamakāvyaṃ svabhāvoktir alamkāraḥ prauḍhā nāyikā mādhyamaṃ gu-	l. 6
101	ṇaḥ jambūpākāḥ gāhā chandaḥ 5	

*

102	kurabakaṃ vicārayantam anabhiṅgaṃ prati narasakhī vadati yad vā puṣpi-	
103	takurabakaṃ vilokya saharṣam anabhiṅgaṃ prati kaścid āha	l. 8
104	dohalia • m appaṇo kiṃ • ṇa • maggase maggase • kuravassa •	
105	eaṃ • khalu • suhaa • tuha • hasāi • valiāṇapaṃkaṃ • jāā • 6	
106	bho • hālika (dauḥḍam ity arthāntaram) • ātmanaḥ • kiṃ na • mārgase • mā-	f. 6r
107	rgase • kurabakasya •	
108	iyam • khalu • subhaga • tava • hasati • valitānanapaṃkajaṃ • jāyā 6	l. 2
109	subhagahālikapadābhyāṃ īdṛśiṃ prāpya subhago 'pi tvam anabhiṅga eveti kiṃ	l. 4
110	ṇa maggase ity anena vicārāksamatvena atijaḍatvaṃ ca vyajyate tac ca guṇībhū-	
111	taṃ vyaṅgyāpekṣayā vācyasyaiva camatkṛtījanakatvān madhyamaṃ kāvyam	l. 6
112	svabhāvoktir alamkāraḥ madhya nāyikā mādhyamaṃ guṇaḥ vaidarbhī rītiḥ	
113	rasālapākāḥ hasa ity atra tvaritapaṭhitaḥ saṃnaddhābhyāṃ varṇābhyāṃ eka eva	
114	varṇaḥ saṃpadyate gāhā chandaḥ 6	l. 8

*

115	puṣpitaṃ aśokaṃ dṛṣtvātikhinnāṃ kāmciḍ virahiṅgaṃ vilokya narasakhī sakhīṃ	
116	prati vadati yad vā tāṃ praty evāha	

99–100 *Kāvyaparakāśa* (p. 26): tadapekṣayā vācyasyaiva camatkāraḥ |

94	jāva] java <i>ms</i>	102	yad vā] madvā <i>ms</i>
98	dvitīye] dvitīyā <i>ms</i>	104	do] p.c.; bho • a.c.
98	ratisamaya] bhāro tatsamaya <i>ms</i>	104	m appaṇo] p.c.; appaṇo a.c.
99	guṇībhūtam] guṇībhūtam <i>ms</i>	106	bho] mi <i>ms</i>
99	camatkāraḥ] camatkāraḥ <i>ms</i>	109	īdṛśiṃ] edṛśiṃ <i>ms</i>
100	mādhyamaṃ] mādhyama <i>ms</i>	111	vyaṅgyāpekṣayā] vyāgyāpekṣayā <i>ms</i>
101	jambūpākāḥ] dauḥḍam <i>ms. dauḥḍam</i> was probably anticipated from its occurrence in the next verse; <i>jambūpākāḥ</i> was evidently skipped and inserted between <i>kurabaka</i> and <i>vicārayantaṃ</i> in the commentary to the fol- lowing verse.	111	vācyasyaiva] vyāsyasyaiva <i>ms</i>
102	kurabakaṃ] kurabakajambūpākāḥ <i>ms</i>	111	janakatvān] manakatvāt <i>ms</i>
		113	saṃnaddhābhyāṃ] sanaddhābhyāṃ <i>ms</i>
		115	puṣpitaṃ] puṣpam <i>ms</i>
		115	khinnāṃ] khinnaṃ <i>ms</i>
		115	sakhī] sakhīṃ <i>ms</i>

117	tāvijjantī • asoehim • laḍahavañiāu • daḍavirahammi •	f. 6r
118	kiṃ • sahañ • ko vi • kassa vi • pāpahāraṃ • pahuppaṃto • 7	l. 2
119	tāpyante • aśokaiḥ • sundara (laliteti vā) vanitāḥ • dayitavirahe •	
120	kiṃ • sahati • ko 'pi • kasyāpi • pādaprahāraṃ • prabhur bhavan 7	
121	iti prākṛtārthaḥ	
122	laḍaheti lalitārthe sundarārthe vā deśī vañiāo ity atra okāro laghuḥ tena ca u-	l. 4
123	kāraḥ paṭhanīyaḥ avyaṅgyatvāt avaraṃ kāvyam svabhāvoktir alamkāraḥ mā-	l. 6
124	dhuryam guṇaḥ bhairavī rītiḥ jambūpākaḥ gāhā chandaḥ 7	
*		
125	śikṣayantīm śvaśrūṃ prati rahasyam prakāśyantī kācid vadati yad vā kācit saṃ-	l. 8
126	ketanāśena duḥkhitā satī tāṭasthyena śvaśrūṃ praty āha	
127	attā • taha • ramañijjam • amhaṃ • gāmassa • maṃḍaṇīhūam •	
128	luatilavāḍisaricchaṃ • sisireṇa • kaam • bisanisaṃḍam •	l. 10
129	iti prākṛtārthaḥ 8	f. 6v
130	taha ramañijjam ity anenaitatsadṛśam dvitīyam saṃketasthalaṃ nāstīti vya-	l. 2
131	vyate amhaṃ gāmassety anena duḥkhāspadatvam vyajyate dhvaneś cama-	
132	tkṛtījanakatvād uttamam kāvyam u (pa) mālāmkāraḥ vartamānasthānavigha-	
133	ṭanena anuśayānā nāyikā mādhuryam guṇaḥ pāñcālī rītiḥ nārikelapākaḥ	
134	gāhā chandaḥ 8	
*		
135	saṃketanāśena duḥkhitām kāṃcit sakhī vadati	l. 6
136	kiṃ • ruasi • oṇaamuhī • dhavalāamtesu • sālichettesu •	
137	hariālamamḍiamuhī • naḍi vva • saṇavāḍiā • jāā • 9	l. 8
138	kiṃ • rodiṣi • avanatamukhī • dhavalāyamāneṣu • śālīksetreṣu •	
139	haritālamaṇḍitamukhī • naṭiva • śaṇavāṭikā • jātā • 9	f. 7r
140	iti prākṛtārthaḥ	
141	dhavalāamtesv ity atra śānaco vartamānatvam arthaḥ tathā ca vartamānakālā-	l. 2
142	vachinnatayā karma pratīyate tena ca saṃketanāśo vyajyate vyaṅgyāpekṣayā vā-	l. 4
143	cyasyaiva camatkṛter madhyamam kāvyam upamālamkāraḥ bhāvīsthānābhā-	

132–133 *Rasamañjarī* 27: anuśayānā yathā – vartamānasthānavighaṭanena ...143–144 *Rasamañjarī* 27: anuśayānā yathā ... bhāvīsthānābhāvaśaṅkayā ...117 laḍaha] laha *ms*117 vañiā] vañia *ms*

117 vañiāu] p.c.; vañiāom a.c.

118 pāa] pā *ms*122 lalitārthe] lālītārthe *ms*123 avyaṅgya] avyaṅga *ms*125 rahasyam] tāihasyam *ms*. Uncertain.126 tāṭasthyena] tāṭasthena *ms*132 janakatvād] janakatvāt | *ms*133 anuśayānā] anuśayānānā • *ms*136 chettesu] chetesu *ms*142 tayā karma] tatka nam *ms*. Uncertain; possibly *tat karma*.142 tena ca] tena ca bhā *ms*143 vyaṅgyāpekṣayā] vamdhyapekṣayā *ms*143 camatkṛter] camatkṛteḥ | *ms*

144 vaśaṅkayā anuśayānā nāyikāḥ | mādḥuryaṃ guṇaḥ | pāñcālī rītiḥ | rasālapākaḥ |
145 gāhā chandaḥ | 9 ||

*

146 kācin narmasakhī premabhaṅgena khinnāṃ kām̐cid āha |

147 sahi • erisi • ccia • gaī • mā • ruvvasu taṃsavaliamaḥadaṃ • | l. 8

148 eāṇa • bālavāluḥkitam̐tukūḍilāṇa pemmāṇaṃ • | 10 ||

149 sakhi • īdṛśyeva • gatiḥ • mā • rodasva • tiryagvalitamukhacandraṃ • | l. 10

150 eteśāṃ • bālavāluḥkitantukuḍilāṇaṃ • premṇāṃ • | 10 || f. 7v

151 iti prākṛtārthaḥ | |

152 erisi ccia iti evakāreṇa cintāṃ mā kurv iti vyajyate | mā ruvvasu ity anena dhai- l. 2

153 ryaṃ dhatsva sarvārthān āyāsaḥ āneya iti vyajyate | tiryakpadena lajjā duḥkhāti- l. 4

154 śayaś ca vyajyate | eāṇa bālavāluḥkitam̐tukūḍilāṇam̐ iti purovartinirdeśena jāta- l. 6

155 mātṛe premni tavedṛśaṃ kartum asāṃpratam̐ iti śikṣā vyajyate | vyaṅgyāpekṣayā l. 6

156 vācyasyaiva camatkārādhāyakatvena madhyamaṃ kāvyaṃ | svabhāvoktir alaṃ- l. 8

157 kāraḥ | madhyā kalahāntarītā nāyikā | prasādo guṇaḥ | pāñcālī rītiḥ | jambūpā- l. 8

158 kaḥ | gāhā chandaḥ | 10 || |

*

159 kācin māninī tasyā evam eva mānasyāpagamo jāta iti kām̐cit praty āha | l. 10

160 pāapaḍiassa • paīṇo • puṭṭhiṃ • putte • samāruham̐tammi | f. 8r

161 diḍhamāṇṇudūmiāi • vi • hāso • gharaṇīa ṇikkam̐to • | 11 ||

162 pādapatitasya • patyuh • pṛṣṭhaṃ • putre • samārohati • | l. 2

163 dṛḍhamanyudūnāyā • api hāsaḥ • gṛhiṇyāḥ • niṣkrāntaḥ • | 11 ||

164 iti prākṛtārthaḥ |

165 dūmiāe gharaṇīe ity atra ekāro laghus tenekāro 'kāraś ca paṭhanīyaḥ [|] ka- l. 4

166 ṣṭatarāpaneyo 'pi (na) gurur mānaḥ | patyur na tu priyasya | tenānyā- l. 6

167 nuraktatvena sāparādhatvaṃ vyajyate | dṛḍhamanyupade saḥajatayaivāpagata l. 6

168 ity arthaḥ | gṛhiṇyāḥ na tu priyāyāḥ tathā ca pādapatanaṃ mukhadākṣi- l. 8

169 ṇyenety arthaḥ | etair nāyikāyāś caṇḍītvam̐ gamyate | vācyacamatkṛtyā ma- l. 8

170 dhyamaṃ kāvyaṃ | patisaṃbaṃdhipṛṣṭhakarmakaputrasamārohaṇarūpārthasya

171 mānāpagamasūcakahāsanīṣkramaṇarūpaprakṛtārthopapādakatvena vilakṣitatvāt l. 10, f. 8v

147 taṃsa] taṃśi *ms*

149 rodasva] ruhasva *ms* p.c.; rodiṣi a.c.

150 bālavāluṅki] bālocasika *ms*. Uncertain.

152 erisi] erasi *ms*

152 ccia] cciā *ms*

152 iti] ita *ms*

153 sarvārthān āyāsaḥ] sarvārthān āyāsaḥ *ms*

153–154 duḥkhātīśayaś] duḥkhātīśayaś *ms*

154 eāṇa] eaṇa *ms*

154 bāla] bālabāla *ms*

155 asāṃpratam̐ iti] asāṃpratam̐ sām̐pratameti *ms*

156 camatkā] camatkā *ms*

159 evam eva] evam evam *ms*

159 māna] māga *ms*

159 kām̐cit] kācit *ms*

161 dūmiāi] p.c.; dūmiāe a.c.

161 gharaṇīa] p.c.; gharaṇīe a.c.

163 hāsaḥ] ṇāsaḥ *ms*

165 gharaṇīe] gharaṇāe *ms*

167 tvam̐] tva *ms*

170 rūpārthasya] rūpo rthasya *ms*

171 vilakṣitatvāt] vilakṣitatvāt | *ms*

- 172 kāvyaliṅgam alaṃkāraḥ | mānāpagame hāsasya hetutvena hetvalaṃkāraḥ | mā- / 2
 173 nāpagamasya hetoḥ hāsavattvasādhyaśādhakatvena anumānālaṃkāraś ca | mā-
 174 ninī nāyikā | prasādo guṇaḥ | pāñcālī rītiḥ | nālikerapākaḥ | gāhā chandaḥ | 11 || / 4

*

- 175 kācit pacantī hasyate kenacid iti kācit kāmicit pra(ty ā)ha |
 176 gharanīa mahānasakammalaggamasimaīlieṇa • hattheṇa • | / 6
 177 chittam • muham • hasijjaī camdāvattham • gaam • pañā • | 12 ||
 178 grhiṇyā • mahānasakarmalagnamaṣīmalinena • hastena • |
 179 sprṣtam • mukham • hasyate • candrāvasthām • gatam • patyā • | 12 | / 8
 180 iti prākṛtārthaḥ |
 181 gharanīe ity atraikāro laghus tenākāraḥ paṭhanīyaḥ | mahānāsakammalaggety / 10
 182 anena prathamābhyāso vyajyate | vācyacamatkṛter madhyamaṃ kāvyam |
 183 aprādhānyena hāsyarasayālaṃkāratā | ivādiḥpadābhāve 'pi pratīter ārthy upa- / f. 9r, l. 2
 184 mālālaṃkāraḥ | mugdhā nāyikā | ojo guṇaḥ | gauḍī rītiḥ | nālikerapākaḥ | gāhā
 185 chandaḥ | 12 ||

*

- 186 kācid dūtī mānanam amānayantaṃ nāyakaṃ praty āha | yad vā gurujanabhayāl / 4
 187 lokanindayā vā anāgacchantam nāyakaṃ prati dūtyā uktiḥ | / 6
 188 saccam • jāṇai • datthum • sarisamma • jaṇamma • jujjāe • rāo |
 189 maraū • ṇa • tumam • bhaṇissam • maraṇam • pi • salāhañijjam se |
 190 13 ||
 191 satyam • jānāti • draṣṭum • sadṛṣe jane • yujyate • rāgaḥ |
 192 mriyatam • na tvām • bhaṇiṣye • maraṇam api • ślāghanīyam • asyāḥ • | 13 || / 8
 193 iti prākṛtārthaḥ |
 194 sarisammīty ādinā aprāpye jane anurāgo na yukta ity arthaḥ | tena ca nāyikāyāḥ / 10
 195 aprāpyakāryatvena ajñatvaṃ vyajyate | maraū ṇety anena yadi tvayā nāgamyate / f. 9v
 196 tadā sarvathā tanmaraṇenaiva bhāvyaṃ iti vyajyate | tena cānurāgātīśayas tasyā / 2
 197 iti vyajyate | vyaṅgyacamatkṛter uttamaṃ kāvyam | prathame ka(la)hāntarītā nā-
 198 yikā | dvitīye gurvādiḥpāratantryāt saṅgamanirodhād virahas tajjanyavirahava- / 4
 199 tvena virahīṇī nāyikā | mādhyamam guṇaḥ | vaidarbhī rītiḥ | nālikerapākaḥ | / 6
 200 gāhā chandaḥ | 13 ||

172 hāsasya] hāsasya *ms*

176 gharanīa] p.c.; gharanīe a.c.

176 kamma] kaṃmya *ms*176 hattheṇa] hastena *ms*183 aprādhānyena] apradhānyena *ms*183–184 ārthy upamālaṃkāraḥ] ārthī upamā-
laṃkāraḥ *ms*186 yad vā ... salāhañijjam se] The first
line was written before the introduction wascompleted; the copyist has put the numeral “2”
on top of each word of the first line, and “1”
after every few syllables of the remaining part
of the introduction, to indicate that we should
read “1” before “2”.188 datthum] daṭṭham *ms*192 ślāghanīyam] ślāghanāyam *ms*195 aprāpyakāryatvena] apreksyakāryaritvena
ms. Uncertain.198 nirodhād] nirodho *ms*



201	kaścīt pākaṃ kartuṃ udyuktāṃ nāyikāṃ praty āha	
202	raṃdhaṅakammaniṇie • mā jūrasu • rattapāḍalasuaṃdhaṃ	
203	muhamāru (aṃ • piāṃto • dhūmāi • sihī • ṇa pajjalaī • 14	l. 8
204	pākakarmanipuṇe • mā • khidyasva • raktapāṭalasugaṃdhaṃ •	
205	mukhamāru)taṃ piban • dhūmāyate • śikhī • na prajvalati 14	
206	iti prākṛtārthaḥ	
207	jūrasu ity asya khider jūravisūrāv ity anuśāsanena khedārthakatvaṃ	f. 10r

Translation

Note that I omit Vrajarāja's rendering of the Prakrit verses into Sanskrit.

Reverence to Gaṇeśa.

Though I am a fool, I devote myself
to that deep red brilliance within.
Through serving it, one can become superior
even to the three orbs in heaven. (1)

I devote myself to the indescribable dark brilliance
that destroys the hosts of the lord of Daityas,
the brilliance known as the 'forehead-mark'
that imparts great beauty to the faces
of Brahmā and the other gods. (2)

In my heart I meditate upon that power that Nṛhari
had to manifest for the benefit of the world,
a power that brings delight, and foretells
the destruction of the lord of the Danujas. (3)

I praise the lord Sāmarāja, like Sāmarāja himself,
attended by crowds of *scholars : gods*,
and made all the more beautiful by the splendor
of *learning : Sarasvatī*. (4)

I praise my father, Śrī Kāmarāja, like Kāmarāja himself,
attended by his sons : worshipped with camphor,
and made all the more beautiful *by copious wealth :*
by his enormous power. (5)

207 *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* 8.4.132: khider jūravisūrāu

201	kartum udyuktāṃ] karttuṃ madyuktāṃ	207	jūrasu] jurasu <i>ms</i>
		207	jūra] jjura <i>ms</i>
202	pāḍala] pāla <i>ms</i>		
203	sihī] sihā <i>ms</i> . Emended in conformance with the Sanskrit gloss.		

By the grace of his revered teacher,
 by the favor of his father, the excellent poet
 Vrajarājadīkṣita now renders completely clear
 the *āryā* verses of Śrī Śālivāhana. (6)

For the sake of the unobstructed completion of the text that he, in order to delight the hearts of lovers of literature, is now about to begin, Śrī Śālivāhana starts with an auspicious verse that takes the form of a recommendation to bow to Sadāśiva at twilight:

Do reverence to Paśupati's cupped hands,
 holding the water of a twilight offering,
 in which Gaurī's moon-face appears
 in a reflected image, red with anger,
 as if they held a red lotus to offer to a guest. (1)

Because there is no restriction on which member of a compound must come first in Prakrit, the phrase "image-reflected" (*paḍimāsaṃkaṃṭa*) is the same as "reflected image". It is a mild red, not a deep red; and moreover it is red with anger, not with rage. The meaning of the word "moon", which is derived from a verbal root that means "delight", is that Gaurī's face is a cause of delight. And thus this mood of hers is not produced by actual jealousy, but rather it is just one of the moods of love, according to the definition that "a mood is sullenness without any cause, due to the fact that love proceeds in crooked ways". Were this not the case, then the word "moon" would not have been used, and something else would have been used instead. Agitation accompanies separation in the form of a mood produced by actual jealousy, whereas a thrill accompanies separation in the form of a mood produced by love. Other emotions, such as eagerness, are common to both forms. For this reason, although her face is red with anger, it still makes sense for it to be a cause of delight.

Furthermore, this verse suggests an aesthetic emotion (*rasadhvani*): what is manifested is love-in-separation, which has as its basis the fully-manifested desire that is located in Sadāśiva, and which has Gaurī as its object. It also suggests an ornament (*alaṃkāradhvani*): what is manifested is the ornament of distinction (*viśeṣa*), since Śiva's being full of an aesthetic emotion imputes a particular excellence in comparison to other deities, who are not capable of taking the forms of the one whose half is a woman (*ardhanārī*) and the dancer (*naṭa*). And it suggests a feeling (*bhāva*): what is manifested is the feeling of desire, of which the author of the text is the subject, and of which the object is Śiva and Pārvaṭī. Because suggestion is the primary cause of our amazement, this is the highest kind of poetry. One ornament is the imagination of a state of affairs (*vastūtprekṣā*), of the variety whose object has been stated, because the redness of Gaurī's face serves as the occasion for it being imagined as identical to a handful of water that contains the red flowers of offering. Another ornament here is identification without a difference (*abhedarūpakam*), in the word "moon-face". There is thus a combination of these two that amounts to a doubt. The quality (*guṇa*) is

sweetness. The style (*rīti*) is *pāñcālī*. The development (*pāka*) is that of the grape. The meter is the *gāhā*. And this particular *gāhā* is auspicious and beneficial because it begins with a *na-gaṇa*, and because of the presence of a *na-gaṇa* and a *ya-gaṇa*, which are the “friend” and “servant”, respectively. It is also a *śūdrā*, because of the presence of twenty-three light syllables.

And as Piṅgala has said:

Know that if a *kāvya*, *gāthā*, or *dohā*
has a *na-gaṇa* in the initial syllables,
his success and intelligence will sparkle everywhere,
and he will overcome difficulties in battle and at court.

and:

A “friend” and “servant” are firm in what needs to be done:
they produce fearless victory on the field of battle.

and:

The rest are *Śūdrās*.

Furthermore, it is a *saṃgrahiṇī* because it has two “leaders” (◡–◡), as Piṅgala also says:

It is *saṃgrahiṇī* on account of two “leaders”. (1)

*

His idea in the next verse is: how is it that those people who don’t know Prakrit, who have a taste for Sanskrit alone, aren’t ashamed when they conduct their investigations into the principles of love?

Prakrit poetry is nectar.
Those who don’t know how to recite it,
or listen to it, but who are still deeply concerned with love –
how are those people not ashamed? (2)

What is suggested by the word “nectar” is that it is extremely difficult to reach for those who are not wise, that is, for those who have no understanding of aesthetic emotions (*rasa*). Through the plural reference and negation in the phrase “those who don’t know”, the sense is that only a handful of people know how to recite and listen to Prakrit poetry. The genitive case of “love” refers to the relationship of what is propitiated and the one who propitiates it. Hence the idea is that what is manifested by propitiating love is the savoring of an aesthetic emotion (*rasa*) that is actually no different from love itself, and what arises from this savoring is the bliss in which all other objects of knowledge fall away, which only those people can obtain. Alternatively, it might stand in a relationship of non-difference, just as in “the head of Rāhu”, and hence the idea will be that they alone can obtain aesthetic bliss (*rasānanda*), which is in fact no different from love. The meter is *gāhā* here as well. (2)

*

Śrī Śālivāhana now specifies the extent of the text of which he is the creator by putting together a short narrative that indicates what he has done:

Hāla, beloved of poets, composed
seven hundreds of beautifully ornamented verses
in the midst of a crore. (3)

In the word *koḍīe* the letter *e* is short, and hence it should be read as the letter *a*. The meter is the *gāhā*. (3)

*

A certain woman says the following to the leading man in setting up a meeting. Alternatively, a certain woman says the following to the leading man, who is saying “I didn’t see you in the meeting place, so I turned back around, and here I am”.

Look: the heron, still as a mountain,
looks beautiful on the leaf of a lotus,
like a pearl conch placed on a plate
made of pure emerald. (4)

The form *rehai* is used because there is no *ātmanepada* in Prakrit. The word “motionless” (*niccala*) refers to a mountain, and hence the sense is “as still as a mountain”. Alternatively, “motionless” is an address to a listener. And thus there is no repetition, although the same idea appears twice. The sense of “pearl conch” is a piece of mother-of-pearl in the shape of a conch. On the first interpretation, what is suggested by its being “still as a mountain” is that it is totally comfortable, which means that there is nobody nearby, and therefore this will be a good place for us to set up a meeting. On the second, what is suggested by the vocative “motionless” is that he has not made any effort, and accordingly, if you had gone there then the heron would have flown away, but since it hasn’t, you are lying. This is “suggestion through something that has itself been suggested” (*vyañjitavyañjanā*). The aesthetic emotions are the erotic in union and in separation, in sequence. Because suggestion is the primary cause of our amazement, this is the highest kind of poetry. Some people say that this is the highest among the highest.

One ornament is the imagination of a state of affairs (*vastūprekṣā*), of the variety whose object has been stated, because the two colors – darkness of the lotus-leaf and the whiteness of the heron – serve as the occasion for imagining the heron, linked to the lotus-leaf, as identical with mother-of-pearl, situated on an emerald plate. The leading lady is one who is married to someone else (*paroḍhaparakīyā*). The quality is sweetness. The style is *pāñcālī*. The development is that of the grape. The meter is the *gāhā*. (4)

*

A certain man says this to a certain woman who is always proud about how good at sex she is. Alternatively, a certain man says this to a friend of his regarding the time just after sex.

The art of seduction of women
at the time of sex reigns supreme –
but only until their eyes,
as beautiful as the petals of a lotus,
begin to close up. (5)

On the second interpretation, it is that the art of seduction can only bestow *rasa* when women's eyes act like closing buds (*mukulībhāva*) during sex. The suggested meaning is secondary. Because the expressed meaning is the primary cause of our amazement, in relation to the suggested meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The ornament is description (*svabhāvokti*). The leading lady is one who is experienced (*prauḍhā*). The quality is sweetness. The development is that of the *jambū*. The meter is the *gāhā*. (5)

*

The close confidante of a woman says this to her friend's lover, who is unaware, as he is taking care of an amaranth plant. Alternatively, a certain man says this to a man, who is unaware, who is happy to see that the amaranth is in bloom.

Hey farmer! Why aren't you seeking
for yourself what you seek for the amaranth?
Your wife is here, god bless you,
laughing with her lotus-face turned down. (6)

What is suggested by the words "god bless you" (*subhaga*) and "farmer" (*hālika*) is that you have had the good fortune to get such a beautiful girl, but you just don't know what to do with her, and what is suggested by "why aren't you seeking" is that you are incapable of thinking about these things, and hence very stupid. These meanings are subordinate. Because the expressed meaning is the primary cause of our amazement, in relation to the suggested meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The ornament is description. The leading lady is of the middle type. The quality is sweetness. The style is *vaidarbhī*. The development is that of the mango. In "laughing", the two syllables (*ha-sa*) should be rushed through, so that they come together and form a single syllable. The meter is the *gāhā*. (6)

*

The close confidante of a certain woman sees that she is very depressed to look upon a flowering *aśoka* tree in her separation from her beloved, and says this to a friend of hers. Alternatively, she says it to the woman outright.

These “painless” (*aśoka*) trees torture beautiful women
when they are separated from their partners.
Is there anyone who will suffer the strikes
of someone’s foot, if he can do something about it? (7)

The word *laḍaha* is a regional expression (*deśī*) meaning “charming” or “beautiful”. In the word “women” (*vañiāo*), the letter *o* is short, and hence should be read as the letter *u*. Because there is no suggested meaning here, it is the lowest type of poetry. The ornament is description. The quality is sweetness. The style is *bhairavī*. The development is that of the *jambū*. The meter is the *gāhā*. (7)

*

A certain woman says this in order to reveal a secret to her mother-in-law who might offer her some advice. Alternatively a certain woman who is upset at the loss of her meeting-place says this to her mother-in-law as if it did not personally affect her.

Mother, the stand of lotuses was so beautiful,
the ornament of our village,
and now the winter has made it
like a field of cut sesame. (8)

What is suggested by the phrase “so beautiful” is that there is no meeting-place that is quite like that one. What is suggested by “our village” is that it is a place of misery. Because suggestion is the primary cause of our amazement, this is the highest kind of poetry. The ornament is comparison (*upamā*). The leading lady is of the “regretful” (*anuśayānā*) type, because of the destruction of her current meeting-place. The style is *pāñcālī*. The development is that of the coconut. The meter is the *gāhā*. (8)

*

A friend says this to a certain woman who is upset at the loss of her meeting-place.

Why are you weeping, with your face turned town,
in the rice fields that are turning white?
The hemp fields have now become like an actress
who has painted her face yellow. (9)

The present participle (*śānac*) here, in *dhavalāmañtesu*, has the sense of the present tense. And thus an action that is delimited by the present time is understood, and what is suggested by that is the loss of the meeting-place. Because the expressed meaning is the primary cause of our amazement, in relation to the suggested meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The ornament is comparison. The leading lady is of the regretful type, because of her concern that her meeting-place will no longer be available. The quality is sweetness. The style is *pāñcālī*. The development is that of the mango. The meter is the *gāhā*. (9)



A certain close confidante says this to a woman who is depressed because her relationship has taken a bad turn.

This is just the way relationships are, friend.
Don't turn your moon-face down and cry about it.
These things are as twisted
as the fibers of a young gourd. (10)

What is suggested by the word “just” (*eva*) is that you shouldn't worry. What is suggested by the phrase “don't cry” is that you should take courage and be strong in all of your endeavors. What is suggested by the word “down” is her shame and great sadness. In “these things are as twisted as the fibers of a young gourd”, she refers to something right in front of them, and what is suggested is her advice, which is that it's not appropriate for you to do this over a relationship that has only just gotten started. Because the expressed meaning is the primary cause of our amazement, in relation to the suggested meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The ornament is description. The leading lady is of the middle type, quarreling with her lover. The quality is clarity. The style is *pāñcālī*. The development is that of the *jambū*. The meter is the *gāhā*. (10)



A certain woman who is in a mood of anger says to a certain other woman that her anger has disappeared on its own.

When her son climbed up
on the back on her husband, who had fallen
at her feet, a smile crept across the housewife's face,
though she was firmly in the grip of anger. (11)

In the words “in the grip of” (*dūmiāe*) and “housewife” (*gharaṇīe*), the letter *e* is short, and hence we must read the letters *i* and *a*. Her anger is hard to appease, but it is not grave. And it is not a lover, but her husband. What is suggested by this is that he has done her wrong by falling in love with another woman. The sense of the word “firmly in the grip of anger” is that it has gone away entirely on its own. The sense of her being a “housewife” rather than a “beloved” is that when he falls at her feet it is because of “politeness to her face” (*mukhadākṣiṇya*). Through these things we understand that the leading lady is irascible. Because of our amazement at the expressed meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The ornament is poetic indication (*kāvyaḷiṅga*), since one meaning, in the form of the son's climbing up onto the back that is connected to her husband, subserves another meaning that is contextually more central, in the form of a smile creeping across the woman's face and implying the disappearance of her anger, and hence it is different. It could be the ornament of “reason” (*hetu*), since the

smile is the reason for inferring the disappearance of her anger, and it could also be the ornament of “inference” (*anumāna*), since the disappearance of her anger is the reason that establishes the conclusion, which is that she is possessed of a smile. The leading lady is of the “angry” type. The quality is clarity. The style is *pāñcālī*. The development is that of the coconut. The meter is the *gāhā*. (11)

*

A certain woman says to a certain other woman that a man is laughing at a woman as she is cooking.

The housewife’s hands are dirty
from the work she’s been doing in the kitchen,
so when she touches her face, her resemblance
to the moon is complete, and her husband laughs. (12)

In the word “housewife” (*gharaṇīe*), the letter *e* is short, and hence should be read as the letter *a*. What is suggested by the phrase “doing work in the kitchen” is that this is her first attempt. Because of our amazement at the expressed meaning, this is the middle kind of poetry. The comic emotion serves as an ornament here because it is not primary. The ornament is an implied comparison, since we understand it even in the absence of a word such as “like”. The leading lady is of the “innocent” type. The quality is power. The style is *gaudī*. The development is that of the coconut. The meter is the *gāhā*. (12)

*

A certain messenger says this to the leading man, who doesn’t take his lover’s anger seriously. Alternatively, it is the statement of a messenger to a leading man who isn’t coming to meet his lover, either out of fear of their parents, or because of what people might say.

It’s true, she knows what to look for.
Desire only makes sense for someone similar.
Let her die. I’m not going to talk to you.
It would be more praiseworthy for her to die. (13)

The sense of “someone similar” is that desire for someone who can never be attained does not make sense. And what is suggested by that is that the leading lady, insofar as she has set herself a task that can never be attained, is clueless. What is suggested by “let her die” is that if you don’t come then it is guaranteed that she will die. And what is suggested by that is that her desire is out of proportion. Because of our amazement at the suggested meaning, this is the highest kind of poetry. In the first interpretation, the leading lady is the type that is quarreling with her lover. In the second, she experiences separation from her lover as a result of the lack of a chance for the two of them to come together, since they are both still dependent on their

parents, and hence since she experiences that kind of separation, the leading lady is the type that is “in separation”. The quality is sweetness. The style is *vaidarbhī*. The development is that of the coconut. The meter is the *gāhā*. (13)

*

A certain man says this to the leading lady, who has just started cooking a dish.

You’re an excellent cook! Don’t get angry.
The fire is smoking, only because it wants to drink in
the breeze of your breath, which is as fragrant
as red *pāṭalī* flowers. It’s not blazing. (14)

The word *jūrasu* means to feel anguished, in accordance with the rule that substitutes the roots *jūra* and *visūra* for the root *khid*. (14)

Notes to the text

References are to line-numbers of the edition.

2–3: The “three orbs” are generally the sun, the moon, and fire (thanks to Anand Venkatkrishnan for this information).

6–7: The use of *prahlādanam*, which I take as an adjective to *prādurbhāva-prabhāvam*, suggests the story of Prahlāda.

8–11: These verses identify Vrajarāja’s grandfather, Sāmarāja, and his father, Kāmarāja. The figure seems to be *ananvaya*: Vrajarāja compares Sāmarāja and Kāmarāja with their eponymous divine counterparts (Sāmarāja apparently referring to Brahmā on this construal) with descriptions that could apply equally to both human and divine figures. I am not certain about the sense of *jaivātīka-* in connection with Kāmadeva; its conventional meanings are “moon” and “camphor”. In connection with Kāmadeva, *vibhūti* also suggests the “ashes” into which the god is transformed by Śiva’s third eye, although that meaning seems to be secondary here.

22–33: Premarāja also identifies three types of suggestion (*dhvani*) in his commentary to this verse in the *Sāhityabhūmi*, although they are of a *vastu*, an *alamkāra*, and a *rasa*, rather than of a *rasa*, an *alamkāra*, and a *bhāva*.

35–37: As noted above (p. 17), Vrajarāja’s analyses of the *utprekṣā* and *rūpaka* recall Appayya Dīkṣita’s in the *Kuvalayānanda* (§5 and §12). *Samdehasamkara* is a type of “commixture” in which it cannot be decided which figure is primary (*Kuvalayānanda* §121).

38ff.: Vrajarāja analyzes the *gāhā* meter – referred to here under its Prakrit name rather than as the *gāthā* or *āryā* – in the terms provided by the *Prākṛtapīṅgala*, from which he quotes. The *gāhā* is auspicious and beneficial (*śubhaphaladā*) because it begins with a *na-gaṇa* (◡◡◡). These auspicious effects are compounded because the first six syllables form a *na-gaṇa* (◡◡◡) followed by a *ya-gaṇa* (◡–), which in the *Prākṛtapīṅgala*’s classification

are considered a “friend” and a “servant” respectively. Additionally, this *gāhā* is a *Śūdrā*, since it has 23 light syllables: the *Viprā* has 13, the *Kṣatriyā* has 21, the *Vaiśyā* has 27, and all others are *Śūdrās*. Finally, the *gāhā* is further identified as a *svayaṃgrāhiṇī*, since it has two “leaders” (*nāyakas*), the *Prākṛtapiṅgala*’s term for a *ja-gaṇa* (◡◡). One is in the sixth *gaṇa* of the first line, and the other is in the second *gaṇa* of the second line.

59–62: The question here is what sense the sixth case ending has in *kāmassa*: it either signifies that which people seek to attain by means of *tattvacintā* (i.e., it is an objective genitive), or it is identical to *tattvacintā* (i.e., it is an equative genitive). Rāhu is a mythical being said to cause eclipses; he is always pictured as a disembodied head, and therefore “Rāhu’s head” expresses a relation of identity. Vrajarāja seems to understand *tattvacintā* as ‘the savoring of *rasa*’ or the bliss that is produced from it, although it is not clear how he comes to this interpretation. My translation (“deeply concerned with love”) is based on his Sanskrit gloss rather than his commentary.

74: The manuscript spells *bhisiṇī* as *bhisaṇī* here and *bisaṇī* in line 128, and alternates between *bisaṇī* and *bisinī* in Sanskrit.

79–85: See the introduction for the relationship between Vrajarāja’s and Gaṅgādhara’s commentary on this verse, and their shared dependence on Mammaṭa’s comments in his *Kāvyaṃprakāśa*. The verse is also discussed by Viśvanātha (p. 15).

85: *Vyañjitavyaṅjanā* is probably Vrajarāja’s rephrasing of Mammaṭa’s *vyāṅgyavyaṅjanā*, of which he cites this verse as an example in his *Kāvyaṃprakāśa* (chapter 2, p. 36); here, and elsewhere, he rephrases Mammaṭa’s definition of suggestion, or *dhvani*, as that wherein the suggested meaning is more striking than the literal meaning (p. 20).

94: Weber’s manuscript ψ reads *maūlenti*, similar to this text’s *moleṃti*.

98: My emendation here is uncertain. Vrajarāja typically uses *prathame* and *dvitīye* to refer back to the scenarios described in the introduction to each verse. Note that, although Vrajarāja reads *jāva ṇa* in the verse, his commentary would support the reading *jā ṇava-* (which would mean “so long as” rather than “until”) that is found in Dhanika’s citation of this verse in the *Daśarūpaka* (p. 95).

101: The copyist apparently skipped the *rīti* and *pāka* for verse 5, copying part of the commentary to the next verse instead. He inserted the *pāka* for verse 5, but not the *rīti*, in the middle of the introduction to the next verse.

104: *bho halia* was the original reading, and correspondingly the *chāyā* originally read *mi* (= *bho*) *hālika*, “You boor!” The text was corrected to *dohaliam*, and the *chāyā* to *dauḥḍam*, “pregnancy longing”. The reading and interpretation of *bho halia* as a vocative in this verse is otherwise unattested. The corrected reading, *dohaliam*, is also relatively uncommon. It is found in one manuscript of Gaṅgādhara’s commentary (Weber’s B). The other manuscripts read *ṇohaliam*, but Gaṅgādhara gives the meaning *dohadam* (= *dauḥḍam*) in his *chāyā*, which may have influenced the reading *dohaliam* in B and in this manuscript.

105: There are metrical problems with the second half of verse 6 that Vrajarāja has tried to fix in a strange way (see lines 113–114). Part of the problem is that Vrajarāja has read *khalu* instead of *khu*. The vulgate readings of this verse come in two groups: one that reads *valiamukha* (so Weber’s ξ) and one that reads *valiāṇaṇa* with Vrajarāja (so Weber’s γ and ψ, as well as the printed edition of Gaṅgādhara’s commentary). The editors of Gaṅgādhara’s commentary have deleted *khu* on metrical grounds.

117: The reading *vaṇiāo* or *vaṇiāu* is shared with Weber’s γ against his ψ (*viraāo*, for *vilaāo*). Vrajarāja himself apparently read *vaṇiāo*, explicitly noting that the *o* was short (see line 123); the copyist, apparently, has taken *ukāraḥ paṭhanīyaḥ* to mean that *o* should be corrected to *u*. The substitution of *a*, *i*, or *u* for a short *e* and *o* happens elsewhere (e.g., with *dūmiāe* and *gharaṇīe* in line 161).

119: The manuscript reads *lalita* “charming” in the Sanskrit gloss, and *lālita* in the commentary; I consider the first to be correct (close as it is to Hemacandra’s glosses of *ramya* and *vidagdha* in his *Deśināmamālā*, p. 242) and have corrected the second instance.

120: *prabhur bhavan* must be an etymological paraphrase of *pahuppaṃto*, which other commentaries (e.g., Gaṅgādhara) render more straightforwardly as *prabhavan*.

126: The reading *asatī* is also possible, although the manuscript typically marks the coalescence of *a*-vowels with an *avagraha*.

129: The copyist has omitted the Sanskrit gloss for verse 8.

134: Note the spelling *nārikela*, in contrast to *nālikera* in lines 174, 184 and 199.

161: Once again (see lines 66 and 117), in the case of both *gharaṇīa* for *gharaṇīe* and *dūmiāi* for *dūmiāe*, the copyist has taken Vrajarāja’s indication of how a letter must be read (*paṭhanīyaḥ*) as short and written the word with a letter that is unambiguously short.

171: Vrajarāja’s explanation of why verse 11 is an example of *kāvyaṅga*, and his remark about it being “distinct” (*vilakṣita*) from other figures, recalls the general tenor of Appayya Dīkṣita’s discussion in the *Kuvalayānanda* (§60), who defines the ornament using a few similar terms (one element of meaning, or *artha*, subserves, or *upapādaka*, another, insofar as it acts as its cause, or *hetu*). Appayya exemplifies but does not define *hetu* or *anumāna*, Vrajarāja’s alternative identifications of the figure, but the definitions would have been well known (from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, among many other sources).

177: Vrajarāja has the same order of verses as Weber’s manuscripts γ and ψ, which read Gaṅgādhara’s verse 13 (*gharaṇīe* etc.) after verse 11 (*pāapa-ḍiassa* etc.).

177: On *gharaṇīe/gharaṇīa*, see the note on line 161.

183–184: *ārthī upamā* is defined in these terms at *Sāhityadarpaṇa* 10.16.

184: This verse is given a different quality (power or *ojah*) and style (*gaudī*) than most of the others, which is probably because of the long compound in the middle of the first line.

186: These two possibilities relate to the reason why the man is inaccessible to the woman (his aloofness in the first case, and the impossibility of a discreet meeting in the second), and have different implications for the interpretation of the verse. *prathame* and *dvitīye* in lines 197 and 198 refer to these two interpretive possibilities. I have not encountered these alternatives in any other commentary.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Kāvya prakāśa of Mammaṭa = *Śrīmammaṭabhaṭṭapraṇītaḥ Kāvya prakāśaḥ*. Ed. by Harihara Śāstrī, Anantaśayana [Tiruvananthapuram], Rājākīyamudraṇayantrālaya, 1926 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 88).

Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Dīkṣita = *Śrīmadappayyadīkṣitaviracitaḥ Kuvalayānandaḥ*. Ed. by Bholāśaṅkara Vyāsa, Vārāṇasī, Chaukhambā Vidyābhavana, 1983, Fourth edition.

Daśarūpakāvaloka of Dhanika = *The Daśarūpaka of Dhanamjaya, with the Commentary Avaloka by Dhanika and the Sub-Commentary Laghuṭīkā by Bhaṭṭaṅṣimha*. Ed. by T. Venkatacharya, Adyar, The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1969.

Deśīnāmamālā of Hemacandra = *The Deśīnāmamālā of Hemacandra*. Ed. by R. Pischel, Bombay [Mumbai], Government Central Book Depot, 1880.

Prākṛtapiṅgala = *Prākṛita-Paiṅgalaṃ (A Text on Prākṛita and Apabhraṁśa Metres)*. Ed. by Bhola Shanker Vyas, Ahmedabad, Prakrit Text Society, 2007.

Bhāvalesāprakāśikā of Gaṅgādhara Bhaṭṭa = *Śrīsātavāhanaviracitā Gāthā-saptaśatī Gaṅgādharaḥaṭṭaviracitayā ṭīkayā sametā*. Ed. by Paṇḍita Kedāranātha & Vāsudeva Śarman, Bombay [Mumbai], Nirṇaya Sagar Press, 1911, Second edition.

Rasamañjarī of Bhānudatta = *Mahākavibhānudattamiśraviracitā Rasamañjarī*. Ed. by Jagannātha Pāṭhaka, Benaras [Varanasi], Śrīharikṣṇanibandhabhavanam, 1951, Second edition.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha = *The Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha*. Ed. by P.V. Kane, Bombay [Mumbai], Nirṇaya Sagar Press, 1922, Second edition.

Sāhityabhūmi of Premarāja = Manuscript no. 181 of 1879–1880, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana of Hemacandra = *Hemacandra's Grammatik der Prākṛitsprachen (Siddhahemacandram Adhyāya VIII)*. Ed. by Richard Pischel, Halle, Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1877.

Hālasaptaśatītātparyāṭikā of Mādhavayajva Miśra = Manuscript no. R3378, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai.

Secondary literature

ĀCĀRYA, Hari Rām

1982 *Mahākavi Hāl aur Gāhāsatsaī*, Jaipur, Śaraṇ Book Depot.

BHANDARKAR, D.R.

1917 “Vikrama Era”, in *Commemorative Essays presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar*, Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, pp. 187–194.

BOCCALI, Giuliano

1999 “Rain Poems and the Genesis of *kāvya*”, *Pandanus '98: Flowers, Nature, Semiotics* (edited by Jaroslav Vacek & Blanka Knotková-Čapková), pp. 13–41.

BOCCALI, Giuliano, Daniela SAGRAMOSO & Cinzia PIERUCCINI

1990 *Le Settecento Strofe*, Brescia, Paideia.

DASH, Siniruddha (ed.)

2013 *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors. Volume XXXII: Vaidyanarasimhasena – śaṅkarācāryotpatti*, Chennai, University of Madras.

DUNDAS, Paul

1985 *The Sattasaī and its Commentators*, Torino, Indologica Taurinensia.

GODE, P.K.

1929 “The Date of Ratikallolinī of Sāmarāja Dikṣita: Saṃvat 1775 (= A.D. 1719)”, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute* 10, pp. 158–159.

HANDIQUI, Krishna Kanta (ed.)

1976 *Pravarasena's Setubandha*, Ahmedabad, Prakrit Text Society.

HART, George L.

1975 *The Poems of Ancient Tamil: their milieu and their Sanskrit counterparts*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

INGALLS, Daniel H.H., M.V. PATWARDHAN & Jeffrey Mousaieff MASSON.

1990 *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana: With the Locana of Abhinavagupta*, Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press.

KHOROCHE, Peter & Herman TIEKEN

2009 *Poems on Life and Love in Ancient India: Hāla's Sattasaī*, Albany, Excelsior editions.

KRISHNAMACHARIAR, M.

1957 *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Madras [Chennai], Tirumalai–Tirupati Devasthanams Press.

LIENHARD, Siegfried

- 1973 “Akapporuḷ and Sanskrit Mukataka Poetry”, in X.S. THANI NAGAYAM & François GROS (eds.), *Association internationale des études tamoules / International Association of Tamil Research: Compte-rendu de la troisième conférence internationale / Proceedings of the Third International Conference Seminar, Paris 1970*, Pondichéry, Institut français d’Indologie, pp. 111–118.

OLLETT, Andrew

- 2017 *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit, Sanskrit, and the Language Order of Premodern India*, Oakland, University of California Press.

RAJIMWALE, Shreekanth Gajananmaharaja

- 1979 “A Study of the Śrauta Ritual of the Kaṇvas with Reference to the Padārthapradīpikā of Sāmarājabhaṭṭa”, Ph.D. thesis. Pune, Savitribhai Phule Pune University.

SELBY, Martha Ann

- 2000 *Grow Long, Blessed Night: Love Poems from Classical India*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

TIEKEN, Herman

- 1983 *Hāla’s Sattasaī: Stemma and Edition (Gāthās 1-50) with Translation and Notes*, Leiden, published by the author.

UPADHYE, A.N. (ed.)

- 1970 *Saptaśatīsāra with Bhāvadīpikā of Vema Bhūpāla along with the Chappañṇaya-Gāhāo*, Kolhapur, Shivaji University.

VASUDEVA, Somadeva & Bergljot CHIARUCCI

- 2011 “The Earliest Commentators on the Gāhākoso: Tribhuvanapāla’s Chekōktivicāralīlā and Upādhyāya Lakṣmīdhara’s Saptaśatakaṭīkā”, *Newsletter of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project 7*, pp. 46–54.

WEBER, Albrecht (ed.)

- 1881 *Das Saptaśatakam des Hāla*, Leipzig, Brockhaus.

WILDEN, Eva

- 2014 *Manuscript, Print, Memory: Relics of the Caṅkam in Tamilnadu*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.