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Pundit Publications

Kathmandu
tad iha na guṇadosau yojanīyau alākau
katham api mahaīyai yat sanskrito' yam śramena

– Bāpū Deva Śāstri (1819-90)

'The undeserved merit or fault therefore should not be applied to it, since it has after all been prepared with great effort.'
Why This Supplement?

It is not that I seek mental pleasure,
or that my mind is stupefied with worldly things,
or that I seek to gain friends, land or riches,
or yearn for my own pre-eminence.
If I exert all my strength, ignoring exorbitant reviling every day,
It is only so that the knowledge accumulated by the forefathers
may be able to do good to people.'

It was exactly 41 years ago to the day that a little pamphlet in the Nepali
language, quite different from the pamphlets motivated by the political passions that stirred the people of Nepal following the recent advent of democracy, was released, selling for six paisá-s. Its title in English translation is:

Correction of [Factual Errors in] Historical Writings
(No. 1)
The refutation with proof of an error which occurred due to historians' carelessness, with the son thus becoming the father, and the father the son, and confusion thus arising in the dynasty of the Kathmandu Mallas.

This was followed by another pamphlet, which was released exactly 12 days later and sold for the same price. Its contents, in English translation, appear in the present supplement as the second article.
Fourteen weeks passed between the publication of the second pamphlet and a thicker pamphlet of a similar nature, this time selling for 20 paisa-s. This third piece of scholarship tries to analyse the cause of the expansion of Gorkhali power from 1786 onwards, the siding of the rulers who were tributaries to Gorkha with British India during the Anglo-Nepal War and the Indian revolt of 1857 - all from the point of view of the Arthasāstra.

No other pamphlet was published for 13 months. This silence was broken with a 25-paisa pamphlet released on Śripañcami, the day for the Goddess Sarasvatī. This time the pamphlet refuted some of the factual errors in a textbook written by one of the two well-known teachers of history having a licence for lecturing in college (Nepal did not have a university at that time). The title of this pamphlet, in English translation, is:

**Correction of Factual Errors in Historical Writings**

Principal Bhairav Bahadur Pradhan M.A. should either take our advice full of good wishes and ward off his ignorance or enter the arena to dispute with us with strong evidence, if he has any enabling him to prove what he has written.

For two years and one month pamphlets, both big and small, or even leaflets, altogether 36 in number, were released in order to correct factual errors in historical publications, which were either mainly based on the famous 19th-century Vamsāvālī edited by Daniel Wright or were written not with a disinterested motive.

There was another silence of almost one year, and then a new pamphlet appeared, followed by ten others published during a period spanning thirty-seven months. All these pamphlets concentrate more on opening up new vistas than merely correcting errors in popular books or in the works motivated by unacademic interest.

The same group during a period of almost eight and a half years released, in addition, many other pamphlets that deal with Nepalese history, Sanskrit grammar, the Nepalese calendar, Sanskrit textbooks, the Rāmāyana and other subjects. They also contributed considerably to a Sanskrit monthly specialising in Nepalese inscriptions and manuscripts. Last but not least, two more substantial works, containing source materials for a history of 18th- and early 19th-century Nepal, were published during this period by a well-endowed institution patronised by a Rana.

On New Year’s Day of Vikrama Samvat 2018 (=A.D. 1961) these scholars formed themselves into the Saṃsodhana-manḍala and started a quarterly to publish hitherto unpublished inscriptions from Nepal. This periodical continued for three consecutive years and was replaced by Puṛnima, which still continues. During this period of three years they produced many such pamphlets and three books bearing on Nepalese history and culture.

The publication of the quarterly Puṛnima enabled them to disseminate both their research and way of thinking on a much more regular basis. It has been almost three decades since the first issue of Puṛnima was released. In addition, the period has witnessed the publication of many more independent works running to thousands of pages. To sum up, all their research published during the past 41 years contains a storehouse of knowledge that sheds light on Nepalese history and the history of Indic mathematics and astronomy.

The outcome of this still ongoing research goes practically unnoticed outside Nepal, mainly owing to the language barrier; since those who carry it on largely confine themselves to writing in the Nepali language. For several years now, I, who am a part of the same Saṃsodhana-manḍala, have been dreaming of publishing a journal in English which could represent the research of the group.

With the passage of time, my own papers in English have gradually become voluminous. Seeing all these papers lying for years in manuscript form in my drawers and trunks has become increasingly unbearable. Similarly, as I have become more and more aware of the richness of both the manuscript and literary heritage of Nepal in the sphere of Sanskrit scholarship, my thoughts have turned toward a journal which could accommodate the translation of the papers written by scholars of the Saṃsodhana-manḍala, including myself, my own papers in English and, last but not least, editions of hitherto unpublished tracts in Sanskrit which were either written, copied or discovered in Nepal.

This idea has yet to bear fruit, but in the meantime I shall make do with publishing this small supplement to Puṛnima to mark the 42nd anniversary of its predecessor, which ushered in a period of unprecedented
intellectual pursuit, one either praised or depreciated but not yet correctly evaluated.

The title *Adarśa* for this supplement seems distinctly poetic, as *Pūrṇimā* did in its time. However, the titles are not so fanciful as they look. More than three decades back, when we were planning the journal, we picked the title over several others, thinking that as we aimed at producing thorough research, *Pūrṇimā* well suited our purpose. Since my intention in publishing the English-language supplement is to disseminate the research of the *Samsādhanamandala* to a wider audience, I have named it *Adarśa*, meaning 'mirror', i.e. a means of reflecting that research.

Though, I am individually responsible for the planning, preparation and publication of the supplement, Philip H. Pierce kindly extended a helping hand and translated the second article and patiently went through all the others with a critical acumen backed up by an Indological background. I should like to take this opportunity to thank Philip, to whom I owe an unpayable debt for his support over the years I have been writing.

When the typesetting of the supplement was already completed, Nepalese rupees 10,000.00 (ten thousand) came out of the blue, which helped to defray partially the expenses of printing. For this I thank Susan and Jayadevakrishna, who founded the Taleju Dhanakurnari Fund.

\[ \text{vahati na purah kaścit paśān na ko'py anuyātt mām} \\
\text{na ca navapadaksunno mārgah katham nā hāma ekakah} \\
\text{bhavatu vīditam pūravyūtho dhunā khitām gataḥ} \\
\text{sa khalu bahalo vāmaḥ panthā mayā śpuṭam ujjhitāh} \]

- Dharmakīrti


   For my reason for accepting the reading *ujjhitāḥ* instead of *urjitāḥ*, see 'Kīna ma yasa pustakako prakāśaka bane?' [Why I became the publisher of this book?], p. 24, note 12 in Gyan Mani Nepal, *Pashupatināthako darsāna sparśana pujanasambandhamā samikṣā*.


Translated by Ingalls

20 September 1993

Mahes Raj Pant

On the Meaning of śabdakāra

– Mahes Raj Pant

As is well known, Pāṇini deals with the formation of the word śabdakāra in III.2.23 of his Astādhyāyī. Two reputable scholars of Pāṇini, one in a cultural and the other in a linguistic vein, have explained the word in its broad derivative meaning, with which a Sanskritist will not easily agree. This note attempts the correct interpretation of the word following the conventional meaning.

V.S. Agrawala, while dealing with Pāṇini’s epithets, writes as follows:

In a kridanta rule (III.2.23) he teaches the formation amongst other words of sūtrakāra and śabdakāra... The title śabdakāra also may be applied to Pāṇini, since grammar concerned as it was with words is referred to as śabda in the Ashūdhyāyī itself (I.1.68 and VIII.3.86, śabda-samjñāḥ).1

In the following sentence, the same scholar equates the meaning of śabdakāra with śabdika:

A writer on grammar is named śabdakāra (III.2.23), or śabdika (IV.4.34, śabdāni karotā śabdikā vaiyākaranāḥ).2

Again, Agrawala takes the word śabdakāra as synonymous with vaiyākaraṇa in the following sentence:

Grammar is called both Śabda and Vyākaraṇa, and a grammarian śabdakāra (III.2.23) and vaiyākaraṇa (VI.3.7).3

These excerpts clearly reveal what Agrawala holds the meaning of the word śabdakāra to be. According to him the word śabdakāra, whose

2. Ibid.:305.
3. Ibid.: 341.
formation is taught by Pāṇini, means ‘grammariam’, as śabdika and vaiyākarana do.

S.M. Katee defines the word in question in his Dictionary of Pāṇini in the following way:

\[
\text{[śabdakāra-] mfn. making a noise or sound; m. a grammarian 3.2. 23.4}
\]

Unlike Agrawala, Katee offers here two alternative meanings of the word. None the less, one of the meanings given by him is the same unconventional one that Agrawala has offered.

In his translation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī which was published not long ago, he explains the same word as such:

\[
\text{sabda + am kar-o-ti = śabda + ø + kṛ + ṭā = śabda-kār-ā (N)}
\]

(1) ‘grammariam (lit. maker of words)’; ...^5

Thus in his latest book on Pāṇini Katee rejected one of the two alternative meanings of the word which he previously offered and took śabdakāra solely as ‘grammariam’.

The principal job of a Sanskrit grammarian being word formation, the word śabdakāra seems to be interpreted by the two Pāṇini scholars as ‘grammariam’, since śabdika, the other derivative of śabda, is restricted to that sense. However, in doing so they did not take into account the tradition which gives a completely different meaning of the word.

This unconventional interpretation tempts me to refer to a statement of Jinendrabuddhi, who speaks of the force of usage in language. In explaining the formation of śabdika, the master commentator on the Kāśikāvṛtti, says that when the word śabda takes the ṭhak-affix in the sense of ‘who makes a śabda (sound)’, the word thus formed is restricted to the sense of grammariam. What we learn further is that to express the sense of ass, the ṭhak-affix cannot be applied to śabda, even though the ass is a sound-maker. He rounds off his argument by saying that therefore the word śabdika is expressive of the meaning of grammariam, who knows all śabda-s (words) through an analysis of them into base, affix and other elements, not that of ass, who makes a sound.\(^6\)

Let us first reproduce the Pāṇiniāna suīra, together with the Kāśikāvṛtti, which teaches us the formation of the word śabdakāra:

\[
\text{na śabdaślokakahagāthāvairacātusūramantrapadeśu III.2.23}
\]

\[
\text{sabdādiśapadeśu karotes taprātaya na bhavati \| hervādīsu praptah \| pratiśiddhyate \| śabdakārah \| slokakārah \| kalahakārah \| gāthakārah \| vairakārah \| cāukārah \| sūrakārah \| mantrakārah \| padakārah} \]

As neither the suīra nor the vṛtti explains the meanings of the words thus formed, we are forced to resort to other sources to get at the meaning of the word in question. Our purposes are served by the kavyasāstra-s, which were composed specifically in order to illustrate the application of the Pāṇiniāna rules.

Let us quote two verses from the Rāvanārjunīya:

\[
\text{na vairakāro bhavatāna tarmantrakārah svadhiyā vidhātuḥ} \| \text{sa slokakāraḥ abhinīyāmāno mamajja tatrāmbhavi caukukārah} \]

\[
\text{sankṣobhitam tena bhūhinā nadyāḥ skhalaj jalam rodhasi śabdakāram \| uṣaḥśiṇāmarasūrakāraḥ driptena rūtirīmarasūdhukāraḥ} \]

---

6. Nyāsa to Kāśikāvṛtti on Aṣṭādhyāyī IV. 4. 34:

\[
\text{... taid ity aṣṭapaiva dvitiyāsamarthavibhaktau labdhāyaṁ}
\]

\[
\text{sabdādarduram iti dvitiyānirdeśo laukikāvya-pradarsanārthāh} \| \text{sabdādarduram karoīty evad vayavāhikām vākyaṁ \| asya}
\]

\[
\text{pratigraho yatram loke vayavāhas tatra pratyayo bhavati}
\]

\[
\text{nāyātretyartham sūcayati \| tena śabdām karoī khaṁ ity atrā na}
\]

\[
\text{bhavati \| loke sa śabdikā ity ucye ātah śabdām vṛttī \| vaiyakaraṇa ēva śabdām vṛttī \| tena tatraiva pratyayo bhavati na khaře \| asa}
\]

\[
\text{vaiyakaraṇaḥ pratyayāprakṛtyadīnā sarvam śabdām jānāti} \]

---


5. Id. 1989: 228.

These two verses illustrate six finished forms whose derivations together with three others are taught in the above-quoted sutra. In these verses, Bhūma, the author of the Ravanārjuniya, describes a bath taken by Rāvana in a river.

These verses can be translated as follows:

He did not become hostile to the enemy who had already bowed down to him. He did not become the composer of Brahmā's mantra with his own intellect. He, praised by the flattering versifiers, there took a dip in the water.

The flowing water of the river sounded against the bank: it was disturbed by him who was proud, encouraged by the composers of the immortal sutra-s and delighted by the applause of the night-wanderers [i.e. rākṣasa-s].

When Rāvana plunged into the water, the waves carried to the bank of a river, as Bhūma tells us, and produced a noise. Here the word sabdakāra qualifies jala. By using the word sabdakāra in this context, the author illustrates its meaning as something far from a grammarian. In other words, he simply associates it with water (jala) which makes a splashing sound (sabdakāra).

Now let us turn to the pages of another kāvyāstra, the Bhaṭṭīkāvyā:

---

Though the learned editors of the text have separated the second and third words of the first verse, I venture to make a necessary correction. As I see it, bhavad is nothing else than abhavad, the initial a of which has been absorbed into the preceding o of vairakāro, having its tone duly represented in the combination.

8. The absence of a critical edition of the text poses many an obstacle to its correct understanding. The only printed edition is of a somewhat fragmentary nature, and the only known commentary on it has yet to find its way out of a manuscript library (cf. Mīmāṃsaka 1984:479-481). This being the state of affairs, the translation given above, I fear, is a tentative one.

9. Bhaṭṭīkāvyā V. 100.
10. Aṣṭādhyāyī III. 2.21, 23.
the Amarakosa as expressive of 'sonorous'. By equating sabdakara with ravana and sabdana, Yadavaprakasa supports the authors of the kavyasatra-s, who, as we have just seen, also use it in the same sense.

These examples of the usage of the word sabdakara are expressive of the sense of 'making a sound or noise, sounding, sonorous or noisy'. All the four oft-consulted modern Sanskrit lexicons attest the conventional meaning of the word. Among them the two most comprehensive ones substantiate this meaning by referring to the above-quoted verse form the Bhattikavya.16

14. Kāśikāvrtti on Aṣṭādhya 3.2.148: calanārihebhyaḥ sabdārihebhyaḥ cākarmakebhyaḥ dhāubhyas tacchilādiṣu kartarṣu yuc pratayo bhavaih l calanāh l copanaḥ l sabdārihebhyaḥ - sabdanaḥ l ravaṇaḥ l akarmakād iti kim l pañhitā vidyām l

Amarakoṣa III. 1.38a-b: ravaṇaḥ sabdano nāndivādi nāndikaraḥ samau l
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A Historical Gloss on the
Kautālīya Arthaśāstra
No. 1*

Bholanath Paudel, Dhanavajra Vajrācārya
and Gyan Mani Nepal

nīśāstraṁṛṣaṁ śṛīmaṁ arthaśāstramahodadheḥ
ya uddadhre namsas tasmāi viṣṇuguptāya vedhase

Kāmandaka

‘Honour be to Kautālīya, [like unto] the Creator, who from
the ocean of the arthaśāstra, churned out the nectar at the
nīśāstra.’

In olden times there was a custom of learning and teaching the Kautālīya Arthaśāstra. Many scholars cited from the Kautālīya Arthaśāstra in their works. Over a period of time the learning and teaching of it gradually disappeared. Finally the book lost currency among scholars and reached something like a stale of unobtainability. Forty-three years ago [A.D. 1909] the work came to be rediscovered and published. Indian and non-Indian scholars alike attempted to make sense of this book, which had long been neglected by the learned. However, these scholars were not able to accomplish their object with regard to the book, whose subject matter was deep. This fact emerges from what the scholars say.

When we, too, began attemptng to study this work, our primary job, since it was written in an extremely mature style of Sanskrit, came to be

first studying Sanskrit well; moreover, as the subject matter of the book
was also very deep a double burden fell upon us. But as our arduous
studying progressed, flashes of light from the wealth of ancient Indic
wisdom began to scintillate in our minds. This light is sweeping away
our burdensome darkness. Still, for lack of means, being unable to make
the flashes of all this light light up at once, we have begun to make it
light up little by little. In doing so – since no subject is understood
without examples – we have given examples occurring in history. These
examples have not been cited to denigrate or extol anyone. They have
been given solely for the sake of a true knowledge of the matter at hand.

Since we are students of the Indic tradition, we are not prayoktr-s nor,
being still students, are we vaklr-s either. Therefore it will be well for no
one to try to gain an understanding of politics from us. Ācārya, too, has
said, ‘dāndaniim vaktrprayoktrbhyāh’ (Kautālīya Arthaśāstra I. 5. 2.8):
‘Learn politics from vaktr-s and prayoktr-s.’ The sense of vaktr is that of
an originator of political thought; the sense of prayoktr is that of one
engaged in political activity.

We have undertaken this labour solely in order that the meaning of
sūtra-s of the Kautālīya Arthaśāstra might properly be disclosed and that
true knowledge might result. If these efforts of ours aid some people in
understanding the real meaning of the Kautālīya Arthaśāstra, we will
consider that we have accomplished our object.

Kautālīya’s Thoughts on Rana Rule

If there is a worthy ruler, his worthiness will ensure that he will rule all
his life with the object of bringing peace to his country and happiness to
his subjects, and he will promote his country’s growth. After his death it
is the rule, under absolute monarchy, for his son to obtain the father’s
throne and authority. It is possible that his son may be either fit or unfit.
In the case where he is fit, he will be able to promote growth even
beyond the point where his father’s good rule left off. If this happens it
is good. But not all heirs apparent (successors) appear to have been fit in
the past. By the rule according to which the father’s royal authority is
transferred to his son, it is often the case that even a son who has not
come of age becomes the direct claimant to the father’s authority. Under
such circumstances persons close to the king or ministers have seized
royal authority. This situation quite often occurs in monarchies. It is
called *rajavyasana*, i.e. 'the danger of a calamity befalling the king'.

This state of affairs is seen to occur from time to time in history. The teachers of the *arthaśāstra* in olden times thought up many ways to avoid this danger. Concerning this, Acārya Kautalya has enunciated the following way:

\[
\text{kulasāya vā bhaved rājyaṃ kulasānghaḥ hi durdjayaḥ}
\]
\[
\text{arājavyasanaśvādāh śaśvad āvasati kṣiitum}
\]

(Kautalya *Arthaśāstra* 1.17.13.55)

'Or let there be a rule by family, since a *kulasāngha* [i.e. 'council made up of the members of the family'] is difficult to conquer. The danger of a calamity befalling the king will not exist, and it [i.e. the *kulasāngha*] will last for a long, long time.'

When things are done according to the stratagem Acārya Kautalya enunciated, any danger of calamity befalling the king in a kingdom is removed. If there is one unworthy ruler in the rule by family, still there will not be a dearth of other worthy persons. That is evident. By this means a kingdom will be spared trouble. The truth of this saying of Kautalya is seen clearly from the following example from history.

It has been almost two hundred years now since the royal house of Gorkha made a big kingdom out of the small kingdom of Gorkha and began ruling over it. During this period Prithvi Narayan Shah and his son administered the affairs of state themselves. After them, Rana Bahadur Shah and the kings after him having ascended the throne during their childhood, the reins of power were not in the hands of the king but came into the hands of ministers. But any one council of ministers did not last for long. The council of ministers changed quite often. Finally, after complete authority over Nepal came into the hands of Jung Bahadur, the council of ministers run by the Ranas continued for one hundred four years.

It is worth examining the reason why what lasted for many years did last so long. This is not the place to consider whether Rana rule was of benefit or not to Nepal. Here only the reason for the longevity of Rana rule will be considered. Once we search for a reason, the main one will be seen to be the rule by family among the Ranas.

Jung Bahadur seized the prime ministership one hundred six years ago [A.D. 1846]. Instead of having the post of prime minister transferred after him directly to his own son, he had it transferred to his eldest younger brother. It was his younger brothers who were instrumental in maintaining the reins of power over Nepal after the old nobility had crumbled under. In order to increase the dignity of his own post of prime minister and that of his family, Jung Bahadur, having consolidated his power on the strength of his brothers' help, conferred on himself the title *śrī 3 mahāraja*, i.e. 'thrice venerable great king', and on the members of his family that of *rajakumarakumārajī*, i.e. 'the son of a son of a prince'. He was quite unable to disregard his younger brothers and was therefore forced to set up a family rule. In any case, the Rana rule was a rule of *kulasāngha*. According to Kautalya's saying, too, it lasted long.

With the natural tendency of a common man to see to it that his power be swiftly passed to his own direct descendants, Jung Bahadur fixed the following roll of succession:

1. Maharajah Jung Bahadur Kunwar Rana
2. Commander-in-chief General Ranoddip Singh (Maharajah Jung's younger brother)
3. Commanding General Jagat Shamsher (Western command) (Maharajah Jung's younger brother)
4. Commanding General Dhir Shamsher (Eastern command) (Maharajah Jung's younger brother)
5. Commanding General Jagat Jung (Southern command) (Maharajah Jung's son)
6. Commanding General Jeet Jung (Northern command) (Maharajah Jung's son)
7. General Pudma Jung (Maharajah Jung's son)
8. Any other son of Maharajah Jung Bahadur born in lawful wedlock
9. Lieutenant General Babar Jung (Maharajah Jung's mixed-caste son)
10. Lieutenant General Ranbir Jung (Maharajah Jung's mixed-caste son)

3. The translation of the term is borrowed from R.P. Kangle 1972:43. - Translator.
11. Yuddhapratap Jung, the son of the commanding general of the southern command, from his wife, the royal princess (Maharajah Jung’s grandson)

12. Any son, if born to the commanding general of the northern command, from his wife, the royal princess

After this the sons of the six younger brothers (Maharajah Jung’s nephews)

(Roll of succession framed in 1868)

The brilliant Jung Bahadur, who set up a rule by kulasāṅgha, made one mistake in fixing the above roll of succession, because of his zeal to have the power rest with his own direct descendants. Jung’s nephews would obtain rank to assume the office of prime minister only upon the death of his not yet born grandsons, and by then would surely have died. The sons of Jung Bahadur’s younger brothers were effectively removed from the prime ministerial power for good. Thus, with one hand, Jung Bahadur gave a place on the roll of succession to the sons of his younger brothers, and with the other he took them away and tried to ensure a monopoly on the power to his own direct descendants. The sons of Jung Bahadur’s younger brothers became unhappy, understanding how the cards were stacked. As one consequence of this, the massacre of 1885 occurred. If instead of showing partiality to his own sons and grandsons over those of his younger brothers, he had shown nobility by continuing the line of succession after himself with his younger brothers and not with his own sons, and had properly introduced a true system of rule by kulasāṅgha, then his family would not have broken up. Nor would his sons have had to be banished from the realm.

In the end Bir, the eldest son of Dhir, pushed aside the offspring of his six uncles and took the title of maharajah. After his grandsons, though, he did not make next in line of succession his younger brothers’ sons, as Jung Bahadur did, but his favourite sons from a mixed-caste marriage. Later Maharajah Chandra showed excessive partiality towards pure over mixed-caste offspring, divided the Rana family into A, B and C classes and made known the distinction in and outside the country. After him, Maharajah Bhim, like Bir, raised to the top rolls of succession his own favourite sons from a mixed-caste marriage. This action of Maharajah Bhim, too, in hampering the old arrangement, came to be a contributing factor in the break-up the Rana family. Later, in 1934, taking Chandra’s move a step further, Maharajah Buddha expelled mixed-caste Ranas from the roll of succession.

Maharajah Chandra, Maharajah Bhim and Maharajah Juddha, in their desire to have their own sons attain to power quickly, carried out with their own hands the measures Kautalya had said the enemies of a saṅgha should undertake to break it up.

The group of Ranas of mixed-caste marriage who were deprived of a place in the roll of succession in 1934 became the main reason for the Ranas’ fall from power. There are many other reasons, of course, but nevertheless

\[ tva yā mayā ca kunyā ca dharitryā vāsavena ca 1 \\
\textit{jāmadagnyenā rāmeṇa śaṭbhīḥ karṇo nipātitaḥ} \]

['Karna was killed by six, namely, by you, by me, by Kunti, by the earth, by Indra and by Rama the son of Jamadagni.’ — Translator]

To borrow the words that came from Krṣna’s mouth after Karna had been slain, the independence India won in 1947 may be said to represent Krṣna, and those Ranas of mixed-caste marriage who were deprived of office in 1934 Arjuna. If the Rana kulasāṅgha had not broken apart, then the rule of the Rana family would not have disappeared in such a deplorable fashion, extinguished by Indian independence.

For the one hundred four years of the long rule under the Rana family, the reins of power were not transferred to other hands in Nepal besides the Ranas. The Ranas never fell under the sway of their own ministers. Under their administration rājavyasana lost its force. Thus Rana rule proved Kautalya’s saying of the arājavyasanābādha, i.e. ‘the removing of the danger of a calamity befalling the king’.
On Reading *The Gopālaraṇjavamsāvalī* *

— Mahes Raj Pant

A good edition of the earliest *Vamsāvalī* from Nepal has been on the wish list of Indologists specialising in Nepal for more than three quarters of a century. By bringing out this edition, Dhanavajra Vajracarya and Kamal P. Malla have tried to fill a gap long existing in Nepalese historiography. Since its discovery by Cecil Bendall in the cold weather of 1898-99 in Kathmandu's Durbar Library, nobody had prepared an exhaustive text-edition and translation of this important *Vamsāvalī*, though some scholars have dealt with it on a rather piecemeal basis. Although Luciano Petecch took the initiative in producing a text-edition in 1958, he confined his endeavour to reproducing the relatively easier portion, for which he found a parallel version. The only ambitious publication was a not completely successful attempt at its editing and partial translation made by Naraharinath in 1959.


2. Petech 1958: Appendix VI.
3. Ibid.: Appendix V.

I ignore both D. Regmi's reproduction of the *Vamsāvalī* (1966: pt. 1, Appendix B) and J. Regmi's presentation of the same (1972: 44-55, 1973: 34-53), which is based on D. Regmi's reproduction, since I fully agree with Malla (p. iv) that '[D.] Regmi's is the least reliable of the transcriptions available in print.'
The present physical condition of the *Vamsāvālī* manuscript, which was written more than six hundred years ago, is not satisfactory. But as Bendall tells us, he received ‘an excellent copy’ of the *Vamsāvālī* manuscript during the end of the last century when he was already back in England. There, he was able to borrow the original manuscript for three months, and thus to do collating and to photograph ‘all important passages’.⁵

As we do not know the present whereabouts of Bendall’s copy and photographs, we cannot take advantage of them. But Bendall did publish photographs of nine pages of the *Vamsāvālī* in his essay on the history of mediaeval Nepal.⁶

Fortunately, as late as 1959, the private library of Field Marshal Kaisher Shumshere Jung Bahadur Rana in Kathmandu possessed photo prints as well as glass negatives of the *Vamsāvālī* manuscript, the latter, according to Malla, apparently photographed at the turn of the century when the manuscript was in better condition‘ (p. iv). However, in passing it should be mentioned that this date for the glass negatives is too early, since at that time Kaisher Shumshere was a mere child of eight or so⁷ and not yet the great connoisseur of books he was to turn out to be.

In 1959, five students of Naya Raj Pant, including Dhanavajra Vajrācārya, spent time in the private library establishing the text of the *Vamsāvālī* more faithfully on the basis of the photo prints housed there.⁸ They improved on previous attempts, but they did not publish the text as originally planned, though they themselves and the scholars who had access to the text used it for their various publications.⁹

---

5. Bendall 1903:3.
6. Ibid.:1-32.
7. Kaisher Shumshere was born on 8 January 1892 (Sever 1993:469).

---

Inexplicably, Malla lets the fact pass unmentioned that Dhanavajra Vajrācārya was only one member of a team:

Dhanavajra Vajrācārya had prepared a Devanāgarī transcription based on the original manuscript. He had also used the Kaisher Library glass negatives of the manuscript... Although he had been using the transcription since 1959, it was not available in print.

---

What hindered Bendall from editing the manuscript (though not from using it as a source for his essay on the history of mediaeval Nepal) was the language of the text, or rather languages: the first Sanskrit and the second Newari.

The first language employed, to quote Bendall, is no doubt intended for Sanskrit, but in obscurity and a perfectly wild absence of syntax it rivals the worst colophons of Nepalese MSS. that I have seen.¹⁰ Newari Hybrid Sanskrit, as it may be called to differentiate it from other forms of Sanskrit, posed the special problem for him of determining word and sentence boundaries, and he had to abandon his original idea of editing it:

I thought at first of printing the whole, but after studying my transcript and taking the advice of friends I came to the conclusion that I should either have to print the whole without spaces, which would be misleading and unsatisfactory, or to publish facsimiles. For the division of words and even sentences, when one had no fixed rules of grammar to help in the interpretation, seemed in many places quite doubtful. I have been consequently permitted by the Council of the Society to take the latter alternative...¹¹

---

11. Ibid.:3-4.
The other language, to quote the same, ‘is unfortunately old Newari... for which I can get no adequate help either in Nepal or in Europe.' He made himself content ‘in the hope of drawing the attention of the few scholars skilled in the Himalayan languages to the matter'.

Malla says that ‘the manuscript has hitherto remained an intimidating experience for most students of history' (p. i), thus making it sound as though the Vajracārya/Malla edition has made difficulties a thing of the past. Even the Newari portion does not seem to strike Malla as particularly problematic. As late as 1958, however, Petitte could still say: ‘The old Newari in which they [i.e., the Vamsāvalī-s -MRP] are written is practically incomprehensible nowadays.' He further stated that ‘the language has changed enormously, the linguistic tradition is lost and even Nepalese Pandits are at loss (sic) for interpreting this text.'

Malla’s reaction to the above statement:

What Petech felt may have been true in the early 1950s. However, today it sounds something of a hyperbole. The fundamental problem with the text is orthographic rather than linguistic. The division of each entry in V2 [i.e., the Newari portion - MRP] into verifiable words, phrases, and clauses is the real problem. As the writing is without spaces, where to make a cut is the problem.

In fact, however, once you understand the language the division of words is no problem at all. It is well known that the widely practised traditional Indian usage in writing does not mark any break between words. Therefore the problem seen by Malla in editing the Newari portion has to be faced by everyone who edits. One can visit the National Archives, Kathmandu and turn over any leaf of any manuscript or printed book in the pothi style to understand how universal the fact which intimidated him really is. Another appropriate course of action for those who have

13. Ibid.: 5.

had hardly any experience in this sort of text-edition might be to read § 9. B of Whitney’s Sanskrit Grammar.

In describing the problem of editing the ‘Newari portion of the text, Malla is essentially echoing the plaint of Bendall quoted above with reference to the Sanskrit portion; but refusing to identify the problem by the same name. The real problem has been and remains linguistic.

Malla’s further pretension that ‘passages which are relentlessly obscure, at this stage of our study, are far and few between’ (p. iv) is not correct, which should become clear in the course of this review.

The book opens with an introduction by Malla (pp. i-xxvi). The body of the book is divided into seven sections, of which the first are the facsimile plates of the Vamsāvalī (pp. 1-24). Then come the Devanagari transcription (pp. 25-72) of the Vamsāvalī and Nepali translation (pp. 73-120) of the same, both done by Vajracārya. The last four consecutive sections are the fruit of Malla’s labour. The first of them is the English translation (pp. 121-165) of the Vamsāvalī. This latter does not follow Vajracārya blindly, but is the outcome of an ‘inductive test of the validity of [Vajracārya’s] transcription and translation' (Preface, p. ii). This has led to a state of affairs in which ‘in fact, the two translations diverge from each other at a number of places’ (Preface, p. ii). The two translators, in other words, do not feel it necessary to settle their differences before going to print but have rather chosen to make the book an arena of their respective competencies. Their stated purpose in doing so is ‘to give the reader the benefit of doubt’ (Preface, p. ii), though the bewildered reader may doubt whether such doubt is beneficial. A glossary of Newari words (pp. 167-189) follows. Then come two indices, one of personal names (pp. 191-197) and the other of place-names (pp. 199-203). There are five appendices, of which A and C are respectively the facsimile plates of the so-called Kaisher Vamsāvalī (pp. 205-213) and those of the so-called Abridged Vamsāvalī (pp. 223-228). Appendix B is a transcription of the Kaisher Vamsāvalī made by Vajracārya (pp. 215-222). The remaining two, drawn up by Malla, are, first, a comparative chart of the king-lists of the three older Vamsāvalī-s (pp. 229-233) and, second, the chronology of Nepalese kings (pp. 234-238).

This text-edition - covering nearly 270 pages - of the most important Vamsāvalī of mediaeval Nepal, a text 'more well-known than
understood\(^{15}\) since more than three quarters of a century, needs an exhaustive review. In the present context, however, I can only touch on a limited number of points brought up by Vajracarya's and Malla's joint venture.

The *Vamsāvalli* does not have a title. As it was discovered by Bendall, later scholars paid their tribute by calling it the *Bendall Vamsāvalli*. However, the unpublished master catalogue of the library where the manuscript is preserved, prepared during 1922 by a group of Nepali pundits utilising the extant catalogues (eight in number, including the one published by Har Prasad Sastri, and dating from 1852 onwards), names the text more appropriately the *Gopālavamsādiprācīnaraṇājavanśāvalli*, i.e. 'the chronicle of the ancient kings beginning with the Gopāla-s', since it started with a description of the Gopāla dynasty.\(^{16}\)

More recent Nepali scholars, true to this tradition, have called it by the name of the *Gopālavamsāvalli*\(^{17}\) or *Gopālavamsāvalli*\(^{18}\).

It was already noticed by its discoverer that the *Vamsāvalli* is not a single work but perhaps as many as three distinct chronicles, designated in his essay *V*\(^1\), *V*\(^2\), *V*\(^3\).\(^{19}\) Malla, however, divides the whole manuscript into two portions. The reason behind his disagreement with Bendall is the following:

Bendall's divisions and designations of the manuscript have been, so far, accepted as a matter of convention by Levi (1905-08), Petech (1958), and Regmi (1965). However, there is no break, orthographic, stylistic or thematic, between Folios 36a and 36b. So we consider that the manuscript consists of two loosely related texts: *Vamsāvalli*\(^1\) and *Vamsāvalli*\(^2\).

This possibility, in fact, was foreseen by its discoverer:

*V*\(^3\) is perhaps merely a continuation of *V*\(^2\). I have called it a separate document, because a slight break with double dandas occurs in the original MS. at the end of fol. 36\(^a\), and because at this point there is a marked difference of style. The string of short paragraphs each recording little more than a birth, is abandoned, and the annals become more expanded.\(^{20}\)

Here I do not wish to get into an argument of how many chronicles really are contained in the manuscript. It is to be noted, however, that the page where the Sanskrit portion supposedly ends has at the end a few words (30a:5)\(^{21}\) which in no way can be connected with the words with which the next page begins (30b:1).

Though Malla contradicts Bendall on the number of chronicles, he endorses Bendall's central idea that it consists of distinct chronicles. Such being the case, the title given by Nepali scholars seems to be more ad hoc than precise.

As I have shown elsewhere, the later, so-called *Bhāṣāvamsāvalli* written in the Nepali language contains an extract of the present *Vamsāvalli* as an integral part of it.\(^{22}\) In the same paper I have shown the similarities in content between the two *Vamsāvalli*-s.\(^{23}\) In addition, the Nepali-language *Vamsāvalli* refers in the beginning to a kind of text designated as *Rājabhogamala*.\(^{24}\) Such a title aptly suits this genre of writing, as the subject matter of the *Vamsāvalli*-s is not far from dynastic history. Also suggestive is the fact that the portion of the traditional annals in Orissa

21. Throughout this paper, the figures which precede and follow the colon are respectively the folio number and the line number of the original manuscript, whenever the *Vamsāvalli* is concerned.
dealing with dynastic history is called Rājabhoga.25 It is tempting to speculate that this type of chronicle was known as Rājabhogamālā or something like that in the whole of the Subcontinent. In any case, it is regrettable that Malla has nothing to say about the problem beyond a few sentences in his 26-page introduction that repeat the facts surrounding its present names.26

One should not ignore at this juncture the logical argument of Gyan Mani Nepal, who points out that the chronicler himself called his work a bhūtavṛtta which can be translated as ‘a past account’. In order to support his argument, Nepal rightly perceives that the chronicler opens his next chain of the narration with svastih bhūtavrānti27 likhitān ca śrṇu (30b:5), i.e. ‘Hail. Also listen to another written bhūtavrūtta’,28 which neither Vajrācārya nor Malla translate completely.29

Though V1 was composed for the glorification of King Sthitirājamalla, it is highly likely that the author did not write the Vamsāvalī at the king’s instance. If the king wanted to have this Vamsāvalī written, he could have hired a better pundit, one comparable with the poet who authored his own inscription.30 Nevertheless, it is to be pointed out that the author, though he wrote the work on his own, was cautious enough not to give offence to Sthitirājamalla by recording the great event of the reconsecration of the lingam of the national deity Pasupati by Jayasimhārāma, formerly Sthitirāja’s arch enemy and later subordinate to him.31 The portion which follows V1 seems to be written not for the reader but only for the chronicler’s own use. It should be remembered that, unlike V1, that portion is not written in the divine but in the profane language and, in addition, it records the reconsecration of the lingam of Pasupati (54a:3-4).32

Though Bendall noted ‘a perfectly wild absence of syntax’ in the Sanskrit of the present Vamsāvalī, he found a ‘method in its madness’:

Scientific students of the vernaculars may probably find ‘method in its madness.’ The frequent locution  

\[ \text{rūpta or kūta for स रुपातन or स अकरोदि,} \]
certainly suggests the familiar Hindi उस ने किया.33

Bendall’s above remarks prompt Malla to comment upon this linguistic phenomenon in the following way:

If there is a “method in madness”, it may have been a more widespread linguistic phenomenon than just the consequences of scribal incompetence or vagaries. Sanskrit appears to be under the pressure of the Indo-Aryan vernaculars which is in clear evidence in the text. At the same time, the contact with Tibeto-Burman has affected its morphology and phonology. It is, therefore, worth

27. Vajrācārya reads tā and ra in vrāntara as the tā and the r with a virāma sign respectively, which goes against the original (M. Pant 1987:19).
29. Vajrācārya translates the sentence as kalyāṇa hōs l bhaeko vrāntā lekhirākheko suunhuos l (p. 87), i.e. ‘Hail. Please listen to the past event which has been written down.’ And Malla follows suit: ‘Greetings, listen to the chronicle as it was written down.’ (p. 134). In doing so, both translators take the vrāntara in which the second aksara is incorrectly degeminated and which stands for vrānta = vrāta + antara as vrānta = vrāta + anta, thus ignoring ra, which, as said already, Vajrācārya reads as an r with a virāma sign.
30. The only inscription so far discovered that Sthitirājamalla himself had executed is far better in its diction and grammar than the present Vamsāvalī. For the inscription, see Acharya and N. Pant 1953:46-48.
31. For Jayasimhārāma, see D. Vajrācārya 1965:12-36.
32. This paragraph is based substantially on a discussion with Hermann Kulke, who read an earlier version of the present paper in the summer of 1988 at Kiel.
33. Bendall 1903:3, note 5.
investigating if the deviant features are due to language-contact situation (i.e., sociolinguistic), rather than a manifestation of the failure to memorise Pa(sic)nini's aphorisms by the anonymous scribe. That there may have been a “method in madness” is at least evident, for example, in the consistency with which consonants m, n, w are geminated following non-vocalized-r, giving us \textit{mm}, for \textit{ma}, \textit{yy} for \textit{ya}, \textit{jj} for \textit{ja}, \textit{nn} for \textit{na} and \textit{ww} for \textit{wa}.

While accepting all examples that Malla cites of a ‘method in madness’ as genuine, I should state that his proposition that the Sanskrit of the \textit{Vamśāvalī} is heavily under the influence of both Modern Indo-Aryan and Tibeto-Burman languages cannot be substantiated from them, since what he cites from the \textit{Vamśāvalī} is concerned exclusively with orthography, and thus not to the point. Nor is the example Bendall has cited a fitting one, since \textit{tena kṛtah} is in accordance with the norms of Sanskrit grammar. Bendall could have cited, though, the sentence \textit{tena śukradine nāṭika sudhanapāla kṛtavān} (25a:4) in order to prove the influence of Modern Indo-Aryan languages. That the \textit{Vamśāvalī} geminates the consonant which is followed by an \textit{r} and preceded by a vowel is no more than adherence to one of the two orthographic systems which had long been regarded as equally authentic (cf. Panini VIII.4.46). Such being the case, such examples cited by Malla to prove a ‘method in madness’ in the Sanskrit of the present \textit{Vamśāvalī} can be found everywhere in Sanskrit works and thus are not at all rare phenomena. Such examples do not show the characteristics of the Sanskrit of the present \textit{Vamśāvalī}.

Something should be said about the unconventional transliteration of Sanskrit words found in the English portion of \textit{The Gopālārājayāvamsāvalī}. The present publication shows some improvement in this respect from Malla’s past endeavours,\textsuperscript{34} no doubt due to help from someone else on the outside who tended to the matter ‘as love’s labour’ (Preface, p. iii). For all that, the reader has to face now and then odd spellings such as Dhūmaśva (p. 122), Kṛṣaśva (p. 122), Kānci (p. 123), Śūpupşa* (p. 123), Amṣuvāmā (p. 125), Naxāl (p. 126), Kailāśa* (pp. 129, 139), Phālguna (pp. 129, 135, 136 etc.), Dvītyā Āśādha (pp. 135, 136, 142, 151), Phārpīng (p. 136), Māgh (p. 139), Vanda (p. 140), Brāhmans (pp. 145, 148), Kārtik (p. 145), Trītyā (p. 146), Āyusmāna (p. 152), Phālgunī (pp. 158, 159), Prathama Ṭāṣādha (p. 164), Triśākṣitī (last page) and 'divasapūrskār (last page). Most puzzling, too, is Vaisākha Nakṣatra (p. 163), which is non-existent in the whole list of asterisms.

A more major problem in the text presented by Vajrācārya is that of distinguishing \textit{ba} from \textit{va} throughout the manuscript. \textit{Va} has traditionally been reserved for transcribing the indented form of the letter, and \textit{ba} the unindented form,\textsuperscript{35} but our manuscript, in fact, does not have any indented forms.\textsuperscript{36} Therefore the burden is on the person who transcribes, if he chooses to introduce the distinction, of at least being consistent in his methods. One might agree with Vajrācārya in transcribing \textit{deya} as \textit{deva} in order to conform to normal Sanskrit orthography. But no one can be in agreement with him when he transcribes a word which begins with the \textit{b}-sound both in Sanskrit and the vernacular, once as \textit{bālārāmāyana} (29a:3, MS. reads \textit{na}) and the other time as \textit{vālārāmāyana} (57a:5, MS. similarly reads \textit{na}).

Another distraction is the misrepresentation of some of the ligatures by breaking them up into two \textit{aksara}-s, which can easily be avoided in Devanagari (e.g. \textit{q} + \textit{yu} for \textit{dyu} (17a:2), \textit{ṇ} + \textit{gha} for \textit{ṅha} (17a:3), \textit{ṭ} + \textit{ma} for \textit{ṭma} (17a:4)). One ligature, \textit{hra}, has not been disjoined but still is annoyingly similar to \textit{ha}. By giving a more faithful transcription of Bhujimo into Devanagari, Vajrācārya would make it easier for those who have a palaeographical interest in the MS.

Further annoyances are the joining of two independent words which form a subject and predicate, such as \textit{grahahāptram} (21b:1) and \textit{bhaṭarikapraśīthiṭam} (24a:1-2), the dividing of a single word into two fragments, as \textit{vaṃ tho} (33b:5), and the separating of compound words, as \textit{vṛhat puskaraṇī} (24b:2),\textsuperscript{37} for which no reason can be found. It is also

\textsuperscript{35.} Sākyā 1974:45.

\textsuperscript{36.} There is perhaps a solitary instance in the facsimile: \textit{va} in \textit{divasa} (37a:4) looks indented.

\textsuperscript{37.} Even in the original, \textit{t} and \textit{pu} form the ligature \textit{tpu}. As said already, since no distinction can be made on the strength of the MS., the correct reading is \textit{bṛhat}. 

\textsuperscript{34.} Malla 1982 and 1984 betray Malla’s less than perfect familiarity with the Sanskrit language and literature and the methods of Sanskrit transliteration. Cf. M. Pant 1984:33-34.
regrettable that several times Vajrācārya forgets to add a hyphen at the end of a line to denote that the word is to be continued in the next line (e.g. vājavahāra 22b:1-2).

There is a fundamental problem of Nepalese palaeography pertinent to the present text. In mediaeval Nepalese writings a symbol is encountered which looks like ः. As far as I know, no Nepalese palaeographical manuals tells us how to interpret it. One Nepalese palaeographer who authored several manuals on the subject seems quite dubious about the meaning of this symbol, as he renders it, when he encounters it twice in the same inscription, once as anusvāra and the next time as m with the virāma sign.38 There seems, in fact, to be two schools that interpret the symbol differently along those two lines: anusvāra39 or m with the virāma sign.40

In Bengali script the ः symbol plays the double role of velar nasal and anusvāra, and one should bear this in mind.41 R.D. Banerji shows the difference between anusvāra in Bengali and that in other documents, of which the former variety of ः.42 As the Bengali and Newari scripts can be grouped under the eastern varieties of the Nāgari alphabet because of their marked resemblance, the anusvāra-ness of the symbol ः is more pronounced as compared to its m-ness with virāma sign, though Newari has a normal anusvāra, too, represented by a dot or a cipher-like symbol above the head-mark of an aksara.

There is, in addition, a symbol with a dotted crescent with the virāma which represents the yama. It indicates the nasalisation of the second of a pair in twin mutes excepting the nasals before any one of the latter43 and

is the usual sign of nasality in the Taittirīya tradition.44 It is also one of the symbols for gūmāra45 which, in the tradition of the Vājasaneyin-s, replaces an anusvāra that follows a short vowel and precedes either of the three sibilants, h or r.46

When we compare the fact that the symbol in Bengali script plays the role of velar nasal and anusvāra, with the fact that the same symbol represents an anusvāra in the Vedic texts, we see that further research is needed into this aspect of palaeography.

In 1977, when I was working on the two earliest Nepalese copperplates, in collaboration with Aishwarya Dhar Sharma, we encountered similar symbols in both inscriptions47 and devoted some attention to the problem. Subsequently we presented the symbol as representing a certain type of anusvāra, accumulating references from Indo-Nepalese documents.48 However, scholars continue transcribing it as an m with virāma.49 And a new school has emerged in the meantime which thinks that the ‘Bengali Style’ combination of an anusvāra with a virāma joined underneath often apparently unites the functions of nasalization and punctuation.50 However, the new school does not seem absolutely certain of its own interpretation, since it cites our argument with the comments that ‘of course, the above procedure in no way invalidates their argument.’51 The reader therefore may justifiably disagree with Vajrācārya’s interpreting the symbol ः to be found throughout the

42. Banerji 1919:92.
43. Siddhāntakaumudi on Pāṇini VIII.2.1; Yājñavalkyaśikṣā, under verse 93d. See also Abhyankar and Shukla 1977:106, 313-314.
45. E.g. cf. the gūmāra sign in the Vājasaneyāsamhitā X.18 with the one presented in Panta Parvatiya 1946:207-208.
46. Kātyāyanaparāśapratiṃsūra 3.
47. M. Pant and Sharma 1977:6 (inscription, l. 4), 26 (inscription, l. 7).
The text as established by Vajrācārya represents 48 folios of relatively small-size palm-leaves consisting of less than 21,000 akṣara-s. It covers 48 large-size printed pages spaciously set up in bold face so as to accommodate a single folio on a single page. The text is complemented by a loose sheet of corrigenda which incorporates 143(!) mistakes. Unhappily, even these corrigenda do not make the text free of all error, as one easily finds while collating the reading with the facsimile. I have accumulated the misreadings of Vajrācārya not included in the corrigenda

52. Exceptionally, Vajrācārya in several places reads the symbol as anusvāra: kṛta for kṛta-devula (24a:2), hma for the symbol (29b:3), thāparapam for hasyap for hasya-kṛta (32a:2), limchi for lulyam (55b:5), and in a few instances as m without a vertical stroke joined with the following consonant: keśasapūjamkṛta (25b:5), paramparāvū. Moreover, the following citations from his transcript bespeak his uncertainty regarding what the symbol really means. He presents the same symbol occurring consecutively once as anusvāra and the next time as m with the virāma sign: kṛtam devulaṁ (24a:2). Similarly, he reads the same symbol occurring twice one after the other as m without a vertical stroke and then m with a virāma sign: keśasapūjamkṛta (25b:5). His astounding inconsistency in transcribing the same symbol occurring in a single line is seen in the following words: lulyaṁ...dvālyam paramparāvū (55b:5).

53. Bendall 1903:10, 11, 12; Petech 1958:Appendix VI; Naraharinath 1959:9-25 (In one instance, he reads the symbol as na vañasa (ibid.: 10 = 19a:3). In all likelihood, the virāma sign was broken in the printing process. If so, he is following the Bengali pronunciation of the symbol, according to which vaṁsa is pronounced as vaṁśā; D. Regmi 1966:Appendix B; M. Pant and Sharma 1977:11, note 37.

54. According to the unpublished master catalogue of the Durbar Library, the MS. contains 650 grantha-s (M. Pant 1987:8, note 16) x 32 = 20,800 akṣara-s.

and refer readers to a separate publication of mine for these corrections, no less than 350 in number.

A transitional problem between transcription and translation is that of the standardisation of Sanskrit names in the translations. The degree of success in this is of a mixed nature. Thus while presenting the genealogy of the solar race, our Vamsāvali seems to have resorted to various Purānic sources. In doing so, the ill-educated chronicler himself seems to have become confused as to names and generations – a theme for an independent paper. Nevertheless, building on Naraharinath’s foundation and his own general knowledge, Vajrācārya has ably reconstructed in his translation many of the names referred to in the Vamsāvali in an incorrect form (pp. 74-75), and Malla follows suit (p. 122). To exemplify this I cite a number of corrections that have been made: Marici for Marīci (18b:2-3), Sagara for Sagara (18b:5), Amsūman for Amsūman (19a:1), Bhagira for Bhagirath (19a:1), Kalmāśapāda for Kannākāpāda (19a:2), Śaṅkhaṇa for Śaṅkhaṇa (19a:2) and Kusa for Kusa (19a:4).

Regrettably, both Vajrācārya and Malla repeat errors in the Vamsāvali which were already corrected by Naraharinath. For example, in the case of Kasyapa, Marici’s son and Śūrya’s (i.e. the sun’s) father, as usual, the Vamsāvali wrongly spells the name as Kasyapa (18b:3). Vajrācārya corrects only the sa to sā but fails to shorten kā to ka, which Malla copies exactly, though Naraharinath had already presented the name in question as Kasyapa.

56. The list excludes the errors concerning the ¥ symbol.
58. Malla spells the same name in his translation once as Kalmāśa and then as Kalmāśa.
59. Naraharinath retains in his translation the dental n of the original, but Vajrācārya correctly (cf. Raghuvaṁśa XVIII,22) replaces it in his translation so as to produce Śaṅkhaṇa, and Malla follows the latter.
Naraharinath is not always successful in the reconstruction of the royal names from Purānic sources which we encounter in the Vamsāvalī. In fact, he does not go beyond correcting the glaring errors which a Sanskritist notices at once. This failure on the part of Naraharinath is not normally noticed by either Vajrācārya or Mallā. For example, there are obviously misspelt names retained both in the Nepali and English translations, such as Pavanāśva (18b:4), which Naraharinath failed to correct. This king is Māndhārī's father, as the Vamsāvalī states. His actual name is Yuvanasva, which the scribe failed to record correctly. Similarly, both Vajrācārya and Mallā have taken a royal name, listed among the solar race as Pasusruva (19a:3), as being in fact Paśusruva, as Naraharinath himself does. The correct name is Praśusrulā, which has two elements, prā and su, prefixed to the root śru taking the kta-affix.

In one instance, however, Vajrācārya and Mallā change a royal name which Naraharinath did not touch. This occurs in a passage from the Vamsāvalī presenting the line of King Viśāla, following the names of the Ayodhyān kings of the solar race:

\[
\text{athāh pūna iksvaśvakaṁśa viśālā \| viśālaputra hemacandra \| hemacandraputra hemacandra \| succandraputra dhūmāśva \| dhūmāśvaputra snmjayah snmjayaputra suvarṇakaḥśi \| suvarṇakhaṭiputra kṛṣaśiva \| kṛṣaśvaputraḥ somadatta \| somadattaputraḥ jāmejaya \| jāmejayaputraḥ paramita \| paramitaputraḥ matimān \| matimānputraḥ vikāksi.}
\]

(19a:5 - 19b:2).

In translating the above passage, Naraharinath confines his efforts to the emendation of relatively less complex names. To be specific, he changes the dental s in Viśāla into the palatal. Though he retains in his translation the palatal s in Śrīmjayya, he correctly replaces the anusvāra with the homorganic nasal. Taking into account the rules of Sanskrit grammar (cf. Pāṇini III.2.28), he corrects Janmejaya into Janamejaya, though he leaves the latter's son's name unattended.

Vajrācārya and Mallā retain both incorrect forms, i.e. Śrīmjayya and Janmejaya, of the original—one left out and the other corrected by Naraharinath. But they emend Paramita to Parikṣit, which Naraharinath did not correct.

The identification of the source, or rather sources, of the Purānic genealogy offered in our Vamsāvalī demands a study of its own. However, with the help of Willibald Kiefel's excellent Purāṇa Paṇca-lakṣāṇa, I am in a position to state that the pedigree quoted above from the Vamsāvalī in most cases corresponds to that given in Brahmāṇḍa (II. 61.12b-18b) and Vāyu (86.17-22) purāṇa-s:

\[
\text{viśālasya suṁ pūna mahābalaḥ \|}
\text{sucandra iti viśvāyaḥ hemacandra anantarāḥ \|}
\text{sucandraputra śrīmjayya śrīmjayaputraḥ suvarṇakaḥśi \|}
\text{dhūmāśvaputra śṛṣṭi śṛṣṭijayaḥ śṛṣṭijayaputraḥ Cáchā \|}
\text{suvarṇaṁśaputraḥ kṛṣaśiva \| kṛṣaśvaputraḥ paramita \|}
\text{jrāmāṇyaḥ paramitaḥ matimān \| matimānputraḥ vikāksi.}
\]

63. Malla spells the same word in his translation both times with the homorganic nasal, once as Śṛṣṭi, and immediately after that as Śṛṣṭi, though Vajrācārya spells it both times as Śṛṣṭi without correcting to the homorganic nasal. Malla's second spelling is correct, though this seems to be more accidental than deliberate.

64. Naraharinath reads the name in the original once as Paramita and then as Parimita. However, he retains the first reading in his translation.

65. However, it is to be noted that the Nepali translation reads the name in question both times as Parikṣit.
As said above, the pedigree of the kings contained in the passage above largely agrees with that of King Visāla given in the present Vamsāvālī. To be specific, of the twelve generations enumerated in the Vamsāvālī, the ten generations from the Brahmāṇa- and Vāyu-purāṇa-s by and large are the same, barring only one name, i.e. the name of Śrījaya’s son or Kṛṣṇa’s father. The name in question is in our Vamsāvālī Suvarna-khatī and in the Purāṇa-s Sahadeva. Minor differences are the Dhūmāśva, Janamejaya and Pramati of the Purāṇa-s having become in the Vamsāvālī Dhūmāśva, Janamejaya and Paramita. Still other differences result from the change of the palatal s into the dental one and vice versa, and thus are inconsequential.

Janamejaya was a popular name among the kings in the hoary past.68 Most well known among them, of course; is the great-grandson of Arjuna, the hero of the Mahābhārata War. As literally means ‘causing a man to tremble’, it is an apt name for an absolute monarch.

Vajrācārya’s and Malla’s emendation of the Vamsāvālī’s Paramita to Parikṣit results from a deplorable ignorance of Purānic lore. They took the Janamejaya of the Vamsāvālī for the Janamejaya who was Arjuna’s grandson Parikṣit’s son. In other words, they ludicrously mixed up the Janamejaya whose name is known to an exclusive circle of specialists with the Janamejaya whose name is widely known among well-informed Hindus. Thus it is beyond doubt that the Vamsāvālī’s Paramita is a corrupted form of the Pramati attested in the Purāṇa-s.69

Now I come to the translation of the text. Both translators, in offering their respective versions, cite the folio number, thereby easing comparison with the text. They even go so far as to mark a change of foliation within a word (e.g. fol. 17 = p. 73 = p. 121, fol. 18 = p. 74 = p. 122). Unfortunately this standard has not been maintained throughout the translation, it being more the exception than the rule (e.g. ff. 19-20 = pp. 75-76 = 123; ff. 21-22 = pp. 77-78 = pp. 124-125; ff. 22-23 = pp. 78-79 = pp. 125-126; ff. 23-24 = pp. 79-80 = p. 127; ff. 24-25 = pp. 80-81 = p. 128; ff. 25-26 = pp. 81-82 = p. 129; ff. 26-27 = pp. 82-83 = p. 130; ff. 27-28 = pp. 83-84 = p. 130; ff. 28-29 = pp. 84-85 = p. 131; ff. 30-31 = pp. 86-87 = p. 134).

Strangely enough, both translators have omitted the translation of a verse in Śloka metre with which the text begins, and they fail to use ellipsis marks (pp. 73, 121), which can be found elsewhere when they do not translate a phrase.

In some places where Malla’s interpretation differs from that of Vajrācārya, it is evident that the former understood the text better than the latter. Take, for example, the phrase yuddhiṣṭiḥ57 rasyādirāja (17a:2). It has been translated by Vajrācārya as yuddhiṣṭhira udārāja (p. 73), i.e. ‘in the first kingdom of Yuddhiṣṭhira’, whereas Malla converts it into ‘in the kingdom of Yuddhiṣṭhira’ (p. 121). Vajrācārya’s version makes no sense and Malla’s interpretation is easily justified, as the scribe fails to aspirate the fifth letter, even as he does the third one.

Another instance is the translation of thava lāna (40a:3), which Vajrācārya joins in his reading and translates as yasapachi (p. 96), i.e. 69.

67. Naraharinath retains the name found in the Vamsāvālī in his translation, changing the long i into a short one: Suvarnakhati, whereas Vajrācārya and Malla change the meaningless khati to khani in their respective translations. I take no notice of the geminated n in Suvarnakhati in this context.
69. It is to be noted that one of the editions of the Vāyu-purāṇa offers Pramiti as a variant of Pramati (cf. Anandaśrama Press 1905:312 (chapter 86, verse 21, note 2)), a form closer to the one found in the present Vamsāvālī.
70. Vajrācārya consistently reads the ligature śa as śha whenever the form in the MS. is śa (cf. M. Pant 1987:18-23).
'after this'. Malla analyses it correctly as 'with his own hands' (p. 143) (*thava* = 'one's own' and *lana* = 'with hands').

However, it is not always so. One instance is the name Trisahkara (18b:4), which Vajracārya correctly reconstructs in his translation as Trisahku (p. 74), which Naraharinath had already done. But Malla retains the name as found in the manuscript (p. 122).

Another example is the interpretation of *cā* (29b:2; 34a:5; 36b:2; 38a:2, 4, 5; 40a:5; 47b:4; 49b:5; 51a:4; 55a:2; 60b:5; 62b:1), which has been translated by Vajracārya correctly as *rāti* (pp. 85, 90, 92, 94, 96, 103, 105, 107, 111, 116, 118), i.e. 'at night'. However, Malla's interpretation of the word is apparently inconsistent: in some instances he translates it as 'evening' (pp. 143, 150, 157, 162, 164) and in other instances as 'night' (pp. 139, 141, 154), and in a few instances leaves the meaning totally out (pp. 132, 137, 152).

The shortcomings of the translations are of various types, some of which I shall exemplify, proceeding from the lesser to the more justifiable ones.

A first group consists of omitting a word or leaving it simply untranslanted. The *Vamsāvali* describes here and there performances of *mance*, dramas on the occasion of the birth of a prince (29a:2), his investiture with the sacred thread (29a:2-4, 57a:4-5), his marriage (60b:5-61a:1, 61a:3-4, 62a:3-62b:2), a coronation (39a:2-3) or on other, less specified occasions (21b:3, 25a:4, 45a:3-4, 54b:1-2, 57b:4). To be specific, a four-act *Rāmāyana* drama was staged when the prince Dharmamalla, the eldest son of Shitirajamalla, was born (29a:2). Another *Rāmāyana* drama, probably modelled after Rājaśekhara's *Bālarāmāyana*, was performed when the same prince was invested with the sacred thread (29a:2-4, 57a:4-5). To denote the latter ceremony the *Vamsāvali* author employs the word *vadukarṇa*, a corruption of *vātukarṇa*, meaning 'the making of a Brahmācārī', which is omitted by both Vajracārya (p. 85) and Malla (p. 132) in their translations without even placing ellipsis marks. This rite for Dharmamalla is narrated in the Newari portion too, together with the same word (57a:4-5). This time both translators do write *vātukarṇa* (pp. 113, 159) – a form which leads the reader to question their competence in Sanskrit but without

71. It should be noted, however, that both translators have misunderstood the passage, two key words of which Vajracārya leaves untranslated, whereas Malla translates the first word, i.e. *ankālā*, as 'help' and leaves the second word, i.e. *uprahaīha*, untranslated. In fact, *ankālā* means 'embrace' and *uprahaīha* 'raised hands' (Nepal 1987:8-14).


73. To mark the wedding ceremony of the same prince a drama, entitled *Bhairavānanda*, composed by Manika, was staged, as the prelude to the drama says (M. Pant 1977b:299-300). This is known also from the Newari portion of the present *Vamsāvali*. The ill-educated chronicler spells the title of the drama once as *Bhervānanda* (61a:3) and the next time as *Bheravānanda* (62a:3). Similarly, he spells the dramatist's name as Manaku Bha, with the title *Pāṇḍya* (61a:4), and the next time as Manaku Bhāro, in which the title *Pāṇḍya* is prefixed (62a:4). A fact worth mentioning is that *Pāṇḍiya* Manaku Bhāro has been mentioned in the present *Vamsāvali* in connection with the Bālarāmāyana dance drama which was staged on the occasion when the same prince was invested with the sacred thread (29a:3-4). Thus it is beyond doubt that this *Pāṇḍiya* Manaku Bhāro or *Pāṇḍya* Manaku Bhāro, mentioned in the context of the *Bhairavānanda*, is Manika, who authored the *Bhairavānandanaśaka*. Since Manika's *Bhairavānanda* was significantly influenced by the Karpūrāmalājī, Rājaśekhara's well-known *saśṭaka* (see also Adhikari, Bhaṭṭarai and Tamot 1992:113), it is highly probable that the Bālarāmāyana with which Manika is related seems to be modelled after Rājaśekhara's *Bhairavānanda*.

Since my forthcoming papers deals with the influence of the Karpūrāmalājī upon the *Bhairavānanda*.

74. Vajracārya reads the word as *vādukarṇa* (29a:3), which is not true to the original.

75. As the word in question takes the *cvi*-affix (cf. Panini V.4.50) and the first component in the compound deriving from *cvi* ends with a vowel, the *u*-element there should be lengthened (cf. Panini VII.4.26). See also the entry *vātukarṇa* in Trikāntādeśa II.7.1c-d.
explanation. One's curiosity is satisfied only by referring to the glossary under vādūkārṇṇa. Such incoherence in translating the text is not rare.

A second, more complicated variant of the same error of omission is the failure on the part of the translators to show clearly where they stand with respect to the meaning of one particular technical term, which they simply leave untranslated, namely, puspbhiseka or pusyabhiseka, it being difficult to decide whether the ligature is spa or syā. However, there is no doubt that there exists a kind of royal consecration known as Puṣyabhiseka, which was originally held when the moon was in conjunction with the asterism Puṣya. Elsewhere Vajrācārya has explained the term in the following bizarre way:

\[\text{yāsa vīdhiṅkāna antyāmā puruhiṭadvārā mantrieko puspa ādi māṅgalika vastu rājāko śrāma rākhine hūnale yo abhiṣeka "puspbhiseka" kahāleko ho} \]

"Since, at the end of this rite, flowers and other auspicious objects consecrated with the mantras are placed on the head of the king by the priest, it is called "puspbhiseka.""

This, needless to say, echoes the acceptance of the reading pusparatha instead of pusyaratha for a chariot meant for the royal procession during the coronation and the distortion of its meaning as 'a chariot as tender as a flower.' In fact, owing to the importance attached to the period when the moon is in conjunction with the asterism Puṣya, very favourable as the auspicious time for the royal consecration, a type of the royal consecration was known as Puṣyabhiseka which, in the later period, 'became independent of any fixed period,' even as the royal chariot meant for the consecration was known as pusyaratha.

As some of the Nepalese kings who reigned in the period between the years 1167-1381 underwent a consecration known as pusyabhiseka, I have previously gathered references from the Śāstric texts and refuted the content of the statement just quoted above. Though Petech endorses these findings and accepts the reading with the ligature syā, Vajrācārya still needs convincing (25b:2; 26a:1, 3, 5; 27b:1). In other cases, however, he reads the same ligature spa instead of syā (18b:3, 4; 21a:2; 33b:2; 34a:2; 35b:1; 38b:4; 40a:2; 45b:4-5; 49b:4; 50a:3; 51a:2; 51b:1; 52a:4; 54a:4; 57a:4; 57b:2; 60b:2). As other palaeographers will not easily distinguish a difference between the ligatures of the words that he spells as puspbhiseka/puspabhiseka/puspbhiseka and pusya/pusya/paṇya, one wonders why Vajrācārya insists on retaining puspabhiseka in his translation (pp. 81, 82, 83) without explaining the term, which Malla too lets pass (pp. 129, 130) without an 'inductive test'.

An example of sheer oversight can be cited in the translation of a passage which tells us of Viṣṇugupta's religious activities. Every fortnight on Ekādaśī, i.e. the 11th of the lunar fortnight, Viṣṇugupta consecrated a copper or stone image of Viṣṇu (= viṣṇupraṇāma tāvra śīlā vā) in various places (22a:3-4). Both translators omit the word śīlā from their versions (pp. 78, 125).

Another type of error may be said to be caused by failing to pay attention to the text and to take account of the previous translation. The text mentions bhṛṅgaṛṣvaraḥ bhaṭārīka (17a:3) and bhṛṅgaṛṣvarī bhaṭārīkā (17a:4) on the same page. Both translators interpret both phrases simply as 'Bhṛṅgaṛṣvara Bhṛṭāraka' (pp. 73, 121) without taking the different genders into account. The first deity is masculine, whereas the second one is feminine, though both of them have the same basic name. In the process of manifestation or installation of deities, Bhṛṅgaṛṣvara bhaṭārīka (correctly bhaṭāraka) is followed by Gotmesvara (correctly Gautameśvara) and others, whom in turn Bhṛṅgaṛṣvarī bhaṭārīkā (correctly bhaṭārīkā) follows, as the text tells us (17a:3-4).

Of more interest is the fact that the goddess Bhṛṅgarṣvarī was roaming about the Śleṣmāntaka forest. As the forest around the Paśupati shrine is

76. D. Vajrācārya 1975:5.
78. For pusyaratha, see M. Pant 1977:110-116.
known as Ślesmāntakavāna in native Purānic literature,83 the goddess wandered not far from the place where the Pāsupati temple later stood. Guhyesvāri is enshrined in a temple which lies within the Ślesmāntakā area, and a bhrṅgāra, i.e. ‘golden pitcher’, represents this formless goddess, so that I am tempted to identify Bhṛṅgāresvāri, which means ‘the goddess [in a] bhrṅgāra’, with the goddess Guhyesvāri. This hypothesis aside, the failure of the present translators to distinguish two different deities could easily have been avoided by referring to the translation made by Naraharinath.84

Another such example involves a passage describing the time when Nepal was drought-stricken for three years when Ganadeva was king (21a:4). What was done by the king to cause rainfall is described in the Vamsāvāli in the following words:

\[
\text{vārīsō vrśti ākāmksānāya kāmenah sṛīpāsuptaśīhārārikāya mahanāga nirjītyah tasya maniyukte ganadeva nāma kośa kṛtā ś pradhokita ś tājprabhāvāt mahāvṛśti kṛtām ś prajā sukhībhavati} \]

(21a:4-21b:1)

This specimen of Newari Hybrid Sanskrit may be translated as follows:

Having conquered the great Nāga (= mahanāga nirjītyah), a treasure (= kośa), named Ganadeva (= ganadeva nāma), was made (= kṛtā) with its [i.e., Nāga’s] jewel (= tasya maniyukte) [and] offered (= pradhokita) to the venerable lord Pāsupati (= sṛīpāsuptaśīhārārikāya), by one desirous of rainfall (= vārīsō vrśti ākāmksānāya kāmenah). Out of the influence of that (= tājprabhāvāt), heavy rain (= mahāvṛśti) was caused (= kṛtām). The subjects (prajā), become happy (sukībhavati).

Both translators miss the central meaning and offer translations without taking into account the words nirjītyah and tasya. They translate nirjītyah as ‘śādhanā garīyo’ (p. 77), i.e. ‘a propitiation was made’ in Nepali and as ‘was propitiated’ (p. 124) in English, in each case neglecting the presence of tasya. Here again, the translators would have done well to refer to Naraharinath, who translates correctly both pertinent words.85

A further source of unjustifiable error results from the failure to properly understand the Sanskrit tradition. A first example involves neglecting common Purānic traditions, which are the source of what is written in the Vamsāvāli on those kings usually regarded as mythological. The Vamsāvāli, in giving the genealogy of the solar race, says that when Viṣṇu was reclining in the waters, Brahmā emerged from the lotus which sprang from his navel: kaipānte bhagavate viṣṇuh jaivasayane, nābhikamalobhavān || brahmā pradarbhubhā || (18b:2). Neither Brahmā’s emergence from the lotus sprung from Viṣṇu’s navel nor the phrase nābhikamala is anything new, as both are borrowed from the Purāṇa-s.86 Both translators nevertheless interpret the phrase ‘quite absurdly, Vajracārya as viṣṇuko nātuṁurūpī kamalā (p. 74), i.e. ‘the lotus in the shape of a navel’, with Malla faithfully converting it into ‘lotus-shaped navel of Viṣṇu’ (p. 122). This compound, needless to say, has nothing to do with such karmadhāraya compounds in which the word denoting the point of comparison comes last, as in nukhkamalā, karakamalā or ekanakamalā.

Malla, who claims the inductive test for the validity of Vajracārya’s translation, should at least have recalled the scene from the mythological pictures hung on the walls of traditional Śivamārgins’ dwellings before slavishly translating Vajracārya’s meaningless phrase.

Two other examples of this same type of error are due to not having a good command of Sanskrit language and literature. Near its beginning the Vamsāvāli describes how Pāsupati was discovered (17a:4-17b:1). It contains a clause: tatapāścāl mālākhyāt gopārṇaya, āgamaṇa (17a:4-5), which the two translators interpret quite differently. Vajracārya translates the clause as ‘tyasapachi mālākhyātā gopārṇaya āgamaṇa bhayo’ (p. 73), i.e. ‘after that the arrival of the Gograma from Mālakhā took place’, whereas Malla offers the following: ‘They (the Gopālas) came from

83. E.g. Himavaṭhānta, chapters 78-81.
85. Ibid.: 27.
86. E.g. Bhāgavatapurāṇa IX.1.8-9 and Devīmāhāmya inserted into the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa I. 66-70.
Malakha to Gograma (p. 121). Even though Vajracarya’s interpretation is syntactically closer to the original than Mallia’s, it does not solve the problem left by Naraharinath of what gograma really means. Mallia interprets the word gograma as a place-name (see Gograma in Index of Place-names). If this is correct it can be translated as a ‘cow village’. Before accepting Mallia’s interpretation one would like to see a change in the word’s case ending.

In this context I recall the use of the word grama as the last member of compounds, in which it means a multitude or collection of anything. Indeed I have come across the compound gograma itself in the sense of ‘herd of cows’. In view of this I suggest that gograna means a multitude of cows. This suits the context, as many cows (gograna) would have been pastured around the place where Pasupati was discovered upon digging, following the voluntary and regular discharge of milk by one particular cow (17a:5-17b:1).

A second such example: In N.S. 376 two nobles looted many valuables, as the Newari portion of the Vamsavali tells us (37a:5 - 37b:1). The text says that they did this by attacking the bhandasala, which Vajracarya in his Nepali translation spells with the palatal s, and Mallia in his English translation does the same and also makes the last akṣara long, but neither translator explains the word (pp. 93, 140), thinking that it is a place-name (see Bhandasala in Index of Place-names). But surely bhandasala is a variant of Sanskrit bhandasala, in an attested meaning of ‘storehouse’. Its several derivatives in modern Indo-Aryan languages convey more or less the same meaning as the Sanskrit word does. In present-day Newari its derivative, bhamsah, means ‘the office which collects customs duties’. I have come across the word in a document more than two hundred and fifty years old, where its spelling is bhansara. One should remember that bhanda also means in Sanskrit ‘goods for sale’. Indic textbooks on arithmetic contain problems concerning the exchange of goods which do not have the same price. This law is known as bhanda-pratibhandha which can be translated as ‘goods for goods’. The Arthaśāstra, in describing the duty of the collector of customs and tolls, repeats the word bhanda several times in reference to goods arriving for clearance, and though in classical Sanskrit sulkasala is more expressive of a customs house, the word bhandasala may also have conveyed the same meaning.

As the present Vamsavali states, when Harasimhadeva, the king of Tirhut, was defeated by the Sultan of Delhi, he together with his family and other nobility left Simaravana Garh and took to the hills. The ill-starred ex-king breathed his last in Timpata, and the local administration detained the deceased ex-king’s son and minister, who asked for asylum. But Majhi Bhāro of Rajagama took all their wealth (cf. 46a:4 - 46b:2).

The Rajagāma of the Vamsavali (46b:1) was known as Rajagāu up to around two centuries back and is called Rajagāu nowadays. It lies on the bank of the Tamakoshi in the district of Ramechap and is 25 miles to

---

88. E.g. Pañini VI.2.84; Mahābhārata III.306.1-2; VI.73.13; Bhagavadgītā VIII.19, IX.8; Manusmrti II.215; Kāśikārvitī on Pañini VI.2.84; Amara III. 3.141; Bhagavatapurāṇa I.3.29; Abhidhānaratnamalā V. 25a-b; Viṣṇuprakāśa, Māntravarga 14c-d.
89. Mahābhārata (Poona ed.) I.805. 1-5 pr.
91. Turner 1973, word no. 9441.
the north-west of Tin Patan (The Vamsávali’s Timpāta), which is located in the present-day district of Sindhuli. All this territory was under the rule of the Mājhī king, as local tradition says.100

Mājhī, as we know, are professional boatmen or steersmen. This word is common to several New Indo-Aryan languages, with or without slight variation, including one with a short vowel, majhī.101

A tribe102 known as Mājhī, or alternatively as Bote,103 lives along the river valleys in the eastern and western regions of Nepal, including the Tamakoshi river valley. Their traditional profession is, as the name would imply, ferrying and fishing.104

The phrase rājagāmaya majhī bharo dhāyāna (46b:1-2) is thus not really a problem. Both translators, however, neglecting the word majhī, simply offer the translations ‘rājagāmaka bharo bhānnele’ (p. 102) and ‘the noble of Rājagāma’ (p. 149). In addition, they have failed to account for the presence of the word dhāyāna, which simply corresponds to ‘bhannele’ in Nepali and ‘a person called’ (agentive form) in English. These omissions result from the mere copying of the translation of the passage chiefly done by Vajrācārya himself almost 23 years before the present translation was published.105 The man who confiscated all the riches of the fugitive royalty seems to have been a noble (bharo) of the Mājhī tribe called by his own tribe’s name, and under whose sway Tin Patan stood. Thus the actual translation of the phrase referred to above should be ‘rājagāmaka majhī bharo bhānnele’ in Nepali and ‘a man called Majhī Bāhro from Rājagāma’ in English. It looks like the chronicler could not recall the first name of the noble from Rājagāma and recorded the name of his tribe only.

Alternatively, as a Newari gloss on the Amarakosā which is contemporaneous with the present Vamsávalī, and another gloss made more than a century and a quarter later have the equivalent majhi for Amara’s mahāmātā or pradhāna (II.8.5a), meaning a ‘prime minister’, Kashinath Tamot suggests that this is what the word occurring in the Vamsāvalī means.106

We come now to those errors which are more justifiable in nature. A first group results from a misreading of aksara-s. Thus Vajrācārya reads one sentence as such: samvat 503 cētra sūdi 10 sīrkoñem bhatārikasa lū pahrobra khatayā dumā mi yogiganuna ll (29b:1). However, a close examination of the manuscript reveals that what he read as mi is, rather, ni, which significantly affects the interpretation. The same event is recorded in the Vamsāvalī some 32 folios later, where Vajrācārya reads the pertinent sentence as follows: thva lānavu thova enisī śukravāro koṣṭhōcom bhaṭīrīṣa khatayā lūm pahrobra dumā, yajamāṇa, lachakoyāni yogiganunah ll (61a:2-3). In the former sentence the ni joined with yogiganuna and in the latter sentence the ni separated from lachakoyā and joined with yogiganunah thus yield the same result.

Both translators interpret the first sentence to mean that the grantors are yogiganā = Jogī-s, who are Kusale-s (pp. 85, 132), adherents even at present of the Newari version of the Kāpālika sect. To accommodate the erroneously read mi to the syntax, it occurred to the translators to make

100. Paudel 1985:51-52 and 1988:2. According to a copperplate issued by the Śāha king Girvāṇa, dated Friday, the 15th of the bright half of Caitra, in Vikrama Samvat (V.S.) 1865, previously the area was ruled by the kings from the Sunuwar tribe (cf. Khanal 1970:51). Another tradition associates the kingdom with the Kuswar tribe (cf. Jest 1977:4).


102. However, one should take note of Jest’s following remark (1977:4): ‘In this area, the Kuswar are known as majhī which includes the Danuwar, as well as all fishermen and those who are in charge of the ferries (ghal), including Newars of the Pode caste, as well as Brahmans, Sarkis and Damais, members of Nepali castes for whom this is a secondary occupation.’

103. Subba (1989:7-10) strongly opposes the idea that the Mājhī and Bote tribes are one and the same. I leave this problem to ethnologists.


it a formative element of *dunia*. Malla thus lists in the Glossary of Newari Words an agentive noun *duniali (sic)*, which he interprets as 'donating person; the donor'.

The donor in the second sentence according to both translators is 'lachakoyaniya yogi harukai gana' (p. 117), i.e. 'the multitude of the Yogin-s from Lachakoyani', or 'the party of yogis of Lachakoyani' (p. 163). It is clear that both of them think the place-name is Lachakoyani. However, in Malla’s Index of Place-names we find only Lachako, which refers to this entry. The syllable *ya* which comes after Lachako is simply the postposition denoting the possessive case. *Ni* after *ya*, however, goes with the following word.

Both entries record that *Niyogin-s* donated a golden roof for a chariot of a certain deity (*bhairika* in the first and *bhairjri* in the second reference) of Kochem (Kothochem in the second reference). The first reference dates the donation to the 10th of the bright half of Caitra in N.S. 503. The second reference does not tell us the month and year of the event; however, it says that it occurred on Friday, the 11th of the bright half 'of the same month'. The year is mentioned in the last line of the preceding leaf as being N.S. 503, in the same context as the marriage of Prince Dharmamalla (in the MS. Dharmadeva), which took place at night, on Thursday, the 3rd of the bright half of Phalguna. The chronicler does not repeat the year for the entries of the event which occurred after the wedding and refers to the months as 'the same month': *thvā lāśavu* (61a:1) or *thvā lāna(g)avu* (61a:2). Such being the case, it is self-evident that the *Niyogin-s* of Lachako donated a golden roof on Friday, the 11th of the bright half of Phalguna in N.S. 503. The two dates record two different events: the *Niyogin-s* donated a golden roof for the chariot of the *Bhajārika* (*Bhajārakā* = god) of Kochem after the lapse of one complete month from the time the same kind of roof was donated for the chariot of *Bhairjri* (*Bhajārika* = goddess) of Kothochem.

I refer my readers to a separate paper of mine in which I have established that these *Niyogin-s* are the butcher caste in the Newar community and were otherwise known as Khagi/Khadgi or Sahe/Sahi. It is to be noted that one of the present-day apppellations of the Newar butchers, i.e. *Nāy*, is a derivative of *Niyogin*.109

Another case involves a phrase transcribed by Vajrācārya as *tava kvala vāsa* (34b:1, 38b:1, 53b:5) or *tavakvala vāsa* (50a:5), and translated by him as *‘thulo pānī’*, i.e. *‘a heavy rain’* (pp. 90, 94, 106, 109), which is faithfully reproduced by Malla in English as *‘a heavy shower’* (p. 137), *‘heavy rainfall’* (p. 141), *‘a heavy rainfall’* (p. 153) or *‘a very heavy rainfall’* (p. 156). Now, to express the medial *o* in the script in which the *Vamsāvali* is written, a little stroke bent cursively downward at the left end of the head-mark of an *aksara* with a right-hand vertical stroke is used. Vajrācārya missed this, and what he reads as *vasa* is unmistakably *vosa*, *kvalabusa* meaning 'locust' in Old Newari.110 The phonetic shape is close enough to the form in the manuscript to suggest that this is, in fact, the intended meaning.111

A second type of justifiable error is illustrated by such passages as the concluding verses of the Sanskrit portion. The first is in *Upajāti* and enumerates five main duties of a king, and the remaining two, in *Sārdiśavikrīdita*, extol Sthitirajarnalla’s merits and record his complete ascendancy over the kingdom following the fall of Arjunadeva (30a:2-5). Though the first verse, as usual, abounds in clerical errors, it is elegantly composed and follows the grammatical norms. Such being the case, one can at once have the impression that the first verse, which is in *Upajāti*, is not from the pen of the chronicler who commits errors throughout in his writing. Vajrācārya does not address the problem, but Malla identifies the verse as *‘a quotation from Varāhamihira, Yogayātra Chapter II–KPM’* (p. 133).

Though I do not possess a printed copy of the *Yogayātra*, there are two complete MSS. in my family collection, one with Utpala’s commentary and the other a mere bare text. After reading the identification made by Malla, I opened the MSS. and found that his reference was correct,

107. According to the verification made by Dinesh Raj Pant, the donation took place on the 11th, following the lapse of the 10th, which lasted for 34 ghati-s and 35 pala-s.


110. See Manandhar 1986: s.v. *kvalabusa*.

111. I am grateful to the late lamented Thakur Lal Manandhar, who drew my attention to this.
though he omits the verse number (32). The present Vamsāvali reads the first pada as dūstasya danda svajanasya pūjāh, in which, obviously, the second and fourth words are incorrectly spelt. In addition, it is to be noted that the reading sujanasya which we find in the Yogayātra has been replaced by svajanasya in the present Vamsāvali. The duty of a king is not only to punish a wicked person but also to honour a good one (sujana). This reading in the Vamsāvali is as corrupt as its other readings, i.e. danda and pūjāh. Moreover, as Utpala, in commenting upon the verse, synonymises sujanasya with sajjanasya (fol. 15a), there is no doubt that the correct reading was sujanasya.

Böhtlingk registers this verse in his well-known Indische Sprüche, though his source is not the Yogayātra but two different texts, namely, the Vikramacarita and the Subhaṣiṭārṇava. He accepts the correct reading as being sujanasya and cites the deviant reading, i.e. svajanasya, in a footnote, having found it in the Subhaṣiṭārṇava. In spite of his success in locating the verse in question in the Yogayātra, it is unfortunate that Malla fails to discard the corrupt reading in the Vamsāvali, and resultantly translates the same reading as 'to respect and reward one’s loyal men' (p. 133). Similarly, Vajrācārya does not perceive any dissimilarity of the reading with dūstasya dandaḥ and consequently translates the same corrupt reading as 'svajana (āphna mānisa) lāi sammāna garnu' (p. 86), i.e. 'to honour one’s own men'. Here, too, they could have avoided error, if they had consulted Naraharinath’s translation.

The verses in Sārūlavikrīḍita are grossly ungrammatical as usual, and a clear understanding has become more difficult owing to scribal errors. The translators have succeeded in conveying the meaning of the first verse but not the second. The first verse tells us that Sthitirajamalla was crowned king twelve years (= dvādaśa vataśā) after king Arjunadeva fled. The second verse begins with the words sapūrṇa raviṣcakha, which remain untranslated in both renderings (pp. 86, 133), in spite of their presence in Naraharinath. There is no problem at all if one recalls the numerical notation by nouns. As the sun gods are twelve in number, the word rāvi (= the sun) followed here by vācaka (correctly vataśā = 'in the year') and sapūrṇa (correctly sampūrṇa (=pasti)) yields, for the entire phrase, 'when the twelve years were completed'. In other words, the chronicler repeats the same fact alluded to in the previous verse by the words dvādaśa vataśā.

In the same verse, the chronicler gives the exact date when Sthitirajamalla’s complete ascendancy over the kingdom took place: nepālābdagatē bdapuskarasāre mārggāśitasayāṃ tikā. Neither in Nepali nor in English is a translation given of this. At first glance, the word-numeral abdapuskarasāre seems hopelessly too large: words meaning ‘cloud’ are recorded as representing 17 in the Sumaitantra, an ancient Nepalese treatise on astronomy; thus abda, lit. ‘giving water’, i.e. ‘cloud’, with two other word-numerals in this interpretation would result in a total of more than five thousand years of Nepāla Samvat (N.S.). As abja, lit. ‘born in water’ also means ‘the moon’ and thus denotes 1, it is quite possible that abda is simply a slip of pen made by the scribe, who had just copied the same word while writing the phrase nepālābdagata. The second figure, puskara (correctly puskara), is not recorded in the manuals listing word-numerals. However, the Sumaitantra tells us that puskara is one of the word-numerals for ‘three’. The application of puskara in this meaning derives from the fact that there is a prominent place of pilgrimage called Puṣkara in Ajmere in Rajasthan, and it is divided into three sections, namely, jyeṣṭha, madhyama and kaniṣṭha:

112. The MS. of the Yogayātra with Utpala’s commentary which is in my family collection reads the word in question both times — in the text and in the commentary — as sajjanasya, which is a mere clerical error. The commentary, in any case, synonymises it with sajanasya. The MS. without commentary reads correctly as sujanasya (fol. 5a).


115. Ibid.

116. Vajrācārya reproduces the pada without the avagraha and reads titthau; neither reading is true to the manuscript (cf. M. Pant 1987:19).

117. Sumaitantra: 10. See also Rajbanshi 1974:59.

118. Ojha 1918:120.

collectively these are known as Tripuṣkara. However, this meaning of puṣkara does not suit our context, since it yields N.S. 531, when Shhitirājamalla was no longer alive. We know, however, that puṣkara has the same meaning as ākāśa (cf. Amara I.2.1-2, III.3.186), i.e. 'sky', and thus, like it, could represent a cipher. Therefore, the figures yield N.S. 501, for which further substantiation is possible in the Newari portion describing the procession held to mark the forced, but honourable, retirement of the deposed king Arjunadeva (59b:2-4).

The other problem in the verse is to determine the lunar day correctly, as the latter has been compressed to its final syllable syāmsyām (in the MS. syām), together with the month (Mārga) and the fortnight (asīt, incorrectly asīta); mārggāsītasyām tithi. There is more than one possible interpretation: (ekāda)syām, (dvāda)syām, (trāyoda)syām (catuṛda)syām or amāvasyām (pāurnēmamsyām is out of place, since the lunar fortnight is asīta, i.e. dark). But as two-repetitions of the date, one given immediately following the last verse (30a:5) and the other in the Newari portion, which is more detailed (59b:2-3), report it as being the 12th or Dvādaśī, the passage is cleared up.

Since Shhitirājamalla's complete ascendancy over the kingdom took place on the 12th of the dark fortnight of Mārga in N.S. 501 (59b:2-4), he should have emerged as co-ruler sometime in N.S. 489, for the Vamsāvalī tells us that he assumed the reins of government when 12 years had elapsed following the flight of Arjunadeva. The Vamsāvalī states that on the 10th of the bright half of Kārtūka in N.S. 489 Arjunadeva, the reigning king from the Bhonta dynasty, entered Tipura, one of the seats of power in Bhaktapur, with Jayasimhārama, the mahātha (chief minister) from Banepa. It seems that they did not obtain entrance easily, as they had to breach the fort named Namvā (54b:5). Shhitirājamalla probably tried to resist their entry, though this is not recorded, and his effort obliged the king to run away.

Lastly, one additional mistranslation needs to be pointed out. When Jiutirimala, a Khasa king from western Nepal invaded the Kathmandu Valley, his people were massacred around the shrine of Swayambhū in Kathmandu. Their numbers amounted to avuṭha saya, as the Vamsāvalī says (26b:1-3). Bendall interpreted the obscure word avuṭha as 'eight (?)', which shows that he was not completely sure of this meaning. A host of later scholars, including Vajracarya and myself, followed his interpretation more assertively, and it remained unchallenged until the beginning of 1985, when I determined the word to be a derivative of adhyāṣṭa and displayed its variations in several Middle and New Indo-Aryan languages to show that it means 'three and a half'. Both translators interpret the word as 'eight' (pp. 82, 129), however.

Malla has made the following assessment:

A constant perusal of the text over the years, reading it over and over again, has provided many an internal clue to the meaning of individual expressions, phrases, and words for which alas! there is no other external gloss available. There is still a small but hard core of isolated items and

120. See Monier-Williams 1899 s.v. puṣkara and Tarkavachaspati 1969-70: s.v. tripuṣkara.

121. The date in the last reference is Friday, the 12th of the dark half of Mārga in N.S. 501, when the moon was in conjunction with the Svāti asterism and the yoga was Śobhana. On the same Friday, Ekādaśī lasted for 26 ghatī-ś and 11 pala-ś, Citrā for 20 ghatī-ś and Śobhana for 37 ghatī-ś and 49 pala-ś, as Dinesh Raj Pant has verified.

122. This name in the Vamsāvalī occurs no less than four times. The first two times it is written with an anusvāra - Namvā - and is designated as a kvātha, i.e. 'fort' (45b:5, 46b:5). The third time, the last aksara has the medial o - Namvo-, and kvātha is replaced by synonymous gahra (50b:1). The last reference, which I have cited above, has neither anusvāra nor appellation. However, Vajracarya's reading of the first entry is hopelessly misleading, since he joins the first aksara with the previous word and omits the anusvāra: toṇa vākvaṭha. Similarly, in the third entry, he again omits the anusvāra (see also p. 61 below).

123. Vajracarya reads a medial u, which is wrong (cf. M. Pant 1987: 19). Etymologically his reading b is also invalid.


words which are inexplicable. But, fortunately, they constitute a marginal component of the narrative (e.g., items in a feast, items in a price-list, items used in the coronation, etc.). The jigsaw puzzle is, hopefully, solved, and the code, finally, cracked.

When one reads this but finds such blunders as are discussed above, none of which fall under the items Malla enumerates, there is no other conclusion to draw but that he has spoken too soon.

I do not know why Vajračārya and Malla show little enthusiasm for the conversion of the dates of the Vamsāvalī, though this is common practice when compiling exhaustive editions. Conversion fulfills the double purpose of easing authentication of statements recorded in the Vamsāvalī and accommodating modern readers who are not conversant in the antiquated system of chronometry. To be sure, Vajračārya in his Nepali translation converts the era in the Nepāla Samvat (N.S.) to that of the Vikrama Samvat (V.S.), but he leaves other elements of the chronometry as they are. Malla, in his English translation, does not go even this far.126

In his attempt at rendering N.S. into V.S., Vajračārya is not always successful. This kind of failure occurs because of the differences between the days when an N.S. year and a V.S. year begin. As the beginning of a new year in N.S. is counted from the 1st of the bright half of the month of Kārtika, and in V.S. according to the solar reckoning from Meṣaṇakrānti, when the sun enters Aries, there is a possibility of committing an error in the conversion of a date in the month of Caitra into the V.S. year, if one is reduced to conjecture and does not bother about the tithiśuddhi, i.e. the number of lunar days elapsed from the first of the bright half of Caitra to the day when the sun entered Aries. For example, Vajračārya commits such a mistake when he converts the 10th of the bright half of Caitra in N.S. 503 and the 12th of bright half of Caitra in 509 into V.S. As the Meṣaṇakrānti of N.S. 503 falls on the 8th of the dark half of Caitra (Vaisākha, according to the Pūrṇāmānā system of chronometry), Vajračārya’s conversion of the 10th of the bright half of Caitra, N.S. 503 into V.S. 1440 (p. 85) is not correct, the correct Vikrama year on that day being the previous one, i.e. 1439. Similarly, the Meṣaṇakrānti of N.S. 509 occurs on the 14th of the dark half of Caitra (Vaisākha, in accordance with the Pūrṇāmānā system); the corresponding Vikrama year for the 12th of the bright half of Caitra, N.S. 509 is not 1446, as Vajračārya writes, (p. 114) but 1445, which I have already substantiated elsewhere.127

Though Malla states that ‘this glossary lists Newāri words from V2 alphabetically’ (unnumbered page preceding p. 167) concerning the section entitled ‘Glossary of Newari Words’, I am at a loss to explain the presence in it of many Sanskrit words in common use, such as ādesa, āmra, upādhiyāya, ubhaya, dina, durbiha, prākāra, pretekriya, bandhanamukti, mahāmārī, mahāsāmkaśta, yajamāna, lokākṣaya, vyavahāra, samsāra, sampūrṇa, subhikṣa and hetu. A lot of quite well-known Sanskrit words which occur in the text with some mistakes in spelling have also been included in the glossary, such as abhiseya, dandaraka, jātrā, bhukampā, māhādurbhiṣa and śūpūtra. All this together with the fact that individual entries are given for the same word where it occurs with a separate postposition, suffix or verb suggests something more than the title would indicate. But still the indexing of words does not cover the text in its entirety, omitting such important Newari lexical items as aśtiin (49a:5) and eniti (61a:2).

Though Malla claims that ‘as the orthography of the text (i.e. of the Vamsāvalī – MRP) bristles with inconsistencies orthographic variants of a word have been listed separately’ (unnumbered page preceding p. 167), he sometimes omits one of the two or more variants offered by themselves of the same word: vaṭukarnīna (29a:3)128 is missing in the

---

126. Exceptionally, Malla goes against his practice of not converting dates a few times: twice he changes a year in the N.S. into the Christian one but not any other chronometrical element (pp. 129, 130). Twice he gives the Christian equivalent of an N.S. which lacks other details (pp. 129, 130). Two final dates, interestingly enough, are completely converted into the Christian dates (p. 131).


128. In actuality, the reading in the manuscript is with the long medial u, which Vajračārya failed to notice (cf. pp. 36-38 above). Malla’s glossary incorporates it nowhere.
glossary, though the same word with the long medial u (57a:4) is listed there.

At best, this glossary with its citation of folio and line number will serve to facilitate the work of those who want to study the Vamsávali seriously. A number of wrong citations can easily be found in the glossary, which, needless to say, mars its utility. A few examples of such are the following: apanáha sano does not occur in 47a:5, though apanaha yána sa does; ubhejásana is not found in 51b:2 but in the next line; kuncina thiva is missing from 58b:1, though cited for there; khasátkhandá occurs in 39b:2, though cited for 39a:4.

As a rule, words are cited with their postpositions, if not always. Take, for instance, the word bhahrírisake (cited in the glossary as bhahríri), which occurs at least two times in the text (39b:1, 41b:1, the last reference with visarga). It has been given in its citation form without sake; a separate entry of sake does not exist.

An entry may be of the form prabhá duniá, where both the noun and verb are included, though the meaning of the two together can easily be deduced by knowing the meaning of the individual components. Other entries of the same verb are cited without a noun, which is logical.

In spite of Malla’s declaration that ‘this glossary lists Newári words from V2 alphabetically’, no special effort is needed to detect violations of this scheme: kadamva precedes kaitiá, and kálatapinsa follows kahríhmáchim. I do not understand why damsá yána comes before damína, tava káhala comes after tvakvala vása and nyávací after tvhrate máná. Similarly, loka intervenes between lichi and luyiti.

One can also cite numerous examples of the presentation of the same word differently in the text and glossary: cuvá anka (54b:1) of the text has been reproduced by joining the two separate words. Conúva (38a:2, 40a:5, 62a:4) of the text has been converted into conúvaga. Similarly cvápan (51b:3) is represented as cvápvana, as if it ends in á. Most ludicrous is the fact that thava sála (58a:1) has been changed into thva sála and translated as ‘this year’ in the glossary (obviously the Persian word sál crept into somebody’s mind), though interpreted more convincingly in the English translation as ‘his own brother/cousin’ (p. 160). Panítitanne (55b:5) of the text is nowhere available in the glossary; litanne (not litanne) is given, but pañi has been joined to the preceding word guní. Panísi kohnupim of the text (53b:1) has been converted into nísikonhu (I do not know the whereabouts of the first and last aksara-s of the phrase). Strangely enough, panti (42a:5) has an additional nasal sound (pamnta in the glossary). Similarly, lichívum (38a:3), limchívú (57b:5) or lichívuh (62b:2) of the text have been metamorphosed into lichívum, and váyaka (52a:5) becomes veyakam.

A lot of words which are reproduced in the text with va occur in the glossary with ba. Some examples of this kind of discrepancy are vamdhí (46b:1): bámdhí, vacchíu* (57a:2): bacchíu, vásana (49a:3), basana, vasarápá (43a:3): basarápá. The ba-entries, therefore, need revision, or a host of words in the text have to be changed to ba. The va-entries need revision as well, though not on the same order as the ba-entries; we find in the va-entries bidhána, bidhi, bíváha and such. Ligatures with h are read by Vajrácarya as h being followed by the second consonant, e.g. kuhnu (62b:2), kohnu (41a:3), or hláyá (41b:2). However, in the glossary the same words are considered as beginning with the non-h letter.

Wrong readings also arise from not having taken note of the corrected readings Vajrácarya made later and incorporated in the corrigenda. Take, for example, dyácamapho of the text (62b:3), corrected in the corrigenda to nyácamapho, which not only escapes Malla’s attention, but also ‘pho becomes ‘ko in his glossary. Resultantly a verbal form meaning ‘(they) could not buy’, correctly translated by Vajrácarya as kuná sakenan (p. 118) and by Malla as ‘could not afford’ (p. 164), is explained as ‘a place-name’; at the foot of the terrace’ in the glossary (see s.v. dyácamako), and also is accorded an entry in the Index of Place-names.

Malla has tried to give the derivations of some words, which, of course, is commendable. However, sometimes he misses the mark. Thus he interprets the word lákha (33b:3)129 as ‘limb or hand or thw (sic) dead body (cf. skt. lása)’. What Malla obviously had in mind was lás, a Turkish word meaning ‘dead body’ and current in several New Indo-Aryan languages in the same sense.

Malla’s glossary has an entry pharísaíjuna (50b:2), and he interprets it as ‘pairs of weapons (cf. phárasakhañá = arsenal)’. I know of no word

129. In reality the word is spelt in the original lákha (cf. M. Pant 1987:20).
phārasakhāna meaning ‘arsenal’. In all likelihood, Malla is thinking of the word farrāshkhānā, the compound of the Arabic word farrāsh meaning ‘the person responsible for bedding and carpeting’ with the Persian word khānāh meaning ‘house’. This is the depository of the bedding, cushions and carpets of the royal household. The word also is current in Nepali as phārasakhāna in the same meaning, with specific reference to the Nepalese royal court. To be specific, we have a government office for bedding and carpeting, and it is situated in the complex of the old Royal Palace in Kathmandu, in the Gaddī Bahāthak courtyard. The place where weaponry is stored is known as silakhānā, meaning ‘a house for weaponry’, which, like farrāshkhānā, is a compound of Arabic and Persian words. In Nepali, we spell the word in question as silakhāna or silakhānā, and there is a Silakhānā in Lagan Tole in Kathmandu.

As mentioned already, the translation into Nepali made by Vajrācārya and the English rendering by Malla differ in some places, purposely so in order, as the authors state, ‘to give the reader the benefit of doubt’. However, the discrepancies between the English translation and the glossary, both originating from Malla’s pen, are all too frequent. A random sampling may be given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning in the Glossary</th>
<th>Meaning in the Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kula yākva (41b:5)</td>
<td>all the rebels; the ones who revolted</td>
<td>the leader of rebels (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khāhra (49a:2)</td>
<td>a ditch, pit, moat</td>
<td>the drain (p. 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gūmsa (36b:5)</td>
<td>in the forest</td>
<td>on the hillock (p. 140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gvalachino (46a:5)</td>
<td>some; some of the party</td>
<td>after some time (p. 149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cānasa (55a:1)</td>
<td>at night</td>
<td>on the evening (p. 157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūmkapāja (50b:1-2)</td>
<td>sword ‘fa? iron; iron-blade, i.e., a sword</td>
<td>shield (p. 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātm pumānā (41a:2)</td>
<td>encircled; surrounded</td>
<td>entered (p. 144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātumānā (in the original</td>
<td>offered; donated</td>
<td>was not allowed inside (p. 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in the text duntamā)</td>
<td>(50a:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part of the reason for the shortcomings of the glossary may be inferred from the Preface (p. iii), which acknowledges the services received from three scholars in compiling it - a case of too many cooks spoiling the broth.

The same problems crop up again in the Index of Personal Names. The compiler continues to evince a lack of skill in placing words in their correct alphabetical order: Jagatasimdeva comes after Jagatasimha Kumara; Jayadevaraja comes before Jayadeva Pva; and Jayānamdara Rājā follows Jayānamdarāma. Similarly, Jotana Bhā is placed before Jaideva, and Jeśha comes after Jaideva.

What was said about the confusion between ba and va in the glossary also applies here. For example, Varmma (18a:4) and Venu (18b:3) of the text begin with b in the Index, and Baladeva (23a:1, 3),130 Balavantadeva (23b:5) and Bālarjunadeva (23a:4) of the text begin with v in the index.

130. Once, exceptionally, Valadeva is printed in the text (29b:4, 5).
As in the glossary, so too here wrong citations of the folio and line number of the manuscript can be found in profusion. Take, to begin with, the case of Anantamaladeva, which according to the index occurs also in 27a:5, but no one will find the name there. Similarly, Anantavarma, referred to in the index as being mentioned in 52a:4, is not there. Ludicrously enough, the index records the presence of Upādhyāya in 58a:5, though folio 58a has only four lines. The index cites Gopālacanda as being in 49b:1 and Gopālacanda Kumara as being in 49b:2, though both the citations refer to Gopālacanda Kumara. Jayānandaśrāvaṁa is listed in the index for 45b:1. However, there is Jayanandarāja instead of Jayānandaśrāvaṁa. Hariścandra does not occur in 27a:2-3, as the index records, but exactly three folios before (24a:2-3).

As the Vamsāvalī lacks a fixed orthography, we can cite many examples in which the same name is variously spelt. The method seemingly employed for the entries in the Index of Personal Names is that variations in the same name are put under a single entry, and that different persons with the same name are given separate entries. However, one can point out several instances where the method is not followed. One is Amṛtadeva, who is cited in the index twice, though the text, in mentioning him as Rudradeva's successor to the throne (25a:4-5) and the third of Śīhadeva's sons, born after his elder brother Rudradeva (31b:1-4), makes clear that this is one and the same person. Similarly, the Vamsāvalī mentions Adityamalla, a Khasa king from western Nepal, twice, first as Aditamala (27b:4) and the second time with the long medial i (46a:2; the index wrongly cites line 3). Malla's index registers him twice, reproducing the same spellings found in the two places of the Vamsāvalī. A third instance of this type of mistake are the citations of Gopāladeva, the ill-fated brother of the consort of Princess Nāyakadevi, and whom the Vamsāvalī also once calls Gopālendradeva (49b:2) and once Gopālacandadeva (50a:3), though many times he is referred to as Gopāladeva. Malla's index makes the entries of the same person thrice. A fourth instance concerns the citations of Jagatśimha, who became the unofficial husband of Nāyakadevi. Malla cites three variations of his name under one entry, but fails to incorporate a fourth under the same entry. A fifth instance can be found in the case of Jitārimalla, Adityamalla's father. The Vamsāvalī refers to him twice, twice as Jayatāri (26b:1-2, 40a:2) and once with the long medial i in the last aksara (26b:3-4, the index wrongly cites only l. 4). Malla separates these two types of spelling into two separate entries.

Likewise, Malla cites three variants of the name of Jayasimhārāma under one entry but reserves two separate entries for two additional variants of the same name. Moreover, his index does not incorporate all the true variations from the text, and in some cases a variation found in the text has been given in the index in a different form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimhāraṁa Mahātha</td>
<td>Jayasimhārāma Mahātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60b:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimhāraṁa</td>
<td>Jayasimhārāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54a:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimhārāma Mahātha</td>
<td>Jayasimhārāma Mahātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29b:3, 63b:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

131. See the references for Jayasimhadeva (50a:5), Jayasimhadeva (37a:4), Jayasimhaladeva (26a:3 etc.), Jayasimhaladeva Pṛṣa (37a:3, 39a:1) and lastly Jayasimhaladeva Pṛṣa (38b:5), all of which are placed under a single entry. Needless to say, Malla violates the alphabetical order by placing Jayasimhaladeva Pṛṣa last.

132. E.g. see entries for the different Udayadevas, Narendradevas and Bhāskaradevas.

133. Actually Malla registers the name in question four times. However, the first entry, i.e. Gopālacanda, nowhere exists in the text.

134. Malla again violates the alphabetical order by placing Jagataśimha Kumara last, after Jagatāsimha Kumara which is preceded by Jagatāsimha Kumara.

135. In actuality, the fourth variant, namely, Jagatāsimdeva, reads in the original as Jagatāsimhadeva (28a:1, cf. M. Pant 1987:19), which is reproduced in the text as Jagatāsimdeva.

136. Jayasimha of the text is corrected to Jayasimha in the corrigenda.

137. The conjunct read as hra here and elsewhere should be hna.
Finally, much the same criticisms apply to the Index of Place-names. ThIS Index, too, continues to prove Malia's lack of attention in placing the words alphabetically. For example, he puts Bhañasala before 138. Jayasimha' of the text is corrected to Jayasimha in the corrigenda.

139. Jayasimha' of the text is corrected to Jayasimha in the corrigenda.

140. M. Pant 1986a:35-36.


Bhaktapura and Valumkhā before Vadyara. Further examples are the placement of Yuhanimam after Yuhonimam Khātha, Rajalakhum after Rājavīhāra Dhamarecetra, Sva Desa after Svākharavākha, Harisiddhi Bhahrih before Harikṣetra and Haripura.

Again, the same problem of confusion between ba and va bewilders the reader. Valambu (51b:4), Vugmalokesvara (23a:4) and Vugandevala (40a:3) of the text begin with ba in the index. Strangely enough, Vyanāpā of the text (43a:1), though spelt in the index as beginning with v, is placed under the ba-entries (44b:4), having been changed to Vaneppā. Similarly, Byanāppā Khātha of the text (47a:4) is changed to Vyanāppakvākha, though it comes in the index under the ba-entries.

One place-name, Ananlam, according to the index, occurs in 45a:2, though no such name is there. The index states that Okhamhana exists in 57b:1, but we do not find Okhamhana but Okhahmnae – exactly one page before (57a:1). The index records the presence of Kamānakvākha in 55:1 (this reference lacks the full page number); the word is located neither on the recto nor verso of the said leaf. Similarly, neither Kapan can be located in 50b:1 nor Kāchem in 40a:5, though the index claims their presence on those pages and lines.

Malla sometimes places two persons with the same name under a single entry, of which an example is Anantamaladeva. The Vamsāvali sets the date of birth of Anantamalla, the king, in N.S. 366 (35a:3). It also refers to an Anantamalla who expelled somebody from a fort in N.S. 370 (38b:4-5). These two dates virtually rule out the possibility that one and the same Anantamalla is being referred to. Moreover, we know Prince Anantamalla had two texts copied, one of lyrical poetry, in N.S. 341 and 344 respectively, long before the birth of King Anantamalla.

Finally, much the same criticisms apply to the Index of Place-names. This index, too, continues to prove Malla's lack of attention in placing the words alphabetically. For example, he puts Bhandaśala before

138. Jayasimha of the text is corrected to Jayasimha in the corrigenda.

139. Jayasimha of the text is corrected to Jayasimha in the corrigenda.

140. M. Pant 1986a:35-36.


Newari name for Banepa. To begin with, the very first and the last three citations (the last citations violate the sequence of folio number for this variation) are not attested in the text. There are at least five variations for the same name – Bholtta (42a:3, 43b:1, 46b:5), Bhoita (44a:3, 53a:3), Bhonta (41b:3 etc.), Bhvamta (36a:1, 42a:4) and Bhvanta (48a:2 etc.) – all of which are placed by Malla under Bholtta. Absurdly enough, he incorporates a word which ends with bhota (38b:4), though both Vajrācārya (p. 94) and he himself (p. 141) interpret it quite differently. I do not understand why Malla cites Bhvamta as occurring in 62b:3 and Bhvanta as occurring in 63a:2 (in the text Bhvamta and in the index Bhvanta, where m without the vertical stroke is joined with the following ta) in the Glossary of Newārī words rather than entering them in the Index of Place-names.

The entry of Thānāmṭarī in the Index shows how carelessly the place-names may be determined. It has been conjured up by taking the last two aksara-s of one word and the first two aksara-s of the following one: vyanāpesanthānam tarī (43a:1). Vajrācārya translates the phrase as banepādeki tarī (tarī) sammākā (p.99), i.e. 'those from Banepā down to Tarī (Terai)', and Malla as 'Bhanape to Tari (river?)' (p. 145). Thānāmṭarī is thus pure phantasy.

All of the foregoing criticism, a fraction of what could have been written, should be more than enough to show that the Vamsāvalī has not yet been fully and adequately understood by either Vajrācārya or Malla, and that there are still significant missing pieces to this particular jigsaw puzzle.
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The Kuvalayānandaparīṣīṭa by Vijñānakeśarīn

Mahes Raj Pant

The Kuvalayānanda by Appayyādīkṣita (c. 1550-1620)\(^1\) is one of the widely read elementary manuals on Sanskrit poetics. This is why it is accompanied by no less than 18 commentaries and two subcommentaries.\(^2\) Since Appayyādīkṣita leaves out the topic of sābdalāṅkāra, a Nepalese pundit has felt instigated to contribute some remarks to the subject to supplement the Kuvalayānanda. The following pages are devoted to reproducing the treatise in order to call to it the attention of historians of alāṅkāraśāstra.

The author, Vijñānakeśarīn, hailed from a Nepalese Brahmin family known as Ārya/Āryā, which was distinguished for literary activities spanning at least one century and a half.\(^3\)

---

3. The earliest composition in the Sanskrit tradition by a member of the Āryā family is Cakrapāṇi’s Praśnātātiv, dated 1767 (Bhandari 1934:12), and the latest is Vīrendrakeśarīn’s poems, published in 1917/18 in Suktisindhu (Baral 1985:26). Cakrapāṇi’s Uttānaganīta is accompanied by a commentary written by his own pupil; in it an eclipse that occurred in 1762 is treated as an example to make the subject comprehensible (N. Pant forthcoming: 80). This indicates that the commentary was written around the year just mentioned, and resultant the date of the text must be set back a few additional years. If one accepts that Vīrēśvara, the author of the Gorkhali king Prthvīpāti Sāhā’s praśastī, dated 1680 (D. Pant 1985-88:702-703), is an Arjyan, as some historians do (e.g. ibid.:473, 489), the literary feats of the Arjyan family may easily be traced back a further 87 years.
We are aware of two *jyauṭiṇa* texts in Sanskrit (*Praśnatattva* and *Uttānagāṇita*) by Cakrapāṇi (born in 1734), the great-grandfather of Vīṇānakesārīn. Seven other of his *jyauṭiṇa* works still remain unpublished. Cakrapāṇi's son Daivajñakesārīn (born in 1768) wrote a versified genealogy in Sanskrit of his own family, entitled *Kulacandrīkā*, which testifies to his being a classical poet. I possess a MS. of the *Śrīkrṣṇapāḍapadmapuspaṉjali*, consisting of 108 Sanskrit verses addressed to Kṛṣṇa, composed by the same Daivajñakesārīn. Interestingly enough, he expressed himself by writing not only in Sanskrit but also in Nepali. Vidyāranyakesārīn (born in 1807), third of the five sons of Daivajñakesārīn, was a poet both of Nepali and Hindi verse, though we are not aware of any Sanskrit writings. Vīṇānakesārīn (1849/50-1931/32), the first of the two sons of Vidyāranyakesārīn's youngest brother Kulacakraokesārīn, is well known among contemporary Nepali scholars, as he was one of the native pioneers in the field of the grammar of the Nepali language. Similarly, he wrote on the *alankārasāstra*, which happens to be the first *alankāra* text in Nepali.

Though both these treatises of Vīṇānakesārīn's are in Nepali, he also composed Sanskrit poems in order to complete the *samasyā*. His

---

4. N. Pant forthcoming: 74-84 deals with the *Uttānagāṇita* and its author.
5. See Cakrapāṇi.
6. Bhandari 1934:13; M. Pant 1985:15. It is to be noted that Cakrapāṇi himself gives his date of birth as the new moon of Phālguna, whereas his date of birth in a collection of horoscopes is given as the 7th of Phālguna, without mention of the lunar fortnight, and the 17th of Caitra according to the solar reckoning. A third source, which still remains unpublished (a note in the collection of Suryanath Arjyal, Gorkha, copied by Dinesh Raj Pant), records his birth as being on the 7th of the dark fortnight of Phālguna, thus filling the gap left by the second source. All three sources agree as to the year and weekday.
11. See Daivajñakesārīn.
12. In addition, a slight portion of the *Bhramakaravicāra* by Daivajñakesārīn has been published in Daivajñakesārīn:24-27.
poems in the Nepali language are no less interesting. Vijñānakesārin, who wrote the Kuvalayānandaparisīṣṭa, was the younger brother of Virendrakesārin.

It is interesting to note that not only Vijñānakesārin's direct or nearest predecessors but also his other collaterals displayed a great zeal for literary activity. Foremost among them are Sāktivallabha (born in 1724) and Udayānanda. Sāktivallabha and Cakrapāṇi were distant

Virendrakesārin's Sanskrit commentary on the Durgāmāhayya from the Mārkandeyapurāṇa displayed for sale to tourists at the Aryaghat of the Pashupati temple (oral communication).


Of Sāktivallabha's nine works, Jayaratnākaranāṭaka and the Nepali-language version of his Hāsyakadamba have been published. See Sāktivallabha for the former and Pokhrel 1986:232-253 for the latter.


27. Ibid.: 222.


29. See below, p. 84.


31. Sāktivallabha wrote no less than three dramas in Sanskrit, namely, Jayaratnākaranāṭaka, Hāsyakadambanāṭaka and Lalitamādhavanāṭaka. The first nāṭaka, which has been published in its entirety, is written throughout in Sanskrit. Whatever portion of his Hāsyakadamba has been published is similarly in Sanskrit. I am not sure of Lalitamādhava, which I know only by name (National Archives MS. no. V-3921, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel-nos. A 1368/3, B 276/11 (microfilmed twice)).
‘Whatever mystery, though small, is explained by me here, the illustrious Nṛsimha is the main cause for that.’

This Nṛsimha, if the poet did not mean the god, could only have been his guru. One likely candidate is Nṛsimhaśastraṇī, a South Indian pundit who specialised in sūhiya and was educated and had settled in Varanasi; Vijñānakesaṇī’s contemporaneity with him may be established. Nṛsimhaśastraṇī, who was under the patronage of the Varanasi king, wrote two books in Sanskrit and one in Hindi, and was well known for his teaching.32 Nṛsimhaśastraṇī’s first son Gaṅgādhara, who later became one of the five topmost pundits in Varanasi, was born four years after Vijñānakesaṇī’s elder brother was born.33

Going to Varanasi for learning is nothing novel to Nepalese Brahmin boys, including the Arjūṇ-s. Vidyārāṇyakesaṇī, Vijñānakesaṇī’s uncle about whom I spoke earlier, was educated in Varanasi. He studied together with Bālasastraṇī,34 who became later a highly revered pundit with the title Bālasarasvatī35 and was one of the gurus of Nṛsimha’s son Gaṅgādhara.36

The Nepalese Chavilāla Sūri (1839/40-1906/07),37 who wrote no less than four Sanskrit works,38 gratefully acknowledges Vijñānakesaṇī’s help in the revision of the Sundaracarita, one of the two nāṭaka-s written by him:

vijñānakesaṇīr kṛtindramukhodgatāni
vāgarṇavācchasalilāni jayanti loke 1

33. For Gaṅgādharaśastraṇī, see Khiste 1928:1-35.
34. Atreya 1985:79.
35. For Bālasastraṇī, see Upādhyāya 1983:181-194.
37. N. Pant 1976:89.
38. For Chavilāla Sūri’s works, see Sharma Khanal 1982:185-200.

The pure water of the ocean of words originating from the mouth of the best of scholars Vijñānakesaṇī is unsurpassed in the world. My prattling, which is as filthy as the water of a mountain-torrent, became spotless when it reached him.

However, not only Vijñānakesaṇī but also another pundit, who revised it following the correction made by the former,40 seem not to have done their jobs properly, since there are still many ungrammatical usage in the book.41

Apart from Vijñānakesaṇī’s scholarly activities, we know something of his normal life. He held the top administrative post of subbaḷaśastraṇī known from a contemporary document. It seems that he was in dire need of money in 1890. The government of Nepal under the Rana Prime Minister Bir Shumshere, the de facto ruler, wanted to help him out, and General Dev Shumshere, the commander-in-chief, instructed the Gūḍi (Sanskrit - ṭoṣṭhī= endowment) administration to advance a loan of rupees 4,000 - a large sum when considered in the context of that period - without interest but subject to 1% commission and repayable over three years.42

Now a word about the MSS. A MS. of the Kuvalayāṇanda-pariṣiṣṭa by Vijñānakesaṇī was microfilmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) on 7.8.1986 under the reel-number E 1947/9. It is written on hand-made Nepalese paper of multiple layers known as pāko kāgaz, i.e. ‘sturdy paper’. The leaves are oblong and measure 27.3 × 11.3 cm. The colour is brown and one side of each leaf is besmeared with harīṭāla to discourage moths. The MS. is written in a

40. Ibid.: verse 4.
41. For grammatical errors in the Sundaracarita, see N. Pant 1976a:128-136.
42. See the document published as Appendix.
43. The only difference between \textit{ba} and \textit{va} seen in both MSS. is in a quotation from the \textit{Sāhityadarpana} which speaks of \textit{da} and \textit{la}, \textit{va} and \textit{la} and \textit{ra} being one for purposes of \textit{yamaka}. To distinguish \textit{va} from \textit{ba}, MS. A puts a dot underneath \textit{va} \textit{˚} and a slanted stroke inside \textit{ba} \textit{˚}; MS. B puts a slanted stroke inside \textit{ba} but leaves \textit{va} uncharged.

44. The only exception is a quotation from Vāmana concerning \textit{yamaka}, where two long \textit{a}-vowels coalesce to form \textit{ā} and this coalescence is expressed by double \textit{avagraha}-s.
Some of the quotations cited in the present text are read slightly differently in the printed editions which I have consulted. I have placed those readings at the end of the Kuvalayānandaparīṣṭa, hoping that this might help those who are interested in the transmission of a certain text.

I conclude this note with the key to various print-types used in the text.

10 point plain: Running text.

10 point italics: A portion of the Karikā or quotations being explained.

10 point bold: Vṛtti on the Karikā.

12 point plain: Illustrative examples or quotations from other texts.

14 point plain: Karikā.

14 point italics: Quotation embedded in the Karikā.

---

**Appendix**

The original, stamped with Dev Shumshere’s seal and registered as Bā. Da. Po. no. 6, Pan. no. 3, is in the Guṭhi Lagata thāṭa Tahāblakāryālaya in Bhadrakali temple, Kathmandu and was microfilmed by the NGMPP under reel no. K 307/44.

श्री ३ सुकार

1. स्वस्ति श्रीनान्दकुमारसुन्दररात्रिज्ञ श्रीकक्ष्यांडर इन विन जनसत देवजोध जङ राणा बाहादुरका
2. यापायलि गुरीबंदोबस्त तहसिल अदाका हारी कारीवाके पुरी पराण्न तर्कका
3. गुरी गैचका गोस्वामा जनेया छुटकारा सौजन्यातमादे सैकडा मोर्ड १ का दरी सलामी
4. ली मोर्ड ४००० चार हजार सबालवानोंको रीत पुन्याई निज दुटकाका कीताप्ना
5. र गुरीबंदोबस्त तहसिल अदाका कीताप्ना धर्म लेबि सुब्जा विजानकप्रिय पड़ि- 
6. तज्युलाई नित्यकी सापटी दिनु चो रुपेमा निन्या भापा वर्ष ३ ना बुनांटला भन्या नि-
7. ज सुब्जको जो चाहिन्या कापाज लेबाई लीनु भाषासम्मा रुपेमा चुक्ति गरी बुनाए-
8. ननु भन्या हाना हनुरना जाहेर गरी नर्जी बक्साबालिको गनौ इति संदर्भू १८४५
9. साल चैत्रमुदी १५ रोज ५ रुप्य ———

---

1. Misreading for निन्या.
2. The full moon lasted for 22 ghati’s and 44 pala’s on Saturday. The date corresponds to Caitra 25, V.S. 1946 in the solar reckoning and April 5, 1890. Source: a Pañcanga in manuscript form in my family collection.
TEXT

श्रीगणेशय नामः 
ननो नीलशिवाय ¹

सुरासुरशिरः ससिनकमन्दकपारशुः।
चरणा गणाथस्य विचन निधनन्तु सानकम् ॥१॥
नादेन सर्वमया या परिपूर्ण देवी
विधारस्तिपिति च्यत्चरणायामाना।
बुझ्र प्रसाध्य धुरी नीलशिवा सहेशी
सा ने सदा स्पूरतु हतकमलान्तरस्य ॥२॥

आश्रित्य दीपितायस्य प्रकम्पनरणिः।
शब्दाक्षारविवृत्ति बालबोधयस्मारे ॥३॥

पुनररत्नवधाया आपाते पुनरहत्त।
अपि सर्दौशरत्स्य सदानुभागमांगमी ॥४॥

अपुनस्तत्त्वपर्यः सार्यायित्य समश्रयाय भाषाय 
पूर्नस्तत्त्ववधायायाय मिथ्याग्राय शान्तस्तत्त्ववधायाय ॥

¹ ऐं नमः श्रीकृष्णपरमाणम्।

(quoted in Visvanatha under X.2)

पूर्विमनुनादारणेष सर्वं परित्ययसहवम्। अत्र तु कुणकुपलीतः 
शाब्दोऽऽ: प्रथमस्येव परिवृत्तिसहवम्। हरः हिष्व इति 
द्वितीयस्येव। शाक्षुण्युः इति द्वयः (Visvanatha X.2, vṛtti)।
शाक्षुण्युः शाशुण्युः शुद्धितस्य द्वयः। पूर्वानादारणेष 
परित्ययसहवः। अ० यत्र व पुनरस्तत्ववधाया शब्दपरिक्षात्सहवः 
गामात्सहवः। अ० यत्र शंखास्यामवथानेत्रवधायायाय 
शब्दाक्षारविवृत्तिर्मिहितवधायायायाय श्रद्धार्धास्य 
शब्दाक्षारविवृत्तियः। अत्र यथा शंख्यास्यामवथानेत्रवधायाय 
शब्दाक्षारविवृत्तियः। अत्र यथा शंख्यास्यामवथानेत्रवधायाय 
शब्दाक्षारविवृत्तियः। इत्यादि।

यथा वा

भुजाकुपली व्यक्तः शाशुण्युः शुद्धितः।
जगात्यिपि सदानुभागमांगमान्ति: हरः। [1]

2. विषयार्थवें B.
नद्यामलितश्चित भिन्ने
नलितिदलमिति, नविदनविरस्यम्: II [2]
(quoted in Viśnātha under X.67c-68)

इत्यादी तत्त्वर्थकाश्च विविधप्रतिविरेण
विनाधि तन्चि हरेन वदोजो तव हरियो। III [3]

(Appayyaadikṣita 75c-d)

इत्यादिदेशेन हरिताविरोधाभासविषयं आपातिकार्यानुसरणे विविधप्रति
व्यवस्थायं यथातत्त्वाविश्वासाभ्यासमेतं च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च तत्त्वर्थकाश्च

जन्मदशूलितविद्यत: I [4]

इत्यादी सर्वाय सर्वसमाहारे
अनुवादलक्षणाप्रदेयःमिति
(quoted in Mammata as lakṣya 141a-b)

इत्यादी स्वर्गायानिपि सादरे यक्षोन्नास:। यथा-जनसाधो यथत्वे
श्यामिष्टः तत्त्वार्थेति लक्षणा जापया भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको भवेदिको

अनुप्रासः श्यामिष्टः स्वरूपः च वर्णवर्णः यत्।
(Viśnātha X.3a-b)

अनन्दानादनदारेः सानन्दानिदिराऽ भजे॥ ॥
स्वरूपः यथा अन्नमुनोऽ
(quoted in Mammata 79a, vṛṣṭi) अग्निधानाश्च प्रयत्नः।

अनुप्रासः स्वरूपः स्वरूपः स्वरूपः च स्वरूपः
(Visnātha X.2, vṛṣṭi) अग्निधानाश्च प्रयत्नः।

3. इत्यादि च श्यामिष्टेऽविकृति० विविधेऽ B.
4. इत्यादि च श्यामिष्टेऽविकृति० विविधेऽ B.
5. यथा-जनसाधणिनियमः स्वरूपानादितिविद्यते B.
कृष्णस्वरूप से बुद्धिमत्त्वात् केवलः। परंतु तत्रावमाक्यवाच्यावसे:
प्राणशमी चक्षुः का युक्तः। ते कान्तिप्राप्ति सरपे यदे यदे
मन्दनमनित्यायो वैमंगिकामिव वद्यामापरावर्त्याः
सम्बन्धवस्त्रे श्वासनसुषणलयस्मादिपि चामलकारीक्यांनुवासस्तु
दुःसांहसः। एवं च चं परस्पराप्रकारत्तस्तु रुपातिनयात्। यथा
आद्यां बुद्धिमत्त्वाति पद्ये।
तेहेक्यितरथावृत्तिः वृत्तनारासो उच्चनेत्।
(Viśvanātha X.4d)
विधानधुरूस्तु धरा धाराधर इवान्तेत्। फलेषुकामान।
ते कान्तिप्राप्ति सरपे मन्दनमनित्यायो वैमंगिकामिव
वद्यामापरावर्त्याः। यथा स्वयं धरा धाराधर इति
भवेच्छेकानुप्राशः। किंतु समस्तासुद्धारते शिशूलस्वंद्रो इति
काम्य वृत्तनारासो वैमंगिकामिव। विधानधुरूस्तु इत्यत्र
तु धाराधरा स्पुती वृत्तनारासः।
यथा वा
सह महंसा व्यवसायः
विवधानो धेर्यधारणाधुरूः।
सिन्धुसारिधेजः जाल्यः
नियततगति स्यातु स सम्पदा पानम्। [13]
पूर्वज्ञाननास्य बहुकृत्व आवृतिः। इह सह महंसेत्यत्रानेको-
व्यावसायाती धेर्यधारणाधुरूः। सकृद्धासिलक्यायनानाति बहुकृत्व
आंसुस्थितिः विषयः। इहाति धेर्यधारणाधुरूः। तेहेकानुप्राशः
बुद्धिमत्त्वातिकामानाति वृत्तनारासः। काम्येषु चौरण्योरकृत्यः
विवधानः।
यथा
उन्मन्ननिधुलंधनमधुपवयाधुलसूताताः
त्रीणितकोकल्कापलसीकलकलसीकुरीणक्षरिः।
यथा ध्विकेष्यन्त्रम् दन्त्यानाम्।
यथा वा
तृणं दशं सन्निः जीवयति दृश्येत या:
विरूपाचर्य जयिनिः स्तुनो वामलोचनः॥ [16]
(Viddha I.2)

अन्तः दन्त्यातालवायतः।
यथा वा
तदवितथमवादिर्यमेव तव प्रिये।
प्रियजनपरिमुलति यद दुःखल दधानः।
सद्विवादिरितिः कामिनानं माभुनी:-
क्रृजति हि सफलत्व बल्लभालोकनेन॥ [17]
(Māgha XI.33)

आदर्श दन्त्यानाम्। एवं कपभद्रपूज्यानामः।
अस्य स्थानसायमानामामूखक्षीनं न्यमुक्तमा चामकार
इति रखितसुविदितं। एवं च श्रुतलक्षणः सहदयाना सुस्वाह इति
धृष्ट्युप्रायः इति चाम्पादिकः। (cf. Viśvanātha X.3d, vṛtti)।

शब्दार्थः: प्रीतस्तथा लार्टस्तात्तपर्यमेदतः।
(Visvanātha X.7a)

सत्यं कामकला रामन रामाशच्चन्द्रकला अयं॥ [10]॥
अर्थी भेदाभावाः श्व तात्त्यस्तात्त्वम्यायेन शब्दार्थः: प्रीत-
स्तथा तत्र लार्टस्तात्पर्यः।
एवं च शब्दं एव चामकालार्थायकत्वं शवदार्श्वार्थकों
परिवर्तितः। लार्टस्तात्त्यस्तात्पर्यः। एवं
पदार्थप्रायः इत्यत्थः। (Māmāta 81a-b, vṛtti)।

यथा च यथानवस्तुहिनिद्धित्तितस्य।
ह तु दवदहनं
तुहिनिद्धित्तितस्य जैविकनिद्धित्तितस्य।
(quoted in Māmāta as lakṣya 357 and in Viśvanātha under X.7a-b)

यथा वा
सूक्तिः न वितर्त्यद् नरो दारिद्र्यशक्ति।
प्राणस्तु वितर्यद्य नरो दारिद्र्यशक्ति॥ [19]
(Adaptation of the lakṣya in Appayyaḍīkṣita 102)

यथा च
पर्यौ सति गदात्स्य किमिःविधितित्वेष्वः।
पर्यौ ्सति गदात्स्य किमिःविधितित्वेष्वः॥ [20]
एवं च श्रवण तविच्छीकरणेन च नामस्तात्त्वानि
नामकरणानिषेधेन वृत्तः। प्रबूटविधितवृत्तम् च नारः
पर्यौ एव।

यथा
सिन्तकरश्वरिचिरिभा विभाकराकार ध्विकेष्यः।
प्रीतस्तथं कक्षेत सापि तैववास्ति नायः॥ [21]
(quoted in Māmāta as lakṣya 359)

जित्वा वितर्व भवावां वितर्वत्वोऽधोः।
वितर्वत्वस्त्रीविहीनेऽरुपादं दिवं गतं।॥ [22]
(Daṇḍin II.119)
हसायते चारसङ्गेन कान्ता
कान्तायते सप्तसुपुरुषन चानिल: || [23]

(quoted in Viśnunātha under X.25b)

एवनुदाहरणान्तराण्यायानि
अर्थातरसर्वगङ्गालोकोविशये
केदरी केदरी करभ: करभ:
कारिराजकर: कारिराजकर: ||
मुनात्रितवेये स्थि विभार्त तुला-
मिदरभूयुगन न चम्फुङ्गुः: || [24]

(Prasanna I.37)

इत्यादिविध लातानुप्रास एव || द्वितीयकल्याणिदशब्दान जाहयादि-
दोषवत कल्याणस्प्रपकवेय शिक्षाधिकस्तदाधिकारीपाठं तत्तात्त्विकायाय जातीय नियोजन
लातानुप्रास तात्पर्यमपुरसारिकायाय द्विय: कल्याणिदशब्दायी:-
स्तात्पर्यायाण भिन्नाधित्वात् || अत एव न यस्मने: 6.

सस्वाण्त्यन्त्यात्वृतिर्न्यानुप्रास उच्चते: ||

वदान्यहदयदयायात धन्या कापि विदग्धता ||[91]||

आधारभूतस्वरूप समन्त्योत्तिकज्ञानमर्नात्त्विन्यन्त्यानुप्रास: ||

उत्पुत्तालकमलाद्विवार लरसि च शुभानामे: || [25]

इत्यादि व्यक्तमाणग्राहूलि च चानकार इत्युङ्ग सस्करेति: || उदाहरण
यथा वदान्यहदयदया ताकार्य: || एव पदात्न्तः पादातान्तत्त्वाद्वायम् प्रक्षिप्त: ||

पदात्न्तः यथा

6. A omits this sentence.
दिव्यस्त्रीणा सचरणलालारागा
रागायते निपतितपुष्पापिडा: 
पीढाभाज: कुसुमचिता सहायस
शशन्तस्यसिद्ध सुरततिशेष शाया II [30]
(Bhāravi V.23)

इद्द पादायन्त्रकमपि भवति
शुद्ध तद यथा
समीरकिशिर: शिरः सु वस्ता
सता जवनिका निकामसुखिनाम्

बिभिन्ति जनयन्तय दुःसमपा
नयायधवला बलाकहकती: II [31]
(Māgha IV.54)

समुद्रक यथा
दोषाकरोशि रानकति विहीनवतः
सदस्वतः प्रजति सिन्तसमागमः II [32]
उत्तराध तुल्यम्

यथा वा
स्मरसुरति तरंश्यः स्वतः
सुरतयोदिष्टाचितसुकानन्त वा I [33]
उत्तराध तुल्यम् प्रवृद्धर्णे पदानामभः | इह तु भक्ति इति

थितं विशीष: |

महायमक यथा
विकाशीयुज्जगतिश्चारणा
विकाशीयुज्जगतिश्चारणा: ।
विकाशनीयुर्जगतिशामागरणा

विकाशनीयुर्जगतिशामागरण: II [34]

(Bhāravi XV.52)

अन्येतिधि विषेशा एवनाके संस्थानसम्भवा: पादारमस्यान्तगतादिका
उँहा: |

यमकादों मनुष्यो डलोबोलोरोस्थत: |

इत्यादिभिकुटकेनादु 

भुजलता जलप्रतागलाजन: II [35] (Raghu IX.46d)

इत्यादिषु न यमकल्वाहमि: |

(Visvanātha after X.8)

इति विवेधम् ।

अथ यस्य स्थाननिमित्ते महाकाव्येषु दृशीयपादगतविभिन्नार्कककस्वर- 

व्यक्तजनसमुदायस्योपादकमेवापृथक्

अथ निर्मलमु युगपत गिरो |

कृत्यारास्तरप्रभविषया |

अथृतुपाणिन निपेविनुमादेपे 

भूरि पदं विपदन्तकृतं सतायम II [36] (Māgha VI.1)

इत्यादी विवक्षकानी यमकक्यपदेजो व्याहतं इति । 

एव तत्र पूर्वांत: पवानं तथास्येत्र प्रक्त्यात्स्थाननिमयानात: |

तदुत्ता वामनने |

पदनेकार्यमचार वास्तवस्य लघुनिमित्ते यमकमु ।

(Vāmana IV.1.1)

इति ।

यथा ते त्याम्बराभास्यु: तस्मान यमकम। दस्यते तेषु इलोकान्तरस्मृतार्थः 

यमकपेदाौतेव स्थानिनयम इति । अथ च त्यायनां गाटातावृति 

लघुप्रतागलाजनं स्मृतार्थं यमकर्मरो तत्वे न निवृत्त: । वामनस्तु 

तत्तत्राः वर्णियमक्षितं नास्य यमकादोहोऽजाहार च 

नानाबिधेन कानोतागुरातिधितमोपभुवा । 

विविषेत विलासेन तत्तद हृदयं नृणाम् II [37] (quoted in Vāmana under IV.1.2)

इति ।

विषयार्थतंवाख्येन नास्तु यमकम। विषयार्थतेव तु स्थानेवेति च । 

विषयार्थतेव च । नक्षत्राणमात्रां स्मृतार्थं स्मृतार्थं गोपया: अथि 

विषयार्थतात्य: प्रयोगिकान्तरस्मृतार्थं स्मृतार्थं विशिष्टविभिन्नार्कककस्वरे 

वाधनस्य वर्णियमक्षितं सतायम । यमकं शालु पदभिनेन राजा भीयंक 

महारः तदुक्तकः ।

(Vāmana IV.1.3)

इति ।

तथा च भक्तान्न्यायोज्यस्य यमकक्षयः (cf. Visvanātha 120-4) । 

भक्तस्यावतानुपूर्व्येन मर्मवायमात्रांवृत्तानुपूर्व्येन: सोराकान्ताः च उभयं: 

सत्यस्यात्मकक्षयं निर्मालक्षयेन: सत्यस्यात्मक्षयं निर्मालक्षयेन: अथ भक्तान्न्यायो: 

बहुस्युरार्थतं स्मृतार्थं प्रददित्या: । शृङ्गारपरिवर्तकचूर्णकादि 

नानाविकार्यादस्येत्रस्मृतार्थं सु वामनकृततत्तत्तत्ततश्च (cf. Vāmana IV.1.4- 

7)। न्युः मद्यनांमक्षकाद नाम भक्तस्यावतानुस्यावतक्षक्तकम् । तथा च 

निर्देशार्थाधुपूर्वः । सक्तात्मकस्यावतक्षक्तकर्तव्यां प्रतत्त्यायिकादे 

अन्येतिधित्वं विशिष्टरूपेति विशिष्टविभिन्नार्कककस्वरे स्मृतार्थं च 

सतायम्। निर्देशार्थानुपूर्वः । काथे भक्तान्न्याय क्षमातात् तत्न 

निर्देशार्थानुपूर्वः अथि सार्यानुपूर्वी विशेषश्चतकनेन गौरी: सार्यात्मक 

स्थिरृतिया: एवं च लोकेन विषयायाय इत्यस्य विषयायाय विशिष्टविभिन्न 

विशेषार्थात्मकक्षेरतयाः: । इति कृतं पर्यवितेन ।
उत्ती न्यासे च कैभिक्य वर्णनाः विषृमुच्यते ।

(Viśvanātha X.13)

समाननामाजू तु मानपेदा वर्षित कृथा: ||१५५||

यद्र काव्यानुपूर्वाः उत्ती बैभिक्य यत्र च किंवरसिद्धेनन्ति

चार्यस्माता चार्यकामां मुख्यार्थां मधकादिरुपेन वर्ल्या

वधितु पवार्तत्तेन तविषिद्धेनाय च काव्यसिद्धांति

सम्भवतेन चित्रालक्ष्याः ।

येन विषृमुच्यते ।

उत्ती न्यासे चैत्य वर्णनाः न्यायः ।

पदानामुक्तिरिति समनवः

पदस्वोतेस्य सुनायत्वदतिविति सामान्यार्थे पदानुस्थानात्

व्यासस्तु वर्णनाः ।

पदानमिः च सम्भविः अपूर्वनिदेशनस्तु

सामान्यानुस्थानानि: ।

तदाह वार्ताभोधिः

व्यासिकन्तिद्रपेंद्रविरोंस्तुकल्पनाः ।

सत्याः प्राप्ती तत्तविभ तत्त्विचः यच्छ विस्धुल्लस ॥

(Vāgbhaṭa IV.7)

इति ॥

यत्र तु लक्षित ममन्तेः

तत्तविभ यत्र वर्णनाः खंडवाकृतितिहुतः ।

(Mammapa. 85c-d)

इति ॥

तद्यथापक्त न्यासेकुशियमात्रे पर्मवस्तात्

उदाहरणम् यथा समाश्चायुक्ताः चैत्यन्वयः ।

8. A omits: सम्मन्तेः

9. B adds: जनस अर्थ ृवर्तन्त न्यासिकेन्द्राः न्यासोऽधिभ दर्शनिः ।

पवतवन्द्वम् यथा

भास्ते प्रतिभासार्य समातातासारविभा ।

भवितालसं शुभम् वादे देवाभ्य बह ते समा || [38]

(quoted in Mammapa as lakṣya 387)

खहबन्द्वम् यथा

मारायिकानमिनभुगृहासारसारस्ते ।

सारारथस्तवा नित्यां तदार्थरणानि || [39]

(quoted in Mammapa as lakṣya 384)

माता नातान्स गढ़धु: क्रियाः बाधितस्माना ।

मान्याय सीमा रामणा श्न मे दिश्यादुमादिनम् || [40]

(quoted in Mammapa as lakṣya 385)

चक्रवन्द्वम् यथा

स तेब मानविक्षिष्टाः मारात्मारात्मा वालम्बव्यः पुरो

लवधाद्वद्यः सूचिकुदात्रात्मवार्तस्मृत्मुद्वा ।

मुक्तवा काममापस्तभे: परमार्गन्धः स नाद हरे:।

रक्ष्येः समकालमभ्रुद्वा रोपिताद तस्ते || [41]

(quoted in Sarasvati II as lakṣya 290)

मुराजबन्द्वम् यथा

सरला बुद्धार्मिन्नमुनिलिन्निलारवाः ।

वारलाबुद्धार्मिन्नदकर्लाबुद्धामिला || [42]

(quoted in Mammapa as lakṣya 386)

गोमृत्रबन्द्वम् यथा
VANANAKE'SARIN
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Vidagdha II.36
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Magha XIX.104

Visvanatha X.13c-14b

Visvanatha X.10 vṛtti

(Māgha XIX.104)
समुकरानयाम् मुष्रमन्दे
धविभूताम् निर्मातादारमुखजे || [59]

अन्तः चौकेच्छिलाटानुप्राप्तानं यन्मकया च समुदायः।
एवमुदायं पूणिच्चि कालोत्पुः सम्पूर्णः पदातीनाय।
सरोत्तप्यदिवंदशिलमुक्तांकलहारं चौकेच्छिलाटानुप्राप्तानं जन्मकथित्रथे चाजाखामानेनकाकनुप्रेषयों च सहः।
सम्भवतः।

मुरुजनदधविभूतत्वत्तत्वः परिभाषां विशेषस्या वनकुलस्य पूणीपरिभाषायों तदुपुरयुतानुसारं सम्भवताः।
विकाराभिन्नानि महायमंकोद्याहणांषाम्य महायमकस्य गोमुरुजनदकथायथ क सम्प्रायाध्ययन सन्येनकाकनुप्रेषयों च सहः।
सम्भवतः।

एवमन्त्वाय भूवक्षी सहारस्थितिपुलमनेतः।

किन्तु श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः इव न चतस्तकरी श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः श्वदलंकारसंस्कृतहः।
तेन हि तत्र नामित्युक्तानि सिद्धेऽध्रति धर्मः।
अस्त्कामशु समस्तगते विद्युः नामवृजदिः।

उतस्मानुस्बन्धित्वानिष्ठ्यि लाघवादि।

श्वदलंकारविषयो दैवितायर्गुप्तितति।

इदं कुवलयान्तरपरिशिष्टम् महो कृताम् || 96 ||

रहस्याः तदं किंवित महोपपायुपपरिशिष्टम्।

श्रीमनुषुप्रस्थिरः।

व्रत्वयं तत्र कारणाम् || 95 ||

इति श्रीमद्बन्धुकारसेवकेशिवर्तकम् कुवलयान्तरपरिशिष्टम् || शुभम् ॥ ॥

16. A adds: वैक्रम न ९४७ मित्र वर्षं। B bears no date. B adds: श्रीमनवित ॥
An Index of Quotations Which Read Differently in Printed Editions from What Is in the Kuvalayānandaparāśīṭa

The number of printed editions of a given text, if widely read, is very comprehensive. I have not checked the readings found in the Kuvalayānandaparāśīṭa against all the printed editions, having, in fact, confined my efforts to the edition mentioned in the bibliography.

1

उरसि सुरिन्द: का गांडालिखितस्ते सतसिजमकर्नामोदिता नन्दने का ।
गिरिसमलघुविरचकायो व्रिसकर्ते-गुस्हिरविन कुता का च्छन्दसा दुःिररका ||

(Text: verse 51)

Vidagdha II.36:
उरसि सुरिन्द: का गांडालिखितस्ते सतसिजमकर्नामोदिता नन्दने का ।
गिरिसमलघुविरचकायो व्रिसकर्ते-गुस्हिरविन कुता का च्छन्दसा दुःिररका ||

2

का काली का मधुरा का शीतलवाहिनी गाढ़ा ।
के सलज्जाधान कृष्ण: के बुलवंत न बाधते शीत: ||

(Text: verse 49)

Subhāṣita antarālāpah 15:
के सलज्जाधान कृष्ण: का शीतलवाहिनी गाढ़ा ।
के दारपोषणरत: के बुलवंत न बाधते शीतम् ||

3

काव्यान्तर्गुमृत्यु या सर ते नेह प्रपल्लयते ।
Visvānātha X. after 13a
काव्यान्तर्गुमृत्यु या सर ते नेह प्रपल्लयते ।

4

किमभ: इलाहमात्त्यति पदिण क: कुतो यशः: ।
गृहव: कीदृशी नित्य दानवारिविराजितः: ||

(Text: verse 46)

Vāgbhata IV.147:
किमभ: इलाहमात्त्यति पदिण क: कुतो यशः: ।
गृहव: कीदृशी नित्य दानवारिविराजितः: ||

5

जित्वा विश्व भवानय विहरत्वरोधेन: ।
विहरत्यप्सरोमीति सिपुकान दिवं गत:: ||

(Text: verse 22)

Dandin II.119:
जित्वा विश्व भवानय विहरत्बरोधेन: ।
विहरत्यप्सरोमीति सिपुकान दिवं गत:: ||

6

दृश: वर्ध्य सनसिष्य जीवविस्त दृश्य य: ।
विरुपाक्षस्य जयिनीस्त: स्तुमु वामलीचनः: ||

(Text: verse 16)

1. Note the line in prose. However, the printed edition referred to in the bibliography gives a versified version identical with Vijnānakāśir's reading as a variant.
Viddha I.2:

दृश्य दर्द वनस्पति जीवन्ति दृश्य वा: ।
विस्पाषस्य जर्जनीता: स्तुवे वामलोचना: ॥

7

वामनस्वरसेन कान्ताभूमराधितमोभवः ।
विस्पाषस्य तत्त्वं हृदयं नृणाम् ॥

8

नानुस्वारविस्तिर तु विज्ञभक्तत सम्मतिः ।

(Text: verse 37)

Vāmana under IV.1.2:

नानाकारणं कान्ताभूमराधितमोभवः ।
विस्पाषस्य तत्त्वं हृदयं नृणाम् ॥

8

नानुस्वारविस्तिर तु विज्ञभक्तत सम्मतिः ।

(Text: p. 110)

Vāgbhaṭa I.20c-d.

नानुस्वारविस्तिर तु विज्ञभक्तत सम्मतिः ।

9

पदनेकार्यनार्चा वायुवृत स्थाननियमे यमकम् ।

(Text: p. 102)

Vāmana IV.1.1:

पदनेकार्यनार्चा चावृत्त स्थाननियमे यमकम् ।

10

प्रयुक्ताद्विकरणसंकराजिः

(Text: verse 29)

Bhāravi V.9:

प्रयुक्ताद्विकरणसंकराजिः

ग्रन्थितमालात्मालवनाकुलम् ।

11

भविष्यमार्गीह ब्राह्मणलालिनिधुनाः
स ते रामः स्थानः न यद्य पुरुती लक्षणसकः।
इत्य यास्यतुम्बिक्षमनादुण्डः वानरचन्द्रः
लौहस्थिणः षट्ठारपरविलोपात पठ पुनः।

(Text: verse 52)

Hanūmat X.12:

भविष्यमार्गीह ब्राह्मणलालिनिधुनाः
स ते रामः स्थानः न यद्य पुरुती लक्षणसकः।
इत्य यास्यतुम्बिक्षमनादुण्डः वानरचन्द्रः
लौहस्थिणः षट्ठारपरविलोपात पठ पुनः।

12

मण्डलमणिमणि-जीरे
कल्लगभीरे विहारसरसीतेरे।

2. The printed edition referred to in the bibliography gives a reading identical with Vijñānakesarine's as the variant.
Visvanātha under X.10:

मन्युजलमणिमञ्जरीि
कलगम्मीि विहारसरसीि । 

Visvanātha under X.10:

विस्वासि केलकीि
किमालि धीिे च गन्धराजसमीि ॥

Visvanātha under X.10:

यत्राङ्गाधिखितशृङ्खलस्तुकलपना ।
सत्याः प्रससी तत्तिच्व तत्तिच्व यच्च विश्रुक्त ॥

(Vāgbhaṭa IV.7:

यत्राङ्गाधिखितशृङ्खलस्तुकलपना ।
सत्याः प्रससी तत्तिच्व तत्तिच्व चिन्तकुण्ड्यत ॥

Visvanātha after X.8:

यमकादी भवेदेक्य डलोबोर्लरस्तथा ।
इत्यादिभियुतन्तनादाय।

Visvanātha after X.8:

यमकादी भवेदेक्य डलोबोर्लरस्तथा ।
इत्यादिभियुतन्तनादाय।

Visvanātha after X.25b:

हस्यायेचारकेतानाना 
कान्तायेच्यपर्सुस्तेन चामिल: ।

(Text: verse 54)

13

(Text: verse 23)

15

3. Note the strange blend of Indravajrā and Indravamsā.
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