ĀDARŚA

No. 1

tad iha na guṇadoṣau yojanīyāv alīkau
katham api mahatā yat saṃskṛto' yaṃ 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.'

ĀDARŚA

A supplement to *Pūrṇimā*, the journal of the Saṃsodhana-maṇḍala

No. 1

Pundit Publications
Kathmandu

Why This Supplement ?

nedaṃ svāntasukhārthinā na viṣayavyāpāramūḍhātmanā
mitrakṣoṇidhanārthinā na ca mayā nātmapratiṣṭhārthinā |
atyarthaṃ paranindanaṃ pratidinaṃ soḍhvā pariśramyate
vidyā pūrvajasañcitā janahitaṃ kartuṃ prabhūyād iti ||

– Naya Raj Pant

'It is not that I seek mental pleasure,
or that my mind is stupefied with wordly 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 *paisā*-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 *paisā*-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 *Arthaśāstra*.

No other pamphlet was published for 13 months. This silence was broken with a 25-*paisā* pamphlet released on Śrīpañcamī, 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Rāmāyaṇa* 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 Saṃvat 2018 (=A.D. 1961) these scholars formed themselves into the Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala and started a quarterly to publish hitherto unpublished inscriptions from Nepal. This periodical continued for three consecutive years and was replaced by *Pūrṇimā*, 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 *Pūrṇimā* 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 *Pūrṇimā* 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 Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala, have been dreaming of publishing of 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 Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala, 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 *Pūrṇimā* 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 *Ādarśa* 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 Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala to a wider audience, I have named it *Ādarśa*, 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.

> *vahati na puraḥ kaścit paścān na ko'py anuyāti mām*
> *na ca navapadakṣuṇṇo mārgaḥ katham nv aham ekakaḥ ।*
> *bhavatu viditaṃ pūrvavyūḍho'dhunā khilātāṃ gataḥ*
> *sa khalu bahalo vāmaḥ panthā mayā sphuṭam ujjhitaḥ ।।*
>
> – Dharmakīrti[1]

'No one rides before, no one comes behind
and the path bears no fresh prints.
How now, am I alone ? Ah yes, I see:
the path which the ancients opened up by now is overgrown
and the other, that broad and easy road, I've surely left.'

Translated by Ingalls[2]

20 September 1993   **Mahes Raj Pant**

1.   · Quoted in Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* as verse 1729. (*The Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa Compiled by Vidyākara*, Harvard Oriental Series 42, ed. D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957), 297.
For my reason for accepting the reading *ujjhitaḥ* instead of *urjitaḥ*, see '*Kina ma yasa pustakako prakāśaka banē*?' [Why I became the publisher of this book ?], p. 24, note 12 in Gyan Mani Nepal, *Paśupatināthako darśana sparśana pūjanasambandhamā samīkṣā* [Observations on the viewing, touching and worshipping of Pashupatinath]. Kathmandu: Mahes Raj Pant, V.S. 2043 Caitra (1987).

2.   Daniel H.H. Ingalls, trans., *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara's "Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa"*, Harvard Oriental Series 44 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1965), 445.

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 *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. 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 *kṛidanta* 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 *Ashṭādhyāyī* itself (I. 1. 68 and VIII. 3. 86, *śabda-samjñā*).[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 *śābdika* (IV. 4. 34, *śabdaṁ karoti śābdiko vaiyākaraṇaḥ*).[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 *vaiyākarana* (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

---

1.   Agrawala 1953:4.

2.   *Ibid.*:305.

3.   *Ibid.*: 341.

formation is taught by Pāṇini, means 'grammarian', as *śābdika* and *vaiyākaraṇa* do.

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

> {śabda-kāra-} *mfn. making a noise or sound; m. a grammarian 3. 2. 23.*[4]

Unlike Agrawala, Katre 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:

> *śabda + am kar-ó-ti = *śabda + ∅[1] + kr + Tá = śabda-kār-á(N)*
> (1)'grammarian (lit. maker of words)'; ...[5]

Thus in his latest book on Pāṇini Katre rejected one of the two alternative meanings of the word which he previously offered and took *śabdakāra* solely as 'grammarian'.

The principal job of a Sanskrit grammarian being word formation, the word *śabdakāra* seems to be interpreted by the two Pāṇini scholars as 'grammarian', since *śābdika*, 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 *śābdika*, 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 grammarian. 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 *śābdika* is expressive of the meaning of grammarian,

---

4.   Katre 1968-69:543.

5.   *Id.* 1989: 228.

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 Pāṇinian *sūtra*, together with the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, which teaches us the formation of the word *śabdakāra*:

> *na śabdaślokakalahagāthāvairacātusūtramantra-padeṣu* III.2.23
>
> *śabdādiṣūpapadeṣu karoteṣ ṭapratyayo na bhavati | hetvādiṣu prāptaḥ pratiṣiddhyate | śabdakāraḥ | ślokakāraḥ | kalahakāraḥ | gāthākāraḥ | vairakāraḥ | cātukāraḥ | sūtrakāraḥ | mantrakāraḥ | padakāraḥ |*

As neither the *sūtra* 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 *kāvyaśāstra*-s, which were composed specifically in order to illustrate the application of the Pāṇinian rules.

Let us quote two verses from the *Rāvaṇārjunīya*:

> *na vairakāro'bhavad ānatārer na mantrakāraḥ svadhiyā vidhātuḥ |*
> *sa ślokakārair abhinūyamāno mamajja tatrāmbhasi cātukāraiḥ ||*
> *saṃkṣobhitaṃ tena babhūva nadyāḥ skhalaj jalaṃ rodhasi śabdakāram |*
> *utsāhitenāmarasūtrakārair dṛptena rātrimcarasādhukāraiḥ ||*[7]

---

6.   *Nyāsa* to *Kāśikāvṛtti* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* IV. 4. 34:
       ... *tad ity anenaiva dvitīyāsamarthavibhaktau labdhāyāṃ śabdadardduram iti dvitīyānirdeśo laukikavākyapradarśanārthaḥ | śabdadardduram karotīy etad vyāvahārikam vākyam | asya pratigraho yatra loke vyavahāras tatra pratyayo bhavati nānyatretyartham sūcayati | tena śabdaṃ karoti khara ity atra na bhavati | loke sa śābdika ity ucyate yaḥ śabdam vetti | vaiyākaraṇa eva śabdam vetti | tena tatraiva pratyayo bhavati na khare | asau vaiyākaraṇaḥ pratyayaprakṛtyādinā sarvaṃ śabdaṃ jānāti |*

7   *Rāvaṇārjunīya* X. 12-13.

These two verses illustrate six finished forms whose derivations together with three others are taught in the above-quoted *sūtra*. In these verses, Bhīma, the author of the *Ravanārjunīya*, 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 *sūtra*-s and delighted by the applause of the night-wanderers [i.e. *rākṣasa*-s].[8]

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

Now let us turn to the pages of another *kāvyaśāstra* , the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*:

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. Mīmāmsaka 1984:479-481). This being the state of affairs, the translation given above, I fear, is a tentative one.

> *satām aruṣkaram pakṣī vairakāram narāśinam |*
> *hantum kalahakāro'sau śabdakārah papāta kham ||*[9]

This verse of Bhaṭṭi is meant for the illustration of four finished forms whose derivations, together with many others, are taught by Pāṇini in two of his *sūtra*-s dealing with *kṛdanta* rules.[10] Excluding *aruṣkaram*, the remaining three, i.e. *vairakāram*, *kalahakārah* and *śabdakārah*, are three out of the nine formations given in the above-quoted *sūtra*. This verse is one of the last thirteen verses from the fifth *sarga* of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, in which is narrated the pious bird Jaṭāyu's heroic but unsuccessful fight with the immoral Rāvana.[11] When translated this verse reads as follows:

> The bird, the quarrel-picking and noise-making [one], soared up in the sky to kill the vexer of noble men, the maker of enmity, the man-eater.

In employing the word *śabdakāra*, Bhaṭṭi portrays a vociferating Jaṭāyu who has little concern with grammar. It is worthwhile mentioning, too, that what Jaṭāyu cried against Rāvana has already been given by Bhaṭṭi in the preceding verses.[12]

A mediaeval lexicographer, Yādavaprakāśa, makes the entry of the word *śabdakara* in his work in the following way:

> *nālikaras tu nālikavāk svano'śobhanasvarah |*
> *kuvade kucarah śabdakāre ravanaśabdanau ||*[13]

As this versified lexical entry gives *ravana* and *śabdana* as synonyms of the word *śabdakāra*, it immensely helps us in the correct understanding of the latter. The first two words are enumerated in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* and in

---

9. *Bhaṭṭikāvya* V. 100.

10. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* III. 2.21, 23.

11. *Bhaṭṭikāvya* V. 96-108.

12. *Ibid.*: 97-99.

13. *Vaijyayantīkoṣa* V. 4.48.

the *Amarakoṣa* as expressive of 'sonorous'.[14] By equating *śabdakāra* with *ravaṇa* and *śabdana*, Yādavaprakāśa supports the authors of the *kāvyaśāstra*-s, who, as we have just seen, also use it in the same sense.

These examples of the usage of the word *śabadakāra* 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.[15] Among them the two most comprehensive ones substantiate this meaning by referring to the above-quoted verse form the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*.[16]

---

14. *Kāśikāvṛtti* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* III. 2.148:
    calanārthebhyaḥ śabdārthebhyaś cākarmakebhyo dhātubhyas tacchīlādiṣu kartṛṣu yuc pratyayo bhavati | calanaḥ | copanaḥ | śabdārthebhyaḥ – śabdanaḥ | ravaṇaḥ | akarmakād iti kim | paṭhitā vidyām |

    Amarakoṣa III. 1.38[a-b]:
    ravaṇaḥ śabdano nāndīvādī nāndīkaraḥ samau |

15. Radha Kanta Deva 1967:22.
    Böhtlingk and Roth 1875:66.
    Monier-Williams 1899:1052.
    Apte 1957-59:1532.

16. Radha Kanta Deva 1967:22.
    Böhtlingk and Roth 1875:66.
    Oddly enough, Tarkavachaspati (1969-70) omits this word in his comprehensive lexicon. However, Vidyasagara's comprehensive dictionary (1900:707) includes the word with its conventional meaning.

Bibliography

Agrawala, V.S.
  1953 *India as Known to Pāṇini*. Lucknow: University of Lucknow.

Amarakoṣa See: Amarasiṃha.

Amarasiṃha *Amarakoṣa*
  The Nâmalingânuśâsana (Amarakosha.) of Amarasimha. With the Commentary (Vyâkhyâsudhâ or Ramâśramî) of Bhânuji Dîkshit. 5th ed. Ed. Śivadatta. Rev. Wâsudev Laxman Śâstrī Pansîkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1929.

Apte, V.S.
  1957-59 *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Editors-in-chief P.K. Gode and C.G. Karve. 3 vols. Pagination unbroken. Poona: Prasad Prakashan.

Aṣṭādhyāyī See: Pāṇini.

Bhaṭṭi *Bhaṭṭikāvya*
  The Bhaṭṭikâvyam of Bhaṭṭi with the Commentary (Jayamangala) of Jayamaṅgala. Ed. Vinâyak Nârâyan Shâstri Joshi and Kacheshwar Vinâyak Joshi. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1900.

Bhaṭṭikāvya See: Bhaṭṭi.

Bhīma *Rāvaṇārjunīya.*
  The Râvaṇârjunîya of Bhaṭṭa Bhîma. Kâvyamâlâ 68. Ed. Śivadatta and Kâshînâth Pânḍurang Parab. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sâgara Press, 1900.

Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth
  1875 *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. Pt. 7. St. Petersburg:Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Jinendrabuddhi *Nyāsa*
  Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti [Commentary on The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini] of Vāmana–

Jayāditya. 6 pts. Ed. Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalikaprasad Shukla. Prachya Bharati Series 2-7. Pts. 1, 2. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan, 1965. Pts. 3-6. Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1966-67.

Kāśikāvṛtti   See: Vāmana and Jayāditya.

Katre, Sumitra Mangesh

1968-69   *Dictionary of Pāṇini*. 3 pts. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 53, 62, 63. Pagination unbroken. Poona: Postgraduate and Research Institute, Deccan College.

1989   *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. Roman Transliteration and English Translation*. Indian ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Leonardi, G.G.,

1972   *Bhaṭṭikāvyam. Translation and Notes*. Orientalia Rheno – Traiectina 16. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira

1984   *Saṃskṛta vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā itihāsa* [A history of Sanskrit grammatical science]. 2. 3rd ed. Sonipat: Self-published.

Monier-Williams, Monier

1899   *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary...: New Edition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nyāsa   See: Jinendrabuddhi.

Pāṇini   *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. See: Vāmana and Jayāditya.

Radha Kanta Deva

1967   *Shabda-kalpadrum*. Pt. 5. 3rd ed. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 93. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Rāvaṇārjunīya   See: Bhīma.

Tarkavachaspati, Taranatha

1969-70   *Vachaspatyam*. 6 vols. 3rd ed. (Vol. 1, 1969, Vols. 2-6, 1970). The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 94. Pagination unbroken. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Vaijayantīkoṣa   See: Yādavaprakāśa.

Vāmana and Jayāditya   *Kāśikāvṛtti*
    Kāśikā: A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana & Jayāditya. 2 pts. Eds. Aryendra Sharma *et al*. Sanskrit Academy Series 17/A.14, 20/A.17. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University, 1969, 1970.

Vidyasagara, Jibananda

1900   *Shabda-sagara, or A Comprehensive Sanskrit–English Lexicon....* Calcutta: Ashu Bodha Bhattacharyya and Nitya Bodha Bhattacharyya.

Yādavaprakāśa   *Vaijayantīkoṣa*
    Vaijayantīkoṣa of Śrī Yādavaprakāśācārya. Ed. Haragovinda Śāstrī. The Jaikrishnadas-Krishnadas Pracyavidya Granthamala 2. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1971.

A Historical Gloss on the
Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra
No. 1*

Bholanath Paudel, Dhanavajra Vajrācārya
and Gyan Mani Nepal

nītiśāstrāmṛtam śrīmān arthaśāstramahodadheḥ |
ya uddadhre namas tasmai viṣṇuguptāya vedhase ||

Kāmandaka[1]

'Honour be to Kautalya, [like unto] the Creator; who from
the ocean of the *arthaśāstra*, churned out the nectar at the
nītiśāstra.'[2]

In olden times there was a custom of learning and teaching the *Kauṭalīya
Arthaśāstra*. Many scholars cited from the *Kauṭalīya 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 state 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 attempting 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 *prayoktṛ*-s nor,
being still students, are we *vaktṛ*-s either. Therefore it will be well for no
one to try to gain an understanding of politics from us. Ācārya, too, has
said, '*daṇḍanītim vaktṛprayoktṛbhyaḥ*' (*Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* I. 5. 2.8):
'Learn politics from *vaktṛ*-s and *prayoktṛ*-s.' The sense of *vaktṛ* is that of
an originator of political thought; the sense of *prayoktṛ* is that of one
engaged in political activity.

We have undertaken this labour solely in order that the meaning of
sūtra-s of the *Kauṭalīya 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 *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra*, we will
consider that we have accomplished our object.

Kautalya'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 *rājavyasana*, i.e. 'the danger of a calamity befalling the king'.[3] 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 Kauṭalya has enunciated the following way:

> *kulasya vā bhaved rājyam kulasaṅgho hi durjayaḥ |*
> *arājavyasanābādhaḥ śaśvad āvasati kṣitim ||*
>
> (*Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* I. 17. 13. 55)

> 'Or let there be a rule by family, since a *kulasaṅgha* [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 *kulasaṅgha*] will last for a long, long time.'

When things are done according to the stratagem Acārya Kauṭalya 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 Kauṭalya 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

---

3.   The translation of the term is borrowed from R.P. Kangle 1972:43. – Translator.

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 mahārāja*, i.e. 'thrice venerable great king', and on the members of his family that of *rājakumārakumārātmaja*, 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 *kulasaṅgha.* According to Kauṭalya'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)

11. Yuddhapràtap 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 *kulasaṅgha*, 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 *kulasaṅgha*, 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 Juddha expelled mixed-caste Ranas from the roll of successon.

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

tvayā mayā ca kuntyā ca dharitryā vāsavena ca |
jāmadagnyena rāmeṇa sadbhiḥ karṇo nipātitaḥ ||

['Karna was killed by six, namely, by you, by me, by Kuntī, by the earth, by Indra and by Rāma the son of Jamadagni.' – Translator]

To borrow the words that came from Kṛṣṇa's mouth after Karṇa had been slain, the independence India won in 1947 may be said to represent Kṛṣṇa, and those Ranas of mixed-caste marriage who were deprived of office in 1934 Arjuna. If the Rana *kulasaṅgha* 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'.

[Bibliography

Kāmandakīyanītisāra

> *Jayamaṅgalopādhyāyanirapekṣābhyāṃ samvalitaḥ kāmanda-kīyanītisāraḥ*. Pt. 1. Ed. Scholars of the Saṅgaveda-vidyālaya. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvali 136. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1958.

Kangle, R.P. trans.

> 1972   *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*. Pt. 2. 2nd ed. University of Bombay Studies Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali 2. Bombay: University of Bombay.

Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra

> *Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya: A New Edition*. Vol. 1. The Punjab Sanskrit Series 4. Ed. J. Jolly and R. Schmidt. Lahore: The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, 1923.

Landon, Perceval

> 1976   *Nepal*. 2 vols. Reprint. Bibliotheca Himalayica Series I, vol. 16. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Paudel, Bholanath, Dhanavajra Vajrācārya and Gyan Mani Nepal

> 1952   *Kauṭilīya arthaśāstrako aitihāsika vyākhyā* 1. Kathmandu: Authors, V.S. 2009 Āśvina.

> 1953   'Kauṭalīyasyārthaśāstrasyaitihāsikī vyākhyā', kauṭalyā-rthaśāstrānusāraṃ rāṇāśāsanasiṃhāvalokanam. *Saṃskṛta-sandeśa*. Vol. 1, no. 4 (V.S. 2010 Śrāvaṇa):34-40. (Sanskrit translation of Paudel, Vajrācārya and Nepal 1952 made by the authors themselves).

Rana, Pudma Jung Bahadur

> 1909   *Life of Maharaja Sir Jung Bahadur, ... of Nepal*. Ed. Abhay Charan Mukerji. Allahabad.

Satish Kumar

> 1967   *Rana Polity in Nepal*. New York: Asia Publishing House.]

On Reading *The Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* *

– Mahes Raj Pant

A good edition of the earliest *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 Vajrācārya 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,[1] nobody had prepared an exhaustive text-edition and translation of this important *Vaṃśāvalī*, though some scholars have dealt with it on a rather piecemeal basis. Although Luciano Petech took the initiative in producing a text-edition in 1958, he confined his endeavours to reproducing the relatively easier portion,[2] for which he found a parallel version.[3] The only ambitious publication was a not completely successful attempt at its editing and partial translation made by Naraharinath in 1959.[4]

---

*   Dhanavajra Vajrācārya and Kamal P. Malla, *The Gopālarāja-vaṃśāvalī*. A facsimile edition prepared by the NEPAL RESEARCH CENTRE in collaboration with the NATIONAL ARCHIVES, Kathmandu. With an introduction, a transcription, Nepali and English translations, a glossary and indices (Nepal Research Centre Publications No. 9). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985. iii + xxvi + 238 pp.

1.   Bendall 1903:1-3.

2.   Petech 1958: Appendix VI.

3.   *Ibid.*: Appendix V.

4.   Naraharinath 1959:9-34.

     I ignore both D. Regmi's reproduction of the *Vaṃśāvalī* (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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* manuscript, the latter, according to Malla, 'apparently photographed at the turn of the century when the manuscript was in a 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 so[7] and not yet the great connoisseuer 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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).

8. Tewari *et al.* 1964:(1). N. Pant 1986: 'Upodghāta' (introduction): 22.

9. G. Vajrācārya 1962:8. D. Vajrācārya *et al.* 1962:289. D. Pant 1974:118. M. Pant 1974:161, 1975:253, 1975a:16-17, 1977:99,

---

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

> Dhanavajra Vajrācārya had prepared a Devanāgarī tran- scription 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.

(p. iv)

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]

1977b:300. M. Pant and Sharma 1977:11, note 37. Slusser 1982:433.

10. Bendall 1903:3.

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.'[12] He
made himself content 'in the hope of drawing the attention of the few
scholars skilled in the Himalayan languages to the matter'.[13]

Malla says that 'the manuscript has hitherto remained an intimidating
experience for most students of history' (p. ii), thus making it sound as
though the Vajrācārya/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, Petech could still
say: 'The old Newari in which they [i.e., the *Vaṃsāvalī*-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.'[14]

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 V$_2$ [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.

(p. iv)

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

---

12.   *Ibid.*:4.

13.   *Ibid.*: 5.

14.   Petech 1958:7.

---

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 *Vaṃsāvalī* (pp. 1-24). Then come the Devanagari
transcription (pp. 25-72) of the *Vaṃsāvalī* and Nepali translation (pp.
73-120) of the same, both done by Vajrācārya. 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 *Vaṃsāvalī*. This latter does not follow
Vajrācārya blindly, but is the outcome of an 'inductive test of the
validity of [Vajrācārya'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 Vaṃsāvalī* (pp. 205-213) and
those of the so-called *Abridged Vaṃsāvalī* (pp. 223-228). Appendix B is
a transcription of the *Kaisher Vaṃsāvalī* made by Vajrācārya (pp. 215-
222). The remaining two, drawn up by Malla, are, first, a comparative
chart of the king-lists of the three older *Vaṃsāvalī*-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
Vaṃsāvalī 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 Vajrācārya's and Malla's joint venture.

The *Vaṃśāvalī* does not have a title. As it was discovered by Bendall, later scholars paid their tribute by calling it the *Bendall Vaṃśāvalī*. 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 Hara Prasād Śāstrī, and dating from 1852 onwards), names the text more appropriately the *Gopālavaṃśādiprācīna-rājavaṃśāvalī*, 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 *Gopālavaṃśāvalī*[17] or *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*.[18]

It was already noticed by its discoverer that the *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 Lévi (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: *Vaṃśāvalī*₁ and *Vaṃśāvalī*₂.

(p. iii)

---

15. Petech 1958, as quoted on p. ii.

16. M. Pant 1987:7-8.

17. E.g. Naraharinath 1953:36-37.

18. E.g. D. Vajrācārya and Nepal 1954:5.

19. Bendall 1903: 3.

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 daṇḍas occurs in the original MS. at the end of fol. 36ª, 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 *Bhāṣāvaṃśāvalī* written in the Nepali language contains an extract of the present *Vaṃśāvalī* as an integral part of it.[22] In the same paper I have shown the similarities in content between the two *Vaṃśāvalī*-s.[23] In addition, the Nepali-language *Vaṃśāvalī* refers in the beginning to a kind of text designated as *Rājabhogamālā*.[24] Such a title aptly suits this genre of writing, as the subject matter of the *Vaṃśāvalī*-s is not far from dynastic history. Also suggestive is the fact that the portion of the traditional annals in Orissa

---

20. *Ibid.*:4.

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 *Vaṃśāvalī* is concerned.

22. M. Pant 1974:171-172.

23. *Ibid.*:167-171.

24. *Ibid.*:162-163.

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 *svastiḥ bhūtavṛtāntara*[27] *likhitañ ca śṛnu* (30b:5), i.e. 'Hail. Also listen to another written *bhūtavṛtta*',[28] which neither Vajrācārya nor Malla translate completely.[29]

Though V[1] was composed for the glorification of King Sthitirājamalla, it is highly likely that the author did not write the *Vaṃśāvalī* at the king's instance. If the king wanted to have this *Vaṃśāvalī* written, he could have hired a better pundit, one comparable with the poet who

---

25. Dash 1978:360,361,362,363.

26. Cf. p. i with Slusser and G. Vajrācārya 1973:79, note 3; and M. Pant 1974:161-162.

27. Vajrācārya reads *tā* and *ra* in *vṛtāntara*˙ as the *ttā* and the *r* with a *virāma* sign respectively, which goes against the original (M. Pant 1987:19).

28. Nepal 1988:5.

29. Vajrācārya translates the sentence as *kalyāṇa hos I bhaeko vṛttānta lekhirākheko sunnuhos* I (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 *vṛtāntara* in which the second *akṣara* is incorrectly degeminated and which stands for *vṛtāntara = vṛtta + antara* as *vṛttānta = vṛtta + anta*, thus ignoring *ra*, which, as said already, Vajrācārya reads as an *r* with a *virāma* sign.

---

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 Paśupati by Jayasiṃharāma, formerly Sthitirāja's arch enemy and later subordinate to him.[31] The portion which follows V[1] seems to be written not for the reader but only for the chronicler's own use. It should be remembered that, unlike V[1], that portion is not written in the divine but in the profane language and, in addition, it records the reconsecration of the lingam of Paśupati (54a:3-4).[32]

Though Bendall noted 'a perfectly wild absence of syntax' in the Sanskrit of the present *Vaṃśāvalī*, he found a 'method in its madness':

> Scientific students of the vernaculars may probably find 'method in its madness.' The frequent locution तेन कृतः or कृत for स कृतवान् or स अकरोत् 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

---

30. The only inscription so far discovered that Sthitirājamalla himself had executed is far better in its diction and grammar than the present *Vaṃśāvalī*. For the inscription, see Acharya and N. Pant 1953:46-48.

31. For Jayasiṃharāma, 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, y, j, n, w* are geminated following non-vocalized–*r*, giving us *mm*, for *ma*, *yy* for *ya*, *jj* for *ja*, *nn* for *na* and *ww* for *wa*.

(p. xx)

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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* is concerned exclusively with orthography, and thus not to the point. Nor is the example Bendall has cited a fitting one, since *tena kṛtaḥ* is in accordance with the norms of Sanskrit grammar. Bendall could have cited, though, the sentence *tena śukradine nāṭika sudhanapāla kṛtavān* (25a:4) in order to prove the influence of Modern Indo-Aryan languages. That the *Vaṃśāvalī* geminates the consonant which is followed by an *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. Pāṇini VIII.4.46). Such being the case, such examples cited by Malla to prove a 'method in madness' in the Sanskrit of the present *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *Vaṃśāvalī*.

Something should be said about the unconventional transliteration of Sanskrit words found in the English portion of *The Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*. The present publication shows some improvement in this respect from Malla's past endeavours,[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 Dhumāśva (p. 122), Kṛsāśva (p. 122), Kāñci (p. 123), Śupuṣpa° (p. 123), Aṃśuvarmā (p. 125), Naxāl (p. 126), Kailāsa° (pp. 129, 139),

---

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.

Phālguṇa (pp. 129, 135, 136 etc.), Dvitīyā Āṣāḍha (pp. 135, 136, 142, 151), Pharpiṅg (p. 136), Māgh (p. 139), *vandha* (p. 140), Brāhmans (pp. 145, 148), Kārtik (p. 145), Tritīyā (p. 146), Āyusmāna (p. 152), Phālguṇī (pp. 158, 159), Prathamā Āṣāḍha (p. 164), *Triśaktti* (last page) and *diwasapurskār* (last page). Most puzzling, too, is Vaiśākha 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 *ba* from *va* throughout the manuscript. *Va* has traditionally been reserved for transcribing the indented form of the letter, and *ba* the unindented form,[35] but our manuscript, in fact, does not have any indented forms.[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 *deba* as *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 b-sound both in Sanskrit and the vernacular, once as *bālarāmāyana* (29a:3, MS. reads *na*) and the other time as *vālarāmāyana* (57a:5, MS. similarly reads *na*).

Another distraction is the misrepresentation of some of the ligatures by breaking them up into two *akṣara*-s, which can easily be avoided in Devanagari (e.g. *ḍ* + *yu* for *dyu* (17a:2), *ṅ* + *gā* for *ṅgā* (17a:3), *ṭ* + *mā* for *tmā* (17a:4)). One ligature, *hra*, has not been disjoined but still is annoyingly similar to *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 *grabhakrtaṃ* (21b:1) and *bhaṭārika-pratiṣṭhitaṃ* (24a:1-2), the dividing of a single word into two fragments, as *vaṃ tho* (33b:5), and the separating of compound words, as *vṛhat puskaraṇī* (24b:2),[37] for which no reason can be found. It is also

---

35.   Śākya 1974:45.

36.   There is perhaps a solitary instance in the facsimile: *va* in *divasa* (37a:4) looks indented.

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

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. *vyavahā ra* 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 ৭. 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: *anusvāra*[39] or *m* with the *virāma* sign.[40]

In Bengali script the ৭ 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 ৭.[42] As the Bengali and Newari scripts can be grouped under the eastern varieties of the Nāgarī alphabet because of their marked resemblance, the *anusvāra*-ness of the symbol ৭ 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 *akṣara*.

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 latter[43] and

---

38.   Rajbanshi: 1974:*lipicitra* 26 = plate 33.

39.   E.g. Bendall 1886:84-85 = inscription IX, Ojha 1918:78 = plate 33, Śākya 1974:71.

40.   E.g. Tewari *et al.* 1961:13.

41.   Chatterji 1975:xxxii, §177 (ii) (a), §§ 283-284.

42.   Banerji 1919:92.

43.   *Siddhāntakaumudī* on Pāṇini VIII.2.1; *Yājñavalkyaśikṣā*, under verse 93[d]. See also Abhyankar and Shukla 1977:106, 313-314.

is the usual sign of nasality in the Taittirīya tradition.[44] It is also one of the symbols for *gūṃkāra*[45] which, in the tradition of the Vājasaneyin-s, replaces an *anusvāra* that follows a short vowel and preceeds 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 inscriptions[47] 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 ৭ to be found throughout the

---

44.   Whitney 1973:69.

45.   E.g. cf. the *gūṃkāra* sign in the *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* X.18 with the one presented in Panta Parvatiya 1946:207-208.

46.   *Kātyāyanapariśiṣṭapratijñāsūtra* 3.

47.   M. Pant and Sharma 1977:6 (inscription, l. 4), 26 (inscription, l. 7).

48.   *Ibid.*: 7, note 16a.

49.   N. Pant, Bhandari and D. Pant 1978. Nepal 1983.

50.   Kölver and Śākya 1985:28.

51.   *Ibid.*: 29, note 10.

manuscript as the *m* with the *virāma* sign[52] without further comment, though most of the transcribers of the manuscript read it as an *anusvāra*.[53]

The text as established by Vajrācārya represents 48 folios of relatively small-size palm-leaves consisting of less than 21,000 *akṣara*-s.[54] 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*: *kṛtaṃ* (24a:2), *hmaṃ* (29b:3), *thāparapaṃ* (32a:2), *hasyaṃ* (45b:5), *limchi°* (55a:1), *lulyaṃ* (55b:5)), and in a few instances as *m* without a vertical stroke joined with the following consonant: *kelāsapūjanamkr°* (25b:5), *paramparāvu* (55b:5). 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: *kṛtaṃ devulaṃ* (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: *kelāsapūjanamkṛtaṃ* (25b:5). His astounding inconsistency in transcribing the same symbol occurring in a single line is seen in the following words: *lulyaṃ ... dvālyaṃ paramparāvu* (55b:5).

53. Bendall 1903:10, 11, 12; Petech 1958:Appendix VI; Naraharinath 1959:9-25 (In one instance, he reads the symbol as *ña 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 *vaṃsa* is pronounced as *vañsa*.); 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) × 32 = 20,800 *akṣara*-s.

---

and refer readers to a separate publication of mine for these corrections[55], no less than 350 in number.[56]

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 *Vaṃsāvalī* 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[57] and his own general knowledge, Vajrācārya has ably reconstructed in his translation many of the names referred to in the *Vaṃsāvalī* 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: Marīci for Marīcī (18b:2-3), Sagara for Śagara (18b:5), Aṃsumān for Saṃsumāna (19a:1), Bhagīratha for Bhagīrathī (19a:1), Kalmāṣapāda[58] for Kannyākhapāda (19a:2), Śaṅkhaṇa[59] for Saṅkhana (19a:2) and Kuśa for Kuśa (19a:4).

Regrettably, both Vajrācārya and Malla repeat errors in the *Vaṃsāvalī* which were already corrected by Naraharinath. For example, in the case of Kaśyapa, Marīci's son and Sūrya's (i.e. the sun's) father, as usual, the *Vaṃsāvalī* wrongly spells the name as Kāsyapa (18b:3). Vajrācārya corrects only the *sa* to *śa* but fails to shorten *kā* to *ka*, which Malla copies exactly, though Naraharinath had already presented the name in question as Kaśyapa.

---

55. M. Pant 1987:18-23.

56. The list excludes the errors concerning the ꜣ symbol.

57. Naraharinath 1959:26.

58. Malla spells the same name in his translation once as Kalmāṣa° and then as Kalmāsa°.

59. Naraharinath retains in his translation the dental *n* of the original, but Vajrācārya correctly (cf. *Raghuvaṃśa* 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 Purāṇic sources which we encounter in the *Vaṃśāvalī*. 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 Malla. 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 Māndhātṛ's father, as the *Vaṃśāvalī* states. His actual name is Yuvanāśva, which the scribe failed to record correctly. Similarly, both Vajrācārya and Malla have taken a royal name, listed among the solar race as Paśuśruva (19a:3), as being in fact Paśuśruva, as Naraharinath himself does.[60] The correct name is Prasuśruta, which has two elements, *pra* and *su*, prefixed to the root *śru* taking the *kta*-affix.

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

> *athaḥ puna ikṣvākuvaṃśa viśāla ꣿ ‖ viśālaputra hemacandra ‖*
> *hemacandraputraḥ sucandraḥ ‖ sucandraputraḥ dhūmāśva ‖*
> *dhūmāśvaputra śrmjayaḥ śrmjayaputraḥ suvarṇṇakhatī ‖*
> *suvarṇṇakhatīputraḥ kṛśāśva ‖ kṛśāśvaputraḥ somadatta ‖*
> *somadattaputraḥ janmejaya ‖ janmejayaputraḥ paramita ‖*
> *paramitaputraḥ matimān ‖ matimānputraḥ vikvakṣi,*

(19a:5 - 19b:2).[61]

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[62] into the palatal. Though he retains in his

---

60.   Naraharinath reads the name in the original once as Paśuśruva and immediately after that as Paśuśruva. Howevei, it should be stressed that neither reading is faithful to the original.

61.   The reading presented above and elsewhere in this paper is collated with the original.

62.   It is to be noted that Naraharinath reads in the original Kṛśāśva and Vikukṣi.

---

translation the palatal *s* in Śrmjaya, 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 Malla retain both incorrect forms, i.e. Śrmjaya[63] and Janmejaya, of the original – one left out and the other corrected by Naraharinath. But they emend Paramita[64] to Parikṣit,[65] which Naraharinath did not correct.

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

> *viśālasya suto rājā hemacandro mahābalaḥ ‖*
> *sucandra iti vikhyāto hemacandrād anantaraḥ ǀ*
> *sucandratanayo rājā dhūmrāśva iti viśrutaḥ ‖*
> *dhūmrāśvatanayo vidvān sṛñjayaḥ samapadyata ǀ*
> *sṛñjayasya sutaḥ śrīmān sahadevaḥ pratāpavān ‖*
> *kṛśāśvaḥ sahadevasya putraḥ paramadhārmikaḥ ǀ*
> *kṛśāśvasya mahātejāḥ somadattaḥ pratāpavān ‖*

---

63.   Malla spells the same word in his translation both times with the homorganic nasal, once as Sṛñjaya, and immediately after that as Srñjaya, though Vajrācārya spells it both times as Śrmjaya 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.

somadattasya rājarṣeḥ suto' bhūj janamejayaḥ |

janamejayātmajaś caiva pramatir nāma viśrutaḥ ||

tṛnabinduprasādena sarve vaiśālakā nṛpāḥ |

dīrghāyuṣo mahātmāno vīryavantaḥ sudhārmikāḥ ||[66]

As said above, the pedigree of the kings contained in the passage above largely agrees with that of King Viśāla given in the present *Vaṃśāvalī*. To be specific, of the twelve generations enumerated in the *Vaṃśāvalī*, the ten generations from the *Brahmāṇḍa-* and *Vāyupurāṇa-*s by and large are the same, barring only one name, i.e. the name of Sṛñjaya's son or Kṛśāśva's father. The name in question is in our *Vaṃśāvalī* Suvarṇa-khatī[67] and in the *Purāṇa-*s Sahadeva. Minor differences are the Dhūmrāśva, Janamejaya and Pramati of the *Purāṇa-*s having become in the *Vaṃśāvalī* Dhūmāśva, Janmejaya and Paramita. Still other differences result from the change of the palatal *ś* 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 it literally means 'causing a man to tremble', it is an apt name for an absolute monarch.

Vajrācārya's and Malla's emendation of the *Vaṃśāvalī-*s Paramita to Parikṣit results from a deplorable ignorance of Purāṇic lore. They took the Janamejaya of the *Vaṃśāvalī* 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

---

66.   Kirfel 1979:304-305.

67.   Naraharinath retains the name found in the *Vaṃśāvalī* in his translation, changing the long *i* into a short one: Suvarṇakhati, whereas Vajrācārya and Malla change the meaningless *khatī* to *khani* in their respective translations. I take no notice of the geminated *ṇ* in Suvarṇṇakhatī in this context.

68.   Sörensen 1978:351-353. Mani 1979:345-347.

Hindus. Thus it is beyond doubt that the *Vaṃśāvalī*'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 *yuddhiṣṭi*[70]*rasyādirājye* (17a:2). It has been translated by Vajrācārya as *yudhiṣṭhirako ādirājyamā* (p. 73), i.e. 'in the first kingdom of Yudhiṣṭhira', whereas Malla converts it into 'in the kingdom of Yudhiṣṭhira' (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.   It is to be noted that one of the editions of the *Vāyupurāṇa* offers Pramiti as a variant of Pramati (cf. Ānandāśrama Press 1905:312 (chapter 86, verse 21, note 2)), a form closer to the one found in the present *Vaṃśāvalī*.

70   Vajrācārya consistently reads the ligature *sta* as *stha* whenever the form in the MS. is *sta* (cf. M. Pant 1987:18-23).

'after this'. Malla analyses it correctly as 'with his own hands' (p. 143) (*thava* = 'one's own' and *lāna* 'with hands').[71]

However, it is not always so. One instance is the name Trisankara (18b:4), which Vajrācārya correctly reconstructs in his translation as Triśanku (p. 74), which Naraharinath had already done.[72] 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 Vajrācārya 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 untranslated. The *Vaṃśāvalī* describes here and there performances of dance 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 *Rāmāyaṇa* drama was staged when the prince Dharmamalla, the eldest son of Sthitirājamalla, was born (29a:2). Another *Rāmāyaṇa* drama, probably modelled after Rājaśekhara's *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, was performed when the same prince was invested with

---

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

72. Naraharinath 1959:26.

the sacred thread (29a:2-4, 57a:4-5).[73] To denote the latter ceremony the *Vaṃśāvalī* author employs the word *vaḍūkarṇṇa*,[74] a corruption of *vaṭukaraṇa*, meaning 'the making of a Brahmacārin', which is omitted by both Vajrācārya (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 *vaṭukaraṇa* (pp. 113, 159) – a form which leads the reader to question their competence in Sanskrit[75] – but without

---

73. To mark the wedding ceremony of the same prince a drama, entitled *Bhairavānanda*, composed by Maṇika, 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 *Vaṃśāvalī*. The ill-educated chronicler spells the title of the drama once as *Bhervvānanda* (61a:3) and the next time as *Bheravānanda* (62a:3). Similarly, he spells the dramatist's name as Manaku Bhā, with the title Paṇḍyā (61a:4), and the next time as Manaku Bhāro, in which the title Pāṇḍyā is prefixed (62a:4). A fact worth mentioning is that Paṇḍiyā Manaku Bhāro has been mentioned in the present *Vaṃśāvalī* in connection with the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* 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 Paṇḍiyā Manaku Bhāro and the Paṇḍyā Manaku Bhā or Pāṇḍyā Manaku Bhāro, mentioned in the context of the *Bhairavānanda*, is Maṇika, who authored the *Bhairavānandanāṭaka*. Since Maṇika's *Bhairavānanda* was significantly influenced by the *Karpūramañjarī*, Rājaśekhara's well-known *saṭṭaka* (see also Adhikari, Bhaṭṭarai and Tamot (1992:113), it is highly probable that the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* with which Maṇika is related seems to be modelled after Rājaśekhara's drama bearing the same title. One of my forthcoming papers deals with the influence of the *Karpūramañjarī* upon the *Bhairavānanda*.

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

75. As the word in question takes the *cvi*-affix (cf. Pāṇini 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. Pāṇini VII. 4.26). See also the entry *vaṭūkaraṇa* in *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* II.7.1[c-d].

explanation. One's curiosity is satisfied only by referring to the glossary under *vaḍukarṇṇa*. 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, *puṣpābhiṣeka* or *puṣyābhiṣeka*, it being difficult to decide whether the ligature is *spa* or *sya*. However, there is no doubt that there exists a kind of royal consecration known as *Puṣyābhiṣeka*, 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:

> *yasa vidhānako antyamā purohitadvārā mantrieko puṣpa ādi*
> *māṅgalika vastu rājāko śiramā rākhine hunāle yo abhiṣeka*
> *"puṣpābhiṣeka" kahalieko ho* | [76]

'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 *"puṣpābhiṣeka."* '[77]

This, needless to say, echoes the acceptance of the reading *puṣparatha* instead of *puṣyaratha* 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'.[78] 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 *puṣyābhiṣeka* which, in the later period, 'became independent of any fixed period',[79] even as the royal chariot meant for the coronation was known as *puṣyaratha*.

As some of the Nepalese kings who reigned in the period between the years 1167-1381 underwent a consecration known as *puṣyābhiṣeka*, I have previously gathered references from the Śāstric texts and refuted the

---

76.   D. Vajrācārya 1975:5.

77.   Translated in M. Pant 1977:109.

78.   For *puṣyaratha*, see M. Pant 1977:110-116.

79.   Petech 1984:69.

content of the statement just quoted above.[80] Though Petech endorses these findings and accepts the reading with the ligature *sya*,[81] Vajrācārya still needs convincing (25b:2; 26a:1, 3, 5; 27b:1). In other cases, however, he reads the same ligature *sya* instead of *spa* (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 *puṣpābhiseṣa/puṣpābhiseka/puṣpabhiṣeka* and *puṣya/poṣya/ pauṣya*, one wonders why Vajrācārya insists on retaining *puṣpābhiṣeka* 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 (= *viṣṇupratimā tāvre śilā vā*) in various places (22a:3-4). Both translators omit the word *śilā* 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 *bhṛṅgāreśvaraḥ bhaṭārika* (17a:3) and *bhṛṅgāreśvarī bhaṭārikā* (17a:4)[82] on the same page. Both translators interpret both phrases simply as 'Bhṛṅgāreśvara Bhaṭṭāraka' (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, Bhṛṅgāreśvara bhaṭārika (correctly bhaṭṭāraka) is followed by Gotmeśvara (correctly Gautameśvara) and others, whom in turn Bhṛṅgāreśvarī bhaṭārikā (correctly bhaṭṭārikā) follows, as the text tells us (17a:3-4).

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

---

80.   M. Pant 1975a:13-27 and 1977:93-109.

81.   Petech 1984:69.

82.   I see no reason for joining these two independent words as if they
       were a compound.

known as Śleṣmāntakavana in native Purānic literature,[83] the goddess wandered not far from the place where the Paśupati temple later stood. Guhyeśvarī is enshrined in a temple which lies within the Śleṣmāntaka area, and a *bhṛṅgāra*, i.e. 'golden pitcher', represents this formless goddess, so that I am tempted to identify Bhṛṅgāreśvarī, which means 'the goddess [in a] *bhṛṅgāra*', with the goddess Guhyeśvarī. 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* in the following words:

> *vāriṣo vṛṣṭi ākāmkṣanāya kāmenah śrīpaśupatibhaṭārikāya mahānāga nirjjityaḥ tasya maniyukte ganadeva nāma kośa kṛta ⸱ praḍhokita ⸱ tatprabhāvāt mahāvṛṣṭi kṛtam ⸱ prajā sukhībhavati ||*

(21a:4-21b:1)

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

> Having conquered the great Nāga (= *mahānāga nirjjityaḥ*), a treasure (= *kośa*), named Ganadeva (= *ganadeva nāma*), was made (= *kṛtam*) with its [i.e., Nāga's] jewel (= *tasya maniyukte*) [and] offered (= *praḍhokitam*) to the venerable lord Paśupati (= *śrīpaśupatibhaṭārikāya*), by one desirous of rainfall (= *vāriṣo vṛṣṭi ākāmkṣanāya kāmenah*). Out of the influence of that (= *tataprabhāvāt*), heavy rain (= *mahāvṛṣṭi*) was caused (= *kṛtam*). The subjects (*prajā*), become happy (*sukhībhavati*).

Both translators miss the central meaning and offer translations without taking into account the words *nirjjityaḥ* and *tasya*. They translate *nirjjityaḥ* as 'sādhanā gariyo' (p. 77), i.e. 'a propitiation was made' in

---

83.   E.g. *Himavatkhaṇḍa*, chapters 78-81.

84.   Naraharinath 1959:26.

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 *Vaṃśāvalī* on those kings usually regarded as mythological. The *Vaṃśāvalī*, 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: *kalpānte bhagavate viṣṇuḥ jalaśayane, nābhikamalodbhavān || brahmā prādurbhūtaḥ ||* (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, Vajrācārya as *viṣṇuko nāitorūpī kamala* (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 *mukhakamala*, *karakamala* or *caraṇakamala*. Malla, who claims the inductive test for the validity of Vajrācārya's translation, should at least have recalled the scene from the mythological pictures hung on the walls of traditional Śivamārgins' dwellings before slavishly translating Vajrācārya'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 *Vaṃśāvalī* describes how Paśupati was discovered (17a:4-17b:1). It contains a clause: *tatapaścāt mālākhātaḥ gogrāmasya, āgamena* (17a:4-5), which the two translators interpret quite differently. Vajrācārya translates the clause as '*tyasapachi mālākhābāta gogrāmako āgamana bhayo*' (p. 73), i.e. 'after that the arrival of the Gogrāma from Mālākhā took place', whereas Malla offers the following: 'They (the Gopālas) came from

---

85.   *Ibid*.: 27.

86.   E.g. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* IX.1.8-9 and *Devīmāhātmya* inserted into the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* I. 66-70.

Mālākhā to Gogrāma' (p. 121). Even though Vajrācārya's interpretation is syntactically closer to the original than Malla's, it does not solve the problem left by Naraharinath of what *gogrāma* really means.[87] Malla interprets the word *gogrāma* as a place-name (see Gogrāma in Index of Place-names). If this is correct it can be translated as a 'cow village'. Before accepting Malla'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 *grāma* as the last member of compounds, in which it means a multitude or collection of anything.[88] Indeed I have come across the compound *gogrāma* itself in the sense of 'herd of cows'.[89] In view of this I suggest that *gogrāma* means a multitude of cows. This suits the context, as many cows (*gogrāma*) would have been pastured around the place where Paśupati 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* tells us (37a:5 - 37b:1). The text says that they did this by attacking the *bhaṇḍasāla*, which Vajrācārya in his Nepali translation spells with the palatal *s*, and Malla 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 Bhaṇḍasāla in Index of Place-names). But surely *bhaṇḍasāla* is a variant of Sanskrit *bhaṇḍaśālā*, in an attested meaning of 'store-house'.[90] Its several derivatives in modern Indo-Aryan languages convey more or less the same meaning as the Sanskrit word does.[91] In present-day Newari its derivative, *bhaṃsāḥ*, means 'the office which collects

87.   Naraharinath 1959:26.

88.   E.g. Pāṇini VI.2.84; *Mahābhārata* III.306.1-2, VI.73.13; *Bhagavadgītā* VIII.19, IX.8; *Manusmṛti* II.215; *Kāśikāvṛtti* on Pāṇini VI.2.84; Amara III. 3.141; *Bhagavatapurāṇa* I.3.29; *Abhidhānaratnamālā* V. 25[a–b]; *Viśvaprakāśa*, Māntavarga 14[c–d].

89.   *Mahābhārata* (Poona ed.) I.805. 1-5 pr.

90.   Böhtlingk and Roth 1868: *s.v. bhaṇḍaśālā*. Monier-Williams 1899: *s.v. bhaṇḍa*.

91.   Turner 1973, word no. 9441.

customs duties'.[92] I have come across the word in a document more than two hundred and fifty years old, where its spelling is *bhansāra*.[93] One should remember that *bhaṇḍa* also means in Sanskrit 'goods for sale'.[94] Indic textbooks on arithmetic contain problems concerning the exchange of goods which do not have the same price. This law is known as *bhaṇḍapratibhaṇḍa* which can be translated as 'goods for goods'.[95] The *Arthaśāstra*, in describing the duty of the collector of customs and tolls, repeats the word *bhaṇḍa* several times in reference to goods arriving for clearance,[96] and though in classical Sanskrit *śulkaśālā* is more expressive of a customs house,[97] the word *bhaṇḍaśālā* may also have conveyed the same meaning.

As the present *Vaṃśāvalī* states, when Harasiṃhadeva, the king of Tirhut, was defeated by the Sultān of Delhi, he together with his family and other nobility left Simarāvana Garh and took to the hills. The ill-starred ex-king breathed his last in Ṭimpāṭa, and the local administration detained the deceased ex-king's son and minister, who asked for asylum. But Majhī Bhāro of Rājagāma took all their wealth (cf. 46a:4 - 46b:2).

The Rājagāma of the *Vaṃśāvalī* (46b:1) was known as Rājagaū up to around two centuries back[98] and is called Rājagaū nowadays.[99] It lies on the bank of the Tamakoshi in the district of Ramechap and is 25 miles to

92.   Manandhar (1986:*s.v. bhaṃsāḥ*) gives *bhandasāla* (*sic*) as the Old Newari form of present-day *bhaṃsāḥ*.

93.   Rajbanshi 1983:60.

94.   *Pañcatantra* I.18 and the passage in prose following the verse. *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* X. 10, XLI. 8.

95.   E.g. *Līlāvatī*, Bhaṇḍapratibhaṇḍaka section. See also Datta and Singh 1935:226-227.

96.   II.21.12, 15, 18, 26, 29, 30, 31.

97.   *Arthaśāstra* II. 21.1. *Kāśikāvṛtti* on Pāṇini IV.3.75.

98.   Khanal 1970:51.

99.   *Ibid.*, MM 1975:163, Jest 1977:5. However, the map enclosed in MM spells the name as Rājagaū, which seems to be sheer oversight.

the north-west of Tin Patan (The *Vaṃśāvalī*'s Ṭimpāta), 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, *majhiā*.[101]

A tribe[102] known as Mājhī, or alternatively as *Boṭe*,[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 *rājagāmayā majhī bhāro dhāyāna* (46b:1-2) is thus not really a problem. Both translators, however, neglecting the word *majhī*, simply offer the translations '*rājagrāmakā bhārādārale*'(p. 102) and 'the noble of Rājagrāma' (p. 149). In addition, they have failed to account for the presence of the word *dhāyāna*, which simply corresponds to '*bhannele*' in

---

100. Paudel 1985:51-52 and 1988:2. According to a copperplate issued by the Śāha king Gīrvāṇa, dated Friday, the 15th of the bright half of Caitra, in Vikrama Saṃvat (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).

101. Turner 1973, word no. 9714.

102. However, one should take note of Jest's following remark (1977:4): 'In this area, the Kuswar are known as <u>majhi</u> which includes the Danuwar, as well as all fishermen and those who are in charge of the ferries (<u>ghat</u>), 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 Boṭe tribes are one and the same. I leave this problem to ethnologists.

104. For *Mājhī/Boṭe*, see Bista 1972:128-133, Koirala 1968:18-20, Jest 1977:1-45, Paudel 1985:49-64 and 1988:1-15, Sharma Paudyal 1985:8-43, Thapaliya 1988, Subba 1989.

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 (*bhāro*) 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 '*rājagāmakā majhī bhāro bhannele*' in Nepali and 'a man called Mājhī Bhāro 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 *Amarakoṣa* which is contemporaneous with the present *Vaṃśāvalī*, and another gloss made more than a century and a quarter later have the equivalent *majhi* for Amara's *mahāmātya* or *pradhāna* (II.8.5[a]), meaning a 'prime minister', Kashinath Tamot suggests that this is what the word occurring in the *Vaṃśāvalī* means.[106]

We come now to those errors which are more justifiable in nature. A first group results from a misreading of *akṣara*-s. Thus Vajrācārya reads one sentence as such: *samvat 503 cetra śudi 10 śrīkochem bhaṭārikasa lu pvahrohra khaṭayā dumtā mi yogigaṇuna* ‖ (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 *Vaṃśāvalī* some 32 folios later, where Vajrācārya reads the pertinent sentence as follows: *thva lānavu thova eṇiśi śukravāra kothochem bhahrīhrisa khaṭayā lum pahrohra duntā, yajamāna, lachakoyāni yogigaṇūnaḥ* ‖ ‖ (61a:2-3). In the former sentence the *ni* joined with *yogigaṇuna* and in the latter sentence the *ni* separated from *lachakoyā* and joined with *yogigaṇūnaḥ* thus yield the same result.

Both translators interpret the first sentence to mean that the grantors are *yogigaṇa* = 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

---

105. D. Vajrācārya *et al.* 1962:233-234.

106. Tamot 1992:26, 50.

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

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

Both entries record that *Niyogin*-s donated a golden roof for a chariot (*khaṭa*) of a certain deity (*bhaṭarika* in the first and *bhahrīhri* 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 Phālguna. 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': *thva lāsavu* (61a:1) or *thva lānavu* (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 Phālguna in N.S. 503.[107] The two dates record two different events: the Niyogin-s donated a golden roof for the chariot of the *Bhaṭārika* (*Bhaṭṭāraka* = god) of Kochem after the lapse of one complete month from the time the same kind of roof was donated for the chariot of Bhahrīhri (*Bhaṭṭārikā* = 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/Khaḍgī or Sahe/Sahi.[108] It is to be

---

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 *ghaṭī*-s and 35 *pala*-s.

108. M. Pant 1988:1-4. See also *Id.* 1988a:5-11 and 1988b:12-13.

noted that one of the present-day appellations 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 '*ṭhulo 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 *Vamsāvalī* is written, a little stroke bent cursively downward at the left end of the head-mark of an *akṣara* with a right-hand vertical stroke is used. Vajrācārya missed this, and what he reads as *vāsa* 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 three verses of the Sanskrit portion. The first is in *Upajāti* and enumerates five main duties of a king, and the remaining two, in *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, extol Sthitirājamalla'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, *Yogayātrā* Chapter II– KPM' (p. 133).

Though I do not possess a printed copy of the *Yogayātrā*, 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,

---

109. M. Pant 1987:46, note 157. See also Sharma 1991–93:142, 144, 146, 148.

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

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 *Vaṃsávalī* reads the first *pāda* as *dustasya 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 *Yogayātrā* has been replaced by *svajanasya* in the present *Vaṃsávalī*. 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 *Vaṃsávalī* 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),[112] 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 *Yogayātrā* but two different texts, namely, the *Vikramacarita* and the *Subhāsitārṇava*. He accepts the correct reading as being *sujanasya* and cites the deviant reading, i.e. *svajanasya*, in a footnote, having found it in the *Subhāsitārṇava*.[113]

In spite of his success in locating the verse in question in the *Yogayātrā*, it is unfortunate that Malla fails to discard the corrupt reading in the *Vaṃsávalī*, 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 *dustasya dandah* and consequently translates the same corrupt reading as '*svajana (āphnā mānisa) laī 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.[114]

The verses in *Sárdūlavikrīdita* 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

---

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

113. Böhtlingk 1966:verse no. 2890.

114. Naraharinath 1959:31.

verse but not the second. The first verse tells us that Sthitirājamalla was crowned king twelve years (= *dvādaśa vatsarā*) after king Arjunadeva fled. The second verse begins with the words *sapurnne ravivacchare*, which remain untranslated in both renderings (pp. 86, 133), in spite of their presence in Naraharinath.[115] There is no problem at all if one recalls the numerical notation by nouns. As the sun gods are twelve in number, the word *ravi* (= the sun) followed here by *vacchare* (correctly *vatsare* = 'in the year') and *sapurnne* (correctly *sampūrnne* (=past)) 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 *dvādasa vatsarā*.

In the same verse, the chronicler gives the exact date when Sthitirāja-malla's complete ascendancy over the kingdom took place: *nepālābda-gate'bdapuskaraśare mārggāsitasyām titho*.[116] Neither in Nepali nor in English is a translation given of this. At first glance, the word-numeral *abdapuskaraśare* seems hopelessly too large: words meaning 'cloud' are recorded as representing 17 in the *Sumatitantra*, an ancient Nepalese treatise on astronomy;[117] 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,[118] 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 *nepālābdagate*. The second figure, *puskara* (correctly *puskara*), is not recorded in the manuals listing word-numerals. However, the *Sumatitantra* tells us that *puskara* is one of the word-numerals for 'three'.[119] The application of *puskara* in this meaning derives from the fact that there is a prominent place of pilgrimage called Puskara in Ajmere in Rajasthan, and it is divided into three sections, namely, *jyestha, madhyama* and *kanistha*:

---

115. *Ibid.*

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

117. *Sumatitantra*: 10. See also Rajbanshi 1974:59.

118. Ojha 1918:120.

119. *Sumatitantra*: 8-9.

collectively these are known as Tripuṣkara.[120] However, this meaning of *puṣkara* does not suit our context, since it yields N.S. 531, when Sthitirājamalla 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 *syām/syam* (in the MS. *syaṃ*), together with the month (*Mārgga*) and the fortnight (*asita*, incorrectly *asíta*): *mārggāsitāsyāṃ titho*. There is more than one possible interpretation: (*ekāda*)*syām*, (*dvāda*)*syām*, (*trayoda*)*syām* (*caturda*)*syām* or *amāvasyām* (*paurṇṇamāsyāṃ* is out of place, since the lunar fortnight is *asita*, 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.[121]

Since Sthitirājamalla'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 *Vaṃśāvalī* tells us that he assumed the reins of government when 12 years had elapsed following the flight of Arjunadeva. The *Vaṃśāvalī* states that on the 10th of the bright half of Kārttika in N.S. 489 Arjunadeva, the reigning king from the Bhonta dynasty, entered Tipura, one of the seats of power in Bhaktapur, with Jayasiṃharāma, the *mahātha* (chief minister) from Banepa. It seems that they did not obtain

120. See Monier-Williams 1899 *s.v. púshkara* 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 *ghaṭī*-s and 11 *pala*-s, Citrā for 20 *ghaṭī*-s and Śobhana for 37 *ghaṭī*-s and 49 *pala*-s, as Dinesh Raj Pant has verified.

entrance easily, as they had to breach the fort named Namvā[122] (54b:5). Sthitirājamalla 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 Jitārimalla, a Khasa king from western Nepal invaded the Kathmandu Valley, his people were massacred around the shrine of Svayambhū in Kathmandu. Their numbers amounted to *avuṭha saya*, as the *Vaṃśāvalī* says (26b:1-3).[123] Bendall interpreted the obscure word *avuṭha* as 'eight (?)',[124] which shows that he was not completely sure of this meaning. A host of later scholars, including Vajrācārya 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 *adhyuṣta* and displayed its variations in several Middle and New Indo-Aryan languages to show that it means 'three and a half'.[125] 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

122. This name in the *Vaṃśāvalī* 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 *akṣara* 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, Vajrācārya's reading of the first entry is hopelessly misleading, since he joins the first *akṣara* with the previous word and omits the *anusvāra*: *toṇa vākvāṭha*. Similarly, in the third entry, he again omits the *anusvāra* (see also p. 61 below).

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

124. Bendall 1903:9.

125. M. Pant 1985:6-24.

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.

(p. xx)

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 Vajrācārya and Malla show little enthusiasm for the conversion of the dates of the *Vaṃśāvalī*, though this is common practice when compiling exhaustive editions. Conversion fulfils the double purpose of easing authentication of statements recorded in the *Vaṃśāvalī* and accommodating modern readers who are not conversant in the antiquated system of chronometry. To be sure, Vajrācārya in his Nepali translation converts the era in the Nepāla Saṃvat (N.S.) to that of the Vikrama Saṃvat (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., Vajrācārya 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 Kārttīka, and in V.S. according to the solar reckoning from Meṣasaṅkrānti, 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

---

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).

---

example, Vajrācārya 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 Meṣasaṅkrānti of N.S. 503 falls on the 8th of the dark half of Caitra (Vaiśākha, according to the Pūrṇāntamāna system of chronometry), Vajrācārya'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 Meṣasaṅkrānti of N.S. 509 occurs on the 14th of the dark half of Caitra (Vaiśākha, in accordance with the Pūrṇāntamāna system); the corresponding Vikrama year for the 12th of the bright half of Caitra, N.S. 509 is not 1446, as Vajrācārya writes, (p. 114) but 1445, which I have already substantiated elsewhere.[127]

Though Malla states that 'this glossary lists Newārī words from V₂ alphabetically' (unnumbered page preceding p. 167) concerning the section entitled 'Glossary of Newārī Words', I am at a loss to explain the presence in it of many Sanskrit words in common use, such as *ādeśa*, *āmra*, *upādhyāya*, *ubhaya*, *dina*, *durbhikṣa*, *prākāra*, *pretakriyā*, *bandhanamukti*, *mahāmārī*, *mahāsaṃkaṣṭa*, *yajamāna*, *lokakṣaya*, *vyavahāra*, *saṃskāra*, *sampūrṇṇa*, *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 *abhiseṣa*, *ācandrāraka*, *jātrā*, *bhukampa*, *mahādrubhikṣa* and *śuputra*. 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 *aṣṭiṅ* (49a:5) and *eṇiśi* (61a:2).

Though Malla claims that 'as the orthography of the text (i.e. of the *Vaṃśāvalī* – 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: *vaḍukarṇṇa* (29a:3)[128] is missing in the

---

127. M. Pant 1974:162.

128. In actuality, the reading in the manuscript is with the long medial *u*, which Vajrācārya 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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: *apanāha sano* does not occur in 47a:5, though *apanāha yānāsa* does; *ubhejāsana* is not found in 51b:2 but in the next line; *kuncina thiva* is missing from 58b:1, though cited for there; *khaṣṭakhaṇḍā* 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 *bhahrīhrisake* (cited in the glossary as *bhahrīhri*), 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 *prabhā dumtā*, 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 Newārī words from V_2 alphabetically', no special effort is needed to detect violations of this scheme: *kadamva* precedes *katilā*, and *kalātapinisa* follows *kahrihāmāchim*. I do not understand why *ḍamḍa yānā* comes before *damna*, *tava kāhala* comes after *tavakvala vāsa* and *tyāvachi* after *tvahrate mānā*. Similarly, *loka* intervenes between *līchi* and *luyiti*.

One can also cite numerous examples of the presentation of the same word differently in the text and glossary: *cavu aṅka* (54b:1) of the text has been reproduced by joining the two separate words. *Coṅgva* (38a:2, 40a:5, 62a:4) of the text has been converted into *coṅagva*. Similarly *cvāpvaṅ* (51b:5) is represented as *cvāpvaṅa*, as if it ends in *a*. Most ludicrous is the fact that *thava sāla* (58a:1) has been changed into *thva sāla* and translated as 'this year' in the glossary (obviously the Persian word *sāl* crept into somebody's mind), though interpreted more convincingly in the English translation as 'his own brother/cousin' (p. 160). *Panīlitamne* (55b:5) of the text is nowhere available in the glossary; *litamne* (not *lītamne*) is given, but *panī* has been joined to the preceding word *gunī*. *Panīsi kohnupiṃ* of the text (53b:1) has been

converted into *nīsikonhu* (I do not know the whereabouts of the first and last *akṣara*-s of the phrase). Strangely enough, *pamta* (42a:5) has an additional nasal sound (*pamnta* in the glossary). Similarly, *lichimvu* (38a:3), *limchivu* (57b:5) or *lichivuḥ* (62b:2) of the text have been metamorphosed into *lichivuṃ*, and *vaiyakam* (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 *vaṃdhi* (46b:1): *bamdhi*, *vacchiju*° (57a:2): *bacchiju*, *vasana* (49a:3), *basana*, *vasarapā* (43a:3): *basarapā*. 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 *bidhāna*, *bidhi*, *bivāha* and such. Ligatures with *h* are read by Vajrācārya as *h* being followed by the second consonant, e.g. *kuhnu* (62b:2), *kohnu* (41a:3), or *hlāyā* (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 Vajrācārya made later and incorporated in the corrigenda. Take, for example, *dyācamapho* of the text (62b:3), corrected in the corrigenda to *ṅyācamapho*, 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 Vajrācārya as *kinna 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. dyācamako*), 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 *lākha* (33b:3)[129] as 'limb or hand or thw (*sic*) dead body (cf. skt. *lāsa*)'. What Malla obviously had in mind was *lāsh*, a Turkish word meaning 'dead body' and current in several New Indo-Aryan languages in the same sense.

Malla's glossary has an entry *pharisajuna* (50b:2), and he interprets it as 'pairs of weapons (cf. pharasakhāna = arsenal)'. I know of no word

---

129. In reality the word is spelt in the original *lākhā* (cf. M. Pant 1987:20).

pharasakhānā meaning 'arsenal'. In all likelihood, Malla is thinking of the word *farrāshkhanah*, the compound of the Arabic word *farrāsh* meaning 'the person responsible for bedding and carpeting' with the Persian word *khānah* meaning 'house'. This is the depository of the bedding, cushions and carpets of the royal household. The word also is current in Nepali as *pharasakhānā* 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 Baithak courtyard. The place where weaponry is stored is known as *silahakhānah*, meaning 'a house for weaponry', which, like *farrāshkhānah* 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:

Word	Meaning in the Glossary	Meaning in the Translation
kula yākva (41b:5)	all the rebels; the ones who revolted	the leader of rebels (p. 144)
khāhra (49a:2)	a ditch, pit, moat	the drain (p. 152)
gumsa (36b:5)	in the forest	on the hillock (p.140)
gvalachino (46a:5)	some; some of the party	after some time (p. 149)
cānasa (55a:1)	at night	on the evening (p. 157)
ñamkapāṭa (50b:1-2)	sword ña ? iron; iron-blade, i.e., a sword	shield (p. 153)
dum pumnanā (41a:2)	encircled; surrounded	entered (p. 144)
dutamntā (in the original *duntantā*, in the text *duntamtā*) (50a:3)	offered; donated	was not allowed inside (p. 153)

duhrisi (29b:4, 30b:4)	twelfth day of a dark/ bright fortnight of a lunar month	Dvitīyā (pp. 132, 134)
pīva (56b:4)	outside/exterior	in all the four (p. 159)
pu (44b:5)	frost; hoar-frost	snowfall (p. 147)
pvam (60a:1)	snow	hail (p. 161)
pharisajuna (50b:2)	pairs of weapons	sword (p. 153)
bāsā (in the text *vāsā*) (48a:2)	ox; bull	calves (p. 151)
lim vasya (52a:4)	invading	entered (p. 155)
lichim (in the original and text - *limchi*ʼ) (35b:3)	all through	a month (p. 138)
luvasyam (48b:1)	seen; emerging	initiative (p. 151)
vā phala (58b:3)	grains	beaten rice (p. 160)

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 Kumāra; Jayadevarāja comes before Jayadeva Pvaha; and Jayānamda Rājā follows Jayānamdarāma. Similarly, Jotana Bhā is placed before Jaideva, and Jesīha 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 Bālārjunadeva (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 that name there. Similarly, Anantavarmma, referred to in the index as being mentioned in 52a:4, is not there. Ludicrously enough, the index records the presence of Upādhyā 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. Jayānaṃdarāma is listed in the index for 45b:1. However, there is Jayanaṃdarājā instead of Jayānaṃdarāma. Harṣadeva does not occur in 27a:2-3, as the index records, but exactly three folios before (24a:2-3)

As the *Vaṃśāvalī* 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,[131] and that different persons with the same name are given separate entries.[132] 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 Sīhadeva's sons, born after his elder brother Rudradeva (31b:1-4), makes clear that this is one and the same person. Similarly, the *Vaṃśāvalī* mentions Ādityamalla, a Khasa king from western Nepal, twice, first as Āditamala (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 *Vaṃśāvalī*. A third instance of this type of mistake are the citations of Gopāladeva, the ill-fated brother of the consort of Princess Nāyakadevī, and whom the *Vaṃśāvalī* also once calls Gopālacanda Kumara (49b:2) and once Gopālacandadeva (50a:3), though many times

---

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

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

---

he is referred to as Gopāladeva. Malla's index makes the entries of the same person thrice.[133] A fourth instance concerns the citations of Jagatsiṃha, who became the unofficial husband of Nāyakadevī. Malla cites three variations of his name under one entry,[134] but fails to incorporate a fourth under the same entry.[135] A fifth instance can be found in the case of Jitārimalla, Ādityamalla's father. The *Vaṃśāvalī* refers to him thrice, twice as Jayatāri (26b:1-2, 40a:2) and once with the long medial *i* in the last *akṣara* (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 Jayasiṃharāma 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:

Text	Index
Jayaśimṅa[136]rāma Mahātha Bhā (60b:2)	Jayasiṃharāma Mahātha
Jayaśimhra[137]ramaḥ Mahātha Bhā (54a:3)	Jayaśimhrarāma
Jayasimhrarāma Mahātha (29b:3, 63b:1)	Jayasimharāma Mahātha

---

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 Jagatasiṃha Kuhmara which is preceded by Jagatasiṃha Kumara.

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

136. Jayasiṃha of the text is corrected to Jayasimṅa° in the corrigenda.

137. The conjunct read as *hra* here and elsewhere should be *hṅa*.

Jayasĩmhra[138]rāma Mahātha Bhā   Jayasimharāma Mahātha Bhā
(63a:2)

Jayasimhra[139]rāma Mahātha Bhā   Jayasiharāma Mahātha Bhā
(62b:5)

Similarly, Malla cites in his index five variations of the name Jayasīhamaladeva. In reality they are eight in number. Of them, Jayaśimaladeva – with the palatal *s* and the short medial *i* and without *ha* – occurs once in 32b:2, and the same name – with the dental *s* and the long medial *i* – is attested in 40a:2. Inexplicably, Malla puts both these variations under Jayasīhamaladeva. Jayasihamaladeva – with the dental *s* – occurs twice in the text (35b:1, 36a:3), but this variation is incorporated into the same name with the palatal *s*. Though Malla cites Jayasīhadeva in 37a:4, the same name in the text includes the addition Pvaha.

Malla sometimes places two persons with the same name under a single entry, of which an example is Anantamaladeva. The *Vaṃśāvalī* 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[140] and the other on dramaturgy,[141] in N.S. 341 and 344 respectively, long before the birth of King Anantamalla.[142]

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 Bhaṇḍaśala before

---

138. Jayaśimha° of the text is corrected to Jayaśimhra° in the corrigenda.

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

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

141. M. Pant 1986:2-3.

142. Cf. Petech 1984:241, M. Pant 1986a:35-40.

Bhaktāpura and Valumkhā before Vadyara. Further examples are the placement of Yuthanimam after Yuthonimam Kvātha, Rājalakhum after Rājavihāra Dhamarecetya, Sva Deśa after Svākharakvātha, Hariśiddhi Bhahrīhri before Harikṣetra and Haripura.

Again, the same problem of confusion between *ba* and *va* bewilders the reader. Valambu (51b:4), Vugmalokeśvara (23a:4) and Vugandevala (40a:3) of the text begin with *ba* in the index. Strangely enough, Vyanāpe 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 Vanepā. Similarly, Byanāppā Kvātha of the text (47a:4) is changed to Vyanāppākvātha, though it comes in the index under the *ba*-entries.

One place-name, Asanimam, 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 Okhahmamne – exactly one page before (57a:1). The index records the presence of Kamsānakvātha 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 Kapana can be located in 50b:1 nor Kāchem in 40a:5, though the index claims their presence on those pages and lines.

Malla cites Navākvātha in 45b:4, though it occurs in the original one line later with an additional *m*-sound: Namvākvātha. Vajrācārya presents the first *akṣara* as being the last of the preceding word and omits the *anusvāra*, thus creating a new place-name, Vākvātha (see p. 101, where the Nepali translation of the passage is printed). Malla, by an 'inductive text', determines the place to be Cāpagaū (p. 148), and he enters the latter in his Index of Place-names. The next reference to it again has the *anusvāra* (46b:5), omitted in the index as well as in Vajrācārya's Nepali translation (p. 102). Still, in Malla's English translation it is spelt correctly with an *anusvāra* (p. 149). The third reference is incorrectly cited as Navā and as being in 50a:1, though in fact it reads Navo and occurs exactly one page later (50b:1). Vajrācārya omits the *anusvāra* both in the text and translation (p. 106), but the word does have one, as Malla notices in his translation (p. 153). It is to be noted that though Malla's index does not include it, the name is followed, as in the previous two references, by the appellative word *gahra*, meaning 'fort'.

The extreme carelessness in compiling the Index of Place-names is seen in the entry of Bhomta and Bhonta, two of the several variations of the

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 – Bhomṭa (42a:3, 43b:1, 46b:5), Bhota (44a:3, 53a:3), Bhonta (41b:3 etc.), Bhvaṃta (36a:1, 42a:4) and Bhvanta (48a:2 etc.) –, all of which are placed by Malla under Bhomṭa 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 Bhvaṃta as occurring in 62b:3 and Bhvaᶜta as occurring in 63a:2 (in the text Bhvaṃta and in the index Bhvamta, 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 Thānaṃtarī in the Index shows how carelessly the place-names may be determined. It has been conjured up by taking the last two *akṣara*-s of one word and the first two *akṣara*-s of the following one: *vyanāpesanthānaṃ tarīṭo* (43a:1). Vajrācārya translates the phrase as *banepādekhi tarī (tarāī) sammakā* (p.99), i.e. 'those from Banepa down to Tarī (Terai)', and Malla as 'Byanāpe to Tari (river?)' (p. 145). Thānaṃtarī 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 *Vaṃśāvalī* 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.

Bibliography

Abhidhānaratnamālā   See: Halāyudha.

Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev and J.M. Shukla

   1977   *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar.* 2nd ed. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 134. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Acharya, Baburam and Naya Raj Pant

   1953   'Mallasamayābhilekhaḥ (vi. saṃ. 1444)' [A Malla-period inscription (1387)]. *Saṃskṛta-sandeśa* 1:8 (V.S. 2010 Mārga): 46-48.

Adhikari, Nav Raj, Shailesh Bhattarai and Kashinath Tamot

   1992   'Nepāla viśvakoṣa 2049' / 'Nepal Encyclopaedia'. *Antarrāṣtriya mañca / International Forum* 57:89-128.

Amara   *Amarakoṣa*

        The Nâmalingânuśâsana (Amarakosha.) of Amarasimha. With the Commentary (Vyâkhyâsudhâ or Ramâśrami) of Bhânuji Dîkshit. 5th ed. Ed. Śivadatta. Rev. Wâsudev Laxmaṇ Śâstrî Panśîkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1929.

Amarakoṣa   See: Amara.

Ānandāśrama Press

   1905   See: *Vāyupurāṇa.*

Arthaśāstra

        The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra. Pt. 1. 2nd ed. Ed. R.P. Kangle. University of Bombay Studies Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali 1. Bombay: University of Bombay, 1969.

Bālarāmāyaṇa   See: Rājaśekhara.

Banerji, R.D.

   1919   *The Origin of the Bengali Script.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Bendall, Cecil

1886   *A Journey of Literary and Archaeological Research in Nepal and Northern India, during the Winter 1884-5.* Cambridge: University Press.

1903   'The History of Nepal and Surrounding Kingdoms (1000-1600 A.D.) compiled chiefly from MSS. Lately Discovered'. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 72: 1-32.

Bhagavadgītā

Śrīmacchankarācāryaviracitam śrīmadbhagavadgītābhāsyam. Ed. H. R. Bhagavat. Vāṇivilāsa Granthamālā 7. Kāśī: Vāṇivilāsa Saṃskṛta Pustakālaya, 1938.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

Bhāgavata Purāṇa of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa with Sanskrit Commentary Bhāvārthabodhinī of Śrīdharasvāmin. Ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Bhairavānandanāṭaka   See: Maṇika.

Bhāskara   *Līlāvatī*

The Līlāvatī: A Treatise on Mensuration by Śrī Bhāskarācārya. Śrī Harikrishna Nibandha Maṇimālā 3. Ed. and comm. Muralidhara Thākura. Benares: Sri Harikrishna Nibandha Bhawana, 1938.

Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita   *Siddhāntakaumudī*

Siddhânta=kaumudî with the Tattvabodhinî Commentary of Jnanendra Sarasvati and the Subodhinî Commentary of Jayakrishna. 5 ed. Ed. Vâsudev Lakshmaṇ Panśîkar. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1915.

Bista, Dor Bahadur

1972   *People of Nepal.* 2nd ed. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Böhtlingk, Otto, ed. and trans.

1966   *Indische Sprüche.* Pt. 2. Reprint. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlagsbuchhandlung, Wiesbaden: Antiquariat Otto Harrassowitz.

Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth

1868   *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch.* Pt. 5. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bṛhatsamhitā   See: Varāhamihira.

Bühler, Georg

1980   *Indian Paleography.* Reprint. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar

1975   *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language.* 3 pts. Pagination unbroken in the first two pts. Reprint. Calcutta: Rupa & Co.

Dash, G.N.

1978   'Jagannātha and Oriya Nationalism' in Anncharlott Eschmann, Hermann Kulke and Gaya Charan Tripathi, Ed. *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa.* New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Datta, Bibhutibhushan and Avadhesh Narayan Singh

1935   *History of Hindu Mathematics.* Pt. 1. Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Das.

Devīmāhātmya inserted into the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*

Śrīdurgāsaptaśatī sthūlākṣarair mudritā [The venerable *Durgāsaptaśatī*, printed in bold face]. Gorakhpur: Gita Press, V.S. 2048 (1991/92).

Halāyudha   *Abhidhānaratnamālā*

Halayudha's Abhidhanaratnamala. A Sanskrit Vocabulary. Ed. Th. Aufrecht. Reprint. Delhi: Indian India, 1975.

Himavatkhaṇḍa

    Himavatkhaṇḍaḥ (skandapurāṇamadhye) [*Himavatkhaṇḍa* from the *Skandapurāṇa*]. Gorakṣagranthamālā 69. Ed. Naraharinath *et al.* Trans. Radhanath Lohani *et al.* Kāśī: Yogapracāriṇī, V.S. 2013 (1956/57).

Jest, Corneille

    1977 'The Kuswar of Caithali (Central Nepal)'. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 4:2, 1-45.

Kālidāsa   *Raghuvamśa*

    The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa with the Commentary of Mallinātha. 5th ed. Ed. and trans. Gopal Raghunath Nandargikar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

Karpūramañjarī   See: Rājaśekhara.

Kāśikāvṛtti   See: Vāmana and Jayāditya.

Kātyāyanapariśiṣṭapratijñāsūtra

    See: under *Vājasaneyisamhitā*. Appendix: 6-7.

Khanal, Mohan Prasad

    1970 'Vābhū tathā rājagrāmako bhaugolika nirṇaya' [Locating Vābhū and Rājagrāma geographically]. *Ancient Nepal* 10:48-52.

Khan 'Maddāha', Muhammad Mustafa

    1972 *Urdū-hindī śabdakośa* [Urdu-Hindi Dictionary]. Hindī Samiti Granthamālā 21. 2nd ed. Lucknow: Hindi Samiti.

Kirfel, Willibald

    1979 *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa (A Collection of Puranic Texts Bearing on the Five Characteristic Topics of the Puranas).* Ed. into Devanagari – Suryakant Shastri. Krishnadas Pracyavidya Granthamala 1. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Kölver, Bernhard and Hemrāj Śākya

    1985 *Documents from the Rudravarṇa–Mahāvihāra, Pāṭan.* Nepalica 1. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Koirala, Shankar

    1968 'Kosī pradeśakā mājhī jāti' [The Mājhī tribe from the Koshi region]. *Ancient Nepal* 3:18-20.

Līlāvatī   See: Bhāskara.

Mahābhārata

    The Mahābhārata for the First Time Critically Edited. 19 vols. Ed. Vishnu S. Sukthankar *et al.* Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933-1959.

Mahābhārata (Poona ed.) See: *Mahābhārata.*

Maheśvara   *Viśvaprakāśa*

    Viśvaprakāśa by Śrī Maheś vara. Ed. Śīlaskandha Sthavira and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series 160/168. Benares: Chowkhambā Sanskrit Book-Depot, 1911.

Malla, Kamal P.

    1982 *Classical Newari Literature: A Sketch.* Kathmandu: Educational Enterprises.

    1984 *Impeccable Historiography in Nepal: A Rebuttal.* Kathmandu: Nepal Study Centre.

Manandhar, Thakur Lal

    1986 *Newari-English Dictionary: Modern Language of Kathmandu Valley.* École Françaice d' Extrême–Orient. Ed. Anne Vergati. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan.

Maṇika   *Bhairavānanda*

    Manika Kavi' s Bhairavananda Natakam. Ed. Shriman Narain Dwivedi. Allahabad: Piyush Prakashan, n.d.

Mani, Vettam

    1979 *Purāṇic Encyclopaedia.* Reprint of the English ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Manusmṛti

    Manusmṛti. With the Sanskrit Commentary Manvartha-Muktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa. Ed. J. L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

MM

 1975 *Mechīdekhi mahākālī* [From the Mechi River to the Mahakali River]. Pt. 2. Kathmandu: His Majesty's Government, Ministry of Communications, Department of Information. V.S. 2031 Phālguna.

Monier-Williams, Monier

 1899 *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary:... New Edition.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Naraharinath

 1953 'Gopālavaṃśāvalī'. *Saṃskṛta-sandeśa* 1:2 (V.S. 2010 Jyeṣṭha): 36-37.

 1959 'Gopāla-vaṃśāvalī' (571 varṣa aghi lekhiyeko itihāsa) [*Gopāla-vaṃśāvalī*, a history written 571 years ago], *Himavatsaṃskṛti* 1 (V.S. 2016 Vijayādaśamī): 9-34.

Nepal, Gyan Mani

 1983 *Jayataracita mahīrāvaṇavadha nāṭaka, vivecanātmaka adhyayana* [*Mahīrāvaṇavadhanāṭaka* by Jayata, a critical study]. Rajatajayantī Prakāśanamālā 2. Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies. Tribhuvan University, V.S. 2040.

 1987 *Paśupatināthako darśana sparśana pūjanasambandhamā samikṣā* [Observations on the visiting, touching and worshipping of Paśupatinātha]. Kathmandu: Mahes Raj Pant, V.S. 2043 Caitra.

 1988 'Itihāsa lekhne paramparā ra nepālavṛtta' [The tradition of historiography and the *Nepālavṛtta*]. *Ancient Nepal* 107 (Nepali section): 1-10.

Ojha, Gaurishankar Hirachand

 1918 *Bhāratīya prācīna lipimālā / The Palaeography of India.* 2nd ed. Ajmer: Self-published.

Pāṇini   *Aṣṭādhyāyī.* See: Vāmana and Jayāditya.

Pant, Dinesh Raj

 1974 'Rājā nirbhayadeva, rudradeva, bhojadeva, lakṣmīkāmadeva' [Kings Nirbhayadeva, Rudradeva, Bhojadeva and Lakṣmīkāmadeva]. *Pūrṇimā* 30 (V.S. 2030 Caitra):116-131.

Pant, Mahes Raj

 1974 'Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī ra bhāsāvaṃśāvalīko sādharmyakā kehī udāharaṇa' [Some examples of similarity between the *Gopālarāja-* and the *Bhāsāvaṃśāvalī*]. *Pūrṇimā* 31 (V.S. 2031 Mārga): 161-172.

 1974a 'Cecil bendallko śabdamā gopālarājavaṃśāvalīko bayāna' [A description of the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* in the words of Cecil Bendall]. *Pūrṇimā* 31:172-177.

 1975 'Nepal in Perspectivemā dekhiekā itihāsasambandhī aśuddhi' [Errors concerning history as detected in *Nepal in Perspective*]. *Pūrṇimā* 32 (V.S. 2031 Māgha): 250-265.

 1975a 'Puṣyābhiṣeka'. *Pūrṇimā* 33 (V.S. 2032 Bhādra): 13-27.

 1977 'Puṣyābhiṣeka'. *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 1:93-109.

 1977a 'Puṣyaratha – The Royal Chariot for Coronation'. *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* 1:110-116.

 1977b 'Cāḍabāda jātrāmātrāmā khelāiekā, nepālamā banāiekā kehī saṃskṛta nāṭaka' [Some Nepalese Sanskrit dramas staged on the occasion of the fairs and festivals]. *Pūrṇimā* 36 (V.S. 2034 Āṣāḍha):294-308.

 1984 *Inept Specimen?* Kathmandu: Self-published.

 1985 'Gopālarājavaṃśāvalīko avuṭha śabdako artha ke ho?' [What is the meaning of the word *avuṭha* which occurs in the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* ?]. *Pūrṇimā* 60 (V.S. 2041 Māgha): 6-24.

 1985a 'Gopālarājavaṃśāvalīmā parekā cāri saya āṭha jastā śabdako viṣayamā' [On words like *cāri saya āṭha* which occur in the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*]. *Pūrṇimā* 61 (V.S. 2041 Phālguna): 1-20.

 1986 'Bhāratīya nātyaśāstrako eka aṃśa, nepālī lekhoṭa pustakaharūbāṭa' [An extract from the *Bhāratīya Nātyaśāstra* from Nepalese manuscripts]. *Pūrṇimā* 68 (V.S. 2043 Vaiśākha): 1-11.

1986a   'Vi. saṃ. 1226 dekhi 1513 sammakā pandhravaṭā puṣpikā'
         [Fifteen colophons dating from 1170 to 1456]. *Pūrṇimā* 69
         (V.S. 2043 Jyeṣṭha):26-48.

1987   'The Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī sarasarī herdā' [On reading *The
         Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī* cursorily]. *Pūrṇimā* 72 (V.S. 2044
         Vaiśākha):1-65.

1988   'Niyogī jātiko pahicāna' [The identification of the Niyogin
         caste]. *Pūrṇimā* 75 (V.S. 2045 Mārga): 1-4.

1988a   'Kasāhīsambandhī, tāḍapatramā lekhiekā daśavaṭā likhata-
         patra' [Ten deeds on palm-leaves concerning the Newar
         butcher caste]. *Pūrṇimā* 75:5-11.

1988b   'Niyogīsambandhī thapa likhatapatra' [An additional deed
         concerning the Niyogin-s]. *Pūrṇimā* 75:12-13.

Pant, Mahes Raj and Aishvarya Dhar Sharma

1977   *The Two Earliest Copper-plate Inscriptions from Nepal.*
         Nepal Research Centre Miscellaneous Papers 12.
         Kathmandu: Nepal Research Centre.

Pant, Naya Raj

1986   *Licchavisaṃvatko nirṇaya* [Establishing (the initial years
         of) Licchavi eras]. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy,
         V.S. 2043 Kārttika.

Pant, Naya Raj, Devi Prasad Bhandari and Dinesh Raj Pant

1978   See: *Sumatitantra.*

Panta Parbatiya, Nityānanda

1946   *The Saṃskāra Dīpaka.* Pt. 1. 2nd ed. The Kashi Sanskrit
         Series 95. Ed. Rāmchandra Panaśīkar Śāstri. Benares: The
         Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Pañcatantra   See: Viṣṇuśarman.

Paudel, Bhoop Hari

1985   'Manthalīkā mājhīharūko kīpaṭa' [The *kīpaṭ* land tenure of
         the Mājhī-s from Manthali]. *Dharmadarśana* 5:2 (V.S.
         2041 Māgha–Caitra), 49-64.

1988   *Manthalīkā mājhī* [The Mājhī-s from Manthali]. *Ancient
         Nepal* 105 (Nepali section): 1-15.

Petech, Luciano

1958   *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1480).* Serie Orientale
         Roma 10. Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and
         Culture 3. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo
         Oriente.

1984   *Mediaeval History of Nepal (c. 750-1482).* Serie Orientale
         Roma 54. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo
         Oriente.

Pokhrel, Balkrishna *et al.*

1983   *Nepalī bṛhat śabdakośa* [Nepali comprehensive lexicon].
         Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy, V.S. 2040 Pauṣa 14.

Puruṣottamadeva   *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*

         *The Trikāṇḍaçesha: A Collection of Sanskrit Nouns by Sri
         Purushottamadeva King of Kalinga, India, with Sârârtha
         Candrikâ, a Commentary by ... C.A. Seelakkhandha Maha
         Thera.* Bombay: Khemaraja Shrikrishnadâsa, 1916.

Raghuvaṃśa   See: Kālidāsa.

Rajbanshi, Shankar Man

1974   'Devanāgarī lipiko vikāsa' / 'The Evolution of Devanāgari
         Script'. *Kailash* 2:23-120.

1983   *Bhūmisambandhi tamasūka tāḍapatra* [Deeds (written on)
         palm-leaves concerning land]. Pt. I. Kathmandu: National
         Archives. V.S. 2040 Āṣāḍha.

Rājaśekhara   *Bālarāmāyaṇa*

         Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara. The Chaukhāmba Sura-
         bharati Granthamala 69. Ed. and Trans. Ganga Sagar Rai.
         Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, 1984.

         Karpūramañjarī

         *Rāja–çekhara's Karpūra-mañjarī, a Drama by the Indian
         Poet Rājaçekhara (about 900 A.D.).* Harvard Oriental
         Series 4. Ed. Sten Konow, trans. Charles Rockwell
         Lanman. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1963.

Regmi, D.R.

    1966   *Medieval Nepal. Part III. Source Materials for the History and Culture of Nepal 740-1768 A.D. (Inscriptions, Chronicles and Diaries etc.)*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

Regmi, Jagadisha Chandra

    1972   'Gopāla vaṃśāvali'. *Ancient Nepal* 21:44-55, 22:34-53.

Śākya, Hemrāj

    1974   *Nepāla lipi-prakāśa* [Light on Nepalese scripts]. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy. V.S. 2030 Caitra.

Sever, Adrian

    1993   *Nepal under the Ranas*. New Delhi: Oxford Publishing Co.

Sharma, Aishwarya Dhar

    1991-93   '*Jāti tathā deśaviśeṣakā nāma-sūci*' [Name lists of castes and regions]. *Tanneri* 13:6, 141-150.

Sharma Paudyal, Hiramani

    1985   *Boṭe bhāṣāko adhyayana* [A study of the Bote language]. Phalewas, Parbat: Indira Sharma Paudyal, V.S. 2042.

Siddhāntakaumudī   See: Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.

Slusser, Mary Shepherd

    1982   *Nepal Mandala: A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*. Vol. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Slusser, Mary Shepherd and Gautamavajra Vajrācārya

    1973   'Some Nepalese Stone Sculptures: A Reappraisal within Their Cultural and Historical Context'. *Artibus Asiae* 35:1-2, 79-138.

Sörensen, S.

    1978   *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Subba, Suraj

    1989   *Botes– the Ferrymen of Tanahun*. Kathmandu: Ashok Kumar Limbu and Kumar Bahadur Rai.

Sūcipattra   [The unpublished master catalogue of the MSS. in Bir Library]. 6 vols.

Sumatitantra

    Sumatitantram. Ed. Naya Raj Pant, Devi Prasad Bhandari and Dinesh Raj Pant. Kathmandu: Curriculum Development Centre, Tribhuvan University. 1978.

Tamot, Kashinath

    1991   'The Real Interpretation of *Ḍhīlī* from the *Gopālarāja-vaṃśāvalī*' (Paper presented in the 12th annual conference of the Linguistic Society of Nepal, held on November 26-27, 1991).

    1992   *Pulāṃgu nepālabhāṣā nithī duguyā chuṃ ādhāra* [Some basis for the fact that the Old Newari language has two varieties]. Kulāṃ Pithanā 1. Lalitpur: Kulāṃ Sāhitya Pāḥlāḥ, Patan Multiple Campus, N.S. 1113 Kārttikaśukla.

    1993   'Gopālarāja vaṃśāvalīyā hara siṃhadeva sambandhī ghatanā ṭipoṭayā bhāṣāy chapulu' [A look into the language of an entry concerning Harasiṃhadeva in the *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī*]. *Paleswan* 4:2, 15-18.

Tarkavachaspati, Taranatha

    1969-70   *Vachaspatyam*. 6 vols. 3rd. ed. (vol. 1, 1969, vols. 2-6, 1970). The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 94. Pagination unbroken. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Tewari, Ramji *et al.*

    1961   *Abhilekha-saṃgraha* [A collection of inscriptions]. Pt. 2. Kathmandu: Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala. V.S. 2018 Śrāvaṇa.

    1964   *Aitihāsika-patrasaṃgraha* (A collection of historical documents). Pt. 2. Kathmandu: Nepāla Sāṃskṛtika-Pariṣad, V.S. 2021 Jyeṣṭha.

Thapaliya, Bhojraj

    1988   *Boṭe jāti eka paricaya* [The Bote tribe: an introduction]. Dharan: Mona Thapaliya, V.S. 2045.

Trikāṇḍaśeṣa   See: Puruṣottamadeva.

Turner, R.L.

~1973   *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages.*
2nd impression. London: Oxford University Press.

Utpala   See: *Yogayātrā.*

Vaidya, Parashuram Lakshman, ed.

1967-72   *The Pratīka–Index of the Mahābhārata, Being a Compre-
hensive Index of Verse-Quarters Occurring in the Critical
Edition of the Mahābhārata.* 6 vols. Pagination unbroken.
Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Vajrācārya, Dhanavajra

1965   'Śaktiśālī bhārādāra rāmabarddhanaharū ra tātkālika nepāla'
[The powerful Rāmavarddhana nobles and contemporary
Nepal]. *Pūrṇimā* 7 (V.S. 2022 Kārttika): 12-36.

1975   'Rājyābhiṣekako aitihāsika mahatva (*sic*)' [The historical
importance of coronation]. *Contribution to Nepalese
Studies.* 2:1, 1-9.

Vajrācārya, Dhanavajra and Gyan Mani Nepal

1954   *Itihāsa-saṃśodhana* [Correction of (factual errors in)
historical writings]. Kathmandu: Self-published. V.S.
2010 Śrīpañcamī.

Vajrācārya Dhanavajra *et al.*

1962   *Itihāsa-saṃśodhanako pramāṇa-prameya* [Proofs and the
matters to be proved for the correction of (factual errors in)
historical writings]. Jagadambā-prakāśana-mālā 27.
Lalitpur: Jagadambā-prakāśana, V.S. 2019 Mārga.

Vajrācārya, Gautamavajra

1962   *Itihāsa-saṃśodhana* 54. Kathmandu: Saṃśodhana-maṇḍala.
V.S. 2019 Vaiśākha.

Vājasaneyisaṃhitā

*Śuklayajurveda=saṃhitā (Śrīmad=Vājasaneyi=Mādhyan-
dina.) with the Mantra-Bhâshya of Mahâmahopâdhyâya
Śrîmad=Uvatâchârya and the Veda=dîpa=Bhâshya of*

Śrīman= Mahîdhara. (With Appendices & Mantra-kośa).
2nd ed. Ed. Wâsudev Laxman Śâstrî Panśīkar. Bombay:
Nirṇaya–Sâgar Press, 1929.

Vāmana and Jayāditya   *Kāśikāvṛtti*

*Kāśikā: A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana
& Jayāditya.* 2 pts. Eds. Aryendra Sharma *et al.* Sanskrit
Academy Series 17/A. 14, 20/A. 17. Hyderabad: Sanskrit
Academy, Osmania University, 1969, 1970.

Varāhamihira   *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*

*The Brihat Saṃhitâ by Varâhamihira with the
Commentary of Bhaṭṭotpala.* 2 pts. Ed. Sudhâkara Dvivedî.
The Vizianagram Sanskrit Series 12. Benares: E.J.
Lazarus. 1895, 1897.

Yogayātrā

(One MS. with the bare text and the other with Utpala's
commentary, in the author's family collection).

Vāyupurāṇa .

Mahāmuniśrīmadvyāsapraṇītam vāyupurāṇam [The
Vāyupurāṇa composed by the illustrious great seer Vyāsa].
Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvali 49. Poona: Ānandāśrama
Press, 1905.

Viśvaprakāśa   See: Maheśvara.

Viṣṇuśarman   *Pañcatantra*

Pañcatantra of Viṣṇuśarman. Ed. with Sanskrit comm. and
English trans. by M.R. Kale. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal
Banarsidass, 1986.

Whitney, William D.

1973   ed. and trans. *The Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya with its
Commentary, the Tribhâshyaratna.* Reprint. Delhi: Motilal
Banarsidass.

1977   *Sanskrit Grammar.* Reprint of the 5th ed. Delhi: Motilal
Banarsidass.

Wilson, H.H.

1855   *A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, and of Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents Relating to the Administration of the Government of British India.* London : Wm. H. Allen.

Yājñavalkyaśikṣā

   Yājñavalkya śikṣā "Śikṣāvallī" vivṛtisamalaṅkṛtā [The *Yājñavalkyaśikṣā* adorned with the commentary *Śikṣāvallī*]. Ed. Amaranātha Śāstrī. Kāśī: Padmanābhaśarmā Dīkṣita, V.S. 1994 [1937].

Yogayātrā   See: Varāhmihira.

The *Kuvalayānandapariśiṣṭa* by Vijñānakeśarin

Mahes Raj Pant

The *Kuvalayānanda* by Appayyadīkṣita (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 Appayyadīkṣita leaves out the topic of *śabdālaṅkāra*, 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 *alaṅkāraśāstra*.

The author, Vijñānakeśarin, hailed from a Nepalese Brahmin family known as Arjyāla/Aryāla, which was distinguished for literary activities spanning at least one century and a half.[3]

---

1.   Kane 1961:416.

2.   Raghavan 1968:249-253.

3.   The earliest composition in the Sanskrit tradition by a member of the Arjyāl family is Cakrapāṇi's *Praśnatattva*, dated 1767 (Bhandari 1934:12), and the latest is Vīrendrakeśarin's poems, published in 1917/18 in *Sūktisindhu* (Baral 1985:26). Cakrapāṇi's *Uttānagaṇita* 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 resultantly the date of the text must be set back a few additional years. If one accepts that Vīreśvara, the author of the Gorkhali king Pṛthvīpati Śāha's *praśasti*, dated 1680 (D. Pant 1985-88:702-703), is an Arjyāl, as some historians do (e.g. *ibid.*:473, 489), the literary feats of the Arjyāl family may easily be traced back a further 87 years.

We are aware of two *jyautiṣa* texts in Sanskrit (*Praśnatattva* and *Uttānagaṇita*)[4] by Cakrapāṇi[5] (born in 1734),[6] the great-grandfather of Vijñānakeśarin.[7] Seven other of his *jyautiṣa* works[8] still remain unpublished. Cakrapāṇi's son Daivajñakeśarin[9] (born in 1768)[10] wrote a versified genealogy in Sanskrit of his own family, entitled *Kulacandrikā*, which testifies to his being a classical poet.[11] I possess a MS. of the *Śrīkṛṣṇapādapadmapuṣpāñjali*, consisting of 108 Sanskrit verses addressed to Kṛṣṇa, composed by the same Daivajñakeśarin.[12] Interestingly

---

4.   N. Pant forthcoming: 74-84 deals with the *Uttānagaṇita* 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.

7.   Aryal 1990:223.

8.   1) *Gaṇitacūḍāmaṇi* 2) *Grahaṇatattva* 3) Commentary on the *Camatkāracintāmaṇi* 4) *Jātakendu* 5) Commentary on the *Jaiminisūtra* 6) *Pañcāṅgasāraṇī* 7) *Sūryagrahaṇasāraṇī* (Bhandari 1934:13; Padmanābhakeśarin 1934: prakāśakīyā binītābhyarthanā; Vīrapustakālaya 1960:55, 72, 117, 231; Lamsal 1964:64. N. Pant forthcoming: 80-81).

9.   Daivajñakeśarin:22. Vajrācārya and Shrestha 1980:263.

10.   M. Pant 1985:23.

11.   See Daivajñakeśarin.

12.   In addition, a slight portion of the *Bhramakaravicāra* by Daivajña-keśarin has been published in Daivajñakeśarin:24-27.

---

enough, he expressed himself by writing not only in Sanskrit but also in Nepali.[13] Vidyāranyakeśarin (born in 1807),[14] third of the five sons of Daivajñakeśarin,[15] was a poet both of Nepali and Hindi verse,[16] though we are not aware of any Sanskrit writings. Vīrendrakeśarin (1849/50-1931/32), the first of the two sons of Vidyāranyakeśarin's youngest brother Kulacakrakeśarin,[17] 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.[18] Similarly, he wrote on the *alaṅkāraśāstra*, which happens to be the first *alaṅkāra* text in Nepali.[19]

Though both these treatises of Vīrendrakeśarin's are in Nepali, he also composed Sanskrit poems in order to complete the *samasyā*.[20] His

---

13.   For Daivajñakeśarin's Nepali writings, see Pokhrel 1986:277-278 and Dikshit 1978:36.

14.   M. Pant 1985:33.

15.   Aryal 1990:173, 223.

16.   For Vidyāranyakeśarin and his works, see Baral 1985:1-32; B. Acharya 1946:22-43; Baral n.d.:65-79 and B. Sharma n.d.:102-129.

17.   Aryal 1990:174-175, 223.

18.   Vīrendrakeśarin's grammar has been published in J. Acharya 1980:113-220.

19.   This text on *alaṅkāra*, entitled *Vesarī*, has been serialised in an incomplete form in *Sundarī*, a short-lived early 20th-century (V.S. 1963-1966) monthly which was published in Varanasi by the Nepali-speaking group called Rasikasamāja, and accepted contributions in Nepali, and to some extent also in Sanskrit (1:157-162, 189-210 and 2:63-66, 99-102, 131-134, 187-190). J. Acharya (1980:221-237) reproduces the second *prakaraṇa*, which was published in 1:189-210. Lohani (1990) reproduces the entire part of *Vesarī* published in *Sundarī*.

20.   Vīrendrakeśarin 1906:101 and Atreya 1985:82. Atreya (1985:81) mentions Vīrendrakeśarin's Sanskrit commentary on the *Kāvyaprakāśa*, though he makes no mention of its whereabouts. Diwakar Acharya saw a few years back some fragments of

poems in the Nepali language are no less interesting.[21] Vijñānakeśarin, who wrote the *Kuvalayānandaparisiṣṭa*, was the younger brother of Vīrendrakeśarin.[22]

It is interesting to note that not only Vijñānakeśarin's direct or nearest predecessors but also his other collaterals displayed a great zeal for literary activity. Foremost among them are Śaktivallabha[23] (born in 1724)[24] and Udayānanda.[25] Śaktivallabha and Cakrapāṇi were distant

---

Vīrendrakeśarin's Sanskrit commentary on the *Durgāmāhātmya* from the *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* displayed for sale to tourists at the Aryaghat of the Pashupati temple (oral communication).

21.   For Vīrendrakeśarin's Nepali poems, see Dikshit 1968:1-6 and 1978:55.

22.   Atreya 1985:85. Aryal 223.

23.   For Śaktivallabha's *Jayaratnākaranāṭaka*, see N. Pant 1957:1-52 and Sharma Khanal 1982:167-185. For his *Hāsyakadambanāṭaka*, see Sharma Khanal 1982:163-167. For the Nepali-language version of his *Hāsyakadamba*, which he himself did, see Gautam 1965:31-43. For his other works, see Pokhrel 1986:382-386, 1964:137-149 and Khanal 1973:7.

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

24.   M. Pant 1985:14.

25.   Though Udayānanda profusely wrote in the Nepali language, the only Sanskrit work of his known to us is his *Duḥsvapnadoṣa-haraṇavaratnākhyastotra*, consisting nine verses. This *stotra* is incorrectly reproduced in Arjel 1964:11-13 with a Nepali translation. In addition, some of Udayānanda's verses in Sanskrit have been preserved (Nepal 1992:105-109). For Udayānanda and his works, see especially Nepal 1982:71-85, 1983:7-45, 1984:12-20 and 1992:100-114. See also Nepali n.d.:1-11, Pokhrel 1964:150-156, Arjel 1964:3-15 and Upadhyaya Ghimire 1975:32-43.

agnatic cousins and Udayānanda was their cousin's son. To be specific the great-grandfathers of Śaktivallabha, Cakrapāṇi and Viśveśvara, Udayānanda's father, were brothers.[26]

We do not know when Vijñānakeśarin was born. However, we know that his older brother[27] was born in V.S. 1906 (1849/50)[28] and that he himself wrote the *Kuvalayānandaparisiṣṭa* in V.S. 1937 (1880/81).[29] Since the interval between the two dates is no more than 31 years, it may be safely concluded that Vijñānakeśarin was at most in his late twenties when he composed it.

I have a MS. of a *hallīsa*, entitled *Yamunāsaṅkarṣaṇa*, which was composed by the same Vijñānakeśarin. This proves that he was not only a theoretical *ālaṅkārika* but also a practical *kavi*.[30] Interestingly enough, unlike Śaktivallabha, his great-grandfather's distant cousin, he employs in his drama not only Sanskrit but also Prakrit when the situation demands.[31]

Perhaps the concluding verse of the *Kuvalayānandaparisiṣṭa* tells something of the guru with whom he learnt *alaṅkāraśāstra*. Translated literally, it reads as such :

---

26.   Aryal 1990:223-224.

27.   *Ibid.*: 222.

28.   *Ibid.* : 174.

29.   See below, p. 84.

30.   Atreya (1985:85) describes Vijñānakeśarin as a good scholar of *vyākaraṇa* and *nyāya*.

31.   Śaktivallabha wrote no less than three dramas in Sanskrit, namely, *Jayaratnākaranāṭaka*, *Hāsyakadambanāṭaka* and *Lalita-mādhavanāṭaka*. 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 Nṛsiṃha is the main cause for that.'

This Nṛsiṃha, if the poet did not mean the god, could only have been his
guru. One likely candidate is Nṛsiṃhaśāstrin, a South Indian pundit who
specialised in *sāhitya* and was educated and had settled in Varanasi;
Vijñānakeśarin's contemporaneity with him may be established.
Nṛsiṃhaśāstrin, 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] Nṛsiṃhaśāstrin's first son Gaṅgādhara, who later became one
of the five topmost pundits in Varanasi, was born four years after
Vijñānakeśarin's elder brother was born.[33]

Going to Varanasi for learning is nothing novel to Nepalese Brahmin
boys, including the Arjyāl-s. Vidyāraṇyakeśarin, Vijñānakeśarin's uncle
about whom I spoke earlier, was educated in Varanasi. He studied
together with Bālaśāstrin,[34] who became later a highly revered pundit
with the title Bālasarasvatī[35] and was one of the gurus of Nṛsiṃha's son
Gaṅgādhara.[36]

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

vijñānakeśarikṛtīndramukhodgatāni

vāgarṇavācchasalilāni jayanti loke |

---

32.   Khiste 1928:3-6.

33.   For Gaṅgādharaśāstrin, seé Khiste 1928:1-35.

34.   Atreya 1985:79.

35.   For Bālaśāstrin, see Upādhyāya 1983:181-194.

36.   Khiste 1928:10-12.

37.   N. Pant 1976:89.

38.   For Chavilāla Sūri's works, see Sharma Khanal 1982:185-200.

āpo yathā giriṇadasya mama pralāpāḥ

samprāpya yeṣu samalā vimalā abhūvan || [39]

'The pure water of the ocean of words originating from the
mouth of the best of scholars Vijñānakeśarin 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 Vijñānakeśarin 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 an ungrammatical usage in
the book.[41]

Apart from Vijñānakeśarin's scholarly activities, we know something of
his normal life. He held the top administrative post of *subbā*, as is
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 *Guṭhī*
(Sanskrit – *Goṣṭhī*= 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 *Kuvalayānandapariśiṣṭa* by
Vijñānakeśarin 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 *haritāla* to discourage moths. The MS. is written in a

---

39.   Chavilāla Sūri 1894:*vijñāpanam* verse 3.

40.   *Ibid.*: verse 4.

41.   For grammatical errors in the *Sundaracarita*, see N. Pant
      1976a:128-136.

42.   See the document published as Appendix.

bold hand in closely set *akṣara*-s, though its aesthetic quality is marred by revisions here and there in the margins and blacked-out words or even sentences. The text extends to the third line of fol. 12a. Generally each side of a folio contains either nine or ten lines. However, there are a few exceptions: fol. 2a has only eight lines, and fol. 6b eleven. This MS. is designated here as A.

I have a MS. of the same text. As usual, it is written on brown-coloured *pāko kāgaz* of oblong size, and the verso of each leaf is besmeared with *haritāla*. The leaves measure 26 × 12 cm., and the text covers a 20.1 × 6.2 cm. portion of each one. The text runs up to the second line of fol. 15a. In all cases each side of a folio has eight lines. The MS. is elegantly written in a bold hand in closely set *akṣara*-s. This MS. is here called MS. B.

To judge from the microfilm, MS. A is slightly damaged in the margins, and this damage in a few instances affects the revisions that were made later. Similarly, MS. B is slightly damaged by moisture in its right-hand margins and in a few *akṣara*-s of the first and second folios on the same side, though this does not affect the readability of the text.

One remarkable fact is that both MSS. have so few scribal errors, an indication of the scribes being well trained. While collating those two MSS., I found that MS. B is a fair copy of MS. A. Neither MS., though, is the author's autograph. Seemingly the author made major changes to his text in MS. A, and this necessitated the fair copy of the same text, which is MS. B. However, MS. B seems not to be personally checked by the author himself, and the corrections made there in all likelihood are not his own.

MS. A is furnished with the year in which it was written: *vaikrame 1937 mite varṣe*; MS. B bears no date.

Both MSS. adhere to the practice of homorganic nasals at the juncture of two words or word components the first of which originally had an *anusvāra*. This strict adherence to the practice of homorganic nasals and no graphic difference between *ba* and *va* in both MSS.[43] and no

---

43.   The only difference between *ba* and *va* seen in both MSS. is in a quotation from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* which speaks of *ḍa* and *la*, *va*

distinction between *ba* and *va* in the pronunciation of the Nepalese have contributed to making a conjunct of *m* and a following *va*. It is noteworthy that in most cases *t* is geminated when it forms a conjunct with the following *akṣara*-s. Similarly, both MSS. geminate even *l* in such cases as *tullya* and *kadallyā*. MS. B is more inclined to double consonants and semi-vowels following the *r* sound preceded by a vowel. MS. A employs a dot at the end of what may be taken to be a sentence, whereas MS. B uses double *daṇḍa*-s, which many times are preceded by a dot. Both MSS. use a dot to denote a short pause – which we may take as equivalent to a comma. MS. A, to indicate the end of a topic, employs a floral design, whereas MS. B leaves space between two sets of double *daṇḍa*-s. There hardly occurs an *avagraha* in either MS.[44]

As for the editing of the text, I have tried to follow the standard practices of modern text-editing in normalising the text throughout. These deviations from the MSS. are not recorded in the critical apparatus. The text is established on the basis of both MSS., and only the genuine *variae lectiones* are recorded in the critical apparatus.

When referring to the citations quoted in the present text from different works, I have tried to locate the original sources. However, it should be admitted that the original occurrences of many of them have yet to be traced. Some are, however, quoted in one or another of the *alaṅkāra* texts. In those cases where I succeeded in locating the original sources, I ignore their presence in such texts, and when I cannot locate the original sources I refer to the citations as 'quoted in such and such an *alaṅkāra* text'. In a few instances I have been forced to leave the quotations without any references at all. In cases where the same quotation is encountered in more than one *alaṅkāra* text, I refer to the text with which Vijñānakeśarin's greater familiarity can be established on the basis of his other quotations.

---

and *ba* and *la* and *ra* being one for purposes of *yamaka*. To distinguish *va* from *ba*, MS. A puts a dot underneath *va* व and a slanted stroke inside *ba* ब; MS. B puts a slanted stroke inside *ba* but leaves *va* uncharged.

44.   The only exception is a quotation from Vāmana concerning *yamaka*, where two long *a*-vowels coalesce to form *ā* and this coalescence is expressed by double *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 *Kuvalayānandaparisiṣṭa*, 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 *Kārikā* or quotations being explained.
10 point bold :	*Vṛtti* on the *Kārikā*.
12 point plain :	Illustrative examples or quotations from other texts.
14 point plain :	*Kārikā.*
14 point italics :	Quotation embedded in the *Kārikā*.

Appendix

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

श्री ३ सर्कार

1. स्वस्ति श्रीमद्राजवुमारवुमारात्मज श्रीकम्यांडर इन चिफ जनरल देवशंसेर जङ्ग राणा बाहादुरका

2. थापाथलि गुठीबन्दोबस्त तहसिल अडाका हाकीं कारीन्दाके पुर्जी उप्रान्त -,- तर्फका

3. गुठी गैह्रका गोस्वारा जगेरा ठुकुटिका मौजदातमध्ये सैकडा मोरु १ का दर्ले सलामी

4. ली मोरु ४००० चार हजार सबालबमोजींको रीत पुन्याई निज ठुकुटिका कीतापमा

5. र गुठीबन्दोबस्त तहसील अडाका कीतापमा षर्च लेषी सुब्बा विज्ञानकेशरि पंडि-

6. तज्यूलाई निर्व्याजी सापटी दिनु सो रुपैआं निर्यां[1] भाषा वर्ष ३ मा बुफांउला भंन्या नि-

7. ज सुब्बाको जो चाहीन्या कागज लेषाई लीनु भाषासम्ममा रुपैआं चुक्ति गरी बुफाये-

8. नन् भंन्या हाम्रा हजुरमा जाहेर गरी मर्जी बक्स्याबमोजीं गर्नु इति सम्बत् १९४७

9. साल चैत्रसुदी १५ रोज ७ शुभम् --------[2]

---

1. Misreading for तिन्यां.

2. The full moon lasted for 22 *ghaṭī*-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 *Pañcāṅga* in manuscript form in my family collection.

TEXT

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

नमो नीलशिवायै ।[1]

सुरासुरशिरःस्रसिमकरन्दकणारुणाः ।

चरणा गणनाथस्य विघ्नं निघ्नन्तु मामकम् ॥१॥

नादेन सर्वमपि या परिपूर्य देवी

विद्यारसं पिबति षट्चरणायमाना ।

बुद्धिं प्रसाध्य धुरि नीलशिवा महेशी

सा मे सदा स्फुरतु हृत्कमलान्तरस्था ॥ २ ॥

आश्रित्य दीदितार्यस्य प्रबन्धसरणिक्रमौ ।

शब्दालङ्कारविवृतिं बालबोधार्थमारसे ॥ ३ ॥

पुनरुक्तवदाभास आपाते पुनरुक्तता ।

अपि सद्दृशजातस्य सदानत्यागमागमी ॥ ४ ॥

अपुनरुक्तत्वपर्यवसायिनामर्थानां प्रथमं पौनरुक्त्यावभासकत्वे विभिन्नाकारशब्दस्य पुनरुक्तवदाभासः ।

अपुनरुक्तत्वपर्यवसायिनामिति लाटानुप्रासविषयव्यावृत्तिर्विभिन्नाकारं*शब्दस्येति यमकविषयव्यावृत्तिश्च । यथात्र दानत्यागशब्दाभ्यां* पौनरुक्त्याभासः । *सदानत्यागमागमाविति* च्छेदेन च तत्परिहार इति पुनरुक्तवदाभासः ।

─────────────

1. ॐ नमः श्रीकृष्णपरमात्मने A.

─────────────

यथा वा

भुजङ्गकुण्डली व्यक्तशशिशुभ्रांशुशीतगुः ।

जगन्त्यपि सदापायादव्याच्चेतोहरः शिवः ॥   [1]

(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.2)

पूर्वस्मिन्नुदाहरणे सर्वथा परिवृत्यसहत्वम् । अत्र तु *भुजङ्गकुण्डलीति* शब्दयोः प्रथमस्यैव परिवृत्तिसहत्वम् । *हरः शिव* इति द्वितीयस्यैव । *शशिशुभ्रांशु* इति द्वयोरपि (Viśvanātha X.2, *vṛtti*) । शशिशुभ्रांशुशीतगुरित्यत्र द्विः पौनरुक्त्याभास इति च विशेषः । परिवृत्तिसहत्वं नाम पौनरुक्त्याभासविषयार्थसङ्केतितत्वेन[2] पर्यायशब्दोप-न्याससहत्वम् । प्रथमोदाहरणे *दानत्यागशब्दावुभावपि* द्वितीयोदाहरणे *कुण्डल्यादिशब्दाश्च* न पौनरुक्त्याभासविषयभूते दानसर्पादिरूपेऽर्थे सङ्केतितास्तत्र तादृशानुपूर्व्यास्तादृशेऽर्थे वक्तुस्तात्पर्याभावात् । आभास-मात्रं तु सम्भवत्यापाततोऽपि । एवं च पुनरुक्तवदाभासस्य शब्दपरि-वृत्तिसहत्वासहत्वाभ्यामवान्तरविशेषबाहुल्येऽपि शब्दत एवालङ्कारप्रमाण-भूतसौन्दर्यसाधकतया तत्रार्थस्य गुणीभावेन शब्दालङ्कारत्वमेव । अत्र यद्यपि शब्दश्रवणमात्रेण यमकानुप्रासादाविव चमत्कारापरिस्फूर्त्या शब्दश्रवणानन्तरमर्थानुसन्धानेनैव पौनरुक्त्यप्रचयेन पौनरुक्त्याभास-रूपमलङ्कारनिमित्तं प्रतिशब्दार्थद्वितयस्यैवोपयोगितया पुनरुक्तवदाभासस्य शब्दार्थोभयालङ्कारत्वं केचिदाहुः । तथापि शब्दतश्चमत्कारपरिस्फूर्त्या तत्रार्थस्य गुणत्वेन शब्दालङ्कारत्वमेवापातिकार्थस्यैव तदुपयोगित्वेन तस्यालङ्कारविषयत्वासिद्ध्या गुणीभावस्यैव योग्यत्वात् । न चैवमाभास-पदार्थस्य परिहारनान्तरीयकतया परिहारस्य च यथार्थतात्पर्यविषयार्था-नुसन्धाननिमित्तकतया यथार्थतात्पर्यविषयार्थस्यापि तदुपयोगित्वेन युक्तमस्योभयालङ्कारत्वमिति वाच्यं यथार्थतात्पर्यविषयार्थानुसन्धान-निमित्तकपरिहारस्याभासत्वं प्रतिनिमित्ततया तस्य निमित्तनिमित्तत्वेन साद्यादलङ्कारनिमित्तत्वाभावात् । न चैव विरोधाभासस्यापि शब्दालङ्कार-त्वं प्रसज्येत ।

तव विरहे मलयमरुद्

दवानलः शशिरुचौऽपि सोष्माणः ।

─────────────

2. ꞓविषयार्थत्वेन B.

हृदयमलिरुतमपि भिन्ते

नलिनीदलमपि निदाघरविरस्याः ॥ [2]

(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.67ᶜ-68)

इत्यादौ तात्पर्यवशादेव विरोधपरिहारेऽपि

विनापि तन्वि हारेण वक्षोजौ तव हारिणौ । [3]

(Appayyadīkṣita 75ᶜ-ᵈ)

इत्यादिश्लेषाङ्कुरितविरोधाभासविषय आपातिकार्थमात्रानुसन्धाने विरोध-स्फूर्त्या यथार्थतात्पर्यविषयार्थानुसन्धाने च तत्परिहारेण तुल्ययुक्तेरिति वाच्यं विरोधस्य पदार्थधर्मतया तस्य शब्दगतत्वाभावात् । पौनरुक्त्य-स्य तु शब्दार्थोभयधर्मत्वादापातिकार्थस्य गौणत्वाच्च पुनरुक्तवदा-भासस्य शब्दालङ्कारत्वानपायात् । विरोधाभासे क्वचिदापातिकार्थानु-सन्धानमन्तरापि तात्पर्यवशादेव विरोधपरिहारादापातिकार्थनियमा-भावाच्च । एवं श्लेषो वक्रोक्तिश्च न शब्दालङ्कारावुभयोरप्यर्थमुख-प्रेक्षितत्वेन शब्दगतचमत्कारस्य गुणीभावात् । एष एव च शब्दार्था-लङ्कारविवेकः ।[3] यत् कविसरम्भगोचरात् प्रधानचमत्कारान्नियम्यते[4] । नो चेत् किं नाम यमकमपि नार्थतश्चमत्कारि तत्राप्यर्थभेदस्य प्रयोजकत्वात् । एतेन शब्दपरिवृत्तिसहत्वासहत्वाभ्यामुभयालङ्कारत्वम् (cf. Viśvanātha X.2, *vṛtti*) अभिधानाश्च प्रत्युक्ताः ।

अनुप्रासः शब्दसाम्यं वैषम्येऽपि स्वरस्य यत् ।

(Viśvanātha X.3ᵃ-ᵇ)

अमन्दामोदमन्दारैः सानन्दामिन्दिरा भजे ॥ ५ ॥

स्वरवैषम्येऽपि व्यञ्जनानां साम्यमनुप्रासः ।

वैषम्येऽपीत्यपिना व्यञ्जनसाम्यं स्वरसाम्यानियमश्च प्रतिपादितः ।[5] तेन

---

3.   एवमेव च शब्दार्थालङ्कारौ विविच्येते B.

4.   ॰चमत्कारादलङ्कारप्रवृत्तिर्नियम्यते B.

5.   व्यञ्जनसाम्यनियमः स्वरसाम्यानियमश्च प्रतिपादितौ B.

मन्दान्दोलितबिन्दुभिः । [4]

इत्यादौ सर्वथा स्वरवैसादृश्ये

अनङ्गमङ्गलगृहापाङ्गभङ्गितरङ्गिते । [5]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 141ᵃ-ᵇ)

इत्यादौ स्वराणामपि सादृश्ये प्राप्तोऽनुप्रासः । व्यञ्जनसाम्ये वक्तव्ये *शब्दसाम्य*मिति लक्षणं ज्ञापयति भेदविशेषे लक्षणविशेषानुरोधात् स्वरव्यञ्जनसमुदायोऽपि लक्ष्य इति । तेन लाटानुप्रासोऽपि लक्षितः । *शब्दसाम्य*मित्यत्र साम्यं च तथा क्वचिदानुपूर्व्या क्वचिच्च धर्मान्तरेणापीति स्थानसाम्यनिमित्तकस्य श्रुत्यनुप्रासस्यापि सङ्ग्रहः । केचित् तु यथोक्तानुपूर्व्येत्यनुप्रासलक्षणेऽप्यभिनिवेश्य सरो रस इत्यादावनुप्रासत्वमनभिमन्वाना यथोक्तानुपूर्व्या स्वरव्यञ्जनोभयसाम्ये यमकमेवेत्यनुप्रासलक्षणे *स्वरवैषम्ये*ऽपीति नापेक्षन्ते । परन्तु यमके स्थाननियमस्य विशेषधर्मत्वेन तेनैव स्वविषयव्यावृत्तेर्यथोक्तानुपूर्व्यो-भयसाम्येऽपि स्थाननियमेऽनुप्रास एव । अत एव *अमन्दामोदमन्दारै*-रित्यत्रापि न यमकम् । तथा च सरो रस इत्यादावनुप्रासत्व-मपन्वद्यानुप्रासलक्षणे यथोक्तानुपूर्व्येति निवेशेऽपि *स्वरवैषम्ये*ऽपी-त्यपेक्षितमेव । निष्कर्षे चानुप्रासलक्षणे यथोक्तानुपूर्व्येति निवेशे प्रायो वृत्त्यनुप्रासस्यैकव्यञ्जनावृत्तिकतया लक्षणस्याव्यापकत्वमपि स्यात् । एवं च स्वरसाम्यस्यान्यथासिद्धत्वेन व्यञ्जनसाम्यमेवानुप्रासनिमित्तम् ।

व्यञ्जनसाम्यमन्तरा स्वरसाम्ये तु

खरतरवरशरहतदशवदन

खगचर नगधर फणधरशयन ।

जगदघमपहर भवभयशमन

परपदलयकर कमलजनयन ॥ [6]

इत्यादौ नानुप्रासः । किन्तु विच्छित्तिविशेषशालित्वेन चित्रविशेषः । रेफस्यासकृदावृत्त्या स्यादपि स्वल्पचमत्कार्यनुप्रासश्च । परन्तु सोऽपि व्यञ्जनसाम्यनिमित्तक एव । अत्र रसाधनुगतः प्रकृष्टो न्यासो–ऽनुप्रासः (Mammaṭa 79ᵃ, *vṛtti*) इति पूर्वेषां व्युत्पत्तिः । परन्तु

च्छेकोऽपि तु वृत्तिरेवेत्यपि केचित् । परन्तु तत्राप्यनेकव्यञ्जनावृत्ते:
प्रबलतया च्छेक एव युक्त: । छेकानुप्रासेऽपि पदे पदे
मन्दमन्दमित्यादौ वीप्सादिविषये वद्यमाणरीत्या यमकस्येवार्था-
नुरोधित्वाभावेन स्वरूपानुपपत्त्यभावेऽपि चमत्काररौथिल्यान्न्यूनभावस्तु
दुष्परिहर: । एष च परम्परामध्यपतितस्तु रम्यतामियात् । यथा
आदाय बकुलगन्धानिति पद्ये ।

छेकादितरथावृत्तिर् वृत्त्यनुप्रास उच्यते ।

<div align="right">(Viśvanātha X.4^d)</div>

विधानधुर्यस्तु धरा धाराधर इवाक्रमेत् ॥ ८ ॥

छेकानुप्रासविषयतानाक्रान्ता व्यञ्जनावृत्तिर्वृत्त्यनुप्रास: ।

यथा *विधानधुर्य* इत्यादौ धकारावृत्ति: । अत्रापि *धरा धाराधर* इति
भवेच्छेकानुप्रास: । किन्तु सञ्ज्ञाशब्दगतत्वेन शिथिलसौन्दर्य इति काव्य
वृत्त्यनुप्रासत्वेनोदाहृतम् । *विधानधुर्य* इत्यत्र तु धकारावृत्त्या स्फुटो
वृत्त्यनुप्रास: ।

यथा वा

सह महसा व्यवसाय

विदधानो धैर्यधारणाधुर्य: ।

सिन्धूनामिव जलधि-

नियतगति स्यात् स सम्पदा पात्रम् । [13]

पूर्वत्रैकव्यञ्जनस्य बहुकृत्व आवृत्ति: । इह तु *सह महस*ेत्यत्रानेक-
व्यञ्जनगतापि प्रातिलोम्येन सकृदावृत्तिरन्यत्रैकव्यञ्जनगता बहुकृत्व
आवृत्तिरिति विशेष: । इहापि धैर्यधुर्ययोरभिच्छेक: । छेकानुप्रासो वृत्त्य-
नुप्रासश्च स्वल्पातिरिक्तविषयाविति प्राय: काव्येषु द्वयोरनयोरेकत्रैव
स्थिति: ।

यथा

उन्मीलन्मधुगन्धलुब्धमधुपव्याधूतचूताङ्कुर-

क्रीडत्कोकिलकाकलीकलकलैरुद्गीर्णकर्णज्वरा: ।

नीयन्ते पथिकै: कथङ्कथमपि ध्यानावधानक्षण-

प्राप्तप्राणसमासमागमरसोल्लासैरमी वासरा: ॥ [14]

<div align="right">(Gītā I.36)</div>

अत्र *उन्मीलन्मधि*ति सकृदावृत्त्या *कोकिलकाकलीकलकलै*रित्यत्रा-
सकृदावृत्त्या *उद्गीर्णकर्ण*त्यत्र सकृदावृत्त्या *पथिकै: कथङ्कथमपी*-
त्यत्राप्यसकृदावृत्त्या *समासमागम*ेत्यत्र सकृदावृत्त्या च च्छेकोऽन्यत्र
वृत्तिरिति ।

यथा वा

विकचकमलगन्धैरन्धयन् भृङ्गमाला:

सुरभितमकरन्द मन्दमावाति वात: ।

प्रमदमदनमाघद्यौवनोद्दामरामा

रमणरभसखेदस्वेदविच्छेददत्ता: ॥ [15]

<div align="right">(Māgha XI.19)</div>

अत्र पादत्रये प्रायश्छेकानुप्रास: । चतुर्थे वृत्त्यनुप्रास: ।

अत्र साम्प्रदायिका:

वृत्तिर्नियतवर्णगतो रसविषयो व्यापार: ।

<div align="right">(Mammaṭa 79^b, vṛtti)</div>

इति ।

तेन चालङ्कारो वृत्त्यनुप्रास: । तथा च वृत्त्यनुप्रासस्य तु सर्वथैव रसा-
ननुगतत्वे स्वरूपहानिमाहु: । अस्माक तु रसाननुगतत्वेन न स्वरूप-
हानिरित्युक्तभूयिष्ठम् ।

असकृत्स्थानसाम्य तु श्रुत्यनुप्रास उच्यते ।

<div align="right">(Viśvanātha X.5^d)</div>

विविधामोदमधुरो वसन्तो मानिनामलम् ॥ ६ ॥

व्यञ्जनानामसकृत्स्थानसाम्य श्रुत्यनुप्रास: ।

यथा ꣼विविधेत्यत्र दन्त्यानाम् ।

यथा वा

दृशा दग्ध मनसिज जीवयन्ति दृशैव या: ।

विरूपाचास्य जयिनीरता: स्तुमो वामलोचना: ॥ [16]

(*Viddha* I.2)

अत्र दन्त्यतालव्यानाम् ।

यथा वा

तदवितथमवादीर्यन्मम त्वं प्रियेति

प्रियजनपरिभुक्तं यद् दुकूलं दधान: ।

मदधिवसतिमागा: कामिनां मण्डनश्री-

व्रजति हि सफलत्वं वल्लभालोकनेन ॥ [17]

(*Māgha* XI.33)

अत्रापि दन्त्यानाम् । एवं कण्ठ्यमूर्द्धन्यादीनामप्यूह्यम् ।

अस्य *स्थानसाम्यमात्रमूलकसौन्दर्यकत्वेन* सकृत्साम्येन चमत्कार इत्युक्तमसवृदिति । एष च श्रुतिमात्रेण सहृदयानां सुखावह इति *श्रुत्यनुप्रास* इति साम्प्रदायिका: (cf. Viśvanāthā X.5^d, *vṛtti*) ।

शब्दार्थयो: पौनरुक्त्यं लाटस्तात्पर्यभेदत: ।

(Viśvanātha X.7^a)

सत्यं कामकला रामा रामाश्चन्द्रकला अपि ॥१०॥

अर्थतो भेदाभावेऽपि यत्र तात्पर्यमात्रभेदेन *शब्दार्थयो: पौन-रुक्त्यं तत्र लाटानुप्रास: ।*

एष च शब्दत एव चमत्काराधायकतया शब्दालङ्कारकोटौ परिपरिगणित: । *लाटजनवल्लभत्वाच्च लाटानुप्रास: ।*एष पदानुप्रास इत्यन्ये (Mammaṭa 81^{a-b}, *vṛtti*) । उदाहरणं यथा कामकलात्वेन चन्द्रकलात्वेन चोपादानतात्पर्येण रामाशब्दार्थयो: ।

यथा वा

यस्य न सविधे दयिता

दवदहनस्तुहिनदीधितिस्तस्य ।

यस्य च सविधे दयिता

दवदहनस्तुहिनदीधितिस्तस्य ॥ [18]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 357 and in Viśvanātha under X.7^{a-b})

पूर्वस्मिन्नुदाहरणे यथाश्रुतान्वयेनैव तात्पर्यसिद्धि: । इह तु *दवदहन-तुहिनदीधित्यो*रुद्देश्यविधेयभावविनिमयेन पदान्तराणामन्वयेनैव च तात्पर्यसिद्धिरिति विशेष: ।

यथा वा

मूर्खो न वितरत्यर्थं नरो दारिद्र्यशङ्क्या ।

प्राज्ञस्तु वितरत्यर्थं नरो दारिद्र्यशङ्क्या ॥ [19]

(Adaptation of the *lakṣya* in Appayyadīkṣita 102)

यथा च

पथ्ये सति गदार्तस्य किमौषधिनिषेवणै: ।

पथ्येऽसति गदार्तस्य किमौषधिनिषेवणै: ॥ [20]

एवं क्वचिद् वृत्तिघटकपदगतत्वेन क्वचित् तद्घटकाघटकपदगतत्वेन नामाख्यातविशेषेण वृत्ते: पञ्चविधत्वेन चाय प्रभूतभेदो दिङ्मात्र-मुदाह्रियते ।

यथा

सितकरकररुचिरविभा विभाकराकार धरणिधर कीर्ति: ।

पौरुषकमला कमला सापि तवैवास्ति नान्यस्य ॥ [21]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 359)

जित्वा विश्वं भवानघ विहरत्यवरोधनै: ।

विहरत्यप्सरोभिस्ते रिपुवर्गो दिवं गत: ॥ [22]

(Daṇḍin II.119)

Sanskrit text on two pages.

हंसायते चारुगतेन कान्ता
    कान्तायते स्पर्शसुखेन चानिलः । [23]

(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.25ᵇ)

एवमुदाहरणान्तराण्यूह्यानि ।

अर्थान्तरसङ्क्रमितवाच्यध्वनिविषये

कदली कदली करभः करभः

    करिराजकरः करिराजकरः ।

भुवनत्रितयेऽपि बिभर्ति तुला-

    मिदमूरुयुग न चमूरुदृशः ॥ [24]

(*Prasanna* I.37)

इत्यादावपि लाटानुप्रास एव । द्वितीयकदल्यादिशब्दानां जाड्यादि-
दोषवत् कदल्याद्युपस्थापकत्वेऽपि तादृशविशिष्टार्थभाने लक्षणाश्रयणेन
लक्षणायाश्च तात्पर्यानुपपत्तिमूलकतया द्वयोः कदल्यादिशब्दयो-
स्तात्पर्यमात्रेण भिन्नार्थत्वात् । अत एव न यमकम् ।⁶

सस्वरान्त्यगतावृत्तिरन्त्यानुप्रास उच्यते ।

वदान्यहृदयख्याता धन्या कापि विदग्धता ॥११॥

आधारभूतस्वरेण सममन्त्ययोऽज्यव्यञ्जनस्यावृत्तिरन्त्यानुप्रासः ।

उत्फुल्लकमलाढ्यानि सरांसि च शुभानने । [25]

इत्यादौ व्यञ्जनमात्रावृत्तौ न चमत्कार इत्युक्तं सस्वरेति । उदाहरणं
यथा वदान्येत्यत्र ताकारस्य । एष पदान्तगतः पादान्तगतश्चेत्युभयथा
प्रसिद्धः ।

पदान्तगतो यथा

मन्द हसन्तः पुलकं वहन्तः [26]

(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.6)

इति ।

यथा वा

केशः काशस्तवकविकासः

    कायः प्रकटितकरभविलासः ।

चन्दुर्दग्धवराटककल्प

    त्यजति न चेतः काममनल्पम् ॥ [27]

(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.6 as his own)

एष पदान्तगतः पादान्तगतश्च ।

यद्यपीह श्रुत्यनुप्रासमन्त्यानुप्रासं च परिगणय्य पञ्च भेदा अनुप्रासस्य
दर्शिता । तथापि श्रुत्यन्त्याख्यौ द्वौ भेदौ तु बहुचमत्कारिणौ प्राचीनै-
रप्यपरिगणितौ कैश्चिदेवाधुनिकैर्नामवन्तौ कृतौ तदनुसारेणैवास्माभिरपि
दर्शितौ । केषाञ्चिन्मते वृत्तिश्रुत्यन्त्यानुप्रासा रीतिस्वरूपस्थितिविशेषा
एव (cf. Mammaṭa 81ᵃ⁻ᵇ) । अस्माभिस्तु शब्दश्रवणजन्यविलक्षण-
चमत्कारहेतुतया शब्दालङ्कारत्वेन प्रतिपादिता । तत्रापि वृत्त्यनुप्रासस्तु
पुनः साधीयानेव ।

क्रमेण विषमार्थाया स्वरव्यञ्जनसंहतेः ।

(Viśvanātha X.8ᵇ)

आवृत्तिः स्थाननियमे यमकं विनिगद्यते ॥ १२ ॥

(Viśvanātha X.8ᵈ)

रहितै रहितैर्भविर्ललितैर्ललितैरपि ।

सहसा सहसा कान्तमधुना मधुनाश्रिताः ॥ १३ ॥

स्थाननियमे सति विभिन्नार्थकस्वरव्यञ्जनसमुदायस्योपात्त-
क्रमेणावृत्तिर्यमकम् ।

सत्यन्तेन स्थाननियमाभावे *अमन्दामोदमन्दारैरित्यादौ* परीरम्भारम्भो
जयति तव रम्भोरुपरित इत्यादौ च न यमकम् । विभिन्नार्थकेति
लाटानुप्रासविषय: शास्त्रीयप्रक्रियामात्रसिद्धो वीप्सादिविषयश्च
व्यावृत्त: । तेन निरुक्तपूर्वस्मिँल्लाटानुप्रासविषये

पथि पथि शुकचञ्चूचारुरामाङ्कुराणा

दिशि दिशि पवमानो वीरुधा लासकश्च ।

नरि नरि किरति द्राक् सायकान् पुष्पधन्वा

पुरि पुरि विनिवृत्ता मानिनीमानचर्चा ॥ [28]

<p align="right">(quoted in Mammaṭa as lakṣya 99)</p>

इत्यादौ वीप्सादिविषयेऽपि न यमक वीप्साया व्यापकताबोध प्रति
द्विर्वचनस्य तात्पर्यग्राहकतया द्वयो: शब्दयो: पृथगर्थत्वाभावात् । एव-
मर्थान्तरसङ्क्रमितवाच्यध्वन्यादिविषयेऽपि लक्षणामात्रेण पृथगर्थतायां
न यमकम् । लक्षणायास्तात्पर्यानुपपत्तिमूलकत्वेन तत्र तात्पर्यमात्रेण
भिन्नार्थतया लाटानुप्रास एवेत्युक्तम् । स्वरव्यञ्जनसमुदायस्येति
स्वरमात्रसाम्ये चित्रविशेषादौ व्यञ्जनमात्रसाम्येऽनुप्रासे च न प्रवृत्ति: ।
उपात्तक्रमेणेति प्रातिलोम्ये दमो मोद इत्यादौ च न यमकम् ।

यथा वा

पृथुकदम्बकदम्बकराजित

ग्रथितमालतमालवनाकुलम् ।

लघुतुषारतुषारजलच्युत

धृतसदानसदाननदन्तिनम् ॥ [29]

<p align="right">(Bhāravi V.9)</p>

पूर्वत्र पादादियमकम् । अत्र पादमध्ययमकमिति विशेष: । एवमन्येऽपि
यमकविशेषा: शृङ्खलासमुद्रकमहायमकादय: ।[7]

शृङ्खलायमकं यथा

---

[7] 'महायमकपादादिमध्यान्तद्विकचतुष्कभ्रमकादय: B.

दिव्यस्त्रीणा सचरणलाद्धारागा

रागायाते निपतितपुष्पापीडा: ।

पीडाभाज: कुसुमचिता: साश्रंस

शसन्त्यस्मिन् सुरतविशेष शय्या ॥ [30]

<p align="right">(Bhāravi V.23)</p>

इद पादाघन्तयमकमपि भवति ।

शुद्ध तद् यथा

समीरशिशिर: शिर:सु वसता

सता जवनिका निकामसुखिनाम् ।

बिभर्ति जनयन्नय मुदमपा-

मपायधवला बलाहकतती: ॥ [31]

<p align="right">(Māgha IV.54)</p>

समुद्रक यथा

दोषाकरोऽपि शनकैर्हि विहीनवृत्त:

सद्वृत्ततां व्रजति मित्रसमागमेन.॥ [32]

उत्तरार्ध तुल्यम् ।

यथा वा

स्मरसुरुचि तरङ्गसङ्गि मूर्ते

सुरतरुचारुचिताशुकानन वा । [33]

उत्तरार्ध तुल्यम् । पूर्वोदाहरणे पदानामभङ्ग: । इह तु भङ्ग इति
विशेष: ।

महायमक यथा

विकाशमीयुर्जगतीशमार्गणा

विकाशमीयुर्जगतीशमार्गणा: ।

विकाशमीयुर्जगतीशमार्गणा

　　विकाशमीयुर्जगतीशमार्गणाः ॥ [34]

(Bhāravi XV.52)

अन्येऽपि विशेषा एवमनेकसंस्थानसम्भवाः पादादिमध्यान्तगतादिका

ऊह्याः ।

यमकादौ भवेदैक्यं डलोर्वबोलरोस्तथा ।

इत्याद्यभियुक्तनयाद्

भुजलतां जडतामबलाजनः ॥ [35]　　　(Raghu IX.46[d])

इत्यादिषु न यमकत्वहानिः ।

(Viśvanātha after X.8)

इति बोध्यम् ।

अथ यमके स्थाननियमे महाकाव्येषु तुरीयपादगतविभिन्नार्थकस्वर-
व्यञ्जनसमुदायस्योपात्तक्रमेणावृत्तौ

अथ रिरंसुममुं युगपद् गिरौ

　　कृतयथास्वतरुप्रसवक्रिया ।

ऋतुगणेन निषेवितुमादधे

　　भुवि पदं विपदन्तकृतं सताम् ॥ [36]

(Māgha VI.1)

इत्यादौ विश्वजनीनो यमकव्यपदेशो व्याहत इति । नैव तत्र पूर्वोत्तरः
पद्यानां तथात्वेन प्रबन्धगतस्थाननियमात् ।
तदुक्तं वामनेन

पदमनेकार्थमिचारं वाऽऽवृत्तं स्थाननियमे यमकम् ।

(Vāmana IV.1.1)

इति ।

यानि त्वेकपादभागवृत्तीनि यमकानि दृश्यन्ते तेषु श्लोकान्तरस्थस्थान-
यमकापेच्चयैव *स्थाननियम* इति च । अत्र चैकस्वरमात्रगतावृत्तौ
लचणप्राप्तावपि चमत्कारलाघवान्न यमकमिति सर्वे नवीनाः । वामनस्तु
तत्रापि वर्णयमकमिति नाम्ना यमकमाहोदाजहार च

नानाविधेन कान्ताभ्रूराराधितमनोभुवा ।

विविक्तेन विलासेन ततत्त हृदयं नृपाम् ॥ [37]

(quoted in Vāmana under IV.1.2)

इति ।

विषमार्थत्वाभावे मास्तु यमकम् । विषमार्थत्वे तु स्यादेवेति च ।
नवीनानां तु द्वयोरनयोः पूर्वमनुप्रासविषयः । उत्तरं चित्रविषयः । परन्तु
लचणप्राप्तौ सत्यां न यमकमिति प्रसह्य वक्तुमशक्यं गौप्या अपि
विषमार्थतायाः प्रयोजकत्वाभ्युपगमादुत्तरस्य विच्छित्तिविशेषाच्चित्रत्वे
बाधकेऽपि पूर्वस्य यमकत्वानपायात् । यमकं खलु पदभङ्गेन
रामणीयकं भवति । उक्तं च वामनेन

भङ्गात् तदुत्कर्षः ।

(Vāmana IV.1.3)

इति ।

तथा च भङ्गाभङ्गप्रयोज्यस्त्रिधा यमकविषयः: (cf. Viśvanātha 12[c-d]) ।
भङ्गादावृत्तानुपूर्व्या नैरर्थक्यादभङ्गादावृत्तानुपूर्व्याः सार्थक्याच्च । उभयोः
सार्थक्यमुभयोर्नैरर्थक्यमेकस्याः सार्थक्यमपरस्या नैरर्थक्यमिति । अत्र
भङ्गेनाभङ्गेन च बहून्युदाहरणानि प्रदर्शितानि । शृङ्खलापरिवर्तकचूर्णकादि
नानाविधावान्तरभेदप्रदर्शनं तु वामनकृतमनुसन्धेयम् (cf. Vāmana IV.1.4-
7)। ननु भिन्नार्थकत्वं नाम भेदवच्छक्यतावच्छेदकत्वम् । तथा च
निरर्थकानुपूर्व्याः शक्यतावच्छेदकाप्रसिद्ध्या तत्प्रतियोगिकभेदस्यैव
दुर्वचतया निरर्थकशब्दस्वरूपस्य विभिन्नार्थकत्वासम्भवान्निरुक्तयमक-
लचणस्योभयनैरर्थक्यस्थलेऽन्यतरैकतरविधत्वस्थले चाव्याप्तिः ।
सत्यम् । निरर्थकानुपूर्व्याः काव्ये भङ्गेनैव सम्भवात् तत्र निरर्थकानुपूर्व्या
अपि सार्थकानुपूर्वीं विशेषघटकत्वेन गौणी सार्थकता जिघृचिता । एवं
च लचणे *विषमार्थायाः* इत्यस्य *विषमार्थायाः* विषमार्थकानुपूर्वीं विशेष-
घटिकायाश्चेत्यर्थः । इति कृतं पल्लवितेन ।

उक्तौ न्यासे च वैचित्र्यं *वर्णानां* चित्रमुच्यते ।

(Viśvanātha X.13[b])

समानमानभाजां तु मानपेद्धां क्वचित् कृथाः ॥१४॥

यत्र काव्यानुपूर्व्या उक्तौ वैचित्र्यं यत्र च विन्यासविशेषवशा-
च्छत्रपद्मखड्गचक्रमुरजगोमूत्रसर्वतोभद्रार्धभ्रमकादिरूपेण *वर्णानां*
क्वचित् पर्यावर्तनेन क्वचिदन्ययैव च काव्यस्वरूपस्थिति-
सम्भवस्तत्र चित्रालङ्कारः ।

येन चित्रकाव्यमुच्यते ।

उक्तौ न्यासे चेत्यत्र *वर्णानां* न्यासः पदानामुक्तिरिति समन्वयः
पदस्फोटस्य मुख्यतयोक्तत्वादिति सामान्यनिर्देशे पदानुसन्धानात् ।
न्यासस्तु वर्णानाम् । पदानामपि च सम्भवति । अपृथङ्निर्देशस्तु
सामान्यानुसन्धानिकः ।

तदाह वाग्भटोऽपि

यत्राङ्गसन्धितद्रूपैरदोरैर्वस्तुकल्पना ।

सत्यां प्रसत्तौ तच्चित्रं तच्चित्रं यच्च चित्रकृत् ॥

(Vāgbhaṭa IV.7)

इति ।

यत् तु लक्षितं मम्मटेन[8]

तच्चित्रं यत्र वर्णानां खड्गाद्याकृतिहेतुता ।

(Mammaṭa 85[c-d])

इति ।

तदव्यापकं न्यासवैचित्र्यमात्रे पर्यवसानात् ।[9]

उदाहरणं यथा *समान्त्येष्वि*त्युदाहरणे च्छत्रबन्धः ।

---

8.   A omits : मम्मटेन.

9.   B adds : अत्र सर्वत्र न्यासचित्रोदाहरणे न्यासोऽपि दर्शनीयः ।

पद्मबन्धो यथा

भासते प्रतिभासार रसाभाताहतांविभा ।

भावितात्मा शुभा वादे देवाभा बत ते सभा ॥ [38]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 387)

खड्गबन्धो यथा

मारारिशत्रुरामेभमुखैरासाररंहसा ।

सारारब्धस्तवा नित्यं तदार्तिहरणाद्दमा ॥ [39]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 384)

माता नतानां सङ्घट्टः श्रिया बाधितसम्भ्रमा ।

मान्याथ सीमा रामाणां शं मे दिश्यादुमादिमा ॥ [40]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 385)

चक्रबन्धो यथा

स त्वं मानविशिष्टमाजिरभसादालम्ब्य भव्यः पुरो
लब्धाघच्चयशुद्धिरुद्धुरतरश्रीवत्सभूमिर्मुदा ।

मुक्त्वा काममपास्तभीः परमृगव्यधः स नादं हरेः
रेकोधैः समकालमभ्रमुदया रोपैस्तदा तस्तरे ॥ [41]

(quoted in *Sarasvatī* II as *lakṣya* 290)

मुरजबन्धो यथा

सरला बहुलारम्भतरलालिबलारवा ।

वारलाबहुलामन्दकरलाबहुलामला ॥ [42]

(quoted in Mammaṭa as *lakṣya* 386)

गोमूत्रबन्धो यथा

नासुरोऽय न वा नागो धरसंस्थो न राच्चास: ।

ना सुखोऽऽय नवाभोगो धरणिस्थो हि राजस: ॥ [43]

<div align="right">(Bhāravi XV.12)</div>

सर्वतोभद्रबन्धो यथा

देवाकानिनि कावादे वाहिकास्वस्वकाहि वा ।

काकारेभभरे काका निस्वभव्यव्यभस्वनि ॥ [44]

<div align="right">(Bhāravi XV.25)</div>

अर्धभ्रमकबन्धो यथा

ससत्त्वरतिदे नित्य सदरामर्षनाशिनि ।

त्वराधिककसन्नादे रमकत्वमकर्षति ॥ [45]

<div align="right">(Bhāravi XV.27)</div>

एवमन्यान्यपि चित्राणि लोकप्रसिद्धवस्तुसंस्थानसमन्यासनिबद्धान्यूह्यानि । सोऽप्युक्तिवैचित्र्यलक्षणश्चित्रस्यैव विशेषो य: पुनरन्तर्लापनिकाबहिर्लापनिकाभाषासमक्च्युतदत्ताक्षरादिरूपो विदग्धमुखमण्डनादौ प्रसिद्ध: । वाग्भटस्त्वन्तर्लापनिका गूढप्रश्नोत्तरमित्यर्थालङ्कारमाहोदाहरच्च

किमम्भ: श्लाघ्यमाख्याति पत्त्रिणं क: कुतो यश: ।

गरुड: कीदृशो नित्य दानवारिविराजित: ॥ [46]

<div align="right">(Vāgbhaṭa IV.147)</div>

इति ।

परन्त्वन्तर्लापनिकाया: शब्दन्यासप्रयोज्यचमत्कारजीवत्वादर्थे चमत्कारित्वाभावेन नार्थालङ्कारत्वम् । प्रश्नोत्तरस्य तु स विषय: । यत्र प्रश्नोत्तराभ्यां प्रतिपित्सायोग्य: कोऽप्यर्थं उपनिबद्ध्येत ।

यथा

अस्मिन्नपारससारसागरे मज्जतां सताम् ।

किं समालम्बनं साधो रागद्वेषपरिच्चय: ॥ [47]

<div align="right">(Vāgbhaṭa IV.145)</div>

दानवारिविराजित इत्यत्र हि शब्दन्यासे कविसरम्भ: । कविसरम्भगोचरो ह्यलङ्कारविषयत्वमर्हति । एतेन च शब्दार्थालङ्कारयोर्विभाग: । तथा च चित्रमेवान्तर्लापनिकादि ।

अन्तर्लापनिका यथा

कस्मिन् वसन्ति वद मीनगणा विकल्प

    किं वापदं वदति किं कुरुते विवस्वान् ।

विद्युल्लतावलयवान् पथिकाङ्गनाना-

    मुद्वेजको भवति क: खलु वारिवाह: ॥ [48]

<div align="right">(Vidagdha II.27)</div>

यथा वा

का काली का मधुरा का शीतलवाहिनी गङ्ग ।

कं सञ्जघान कृष्ण: कं बलवन्तं न बाधते शीत: ॥ [49]

<div align="right">(quoted in *Subhāṣita* under antarālāpāḥ 15)</div>

पूर्वस्मिन्नन्तिमप्रश्नोत्तराच्चरपरिवर्तनेन[10] पूर्वपूर्वप्रश्नोत्तरलाभ: । अत्र तत्तत्प्रश्नानां तत्तदानुपूर्वीभिरेव तत्तदुत्तरलाभ इति विशेष: ।[11]

यथा च

निरीच्य कमुपस्थित हृदयमार्द्रतां गाहते

    किमाह परिपीडिता प्रियतमेन बालाबला ।

विमर्श्यमथ किं विदु: परिणिनीषत: कन्यका

    कथं भवति कामिनो विलसितं हि वामाकुलम् ॥ [50]

अत्र *वामाकुलमित्यश*स्य प्रत्येकमच्चरयोजनया[12] तत्तदुत्तरलाभ: ।

---

10. °द्दारविभागेन B.

11. B adds: प्रशसार्हा खल्वेषा कविता ।

12. °मच्चरपरिवर्तनेन योजनया B.

बहिरलपनिका यथा

उरसि मुरभिदः का गाढमालिङ्गितास्ते
　सरसिजमकरन्दामोदिता नन्दने का ।
गिरिसमलघुवर्णैरर्णवाख्या त्रिसङ्ख्यै-
　र्गुरुभिरपि कृता का च्छन्दसा वृत्तिरेका ॥ [51]

<div align="right">(Vidagdha II.36)</div>

अस्योत्तरं मालिनीति ।

च्युतदत्ताचारा यथा

भवित्री रम्भोरु त्रिदशवदनग्लानिरधुना
　स ते रामः स्थाता न युधि पुरतो लक्ष्मणसखः ।
इयं यास्यत्युच्चैर्विपदमधुना वानरचमू-
　र्लघिष्ठेयं षष्ठाक्षरपरविलोपात् पठ पुनः ॥ [52]

<div align="right">(Hanūmat X.12)</div>

यद्यपि च्युतदत्ताचाराया वर्णन्यासवैचित्र्यलक्षणत्वमपि दृश्यते । तथापि मुरजबन्धादेरिव केवलन्यासवैचित्र्याभावादुक्तिसान्निपातिक एव चमत्कार इत्युक्तिवैचित्र्यलक्षणत्वं वर्णितं द्वितयसान्निपातिकेऽपि पदस्फोटस्य मुख्यतयोक्तेरेव प्राधान्यात् ।

च्युतदत्ताचारा खलु कविता व्यक्तीकृतैव रम्या न तु प्रहेलिकादिरूपा । तस्यास्तु प्रत्युत रसप्रतिकूलत्वेन[13] न सत्काव्यविषयत्वम् ।[14]
यथा

महानपि सुधीरोऽपि बहुरत्नयुतोऽपि सन् ।
विरसः कुपरीवारो नदीनः केन सेव्यते ॥ [53]

<div align="right">(Vidagdha IV.65)</div>

13.　रसादिचर्वणप्रतिकूलत्वेन B.

14.　A adds: तत्र क्लिष्टत्वाच्छ्रोतुर्वैमुख्येन रसास्वादभङ्ग इति रसप्रतिकूलत्वम् ।

अत्र नदीनामिन इति समुद्रपक्षे तु स्पष्टम् । नकारच्युत्या दीन इति स्मरणेन कृपणपक्षे तु क्लिष्टं तदक्षरच्युतिविषयककवितात्पर्या-भिव्यञ्जकसामग्र्यभावात् ।

तदुक्तमभियुक्तैः:

काव्यान्तर्गडुभूता[15] या सा तु नेह प्रपञ्च्यते ।
रसस्य परिपन्थित्वान्नालङ्कारः प्रहेलिका ॥
उक्तिवैचित्र्यमात्रं सा च्युतदत्ताक्षरादिका ।

<div align="right">(Viśvanātha X.13ᶜ-14ᵇ)</div>

इति ।

भाषासमकं यथा

मञ्जुलमणिमञ्जीरे
　कलगम्भीरे विहारसरसीतीरे ।
विरसासि केलिकीरे
　किमालि धीरे च गन्धराजसमीरे ॥ [54]

<div align="right">(quoted in Viśvanātha under X.10 as his own)</div>

इदं पद्यं संस्कृतप्राकृतशौरसेनीप्राच्यावन्तीनागरापभ्रंशेष्वेकविधं वदन्ति (cf. Viśva X.10 vṛtti)। द्वयक्षरैकाक्षरगतप्रत्यागतादिकमपि न्यासवैचित्र्य-लक्षणश्चित्रविशेषः । तस्य क्वचिद् यमकादिलक्षणन्नमन्वयेऽपि विच्छित्तिविशेषाच्चित्रत्वं बाधकम् ।

द्व्यक्षरं यथा

क्रूरारिकारी कोरेककारकः कारिकाकरः ।
कोरकाकारकरकः करीरः कर्करोऽर्करुक् ॥ [55]

<div align="right">(Māgha XIX.104)</div>

15.　A adds: अन्तर्गडुभूता विशेषप्र...नरूपप्रयोजन...त्येन वृथोपन्यास...णा ।

एकाचर यथा

दाददो दुद्दुद्दादी दादादो दुददीददो: ।

दुद्दाद ददद्दे दुद्दे ददादददददोऽदद: ॥ [56]

अनुस्वारविसर्गाभ्यां तु नैकाचारत्वहानि: ।

तदाहु:

नानुस्वारविसर्गौ तु चित्रभङ्गाय सम्मतौ ।

इति ।

गतप्रत्यागत यथा

वेत्रशाककुञ्जे शैलेऽलेशेजेऽकुकशात्रवे ।

यात किं विदिशो जेतु तुञ्जेशो दिवि किन्तया ॥ [57]

एव क्रियाकारकगुप्तादीन्यप्युक्तिवैचित्र्यलक्षणाश्चित्रविशेषा: ।

तत्र क्रियागुप्त कर्तृगुप्त च यथा

जम्बूफलानि पक्वानि गत्वा गत्वा वनं वनम् ।

वीप्सात: कथितो ह्यर्थो भवद्भिर्नावगम्यते ॥ [58]

इत्थमन्यान्यपि चित्ररूपाणि यथासम्भवमूह्यानि ।

अथैतेषां शब्दालङ्काराणामप्यर्थालङ्काराणामिव **संसृष्टि: सङ्करश्च** सम्भवत: ।

तत्र संसृष्टिर्यथा

मधुरया मधुबोधितमाधवी-
    मधुसमृद्धिसमेधितमेधया ।

मधुकराङ्गनया मुहुरुन्मद-
    ध्वनिभृता निभृताचारमुज्जगे ॥ [59]

अत्र च्छेकवृत्तिलाटानुप्रासानां यमकस्य च संसृष्टि: । एवमुदाहृत-पूर्वेष्वपि काव्येषु संसृष्टि: पर्यालोचनीया । सरलेत्यादिप्रदर्शितमुरज-बन्धोदाहरणे च्छेकवृत्त्यनुप्रासयोर्मुरजबन्धचित्रस्य चाङ्गाङ्गिभावेनैक-वाचकानुप्रवेशेन च सङ्कर: सम्भवति । मुरजबन्धनिमित्तभूतस्य परिवर्त-विशेषस्याप्यनुकूलानुपूर्वीपरिनिष्ठयां तदनुस्यूतानुप्रासमन्तरा प्रवृत्त्य-सम्भवात् । *विकाशमीयुरिति* महायमकोदाहरणेऽपि महायमकस्य गो-मूत्रिकाबन्धस्य च समप्राधान्येन सन्देहेनैकवाचकानुप्रवेशेन च सङ्कर: सम्भवति । एवमन्यत्रापि भूयसी सङ्करस्थितिरुपलभ्येत ।

किन्तु शब्दालङ्कारसङ्करोऽर्थालङ्कारसङ्कर इव न चमत्कारी शब्दा-लङ्काराणामुत्कृष्टालङ्कारान्तरप्रवेशेऽपकृष्टालङ्काराणामपरिगणनात् । तेन हि तत्र नाभियुक्तानां निर्णये प्रवृत्ति: । अस्माभिस्तु सम्भवतीत्येव दिङ्-मात्रमुपदर्शितम् ।

उत्तमाननुबन्धित्वान्निर्णये लाघवादपि ।

शब्दालङ्कारविषयो दीदितार्यैरुपेक्षित: ॥ १५ ॥

जिज्ञास्य एव बालानामप्येष विषयस्त्विति ।

इदं कुवलयानन्दपरिशिष्टं मया कृतम् ॥ १६ ॥

रहस्यमिह यत् किञ्चित् स्वल्पमप्युपदर्शितम् ।

श्रीमन्नृसिंहचरणा: प्रथमं तत्र कारणम् ॥ १७ ॥

इति श्रीमद्विज्ञानकेशरिकविरत्नकृत कुवलयानन्दपरिशिष्टम् ॥ शुभम् ॥[16]

---

16.   A adds: वैक्रमे १९३७ मिते वर्षे । B bears no date. B adds.: श्रीभगवति ॥

An Index of Quotations Which Read Differently in Printed Editions from What Is in the *Kuvalayānandapariśiṣṭa*

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

1

उरसि मुरभिदः का गाढमालिङ्गितास्ते
   सरसिजमकरन्दामोदिता नन्दने का ।
गिरिसमलघुवर्णैरर्णवाख्या त्रिसङ्ख्यै-
   र्गुरुभिरपि कृता का च्छन्दसां वृत्तिरेका ॥

(Text : verse 51)

Vidagdha II.36:

उरसि मुरभिदः का गाढमालिङ्गितास्ते
   सरसिजमकरन्दामोदिता नन्दने का ।
गिरिसमलघुवर्णैरर्णवाख्यातिसङ्ख्यै-
   र्गुरुभिरपि कृता का च्छन्दसां वृत्तिरम्या ॥

2

का काली का मधुरा का शीतलवाहिनी गङ्गा ।
कं सञ्जघान कृष्णः कं बलवन्तं न बाधते शीतः ॥

(Text : verse 49)

Subhāṣita antarālāpāḥ 15:

कं सञ्जघान कृष्णः का शीतलवाहिनी गङ्गा ।
के दारपोषणरताः कं बलवन्तं न बाधते शीतम् ॥

3

काव्यान्तर्गडुभूता या सा तु नेह प्रपञ्च्यते ।

Viśvanātha X. after 13[a]

काव्यान्तर्गडुभूततया तु नेह प्रपञ्च्यते ।[1]

4

किमम्भः श्लाघ्यमाख्याति पद्मिणां कः कुतो यशः ।
गरुडः कीदृशो नित्यं दानवारिविराजितः ॥

(Text : verse 46)

Vāgbhaṭa IV.147:

किमैम्भ श्लाघ्यमाख्याति पद्मिणां कः कुतो यशः ।
गरुडः कीदृशो नित्यं दानवारिविराजितः ॥

5

जित्वा विश्वं भवानद्य विहरत्यवरोधनैः ।
विहरत्यप्सरोभिस्ते रिपुवर्गो दिवं गतः ॥

(Text : verse 22)

Daṇḍin II.119:

जित्वा विश्वं भवानत्र विहरत्यवरोधनैः ।
विहरत्यप्सरोभिस्ते रिपुवर्गो दिवं गतः ॥

6

दृशा दग्धं मनसिजं जीवयन्ति दृशैव याः ।
विरूपाक्षस्य जयिनीस्ताः स्तुमो वामलोचनाः ॥

(Text : verse 16)

---

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

Viddha I.2 :

दृशा दग्धं मनसिजं जीवयन्ति दृशैव या: ।
विरूपाचास्य जयिनीस्ता: स्तुवे वामलोचना: ॥

7

नानाविधेन कान्ताभ्रूराराधितमनोभुवा ।
विविक्तेन विलासेन ततत्त हृदयं नृणाम् ॥

(Text : verse 37)

Vāmana under IV.1.2 :

नानाकारेण कान्ताभ्रूराराधितमनोभुवा ।
विविक्तेन विलासेन ततत्त हृदयं नृणाम् ॥

8

नानुस्वारविसर्गौ तु चित्रभङ्गाय सम्मतौ ।

(Text : p. 110)

Vāgbhaṭa I.20^c-d:

नानुस्वारविसर्गौ च चित्रभङ्गाय सम्मतौ ।

9

पदमनेकार्थमत्तारं वाऽऽवृत्तं स्थाननियमे यमकम् ।

(Text : p. 102)

Vāmana IV.1.1:

पदमनेकार्थमत्तारं चावृत्तं स्थाननियमे यमकम् ।

10

पृथुकदम्बकदम्बकराजितं
ग्रथितमालतमालवनाकुलम् ।

लघुतुषारतुषारजलच्युतं
धृतसदानसदाननदन्तिनम् ॥

(Text : verse 29)

Bhāravi V.9:

पृथुकदम्बकदम्बकराजितं
ग्रथितमालतमालवनाकुलम् ।
लघुतुषारतुषारजलश्च्युतं [2]
धृतसदानसदाननदन्तिनम् ॥ [29]

11

भवित्री रम्भोरु त्रिदशवदनग्लानिरधुना
स ते राम: स्थाता न युधि पुरतो लक्ष्मणसख: ।
इयं यास्यत्युच्चैर्विपदमधुना वानरचमू-
र्लघिष्ठेय षष्ठाद्दारपरविलोपात् पठ पुन: ॥

(Text : verse 52)

Hanūmat X.12:

भवित्री रम्भोरु त्रिदशवदनग्लानिरधुना
स ते राम: स्थाता न युधि पुरतो लक्ष्मणसख: ।
इयं यास्यत्युच्चैर्विपदमधुना वानरचमू-
र्लघिष्ठेद षष्ठाद्दारपरविलोपात् पठ पुन: ॥

12

मञ्जुलमणिमञ्जीरे
कलगम्भीरे विहारसरसीतीरे ।

---

2.   The printed edition referred to in the bibliography gives a reading
     identical with Vijñānakeśarin's as the variant.

विरसासि केलिकीरे

   किमालि धीरे च गन्धराजसमीरे ॥

(Text : verse 54)

Viśvanātha under X.10 :

मञ्जुलमणिमञ्जीरे

   कलगम्भीरे विहारसरसीतीरे ।

विरसासि केलिकीरे

   किमालि धीरे च गन्धसारसमीरे ॥

· 13

यत्राङ्गसन्धितद्रूपैरद्वारैर्वस्तुकल्पना ।

सत्यां प्रसत्तौ तच्चित्रं तच्चित्रं यच्च चित्रकृत् ॥

(Text : p. 104)

Vāgbhaṭa IV.7 :

यत्राङ्गसन्धितद्रूपैरद्वारैर्वस्तुकल्पना ।

सत्यां प्रसत्तौ तच्चित्रं तच्चित्रं चित्रकृच्च यत् ॥

14

यमकादौ भवेदैक्यं डलोर्बबोर्लरोस्तथा ।

इत्याद्यभियुक्तनयाद्

(Text: before verse 35)

Viśvanātha after X.8 :

यमकादौ भवेदैक्यं डलोर्बवोर्लरोस्तथा ।

इत्युक्तनयाद्

15

हंसायते चारुगतेन कान्ता

   कान्तायते स्पर्शसुखेन चानिल: ।[3]

(Text : verse 23)

Viśvanātha under X.25[b]:

   हंसायते चारुगतेन कान्ता । (*pāda* 2)

कान्तायते स्पर्शसुखेन वारि (*pāda* 3)

---

3.   Note the strange blend of *Indravajrā* and *Indravaṃśā*.

Bibliography

Acharya, Baburam

1946   *Purāṇā kavi ra kavitā* [Older poets and poems]. Kathmandu: Nepālī Bhāṣāprakāśinī Samiti, V.S. 2003 Vaiśākha.

Acharya, Jayaraj

1980   *Traditional Grammars: English and Nepali: A Study.* Kathmandu: Self-published.

Appayyadīkṣita   *Kuvalayānanda*

Śrīmadappayyadīkṣitapraṇītaḥ kuvalayānandaḥ | jayadeva-viracitacandrālokavyākhyārūpaḥ candrālokasahitaḥ | śrīmat-tatsadupākhyavaidyanāthasūriviracitayā alaṃkāracandrikā-vyākhyayālaṃkṛtaḥ. 2nd ed. Ed. Wāsudev Laxman Pansīkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 1907.

Arjel, Dhruva Prasad

1964   'Kavi Udayānanda' [The poet Udayānanda]. *Nepālī* 18 (V.S. 2020 Māgha-Caitra): 3-15.

Aryal, Ramji Prasad

1990   *Nepālako itihāsa ra arjyāla-parivāra* [The history of Nepal and the Arjyal family]. Kathmandu: Bindu Aryal, V.S. 2047 Vijayadaśamī.

Atreya, V.R.

1985   *Arjyāla vaṃśāvalī ra kula-vṛtta* [The genealogy of the Arjyals and the family history]. Varanasi: Alaka Prakashan.

Baral, Ishwar

n.d.   'Prāthamika nepālī sāhitya 1: indirasa tathā vidyāranya-kesarī aryāla [Early Nepali literature 1. Indirasa and Vidyāranyakesarī Aryāla]. *Pragati* 10:65-79.

1985   'Viṣṇubhakta kavi vidyāranyakesarī arjyāla' [Vidyā-ranyakesarī Arjyāla, a poet devoted to Viṣṇu]. *Prajñā* 50 (V.S. 2042 Vaiśākha-Āṣādha): 1-32.

Bhandari, Vishnu Prasâd

1934   'Bhūmikā':1-14 to Cakrapāṇi. See: Cakrapāṇi.

Bhāravi   *Kirātārjunīya*

The Kirâtârjunîya of Bhâravi with the Commentary (Ghaṇṭâpatha) of Mallinâtha and Various Readings. 10th ed. Ed. Durgâprasâd and Kâśinâth Pânḍurang Parab. Rev. Wâsudev Laxman Shâstrî Pansîkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sâgar Press, 1926.

Bhoja   *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇālaṅkāra*

Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇālaṃkāra. Ed. Biswanath Bhatta-charya. The Banaras Hindu University Sanskrit Series 14. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1979.

Cakrapāṇi   *Praśnatattva*

Praśnatattvam | kāśināthaviracitaṭīkopetam uttānaganitam ca | rājagurupurohitapaṇḍitacakrapāṇiviracitam. Ed. Vishnu Prasâd Bhandari. Kathmandu: Padmanābhakeśarin, 1934.

Chavilāla Sūri

1894   *Sundaracaritaṃ nāma nāṭakam.* Bombay: Self-published, Śaka 1816.

Daivajñakeśarin   *Kulacandrikā*

Paṇḍitadaivajñakeśariviracitā kulacandrikā (arjyāla-vaṃśāvalī). Gorakṣagranthamālā 61. Ed. Candranath Yogi. Varanasi: Yogapracariṇī, V.S. 2013 Mārga [1956].

Daṇḍin   *Kāvyādarśa*

The Kāvyādarśa of Śrī Daṇḍin. Bibliotheca Indica 30, 33, 38, 39, 41. Ed. and comm. Premachandra Tarkavāgīśa. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1863.

Dharmadāsa   *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana*

Śrīdharmadāsasūripraṇītaṃ vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana-kāvyam | svopajñavyākhyāsamalaṃkṛtam. 4th ed. Ed. Wâsudev Laxman Pansîkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1926.

Dikshit, Kamal, ed.

~1968   *Sūktisindhu (pheri)* [*Sūktisindhu* (again)]. Jagadambā
         Prakāśana 49. Lalitpur: Jagadambā Prakāśana, V.S. 2024
         Caitra.

1978   *Buĩgala* [Attic]. 3rd ed. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan. V.S.
         2034 Caitra.

Gautam, Dhanush Chandra

1965   'Hāsyakadamba: nepālī bhāṣāko jetho nāṭaka' [*Hāsya-
         kadamba*: the earliest drama in the Nepali language]. *Roop-
         Rekha* 55 (V.S. 2022 Mārga):31-43.

Gīta   *Gītagovinda*. See: Jayadeva.

Hanūmat   *Hanūmannāṭaka*

              Hanūmannāṭaka of śrī Hanumāna. Ed. comm. and trans.
              Jagadīsha Mishra. The Haridas Sanskrit Series 271.
              Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1967.

Jayadeva   *Gītagovinda*

              Gītagovinda of Jayadeva: Love Song of the Dark Lord. Ed.
              and trans. Barbara Stoler Miller. Reprint. Delhi, Varanasi,
              Patna: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

Jayadeva   *Prasannarāghava*

              The Prasannarâghava of Jayadeva. Ed. Vâsudev Laxmaṇ
              Shâstrî Paṇsîkar. Bombay: Nirnaya-sagara Press, 1922.

Kālidāsa   *Raghuvaṃśa*

              *The Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa with the Commentary of
              Mallinātha*. 5th ed. Ed. and trans. Gopal Raghunath
              Nandargikar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

Kane, P.V.

1961   *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. 3rd ed. Delhi: Motilal
         Banarsidass.

Khanal, Mohan Prasad

1973   'Śaktivallabhako arko nepālī anuvāda' [Another Nepali
         translation by Śaktivallabha]. *Gorkhapatra*. V.S. 2030,
         Śrāvaṇa 13 (July 28);7.

Khiste, Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī

1928   *Vidvachcharita Panchakam*. The Princess of Wales
         Saraswati Bhawana Texts 27 (Monograph 1). Benares:
         Government Sanskrit Library.

Kuvalayānanda   See: Appayyadīkṣita.

Lamsal, Devi Prasad

1964   *Nepālarāṣṭriyapustakālayasthahastalikhitapustakānām sūcī-
         patram*. Pt. 2. , subpart 1, Purātattvagranthamālā 27.
         Kathmandu: Nepal National Library, V.S. 2021 Jyeṣṭha.

Lohani Pushkar, ed.

1990   '*Sundarī*' *kālako sāhityaśāstra vesarī* [Vesarī, the poetics of
         the Sundarī period]. Prajendramālā 4. Kathmandu: Prajendra
         Prakashan, V.S. 2047 Vijayādaśamī.

Māgha   *Śiśupālavadha*

              *Śrīdattakasūnumahākavimāghapranītam śiśupālavadham.
              mahopādhyāyakolācalamallināthasūrikṛtayā sarvaṅ-
              kaṣāvyākhyayā, vallabhadeva–dinakara-tīkāviśeṣāṃśa-
              pāṭhāntara-ṭippaṇī-pariśiṣṭādibhih samullasitam.* 12th ed.
              Ed. Durgāprasāda *et al*. Rev. Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya.
              Bombay: Nirnaya-sāgara Press, 1957.

Mammaṭa   *Kāvyaprakāśa*

              Kāvyaprakāsha of Mammaṭa. Ed. and trans. Ganganatha
              Jha. Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1967.

Nepal, Gyan Mani

1982   'Nepālī sāhityakā eka ujjvala tārā; ajhai ojhelamā' [A
         bright star in Nepali literature, who remains still shrouded
         in darkness]. *Prajñā* 39 (V.S. 2039 Śrāvaṇa–Āśvina): 71-
         85.

1983   'Mahākavi paṃ. udayānanda arjela ra unako kāvyasādhanā;
       – eka adhyayana' [The great poet Pandit Udayānanda Arjela
       and his accomplishments in poetry: a study]. *Prajñā* 41
       (V.S. 2039 Māgha–Caitra): 7-45.

1984   'Nepālako prācīna itihāsamā paṃ. udayānandakā udgāra'
       [Pundit Udayānanda's utterances on Nepal's ancient
       history]. *Raśmi* 3 (V.S. 2040 Māgha-Caitra):12-20.

1992   'Śrī mahākavi udayānanda arjelakā grantha, grantha-
       saṃgraha ra saṃskṛta padya' [Works, collections and
       Sanskrit verses by the venerable great poet Udayānanda
       Arjela]. *Unnayan* 8 (V.S. 2048 Māgha–Caitra): 100-114.

Nepali, Chittaranjan

   n.d.   'Nepālī bhāṣāko euṭā purāno kavitā' [An early poem of the
          Nepali language]. *Pragati* 13:1-11.

Padmanābhakeśarin

   1934   'Prakāśakīyā vinītābhyarthanā' in Cakrapāṇi.
          See: Cakrapāṇi.

Pant, Dinesh Raj

   1985-88   *Gorakhāko itihāsa* [History of Gorkha]. 3 pts. Pagination
             unbroken. Kathmandu: Self-published.

Pant, Mahes Raj

   1985   'Ṭippanako pustaka' [A manuscript of horoscopes].
          Pūrṇimā 64 (V.S. 2041 Caitra):12-33.

Pant, Naya Raj

   1957   'Upodghāta' [Introduction]: 1-52 to Śaktivallabha. See:
          Śaktivallabha.

   1976   'Vedāṅgajyautiṣa ra licchavi-kālagaṇanā' [The
          Vedāṅgajyautisa and Licchavi chronometry]. *Pūrṇimā* 34
          (V.S. 2033 Vaiśākha): 83-94.

   1976a 'Saradāra paṇḍita chavilāla dhuṅgelako sundaracarita-
          nāṭakamā parekā vyākaraṇaviṣayakā kehī aśuddhiko
          saṃśodhana' [Correction of some of the grammatical errors

       occurring in the *Sundaracaritanāṭaka* by Sirdar Pundit
       Chavilāla Dhuṅgela]. *Pūrṇimā* 34:128-136.

Forthcoming *Daivajñaśiromaṇi lakṣmīpati pāḍeko dhūpaghaḍī* [A sundial
       by Daivajñaśiromaṇi Lakṣmīpati Pāḍe]. Kathmandu: Royal
       Nepal Academy.

Pokhrel, Balkrishna

   1964   *Nepālī bhāṣā ra sāhitya*   [Nepali language and
          literature]. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, V.S. 2021
          Bhādra.

   1986   *Pāca saya varṣa* [Five hundred years (of the Nepali
          language)]. 3rd ed. Lalitpur: Sajha Prakashan, V.S. 2043.

Prasanna   *Prasannarāghava.*   See: Jayadeva.

Praśnatattva   See: Cakrapāṇi.

Raghavan, V.

   1968   *New Catalogus Catalogorum.* Vol. 4. Madras: University
          of Madras.

Raghu   *Raghuvamśa.*   See: Kālidāsa.

Rājaśekhara   *Viddhaśālabhañjikā*

              *Viddhaśālabhañjikā-Nāṭikā of Mahākavi Rājśekhar… with
              Nārāyaṇ Dixit's Sanskrit Commentary and Own Hindi
              Commentary 'Dīpti'.* Ed. and comm. Bābūlāl Shukla.
              Chaukhambha Prachyavidya Granthamala 6. Varanasi:
              Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1976.

Sahaya 'Hira', Rajavamsha

   1973   *Bharatiya Sahityashastra Kosh.* Patna: Bihar Hindi Grantha
          Akademi.

Śaktivallabha   *Jayaratnākaranāṭaka.*

                   Jayaratnākara nāṭaka. Ed. and trans. Dhanavajra Vajrācārya
                   and Gyan Mani Nepal. Kathmandu: Nepāla Sāṃskṛtika
                   Pariṣad, V.S. 2014 [1957].

Sarasvatī   *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇālaṅkāra.* See: Bhoja.

Sharma, Balchandra

   n.d.   Indĭrasa, vidyāraṇyakeśarĭ ra vasanta śarmā [Indĭrasa,
          Vidyāraṇyakeśarin and Vasanta Śarmā]. *Pragati* 11:102-129.

Sharma Khanal, Tikaram

   1982   *Nepālamā rājaparamparā ra sāhityika rūparekhā* [The
          monarchic tradition and an outline of literature in Nepal].
          Kathmandu: Pratibha Prakashan, V.S. 2039.

Śrīdharadāsa   *Sadŭktikarnāmṛta*

          Sadukti=karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa. Ed. Sures Chandra
          Banerji. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965.

Subhāṣita   *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra*

          Subhāṣita-ratna-bhāṇḍāgāra. Enlarged and re-ed. Nārāyaṇ
          Rām Āchārya. Reprint. New Delhi: Munshiram
          Manoharlal Publishers, 1978.

Upādhyāya, Baldeva

   1983   *Kāshĭ kĭ pāṇḍitya paramparā* [The pundit tradition in
          Varanasi]. Varanasi: Vishvavidyalaya Prakashan.

Upadhyaya Ghimire, Keshav

   1975   'Udayānandako kavitā: eka anuśĭlana' [A poem by
          Udayānanda: a study]. *Prajñā* 14 (V.S. 2032):32-43.

Uttānagaṇita   See: Cakrapāṇi.

Vāgbhaṭa   *Vāgbhaṭālankāra*

          *The Vâgbhaṭâlankâra of Vâgbhaṭa with the Commentary of
          Simhadevagaṇi*. Kâvyamâlâ 48. 4th ed. Ed. Kedâranâtha
          Śâstrî and Wâsudev Laxmaṇ Śâstrî Paṇśĭkar. Bombay:
          Nirṇaya Sâgar Press, 1928.

Vajrācārya , Dhanavajra and Tek Bahadur Shrestha

   1980   *Śāhakālakā abhilekha* [Shah-period inscriptions].
          Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies,
          Tribhuvan University, V.S. 2037 Bhādra.

Vāmana   *Kāvyālankārasūtravṛtti*

          Vâmana's Lehrbuch der Poetik. Ed. Carl Cappeller. Jena:
          Verlag von Hermann Dufft, 1875.

Vidagdha   *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana*.   See: Dharmadāsa.

Viddha   *Viddhaśālabhañjikā*.   See: Rājaśekhara.

Vĭrapustakālaya

   1960   *Nepālarājakĭyavĭrapustakālayasthepustakānām bṛhatsūcĭ-
          patram*. Pt. 1. Purātattvaprakāśanamāla 5. Kathmandu:
          Vĭrapustakālaya, V.S. 2017 Mārga.

Vĭrendrakeśarin

   1906   ['Samasyāpūrti']. *Sundari* 1:6 (V.S. 1963 Mārga), 101.

Viśvanātha   *Sāhityadarpaṇa*

          Sāhityadarpaṇa of Śrĭ Viśvanātha Kavirāja. The Kashi
          Sanskrit Series 145. 3rd ed. Ed. and comm. Kṛṣṇamohan
          Śāstrĭ. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office,
          1967.