

Title	Jalandharāsuravadha, a Bengali drama from the 16th century Nepal. A Romanized text based on the manuscript. Report on the research of dramatic manuscripts written in Nepal of the Malla dynasty. : Accompanied by Appendix: Baṛu Caṇḍīdās' Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan and its parallels in two dramatic manuscripts from Nepal.
Author(s)	Kitada, Makoto
Citation	
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/71179
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

ネパールの演劇写本：マッラ朝のベンガル語演劇写本（3）Jalandharāsūravadhā
研究成果報告 2019年1月
大阪大学言語文化研究科 北田信

Jalandharāsūravadhā, a Bengali drama from the 16th century Nepal. A Romanized text based on the manuscript. Report on the research of dramatic manuscripts written in Nepal of the Malla dynasty.

Makoto Kitada Ph.D., Associate Professor at Graduate School of Language and Culture, Osaka University, Japan

Title of Drama: Jalandharāsūravadhā, “The murder of Demon Jalandhara” written under Purandharasimha (1560- 1597) of Pāṭan.

Manuscript: NGMPP Reel No. E 460/33 (The first part)

This article is a report of research in a provisory form.¹ My English is yet to go through a checking by a native speaker. In spite of many faults it contains, I decided to publish it, thinking that it will be of great public benefit.

This drama is based on a legend contained in the Śiva Purāṇa. Demon Jalandhara, born from the ocean, is considered the brother of Lakṣmī. In p. 22, l. 1 of our manuscript, he is said to be a very handsome man renowned in the world. This might sound a bit peculiar to us, for, in our modern age, the demons are habitually depicted as ugly and terrifying. In addition, Jalandhara is not necessarily depicted as completely evil. Only, he challenges the power of gods, and as the result, he is defeated.

Intriguingly, a reminiscence of this story is found in the Devī Nāc Dance performed during the Indra Jātrā Festival in Kathmandu city.² This dance drama handed down by the inhabitants of Kilāgal quarter represents the fight between Kumārī, i.e. Goddess Caṇḍī’s daughter and a demon (*daitya*) whose name is not mentioned. The role of Kumārī is played by a masked male actor. Kumārī is considered a beautiful (*sundarī*), smart (*cancaḷ*) goddess [Maharjan VS 2073: p. 58]. Meanwhile, the demon is considered as having a handsome face (*sundar anuhār*) and a sturdy body (*sugaṭhit śarīr*) [ibid., p. 59]. Actually, it is played by a handsome young man unmasked with a diadem. Thus, I wonder

¹ In the study of this manuscript, I worked together with Prof. Kashinath Tamot, specialist in paleography and classical Newari language and literature. Prof. Tamot first made a preliminary transcription of the whole text written in Newari script, then we sat together to examine the text closely, especially its linguistical details peculiar to Bengali. I express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Kashinath Tamot for his cooperation and instruction.

² I express my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Nātikāji Maharjan, the organizer of the Devī Nāc. Also, thanks to Yagyaswor Joshi, M. A. for his assistance in my field research.

whether the demon might be a metaphor of a human challenging the god, like Jacob, although in our case, the challenger is defeated after fighting with fierce desperation. From other point of view, it looks like a battle between a beautiful woman and a man. In fact, in the performing arts of the Newars, it is often observed that demons are not necessarily hundred percent bad; they might have committed an error, but with a certain reason. Although I am not sure whether it has a direct connection to the Devī Nāc, the Indra Jātrā Festival itself has the legend of Yalambara, the king of Kirāṭas, i.e. the barbarians, in the background. All these matters suggest that this drama of Jalandhara should not be observed as a simplistic antagonism of good vs. evil.

Romanized Text³

(The first four lines are considerably damaged, and many contained letters are hardly identifiable.)

□□□□ lina lāyane□ nābh□□nālijah□□timalāne // palita je gunijane // pālita śrī
pu[landa(2)lanṛpe]□□amkaseśa□□pārane // 1⁴ // śrī dha[mma]la □[ma]li⁵ // gamana[]ula śa[pa]tha⁶
// alula⁷ [ati] śo(3)[bhe]⁸ // onisayaālaṃkā□ // makuta ati śvabhe // calaṇa salaṇa kailo □e□e vachale
// śrī vugama lokesola⁹ (4) □□□□ magale¹⁰ //

ŀ¹¹ rāga kedālā // palimāna //

jagata maṃgala kathā, jālaṃdhala nite¹² ha(5)yro¹³ prakāśa ave dekhite sya nṛtya¹⁴ //

// kahnala // jati //

acala duhitā pa(6)ti, vṛṣabhe gamaṇa gati,

tri-nayana sobhati, virupākṣa kṣāṃti¹⁵,

devagaṇa trāśati, abhaya (7) se kalati,

dakṣa jagya vināsati, vilabhadra kathayati, // dhru //

³ I present a diplomatic edition, i.e. a Romanized reproduction of the original text as it is in the manuscript, without the attempt of normalization, i.e. correcting the corrupted spellings into spellings considered as authentic Bengali.

⁴ Or, a sign resembling “8” in shape, or a *visarga ḥ*.

⁵ *Phamali*, or *phamali*?

⁶ Or *śaratha*?

⁷ Or *aluṇa*

⁸ The letters *atiśobhe* is extremely difficult to decipher, except for *śo*, but it is reconstructed on the base of its comparison with the *atiśvabhe* close behind.

⁹ I.e. *vugama lokeśvara*, i.e. the Avalokiteśvara of Bungamatī, or Rāto Macchendranāth.

¹⁰ Maybe a corruption of *maṃgale*?

¹¹ A sign resembling the letter for number 1 in shape (but it is actually not).

¹² A corruption of *nṛtye*?

¹³ B. *hailo*? Or: *hathiro*, or *ha thīyo*.

¹⁴ I.e. *prakāśa dekhite se nṛtya*.

¹⁵ Or: *kṣīti*? Both readings deviate from the required rhyme *-ati*. However, *kānti* is also found in the rhyming position.

āyiro he paśupati, kai(p. 2: 1)lāśa adhipati,
candra samāṇa kānti, bhagatero gati //

// bhūpāli // khara jati //

jā(2)cakelo kalpataru satya judhisthire,
nayaniti deva-gulu¹⁶ pratāpa anare,
lipu¹⁷ rāya (3) trāśa karu, śaraṇa paṃjare,
gaṃbhira niścala meru, hṛdaya nirmmare,
śrī jaya purandala¹⁸ nṛ(4)pa vila¹⁹ khitidhare,
udayalakhmi khalu, pratāpa suthire //

// mallāḍa // paritāla // (5)

śiva ati ānanda re, jāyivo kairāśa-pure,
deva śakala āyire, livo puja vi(6)vidhire //

// rāga goṇḍagili // ekatāli //

kamala-nayana prabhu garuḍa gamane,
pita-vasa(7)na bhuva-mokṣe-kālāne,
saṃkha cakra gadā padma dhala /
sobhane, dhalaniro ati bhāla śa(p. 3: 1)kala khaṇḍane,
praveśa kayilo kṣṣṇa lakhmi sahite,
dvālāvati-puli²⁰ jana ānanda (4) kalite, //²¹

// rāga nāṭa // jati //

calana sevita hali, śuthila²² mānase,
dhanamjaya nāma voli, kayiro prakāsem,
lipu lāya sava nāli rudati ṭalāse,²³
vijaya savada kali ānanda śusāre,²⁴

¹⁶ I.e. *nyāya-nīti deva-guru*

¹⁷ = *ripu*

¹⁸ Purandara is a Mahāpātra king of Pāṭan. Udayalakṣmī is his wife.

¹⁹ = *vīra*

²⁰ = *dvārāvati-purī*

²¹ Entrance of Viṣṇu-Kṣṣṇa

²² = *susthira*

²³ Enemy kings (*ripu-rāya*) and women (*nārī*) all weep with terror (*trāsa*), or enemy kings weep like women.

²⁴ I.e. *vijaya śabda kari, ānanda susvare*

śiva nālāyana, śrī jaya pulusotamasimhe²⁵,
bhuvanalakhami (5) mukha amṛta vikāse //

// rāga savari²⁶ // cāli //

cala priya lukumini dvālāvati(6)pure,
bhagata sakala jana āsive se pure //

// १²⁷ rāga pahaḍiyā // thaka tāla //

jala(7)dhi tanayā sula bhuvana vidite,²⁸
sakala trāsati deva disva dasa²⁹ kalite 2
hala(p. 4: 1)ti je adhikāla sura nāga sahite,
yaka³⁰-chatra rāje kailo tridaśa pujite // dhru // (2)
āyiro he jalamdhara vire, rudra teja sambhava pitāmaha pālite //
prativratā³¹ vṛndā³² samjute //

// rāga dhanāśrī // cāli //

jāvo vṛndā halakhita jālamdhala pure,
deva asura nā(4)ga vaśilo sakare,
āyisva sakhi virambha na kale //

// mālava // palitāra //

amara asu(5)la-puli nirvvādhā gamane, deva likhi nālada vare,³³ //
veda vina dhala suśara gāne,³⁴ dhava(6)[la]³⁵-keśa kusa dhare
āyiroṃ³⁶ vrahmaputra kalaha-kālāne, vāsuvā vikata ati (7) core,

²⁵ Puruṣottamasimha (NS 701–718 = AD 1580-1597 according to my teacher) is the son of King Purandarasiṃha (AD 1560-1597, cf. Brinkhaus 2003, p. 70, footnote 11). Based on this, the date of this manuscript is known. Bhuvanalakṣmī is his wife.

²⁶ It seems that *dhanāśrī* which was originally written in this place was blotted out in black, and *savari* is indicated above it as the correction.

²⁷ A sign resembling the letter of number 1 in shape.

²⁸ I.e. the son of the Ocean (i.e. Jalandhara), well-known among the gods and on the earth. Or else: The Asura, the son of the Ocean (i.e. *jalandhi-tanaya-asura*), well-known on the earth.

²⁹ I.e. *diśa daśa*?

³⁰ = *eka*

³¹ = *pati-vratā*

³² Vṛndā is the wife of Jalandhara.

³³ I.e. *deva ṛṣi nārada vare*

³⁴ I.e. *veda vṛndā-dhara susvara gāne*

³⁵ I.e. This letter is totally blackened in the shadow when filmed, but obviously it should be *la*, according to the context.

³⁶ The ink has become so faint this letter looks almost like *rī*, but actually it is *ro* + *śrībindu*.

deva kārja ahme kalivo nidhāne, rāma nāma kaha sāre //

//³⁷ (p. 5: 1) ॥³⁸ rāga larita // jati //

calaha vāsuvā tuhme na kala viramve,
kailāsa puri giyā (2) mahesa pujive //

// mallāḍa // paḍitāla //
śiva ati ānanda re //

vibhāsa // (3)

anupama puli prīya kailā je³⁹ vase,
pālijāta cintāmani gāche,
sahaśra je kāma(4)dhyānu pulita je āche,⁴⁰
deva ṛkhi tota kare svache⁴¹ // dhru //

sārūpya muguti dekho ā(5)ve molā⁴² piche,
dulhavapuli⁴³ umā saha vase //

// calaha vāsuvā na ka[ra]⁴⁴ vilamve //

// nāta // cāri //

cala prīya pālavati halakhita mane,
deva-gana ahme giyā a[bha]ya⁴⁵ (p. 3: 1) kālāne, //

// indra praveśa //

// pahadiyā // ekatāra //

sahaśra nayāna sobhe vici(2)tra makute,
asami āyudha mola⁴⁶ daitya-kula ghāte, 2

³⁷ Actually, this double *daṇḍa* is set at the end of the foregoing line, close to the right margin.

³⁸ A sign resembling the letter of number 1 in shape.

³⁹ My teacher read it as *o*, but it seems not necessarily to do so.

⁴⁰ I.e. *kāmadhenu*. *Pulita* seems to be *purī-ta* ‘in the city’ (Loc.) or *pūrīta* ‘filled’.

⁴¹ I.e. *rṣi*, *stotra*, *svacche*

⁴² = *morā*

⁴³ = *dullabha-purī*

⁴⁴ By mistake, it is only written *na ka*.

⁴⁵ The letters *bha ya* are quite damaged by a wormhole.

⁴⁶ = *mora*?

purvva diga adhipati nāga⁴⁷ airā(3)vate,
amalāvati pālita saṃci devi saṃjute // dhru //⁴⁸
āyiro sūlapati⁴⁹ bhuva(4)ṇa ānande,
gaṃdharvva apsara-gaṇe gāvati⁵⁰ su-nāde //

// sevā me⁵¹ //

// indra pi(5)hā va⁵² //
// kahnara // paritāra //
jāvo priya śaci tuhme amala je pure,
śata-makha⁵³ (6) kairo ahme pāyuro⁵⁴ se hi pure //

// śukra⁵⁵ praveśa //
kvarāva // ekatāla // kha⁵⁶ (7) //
bhārggava kule mama saṃbhava sāle,
veḍa⁵⁷ sāstra mukhe rāma nāme 2
hāthe kuśāṃguri (8) pustaka vāme,
ekāke sulagulu vorati nāme⁵⁸ // dhru //
āyiro vipra va·laka⁵⁹ (9) tora nāme,
mṛta saṃjivani⁶⁰ guṇa tuhme sava jāne //

// śukra pihāva⁶¹ // // (p. 7: 1)
gu[ñ]jari⁶² // jati //

⁴⁷ Here, *nāga* means ‘elephant’.

⁴⁸ Description of Indra accompanied by his consort Sacī.

⁴⁹ = *sura-pati*, but maybe contaminated with *śūra-pati*.

⁵⁰ The letter *va* looks like *ve*, merely because the ink is simply faint.

⁵¹ Nw. “The song of service/worship”.

⁵² Nw. “Indra went out”.

⁵³ *Śata-makha* is an epithet of Indra. Or else, perhaps its literal meaning is to take: “We have performed the hundred sacrificial rites.”

⁵⁴ *Pāyuro* is obscure. Maybe B. *pāula* ‘hurried stepping’ [Sen 1971, vol. 2: 537]?

⁵⁵ Śukra is the guru of Asura-s.

⁵⁶ This letter is badly blurred and very difficult to identify.

⁵⁷ = *veda*

⁵⁸ = *ekāke sura-guru bolati nāme*

⁵⁹ *vālaka*? The letter *va* is accompanied by a small point.

⁶⁰ I.e. *mṛta-saṃjivani*, i.e. the charm of resuscitation of the dead.

⁶¹ Nw. “Śukra went out.”

⁶² It almost looks like *gujari*, but the small short line attached to *ja* seems to stand for *ñ*. Compare this with the shape of *guñjari* at the end of line 8 of this page.

ahme jāvo jalaṃdhara puli thāyi cokhe,
mantranā kalivo⁶³ ahme rāja thāke sūkhe //

// ghasmara⁶⁴, rāhu⁶⁵ praveśa //

// dhanāśrī // jati //

vikata bha(3)yaṃkala kalāla vaḍane,⁶⁶ nīla megha sama rupe,
hāthe khargga⁶⁷ carmma dhari, lo(4)ka trāśaka rupe 2
āyiro siṃhakā sūta, ghasmara sahite,
muktakeśa ati (5) vile⁶⁸, deva-ṛkhaya vidāre //

// ghasmara, rāhu pihāva // // (6)

calaha ghasmala jāvo jaraṃdhara pure, śilasā dharivo āgyā ānanda se kale // (7)

// jaraṃdhara-sa vava⁶⁹ //

// dhanāśrī // cāli //

jāvo vṛṇḍā harakhita jāraṃdhara pu(8)re,
deva asura nāga desiro śakale //⁷⁰

// X [thanā jaraṃdhara puri vaṇā]⁷¹ //

// śukra sabhā-sa vava⁷² //

guñjari // (p. 8: 1) jati //

ahme jāvo jalaṃdhara puli thāyi cokhe //⁷³

// ghasmara, rāhu sabhā-sa vava (2) //

⁶³ = *karivo*

⁶⁴ Skt. *ghasmara* ‘voracious, gluttonous’. Ghasmara is one of Jalandhara’s messengers.

⁶⁵ Rāhu is here considered as one of Jalandhara’s messengers.

⁶⁶ I.e. *vikata*, *vadane*

⁶⁷ I.e. *khadga*

⁶⁸ = *vīre*

⁶⁹ Nw. “[He/They] came in[to] Jālandhara[pura].” Nw. *vava* is a past tense of *vaya* [Dic. Cl. Nw.: 459].

⁷⁰ In the lower margin just under the letters *ra nā*, a letter *bhā* is written as an addition to be inserted in some place. However, the place to fill in is not indicated. Is *bhā* an abbreviation of *bhāsa* ‘speech’?

⁷¹ An X sign indicating the insertion. The addition to be inserted (in brackets) is indicated just below, in the lower margin. It means Nw. “Here, [he] has gone to Jālandharapura.”

⁷² Nw. “Śukra comes in the assembly.”

⁷³ This song is parallel to the one in p. 7, l. 1.

// bhathyāri⁷⁴ // eka //

calaha ghasmara jāvo jaraṃdhara pure //

// ghasmara indrayā(3)-ke duta choyā⁷⁵ //

// varāri // paḍimāna //

aviraṃve jāvo ahme amarāvati, (4)

jāraṃdhara āgyā duta kahe purvva gati //

// vṛhaspati praveśa //

// māllava // (5) ekatā⁷⁶ //

sūragulu pulvahita⁷⁷ sava guṇa jāṇe,

siṃdhu desi kula aṃgiraśa gane 2 (6)

śakala devaga[ṇa]⁷⁸ vandita calane,

prasiddha vṛ[ha]spati⁷⁹ nāma volane // dhru //

āyiro vi(7)pra kula pustaka dhāline,

mantra tantra veḍa bhuvāṇa nidhāne //

// vṛhaspati vaṃ(8)ṇā⁸⁰ //

// bhathari // paḍimāna //

calati devaguru śaci-pati thāne,

śaṃkata⁸¹ hoyive (9) sarvvathā 2

jalaṃdhara āsive saṃgrāma kārane,

upāya kalite jāvo tathā // //

(p. 9: 1)

nālaḍa snāna //⁸² (2)

~~prīya [śa]ci tuḥme amala []e~~⁸³

⁷⁴ The letter *ri*, distorted, is difficult to identify. It rather seems that the scribe tried to amend his mistake (*bhathā?*) into *bhathari*. We have *bhathari* again in p. 8 (this page), l. 8, while *bhathyāli* in p. 13, l. 3.

⁷⁵ Nw. “Ghasmara sent a messenger to Indra.”

⁷⁶ I.e. *ekatāla*. This perhaps reflects the real pronunciation in Newari, with its tendency to omit the final consonant.

⁷⁷ = *sura-guru purohita*. *Sura-guru* is an epithet of Bṛhaspati.

⁷⁸ The letter *ṇa* is lacking.

⁷⁹ The letter *ha* is lacking.

⁸⁰ Nw. “Bṛhaspati went (i.e. exit).”

⁸¹ = *saṅkaṭa*

⁸² After this, the whole line is left empty.

⁸³ This sentence is cancelled. The next sentence begins from the second half of l. 2. Leaving one and a half line after *nālaḍa snāna* empty, the scribe presumably planned to fill some new sentences in

// indra sabhā vava⁸⁴ //

kahnala // paḍi //

jāvo (3) prīya śaci tuhme amara je pure //

// amarāvati varṇā⁸⁵ //

// gauri // rupaka (4) //

amarāvati puri ati manohale,

vahana airāvata sūrapati ghale⁸⁶ 2

gāve (5) citraratha gaṇa nāce apaśare,

jagata ānanda kari veḍa dhvani śvale⁸⁷ // dhru // (6)

āhe devi śaci tuhme pativratā śāre⁸⁸,

śakara devatā vase bhuvaṇa vicāle⁸⁹ //

// vṛhaspati vava //

// guñjari // jati //

calati devaguru śacipati thāne (7) //

// indrayā-ke duta vava⁹⁰ //

// valāli // padimāna //

avira[m]ve jāvo ahme (8) amarāvati //

// du[ta] lihāyāva // indra-śa //⁹¹

dutayā vacana⁹² // //

(p. 10: 1)

this blank afterwards. Then, he made the mistake to write *prīya śaci* etc. which actually belongs to the next line, in this blank.

⁸⁴ Nw. “Indra came to the assembly.”

⁸⁵ Nw. “[He/the two] went to Amarāvati.” Or else, it is perhaps a mistake for *amarāvati varṇanā* “The description of Amarāvati.”

⁸⁶ = *surapati ghare*

⁸⁷ = *veda-dhvani-svare*

⁸⁸ = *sāre?*

⁸⁹ = *sakala, vicāre*

⁹⁰ Nw. “The messenger came to Indra.”

⁹¹ These two stage instructions are cancelled. Nw. “The messenger went back (*lihā vayāva*)” or “[They] sent back the messenger.” “Indra [and] Śaci.” Presumably, the scribe was intending to write a dialogue of Indra and Śaci after the messenger has returned.

⁹² Nw. “The messenger’s word.”

𑒧⁹³ rāga dhanāśrī⁹⁴, // tāla patāla⁹⁵ //
suna devarāja tuhme jālaṃdhare kahe,
māgirom⁹⁶ ratana sava jaladhi(2)ro vahi //

// vipaliti⁹⁷ kathā hairo kavahu na sune,
ava se na divo ave tā-ke na(3)hi māne //

duta lihāva⁹⁸ //
indra saṃgrāma vaṇa⁹⁹ //
// korāva // paditāra //
ghasma(4)la vacane ave jāvo rana-laṃge¹⁰⁰ 2
sakala jinivo¹⁰¹ senā jālaṃdhara saṃge // // (5)
𑒧 rāga pahaḍiyā // paḍitāla //
ahme jāvo halakhita sulapati thāne 2
māli(6)vo deva-gaṇa ānivo latane¹⁰² //

dhanāśrī // e //
daitya-rāya molā prabhu gya(7)lā eka-mane, śaṃgrāma vijayi kali haive //¹⁰³

// śrī // e //
āre, jālaṃdhara (p. 11: 1) ave garvva tuhme kāhe¹⁰⁴ kare,
vrajero prahāla siha parāyina kare //¹⁰⁵
tvala¹⁰⁶ a(2)haṃkāla āji dekhivo samare,
jiniyā sakara nivo ratana amure //¹⁰⁷ // (3)

⁹³ A sign resembling the letter for nāgarī 1 in shape.

⁹⁴ The tendril-formed sign for *r* is very thin. Perhaps *dhanāśrī*.

⁹⁵ *Patāla* perhaps reflects the real pronunciation of *pratāla*.

⁹⁶ The ending *-rom* seems to be a past tense 1 person.

⁹⁷ = *viparīti*

⁹⁸ Nw. “The messenger came back.”

⁹⁹ Nw. “Indra went to the fight.”

¹⁰⁰ = *raṇa-raṅge*

¹⁰¹ “I will defeat.”

¹⁰² = *ratane*

¹⁰³ I.e. *morā, gelā, kari*

¹⁰⁴ The scribe first wrote *kāre* falsely, seemingly because of confusion with the following *kare*, then amended it into *kāhe*.

¹⁰⁵ The stroke of the vajra (weapon) makes [even] the lion flee.

¹⁰⁶ = *tora*

¹⁰⁷ I.e. *sakala, amūle* (< *amūlya*)

rāmakṛ // jati //

dvālāvati puli priya ati manohare,
vāmchita se bhakta-jane duhla(4)va¹⁰⁸ je pure 2
cau-disa ṅṅpa-gane sevīta kamare,
vaikuṅṭha sadṛṣa jehne rāma rāje kare // (5) dhru //
nirbhaya sakara janadavimare¹⁰⁹,
kamala vikāsa kairo jehne divākare //

// rāga śrī // (6) astālā //

kamala-nābhi tuhme suno ahme pathāyiro,
jalaṃdhara devarāja jiniro samare, (7) //
āhe vipra-gulu na suniro vātrā,¹¹⁰
saṃgrāma kālāne ahme kalivo se jātrā // // (8)
(p. 12: 1)

‡ lakṣmī-na kṛṣṇa gaṇā //¹¹¹

valāri // jati //
suna prabhu tola pāda dhali ahme kahe,
pilati (2) śakala madhe mu-ke galu kahe 2
apuna maṃdila tiri bhrātṛ-vadhā cāhe,
vicāla kariho svā(3)mi nilakhila cāhe //¹¹² dhru //
tridasa bhuvana tvala¹¹³ sarvva adhikāre,
na kala vijayi ra(4)ne apajasa kare //¹¹⁴

// vibhāsa // ekatāla //

āhe priya suna tuhme saṃkā na(5)hi kare,
devarāja pathāyilo sulagulu-vare, 2
aṃgikāla kairo ahme mi(6)thyā kāhe kare //
tola vora¹¹⁵ laṃghi ave bhrātṛ-vadhā nāre /

¹⁰⁸ Compare with H. *dulhā* < Skt. *durlabha* Pkt. *dullaha*.

¹⁰⁹ It seems to be a mistake for *sakala-janapada-vimale*.

¹¹⁰ I.e. *vipra-guru, vārtā*

¹¹¹ Nw. “Lakṣmī stopped/prevented Kṛṣṇa [from leaving].”

¹¹² The letter *svā*, blurred and difficult to identify, seems to be an amendment of some other letter. *Kariho* seems to be a future imperative.

¹¹³ = *tora*

¹¹⁴ I.e. *na kara, raṇe, apajasa* (< *apa-yaśas*).

¹¹⁵ = *tora bola*

dukha je sāgala¹¹⁶ (7) tuhme na paḍiho¹¹⁷ saṃge,
ava se¹¹⁸ nutaṇa puli jāvo tvala¹¹⁹ saṃge //

// śrī // (8) ekatāla //

vinatī kayiro āhe prabhu kalunā-sāgare,
na jāsi 2 tuhme (p. 13: 1) saṃlāma-kālāne¹²⁰ //

// rāga śoli // e //

sula-patī vacane jāvo lana-raṃge,
ja(2)laṃdhara senā ave kalivo vināse //

// vibhāsa // paḍitāla //

prabhu molā sa(3)te kali¹²¹ saṃgrāma-kālāne,
hṛdaya talāsa molā ki hayive//

// rāga bhathyāli // e // (4)

śakrelo vacane tuhme āyilo vada¹²² roṣe,
diga-vijayī ahme jāni ave cokhe, (5)
cakrero prahāla kailo saha daitya-rāje
samala kusala tuhme ahmāla ānaṇḍe¹²³ // (6)

// ṛ rāga vasanta // ekatāla //

āhe kṛṣṇa tuhme molā bhaginīro svāmi,
vala dire sandi (7) kairo jāvo molā pure //¹²⁴
he jagadīse¹²⁵, //
(p. 14: 1)

ṛ ~~████████~~ dhanāśrī¹²⁶ // korāva //

¹¹⁶ = *sāgara*

¹¹⁷ Seems to be a future imperative *paḍiho* (cf. *kariho* above).

¹¹⁸ Another possibility is to read *avase*, i.e. *avaśya*.

¹¹⁹ = *tora*

¹²⁰ = *saṃgrāma-kāraṇe*

¹²¹ = *kari*

¹²² = B. *baḍa*

¹²³ It seems to be written *ānaṇḍe*. I.e. *ahmāra ānande*.

¹²⁴ I.e. *vara dile sandhi kailo*

¹²⁵ = *jagadīse*.

¹²⁶ Blotted out in blank. Perhaps, it was written [*rāga*□□] *dhanāśrī*.

rā¹²⁷riraka¹²⁸sarese e¹²⁹tadinagara¹³⁰,
tua anugati kichu (2) kai e na bhela //
he jagannātha nātha punu punu,
vinavamaya avasa[ra]ha janu //
para (3) aparādhe sevakā neti¹³¹ //
supahu¹³² kavahu nahi kae se cita //
bhanāi gadādha(4)ra alapa-geāna¹³³
harika [va]¹³⁴cana chāḍi dosari na āna // // (5)

𑒧 rāga // tāra //¹³⁵ patamaṃjari rāga //
// hari māлага jovati¹³⁶ rupa¹³⁷ sājha // dhru // (6)
dina-mani¹³⁸ asta bhaya¹³⁹ godhula dhani,
āvata vane hari midara mājha //¹⁴⁰ dhru //
vā(7)jata venu renu tanamadita,
vanamārā¹⁴¹ jara¹⁴² locana cāri,,¹⁴³
varahā makuta dāmini gujaniko // (8)
vane haya dhātu tiraka sigāra¹⁴⁴ // dhru //
rādhā naena bhi¹⁴⁵ garaśarapata,,

¹²⁷ This letter, seeming to be an amendment of another letter, is a little bigger than the usual *ra*. Or else, it is perhaps *na*, i.e. *nāri* ‘woman’?

¹²⁸ The letter *ka* has a strange form.

¹²⁹ The shape of this *e* slightly differs from the *e* in the next line.

¹³⁰ When considering the rhyme *na bhela* in the next verse-half, it is perhaps a corrupted form of *dina gela* ‘the day has gone.’

¹³¹ It can be read in various ways: *neni*, *teti*.

¹³² I.e. *suprabhu*

¹³³ < Skt. *alpa-jnāna*. Gadādhara is the author of this verse.

¹³⁴ The letter *va* is lacking.

¹³⁵ The part beginning from the first line (𑒧 □□□□ *dhanāśrī* // *korāva*) upto this is written by another hand than the next. The language in this part is not Bengali, but seems to be Maithili. Presumably, this is a secondary insertion made in the later period in which Maithili became the court language.

¹³⁶ The vowel sign of *i* (*i-kāra*) has a washed-out color. Perhaps it was erased by the scribe, resulting in *jovana* (< *yauvana*).

¹³⁷ My teacher read *rupa*. But the letter *ru* has a very strange form. Or else, it might be *bhaya*, which seems to be a conjugated form of *bhū* (see below).

¹³⁸ I.e. *dina-maṇi*

¹³⁹ This *bhaya* seems to be a conjugated form of *bhū*.

¹⁴⁰ Hari is coming to the jungle, through the middle of [...].

¹⁴¹ = *vana-mālā*

¹⁴² Perhaps *jana* or *jala*

¹⁴³ Peculiarly, two oblique lines (which seem to function as a sort of comma) are put vertically one above the other.

¹⁴⁴ I.e. *tilaka siṃgāra* (< *śrṅgāra*)

¹⁴⁵ I cannot identify this letter. My teacher read it as *di*, but the usual *da*-letter looks otherwise. It

sādara karata adhara mupā (9)
viraha tāpa mocana paramānanda,,
murari manohara guna-ka nidhāna // dhru //

(p. 15: 1)¹⁴⁶

𑒧 rāga nāṭa // paḍitāla //
kalaha-kālāne mama śṛjile prajāpate,
ahme gelā sabhā (2) pasupate,
jalaṃdhara thāyi jāya pisuna kahite,
avasya vighraha vija¹⁴⁷ haite // dhru // // (3)

𑒧 rāga vibhāsa // ekatāla //
hame jāvo he, nālada muni, mama śṛjire caturāyiche¹⁴⁸ // (4)

𑒧 rāga dhanāsrī // ekatāla //
puluva sukṛta phala phaliro yakhane,¹⁴⁹
lakṣmī sahita kṛṣṇa vasilo śadane,
hairo ānanda molā manasā pulane,¹⁵⁰
āhe vr̥ṇḍā tolā mora saphala ji(6)vane // dhru //
molā seṇā tuhme sanana hoyi sya āne,¹⁵¹
usanā prasāde ave saka[ra]¹⁵² sapa[n]ne¹⁵³ // (7)

𑒧 rāga āsāvali // paḍitāla //
śuna priya ānaṇḍa molā, tola vacana dhare molā, sundali (8) vaisiro nutana pulā //

rāga vibhāsa // e //

might be also *ki*.

¹⁴⁶ From the beginning of this page, the writing hand changes again.

¹⁴⁷ Seems to be a mistake for *vijaya*.

¹⁴⁸ Or perhaps *catucāyiche*. If analyzing it as *caturāyi he*, this sentence means: “You (or someone) created my cleverness (B. *caturāi*).” Or else, if analyzing it as *caturā yihe*, it would mean: “To me, [something] wonderful (*caturā*) was created (= has happened) here (B. *ihe*).”

¹⁴⁹ I.e. *pūrva, ekhane*

¹⁵⁰ I.e. *hailo, morā, pūrane*

¹⁵¹ Interpreted as B. *se āne* ‘[he] brings’ or ‘[someone] brings it’. Or else, *seāne* would be the same as *seānā* ‘clever, cunning’.

¹⁵² The insertion of the *ra* letter is indicated at the end of the last line.

¹⁵³ The upper half of this letter is damaged due to a worm hole. It seems to be a ligature (X + n). I interpreted it as *sa[m]panne*. Another option is *sapatne* ‘enemy’. Or else, a corruption of *sapane*, although much less possible?

hame jāvo he, nālada muni //

(p. 16:1)

‡ rāga kvalāva // khala jati //

āhe deva-gulu molā sane, padiro saṅkata¹⁵⁴ ahme 2
parājaya aṅpavāde¹⁵⁵, priya saci he, hāsa kailo deve,¹⁵⁶
kathā jāvo se kārja kalivo // // (3)

‡ rāga śoli // paḍitāla //

śilasā dhalite jāvo ahme yakamane,¹⁵⁷ ānivo tili¹⁵⁸-ratna (4) divo daitya-rāya //

// rāga śrī // paḍitāla //

āhe pria molā manya hailo je dukha,
duta (5) pathāyiyā lāhu ki kahive saṅkhā¹⁵⁹ //

// rāga kahnala // e //

ahme deva mahēśvala vṛ(6)khabha-gamane,
gauli arddhāṅga saha vidita bhuvanya 2
jalaṅdhara dukha diro tridasa bhuvanya (7)
ahe priye āyūśva¹⁶⁰ tuhme kalivo mantrane //

// rāga pahaḍiyā // paḍimāna //

sunā (8) śiva ahme āyuro¹⁶¹ daityaśvara āgyā,
torā tili-ratna māge¹⁶² deho [se]¹⁶³ subha cāhe // //

(p. 17:1)

¹⁵⁴ = *saṅkaṭa*. In this manuscript, the śrībindu (transcribed in *ṃ*) has the shape of a small hook.

¹⁵⁵ I.e. *apavāde*. The second letter which is unidentifiable is cancelled by the scribe.

¹⁵⁶ The mention of Śacī indicates this statement is Indra's.

¹⁵⁷ I.e. *śirasā, eka-mane*

¹⁵⁸ = *tiri* < *strī*

¹⁵⁹ Seems to be a corruption of *saṅkā*.

¹⁶⁰ Maybe B. *āiso*. However, I suspect that this sign resembling the vowel sign of u (*u-kāra*) was originally a *halanta*, which was mistaken by the transcriber.

¹⁶¹ Maybe B. *āilo*. We had *āyiroṃ* (p. 4, l. 6) for 1st person singular past tense. Perhaps the labialization of the vowel -*yu-* was caused by the influence of -*oṃ*. Or else, it is a mistake of a *ya* letter with a *halanta*, i.e. *āyro*. A case of the *ya* letter with the *halanta* is found in *jāyvo* (p. 18, l. 4).

¹⁶² This letter *mā* has a strange form.

¹⁶³ The letter *se* is noted in the lower margin just under *ge su*.

𑒧 mahādevayā vacana¹⁶⁴ //

nilaja vacana kahe tola prāṇa jāyi,

khaṇḍa khaṇḍa sila¹⁶⁵ kare kahe mu(9)ḍha seyi //

// 𑒧 rāga śrī // paḍitāla //

dutero vacana jāvo lanaḅga¹⁶⁶, jinivo samela¹⁶⁷ (3) ati vada laṅge¹⁶⁸, māliivo jalaṁdhare //

// rāga dhanāśrī // jati //

ānanda hayi(4)ro vāsu karmma je saphale 2

devāsula saṁgrāma je ati rosa kare, //

// rāga śrī // jati // (5)

cala priya vṛṇḍā ave duta pathāyiro //

// rāga pahaḍiyā // thakatāla //

ahme gerā śivā(6)laya duta āgyā torā,

bhayaṁ[kala] thāna tuhme na jāyivo torā //¹⁶⁹

// jalaṁdhara vacana //

tuhme ni(7)camati¹⁷⁰ lāhu talāsīte āyā,

maheśero māyā-kṛta na jāṇe sya kāyā //

// rāga kāli // (8) paḍi[gaṇḍara]ḅḅ¹⁷¹ //

sunā prabhu molā mane na kala vīgrahe,

kupita hoyive śiva kone nahi sa(p. 18:1)he //

paḍi //

tiri vudhi priye tola adhika je kahe,

¹⁶⁴ Nw. “Mahādeva’s word.”

¹⁶⁵ = *sira* < *śira*

¹⁶⁶ This word seems to be *lanaraṅga*, or *lanalaṅga* (= *raṅa-raṅga*), although the third letter (blurred) does not look like *raṅ* nor *laṅ*. On the other hand, *lanarage* is found in p. 18, l. 6.

¹⁶⁷ It seems to be a corruption of *samara*.

¹⁶⁸ I.e. *baḍa raṅge*.

¹⁶⁹ The insertion *kala* is indicated above *thāna*. Besides, *thāna* is bracketed by two x-formed signs, which might indicate cancelation. However, *thāna* is indispensable for the metric reason.

¹⁷⁰ I.e. *nīca-mati*

¹⁷¹ It seems that originally it was written *paḍi* (*paḍitāla*?), which was afterwards cancelled by the scribe. Besides, the X-formed signs indicating the insertion of *gaṇḍara* is set between *paḍi* and .

□¹⁷² tailokya vijayi ahme nite (2) āgyā vahe //
ati sava¹⁷³ na kaliho kathā suna pure,
apuna vacana palamāna¹⁷⁴ kāhe ka(3)re //

paḍi //
caturamṅga vala morā adhika je senā,
talāsa¹⁷⁵ na kala priye halinayanā¹⁷⁶ (4)

𑌒 rāga śyāma // e¹⁷⁷ //
ahme jāyvo¹⁷⁸ latha cadhi sene sahite¹⁷⁹
jiniyā saṅgrāme umā (5) āni[vo]¹⁸⁰ je vale //

dhanā[śrī]¹⁸¹ //
molā svā¹⁸² daityaśvala gero saṅgrāmere¹⁸³
ya sakhi, na jāna ki hai (6) prabhu, paḍiro je saṅkhā¹⁸⁴ //

// rāga śrī // paḍitāla //
dutyaro vacane jāvo lanarage¹⁸⁵ // (7)

// // rāga śyāma // ekatāla //
ahme jāvo latha cadhi sayine sahite //¹⁸⁶

// rāga bhathali (8) // paḍitāla //
are digamvala tuhme ratna joge nahi, jinivo saṅgrāme ahme umā livo (p. 19:1) sehi //

¹⁷² A strange letter which looks like the left half of *va* or *ka*. Presumably the scribe just started writing a letter, when he suddenly realized it was false and left it uncompleted.

¹⁷³ Maybe a corruption of *atiśaya*?

¹⁷⁴ I.e. *pramāṇa*

¹⁷⁵ The first letter *ta* of *talāsa* (= *tarāsa*) looks like *ṭṛ*, perhaps influenced by Skt. *trāsa*.

¹⁷⁶ = *hari-nayanā*

¹⁷⁷ Abbreviation of *ekatāla*

¹⁷⁸ The letter *ya* has a *halanta* sign.

¹⁷⁹ I.e. *ratha caṛhi sāinya sahite*

¹⁸⁰ The letter *vo* is indicated just above *ni je*.

¹⁸¹ The letter *śrī* is indicated on the above to the right of *nā*.

¹⁸² Obscure. Is it an abbreviation of *svāmī*?

¹⁸³ It seems that *saṅgrāmare* was amended in this way, or the converse might be the case.

¹⁸⁴ Seems to be a corruption of *saṅkhā*.

¹⁸⁵ I.e. *raṇa-raṅge*

¹⁸⁶ This is the same song as in l. 4.

are muḍha akālana vayari¹⁸⁷ kalite,
chedivo tuhmāla sira kilita¹⁸⁸ sahite // (2)
// // //
citrālatha morā nāma suśala je gāṇe,¹⁸⁹
apasalā uravisi¹⁹⁰ nāce bhala (3) jāne //

rāga kedālā // pachimā jati //
mohivo sakala mana nāṇā lasa¹⁹¹ kare,
mṛdamṅga vina¹⁹²-vaṃ(4)sa śuna sukhakare,
halivo je mana ahme pavana vikāre,
mola sama nahi āne, gandharvva nā(5)me //¹⁹³

śrī rāga // ekatā¹⁹⁴ //
āysva¹⁹⁵ umā tolā kali molā kore vaiśya¹⁹⁶ 2
na ciniro tvalā svāmi (6) tailokyero īse //

rāga vibhāsa // ekatā //
nilaja asatyā tuhme jalamdhara nāme,
jamālaya (7) jāve tuhme sahi pāpa phare //¹⁹⁷

// rāga śrī // ekatā¹⁹⁸ //
kayiro upāya tuhme paḍiro je (8) dhamdhā,

¹⁸⁷ The two letters na va are badly blurred. Maybe *viyari*. It seems to correspond to Skt. *akāraṇa-vaira*.

¹⁸⁸ = Skt. *kirīṭa* ‘diadem’.

¹⁸⁹ I.e. *citraratha*, *susvara*

¹⁹⁰ I.e. *urvaśī*

¹⁹¹ = *rasa*

¹⁹² = *vīṇā*

¹⁹³ “Upon seeing Shiva and his avatars (*sic* followers?) dominate the battlefield, Jalandhara created an illusion of beautiful apsaras singing and dancing. This distracted his army but not himself. Meanwhile, Jalandhara disguised himself as Shiva and went to Parvati in order to trick her.”

[Wikipedia *Jalandhara*]

¹⁹⁴ Here again *ekatā*, which is not a mere abbreviation of *ekatāla*, but must reflect the real pronunciation by the Newars.

¹⁹⁵ I.e. B. *āiso*. The *ya* letter has a *halanta* sign. It almost looks like *āyusva*, but is actually not.

¹⁹⁶ I.e. *morā kole baśiyā*

¹⁹⁷ I.e. *nirlajja*, *pāpa-phale*

¹⁹⁸ The first two letters of this name of *tāla* is badly blurred due to amendment. Something like *pa krī* or *ma krām* seems to have been amended into *e ka*.

śriyamada¹⁹⁹ molā hairō na dekhīro aṃdhā 2
apajasa rāge²⁰⁰ ave putimāsa ga(p. 20:1)ndhā,²⁰¹
vedhīro je pañcavāne hṛdaya sya vandhā //

// rāga śrī // paḍitāla²⁰² //
deva-gulu²⁰³ (2) upadesa kairo mola āge, ave vala māge tolā āhe piyā //

// mālaśrī // paḍi(3)tāla //
jagatajanāni²⁰⁴ tuhme abha[ya]²⁰⁵ kalati,
bhagata-tālanī devi siṃha-gamani,
dukha-[su]ka²⁰⁶-vi(4)nāsinī devi bhavāni,
calana salana kairo vaili-vināsinī //²⁰⁷

// rāga śrī // jati //
he vi(5)pra 2 ānanda hairō mola, devi prasana²⁰⁸ haiyā pāyiro je vare //

rāga rāmakrī // asatā(6)rā //
nālāyana tuhme sarvva vṛttāntāla²⁰⁹ jāne,
jalandhare ahme dukha dire āyā²¹⁰ jāne 2
ahme (7) hairō himālaya ṛkhi rāja putri,
sati pativratā haitya āyuro²¹¹ chala mantri //
tridasero u(8)pakāla āna ṇahi kare,
tathā giyā molā mane kaliha ānande //

¹⁹⁹ Obscure.

²⁰⁰ It should be *apajasa lāge*.

²⁰¹ Obscure. Maybe related with Skt. *pūti-gandhi* ‘foul-smelling’.

²⁰² The letters *tā la* are badly blurred.

²⁰³ I.e. Bṛhaspati

²⁰⁴ I.e. Goddess Bhavānī/Durgā

²⁰⁵ The mark of insertion is indicated, but the letter to be inserted is found nowhere. I added *ya* according to the context.

²⁰⁶ The letter *su* is badly blurred. I presume the word to be *suka* (< Skt. *śoka*).

²⁰⁷ I.e. *carāṇa-śaraṇa, vairi*.

²⁰⁸ I.e. *prasanna*

²⁰⁹ I.e. *vṛttānta*. The last syllable *-la* is obscure. Perhaps some confusion like *vṛttāntara*?

²¹⁰ *Āyā* is obscure. Or else, is it some corruption like *ayojane*?

²¹¹ The *ya*-letter has a *halanta* sign. It almost looks like *āyuro*, but actually is not so. Besides, this *ya*-letter lacks the horizontal line.

utrapāda²¹² //

rāga śrī // ~~paṭitāla~~²¹³ // jati //

āhe devī pālavati dukha nahi māne,

se kālāne ahme jāvo kapata kālāne //

(p. 21:1)

// // rāga valāri // ekatāla //

s[e] t[o]r[e]²¹⁴ kaliyāvo vṛṇḍā mohivo,²¹⁵

nānā vīdhi²¹⁶ māya kali avasya kari(2)vo //

// morā svāmi daityaśvara gelā saṃgrāma re //²¹⁷

vṛṇḍāyā sapana //

rāga śrī gaṇḍāra, gaṇḍāra²¹⁸ (3)

// prathame gamane svāmi muku²¹⁹ padiro,

āju morā sapane, hairi mahiṣa caliro 2

mukta-keśa kṣṣṇa(4)-vesa dakṣina disa gero,

prabhu morā a-saṅṅe na jāne ki hairi // dhru //

ki vudhi upāya sakhi (5) upadesa karo,

śiva 2 rākho tuhme svāmi dāna karo //

// rāga śrī // jati //

sunā ta(6)podhane manā dhari, tapēśvara,

hātha joli kahe vaise dhyāna kari,

śiva 2 morā prabhu (7) ki hairi vicāli,

svargga ma[r]tya²²⁰ pātāle[lo]²²¹ vore pāya śiva 2 //

²¹² Seems to a corruption of *uttarapāda*, i.e. “The word[s] of response” by Nārāyaṇa.

²¹³ Cancelled.

²¹⁴ The vowels of these three letters are obscure, because the horizontal line is totally blurred. The second letter *t[?]* might be *t[ā]*.

²¹⁵ The context seems to be as follows: Nārāyaṇa offers to disguise himself as Jalandhara, and to allure Jalandhara’s wife, Vṛṇḍā. The word-form *kaliyāvo* is strange. Perhaps it should be understood as B. *kari jābo*.

²¹⁶ The upper part of this letters is damaged by a worm-hole.

²¹⁷ The speech of Vṛṇḍā.

²¹⁸ The name of the rāga seems to be a corrupted form of *śrī gandhāra*. The last word *gaṇḍāra* seems to be a tāla-name.

²¹⁹ Perhaps the third letter of *mukuṭa* is lacking.

²²⁰ It is only written *matya*, lacking *r*.

²²¹ The insertion of *lo* is indicated in the lower margin.

śubhāśubha kaise tapo(8)vali,
hṛdaya vipbhāla dukhita je nāri śiva 2 //

// rāga madhati // ekatāli // (p. 22:1)
kathā gelo morā prabhu sakala vicāre,
bhuvana śundala jehne madana samāne,
morā rū(2)pa²²² se jauvana hayiro asāre,
katha dekho prabhu mora, guna se nidhāne //
dusva(3)ṇa dekhiyā phala phariro he sakhi,
katha pāyvo²²³ morā svāmi tailokya ratane // (4)

// rāga padmaṃjali // paḍitāla //
tuhme deva tuhme guru tuhme sava jāne,
nalaka padiro (5) ahme udhālāne,
candra vinu rātri ati aśvabhane,
svāmi vinu tirī nisphala jivane, (6)
calana dhaliyā kahe tapodhane,
avilaṃve kaliyā deho svāmi dāne //

// rāga dhanā(7)śrī // jati //
āhe vṛṇḍā dhīrja karo morā tapovare,
tvarā²²⁴ svāmi divo ahme mahese(p. 23:1)ro vale //

// saṃgrāma //
me ḍaṇa²²⁵ //
// rāga bhaira[vi]²²⁶ // ekatāra //
sumeru dekhi he priya sa(2)va deva vase,
nānā mṛga paṃkhi gaṇa sobhite,
pradakṣina sadā kare ravi saśi bhrame (3)

²²² Almost looks like *rupa*. There is nothing but a subtle difference between the vowel sign of *u* and that of *ū*.

²²³ The *ya*-letter has a *halanta* sign whose shape resembles the vowel sign of *u*. Peculiarly, it lacks the horizontal line, which is also observed in *āyro* (p. 20, l. 7).

²²⁴ It is obviously a way of writing *torā*, but the scribe might have confounded it with Skt. *tvara* ‘fast’.

²²⁵ Nw. It seems to mean something like “The song rose up (= was performed).” It might be read *me uṇa* or *me duṇa* (but its meaning is obscure in this case).

²²⁶ The letter *vi* is added above to the right.

trayodaśa bhuvana se jāne, //

// rāga nāṭa // jati //

tolā vore laṅghi, ahme (4) śaṃgrāma je gerā,
tuhme na dekhire cita nahi thila molā,
torā kairo ā(5)yo²²⁷ ahme halinī-ṅayanā,
vacana-amṛta-pāna deho āriggane²²⁸, // (6) // dhru //
tailokya śundari pṛya sama nahi āne,
madana pidiro ahme lati (7) cāhe mane,²²⁹

[Here the story brakes off. The next picture of the microfilm shows only one folio (instead of two folios). Peculiarly, the microfilm continues further.]

(p. 24:1)²³⁰

᳚ rāga sauri // ekatāla //

āhe prabhu ki kahivo tuhme, prāṅnātha morā tuhme kahe ju(2)kta vore, //
āhe prabhu daityasvara sava tuhme jāne,
tuhmāra je hāthe a[hme]²³¹ śaṃkhā²³² nahi kare, // (3)
ehi velā āliṅgana kahe kona jāne,
tila eka khemā karo morā vora²³³ māne, // // (4)

᳚ kṛṣṇayā²³⁴ //

keḍālā // paritāla //

praphula kamara-mukhi tora na~~hi~~²³⁵ sama āne,
bhra(5)mara hayire ame²³⁶ deho madhupāne,
tumāra yauvane mora hariro parāne,
rākhaha su(6)ndari ave dagadha jivane, // • //

²²⁷ The *ya*-letter, peculiarly lacking the horizontal line, has a *halanta* sign whose shape resembles to the vowel sign of *u*. The same is observed in 20,7 and 22,4.

²²⁸ Or else, *āriggnane*. I.e. *āliṅgane*.

²²⁹ I.e. *pīḍilo*, *rati*

²³⁰ As mentioned above, the microfilm contains only one folio.

²³¹ The insertion of *hme* is indicated in the lower margin.

²³² Seems to be a corrupted form of *śaṅkā*.

²³³ Or else, *cora*.

²³⁴ Nw. “[The speech] of Kṛṣṇa.” I.e. Kṛṣṇa, disguised as Jalandhara, importunately woos Vṛndā who is refusing.

²³⁵ = *nahi*. The second letter is cancelled in black.

²³⁶ Is this an unusual type of corruption of *ahme*?

vṛndāyā²³⁷ //

dhanāśrī // ekatāla //

avela vacana prabhu (7) ahmeke vola kāhe sune,, udyāna je vaisire, choda svāmi ehi vela //

// śṛṅgāla // (8)

dhanāśrī // ekatāla //

haṁṣa-gamani tuhme kajala-nayāne,

sarada saṁpurṇa śaśi nirmala

[The part beginning with the next page deals with a totally different text, i.e. a collection of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs. The writing hand also changes. It is a neat handwriting.]

(p. 25:1)

guṇa hṛdaya vidāre // dhru //

divasa na jāya priyā na pohāya²³⁸ rātri,

dāruna madana vadāyi, hṛdaya jale vāte, //²³⁹ (2)

// // rāga sauri // tāra śarjjati²⁴⁰ //

suniyā sāgara ratana pāyivo, robhe jhāpa dire,

taraṅga utaraṅga tira²⁴¹ (3) tarāyive²⁴², aiśena karama re e vadāyi go //

dayā dāluna duṣa na²⁴³ dije, āsā bhaṅga karahu janu re // dhru //

sumeru (4) pare vora parisama dhāyive, kāñcana pāda kare,

kara²⁴⁴ pariśita dūra parāya, aisena karama re // // (5)

rāga varāri // tāra jati //

duṣero upara duṣa, yihana na jā,²⁴⁵

cakuvāhe rāyā jehne caku nivedane //

²³⁷ Nw. “[The speech] of Vṛndā.”

²³⁸ B. *pohā*- ‘to pass over (with difficulty) the night time’ [Sen 1971]

²³⁹ This seems to be a part of a Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa song, mentioning Baṛāyi.

²⁴⁰ The tāla-name *śarjjati*, i.e. Kharjati, appears for the first time. The word order *tāra śarjjati* also differs from the method in the former pages.

²⁴¹ = *tīra* ‘the shore’.

²⁴² The scribe wrote this word over his wrong writing (maybe *tārayive?*).

²⁴³ Or *ma*? However, **dayā dāruṇa dukha na dije* “Mercy please, don’t give [me] a dreadful pain” makes good sense.

²⁴⁴ Or *kare*?

²⁴⁵ A reconstruction would be: **dukhero upara dukha, sahana na jāya*.

cāho cāho (6) cāho vadāya cāho viṇḍāvane,
yathā vāśi vāje tathā devakīnandane //
hamāra samāda raiyā jāu²⁴⁶ go vadā(7)yi,
voraha rādhā-ke prāṇanātha kāhu darasane //

// rāga śauri // tāra jati //
rāma avatāra duḥkha (8) syahi suṣa hairō²⁴⁷,
rāvaṇa vandhiyā²⁴⁸ śitā ghareto ānirō //
nisphala hairō morā kṛṣṇa avatāre,
kaṃ(p. 26:1)śa-vadhana kairō devaloka udhāre // dhru //
aṣṭāṃgaḍa²⁴⁹ dahe vadāyi rādhāro virahe,
jalāṃkuśa vaisya va(2)dāyi rādhāro adhare //

// rāga dhanāśrī // tāra dharamjati²⁵⁰ //
ṣopā parateka mora²⁵¹ ṭṛdaśa-iśvara (3) syāmbhu²⁵²,
keśa-pāśe niravidha māne, suna vadāyi go //
siśe[to]siṃdula□□□sūlaśūlālā²⁵³(4)lāta tiraka cande,²⁵⁴
nayāne to vaisya to madane, //
vora giyā govindero vāte, sorasra ṇṇpati ga(5)ṇa rāśaha yauvana mora,
ki karite pāre jagannāthe //

// rāga dhanāśrī // tāra dhara ekatari //
ava(6)hu vore dhiraja vāni,
torā vore jive cakrapāni //

²⁴⁶ This word is written over a writing mistake. The letter *jā* is recognized with difficulty.

²⁴⁷ I.e. *sehi sukha hailo*.

²⁴⁸ I.e. *vadhiyā* ‘having killed’.

²⁴⁹ The Newari *ḍa*-letter has the same form as the Bengali *ta*-letter. Supposing the scribe/scribes had the original manuscript written in Bengali script, it might have been *aṣṭāṃga-ta*, namely, *-ta* could be interpreted as the locative ending. In that case, this sentence would mean: “Because of separation from Rādhā, it burns in my whole body (lit. in the eight limbs).”

²⁵⁰ This *tāla*-name appears for the first time.

²⁵¹ The *ra*-letter is written over a writing mistake (*sa?*).

²⁵² Maybe a corruption of *śambhu*, or *svayambhū*.

²⁵³ The scribe, having erased a phrase, wrote a new phrase over it. It seems that at first the scribe had written **siśetosimḍula* in the place in which now □□□sūla is written; thereafter, he erased it and rewrote it from the beginning of the sentence. One of the repeated *sūla sūla* also seems to have been erased. As the result, we have *siśeto simḍula sūla lā*. Obviously, *siśeto simḍula* is a corruption of *śīrṣeto sindūra*. A parallel *siśeto simḍure* is found in p. 27, l. 1.

²⁵⁴ Maybe *su-lalāṭa-tilaka-candre*? A thin trace of erasion is seen under the letters *ta tiraka*.

bhujaratā e phāsaya diyā,²⁵⁵
to-ke thāko hṛdaya kari(7)yā // dhru //
na māro je virahero jare²⁵⁶,
mukhari cāho ke hamāre²⁵⁷ suno vadāyi go //

// rāga śrī // tāra ru²⁵⁸(8)paka //
śakra cāpa bhruvo rādhe kāma śara vāṇe,
kiṃcita cāhiyā mane na dhara parāne //
nayāna kāñjara²⁵⁹ so(p. 27:1)bhe siśeto siṃdhure²⁶⁰,
carite susara²⁶¹ vāje pāeto nepure //
padiro je kāma śāgare, sundari rādharo na jāne (2) satrare,
duya kuṃca bhero rādhyā kahnāyiro pāre //

// rāga deśāka // tāra jati //
ahmāra jauvana gusā(3)yi gero turi dhani,
mundita bhaṇḍāra²⁶² na sāmāu curi,
dharmma raṃbhiyā reho sātha sari hāre,
tora patiyega²⁶³ (4) nahi jauvana ahmāre //
pathe na vicora nidhaka vanamāri²⁶⁴,
hahme²⁶⁵ kichu nahi jāne a[hmāra]²⁶⁶ govāri²⁶⁷ // // (5)

rāga dhanāśrī // tāra astrārā //
tribhuvana-pati tuhme raśika vaṇa-māri,
ahme kichu nahi jāne mugudhi govā(6)rinī //
kāma sarūpa²⁶⁸ tuhme kāminī mohane,

²⁵⁵ I.e. *bhuja-latā*. Perhaps *bhujalatā-e* is a locative.

²⁵⁶ = *jvare*

²⁵⁷ Or: *keha māre?*

²⁵⁸ Maybe *rū*, but I cannot see a very subtle difference between the signs of *u* and *ū*.

²⁵⁹ I.e. *kājjala*, *kājala*.

²⁶⁰ Parallel to *siśe[to] siṃdu[la]* (p. 26, l. 3).

²⁶¹ = *susvara*

²⁶² I.e. B. *mudita bhāṇḍāra* (Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtana dānakhaṇḍa, Fol. 29v = 62th song)

²⁶³ Seems to be a mistake for *pati yoga*. There is a parallel *tora patiñ joga nahi* in p. 27, l. 6.

²⁶⁴ = *vana-mālī*

²⁶⁵ *Hahme* is an exceptional spelling for *ahme*, that I have not seen before.

²⁶⁶ Very difficult to identify, being written over mistaken words.

²⁶⁷ Or else, *gocāri*

²⁶⁸ The sign of the long *ū* is clear.

tora patiñjoga²⁶⁹ nahi yauvana hamāre // dhru //²⁷⁰
vṛkaśita puṣpa ja(7)thā tathā madhukare,
mukurita puṣpa syaho tathā dura parihare //²⁷¹ //

[Here, this Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa text breaks off. From the next page, the writing hand changes. Again, it is a rough style of writing.]

(p. 28: 1)

ṛ vibhāsa // e²⁷² //

java dina dāhinī hītamṛta²⁷³ mira²⁷⁴la²⁷⁵,
amī(2)ra miraya²⁷⁶ sava koyi // [dhru]²⁷⁷ //

java divāmavāpanī dāruṇi,
vairī bhera (3) ghara kela jorī //²⁷⁸
daiyā he kāhe karava dina vaṃkā // dhru //
asamaya pa(4)ralaya ki rīkhi na phalaya,
asamaya vānī ja²⁷⁹ vorā // dhru //
asama(5)ya parare²⁸⁰ sevaka jana parī haya,
saravara śukhe paṃkhi udāya // dhru //²⁸¹ (6)
jadi kopa²⁸²thāvara mānī[na]²⁸³ dāvaya,
jivana ke mora nahi saṃkhā // dhru // (7)
bhanaya vidyāpati²⁸⁴ suna vada jaivati,

²⁶⁹ I.e. *tora pati joga nahi* “My youth is not matching to you.”

²⁷⁰ The second half of this verse is parallel to p. 27, ll. 3-4.

²⁷¹ This song is parallel to the song contained in NGMPP E167/37 (second part p. 18, ll. 5-6). There, the text is as follows: dhanāsrī // atā // suvanasāgīdha tībhūvana pati tuhme, rasika vanamāli, ahme kichu nahi jāne mugudha govāre, kāma sarupa tuhme kāmi[nī] mohāna, tyarā pati joge nahi, jobhana ahmāra, vīgasi□tapopa jathā tathā madhukare, mukurītāpopa se hya dura parihare.

²⁷² I.e. *ekatāla*

²⁷³ Perhaps a corruption of *hitāmṛta*.

²⁷⁴ This *ra*-letter resembles *ca* in shape.

²⁷⁵ Difficult to identify. The scribe has amended a wrong letter into *la*.

²⁷⁶ It seems to be a corruption of *a-mila milaya* ‘to unite the ununitable’.

²⁷⁷ The insertion of *dhru* is indicated in the upper margin.

²⁷⁸ “The pair of the home became enemies.” *Kela* seems to be the same as Brajabulī *kera* [Sen 1971].

²⁷⁹ Or else: *vānīja*, i.e. Skt. *vāñijya* or *vāñija*?

²⁸⁰ The vowel sign of *e* is blurred. It might be *ra*, i.e. *parara*.

²⁸¹ “[Above] the lake, birds fly joyfully (*sukhe urāya*).”

²⁸² Or maybe *kova*.

²⁸³ The *na*-letter is added below to the right.

²⁸⁴ I.e. this is a Vidyāpati song.

cite janu ghaṃ²⁸⁵ṣa sayāne // dhru // (8)

rāja śivasimha²⁸⁶ rupa nārāyaṇa²⁸⁷, lakṣmīmādevī vimāne // dhru //²⁸⁸

[From the next page 29 onward, another drama, i.e. the Kṛṣṇacaritra, is contained. This part will be dealt with in another report.]

Abbreviations

Nw. Newari Skt. Sanskrit B. Bengali

Dic. Cl. Nw. A Dictionary of Classical Newari (see bibliography)

Bibliography

Brinkhaus, Horst 2003, “On the Transition from Bengali to Maithili in the Nepalese Dramas of the 16th and 17th Centuries”, in: W. L. Smith (ed.): *Maithili Studies. Papers Presented at the Stockholm Conference on Maithili Language and Literature*. Department of Indology, University of Stockholm: 67-77.

Jha, Subhadra 1954, *Vidyāpati-gīta-saṅgraha. The songs of Vidyāpati*. Banaras: Motilal Banarsidass.

Malla, Kamal P. (ed.) 2000, *A Dictionary of Classical Newari. Compiled from Manuscript Sources*. Nepal Bhasa Dictionary Committee. Kathmandu: Cwasā Pāsā.

Regmi, D. R. 2007, *Medieval Nepal*. Vol. I & II. New Delhi: Rupa (Reprint. First published in 1965).

Sen, Sukumar 1971, *An Etymological Dictionary of Bengali: C. 1000–1800*. Vol. I & II. Calcutta: Eastern Publishers.

Acknowledgement

This research was subsidized by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Grants-aid Nos. JP25370412 and 17K02659.

²⁸⁵ The śrībindu has a strange form of a small hook. It might be the vowel sign of *ī*, i.e. *ghī*.

²⁸⁶ A small letter resembling *e* is written in the lower margin, below to the right of *ha*. However, *śivasimhae* would not be suitable.

King Śivasimha of Mithilā was Vidyāpati’s patron [Jha 1954: 22], and his name, accompanied by his epithet Rūpanārāyaṇa, is frequently mentioned in Vidyāpati’s *bhaṇitā*-verses. Lakṣmīdevī (Lakhimādevī) was his queen [ibid.].

On the other hand, Śivasimha is also the name of a king of Kathmandu (AD 1578-1620) [Regmi 2007 II: 46ff], who defeated King Puarandarasimha of Pāṭan and incorporated Pāṭan into Kathmandu [Regmi 2007, II: 267f].

²⁸⁷ The insertion of *ra*-letter (or *na*-letter) into line 2 (or 3?) is indicated in the lower margin just below the *rā*-letter of *nārāyaṇa*. However, the place in which it should be inserted is not marked.

²⁸⁸ A typical *bhaṇitā*-verse of Vidyāpati songs. Compare it with another one contained in Jha [1954: 136, song no. 135]: bhaṇāi vidyāpati are re juvati abe cite karaha uchāha / rājā sivasimha rūpanarāena lakhimādevi-varanāha //