



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: Baru Caṇḍīdās' Srīkrṣṇakīrtan 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	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

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

The University of Osaka

本論考は次の研究成果報告に対して 2019 年 3 月に作成された補遺である

『ネパールの演劇写本：マッラ朝のベンガル語演劇写本（3）*Jalandharāsuravadha*』（研究成果報告 2019 年 2 月公開）

大阪大学言語文化研究科 北田信

Baru Caṇḍīdās' Śrīkrṣṇakīrtan and its parallels in two dramatic manuscripts from Nepal

Makoto Kitada (Osaka University) Published in 2019/03/01.

Appendix to “*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” published in January 2019

Abbreviation ŠKK = *Śrīkrṣṇakīrtan* B. = Bengali MS = manuscript NGMPP Reel No. E 460/33

Notice: 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.

§1. Foreword

In February 2019, I participated in the International Conference “Negotiations between the ‘Local’ and the ‘Global’ in ‘Cultural Bengal’: Community, Society and Politics” at the Acharya Brojendra Nath Seal College, Cooch Behar (West Bengal), and made a speech titled “*Nava Caryāpada, Śrī Kṛṣṇa Kīrtan* and Bengali dramas in Kathmandu”.¹ In this speech, I discussed our recent finding of a fragmental manuscript from Nepal (NGMPP No. B 287/2), containing parallels to *Baru Caṇḍīdās'* *Śrīkrṣṇakīrtan* (ŠKK)². After that, I shifted to Kolkata and visited Durgapada Datta M.A., one of my closest friends and my teacher at the same time. For longer than ten years, Mr. Datta, an erudite specialist in Bengali folklore, has introduced me into the rich folkloric culture of West Bengal, taking me to villages in Bākuṛā and Puruliā districts for fieldworks on various folkloric genres such as Jhumur

¹ I express heartfelt thanks to my colleagues at A. B. N. Seal College, especially Ratul Ghosh, assistant professor. Without their invitation, I would have not visited West Bengal in this time, and I would not have been able to find out the matter dealt with in this article. During the conference, I met Prof. Rahul Peter Das, my former academic supervisor “Doktorvater”, and received instructive advises about this matter.

² For further information on this matter, consult Tamot & Kitada [2013] and Kitada [2016].

Gān, Bhādu Gān, Pālā Kīrtan etc.³

In our merry conversation with a cup of tea and biscuits, I discussed with him about the several Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs contained in the manuscript NGMPP Reel No. E 460/33, i.e. one of the Nepalese dramatic manuscripts in Bengali language. This manuscript (abbr. MS), in its first part, contains the drama Jalāndharāsuravadha⁴, and in its second part, the drama Kṛṣṇacaritra. Peculiarly, several Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs are inserted between the two parts. These songs are written in different handwriting(s) from the two parts. These songs do not seem to have any direct connection to either of the two dramas, at least in regard to their plots.⁵

Some of these songs contain the word *vadāyi* (= Bengali *barā(y)i*), i.e. the old woman who acts as a go-between between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, a term which frequently occurs in Baṛu Caṇḍīdās' Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan (abbr. ŠKK). I asked Mr. Datta whether *barā(y)i* also occurs in Middle Bengali songs by other poets. In his opinion, *barā(y)i* does not occur frequently in the Padābali songs by Caṇḍīdās⁶, Gobindadās, Jñān'dās etc. In fact, I did not see this word in the anthologies of Vidyāpati, Gobindadās, and Jñān'dās, as far as I checked, although I must confess my investigation was not exhaustive at all. On the other hand, dictionaries give evidences of the usage of *barā(y)i* in other texts than ŠKK. Sukumar Sen's etymological dictionary mentions, besides ŠKK, three titles of texts in which this word occurs [Sen 1971: 608]: <1> Caitanya-bhāgabater Aprakāśita Adhyāya-tray (edited and published in 1909), <2> Kṛṣṇamañjala by Mādhava Ācārya (16c) and <3> Karuṇānidhānavilāsa by Jaynarayan Ghosal (*sic*) (completed 1813).⁷ Bandyopadhyāy's dictionary [1966-1967] gives also evidences: <1> Bhaktamāla-grantha 141⁸, <2> Śrī-kṛṣṇa-maṅgal 63⁹ and 65, <3> Caitanya-bhāgabata 283¹⁰, <4> Maṅgalacāṇḍī-pāñcālikā 68, <5> Kābikānkaṇa-caṇḍī 262¹¹, <6> Bāiś Kabi Manasā 278¹². Therefore, the usage of *barāi* is not confined to ŠKK. Anyway, it would not be very inappropriate to consider *barāyi* as belonging to vulgar vocabulary. Thus, it is understandable that this word frequently occurs in ŠKK which, in spite of dealing with Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa romance, retains the characteristics of folksongs of rustic love affair, while it is far less encountered in Vaishnava lyrical texts (*padābali-s*) of later period, which underwent the sophistication by classical poetics (*kāvyaśāstra*).

³ Some scholars see, in the folkloric tradition of Jhumur Gān and Pālā Kīrtan, continuity from ŠKK. Unfortunately, I cannot deal with this matter in this article. It will be another big object of argument.

⁴ A Romanized text is published online [Kitada 2019c].

⁵ Although the second half deals with the Kṛṣṇacaritra, i.e. a Kṛṣṇa story.

⁶ Usually, the author(s) of the Vaishnava *padābali*, having the same name Caṇḍīdās, is/are considered different from Baṛu Caṇḍīdās, the author of ŠKK.

⁷ He does not quote these instances.

⁸ *yaśodāra mā pāṭalāra sahacarī, yaśodāra dhāi, kṛṣṇera āi.*

⁹ *barāi pāṭhāyā kari ānaha satbara.*

¹⁰ *nityānanda haiben barāi.*

¹¹ *hāta pāo kāpe buri, kothāra barāi-buri.*

¹² *barāi sāśurī – barā āi-sāśurī.*

§2. Outline of my findings

As the result of further investigation, at least one song turned out to be a parallel of ŠKK. The details of the condition of the manuscript in question are as follows:

- (1) The drama Jalandharāsuravadha which is in a rough handwriting abruptly breaks off in MS p. 27.
- (2) Three pages from 25 to 27 contain eight Kṛṣṇa songs in Bengali language. The handwriting, obviously different from those in the foregoing and following parts, is neat. Therefore, these three pages 25-27 must have been taken from another manuscript.
- (3) The page 28 contains a Kṛṣṇa song composed by Vidyāpati in Maithili language. The handwriting is rough, but different from that of the drama Jalandharāsuravadha.
- (4) The part from p. 29 onward is the drama Kṛṣṇacaritra. The handwriting is rough. In the moment, I can not decide whether it is the same hand as in the foregoing page 28, i.e. the Vidyāpati song.

§3. Parallel of ŠKK

The fifth one (MS p. 26, ll. 2-5) among the eight Bengali songs is parallel to the 290th song of ŠKK (bāṇakhaṇḍa) [Bhāṭṭācārya 2011, p. 366f; Rāy 1414, p. 108 (Fol. 159/2-158/1)]. In the following, the fifth song of MS is given:

(The original page number and line numbers are retained for convenience.)

(p. 26:2) [...] // rāga dhanāśrī // tāra dharamjati¹³ //
śopā parateka mora¹⁴ ṭṛdaśa-iśvara (3) syambhu¹⁵;
keśa-pāśe niravidha māne, suna vadāyi go //
siśe[to]simdula□□□śūlaśūlalā¹⁶(4)lāta tiraka cande,¹⁷
nayāne to vaisya to madane, //
vora giyā govindero vāte, sorasra nṛpati ga(5)ṇa rāṣaha yauvana mora,
ki karite pāre jagannāthe //

¹³ This *tāla*-name does not occur in the drama Jalandharāsuravadha. This also points out the discontinuity between the drama and the eight Bengali songs.

¹⁴ The *ra*-letter is written over a writing mistake (*sa*?).

¹⁵ Maybe a corruption of *śambhu*, or *svayambhū*.

¹⁶ The scribe, having erased a false phrase, wrote a correct phrase over it. It seems that at first the scribe wrote *siśetosimdula in the place in which now □□□śūla is written; thereafter, he erased it and rewrote it from the beginning of the sentence. One of the doubled śūla śūla also seems to have been erased. As the result, we have siśeto simdula śūla lā. Obviously, siśeto simdula is a corruption of B. *sisetosindūra. A parallel siśeto simdure is found in MS p. 27, 1. 1.

¹⁷ Maybe *su-lalāṭa-tilaka-candre*? A thin trace of erosion is seen under the letters *ta tiraka*.

Its parallel in ŚKK is as follows, according to Bhaṭṭācārya [2011]’s edition:

dhanuṣī rāgah // laghuśekharah //
khōpā paratekha mora tṝdaśa īśbara hara
keśa-pāśe nīla bidyamāne / e ā /
sisera sindūra sūra lalāte tilaka cāda
naẏanata basae madane // e ā // 1
suṇa baṛāyi la
bola giā gobindaka bāte / e ā /
tīna bhubana bīra rākhae yaubana dhana
ki karitē pāre jagannāthe // dhru

(The verses posterior to these, being irrelevant to our matter, are not quoted here.)

Here are some distinctive features observed through comparison:

MS has *syambhu* instead of ŚKK *hara*. MS *sorasra nr̄pati gana* (i.e. **sahasra nr̄pati gana* or **sorasa nr̄pati gana*) seems to be a semantic correspondent of ŚKK *tīna bhubana bīra*. MS *govindero* has a genitive in *-ro*, while ŚKK *gobindaka* has *-ka*. The phrase of addressing, MS *sunā vadāyi go* and its correspondent in ŚKK *suṇa baṛāyi la*, are situated in different places from each other. The *rāga*-names, MS *dhanāśrī* and ŚKK *dhanuṣī*, seem to refer to one and the same *rāga*, while the employed *tāla*-s are different.

Besides, the trace of the scribe’s cancelling and amendment in MS p. 26, l. 3 (*siśe[to]simdula□□□□śūlaśūlalā*)¹⁸ indicates that the scribe had an older manuscript from which he copied these eight Bengali songs. Later in this article, I will come back to discuss this very intriguing problem of the older manuscript.

§4. Maithili song by Vidyāpati

The Maithili song in MS p. 28, which mentions the author’s name Vidyāpati in its *bhanitā*-verse, is as follows:

(The MS page number and line numbers are retained for convenience.)

(p. 28:1) vibhāsa // e¹⁹ //

¹⁸ For further detail of the MS condition, see my footnote on the line in question, given in my Romanized text [Kitada 2019c].

¹⁹ I.e. *ekatāla*

java dina dāhinī hītamṛta²⁰ mira²¹la²²,
 amī(2)ra miraya²³ sava koyi // [dhru]²⁴ //
 java divāmavāpanī dāruṇī,
 vairī bhera (3) ghara kela jorī //²⁵
 daiyā he kāhe karava dina vāmkā // dhru //
 asamaya pa(4)ralaya ki rīkhi na phalaya,
 asamaya vānī ja²⁶ vorā // dhru //
 asama(5)ya parare²⁷ sevaka jana parī haya,
 saravara śukhe pāmkhi udāya // dhru //²⁸ (6)
 jadi kopa²⁹thāvara mānī[na]³⁰ dāvaya,
 jivana ke mora nahi samkhā // dhru // (7)
 bhanaya vidyāpati suna vada jaivati, cite janu gham³¹ṣa sayāne // dhru // (8)
 rāja śivasimha³² rupa nārāyaṇa³³, lakṣmīmādevī vimāne // dhru //

I have not yet identified this song in Vidyāpati's anthology, but its *bhaṇitā* follows the typical pattern of Vidyāpati's songs. Compare it with a *bhanitā* contained in Jha [1954: 136, song no. 135]:

bhanaī vidyāpati are re juvati abe cite karaha uchāha /
 rājā sivasimha rūpanarāena lakhimādevi-varanāha //

²⁰ Perhaps a corruption of *hitāmṛta*.

²¹ This *ra*-letter resembles *ca* in shape.

²² Difficult to identify. The scribe has amended a wrong letter into *la*.

²³ It seems to be a corruption of *a-mila milaya* 'to unite the ununitable'.

²⁴ The insertion of *dhru* is indicated in the upper margin.

²⁵ "The pair of the home became enemies." *Kela* seems to be the same as Brajabulī *kera* [Sen 1971].

²⁶ Or else: *vānīja*, i.e. Skt. *vāṇijya* or *vānija*?

²⁷ The vowel sign of *e* is blurred. It might be *ra*, i.e. *parara*.

²⁸ "[Above] the lake, birds fly joyfully (*sukhe uṛāya*)."

²⁹ Or maybe *kova*.

³⁰ The *na*-letter is added below to the right.

³¹ The śrībindu has a strange form of a small hook. It might be the vowel sign of *ī*, i.e. *ghī*.

³² 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 *bhanitā*-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 Pātan and incorporated Pātan into Kathmandu [Regmi 2007, II: 267f].

³³ 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.

The MS page 28, which contains solely this Maithili song, is in a rough and unskilled handwriting different from both handwritings in the Jalandharāsuravadha and in the eight Bengali songs.

The exact reason why the eight Bengali songs and this Maithili song are juxtaposed is not clear. However, there is a helpful hint on this matter. Prof. Nirmal Gupta points out the fact that the newly discovered fragment of manuscript (NGMPP No. B 287/2) containing parallels to ŠKK also contains a few songs by Vidyāpati.³⁴ Does this fact suggest that some connection existed between Baru Caṇḍīdās and Vidyāpati, at least in the view of the Nepalese scribes, so that they considered it apt to put the two poets together?

§5. The remaining Bengali songs. Parallels of ŠKK?

So far, I am not yet successful to identify the remaining Bengali songs. Although these may possibly be parallels to ŠKK, too, I cannot give a definitive proof for the moment. Still, these songs contain expressions and phrases common to ŠKK. A good instance would be the phrases containing *vadāyi* (= B. *barā(y)i*). I give these below:

dāruna madana vadāyi, hr̥daya jale vāte (MS p. 25, l. 1)

(My reconstruction: *dāruna madana barāyi, hr̥daẏa jbale bāte)

aiśena karama re e vadāyi go (MS p. 25, l. 3)

hamāra samāda raiyā jāu go vadāyi (MS p. 25, ll. 6-7)

(MS *raiyā* must have been B. *laiyā*. The word *samāda* (< Skt *saṃvāda*) occurs in ŠKK.³⁵)

aṣṭāmgada dahe vadāyi rādhāro virahe, jalāṅkuśa vaisya vadāyi rādhāro adhare (MS p. 26, ll. 1-2)

The obscure expression *aṣṭāmgada* in this instance would suggest a troublesome, but intriguing problem. In Newari script, the *da*-letter has the same form as the Bengali *ta*-letter. Supposing the scribe(s) had an original manuscript written in Bengali script, it might have been *aṣṭāṅga-ta*. That means, *-ta* could be interpreted as the locative ending.

Such confusion of Newari and Bengali scripts is frequently observed in the manuscript NGMPP No. B 276/16, which is one of the dramatic manuscripts in Bengali language, containing the drama

³⁴ Gupta [2018] has a chapter dealing with this matter in detail.

³⁵ E.g. ŠKK dānakhaṇḍa (Fol. 21/2) *buliā pāṭhāibō dukha samāde* [Rāya 1414, p.17; Bhaṭṭācārya 2011, p. 225 (No. 45)]

Vidyāvinoda, although it is the unique case I have ever seen. If it is also the case here, the original verse could be reconstructed as follows:

*aṣṭāṅga-ta dahe barāyi rādhāro virahe, jalāṅkuśa base/baiśe barāyi rādhāro adhare
“Oh Grandma, because of separation from Rādhā, it burns in my whole body (lit. in the eight limbs).
Oh Grandma, a fishing hook [to angle for men] is set in Rādhā’s lips ”

Further instances of *barāyi*:

na māro je virahero jare³⁶, mukhari cāho ke hamāre³⁷ suno vadāyi go (MS p. 26, l. 7)

cāho cāho cāho vadāya cāho viṇḍāvane (MS p. 25, ll. 5-6)
(MS *viṇḍāvane* is a corruption of *vṛṇḍāvane/bindāvane*.)

To this phrase, a similar expression is found in ŚKK:

cāhā cāhā cāhā barāyi yamunāra bhīte (ŚKK Fol. 221/1; Bhaṭācārya 2011, p. 444, No. 408)

However, only the fact that these verses contain *vadāyi* (*barā(y)i*) does not suffice to prove that they are parallels to ŚKK, as, mentioned above in §1, this word occurs in other Kṛṣṇa poems, too.³⁸

Besides these instances of *barāyi*, compare the following manner of MS’ addressing Kṛṣṇa and that of ŚKK:

tribhuvana-pati tuhme raśika vaṇa-māri (MS p. 27, l. 5)

tribhubana-nātha tohme hari (ŚKK Fol. 130v = Bhaṭācārya 2011, p. 341, Song No. 251)

Certainly, the possibility that these parallels and resembling phrases might be also found in other Middle Bengali poets’ works than ŚKK is not denied, as my search is unfortunately not exhaustive. However, these Bengali songs show striking resemblances to ŚKK in every aspect of language,

³⁶ = *javare*

³⁷ Or: *keha māre?*

³⁸ However, the Kṛṣṇa songs contained in MS should have been composed earlier than the reign of Bhaktapur king, Jagajyotirmalla (AD 1614-1637), as I am going to discuss in §8. My question, which I myself unfortunately cannot give any answer, is whether the Vaishnava *padābalī* poets so frequently used *barāi* as in these songs.

contents and style of formulation. Their parallels may possibly be found in ŠKK in the course of my further investigation. Otherwise, these songs might possibly be even the ones that were lost from the ŠKK manuscript discovered in Kānkilyā, Bākurā district of West Bengal. As well known, this solely existing manuscript of ŠKK lacks several folios in its beginning and end. However, for the moment, I am not so far as to be able to deny the possibility that these are other poets' composition.

Whatever it may be, this fragment of manuscript from Nepal, consisting of merely three pages, shows that it used to be a part of a longer text. The first song must have contained more words in its beginning, for, in the existing condition, its *dhruvā*, i.e. verse of refrain, contains only three words (*guṇa hr̥daya vidāre*):

(MS p. 25, l. 1) *guṇa hr̥daya vidāre // dhru //*
divasa na jāya priyā na pohāya³⁹ rātri,
dāruna madana vadāyi, hr̥daya jale vāte, //

In contrast, MS p. 27, i.e. the last page of the three pages, seems to be the end of a text or chapter, for this page contains only seven lines, i.e. fewer by one line than the other pages (p. 25 and p. 26); the last verse ends in the middle of the seventh line, and the rest space of the page is left blank.

As already mentioned above in §3, the trace of the scribe's cancelling and amendment in MS p. 26, l. 3 suggests that the Bengali songs in MS were copied from another manuscript which is now lost.⁴⁰

§6. Quotation of the same Bengali song in another dramatic manuscript from Nepal

Further, there is another remarkable fact. The same Bengali song as the last one of the eight songs in this manuscript is quoted in another manuscript. It is the dramatic manuscript NGMPP No. E 167/37. The second part of this manuscript contains the drama Pārijātaharāṇa⁴¹. Peculiarly, several Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa songs which do not seem to have a direct connection to the plot of the drama are quoted after the end of the drama, i.e. at the end of the manuscript (i.e. E 167/37, second part, pp. 15-18). The last one of these songs is the same as the song in question. First, I give the version of the song as contained

³⁹ B. *pohā-* 'to pass over (with difficulty) the night time' [Sen 1971]

⁴⁰ Of course, there remains the possibility that the scribe wrote down the songs as they were orally recited. However, if my above-mentioned presumption of the confusion of Bengali and Newari scripts (e.g. misreading Bengali *ta* as Newari *da*) is true, we should think of the existence of another lost manuscript which is supposed to have been written in Bengali script. On the other hand, the Newar scribes' typical features of confusion in spelling words (e.g. confusion of R/L, dental/retroflex etc.) indicate that the scribe wrote down the text, as someone else recited it orally, or at least read it orally from a manuscript.

⁴¹ A Romanized text is published online [Kitada 2019b].

in the manuscript of the Jalandharāsuravadha (NGMPP Reel No. E 460/33)⁴².

E 460/33 (= MS), p. 27. ll. 5-7

(5) rāga dhanāśrī // tāra astrārā //
tribhuvana-pati tuhme raśika vaṇa-māri,
ahme kichu nahi jāne mugudhi govā(6)rinī //
kāma sarūpa tuhme kāminī mohane,
tora patiñjoga⁴³ nahi yauvana hamāre // dhru //⁴⁴
vr̥kaśita puṣpa ja(7)thā tathā madhukare,
mukurita puṣpa syaho tathā dura parihare //

The version contained in NGMPP E 167/37 (second part, p. 18, ll. 5-6) is as follows:

(5) dhanāśrī // atā //
suvanasāgidha tibhūvana pati tuhme, rasika vanamāli,
ahme kichu (6) nahi jāne mugudha govāre,
kāma sarupa tuhme kāmi[nī] mohāna,
tyarā patijoge nahi, jobhana ahmāra,
vigasi tapopa jathā tathā madhukare,
mukurītāpopa se hya dura parihare

To my deep disappointment, I am not yet successful in identifying this song. However, the fact that the same song is contained (more precisely, inserted) in the two manuscripts suggests that this song (and perhaps the other Bengali songs, too) widely circulated in the Kathmandu Valley in the period⁴⁵ during which Bengali dramas were composed, i.e. manuscripts of Bengali dramas were produced in Kathmandu under the rule of the Malla kings.⁴⁶

⁴² I.e. the manuscript which I have until now denominated by the abbreviation MS in this article.

⁴³ I.e. *tora patijoga nahi* “My youth is not matching to you.”

⁴⁴ The second half of this verse is parallel to a verse-half contained in the foregoing song, i.e. MS p. 27, ll. 3-4: *tora patiyega nahi yauvana ahmāre*.

⁴⁵ I.e. in the second half of 16c and the very beginning of 17c, before Bhaktapur king Jagajyotir Malla (AD 1614-1637) introduced Maithili as the court language in the place of Bengali. [Brinkhaus 2003: 70]

⁴⁶ I make this rephrasing, because not all the dramas were composed in Nepal. The drama Vidyāvinoda contained in the manuscript NGMPP No. B 276/16 seems to have been originated in Bengal.

§7. Question of the Bengali songs contained in the manuscript NGMPP No. E 167/37

As mentioned above, the manuscript with the drama Pārijātaharāṇa (NGMPP E167/37), coming up as a new object of our interest, contains eight⁴⁷ Kṛṣṇa songs. I listed all the song-texts in Romanization at the end of this article. In this song list, I numbered the eight songs from Song No. 1 to No. 8.

Song No. 8 is the one we just dealt with in the previous section of this article. Song No. 7 mentions Sūr'dās in its *bhanitā*; its language seems to be Braj Bhāṣā. Song. No. 2, 4, 5 and 6 are obviously in Bengali language. For Songs No. 1 and 3, I cannot specify in which language(s) the two songs are, although it is obviously New Indo-Aryan.

To my astonishment, Song No. 2 contains wordings parallel to ŚKK!

Song No. 2

marāra // rupaka //
medani je jorilo āre hārelo rādhe vrahmāro daṇḍelo jotāro rādhe,
vāsukī je nāgero, āre, jotāro rādhe, giri-paravata chātāro rādhe, //
jotāro rādhe ro, āre teyāro rādhe, kāhnu māhādāne, paṇṭhero rādhe //

The parallel in ŚKK is as follows:

ŚKK No. 54 [dānakhaṇḍa, Bhaṭṭācārya 2011: 230]
deśāga rāgah // rūpakah //
medani yoṛilo hāle / kauṇo brahmāra daṇḍa yōāle //
goālī bādhilō bāsukī daṛā / giri karilō mothāṛā gobālī //
jāibāra bāsanā teja goālī / kāhna māhādāṇī tore la bālī // dhru
[The irrelevant verses after this are not quoted.]

Although I feel reasonably permitted to consider the two songs as parallels, their wordings deviate from each other considerably. The fact that the Nepalese version contains repetitions suggests that this deviation was caused by the modification in musical performance.

Although the *rāga*-s are different, the *tāla* is the same *rūpaka*. Possibly *marāra* (i.e. *malhāra*) and *deśāga* have similar structural features of melody, although, of course, the possibility that it is a mere coincidence cannot be denied.

Besides, Song No. 4 contains one verse-half parallel to ŚKK. Compare the two:

⁴⁷ Seven, in the case Song No. 3 and 4 are counted as one song. I have not yet come to a final judgement.

Song 4: vāraha varisa nāli, teraha na pure (NGMPP E167/37, II-16, 1. 3)

ŚKK Fol. 35/1 (dānakhaṇḍa): e bāra bariṣa mora tera nāhī pūre (Rāy 1414, p. 28)

To my disappointment, the two songs do not contain any further parallel verses or phrases. This trivial parallelism would not suffice to prove that this song, as a whole, is a parallel of ŚKK. Perhaps it is an idiomatic phrase, or a kind of ‘floating verse’ widely circulating among Middle Bengali poets, and not necessarily confined to Baṛu Caṇḍīdās’ compositions.

In any case, we have now, as the result of investigation, confirmed that the two manuscripts contain at least one parallel of ŚKK respectively, and also observed resemblances in various aspects. Although further investigation is highly requisite, these features suggests that ŚKK, or at least some songs by Baṛu Caṇḍīdās⁴⁸, were circulating in the Kathmandu Valley.

If my argument so far is correct, it would be a surprise, because the situation and evaluation of Baṛu Caṇḍīdās’ ŚKK, with its uniquely existing manuscript discovered in a small village in Bākuṛā district, has been always an object of heated controversy.

§8. The era of transcribing these Bengali songs

As to the era of writing down these Kṛṣṇa songs in the manuscripts E460/33 and E167/37, I can not give any exact year, because these songs do not have connection to the plots of the dramas: they are separately written down in the marginal part of each manuscript. In any case, the songs in E167/37 were likely written down in or after AD 1561, i.e. the era of the production of the drama Pārijātaharāṇa in the Pāṭan Kingdom [cf. Brinkhaus 2003: 70]. On the other hand, the case of the songs in E460/33 is a little troublesome, for the three pages 25-27 (with eight Bengali songs) are obviously a fragment belonging to another work, as the neat, totally different handwriting indicates. These three pages were secondarily inserted at the end of the text of the drama Jalāndharāsuravadha which is itself broken off in the middle without completion of the plot. Therefore, these songs can be either earlier or later than the text of the drama which was composed under King Purandarasiṁha (AD 1560-1597) of Pāṭan [cf. Brinkhaus 2003: 70]. As to the page 28 (with a Maithili song by Vidyāpati), I cannot tell anything concrete for the moment, either, for its handwriting is perhaps the same as in the drama-text Kṛṣṇacaritra which was composed under Śivasiṁha (AD 1597-1619) of Pāṭan, contained in page 29 onwards.

In any case, the last limit for the Bengali songs must be set before the reign of Bhaktapur King Jagajjyotir Malla (AD 1614-1637) who replaced Bengali with Maithili as the court language [Brinkhaus 2003: 70]. After him, the literary works were composed in Maithili (and later also in

⁴⁸ One peculiar fact which should not be overlook, however, is that none of these Bengali songs contain any *bhaṇītā* verses.

Newari).⁴⁹

§9. Bengali used in the Kathmandu Valley

As we have seen, Baru Caṇḍīdās' songs were known to a certain degree in the Kathmandu Valley. Now, a new question arises: Which type of Bengali was adopted as the court language in the Kathmandu Valley? The type(s) of language used in the Bengali dramatic manuscripts from the Kathmandu Valley has/have strikingly similar features to ŚKK in vocabulary and flexion. Perhaps, the Bengali dialect of ŚKK was the lingua franca in the wide area along the route from Bengal to Nepal, and therefore adopted as the court language in the Kathmandu Valley, although further minute analysis of the language(s) of these dramatic manuscripts is indispensable to ascertain the truth.

Bibliography

(Only those which are not mentioned in the bibliography of my report on Jalandharāsuravadha)

Bandyopadhyāy, Haricaraṇ 1966-1967: Baṅgīya Śabdakoṣ. I. Natun Dillī (New Delhi): Sāhitya Akādemi. Third printing 1988. (On the back side of the front page: Pratham prakāś 1340-1353, saṃskaraṇ, Pratham khaṇḍa 1966, dbitīya khaṇḍa 1967)

Bhaṭṭācārya, Amitrasūdan (ed.) 2011: Baru Caṇḍīdāser Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan. Samagra. Bhūmikā sampādanā tīkā: Amitrasūdan Bhaṭṭācārya. Kal'kātā: De'j Pābliśīm. Trajyodaś saṃskaraṇ (13th edition): 2011 (Pratham prakāś (1st publication): 1966)

Gupta, Nirmal Nārāyaṇ 2018: Āntarjātik Baru Caṇḍīdās. (On the outside book cover additionally: Sr̥ṣṭi anubād samālocanā.) Jagāchā, Hāorā: Prajñā Prakāśanī.

Tamot, Kashinath & Kitada, Makoto 2013: "Newly Discovered Fragment of the Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan." *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 33: 293-300. Available online:

[file:///C:/Users/luckn/AppData/Local/Packages/Microsoft.MicrosoftEdge_8wekyb3d8bbwe/TempState/Downloads/ggr033017%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/luckn/AppData/Local/Packages/Microsoft.MicrosoftEdge_8wekyb3d8bbwe/TempState/Downloads/ggr033017%20(1).pdf) (Last access on 21/01/2019)

Kitada, Makoto 2016: "A Fragment of Baru Caṇḍīdāsa's Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtan Newly Discovered in Kathmandu." *International Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 8. New Delhi: Manohar: 35-48

Kitada, Makoto 2019a: *Bengali drama from Nepal. Uṣāharāṇa-nāṭaka. A Romanized text based on the manuscript : Report on the research of dramatic manuscripts written in Nepal of the Malla dynasty.* Published online (<http://hdl.handle.net/11094/71130>)

Kitada, Makoto 2019b: *Pārijātaharaṇa, a Bengali drama from the 16th century Nepal. A Romanized*

⁴⁹ I.e. besides Sanskrit and Prakrit.

text based on the manuscript. Report on the research of dramatic manuscripts written in Nepal of the Malla dynasty. Published online (<http://hdl.handle.net/11094/71131>)

Kitada, Makoto 2019c: *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.* Published online (<http://hdl.handle.net/11094/71179>)

Rāy, Basantarañjan (ed.) 1414: *Śrīkrṣṇakīrtan. Caṇḍīdās-biracita.* Kal'kātā: Baṅgīya-Sāhitya-Pariṣat. Ekādaś samskarāṇ 11th edition: Bengali year 1414 (=AD 2006).

Acknowledgement

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

List of Krṣṇa Songs contained in the manuscript NGMPP No. E 167/37 (from page II-15⁵⁰ to page II-18)

- I added the numbering of the songs in boldface type for convenience. The page numbers and line numbers according to the original manuscript are also given.
- These songs seem to have been written down to fulfill the remaining blank pages at the end of the drama-text. A conspicuous tendency observed in these pages (i.e. from pages II-15 to II-18) is that the letters in the first line are written meticulously and neatly, but the handwriting becomes sloppier and sloppier in the lower lines.

Song No. 1

(II-15, 1) rāga savari //
madanā re, kata mālasivānu, sava voli āge, sadī mada, nā, bhāra, //
(2) madanā rāgi⁵¹, mola vikara palāva⁵² //

Song No. 2

⁵⁰ For my method of numbering the pages of this manuscript, see my report on this manuscript published online [Kitada 2019b].

⁵¹ = *lāgi*

⁵² I.e. *pallava*?

marāra⁵³ // rupaka //
 medani je⁵⁴ jorilo āre hārelo rādhe (3) vrahmāro daṇḍelo jotāro rādhe,
 vāsukī je nāgero, āre, jotāro rādhe, (4) giri-paravata chātāro rādhe, //
 jotāro rādhe ro, āre teyāro rādhe, kāhnu māhādāne, (5) pamṛthero rādhe //

Song No. 3⁵⁵

// savari // jati // idra⁵⁶ varise rādhe

Song No. 4

(II-16: 1) kālā rūpa bhamara, bhūrāyilo⁵⁷ sava phule
 piriti vadhāyilo ālo vaṇḍhu āpuna jātelo kule // dhru // (2)
 e parānevo⁵⁸ nātha jīvanero nāthe, dayā na chodivo //
 tuhe to chodivo dayā vandhu āmī tvamara livo, (3) āro vaṇḍhu 2 / dhru //
 e parānero nātha, vāraha varisa nāli, teraha na pure, dīne² vādhayasi ma(4)rero⁵⁹ ku□[i]⁶⁰ //
 dhru //

Song No. 5

(II-17, 1) // korāva // e mārini ki vā kāja, dhana jana sa[ja]⁶¹na rāgīyā e rāgīyā nahi jāna,
 mu-ke kṣediyā (2) pathāero //

Song No. 6

korāva //
 kura deśi kura chādi, sāyalare, dhasadire, e kura va kura eka kura pāe(3)ve, //
 ahma abhāgīnīre hini nā[rī]⁶² ekaramare, gunamāṇta nāgara gero, hama chādi //

⁵³ I.e. Rāga Malhāra. The letters are badly stained with ink.

⁵⁴ The letter is obscure. Maybe *te*?

⁵⁵ Song No. 3 with only three words, although being here considered an independent song, might be the beginning part of Song No. 4. However, Song No. 3 breaks off in the middle of the line, and the rest of the page is left blank. Besides, in the manuscript, a mark indicating the opening of a song is set at the beginning of Song No. 4 (I did not reproduce this mark in this list for the purpose of avoiding complication). This is a peculiar feature, for Song No. 4 does not contain a *rāga*-name or *tāla*-name.

⁵⁶ = *indra*

⁵⁷ Stained with ink. I.e. *bhūrāyilo*.

⁵⁸ The letter *vo* seems to be a mistake for *ro*. Originally the word must have been *parānero*.

⁵⁹ Or *maroro*?

⁶⁰ A blurred letter with the vowel sign of *i*. Maybe *kupi* or *kudi*?

⁶¹ The letter *ja* is inserted according to the note written in the upper margin.

⁶² The letter *rī* is noted in the lower margin.

uvi duvi mari jāevo virahe⁶³re, jara bhāri, e piyā-ke prema madana saramāri⁶⁴ //

Song No. 7

(II-18, 1) raguna⁶⁵ dharāvat⁶⁶, saguna manāvat⁶⁷, kākā udāvat,
hāri syāma mora, niju kene visār⁶⁸ //
na jāno vidhi ka(2)vana pāpa-te, vyāpati hae dukha bhāri syāma mo⁶⁹hi, //
nayāna tupatu deśi darisanave-ko, kāma-vāna (3) sala māri syāma mora //
nīju kene visāra, suradāśa⁷⁰ prabhū tuhmāra darasana-ko, anega jatana (4) kari,
hāri syāma mora rāra visāri syāma syāma vīsā[ri] syāma mora // dhru //
niju kene visār⁷¹ //

Song No. 8

(5) dhanāśrī // atā // suvanasāgidha⁷² tibhūvana pati tuhme, rasika vanamāli,
ahme kichu (6) nahi jāne mugudha govāre, kāma sarupa tuhme kāmi[nī] mohāna,
tyarā pati joge nahi, jobhana ahmāra, vigasi⁷³ tapopa⁷⁴ jathā tathā madhukare,
mukurītāpopa⁷⁴ se hya dura parihare

⁶³ Or *ha*?

⁶⁴ Or *maramāri*?

⁶⁵ It seems to be a corruption of *niraguṇa*.

⁶⁶ With a *halanta* sign.

⁶⁷ With a *halanta* sign.

⁶⁸ With a *halanta* sign.

⁶⁹ A blurred letter with the vowel sign *u*. Or, perhaps it was erased intendedly.

⁷⁰ I.e. the poet Sūrīdās.

⁷¹ With a *halanta* sign.

⁷² The letters *gi dha* are blurred.

⁷³ I.e. *vikasita-puṣpa*.

⁷⁴ I.e. *mukulita-puṣpa*.