

Hāla's stanzas on life and love in Ancient India: A review article

J. C. Wright

School of Oriental and African Studies

Abstract

A new English translation, by Peter Khoroché and Herman Tieken, of “Hāla’s 700” Prakrit verses caters for a long-felt want in the field of classical Indology. It is an attractive literary rendering, succinctly annotated, of stanzas epitomizing the delights and sorrows of love. The result is not, however, in every case an improvement upon previous efforts, and it emphasizes the need for more objective textual criticism. It is the compilers’ personal selection, both from among the thousand or so verses that vie to represent the nominal 700, and from among the multifarious variant readings that have accrued over the centuries in half a dozen distinct recensions. It is particularly regrettable that the work is based substantially upon Weber’s Madhyadeśa Vulgate text, despite the indications, largely provided by Tieken’s own previous work on the text, of the reliability of the “Jaina” recension, especially Bhuvanapāla’s readings when supported and corrected by their Madhyadeśa and Kerala offshoots. The evidence does not really justify postulation, following Weber, of an underlying original corpus of 700 verses.

The remarkable and large anthology of epigrammatic single verses known as “Hāla’s 700” epitomizes all the grave and gay aspects of love in a rural Indian environment. The ancient and rustic Maharashtri Prakrit language in which they are couched was made accessible through the sterling work of Albrecht Weber between 1870 and 1883, but many philological problems remain. There has been no previous full-scale attempt to render them into English verse, but a new translation by Peter Khoroché and Herman Tieken¹ has often succeeded in producing accurate and attractive renderings in elegant free verse, rearranged thematically, and competently and succinctly explained in prefatory notes.

The translation has, however, its shortcomings. In the following example of a typically colourful twist on one of the more hackneyed themes (v. 305 = AW [i.e., A. Weber] v. 496),²

Just look!

After her husband had addressed her with his mistress’s name

The ornaments she had put on for the fair

Suddenly appeared like a garland on the head of a buffalo

Being led to sacrifice.

1 Peter Khoroché and Herman Tieken, *Poems on Life and Love in Ancient India: Hāla’s Sattasāi. Translated from the Prakrit and Introduced* (SUNY Series in Hindu Studies), vii, 212 pp. Albany NY: Excelsior Editions, 2009. \$75 HC. ISBN 978 0 7914 9391 5. \$24.95 PB. ISBN 978 0 7914 9392 2.

2 *gottakkhalaṇaṃ soṅṇa piaame ajja tīa chaṇḍiahe, vajjhamahisassa māla vva maṇḍaṇaṃ uaha paḍihāi.*

the translators' rendering makes the point more forcefully than any strictly literal prose presentation; but their wilful transposition of the verse into the past tensed, clashes awkwardly with the retained imperative.

In another verse (54, AW 318):³

Having missed the assignation
In all those reed-beds,
She looks for you everywhere
As though in search of lost treasure.

It may not matter that we lose something of the direct comparison between an unfindable rendezvous and a forgotten hiding place. Again, however, the notion of arranging a meeting in "all those reed-beds" is odd. In fact, she is searching "here and there among the canes" (*vāñīravaṇammi*).

For the vocative *māmi*, where the maiden is confiding her romantic adventures, neither "Aunt" (passim), "O auntie!" (178, AW 344), nor "Mother" (43, AW 246 and 465, AW 124: tacitly reading **māē*?) seems appropriate. Even if a youngish relative is implied, the contexts suggest that *māmi* is no more than a prosodically conditioned substitute for *sahi*, and might be translated as "dear friend" or the like (*PSM: māmi "sakhī ke āmantraṇ mē prayukt avyay"*).⁴

Another linguistic problem underlies 160, AW 271:⁵

How can I describe her?
Once you see her body
You cannot take your eyes off it:
They are like a helpless cow
Stuck in the mud.

The number of cows and eyes might have been made to correspond.

In all these, more attention ought to have been paid to existing translations. The explanation given for another verse (53, AW 365)⁶ is that "the boy does not show up or is late", but the intimation is that he arrives on cue: "(she) awaits" may adequately render *diṇṇasaṃkeā* "she has made an assignation with", but "Listening for the rustle of dead leaves / Stirred by his footfall" does not do justice to *āṇṇei* and *aggapaa-* (she hears his cautious approach, tiptoeing through the leaves). Here, as elsewhere, one misses Weber's succinct explanatory caption: "Da kommt er!".

3 *aha sā tahiṃtahiṃ cia vāñīravaṇammi cukkasaṃkeā, tuha daṃsaṇaṃ vimaggai pabbhaṭṭhañihāñathāṇaṃ va.*

4 The Grimms' *Deutsches Wörterbuch* shows that Weber's rendering "Muhme" could refer to a relative of similar age; but surprisingly he used "Tante" in some occurrences in the final 1881 edition (358, AW 431; 613, AW 592; 16, AW 610).

5 *kaha sā ñivvaññijjau jā jahāloiammi aṃgammi, diṭṭhī dubbalaḡāi vva paṅkapaḡiā ña uttarai.*

6 *āṇṇei aḡaṇā kuḡuṃḡaheṭṭhammi diṇṇasaṃkeā, aggapaapelliāṇaṃ mammaraṃ juṇṇapattāṇaṃ.*

The minimal annotation does not cater for a case like 372, AW 26,⁷ where the translation:

You would not be so touchy
If you knew the pain of falling asleep beside one's lover
And waking up in the middle of the night
To discover that the bed is empty.

tends rather to imply a woman reproaching an errant and impenitent male, in keeping with the masculine participles of the Vulgate; but the feminine readings of the Jaina and Kerala recensions are listed as having been adopted: *ṇa kuṇanti ccia (māṇam)* and *jāṇantī*. This, and the discussion in Tieken's *Hāla's Sattasāi*, 1983 (*HS*), 230 ff., show that we are meant to envisage a third party's advice that the woman must make the best of things lest worse befall. In fact, past conditional "you wouldn't have, if you had known" makes rather better sense: it serves her right, he's gone (as in AW 129).

A duly corrected version of Weber's translation of 310, AW 909⁸ also requires some elucidation:

Foolish girl, you're in a muddle.
His getting your name wrong
Is nothing to cry about.
What do you think?
With those big eyes
He could never have made such a mistake.

We are presumably supposed to understand from this that he merely teases the girl thus, those unmistakable big eyes being hers (since an equivalent phrase *eddahamettehi acchivatehim* in AW 973 refers, as one would expect, to a girl's outstanding beauty). Nothing is gained by transposing the habitual present (*gottakkhaliehi . . . kiṃ va ṇa pecchai aṇṇaha* "he can't really be making such mistakes, can he?") into an ambiguous "could", or indeed by separating the verse from its pendant 306, AW 908,⁹ where the notion of deliberate teasing is explicit.

The maverick Telinga-Kerala readings listed in *HS*, 35–7, have generally, and rightly, been passed over.¹⁰ Surprisingly, however, the clear instances listed in *HS*, 37f., of correct Bh. readings that are retained largely or only in Kerala

7 R, γ: *ṇa kuṇanti ccia māṇam ṇisāsu suhasuttadaravivuddhāṇam, suṇṇaiapāsa-parimusanaveṇaṇam jai si jāṇantī*. Bh.: *kuṇanta ccia . . . jāṇanto*; his *kuṇanta*, probably erroneous for *kuṇanti*, explains his own *jāṇanto* and others' *kuṇanto*, *jāṇanto* (Vulgate except γ, and S, followed by AW). The attractive Bh. reading *ṇisāsu pāsutta-* is supported by the translators' recourse to "falling asleep", in spite of their "beside" which indicates that *sahasutta-* (Kerala, ψ) has been tacitly adopted.

8 *veṛijjasi, muddhe, gottakkhaliehi mā khu tuṃ ruvasu, kiṃ va ṇa pecchai aṇṇaha eddahamettehi acchihim?*

9 *ai caṇḍi, kiṃ ṇa pecchasi? jai so vāharai aṇṇagotteṇa, aha de icchai maccharapaṇaciaccaṃ muhaṃ daṭṭhuṃ* ". . . it's that he wants to see your eyes dance with jealousy".

10 Even in *HS*, 185, the support of neighbouring Telinga for the Kerala reading *pāḍa* for AW 2 was discounted at the outset; and although *kaha te . . .* was adopted there on that basis alone, Weber's *te kahā . . .* gives a preferable emphasis.

manuscripts have been ignored in favour of Weber's Vulgate distortions.¹¹ A dozen examples of alleged "common errors" in Bh. and Kerala (*HS*, 43) could rather be discounted as mere perseverance of orthographic vagaries (e.g. Bh. *garuyana* "parents" versus AW 367 *guruana*), except for Bh. *sirīsatata*, a better reading than AW 49 *sarīratata*. Neglect of the evidence of Bh. can lead to a struggle to read meaning into a text to which the key has been lost, as in 408, AW 219:¹²

What makes you think I'm lying, you fool?
I know spring can do anything,
But the fragrant flowers of the amaranth
Have not made me in the least unfaithful.

The need to provide a non-existent "but" indicates that the sense is rather "I assure you, foolish boy, that spring can do anything: the scent of amaranth has made me quite unfaithful": irrespective of whether the Vulgate reading is *maṇammi* / *manasi* or *maṇam* / *manāk*, its commentators (with *śīlam khaṇḍitam*, etc.) variously accept an admission of infidelity. The explanation may lie in an Apabhraṃśa pun, whereby *maṇammi* can convey, besides "only mentally" (the deprecatory Leśa figure of the Bh. commentary), a positive incitement *maṇam pi*. Only thus does the provocative address *vālaa* "foolish boy" (T: *jāraṃ dṛḍhānurāgāya protsāhayati*) make obvious sense.

A set of readings that were dismissed in *HS*, 42, as innovations peculiar to the Jaina recension (Bh. and R) have also been ignored, although they are defensible and even preferable. The 26 "variant readings" that have been adopted for the translation are listed without apparatus or comment (p. 205), and they too

11 From Bh. and Kerala, the convincingly "ascertained" (*HS*, 50) reading *anisam* (*isaṃ-taṃsa-*) for 19, AW 370, and confident solutions for such as AW 22, 325, 532 (*HS*, 38), 160 (*HS*, 219), 233 (*HS*, 57), and 315 (*HS*, 83) have been ignored. For 203, AW 156, the rendering "need for the pleasures of love" reflects Vulgate *suraasuharasa-taṅhā* "suratasukharasa-tṛṣṇā", rather than the more plausible and forceful *suraa-sarahasatanhā* "surata-sarabhasatṛṣṇā" (*HS*, 49). Their "faces" red with jealous fury seem preferable for 270, AW 106 (*HS*, 37), since the red "eyes" of the Vulgate are more in need of explanation, and the translators' suppletion "sleepless" is rather less convincing than Weber's two different suggestions. The reading *paiṇṇa* has been kept as "(lotus) surrounded by" in 186, AW 78, despite its rejection in *HS*, 49, in favour of Telinga-Kerala *pa(p)hulla* "blooming"; but Bh. *pahalla*, R *pailla*, S *paala* "(an)dolita, *pracala*" implies that they both are wrong emendations of **payalla* < *pracala* (cf. *callai*, *oalla*: Pischel, *GrPk.*, §197), and the resulting "lotus shaken by" yields a more appropriate simile for "locks shaken by". It was not observed in *HS*, 37, that for 545, AW 165, the K misreading *-maṅgalamgale*, probably reflecting Bh. *-maṅgale maṅgalam*, explains the unsatisfactory emendations, R *hale*, Vulgate-Kerala *laṅgale*. For 188, AW 176, a paraphrase attempts to deal with the Vulgate reading *phukkaṃto* "blowing", although the *pūmeṃto* of Kerala supports Bh. *phūmitta*- "with just a puff". An inverted bahuvrīhi *maṇṇusamuppaṇṇeṇa* "utpannamanyunā" is correctly recognized in 379, AW 184; but there the Kerala reading *aṇṇama-* again supports Bh. *unnama* "do stand up!" against the less attractive Vulgate *aṇṇua* "you fool!".

12 *saccam bhaṇāmi*, *vālaa*, *ṇa thī asakkam* (Bh., R, T: *asajjham*) *vasamtamāsassa*, *gamdheṇa kuravaāṇam maṇam pi asaittaṇam ṇa gaā* (Bh. *maṇammi asaittaṇam pattā*, T: *aham pi asaittaṇam gamiā*).

seem justified only to the extent that they are supported by Bh. and R. An inverted bahuvrīhi reading *hīaam māṇapauttham* “pride has left her heart” that has been preferred to prevailing *hīaam pautthamāṇam* “*hṛdayam proṣitamānam*” (343, AW 188) is convincing only because, as was shown in *HS*, 239, it is based on the combined evidence of Bh., Kerala and *Daśarūpa*. For 202, AW 759,¹³ the opaque Jaina reading *paṇḍiaittam* is tentatively adopted and paraphrased (following Bh. “*paṇḍitamanyam*”) as “If you are the scholar / You say you are”; but the simple emendation *paṇḍia itt[h]am* would still yield the appropriate irony and better explain the variant readings (R *paṇḍiya ittam*, S *paṇḍiam ṇiccam*, T *paṇḍia iddhiē/itthiē*). Patwardhan’s edition has confirmed the Jaina readings that have been adopted in the case of AW 114 *sirigoviāē*, 226 *-suttāe* 692 *ahilijjai*, 748 *ne[v]a tāṇā khayamaggo*, and 788 *vaṇa-*. Though absent from Bh., other confirmation exists for 2 *taṃta-* and 651 *jāi* (misprinted on p. 205 as *jai*); and 949 *kaaveṇiāṇa* is fully justified by both sense and metre.

Other proposed readings are far from convincing. For 334, AW 488,¹⁴ *āṇāvarāhē kuvio* is no improvement on **āṇāvarāhakuvio*, which was Tieken’s conjecture in *HS*, 84. The verse is translated as:

A man who is angry at one’s being bossy
Can be won round in due course,
But someone who is angry at one’s being servile
How can I appease him?

The proposed reading *pesattaṇāvarāha-* “one’s being servile” for *vesattaṇāvarāha-* stems from a palpable misreading in the Bh. commentary (not retained in Patwardhan’s edition), and **āṇāvarāha-* “one’s being bossy” was Tieken’s consequent conjecture in lieu of *aṇṇāvarāha-*; but the attested forms (equivalent to *anyāparādha* “the faults of others” and *dvesyatvāparādha* “the fault of being unloved”) are as convincing in the context as the proposed forms (*preṣyatva* “servility” and *ājñā* “bossiness”) are implausible.

For 353, AW 420, the Telinga reading *paravasana-ṇaccirī-*, adopted and rendered as “laughing at someone else’s misfortune”, is likely to be condoning a *lectio facillior*, since an attractive pun “dancing to another’s sins/tunes” is implied elsewhere (*par’avajja-* in Bh., *para-vādyā-* in G). The same may be said of redundant *āliṅgasi* “you are embracing” for 369, AW 33:¹⁵

- 13 R: *sa cciya rāmeu tumam paṇḍiya ittam, alam mha ramieṇa . . .* AW: “Möge die denn stetig mit dir kosen, du Feiner! – lass ab von der Liebe zu uns . . .”.
- 14 *aṇṇāvarāhakuvio jaha taha kāleṇa gacchai pasāam, vesattaṇāvarāhe kuviam kaha tam pasāemi?* AW: “Ein wegen anderer Vergehen Erzürmter wird wohl mit der Zeit irgendwie wieder gut. Wie soll ich aber ihn wieder gewinnen, der darüber zürnt, weil ich ihm feindlich gesinnt sei (oder: weil ich ihm unausstehlich bin)?” Gaṅgādhara’s syntactically misguided gloss *anyaḥ ājñākhaṇḍanādirūpaḥ [aparādhaḥ]* does not make a reading **ājñāparādha-* any more plausible.
- 15 Bh.: *uṇhāi ṇīsasamto sayanaddhe kīsa me parāhuttim, hiyayam palīvium* (R: *palīviam*) *anusaṇa paṭṭhim palīvesi?* Vulgate, followed by AW: *uṇhāi ṇīsasamto kīsa maha parammuhīa saanaddhe, hīaam palīvium . . .* “Nachdem du mir das Herz verbrannt, was verbrennst du mir, die ich auf meiner Lagerhälfte von dir abgewendet liege, nun auch noch den Rücken, heisse Seufzer ausstossend?”. Kerala, Telinga: *uṇhāi ṇīsasamto* (Kerala: *uṇham vi-*) *āliṅgasi kīsa mam parāhuttim, hīaam palīviam . . .*

What do you think you are doing
 Embracing me from behind?
 First you set fire to my heart
 And then you start burning my back
 With these hot sighs of remorse.

The “embracing from behind” ousts the preferable explanatory phrase in Bh. *sayaṇaddhe kīsa me parāhuttim* “why, when I am turned away on my side of the bed”; and, engendered by the Kerala-Telinga finite reading *palīviām* (tacitly adopted instead of gerund *palīvium*), it breaks the verse uncharacteristically into three sentences.

A (Kerala?) reading *ṇa daṃsase piṭṭham* for 384, AW 943, rendered as [most politely, you] “never turn your back on me”, is banal compared with the irony of Weber’s *ṇa jampase piṭṭham* “sprichst nicht einmal von dem, wonach du gefragt wirst!” In any case, “back” is otherwise *paṭṭhim*, *putṭhim* in the text, and not *piṭṭham*. Even support from Kerala alone would hardly justify preference for *sirivandīnam* as “royal hostages” over AW 54 *sarivamḍīnam* (“fellow-prisoners”), *oraṃtamuhīe* “with tears streaming down her face” over 539 *oruṇṇamuhīe*, or *uppakka* “clot” over normal *uppamka*, the Bh. reading for 586. The graph *āsamḍhia-* “intended” (as read by Weber also in Bh. 389: *Ind. St.*, XVI, 135) seems preferable to *āsamghia-* understood as “reached” (76 and 707). An awkwardly placed negation *kae ṇa* has been introduced into 473 (Jaina *kaeṇa*, not *kae na*). It is not clear why a (Kerala?) reading *phalahī* is recommended for 550, since the rendering remains “bolt”, in keeping with Jaina *phaliham*. The Jaina readings *hayasuṇhāē taha kao* “(my son) has been so ruined by his atrocious wife” and *aṃgacchittam miva vammahēṇa* “(given) by Eros as a personal gift” (Patwardhan, pp. 282, 277) seem preferable to the Vulgate variant selected in the former case, 632, and to the violent and improbable alteration imposed upon the latter, 782.

A brief introduction gives a good account of the background, but it represents (p. 10) Weber’s edition as containing “no fewer than 964 poems, of which only 430 are common to all versions”. These are indeed Weber’s figures (AW, xlvi): Ticken’s own study of the Kerala recension brought the total to 989, however, of which (judging by *HS*, App. 2) hardly more than 400 are ubiquitous. Conveniently, for the sake of presentation, the 964 are listed (p. 207 ff.) as 9⅔ separate “centuries”, but with no indication that they represent the seven arbitrarily separated “centuries” of Weber’s Madhyadeśa Vulgate, followed by miscellaneous sets of progressively less “well” attested verses. By making their own personal selection of 701 verses, the translators have created yet another recension, one that corresponds to a degree with Weber’s Vulgate: it admits only 17 of the 52 stanzas that are peculiar to the two Telinga texts and none of those that are peculiar to the Kerala.

It seems, however, highly improbable that any one single 700-verse archetype ever existed, although the recensions have variously striven to reach this total. In his evaluation of the Kerala recension, Ticken did not question Weber’s assumption of an original 700-verse compilation, emending it only to the extent of granting equal authority to the constitution of the Vulgate and Jaina versions (*HS*, 41). His explanation, however, that the Kerala text (and ultimately the

Telंगा) was forged from some full-scale Vulgate-Jaina compromise version was hardly plausible. It is not likely that the compiler of the Kerala would go through this text picking out less than half its verses, more or less in sequence; go through it again for a second collection, drastically re-shuffled this time; and finally restore the total by strewing in other and apocryphal verses throughout the whole. The initial trawl, thus postulated, would have dismissed many verses that subsequent compilations, including the present one, preferred to retain.

Rather more credible is a much smaller archetype, comprising the bulk of those that are in consistent sequence, compactly within the first 425 verses in the Kerala, but dissipated throughout the 700 in Vulgate and Jaina, and further jumbled up in Telंगा. The factitious title “Hāla’s 700” is after all in competition with non-committal labels like *Gāthākośa*, a name that applies also to the 156-verse collection published under the title *Chappanṇaya-Gāhāo* by A. N. Upadhye (Kolhapur, 1970). The latter (literally “56 verses”) is a name so closely associated with the genre, especially via its palpable Sanskritization *Ṣatprajñādi-gāthāh*, as to suggest that a 56-verse compilation of similar material has long since been subsumed within the longer version.

The Gaṅgādhara Vulgate verses AW 188–95 occur earlier and more widely scattered in the Jaina recension (in Bh. as 29, 34, 45, 104–5, 123, 30, 140; in R among its vv. 31–127) and in the Kerala (among its vv. 69–84 and 173–5). This seems to be not so much a clear indication of arbitrary “transposition in the Vulgata” (cf. *HS*, 161), but rather a symptom of deliberate culling of supplementary Jaina material, on the part of the “Madhyadeśa” Vulgate. The intention would be to complete a further century, for AW 188–95 correspond to 191–9 in another Vulgate manuscript and most of them correspond to 192–9 in a third. The manuscript χ , however, had achieved a total of 196 before drawing on any of the verses in question, and so used only three of them to reach 199, three that form a similar compact group only in R. Comparable inflation of the Kerala offshoot is to be observed: most of the thirty-odd verses that in Kerala intervene between AW 19 and 20 (Bh. 17 and 18) recur elsewhere in the seventh and final century, somewhat similarly arranged in the Jaina recension (R), but randomly dispersed in the Vulgate. Expansion using supplementary Jaina Maharashtrian material seems again the likely hypothesis.

The ubiquitous near-initial verse (1, AW 3):

*satta saāim kaivacchaleṇa koḍīe majjhaārammi,
Hāleṇa viraiāim sālaṃkārāṇā gāhāṇaṃ.*

Among the myriad (of Prakrit verses: cf. 2, AW 2 *amiam pāuakavvaṃ*),
Hāla, patron of poets, composed seven hundred ornate stanzas.

is rendered tententiously as “Among countless elegant poems./King Hāla, patron of poets,/Has selected seven hundred”.¹⁶ “King” is indeed the implication

16 Construing Hāla’s “700” together with “ornate stanzas” (as in Bh. and Weber), rather than *koḍī* “myriad” together with “elegant poems” in general, is justified by the tendency of Sanskrit and Prakrit verses to encapsulate, by associating or construing together a verse’s opening and closing words: cf. AW 33 *ṇa kuṇaṃti ccia ... jai si jāṇaṃti* (n. 7, above), AW 372 *uṇhāi ... palīvesi* (n. 15).

of the term “patron of poets” and of the Telinga reading *Sālainā*, this being a compressed attempt to introduce the *Sālāhaṇa-ṇarindo* mentioned in AW 467.¹⁷ The rendering “selected among countless” recalls Weber’s implication of merely editorial activity: “mitten aus einer Unzahl (hier) zurecht gestellt”.¹⁸ Since, however, the compound *virac-* is always at most perfective, like *vinirmā-*, the preverb would not affect its regular sense of original composition. Bhuvanapāla’s gloss on it, *prakhyāpitāḥ*, was not intended to imply “published by Hāla”: he presented the qualification “patron of poets” as confirmation that the stanzas could rightly be ascribed to Hāla (*tadīyā eva gāthāḥ prakhyāpitāḥ*).¹⁹ The notion of selection is not justified even by the explicit ablative *majjhaārāo* that is read by Bh., Telinga, and Kerala and was adopted in HS, 187, as implying “collected from among”. The contrast between Kalhaṇa’s ablatives *tebhyo dṛṣṭaṃ catuṣṭayam ... abravīt tān dvāpañcāsato madhyāt* “four of them are seen ... he mentioned those (five) of the 52” (*Rājat.* 1.16, 19) and Kālidāsa’s locative *jahāra tayor madhye* “he took (her) from between the two” (*Ragh.* 12.29) suggests that the ablative has no semantic significance, and that the Vulgate locative *majjhaārammi* may reflect a preference for Mahākāvya elegance.

Especially since it was prefixed also to a Telinga text comprising only one century of such verses, there is no reason to believe that this Hāla verse was meant to be a description of the contents of the work in question. It is not an unnumbered final colophon, but forms part of a prefixed apologia for vernacular poetry: it is classified as *jayakāra* (in Telinga) and *namaskāra* (in S). The sense is that the vast legacy of Prakrit literature had been enhanced by Hāla’s contribution. It is, like Bāṇa’s similar verse, not a compiler’s recommendation of his own work, but a reference to the established fame of a predecessor.

The manuscript colophons have been slow to adapt to the notion of Hāla as sole author. Only the Gaṅgādhara version of the Vulgate has an actual final colophon verse that introduces the fiction of Hāla’s authorship (AW 698 *ia siriHālaviraie ...*). It is included in the numbering, presumably because Vulgate versions do not always manage to reach a complete seventh “century”. The R recension evidently reached the 700 mark independently, since most of its non-Vulgate makeweight verses are clustered in the final century, just as are most Vulgate-only verses. After its v. 705, R has a colophon verse, unnumbered according to Weber, which differs in substance from AW 698 only in attributing

17 Perhaps metri gratia for **Sālainā*, rather than Weber’s **Sāleṇa*, as a **Hamsakinā* might conceivably, in similar straits, be coined to represent *Hamsavāhanena*: it is unlikely that an obvious instrumental *-eṇa* would be miswritten as *-aiṇa*.

18 The translators’ rendering “countless” could, intentionally or otherwise, further allow the implication that 700 were originally culled solely from the thousand or so attributed to Hāla: but presumably there was never any thought of crediting him alone with the “Unzahl” or ten million verses that are actually specified.

19 Sādhāraṇadeva’s verse colophons use *rac-* and *virac-* (for metrical convenience, versus *kṛ-* in prose) to refer, not as Weber implies (AW, xxxviii) to his thematic arrangement of the verses, but to his composition of a Sanskrit *Ṭikā* (*-viracitāṃ ṭikāṃ ... Rasikā-Muktāvalī-nāmnīm*). It was Viśvanātha, SD, §565, who transferred the verb and the title to the editorial activity involved (*koṣaḥ ... vṛjyākrameṇa racitaḥ ... yathā Muktāvalī*).

the verses, not to *siriHāla*, but to unidentified poet(s), *sukai*. Being ambiguous as to number, the R colophon is compatible with the view of several recensors who have tried to provide different authors' names for each verse (some palpably guessed from the context). It runs:

*rasiyajaṇahiyayadaie kaivacchalapamuhasukai[ṇimm]aie,²⁰
sattasayammi samattamṇ sattamā gāhāsayaṇ eyaṇ.*

Here ends the seventh century of verses in the set of 700,
dear to the hearts of connoisseurs,
and composed by eminent poet(s), preeminent patron(s) of poets.

The curious wording tends to suggest that plural authorship is indeed the intention of the colophon. Its application of the regal epithet "patron of poets" to unnamed *sukai* shows that it has adapted the expression *kaivacchaleṇa Hāleṇa* of the integral verse AW 3, pluralizing it in keeping with that verse's actual intimation that Hāla was not the only eminent Prakrit poet (*koḍīe majjhaārammi*). An equally non-committal colophon verse (*ettha cautthamṇ viramai gāhāṇa saamṇ . . .*), anomalously occurring, largely unnumbered, after the fourth century of the Vulgate presumably marks the original ending of an as yet anonymous 400-verse recension. Since, unlike all the other colophon verses, it involves no false inference from AW 3, it can have some claim to authenticity.

The verse R 705 that immediately precedes its colophon happens to close the sixth century in Gaṅgādhara's Vulgate (8, AW 599). This must be why the R colophon has been incorporated, and again numbered, in most Vulgate manuscripts, not after the seventh century, but mechanically after the sixth (suitably modified: *sattṭhamṇ gāhāsaamṇ*). It recurs sporadically (after the first century in R and also elsewhere in the Vulgate), but it is not found at all in available centuries of the Kulanātha Vulgate or in any other non-Vulgate text. The fact that the Gaṅgādhara Vulgate has its own distinct final colophon seems to be further confirmation that R and the Vulgate texts independently achieved the total of 700 verses that was thought to be promised at the outset in AW 3.

Even if there is thus no compelling reason why Khoroché and Ticken should have made, specifically from Weber's 964, yet another, and quite arbitrary, selection of 701 verses "following our own judgment and interpretation", their anthology is a most necessary addition to the scanty materials available in English. Arvind Krishna Mehrotra's work, *The Absent Traveller* (London: Sangam Books, 1991), not mentioned in their bibliography, was a poetic English paraphrase of over 200 of the *Sattasaī* verses; but a complete English version that would match the lucid accuracy of Weber's German prose has yet to be achieved. Although the volume leaves the Prakrit original texts "buried in the learned publications in which they first appeared", its publication should

20 The Vulgate reading *-ṇimmaie sattasayammi* confirms the sense "composed" for *satta saāim . . . viraiāim* in AW 3. R reads *-viraie* against the metre, the copyist evidently influenced by *viraiāim* in R 3 = AW 3, above. Though the verse recurs in the Vulgate in sporadic adaptations to centuries other than the last, it would be perverse to deny the verse the status of colophon for the work as a whole in R, as Weber did for the analogous verse 698 that closes the Gaṅgādhara Vulgate.

prove a welcome stimulus for further philological investigation of a significant and enthralling component of world literature.

Abbreviations

AW:	Albrecht Weber, <i>Das Saptasatakam des Hāla</i> (AKM, VII, 4), Leipzig, 1881.
<i>Ind. St.</i> :	Albrecht Weber, “Über Bhuvanapāla’s Commentar”, <i>Indische Studien</i> , XVI, 1883, 1–204.
Patwardhan:	M.V. Patwardhan, <i>Hāla’s Gāthākosa (Gāthāsaptasatī) with the Sanskrit Commentary of Bhuvanapāla</i> (Prakrit Text Series, 21.), Ahmedabad, 1980.
<i>HS</i> :	Herman Tieken, <i>Hāla’s Sattasāi: Stemma and Edition</i> (Gāthās 1–50), with Translation and Notes, Leiden, 1983.
Bh., R:	Bhuvanapāla, Raivāsā: the Jaina recension.
K, γ, ψ, χ:	Kulanātha and other versions akin to Gaṅgādhara’s Vulgate recension.
S:	Sādhāraṇadeva’s recension.
T:	the “first” Telinga recension.