THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

I. GENERAL ACCOUNTS OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

The manuscript materials, collected for textual criticism of Śaṅkaradeva's Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas, seem to belong to a much later period of Śaṅkaradeva's time and some of them are merely copies of copies. Seven of them bear dates of their transcriptions. While five of them are somewhat old, two are recently copied which are preserved in the library of Gauhati University. The dates are: Śaka 1738 (ca A.D. 1816), 1239 (Bāṅglā), 1253 (Bāṅglā), 1295 (Bāṅglā) and 1319 (Bāṅglā).

It is not possible for us to say how many manuscripts of Śaṅkaradeva's Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas were prepared and how many of them still survive, firstly, because no complete list of these manuscripts has ever been compiled; secondly, because no attempt has ever been made to trace, collect and preserve them properly; thirdly, because most of them have either been damaged or destroyed by fire, flood or other natural calamities or through human negligence; and fourthly, because the 'Aṅkīyā-nāṭa manuscript' is ambiguous as it may be applied to a single nāṭa or several nāṭas collectively. The term 'Aṅkīyā nāṭa' is ordinarily applied in Assam collectively to all the nāṭas or plays written by Śaṅkaradeva and Mādhavadeva.
I have come across only fifteen manuscripts in all, of Śaṅkaradeva's Rukmini-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas, taking into account manuscripts falling within my purview from Descriptive Catalogue of Assamese Manuscripts (compiled by Hem Chandra Goswami), the hand-written catalogues of public, educational and Government institutions (viz. Gauhati University Library, Kāṅmarūpa Anusandhān Samiti, Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Bordowā Śaṅkaradeva Research Centre, Pūrba Bhārati of Nalbari, Nalbari Sanskrit College, the Barpetā Sattra, Bārdowā Sattra etc.). Of these six are of Rukmini-haraṇa Nāṭa (five complete and one incomplete) and nine of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa (eight complete and one incomplete). But this does in no way give us an idea of the actual number of extant manuscripts of Rukmini-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas, because there are quite a large number of manuscripts still in private possessions or in various sattras and temples of Assam. In course of my study I have observed that the Aṅkiyā-nāṭas of Śaṅkaradeva were usually copied separately. Only two manuscripts - one written on sācipat (G) and one on modern paper (B, B₂) contain all the natas together. Another manuscript written on tulāpat (indigenous paper folio) contain several Aṅkiyā nāṭas of which only one is by Śaṅkaradeva. Sācipat manuscript (No. 93, G) preserved in the Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam contain thirteen Aṅkiyā nāṭas of Śaṅkaradeva, Mādhavadeva and Gopāl Ātā. The manuscript is carefully preserved in a wooden chest. In one of the manuscripts written on modern paper preserved in the Gauhati University Library I find all the nāṭas
by Śaṅkaradeva together. However, each of the nāṭas bears separate serial number with the date of transcription. Another tulāpāṭ manuscript (No. 2804, J, of the Gauhati University Library contain altogether eleven nāṭas of Śaṅkaradeva, Mādhavadeva and Gopāl Ātā of which only one viz. Rukmini-haraṇa Nāṭa is by Śaṅkaradeva.

In the past manuscripts were copied and preserved mainly in the sattras. Those works of pre-Śaṅkaradeva's times which did not conform to fundamental tenet of devotion (bhakti) or which were not approved by the Gurus, Śaṅkaradeva and Mādhavadeva, were not likely to be copied or kept in a sattra. Only those manuscripts that were approved by the Gurus were preserved carefully. It may be worth noting that several works of Śaṅkaradeva's contemporary Pīṭāmbara Kavi with dominant erotic sentiment are found in no sattras. In fact, they disappeared from general preservation elsewhere also. The reason is that Pīṭāmbara Kavi was on one occasion was highly disapproved by the Guru.¹

Of all the six surviving nāṭas of Śaṅkaradeva manuscript materials are most copious in regard to Rukmini-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa, perhaps owing to their dramatic perfection and stageworthiness. It is worth noting that of the fifteen manuscripts I have collected thirteen are complete, only two are incomplete. Eight

---

of these manuscripts are written on sacipāt three on tulāpāt and four are on modern paper. I have selected eleven manuscripts (five for Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and six for Pārijāta-haraṇa) out of total fifteen manuscripts. Among the manuscripts collected eight are in Kāithelī type of script, two are in a mixture of Gaḍgaṇā and Kāithelī scripts and one in modern script. 'Description of Manuscripts Used' brings out in detail the peculiarities of these manuscripts.

1. Sacipāt was made from the bark of sāci (Agaru) tree and Tulāpāt was made by pressing cotton. The details of the process of preparing Sacipāt have been given by Sir Edward Gait in an appendix to his A Histor of Assam (1967, ed. 2, p. 428).

2. In regard to the peculiarities of the different styles of Old Assamese Script, Dr. Maheswar Neog writes, "There appeared variations of this Assam Script; and as many as three or four types of the script were now to be distinguished. The most widely used type was known as Gaḍgayā ākhar possible because it had its main centre of culture seems to have been the Ahom capital, Gaḍgāō. The traditional Sanskrit scholars had their own style, Bāmuṇīyā, generally used in the preparation of copies of Sanskrit texts. The writer caste, Kāẏasthas, again stuck to their own method of writing mainly in their books of accounts and official documents. Their system became known as Kāithelī or sometimes, Lahkari... The Kāithelī type was the most artistic and clearest writing and made for excellent calligraphy. The Bāmuṇīyā type is characterised by long tendril-like endstrokes, while Gaḍgayā ākhar is very much simple and unornamented. Sometimes the copists are seem to have vacillated between two styles. But whatever be the small variations in style, the system of writing, widely speaking is the same". ('Introduction' to the second edition, Asamīyā Prācīn Lipt, 1979, pp. 6-7).
II. MANUSCRIPT MATERIALS

With a view to limiting the volume of work I have selected only two nātās, viz. Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas of Śaṅkaradeva for text-critical study. The former is the longest of all his nātās while the latter is considered dramatically perfect. Moreover, 'haraṇa' (which means abduction as well as stealing) constitutes the theme of both the plays. In Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa the story revolves round the abduction of Rukmiṇī, daughter of king Bhīṣmaka and in Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa it about the stealing of Pārijāta flower from heaven. In the present text-critical study I have made use of a good number of printed editions of both the plays besides the MSS collected for the purpose.

The manuscripts collated and utilized for the Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas are as follows:

Kaitheli type of script:

B₁ = Bardowā, Nagaon; preserved at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 2375. Undated. Incomplete Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa.

C = Carāibāhī, Nagaon; kept at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies; MS No. 94. Undated. Complete text of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa.
\textbf{Gadgañā-Śāithelī (mixed) type :}

\textbf{B}_{2} = Bhogbārī, Nagaon; deposited at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 713. Undated. Complete \textit{Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa}.

\textbf{P} = Powāmarā, Nagaon; preserved at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 1494. Dated Sana 1253 (Bāṅglā). Complete \textit{Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa}.

\textbf{Modern Assamese Script :}

\textbf{B} = Bardowā, Nagaon; kept at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 692. Dated Śaka 1861 (ca A.D.1939). Complete \textit{Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa}.
For this critical edition of both the Ankiya-nāṭas the following printed book is also collated and utilized:

\[
\text{CR} = \text{Ankawalī, edited by Kaliram Medhi, 1950. 21 dramas of Šānkaradeva, Mādhavadeva, Gopāladeva, Rāmcaraṇ Thākur, Dvijabhūṣāṇa and Daityāri Thākura. 'C' is used for Rh and 'R' is used for Ph.}
\]

Besides these the following manuscripts and printed texts were also partially collated and used as critical apparatus:

(a) Manuscripts

Kaithelī type of Script :

\[
\text{J} = \text{Jāmugurihāt, Ceca Sattra, Nagaon; kept at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 2804. Undated. Complete Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa.}
\]

Modern Assamese Script :

\[
\text{B₃} = \text{Bardowā, Nagaon; deposited at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 696. Dated Śaka 1865 (ca A.D. 1943), complete Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa.}
\]

(b) Printed Texts

\[
\text{Am} = \text{Ahkamālā, ed, Keshabananda Deva Goswami; Dibrugarh, ed. I, 1988.}
\]
An = Āṅkīyā Nāṭa, ed, Birinchi Kumar Barua, Guwahati, ed, 1. 1940; ed. 3, 1983 (consulted).

Sb = Śaṅkaradevar Nāṭa. ed. Mahim Bora; ed, 1, 1989. 6 complete dramas of Śaṅkaradeva.

Moreover, in considering the identity of the author and in the matter of accepting or rejecting the text because of disagreement and more particularly in highlighting the historical value of Rukmini-haraṇa (Rh) and Pārijāta-haraṇa (Ph), the following manuscripts as well as the printed texts were also consulted:

(c) Manuscripts

Cm = Camcauhi, Nagaon; preserved at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, MS No. 205. Undated. Complete Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa.

D = Guwahati; deposited at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, MS No. 1534. Undated. Incomplete middle part of Daśama Skandha Bhāgavata.

K = Guwahati; kept at Kāmarūpa Anusandhān Samiti, MS No. 97. Śaka 1738 (ca A.D. 1816). Complete Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa.
Rk = Kāługāon, Sibasagar; preserved at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies; MS No. 1954. Dated Śaka 1758 (ca. A.D. 1836). Complete Rukmini-haraṇa Kāvyā.

(d) Printed Texts


III. DESCRIPTION OF MANUSCRIPTS USED

I include here both the manuscripts and the printed texts used in the preparation of texts. Colophons and texts quoted from those manuscripts are markedly corrupt. They appear in the description without correction as they are found in the manuscripts. Two signs are used here:

- placed before a manuscript indicates that it is only partially collated.
+ placed before a manuscript indicates that it is not collated at all.

The MS G containing both the two dramas along with other four
plays of Śaṅkaradeva together, is discussed at the beginning. The other MSS are discussed in alphabetical order of identity given in accordance with their sources and significance:

G

Guwahati, Assam Government collection; collected from Sarat Chandra Goswami and deposited at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati, Ms No 93. The total number of folios is 110, with about 12 lines to a side and 40-50 letters to a line; size 35cm x 11cm. Undated, but from the palaeographical peculiarities as well as the general condition of the MS seems to be written in the early part of 19th century. Śacipāt.

In this manuscript there are altogether 13 dramas of Śrī Śaṅkaradeva viz. Kāli-damana, Patnī-prasāda, Keli-gopāla, Rukmini-haraṇa, Pārijāta-haraṇa and Rāma-vijayā (pp. 1-75); Śrī Mādhavadeva’s Arjuna-bhaṇjanacora-dhāraṇa, Bhūmi-lutiya, Pimpara-gucowā (pp.76-96) and Gopāldeva’s Janma-yātrā and Syāmanta-haraṇa (pp.97-110). Each folio of the MS bears in the left hand margin the serial number near the word Śrī (Srī). The folio No. 1 of the MS is missing. The condition of the MS is good. The writings are neat and legible. The MS is written as far as one can judge, in the same hand. In the middle of each folio there is a square size blank place where there is a little hole which is called śalābindhā. The MS is written very carefully with a few marginal corrections.

The MS begins with the Kāli-damana Nāṭa of Śaṅkaradeva
In this MS the Rukmini-harana Nāṭa begins (on f.28b) as: "śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//rukmini-harana//sloka//jatpada paṅkajarajaḥ sirasa sarbbādayo dibihsadoti mudodbahanti/jatkṛttanāt kalimaṁ manujāḥtyajanti kṛṣṇasya tasya caranaṁ saraṇaṁ brajema//apicha, chaidyādīṁ nṛpatin pramathya tarasā jenāḥṛta rukmini/jenājau binirjitya duryayarīpu rukmi birūpaḥkṛtaḥ//baidarbhyīṁ bidhiyat bibāhamakarot jo dvāravatyam mudā/tasmai śrī paramātmane bhagavate kṛṣṇāya kurmo namaḥ?//and ends (on f. 46a) "jāhe jāhite icā baikunthaka bāṭa/ sunasāvadhāna kaya kṛṣṇaka nāṭa//parama bandhu hari caritra bināyi/ nāhi nāhi gati kalita lokāyī//abahu nahi bujhi sāstraka marama/ nāmata sarana lela saba dharma// kalimala mathana parama hari nāma/ jāni sabahi nara bolā rāma rāma//rukmini-haraṇa nāma nāṭakaṁ sampūrṇnoyamiti//śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//śrī śrī jaya jaya rāmamiti"//

(on f. 2a) as: "jākeri sarba gopamukhe anamāgala bhāṅgalā dvīyanīja karma gana gokula jana jata tāraka māraka kubalaya dhenuka nāsi/ putaniṅkāṭana sosana mosana tosana mana brajabāsi//edukha dāhaka pāwaka bhāwaka pūrala punamanākāma/jagajana jātaka pātaka ghātaka jākeri eguna nāma"; and ends (on f. 110b) with the Syāmanta-harana Nāṭa of Gopāladeva as: "tadanantare capaya canda mangala baktabyam// bhatimā//jaya jaya jag a jana jiwana murāri/ye kaṁsa baka adaya antakāri//yo gopinika mana pura bhagawāna/jaya jayatu hari jaga jana prāṇa//yo ........ sādhala yo jāne ki manakāma/māyā mṛga badhala murāri//masya rupe betda uddhāra .... tohi/.... hari kurma rupe sohi// narasiṅgha rupe bāra bhakata prāṇa/jayatu jayatu hari jagajana prāṇa"//
The Parijātā-harana Nāṭa begins (on f.46b) as: "śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//śloka//namaḥ kṛṣṇabिस्तुचयनांत सक्ते/namaḥ rāmārājība netra prabhoto te//namaḥ brahmmārtti mūrāre paresa/namaḥ bisvabāsa praśīda praśīda//apīcha//khagendraṃ samārūhya nijjītya sakrāṃ/ mūḍa lilayā jora tāro devakya//pryam pārijātaṃ jahāra pryārthaṃ/paresāya kṛṣṇāya tasmai namaste"/ and ends (on f. 61a) : "kayala kali dekho ekākāra/ pāpa punya kicu nāhi bicāra// malamati loka abahu nāhi jāni/ nāhi nāhi gati bine sāraṅga pāni//cintaku harika coḍaku ānawāsa/ harināme karu sudṛha bisvāsa//dharamaka upari rājā nāma/kṛṣṇa kimkara kaha bola rāma rāma//śrī pārijāta-harana nāma nāṭakaṃ sampurnnamiti//śrī śrī kṛṣṇāya namah"/

Collated at DHAS from the manuscript.

A fecsimile of f.42a is given between pp. 0.18 and 0.19.

*Am


In the Preface Goswami has observed: "The book comprises eight plays by four playwrights. It shows the process of the growth and development of old Assamese dramas. No attention towards the variations of text is given. So, there remains ample scope for the textual critics to
Facsimile of f. 42a of G (Guwahati) of Rukmini-harana Nata, undated.
critically edit the texts by collecting old śācipāṭi manuscripts scattered all over Assam.

The books opens at p. 1. with Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa with a Nāndī śloka, thus: "śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//nāndī śloka//namaḥ kṛṣṇa
biscyutāntasakte/namo rāmarājīvanetra prabho te//namo
brahmamūrte murāre paresa/namo viśavasa prasīda prasīda7/

The book ends at p. 247 with a verse of Rāmcaraṇ Ṭhākur's
Kamśa-badha; the verse is: "kali kalamasa ghora payodhi uttāra/
bhayo hari bhakati dhyāma paracāra/sakala dharama kaho rājājāni/
sava kāma
coḍi japahu rāmabāni//hari guna nāma bhakati anupāma/jākeri thika
svargaka mana kāma//kaya mana thira japahu rāma nāma/mādhava
kaha āiki bolahu rāma rāma"/

Pages 1 to 51 contain Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa and Pages 142 to 205 contain Rukminī-harana Nāṭa.

°An

The book starts at p. 1 with Śrī Śaṅkaradeva's Kāli-damana thus: "Śrī krṣṇāyāh namah//śloka//meghaśyālamūryatimayatamaḥ-bāhūm mahorassthalam/āraktāyatakanjalocanayugamā pitāmbaraṁ sundaram//muktāhīrakahemahārabalayālankārakāntidvutīṁ/krṣṇaṁ śāradsāndracandrasadṛśaṁ hṛdpankejambhaje"//

The books ends at p. 288 with Uddhava-sambādana Nāta of Gopāladeva as: "suna haba loi bacankamoi sava teji bhaja hari pāva//iha saṃsāraka sāgare tarana krṣṇa pada pallava nāva//devaka upari rājā mādhava dharamaka upari nāma/koti kalapaka pātaka nāsaka dāki bohu rāma rāma//iti uddhava-sambdanāṭakaṁ samāptam"//

Text of Rukmīṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa is from pp. 57 to 100 and text of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa from pp. 132 to 167.

B

Baradowa, Nagaon, collected from Dinakanta Adhikari; kept at Gauhati University Library, MS No. 692, dated Śaka 1831 (ca A.D. 1939); the MS is neither sācipāṭ nor tulāpāṭ, it is made of modern paper, the total No. of folios is 31 with about 11-22 lines to a side; size 20 cm x 16.5 cm. The scripts are modern Assamese. Complete Rukmīṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa.

Each follio of the MS bears the serial number on the upper margin near the word Śrī (श्री). It should be mentioned here that though the condition of the MS. is good but the letters of the Rukmīṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa somewhere damaged. There are some scribal errors, for example 'charana' (চরণ), 'chira' (চিরা) etc.
The MS begins (on f.1a): "śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ// śloka// jatpāda pankaja rajaḥ siresā śuresā/ sarbbadaio bidisadati mudādohanti// jat kṛttanat kalimalam manujyatejanti/ kṛṣṇasya tasya caranaṁ saraṇaṁ brajema// apicha// caidyādin nrpatin prathama tarasā yenāḥṛdā rukmināṁ/ yenāyau biniyitbaca durjayaṁ ripu rukmubirupā kṛtaḥ// baidarbhi bidhibat bibahamakarot kho dbāraatyam mudā/tasmau śrī paratmā bhagayate kṛṣṇāya kurme namaḥ"//and eds(on f. 3la): "abahu nāhi buji śāstraya marma/ nāmata śarana lela saba dharma// kalimala m athana para ma hari nāma/ jānī sabahi nare bolā rāma rāma// rukmīṉi-haranaṁ nāma nāṭakaṁ sampurnnamitì/ śloka// śrutiṁ tin samasta tirtha sanine dattbaṁ prithbiyejana// gitatyati - 1861 śaka sanibār 1939 cana 2 bhādra samāpta"//

Collated at Gauhati University Library from the manuscript.

B₁

Bardowā, Nagaon; collected from Kusha Chandra Deva Adhikari and preserved at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 2375. The total number of folios is 29 with about 9 lines to a side and 30-35 letters to a line; size 30 cm x 12 cm; the scripts are of Kaitheli type in modern shape; undated, but from the palaeographical peculiarities as well as its general condition, it seems to have been written in the first part of the 20th century; tulāpāt; incomplete Rukmīṉi-haraṇa Nāṭa, written perhaps by more than one scribe.

Each folio bears the serial No. on the left hand side near the word Śrī (ॐ). The condition of the MS is not good. The first follio of the MS
is missing. The MS begins from the folio No. 2a. In the middle of each folio of the MS there is a square size blank place. In this place the scribe drew some flower etc. Some corrections of words are noted in the margin. The manuscript is written carefully but it is not free from scribal errors. For example, 'boli' ('বলি'), 'saksi' ('সক্ষি'), 'sunaha' ('সুনাহা') 'brāhmūnaka' ('ব্রাহ্মুনাকা') etc.


Collated at Gauhati University Library from the manuscript.

B2

Bhogbarī, Nagaon; obtained from Soma Chandra Mahanta and deposited at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 713. The total number of folios is 26 with about 8-10 lines to a side and 32 - 40 letters to a line, size 33 cm x 10 cm; the scripts are of Gaḍgaṇā-Kāitheli mixed type. No date has been given but from the palaeographical peculiarities of the MS
and its general condition, it can be said that the MS belongs to early part of 18th century. Complete *Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa*. Śācipāṭ.

A few folios of this MS is worm-eaten and damaged. Each folio of this MS which is written perhaps in the same hand, bears on its reverse, in the left hand margin the serial number below the word Śrī (Ś). The writing is neat and careful and the MS is comparatively free from orthographical mistakes. Though the MS is complete, the last few lines of the last śloka and the muktiṁaṅgala bhaṭīmā is not there.

The MS begins (on f. 1b): "Śrī kṛṣṇāya namo namaḥ// śloka// namaḥ kṛṣṇabīṣṭoanantasakte/namo rāmarājīva netra probho te// namo brahmamūrttemurāre paresa/namo bīsbabāsa prasidāḥ prasidāḥ// apicha // khagendraṁ samāruhya nirjita sakra/mudā lilayā yo daivakinandanaḥ// prvaṁ pārijātaṁ jahāra pryārthaṁ/paresāya kṛṣṇāya tasmai namo nama // suttra// ohibuli śrīkṛṣṇaka pranāma kaye kahu sabhāsada lokaka sambudhi bolala"// and ends(on f. 25a) : pada// kuncita căru cibuka baru draru karu cumbana banamāli/ kancuri lichori bhare rasikā kānu kuca nakha ghana ghana ghāli// ramayā ramani milite mānika makara kundala dole/hire racita mani motima mālā hemahāra ure lule// carane ratana mani manjira janake kanaka kiṅkini role// Śrī jagatānanda bhakati rasika kahe kṛṣṇa kiṅkare bole// suttra// aicana keli kalā kautuke kaya śrīkṛṣṇa bhakatara manoratha purie haribola// āsvinamāse kṛṣṇapakhe dasamyā tithau sukrabāre pārijāta- harana nāṭa sapurnna bhela.

Collated at Gauhati University Library from the manuscript. A facsimile of f. 17b is given between pp. 0.23 and 0.24.
Facsimile of f.176 of B₂ (Bhogbarī, Nagaon) of Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa, undated.
Bardowā, Nagaon; collected from Dinakanta Adhikari and deposited at Gauhati University Library, MS No.-696. The total number of folio is 22 with about 17 to 21 lines to a side and 16 to 25 letters to a line; size 20cm x 16.5cm, the scripts are of modern Assamese letters. Dated Śaka 1865 (ca A. D. 1943). The MS is neither sācipāt nor tulāpāt, it is made of modern paper. Complete text of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa.

Each folio of the MS bears the serial number on the upper margin near the word Śrī (Ś). Though the condition of the MS is not bad, some letters of the MS is not legible. The MS is not free from scribal errors; for example, 'mānuṣī', 'kadarthīte', 'pranāmi' etc. The writing is not uniform and perhaps written by more than one scribe.

The MS begins (on f. 1a): "Śrī kṛṣṇāya namah//śloka//namaḥ kṛṣṇa bīṣṇu ananta sankte namo rāma rājiya netra prabhū te/namo brahmamurtti murūru paresāṇaḥ namaḥ bīṣnabāsa prasīdhāḥ prasīdhāḥ// apīcha// khagendra samāruyunāṁ nirjitaṁ sankte mudā lilawa yo daivaki nandanaṁ/pryāṁ pārijāta jahāra pryārthan paresāyaṁ kṛṣṇāya tasmau namo namaḥ// suttra/pahilahi Śrī kṛṣṇaka pranāma kaye kaho sabhāsada lokaka sambuddhi bolala"/and ends (on f.22b) : "jaya jaya pitambara banamāli/ kālindri hṛade marddala kāli// sohi jagata guru bhakata bha ya hārī/ bhukuti mukuti karata tohā ri/jaya jaya dusta daita anta kārī/ kublaya mārala danta utpāri// sarata gopini nārī/ bhukuti mukuti nitya karata tohā ri//Śrī jagatānanda dalapatijāna/hariko pada pankaja bhajmāna// karāyata nāța uhi bahu cande// jeśtha māśe kṛṣṇa pakse bṛhaspatibāre nobami tithou 1865 sāka 13 jetha āga belā likhā samāpta-ehāta baghā tutā dosa hari carane khematu"/

Collation ends at f.27.
Carāībāhī, Nagaon; obtained from Satyendra Nath Bhattacharyya and kept at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati, MS No. 94. Complete text of Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa with a total number of 18 folios; size 30cm x 11cm with 10-20 lines to a side and 40 - 50 letters to a line. The scripts are of Kāthelī type in modern shape, undated, but from the palaeographical peculiarities it seems to has been written in early part of 20th century. Paper.

The MS bears the serial number on the reverse side of each folio on the left hand margin near the word Śrī (Ś). The writing is very neat and clear. All folios are in good condition. The MS is complete but the muktimaṅgala bhaṭīma at the end is not completed. The MS is remarkable because of its uniformity of style. Spellings are comparatively correct.

brahmā hara karū sohi padasevā//sohi nārāyana bhubana adhikārī"//
Collated at D H A S from the manuscript
A facsimile of f.1b is given between pp. 0.26 and 0.27.

C1

Carāibāhī, Nagaon; Assam Government collection, collected from Satyendra Nath Bhattacharyya and preserved at Department of Historical & Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati, MS No. 95, the total number of folios is 28 with about 9-11 lines to a side and 35-45 letters to a line; size 25cm x 9cm. Complete text of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa. The script is of Kāiteli type of Assamese script; dated Śaka 1295 (Bāṅglā); paper.

Each folio of the MS which is written perhaps by one scribe, bears on its reverse, in the left hand margin the serial number near the word Śrī (श्री). The writing is neat and clear. Though the condition of the MS is not bad, some folios are not in a good condition. The writings are uniform and legible. Instead of 'i' (ई) the copyist mostly uses ī (ई); for example 'sahīte' (सहीते), 'pīta' (पीत), 'manī' (मनी), 'murūti' (मुरूती), 'uru' (उरु), 'rūci' (रूची), 'karū' (करु) etc. Though the MS is complete the mukti maṅgala bhaṭīmā at the end is not completed.

The MS begins (on f. 1b) : "Śrī kṛṣṇāya namo namaḥ//prathame śloka//namaḥ kṛṣṇa-bīṣṭūsrūtyānadaṃsakte/namo rāmarājīyanetraṃ prabhu te//namo brahmamūrtti murārū paresā/namo bisbabāsaṃ prasidhyaṃ prasidhyaṃ//apiścha //khagendraṃ samāruhya nirjītya sakte/mudā lilayā daiyakinandanaḥ yah//priyaṃ pārijātaṃ yāhāra pṛyartham/paramesvaram śrī kṛṣṇāyaḥ tasmai nityaṃ namo
Tacsimik off.

8a of K (Kami Opafa Sattra, Kagaon) dated Sana 1239

Facsimile of ff 8a of N (Narai Cipah Sattra, Nagpuri) dated Sana 1239 (Barija)
namah"// and ends (on f.29b): "bhaja hari carane coḍa saba āsa/harināme karū sudṛṣṭa bīṣvāsa// dharamaka upari rājā nāma/krṣṇa kiṅkare kahe bola rāma rāma// apanadha sahasrāñiḥ kṛyante harisamāya dāsōham hṛdiwematya ksemachamadhusūdanaṁ//eti// pārijāta harana nāma nāṭakaṁ sampūrṇnam// sana 1295/25 śrābana// yathādṛṣṭam tathā likhitaṁ liksake nāsti dosanaṁ// bhimechāpi ranabhramaṁ muminānca matibhramaṁ/Śrī krṣṇāya nāmo nāmaḥ"//

Collated at D.H.A.S. Library from the manuscript.

+ Cm

Cāṇḍauhi, Nagaon; Assam Goverment collection. collected from Bhabikanta Mazumdar and preserved at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati MS No. 205. Undated. But from the palaeographical peculiarities of the MS and its general condition, it can safely be said that the MS belongs to the early part of the 19th century. The total number of folios is 18 with about 12 lines to a side. Each lines consisting of 39 to 50 letters; size 26cm x 9cm. Sācipāt. complete text of Pārijāta- harana Nāṭa, the scripts are of Godgana type written in the same hand.

Each folio of this MS bears on its reverse in the left hand margin the serial number near the word Śrī (Ś). The writing is neat and careful. Spelling mistakes are few. The condition of the MS is not good. The first two folios are badly worm-out. In the midle of each folio a square sized blank place is there which is called salābinadhā. At the end of each line signs `'\' and `'/ have been used. In some of the folios of the MS there are some pictures of flowers in the blank places of the margin.
The first sloka of the MS is not legible. The MS begins (on f.1b) : "apica//khagendraṁ samāruhya nijitya sakraṁ/mudā lilavā jo devaki nandanah//priyaṁ pārijātaṁ jāhāra priyartham/paresāya kṛṣṇāya tasmai namo me//sutra//pahila śrī kṛṣṇaka pranāṁ .......... bola "; and ends (on f.18b) : "karāwata nāṭa ohi bahu cande/kṛṣṇata bhakati karite prabandhe//pārijāta-harana āhera nāma/suna buddhajana hariguna anumpāma//kalijuga madhye dhara ohi sara/nāhi nāhi gat. jañaba āra//kṛṣṇa kiṅkare ohi saṅkare bola/kara narasaba hār hār rola";

(Printed text) Ankāwali, edited by Kaliram Medhi, First part, 1950, pp cxi + 590; size 17cm x 12cm. It includes 21 plays in total. Śrī Śrī Śaṅkaradeva's Kāli-damana Yātrā, Patni-prasada Nāṭa, Keli-gopāla Nāṭa, Rukmini-harana Nāṭa; Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa and Śrī Rāma-vijaya Nāṭa; Mādhavadeva's Arjuna-bhaṇjana Yātrā, Cora-dharā Jhumurā; Bhūmi-luṭiyā Jhumurā, Pimparā-gucowā Jhumurā, Bhojana-bihāra Jhumurā; Brahmamohan Jhumurā, Rāsa Jhumurā and Kotorā-khelā Jhumurā; Gopāl Āta's Janma-yātrā, Udhvava-saṃbāda; Rāmcaraṇ Thākur's Kaṃsa-badha Nāṭa; Dvijabhūṣana's Ajāmila-upākhyaṇ Nāṭa and Daityāri Thākur's Nṛsimha Yātrā and Syāmanta-harana Yātrā.

The book begins with Śaṅkaradeva's Kāli-damana Nāṭa at p.1 as : "namah srikṛṣṇaya//sloka//meghaśyāmalamūrttimaṭy-atamahābāhuṁ mahorāṣṭhalā māraktaṭyata kaṇjalocanayugaṅ pīṭāmbaraṁ sundaram/muktāhirakahemahārabalayālankārakanyutim kṛṣṇam sārada sāndracandra sadṛśaṁ hṛdpankajebhaje"/
The book is completed with Daityāri Thākur’s Syāmanta-haraṇa Nāṭa at p. 590 thus: "sajjana jana niruja kāri/mukutī karatu sohi murāri// karahū abā karunā jadurāi/lailohon sarana tohāri pāi//mukhe jono chaḍo tabā nāma/māgo ataye bhiksā tohāri thāma//kahayā dātīyāri dina mātī hina/bhakati minati tohāri carana//kali juge parama dharmā hari nāma/jani saba loka bolahu rāma rāma//śrī kṛṣṇā pāda padmasya prasādena suniścitam/syamantaharanāṁ nāma nāṭakaṁ pūrṇatāṅgatam//iti syamanta haraṇa jāṭrā samāpta"//

In this edition of the book Rukmīṇi-haraṇa Nāṭa (C) constitutes pp. 105 to 169 and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa (R) constitutes pp. 171 to 126.

Rukmīṇi-haraṇa Nāṭa begins at p. 105 in the following manner:
"nāmaḥ śrīkṛṣṇāya//śloka//yat pāḍa paṅkajaraja sīrasā sureśāḥ
śarbbaḍayō diviśadoati mudodbahanti/yat kīrttanāt kalimalaṁ manujāḥ
tyajanti kṛṣṇasya tasya caranaṁ śaraṇaṁ brajema"// and ends at p. 169
with the following verse: "paramabandhu hari caritra bināi/nāhi nāhi
gati kalita lokāi//abahu nāhi bujhi sātraka marmma/nāmata sarana lela
saba dharmma//kalimala mocana parama hari nāma /jāni sabahi nara
bola rāma rāma//iti rukmīṇi-haraṇa nāṭa samāpta"//

About the source of Rukmīṇi-haraṇa Nāṭa Medhi has observed,
"The text is taken from one sācīpāṭ manuscript (undated) preserved at
Historical and Antiquarian Studies, another sācīpāṭ manuscript (undated)
obtained from the Sattraḍhikāra of Kāṃsapār-sattra, one copy found at
Ulubāṛi-sattra of Nagaon and one tulāpāṭ manuscript (Saka 1244) preserved
at Camariyā-sttra of Kamrupa. Orthography of Camariyā manuscript is
maintained."
He has also commented on the text of *Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa*. The whole text as well as orthography is according to the Sācīpāt manuscript (found at Rāmdiyā). Some help is taken from another Sācīpāt manuscript (undated) found at Rāmdiyā, one copy found in Ulubāri-sattra of Nagaon and another copy of Barpetā-sattra. Variations of texts are given chiefly from the Sācīpāt manuscript of Śaka 1738 kept at in Kāmarūpa Anusandhān Samiti. The text of this play starts at p. 171 of *Āṅkumli* in the following manner: "namah śri kṛṣṇaya//loka//namah kṛṣṇaviśnoacyutānantasakte namo rāmarājīvanetraprabho te/namo bhrāhmamūrtte murāre paresā namo viśbavāsa prasīda prasīda//and ends at p. 226 as: "bhaja hari carane coṭahu saba āsa/harināme karu sudṛḍha bichoāsa//dharamaka upari rāja nāma/jāni sabahu nare bolo rāma rāma//iti jeṭh māsa sombāra caturthi tithi//deva 1730 iti saka 1218 iti rāja saka/samāpta"/

† D

Guwahati, Assam Government collection; collected from Surendra Kumar Medhi, deposited at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati, MS No. 1534. The total No. of folios is 81 with about 10-11 lines to a side and 60 to 66 letters to a line; size 45.5cm x 11.5cm, Undated, but from the palaeographical peculiarities as well as the general condition of the MS it seems to has been written in the middle part of the 18th century. Sācīpāt, Incomplete middle part of the Dasāma Skandha Bhāgavata written by one scribe.

The first page of the MS is not legible. We have found (on f. 2d) as: "uddhavako sehimate karilā bhakati/kṛṣṇara bhakati āti jāni
mahāmati//durate rahila jāni kṛṣṇara ingita/dileka āsanā tato basila
bhumita//=and ends (on f.87a) : “āsilā āsilā buli madanarajāle/nedekhi
bilāpa kare//=ēhimate dukha jebe pāwaya sundari/sakalo jānila prabhu
antaryāmi hari//=bhakatara dukhe jāra .......... hṛdaya/apuni manato
ālocanta kṛpāmaya//=..........moro...... nājāi/johi bakte......... jodoṣaka nācāi//=
gokulara gopiṣṭa karāileka conānta/āsilāsā bodha kari....... mahanta//=
kujiyo candana moka dileka sādari/........ karilā āpona kare dhari//=.....
jānanta candanara dhāra ”//

Jāmugurihāṭ,Cecā Sattra, Darrang; collected from Bhabendra
Nath Goswami and preserved at Gauhati University Library. MS No. 2804.
The total No. of folio is 100 with about 9-10 lines to side and about 38-42
letters to a line, size 42cm x 14cm. Scripts are of Kaitheli type. Undated,
but from the palaeographical peculiarities as well as the general condition
it seems to has been written in the middle part of the 18th century. Tulāpāt.

The MS contains altogether 11 dramas of Śrī Gopāladeva’s
viz. Śrī Kṛṣṇara Janma-yātra (pages 1-10); Śrī Mādavadeva’s Bhūmi-lutiya, Cora-dhārā, Pimpārā-gucowā, Bhojan-bihār, Rāṣa-jhumurā and Arjun-
bhaṅjan (pages 10-40) and Śrī Śaṅkaradeva’s Kāli-damana, Patnī-prasāda,
Keli-gopāla and Rukmini-haraṇa Nāṭa (pages 41-100).

Each folio bears its number in the left hand margin near the
word Śrī (Śrī). Though the condition of the manuscript is good but some
folios are not legible. The writings are careful and uniform. The
manuscript is written by one scribe. It may be possible that the folio
No. 20 is written by some other scribe letter on after the missing of first one. In the middle of each folio there is a square size blank place where there is a little whole which is called Śalābindhā. Some spelling mistakes are there 'ṅ' (ṅ) is used for, 'n' (n) and 'ś' (ś) for 's' (s) etc.; for example 'nārayana' (नारायण), 'rāṣa' (राष), etc.

The MS begins with the Janma-yātra Nāṭa of Gopāladeva and ends with the Rukmiṇī-harana Nāṭa of Śaṅkaradeva.

The MS begins (on f. 1a) : "śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//prathama suttra//āhe sāmajika loka Johi parama puruṣa puruṣottama jāhera kātkse śriṣṭi sthiti pralaya haice brahmārudraindrādi carana kiṅkara jāhera nāma smarana mātre chāttāla paryante parama gati pāwata sohi parameśvara parama kṛpālū kalira malinaloka anugrahe bhumika bhāra harana nimitte devakira garbhe bekata huya kahu parama isvara rupe pitṛ matrika āge upari janama kathakaye kahu māyā manusyabilāka rupe gokule palāwala sohi kṛṣṇaka janama-yātra bhumi sabhāmadhye karaba tāheka dekhaha sunaha nirantare haribola haribola"//

The beginning and ending of Rukmiṇī-harana is not clear. We have found the beginning of Rukmiṇī-harana from the śloka (on f. 88b) as : "jenāḥṛdā rukmini yenājau binirjīya durjjaya ripu rukmī birūṇikṛta baidarbhya bīdhibata bībahamakaretā yo dvārabatyāṁ mudā tasmai śrī paramātmane bhagavate kṛṣṇaya kurmo namaḥ//nandigī//rāg suhāi// man ektāli//dhṛung//jaya jaya jiwana murāru/pāwe paranāma hāmāru// and ends (on f. 100b) : "suttra//se pāpi rukmī astre nāhi pāri kṛṣṇaka hṛdaye muṣṭi mārāla śrī kṛṣṇa tannikara kese dhariye kāṭite lági khaḍga"
Guwahati, collected and preserved at Kāmarūpa Anusandhān Samiti, Guwahati, MS No. 97; the total number of folios is 27 with about 7-8 lines to side and 36 - 42 letter to a line, size 30cm x 8cm. Complete text of Pārijāta hāraṇa Nāṭa. The scripts are of Kāitheli type of Assamese script. Sačipāt. Though in the catalogue of Anusandhān Samiti the date of the MS is given in Śaka 1714, but in the MS is seems to be written as in Śaka 1738.

Each folio of the MS which is written perhaps by one scribe, bears on its reverse, in the left hand margin the serial number near the word Śrī (ॐ). The writing is clear and legible. The writing is very neat and careful also. The folios are in good condition. Spelling mistakes are few and the orthography is moderately trustworthy.

The MS begins (on f.1b) : "om śrī kṛṣṇāya namaḥ//śloka// nāmaḥ kṛṣṇa biṣṇocytāntasakte namo rāma rajābanetra prabho te/ namo brahmanārttī murāre paresa namobhāva hāsa prasīda prasīda// apicha//khagendirā samārushiya nirjiye śakraṁ mudālīlayā yo daivakindanānāḥ//pṛyāṃ pārijātāṁ jāhāra priyarthāṁ paresāya kṛṣṇāya tasmai namo me//sutra//pahīlaḥ śrī kṛṣṇaka pranāma kaya kahon sabhāsada lokaka sambuddhi bola"; and ends (on f.27b) : "kayali kali dekho ekākāra/pāpa punya kicu nāhi bicāra//malamali loka abahu nāhi
Nanai Cipahā Sattra, Nagaon; collected and preserved at Śaṅkaradeva Research Centre, Nagaon, MS No.55; the total number of folios is 38 with about 8-11 lines to a side and about 30-35 letters to a line, size 30.5cm x 12cm. Complete text of Rukmini-harana Nāta. The scripts are of Kāitelī type but comparatively in modern shape. Tulāpāṭ. Dated Sana 1239 (Bāṅglā).

Each folio of the MS bears the serial number on the left hand margin below the word Śrī (Ś). After each line of song or śloka sign 'ि' and at the end of the line of general conversation or dialogue 'अ' or 'ए' has been used.

The writing is clear and legible and some corrections are there. All folios are in good condition. The MS is written perhaps by two scribes—from folio 1 - 28 by one and the remainings by other. Spelling mistakes are few and the orthography is moderately trustworthy. Though the MS is complete the ṇuktī maṅgala Bhaṭimā at the end is not completed.

The MS begins (on f. 1a) : "Śrī krṣṇāya namo namaḥ//śloka// jarttapāda pankajaraja siresā sureśā sarbadāyā dibisadoati mudoduhanti/ jatakṛttanāta kalimalaṁ manujastāṁjanti krṣṇa charanaṁ saraṁaṁ
brajema//apicha//caidyadin nrppati manusya trarasā benāḥṛḍā rukmini
jenājau vinijitya duyayaripuḥ rukma birupam traḥ/baidyabhāṁ vidhiata
bibāhamakaro yo dvāravatyaṁ mudā tasmai śrī paramātmame bhagavate
kṛṣṇāya kurmo namo namah"//and ends (on f.38a) : "murukhaTu dosa
dharabi nāi koi//ḥṛdi mādhabo johi meti dilā/sohi anurūpe kahalo hari
līlā//jahe jāite icā baikuṇṭhaka bānta/ suna sādhudhānaka kaya kṛṣṇaka
nāṭa//parama bandhu hari caritra bināi/nāhi nāhi gati kalita lokāi/
abahu nāhi buji sāstra karma/nāmata sarana lela saba dharma//kalimala
mathana bara hari nāma/jāni sabe nirantare bolā rāma rāma//śrī śrī
rukmini harana nāta sapunu bhaila//eti saka 1239 sana"//

Collated at Śaṅkaradeva Research Centre, Nagaon from the
manuscript.

A facsimile of f.8a. is given between pp 0.35 and 0.36

N1

Nanai Cipaha Sattra, Nagaon; collected and preserved at
Śaṅkaradeva Research Centre, Nagaon; MS No. 68. The total number of
folios is 15 with about 12-14 lines to a side and 30-38 letters to aline; size
26cm x 10cm. Incomplete text of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa. The scripts are of
Kāithelī type but comparatively in modern shape. Undated, but from the
palaeographical peculiarities of the MS and its general condition it can be
said that the MS belongs to last part of 19th century or beginning of the
20th century. Sācipāt.

The MS is written perhaps by more than one scribe. Each
folio of the MS bears the serial number in the left hand margin of the
চিত্মানাবর্ণমায়: কার্মিকফলকীতিকলিতিও এক ১৩ । অর্থ জানানাটক: রাজারানাটক: কাল্পনিকধর্মক তথ্যক্ষালনকে করুণ করিয়া তৎজন্মতাত্ত্বকানিকানিতির উপরে জানালাম । সৃষ্টিস্থিত: সৃষ্টিকরণযোগ্যবিষ্ণুর সাক্ষাতে সম্মান: আচারযোগ্য বিষ্ণুর আচারে: সহিত। 

কনাকলমখান্তক আলাদানির: সাথে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে আলাদানির কিভাবে।

Facsimile of f. 8a of N (Nanai Cipah Sattra, Nagaon) of Rukmini-harana Nata, dated Sana 1239 (Bengla)
reverse side below the word Śrī (श्री). The writings are not very clear. The condition of the MS is not good. Some folios of the MS is unfortunately missing. The MS is not free from scribal errors, for example, 'karū' (करु), pādijāta (पाडिजात), 'bātra' (बात्र) 'gurū' (गुरु), barūna (बरुन) etc.

The MS begins (on f. 1b.) : "śrī kṛṣṇāya namah//śloka// namah kṛṣṇabisnocyutānantasakte/nomo rāmajījvanetra probho te// namo brahmamūrtte murāre paresa/namo viśvavāsa prasiddha prasiddha//apicha//khagendraṁ samāruhyām nirjitya śakra/mudā līlayā
daivikānandanaṁ//pṛyāṁ pārijātam jahāra pṛyartham/paresāya kṛṣṇāya
tasmai namo namah//sūtra//pahi śrī kṛṣṇaka pranāma kaye kahuḥ
sabhāsada loka sambudhi bola"/and ends (on f. 15b) : "kathā//kṛṣṇabola// ae duṣṭa dewarāja hāmāka bhiṭi dekhāwa jata sakati thika prahāra
karahā//sūtra//suni indre braja dhariye punu svastha huyā kṛṣṇaka
hānala śrī kṛṣṇa hāsi hāsi lumphi dharala jaiche tā dekhaha sunaha
nirantare haribola//git kathā//swastha kalebara punū purandara dharala
braja bira tulī/hānala sandhāna"

Collated at Śaṅkaradeva Research Centre, Nagaon from the manuscript.

Powāmarā, Nagaon; collected from Ānandamayī Puthibharāl
of Powāmarā Sattra and preserved at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 1494. The total No. of folios is 21, with about 9-11 lines to a side and about 50-55 letter to a line, size 37.5cm. x 8.5cm ; scripts are of Gaḍgānā Kāithelī mixed type and look quite uniform. Dated Sana 1253 (Bāṅglā).
Complete Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa. Sācipāt.
Facsimile of f. 146 of P (Powañar, Nagaon) of Rukmini-haraṇa Nāṭa, dated Saka 1253.
Each follio of the MS bears on its reverse the serial number on the left hand margin below the word Śrī (Ś). In few cases after the ending of a line signs २, ४ and ७ have been used. Written perhaps by one scribe, the MS is in good condition. The writings are neat and clear. A few corrections are made in the margin seems to be by different scribes. Though the MS is complete but the last bhaṭṭimā is not there. The MS is not free form scribal errors. Instead of 'ś' (ś) and 's' (स) the copyist frequently used 'ś' (श), for example, 'śvāśa' (श्वास), 'bāsāghara' (बासाघर), 'śiśā' (शिश), 'parakāśa' (परकाश) etc.

The MS begins (on f. 1b): "Śrī śrī kṛṣṇaya namo namaḥ / śloka//yatpāda pankajarajaḥ sīrasā suresā sarbbādavo dibisadoti mudodbahanti//jat kīrttanāt kalimalaṃ manujāstvajanti kṛṣṇasva tasva caraṇaṃ sara namḥ brajema//apicha//cadiyādin nṛpatin pramathya ta asā jenāhytā rukmīni jenājau viniyitya duryāvāri pu rukmi bīrūpaḥ kṛtyāḥ//baidarbhi bīdhivata bībāhamakarot dvāraatyāṃ mudā taśmaī śrī paramānane bhagavata kṛṣṇāya kumma namaḥ// and ends (on f.21a.): "hāsi hāsi harakhe harakhe nakha parase kichu kāncira phoqē kāṇe/purala paraṇa manoratha kāmini sādhu adhara madhu pāne//śrī rāma rāyā harike parasa pāyā bhakati rasika sūjānā/śrīkṛṣṇaka carana sarūrūha sānkara hariraṣa gāna//śrī rūkminī harana nāma nāta sampunna/samāpta//aparādha sahaśrāṇi kṛyanti hannir saṃmayā// dāsohāṃmitisametvā kṣementu madhusudana//saka 1253 taṃ 20 āghrāna//ācal dāṃ sāt takā śrī amara hastāksaramidaṃ ihi aksarāni āmi pustaka lekhilām bahudoṣa khemā karatu"/

Collated at Gauhati university Library from the manuscript. A facsimile of f.14b. is given between pp. 0.37 and 0.38.
+ **Ps**


+ **Pt**


+ **Rb**


+ **Re**


+ **Rk**

Sibsagar, Assam Government collection, collected from Golap Chandra Sarma, preserved at Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam, Guwahati, MS No. 1954. The total number of folios is 80 with about 6 to 7 lines to a side and 50 to 55 letters to a line; size 31cm x 8cm.
Dated Śaka 1758. The scripts are of Kaitheli type and look quite uniform. Sācipāt. Complete Rukmiṇī-harana Kāvyā written by one scribe.

The MS begins (on f.1b) : "śrī śrī krṣṇāya namo//pada//java jaya jagannāth jagatara jiya/trailokymohanā sanātana sādāśiva//java jaya asuranaramunijana pariṭrāna//pranāmo saṃsāra sāra purūsa pradhāna"/and ends (on f.80a.): "krṣṇarakathāta pare mahantara nāhiwāna purūsārtha/sakale śāstrara ehitatāparā jānibāhā paramārtha/iśvarakṛṣṇara caranaśeṣā kāma/krṣṇara carana manata dharīwa dākībola rāma rāma/iti saka//1758//śrī kātir 4 din thakata dutīwātithita bīhapatiḥāre śrī rūkmiṇī harana pustaka sampurnnaissam āpata "//

+ Rn


+ Rp

(Printed text) Rukmiṇī-harana Nāṭa, ed. Dr. Ramesh Pathak, published by Binod Nath, Bookland, Guwahati, ed.2, 1993, pp. 98, size 18cm x 12cm.

+ Rs

+ Rt


+ Sb


\[ \text{asā̱kṛṣṇāya namah}/nāndī//

laksmyā oka natau natastava pade bhaktasva bhītanjake vande nandanivāsavāsa danujaśrikacchidā garbbita/padmāmodana sundarendu-dalita-prāya prakāśa prabho bhogabyālavālavalepa viṣmennoannāṁrtaṁ dehi bho"/and ends with the *Ram-vijaya Nata of Sankardeva* at page 271 as: "sloka//śrī gopālapadacchattracchāyālālasanāmamah//bindurandhra vedacandraśāke śaṅkara sampgyake//śrīrāmavijayāṁ nāma nāṭakam bidadtheadhunā/rāma-vijayā tāṁ śrīkṛṣṇā pāda-prasādataṁ //

[ Bindu = O, Randra=na, Veda =4, Čandra=1 = 1490 Śaka ]

The book contains *Rukmini-harana Nāṭa* from pages 135 to 188 and the *Pārijāta -harana Nāṭa* from pages 50 to 90.

+ Sd


+ Sg

(Printed text) Śrī Madbhāgavata, ed Sri Kesavananda Deva Goswami, published by Makhan Hazarika, Dibrugarh, ed.1, 1984, pp 02+1632 size 24cm x 18cm. Complete text of 12th Skandha Bhāgavata along with the Anādipatana and Nimi-nvasiddha sambād of Śaṅkaradeva.

+ Ss


T

Tezpur, collected from Golak Chandra Dutta and kept at Gauhati University Library; MS No. 2269, the total number of folios is 17 with about 10-12 lines to a side, each line consisting of about 40-60 letters; size 35cm x 10cm, the scripts are of Kāithelī type. No date is given, but
from the palaeographical peculiarities as well as its general condition, it seems to have been written in last part of the 18th century. Complete text of *Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa*.

Each folio of the MS bears on its reverse, in the left hand margin the serial number near the word Śrī (ॐ). The writings are clear and legible. The condition of the MS is very good. In the middle of each folio there is a little square size blank place which is called *śalābindhā*. After the end of each line the sign 'ṣ', 'II', have been used. The MS is written perhaps by two scribes. The MS on the whole, is carefully written one but some spelling mistakes are there. The copyist frequently writes 'v' (ॐ) for 'w' (ॐ), 'n' (ॐ) for 's' (ॐ) etc., for example, rājiya (रत्न), dayaki (दापड़), kaṇaka (कच्चे), rataṇa (रत्न), bhuvaṇa (भूवन), nayaṇa (नयन), kaṃsa (कांस) etc.

The MS begins (on f.1b.) : "śrī kṛṣṇāye namo namaḥ\1//šloka// namaḥ kṛṣṇaśṛṣṭiṣṇucutanandasakte/namo rāmarājiyanetra prabho kṣo// namo brahmacittai mararū paresām// namo bisbabāsāh prasidai// prasīta\//apisca//khagendra samarustām chakra/padalilavā layā jō dayaki nandanaḥ// prīyam pārijātām. jāhāra prīyātai//paresāya kṛṣṇāya tasmai namo me// suttra// pahilahi śrīkṛṣṇa pranāma kaye kaho sabhāsadaka samboddhi bola\// and ends (on f.17a.) : "nāhi nāhi gati jānaya āra// kayali kali deku ekākāra/pāpa punya kichu nāhi bicāra// malamali loka abahu nāhi jāni/nāhi nāhi gati bine sāraṅgapatānī// bhaja hari carane chōḍa saba āsa/hari nāme karu sudṛḍha bichoāśa dharamaka upari rājā nāma kṛṣṇa kirākare śaṅkare bolā rāma rāma"//

Collated at G.U. Library from the manuscript.

A facsimile of f.14b is given between pp. 0.42 and 0.43.
Facsimile of f.146 of T (Tezpur) of Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa, undated.
IV. TESTIMONIA

The stories of Śaṅkaradeva’s Rukmiṇi-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas are found in Śrīmadbhāgavata-purāṇa, Harivamsa and Viṣṇu-purāṇa and therefore, these three scriptures have been used as chief testimonia in constituting the texts of these two nāṭas. Śaṅkaradeva had composed a long poem on the theme of Rukmiṇi-haraṇa prior to his writing of the play on the same theme. The episodes of Rukmiṇi-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa are also found in the Assamese rendering of the middle and last part of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa by Ananta Kandali. These two books have also been used as testimonia in constituting the texts of these two nāṭas.

V. INTERPOLATION

Rukmiṇi-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas were composed by the great saint Śaṅkaradeva himself and therefore, preserved with much care in all the sattras. Perhaps owing to this reason mainly no interpolation of serious nature is marked. Only in Rukmiṇi-haraṇa Nāṭa the episode wherein Kṛṣṇa’s mother Daivakī, apprehending that her son might be engaged in fighting with other kings in the swayambara of Rukmiṇī, sent Balkabhadra, Sātyaki and others to Kundina to Kṛṣṇa’s aid seems to be an interpolation on the evidence of some printed text. It should be noted that this episode does not occur in original Sanskrit Bhāgavata, Harivamsa or Viṣṇu-purāṇa and even Śaṅkaradeva himself has not included it in his own poetic composition on the same theme. It is also not found in the Assamese version of Bhāgavata by Ananta Kandali.

1. See constituted Text P.0.57
VI. INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE MANUSCRIPTS

As in other parts of India, in Assam also there is no manuscript history. As such in determining the genealogy and source and also the relationships among the various MSS there is no extant guide. While at the end of a few manuscripts there is an assertion of the scribes that the MSS were copied as they were found, there is no mention either of the names of the scribes or the source from which the exemplar was received. Therefore, in determining the relationship of such manuscripts and in preparing their pedigree we have nothing but, 'the skilled and methodical exercise of human intellect' to fall back upon. Usually two things are taken into account in ascertaining the genealogical relationships among various MSS. They are: (a) omissions of words and passages and transposition of passages, and (b) agreement in a number peculiar readings or in other peculiarities. These two tests have been our mainstay in analysing the relationships of the sācipāt and tulāpāt manuscripts collated to prepare the critical texts of Śaṅkardeva’s Pārijāta-haraṇa and Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭas and in determining their pedigree. While due stress has been given on frequencies and numbers of omissions, insertions etc; we have also considered and analysed the circumstances leading to these changes and also the nature of errors that crept in, by way of scientifically weighing all the available evidence. Scriptwise also some peculiarities are marked. The MSS collected and collated for constituting the texts of Rukmiṇī-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas show the use of two types of scripts, viz. Gaḍgaṇa and Gaḍgaṇa-Kāithelī mixed. A study of the shape and type of the letters used is of significant help in determining the genealogy of the manuscripts.
Almost all the manuscripts of Śaṅkaradeva's *Rukmīṇī-harana* and *Pārijāta-harana* Nātas have been copied separately. I have got only one manuscript (G) which contains both the nātas together. In analysing the inter-relationships among the manuscripts and in determining their pedigree, the manuscripts used for each nāta is treated separately.

For *Rukmīṇī-harana* Nāta, besides one printed text (C), N, P, G, B, B₁ - these five MSS have been fully collated for preparing its critical edition. As to form a general idea of the peculiarities of these manuscripts we have first looked into the omissions in various manuscripts. They are:

1. Lines or verses omitted in N, but found in C, P, G, B and B₁:
   a) from *tadanantare* to *pāyā* (p.15)
   b) *śloka /* *śrutvā* bhikṣuka mukhāt *krṣṇo*
      \[ rukmīṇyāh. rūpamadbhutaḥ. \]
      \[ tāmeva satatāṃ dhyāyan tasthau \]
      \[ vyākulumānasāh. /**7/** (p.15.) \]
   c) from *avaśye* to *karaba* (p.53.)
   d) from *kāhu dante* to *bola* (p.65.)
   e) from *rukminika* to *hante* (p.67.)
   f) from *parase* to *calali* (p.79.)
   g) from *kāṭakā* to *prahāri* (p.80.)
   h) from *tadanantare* to *lāgala* (p.82.)

2. Lines omitted in B, but found in C, N, P, G, and B₁:
   a) from *kāraka* to *sampada* (p.6.)
   b) from *ḥṛdaye* to *śrīkrṣṇa* (p.82.)

3. Lines omitted in B₁, but found in C, N, P, G & B:
   a) from *ahe* to *bījata* (p.7.)
   b) from *gale bastra* to *upārala* (p.85.)
4. Lines omitted G, but found in C, N, P, B and B₁.
   a) from niswāsa to kahu (p.54.)
   b) from kāmini to keli (pp.93-94.)

5. Lines omitted in N and P, but found in C, G, B, and B₁
   from suttra to thika (p.25.)

6. Part of bhatimā omitted in N and B, but found in C, P, G and B₁.
   from agha baka to bidhāna (p.97.)

   We can now compare a few peculiar readings of words and parts of sentences:

   a) In C P G B B₁ jākeri (p.6) but in N sohi nija
   b) In C P G B B₁ kanyāeka (p.12) but in N divya kanyā.
   c) In C P G B B₁ māi (p.21) but in N gosāni
   d) In C P G B B₁ subasati (p.58) but in N subabahati
   e) In C P G B B₁ ādolita (p.49) but in N mandita
   f) In C P G B B₁ srutibhāṅga (p.49) but in N sṛtihaṭa
   g) In C P G B B₁ niḥsare (p.49) but in N nispāṇa
   h) In C P G B B₁ taba (p.46) but in N bhagaṭṭa
   i) In C P G B B₁ ratha (p.48) but in N uthikaho
   j) In C P G B B₁ dāsi (p.95) but in N dadhi

   From the above we find that in the first list there are omission of verses, lines or words in eleven places in N, three places in B and two places each in B₁, P and G. Number of omissions are more numerous in N than in other MSS. In case of peculiar readings as shown above in the second list C P G B and B₁ are in agreement in all ten court but N stands out as the only variant reading. From the above discussion the pedigree of the Rukmiṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa may be reconstituted as follows:
For Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa besides one printed text \( R \), T G C  
\( C_1 N_1 \) and \( B_2 \) these six MSS have been fully collated for preparing the 
critical editin. Some peculiarities are marked in each of the MSS. However, 
\( B_2 \) stands out as the only variant reading, while others are more or less in 
agreement in all counts.

1. A list of peculiar readings of word and parts of sentences is given 
below :

   a) In \( R T G C C_1 N_1 \) samipa pāi (p.148) but in \( B_2 \) lāgi āwala
   b) In \( R T G C C_1 N_1 \) parirambha (p.104) but in \( B_2 \) paritambha
   c) In \( R G C C_1 N_1 \) galedhari (p.153) but in \( B_2 \) bāndhitāhari
   d) In \( R T C C_1 N_1 \) nāhi khele (p.126) but in \( B_2 \) uthale nāhi
   e) In \( R G C C_1 N_1 \) tambha (p.104) but in \( B_2 \) rambha
   f) In \( R T C \) cira (p.104) but in \( B_2 \) kara
   g) In \( R T G C N_1 \) bāncā (p.115) but in \( B_2 \) monoratha
   h) In \( R T G C C_1 N_1 \) rahe (p.112) but in \( B_2 C \) thāke
   i) In \( R T G C C_1 N_1 \) māthe (p.111) but in \( B_2 C \) māthāhi
   j) In \( R T G C C_1 N_1 \) tohāri (p.117) but in \( B_2 C \) saba tohāri

2. Omissions of same words are marked in \( B_2 \) and \( C \), for example :

   a) hāmāra (p.119)
   b) purandara (p.119)
   c) nirantāre (p.151)
   d) haribola (p.151)
   e) keli (p.175) etc.
3. Let us now look into the omissions of verses, or parts of sentences in various manuscripts.

i. Omitted in B₂, but found in R T G C₁ N₁
   a) from tāhera to māraha (p.141)
   b) from paramānande to āwala (p.148)
   c) from paranāma to kayala (p.151)
   d) from satyabhāmā to delaha (p.156)
   e) from tāheka to bolala (p.158)
   f) from saci to ataye (p.164)
   g) from dvārikāpura to nirantare (p.180)

ii. Omitted in N₁, but found in R T G B₂ C C₁
    a) from ki to koṭi (p.119)
    b) from se to bhalla (p.141)
    c) from he to smarala (p.141)

iii. Omitted in C, but found in R T G B₂ C C₁ N₄.
     a) from jaice to haribola (p.167)
     b) from sakhi to bolala (p.175)
     c) from āpuna to taru (p.178)

iv. Omitted in G, but found in R T B C C₁ N₁.
    a) from tadanantare to bolala (p.120)
    b) from kṛṣṇaka to nāhi (p.176)

v. Omitted in T, but found in R B G C C₁ N₁.
   from jaya jaya to tohāri (p.181)

vi. Omitted in C₁, but found in R T B G C N₁.
    from jaya jaya to tohāri (p.181)

vii. Omitted in B₂ C, but found in R T G C₁ N₁.
     from se to haya (p.113)

vii. Omitted in T B₂ C N₁, but found in R G C₁.
     from nārada to pādhala (p.115)
From the first list of three given above we find that $B_2$ differs in reading with others in six places while $B_2C$ together in four places with others. The second list shows the omissions of the same words in $B_2$ and $C$. As regards omissions of verses, parts of sentences or words it as shown in the third list we find that there are such omissions in nine places in $B_2$, in five places in $C$, in four places in $N_1$, in two places each in $T$ and $G$ and in one place in $C_1$. From the above discussion the pedigree of *Pārijāta-harana* may be reconstituted as follows:

![Pedigree Diagram]

**VII. PROBLEMS OF ORTHOGRAPHY**

The prevalent confusion in orthography is the most serious problem in a text-critical study of Śaṅkaradeva’s *Rukmini-harana Nāṭa* and *Pārijāta-harana Nāṭa*. This, however, is not peculiar to Śaṅkaradeva’s writings alone "as we face this problem in studying most old Assamese texts." Commenting on the peculiarities of the orthography of *Śrīmad-bhāgavata Daśama-Skandha* (first part) published in 494 Śaṅkarabda on basis of the text exactly copied from a sāci manuscript believed to be belonging to Śaka 1461 (ca A.D. 1539), Harinarayan Duttabaruua says:

"The peculiarities that are to be noted in the text are the predominance of
dental 's', rare use of long 'ī' and long 'ū', and not compounding of letters
following 'r' sound, specially 'yy' after 'r' remains 'y', e.g. sūryya> sūrya,
bhāryyā> bhāryā, kāryya> kārya etc. In place of other 'y', 'j' is commonly
used. Distinction between 'c' and 'ch' is not often maintained. 'e' - ending
verbs are commonly transformed into 'ai'- ending, e.g. kare > karai, piye >
piyai etc. 'trī' is often written as 'tṛi', e.g. tṛdaśā, on the other hand 'tṛ' of
'piṭṛ' and 'māṭṛ' becomes 'tṛi', e.g. 'piṭṛ', 'māṭṛ' etc. The word 'gōṣṭha' often
becomes 'goṣṭha'. Similarly, 'utsuka' becomes 'usvuk', svacchanda becomes
'svacanda', 'ucched' becomes 'ucād', 'padma' becomes 'paddā' 1.A similar
practice has been noted by Kaliram Medhi long before, while considering
the orthography of Prahlād - caritra by Hem Saraswati in his edition of
1913 based on the exact copy of an old manuscript. In his preface analysing
the orthographical method of the book he observes: "The orthographical
corruption that underwent in Prakrit in transcription of Sanskrit words
left its mark in Prahlād - caritra. But a consideration of the pronunciation
of Assamese words of those days shows it was utterly different from the
present pronunciation of Hindi or Bengali. Despite changes in spellings
the peculiar Assamese pronunciation has been consistently maintained:
"śa-śo-sah (শো সা) formula of Prakrit has been consistently maintained.
But this must be borne in mind that only in places where palatial 'ś' and
cerebral 'ṣ' are nearer in sound to the Assamese 's' (dental), they are
transcribed as 's', in other places the 's' is shown as 'kh' and 'kh' as 's'.
Cerebral 'ṅ' and long 'ī' and 'ū' are also not present in the text. 'b' and 'v'
are transcribed as they actually pronounced" 2. The same findings are also

---

1. From preface (Bhūmīkā) to Arunodai edited by Dr. M. Neog, 1983, p.115
2. Preface to Prahlād - caritra ed.by Kaliram Medhi, 1913, pp. o-au
seen to apply to both the plays of the great saint from our study of the various śācipāṭ and tulāpāṭ manuscripts collected and collated for constituting the present text. In the text-critical study of the manuscripts we have noticed clear signs in each of them of the changes that took place in the pronunciation of words of original Sanskrit after it had passed through the Prakrit-Āpabhraṃśa stage to attain its Neo-Indo Aryan-Assamese stage. In Sanskrit there is no disparity between sounds and letters. Every letter used had a corresponding individual sound. But these letters underwent great changes to attain to the Middle-Indo-Aryan Āpabhraṃśa stage from the original Sanskrit or Indo-Aryan stage, and sounds and letters became distinct and separate entities. For example, the word 'śiālā' in Prakrit which is the Āpabhraṃśa form of Sanskrit śṛgālā, may be pointed out. An analysis of the peculiarities of pronunciaion of Assamese shows that even though the letters 'i/ī', 'u/ū', 'r/ṛi', t (dental)/ṭ (cerebral), 'ś/s/ṣ', 'j/jh/y', r/ḍ are used in writing Assamese now, they have no separate significance as far as pronunciation is concerned. The study of old manuscripts reveals that their scribes, who were by no means much educated, were also conversant with this peculiarity of Assamese language and never faithfully adhered to Sanskrit orthography in writing or copying the manuscripts. An examination of the manuscripts collected for text-critical study of Śaṅkaradeva's Rukmīṇī-haraṇa Nāṭa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭa reveal that the scribes did not follow a rigid and uniform method of orthography. Same word is variously spelt in different places. For example, īśvar, 'ṛṣi rāj', 'yaśa', 'yātra', 'jalamāj' etc. are variously written as īśvar/iswar; riśirāj/ṛṣirāj; jaṣa/jasa/yaṣa /yaṣa; yātra/ jātra; jalamāj/ jalamājh,etc. Not only in tadbhava and semi-tatsama words, even in the
tatsama and proper nouns, the scribes have been very lax about orthography. For example, 'swāmi', 'Rukmini', 'Śīśupāl', 'āswās' 'bīśīṣṭa', 'bhiṣmak', 'yadarte' — these tatsama and proper nouns of Sanskrit we find as 'swāmi', 'Rukmini', 'Śīśupāl', 'bīśīṣṭa', 'bhiṣmak', 'yadarte' in the manuscripts of the plays. From this we can surmise that amongst the common people of those days orthography was entirely based on pronunciation and in a way quite scientific. As these scribes were familiar with all forms of Assamese script which had evolved from old Brāhmī script and as they did not find any particular significance in the forms of the letters, so in writing words of homophonic letters they used whatever form came to their mind or whatever they found easier to use. In this regard the observation of Dr. R. Thakuria, who has given a new direction to the text-critical studies in Assam, is quite relevant. "It is not definitely known if the early poets and writers of Assam had followed any principles and rules of orthography; but amongst the common people there was no set rules of orthography. Pronunciation was the only basis of orthography in those days. They applied this principle in writing not only tadbhava, foreign and native words, but also in writing tatsama words and proper nouns."9
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In determining the orthography of Śaṅkaradeva's Rukmiṇī-
varaṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas emphasis is put on pronunciation and
therefore, of the homophonic letters whatever is found repeatedly used in
the manuscripts are retained. For example, 'i' in place of 'i' and .cleanup; 'u' in
place of 'u' and 'ū'; 'c' in place of 'c' and 'ch'; 'ja' in place of 'ja', 'jha' 'ya'; 's'
in place 'ś', ś(cerebral) and 's'; 't-series' in place of 'ṭ-series' and
't(dental)series' and 'r' in place of 'r' and 'ř'. However, on the basis of
reasons in the manuscripts considered to be more reliable, we have in
places, used ṭ and 'y', as in Śri Kṛṣṇa, devakāryya, Sabhārya, and 'ś',
ṭ(cerebral), ṭḥ(cerebral), 'ḍ', d as in parameśvara, hethamātha, bhāṭa,
'garudā' etc. Compound form of letters after the 'r' sound is usually retained
e.g. 'sarbbe', 'sarbbatha', 'darppa', 'murccita', 'sampurnna', 'garbba' etc. There is no 'r'/r̥ sound in Assamese; it being pronounced 'ri'. But we
have retained for 'ṛ' and 'ṛi' as is found in the manuscripts. We have also
retained the forms 'johi', 'jahe', 'jo', 'jatana', 'jaba' etc. as found in the
manuscripts in stead of using the commonly accepted forms of those words,
viz. 'yohi', 'yāhe', 'yo', yatana', 'yaba' etc. In case of tatsama words and
proper nouns we have accepted the orthography of the MSS. However,
Sanskrit orthography is strictly adhered to in case of Sanskrit verses.
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VIII. ERRORS IN MANUSCRIPTS AND THEIR TYPES

In our study of the old manuscripts of *Rukmini-harana* and *Pārijātaharana* Nāṭas we have marked certain errors and corruptions in their texts which seem to have been handiworks of the scribes. Dr. S.M. Katre in his treatment of error and corruptions in old manuscripts in general has observed that they may be either visual or psychological\(^1\). These errors and corruptions may broadly be divided in three categories: (a) Involuntary or Mechanical, (b) Voluntary and (c) Semi-voluntary. Lack of experience of the scribes, their unfamiliarity with the faces or style of some old Assamese scripts, their carelessness and often their zeal to modify or change led them to commit most of the errors. Following are some examples of errors and corruptions found in the old MSS of *Rukmini-harana* and *Pārijātaharana* Nāṭas:

1. **Unfamiliarity with the Old Assamese Scripts:**

In old Assamese Scripts the shapes or forms of several letters were confusing. The scribes often failed to identify them properly and as a result wrote 'a' (অ) for 'ta' (ত) 'sa' (স) for 'ma' (ম) 'tha' (থ) for 'ha' (হ) and 'na' (ন) for 'la' (ল). As for instance, 'aba' (অব) in place 'taba' (তব) (Rh, N, p.20), 'kathana' (কথন) in place of 'kahana' (কহন) (Rh, G, p.18), 'harana' (হরন) in place of harala' (হরালা) (Rh, N, p.96), 'harakhe' (হরাখে) in place of 'harase' (হরাসে) (Rh, NGBB\(_1\), p.96) etc.

---

2. **Replacement of unfamiliar Words by familiar ones:**

It has been observed that often the scribes replaced some unfamiliar words with familiar or easy words. For example; 'gharini' (গারিনি) for 'grhini' (গ্রহিনী) (Rh, B, p.14), 'bara' (ব্রা) for 'parama' (পরাম) (Rh, N, p.99), 'nirada' (নিরদা) for 'megha' (মেঘা) (Rh, C, p.86), 'uṭhala' (উঠলা) for 'carala' (করালা) (Rh, N, p.48), 'sādhiye' (সাধিয়ে) for 'prārthiye' (প্রার্থির্যে) (Rh, G, p.61), 'kātite' (কাতিতে) for 'cedite' (চেদিতে) (Rh, N, p.81) etc.

3. **Difference in Pronunciation:**

Quite a few errors are owing to difference of pronunciation of the words; for example, 'sāikṣāte' (সাইক্ষাতে) for 'sākṣāte' (সাক্ষাতে) (Rh, N, p.6), 'huiyā' (হুইয়া) for 'huyā' (হুয়া) (Rh, B, p.59), 'kainyā' (কাইন্যাদা) for 'kanyā' (কান্যাদা) (Rh, C, p.43), 'bhoyāi' (ভোয়াই) for 'bhāyā' (ভায়া) (Rh, C, p.84), 'bhāigya' (ভাইগ্যা) for 'bhāgyā' (ভাগ্যাদা) (Rh, N, p.89), 'kampāla' (কম্পালা) for 'kapāla' (কপালা) (Ph, C, p.56) etc.

4. **Transposition of Letter:**

Examples of such errors are; 'maracai' (মারাচাই) in place of 'maraice' (মারাইচাই) (Rh, N, p.43), 'kaihaci' (কাইহাচাই) in place of 'kahaica' (কাহাইচাই) (Ph, N, p.123), 'dehalo' (ডেহালো) in place of 'deloho' (দেলোহো) (Ph, B, p.134), 'harala' (হারালা) in place of 'rahala' (রাহালা) (Ph, BC_{1} N, p.138), 'karacai' (কারাচাই) in place of 'karaice' (কারাইছে) (Ph, T, p.149).

5. **Omission of Letters:**

Examples are: 'ekhane' (এখানে) for 'etikṣane' (এতিক্ষানে) (Rh, N, p.47), 'cala' (চলা) for 'calaha' (চলাহা) (Rh, GB, p.51) etc.
IX. PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

There are no hard and fast rules to be followed in the constitution of a text, though evidence of manuscripts is mainly relied upon to reconstruct a text. Even this evidence may prove inadequate sometimes for the reconstruction of a text. To determine the original or nearer to the original form of the text it often becomes imperative to assess the relative qualities of the MSS and to find out their distinctive marks. It should be noted that the same principle cannot be applied in all type of texts in the same manner. For instance, the principles followed by western scholars in constituting western classical texts are not appropriate for Indian classical Sanskrit texts. Therefore, Dr. V.S. Sukthankar, in constituting the text of the Ādīparvan of the Mahābhārata formulated and enunciated some principles for the reconstruction of the Indian classical Sanskrit text. These principles are followed by other scholars to reconstruct the texts of other parvas of the Mahābhārata. These principles are followed by the scholars of the Oriental Institute of Boroda for the critical edition of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa¹. These principles, though proved adequate for the reconstruction of texts of Indian classical Sanskrit literature, are not applicable to vernacular text. Therefore, these principles cannot be applied to in the reconstruction of Śaṅkaradeva’s Rukminiḥ-haraṇa and Pārijāta-haraṇa Nāṭas which were composed in old Assamese language.

However, the most commonly recognised maxims of textual criticism, (a) 'lectio difficilior' (prefer the harder reading) and 'codices are

---
¹ Dr. R. Thakuria, Pāṭh-Śuṁśa Prasāṅga, 1986, p. 4
to be weighed and not counted', have been primarily relied upon in constituting the texts of Rukmini-harana and Parijata-harana Nāṭās. Ankāwali edited by Kaliram Medhi has been taken as the base for both the plays ('C' for Rukmini-harana and 'R' for Parijata-harana Nāṭās) and in case of Rukmini-harana collated with N, P, G, B, and Bx and in case of Parijata-harana collated with T, B2, G, C, Cx and N1 keeping in view the intrinsic and extrinsic probabilities to determine their texts. In constituting the texts doctrine of Conservation is given preference over the doctrine of Emendation.

X. THE CONSTITUTED TEXT

In reconstituting the texts of Rukmini-harana and Parijata-harana Nāṭās the evidence of old MSS are primarily relied upon, though in determining the text of doubtful words or sentences the principles of intrinsic probabilities and extrinsic probabilities are applied. Of the two recognised doctrines of textual criticism conservative school and school of emendation — the former is given preference over the latter. In most of the printed texts there appears an episode wherein Kṛṣṇa's mother Daivakī out of love for her son sent Balabhadra, Sātyaki and others to Kuṇḍā to help Kṛṣṇa in the fight with other kings who came to attend the sayambara of Rukmini. But this episode could not be found in any of the MSS, and therefore, has been excluded as interpolation in the constituted text of the play.
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