

ALESSANDRO BATTISTINI

CARDBOARD WEAPONS: RUDRAṬA,  
THE GODDESS AND THE ORIGIN OF *CITRAKĀVYA*<sup>1</sup>

The genre of *citrakāvya* (“marvelous/ figurative poetry”)<sup>2</sup> has always enjoyed notoriety as the brightest example of how decadence in (Indian) literary taste looks like. The only serious and widely accepted attempt to read it in historical context and give reason of its origin has been attempted by S. Lienhard (1992; 1997) in a series of papers, and his conclusions were based essentially on the famous statement by Māgha (*Śiṣupālavadhā* 19.41), explicitly comparing his marvelous canto to the deployment of versatile armies:

*viṣamaṃ sarvatobhadracakragomūtrikādibhiḥ |*  
*ślokaiv iva mahākāvyaṃ vyūhais tad abhavad balam ||*

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was delivered at the Cagliari seminar with a different title, and focused on the lexicon of bladesmithing employed in descriptions of *āyudhabandhas* (“weapon-graphs”). Here, we will try a broader understanding of the whole phenomenon.

<sup>2</sup> The term is ambiguous and needs some preliminary remarks. It can indicate both word plays in general (riddles, palindromes, tongue-twisters) and pictorial stanzas in a narrower sense. In this second meaning, the terms *citrabandha/ bandhacitra* can be found. Indian rhetoricians are not consistent at all, and the most lucid definition is given by Bhoja in *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharāṇa* 2.109, classifying *citrakāvya* in six subcategories (comprising *bandha*). Rudraṭa does not make any distinction, and Namisādhū maintains the ambivalence stating: *citrasādṛśyād āścaryād vā citram*, “*citra* [is called thus] because of its similarity to a picture, or because of its marvel” (*Kāvyaṭīkā* 5.1). In this paper we will try to respect the difference between the meanings, employing words such as “*bandha*, figurative poetry, *carmina figurata*” only when referring specifically to pictorial stanzas, and *citrakāvya* to marvelous poetry in general, that may comprehend *bandhas* as well. But the reader must keep in mind that a neat distinction is not always possible: *gomūtrikā* for example, that shares many properties with *citrabandhas*, is usually classified by Indian rhetoricians as a *gaticitra* (a game based on the direction of reading, as for palindromes).

“That army was difficult to seize because of *sarvatobhadra* (auspicious in all directions), *cakra* (discus), *gomūtrikā* (cow’s urine) and similar formations, as a *mahākāvya* because of such stanzas.”

The origin of figurative poetry lay then in the shapes of battle-formations (*vyūhas*). This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that the *citra* sections in Bhāravi’s, Kumāradāsa’s and Māgha’s poems (*Kirātārjunīya* 15<sup>th</sup> *sarga*; *Jānakīharaṇa* 18<sup>th</sup> *sarga*; *Śiśupālavadhā* 19<sup>th</sup> *sarga*) described battle scenes, and that the names of the three above-mentioned *alaṃkāras* were already contained in Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra* (10.6) as names of specific *vyūhas*.

Lienhard’s assumption that poets referred to real “maps of the battlefields” as models for their pictorial stanzas is extremely fascinating, and deserves to be taken seriously. Still, it can be improved pointing out a series of facts: Bhāravi, the true trend-setter of war-scenes in *citra* style, did not say anything on his sources of inspiration. Since Māgha was trying to imitate and outclass Bhāravi in the structure of his poem,<sup>3</sup> it may then be a pure consequence that he chose war as the subject of figurate stanzas, and worked out an effective simile. Moreover, no rhetorician has ever prescribed the employment of figurative poetry for such topic, despite pointing out battle scenes as a requisite for *sargabandhas*.<sup>4</sup> What certain rhetoricians were actually prescribing, was to devote figurative poetry to God.

The Jain scholar Namisādhu (11<sup>th</sup> c.), commenting on *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 5.14 states indisputably: *yathā prāyeṇa citrasya devatāstutir viṣayo na sarasaṃ kāvyam*, “As in the majority of cases, the subject of *citra* is the praise of a deity, not poetry with *rasa*.”

A stanza from a lesser-known treatise by the vaiṣṇava

<sup>3</sup> As for Kumāradāsa, whose main influence was anyway Kālidāsa, he knew the work of Bhāravi, and a stanza of his poem has been imitated by Māgha.

<sup>4</sup> Daṇḍin, *Kāvyaḷarśa* 1.17.

devotee Kavi Karṇapūra (Bengal, 16<sup>th</sup> c.) provides the most suggestive image:

*citraṃ nīrasam evāhur bhagavadviṣayaṃ yadi /  
tadā kiñcic ca rasavad yathekṣoḥ parvacarvaṇam ||*  
(*Alaṃkāraustubha* 7.214)

“Some say *citra* has no *rasa*. But if it talks of God then it acquires some, like chewing the joints of sugarcane.”

This predilection for religion is reflected in the contents of some of the most famous *citrakāvya*s. The first and foremost piece of poetry entirely devoted to *citrakāvya*, Ānandavardhana’s *Devīśataka*, is indeed a hymn for the Goddess. The author himself admits the purely devotional inspiration of his work, claiming that he composed his prayer after the Devī in person appeared to him in a dream.<sup>5</sup> This reflects Rudraṭa’s statement (*Kāvyaālaṃkāra* 1.9) that “certain poets overcome the hardest difficulties, or recovered from sickness or obtained their dearest wish by resorting to the Goddess”.<sup>6</sup> Other *stotras* (hymns) composed totally or partially in *citra* are Avatāra Kavi’s *Īśvaraśataka* (Kashmir, 17<sup>th</sup> c.), again a century of stanzas in praise of a deity, Vedānta Deśika’s *Pādukāśahasra* and Veṅkaṭādvārin’s *Lakṣmīśahasra*, devoting long sections to *carmina figurata*.

Other elements come from the language used by rhetoricians and commentators to describe and explain pictorial stanzas: the ‘instructions’ to draw pictorial stanzas employ very often the same technical lexicon of ritual and religious architecture,<sup>7</sup> and the graphic renderings of stanzas (*uddhāra/ prastāra/ nyāsa*)

---

<sup>5</sup> *Devyā svapnodgamād iṣṭadevīśatakasamjñayā / deśitānupamām ādhād ato noṇasuto nutim ||*

*Devīśataka* 101.

<sup>6</sup> *Navā tathā hi durgāṃ kecit tīrṇā duruttarāṃ vipadam / apare rogavimuktiṃ varam anye lebhire*

*’bhimatam ||*. The passage is discussed by Ingalls (1989: 566).

<sup>7</sup> See Battistini (forthcoming).

reflect the same language of *mantraśāstra* for the disposition of the syllables in *yantras* (sacred diagrams).<sup>8</sup>

This ‘mystic atmosphere’ of *citrakāvya* had been already pointed at by L. Renou (1978), followed by Lienhard himself, who referred very briefly to mystic and folkloric elements without exploring further their actual purport and possible implications, but recurring to the oft quoted sentence from *Aitareya Upaniṣad* 1.3.14: *parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ* “The gods love the cryptic”.

All these elements find place in the work of Rudraṭa (9<sup>th</sup> c.), the first rhetorician<sup>9</sup> to treat *citrabandhas* with considerable length, providing both a general definition of the figure, an overview of its purport, and adequate original examples. For our analysis we can rely also on Namisādhu’s commentary, which provides us with deep insights. The Kashmirian author places *citra* among the *śabdālaṃkāras*, together with *vakrokti* (crooked speech), *anuprāsa* (alliteration), *yamaka* (cadence) and *śleṣa* (pun) (*Kāvyaśāstra* 2.13) and devotes to it the whole fifth section of his treatise. After a definition of the figure and of its sub-categories (5.1-5.5), he exemplifies pictorial poetry in eight stanzas, from 5.6 to 5.13, leaving the remaining stanzas of the *adhyāya* to other varieties of verbal tricks.<sup>10</sup>

These *citrabandhas*, instead of being a mere collection of individual, self-contained stanzas, are instead conceived as a tightly unified cluster, both formally and in content: not only each of them depicts a different weapon,<sup>11</sup> but they can be ingeniously entwined together to create a big eight-spoke wheel (*aṣṭāracakra*). As for their subject, they all contain invocations to the Goddess, described in her fierce aspect of Mahiṣāsūramardīnī, and repeatedly addressed as protector of

<sup>8</sup> Rastelli and Goodall (2013) s.v. *nyāsa, prastāra*.

<sup>9</sup> Daṇḍin’s otherwise bulky treatment of *citrakāvya* in *Kāvyaadarśa*’s third chapter does not comprehend *bandhas*.

<sup>10</sup> Such as riddles and stanzas whose syllables are arranged according to the movements of chess. On the latter see Rajendran (1998).

<sup>11</sup> Except for stanza 13 (a plough).

rulers and dispeller of enemies. It is not improper then to read the whole set of stanzas as a real composition within the composition: a real *Durgāṣṭaka* hidden into an aesthetic treatise.

Turning to the other ‘capriccio for the Goddess’, it is significant to note that Ānandavardhana’s *Devīśataka* too contains in almost every stanza references to battles, supplications for victory and for the defeat of enemies, and that many of its stanzas are shaped in form of weapons (*cakra* “discus”, *jāla* “net”, *muraḥa* “battle-drum”, *tūṇa* “quiver”). As F. Hardy has hypothesized in an unpublished paper<sup>12</sup> it may well be that this *Century* had been composed in a period of severe crisis reflected in the poet’s words, or even commissioned by the king himself (at the time of Ānandavardhana, Avantivarman)<sup>13</sup> as a prayer for protection for an impending war. This would seem another instance of the well-known association between the buffalo-slaying Goddess and military cults<sup>14</sup> and here we will follow this track by asking a question: did *citrabandhas* play a role in this association?

To investigate this, we will first take into account one of the most iconic features of *citrabandhas*: that of *nāmāṅka* (“signature”). Starting at least from Māgha (*Śiśupālavadhā* 19.120), composers of pictorial stanzas have often hidden within their *bandhas*<sup>15</sup> their name and the title of their work, that could be extracted from syllables in strategical positions. The convention of signing *citrabandhas* has been explicitly prescribed for the first time by Rudraṭa (*Kāvyaḷamkāra* 5.1), who recommended them to be “*sāṅkāni*” “having a signature”.<sup>16</sup> Given the extremely difficult character of this poetry, it is no

<sup>12</sup> Hardy (unpublished). I am indebted to Prof. David Smith for this reference.

<sup>13</sup> 855/856-883, See Kalhaṇa, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 5.34.

<sup>14</sup> M. Biarreau (1981) discusses the topic in detail, with particular reference to the *śamī pūjā*. B. Sarkar (2012: 345-346) highlights the puranic myth in which Indra performs the lustration of Durga’s army after the defeat of Mahiṣa: this would be at the base of subsequent martial cults associated with the Goddess.

<sup>15</sup> Usually *cakrabandhas*, placed at the end of *citrakāvya* cantos (in addition to Māgha’s example, see also Kumāradāsa, *Jānakīharaṇa* 18.87), or of whole compositions (Ānandavardhana, *Devīśataka* 101). A signed *padmabandha* (by Rājaśekhara) is quoted in Bhoja’s *Sarasvatīkaṅṭhābharaṇa* 2.294.

<sup>16</sup> Namisādhu comments: *sahāṅkena svanāmācīhena vartanta iti sāṅkāni*.

surprise that the authors felt the need to seal their efforts, and to employ additional ‘special effects’ in doing so.

But apart from copyrighting one’s creations flattering one’s pride, these poetic seals served also a different purpose. As Lokanātha Cakravartin points out,<sup>17</sup> “in these [viz. *citrabandhas*] is repeatedly present the signature of the poet or of his teacher’s” (*eṣu kvacit kaver gurusmaraṇam gurunāmāṅkatā ca varīvartti*) and this is connected to the fact that “a large number of rhetoricians have prescribed that the use of *citrakāvya*s, despite being devoid of *rasa*, is acceptable with respect to the praise of gods, brahmins, teachers and kings” (*nīrasānām citrakāvyanām devadvijagurunripaprasastiparatve upādeyatvam upayogaś cālaṅkārikaiḥ subahubhiḥ svīkriyate*).<sup>18</sup> Another testimony of the religious or eulogistic purpose of figurative poetry, and to the role *nāmāṅkas* played in this sense.

With this feature in mind we can then reconsider A.B. Keith’s (1920: 127) remark that “these tricks arose from the practice of writing inscriptions on swords or leaves”.<sup>19</sup> Such practice finds confirmation in material evidences<sup>20</sup> and is abundantly testified in literary sources as well:<sup>21</sup> *nāmāṅkita śaras*, “signed arrows” seems to have been shot by a great number of literary heroes. These signatures testified the romantic concern for the code of honor in battle (*yuddhamaryādā*), that didn’t want a warrior to die ignoring his vanquisher.

Getting back to religion: can we trace any instance of a

<sup>17</sup> Commentary to Kavi Kaṇṇapūra, *Alaṅkāraustubha* p. 273.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 274.

<sup>19</sup> The reference to leaves could give reason of the *padmabandhas*, on which see Cielas (2013).

<sup>20</sup> Almost every collection of Indian weapons displays inscribed swords. To restrict to our sources, Sivaramamurti (1940: 158) bears the example of arrows (from the Madras museum) sealed by one of the Tanjore Rājas, Sarabhoji.

<sup>21</sup> Sivaramamurti (1940) and Pusalker (1941) list 12 instances (five from Kālidāsa’s works). Examples cover the epics, classical poetry and theatre, and present the form *svanāmācīhna*, *nāmākṣara*, *nāmāṅka*.

concrete connection between (inscribed) weapons and the Goddess? We can jump to Modern India and take as an example possibly the most famous sword of Indian history, a weapon that was actually named after the Goddess herself: King Śivājī's sword Bhavāni.<sup>22</sup> This sword, gifted to the king by his allies, the Sāvants of Wadi, was thought to be pervaded by the *kuladevatā* of the royal family (the goddess Tulajā Bhavāni), and to be endowed with special powers, such as to take life in dreams.<sup>23</sup> After having won the king many victories, and having been sung in innumerable *bakhars*,<sup>24</sup> it finally went lost within donations and loots between Śivājī's heirs, Aurangzeb and Great Britain's museums, and its actual whereabouts are uncertain. What we know for sure is that Bhavāni was kept on the altar of the Goddess and 'received back' by the king every year on the occasion of Vijayādaśamī, the day in which military campaigns were traditionally set forth at the beginning of autumn. This festival<sup>25</sup> (to be held on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of Āśvina's waxing moon) concluded the celebrations of Durgā Pūjā, and was traditionally associated with the victory of the Devī against Mahiṣāsura. Its main features were the worship of the 'invincible' divine forms of Aparājitā, Jayā and Vijayā,<sup>26</sup> and most notably the *āyudha pūjā*, an offering of lamps to the king's weaponry and army.<sup>27</sup> The purpose of this *pūjā* was overtly to secure the king success in battle, as can be evinced also by the *āśīrvāda* ("benediction") allegedly uttered by him while reviewing his troops:

*caturaṅgabalam mahyaṃ niraritvaṃ vrajatv iha |*  
*sarvatra vijayo me 'stu tvatprasādāt sureśvari ||*<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup> On the Maratha king (who reigned between 1674 and 1680) and his sword: Sardesai (1927), Edwardes (1924) and Gode (1940).

<sup>23</sup> Westerners reader might recall the episode of Excalibur, bestowed to King Arthur, and taken back by the Lady of the Lake.

<sup>24</sup> Marathi historical narratives.

<sup>25</sup> Details and complete scriptural sources in Kane (1958: 188-194).

<sup>26</sup> These appellations are widely present in the *Devīśataka*.

<sup>27</sup> An earlier (poetic) description of this very same ceremony, called *vājinīrājana* ("horses' lustration"), is found in Kālidāsa, *Raghuvamśa* 4.24-25.

<sup>28</sup> Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, *Nirṇayasindhu* p. 671.

“May my fourfold army here have no enemy,  
may I enjoy victory everywhere through your grace,  
Sureśvarī!”

As for the shapes in which the Goddess was to be actually approached, two puranic texts inform us that on the occasion of Durgā Pūjā, the devotee “could worship the Goddess Mahāmāyā in the shape of *liṅga*, book, altar, sandals, statue, picture, trident, sword, and water”;<sup>29</sup> and again “as a piece of cloth and a sacred diagram”.<sup>30</sup>

Can we suppose then that such tridents and swords, as the sacred diagrams,<sup>31</sup> were engraved with auspicious mantras and formulas? Looking at Rudraṭa’s *citrabandhas*, we are induced to answer affirmatively: his *śūlabandha* for example, constructed so that the prongs display three auspicious words (*stuhi* “sing”, *śivā* “favours/ Śivā”, *siddhyā* “with success”)<sup>32</sup> and the *śarabandha*, with the head bearing “*sadrasa devīm sannama*” (“O good devotee, pray the Goddess with all your heart!”) provide a fascinating image of how such inscribed weapons could have looked like. Another element pointing to the possibility that these *bandhas* were being inspired by real inscribed models is their relatively realistic and accurate shape, as reflected also by Namisādhu’s use of technicalities in describing their parts.

As for the presence of a plough in Rudraṭa’s *aṣṭaka*, we prefer not to take it as a simple show-off of poetic virtuosity, but, if our assumption is reasonable, to link it to the presence of farming tools at the lustration ceremony, as can be evinced by the brief mention by Kane (1958: 193) of the “worship of [...] implements of one’s trade”.

---

<sup>29</sup> *liṅgasthām pūjayed devīm pustakasthām tathaiva ca | sthaṅḍilasthām mahāmāyām pādūkāpratimāsu ca || Kālikā Purāṇa* quoted in Kane (1958: 178).

<sup>30</sup> *citre ca triśikhe khaḍge jalasthām cāpi pūjayet. Garuḍa Purāṇa* quoted *ibidem*.

<sup>31</sup> But also the sandals: an example of *pādūkābandha* can be found in Vedānta Deśika’s *Pādūkāsahasra* 949.

<sup>32</sup> At the base of the prongs is “*tām*” “her”, so that the play could also mean “sing her (for favors) with success”.



To sum up: the association between the Goddess and military cults in ancient and mediaeval India can be literarily documented in a span of time ranging at least from the *Mahābhārata* up to Śivājī's times. Few hints lead to suppose that one form of this martial devotion to the Devī, out of one's piety or on special festivities with royal patronage, took the form of praising her (along with other deities) with pictorial stanzas (Ānandavardhana's *Devīśataka*, Rudraṭa's *Durgāṣṭaka*). This usage might have originated with, or simply have been influenced by, a specific habit of writing inscriptions on the weapons and other paraphernalia used in such cults. In a way, this hypothesis saves also Lienhard's theory: the poet could have taken his inspiration from these ritual for weapon-shaped stanzas, and from military formations for (the naming of) *gomūtrikās*, *sarvatobhadras* and *cakrabandhas*.

We are aware of the high possibility of failure intrinsic to theories relying on scanty literary evidences, and it is quite very likely that our attempt here would turn out to be not the final answer to the question "Where does *citrakāvya* come from?", if such an answer exists. Our method consisted in following feeble traces scattered in the most different sources, belonging to a variety of genres and often separated by centuries. In this we have been led only by the fact that certain aesthetic thinkers underlined the connection between *citra* and *stuti* ("praise"). This is why we really hope that art historians, archaeologists and experts in Indian ritual would take on the issue of engraved weapons and confirm or deny our assumptions. In any case, we would be satisfied if we will have managed to show that *citrakāvya* can be approached with the same degree of attention as any other poetic genre or device, without prejudices based on old-fashioned aesthetic values. *Citrakāvya* deserves to be studied historically and philologically: and this can shed new light not only on poetic matters, but to Indian cultural history in general.

### Appendix: Rudraṭa's "Durgāṣṭaka" (Kāvyaḷamkāra 5.6-14).<sup>33</sup>

*tatrāṣṭabhiḥ ślokair  
garbhikṛtakhaḍgādivasturūpāntaraiś cakram āha –*

There he has composed a wheel with eight *ślokas* having the shapes of a sword etc. hidden inside:

*mārāriśakrarāmebhamukhair āsāraramhasā |  
sārārabdhastavā nityaṃ tadartiharaṇakṣamā || 6 ||  
mātā natānāṃ saṃghaṭṭaḥ śriyāṃ bādhitasaṃbhramā |  
mānyātha sīmā rāmāṇāṃ saṃ me diśyād umādiḷā || 7 ||  
khaḍgabandhaḥ || (yugmam)*

May Umā, mother of the world, whose hymn is sung vehemently, like a shower of energy, by Śiva, Indra, Rāma and Gaṇeśa, grant me peace. She is always capable of dispelling their pains. She is like a mother for the devotees, and a treasury of riches. The fear of the devotees has been destroyed by her. Worthy of worship, she is the non plus ultra of beauties.

Namisādhu: [...] *anena saṃdānitakena khaḍga  
utpadyate | ādyaḥ ślokaḥ phalarūpo 'paro muṣṭirūpaḥ |  
'sā' śabdaḥ phalānte taikṣṇyākārī 'diḷā' iti muṣṭer upari  
'mā' śabdau atra sādharāṇau | [...]*

With this *saṃdānitaka* is produced a sword. The first stanza has the shape of the blade, the second the shape of the hilt. The word *sā* has the shape of the edge at the end of the blade. *Diḷā* is above the hilt, and the two words *mā* are in common.

*atha musaladhanuṣṭī –*  
Now a pestle and a bow:

---

<sup>33</sup> The *aṣṭaka* is actually composed of nine stanzas: eight forming the *cakrabandha* plus one left out, but essential to complete the final *viśeṣaka* (triplet of stanzas syntactically linked).

*māyāvinam mahāhāvā rasāyātām lasadbhujā |*  
*jātalīlāyathāsāravācam mahiṣam āvadhīḥ || 8 ||*  
*musalam ||*  
*mām abhīdā śaranyā mut sadaivārukpradā ca dhīḥ |*  
*dhīrā pavitrā samtrāsāt trāsīṣṭhā mātā ārama || 9 ||*  
*dhanuḥ || (yugmam)*

O mother, give up [other occupations]<sup>34</sup> and protect me from fear. You have slain Mahiṣa, supreme delusion, proud, whose voice was too high. But your blandishment is great. You are playful, and so your arms play. You instill bravery and afford shelter. You are blissful, always bestowing health. And you are intellect, you are brave and pure.

Namisādhu: [...] *atrādyaślokena musalam – madhye tanu pāśvayoḥ sthūlam ekatra prānte tīkṣnam | tatra madhye ‘vārasā’ ity akṣaratrayam sādhanam ante ‘jā’ iti | dvitīyaślokena dhanuḥ – tatrādyaḥ ardham kuṭilam vaṁśabhāge, dvitīyam guṇākāram ‘mā’ śabdo ‘dhanakoṭiprānte, tadupānte ca makāro dvirāvṛtti, ‘dhī’ śabdaś ca śikhārūpaḥ | [...]*

Here from the first *śloka* is a mace. In the middle is thin, in the two ends is thick, and at the end in one point is sharp. In the middle the three syllables *vārasā* are in common and so *jā* above. With the second *śloka* a bow: the first half is bent in the part of the bamboo; the second half has the shape of the string; the word *mā* is at the end of the lower edge, and next to that “*ma*” is repeated twice, and the word *dhī* has the shape of the head.

*atha śaraḥ –*  
 Now an arrow:  
*mānanāparuṣam lokadevīm sadrasa sannama |*  
*manasā sādaram gatvā sarvadā dāsyam aṅga tām || 10 ||*  
 || *śaraḥ* ||

<sup>34</sup> Namisādhu: *ārama vyāpārāntarān nivartasva.*

O [tender heart, soaked in the] juice of good devotion,<sup>35</sup> give yourself up and praise unconditionally the goddess of the world. With your mind, with every effort: her anger is pacified through worship.

Namisādhu: [...] *atra prathamapādena daṇḍaḥ, dvitīyena phalam, tṛtīyacaturthābhyām vājāv aṭanī ca* | [...]

Here with the first *pāda* is the shaft, with the second the head, and with the third and fourth the feathers and the notch.

*atha śūlam* –  
Now the trident:

*mā muṣo rājasa svāsūṃl lokakūṭeśadevatām |*  
*tām śivāvāśītām siddhyādhyāsītām hi stutām stuhi ||*  
*II || śūlam ||*

O man of passion, don't delight in your life. Sing instead the deity of the kings of the masses of men. Invoked by Śiva/screamed by jackals,<sup>36</sup> praised by the world, she sits with success in the highest abode.

Namisādhu: [...] *triśikhāmetena śūlam utpadyate | prathamam ardham daṇḍabhāge dvitīyaṃ tv āvartaparāvartaiḥ śikhāsu | tatra sarvaśikhāmūle 'tām' śabdo vārapañcakam uccāryate | śikhāyām ekasyām 'śivā', dvitīyāyām 'siddhyā', madhyamāyām 'stuhi' | nyāsaḥ ||* [...]

With this is produced a trident with three prongs. The first half is in the part of the shaft, and the second in the prongs with continuous repetitions. There at the base of each edge the word *tām* is uttered five times. In one edge is *śivā*, in the second *siddhyā*, in the middle one *stuhi*.

*atha śaktyādīni* –

<sup>35</sup> Namisādhu: *aṅgeti komalāmantraṇe | he sadrasa subhaktibhareṇārdrahrdaya.*

<sup>36</sup> Namisādhu: *śivena śambhunā vāśītām āhūtām śivābhir vā vāśītām kṛtakalakālām.*

Now a spear etc.

*māhiṣākhye raṇe 'nyā nu sā nu nāneyam atra hi /  
himātānkād ivāmuḥ ca kaṃ kampinam upaplutam // 12  
|| śaktiḥ ||  
mātaṅgānaṅgavidhināmunā pādaṃ tam udyatam /  
taṅgayitvā śirasy asya nipāty āhanti raṃhasā // 13 //  
halam ||  
itīkṣitā suraiś cakre yā yamāmam amāyayā /  
maḥiṣaṃ pātu vo gaurī sāyatāsisitāyasā // 14 //  
rathapadam || (viśeṣakam)*

May Gaurī, the slayer of demons who depend on their long swords, protect you. In battle she was beheld by the gods: “Is it her or someone else? Yes, who else can stand here in this battleground?” and sent Mahiṣa to hell without tricks. That vile, trembling as for the strokes of winter. She kills him, intoxicated with pride, as playing with an arrogant elephant: raising her glorious foot, moving it around, casting it with violence on his head.

*Namisādhu [...] atrādyaślokena madhyatanvī tīkṣnaprāntā śaktir utpadyate | tatra 'himātam' ity akṣaratrayaṃ madhye, 'nusā' adhaḥ, 'kaṃ' upari | tatra 'hi' dvirāvṛttiḥ, 'mātāmukam' ete dvirāvṛttayaḥ | dviṭīyaślokena halam | tatra halapraviṣṭeśāśalyabhāge 'tam' śabdaḥ, 'mā' tasya pṛṣṭhe, 'nāmu' phalatīkṣṇāgre, 'gānaṅgavidhi pādaṃ tamudya' varṇāḥ phale 'nulomavilomaśreṇidvayasthāḥ, 'gayitvā śirasy asya' itīṣāyām, 'nipātyā' halordhvabhāge, hakāro halordhvabhāge kīlikāśalyamadhye, hakārordhve 'nti', hakārāgre 'raṃ', hakārapṛṣṭhe 'sā' | mārāripramukhair ebhir aṣṭabhiḥ ślokair aṣṭāraṃ cakram utpadyate | atra pūrvārdhāny aṣṭārāḥ | antyārdhāni tv ekā nemiḥ | 'mā' śabdo nābhiḥ sarvasādhāraṇaḥ | ardhāntyaślokāntyākṣarāṇi ca<sup>37</sup> | atra ca cakre svanāmāṅkabhūto 'yaṃ ślokaḥ kavināntarbhāvito yathā –*

<sup>37</sup> The passage is corrupt. It must mean that the last syllables of the first halves are the same as the first syllables of the second halves, and coincide in the spokes' junctions to the rim.

'*śatānandāparākhyena bhaṭṭavāmukasūnūnā |*  
*sādhitaṃ rudraṭenedaṃ sāmājā dhīmatāṃ hitam ||*' [...]

Here with the first *śloka* is made a spear, thin in the middle and sharp at the end. The three syllables *himātaṃ* are in the middle, *nusā* below, and *kaṃ* above. Among these, *hi* is repeated twice, and *mātaṃnukaṃ* are repeated twice.

With the second *śloka* the plough. There the word *taṃ* is in the part of the peg of the beam entering the mouldboard, 'mā' is behind that, 'nāmu' is in the sharp edge of the share, the letters *gānaṅgavidhi pādaṃ tamudya* stay in two rows back and forth in the mouldboard, *gaitvā śirasyasya* are in the beam, *nipātyā* are in the mouldboard's upper part; *ha* in the upper part of the mouldboard in the middle of the peg of the yoke, above *ha* is *nti*, in front of *ha* is *raṃ*, and behind *ha*, *sā*.

With these eight *ślokas* beginning with *mārāri* is made an eight-spoke wheel. The first halves are the eight spokes, the second halves are one rim and *mā* is the hub, common to all.

And here in the wheel, this *śloka* has been inserted by the poet:<sup>38</sup>

"This has been accomplished as a benefit for connoisseurs by Rudraṭa Śatānanda, son of Bhaṭṭa Vāmuka, chanter of the *Sāma Veda*."

### ***Bibliographic References***

#### **Primary sources**

*Alaṃkāraustubha of Kavi Karṇapūra*, with comm. by Lokanātha Cakravartin and notes by S. Bhaṭṭācārya. Ed. by R.S. Nagar. Delhi: Parimal Publications 2010.

*Devīśataka* of Ānandavardhana, with comm. by Kayyaṭa. Ed. by Pt. Shivadatta and V.L. Shastri Panashikar, *Kāvya Mālā* anthology №9, Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press 1916.

<sup>38</sup> The four pādas of this *nāmānkaśloka* are obtained respectively from the 3rd, 7th and 11th syllables of each spoke (starting from the hub), and from the junctions' syllables.

- Dhvanyāloka* of Anandavardhana, with comm. by Abhinavagupta and Śrī Rāmaśāraka and notes by Pt. Mahādeva Śāstrī. Ed. by Pt. Pattabhirama Shastri (Kashi Sanskrit Series №135). Benares 1940.
- Kāvyaḷamkāra* of Rudraṭa, with commentary by Namisādhu. Ed. by Pt. Durgāprasāda and L.S. Pansikar (Kāvya Māla №2). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1983<sup>3</sup>.
- Nirṇayasindhu* of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, with comm. by Kṛṣṇam Bhaṭṭa. Ed. by Pt. G.S. Nene (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series №52). Benares: Vidya Vilas Press 1930.

### Secondary sources

- Battistini, A. Forthcoming. “*Latet anguis in herba: nāgabandhas* in Sanskrit literature.” Paper read at the meeting of the Associazione Italiana di Studi Sanscriti (Bologna, 27-28 march, 2015).
- Biardeau, M. 1981. “L’arbre śamī et le buffle sacrificiel.” In *Autour de la Déesse hindoue. Études reunies* (Coll. Puruṣārtha №5). Ed. by M. Biardeau. Paris: EHESS, pp. 215-243.
- Cielas, H. 2013. “The eight-petalled lotus flower pattern in Sanskrit figurative poetry. A study.” *Pandanus* Vol. 7,1, pp. 73-88.
- Edwardes, S.M. 1924 “Sivaji’s sword, Bhavāni.” *The Indian Antiquary* vol. 53, pp. 18-20.
- Gode, P.K. 1940. “Hari Kavi’s contribution to the problem of the Bhavāni sword of Shivaji the Great.” *New Indian antiquary* vol.3, pp 81-100.
- Hardy, F. unpublished. *War, wisdom and poetry – the many-faceted Goddess: Ānandavardhana’s Devīśatakam*.
- Ingalls, D.H.H. 1989. “Ānandavardhana’s Devīśataka.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109, 4, pp. 565-575.
- Jha, K.N. 1975. *Figurative poetry in Sanskrit literature*. Delhi.
- Kane, P.V. 1958. *History of Dharmāśāstra* vol. V pt. 1. (Government Oriental Series Class B, № 6). Poona: BORI.
- Keith, A.B. 1920. *History of Sanskrit Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leela, K. 1999. *Rudraṭa’s Kāvyaḷamkāra. An Estimate*. Delhi: Indu Prakashan.
- Lienhard, S. 1992. “*Carmina figurata* dans la poésie sanscrite.” *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* vol. 10, pp. 203-214.

- Lienhard, S. 1997. "Martial art and poetics: some more observations on *citrakāvya*." In *Lex et Litterae. Studies in honour of Professor Oscar Botto*. Ed. by S. Lienhard and I. Piovano. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, pp. 343-359.
- Rajendran, C. 1998. "Caturaṅga movements described in Rudraṭa's *Kāvyaḷamkāra*." *The Adyar Library Bulletin* vol. 62, pp. 99-107.
- Renou, L. 1978. "Le 'jeu de mots' et ses implications." In *L'Inde fondamentale: Études d'indianisme réunies et présentées*. Ed. by L. Renou. Paris: Hermann, pp. 29-34. [1951].
- Pusalker, A.D. 1941. "Signed arrows: a note." *New Indian antiquary* vol.3, p. 414.
- Rastelli, M. and Goodall, D. (ed. by) 2013. *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa : T-Ph. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literatur. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantrén*. (BKGA 76). Wien : VÖAW.
- Sardesai, G.S., ed., 1927. *Shivaji souvenir*. Bombay: K.B. Dhawale.
- Sarkar, B. 2012. "The rite of Durgā in medieval Bengal: an introductory study of Ragnunandana's *Durgāpūjātattva* with text and translation of the principal rites." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, vol. 22 №2, pp. 325-390.
- Sivaramamurti, C. 1940. "Signed arrows." In *Professor K.W. Rangaswami Aiyangar commemoration volume*. Madras: G.S. Press, pp. 155-158.