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CHAPTER ELEVEN
FROM MY GRANDFATHER’S CHEST
OF PALM LEAF BOOKS

Sreeramula Rajeswara Sarma

0.1 When manuscripts began to be systematically collected in the three presidencies of British India in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the majority of manuscripts so collected were from the individual collections of priestly or other Brahmin households. In order to understand the manner of production and distribution of manuscripts in pre-modern South India, it would be useful to know about the nature of such individual collections.

In this paper, I shall discuss a set of palm leaf manuscripts which I saved from my grandfather’s chest of palm leaf books, dwell on the manner how they were preserved, speculate how they may have been collected and narrate the family tradition regarding these palm leaf books.

0.2 The nature of the subject makes it necessary that I say a few words about my family. It was a family of śrotiya or vaidikī Brahmins, who followed the Āpastamba Sūtra of the Taittiriya Śākhā of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda. According to a legend perpetuated in the Kanyakāpurāṇa,1 an ancestor named Bhāskarācārya provided leadership to a community of Vaiśyas in their conflict with the local king several centuries ago. Since then the members of the family became the hereditary gurus of this community of Vaiśyas and held the title Bhāskarācārya. Then about twelve generations ago, an ancestor performed a Rāma-yajña and dedicated himself and his future descendants to Śrīrāma. Through this dedication, he replaced the then current surname or

---

family name *Toṭapalli* by Śrīrāmula, which is genitive plural of Śrīrāma in Telugu, meaning “of / belonging to Śrīrāma.”

The family avidly cultivated this twofold tradition. The first was that of Bhāskarācārya, the preceptor-ship of certain clans of Vaiśyas. As the Vaiśya clans gradually spread across south India, the Bhāskarācārya travelled all over his “territory” to regularly visit his followers and offer spiritual counsel. In the family parlance, this travel is termed *saṁcāram*. The second tradition was the annual performance of the Rāma-yajña, which included the recitation of the complete *Ārsā-Rāmāyaṇa*, i.e. the Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇa* by Vālmīkin. Since this was an expensive affair, the Bhāskarācārya utilized his extensive travels to collect contributions from his Vaiśya disciples.

I often thought that the family must have had highly interesting archives, containing the itineraries of the various Bhāskarācāryas, documents about the method of performing the Rāma-yajña, and of course several manuscript copies of the *Kanyakāpurāṇa* and of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Unfortunately, none of these survives save a single copy book in which my grandfather recorded the subscriptions he collected and the expenses he incurred for what I presume to be his last Rāma-yajña. All other documents were lost because the family left the ancestral village and moved to another village.

A year before I was born in 1937, my father abandoned the ancestral house in the village Achchammapeta (16° 38´ N; 80° 7´ E) in Guntur District in what is today the state of Andhra Pradesh and moved to south-east along with his mother and wife to a much smaller village called Ulichi (15° 33´ N; 80° 9´ E)—situated in the same district, but on the cyclone-prone coast of the Bay of Bengal—to look after a childless old couple who were closely related to my grandmother. With this move my father gave up his paternal inheritance and gained the inheritance of his mother’s family, or—to speak from the perspective of this workshop—he lost one set of palm leaf manuscripts to acquire another. This second set is the subject of this paper.

In this new village, my father succeeded his grand uncle as *purohita*; he had half a share of *paurohitya* in this village. At some point in

---

2 Telugu family names (*intiperu*, lit. “house name”) are generally derived from the village from where the family originated. In Telugu culture, the family name constitutes the first element of one’s name. Thus the first initial “S” in my name expands to Sreeramula. Today, however, many Telugu people, as they migrate to other parts of the world, are placing the family names after the given name, in order to conform to the general practice in the US and Europe.
the past, the purohitas were given agricultural land for performing this essential task. They did not cultivate the land themselves but leased it to farmers who paid rent in kind or cash. Besides this modest income, the purohita received, whenever he performed a domestic ritual in a client’s house, some remuneration in kind: a measure of rice, a handful of pulses, some dried coconut, a vegetable or two, a few leaves of tāmbūla, two or three betel nuts—barely enough for one square meal—and some copper coins.

My mother used to store some of the non-perishable items so received in a large wooden chest which went by the designation of the “grandfather’s chest of palm leaf books” (tāṭa-gāri tāṭāku-pustakāla-bhoṣāṇam). In my childhood, whenever my mother opened this chest, I would try to peep into the chest to see and smell the diverse kinds of objects stored there: dried coconut halves, turmeric roots, betel nuts, silver trinkets, packets of incense sticks, tablets of camphor, piles of old letters, rolls of paper documents, and bundles of palm leaf books wrapped in cloth. Sometimes, to amuse me, my father would take out a palm leaf book, undo the rope, and show me how the letters were incised on the surface of the leaves. Once, as a special treat, he showed me a secret drawer in the chest which contained some old coins and rolls of palm leaves. Many decades later, when we had to empty the house and sell it, I retrieved some palm leaf books and rolls from the grandfather’s chest. My mother gave away the empty chest to the temple of Venugopāla; now it has the privilege of storing—no more palm leaf books, but—God’s festival clothes (Fig. 11.1).

Figure 11.1. Grandfather’s Chest is being carried to the temple of Venugopāla, which is inside the walls with the vertical stripes to the left. See colour section, Plate XVI.
The palm leaf manuscripts that I saved from the grandfather’s chest (Fig. 11.2) have been with me for some time, but they were not of my immediate academic interest (which is served mainly by north Indian paper manuscripts and museum artifacts). Saraju Rath’s proposal of the workshop gave me the opportunity to spend some hours with the family manuscripts (and to indulge in excursions into the past).

Figure 11.2. Palm leaf manuscripts and rolls retrieved from the grandfather’s chest. See colour section, Plate XVII.

1.1 Material

All the manuscripts are incised on the processed leaves of the Palmyra palm (Borassus flabellifer Linn., Sanskrit: tāla / khara-tāla) which grows abundantly in our area on the sea coast. The manuscripts have very neatly bored holes; I do not know how this was achieved. In one manuscript, the corners of the leaves are rounded very nicely; I do not know how this was done either. The covers of the manuscripts were made up of the leaf stalks (petiole) of what appear to be larger Talipot palms (Corypha umbraculifera; Sanskrit, śrītāla); these leaf stalks were cut to the exact size, smoothened and varnished. Some covers were made of bamboo; some others of wooden planks; in some manuscripts, the palm leaves themselves were made to serve as the covers. On these leaves, the letters were incised with an iron stylus (Telugu, gaṇṭamu from Sanskrit, loha-kaṇṭaka), as is the custom in South
India and all along the eastern coast. The manuscripts appear to have been used frequently. In one manuscript, a slightly broken edge of a leaf was carefully repaired by stitching it with thread.

1.2 Age of the Manuscripts

The manuscripts are generally dated in the years of the southern style Jovian cycle. Since these repeat every 60 years, it is difficult to determine the age of a manuscript. Luckily, in one manuscript the Jovian year is accompanied by its equivalents in Kali and Śaka eras (Subhakr / Kali 4943 / Śaka 1764) so that the year can be fixed at AD 1842-43. In another case, the date is given in the Christian era also as 23 September 1856. I am inclined to think that the remaining documents also belong to this period, namely the middle of the nineteenth century of the Christian era. Although paper was available at this period—the chest contained many government documents with Queen Victoria’s seal embossed on them—it had to be purchased against ready cash whereas palm leaf was free and plenty. There must have been people in every village who processed the palm leaf and made it ready for writing. I cannot say whether there were special classes of people whose profession it was to process the leaves or whether every literate person (i.e. every Brahmin) prepared his own writing material. Perhaps both cases were true. For making the covers one took naturally the village carpenter’s help. This state of affairs continued up to the beginning of the twentieth century; in the first decade my father still used the palm leaf and stylus for his first writing lessons.

1.3 Orthography

These manuscripts are predominantly of Sanskrit texts but written in Telugu characters. The Telugu alphabet is capable of reproducing all the Sanskrit sounds. Yet there are certain peculiarities in the transcription of Sanskrit words. Since these peculiarities are common to all the manuscripts in this collection, it appears that all these manuscripts (with one exception, see 2.4 below) were produced broadly in the same geographical area and in the same period. These peculiarities are as follows:

---

1. Telugu has long and short e and o, while Sanskrit has only long e and o. However, the Telugu scribes rarely pay attention to long e and o in Sanskrit, transcribing them often as short. Thus devānām becomes dēvānām. But in actual pronunciation, Telugu Brahmins never shorten the Sanskrit e and o.

2. But they do indulge in what is known as ya-śruti; i.e. insertion of ya in front of vowels i, e, and of v in front of u, o. For example, eka becomes yeka; idam becomes yidan and so on.

3. As in Middle Indic, the anusvāra is used consistently in the place of parasavarna, e.g. anta > anta, indu > indu, indra > indra.

4. But more interestingly, anusvāra is inserted before a nasal consonant when it is in conjunction with another consonant. Examples: brahmā > brahma; anna > aninja; punya < punnya; yajña < yamija.

5. The consonant following an anusvāra is reduplicated, e.g.
   santati > samtati > samtatti
   śṛgāra > śṛgāra > śṛgṛgāra
   vande > vanđe > vanđde

So much so, the verse from the Puruṣa-sūkta is transcribed as follows

vande brāhma śṛgārām āsad yajña
bāhū rājya śṛgārān āsad yajña

2.0 Description of the Manuscripts

The manuscripts can be divided into three groups: Veda, ritual and kāvya. There are three Vedic manuscripts, belonging to the Taittirīya branch of the black Yajurveda. Two of the largest manuscripts in the

---

4 A similar feature I noticed in Punjabi, or at least in a Punjabi astrolabe where an anusvāra is inserted in kanyā (kannya) and vahni (vamnhi).
collection contain respectively the second and third aṣṭakas of the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa. It is likely that the first aṣṭaka was also there once.

2.1 The manuscript of the second aṣṭaka contains all the eight prapāṭhakas. Each prapāṭhaka begins on a new page with an auspicious formula like hariḥ om or hariḥ om śrīgurubhyo namah, but at the conclusion, the serial number of the prapāṭhaka is not given, nor is there a mention anywhere of the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa. The final colophon, however, states remdho āṭha parāyitam. This expression will be discussed below. Fortunately there is the scribe’s colophon at the end which states as follows:


“In the Jovian year named Vikārin, in the dark half of the month Bhāḍrapada, on the 12th day [is completed] the book (postakam) of the Parāyitam belonging to Telidevulapalli Tātāṁbhōṭu. The book is written by Dattaṁbhōṭu. Homage to Dattātreya.” Vikārin is the 33rd year in the Jovian cycle and can correspond to 1779-80, or 1839-40, or 1899-1900. Perhaps 1839-40 would be the right year.

The scribe Dattaṁbhōṭu is not the owner of the manuscript; the owner is mentioned as Telidevulapalli Tātāṁbhōṭu followed by an honorific gāru. The scribe does not mention his family name probably because it is the same as that of the owner. It is possible that Dattaṁbhōṭu is a younger member of the family of Tātāṁbhōṭu and therefore refers to the latter with the honorific gāru. It may be noted that both these names, and many others which will occur in the course of this narrative, end in the suffix bhoṭu, which is derived from Sanskrit bhaṭṭa to which a Telugu plural particle is added honoris causa. It is therefore certain that Dattaṁbhōṭu is not a professional scribe from a lower caste but a Brahmin of the same family.

2.2 The manuscript of the third aṣṭaka was copied by another person, for the writing is much superior to that of the previous manu-

---

5 Length 39.5 cm, breadth 3 cm, thickness 5 cm, thickness with covers 7.8 cm; covers made of palm leaf stalks.

6 Length 43.5 cm, breadth 3 cm, thickness 5.5 cm, thickness with covers 8 cm. Covers are made of palm leaf stalks. There is no pagination; the string got broken.
script. However, there is no colophon stating who copied it and when. On the penultimate leaf is written in a different hand:

Pullămboṭla postakam / mūḍo aṭhaṁ / pannaṁdu ppanmnālū samppūrṇam //

“Book of Pullămboṭlū. Third aṭha. Twelve pannās [are] complete.”

On the final leaf is written, again in another hand, within ornate borders,

Yimaṇillī Pullămboṭlā mūḍa aṭha parāyitam saṃppūrṇam.

“Of Yimaṇillī Pullămboṭlū, third aṭha parāyitam [is] complete.”

So clearly this book belongs to Pullămboṭlū with the family name Yimaṇillī. But more important are the expressions remdo aṭha parāya- 
tam in the manuscript of the second aṣṭaka and mūḍa aṭha parāyataṁ in the manuscript of the third aṣṭaka. In Telugu remdo means “the second” and mūḍo “the third”. Thus the second aṣṭaka of the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa is designated as the “second aṭha parāyitam” and the third aṣṭaka as the “third aṭha parāyitam.” Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that in the Telugu priestly circles the expression aṭha refers to 
aṣṭaka; there is at least the superficial resemblance between the two expressions aṣṭaka and aṭha. Does parāyitaṁ then refer to the 
Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa?

There is yet a third expression panna/ā. The third prapāṭhaka of the 
second aṣṭaka is described as the third (mūḍo) pannā and the eighth prapāṭhaka as the eighth pannā. Again at the conclusion of the third 
aṣṭaka, it is said that twelve pannās are complete. So panna/ā appears to be a local term for prapāṭhaka or a sub-section.

2.3 The third manuscript in this collection pertains also to the Tait- 
tiriya branch.7 It contains the prapāṭhakas 3, 5 and 6 of the Taittiriya Āranyaka. These three prapāṭhakas are copied on two sets of leaves 
numbered separately from 1 to 33 and again from 1 to 31, with colo- 
phones at the end of each set. The third prapāṭhaka which deals with the Brahmareśa and includes the famous Puruṣasūkta is not identi-
fied in the manuscript as such. It is followed by the fifth prapāṭhaka 
which constitutes the Taittiriyopaniṣad. The three subsections of this

and the leaves got disorganized. Apparently it was used frequently; the broken edge 
of a leaf was joined by stitching. The script is very clear and easy to decipher.

7 Length 26.7 cm, breadth 2.8 cm, thickness 3.3 cm. There are no separate covers, 
the outer leaves being treated as the covers.
Upaniṣad, called vallīs, are clearly separated with the śānti-pāṭha occurring at the beginning and the end of each vallī, but the vallīs are not named, nor was the Upaniṣad itself. Within each vallī, the anuvākas are not distinguished. This is followed by the sixth prapāṭhaka which constitutes the Nārāyaṇopaniṣad, also known as the Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad, or Yājñikopaniṣad. This is identified in the margin as Nārāyaṇam.

I mentioned that the leaves are numbered as two separate sets. At the conclusion of the first set, which contains the text of the prapāṭhakas 3 and 5, there is a colophon by the scribe which reads thus: Ṛgdra-ka/tā Raghupatinā yida/m likhitam “This was written by Indra-kamṭham Raghupati.”

In the second and final colophon, the edge of the leaf is broken where the scribe’s name occurs; but it must be the same scribe Indra-kamṭham Raghupati. This colophon reads as follows:

śubhakr tāma samvatsara kārtika şu 11 śukravāraṁnādu — upaniṣattulu 5 paṁnnālu svahastaṁgā vrāśi yītamukkalalo telidevulappalli vumāmahēśvarudikī dānapūrvāṁgā yī[ccinadi]/*umāmahēśvarārpaṇam astu/*

“In the year named Śubhakṛt, in the bright half of Kārttika, on the 11th day which is a Friday, having written with his own hand the five paṁnnās of Upaniṣads, given as dāna to Telidevulappalli Umāmahēśvaruḍu in the village Ītamukkala. May this be an offering to Maheśvara [accompanied by] Umā.”

This colophon is interesting for several reasons. First “Telidevulappalli” is the family name of my grandmother’s father (see 4.0 below). The recipient of the dāna, Telidevulappalli Umāmahēśvara must be a member of this family and it explains the presence of this manuscript in the “grandfather’s chest.”

The year Śubhakṛt, the 36th year of the Jovian cycle, corresponds to AD 1782-3, 1842-43, or 1902-3. If we accept the middle one, kārtika śukla 11 translates to Friday 3 November 1843 when the dāna was performed.8

The scribe describes the contents of the manuscript as upaniṣattulu 5 paṁnnālu, lit. “five paṁnnās of Upaniṣads”. The manuscript contains the third, fifth, and sixth prapāṭhakas of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka.

---

8 For the conversion of dates here and in the following pages, I used the pāncanga programme designed by Yano and Fushimi, http://www.cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~yanom/pancanga/index.html
According to tradition the fifth prapāṭhaka constitutes the Taittirīya-paniṣad and the sixth the Nārāyaṇopaniṣad. But in the scribe’s view, the third prapāṭhaka which deals with the Brahmadeha and includes the famous Puruṣasūkta is also an Upaniṣad.

Now we come to the expression panna/a, which we encountered earlier in the sense of prapāṭhaka. The present manuscript contains only three prapāṭhakas. How do they become five pannas? I believe that the scribe counted the third prapāṭhaka as 1 panna, the three vallis in the fifth prapāṭhaka as 3 pannas, and the sixth prapāṭhaka again 1 panna; together these make (1+3+1=) 5 pannas. Charles Philip Brown’s A Telugu-English Dictionary, which is available online, gives the meanings of pannam in English and Telugu.9 Here the English meaning “One Verse in a chapter of the Vedas” is quite off the mark; but the meaning given in Telugu is better: vedamulo aṣṭakamuloni bhāgamu, “a part of an aṣṭaka in the Vedas”. As I think back to my childhood, I remember to have heard of Brahmins who knew so many pannas of Veda by heart. Panna then must be a unit of recitation or memorization, that is as much as is denoted by the expression prapāṭhaka. Brown’s dictionary, however, does not know the expressions aṭha and parāyatam; probably all the words had a limited currency in śrottriya circles.

But the most important item of the colophon is the purpose for which the manuscript was copied, namely for giving it away as dāna. Sanskrit texts on Dharmaśāstra, such as the Caturvargacintāmani, speak of vidyādāna which consists of copying a manuscript, or getting it copied, and then giving it away as dāna to a learned person. Among the Jainas, this type of dāna is given a high importance; there are large numbers of manuscripts which were caused to be made for this purpose.10 But among the Brahmanic manuscripts, the present one must be one of the few which were copied for the sake of dāna.

9 “pannamu (p. 0712) [ pannamu ] pannamu. [Tel.] n. One verse in a chapter of the Vedas. vedamulo aṣṭakamuloni bhagamu.”
10 Cf. Hampa Nagarajaih, "The Concept of Shastra-dana in Jainism," Jain Journal, 33.3 (Jan 1999), pp. 81-85. The colophons of Jaina manuscripts often mention that the manuscripts were copied for the purpose of vidyādāna or śāstradāna. For a collection of such colophons, see Jaina Pustaka Praṣasti Sangraha (A Collection of Praṣastis and Colophons of Ancient Manuscripts preserved in the Jain Bhandars at Patan, Cambay, Jaisalmer, and other Places), first part, ed. Jina Vijaya Muni, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1943 (Singhi Jain Series, No. 18). See also Jaina-grantha-Praṣasti-Sangraha, part 1, ed. Jugal Kishor Mukhtar, Vira Seva Man-
Finally, the texts copied on these manuscripts are generally those which the members of the family were expected to know by heart. The manuscripts merely served as aids while memorizing the text. Since the Vedic accent is learnt directly from the teacher and not from the books, the Vedic manuscripts here do not carry accent marks. The Vedic anusvāra, however, is denoted by a special symbol. The manuscripts avoid the other frills like the colophons identifying the text, author, the chapter number and the like, probably because these are never recited in the ritual.

2.4 The next group consists of texts which are connected with the profession of the purohita, namely texts on Grhya ritual, vratas, pūjās, and stotras. Here each manuscript contains several texts, not always clearly separated from one another. There are rarely any end colophons; sometimes the individual texts are identified in the margin.

The fourth manuscript in this connection deals mainly with the Grhya and Purānic ritual.12 Here the various sections are identified in the margin with their titles such as: Cūrṇike, Daśāvatārāla arghyālu, Sthālpāka, Dahanāgnividhiḥ, Vṛṣotsargaḥ, Dūrvāṣṭāmi, Śravaṇa-dvādaśi-nirṇayaḥ, Anantavrata-nirṇayaḥ, Naracaturdāsi, Dīpāvalī, Skandā-śaṣṭiḥ, Punyāha-lakṣaṇam, Agni-praṇayaḥ, Yajñapurusā-lakṣaṇam, Tāmbūlacarvaṇānumatiḥ, Vivāhamadhye kanyakā rajasvalā.

Among these, the first two items are particularly interesting. The first one, entitled Cūrṇike is a long ornate passage in Sanskrit which the householder is to recite when he gives away his daughter in marriage. It begins with

svasty aṣṭāśiṣitahāsrāṇām dvijagurudevātītānām / pākaśāsana-hutaśāana-dāṇḍadhara-nirṛuti-varūna-sāmṛṭa-nāvīśravaṇa-śaśiśekharānāmām āyuṣataḥ kamalāsanasya /


11 Colophons also occur in the middle of the text, such as, at the conclusion of a section or at the conclusion of a chapter, besides at the end of the book or manuscripts.

12 Length 34.5 cm, breadth 3.5 cm, thickness 4 cm, thickness with covers 5.3. Covers are made of wooden boards slightly larger than the leaves. The leaves are numbered from 18 to 92; the first 17 leaves are missing.
and concludes, after several leaves, with the words

daśa pūrveśaṃ daśāpareśaṃ madvaṃśyaṇaṃ mayā saha narakād
uttīrya brahma-loke nivāsa-siddhyartham /
yāvadrātri-guṇīkṛtāgni-tātāma-japeya-puṇḍarikāsvamedhādi-śatakuphalāvāpti-siddhyartham /
īhaloke anekabhogasiddhyartham /
tataḥ viṣṇuloke ācāndratārakaparyāntaṃ [lacuna]
svaghe [vi]dhyuktaprakāreṇa sahira-sāla-kanyā-dānam ahaṃ kariye /

Here we seem to have a relic of an earlier practice where the bride’s father gave such a long discourse.

This is followed by what are stated to be offerings (arghya) for the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu (daśāvatāra arghyālu). In this interesting version of the Daśāvatāra-pūjā (for the full text, see Appendix I), the lunar tithi and the time of the day of the manifestation of each avatāra is mentioned. The incarnations are praised accordingly in association with the relevant tithi. Thus for instance the fish incarnation is extolled in the following words:

caitrakṛṣṇe tu pañcamyāṃ mahāmatyāvatārabhāk /
ghnārghyāṃ mayā dattam mahālaṃṣmyā hare saha //

There is no colophon, nor a date in the manuscript. On the wooden cover is incised Śanagavara Ko/m+dotbelow/d+dotbelow/ swayyā for his own sake ... “written by Śanagavaru Ko/m+dotbelow/d+dotbelow/ karṇa/karṇa by Śanagavaru Komḍayya for his own sake ...” The orthography is rather peculiar: ka is written as in Kannada script. The first text is termed cūrnikē, which is a Kannada form of Sanskrit cūrnikā. These two facts suggest that this manuscript may have been copied in or near Karṇaṭaka by Śanagavara Ko/m+dotbelow/d+dotbelow/.
2.5 The contents of the next manuscript\textsuperscript{13} are also of similar nature; these are \textit{Varalakṣṇīvratavidhāna}, \textit{Navagrahapūjā}, \textit{Pāṅgrahana-śaṃskāra-vidhāna} and so on. In the \textit{Varalakṣṇīvratavidhāna}, the \textit{vṛata} is in Sanskrit and the \textit{kathā} in Telugu. The rest of the manuscript is in Sanskrit.

2.6 The sixth manuscript of the collection is rather small in size.\textsuperscript{14} The leaves have not only very neatly bored holes, but also round corners. The well polished covers are made of some soft timber. However, the writing is rather indifferent; there are several hands and several texts, not clearly differentiated. These are mainly prayers addressed to different deities, sometimes these are named as \textit{kavaca-s} in the margin. Some of the titles are \textit{Tripurasūndari-kavaca}, \textit{Hanumanta-kavaca}, \textit{Subrahmaṇya-kavaca}. There are also some \textit{ślokas} in praise of Venkaṭeśvara with the refrain \textit{venkateśam bhaję}, some on the river Kāverī and yet others on the bridge (\textit{setu}) to Laṅkā built by Rāma.

2.7 Then there is a completely Telugu text, albeit with a large sprinkling of Sanskrit terms.\textsuperscript{15} It is a \textit{śatakam} with the refrain \textit{rāmaprabho}. There are just 11 leaves, containing some 191 verses; then the manuscript breaks off. Here the first verse reads thus:

\begin{verbatim}
pāhi rāmaprabho pāhi rāmaprabho
pāhi bhadrāḍrī\textsuperscript{16}-vaidehi-rāmaprabhabho /
pāhi māṁ pādapadme hitāṁ mohitāṁ
dehi bhadrāḍrī-vaidehi-rāmaprabhabho //1//
\end{verbatim}

2.8 The texts described so far pertain to the repertoire of a \textit{purohita}; so do the \textit{pañcāṅgas}. These are elaborate astronomical tables providing for each day of the year the five \textit{aṅgas}, namely \textit{tīthi}, \textit{vāra}, \textit{naksattra}, \textit{yoga} and \textit{karaṇa}. These \textit{pañcāṅgas} were used by the \textit{purohitas} while fixing the auspicious moments for performing the various rituals, and also for various types of astrological forecasts. There were many \textit{pañcāṅgas} in the grandfather’s chest, but one deserves special mention.

\textsuperscript{13} Length 38.7 cm, breadth 3 cm, thickness 2.4 cm; there are no covers.
\textsuperscript{14} Length 21 cm, breadth 3.6 cm, thickness 4 cm, thickness with covers 4.8 cm. Covers are made of wooden boards. Some leaves are worm eaten.
\textsuperscript{15} Length ca. 23 cm, width 3 cm. The right edge is worn off and broken. There are 11 leaves, incomplete.
\textsuperscript{16} Bhadrāḍrī in Andhra Pradesh has a famous Rāma temple.
It is a neatly written manuscript with some marginal decorations (Fig. 11.3). It was compiled for Śubhākṛt, which is the 36th year in Jovian cycle; the compiler also records the year in other eras, among others, Kāli 4943 and Śālivāhana Śaka 1764. With these we can identify the year as the one beginning on Monday 11 April 1842 and ending on Thursday 30 March 1843. The author is Purāṇaṁ Limanna, son of Limayya, of Kaśyapa-gotra, and resident of Kalvakūru, which is 80 km from my village Ulichi. Although it is described as Śubhākṛt-nāma-samvatsara-paṅcānagamu, it is not the paṅcāṅga proper, but varṣaphala, lit. “fruit of the year,” i.e. a forecast of the possibilities for the coming year, such as the rain fall, crop yield, well-being or otherwise of different castes, prices of various items and so on (see Appendix II for extracts). The possibilities are given in terms of certain number of parts, perhaps in a scale of 20 because the parts vary between 4 to 20. Thus it is stated that the rainfall will be 11 parts, crop yield 19 parts, happiness 13 parts, sorrow 9 parts, truth 13 parts, untruth also 13 parts, increase in locusts 8 parts, elimination of locusts 7 parts, … increase in the price of emeralds 4 parts, loss 5 parts, … increase in the yield of coconuts 17 parts, of bananas 11 parts, of mangoes 17 parts, … etc. etc.

17 Length 41.2cm, breadth 3.3 cm in the middle, at the ends to 2.7; 6 folia.
It is customary that on the New Year's Day (ugādi in Telugu from Sanskrit yugādi), which is observed on the first day of the bright half of the lunar month Caitra by the Telugus, the purohita reads out this varaṇaphala to the assembled villagers in the local temple. The text concludes with a phalaśruti: the reward for hearing to the varaṇaphala:

\[
\text{kanyāvanikāṇcanadiggajānāṃ gavāṃ sahasrāṃ satatāṃ dvijebhyāḥ} \\
\text{datvā phalam yal labhate manusyaḥ tatatatphalāny abdaphalāṃ śrōtāḥ/}
\]

“Whatever merit a man obtains by gifting constantly a thousand maidens, [pieces of] land, gold, elephants and cows to the Brahmins, the same merits [he would obtain by hearing] the varaṇaphala. [Therefore] may you hear [it].”

2.9 The manuscripts so far pertain to the requisites of śrotriya Brahmins who also act as purohitas, dealing as they do with the Yajurveda, Gṛhyā and other rituals, vrata, pūjās, and stotras. One whose intellectual range does not go beyond these is called derisively chāndasa. I am pleased that the grandfather’s palm leaf book collection did not just cater to the chāndasa demands; it had some kāvya too.

Actually the best preserved and oft-used manuscript deals with kāvya. This manuscript contains three separate texts. The first, in 39 folia, is the second adhyāya of the Kṛṣṇakarnāṁṛta, with a Telugu tīkā with extracts from the commentary Svārṇacaśaka by Pasumarti Pāpayya Sūri. In contradistinction to the manuscripts which we have discussed so far, there is a proper colophon at the end identifying the text, the commentary and the adhyāya. The colophon informs further that the manuscript was copied by Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma up to Vaiśākha śu 14 in the year Vyaya, which can be either Saturday 20 May 1826, or Monday 17 May 1886. I opt for the former for reasons to be explained later (in 4.0 below).

---

18 Length 34 cm, breadth 3.2 cm, thickness 3.8 cm, thickness with covers 5.5 cm. Covers are made of polished palm leaf stalks.
19 yidi vedavākyapramāṇa-pārāvāra-pāriṇa-Pasumarti-Tirumalabhattopādhyāya-vaputra-Komādatamāmbā-garbhaśaktinuktāmanā / Yallaśāri-viracitāyām Karṇīṅtavyākhyāyāṃ Svavara-cāsakākhyāyāṃ dvityo’dhyāyāḥ / Maṅgalaṁ mahat / śī śī śī jeyunā / śīśrīśrīpāāppanam astu / śīmadanagopāyā namah / śī śī śī śī śī śī / Vyajjanāma-sam vatsara-vaiśākha-śu-14-la varaku Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma karmāṁ ta-vyākhyānām rem d o āśvāsam vrāsukonenu. Śrīrāmulu nīve kalavu/ śī śī śī śī
The second text, copied in 10 leaves, is a \textit{dvipada-kāvya} in Telugu entitled \textit{Ātmaikabodha}, a vedantic tract, by Naṭa-mahā-yogānamda-avadhūta-svāmi. There is no copyist’s name, but it is certain that it was the same Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma. It was copied three years later in the year \textit{Virodhin}, on \textit{Jyeṣṭha bahula} 7 (= Tuesday 23 June 1829). The beginning and the end of this text are reproduced below.

\textbf{Beginning:}
\begin{verbatim}
śrī[ma]ṃmahābhāgya-śrīgāram agucu /
nāmarūpulakella nāṭapatiṭhagucu /
bhānukotiprabhā-bhāsītud agucu /
nānā-kriyala-kella nādhāram agucu /
vēdāntaśāstramula vivarampa baducu /…
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{End:}
\begin{verbatim}
cakkagā yā yikya cavi gonerayya /
yā lokamuna janula yī dvipada vinma /
pālīmcićūcina paṭṭi vrāsinānu /
buddhi kudurai lessa budhajanula cevi /
siddhulai yihapara sukhamu goruduru/
\end{verbatim}

The third text (in 21 leaves) is the first \textit{sarga} of the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, with a Telugu \textit{ṭīkā}. This text is also accompanied by a regular colophon, identifying the text, the author and the section; it also informs that the manuscript was copied by Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma up to \textit{Phālguṇa śu} 10 in the year \textit{Khara} 20 (= Monday 12 March 1832).\footnote{ity ār/sre śrīmadvṛsāméyane ādikāvye nāradavākye vālmikā(!)prakte saṇ—pra-thamasargaḥ / Kharanāma-saṅvatsara-phālguṇa-śu 10 la-varaku Pālaparti kṛṣṇanmma vrāsinādu /}

As mentioned earlier, the two Sanskrit texts, viz. the second \textit{adhyāya} of the \textit{Kṛṣṇakarnāmyṛta} and the first \textit{sarga} of the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} are accompanied by a \textit{ṭīkā} which provides word by word meaning in Telugu. Stylistically the two \textit{ṭīkās} are identical and must have been composed by the same person, probably by the scribe Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma himself. I am not in a position to answer why Kṛṣṇamma composed the \textit{ṭīkā} only on the second \textit{adhyāya} of the \textit{Kṛṣṇakarnāmyṛta} and only on the first \textit{sarga} of the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, nor can I say when this practice of writing \textit{ṭīkās} in Telugu on Sanskrit texts commenced. However, the kind of Telugu used in the \textit{ṭīkās} is interesting: here the retroflex dental \textit{ṭ} is replaced at certain places by the retroflex sibilant \textit{ṭ}.

\footnote{ There is a gap of about three years between the dates of copying of these three texts. But it may not mean that Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma took three years to copy each of the three texts; chances are that he did not copy every day continuously, but did so only whenever he had time or inclination.}
My great-grand aunt used to tell me that Somayājis, i.e. those who performed the Soma sacrifice, affected this kind of Telugu, which she called Somayājula Telugu. Further research is needed to find out whether this Somayājula Telugu is recorded in any other text.

3.0. Palm Leaf Rolls

Now I come to the palm leaf rolls which were stored in the secret drawer of the grandfather’s chest. Here I could retrieve six rolls which were fully intact. These are single processed palm leaves, which were inscribed and then rolled up into small rolls of about three to four cm diameter. Three of these rolls are enclosed inside slightly larger rings of blank palm leaves which function like envelopes. In these envelopes incisions were made at two places and the incised portions were pushed into one another so that the leaf does not roll back (Fig. 11.4).

\[\text{Figure 11.4. Inscribed palm leaf roll and the protective envelope. See colour section, Plate XX.}\]

\[\text{22 For example, this is how the } tīkā \text{ on } Kṛṣṇakṛṣṇamṛta 2.1 \text{ runs: abhinavavanītasnigdham āpitadugdham – abhinava / nītānamaināṣuvaṃṭī / navaṇita / venna cātanu / snigdham / svacchāmaināṣuvaṃṭī / dugdham / pāluga lina / ... }\]
In his *South Indian Palaeography*, A. C. Burnell makes a brief mention of letters written on single palm leaves which were then rolled up and tied with a string, but he does not mention legal documents incised on single leaves and then preserved inside envelope rolls. Nor am I aware of any other description of such documents in South India written after Burnell’s time.

Therefore, I was eager to know the content of the rolls, but was faced with technical problem of unrolling these leaves without damaging them. I filled a bowl with hot water and dropped one palm leaf roll into the hot water. It uncoiled itself instantly and also got cleansed in the process. Then I dried the leaf between two sheets of newspaper. Thus the technical problem of unrolling the palm leaf was solved easily enough, but the problem of deciphering the leaf was rather daunting.

For, unlike the other palm leaf manuscripts, this one is a legal document and was written by a professional who is usually the village clerk (*karanam*) in what appears like a chain writing. While the ideal of Telugu script is that each letter should be distinct and separate like a pearl, here each letter was linked to the next one in a long chain. One has the impression that the scribe incised the entire line without once lifting the stylus from the surface of the leaf. I could not decipher much from the leaf. I soaked one more roll with the same result.

23 A. C. Burnell, *Elements of South-Indian Palaeography from the fourth to the seventh Century AD, being an Introduction to the Study of South-Indian Inscriptions and Mss*, Trubner & Co., London 1978, 2nd edition “enlarged and improved” [1st edn, Mangalore 1874], pp. 89-90: “… in S. India and Ceylon … palm-leaves have always been used for this (= letter writing) purpose up to recent times. For this purpose a strip of palm-leaf is cut in the usual form, and smearsed with turmeric or some similar colour for ornament. The ends are split a little way to secure the whole which is folded in a ring, and then fastened by a thread. The earliest complete description of such a letter that I know of is in the middle of the 16th century in De Battos’ ‘Asia’; he says: ‘As outras coussas, que serve ao modo de nossas cartas mesiuas e escriptura comum, basta ser a folha escrita e enrolada em si e por chancella atase com qualquer linha, ou neruo da mesma palma.”

I uncoiled yet a third roll; here I could read some but not at all. What I gathered from the three rolls is the following.

3.1 Palm Leaf Roll 1

This is rather a small document, with a length of 22.8 cm and a width of 2.5 cm (see Fig. 11.5). There are 4 lines of writing on the recto side and one and half lines on the verso. I could decipher just a little at the beginning and at the end. The beginning states that this is a document issued in the year Vibhava on Śrāvaṇa śuddha 1. The document is addressed to Telidevulapalli—bhōṭu, ditto Guvvaḥbhōṭu, and ditto Pullambhōṭu. At the end of the document is the signature of the scribe: “This is the handwriting (dastūri) of Mantri Veṃkayya.” It is followed by the signature of the person on whose name the document is issued. The signature reads “Koṭappa vrālu”. In Telugu legal documents, it is customary to write “vrālu” after the signature.

3.2 Palm Leaf Roll 2

The second document is 43.0 cm long and 2.3 cm wide and carries 3 lines of writing on each side. I could decipher a little more in this document, which was issued in the year Pramādin (1819-20 or 1879-80) on Yeṣṭha bahula 12. It was addressed to Telidevulapalli Rāmakṛṣṇamma, ditto Gurumūrti, ditto Piccayya. Probably these three are brothers and joint holders of some agricultural land. The document is issued by a farmer named Cuṃcu Koṭappa. He took from the three

25 The Telugu expression is “ā”; I understand this to mean that Guvvaḥbhōṭu also has the same family name “Telidevulapali.”

26 Several families still bear this name in my village. These are rich landholders, belonging to the Kamma caste.
persons mentioned above a piece of land on lease (kavulu); he owes (runam) them the lease money which he cannot pay now; he promises to pay it by Mārgiśīrṣa ba 30 of the same year… [which is about 6 months hence]. The document concludes with the signatures of the farmer, the scribe and the witnesses.

3.3 Palm Leaf Roll 3

The third roll is much larger with a length of 33.2 cm and width of 2.4 cm. There are 6 lines of writing on the recto and 5 lines on the verso. I was able to read much of this document if not the whole and feel that the document records a very important event in the history of the family. Fortunately it is dated both in the year of the Jovian cycle and in the Christian era.

The document begins by stating that “This is an agreement (kharā-runāma) caused to be written in the year Nala, on the 11th day of the dark half of Bhādrapada, that is, in 1856 September, on the date (tedī) 23, by the purohitas of the Vulichi village Mámi/l5dotbelow/l5dotbelowapalli Bucca/m5dotbelowbho/t5dotbelowlu, ditto Kanaka/m5dotbelowbho/t5dotbelowlu, ditto Ko/t5dotbelowappa.” Bucca/m5dotbelowbho/t5dotbelowlu and Kanakambhoṭṭu are probably brothers. The third one apparently was Kanakambhoṭṭu’s son; at the end of the document, he signs on his father’s behalf.

The agreement deals with the partition of the agricultural lands (mānya/m) which were endowed to the family by the village for performing the paurohitya. Therefore it is emphasised that the partition is done in accordance with the adjudication made by the village clerk (kara/nam) and the senior land-holders (pedda kāpulu). The fields are situated in three different locations, to the west of the village, to the east, and on the banks of a water reservoir. These are now divided between the two brothers, both sharing the liabilities and incomes.

The document concludes by stating that “This is the agreement caused to be written with our approval.” Then follow the signature of Buccambhoṭṭu, signature of Koṭappa on behalf of his father Kanakambhoṭṭu; signature of the scribe (vulichi koṃḍalarāyuḍu dastūri), and the signatures of four witnesses.

I recall from my childhood that we had holdings in these three locations; and at each place there were two equal halves, one belonging to us and the other to our immediate neighbours who likewise shared the paurohitya of the village. Now I know that the partition was done on 23 September 1856.
4.0 Production and Collection of Manuscripts

As shown above, these palm leaf manuscripts were produced by individual Brahmins for their own use or for the use of their family members. In one rare instance, the manuscript was produced for the purpose of dāna.

It must be added that the nine manuscripts and six palm leaf rolls that I retrieved do not constitute the whole collection of the chest. As this chest was known in the family as “the chest of palm leaf books”, I assume that it contained mainly documents made of palm leaves; later paper documents were also added. In my childhood, there used to be many more manuscripts in the chest and the family tried to preserve these documents as best as they could, but several were damaged through the generally humid climate of the sea coast and the frequent cyclones. But the few that remain suggest the nature of the collection in this śrotriya family: primarily Sanskrit texts connected with the family’s Vedic śākhā and with the family’s profession of paurohiya, some poetry of the devotional kind, some Telugu texts of similar nature.

The chest is referred to as “grandfather’s chest”. It was never specified who this grandfather was, nor did I ask this question until now. The personal names inscribed in the manuscripts point mainly to two families: Telidevulapalli and Mamilappalli. The first is the family of my grandmother’s father; the second is the family into which my grandmother’s father’s sister was married. These two families are thus mutually related, and the manuscripts of both families are in this collection. One of these manuscripts contained a clue to the possible owner of the chest. In the manuscript containing the Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta (see 2.9 above), on the verso side of the last folio of this section, there is the signature of my grandmother’s father “Telidevulapalli Ātreyulu” and the date “vrṣa-nāma-saṃvatsara-phālguna-śuddha 5.” Vṛṣa is the 15th year of the Jovian cycle and corresponds to AD 1821-22 or 1881-82. In the case of my grandmother’s father, 1881-82 would be more appropriate, and Phālguna śuddha 5 would then translate to Wednesday 22 February 1882. Is this the date on which he acquired the manuscript or the date when he read the Kṛṣṇakarnāmṛta? Whatever

---

27 See sections 2.1, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2.
28 See section 3.3.
29 Therefore the manuscript in question must have been copied prior to this date, namely in 1826, 1829, 1832.
be the case, he appears to be “the” grandfather who owned the chest and who collected the manuscripts that were preserved in the chest.\(^{30}\) The manuscripts preserved in the chest were mainly produced in the family, but the grandfather appears to have also collected those produced elsewhere. Three manuscripts clearly came from outside the family. The *Varṣaphala* of 1842-43 (see 2.8 above) was composed and scribed by Purāṇaṁ Linganna at a place called Kalvakūru which is some 80 km distant from my village. The manuscript containing texts on *Gṛhya* and *Purāṇic* ritual (see 2.4) was copied still farther away in or near Karnāṭaka. It is not known where Pālaparti Kṛṣṇamma copied the *Kṛṣṇakarnāṃṭa* and other texts during the years from 1826 to 1832 (see 2.9), but he does not seem to belong to the circle of our relatives.

5.0 Epilogue

This account shows that palm leaf manuscripts were actively produced and collected till the end of the nineteenth century in my area in the coastal Andhra Pradesh. I regret my narrative is rather incoherent, partly because I cannot identify the personal names found in the manuscripts, partly because of my inability to fully decipher the legal documents in the palm leaf rolls. I wish, had this workshop organised some ten years earlier; then I could have at least consulted my father’s best friend who could read the legal documents and perhaps also identify many of the persons mentioned there. My father, of course, would have asked: why perform *gata-jala-setu-bandhanam*? Why build a bridge across waters which are no more there? But then isn’t that what we Indologists do much of the time?

Postscript: On a visit to Vadodara in October 2008, I donated the palm leaf books and rolls to the Oriental Institute of the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, retaining for myself the two manuscripts of the *Varṣaphala* and *Kṛṣṇakarnāṃṭa*, and one of the palm leaf rolls.

\(^{30}\) His son who lived into the twentieth century did not collect palm leaf manuscripts any more but only printed books, on each of which he signed in English with a flourish “This book belongs to …”
This small text is constituted by four different strands: i. enumeration of the incarnations (verse 1), ii. time of the day of descent of each avatāra (verse 2), (iii) the lunar tithi of each descent (verses 3-8), and (iv) the praise of each avatāra in association of with the tithi (verses 9-30). These four strands do not agree on the identity of the eighth and ninth avatāras. In the first strand, they are [Bala]rāma and Buddha; in the second they are Buddha and Kṛṣṇa; in the third and fourth Balabhadra (i.e. Balarāma) and Kṛṣṇa. Consequently, the time of Balarāma’s descent is missing, so too the tithi of Buddha’s manifestation. Again within each strand there are inconsistencies or at least lacunae. In the fourth strand, the praise concludes with the refrain gṛhārghyam mayā dattam which is missing in the case of Vāmana. Likewise, the tithi of Narasiṁha’s manifestation is missing in this strand. Verse 7 correctly places Kṛṣṇa’s birthday on Śrāvana kṛṣṇa, but verse 27 has it on śukla 8. Finally, while verse 2 states that Kalkin will manifest himself in the evening (sāyam), verse 29 mentions the time as that of sunrise (sūryodayaveḷāyam). Even so, it is an interesting text. I have silently corrected the orthography and numbered the verses; metrical and syntactical anomalies are reproduced as they are, but these are underlined.

matyaḥ kūrmo varāhaś ca narasiṁhaś ca vāmanaḥ /
rāmaḥ rāmaś ca rāmaś ca bauddhaḥ kalkim eva ca\textsuperscript{31} //1//
ahnor madhye vāmana d rāmacandro kroḍāditye cāparāhne vibhaṅge /
matyaḥ kūrmo bauddha-kalkyaḥ ca sāyaṁ kṛṣṇo rātrau kālasandhyā
nṛṣimhaḥ //2//
caitre tu kṛṣṇapaṇcamyāṁ bhagavāṁ matsyarūpabhrī /
jyeṣṭhakṛṣṇa-caturdaśyāṁ kūrmaraṇaḥ bhavedd hariḥ //3//
caitrakṛṣṇa-trayodasaḥ hariḥ vārāharūpabhrī /
narasiṁhaḥ caturdaśyāṁ vaiśākhe śuklapakṣake //4//
māse bhāḍrapade śukle dvādaśyāṁ vāmamo hariḥ /
mārgaṁadvidyāyāṁ rāmam paraśurūpabhrī\textsuperscript{32} //5//
caitrasuddhanavyāyāṁ tu rāmo daśarathātmajaḥ /
śukle trīṭyāvaiśākhe balabhadro ṇaḥvedd hariḥ //6//
kṛṣṇāṣṭamāyāṁ nabhomāśe krṣṇo bhūlokaraṇkṣakāḥ /
nabhaye ca dvitiyāyāṁ śukle kalkir bhaviṣyati //7//

\textsuperscript{31} A more popular and metrically correct reading is buddhaḥ kalki ca te daśa //
\textsuperscript{32} MS त्र।
viṣṇuḥ dasāvatārāṇāṁ tithayor atyantapunyayoh /
uposaitāṁ narair etān tithayo muktidāyakāḥ //8//
vedānāṁ apahartus ca saumukhākhyasya rakṣasah /
vinaśānāya ca bhūmavai vedānāṁ śhāpanāya ca //9//
caitrakṣe tu pañcanyāṁ mahāmatsyavitārābhāk /
ghrāṅgryāṁ mayā dattaṁ mahalakṣmyā hare saha //10//
yeṣṭhe kṛṣṇa-caturdaśyāṁ kārmarañsadharāya ca /
bhūbhāravanārāṁtyā va grhāṅgryāṁ namo'stu te //11//
bhuvi sahadbhī nirmagnāṁ kroḍarūpa janārdana/
daṃśtrayor dhurate tubhyam arghyam dāśyāṁ upoṣitaḥ //12//
caitrakṣa-trayodaśyāṁ harir vārāharūpanbhṛt //33//
grhāṅgryāṁ mayā dattaṁ vrataṁ suvatam astu te //13//
hiranyakavadhārdhāya prahlādānugrāhāya ca /
sarvalokārthāhāya stambhe jāto nyāsariḥ //14//
duṣṭadāityaprāśamanam sadā sajanapālaśaṁ / //34//
grhāṅgryāṁ mayā dattaṁ stambhaṁ jāto svayaṁ hariḥ //15//
taptahāṭakakshaṁ jvalatpāvakalocana /
vajrāyadhanabhasparśaṁ divyasimha namo 'tu te //16//
vāmanāpharyena ? site nabhaśya saśrone śma(m)dhyānadvādaśi-
dine /
bandhanāya baler jāto vāmanāṛgyam namo'stu te //17//
vāmanā(ā)ya va to tubhyam dānaṁ chatradhārīne /
kamandāludharāṁ devaṁ kājinam labhate namah //18//
suraraṇyaṁ pratisthāpya aditer garbhavāridhau /
vāmanāyaṁ samabhāryacaskapo brāhmaṇo varāṁ //19//
mārgaśīrṣe kṛṣnapakṣe dvitiyāyaṁ bhṛghoḥ suṭah /
śrimatparaśurāmo'tra jātaḥ somānyakṣaye //20//
grhāṅgryāṁ mayā dattaṁ brahmācarye vidhiyate /
dāśānapāvadārdhāya bhūbhārotrānāya ca //21//
paritrāṇāya sādhūnāṁ jāto rāmaḥ svayaṁ hariḥ //
caitramāse site pakṣe navamyāṁ ca punarvasau //22//
madhyāhne karkate lagne jāto rāmaḥ svayaṁ hariḥ /
kausalyāgarbhasaṁ bhūta rāvaṁ rāghava //23//
grhāṅgryāṁ mayā dattaṁ sitāya saha rāghava /
tretāyakṣatṛtiyāyaṁ vaiśākhe yaduvanāśajāḥ //24//
balabhadrāvatāreṇa grhāṅgryaṁ namo'stu te /

//33 MS ‘drk.
//34 The sentence is incomplete. Perhaps a line is missing here, which contains the
verb related to the words in the accusative, and also the tithi of Narasimha’s descent.
Accordingly, the ten incarnations manifested themselves on the following lunar *tithis* at the given segments of the day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Incarnation</th>
<th><em>tithi</em></th>
<th>Segment of the Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Matsya</td>
<td>Cātra</td>
<td>kr 5 sāyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kūrma</td>
<td>Jyeṣṭha</td>
<td>kr 14 sāyaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Varāha</td>
<td>Cātra</td>
<td>kr 13 aparāhṇe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nārasimha</td>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>śu 14 sandhyāyāṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vāmana</td>
<td>Bhādrapada</td>
<td>śu 12 madhyāhne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parāśurāma</td>
<td>Mārgaśira</td>
<td>kr 2 aparāhṇe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rāma</td>
<td>Cātra</td>
<td>śu 9 aparāhṇe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Balarāma</td>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>śu 3 …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddha</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>Śrāvaṇa</td>
<td>kr/sū 8 rātrau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kalkin</td>
<td>Āśādha</td>
<td>śu 2 sāyam/sūryodayavelāyāṃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GRANDFATHER’S PALM LEAF BOOKS*
Appendix II: Varṣaphala

by Purāṇaṃ Limanna, son of Limayya, of Kaśyapa-gotra, and resident of Kalvakūrī for the year Śubhaktī / Kali 4943 / Śālivāhana Śaka 1764 (AD 1842-43).

Beginning:
śrīrāma // subham astu // avighnam astu // subhakṛt-nāma-saṃvat-sara-paṇcāṅgam //
śrīmad-vāgīśa-lakṣmīsa-gauriśādy-akhilāmaraḥ /
yāḥ pujyate mudā nityam taṁ vande dvirādānanam //
acintyāyaktarūpāya nirgunāya guṇātmane /
śrīmad-vāgīśa-lakṣmīsa-gauriśādy-akhilāmaraḥ /
vāgīśādyāḥ sumanasah sarvarthānāṃ upakrame /
yāṁ nataśa kṛtakṛtyāḥ syas taṁ namāmi gajānanam //
śrīmad-vāgīśa-lakṣmīsa-gauriśādy-akhilāmaraḥ /
svāmī viṣṇum ahaṁ gajānanam śrīkalvakūrī purī //
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
svāmī viṣṇum ahaṁ gajānanam śrīkalvakūrī purī //
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
śrīmatkaśyapa-gotra-vani yo śrīmān purāṇaṃvyaya /
End

vindhyāsottaradēśe bārhaspatyamānābdo grāhyah / bārhaspatya-
mānenaParidhāvī saṃvatsarah vaisākha ba 9 paryantam ata ārdhān
pramādica nāma saṃvatsarah / taddakṣiṇadēśe cāndramānābdo
grāhyah / cāndramānena śūbhaṅkṛt nāma saṃvatsarah / śeṣaṅcalasya
dakṣiṇadēśe sauramānābdo grāhyah / sauramānena caitra śu 1
prabhṛty ataḥ param śūbhaṅkṛt nāma saṃvatsarah / Pañcānga-
sravaṇa-phalam āha /

kanyāvanikāñcanadiggajānaṁ gavāṁ sahasraṁ satataṁ dvijebhyah /
datvā phalam yallabhate manusyaṁ tattat-phalān abdaphalam śṛṇu tā/

śrīkṛṣṇārpanam astu / śrī śrī śrī ...
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