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FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

SANSKRIT LITERATURE is vast and comprehensive. Its period of literary activity is longer than the period of literary activity of any other literature in the world. In intrinsic merit it is second to none. History is supposed to be the only weak spot. As far as political history is concerned, the alleged weakness is not quite apparent. Kalhana, the author of Rājatarāṅgini has stated that he utilised eleven previous histories for writing his own famous chronicles of the kings, and he found numerous histories in the royal archives which were eaten by worms and had become illegible and could not therefore be utilised. This statement of Kalhana clearly shows that political histories were written in Sanskrit.

But, so far as history of literature is concerned, there is no evidence to show that any history of Sanskrit literature was ever written in any Indian language. This is a modern development and has been introduced in our country by western Indologists. Most of the histories of Sanskrit literature are written by European and American scholars. It is, however, obvious that foreigners, howsoever cultured, cannot thoroughly appreciate or deeply enter into the spirit of the literature of a race or community which differs so widely in civilisation, culture, philosophy, art and outlook on life. Literature of a race or community is the outcome of heredity, environments, geographical situation, climatic conditions and political institutions. It is, therefore, a difficult task for a foreigner to interpret accurately the literature of another race or community. It is time that Indians themselves wrote histories of their own literature and themselves interpreted the underlying spirit thereof. On this ground alone, I should welcome this History of Sanskrit Literature written by Mr. H. R. Aggarwal, M.A.

Mr. Aggarwal is a scholar of repute and a Fuller Exhibitioner and Gold Medallist of the Panjab University. It is a happy sign of the times that Indians have begun to take interest in the history of their own literature. He is the first Punjaee and I think one of the very few Indians to write a history of
Sanskrit literature. At present, there is no work available which may suit the needs of the undergraduate students and help them in the study of the history of Sanskrit literature, as most of the histories available are of too high a standard for them. This book has been specially written with a view to satisfying the needs of the undergraduates. He has taken great pains in writing this history, and I have no doubt that this will eminently serve the needs of those for whom it is intended.

March, 1939.  

Lakshman Sarup
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

History of Sanskrit Literature has been my special subject. Even while I was a student of the IV Year class I wrote the following in the college magazine:

"It is a matter of surprise to me as to why some of the Indian Sanskrit scholars do not take upon themselves the task of writing an authenticated history of Sanskrit literature. It is a disgrace to the whole Indian community that even for the study of its own cultural language it has to depend upon materials collected and the works composed by foreigners. We—at least those who having become scholars think it not proper to enter this field and the others who cannot derive any benefit from them at least in this field—ought to be grateful to these western scholars although it is true that they did not labour for our sake......

"We find some works on the history of Sanskrit literature by Indians as well, but sorry to say, that they seem to have taken no pains in their compilation. They have thought it proper to follow the western scholars without going through the original texts or even doubting the truth of their writings....

"Macdonell is an able successor of Max Müller. He has written a history of Sanskrit literature. A cursory reading of it shows that many of his remarks are off-hand....

"On p. 332 he writes, 'Vāsavadattā by Subandhu relates the popular story of the heroine Vāsavadattā, princess of Ujjayini, and Udayana, king of Vatsa.' It is a mistake no less than if an Indian were to say that The Merchant of Venice by Shakespeare relates the story of Macbeth.' I do not know how many Europeans would there be who would excuse this supposed Indian, yet there are Indians who regard such mistakes as trivial in spite of the fact that a great responsibility lies upon such distinguished writers who are taken by many as absolute authorities....

"Even Indian scholars like Mahesh Prasad B.A. and

M. Chakravarty M.A. have been misled by this credulous nature of theirs and have committed the same mistake in their works simply because they followed Macdonell.

"It is a matter of joy to learn that Keith has been able to correct a part of it by saying that the hero was Kandarpaketu, but he is also mistaken inasmuch as he calls Vāsavadattā the princess of Pāṭaliputra while she was actually that of Kusumapura..."  

I have had to quote this long extract from the article because it is in a way responsible for the writing of this book. When I wrote the article, fourteen years ago, I had no idea of doing my M.A. in Sanskrit. I could then little foresee that I would have to undertake this arduous task myself one day. But once when in a moment of leisure I chanced to see this article, the opening words of the extract, "Why do some of the Indian Sanskrit scholars not take upon themselves the task of writing an authenticated history of Sanskrit literature," began to din in my ears and I felt honour-bound to make a sincere attempt in my own humble way. I am fully conscious of the voluminous nature of the task and my own limited capacity; the present work is yet far from the realisation of my dream, still I have agreed to its being published, feeling 'something is better than nothing.'

This book is intended for the students appearing in the B.A. and B.A. Hons. examinations of the various Indian universities. Several years of practical teaching experience of the subject has enabled me to visualise somewhat the main difficulties of the Indian student and I have tried to solve them here as far as possible.

My chief aim in the writing of this book has been to make the subject easier and more attractive to the students of Sanskrit literature. To achieve that end, I have mainly followed the analytical method and have preferred, for example, to give a complete account of the master-poet Kālidāsa in one place rather than describe him in three different places as a mahākāvyā writer, as a dramatist and as a lyric writer. The simplicity of language has been aimed at, and the results arrived

1. I did not then take into consideration the identity of Pāṭaliputra with Kusumapura.
at by modern research have been incorporated wherever possible. According to the dictum of Mallinātha, this work includes all that is important and excludes all that is unimportant from the point of view of students.

I am deeply grateful to the various authorities—the notable among them being Professors Macdonell, Keith, Winternitz, Peterson, Thomas, Hopkins, Rapson, Pargiter and Edgerton—whom I have consulted in the preparation of this book and have specifically acknowledged in the footnotes. My special thanks are due to my revered teacher Dr. Lakshman Sarup, M.A., D. PHIL., Officier d’ Academie, Professor of Sanskrit, University of the Panjab, Lahore, at whose feet I sat and learnt much that is contained in this work. I am also deeply indebted to him for his having taken pains in writing the Foreword to this work.

_Baisakhi, 1939_                      H. R. AGGARWAL
PREFACE TO THE PRESENT SECOND EDITION

This book primarily deals with a short history of the classical period of Sanskrit literature, but in order to comprehend the spirit that underlies this important phase of Indian literature rightly, it is desirable to know the outline of Vedic literature. Many Indian Universities have included it in their syllabus for post-graduate studies. I have, therefore, thought it fit to add this portion in the appendix so that students of Sanskrit learning who have a yearning for a study of the literature of the more ancient Vedic period may benefit by the same.

The first edition of this book was printed more than two decades ago. It fulfilled a long-felt need and the book soon went out of print. Many friends and scholars had pressingly desired me to bring out a new edition, but the medium of instruction in many universities had become Hindi and hence I was busy in first bringing out its Hindi edition and then a Sanskrit edition (Saṁskṛta Sāhityetihāsah—A Short History of Sanskrit Literature in Sanskrit) which took a very long time indeed, and then the political upheaval and other difficulties such as obtaining paper, finding a suitable press combined with my arduous official duties left me no alternative but to postpone its publication from year to year. Hence my sincere apology to all concerned for this late appearance of this edition.

The votaries of Sanskrit are proud of calling Sanskrit as amara bhāṣā. It is immortal and undying like the soul with which it primarily concerns. There is an innate desire in every human soul to know ‘Who am I?’, ‘Where from have I come?’, ‘What is the goal of my life?’, ‘How to find real happiness?’, etc. This yearning of the human mind is eternal. As Sanskrit literature fulfils it most satisfactorily, it is bound to continue as a living force and potent vehicle for the preservation and transmission of this lofty ideal. While answering ‘What is knowledge?’ Lord Kṛṣṇa said in the Bhagavadgītā (Ch. XIII, 7-11): “Absence of pride, freedom from hypocrisy, non-violence, forgiveness, straightforwardness, service of the preceptor, purity of mind and body, steadfastness, self-control, (st. 7); dispassion towards the objects of senses, and absence
of egoism, constant revolving in mind of the pain and evil inherent in birth, death, old age and disease (st. 8); absence of attachment, absence of self-identification with son, wife, home, etc.; constant balance of mind both in favourable and unfavourable circumstances (st. 9); unflinching devotion to the lord through exclusive attachment of mind, living in secluded and sacred places, absence of pleasure in the company of men (st. 10); fixity in self-knowledge, observing everywhere the object of true knowledge (God)—all this is declared to be knowledge (wisdom); What is contrary to this is called ignorance (st. 11)”.

‘Fixity in self-knowledge’ is the kernel of what is noblest in Sanskrit literature. The great German philosopher Schoepenhauer once said, ‘The Upaniṣads are the solace of my life; They will be the solace of my death.’ Someone has aptly said, “Who lives if Sanskrit dies and who dies if Sanskrit lives?”

Some scholars who are not fully conversant with the spirit of Sanskrit literature are inclined to call it a dead language like Greek and Latin, mainly because it has ceased to be a spoken language. On examination, however, it becomes clear that there are potent signs of life in the Sanskrit language. There are numerous families in India whose mother language is Sanskrit. Śāstrārthaś are frequently held in Sanskrit among the Pāṇḍits. Literary discussions, dialogues, recitation contests, staging of Sanskrit plays old and modern, and other such-like literary activities in Sanskrit are occasionally held throughout the length and breadth of India. More than twelve¹ magazines are published in Sanskrit from various parts of India. Whatever language an Indian speaks, it is directly borrowed from Sanskrit or is greatly affected by the same. Whatever thought an average Indian conceives it bears the impress of Sanskrit literature. There is a proverb that says: Vyāsocciṣṭaṁ jagat sarvaṁ, ‘there is no topic in the world which Vyāsa has not touched’. Sanskrit is not only the cultural language of the masses and the classes, but is also politically important because it possesses unique unifying values. From the extreme north to the extreme

¹ Important among them are: Saṁskṛti (daily), Poona; Saṁskṛtaṁ (weekly), Ayodhya; Divya Jyotiḥ (monthly), Simla; Bhāratī (monthly), Jaipur; Saṁskṛta Ratnākara (monthly), Banaras; Śāradā (monthly), Poona.
south and from the extreme east to the extreme west of India the daily life of a Hindu from birth to death is governed by the same *saṁskāras*, the same *mantras* being recited on each occasion everywhere. A follower of the Purāṇas living in northern India has the same reverence for Ramesvaram (a place of pilgrimage in extreme south) as a follower of the Purāṇas living in southern India has for Amarnath and Badarinath in the Himalayas. Similarly a devotee of Sanskrit living in the east has the same reverence for Dvaraka in the extreme west as one in the west of India has for Jagannatha Puri in the east. No other circumstance can be potent enough to exert such a powerful unifying influence. The day the study of Sanskrit literature is ignored, the cultural and political unity of India will crumble into pieces.

Verily Sanskrit is regarded by many as the *Kāmadhenu*, as the cow that fulfils all our cherished desires. Without the study of Sanskrit, we cannot master the different regional languages, nor comprehend and appreciate their comparative study. The study of Sanskrit is equally important for the development of technical terminology in the various fields of science and literature. Sanskrit literature provides us with a unique record of our ancient history, religious, cultural, political and social. If we are in search of a mirror that can adequately reflect our past, if we want to understand our culture and civilisation thoroughly, if we want a career here and hereafter, if we want to realise the harmony between body and soul, then Sanskrit must be studied.

*Volume of Unpublished Works*. From time immemorial knowledge has been passed on from one generation to another through oral tradition either by *vamśa-paramparā* (i.e., handed down from father to son in the same family) or by *guru-paramparā*, (i.e., from preceptor to disciple by oral tradition). It was the sacred duty of the preceptor to find out a worthy disciple and pass on his whole knowledge to him; otherwise, it was enjoined, he would not attain salvation and would come to take re-birth. Gradually there was decline in the *medhā-śakti* of man and need arose for writing books on birch-bark, palm-leaf, copper and earthen plates and bark of the trees. Mostly these manuscripts are on palm-leaves. Few manuscripts go beyond the 14th century. Thousands of these manuscripts were burnt to ashes by the foreign invaders and have been lost to
us for ever. Still it is no exaggeration to say that the literature now available to us in the form of manuscripts perhaps exceeds in volume the number of published books in Sanskrit. Numerous manuscripts were collected and exported to foreign countries like China, Japan, Germany and England from time to time. Still several thousand manuscripts lie scattered all over the country in the houses of the Pāṇḍits, in the temples and in the Maṭhas, etc. It is the sacred duty of the Union and the State Governments to make a vigorous search for these manuscripts and preserve them in safety, because even if a single leaf is lost through want of care or wear and tear, that knowledge world be lost to humanity for ever.

Be it said to the credit of western scholars that they have worked zealously and faithfully for the collection of the manuscript-material in India. The Asiatic Society was established in 1784 for this purpose. The first list of the first collection of Royal Asiatic Society prepared by Sir William Jones and Lady Jones appeared in 1807.

Henry Thomas Colebrook (1765-1837) was appointed President of Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta) in 1807 and did laudable work in this capacity. Thousands of MSS. were collected. First seven collections of the same were published during 1817-1934. The eighth collection was published in 1939-40 by Chintaharan Chakravarty and the tenth was published in 1945 by Chandrasen Gupta.

Max Müller (1823-1900) drew the attention of the western world that huge literature existed in India in manuscript form which need be collected and collated.

Research Institutes were established in Bengal, Bombay and Madras in 1866 and Dr Bühler (1837-98) was appointed President of the Bombay Research Institute. He made a valuable collection of about 2,300 MSS. Some of them are lying at the Elphinston College, some were sent to the Berlin University and the remaining to the India Office.

Dr Weber (1825-1901) prepared a huge list of the MSS. collected at the Berlin University. Aufrecht got published the list of MSS. lying at the Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1869. Soon after, James D. Alice got a list published of Indian Sanskrit MSS. from Colombo in 1870.

At India Office, London, the first list of collected MSS. was
published by A. C. Burnell in 1870, the second in two parts by Julius Eggling in 1887-96, and the subsequent lists by Keith and Thomas in 1935 and Oldenberg in 1942 respectively.

Thereafter the work of collection of Sanskrit MSS. started more vigorously in India. MSS. were collected from Gujarat, Kathiawar and Sindh and their first list was published from Bombay in 1871-3. During 1871-90, The Notices of Sanskrit MSS. appeared in eleven parts, the first nine by Rajendralal Mitra and the other two by Har Prasad Shastry. The List of Sanskrit MSS. of Central India was published from Nagpur by Kielhorn in 1874. Another list of the Bombay MSS. was published by him in 1881. A Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore was published by A. C. Burnell in 1880 from London. Thereafter, a list of the MSS. lying at the Royal Saraswati Palace at Tanjore was published by P. P. S. Shastry in 19 parts. This library alone contains over 25,000 Sanskrit MSS.

There was considerable activity in this field in the last two decades of the 19th century. A catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. of the south was published in two volumes in 1880 and 1885. The lists of Sanskrit MSS. of Oudh were published in many parts between 1881-1893 by Pt. Devi Prasad. A catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. of the British Museum, London, was published in 1883. In the same year were also published the lists of the Sanskrit and Pali MSS. of Cambridge University Library.

An important catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. of Bombay Presidency was published by Peterson in 6 volumes between 1883-88. The list of Sanskrit MSS. of Mysore and Coorg was published from Bangalore in 1884.

Laudable work has been done at the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras. Its first catalogue appeared in 1893. Since then 29 volumes have been published under the supervision of different editors among whom S. Kuppuswamy Shastri deserves special mention. Useful work was also done on the Sanskrit MSS. of Bombay Presidency under the supervision of R. G. Bhandarkar.

The catalogue of Royal Asiatic Society deserves special notice. Its eleventh volume was published by Har Prasad Shastry in 1895.

Dr Aufrecht did commendable work by compiling the
different catalogues available to him and publishing an exhaustive catalogue known as *Catalogus Catalogorum* in three volumes in 1891, 1896 and 1903 from Leipzig. A revised and enlarged edition of this work has been brought out by Dr V. Raghavan and Dr C. Kunhan Raja under the title of *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. Its first volume was published by the Madras University in 1949.

In this manner, the work of the collection of Sanskrit manuscripts is going on at various centres throughout the country with vigour. At Saraswati Bhawan Library, Varanasi, alone, there exists a collection of over one and a quarter lakh Sanskrit manuscripts, out of which 16,000 were catalogued in eight volumes between 1953-58. A useful catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. at Jaisalmer has been published in the Gaekwar Oriental Series No. 21. A catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. at Trivandrum Govt. Library has also been published in eight volumes. A good collection of Sanskrit MSS. exists also at the Vishveshvarananda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, where commendable research work is being done under the supervision and guidance of Acharya Vishvabandhu Shastri.

There are still thousands of manuscripts lying scattered all over the country with individuals and at temples as well as monasteries. This is our rich national heritage which must be preserved at all costs. There is a vast field before the Sanskrit scholar. Uncatalogued MSS. have to be catalogued; catalogued MSS. have to be sorted out and their relative importance estimated; rare MSS. have to be edited critically with notes and commentaries wherever necessary. This is not a work of months and years but of decades and centuries which cannot be done without the patronage of the Government. There are numerous rare and very important MSS. in foreign libraries, too. Efforts should be made to get them in India by purchase, exchange or as gift, or else the Government of India should procure their photostat or microfilm copies and make them available to the Sanskrit scholars.

*Central Sanskrit Commission.* After the attainment of political independence in 1947, there was naturally a great public demand for the revival of Sanskrit language and literature. The voluntary organisations like Sanskrit Sahitya Sammelan, International Congress of Orientalists, All India Oriental Conference,
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Indian Philosophical Conference, Linguistic Society of India, and Indian History Congress became more active. In May 1951, the World Academy of Sanskrit (Sanskrit Vishva Parishad) was founded at the historic site of Somnath with the late Dr Rajendra Prasad, the then President of India, as life president and Sri K. M. Munshi, the then Food Minister of India, as chairman. In response to the resolutions of these and other similar bodies, the Government of India appointed a central Sanskrit Commission in October 1956, with Dr Suniti Kumar Chatterji as chairman. The Commission submitted a comprehensive report to the Government on November 30, 1957.

Central Sanskrit Board. In pursuance of the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission, the Government of India set up in 1959 the Central Sanskrit Board with a view to advising the Government on matters relating to the propagation and development of Sanskrit.

A scheme for financial assistance to voluntary Sanskrit organisations, institutions, and Pāṭhaśālās, etc. has been formulated. An ad hoc grant has been given to 12 Sanskrit journals for improvement of their content and quality. A Special Officer has been appointed in the Education Ministry of the Government to look after the work relating to the propagation and development of Sanskrit. A scheme has been formulated for the award of Research Scholarships to the products of traditional Sanskrit Pāṭhaśālās. Eminent Sanskrit scholars have been addressed by the Education Ministry inviting suggestions for the evolution of a simplified form of Sanskrit so that people may be able to learn it easily. This is the need of the day. Further, a scheme for the printing of popular, out-of-print and rare Sanskrit works has also been drawn up. A Central Sanskrit Institute has been set up at Tirupati (Andhra) for training Sanskrit teachers and for research in improved methods of teaching Sanskrit. Steps have been taken to collect necessary information in regard to defunct Trusts and the Endowments specifically earmarked for Sanskrit. On the advice of the Central Sanskrit Board, the Education Ministry of the Govt. has further decided to prepare a National Register of Sanskrit Paṇḍits.

For the Third Five-Year plan, an amount of Rs. 75 lakhs has been allocated by the Ministry for the development of Sanskrit
as under:

(i) Grants to voluntary Sanskrit organisations. 15.00
(ii) Production of literature for the popularisation, 7.50
propagation and enrichment of Sanskrit.
(iii) Scholarships Scheme for encouraging research
in Sanskrit. 5.00
(iv) Grants to State Governments. 9.50
(v) Modernising the Sanskrit Pāṭhaśālās. 10.00
(vi) Development of Gurukulaś. 10.00
(vii) Preparation of Dictionaries. 3.00
(viii) Providing facilities for the teaching of Sanskrit
in secondary schools. 4.00
(ix) Establishment of Central Sanskrit Institute. 10.00
(x) Implementation of other recommendations of
the Sanskrit Commission. 1.00

On the suggestion of the Central Sanskrit Board and taking
into consideration the cultural and unifying values of Sanskrit,
the Union Government has requested the State Governments
and the Secondary Education Board
(i) to encourage the composite course of a classical language
with the mother tongue or the regional language;
(ii) to make the passing in the classical language part of the
composite course compulsory; and
(iii) to assign a reasonable percentage, say 30 to 40 per cent,
to the classical language.

Research Work. Laudable research work has been done
by the Sanskrit departments of most Indian Universities and
the following research institutes:

1. Mithila Institute, Darbhanga.
2. B.J. Institute of Learning and Research, Ahmedabad.
3. Deccan College, Poona.
4. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
5. India-Asia Cultural Society, Calcutta.
6. Vishveshvarananda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur.
7. Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur.
8. Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain.
10. Oriental Institute, Baroda.
11. International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi.
12. The Asiatic Society, Calcutta.
13. Svadhyaya Mandala, Pardi.
14. The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras.
15. All India Kashmir Trust, Varanasi.
17. Institute of Indology, New Delhi.

**Fundamental Omissions.** 1. Several State Governments and Universities have reported that in spite of the numerous facilities granted to the scholars of Sanskrit, their number in Sanskrit Pāṭhasālās, schools and colleges is alarmingly on the decline. This ought to be a matter of great concern to all of us. It should be evident from this that all our schemes for the promotion of Sanskrit studies in the country are just like watering the leaves of a tree, whose root remains dry and unattended. Free studentships and free board and lodging cannot attract students to the Sanskrit Pāṭhasālās when they know that it affords no career for them. When the Britishers wanted to popularise English, they gave a Matriculate with a smattering knowledge of English a better standard than a Śāstrin today. Even after Independence, more or less the same state continues. The syllabus for Shastri Examination is practically the same as that of M.A. in Sanskrit. If the Government is really serious that the traditional Pāṭhasālās and Gurukula system should flourish, it should treat the Śāstrin at a par with the Master of Arts.

2. Before Partition, Sanskrit was grouped with other classical languages, Persian and Arabic, and a student at the school stage had to study any classical language out of this group. The result was that most Indian students chose to study Sanskrit. After Partition, Sanskrit has unfortunately been grouped with popular subjects like Drawing, Science, Tailoring, Music, Needle-work and Domestic Science, with the result that even the willing students are deprived of the opportunity of studying Sanskrit.

(3) The educationists at the helm seem to think that Hindi must be learnt, because it is our national language, the regional language must be learnt because it is of regional importance, English must be learnt because it is of international importance; if the study of the fourth language is also made compulsory, the language course will become heavy;
therefore, Sanskrit may be studied as an optional subject. It has been unfortunately ignored that proficiency in our national and regional languages is not possible without an adequate knowledge of Sanskrit. Besides, Sanskrit possesses unique unifying and cultural values. English may be more important to an Indian than other foreign languages, but it cannot be certainly more important to every Indian than our regional and classical languages. Those who want to go abroad or pursue an advanced course of scientific studies may learn English; facilities should be provided to them; but it should not be made a compulsory subject of study for every Indian student. India is perhaps the only unfortunate independent country in the world, where a foreign language is a compulsory subject of study and her cultural language is thrown to the background like this. As the author of this work happened to state in his evidence before the Sanskrit Commission, a student should be given the choice to study any three languages: (1) National language, (2) A regional language, (3) A classical language, (4) A foreign language (including English). In fact, a four-language course doesn't become heavy, because instruction in different languages starts at successive stages.

(4) The Higher Secondary system has thrown a bomb-shell on Sanskrit. Out of about a dozen groups, there exists an optional provision for Sanskrit, only in the Humanities group. In the other groups, there is absolutely no provision for Sanskrit. It has escaped the notice of the veteran educationists that Sanskrit is not a technical subject like other non-language subjects and that there is in Sanskrit a huge, scientific literature comprising all branches (Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Engineering, Medicine, Music, Astronomy, Science of manufacturing war material, etc.). In order that a student of Science may flourish in life like Sir J. C. Bose or Sir C. V. Raman, he should have an adequate knowledge of Sanskrit so that he may be able to make an advanced comparative study of Scientific literature in Sanskrit with the scientific literature in modern languages (western languages included).

We shall be politically, culturally and even economically strong if these sad omissions are rectified early.

Our Present-day Problems. A perusal of the resolutions passed at the seven sessions of the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad...
from 1951 to 1961 given in Appendix IV will give the reader an adequate idea of our present-day problems.

Before I conclude, it is my earnest duty to express my sincere and profound gratitude to Sri S. Balu Rao, Publication Assistant, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, who has gone through the press-copy and the proofs of this book. He has also made certain changes in the style of presentation without which the book would not have seen the light of the day in its present form. His rich experience in this line has been of great value to me in bringing out the book so well.

I am also to express my sincere thanks to Sri Manohar Lal Jain, Proprietor, Messrs. Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, the publishers, who readily and ungrudgingly undertook the publication of this work. Without his personal attention, the book would not have appeared this season.

Śrāvana Śukla 3, Samvat 2020
23 July, 1963

H. R. Aggarwal
CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTORY

CHAPTER II
THE POPULAR EPICS: RAMAYANA AND MAHABHARATA
The Origin of Epic Poetry—The Rāmāyana—The Mahābhārata—Inter-relation of the Two Epics.

CHAPTER III
THE PURANAS
The Origin of the Purāṇas—The Development of the Purāṇas—Contents—History in the Purāṇas—Ancient Genealogies—Date.

CHAPTER IV
BHASA
Bhāsa's Position in Sanskrit Literature—Do the Plays attributed to Bhāsa belong to the Same Author?—Bhāsa's Other Works: Yajñaphalaṁ, Viṣṇudharma—His Style—Date.

CHAPTER V
THE ARTHASAstra OF KAUTILYA
A Contribution of the Deccan—The Author—Date of the Work—Style.

CHAPTER VI
KALIDASA
Renaissance of the 1st Century B.C.—Kālidāsa and His Works—Mālavikāgnimitraṁ—Vikramaśīyam—Adbhījñāna Śākuntalam—Ritusamhāra—Meghaduṭa—Kumāra-
sambhavam—Raghuvamśa—The Genuine Portions of Kālidāsa’s Works—Recensions of the Plays—Date of Kālidāsa—His Thought and Style.  

CHAPTER VII

ASVAGHOSA

Aśvaghoṣa and His Dramatic Art—Buddhacaritam and Saundarāṇanda—His Other Works—His Style.

CHAPTER VIII

MAHAKAVYA

General Features—Bhāravi’s Kirātārjunīyam—Bhaṭṭi’s Rāvaṇavadhā (Bhaṭṭikāvya)—Māgha’s Śisupālavadhā—Ratnākara’s Harāvijaya—Śrīharṣa’s Naiṣadhiyam.

CHAPTER IX

KAVYA AND ITS AUTHORS


CHAPTER X

LYRIC POETRY AND ANTHOLOGIES


CHAPTER XI

HISTORICAL KAVYA

The Commencement of History in India—Bāṇa’s Harṣacaritam—Padmāgupta’s Navasāhasāṅkacaritam—Bilhaṇa’s Works—Kalhaṇa’s Rājataraṅgini—Minor Works.
CHAPTER XII
THE PROSE ROMANCE AND THE CAMPU
The Origin of the Prose Romance—Daṇḍin—Subandhu—Bāṇa—The Later Romances—The Campū.

CHAPTER XIII
THE POPULAR TALE

CHAPTER XIV
THE DIDACTIC FABLE

CHAPTER XV
THE DRAMA
APPENDIX I

THE VEDIC PERIOD

General Outline: Ṛgveda—General Description—Arrangement—Chronological Strata in Ṛgveda—Importance and the Age of the Ṛgveda—Its Interpretation—Religion and Philosophy in Ṛgveda—Subject-matter—Recensions—Accent—Metre. 214

The Later Vedas: Sāmaveda—Relation with other Vedas—Form—Division and Scope—Internal and Comparative Data—Commentaries—Recensions. 235

Ṛṣyveda: Śukla-Ṛṣyveda—Contents—Its Original Text—Commentators—Ṛṣy-Ṛṣyveda—Its Recensions and Commentaries—Date of the Ṛṣyveda. 237

Aṭhārvasveda—Traditional View about its Origin—Scope and Subject-matter—Recensions—Prominent Sages of Aṭhārvasveda 241

The Brāhmaṇas—Their Contents and Importance—Subject-matter—The Brāhmaṇas of Ṛgveda—of Ṛṣyveda—of Sāmaveda—of Aṭhārvasveda. 242

The Āraṇyakas—The Upaniṣads—The Śūtras and the Six Vedāṅgas—The Anukramanis—The Pariśiṣṭas. 245

APPENDIX II

How Sanskrit came to be known to the West. 255

APPENDIX III

The Origin of the Indian Alphabet. 258

APPENDIX IV

Resolutions of the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad. 264

APPENDIX V

Test Questions. 284

Questions of the Punjab University Examination. 286
APPENDIX VI

The Quotations in the Nāgarī Script. 293

INDEX

English Index 313
Sanskrit Index 316
TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION

The following scheme of transliteration has been followed in this work:

**Vowels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ए</th>
<th>े</th>
<th>ा</th>
<th>ी</th>
<th>ी</th>
<th>ऊ</th>
<th>ु</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ङ</th>
<th>े</th>
<th>ः</th>
<th>े</th>
<th>े</th>
<th>ः</th>
<th>े</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭh</td>
<td>ḍ</td>
<td>ḍh</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ</td>
<td>ṭh</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anusvāra** ń, m; **Visarga** ḷ.

In the Headings and Sub-headings which appear in bold face, no diacritical marks have been shown because of their non-availability.
INTRODUCTORY

1. Importance of Sanskrit Literature. The importance of Sanskrit literature cannot be overexaggerated. The high age, the wide geographical distribution, the extent and the wealth, the aesthetic value and still more the value from the point of view of the history of culture, would fully suffice to justify our interest in this great, original and ancient literature. But there are other features which lend a peculiar interest to the study of Sanskrit literature. Some main points are given below:

(a) The study of Sanskrit literature is of particular interest to the historian. It is not only a record of the history of the mental life of the inhabitants of vast India extending over more than 3,000 years, but it has also exerted in the past a remarkable influence on the mental life of other nations in Greater India, Tibet, China, Japan, Korea in the north, Ceylon in the south, distant Malay Peninsula and other Pacific islands in the east and Central Asia in the west.

(b) In modern centuries it has exerted an epoch-making influence on the west.

(c) Sanskrit is the most ancient language of the Indo-European group and its literature, therefore, undoubtedly records the most ancient literary monuments of this group. It gives a clearer picture of the development of religious ideas than any other literary monument of the world.

2. For a detailed note see § 2 below.
3. The languages that bear affinity to Sanskrit have been classified into a separate group known as Indo-European group because it includes all Indo-Aryan languages in the extreme east, and most European languages in the extreme west.
all other languages were derived from it. It was noticed that Latin and Greek could not be related to Hebrew and Arabic, nor could the former be original languages themselves. The discovery of Sanskrit revealed the hidden truth. Some scholars hastened to conclude that Sanskrit was the original language and other languages bearing affinity were derived from it, but gradually the considered conclusion was arrived at, that Sanskrit was the eldest sister and not the mother, to speak metaphorically, of these languages. Since then comparative philology became a science which had some solid facts to deal with. Afterwards Rask, followed by Grimm, discovered that the Teutonic languages also belonged to this group, which is more conveniently called Indo-European. Various languages like the Umbrian, Osca, Albanian, Lithuanian, Armenian, Phrygian and Tocharish (Latin, Greek and Avesta are of course understood) have been assigned to this group, and many more like the Hittite and Sumerian may, in the future, be assigned to the same group.

(b) *Comparative Mythology.* With the aid of comparative philology, it has been possible to advance much further in the field of comparative mythology. It has been discovered that we have the cognate Indo-European words for Sanskrit words: devas, bhaga, yaj, sṛaddhā and other religious words in the various languages belonging to this family; and that there are certain duties which go back quite to the Indo-European period. For instance, we have:

\[
\text{Skr.:} & \quad \text{Pitṛivī mātā} & \quad \text{Lat.:} & \quad \text{Terra mater} \\
\text{Aśvins} & \quad \text{Dios-curi} \\
\text{Parjanya} & \quad \text{Lith.:} & \quad \text{Pērkunyja} \\
\text{Varuna} & \quad \text{Gk.:} & \quad \text{Oúpavós.}
\]

The remarkable feature is that the Indo-European gods referred to above have almost similar characteristics in the different languages.

(c) *Influence on European Thought.* The Upaniṣads represent the best and most profound thought of Indian mind. They were got translated into Persian by Dārā Shikoh about the middle of the 18th century. Later (A.D. 1775) the Persian translation was re-translated into Latin by Anquetil Du Perron. This proved eventful. Even though he read only the re-translations, Schopenhauer caught the spirit of the Upaniṣads.
and said, 'It has been the solace of my life; it will be the solace of my death.' It greatly influenced the philosophic system which he propounded.

The points of agreement between the German and the Indian mind are even more striking. "The Indians," says Leopold von Schroeder, "are the nation of romanticists of antiquity; the Germans are the romanticists of modern times." The tendency towards contemplation and abstract speculation, the inclination towards pantheism, the spirit of Weltschmerz ('world sorrow', the basic principle of Buddhism) are remarkably common between the Germans and the Indians. Again both German as well as Sanskrit poetry possess the common qualities of sentimentality and feeling for Nature which are foreign to Hebrew or Greek poetry.

(d) Epigraphical Researches. It would be no exaggeration to say that without the knowledge of Sanskrit, we would have known far less of ancient India than we do at present. It is due almost entirely to western scholarship that we are today so advanced in the field of epigraphy and research of the the Indian antiquities, which scholarship in turn owes its origin to the impulse given by the study of Sanskrit.

(e) General. (1) The study of Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini gave impetus to the European scholars to complete the grammar of their own languages as far as possible.

(2) The translation of Sākuntala, Kālidāsa's master-play, was read with great appreciation in the west, and Goethe wrote the Prologue to his Faust in a similar manner. German translations of Sanskrit works have greatly influenced German literature. F. Schlegel translated Sanskrit poetry into German.

(3) The authoritative texts of the Mahāyānists are in Sanskrit. Their translation into western languages greatly influenced the Buddhists in Europe.

(4) In less than two centuries the whole range of Sanskrit literature—from the Vedic period down to the classical—has been surveyed by western scholars. The Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, lyric poetry, popular tale and didactic fable and in fact every department of Sanskrit literature including even the scientific literature have been critically edited, annotated and translated into western languages. Their influence on western thought cannot therefore be little.
historical sense completely. There are numerous accurately dated inscriptions, besides the purāṇas and several works on historical writing. The authors of astronomical works have recorded even the exact date of the completion of their works.

4. Sanskrit and Modern Languages. The term Sanskrit occurs first in Pāṇini’s Āstādhyāyī. It also occurs in the earliest epic, the Rāmāyana. Literally it means put together, polished or refined. As opposed to this, Prākrit means natural, unsophisticated and therefore connotes the spoken dialect of India as distinguished from the principal literary form of speech.

In Vedic age, the Aryan language was called Vedic. The comparative study of the modern languages shows that they are descended from a common source. For the history of our language, therefore, we have to go to the oldest specimen extant, which we have in the Rgveda, and trace its history downward. As the Rgveda is entirely in verse, it can safely be asserted that the Rgveda does not contain the true record of the contemporary spoken speech. However, it cannot be doubted that the language of the Rgveda approached nearest to the spoken speech. The table on the next page illustrates the growth of the Indian language through its various stages.

It will be noticed that as the language grows, the difference between the literary form and the spoken speech becomes wider.

Dr. Bhandarkar has divided the post-Vedic literary period into Middle Sanskrit and Classical Sanskrit. By the former he means the period between the Brāhmaṇas and the epics, of which the chief grammarian is Pāṇini. The classical Sanskrit period is post-Pāṇini and its chief grammarians are Kātyāyana and Patañjali. The spoken speech of the masses is represented in its different stages by the Prākrits, the Apabhraṃśas and the modern languages. The Prākrits as found in the dramas again are not the true records of the contemporary speech. No doubt, in their early stage, the Prākrits represented the spoken speech of the masses, but gradually they too like literary Vedic and literary Sanskrit became regulated by the rigid rules of the grammarians and became fossilized as literary dialects. The spoken languages were then represented by the Apabhraṃśa (decadent) which in its turn became gradually fossilized as literary dialect while the spoken language of the masses came
to be represented by the modern Indo-Aryan languages. There is a close transition from one period to the other. For instance, the Śaurasenī Apabhramśa resembles very closely with Prthivi Raj Rasesu of Candra Bardai (a renowned work in Old Hindi) while the latter differs very much from the present Hindi.

The table given on page 10 illustrates the growth of modern Aryan languages.

These modern languages, which began to develop from about A.D. 1000, are no longer inflexional languages, but are analytical like English. Says Mr. Beams, "The flower of synthesis budded and opened; and when full-blown began, like all other flowers, to fade. Its petals, that is, its inflexions, dropped off one by one; and in due course the fruit of analytical structure sprung up beneath it, and grew up and
**PRÁKRITS**

- **Paiśācī**
  - **Sauraseni**
  - **Mahārāṣṭrī**
  - **Māgadhī**
  - **Ardhamāgadhī**

- ***(unknown)* Vṛāchada**
  - **Saurasena**
  - **Avanti**
  - **Gaujārī**
  - **Apabhramśa**

- **Mahārāṣṭrā Apa**
- **Māgadha Apa**
- **Ardha Māgadha Apa**

- **Eastern Hindi**
  - **Bihārī**
  - **Oriyā**
  - **Bengali**
  - **Asaamese**

- **Sindhi**
- **Rajasthani Gujarati**

- **Lahnda (spoken in western borders of the Panjab)**
- **Kashmirī**
- **Western Hindi**
- **Pānjabi**

*It presents some Piśāca language, akin to Shinā.*
ripened in its stead."

The superiority of the Aryan languages will be observed from the fact that when an Aryan tongue comes into contact with an aboriginal one, it is invariably the latter which goes to the wall. At the present day, in ethnic borderlands, we can see this transformation still going on, and can watch it in all stages of its progress. The non-Aryan languages of the Dravidian group—Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam and Tamil—have held their own in southern India. There is no instance in the entire history of Indian languages when an aboriginal tongue took the place of an Aryan one.

5. Sanskrit as a Spoken Language. To the question, "In what degree was Sanskrit a spoken language?", Prof. E.J. Rapson says, "Sanskrit was a spoken language in precisely the same sense as the literary English which we speak. (Italics are ours). It represents the north-western dialect, the development of which may be traced throughout the literature, and the phonetic characteristics of which are to a great extent preserved in the popular inscriptions of that region. It was, originally, the language of the Brahmanism which came from the same region. Its extension corresponded to the extension of Brahmanism, and its progress was held in check for a period by the growth of other great Indian religions—Jainism and Buddhism. With the decline of these in India, its progress was unimpeded, and it spread over the whole of the continent. At first the dialect of a district, then the language of a caste it ultimately became the language of a religion, politics and culture throughout India. It became a great national language, and ceased to be so only when Hindu nationality was destroyed by the Mohammedan conquests."

The following points will serve as a testimony of the fact that Sanskrit was actually spoken in India:

(1) For a long time the literary descendant of the Vedic language—namely the middle Sanskrit as well as the classical Sanskrit—served as the spoken language of the educated class and thus also influenced the spoken dialects of the masses—Pāli and the dramatic Prākrits.¹

¹. It will become clear from the following example. In the dramatic Prākrit we have the words riddhi and sudarīsana. In the Pāli we have the:
(2) The older grammarians from Yāśka onwards speak of this classical Sanskrit as Bhāṣā (cf., bhāṣ— to speak).

(3) Many rules of Pāṇini¹ have no significance except in connection with living speech.

(4) Patañjali (2nd century B.C.) refers to it as used in the world (loke) and designates the words of his Sanskrit as 'current in the world.'

(5) There is clear evidence of its having had dialectical variations. Thus Yāśka and Pāṇini mention the peculiarities of the ‘Easterners’, and ‘Northerners’; Katyāyana refers to local divergences, and Patañjali specifies words occurring in single districts only.

(6) The legend of the proposal of the Bhikkhus to the Buddha to adopt Sanskrit as the medium of his speech clearly shows that Sanskrit was a living language in the time of the Buddha;

(7) The fact that the Buddhist poet, Aśvaghoṣa (2nd century A.D.) had to compose his works in Sanskrit in order to propagate his doctrines shows that Sanskrit had regained its temporarily-lost position and appealed to the masses even more than the Pārākṛts.

(8) From the second century A.D. onwards the inscriptions are more and more in Sanskrit, and from the sixth century A.D. onwards they are exclusively in Sanskrit (except the Jain ones). That inscriptions are generally written in a language commonly read and understood is not difficult to see.

(9) The fact that most of the Northern Buddhist texts have come down to us in Sanskrit shows that even Buddhism could not resist the onward progress of Sanskrit as a living language.

(10) Hiuen Tsang tells us in unmistakable terms that in the seventh century A.D. the Buddhists used Sanskrit even in oral theological discussions. The Jains also did the same, though without entirely giving up Pārākṛt.

¹: e.g., when he describes the accent or the lengthening of vowels in calling from a distance, in salutation or in question and answer.
(11) The Sanskrit dramas are written partly in Sanskrit and partly in the various forms of the Prakrit well-suited to the different characters using them. While the hero and the actors of superior rank including ascetic ladies speak Sanskrit, the females and people of lower rank speak Prakrit. This shows that those who did not speak Sanskrit at any rate understood it. Besides there is abundant evidence to suggest that the Sanskrit dramas were actually staged which means that the theatrical public both understood and appreciated conversations in Sanskrit.

(12) There are frequent references in the literature of the great epics (Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata) being recited. The audience before which these epics were recited must of course have understood Sanskrit.

Thus we see that Sanskrit was actually spoken in the whole country of Āryavarta, lying between the Himaḷaya and the Vindhyā ranges. Its use extended even beyond the Brahmīns (cf. the term śīṣṭa of Patañjali). Patañjali refers to a head-groom disputing with a grammarian as to the etymology of the Sanskrit word sūta (charioteer). The tradition has it how a wood-cutter was pained to hear bādhati instead of bādhate from a king who sympathised with his lot. Even the Buddhists and the Jains spoke Sanskrit in the 7th century [vide. (10) above]. Even nowadays Sanskrit is actually spoken by the learned pundits among themselves, especially in literary discussions. What is most important is that many magazines—daily, weeklies, monthlies and quarterlies are published in Sanskrit and widely read throughout the length and breadth of India. In short, the position of Sanskrit has all along been, and still is, much like that of Hebrew among the Jews or of Latin in the Middle Ages.

6. Characteristics of Classical Sanskrit. The history of Indian literature falls into two main periods: (i) Pre-Pāṇinian or the Vedic period which includes the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āranyakas, the Upaniṣads and the Sūtras. (ii) Post-Pāṇinian or the classical Sanskrit period which includes the great epics, the Purāṇas, the court epics, the drama, lyric poetry, prose romance, popular tale, didactic fable, gnomic poetry and scientific literature on grammar, phonetics, medicine, the law, astronomy and mathematics, etc. The latter-
literature differs from the former in form, in spirit, in matter, and in style. Some of the main characteristics are given below:

(a) Form. The *Rgveda* is entirely in verse. Gradually the use of prose developed. In the *Yajurveda* and the *Brāhmaṇas* prose attained a fair degree of development. Its use continued partly in the *Upaniṣads* also, but in classical Sanskrit prose almost disappeared. Even subjects like the law and medicine are dealt with in verse. Prose is found in grammar and philosophy which are dealt with in an enigmatic and cramped style. Literary prose also appears in romance, popular tale, fable and drama, but it abounds in big compounds and and does not compare favourably with the prose of the *Brāhmaṇas*.

In verse, too, the metres employed in classical Sanskrit literature, though nearly all based on those of the Vedas, are different. The *sloka* metre predominates. The Sanskrit metres are not only numerous but also more elaborate than their Vedic originals, inasmuch as, in Sanskrit, the quantity of every syllable in the line is strictly determined.

(b) Spirit. The theory\(^1\) of transmigration of soul which is in the Veda in its elementary stage acquires supremacy in the *Upaniṣads*. In the Sanskrit literature it becomes exceedingly elaborate; for instance, god Viṣṇu is made to come down to earth several times either in the form of some beast or illustrious human being to suppress sin and propagate dharma.

Another characteristic is the fondness for introducing the supernatural element in the ordinary description of human events. Thus there is a free communication between Indra’s heaven and this mortal earth.

Mention must also be made here of the tendency to exaggeration which surpasses all limits. The instances are so numerous that oriental exaggeration has become proverbial. In Bāna’s *Kādambarī*, Ujjayinī is described as *tribhuvanālakṣaṇa-bhūtā*, ‘a veritable gem of the three worlds’; *apareva prithvi samupādītā*, ‘as if another earth created’; *satatapraṇāya-

---

\(^1\) According to this theory, the soul never dies. It only abandons the decaying bodies to acquire fresh ones, just as a person abandons worn-out garments to get new ones (cf., *Bhagavadgītā*, II. 22). This theory forms the central principle of Hindu civilization.
CHARACTERISTICS OF CLASSICAL SANSKRIT

1. The description of Ujjaini extends over more than two portfolio pages in the same style. The description of Puṣpāpurī in Daśakumāracaritam of Daṇḍin is a close parallel to this.


3. Hence god Ganeśa is invoked in the commencement of all undertakings.

traditions of the Indians are essential requisites of a Sanskrit scholar. In this book we shall give in brief the history of classical Sanskrit literature.
7. The Origin of Epic Poetry. Says Arnold, "The subject of the epic poem must be some one great, complex action. The principal personages must belong to the high places of society and must be grand and elevated in their ideas. The measure must be of a sonorous dignity befitting the subject. The epic is developed by a mixture of dialogue, soliloquy and narration." This entirely applies to our popular epics, Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata. The Rāmāyaṇa deals with Rāma's victory over Rāvaṇa and the Mahābhārata describes at length 'the Great War' between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. The characters belong to royal families and are very skilfully depicted. The female characters have an individuality of their own.¹

The two epics did not come into existence all of a sudden. The origin of epic poetry in India may be traced to the dialogue-hymns in the Ṛgveda. In later Vedic literature—the Brāhmaṇas—we find references to the Itihāsas, Ākhyānas and Purāṇas.² There is ample evidence to show that the recital of these epic poems formed a part of the religious ceremonies at sacrificial and domestic festivals. Although there is no proof that collections of such poems existed as books, still it cannot be denied that the professional storytellers (Aitihāsikas and Paurāṇikas) existed in very ancient times. The epic poets (and even the Buddhists and the Jainas) drew abundantly from the rich store of narratives—

¹ E.g., Draupādi in Mahābhārata is a noble woman, ever conscious of her dignity, never losing her temper in the severest trials, chaste and pure beyond all thought and yet not free from human frailties.

² In the later Vedic texts the study of Purāṇa and Itihāsa counts as a work pleasing to the gods: in fact the Itihāsa-Purāṇa is actually called 'the fifth Veda.'
and, therefore, easily comprehended. In the Rāmāyaṇa, we find cut and dried solutions for the abstract mysteries of life. The reader finds for himself how ideal brothers (Bharata and Lakṣmīna), an ideal husband (Rāma) and an ideal wife (Sitā), an ideal servant (Hanumān), an ideal son (Rāma) and even an ideal king\(^1\) (Rāma) should behave in life. Daśaratha’s sincerity of promise\(^2\) and affection for son are unique; Kauśalya’s sense of duty and Sumitra’s\(^3\) spirit of sacrifice are unparalleled; and Lakṣmīna’s reverence for elder brother’s wife is simply amazing.\(^4\) Rāma is deservedly called maryādā puruṣottama. In short, we find living examples of highest morality in the Rāmāyaṇa. As such, it has inspired in the past, inspires today and will inspire in the future, millions of lives in India and abroad.

The study of the Rāmāyaṇa is also important from historical point of view because it gives us an account of the state of Aryan civilization in ancient times. It gives us an insight into the social and political conditions of ancient India. Besides it gives us copious information about the geographical conditions of epic India.

(c) Recensions. The Rāmāyaṇa has come down to us in different recensions:

1. Bombay recension (published at Bombay). The most important commentary is Tilaka of Rāma. Other commentaries in Sanskrit are Śiromaṇi and Bhāṣya.

2. Bengal recension (published at Calcutta). It was translated with valuable notes by G. Gorresio, which is available in five big volumes. The name of the Sanskrit commentator is Lokanātha.

3. North-western recension (also known as Kashmirian recension). It is published from Lahore. Its commentator is Kaṭaka.

4. South Indian text (published from Madras). It does not differ much from the Bombay recension. The other three recensions differ from one another considerably.

---

1. Rāmarājya in India has become a synonym for ideal government.
2. A true Kṣatriya would abandon his life rather than his word.
3. She was not sorry to send her son Lakṣmīna to accompany Rāma in his exile.
4. He could recognise the ornaments of her feet only, for he had never looked at her face.
It is difficult to answer which recension comes closest to the archetype of Vālmīki. Schlegel¹ favoured the Bengal recension while Böhtlingk concluded that most of the old forms are found in the Bombay² recension. Historical evidence does not lead us far. References to the Rāmāyana in Harivamśa (Chapter 236) bear more resemblance to the Bengal recension. Quotations from the Rāmāyana occurring in the classical works of the 8th and 9th centuries bear more affinity to the Bombay recension. The Rāmāyana-mañjarī of Kṣemendra (11th century), presupposes the existence of the North-western recension. The Rāmāyana-campū of Bhoja (11th century) is based on the Bombay recension. In fact, these different recensions assumed definite shape at a very early date. Since then they have existed independently, influencing one another where possible.

(d) Contents. The Rāmāyana consists of about 24,000 ślokas and is divided into seven books, called kāṇḍas.

Book I (Bāla-kāṇḍa) narrates Rāma’s early youth, his accompanying Viśvāmitra to protect the latter’s sacrifice, his slaying the Rākṣasas there, and his marriage with Sītā.

Book II (Ayodhya-kāṇḍa) deals with the events at the royal court of Ayodhya, preparations for Rāma’s coronation, Kaikeyi’s hostility, Rāma’s exile, Daśaratha’s death in separation and Bharata’s futile efforts to bring Rāma back to the capital.

Book III (Araṇya-kāṇḍa) deals with Rāma’s life in the Daṇḍaka forest, his slaying of demons like Virāgha, his life in the Pañcavaṭi, meeting with Śūrpanakhā, slaying of Khara and 14,000 demons, Rāvana’s stealing away of Sītā and Rāma’s bitter lamentations.

Book IV (Kiṣkindha-kāṇḍa) narrates Rāma’s alliance with Sugrīva, his slaying of Vālin, and Hanumat’s quest for Sītā in company with other monkeys.

Book V (Sundara-kāṇḍa) describes the beautiful island of Laṅkā, Rāvana’s magnificent palace, Hanumat’s consoling of Sītā and his return back with the happy news.

1. Rāmāyana of Vālmīki, original text with translation and annotation (3 Vols.), 1829-1838.
2. The Bengal and the North-western recensions arose in the centres of classical Sanskrit literature, where the Vaidarbha and the Gauda styles of composition respectively flourished, the irregularities of the epic language having been removed from them.
Book VI (Yuddha-kāṇḍa) is the most extensive of all and deals with Rāma’s final victory over Rāvana.

Book VII (Uttara-kāṇḍa) deals with Rāma’s later life at Ayodhya, ill-report about Sītā, her exile by Rāma, Sītā’s grief, birth of two sons Kuśa and Lava at Vālmīki’s hermitage and the ultimate end.

(e) Episodes. There are several interesting episodes in the Rāmāyana, more so in Book I and Book VII. The more important among them are those of dwarf-incarnation of Viṣṇu (1.29), the birth of Kumāra or Kārtikeya (11.35-7), the descent of Gaṅga from heaven (11.38-44), the churning of the ocean (1.45) and the invention of the śloka1 (1.2) in Book I; the legend of Yayāti and Nahuṣa (58), slaying of Vṛtra by Indra (84-7), of Urvaśī and Pururavaś (87-90) and the story of the Śūdra ascetic Śambūka in Book VII.

(f) Genuineness. There are indications which clearly suggest that the original story of the Rāmāyana concluded with the sixth kāṇḍa. The seventh kāṇḍa abounds in myths and legends which have nothing to do with the main story. For instance, the introductory portion of the seventh kāṇḍa deals with the origin of the Rākṣasas and the battles of Indra with Rāvana, the youth of Hanumat and several myths which considerably interrupt the progress of the story. Similarly in the first kāṇḍa, there is much extraneous matter which could have not belonged to the original Rāmāyana. The following points further deserve notice in this connection:

1. The language and style of these kāṇḍas are inferior to those of kāṇḍas II-VI.

2. There are numerous internal contradictions in these kāṇḍas. There are details in the first kāṇḍa which directly contradict the account given in later kāṇḍas, e.g., the marriage of Laksmana.
(3) In kāṇḍas II-VI, apart from the interpolated passages, Rāma is recognised as an ideal mortal hero but in kāṇḍas I and VII he is definitely regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

(4) The first kāṇḍa contains two tables of contents (in cantos I and 3) and one of them does not recognise the first and last kāṇḍas.

On these several grounds Prof. Jacobi concluded that kāṇḍas II-VI form the nucleus of the Rāmāyaṇa to which kāṇḍas I and VII were added later and several passages were interpolated even in kāṇḍas II-VI. Several opening cantos of kāṇḍa II were added to kāṇḍa I. The original Rāmāyaṇa commenced with what now forms canto 5 of kāṇḍa I.

(g) Date. (1) With reference to the Mahābhārata. The original portion of the Rāmāyaṇa is older than that of the Mahābhārata. No hero of the Mahābhārata is anywhere referred to in the Rāmāyaṇa; on the other hand the story of Rāma is occasionally referred to in the Mahābhārata. Moreover, Mahābhārata (parva VII) quotes two identical ślokas from Rāmāyaṇa (kāṇḍa VI), and Mahābhārata (parva III, cantos 277-291) contains Rāmopākhyāna, which is evidently based on the Rāmāyaṇa. In fact, the author of Rāmopākhyāna presupposes the knowledge of the Rāmāyaṇa on the part of his readers.

(2) With reference to the Buddhist literature, the following points are noteworthy:

(i) The Daśaratha-jātaka, (a story of Rāma), occurs in somewhat altered form in the Pāli jātakas. It also contains in Pāli form a verse from the Rāmāyaṇa (VI. 128).

(ii) The Sāma-jātaka contains probably an older form of

1. Says Jacobi in Das Rāmāyaṇa, “As on many of our old, venerable cathedrals, every coming generation has added something new and repaired something old, without the original construction being effaced in spite of all the added little chapels and turrets, so also many generations of singers have been at work on the Rāmāyaṇa; but the old nucleus around which so much has grown is, to the searching eye of the students, not difficult to recognise, if not in every detail, yet in its principal features.”

2. These jātakas are a species of literature in themselves. They are Buddhistic in character and deal with the birth-stories of the Buddha in his different cycles of existence prior to his attaining the exalted position of the Buddha.

3. Another Pāli jātaka in the Tripitaka.
the tale about the hermit boy killed in the chase, which is told by Daśaratha in the Rāmāyaṇa, II. 63.

(iii) There are a few other jātakas,1 too, in which we find passages reminding us of the Rāmāyaṇa, but only very seldom in literal agreement.

(iv) Sylvain Levi who has made a detailed study of the subject has come to the conclusion that the Buddhist work Saddharma Smaṛtyupasthāna2 is undoubtedly indebted to Vālmīki. The description of Jambudvīpa given therein forms a close parallel to that of digvarṇanām of the Rāmāyaṇa. Besides, the mention of rivers, oceans, countries and islands, etc. in this book is exactly in the same manner as in the Rāmāyaṇa.3

(v) On linguistic grounds also, Jacobi has arrived at the conclusion that the Rāmāyaṇa is pre-Buddhistic.4

(vi) As regards the question whether traces of Buddhism can be found in the Rāmāyaṇa, Winternitz says, “It can probably be answered with an absolute negative; for the only place in which the Buddha is mentioned is decidedly spurious.

(3) With reference to the Greeks. There are two verses in the whole of the Rāmāyaṇa which make mention of the yavanas (Ionians, Greeks), on the basis of which, Weber tried to show Greek influence in the story of the Rāmāyaṇa. Jacobi has since then conclusively shown that both these verses were interpolated, of course, sometime after 300 B.C.

(4) Internal Evidence. (i) The capital of Kosala as given in the original Rāmāyaṇa is called Ayodhyā. Later, on, this city—Ayodhyā came to be called as Sāketa by the Buddhists, the Jains, the Greeks and even by Patañjali. The capital of Lava, as given in the VII kāṇḍa, was established at Śrāvasti, where we know King Prasenajīt of Kosala reigned in the Buddha’s time.

---

2. This work itself is lost but a long fragment is preserved by Sāntideva in his Śīkṣā-samuccaya.
3. As regards the possibility of Vālmīki borrowing from the Buddhist smṛti, there was no need for it. The Brāhmīns were too conservative to borrow from the Buddhist texts. Besides, the Rāmāyaṇa teaches the highest principles of morality to illustrate which Vālmīki would not borrow from an obscure Buddhist text. On the other hand, there are numerous instances of Buddhists borrowing from Brāhmīnic texts.
4. If Vālmīki existed later than the Buddha, a popular epic like this would have been composed in some Prakrit.
Nowhere is any mention made of Śrāvasti in the original Rāmāyaṇa (kāṇḍas II-VI). This shows that the original Rāmāyaṇa was composed at a time while the city of Ayodhyā was still a flourishing one, before it had acquired the new name of Sāketa and the city of Śrāvasti came into prominence.

(ii) In the first kāṇḍa (canto 35) Rāma is described as passing through the very spot where Pāṭaliputra¹ (modern Patna) stands. Mention is also made of certain important towns like Kauśāmibi, Kānyakubja and Kāmpilya in Eastern India where the fame of Rāmāyaṇa had reached. Nowhere in the whole of Rāmāyaṇa is any mention made of Pāṭaliputra which would have been described if it had existed in the epic times.

(iii) Mithilā and Viśālā are described in Bāla-kāṇḍa as twin cities under two separate rulers. By the time of the Buddha, we know, they had coalesced into one famous city of Vaiśālī.

(iv) Further we find that in the times of the Rāmāyaṇa India was split up into small territories ruled by petty kings.² Such political conditions existed in India only before the time of the Buddha.

In conclusion, we might say that the original Rāmāyaṇa must have been composed before 500 B.C.

It has been argued that the language of the Rāmāyaṇa, especially that of the Bombay recension, betrays a stage of development later than that of the grammarian Pāṇini, who takes no notice of the epic language. This, however, does not prove any later date for the Rāmāyaṇa. Pāṇini dealt only with the refined language of the cultured (śīṣṭas) and did not take into consideration the popular language. On the other hand, if the Rāmāyaṇa had been composed later than Pāṇini, it could not have escaped the dominating influence of grammar.

(h) Style. As mentioned above, the Rāmāyaṇa is called ādi-kāvyya (the first epic) and its poet ādi-kavi (the first poet) by all Sanskrit writers without exception. As such it represents an early stage of kāvyya in Sanskrit. The legend of the invention

¹. This city was founded by king Kālāśoka, under whom the second Buddhist Council was held at Vaiśālī about 380 B.C. By the time of Megasthenese (300 B.C.) it had become the capital of India.
². As opposed to this, we find in the Mahābhārata powerful kings like Jarāsandha, whose territories had extended over large areas.
of śloka metre (referred to above) seems to suggest that this metre originated with Vālmīki. The language is throughout chaste and refined. Not infrequently it is ornamented with alāṅkāras (embellishments). Vālmīki is more skilled in the use of upamā (similes) and rūpaka (identification). Simplicity of style and clarity of thought are the chief characteristics of his poetry.

9. The Mahābhārata. (a) The present Mahābhārata is an amplification. The original work was in its nature a historical and not a didactic work. Vyāsa, in all probability, gave to it the name Jaya.¹ This original work also embraced a lengthy description as is clear from the grandeur of the events described. It was not probably confined to 8,800² ślokas, as is asserted by Macdonell.

We see three definite stages in the development of the Mahābhārata. A verse in the Ādi-parvan says:

manvādī bhārataṁ kecidasīkādī tathāpare
tathā paricarādyanye vipraṁ samyagadhīyate

In the first stage, Vyāsa taught his work to Vaiśampāyana, one of his five pupils. This original begins probably with Paricara.

In the second stage, Vaiśampāyana recited this work to Janamejaya at Sarpa-satra (snake-sacrifice) with dialogues of his own. This probably contained 24,000 verses. This edition begins with Astikopākhyāna.

In the third stage, the amplified edition was again recited by Sauti before Śaunaka at his twelve years’ sacrifice where certain questions are asked by Śaunaka and answered by Sauti. The present number of one hundred thousand ślokas was now approached. cf.,

asminstu māṇusya loke vaiśampāyana uktavān
ekaṁ śatasahasram tu mayoktaṁ vai nibodhata

¹ cf., the occurrence of jayo nāmetihāso’yaṁ in the 8th parvan. Besides, every parvan in the Mahābhārata begins with the benediction:

Nārāyaṇam Namaskṛtya naraḥ caiva naraottamaṁ
Devi Sarasvatīṁ caiva tatojayaṁudārayet

The commentator Nilakanṭha translates tatojayaṁudārayet as, “..... one should recite Mahābhārata.”

² This is probably not the number of ślokas, but that of kūṭa ślokas, namely, riddles, contained in the Mahābhārata.
This edition begins with Manu. Sauti probably gave this work the title of *Mahābhārata*.  

Originally *Mahābhārata* belonged to the class called *itiḥāsa, purāṇa* or *ākhyāna*. At present it forms an encyclopaedia of moral teaching. It is directed towards the attainment of the fourfold goal of *dharma, artha, kāma* and *mokṣa*. It is called the fifth *Veda* and also as *Kṛṣṇa Veda* (Veda of *Kṛṣṇa*). Owing to the predominance of Vaiṣṇava doctrines throughout the work, it is also styled as ‘the *smṛti* of the Vaiṣṇavas’. In fact, the didactic matter in the present *Mahābhārata* is at least four times as much as the epic matter.

*(b) Importance.* Although the *Mahābhārata* is not as popular as the *Rāmāyana*, its importance is no way less than that. Its epic matter deals with a comprehensive account of the great war and a detailed history of the Kurus and the Pāṇḍavas. It furnishes us with valuable information about the social and political India of those times. Further it also informs us of the stage of civilization that the Aryans were then passing through. Its importance further lies in the fact that it gives us copious knowledge not only about the arts of peace but also of the arts of war. Its didactic matter, by virtue of the high authority that it has come to claim, has won for this work the unique title of ‘the fifth *Veda*’, which amply testifies its great importance.

*(c) Recensions.* The *Mahābhārata* has come down to us in two recensions:

(i) Devanāgarī or the North Indian recension.
(ii) South Indian recension.

The one differs from the other about as much as the

1. cf., *mahatvād bhāravatvāccamahābhāratamucyate.*

That *Mahābhārata* is a later name may also be deduced from the fact that Pāṇini is acquainted with heroes like Yudhiṣṭhira but not with any work like *Mahābhārata*.

2. These terms are generally used by the Indians as synonyms.

3. It gives, with the authority of the Vedas, instructions to the Kṣatriyas about their warrior life.

4. It preaches to the Kṣatriyas the cult of *Kṛṣṇa* as a guarantee of success and welfare (cf., Sylvain Levi).

5. It will be recognised that nothing commands in Brahmanism an authority equal to that of the Vedas.
different recensions of the Ramāyāṇa from one another. They are of about equal length, omissions in the first being compensated by others in the second. The complete manuscripts of this work are to be found in Berlin, Paris, London and Oxford in Europe besides many other places in India. There are also numerous other manuscripts containing portions of the work. None of the manuscripts is older than four or five centuries. It cannot, therefore, be possible for us to reconstruct the original Mahābhārata or even to establish the superiority of one recension over the other with accuracy.

   (d) Editions. (i) The editio princeps including the Harivamśa, was published at Calcutta¹ (1834-39) in four volumes. It does not contain any commentary.

   (ii) Another edition was published at Bombay in 1863. It does not include Harivamśa but contains the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha. It has better readings than the first and has been reproduced several times since then.

   Both these editions belong to the North Indian recension and, therefore, they do not differ much from each other.

   (iii) Another edition was published at Madras (1855-60) in four volumes. It is printed in Telugu characters and follows the South Indian recension. It includes the Harivamśa and also contains extracts from Nilakaṇṭha’s commentary.

   (iv) A critical and illustrated edition of the Mahābhārata is being published at Poona by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. It follows, in the main, the North Indian recension.

   No edition of the Mahābhārata has been published outside India up till now.

   (e) Commentaries. The oldest commentary extant is that of Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa. He belongs at the latest to the 14th century. Another commentary is that of Arjunamiśra who is quoted by Nilakaṇṭha. It appears in the Calcutta edition (1875). The best known commentary, however, is that of Nilakaṇṭha who, according to Burnell, belongs to the 16th century. He was a resident of Kūrpura in Maharashtra.

   (f) Contents. Vyāsa’s original work was presumably divided into parvans and adhyāyas. Vaiśampāyana also followed the

¹. Another edition was published at Calcutta in 1875. It contains the commentary of Arjunamiśra, along with that of Nilakaṇṭha.
same arrangement. His work contained about a hundred parvans. Sauti arranged them into 18 parvans. Oftentimes the same name is assigned to the main parvan as well as to a portion of it, e.g., Sabhā-parvan contains another smaller Sabhā-parvan.

Besides this, there is the supplementary portion, called khila-parvan or Harivamśa. It bears almost the same relation to the Mahābhārata as the Uttarakāṇḍa does to the Rāmāyaṇa. The total number of ślokas as given in the Mahābhārata is 95,826, or in round numbers one lac.

(g) Subject-matter. The Ādi-parvan describes the early life of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas, Draupadi’s marriage, and the Pāṇḍava’s acquaintance with Kṛṣṇa, the hero of the Yādavas. The second parvan describes the prosperity of the Pāṇḍavas at Indraprastha, and the losing of everything, including Draupadi, by Yudhiṣṭhira in a play of dice with Duryodhana. The Pāṇḍavas ultimately agree to go into banishment for a period of 12 years and to remain incognito for a thirteenth. The Vana-parvan describes the forest life of the Pāṇḍavas for 12 years in the Kāmyaka forest, and the Virāṭa-parvan narrates how they spent the thirteenth year incognito as servants of Virāṭa, the king of Mātysyas.

The Udyoga-parvan narrates the preparations for war by the Pāṇḍavas as the Kurus give no sympathetic response to their just demands. The next five parvans give in detail an account of the great battle, in which all except the Pāṇḍavas and Kṛṣṇa were lost. The 11th parvan deals with the funeral rites of the dead. The next two deal with Bhīṣma’s lengthy discourse to Yudhiṣṭhira on Rājadharma. The 14th parvan deals with Yudhiṣṭhira’s coronation and horse-sacrifice; the 15th with the resort to forest of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and his queen Gāndhārī; and the 16th with internecine conflict of the Yādavas and Kṛṣṇa’s accidental death at the hands of a hunter. The 17th parvan describes how the Pāṇḍavas get weary of life and


2. This shows that the arrangement is made by at least two persons.
(6) The Mahābhārata existed in Java and Bali islands in the 6th century. It had also been translated into Tibetan before that date.

(7) The Mahābhārata is quoted like smṛti (Dharmaśāstra) in the land-grant inscriptions of the 4th and 5th centuries.

(8) An inscription dated A.D. 462 refers definitely to the Mahābhārata of one lac ślokas, composed by the highest sage, Vyāsa, the Vyāsa of the Vedas, the son of Parāśara.¹

(9) Hertel has convincingly shown on the evidence of three chapters of the Śānti-parvan preserved in a Syrian translation that the metrical Mahābhārata text as we have today does not generally speaking, differ much from what it was in A.D. 500. The recent researches in Chinese Turkistan and Chinese literature may carry this date back by several centuries. Further researches in the writings of the Northern Buddhists are also expected to throw welcome light on this problem.

(10) We have the direct evidence of Dion Chrysostom that the Mahābhārata with its one lac verses was well-known even in the south of India in A.D. 50.²

(11) Aśvaghoṣa, the author of Vajrasūcī (1st century A.D.) quotes a verse from Harivamśa.

(12) Certain plays of Bhāsa are based on the episodes of the Mahābhārata.

Thus we may conclude with Macdonell that we are justified in considering it likely that the great epic had become a didactic compendium before the beginning of our era.³

---

¹ This conclusively disproves the theory of Prof. Holtzmann which he put forward in his work on the Mahābhārata that it was turned into a Dharmaśāstra by the Brahmins after A.D. 900
² cf., Criticism of Mahābhārata, C.V. Vaidya.
³ According to Vaidya, the Mahābhārata attained its present form between 300-100 B.C. The arguments for 300 B.C. as the upper limit are as follows:

(i) The Yavanas are frequently mentioned;

(ii) The mention of nagna kṣapāṇaka in the Ādi-parvan suggests the same;

(iii) The state of society, religion and knowledge, depicted in the Mahābhārata corresponds to that described by Megasthenes, e.g., flesh-eating was going out of fashion; worship of Śiva and Viśṇu had become established; Grammar, Logic and Vedānta were already formulated and studied.
Certain additions may, however, belong to the 2nd century A.D.

(i) The Roman denarius is known to Harivamśa and Harivamśa is known to Part I of Book I as well as to Book XVIII. Such parts as recognise Harivamśa must, therefore, be later than the introduction of that coin.

(ii) The occurrence of rāsis (signs of the Zodiac) also suggests the same.

(iii) Prophecies about the Greeks, the Scythians and the Bacterians are made.

II. As regards the date of the original Mahābhārata, the following points are noteworthy:

1. We have the evidence of Dahlmann that Pāṇini knew this work.

2. A Bhārata and Mahābhārata are mentioned in the Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra (5th century B.C.).

3. References to the Mahābhārata are also to be found in the Baudhāyana Dharmasūtras (about 400 B.C.).

4. The Baudhāyana Gṛhyasūtras quote Viṣṇu-sahasranāma (thousand names of Viṣṇu) from the Mahābhārata.

5. Śānti-parvan does not include the name of the Buddha among the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu.

6. Megasthenes has related in his work Indica certain stories1 which are found in the Mahābhārata only.

7. In the original Mahābhārata, Brahmā is regarded as the highest god. As evidenced by the Pāli literature this alludes to conditions in India not later than 5th century B.C.

8. On the basis of astronomical data also, some scholars have concluded that the original Mahābhārata is not later than 500 B.C.

III. As regards the origin of the epic story, it may be said with a fair degree of accuracy that it certainly goes back to the Vedic times. The two historical tribes, Kurus and Pañcālas, are described in the Yajurveda, and the king Dhṛtarāṣṭra Vaiśṇavīrya is mentioned in the Kāṭhaka Samhitā.

(k) Style. While the Rāmāyaṇa is the earliest representative of the Kāvyā, the Mahābhārata is the earliest representative of the class of literature called itihāsa, purāṇa, or

1. e.g., Ants, as big as dogs, dig the earth and the gold-sand comes out.
ākhyāna. The bulk of it is written in śloka metre. It also contains, as remnants of an older phase, archaic verses in the upajāti and vamśasātha metres. Some stories are preserved in the old prose. Besides, there are introductory passages like Kṛṣṇa uvāca, Bhīṣma uvāca, which do not form part of the śloka. The central aspect of dharma outlined in this work appears to be:

yasmin yathā vartate yo manoṣyaḥ
tasmin tathā vartitavyam sa dharmaḥ
māyācāro māyayā bādhitavyaḥ
sādhvācāraḥ sādhunā pratyupeyahi

The language is on the whole much simpler than that of the later classical epics.

10. Inter-relation of the two epics. (a) Extent. The present Mahābhārata is seven times as large as the Iliad and Odyssey put together while Rāmāyaṇa is only a quarter as long as the Mahābhārata. As mentioned above, the present Mahābhārata is an amplification. Originally composed of 8,800 ślokas according to Macdonell, or 8,800 kūṭa-ślokas (riddles) besides others according to C.V. Vaidya, it was amplified gradually to one lac ślokas. Rāmāyaṇa, on the other hand, knows no such amplifications.

(b) Authorship. Rāmāyaṇa is the work of only one author, Vālmiki, a poet who was familiar with the older epic style and who was the first writer of artistic poetry called Kāvya, as distinguished from Ākhyāna. The present Mahābhārata, on the other hand, is the outcome of several authors. It is attributed to Vyāsa, the arranger (of the four Vedas), who according to Hopkins was an editor rather than an author. The Rāmāyaṇa is more symmetrical, more homogeneous, and lastly it is more refined both in its polished metre and social atmosphere.

(c) The Text. Neither epic has a definitive text. There are different recensions of both the epics which vary a good deal from one another. It is not possible to arrive at any definite text by their comparative study. The southern recension of the

1. The true dharma is that a person should so behave towards another as he behaves towards himself. A deceitful person should be suppressed by deceits, and a noble person should be approached with nobility.
Mahābhārata is in no way superior to, but is rather inferior to the Northern recension, and it is, therefore, of little help in arriving at any definite text. In fact there is no fixed epic text because Hindu epic poetry was never fixed. All epic poems were transmitted at first orally and various re-writers treated them exactly as the rhapsodes had previously done, altered and added as they pleased. Reconstruction of the original text is, therefore, out of question. All that can be done is to excise the most palpable interpolation in each traditional writing.

(d) Growth of the Epics. As regards the final growth of each, it may be said at once that neither epic was developed quite independently of the other. The later Rāmāyana implies the Mahābhārata as does the later Mahābhārata recognise the Rāmāyana of Vālmiki.

(e) The Mutual Relation. Neither epic as such is recognised before the late period of the Gṛhyasūtras and the first epic recognised here and in other Sūtras is the Bhārata. A comparative study of the two epics shows that there are various quotations from the Rāmāyana in the Mahābhārata. Besides the Rāmopākhyāna and other incidental references in the Harivamśa, there are clear references to the priority of Vālmiki’s work, e.g.,

apicāyaṁ purā gītaḥ śloko vālmīkinā bhuvi.

These allusions, according to Hopkins, prove nothing in regard to the general priority of Vālmiki as the first epic poet. They prove only that the Mahābhārata was not completed before Vālmiki wrote, just as the mention of a Vāyu-purāṇa in the Mahābhārata shows only that there was a purāṇa of that name not before Mahābhārata’s beginning, but before its end. It is noteworthy in this connection that the later Rāmāyana in its present shape, therefore, was not complete before the beginning of the Mahābhārata. The Rāmāyana recognises Janamejaya as an ancient hero, and knows Kurus and Pañcālas, as well as the town of Hastināpura. From this it is concluded

(1) that the story of Rāma is older than the story of the Pāṇḍus;
(2) The Pāṇḍu story is older than Vālmiki’s Rāmāyana; and
(3) Vālmiki’s Rāmāyana as a whole is older than Mahābhārata as a whole.

(f) The Locality of Composition. A critical study of the
parallel passages and proverbs shows that the Uttara-kāṇḍa has many tales of the Gangetic plain, and that the early Mahābhārata shows familiarity with the customs of the Panjab, and the later didactic portions are generally laid in Kosala and Videha. In other words, the two epics in their later development belong to the same locality.

(g) The Mutual Resemblances. (i) Style. As mentioned before, the Rāmāyaṇa is on the whole more refined (in the polish of metre and social atmosphere), more symmetrical and more homogeneous. Yet there is a closer resemblance of style in the two epics. Hopkins has collected over three hundred parallel passages which are almost identical—the same phraseology and the same proverbs. In describing peaceful scenes, for example, notkaṇṭhāṁ kartum arhasi is very common in both the epics.

(ii) There are identical similes and even identical descriptions of the battles.

(iii) More remarkable still is the correspondence in the story. The heroines Sitā and Draupadī—if heroines they be called—are both born by miraculous power. The marriage of both takes place by svayamvara (self-choice) but there is no choice by the heroine in either case, and the physical test is supreme in both. In both the epics, the banishment of the heroes takes place; and in both, heroines (Draupadī and Sitā) are carried away by Jayadratha and Rāvana respectively. Thus we notice the influence of one story in the weaving of the other.

(iv) Mythology. There is also a close resemblance between the mythology (and we may add even the philosophy) of the two epics. The nature-worship of the Rigvedic times is now obscured; gods like Varuṇa, Aśvins and Ādityas are no more known, goddesses like Uṣas no more recognised. Their place is now taken by the trinity—Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva—and Gaṇeśa, Kubera and Durgā. Anthropomorphism becomes supreme. Gods like Indra become family-men, have wives, live in heaven, possess beautiful palaces and in their dealings behave like men. Shrines and temples of gods are erected, images of metal, clay and salt are worshipped and this development of mythology takes place equally in the two epics.

---

1. cf., senā bhinnā nauriva sāgare;
   senā bhinnā naurivāgādhe.
11. Puranas. (a) The Origin of the Purāṇa. The term Purāṇa occurs in the Atharvaveda and the Brähmaṇas in the sense of 'cosmogonic enquiries'. In the Mahābhārata, it is used to designate 'ancient legendary lore'.

The Vāyu-, Brahmāṇḍa- and Viṣṇu-purāṇas give an account of how the original Purāṇa came into existence. (The Bhāgavata-purāṇa also gives an account, which, however, is different, and being late and unreliable need not be taken note of.) It is stated that Vyāsa (the arranger)—so called on account of his having divided the Veda and arranged it into four parts—entrusted them to his four disciples. He afterwards with tales, anecdotes, songs and lore that had come down from the ages compiled a Purāṇa, and taught it and the the Itiḥāsa to his fifth disciple, the sūta Romaharṣaṇa (or Lomaharṣaṇa). After that he composed the Mahābhārata.1 Whether or not Vyāsa composed the original Purāṇa is immaterial for the present purpose. What is important is that there was abundant tradition of diverse nature, which could and would naturally have been used in its construction. It would be quite natural that, after the religious hymns were formed into the Veda, the ancient secular tales and lore should have been collected into a Purāṇa.

(b) The Development of the Purāṇa. Romaharṣaṇa made that Purāṇa-saṁhitā into six versions and taught them to his six disciples. Three of them made three separate saṁhitās, which were called after their names. Romaharṣaṇa’s saṁhitās and those three were the 'root-compositions' (mūla-saṁhitā). They consisted of four divisions (pāda) and contained the same matter but different in their diction.

Those variations do not exist now; still some of those persons, besides Romaharṣaṇa, appear as inquirers or narrators in some of the Purāṇas and also in the Mahābhārata. The passages

---

1. The epic itself recognises the priority of the Purāṇa.
in which those persons appear may be remnant of those old Purāṇas, incorporated in the Vāyu and Brahmnāda. Moreover these two Purāṇas alone have the old four-fold division spoken of above, and their four pādās are called prakriyā, anusānga, upodghāta and upasamāhāra.

Five of the six disciples being Brahmmins, the Purāṇa passed into their hands. Thus there were composed new and frankly sectarian Purāṇas. It is also to be noted that the Purāṇas grew up in various localities. The internal evidence of the Purāṇa attests this origin and development of the Purāṇa.

(c) Contents of the Purāṇas. Bearing in mind that the materials used were ākhyānas, upākhyānas, gāthās and kalpa-vākyas, we may form an idea of the contents of the earliest Purāṇas. The verse

sargāśca pratisargāśca vaṁśo manvantarāṇi ca
vaṁśānucaritam caiva purāṇam pañcalakṣaṇam

in fact, deals with the contents of the original Purāṇa, before other matters, e.g., the religious doctrines, the merits of tīrthas (pilgrimage), and the dharma in all its branches were incorporated into the Purāṇas. At present, the Purāṇas are more didactic in nature than historical. They contain mythical legends, accounts of the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu and rules regarding the worship of the gods and observance of festivals. Their authority rivals with that of the Vedas. The Vāyu-purāṇa calls itself Purāṇa-Veda. The terms sruti, āc, sūkta are applied to the verses and sections of the Purāṇas, and they claim—

1. Primary creation, secondary creation, genealogies, calculation of ages and the dynastic accounts form the five main topics of Purāṇa.

It may be noted that sarga, pratisarga and manvantara are generally based on imagination and are wholly fanciful. The fourth and the fifth subjects—genealogies and dynastic accounts—profess to be historical and are important.

2. The Purāṇas, the epics and the law-books are closely related to one another in form, in language, and in subject-matter. Not only isolated verses but long passages recur word for word in them all. As regards the nature of the contents, it is not always possible to draw any hard and fast line of distinction between them. From different points of view the Mahābhārata may be regarded as an epic, a law-book or a Purāṇa.

It will be noted that the Purāṇas are partly legendary and partly historical. In this respect, they can be compared to the Christian Purāṇa, Paradise Lost.
divine origin like the Vedas. Many of them assert that they are Veda-saṃhitā—of equal measure with the Vedas. Their study bestows blessings upon the reader equal, or rather superior, to those of the Vedas.

(d) History in the Purāṇas. The following Purāṇas contain accounts of the dynasties that reigned in India during the Kali age.

(i) Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa. The versions of these three Purāṇas present a remarkable similarity. The latter two agree so closely that they resemble two recensions of the same text, and the Matsya, though not in such marked agreement, contains a text very much similar. It seems that these versions are based upon one common original compilation. The verse is almost epic, one line being generally assigned to one king.

(ii) Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata. They are much condensed than the above. Viṣṇu is mainly in prose. It appears that these two are condensed redactions.

(iii) Garuḍa. It is a late version and is more condensed than the Bhāgavata. It gives accounts of the Paurava, Aikṣvāku and Bāhradrattha dynasties.

(iv) Bhavisya. It often contains a vitiated account of the genealogies. For instance, it says each Paurava king ruled at least for 1,000 years. The prophecies, contained in it, come down to the 19th century A.D.

The accounts of these Purāṇas are mainly based upon the original authority of the Bhavisya. They have been related by the sūta Romaharṣaṇa to his son Sauti or the sages in the Naimiṣa forest giving accounts from the time of the Great Battle down to the ruling king and then being asked about the future.

Thus out of the 18 Purāṇas, only seven contain accounts of genealogies and dynasties. The remaining Purāṇas, therefore, are not important for the political history of India.

---

1. They are Agni, Kūraṇa, Padma, Mārkaṇḍeya, Brahmavaivarta, Brahma, Vāmana, Varāha, Skanda, Śiva, and Linga. The 18 Purāṇas contain more than four lac ślokas, varying from seven thousand to 81 thousand. The Viṣṇu-purāṇa usually regarded as the best conserved of all has less than 7,000 ślokas.
After having been unduly appraised they were unduly neglected. Now there is a growing belief that the historical information conveyed by them is not as untrustworthy as it was formerly thought. Dr. Vincent Smith in 1902 was able to prove that both the dynastic list of the Andhra kings and the duration of the different reigns as stated in Matsya-purāṇa are substantially correct. The traditions preserved by the Purāṇas, howsoever distorted and perverted in form, go back to the antiquated period of the Brāhmaṇas. Their chief importance lies in the fact that they record the Kṣatriya tradition as opposed to the Brāhmaṇic tradition of the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas etc. The Kṣatriya tradition is important because it enables us to picture ancient India and its political conditions from the Kṣatriya standpoint.

(e) Ancient Genealogies. The ancient genealogies recorded in the Purāṇas do not pretend to mention every king, but only those who left some memory behind them. Evidently they were preserved, not by the oral tradition of the Brahmins (who had no interest in the mundane affairs), but by the bards of the kings. If the Brahmins could preserve the Brahmanical works with verbal accuracy, there should be no difficulty in believing that the paurānic bards could do the same with regard to the genealogies. Ancient lineage has always been a matter of great pride in India and its popularity must have considerably reduced the chances of corruption. The ancient royal dynasties of India have been assigned to two main

1. The weak points of the Brāhmaṇic tradition are:
   (i) It deals with religious matter and is not of historical purpose;
   (ii) the Brahmins, its authors, lacked historical sense; and
   (iii) they lived in secluded hermitages, and so locked true knowledge.

   To quote one example the Brahmanical story of Śunahṣepa speaks of the most famous city of Ayodhyā as a village.

2. The Kṣatriyas manifestly played the most important part in the Aryan conquest of India, and if we wish to discover and estimate what their position and achievements are, it is essential to study their tradition. The Paurānic genealogies alone give us an account of how the Aila race dominated all the regions to which we assign the Aryan occupation while the Brahmanic literature gives no inkling whatever of that great transformation.

3. Mistakes, omissions and corruptions must have crept into the genealogies during the lapse of time, but that does not warrant us to
stocks—the Solar and the Lunar. It is hoped that a critical study of the Purāṇas as historical documents will give us much useful information about ancient India. The Purāṇas undoubtedly contain a good deal not only about the genealogies of the Purus, and the kings of Kosala and Magadha, but also about the later Śiśunāgas, Nandas, Śuṅgas, Kaṇvas and the Andhras. Their unity is thus great.¹

(f) Date. The Purāṇas are dated by scholars according to the latest indications discovered in them. The elementary fact that the date, whether of a building or of a literary production, is not determined by its latest addition is in their case generally ignored.² The Brahma-purāṇa also called Ādi-purāṇa (an ancient purāṇa) the earlier part of which contains enough antiquated material, is dated in the 13th or 14th century by Wilson on the evidence of later additions alone. At what time the eighteen purāṇas assumed their distinctive titles is uncertain. All the same, they may well be placed in the

disbelieve the whole tradition. The Kṣatriya tradition has to be weighed and estimated independently on its own grounds.

1. Interesting in this connection is the theory of westward migration of the Aryans propounded by Pargiter on the basis of Paurāṇic evidence. The Paurānic tradition places Ilāvṛta—the original habitat of the Ailas (Aryans)—in the north of Nābhi (India). It is this region and not the north-west—which is regarded sacred by the Aryans up to the present day. It is believed that the Aryans migrated into India from the Mid-Himalayan region not later than 2050 B.C., and that the Druhyus migrated about 1600 B.C. from India to the North-west. The Boghaz-koi inscriptions, dated about 1400 B.C., record names of Indian deities. The approximate date of Ṛgveda—the earliest record of the Aryans in India—is given by scholars as nearly 2000 B.C. The eastward migration theory, now in vogue, does not explain these facts satisfactorily. It seems more probable that the Druhyus carried the Indian gods with them about 1600 B.C. at the time of their migration. The verse in Ṛgveda (X. 75), quoted below, mentions the names of the Indian rivers westward which accords better with this theory. There are no very strong arguments in favour of the eastward migration theory except that it came into the field earlier. Indian tradition cannot be dismissed as false unless there are cogent reasons for that. If the tradition is to be regarded as false it requires to be shown why, how and in whose interests it was fabricated.

imāṁ me gange yamune sarasvati śutudri stomaṁ sacatā paruṣṇyā
asikñyā marudvyḍhe vitāstāyārjñāte śṛṇuhyāśuṣomayā

2. cf., Cambridge History of India, Essay on the Purāṇas by E. J. Rapson.
antiquated period of the Brāhmaṇas. They can scarcely have been reconstructed from the fragmentary evidence supplied by the Vedas and Brāhmaṇas at a time when no one could have dreamed of treating the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas as historical documents—a task reserved for the 19th century.

As regards the age of original Purāṇa, the following points are noteworthy:

(i) Bāṇa (A.D. 620) in his Harṣacaritam refers to Vāyu-purāṇa.

(ii) The land-grants of A.D. 475 and thereabouts quote verses of Vyāsa, ascribed to Mahābhārata, but really found in the Padma- and Bhaviṣyat-purāṇas.

(iii) Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa say that they borrowed their accounts from the Bhaviṣya; and the internal evidence therein shows that the Bhaviṣya existed in the middle of the 3rd century A.D.; the Matsya borrowed before the end of that century; and the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa borrowed in the next century.

(iv) The Āpastamba-sūtra (of not later than the 3rd century B.C., possibly two centuries earlier) quotes Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa as an authority. The term Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa is a contradiction in terms, and shows that the title purāṇa had come to be used as a mere class designation. It must have taken at least two centuries; and thus the Purāṇas must have existed at least as early as the beginning of the 5th century B.C., or even two centuries earlier. [Note the distinction between Bhaviṣyat (referred to by the Āpastamba) and Bhaviṣya of the 3rd century A.D., which in a tampered state we now have.]

(v) Kauṭilya has referred to, in his Arthaśāstra, on various occasions, the high authority of the Purāṇas.

(vi) The Śāṅkhyāyana Śrauta-sūtras and the Āśvalāyana-sūtras refer to Purāṇa.

(vii) The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa recommends the daily study of Itihāsa and Purāṇa.

(viii) The different Purāṇas agree in regard to all matters before Parikṣita as ‘past’, and all matters after a century after the great battle (950 B.C., according to Pargiter) as ‘future’. This century marks the transitional period. All
floating historical tradition must have been collected into one
original Purāṇa about this time.

(ix) The ancient lore of the bards from which, like the
epics, they are derived is known to the Atharvaveda as a
- class of literature with the general title itihāsa-purāṇa, and
both in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad and in early Buddhist books
-(Sutta Nipāta) this literature is called the fifth Veda; and as
such it is recognised up to the present day.

(g) Lower Limit of the Purāṇas. In fact, the different
Purāṇas as we have them at present, belong to the different
periods. As regards the lower limit of the important Purāṇas
that are really useful for our purpose, the following points
deserve notice:

(i) The Matsya-purāṇa gives accounts down to the downfall
of the Andhras (A.D. 236) mentioning the surviving Kilakila
kings. This brings down the historical narrative down to
about the middle of the 3rd century A.D. and no further.

(ii) The Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Brahmanda and Bhāgavata all carry
the narrative on to the rise of the Guptas. The conquests of
Samudragupta are not the least referred to. The historical
narrative, therefore, goes up to A.D. 330 at the latest. As the
Vāyu, Brahmanda and the Matsya are based on the original
evidence of the Bhaviṣya, it follows that Bhaviṣya must have
existed in some form by the end of 3rd century A.D. The
Matsya borrowed in the last quarter of the 3rd century A.D.
and Vāyu and Brahmanda in the early part of the 4th century
when the accounts had been augmented including those of the
early Gupta kings.

(iii) The treatment of the evils of Kali Age and chronologi-
cal-astronomical particulars corroborate the conclusions given
above.¹

(iv) The textual particularities also confirm the above
conclusions.¹

(v) C.V. Vaidya has drawn attention to the following śloka
in the Vāyu-purāṇa

anugaigaṁ prayāga ca sāketatī magadhāṁstathā
etāṅjanapadāṁ sarvān bhokṣyante guptavamśajāh
This refers to conditions later than A.D. 500 when the

¹. For detailed reasoning, cf. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age.
Gupta power came to an end.

\textit{(vi)} \textit{Viṣṇu} is decidedly later than \textit{Vāyu} for it carries the description further. It also gives details of Yavana kings of Kilakila who ruled in Andhra in the 8th and 9th centuries. This shows that interpolations continued to be made in the \textit{Purāṇas} up to that century at least.

\textit{(vii)} Vaidya has considered in detail the date of the \textit{Bhāgavata} and arrived at the conclusion that it is posterior to Śaṅkara\(^1\)(9th century) and anterior to Jayadeva,\(^2\) author of \textit{Gīta-govinda} (A.D. 1164) and thus belongs approximately to the 10th century. This \textit{Purāṇa} is much more popular than any other \textit{Purāṇa}. It has been translated into almost every one of the modern Indian languages.

---

1. \textit{Bhāgavata} mentions the Buddha as one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu, while Śaṅkara was hostile to the Buddha.

2. \textit{Bhāgavata} does not mention the name of Rādhā at all, while \textit{Gītā-govinda} is based on the love of Rādhā for Kṛṣṇa. If \textit{Bhāgavata} were later, the mention of Rādhā would have been made.
12. Bhasa’s Position in Sanskrit Literature. Till recently the illustrious Bhāsa was a mere name to the students of Sanskrit literature. Kālidāsa mentioned his name with honour in his play Mālavikāgnimitraṁ. Some other Sanskrit writers also mentioned his name and gave him the place of honour. Says Rājaśekhara:

Bhāso Rāmila-Somilau Vararucīḥ Śrī Sāhasāṅkaḥ Kaviḥ
Merātho Bhāravi Kālidāsa taralāḥ Skandāḥ Subanduṣca yaḥ
Daṇḍi Bāṇa-Divākarau Gaṇapatiḥ Kāntaśca Ratnākaraḥ
Siddhāyasya Sarasvatī Bhagavatī ke tasya sarve’pi te

In the prologue of Prasānna-rāghava, it is mentioned:
yasyaścakoraścikurā-nikaraḥ Karṇapūro mayūro
bhāso hāsaḥ kavi-kula-guruḥ Kālidāso vilāsaḥ
harṣo harṣo hṛdayavasatiḥ paṅcabāṇaṁ Bāṇaḥ
keśaṁ naiśā kathaya kavitā kāmini kautukāya

Some really beautiful stanzas, attributed to Bhāsa, occur in the anthologies. The following two occur in the Subhāṣītāvalī:
bāḷaṁ sā vidita pāṇicaśara-prapaṇcā
tanvī ca sā stanaḥ harapacitāṅgayaśṭīḥ
lajjāṁ samudvahati sā suratāvāsāne
hā kāpi sā kimiva kim kathayāmi tasyāḥ

dūḥkhārte mayi duḥkhitā bhavati yā hṛṣṭe prahṛṣṭā tathā
dine dainyamupaiti roṣaparuṣe pathyaṁ vacho bhāṣate
kālaṁ vetti kathāḥ karoti nipaṇā matsanistave rajyati
bhāryā mantrivaraḥ sakhā pariṣanaḥ saikā bahutvaṁ gatā[1]

There are about ten more ślokas attributed to Bhāsa which occur in Śārangadharapāḍāhati, Saduktikarnāṁrta and Sūktimuktāvalī.

1. cf., Wordsworth:
   A perfect woman nobly planned,
   To warm, to comfort and command.

   and Pope:
   “Thou wert my guide, philosopher and friend.”
Not much was known of Bhāsa, beyond these stray references. The discovery of thirteen plays in the Trivandrum series by T. Ganapati Sastri however has shed a flood of light on Bhāsa and his works. All these 13 plays\(^1\) are attributed to Bhāsa by scholars like Keith, Jacobi, Sten Konow, Lacote, and Winternitz, etc. Ganapati Sastri himself propounded this theory. The plays are of no little merit and do certainly deserve the honour bestowed upon them. Scholars like Barnett and Sylvain Levi disagree with this theory. We shall therefore consider this point in detail. The problem is: Do these thirteen plays belong to one and the same author or several authors? and if they belong to one and the same author, who is that author?

13. Do these dramas belong to the same author? The scholars are generally agreed on the point that all these dramas belong to one and the same author. The following points are adduced in support of this contention.

1. One striking feature is the position of the stage-direction nāndyante tataḥ praviṣati sūtradhāraḥ. In other plays of Sanskrit literature the stage direction follows the benedictory stanza or stanzas.

2. In these dramas we find community of technique, for instance, we find the term sthāpanā instead of the usual prastāvanā for prologue. Although some plays of other authors also bear the same technique\(^2\), yet these thirteen dramas form a separate group by themselves inasmuch as they contain no prarocanā i.e., they eschew all mention of the title and the poet.

3. The nāndi of at least four plays contains Mudrālāṅkāra, i.e., the names of the prominent characters in the play.

---

1. These thirteen plays may be divided into the following four categories:
   
   (a) Dealing with Udayana: Pratijñāyaugandharāyāṇa, Svapnavāsavadattam,
   
   (b) Based on Mahābhārata: Īrubhaṅgam (the only Indian tragedy), Bālacakirita, Dūta-ghatotkacan, Dūtavākyam, Kāraṇabhāram, Madhyama-vyāyogah, Pañcarātra,
   
   (c) Based on Rāmāyaṇa: Abhiśekha-nātaka, Pratimā-nātaka,
   
   (d) Based on fiction: Avimbāraka and cārūdattam.

2. Åścarya-cudāmaṇi of Śāktibhadra and Mattavilāsā (7th century A.D.) of King Mahendra Vikrama Varman, besides four Bhāṇas (a kind of farcical play) and two other plays possess the same characteristics.
4. These plays are mutually related to one another in different ways:

(a) Svapnavasāvadattam is the sequel to the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam, and thus bears the same relation to it as the Uttararāmacaritam does to the Mahāvīrācaritam of Bhavabhūti. The characters are the same. The diction, style and even the depiction of characters are remarkably alike in both. Not only that, Svapnavasāvadattam contains certain allusions to Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam.

(b) The scene in Avimāraka (Act I) where the king is anxious to select a suitable husband for his daughter closely resembles that in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam where Mahāsena is anxious to select a good husband, noble and brave, for his daughter Vāsavadattā.

(c) Bālācaritam (Act III, scene 1—cowherd scene) is almost identical with Pañcarātram, Act II, scene 1.

(d) Certain passages are common in Abhiśeka and Svapnavasāvadattam (e.g., kiṁ vākṣyatīti hṛdayāṁ pariśāṅkhitam me). Similarly certain passages are common in Bālācaritam and Cārudattam. The last words of Valin in Abhiśeka are identical with those of Duryodhana in Urudbhāgam.

5. These plays present us with common imagery: e.g., we find (a) simile of flash of lightning, seen and lost in the clouds in Avimāraka, Cārudattam, Abhiśeka and Dūtavākyāṁ.

(b) Simile of the moon in the mouth of Rāhu in Pratimā, Bālācaritam, Dūtavākyāṁ Madhyama Vyāyoga and Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam.

(c) The comparison of the powerful (e.g., Kṛṣṇa) with Mandāra mountain in Bālācaritam, Dūtavākyāṁ, Abhiśeka and Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam.

(d) The adventurous act of Kārtikeya’s mounting Mt. Krauñca is often repeated.

(e) Of adversaries, the stronger one is compared to a lion, and the weaker to an elephant.

(f) Wrath of an enemy in these plays is generally compared to conflagration.

(g) The loud sound is compared to the sound of the ocean at the time of dissolution, e.g.,

śaṅkha dhvanīḥ pralayasāgara ghoṣatulyaḥ (Karnabhāram) yasya svanāṁ pralayasāgara ghoṣatulyam (Dūtavākyāṁ)
6. Certain ideas are remarkably repeated in these plays, e.g., (a)
śāpāmi satyena bhayam na jāne (Madhyama-vyāyogaḥ)
kimetad bho bhayam nāma bhavatodya mayā śrutaṁ (Bālacaritam)
(b) To the beautiful, everything lends beauty: (athavā
sarvamalaṅkāro bhavati surūpāṁ) is repeated in different plays.
(c) The idea ‘that the natural arm is the most appropriate
weapon of the brave’ is also repeated several times. These
instances can be multiplied.

7. There is a remarkable agreement in the vocabulary
and expressions of these dramas, cf., the use of the term
yavanikā, and the expression aho akarunā khu issarā.

8. In these dramas we find the repetition of certain
dramatic devices and dramatic situations, e.g., Svapnavāsava
dattaṁ, Act VI with Abhiṣeka, Act III.

9. The demand for water āpastāvat by a dying man is
repeated in about six plays.

10. In these plays, the pathetic death-scenes have almost
common sentiments.

11. Another chief feature of these plays is that they have
short prologues.

12. Even the names of the secondary characters are repeated
in these plays, e.g., the female door-keeper is Vijayā, the
chamberlain is Bādarāyaṇa, and the cowherds are called
Vṛṣabhadatta and Kumbhadatta.

13. Another distinguishing feature is the use of metonymics
in some plays, e.g., yādavimātah, sauraseni-mātah, sumitrāmātah.

14. The deviation from Pāṇini’s rules is also quite common
in these plays, e.g.,
āpracchu is used in Parasmaipada, and the word Rājña is
used in compounds (cf., the use of Kaśirājñe, sarva rājñaḥ, etc.)

15. Last, but not the least, we have to refer to the similarity
of the Bharata-vākyā (the benedictory stanza of the play)—
imamapi mahīṁ kṛtām rājasimhaḥ praśāstu naḥ which is
common in several plays.

These several points lead us irresistibly to the conclusion
that these thirteen dramas belong to one and the same author.

1. cf., Kālidāsa’s Śākuntala, I. 18,
kīmīga hi madhurānāṁ maṇḍalam nā kṛtānāṁ
Even those who do not believe in attributing them to the illustrious Bhäsa do readily accept that they possess characteristics of common authorship.

14. Who is then the author? Bäña, the court-poet of Harśa (A.D. 606-648), has referred to the dramas of Bhäsa in his introduction¹ to Harṣacaritaṁ as follows:

 sûtradhära kṛtārmbhairnāṭakaṁ bahubhūmikaiṁ
apatākairyaśa lebhe Bhäso devakulairiva

All these three characteristics, sûtradhära kṛtārmbhatva (beginning with Sūtradhära), bahubhūmikatva² (large number of characters) and sapatākatva (variety of episodes in different plays³) which Bäña points out as the special features of Bhäsa’s plays are found in these thirteen dramas.

Again Rājaśekhara (9th century) has referred to Bhäsa-nāṭaka-cakra (a cycle of plays by Bhäsa) and definitely points out that Svapanvāsavadattam was one of his plays which survived the fire (of criticism), cf.,

svapnavāsavadattasya dāhako’bhūnna pāvakaḥ

These arguments suggest the authorship of these dramas by Bhäsa, but the opponents of this theory advance the following ślokas of Rājaśekhara.

kāraṇam tu kavitvasya na sampanna kulinatā
dhāvako’pi hi yad Bhäsaḥ kavināmagrimo’ bhavat
ādau Bhäsena racitā nāṭika Priyadarśikā
tasya Ratnāvali nūnam ratnamāleva rājate

................................................

Nāgānandam samālokyam yasya Śrīharṣavikramah

The argument advanced is that either Rājaśekhara is incorrect or there are two Bhäsas, (1) of pre-Kālidāsa and (2) post-Kālidāsa eras and in that case Svapanvāsavadattam is the work of the later Bhäsä. According to this rendering Dhāvaka in the above ślokas means washerman and Bhäsa the proper name. But this shows an utter ignorance of the Indian tradition

---

¹ This introduction is very useful from historical as well as chronological point of view. It is also important because it gives us an insight into the merits of the works referred to therein.
² In Kālidāsa’s Šākuntalam there are 23 characters, in Vikramorvaśīyan only 18; but these plays have an average of about 30 characters.
³ In Kālidāsa’s plays, the theme is almost identical.
supported by numerous Sanskrit writers that Dhāvaka was the author of three dramas mentioned above (Priyadarśikā, Ratnāvalī and Nāgānanda) and that he on that account got wealth from Śrīharṣa, the ruling monarch. Rightly interpreted Dhāvaka in the above ślokas is the proper name of the author and Bhāsa is the qualifying adjective meaning ‘lustrous one’. Hence the information of Rājaśekhara is correct.

It has been pointed out\(^1\) that the Svapnavāsavadattam spoken of by Rājaśekhara and referred to by several ancient poets and critics cannot be identified with the play now passing under that name. The writer of these dramas now passing under the name of Bhāsa is some obscure southern poet who may be placed in the 7th century A.D.\(^2\) Prof. Sylvain Levi has pointed out a stanza\(^3\) from Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra Guṇacandra which is not found in the extant edition. That the essence of this stanza is found in the present play cannot be denied. This only proves that Svapnavāsavadattam has more than one recension. This in no way is proof against the genuineness of the play. A parallel case is furnished by the Mālavikāgnimitraṁ of Kālidāsa. That there must have been more than one recension of Svapnavāsavadattam is also corroborated by the evidence of Śrī Bhoja Deva of Śrṅgāraprakāśa whose quoted passage is just the synopsis of Act V of Svapnavāsavadattam.

The Bhāvaprakāśa of Śrāradātanaya (12th century) quotes a śloka\(^4\) from Svapnavāsavadattam which actually occurs in the present version, and is therefore a testimony of its being a genuine work of Bhāsa. From this we may conclude that Bhāsa was the author of all these dramas.

15. His Other Works. The ślokas attributed to Bhāsa in the anthologies do not appear in any of these dramas. It is therefore quite probable that Bhāsa might have written some more dramas and possibly also some poetry (entitled Viṣṇudharma) besides a treatise on poetics, as evidenced by the

---

2. Barnet also agrees with this view.
3. pādākṛantāṁ puspāṁ soṣṭāṁ cedamāṁ śīlāsanām nūnāṁ kāciddhāśīṁ māṁ dṛṣṭvā sahasā gatā
c. cīrāprāṣuptaṁ kāmo me viśayā pratibodhitaṁ
tāṁ tu devīṁ na gaṇyāṁ yasyā ghaṇavati priyā
medieval Sanskrit literature. A drama named *Yajñaphalam* or *Yajñanāṭakam* was discovered and published by Rajavaidya Jivarama Kalidasa Sastri from Gondal (Kathiawad) in Samvat 1997. Its plot is taken from the Bālakāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmiki. Two manuscripts written in devanāgarī characters were discovered. The one ends as follows: *Iti yajñanāṭakam samāptaṁ vikramārka samvat 1727 Āśvina kṛṣṇapakṣe dvitiyāyām bhaumavāsare likhitam Svāmī Śuddhānandatīrtha.* The other ends with the words: *Iti Yajñaphalam sampūrṇam vikramiya samvatsara 1859 māsānāmuttam paūṣa māse site pakṣe pūrṇimāyām guruvāsare likhitam Devaprasāda Ṣarmanā Hastināpura nivāsī.*

It would appear that the full name of this drama is *Yajñaphalam* and that *Yajñanāṭakam* is its abbreviated form, just as we find *Svapnavāsavadattam* concluding with the words: *iti Svapnanāṭakamavasitam.* Like other dramas of Bhāsa, it commences with nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtrailhāraḥ, has a short prelude called *sthāpanā* which contains the names of neither the plot nor the drama and has a similar Bharatavākyā; cf.,

*rakṣantu varṇā dharmaṁ svam, praśāh syuranupaplutāh
tvam rājasimha prthvīṁ sāgarāntāṁ praśādhi ca*

We also find in it abundance of characters (*bahuḥhūmi-katva*). On these and other grounds of archaic language, sentiments, figures of speech and style etc. it was attributed by the editor Kalidasa Sastri to the illustrious Bhāsa and many scholars felt the same way; but further research has now shown that this constitutes an unsuccessful attempt of a modern scholar to write in the style of Bhāsa and is nothing but a forgery.

**16. Bhasa’s Style.** The chief characteristic of Bhāsa’s poetry is the simplicity of language and the force of eloquence. It is possessed of fire of passion, sense of rhythm and vividness of high-soaring imagination. In the interpretation of human psychology Bhāsa perhaps surpasses even the master-poet Kalidāsa who is a poet of nature *par excellence.* His dramas are based upon a variety of themes, and their plot is always interesting and simple. His great skill manifests itself not only in his beautiful language but also in the apt creation of dramatic situations. The splitting up of a *śloka* into bits
and then putting each bit in the mouth of a different character is another remarkable feature of his style. For quickness of repartee and the dazzling play of dialogue this device is admirably suited. In verse as well as in prose the author proves himself as the master of Kāvyā style. According to rhetoricians he belongs to the Vaidarbha school of poetry.

We find in his poetry the preponderance of śloka metre—rather a sign of antiquity. Another characteristic feature of Bhāsa’s style is, as we have noticed before, his frequent deviation from Pāṇini’s rules (which again is a sign of antiquity).

17. Date. Different scholars have assigned different dates to Bhāsa. Ganapati Sastri has assigned him to the 4th century B.C. on the ground that Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra quotes a śloka from Pratijñāyaugandharāyahāṁ. This argument presupposes that the Arthaśāstra was written in the 4th century B.C. which we cannot assert with definiteness in the present state of our knowledge. Rāmāvatāra suggested 10th century A.D. on the flimsy ground that Cārudattam was a bad abridgment of

---

1. For a similar tendency, cf. Viśākhadatta’s Mudrārākṣasa.
2. According to Danḍin (who follows Bharata in this respect) the following ten qualities are predominantly found in the Vaidarbha school of poetry.

śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samati mādhuryaṁ sukumāratā
arthavyaktiruddravamōjaḥ kāntisamādhayaḥ [Kavyādarśa, I. 41].

3. There are several varieties of this metre, but that which is most in use has eight syllables in each quarter—fifth syllable being always short, sixth always long and seventh alternately long and short, cf.,

śloke śaṣṭhaṁ gurujñeyam sarvatra laghu paṇcamaṁ
dvicaṭuḥ pādayorhṛasvaṁ saaptamaṁ dīrgamānayaḥ

4. navam śarāvaṁ salilasya pūruṇāṁ susaṁskṛtaṁ darbhaṅktottariyaṁ
tattasya mā bhūnnarakaṁ ca gaccheyo bhartṛpiṇḍasya kṛte na

5. The relation of Mṛcchakaṭikā and Čārudattam is so close that it precludes all possibility of independent origin. The two logical hypotheses can therefore be that either one of the plays has directly formed the basis of the other, or both of them are to be traced to a common source. As regards the first hypothesis, opinions differ whether Čārudattam which is admittedly an incomplete play in four acts is an abridgment of Mṛcchakaṭikā for stage-purposes, or it is an elaborate amplification of Čārudattam. Following arguments are adduced in support of the first view:

(i) Earlier rhetoricians like Vāmana and Abhinavagupta were acquainted with Mṛcchakaṭikā, rather than with Čārudattam. The citation of Vāmana, dyūtāṁ hi nāma puruṣasya simhāsanaṁ rājyaṁ occurs in Mṛcchakaṭikā.
Similarly while speaking of śleṣā, Vāmana says that it is to be greatly found in the works composed by Śūdraka and others.

(ii) The simile asatpurūṣaseveva is more appropriate and natural in its context in the Mrčchakaṭṭikā, while it is merely a rhetorical trifle in Cārudattaṁ.

(iii) The internal evidence shows that Cārudattaṁ is vague and the situation becomes clear only when we refer to Mrčchakaṭṭikā.

It appears that while these arguments carry some weight, they are by no means conclusive. On the other hand, the theory fails to account for the following facts: viz., (a) that there are certain passages in Cārudattaṁ which do not occur in Mrčchakaṭṭikā (b) the author of Cārudattaṁ makes no reference to the political revolution at Ujjayini. If the author of Cārudattaṁ were later, he could not avoid all reference to this important by-plot.

An attempt has been made to arrive at some result on the ground of mutual differences rather than mutual resemblances. The main differences are in (a) Technique, (b) Prakrits, (c) Versification, and (d) Dramatic incident.

(a) Technique. The two main differences are (i) that the usual nāndī is missing in both the MSS. of the Cārudattaṁ and (ii) the name of the playwright is not given in the sthāpanā. The Mrčchakaṭṭikā has both nāndī as well as the name of the playwright in its prologue. The argument however is not conclusive and cannot lead us either way.

(b) Prakrits. The result based on the comparative study of the Prakrits also cannot be decisive, particularly so in this case when we know that Cārudattaṁ being a MS. of the southern India has naturally survived archaic forms. This argument need not therefore be discussed in detail.

(c) Versification. The comparative study of the verses of the two plays reveals to us the fact that whenever there is textual difference, the reading of Mrčchakaṭṭikā is generally better. To quote a few examples,

(i) Cārudattaṁ, yathāndhakārādiya dipadarśanaṁ [Tautology of yathā and īva.]

Mrčchakaṭṭikā, ghanāndhakārādiva dipadarśanaṁ

(ii) Cārudattaṁ, yo yāti daśāṁ daridratāṁ [Two abstract nouns—one Mrčchakaṭṭikā...naro...... used as qualifying the other.]

(iii) Cārudattaṁ, Kīlina Kharjūra pāṇḍu [quoted as a simile of the moon. Very naive and original.]

Mrčchakaṭṭikā, Kāmini gaṇḍa pāṇḍu [Polished, and in accordance with the Rasa theory.]

These instances can be multiplied. They show that Mrčchakaṭṭikā must have been composed later, otherwise the faulty text of Cārudattaṁ cannot be accounted for.

(d) Dramatic incident. The above conclusion is again corroborated by differences in dramatic incident. The plot of Mrčchakaṭṭikā is far more skilful. The chief point to be noticed is that some of the discrepancies of
and Sten Konow have assigned these plays to the period between 2nd and 4th century A.D. on the ground that the Prakrit of these plays occupies an intermediate place between the Prakrit of Āśvaghoṣa and that of Kālīdāsa. Any conclusion arrived at solely on the basis of the Prakrits cannot, as suggested elsewhere, be regarded as conclusive because the dramas of Bhāsa were discovered in Southern India, while that of Āśvaghoṣa in Central Asia. As regards the internal evidence furnished by these dramas, we notice the following points:

(i) The Bharatavākyya is in its primitive stage.
(ii) Yavanikā is mentioned not to denote 'curtain' but 'veil.'
(iii) A change in location is effected by a new act, but no direction as to locality is ever given.
(iv) The language of these dramaś is absolutely free from the Kāvya artificiality which we find in the Rudradamana inscription of 2nd century A.D. We find in them archaic grammatical forms and not alliteration or long compounds.
(v) We find the use of archaic expressions, e.g.,
(a) The expression Ārṇaputra is used in the sense of Prince similar to that in the Siddapur inscription of Aśoka;
(b) The epithet Mahābrāhmaṇa is used in good sense and not in that of a funeral priest;
(c) The term yakṣipī occurs as a female evil spirit as in the early Buddhist literature;
(d) The house of the Bharatas has been identified with that of the Vedas by Bhāsa, cf.,
Vedākṣarasamasavāyapraviṣṭo Bhārato vanśaḥ (—Pratiṣṭā.)

Carudattam have been avoided in Mrčchakaṭikā. To quote one example, Carudattam mentions the late rising of moon in the evening of the 6th of a fortnight; two days after it mentions the setting of moon at midnight. This is an erroneous description which Mrčchakaṭikā has rightly corrected. It would be difficult to believe that an accurate description was changed into an erroneous one as a result of an abridgment for dramatic purposes.

The conclusion therefore is that Mrčchakaṭikā is a deliberate amplification of Carudattam. Whether the motive of elaboration was the incompleteness of the original Carudattam or Kāvyaṭhā Cauryanṭ is difficult to say at this stage.

If further discoveries bring forth new materials which go against Carudattam as an original work which we do not expect in this case, then also as a corollary of our former conclusion we may assume that Carudattam has preserved a great deal of the original upon which Mrčchakaṭikā is based.
(vi) In relating a story the sentence commences with "There was king Brahmadatta of Kāmpilya" in the familiar style of the Jātaka literature.

(vii) The drama Pañcarātram is based on a version¹ unknown to our present Mahābhārata.

(viii) These dramas depict a society which had just adopted Buddhist institutions in the orthodox system: for instance, cf. the character of Śramaṇaka in Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇam. At the same time we find anti-Buddhistic tendencies.²

(ix) The stanza

\[ \text{imāṁ sāgaraparyantāṁ himavadvindhya kuṇḍalāṁ} \\
\text{mahīṁ ekātapatraṅkaṁ rājasimḥaḥ prāṣastu naḥ} \]

refers to ekātapatra, sovereignty extending to the Himālayas, the Vindhyas and the seas. Such a period existed between 325 and 100 B.C.

(x) The preponderance of śloka metre and the frequent deviation from Pāṇini’s rules, as mentioned before, are also signs of antiquity. On these grounds it appears that Ganapati Śastri’s suggestion of 4th century B.C. might be regarded as a probable date. This marks the upper limit of Bhāsa’s date.

As regards the lower limit, we know for certain that these dramas are earlier than Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgnimitram, as well as Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra. Kālidāsa’s date is still a matter of controversy. The lower limit of Arthaśāstra is generally regarded by scholars as 2nd century A.D. Bhāsa must have therefore flourished earlier than that.

---

1. In Pañcarātram Duryodhana is known to have promised to share the territories with the Pāṇḍavas if they were found in five nights. Besides Abhimanyu is mentioned as fighting on the side of Duryodhana against Virāṭa by whose party he was seized.

2. Such a period existed in the anti-Buddhistic Brahmin Empire of the Śuṅgas and the Kaṇvas.
THE ARTHASAstra OF KAUTILYA

18. A Contribution of the Deccan. The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya is the most important contribution of the south to Sanskrit literature. Its discovery has revolutionised all our notions about the culture and civilization of Ancient India. Before it came to light, the Indians were regarded ignorant in the sphere of Political Science. The general opinion was that the Indian civilization had distinguished itself only in the sphere of thought, but had miserably failed in that of action. The Arthaśāstra deals not only with the principles of Government but also with the administrative details. Its sphere is comprehensive. It gives us an insight into the manifold duties of a king, the formation of villages, the problems of land, agriculture and commerce, ways of developing arts and crafts, excise, forests and mining, forms of punishment, irrigation and famine, etc. The chief feature of the Arthaśāstra is that we find in it a harmonious combination of theory and practice. Thus its position in Sanskrit literature is even more important than of the works of Aristotle and Plato in Greek literature.

19. The Author. (a) Fortunately we have got internal evidence on this point. Towards the end of the work we find,

yena śāstraṁ ca śāstraṁ ca nandarāja-gatā ca bhūh
amarṣeṇodadhīrtīnāyāsu tena śāstramidām kṛtaṁ

Further it is stated at the end,

"Having seen discrepancies in many ways on the part of the writers of commentaries on the Śāstras, Viśṇugupta² himself has made (this) sūtra and commentary."³

1. Some other notable contributions of the south are Bhāsa's thirteen plays, Bhāmaha's work on Aṅkāra and the Avantisundari-kathā.
2. svayameva viśṇuguptaścakāra sūtraṁca bhāṣyaṁca.
3. Similarly other passages in the text may be quoted, e.g.,
   (a) Kauṭilyena kṛtaṁ śāstraṁ vinuktah granthavistaraṁ (I. 1)
   (b) Kauṭilyena narendrārthe śūsanasyavidhīkṛtaṁ (II. x)

This clearly shows that Viśṇugupta and Kauṭilya are the names of one and the same person.
(b) As regards external evidence, the following points are noteworthy:

1. The Nitisāra of Kāmandaka purports to be an abridgement of the Arthasastra and the author pays homage to Viṣṇugupta in the beginning of his work.

2. In the Chapter VIII of the Daśakumāracaritam, Daṇḍin says:

\[ iyamidānīṁ acāryya Viṣṇuguptena mauryārthe śadbhiḥ śloka-
sahasraṁ samkṣiptā \]

Besides, while describing the daily duties of a king, he has borrowed certain passages verbatim from the Arthasastra. In the story of Somadatta in the Daśakumāracaritam he again refers to the work of Kauṭilya as follows:

Kauṭilya Kāmandakīyādi nītīpaṭalalakausalaṁ

3. References to Cāṇakya’s Arthasastra occur in the Nandisūtra of the Jainas, the Pañcatantra, the Nītivākyāṃṛta of Somadeva, and Mallinātha’s commentaries on Kālidāsa’s works.

4. That Kauṭilya had definite connection with Candragupta Maurya is clearly established by the following evidence:

(i) The Viṣṇu-purāṇa says:

\[ navaivā tān nandān kauṭīlyo brāhmaṇaḥ samuddhariṣyati \]

…….kauṭīlyo eva candraguptaṁ rājye’bhisekṣyati

The Bhāgavata-purāṇa says in the same strain,

\[ navaṇandān dvijāḥ kāśicī prapannāmuddhariṣyati \]

sa eva candruguptaṁ vai dvijo rājye’bhisekṣyati

The Vāyu-, Matsya- and Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇas also contain similar passages.

(ii) The above is corroborated by the frequent references occurring in the Jaina¹ and the Buddhist² literatures.

(iii) The Mudrārākṣasa also has for its plot the efforts of Cāṇakya to stabilize the government of Candragupta Maurya after having first murdered the nine Nandas.

5. That Cāṇakya was known by various names is clear from the following verse occurring in the Abhidhāna Cintāmaṇi.

---

1. The important Jaina works are the Sthavirāvalī-carita, Nandisūtra and Rṣi-maṇḍala prakaraṇavṛtti.

2. The important Buddhist works are the Samantapaśādikā of Buddhaghoṣa (a commentary on Vinayapiṭaka) and Mahāvaṇṇasatikā.
vātsyāyane mallanāgaḥ kuṭilāśca naṇakātmajāḥ.

drāmilaḥ pakṣilambāmi viṣṇugupto'ngulaśca saḥ.

It appears that his proper name was Viṣṇugupta. He came to be known as Cāṇakya because he was the son of Cāṇaka, and he was called Kauṭalya because he did probably belong to the Kuṭala gotra. He came to be known as Kauṭilya because of his kuṭila-nīti (crooked politics). His other names are not important.

6. The Work of an Individual. There occur passages like iti Cāṇakyaḥ; neti Cāṇakyaḥ in the text itself as many as seventy-two times. On this ground, Hillebrandt argued that this could not have been the work of an individual, much less that of Cāṇakya. According to him it was the work of several writers, belonging to the same school. It has been pointed out that we do not find passages like iti Yāskā and iti Patañjaliḥ in the Nirukta and the Mahābhāṣya. This argument has been strongly challenged by Jacobi. Many writers in India have used their names in the third person in their own works to escape the charge of egoism. Nanak, Kabir, Tulsi Das and several other poets have done the same. There is ample evidence to show that the book begot the school, and not the school the book.

(i) Kāmandaka clearly refers to the individual author of the work and knows no such school.

(ii) The work has been written by the author with a definite purpose. In the beginning of the work he says: prthivyā lābhe pālane ca yāvanti arthasāstrāṇi pūrvācāryyaḥ prasthāpitāṁ prāyaśastāni saṁhṛtya ekāmidimarthaśāstrāṁ kṛtam. No two portions of the Arthasāstra contain contradictory views.

(iii) If some writer, later than Cāṇakya, were the author of this work, then the passages iti Cāṇakyaḥ, neti Cāṇakyaḥ and iti ācāryyaḥ would lose all significance because then Cāṇakya himself would be an ācārya!

(iv) Kauṭilya himself has mentioned his predecessors as many as 114 times and has strongly criticised their views.

(v) Wheresoever the name of the author has been mentioned or reference to him made in the text, it is always in the singular.

(vi) The work commences with a carefully drawn table of contents. We find in it a rare unity of plan and structure.

That there were before the author numerous works on
arthaśāstra which he abridged and modified is quite evident from the text itself. That he may have got substantial help from his State-officers in the collection of the necessary data for his work may also be true, but there is nothing to show that the work is not a genuine production of Cāṇakya.

20. Date of the Work. 1. In his introductory note to Shamasasya's translation of the work (published from Mysore, 1923) Dr. Fleet has assigned the probable date 321-296 B.C. to this work. Jacobi, Thomas and several other scholars agree with this view.

2. According to Jolly, this work resembles Kāmasūtra of the 4th century A.D. and may therefore be roughly dated about that time. He has mainly depended upon the fact that his name is not mentioned by Megasthenese. Recent researches have shown that the evidence of Megasthenese is not very reliable. For instance, he says that the Indians were not acquainted with the art of writing, but no scholar can believe such a thing now. Jolly himself admits that Megasthenese did not know the languages and literatures of India and that his evidence is therefore inferior in value even to that of Alberuni. In fact, the Arthaśāstra portrays a Pre-Mauryan period. Even if Megasthenese had been a close observer, the discrepancies between him and Cāṇakya would have been but natural. Besides it may be stated that argumentum ex silendo is seldom satisfactory. Megasthenese has not made any mention of the Nandas. How can then we expect any mention

---

1. Some characteristic features of the society depicted in the Arthaśāstra are:

(a) The killing of Brāhmaṇa is allowed for political offences.
(b) The looting of temples is allowed in the interests of the State.
(c) The divorce of husband and wife is permitted under special circumstances.
(d) The re-marriage of woman is permitted when the husband is dead or has been in a foreign country for a very long period.
(e) The practice of Atharvan witchcraft was observed.
(f) The worship of Vaiśvānara, Saṁkaraṇa and Mahākaccha is laid down.
(g) Marriage of girls at their own choice after puberty is allowed.
(h) Marriage of a Śūdra-wife by a Brāhmaṇa is permitted.
(i) The embracing of military profession by Brāhmaṇa was practised, etc.
21. **Style.** The style of the *Arthaśāstra* closely follows that of the Āpastamba, Baudhāyana and other Dharmasūtras. We find in it a mixture of prose and verse. The prose and the verse here are supplementary to each other. Without the one the other remains incomplete. Again it is a combination of *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* (commentary), both written by the author himself. Occasionally the commentary approaches the diction of the Upaniṣads and the later Brāhmaṇas. A rare unity of plan and structure pervades the whole work. Some words violate the rules of Pāṇini, e.g., we find *aupaniṣadīka* for *aupaniṣatka*, *rocayānte* for *rocante* and *caturāśrikā* for *cāturāśrikā*. 
22. Renaissance of the 1st Century B.C. As mentioned earlier, Aśvaghoṣa was a great Sanskrit poet. He was a Buddhist monk and follower of the Mahāyāna school. He was a contemporary of Kāniṣka (1st century A.D.). He wrote several Sanskrit commentaries on Buddhist canonical works of Pali. That a Buddhist preacher felt compelled to make use of Sanskrit even for the propagation of his religious doctrines shows that a renaissance of Sanskrit must have taken place before the Christian era. It appears that some political upheaval of great importance which could not be resisted by the Mahāyānists took place after Aśoka’s reign. Certain Hindu powers like the Śungas and the Kaṇvas came into prominence and popularised Sanskrit. The influence of the Takṣaśilā university was felt far and wide. Puṣyamitra is known to have performed the horse-sacrifice in the 2nd century B.C. in the heart of the empire. Patañjali flourished during this period and he refers to many other contemporary works. The bulk of the Mahābhārata was edited during the period. The metrical Śṛṣṭis—the Manu-smṛti, the Yajñavalkya-smṛti, etc.—belong to this period. Most of the Purāṇas also were composed during this period. The pre-Christian period was therefore a period of great Sanskrit activity. The influence was so great that even the inscriptions\(^1\) began to be written in Sanskrit, and the later literature of the Jainas also came to be written in it. The Vikrama\(^2\) era is dated 57 B.C. It must obviously have been founded in honour of some great Hindu King or in commemoration of some important Hindu victory. According to tradition, Kālidāsa is also said to have flourished in the 1st century B.C.

---

1. The Rudradamana inscription dated 72 śaka era (A.D. 150) is certainly not the earliest inscription in Sanskrit. Both its language as well as style show a high degree of development.

2. In earlier inscriptions an era dated 57 B.C. is referred to as Kṛta era.
23. Kalidasa. Kalidāsa is admittedly the greatest poet of Sanskrit. He is truly represented as 'Shakespeare of India.' By the Indian scholars and rhetoricians he has been referred to as Mahākavi, Kavi-śiromāṇi and Kavikulaguruḥ, etc. It is deplorable that we know nothing definite about the poet's personal history or even about his date. His upper limit and lower limit still vary from one another by five centuries. He was a profound scholar and trained in all the arts of learning available in his time, not excluding, of course, the science of politics, astrology and the Kāmaśāstra.

Kalidāsa is known to us as a writer of dramas, lyrics and epics. The number of works attributed to him is large indeed, but the following works are of great importance and deserve detailed description:

(1) Mālavikāgnimitraṁ
(2) Vikramorvaśīyaṁ
(3) Abhijñāna Śākuntalam
(4) Ritusamhāra
(5) Meghadūta
(6) Kumārasambhavam
(first eight cantos)
(7) Raghuvamśa

( Dramas)
( lyrics)
( epics)

24. Malavikagnimitram. Wilson once doubted the genuineness of this work, but since then it has been conclusively shown that this drama unquestionably belongs to Kalidāsa. The evidence of the manuscripts of the play, the contents of its prologue, the internal evidence (e.g., the striking similes), the delineation of characters (each character having its own individuality after Kalidāsa’s manner), the excellence of dramatic art (he builds a remarkable composition out of an ordinary story), as well as the style and the language of the play leave us in no doubt regarding its being rightly attributed to Kalidāsa. It is undoubtedly the earliest play of Kalidāsa. In the prologue to the play, he feels diffident if the audience will care to witness

---

1. The few legends such as the one describing early ignorance and boon from goddess Śakti and the other describing his death in Ceylon at the hands of a greedy hetaira, are of little credence, and do not carry us far.
the performance of his drama when there existed the compositions of famous poets like Bhāsa, Saumilla and Kaviputra. It contains five acts and records the love-story and final union of King Agnimitra of Vidiśā and princess Mālavikā of Vidarbha. Incidentally, it refers to Puṣyamitra¹ (King's father) sending news of victory from the north, and Vasumitra (King's son) defeating the Yavanas on the bank of the Indus while guarding the sacrificial horse, which King Agnimitra had let loose in order to proclaim himself as emperor.

25. Vikramorvasiyam. This play was written earlier than the Śākuntalam wherein the poet reaches the climax of dramatic art. It contains five acts and its theme is the love of Pururavas, a king, with Urvaśī, a divine nymph. In the first act, Urvaśī who is seized by the demon Keśīn is rescued by King Pururavas who is possessed of extraordinary valour. Before they part, they fall desperately in love with each other. In the next act, the King is seen conversing with Vidūṣaka on his deep love for Urvaśī who appears there in an invisible form with her friend and drops a message of love written on birch-bark. Then follows the conversation between the two, Pururavas and Urvaśī; she is, however, soon called back to take part in a drama in heaven. The love message of Urvaśī, entrusted to Vidūṣaka by the King, falls into the hands of the Queen who gets furious. The King makes vain efforts to appease her (Act II).

In the interlude we learn how Urvaśī has been cursed by Bharata to go down to the mortal region. She badly played the role of Lakṣmī and said she loved Pururavas when she ought to have said Puruṣottama meaning Viṣṇu. On Indra's intercession, she was permitted to come to heaven after the sight of her son by Pururavas. In Act III the Queen is reconciled; she permits Pururavas to marry his lady-love. Urvaśī invisibly overhears their conversation and joins Pururavas when the Queen has left him (Act III).

In the interlude we further learn of a misfortune. Urvaśī gets enraged, enters the grove of Kumāra, prohibited to ladies,

¹. He was the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty and came to power in 178 B.C. through the deposition of the last Maurya.
and is transformed into a creeper. The King gets mad in her quest. In vain, he seeks help from the cloud, the peacock, the cuckoo, the bee, the elephant, the antelope and the stream. At last, he hears a voice from heaven and finds a magic gem through the influence of which he embraces that creeper which transforms into Urvasi on his touch (Act IV).

In the last act, we find the happy King and his beloved back in the capital. Soon after, we find that the magic gem has been stolen by a vulture who is, however, pierced by an arrow which bears the inscription, "Ayuś, son of Pururavas and Urvasī." Soon after, a brave Kṣatriya boy is brought to the King's presence by a woman from the hermitage to return him to his mother Urvasī, because he had violated against the rules of the hermitage. The King knew nothing of his son but feels glad to see him. Urvasī is, however, sad at the thought of her departure. The King, too, feels distressed. Soon after, Nārada appears with a happy message from heaven. The help of Pururavas is sought by Indra in a battle against the demons and he is permitted to enjoy the company of Urvasī for life.

26. Abhijnana Sakuntalā. It is admittedly the finest work of Kalidāsa which he wrote in his later years. It won the admiration of Goethe whose introduction to Faust bears its impress and was first translated into English by Sir William Jones. It contains seven acts. In the prologue we find King Dūṣyanta swiftly pursuing a deer which escapes into the penance-grove of Kaṇva. The King then alights from the chariot to pay homage to the sage but he is away. His foster-daughter Sakuntalā, who is his very breath, is in charge of the hermitage. She is pursued by a honey-bee and cries for help. Her friends, Anasūya and Priyāvāda, jokingly remark that Dūṣyanta, the legal protector of the hermitage, should protect her. The King is ready for the occasion. From her friends, he learns that Sakuntalā was the daughter of Vīśvamitra and Menakā. She was, therefore, not unworthy of him. Before departure, the King writes a letter to her instructing her to return to her former abode. In the second act the story is continued.

1. The whole act is, so to say, a refined piece of high lyric poetry consisting of the mad king's soliloquies.

2. The story incidentally illustrates how husband's love is more paramount than the love of offspring to a woman.
the King is called to ward off a wild elephant, menacing the hermitage; they are in deep love with each other (Act I). The King narrates his experiences of love to Vidūsaka. He willingly accepts the burdensome duty of protecting the hermitage against the attacks of demons. He gets an urgent call from the capital to be present in a festival there but sends Vidūsaka in his stead, warning him at the same time that his remarks about Sakuntalā may not be treated as serious (Act II).

Sakuntalā is unwell and her friends are very anxious about her health (Interlude). She has gone far in love for the King; at the suggestion of her friends, she pens a letter indicative of her love. Duṣyanta overhearing appears in person. A long conversation takes place between the two till the King is obliged to part on the arrival of the nun Gautami (Act III). The King has now returned to the capital and seems to have entirely forgotten his love who remains in a pensive mood and fails to notice the arrival of the wrathful Durvāsas, thus incurring his irrevocable curse, which is mitigated at the intercession of her friends; she will be forgotten by her husband, unless of course he is presented with his own ring as a token of recognition (abhijnāna). This forms the central basis of the whole plot (Interlude).

Kanva by supernatural power comes to know of Sakuntalā's Gadharva marriage. Unwillingly he decides to send her under escort to the King. Even the Sage feels the pangs of separation. Sakuntalā, too, is very sad to leave the aged Sage, her friends and even the birds and plants of the hermitage that she reared with her own hands. Pathos reigns supreme in this Act and the perfection of Kālidāsa reaches its zenith here (Act IV). Overwhelmed with royal duties, the dutiful King is busy in court when the arrival of two hermits and a lady is reported to him. Under the influence of Durvāsas' curse, he fails to recognise his wife and refuses to admit her. The hermits try to awaken him to his duty but the King expresses his helplessness. At last, they decide to leave Sakuntalā in the presence of her husband and retire. To the surprise of all, a divine light (Menakā) appears in human form there and carries her away (Act V).

A fisherman is found in possession of the royal ring which Sakuntalā had dropped while bathing. He is charged with
theft and is arrested by the policemen (Interlude). The King recognises the ring. The influence of curse being now over, he is reminded of Śakuntalā and other associations with her. He repents for his utter forgetfulness and feels miserable. Soon after he hears the woeful screams of Vidūṣaka who has been roughly handled by Mātali, Indra’s charioteer, from whom he learns that his aid is needed in heaven against the demons (Act IV). After his victory in heaven, Mātali leads the King to show him the interesting places of heaven till they reach the hermitage of Mārīca, where the King sees a young boy playfully pulling a lion’s cub. Soon after, the King learns that the brave little boy is his own son. Śakuntalā appears there in ascetic garb and the sage Mārīca celebrates their happy union, informing Śakuntalā at the same time that the King was in no way responsible for her sorrowful sufferings (Act VII).

27. Ritusamhara (The Cycle of Seasons) is Kālidāsa’s lyric work written in early days. It begins with an elaborate account of summer season and ends with a rather meagre account of the spring when young love is at its climax and reaches its perfection in the hands of Kālidāsa. The main characteristics of the six seasons are described in a picturesque manner; and the emotions that they produce in the lovers are explained in each case. The bright days of the summer are oppressive to the young lovers who find solace in the cool nights when even the moon feels jealous of the lovely young maidens and the separated lovers feel the pangs of separation. The rainy season approaches with its thick clouds bending down as it were to kiss the mountain-tops and inspiring feelings of love in the young lovers. The winter season has its own charms. The condition of the separated maiden is like that of a priyāṅgu creeper, exposed to the onslaughts of wind; but the maiden whose lover is near her, finds it the best of seasons. Lastly, comes the spring, richly decorated with the blossoms of the mango which serve as cupid’s shafts to pierce the hearts of young ladies.

The work consists of 153 stanzas in six cantos (each canto dealing with one season) and is composed in various metres. Even at this early stage Kālidāsa manifests keen powers of observation and quality of perfect lucidity. “Perhaps no
other work of Kālidāsa manifests so strikingly the poet’s deep sympathy with Nature, his keen powers of observation and his skill in depicting an Indian landscape in vivid colours.”\textsuperscript{1} No other work of Kālidāsa’s possesses “that perfect lucidity which is one of the charms of the poem to modern taste, even if it did not appeal to writers on poetics”.\textsuperscript{2}

28. Meghaduta (The Cloud-messenger). It is undoubtedly a mature lyrical work of Kālidāsa. It is, so to say, a Greek elegy in Sanskrit literature. A Yakṣa has been exiled by Kubera,\textsuperscript{3} his lord, for one year. Severed from his beloved, he lives in Rāmagiri hills (in central India), and seeing a cloud going northwards sends the message of consolation to his beloved through him. He bids the cloud follow its way over mount Āmrakūṭa, quench the forest fires with its rains, proceed across the Narmadā, beneath the Vindhyas, over the city of Vidiśā, the stream of Vetravatī and the city of Ujjayinī to the holy Kurukṣetra and drink the sacred and sweet waters of the Sarasvatī. Thence it must proceed to Kanakhalā (near Hardwar), and then to Kailāsa and the Mānasā lake where having refreshed itself with its waters, it should reach Alakā, his own place or more appropriately the place of his beloved. Thereafter the Yakṣa gives the exact situation of his beloved’s residence so that it may have no difficulty in finding it out. The Yakṣa then entreats the cloud to let its lightning play gently and to muffle its thunder so that it may not awaken his beloved rudely from a dream in which perchance she might be thinking of her husband. He describes her as pale and emaciated on account of separation. When she is awake, it should give her the message of his sincere and faithful love and console her by giving an assurance of the union which is not very far.

Suggestions for the subject-matter may be traced in Vālmiki’s Rāmāyana, e.g., Rāma’s grief for the lost Sitā forms a prototype of the Yakṣa’s sorrows for his beloved and the description of the rainy season in the Rāmāyana (iv. 28)

\textsuperscript{1} Macdonell, A History of Sanskrit Literature, 4th Edition, p. 337.
\textsuperscript{2} A. B. Keith, A History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{3} Not by Śiva, as Keith wrongly puts it in his A History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 85.
suggests some points of resemblance. Still Kālidāsa’s description is his own and his power of developing the idea is remarkable. Kālidāsa’s theme is certainly possessed of originality and his diction dignified. The poem is divided into two sections containing 101 to 120 stanzas, and is wholly written in mandākrānta metre with great command.

A parallel theme exists in Schiller’s Maria Stuart, where the captive queen bids the clouds as they fly towards the land of her happy youth. Here the separation of the queen is permanent and her sad plight arouses sympathy in the reader’s mind.

The Meghadūta has been widely read, imitated and commented upon by different scholars in different centuries. Vatsabhātī certainly accepted it as a model in his famous panegyric found in the Mandasor inscription dated v. s. 530 (i.e., A.D. 472-3) which he wrote rather with effort (prayatnena) to consecrate the temple of sun at Daśapura. Although it is written in the Gaudī style as opposed to the Vaidarbhī of Kālidāsa, some stanzas are really very fine and in the 44 stanzas that this praśasti contains, he manages to bring in a lengthy description of the city of Daśapura and an account of the spring and the winter seasons. It is noteworthy that the Meghadūta exists in a Tibetan version in Tanjūr and also in a Sinhalese rendering. Besides we find many verses quoted in works on poetics. In the 12th century we find it imitated in the Ravanadūta of Dhyoyika.

The poem is of great interest to the geographer as well, because it furnishes us with ample geographical data as we have it in the times of Kālidāsa.

29. Kumaraśambhavam. It is a mahākāvyya in seventeen cantos, ix to xvi of it being the work of a later writer. As the title suggests it deals with the birth of Kumāra Kārttikeya, the son of Śiva and Pārvatī, who destroyed the demon Tāraka, the oppressors of the gods and in fact of everything noble in...
the world. Even the demi-gods and the divine spirits take delight in immovable sports here. Siva, the destined spouse of Siva, is born in such environments and grows to be a marvellous beauty. Although she has attained the majority, her father does not dare to make request to Siva lest he might refuse abhyar!han! bhangabhayena sÄdhur
dhâyasthyâmi, yāpavâlambate xthe.' All the same, she is permitted to wait upon Siva, and serve him along with other companions (Canto I). In the meantime, the gods, oppressed by the demon Târaka, approach Brahma and pray for aid. Even Brahma is helpless; he has himself bestowed a boon upon the demon, and even if poisonous, a tree ought not to be cut by the planter himself. Only Siva's son from Pârâvati can deliver them from the distress (Canto II). Indra sends for Cupid who undertakes to stagger the resolve of Siva, if assisted by his friend Vasanta (the Vernal Season). On his advent, the whole nature revives; even the birds and the beasts feel love-stirred in Pârâvati appears before Siva, who feels a strange perturbation of heart. On breaking his samâdhi, he finds Cupid ready to shoot his shaft, when a flash of light issues forth from the third eye of the enraged Siva, and burns him to ashes (Canto III). Rati is unable to bear the separation of Cupid. She resolves to perish on the same pyre along with her husband. The exhortations of Vasanta are of no avail. A voice from heaven saves her from the calamity; her husband would be revived when Siva's marriage with Pârâvati takes place. Anxiously she awaits that fortunate day (Canto IV). Baffled in her attempts, Pârâvati now makes up her mind to win Siva by penance! Her mother's protests go all in vain, she goes to a mountain-peak and practises such a severe penance that even the sages envy her. She would not take even leaves of trees fallen on their own accord and lives upon water that came to her unasked. Siva can not remain unaffected. Disguised as an ideal brahmacarîn he appears before her and in order to test her fidelity points out the numerous defects of Siva. Pârâvati gives a befitting reply and says that he did not know the real Siva. She moves away from that place, it is sin not only to talk ill of the great, but even to listen to their dispraise. Siva then assumes his real
form, holds her by the arm and says, 'I am your slave purchased by penance.' (Canto V). The Seven Seers, accompanied by Arundhatī approach Pārvatī's father on Śiva's behalf and praise the wooer. Pārvatī standing by her father's side listens to all that they say with face downcast and her father seeks her mother's consent, for in the matter of their daughters the householders are generally guided by the advice of their wives. The mother readily agrees (Canto VI). Huge preparations for the royal wedding take place and the marriage is celebrated with great pomp and show. The poet vividly describes the mingled feelings of joy and sorrow of Pārvatī's mother (Canto VII). The next Canto describes in all detail of Kāmasūtra the amour of Śiva and Pārvatī.

From Ānandavardhana (iii. 6) we learn that critics took objection to the exchange of love-passages between the parents of the universe. Possibly this criticism was responsible for Kālidāsa's not writing further and carrying the story at least to the birth of Kumāra which the title suggests. Evidently he was not taken away by death, because Raghuvamśa is admittedly the work of his maturity and is likewise incomplete.

The later cantos carry the story beyond the point suggested by the title. Skanda, the war god, is born. He grows to be a valiant youth of unsurpassed heroism. Ultimately his victory over the demon Tāraka is described.

30. Raghuvamsa. It is a mahākāvya in nineteen cantos and is admittedly the last work of Kālidāsa. Although the story is much the same as we find in the Rāmâyana and the Purāṇas, yet Kālidāsa's originality and his keen power of observation are remarkable. The account begins with King Dilīpa. His numerous qualities are described. Unfortunately he once failed to pay due homage to Surabhi, Indra's cow, and incurred the curse of childlessness. This could be mitigated only by his receiving a boon from her daughter Nandinī (I). On Vasiṣṭha's advice, Dilīpa served Nandinī in the forest. Once a lion leapt over Nandinī; the king offered his own body to save the cow, and passed through the ordeal of proving his fidelity to the cow. The lion was none else than a servant of Śiva sent for the purpose. The king got the desired boon (II). A son named Raghu is born. His early childhood is described. When he grows, he is entrusted with the guardianship of the sacrificial
horse. He has to fight even against Indra for the possession of the horse (III). After Dilipa, Raghu ascends the throne. His conquest of the world is described briefly but very forcibly. He then performed a viṣvajit (world-conquering) sacrifice in which he gave away in charity all that he had received in his triumphant march, ādānāṁ hi visargāya satāṁ vārimucāṁiva (IV). Raghu’s generosity has left him a bankrupt. When the sage Kautsa comes to beg alms of him, he feels perplexed. Kubera’s timely help saves him from the difficult situation. He gets a son, named Aja (V). The śvayāṁvara of Indumati is described. The different princes are disposed off on various pretexts; one valiant hero is rejected by the princess saying, ‘Tastes differ.’ Aja is selected (VI). The marriage is performed. The discomfited princes attack the bridal party but are all repulsed by the marvellous prowess of Raghu who spares their lives in sheer pity (VII). Aja’s peaceful reign is described. Indumati’s sudden death hits him like a thunderbolt. His constancy is shattered and he finds no pleasure in life. No consolation can impress him. He welcomes early death to be reunited with his spouse in heaven (VIII). His son Daśaratha succeeds him. The incident of Śravaṇa Kumāra is described (IX). The next six cantos describe in detail the life of Rāma. Canto XVI describes the life of Kuśa, Canto XVII of Kuśa’s son and Cantos XVIII and XIX narrate their numerous successors, some of them being mere names. The poem remains incomplete; presumably the poet was taken away by the cruel hand of Death.

31. The Genuine Portions of the Works of Kalidasa. That Wilson once doubted the genuineness of Mālavikāgnimitraṁ on flimsy grounds but that it is a genuine work of Kālidāsa has been shown above.¹ The other two dramas are unanimously believed to be his genuine works.

A great controversy exists on the genuineness of Rtusamhāra. The opponents point out:

(i) The word samhāra in the title is used in the sense of ‘cycle’ while Kālidāsa uses the word in a different sense in the Kumārasambhavam, e.g.,

---

¹. See § 24.
The poem begins with the vivid description of the summer season and ends with the meagre description of the spring which shows disproportion unexpected of Kālidasā.

Even when the writers on Alāṅkāra quote the description of seasons, they do it from Raghuvamśa and not from Rūtasāṁhāra.

Mallinātha has commented upon the Kaavyāvatāryaṁ of Kālidasā but not upon Rūtasāṁhāra.

There are commentaries from the 10th century onwards on the other works of Kālidasā while Rūtasāṁhāra remains uncommented upon up to the 18th century.

The supporters, on the other hand, admit that the work is inferior to other works of Kālidasā but that is due to its being an early attempt of the poet. Equally great is the discrepancy between the earlier and the later works of Tennyson and Goethe. This also explains why the writers on Alāṅkāra prefer to quote from Raghuvamśa, a mature work rather than from Rūtasāṁhāra, an early attempt. The simplicity of Rūtasāṁhāra explains why Mallinātha or any other commentator thought it unnecessary to comment upon this work. No ancient opinion ever doubted the genuineness of this work. Besides, it appears probable that Vatsabhatti knew this poem and even imitated it in his Mandāsor prāśasti [4, v. s. 530].

As regards Meghadūta we find that Vallabhadeva, the oldest commentator, knew only 111 verses, while the commentary of Mallinātha contains 118 verses. Evidently some stanzas, particularly in the second chapter have been added by some later writer.

As for Raghuvamśa, Hillebrandt suggested (in Kālidasā, p. 42) that cantos XVIII and XIX are not the genuine works of Kālidasā. It is true that these cantos are inferior in character and do not represent the poetical insight and that remarkable warmth of feeling that Kālidasā abundantly possessed but that does not warrant us to conclude that they are not Kālidasā's own work. No other scholar has ever doubted the genuine character of these cantos. At the most we may say that they do not represent the best in Kālidasā.
As regards Kűnārasambhavīmā's cantos IX to XVII of it are admittedly the work of some later writer in Mallinātha's commentary goes up to canto VIII. It is only the first eight cantos which are quoted by the writers on Alāikārāśāstra. The internal evidence of style, phraseology and material skill at once brings out the spuriousness of the later cantos. Against the manner of Kālīdāsa some favourite phrases of the author are repeated over and over again in these cantos. Superfluous words like nūnāṁ, khalu, sadyas and alām are inserted to meet the exigencies of metre, and in several places we find the absence of cēṣura at the close of the first and the third lines. The prepositional compounds and the ātmanepada forms in the passive sense are frequently used. The author delights in the use of anta in the end of compounds; comparing it with the Marathi locative suffix -āmt, Jacobi has suggested that the author might belong to Mahārastra.

32. Recensions of the Dramas. It is but natural that the more popular dramas of Kālīdāsa should have come down to us in more than one recension. The Mālavyākāgnimitram has come down to us in only one recension known so far, but there was another version also as referred to in the Sāhityadarpāṇa quoting a long passage which is not identical with the modern recension. The published passage is an amplification of the passage in the Sāhityadarpāṇa.

The Vikramorvaśiyam has come down to us in two recensions, (i) the northern (preserved in Bengali and devānāgarī manuscripts) and (ii) the southern (preserved in South Indian manuscripts). The former was commented upon by Rāṅga Nātha (A.D. 1656) and the latter by Kāṭayavema (A.D. 1400). The IVth Act in the northern recension is much amplified. It contains many verses in Apabhramśa with their melodies specified. The hero sings in Apabhramśa which is against the rules of dramaturgy but which is justified on the ground that the hero is insane. It is implausible that Kālīdāsa wrote these stōkas in Apabhramśa. None of the several imitations of

1. As opposed to this we find that the cantos of Raghuvamśa have been quoted by the rhetoricians.

1. cf., Bhāvabhūti's Mālatīmādhavam, Act IX; Rājaśekharā's Bālārāmāyanam, Act V; Jayadeva's Prasannarāghava, Act VI and, also Mahārāṣṭra, nāṣaka, Act IV.
this Act contains a verse in Apabhramśa. Besides, it is doubtful that the Apabhramśa of this type existed in the times of Kālidāsa. The northern recension has styled the play troṣṭaka, and the southern one nāṭaka.

The Abhijñāna Śākuntalam has come down to us in four clear recensions, Bengali, devanāgarī, Kashmiri and South Indian, the former two being in the main important. The Bengali recension is commented upon by Saṅkara and Candraśekhara and contains 221 ślokas. The devanāgarī recension, on the other hand, is commented upon by Rāghavabhaṭṭa and contains only 194 ślokas. Which of the two is of superior merit is difficult to assert, but evidence is certainly in favour of the longer recension. Harṣa, in the 7th century A.D., imitated the Bengali recension; the scene where the heroine Sāgarikā goes, comes back, overhears the King and appears before him is a close imitation of a similar scene in the longer recension. The devanāgarī recension, on the other hand, is incomplete. Probably it represents the abridged version for stage-purposes. At one place the King detains Śakuntalā saying, ‘it is noon’; soon after Gautamī comes saying, ‘it is evening.’ There is no such contradiction of time in the longer recension. Besides, the Prakrit of the Bengali recension is certainly more correct. That Rājaśekhara knew the Bengali and not the other recension is fairly certain. Weber’s contention for the priority of the devanāgarī version is unconvincing.

33. Date of Kālidāsa. Unfortunately, no conclusive evidence is available on the date of India’s greatest poet. The lower limit is determined by (a) the Aihole inscription of Śaka era 556 (i.e., A.D. 634) which refers to the fame of Kālidāsa, (b) Bāṇa’s (about A.D. 620) introduction to Harṣacaritam wherein he eulogises the sweet melodies of Kālidāsa and (c) an indirect reference of Subandhu. Kālidāsa must have lived at least a century before this so as to be universally renowned. The upper limit is suggested by the plot of the Mālavikāgnimitram wherein his hero is Agnimitra (about 125 B.C.) of the Śūṅga-
dynasty which came to power in 189 B.C. Different dates have been suggested by scholars between these two extremes.

(a) The traditional theory of 1st century B.C. Traditionally Kālidāsa is said to be one of the nine jewels in the court of Vikramāditya Śakāri, who, it is alleged, established the Vikrama era in 57 B.C. by the overthrow of the Śakas. That Kālidāsa was a protégé of Vikramāditya is also suggested by the title of the play Vikramorvaśīyam wherein he breaks a rule of Pāṇini that the suffix -īya is to be added only to Dvandva compounds, simply to bring in the name of his patron. The theory is supported by the following points:

(i) The plot of Mālavikāgnimitram shows the author’s intimate knowledge of the history of the Śuṅga period of which no trace is found in the Purāṇas. The facts recorded in the play, e.g., that Puṣyamitra was called senāpati, that his grandson Vasumitra conquered the Yavanas on the banks of the Sindhu (V. 15) and that Puṣyamitra performed a horse-sacrifice are all historical, and Kālidāsa could best derive the knowledge from the Śuṅgas themselves. Besides, according to the rules of dramaturgy, the subject-matter and the hero should be vikhyāta (well-known). If Kālidāsa lived in the Gupta period, the choice of the then insignificant Agnimitra for hero would become inexplicable.

(ii) In the Bhita medallion we find a royal hunter in chariot pursuing a deer. The scene is a close parallel to the first Act of Abhijñāna Śākuntalam: there is no other parallel in the whole range of Sanskrit literature. This medallion was found in the Śuṅga strata; Kālidāsa therefore must have flourished before the extinction of the Śuṅga Dynasty (i.e., 25 B.C.).

(iii) The style of Kālidāsa is free from artificiality; it resembles very much the style of the Mahābhāṣya. Naturally Kālidāsa should be placed much earlier than the Nasik and Girnar inscriptions which are fine specimens of elaborate and artificial style.

(4) From the history of certain words Sanskrit seems to be the spoken language of the learned of his time. For instance, words parameṣṭhin and pelava are given a sense quite different from that of the Amarakoṣa.

(v) From the use of certain Vedic words it appears that he belonged to the transitional period which extends from 300 B.C.
to the beginning of the Christian era. Even the writers of the early Christian era do not use any Vedic word in their compositions.

(vi) Kālidāsa regards Parasūrāma only as a sage and not as an incarnation of Viśnū as which he came to be regarded only later.

(vii) The comparative study of Kālidāsa and Āśvaghoṣa precludes the possibility of their having written independently. Few scholars would deny that Āśvaghoṣa is more artificial than Kālidāsa; he often sacrifices sense to sound. The history of Kāvyā style is generally the history of its growing artificiality. Naturally, Kālidāsa should be placed earlier than Āśvaghoṣa (1st century A.D.). On other grounds too, it sounds more logical that a Buddhist poet imitated in his Buddhistāraṇī some scenes from the works of Kālidāsa rather than that the greatest poet of Sanskrit literature imitated the Buddhistāraṇī of Āśvaghoṣa and paraded the stolen gods, not in one but both the mahākāvyas.

(viii) In Hāla’s Sattasai (1st century A.D.) there occurs a stanza in which King Vikramādiṭya is praised for his extensive gifts. It is clear that the name Vikramādiṭya was already in use in the 1st century A.D. (vi) That from allusions to Buddhism and its patronage by royalty in the Abhijñāna Śākuntalam, Kālidāsa seems to have flourished a little before the beginning of the Christian era when Buddhism was yet patronised by the kings. It is with almost an aching heart that he says, "pravartatām prākṛtiḥ hi yā pārśvih Śakasvantrī śrutamahatām mahiyatām." That statement indicates the need for an alternate version of the legend:

The theory is, however, not without weak points:

(i) There is no evidence that any king Vikramādiṭya (even if the reference to Vikramādiṭya in the Hāla’s Sattasai be a genuine one) conquered the Sakas in the first century B.C.

(ii) Most probably, Vikramādiṭya, with whom Kālidāsa’s name is traditionally associated, might be an epithet rather than a proper name.

(iii) There is no proof that the era established in 57 B.C. was the Kṛta era. What we know from epigraphic evidence is that the era established in 57 B.C. continued to be designated the Kṛta or Mālava era for six centuries, and it is much later (about 1000 A.D. or about two hundred years after his lifetime) that the legend of the Kṛta era began to be spread.
that the era came to be known as Vikrama era. Among the nine jewels mentioned contemporary to Kalidasa, we have the names of Amarasiṃha and Varahamihira who can be assigned a later date on independent grounds.

(iii) **6th Century Theory.** (i) Fergusson suggested that a certain king Vikramaditya conquered the Hūnas in A.D. 544 and that in commemoration of his victory he established the Vikrama era, ante-dating it by 6 centuries in order to give it sanctity of age. Max Müller’s ‘Renaissance Theory’ that Sanskrit was revived in the 5th century A.D. after a slumber of six centuries gave weight to this theory. The epigraphic evidence, however, showed that the theory of Max Müller could not be held and that the theory of Fergusson was certainly erroneous, since the era of 57 B.C. was known in the inscriptions under the name of Kṛta or Mālava era at least a century before.

(ii) Although Fergusson’s theory was discarded, Kalidasa continued to be placed in the 6th century A.D. by some scholars on independent grounds. According to Dr. Hoernle, Kalidasa was the protege of Yaśodharman (6th century A.D.). The arguments are mainly based on the description of Ragu’s digviyā and the position of the Hūnas in the country where saffron grew (i.e., Kashmir). The theory has no defenders and seems to rest on erroneous premises.

(c) **5th Century Theory.** (i) It is suggested that Candragupta II Vikramaditya was the patron of Kalidasa.

(ii) That the geographical data supplied by Kalidasa in his Meghadūta and in Ragu’s digviyā and Rama’s return from Lanka in the Raghuvamśa describe the India of the Gupta period.

(iii) That Ragu’s digviyā was suggested by the digviyā of Samudragupta which is almost in the same order.

(iv) That the Kumārasambhavān may just hint at the birth of Kumāragupta.

---

1. There is no other parallel in the world where ante-dating of an era took place like that; still this fantastic theory held the ground for some time.

2. JRAS (1909).

3. From this very mention of saffron a suggestion was made to identify Kalidasa (Slave of Mother Kafi) with Mātṛgupta (protected by mother) of Kashmir, apparently from the similarity of meaning but without any proof. It has no supporter.
(v) That the horse sacrifice in the *Malavikāgnimitram* might allude to the horse sacrifice of Samudragupta which he undoubtedly performed.

(vi) That this is corroborated by the Mandasor inscription of Kumāragupta composed by Vatsabhaṭṭi (A.D. 473) some of whose stanzas recall to our memory the stanzas of Kālidāsa’s *Rūtamārya* and *Meghadūta*, e.g.,

*calatpatākānyabāla sanāthānyatyartha śuklānyadhikonnatāni
taḍillācitāra sitābhraṇāṭa tulyopamāṇāni grhāṇi yatra
kailāsatuṅga śikharaprātimāni cānyānyabhāṇi dīrghavaḷa-
bhīni savedikāni
gāndhāravasābdamukhāraṇi niviṣṭācitakarmāṇi lolakadali-
vana śobhitāni*

These verses of Vatsabhaṭṭi are only a paraphrase of the following verse of the *Meghadūta*:

*vidyutvantāṃ lalitavanītāḥ sendracāpam sacitrāḥ
sangītāya prahatamurajāḥ snigdhaṃbhārargoṣam
antastoyam mṛṇimayabhuvastuṅgamabhramihāgrāḥ
prāśādāstvāṁ tulayitumalam yatra taistairvīṣēśaiḥ*

(vii) That the Pārasīkas and the Hūṇas are described in the *digvijaya* as living on the north-western frontier of India. This could not have been the case at a later period than that of the imperial Guptas who ruled over the entire northern India including the Panjab.

(viii) It is alleged on the evidence of Mallinātha that Kālidāsa in his *Meghadūta* has alluded to Divnāga, and Nicula. The evidence of Mallinātha is too late; no previous writer has alluded to it. Besides, the double entendre is quite against Kālidāsa’s manner. Neither would one allude to an enemy of his in plural number showing respect as Kālidāsa does; (cf., *Divnāgaṇāṃ pathi pariharan*). Even if this allusion be taken as genuine, it in no way clashes chronologically with this theory. The work of Vasubandhu, Divnāga’s teacher, was translated into Chinese in A.D. 404 and Candragupta II lived up to A.D. 413.

(ix) On the ground of Kālidāsa’s supposed explanation of lunar eclipse as caused by the shadow of the earth, it is alleged that Kālidāsa borrowed it from Ārya Bhaṭṭa (A.D. 499). It is doubtful if it refers to anything more than the stain in the moon. Even if the explanation be the right one, he could have
borrowed it from Romakasiddhānta (A.D. 400).
(x) Kālidāsa has used an astronomical term jāmitra, which appears to be of Greek borrowing. According to Dr. Keith it suggests a date not prior to A.D. 350.
(xi) It has been suggested that the Pārkits of Kālidāsa are later than those of Āsvaghoṣa, but the comparison is not fair because the manuscripts of Āsvaghoṣa’s works were found in Central Asia, while those of Kālidāsa in India.

Thus we see that the date of Kālidāsa falls between the two extremes of 1st century B.C. and A.D. 400. "The question of his age, however, is not likely to be definitely solved till the language, the style, and the poetical technique of each of his works have been minutely investigated, in comparison with datable epigraphic documents, as well as with the rules given by the oldest Sanskrit treatises on poetics."

34. Kālidāsa’s Thought. Kālidāsa is a true representative of the Brahmanical system in its perfection. He believes in the four varṇas (castes)—Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras with their well-defined duties—and the four āśrama (stages of human life)—Brahmacaryā, Gṛhasthā, Vānaprastha and Śannyāsa with their prescribed rights and responsibilities. Even the opening lines of the Raghuvamśa afford an evidence to this conclusion:

śaiśave'bhysta-vidyānāṁ yauvane vīṣyāsināṁ
vārdhake munivrītināṁ yogenānte tanutvajjāṁ.

He is a firm believer in the fourfold objects of human enterprise, viz., dharma (duty), artha (pursuit of wealth), kāma (pursuit of love), and mokṣa (final release). The pursuit of wealth and of love should be strictly according to dharma with a view to attain final release. This is well brought out in his different works: Duṣyanta does not express his wish for Śakuntalā until he makes sure of her being a Kṣatriya girl worthy of a king. He refuses to accept Śakuntalā in court for

2. In childhood they acquired knowledge; in youth they enjoyed (lit., desired) pleasures; in old age they resorted to ascetic life; in the end they abandoned their bodies by yoga.
3. Keith remarks on p. 98 of his A History of Sanskrit Literature that Kālidāsa 'finds them embodied in the sons of Dilipa.' Possibly he means Daśaratha because Dilipa had only one son, Raghu.
he feels she is not his wedded wife.

As regards his conception of love, he believes that suffering chastens love. Love is purified and made permanent by the long suffering of the lovers. Śakuntalā and other heroines in his plays have all suffered before their final reunion with their lovers, and so have the heroes, Duṣyanta and others, suffering being mutual and equally intense. A similar note we find in his poems. The remark of Śiva to Pārvaṭī in the Kumārasam- 

bhavanī (Canto V) is very apt in this connection:

Not superhuman beauty, but true suffering can win Śiva to Pārvaṭī:

\[ \text{tavāṣmi dāsah kṛitaśtapobhiḥ.} \]

Kālidāsa seems to believe in the ultimate oneness of the three gods—Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. In Kumārasambhavanī 

(Canto II) he has addressed a prayer to Brahmā; in Raghuvamśa, Viṣṇu is naturally regarded as the highest deity, while Śiva stands supreme elsewhere. In fact, he was the follower of Kashmirī Saivism; there is pratyabhijñāna after forgetfulness. This is well brought out in his plays, particularly the Pratyabhiṣaṭāna Śakuntalam. As regards the nature of the universe, he 

believed in the Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems of philosophy which is evidenced more particularly in the Raghuvamśa. The Rāghus 

retire to the forest in their old age, practise penance for several years and abandon their bodies in the end by Yoga¹ (yogenānte 

tanu tyāgam). Of course, he believes in the transmigration of soul, the essential doctrine of Hinduism, and copiously illustrates it; Aja welcomes early death to meet Indumati in the next birth; Raṭī is ready to burn herself alive on the pyre of her husband Kāma to secure reunion in the life hereafter, and Sitā 

practises hard penance to secure her reunion with Rāma in the next life.

35. Kalidāsa’s Style. Kālidāsa is the best model of the Vaidarbha school of poetry. He has been universally regarded as the greatest poet in Sanskrit literature. His eminence is recognised in the Athole inscription (A.D. 634) and Bāṇa praises him in his introduction to Harṣacaritānī:

---

¹ The ultimate goal of human life is to attain union with the supreme power, called Brahmā, the controller of the universe, which is possible through the practice of Yoga.
nirgatāsu na vā kasya Kālidāsasya sūktaśu
prītrmadhura sārdrāsu mañjariśviva jāyate.¹

Indeed, the Indian opinion regards him as ‘unequalled.’
purā-kavīnāṁ gaṇanā prasānge kaniśṭhikā’dhiśṭhita Kālidāsā
adyāpi tattulya kaśerabhāvādaṇāṁikā sa’ṛhavatī babhuva
Goethe, the great German poet, read only the translation
of the Abhijñāna Śākuntalam by Sir William Jones (A.D. 1789)
and remarked :

Would’st thou the young year’s blossoms and the fruits of its
decline,
And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted, fed,
Would’st thou the earth and heaven itself in one sweet name
combine?

I name thee, O Śākuntalā, and all at once is said.

The fundamental characteristic of his poetry is suggestiveness
(cf. the dictum kāvyasyātmā dhvanīḥ). His is a golden mean
between the utter simplicity of the Purāṇas on the one hand and
over-ellation of the later writers on the other. Occasionally,
we find in him the simplicity of Bhāsa but the same is combined
with an elegance and refinement; for instance, the following
verse of Kālidāsa can be very aptly compared to Bhāsa’s verse
No. 1353 in Vallabhadeva’s Subhāṣitāvali :

grhini sacivah sasvi mitah priyaśityā lalite kalāvidhau
karunā vimukhena mṛtyunā haratā tvām vada kim na me hṛtam².

---

1. Where find a soul that does not thrill
In Kālidāsa’s verse to meet
The smooth, inevitable lines
Life blossom—clusters, honey sweet?

2. Wife, adviser, friend, a loving pupil in every fine art
Let me know, what has not the cruel Death taken away by taking thee.

Bhāsa says:—

Bhāryā mantraṃvrahaḥ sakhiḥ parījanyaḥ saikā bahutvam gataḥ.
Wife, counsellor, friend, attendant; thus one alone, she becomes manifold.

For similar ideas, cf. Wordsworth,
A perfect woman nobly planned,
To warm, to comfort and command.

or Thou wert my guide, philosopher and friend, of Pope.
Kālidāsa possesses an extraordinary skill in the weaving of the plot, and wonderful power of delineating his characters. Every character of his, like that of Shakespeare’s, has got its own individuality. In the Abhijñāna Śākuntalam we find three sages—Kaṇva, Mārica and Durvāsas. Only one sentence would reveal the irritable nature of Durvāsas or the other qualities of the other sages. Similarly, of the two friends of Śakuntalā, Anasūyā is serious but Priyāvadā gay. Likewise, both the pupils of Kaṇva have got their individual characteristics. His language is very appropriate: the domestic priest begins with philosophical sūtras while the maidens talk in simple Prakrit.

Kālidāsa is best known for his similes which are apt, original and striking. They are culled from different spheres of knowledge, not excluding even grammar and rhetorics. The comparisons are drawn out in full, a mere hint not sufficing. Like Wordsworth, he is one with Nature. His power of observation is great; he can speak to and listen from the mountains, the winds and the streams around him. His trees and plants, his birds and beasts are all possessed of human feelings—joys and sorrows, cares and anxieties. No other poet can surpass or even equal Kālidāsa in this characteristic of his.

The other figures of speech which he employs with success are utprekṣā, arthāntaranyāsa and yamaka. In Canto IX of the Raghuvamśa he exhibits his skill in the different varieties of alliteration and in the large number of metres. He is not at all fond of śleṣa.

His works have served as models. We have already referred to the imitations of the Meghadūta. The two plays of Harṣa are modelled after the Mālavikāgnimitram. Bhavabhūti in his Mālatimādhavam has drawn his inspiration from Kālidāsa. Daṇḍin’s verse malinām himāṃsorlakṣma lakṣnīṃm tanoti is evidently borrowed from Kālidāsa. Vāmana (8th century) has quoted him and from the time of Ānandavardhana onwards he has been widely read and commented upon.

1. cf., upamā Kālidāsasya Bhāraveraarthagauravaṁ
   Daṇḍināḥ padalālityam Māghe santi trayogyuṇāḥ

2. There is a fine balance in the use of his śabdālaṅkāras and artha-laṅkāras. He is not fond of creating sound effect at the cost of sense.
He is skilled in the use of metres. In the Meghadūta he has used Mandākrāntā alone. He frequently employs Indravajra (Kumārasambhavaṁ, Cantos I, III and VII and Raghuvanaṁśa II, V, VII, XIII, XIV, XVI and XVII; i.e., eleven cantos in both the mahākāvyas) and śloka (Kumārasambhavaṁ, II and VI, and Raghuvanaṁśa I, IV, X, XII, XV and XVII). There is, of course, greater variety of metres in the Raghuvanaṁśa than in the Kumārasambhavaṁ.
36. Asvaghosa and His Dramatic Art. Aśvaghoṣa is known to us as one of the greatest poets of Sanskrit literature—the writer of epic, dramatic and lyric poems. He was a Buddhist monk. According to tradition he was a contemporary of king Kāniṣka. He was the most important figure, if not the founder, of the Mahāyāna system of Buddhism which spread in Tibet, China and Central Asia. According to a biography of Aśvaghoṣa, he lived in central India and was the disciple of the venerable Pārśva, who by his superior talents converted him to Buddhism. According to another tradition, he was so eloquent in speech that even horses listened to his discourse rather than eat fodder. Hence he came to be known as Aśvaghoṣa.

Thanks to the efforts of Prof. Lüders, we know for certain that Aśvaghoṣa did write some dramas. The Śāriputra-prakarana (the fuller name being Śāradvatiputra-prakarana) is one of the three Buddhist dramas discovered from the fragments of manuscripts on palm-leaf in Central Asia. This drama is undoubtedly that of Aśvaghoṣa because (i) the colophon of it bears the name Aśvaghoṣa, son of Suvarṇākṣi, (ii) one verse is bodily taken from the Buddhacaritāmī and (iii) the poet refers twice to this work in his Sūtrālāṅkāra.

This drama tells us of the events that brought about the conversion of the Young Maudgalyāyana and Śāriputra by the

---

1. The Saṃyukta-ratna-piṭaka and Dharma-piṭaka-nidāna, translated into Chinese in A.D. 472, state that Aśvaghoṣa was the guru of Kaniṣka.
2. It was translated into Chinese under the dynasty of Yao-Tzin (384-417) by Kumāraśīva (Kumāraśīla?) from which M. Vassiliev derives the abridged life which was then translated by Miss E. Lyall.
3. The colophon of the Tibetan Buddhacaritāmī states that he was a native of Sāketa (LA, 1903, p. 350).
4. According to another biography by Pūrṇayāsah, he was the disciple of a student of Pārśva.
Buddha. The story deviates a little from that in the Buddha-
caritam inasmuch as the Buddha in this play foretells his prophecy
directly to these pupils as soon as they go to him. Like the
Mṛchhakaṭīka and the Mālatimādhavam, this drama is styled
Prakaraṇa and contains nine acts. The drama closely follows
the stereotyped rules of dramaturgy as laid down in the Nātya-
śāstra. The hero Śāriputra is of dhīrodātta (calm and dignified)
type. The Buddha and his disciples speak Sanskrit while
Vidūṣaka and other minor characters speak Prakrit. The fact
that Aśvaghoṣa has to introduce Vidūṣaka even with such a
hero shows that the Sanskrit drama had attained its stereotyped
character by his time. Even the words atah param arc very skil-
fully blended in the Bharatavākya itself.

The different characters speak different languages according
to their status in society and in strict accordance with the rules
of dramaturgy. Three kinds of Prakrit are used in the drama;
the Prakrit of Dūṣṭa resembles Māgadhī, that of Gobāṁ, Ardha-
māgadhi and that of Vidūṣaka, a mixture of the two.

As regards the other two Buddhist plays, it is not possible
to know their authorship with certainty because they are
available in fragments only, but we may presume them to be
the works of our dramatist Aśvaghoṣa rather than of some other
contemporary dramatist. One of them is allegorical in
character and resembles the Prabodha-candrodaya of Kṛṣṇamīśra
where most of the characters are abstract and speak in Sanskrit.
The other play resembles to some extent the Cārudattam of
Bhāsa and shows the poet’s sense of humour.

37. Buddhacaritam and Saundarānananda. Aśvaghoṣa occu-
pies a prominent position in the galaxy of Sanskrit literature, more
on account of his two mahākāvyas—Buddhacaritam and Saundarā-
nanda—than on account of his other works. The Buddhacaritam

1. It has been pointed out that the question atah paramapi priyamasti?
does not occur in this drama and that the Bharatavākya is not recited by
the hero. From this, Lüders concluded that the close of Sanskrit drama
was still in a transitional stage. The argument is clearly fallacious. He
has ignored how the poet has tried to follow the rules closely by bringing
in the words atah param in the Bharatavākya. Besides, even in the later
centuries, the Bharatavākya has been uttered by venerable persons other
than the hero, e.g., in the Venīsannītā of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa it has been
ercited by Kṛṣṇa, and in the Kundamālā of Dīnāga by Vālmiki.
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is based on the one manuscript found written in Śāradā characters which gives 13 cantos plus four verses of the 14th. The *Buddhacaritām* was translated into Chinese (A.D. 414—421) and I-tsing ascribes this work to Aśvaghoṣa.¹ The evidence not only of the Chinese version but also of the Tibetan shows us that the original *Buddhacaritām* consisted of 28 cantos. The story is complete up to the *nirvāṇa* or the Buddha’s renunciation of this mortal body.

The evidence of I-tsing shows us that the *Buddhacaritām* was read throughout India in the 6th and the 7th centuries A.D. Amṛtananda in the 19th century added four cantos more to the extent thirteen and carried the story up to the first preaching of the Buddha in Benares.

The *Buddhacaritām* is an excellent *mahākāvya* containing all the essential requisites—the representation of love-scenes, the principles of *nītiśāstra* and even the representation of battle-scenes. The amorous sports of the beautiful ladies, the preachings of the family priest to the Buddha and the latter’s fight with Māra are all described in a very vivid and picturesque manner.

In spite of the poet being a Buddhist, this poem is full of Paurāṇik allusions and other references to Hindu mythology; e.g., Indra, Māyā, the thousand-eyed Indra, Pṛthu and Kāsivat, Vālmiki, Kauśika, Sagara, Skanda, the story of Māndhārī, the legends of Nahuṣa and Purūravas, the story of Śīva and Pārvati and even the orthodox manner of receiving the guests. There are also references to the Upaniṣads, the *Bhagavadgītā*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyana*. Evidently the poet must have very deeply studied the Brahmanic literature.

As mentioned before, the *Buddhacaritām* bears a close resemblance to the *mahākāvyas* of Kālidāsa, e.g., the women crowd in balconies to have a glimpse of the Buddha coming in the public for the first time (*Buddhacaritām*, III. 13-19), as they do in the case of Aja (*Raghuvaṁśa*, VII. 5-12); again the attack of Māra on the Buddha (*Buddhacaritām*, XIII. 6) is a close

¹ There is a story to the effect that Aśvaghoṣa was carried away from Pātaliputra by Kaniṣka. He was made the vice-president of the Buddhistic Council convened by Kaniṣka, the result of which was the composition of *Mahāvibhāṣa* which still exists in Chinese and is described as an encyclopaedia of Buddhist philosophy.
parallel to his attack upon Śiva (Kumārasambhavaṁ, III. 6) both in conception and description. These instances can be multiplied. We may further note that the description of sleeping women in the Buddhacaritam bears a close resemblance to that in the Rāmāyaṇa. The whole poem is written in Vaidarbhī style and thus specially possesses the qualities of clearness and lucidity. As in Kālidāsa it is free from long compounds. The language is simple and beautiful, eloquent and chaste.

The Saundarāṇanda relates in epic manner the story of Sundarī and the Buddha’s half-brother Nanda and tells us of the events that led to the conversion of Nanda by the Buddha in spite of his great love for Sundarī. All its twenty cantos are preserved. It is certainly the work of Āśvaghoṣa because:

(i) The Saundarāṇanda and the Buddhacaritam have an affinity; they are supplementary to each other. For example, in the Buddhacaritam there is a little description of Kapilavastu, but in the Saundarāṇanda there is a long description of the same. In the Buddhacaritam there is a long description of the Buddha’s renunciation, but the same is meagrely described in the Saundarāṇanda. There is a little description of Nanda’s conversion in the Buddhacaritam but a detailed description of the same is to be found in the Saundarāṇanda. These instances can be multiplied;

(ii) The references to epic mythology, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Hindu doctrines are almost identical in these two works;

(iii) Many seers like Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, etc. are mentioned in the same order in the two epics.

The Saundarāṇanda makes no allusion to an earlier poem. Keith has therefore concluded that it was his first attempt. The evidence to the contrary, however, is more convincing. The

1. In fact, the close resemblance between Kālidāsa and Āśvaghoṣa is admitted by all scholars. They however disagree regarding the priority of one or the other. Words like dhīṣṇya (abode), nirvāhāna (carrying out) and several compounds are used in the same sense by both. It is more natural to believe that the difference between them is of one century rather than of three centuries. Āśvaghoṣa, unlike Kālidāsa, uses Vedic words. He came after the transition. Besides it would appear that Āśvaghoṣa is more artificial than Kālidāsa. He often sacrifices sense to sound.

Sūtrālankāra mentions the Buddhacaritam but not the Saundarananda. Not a single Mahāyāna doctrine is found in the Buddhacaritam but the concluding portion of the Saundarananda already exhibits a leaning towards the Mahāyāna doctrine. In the Saundarananda the poet narrates philosophical discussions and preaches the Buddhistic doctrines very skilfully. In the refinement and the elegance of style the Saundarananda is certainly far superior to the Buddhacaritam; in the former we find really charming and fine poetry whereas in the latter it is only versifying.

The Saundarananda was first published in 1910 by Haraprasada Sastri from the only manuscript from Nepal. In some respects it can be aptly compared to Tennyson’s ‘In Memoriam’.

38. Other Works. Some other works are also attributed to Āśvaghosha, which show that the poet really possessed manifold genius.

1. The Sūtrālankāra which has been already referred to above is known to us through the medium of the Tibetan translation. It illustrates his ability in turning a tale for Buddhist propaganda.

2. The Mahāyāna-śraddhopotāda is a famous text-book of the Buddhists which ably records the early views of the Mahāyāna school. The tradition ascribes this work to Āśvaghosha, and if the tradition is correct, he was certainly a great metaphysician.

3. The Vajrasūci is a record of his serious attack on-caste-system which condemned Buddhism on the ground that it was improper that the Kṣatriya Buddha should instruct the Brahmins.

4. The Gāndistotragāthā is a lyric of no mean value. It contains some excellent songs couched in different metres that would do credit to any poet. It shows that the poet commanded sound knowledge of music and possessed great metrical skill. The main object of the lyric is to propagate his religious views.

39. Style. Āśvaghosha is an able representative of the Vaidarbhī style. His language is simple and chaste, style refined and dignified and the diction vivid and elegant. The main object of his writings, as we learn from the concluding
portion of the *Saundarananda*, is the propagation of his views couched in an attractive garb so that the people may realise truth and attain salvation. Thus we find that Asvaghosa is not fond of long compounds or creating effect by bombast or affectation. Even abstract rules of philosophy are expressed in a very simple language, e.g.,

\[ \text{dīpo yathā nirvṛtīmabhṛyupeto naivāvanim gacchati nāntarikṣam diśam na kāṇcid vidiśam na kāṇcit snehakṣayāt kevalameti śāntim} \]
\[ \text{tathā kṛtī nirvṛtīmabhṛyupeto naivāvanim gacchati nāntarikṣam diśam na kāṇcid vidiśam na kāṇcit kleśakṣayāt kevalameti śāntim.} \]

Not only is the language very simple, but the simile also is very homely and striking. Some scholars believe that in the aptness of his similes he has in a few instances surpassed even Kālidāsa. The following is cited as an example:

\[ \text{mārgacalavyatikārākuliteva sindhuḥ sālādhīrājanayā na yayau na tastau} \]

*Like a stream impeded by an obstruction of the mountain on the way, the daughter of the lord of the mountain neither went nor stayed.*

\[ \text{so'niścayānāpi yayau na tastau taramstaraṅgeśviva rāja-} \]
\[ \text{hamsaḥ.} \]

On account of irresolution he neither went nor stayed *like a royal goose floating on the waves.*

The other scholars have doubted if a goose floating on the waves is stationary and if even this particular simile is better than that of Kālidāsa.

Giving an account of Dilāpa, Kālidāsa says,

\[ \text{vyūḍhorasko vrṣaskandhaḥ śalaprāṁśurmahābhujah.} \]

Similarly while describing Nanda, Asvaghosa says,

\[ \text{dirghabāhumahāvaksāḥ simhāṁso vrṣabhkeśaṇaḥ.} \]

The line is a close parallel but the simile of Asvaghosa is not as appealing as that of Kālidāsa. The comparison of eyes

---

to those of bull by Aśvaghoṣa cannot impress a reader much. "Kālidāsa here does not mention the eyes of Dilīpa, but his shoulders are likened to those of a bull. Poor Aśvaghoṣa attempted variation and betrayed his plagiarism."  

Aśvaghoṣa can paint a beautiful picture of ideal love in simple words, e.g.,

\[ \text{tāṁ sundarī cenna labheta nandaḥ sā vā niśeveta na tāṁ natabhraḥ} \]
\[ \text{dvandvam dhruvaṁ tadvikalam na śobhetānyonyahināviva rātricandrau.} \]

His description of Sundarī’s beauty is simple and effective:

\[ \text{svenaiva rūpeṇa vibhūṣitā hi vibhūṣanānāmapi bhūṣanam sā.} \]

Aśvaghoṣa is also fond of yamakas, simple and clear, e.g.,

\[ \text{pranaṣṭavatśāmiva vatsalāṁ gāṁ or udārasankhyaiḥ sacivair-} \]
\[ \text{asankhyaiḥ.} \]

He is a thorough grammarian and illustrates sometimes the remote rules of grammar, e.g., the use of astī as a particle of simile. In Canto II of the Saundarāṇanda he exhibits his skill in the use of aorist forms and shows how forms like miyate can be the passive of the three roots mā, mi and mī. Occasionally there are some irregularities under the influence of the epics and the Buddhist writers, e.g., the gerunds grhya and vivardhayitvā, and the use of the particles kim vata and prāg eva instead of kim uta or saced instead of ced. Of course, he possesses great metrical skill and can handle even rare metres like udgatā successfully.

Some stanzas of Aśvaghoṣa bear close resemblance to those of Bhāsa, e.g.,

\[ \text{kāśṭhādaṅgirjāyate mathyamānadh bhūmisotyam kāmyamānā} \]
\[ \text{dadāti} \]
\[ \text{sotsāhānāṁ nāstyasādhyam naraṁ mārgārabdhiḥ sarvayatnaḥ phalanti (Bhāsa).} \]

1. Chattopadhyaya.
2. Saundarāṇanda, IV. 7. If Nanda would not obtain Sundari or she whose eye-brows were bent would not serve him, then the separated pair would not surely shine like the night and the moon, devoid of each other. For a similar idea see Kumārasambhāvatī, VII. 66.
3. Saundarāṇanda, IV. 12: She was embellished with her own beauty; she was an ornament even of the ornaments.
4. Like a loving cow whose calf is lost.
5. With numberless ministers of noble advice.
and

kāśṭham hi māthnaḥ labhate hutāśanaṁ, bhūmim khanan bindati capi toyāṁ
nibandhinaḥ kīścinnāstyasādhyāṁ nyāyena yuktāṁ ca
kṛtaṁ ca sarvaṁ (Aśvaghoṣa).

There are other occasions when Aśvaghoṣa appears to have been imitated by the Naiṣadhīya, e.g.,
Rāmāmukhendūnabhībhūtapadām, yatrāpayato'pyavamāṇya bhānuḥ
santāpayogādīva vāri veṣṭaṁ, paścāt samudrābhīmukham
pratāsthe (Aśvaghoṣa).

and

nijāṁśunirdagdhamaṇḍaṅgabhānasabhīrmutdāḥ vidhurvaṁchati lāṁchanonmrjāṁ
tvadāsyatāṁ yāsyati tāvatāpi, kiṁ vadhuvadhenaiva punaḥ
daṅkitaḥ (Naisadhīya).
40. **General Features.** There are illustrious epic poets like Amara, Acala and Abhinanda who might possibly have ranked with Kālidāsa but are now known to us as mere names in the anthologies, their works having all been destroyed by the destructive forces of nature. There are several other poets of lesser merit frequently mentioned in the literature but unfortunately their works have not come down to us. We shall, therefore, refer to only those poets in this chapter whose works are now extant.

As distinguished from the popular epics, the court epic or Kāvya forms a class by itself. In it more care is bestowed on the form such as the style, figure of speech, conceits, descriptions, etc. than on the matter. As time passes, it tends towards more and more artificiality. It is divided into two classes, (i) Mahākāvya and (ii) Kāvya. We shall first take the remaining writers of the Mahākāvya and then deal with the Kāvya writers.

41. **Bharavi** (about A.D. 550). Bhāravi occupies an illustrious position in epic literature. Like Kālidāsa’s epics, his *Kirātārjunīyām* ranks as a Mahākāvya. Tsuly indeed, the

---

1. *kaviramarāh kavirocalaḥ kavirabhinandasāca Kālidāsasya anye kavyayah kapayaṣcādapalamātraiḥ paraṁ dadvati*

2. The definition of Mahākāvya is given by Daṇḍin in his *Kavyādārśa* (Chap. I. 14-20): It should begin with a benediction or salutation or direct statement of the subject-matter. The theme should either be taken from tradition or be real. The aim should be one of the four—dharma, artha, kāma and mokṣa. The hero should belong to the dhīrodattā type (heroic and noble). It should contain lovely descriptions of natural phenomena—sunrise, moonrise, seasons, mountains, seas, etc.; separation or wedding of lovers, birth of sons, battle and finally the victory of the hero. It should not be short. It should be full of sentiments and feelings. The cantos should not be too long. The metres should be attractive and should vary near the end of a canto. Transition from one canto to another should be clear and natural.
luster (bhā) of his poetry was comparable to that of the sun (ravi). Like Kālidāsa, we do not know anything about the personal life of this poet also.

As regards his date, the following external evidence is available.

(i) He is quoted in the Aihole inscription (A.D. 634) as a famous poet along with Kālidāsa.

(ii) He is also cited in the Kaśikāvyātti.

(iii) Apparently his poetry bears the influence of Kālidāsa and he himself strongly influenced Māgha.

(iv) Bāṇa has not made any mention of him in his introduction to Harsacaritām. Possibly Bhāravi had not become famous enough by his time. We may, therefore, place him at about A.D. 550.

Kirātārjunīyam. The subject-matter of this work is derived from the Vana-parvan of the Mahābhārata. Even the opening shows how Bhāravi improved upon the original like a refined artist. In the Mahābhārata the discussion of the Pāndu brothers arises from their sad plight in the forest, but Bhāravi begins with the return of a secret envoy whom Yudhiṣṭhira had sent to report on the deeds of Suyodhana (Duryodhana). Coming to know that Suyodhana was fast gaining popularity by his virtuous deeds, Draupadi urges for immediate war (Canto I). Bhīma strongly supports her case but Yudhiṣṭhira is unwilling to break the vow (Canto II). Yudhiṣṭhira seeks advice from Vyāsa who instructs Arjuna to go to the Himālayas to practise penance and win divine aid. A Yakṣa appears there to lead Arjuna (Canto III). Cantos IV to XI manifest the inventive genius of the poet. The autumnal scene, the Himālaya mountain, the bathing scene, the evening, the sunset, the rising moon and the like phenomena are depicted in glowing colours. It then describes the severe battle of Arjuna with Śiva’s host under Skanda’s leadership (Canto XV) and ultimately with Kirāta (Śiva as disguised) who is pleased (Canto XVII) and bestows on him the magic weapons that he craves for.

(a) Criticism. As hinted above, the poet has not slavishly

1. prakāśam sarvato divyam vidādhāna satāṁ mude
   prabodhanaparā ḫṛdyā bhā rāverive bhāraveḥ
followed the original story of the epic but has introduced some innovations of his own. For instance, we may cite: Arjuna’s fight with Śiva’s host under Skanda’s leadership and the use of magic weapons on either side. The prolongation of struggle has occasionally given rise to the repetition of certain ideas, e.g., description of the amours of the Apsarasas with the Gandharvas and their futile attempts on the hero.

(b) Style. (i) The traditional criticism has endowed Bhāravi with artha gaurava (depth of meaning). His power of description is great and the force of diction admirable.

(ii) His style possesses a calm dignity which is at once appealing and attractive. The very first canto of the work impresses the reader with this quality of his.

(iii) His observation of the beauties of nature and maidens is remarkable, e.g., see the description of the cool season:

katipyasahakāra pusparamyās tanutuhino ’lpavinidrasinduvāraḥ
surabhimukhahimāgamāntaśaṁśi samupayayau śisirah
smaraikabandhuh.

(iv) Many lines of Bhāravi are so striking that they have since then assumed the character of proverbs, e.g.,

hitam manohāri ca durlabhaṁ vacaḥ
or na hi priyaṁ pravaktumicchanti mṛṣā hitaṁṣaḥ.

(v) He is gifted with poetic fancy which is both constant and extensive.

(vi) It is characteristic of Sanskrit epic poetry that the more it advances in age, the more artificial it tends to become. Thus even Bhāravi is not free from artificiality of style which may have been extolled by the Alaṅkāra school of poetics but which does not conform to the modern standards of poetry—evidently because the style becomes forced and loses all flow. In Canto XV he reaches the climax in the use of these Śabdālaṅkāras. One sloka has got all the four lines identi-
cal; another gives three senses; still another śloka may be read backwards and forwards unchanged, etc. To take one instance, the following śloka contains only the consonant n with the final t:

\begin{align*}
na \text{ nonanunno} & \text{ nunonono nānā nānānanā nanu} \\
nunonononono \text{ nannunnen} & \text{ nānennānunnanunnanunat}.
\end{align*}

(vii) His style is free from long compounds. On the whole, he is not obscure.

(viii) He was a skilled grammarian. In the illustration of remote rules of Pāṇini's grammar, he surpasses his predecessor Kālidāsa and even his successor Māgha. For instance, take his strict usage of the past tenses. He confines the use of aorist (adyatane) only to the events of the immediate past, and that of the past imperfect (anadyatane aparokṣe) to remote events experienced by the speaker himself. The perfect is thus the tense of narrative (parokṣe). Thus he has used aorist only ten times as compared to 272 times of Māgha.

(ix) In the use of metres he is quite accomplished. He occasionally uses rare and difficult metres too, e.g., in Canto XII only udgatā is used; otherwise he is very chaste in the use of metres which are quite varied. In Canto V alone sixteen metres are used. It may be noted that he rarely uses sikhariṅī which became most favourite with the dramatist Bhavabhūti.

42. Bhatti (about A.D. 600) is another famous writer of epic poetry. His work Rāvaṇavadhā or more usually styled as Bhatti-kāvyā, serves the double purpose of narrating the story of Rāma and illustrating the rules of grammar. His work is styled as Mahākāvyā by Indian scholars. It contains twenty-two cantos, divided into four sections. Section I (Cantos I—IV) deals with miscellaneous rules; Section II (Cantos V—IX) with leading rules and Section III (Cantos X—XIII) with figures of speech. Canto XIII contains ślokas which are identical in Sanskrit and Prakrit. Section IV (Cantos XIV—XXII) deals with the uses of moods and tenses.

(a) Style. Bhatti's style is simple and clear but it lacks fire and colour. We find in him neither Kālidāsa's characteristic similes nor Bhāravi's force of diction. His style is singularly free from long compounds and complexity of thoughts. His love for short metres accounts for the comparative simplicity
of his style. Some of his ślokas\textsuperscript{1} are really very fine and can be compared to those of Kālidāsa.

(i) Date. We learn from Bhaṭṭi himself that he wrote at Valabhi uuder Srīdharasena, but there are four kings of that name and the last of them died in A.D. 641. Bhaṭṭi may, therefore, be placed at about A.D. 600. The following external evidence is also of value in this connection.

(ii) He was in all probability known to Bhāmaha, for he quotes the following śloka of Bhaṭṭi in almost identical terms.

vyākhya gamyamīdāṁ kāvyam utsavaḥ sudhiyāmālāṁ
hatā durmedhasācāsmīn vidvat priyatayā mayā
taptena taptasya yathāyasya nahi sandhiḥ pārenaśtu vimuñca sitāṁ

(iii) He is imitated by Māgha with great zeal to show his skill in grammar.

(c) Identification. It is not possible to identify Bhaṭṭi with any other poet in the present state of our knowledge. His identification with Vatsabhāṭṭi cannot be regarded serious for the latter makes mistakes in grammar. His identification with Bharṭhari is suggested on the ground that Bhaṭṭi is the Prākritised form of Bharṭṛ, but it lacks plausibility. In all probability, Bhaṭṭi was a separate poet.

43. Māgha (A.D. 650—700) occupies an illustrious position in the history of epic poetry. Like Kālidāsa, Aśvaghoṣa, Bhāravi and Bhaṭṭi, his work Śiśupālavadhā (also known as Māgha-kārya) is styled as Mahākāvyya par excellence. In certain respects he excels his predecessor Bhāravi.\textsuperscript{2}

---

\textsuperscript{1} cf., the following with Vikramoryāśyaṁ, II. 16.

Ramō'pi dārāharaneṇa taptō yaṇam hatairbandhubhirātmatulaṁ

taptenā taptasya yathāyasya nahi sandhiḥ pārenaśtu vimuñca sitāṁ

\textsuperscript{2} cf., Indian opinion:

tāvad bha bhāraveryāvanmāghasya nodayaṁ
udite tu Māgha Bhāraverbhā raveriva.

Also upamā Kālidāsasya Bhāraverarthaguravāṁ
Daṇḍinaḥ padalalityāṁ Māgha santi trayo gunāṁ

and Māgho māgha ivāśeṣa kṣamāḥ kampayitum jagati
śleṣāmodhabharanē cāpi sambhāvayitumāśvāṁ

It will be noted that the immense praise bestowed on him is not altogether undeserved.
The Śiśupālavadāhā contains twenty cantos. It records the slaying of Śiśupāla at the hands of Kṛṣṇa after the Rājasūya sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira. The original story in the Mahābhārata is very simple, but Māgha has made definite improvements. The picture of the sacrifice replaces the single line given to it in the Mahābhārata. The rival speeches have been shortened. The preliminaries of the fight are carried on not by the rivals but by their messengers. A struggle of the rival armies takes place before the contest of the rivals. The theme of the Mahābhārata was hardly sufficient for a Mahākavya but the defect has been made good by the descriptive power of Māgha. While Bhāravi adores Śiva, Māgha praises Viṣṇu in this Mahākavya.

A. Style. (i) Māgha possesses luxuriance of expression and great imaginative power.

(ii) He was deeply read in the Kāmasūtra (treatise on erotics). His love-stanzas generally abound in sweetness and prettiness. Sometimes, however, the details are given in a manner that appears tedious to the western mind.

(iii) He is very fond of Alankāras which are generally happy and effective. His alliterations are beautiful and clear. Oftentimes he is fond of ślesā (double meaning), e.g., abhidhāya tadā tadapriyaṁ śiśupālonaṁ saṁsāraṁ parāṁ gataṁ bhavato bhimānaṁ saṁhitā saruṣaṁ kartumupetya mānanaṁ.1

(iv) On the whole his style is elaborate and in the grandeur of sense and sound he vies with Bhaṭṭi and Kumāradāsa.

(v) In certain respects he is comparable to Bhāravi:

(a) Canto IV of Kirātārjunīya may be compared to Canto IV of Śiśupālavadāhā in the variety of metre2;

(b) Canto XV of the former may be compared to Canto XIX of the latter in the curiosities of form. In this Canto, Māgha indulges in Alexandrian tricks and illustrates figures like sarvatabhadra, cakra and gomūtrikā. To quote one example, in the third śloka, the first line contains the only consonant ḷ, the

1. Then having uttered the disagreeable speech, Śiśupāla became very angry (regretful); he desires fearlessly (eagerly) to come before you and kill (pay due homage to) you.

2. Māgha is very skilled in the use of metres. This canto alone contains 22 metres.
second line the only consonant \( t \), the third line the only consonant \( bh \) and the fourth line the only consonant \( r \).

(c) Certain stanzas of Māgha contain the simplicity of Bhāravi’s moral sentiments and the force of diction, e.g.,

\[
\text{nālambate dāṭhīkatāṁ na niśiḍati pauruṣai}
\text{śabdārthau satkavirīva dvayaṁ vidvānapekṣate.}
\]

(vi) He is frank, eloquent and very effective, especially in the speeches of his heroes, e.g., when Śiśupāla says to Yudhiṣṭhira:

\[
\text{anṛtāṁ girāṁ gadasīti jagati paṭahairvīghusyase}
\text{nindyaṃatha ca harimarcayatastava karanāiva vikasatyasatyatā.}
\]

(vii) He is an authority on grammar and gives numerous examples of the use of grammatical rules, very possibly under Bhaṭṭi’s influence.

B. Date. (i) Māgha was the son of Dattaka-sārvāśraya, and the grandson of Supabhadeva, minister to a king named Varmalāta (Varmalākhyā). An inscription from Vasantagarh dated 682 v.s. (= A.D. 625) bears the name Varmalāta. On this epigraphic evidence we may place Māgha in the latter half of the seventh century.

(ii) Verse II.12 contains the words \( vṛtti \) and \( nyāsa \) and according to Mallinātha it conveys a covert allusion to Kāśikā-vṛtti (one of whose authors, Jayāditya died in A.D. 661 according to I-tsing) and its commentary Nyāsa by Jinendrabuddhi (about whom I-tsing is silent). According to this evidence, Māgha might be placed in the first half of the 8th century, but this is not of much importance, especially when we know that Bāna, too, used the same terms \( vṛtti \) and \( nyāsa \) in his Harṣacaritaṁ in the phrase prasannavṛttayo grhītavākyā kṛtayugapadanyāsā loka iva vyākarāṇeṣā). Māgha may possibly have alluded to these earlier \( vṛtis \) and \( nyāsas \).

(iii) The name of Māgha has been traditionally2 associated with king Bhoja. On this basis, some scholars placed him in the 11th century, while others discarded this evidence as not a record of genuine history. It is noteworthy that Col. Tod in his Annals of Rajasthan on the strength of a Jaina chronogram-

---

1. "You utter no word of falsehood," thus you are proclaimed in the world by beat of drum, but falsity spreads by the very action of yours, having worshipped the censurable Kṛṣṇa.

2. cf., Prabhāvikacaritaṁ.
matic catalogue has mentioned three kings, bearing the name of Bhoja, ruling in Mālava in A.D. 575, 665 and 1042. We may, therefore, believe in the authenticity of this tradition.

(ii) He was undoubtedly later than Bāravi who was in a sense his model and also later than Bhaṭṭi whom he has imitated in several respects. Of course he knew the Nāgānanda of Harṣa. The effort to prove that he was used by Subandhu is very ingenious and unconvincing.

44. Ratnakara (about A.D. 850). Haravijaya by Ratnakara is an extensive Mahākāvya in 50 cantos written in about A.D. 850. It describes the conquest of Śiva over Andhaka. The poem lacks proportion and is not popular. The poet is greatly influenced by Māgha. Kṣemendra attests the poet’s skill in vasantarīlakā.

45. Sriharṣa (A.D. 1150—1200). The last Mahākāvya Naiṣadhacaritam or Naiṣadhiya was written in the latter half of the 12th century by Śriharṣa under Jayacandra of Kanauj. The work consists of twenty-two cantos and describes the story of Nala up to his marriage with Damayantī. It breaks off with the amorous dialogues of the pair in the last canto. Although a logician, he almost converts Kāmasūtra into poetry in describing the wedding theme. The poet possesses great power of description. He has turned a simple tale into an epic theme. He is styled as mahākavi by Indian rhetoricians, and the praise is not altogether undeserved. There appears to be little truth in the story that he was the cousin of Mammaṭa and that when Śriharṣa showed his achievement to him in pride, Mammaṭa felt sorry that he did not see it earlier while writing the chapter on doṣas (defects) in his treatise for otherwise it would have saved him the enormous labour of searching illustrations from other writers.

1. The second Bhojadeva of A.D. 665 is also corroborated by the Mānasaravar inscription of A.D. 714.
2. He bears the styles of Rājānaka and Vāgīśvara.
3. He also wrote other works, including the khaṇḍāna khāṇḍakhādyā in which he establishes the reasonableness of Vedānta.
4. It is said that the original contained 60 or 120 cantos, and it is hoped by some that the remaining cantos may sometime be discovered in manuscript [Krishnamacharya, Sanskrit Literature, p. 45], but it is doubtful if the author wrote beyond this.
His power of double entendre is great. He is skilled in the use of language and is capable of elegance and sweetness in expression. He is very fond of alliteration and rhyme. Occasionally he resorts to antyanuprāsa (end-rhyme). He uses only nineteen metres, the favourites being upajāti and vanśastha.

All these Mahākāvyas, except Haravijaya, have been commented upon by the great commentator Mallinātha.
46. Vatsabhatti (A.D. 472-3). He is a poet, of not much repute. He wrote a prāsasti (or panegyric) of the temple of the sun at Mandasor in v.s. 529. It contains 44 stanzas and is written in the gaudī style. Thus it contains long compounds, sometimes a single compound running over a whole line. The poet makes every attempt to show that he knows the rules of the Kāvya well. He has included in this poem an account of the town of Daśapura and the descriptions of both the spring and the winter. He uses twelve metres, especially, the vasantatilakā. Often he carries the sense over more than three stanzas in the best Kāvya style. Occasionally in his poetry we find that ‘sound echoes sense’, e.g., in verse 26, the first three lines which mention the good qualities of the king contain smooth and pleasant sound, but the fourth line which describes his dread power contains harsh syllables (dvitīśaptapakṣa kṣapanaikadakṣah, ‘alone expert in destroying the haughty hosts of the enemies’). In verses 11-12, he imitates the Meghadūta and Ritusamhāra of Kālidāsa.

Setubandha is a poem in Mahārāṣṭrī and is supposed to have been written by the poet to commemorate the building of the bridge across the river Vitastā (Jhelum) by king Pravarasena of Kashmir. It is attributed to Kālidāsa and has elicited high praise from Daṇḍin and Bāṇa, but the long compounds and artificial style disprove this.

47. Kumaradāsa (7th century). Jānakīharanaṁ is a poem by Kumāradāsa which has been preserved only in a Sinhalese verbatim translation. It was first published from this source; but since then it has been discovered in south India. The author is identified with a king of Ceylon (A.D. 517-26) and is connected with the death of Kālidāsa, but this lacks plausibility. The original poem contains twenty-five cantos. Its theme is similar to that of Raghuvamśa. The poet gives abundant proof of his descriptive power. Thus we have poetic pictures of
Daśaratha and his wives as well as of Ayodhya (Canto I), vivid descriptions of water-sports, of spring, sunset, night and morning (III), sunset and night (VIII), rainy season (XI) and of autumn (XII). The poet was greatly influenced by Kālidāsa both in the choice of subject as well as in style. Admittedly the poet is a great admirer of Kālidāsa and he imitates him very freely in manner and general treatment of the subject. The poet's svāmi sammadaphalahi maṇḍanāṁ is a close parallel to Kālidāsa’s priyeṣu saubhāgyaphalā hi cārutā (Kumārasambhavaṁ, V. 1). Also compare the picture of the married bliss of the pair (Canto VIII) with a similar picture in the Kumārasambhavaṁ (VIII).

(a) Style. He adopts the Vaidarbhī form and develops to a marked degree the love of alliteration, though he never carries it to the point of affectation. Prettiness is the chief characteristic of the poet. As A.B. Keith says, ‘He abounds in dainty conceits expressed with a felicity of diction and a charm of sound and metre which no language but Sanskrit can produce.’ He is capable of painting lovely pictures and charming situations. Thus he describes feminine beauty:

\[ paśyan hato maṇmatha bāṇapātaĩ ṣakto vidhātuṁ na mimiśa caṅkuḥ \]

\[ urũ vidhātra hi kṛtau kathāṁ tāvityāsa tasyāṁ sumatervitarkaḥ. \]

The following gives a picture of the young Rāma:

\[ na sa Rāma iha kva yāta ityamuyukto vanitābhiragraṭaḥ niḥahastaputāvyrtanano vidadehī likanilinamarbhakaḥ. \]

He is a great scholar of grammar and uses rare formations like halacarma (furrow). He borrows rare constructions like acakamata and marmāvidh from the Kāśikāvṛtti. He uses rare words like paśyato hara, jampati and saukhva rāṭrika. His command over language was undoubtedly great.

---

1. cf., Raghuvamśa, Canto XII, with relevant portion of the Jānakhilaranāṁ.
3. How have those thighs been fashioned by the creator? If he looked (at them) he would be struck by the arrows of Love, and if he closed his eyes he could not create. Thus even the wisest was at fault about her.
4. The ladies in front enquired, 'Rāma is not here. Where is he gone?' But the child having covered his face with his clasped hands, played hide and seek with them.
He is skilled in the use of metre. The šloka is predominant in Cantos II, VI, and X and vanśastha in III, V, IX and XII.

(b) Date. (i) It is beyond doubt that Kumāradāsa knew Kāśikāvṛtti (about A. D. 650).

(ii) He is earlier than Māgha who seems to echo a verse of his.

(iii) He must have been known to Vāmana (A. D. 800) who censures the use of khalu as first word, found in Kumāradāsa.

(iv) Rājaśekhara (A. D. 900) asserts his fame:
Jānakīharanāṃ kartuṃ raghuvarśe sthite sati kaviḥ Kumāradāsaśca Rāvanaśca yadi kṣamaḥ.

Kumāradāsa may, therefore, be assigned the period between A. D. 650 and 700.

48. Vakpati (beginning of 8th century) is the author of Gaudavaha (Gauḍavadhā), a Prakrit poem dealing with the overthrow of a Gauḍa prince by his patron Yaśovarman of Kanauj. It contains long compounds and serves to show how Prakrit poetry kept pace with Sanskrit in the growing artificiality of style. The poet is indebted to Bhavabhūti.

49. Kaviraja (12th century) is the author of Rāghavapāṇḍaviyam. The poet is also known as Sūri or Paṇḍita. He appears to have written it under the Kādamba Kāmadeva about A. D. 1190. The work relates the story of Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata in the same words, a task difficult to achieve in any other language. An instance will interest the reader:

nṛpeṇa kanyāṁ janakena dītsitaṁ, ayonijām lambhayituṁ svayanāvare
dvija-prakarṣeṇa sa dharmanandanaḥ sahaṁjastāṁ bhuvan-
apyanīyata.¹

The poet expressly states that he claims to be unrivalled by any but Subandhu and Bāṇa in the use of vakrokti (twisted language).

50. Haradatta Suri’s Rāghava-naśadhiyam is of an unknown date and is not popular. It tells the tale of Rāma and Nala in the same words.

¹. The lover of righteousness, i.e., Rāma (the son of DharmャYudhiṣṭhira) was brought together with his younger brother (brothers) by that best of sages (Visvāmitra, Vyāsa) to the place of svayaṁvara in order that he might be able to obtain the girl born of no mortal womb whom King Janaka (her royal father) was fain to give in wedlock.
51. Cidambara’s Rāghava-pañḍaviyaṁ-yādaviyaṁ is also not popular. It tells the tale of the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavata in the same words.

52. Halayudha’s Kavirahasya is not important as literature. It was written in the 10th century A.D. to illustrate the rules of verbal formation. Incidentally it serves as an eulogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Kṛṣṇa III (A.D. 940-56).

53. Mentha (also known as Bhartrmentha or Hastipaka). His Hayagrīvavadāhā elicited high praise from King Māṭṛgupta. He received the honour of being placed second in the spiritual lineage of Vālmiki, Bhavabhūti and Rājaśekhara following him. Maṅkha places him beside Subandhu, Bhāravi and Bāṇa. Some pretty verses are cited from him in the anthologies. He may be placed towards the latter part of the 6th century A.D.

54. Mātrgupta is alleged to be a poet himself. According to Kalhaṇa he was a predecessor of Pravarasena of Kashmir. His personality is often confused with that of Kālidāsa but not with any plausibility. His date is unknown. He is said to have written a commentary on the Nāṭyasāstra of Bharata of which quotations are extant.

55. Bhaumaka (about 7th century A.D.) wrote his Rāvanārjuniya in about the 7th century A.D. It contains 27 cantos and tells the story of the struggle between Rāvana and Arjuna Kārtavīrya. The real object of the poet was to illustrate the rules of grammar.

56. Sivasvamin’s (9th century) Kappanābhhyudaya is an interesting Buddhistic epic but not very popular. It was written by the Buddhist poet Śivasvāmin in the latter half of the 9th century under king Avantivarman of Kashmir. The theme is based on a tale in the Avadāna-śataka and deals with the conversion of a king of south. The poet writes manifestly under the influence of Bhāravi and Māgha. He also alludes to the Nāgānanda of Harsa.

57. Abhinanda (9th century) is from Kashmir and is known for his Kādambari-kathāsāra which is an epitome in epic form of the Kādambari of Bāṇa.

58. Ksemendra (11th century) wrote his Bhārata-mañjarī, a summary of the Mahābhārata in A.D. 1037 and Daśāvatāra-carītām in A.D. 1066. The Buddha is described by him as the
ninth incarnation. He also wrote Rāmāyaṇa-mañjari, a summary of the Rāmāyaṇa, and Padya-Kādambarī. He also belongs to Kashmir.

59. Mankha (12th century) is the author of Śrikaṅṣṭha-caritam. This poem relates in 25 cantos the tale of the overthrow of the demon Tripura by Śrikaṅṣṭha or Śiva.

60. Ramacandra’s (16th century) Rasikarañjana was written by the poet at Ayodhya in A.D. 1542. The interest of the poem lies in the fact that the verses, read one way, make an erotic poem, and in another a eulogy of asceticism. It is comparable to the elegy of Leon of Medina on his teacher Moses Bassola, which can be read either as Italian or Hebrew.

61. Some Jaina Works. There are some important Jaina works but they are not very popular. A reference to them will suffice here.

(i) Yaśodhara-caritam of Vādirāja. It was written by the poet in the 10th century A.D. It contains only four cantos comprising 296 ślokas.

(ii) Trīśasiśalākāpuruṣa-carita of Hemacandra (A.D. 1160-1172). It relates in ten parvans the lives of sixty-three best men of the Jaina faith (24 Jinas, 12 Cakravartins, 9 Vāsudevas, 9 Baladevas and 9 Viṃśudviṣas). It is long and wearisome but important all the same.

(iii) Dharmasārmābhgyudaya of Haricandra. It contains 21 cantos. Its date is unknown. It deals with the life of the fifteenth Tirthakara, Dharmanātha.

62. The Renaissance Theory of the 6th Century A.D. The renaissance theory of Sanskrit in the middle of the 6th century A.D. was ably propounded by Max Müller in his India, What Can It Teach Us?, and held the field for several years in spite of its weak points.

The preliminary assertion of Max Müller was that consequent to the invasion of the Śakas (Scythians) and other foreigners, Sanskrit went to sleep in the first two centuries of the Christian era. It suffered from the following weak points:

(i) The Scythians conquered only one-fifth of India.

(ii) They themselves became rapidly Hinduised even in the territory conquered by them. They adopted not only Hindu names, but also their language Sanskrit and religion. One of them, Uṣabhadatta (Rṣabhadatta) got his exploits inscribed in
a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit. Kaniṣṭha himself was a great
patron of Buddhism.

(iii) It is beyond doubt that national Indian architecture and
sculpture attained a high development at Mathura under these
rulers.

Modern researches have now given a final blow to this
theory. We have seen that the great Buddhist poet Aśvaghosa
flourished in the 1st century A.D. and that demand for Sanskrit
was so great that even he had to preach his gospels and write
his works in Sanskrit. The Girnar and Nāšik inscriptions, both
belonging to the second century A.D. (which have been discover-
ed since then) are written in elaborate Kāvyā style, comparable
in many respects to that of the classical tales and prose
romances. They conclusively show that Kāvyā poetry must
have been extensively composed at the courts of the then kings.
In fact, Sanskrit poetry continued to be cultivated during the
succeeding centuries unimpeded. From Hariśena's panegyric
of Samudragupta (A.D. 350) we learn that he was a great patron
of poets and himself a poet. His inscription is written partly
in Vaidarbhi style (like that of Kālidāsa and Daṇḍin) and
partly in prose of long compounds (one compound runs over
more than 120 syllables). There are numerous other inscrip-
tions, written in the Kāvyā style, belonging to the Gupta
period which have been discovered since then. These epigraphic
researches do conclusively prove that Sanskrit did not go to
sleep at any time up to the 6th century A.D., much less in
the first two centuries,

The main thesis of Max Müller was that the middle of the
6th century A.D. was the golden age of Sanskrit Kāvyā. It was
evidently based upon the ingenious hypothesis of Fergusson
that a certain king Vikramāditya of Ujjain conquered the
Scyths in A.D. 544 expelled them from India and founded
the Vikrama era, in commemoration of his victory pre-dating1 it
by 600 years, in order to give it more sanctity. The epigraphic
researches of Fleet have now conclusively shown that the era

1. The scholars doubted its possibility from the very beginning.
History knows no other instance when a certain era was founded and
then pre-dated in order to give it more sanctity or on any other ground.
The question would arise, "Why pre-date it exactly by 600 years? Why not a
thousand years or even more?"
of 57 B.C. was in vogue at least a hundred years earlier, and that there was no possibility of the Scythians being expelled from Western India in the middle of the 6th century because this part of India had already been subjugated by the Guptas in the 5th century A.D. No doubt, the other foreigners, the Hūṇas were expelled from Western India in the middle of the 6th century but they were conquered, not by any Vikramāditya, but by Yaśodharman Viṣṇuvarṇdhana.

It was supposed by Max Müller that Kālidāsa and other literary gems associated with Vikramāditya must have brought about a renaissance of Sanskrit Kāvya in the middle of the 6th century A.D., but now Vikramāditya vanishes altogether from the historical ground of the 6th century and Kālidāsa can be assigned an earlier date on other grounds. There are reasons to believe that there was more activity of Sanskrit learning in the first century B.C. than in the 6th century A.D.
LYRIC POETRY AND ANTHOLOGIES

63. Origin of Lyric Poetry. The history of lyric poetry generally commences with Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta and Ritusamhāra, but it ignores all the background of the classical lyric which goes back to the Ṛgvedic times. The lyric poetry of India is of five kinds and can be assigned to five epochs.

1. Inspired lyric of the Ṛgvedic age. It is partly religious and partly worldly. Sometimes the heroic themes are united with a religious element, e.g., compare the excellent songs addressed to Dawn and Heaven, or the heroic lyrics addressed to the rivers Vipāśa and Śutudrī, or the heroic hymn of the victory of Sudās. These lyrics constitute the sincere outpouring of the seers, generally in communion with the beneficent powers of Nature. These mantras are couched in well-chosen metres, often in rhymes that can be sung.

2. Devotional lyric. The examples of this kind are found in abundance in the Buddhist works as well as in the Upaniṣads where wonder at the new-found religion often bursts forth in lyrical stanzas.

3. Epic or sentimental lyric. Examples of this kind are found in the frequent nature-descriptions of the Rāmāyaṇā and the Mahābhārata, of course more so in the former.

4. Simple love-lyric of the dramatists. It is represented by stray ślokas of description and love recited by the characters in drama. It serves as a stepping stone from the devotional or the epic lyric to the next stage represented by later poets like Bhartṛhari and Amaru when it becomes an independent form of literature.

5. Complex love-lyric or mystic lyric of the later poets. It constitutes a fusion of erotic and religious sentiments, where

1. The essential characteristic of a lyric is that it consists not of connected poems of considerable length but of that miniature painting which depicts an amatory situation or sentiment in a single śloka.
it is difficult to say whether the poet is influenced by more amorous sentiment or by devout piety. As compared with the devotional or epic lyric, it has more of the erotic element and is more extravagant in description in portraying the charms of nature and woman. These lyrics bear evidence to great wealth of observation and depth of feeling. Many of them are in matter and form gems of perfect beauty. Various birds like Cātaka, Cakora and Cakravāka are frequently introduced in these lyrics as furnishing analogies to human life and love. In all this lyrical poetry the plant and animal world plays an important part and is presented with much charm. In this chapter we shall confine our attention to these later poets alone who deal with lyric poetry as a separate form of literature.

64. Srngaratilaka. It is attributed to Kālidāsa, but without proof. It contains twenty-three stanzas only. Some of these stanzas are really very fine:

\[\text{iyāṁ vyādhāyate bālā bhrūrasyāḥ karmukāyate} \\
\text{katākṣāśca śarāyante mano me harināyate.}\]

The poet complains why the heart of a lady is made of stone when her other limbs are comparable to tender lotuses and leaves:

\[\text{indīvareṇa nayanaṁ mukhambujena, kundena dantam} \\
\text{adharam navapallavena} \\
\text{aṅgāni campakadalaṁ sa vidhāya vedhāḥ kānte, kathaṁ} \\
\text{ghaṭītavāṇupalena cetaḥ.}\]

Another poem ascribed to Kālidāsa is Rākṣasakāvyā, but it is much inferior to the above and is certainly not worthy of this honour.

65. Ghatakarpasa (Potsherid). It is a poem in twenty-two stanzas by the poet of the same name (i.e., Ghatakarpara). He is mentioned as one of the nine gems in the Court of King Vikramāditya. In the last stanza the poet boasts that he will carry water in a broken jar for any one who can surpass him in yemakas. In this poem the theme is the same as in

1. This maiden like a huntsman is,  
   Her brow is the bow he bends,  
   Her sidelong glances are his darts,  
   My heart’s the antelope she slays.
Meghadūta but the characters are reversed, i.e., a lady sends message to her absent husband through a cloud at the commencement of rainy season.

66. Sat-sai (Saptaśatī). It is a poem in Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit and contains 700 unconnected stanzas which pass under the authorship of Hāla or Sātvāhana. Whether the poet collected them or composed them himself is difficult to say. It belongs to the early centuries of the Christian era but it is not possible to assign any definite date to it. Bāna has praised it in his introduction to Harṣacaritām.

The Sat-sai is not folk-poetry, because it is definitely written in an artificial and carefully studied language. The topics dealt with are manifold. Thus we find attractive and charming descriptions of persons in different walks of life—the cowherds and cowherdresses, the huntress, the female gardener and the working hand,—lovely pictures of nature, sometimes influenced by love and sometimes independently; and also gnomic sayings here and there. Thus a lady implores the moon to touch her with the rays which have touched her husband; she wants the night to stay for ever, for the morning is to bring her husband’s departure and separation from him.

A traveller looks at a beautiful girl drawing water, feels thirsty, and in order to prolong his looking at her face, lets slip the water through his fingers while she on her part lessens the stream of water with the same desire. In the description of the rainy season we find how the black bees hover over flowers, the peacocks and the crow enjoy the pelting rain, and the antelopes and the apes longingly seek their mates. As an example of gnomic saying, we have, "Miser’s gold is as useful to him as his shadow to a traveller", "The deaf and the blind are happy people in the world, for while the former cannot hear unpleasant things, the latter cannot see disagreeable faces."

Occasionally we have dramatic situations described: a clever lady pretends she has been bitten by a scorpion in order that she may be able to go to the doctor’s house who is in love with her.

There are many imitations of Hāla’s Saptaśatī, the best known of them being the Āryasaptaśatī, which was composed by Govardhana, the court poet of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, in
the latter part of the 12th century A.D. It contains 700 disconnected ślokas, arranged in alphabetical order. The predominant sentiment in them is erotic. They are divided into sections called Vrajaś as. As a consequence of the influence of the Dhvani school of poetry, the poem abounds in anyōkri (indirect suggestion). Often an erotic sentiment is indirectly suggested, as in the Anyōktimuktalatā of Śambhu (A.D. 1100), or the Anyōktiśataka of Vireśvara (whose date is unknown). It is written in Sanskrit but is, in poetic value, inferior to Ḥāla's Satsai.

Another imitation of recent date is Behari's Sat-sai which is in Hindi. It contains nearly 700 dohās, mainly erotic. They describe the numerous phases of heroines with respect to their lovers under different situations inspired by varied emotions.

66. Bhartrhari. Bharṭṛhari occupies a position in the history of lyric poetry which is next to that of Kālidāsa alone. He is known for his three Śatakas—Śrīgāra-śataka, Nīti-śātaka and Vairāgya-śataka. The first treats of love (Śrīgāra), the second of moral policy (nīti), and the third of renunciation (vairāgya). Each of these śatakas contains more than a hundred ślokas but it is not possible to say that they are all original. Some of these ślokas occur in the Śākuntalā, the Mudrārākṣasa and the Tantrākhyāyikā. There are others which are ascribed to other authors in the anthologies. Even if his Nīti- and Vairāgya-śatakas might include some ślokas of other authors, the Śrīgāra-śataka appears to be the product of his own creative mind.

(a) Identification. Little is known of the poet's life. Tradition does not help us much. Even the identity of the poet is not certain. The Chinese pilgrim I-tsing has recorded the death of a grammarian, Bhartrhari, the author of Vākyapadīya in A.D. 651. It is stated that he wavered several times between the peace of the monastic life and the charms of the worldly life. On this evidence, Max Müller suggested that this might refer to the author of the above Śatakas. Although probable, it cannot be claimed with certainty because the author of these Śatakas is not a Buddhist but a devout Śaiva of the

---

1. We cannot, however, depend upon the evidence of the anthologies for they often contradict one another.
Vedánta school. It is possible that I-tsing was not either aware of these Šatakas or deliberately ignored them.

(b) Style. Each śloka of Bhartṛhari constitutes a brilliant poem in miniature and contains material sufficient for an English sonnet. It is possible to achieve this result because Sanskrit possesses peculiar power of compression, in which Bhartṛhari is undoubtedly at his best. His Niti-šataka is full of gnomic² verses, e.g., the description of the magnanimous man:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{vipadi dhairtyamathābhhyudaye kṣamā, sadasi vākpaṭutā yudhi} \\
\text{vikramaḥ} \\
\text{yaśasi cābhirucivyarsanaṁ śrutau, prakṛti siddhamidaṁ hi} \\
\text{mahātmanāṁ.}²
\end{align*} \]

In Vairāgyasataka a very different note is struck:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ākrāntāṁ maraṇena janma jārasā yatyuttama yauvamaṁ} \\
\text{santośo dhanalipsayā śamasukham praūḍhāṅganā vibhramaṁ} \\
\text{lokairmatsaribhirgūṇā vanabhuvo vyālairnṛupā durjanai} \\
\text{rasthairyeṇa vibhūtayo'pyupahatā grastaiṁ na kim kena vā.³}
\end{align*} \]

Also note the supreme power of Love God:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{kāminīkāya kāntāre kucaparvatadurgame} \\
\text{mā saṅcara manaḥ pāntha tatrāste smaratakaraḥ.⁴}
\end{align*} \]

His favourite metres are Śārdūlavikrīḍita and Śikharini.

(c) Date. Nothing definite is known about the date of the poet, unless of course we identify him with Bhartṛhari, the grammarian. Some legends make him the brother of the famous Vlkrāmaditya but that does not help us much regarding his date. Nor is there any adequate proof to identify him with Bhaṭṭi, the author of Bhaṭṭikāvya.

1. Pithy sayings containing moral maxims.
2. The following are naturally accomplished by the great: steadfastness in calamity and forgiveness in prosperity, eloquence in meeting and valour in battle, delight in fame and taste in scriptures.
3. Life is overpowered by death, excellent youth by old age, contentment by desire of wealth, the inner peace by coquetties of youthful ladies, virtues by jealous people, forest grounds by snakes, kings by wicked people, prosperity by instability; or what is that (in the world) which is not assailed by another.
4. O mind-traveller, don’t you move about in the forest of lady’s body, difficult to traverse on account of the steeps of breasts; there lurks the robber Cupid,
67. Amaru[ka] (7th century A.D.). The poet is variously known as Amaru or Amaruka. His poem, called Amaru-śataka, has come down to us, in at least four recensions which contain 90 to 115 ślokas. Only 51 of them are common and there is much variation in order. The ascription of the anthologies does not agree with any recension. It cannot therefore be possible to arrive at the original text with any definiteness. The text of the commentator Arjunavarman (1215 A.D.) might be regarded as the nearest approach to the original.

(a) Commentaries. An ill-authenticated tradition describes it as a record of the experiences of love with a hundred ladies of the harem, of sage Śaṅkara having animated the body of a king of Kashmir. The Commentator Ravicandra finds a theosophic sub-meaning in these ślokas. Vemabhūpāla (14th century) finds therein the types of heroines described, while others find in them the illustrations of different Alāṅkāras. On the whole, it may be regarded as a collection of pictures of love. The view-point of Amaru is essentially different from that of Bhartṛhari. While the latter treats of the general aspects of love and women as factors in life, the former concentrates on the relation that exists between lovers.

(b) Style. Amaru is the follower of the Vaidarbhī school of poetry. Thus he avoids long or difficult compounds. His language is chaste and style elegant. His ślokas possess force and charm that have effect on the reader. As regards his conception of love, it is gay and high-spirited. The poet takes delight in lover’s quarrels, ending in smiles. The following depicts the remarkable power of the poet of compressing a lively dialogue into a śloka:

bāle, nātha, vimūnca mānini ruṣam, roṣānmaya kīṁ kṛtam
khedo’smāsu, na me’parādhya bhavān sarve’parādha mayī
tat kīṁ rodiśi gadgadena vacasā, kasyāgrato rudyate
nanvetanmama, kā tavāsmi, dayitā, nāsmītyato rudyate.¹

---
¹ (Dear) girl.” “(My) lord.” “Abandon your wrath, O high-minded lady; what have I done to cause wrath?” “Regret to me; you have done me no wrong, all the faults are mine.” “Then why do you weep with a choking voice?” “Before whom do I weep.” “Surely before me.” “What am I to you, beloved; I am not and therefore I weep.”
His most favourite metre is Śārdūlavikṛṣṭīta.
(c) Date. (i) Ānandavardhana (A.D. 850) recognises Amaruśataka as a work of high repute.
(ii) Vāmana (A.D. 800) cites three ślokas from this work. Nothing can be said with certainty, but the 7th century A.D. will be a fairly approximate date.

68. Mayura (7th century). Mayūra is the reputed father-in-law of Bāṇa, the court poet of Harṣavardhana. He is known for his Sūrya-śataka, a century in praise of the sun-god. An ill-authenticated tradition furnishes us with the occasion that caused this poem to be written. It is said that the poet described the beauties of his daughter so minutely that she cursed him in anger and he became a leper. It was with great difficulty that he got deliverance by the panegyric of the sun-god.

69. Matanga Divakara (7th century). He is a contemporary of Bhartṛhari and Mayūra. He won good fame in his time. Some ślokas of his are preserved.

70. Mohamudgara. It is comparable to the Vairāgya-śataka of Bhartṛhari, both in matter and form. It contains some really fine ślokas. Its authorship is attributed to Śaṅkara, but there is no proof to substantiate it.

71. Silhana’s Śānti-śataka shows some Buddhistic tendencies. Its date is uncertain. In poetic value it is inferior to the work of Bhartṛhari and is not very popular. In depth of feeling, it surpasses the other without doubt.

72. Bilhana’s Caurapancāśikā (11th century). The title of the work Caurapancāśikā has been variously interpreted as ‘Fifty stanzas by the thief’, ‘Fifty stanzas on secret love’, ‘Fifty stanzas by the poet Caura’, etc. In some manuscripts it is known as Bilhana-kāvyya, so that there can be no doubt that its author is Bilhana, the reputed author of Vikramāṇkaṇḍevacarita. The two versions of this work, of Kashmir and South India, do not agree in the details of the princess with whom the poet was in love-intrigue according to tradition. Possibly he portrayed the love of a robber chief with a princess.

It depicts with minute and charming detail the so-called past scenes of happy love. The style is throughout simple.

1. For note on this see § 80.
and elegant, suiting the occasion. There is a good deal of variety in the ideas expressed. Each śloka begins with adyāpi, ‘even to-day,’ and is full of intense feeling and deep emotion:

adyāpi tāṁ praṇayinīṁ mṛgaśāvakākṣiṁ pīyuṣavarṇa kuca kumbhayugam vahantīṁ paśyāmyahāṁ yadi punardivasāvasāne, svargāpavargavara rājya sukham tyajāmi.¹

The prevailing metre throughout is Vasantatilakā.

73. Jayadeva was one of the five gems in the court of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal. His Gītā-govinda is one of the finest poems in Sanskrit literature. It is difficult to conceive of another lyric, more popular than this. For centuries together, the songs of the Gītā-govinda were sung at night in a festival that was celebrated at his birth-place in his honour. His claim of being a kavirāja-rāja ‘king among master-poets’ has been quite justified. Even the distorted version of Sir William Jones won the high esteem of Goethe for his work. “If to be untranslatable is a proof of the highest poetry, Jayadeva has certainly claim to that rank.”²

(a) Form. There is a great divergence of opinion on the form of the poem which has been differently styled by different scholars, e.g., lyric drama (Lassen), melodrama (Pischel), refined Yātrā (Von Schroeder), pastoral drama (Jones), between-song-and-drama (Lévi). The work is however pre-eminently of the Kāvya category. It is noteworthy that the poet divides it into cantos and not acts. The songs were meant to be recited in the temples on festive occasions. Thus they are set to rāga and tāla (melody and time) of the music. In fact, it is an altogether original form which is the result of the poet’s own creative mind. The recitative and the song, narrative, description and speech are cleverly interwoven, all with deliberate purpose.

(b) Contents. The poem contains twelve cantos, divided into 24 sections called prabandhas. The latter are further

¹ If I could see once again towards evening (lit., at the end of day) that beloved who is possessed of fawn-like eyes and a pair of ambrosia-coloured, pitcher-like breasts, I would (gladly) forego the highest pleasure of kingdom, paradise and salvation.

subdivided into songs of eight stanzas each, which are placed in the mouths of Kṛṣṇa, his beloved Rādhā and the latter’s confidante. Every phase of Indian love except that of utter disappointment and final separation is brilliantly described—longing, jealousy, hope, disappointment, anger, reconciliation and fruition. The description is so picturesque that the poet appears to be transforming Kāmasūtra into poetry. The beauty of nature plays a prominent part in the description of human love. Thus we have an account of the spring, moonlight and of the fragrant winds. Even the birds sing of the omnipotence of the god of love.

(c) Allegory. An effort has been made to find a sub-meaning in the poem and treat it as an allegory. Thus Kṛṣṇa represents human soul; the spirit of the gopikās, the confusion of the manifold which the soul in its ignorance enters, and Rādhā, the final bliss. That Kṛṣṇa was an object of the poet’s devout worship cannot be denied.

(d) Style. Jayadeva is the follower of the Vaidarbhī school of poetry. He might occasionally use some long compounds but he is never obscure or difficult. In fact, his songs were intended to be recited on popular occasions. His creative genius enabled him to invent an altogether original form of literature. His songs are characterised with simplicity and melody beyond compare. His style is unrivalled in the beauty and music of his diction as well as in the elegance of composition. He has got the marvellous quality of creating the desired effect upon the reader or listener, now by a rapid flow of short words and now by a more measured movement of long and skilfully constructed compounds. The poet is skilful not only in the varied use of metres but is also supreme in alliteration (yamakas) to an extent that it results in middle- and end-rhymes, e.g.,

haritarbhisarati vahati madhupavane
kimaparamadhihakasukham sakhi bhavane.

On the evidence of this end-rhyme, it has been pointed out that this form of composition might have been based on some Apabhramśa model, but that is not correct because such a form can owe its origin to antyānuprāsa which was quite well-known in Sanskrit. In short, his style is worthy of high praise. He can ably blend not only the beauty of nature
with human love, but also sound with emotion in a manner that his poetry defies all translation. An example will make it clear. Says Rādhā in Canto VII:

kathitasamaye’pi harirahaha na yayau vanaṁ
mama viphalamidamamalarūpamapi yauvanaṁ
yāmi he kamīha šaraṇaṁ sakhijanavacanavaṇcitā
mama maraṇameva varamiti vitathaketanā.
kīmitī viṣahāmi virahānalamacetanā, yāmi he...

Says Mādhava, in the bower on the river-side in Canto III:

māmiyam calitā vilokya vṛtaṁ vadhūnicayena
sāparādha tayā mayāpi na vāritā’ti bhayena
hari hari hatādaratayā gatā sā kupiteva
kīṁ kariṣyati kīṁ vadīṣyati sā ciraṁ virāheṇa.
kīṁ dhanena janena kīṁ mama jīvitena grheṇa, hari hari...

There are numerous commentaries and imitations of this work.¹

74. Silabhattarika. There are several other lyric writers referred to in the anthologies but they hardly deserve any notice here. A passing reference to the poetess Silabhāṭṭārikā might be made, many of whose ślokas are really very fine, e.g.,

dūti tvan taruṇī yuvā sa capalaḥ śyāmāstamobhirdisāḥ
śandēśassarahasya eṣa vipine saṅketakāvāsakaḥ
bhūyo bhūya ime vasantamurarūṣceto nayantyanyathā
gaccha kṣemasamāgamāya nipuṇaṁ rakṣantu te devatāḥ.

Her language is simple and style elegant. Her favourite metre is Śārdula-vikrīḍita.

75. The Anthologies. The anthologies are collections of selected ślokas from several authors. They are comparatively late in date but preserve much that is old. Several lyric and gnomic writers, otherwise mere names, are preserved in these anthologies. They are not wholly trustworthy because there are constant variations from anthology to anthology. The ślokas ascribed to one author in one anthology are quite often shown as of other authors in other anthologies. This only shows how difficult it had become to assign the ślokas to their original authors because of a lack of proper tradition. There are several

¹. The only other thing of value that we have of Jayadeva is a small Hindi panegyric of Hari Govind, which is preserved in the Adi Granth of the Sikhs.
anthologies in Sanskrit but we shall mention here only the important ones.

(i) Kavīndracāna-samuccayya. It is the oldest anthology known so far. It was edited by Dr. F.W. Thomas from a Nepalese manuscript of the 12th century. It contains 525 ślokas from several authors none of whom is later than A.D. 1000.

(ii) Sadukti karṇāṁṛta (or Sūktikarṇāṁṛta). It was written in A.D. 1205 by Śrīdharadāsa, a servant of Laksmanaśena of Bengal. It includes selections from 446 poets most of whom belong to Bengal.

(iii) Subhāṣitamuktāvalī. It was written by the poet Jalhana in the 13th century. It is arranged according to subject-matter, and is especially important because of its section on poets and poetry which gives us definite information about several authors.

(iv) Śāṅgadharapaddhati. It was written by Śāṅgadhara in A.D. 1363. It contains 4,689 ślokas, arranged in 163 sections. Some ślokas are the poet’s own. It is the most important of all.

(v) Subhāṣitāvalī. It was composed by Vallabhadeva in the 15th century. It contains 3,527 ślokas of over 350 poets, arranged in 101 sections. There is another Subhāṣitavālī of Śrīvara, son or pupil of Jonarāja, who continued Kalhana’s Rājaranagīni. It belongs to the 15th century and contains ślokas from more than 380 poets.

76. Gnomic Poetry. There is abundant evidence of gnomic poetry in Sanskrit literature. The earliest traces are of course to be found in the Rgveda. Later in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we find many such examples in the Śunahṣepa episode. The Upaniṣads, the Sūtras, the Legal Literature and the Mahābhārata all contain such pithy observations on life and morals. From Patañjali we learn that he was well conversant with such a literature. The Pañcatantra and Hitopadeśa are full of such maxims which appear very curious in the mouths of the cat, the mouse, the ass, and the tiger. We have already considered that Bhartṛhari’s Nīti-śataka is an important work on gnomic poetry and that the anthologies are full of such examples.

1. According to Madras Catalogue XX, 8114, it was written in A.D. 1257 for Jalha by Vaidyabhānu Paṇḍita.
Some other works on gnomic poetry are noted below.

(i) Cāanyakā Nitiśāstra (variously known as Rājanīti-samuccaya, Cāṇakya Rājanīti, Vṛddha Cāṇakya, etc.). It is said to have been composed by Cāṇakya (also known as the author of Arthaśāstra), the minister of Candragupta, but without any adequate proof. It has come down to us under numerous recensions which vary considerably, e.g., one recension contains 340 ślokas in seventeen chapters of equal length, while another by Bhojarāja contains 576 ślokas in eight chapters. All kinds of maxims occur in this work:

\[ sakṛjjalpanti rājānaḥ sakṛjjalpanti paṇḍitāḥ \]
\[ sakṛt kanyā pradīyate triṇyetāni sakṛt sakṛt. \]

The style is simple and the predominant metre is the śloka.

(ii—iv) Nītiratna, Nītisāra, and Nītipradīpa are other minor works attributed to Vararuci, Ghaṭakarpara and Vētālabhaṭṭa respectively. Their dates are uncertain. Some of the stanzas are reaļy fine.

(v—vii) Samyamāṭrākā, Cārucaryā and Kalāvilāsa are all attributed to the polymath Kṣemendra (11th century). They show his skill better than his other works.

There are several works of minor importance by other authors but they do not deserve any mention here.

---

1. The kings order but once, the wise speak but once, the girl is given away but once; these three things (are done) once and once alone.
IN Chapter IV we dealt with the works on Kāvya in general. In this chapter we shall now consider the few works on Historical Kāvya that are found in Sanskrit. India is rather miserably represented in this branch of learning. The greatest writer on history in Sanskrit is Kalhana. He was gifted with critical judgment and was in a position to give unbiased views on events of recent history for which he had several sources of information. In spite of all that, he cannot be matched even to Herodotus, not to speak of a modern historian. Other Sanskrit writers on history cannot even be remotely compared to Kalhana.

77. The Commencement of History in India. (i) We have already referred to the value of the Purāṇas as sources of early Indian history.

(ii) Next we might make mention of the lists of teachers and pupils given in the later vedic texts. Although fairly well preserved by oral tradition, we cannot assert that they are altogether free from interpolation and exaggeration.

(iii) Next we come to the Buddhist works wherein we find numerous legends about the Buddha, but they lack historical sense on the whole. It is noteworthy that even the Mahāvamsa of Mahānāmaṇi gives no historical details about the life of Aśoka.

(iv) Among the Jainas also there is no serious historical work. The Paṭṭāvalis contain nothing more than the lists of pontiffs.

(v) The praśastis1 in the inscriptions represent the first step towards serious history in India.

(vi) The gaudavaha of Vākapatirāja might be ranked as a near approach to history. It describes the overthrow of a

1. They are the panegyrics of contemporary kings or donors couched in an elegant Kāvya style. They are dated from 2nd century A.D. onwards.
Gauḍa prince by his patron, Yaśovarman of Kanauj (about A.D. 740) and gives some vivid pictures of village life in India, but it reads more as a Kāvyā than as history. It is noteworthy that even the name of the Gauḍa king is not recorded.

Next we come to the important works on Historical Kāvyā.

78. Harsacaritam of Bana was written in the first half of the 7th century. It is divided into eight chapters called ucchvāsas and is left unfinished like the poet’s other work, Kādambari. Probably the author died in the middle. It gives us a few facts about the immediate predecessors as well as personal life of Harṣa but leaves many important points (e.g., the details of the murder of Grahavarman, husband of Harṣa’s sister Rājyaśrī, and his brother) obscure. Except for its historical background the work is essentially a romance, and it begins with the mythical origin of the poet’s race. The introduction incidentally records the names of some famous writers of the past, e.g., the author of Vāsavadattā, Bhaṭṭāra Haricandra, Sātavāhana, Pravarasena, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, and the author of Brhatkathā, and is therefore of special importance to literary history.

As distinguished from kathā, this work is styled as a model of ākhyāyikā by the rhetoricians.1 He is decidedly one of the best writers of Sanskrit prose according to the Indian rhetoricians who believe ojah samāsbhūyastvametad gadyasya jīvitam2. He is described as the best votary of the Paṅcāla style in which both sense and sound are of equal importance. Kavirāja describes him (and Subandhu) as incomparable in vakrokti (double entendre). He is regarded supreme in dhvani (suggestiveness). He is at best the master of forceful description. His sentences are sometimes too long, e.g., a

1. The distinction between kathā and ākhyāyikā as laid down by the rhetoricians is simply puerile. An ākhyāyikā contains verses in Vaktra and Apavaktra metres, but in kathā the metres used are Āryā, etc. In ākhyāyikā the chapters are styled ucchvāsa but in kathā the divisions are called lambha. Daṇḍin was inclined to obliterate this traditional distinction between the two: jātirekā sahīnā dvayāṅkitā, ‘One species and two names.’ Perhaps it will be right to say that an ākhyāyikā has a historical background, but the kathā is fiction, more or less.

2. Vigour and long compounds constitute the life of Prose (Kāvyā-darśa, I. 80).
single sentence in Chapter VIII runs over five printed pages, another over three printed pages. The reader is kept in suspense till he reaches the end of the sentence. Such a style can hardly appeal to the western mind of the modern age. Thus Weber said, ‘Bāṇa’s prose is an Indian wood where the undergrowth must be cut away to render a passage possible, and wild beasts in the shape of unknown words lie in wait for the wayfarer’. So also Keith: ‘The demerits of Bāṇa as a stylist are deplorable.’

Bāṇa was admittedly a great scholar of mythology, and he possessed high-flown imagination. He was very fond of puns, and he abounds in far-fetched allusions. He is capable of vivid and graphic description that appeals direct to the reader’s heart. The death account of Prabhākaravardhana is an instance in point.

79. Navasahasankacaritam of Padmagupta [or Parimala] (A.D. 1005). Like other works on Historical Kāvya that followed, it is written in poetic form. It consists of eighteen cantos. The author was a protégé of the kings of Dhārā, Vākpaticāra and Sindhisrāja, from whom he borrowed the inspiration for this work. It narrates the theme of the winning of the princess Śaśāprabhā, but is intended at the same time to allude to the history of the king Navasāhasānka of Mālava.

80. Bihana (11th century A.D.) He is known to us for his semi-historical play Karnasundari and his more famous Historical Kāvya Vikramāṅkadeva-caritam (besides his lyric Caurapaṅcāśikā already mentioned). In his drama Karnasundari the poet describes the marriage of a Cālukya prince with the daughter of a Vidyādhara king. It is intended at the same time to celebrate the marriage of his patron to a princess that was actually performed. It contains many stanzas which are really fine and is an ample proof of the poet’s power of description, simple and graphic.

The Vikramāṅkadeva-caritam begins with a mythical origin of the Cālukya family and then dwells at length on the personal account of Āhavamalla (1040-69), the king’s father. It then eulogises the Cālukya king, Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāṇa (A.D. 1076-1127), at whose court he resided. The account is of

1. This feature is more visible in his other work, Kādambarī.
course sketchy and imperfect. Chronology is utterly lacking, as in Bāṇa. Thrice is Śiva introduced to avoid the mention of facts possibly not favourable to the king. Nor is the work free from exaggeration; as an instance we may cite his alleged Gauḍa conquests. The description of Svayānvarā is Kālidāsa-like and picturesque; it does not appear to be real and historical. He frequently leaves out the names of minor personages. The character of the poem is more epic-like than historical. Thus it contains lengthy description of spring, and its effect in arousing the passion of love, of sports in water, the advent of monsoons and the pleasures of winter. The heroes, Āhavamalla and Vikramāditya are paragons of beauty; the others vicious. It contains eighteen cantos. In the last canto the poet gives us an account of his own family, his life as a wandering paṇḍita and a short account of the kings of Kashmir which was his home. He was the son of Jyeṣṭhakalasa, a veteran scholar of grammar. He himself was well versed in the Vedas and had read Mahābhāṣya and poetics. He travelled from country to country till he established himself at the court of Vikramāditya VI, the Cālukya king, where he was received as Vidyāpati.

Bilhana might be regarded as one of those who made some serious contribution to history. The work is to be dated before A.D. 1088,

(i) because it is silent about the King’s expedition to the south which took place in A.D. 1088.

(ii) because it mentions Harṣadeva of Kashmir, as a prince and not as a King, which he became in that year.

*Style.* Bilhana belongs to the Vaidarbhī school of poetry and at his best he is the master of simple and graphic description. The last moments of Āhavamalla will serve as an instance:

\[jānāmi karikarṇāntacāṇcalam hatajīvitam mama nānyatra\]

\[visvāsah pārvatijīvitēṣvarāt,\]

\[utraṅge tuṅgabhadrāyastadeṣa šivacintayā vānchāmyahair\]

\[nirākartuṁ dehagrahavidambanāṁ.\]

1. I know the cursed life, tremulous like the tip of an elephant’s ear. My confidence is in none except Śiva (lit., the lord of Pārvati’s life). With thought of Śiva, I want to lay aside this mockery of human life in the lap of (river) Tuṅgabhadrā.
He avoids long compounds and does not overdo alliterations or play on words. His diction is normally precise. Occasionally he becomes artificial and the sense becomes obscure, but in the main he is a model of simplicity and clearness. His predominant metres are *Indravajrā* (6 cantos) and *Varṇāstha* (3 cantos).

81. Kalhana’s *Rajatarangini* (A.D. 1149-50) Kalhaṇa\(^1\) is undoubtedly the greatest historian of Sanskrit literature. Fortunately we know enough of his personal history from himself. He was born in Kashmir, about A.D. 1100. He was the son of Campaka, a faithful adherent of King Harṣa of Kashmir (A.D. 1089—1101). The King being assassinated by conspiracy, Kalhaṇa’s family had to quit the royal court which fact explains the unbiased and impartial view with which Kalhaṇa could depict his characters. He was a devout follower of Śaivism (for which Kashmir is famous up till now) but he had no liking for the Tāntric rights of that system of philosophy. He was tolerant and had great regard for Buddhism\(^2\) and its principle of Ahimsā (non-injury to life).

Kalhaṇa was an erudite scholar of the epics, had widely read the Mahākāvyas and works like Bāṇa’s *Harṣacaritāmaṇi*, intimately knew Bilhaṇa and was conversant with works on astrology.\(^3\) The task of writing a comprehensive history of Kashmir which he undertook was an arduous one indeed; there were insuperable difficulties in this way. The old royal chronicles had either vanished by his time or were useless for they supplied untrustworthy information and incorrect chronology. Kalhaṇa had an historical attitude and made best use of the sources available to him. Still, we know, his chronology is poor so far as earlier history is concerned, e.g., the date of Aśoka as given in the *Rājatarangini* is a thousand years earlier than the date known to us. Kalhaṇa himself tells us that he consulted eleven works of ancient writers (now all

---

1. Maṅkha has mentioned him under the more elegant appellation of Kalyāṇa.
2. In fact, Buddhism had long since reconciled itself to Hinduism. Kṣemendra eulogised the Buddha as an incarnation of Viṣṇu and married monks were known long before Kalhaṇa’s time.
3. cf., his references to Varāhamihira’s *Bṛhat Saṅghita*. 
disappeared) as well as the Nilamata-purāṇa. He gives the traditional number fifty-two of the earlier kings, mentions the first four on the basis of Nilamata and then there is a wide gap of thirty-five kings of whom nothing is known. The next batch of eight kings beginning with Lava is taken from Padmamihira.¹ The next five he took from Chavillākara. Regarding events of recent history, Kalhana’s account is both truthworthy and valuable. He personally inspected inscriptions of all sorts that came across his way—the records of landgrants and praśastis, as well as those recording the construction of palaces, memorials and temples. He was a great master of the topography of the valley and studied coins and inspected historical buildings. Besides, he used freely local traditions of all kinds in addition to the family records that were available to him. His detailed knowledge of the previous fifty years and contemporary events was based on the information sought from his father and many others.

Kalhana was a keen and dispassionate observer. His character sketches are realistic and impartial. His account of his ruling king Jayasimha is far from eulogistic. The word-picture that he has drawn of the merits and demerits of his countrymen is clear, accurate and interesting. The Kashmiris, he says, are fair, false and fickle. The soldiery is disorderly and cowardly, prepared to fly at a rumour. The Rājputras are full of courage and loyalty. The officials are greedy, oppressive and disloyal. On the other hand, he has true appreciation for ministers like Rilhana and Alaṅkāra.

In the delineation of characters, Kalhana far excels his predecessors Bāṇa, Padmagupta and even Bihana. Nor does he lack humour when it is due. “His accuracy in genealogical information is conspicuous, and his topography most favourably distinguishes him from such a historian as Livy, who apparently never looked at one of the battle-fields he described.”²

Kalhana, however, suffered from certain limitations. The

¹ The source of Padmamihira was a certain Pāṣupata Helarāja whose work must have been an extensive one but disappeared before his time.
² A. B. Keith, History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 169.
geographical isolation of Kashmir made his vision narrow. We do not find in him any appreciation of the relations of Kashmir with the outside world. His view of life is essentially Indian. Thus fate plays a predominant part in the course of important events and witchcraft is as real a cause of death as any fatal disease. He lacked also the scientific spirit of the modern age. He does not tell us anything about the divergence in his authorities.

Of course, we do not find in him the poetic subtleties of Bhāravi and Māgha. The amplitude of his task forbade him to undertake any such thing. Naturally the digressions are few and modest in kind. He however believed that the creative genius (pratibhā) of a poet alone could picture past times before the reader’s eye. Thus we find that the dominant sentiment in his poetry, as required by poetics, is that of resignation (vairāgya). His didactic tendency cannot pass unnoticed. The various doings of his characters are judged and estimated by the canons laid down in the Dharmaśāstra, and always with a distinct moral bias. His own contribution to the art of governing Kashmir is placed in the mouth of Lalitāditya and is very much in the spirit of Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra.

*Style.* As we have mentioned before, Kalhaṇa’s Rāja-taraṅginī is not couched in the kāvya style of higher type. It is rather versified prose, comparable to medieval chronicles. The language is both simple and beautiful. It possesses an easy flow which is the chief characteristic of this poem. On occasions, the poet does not fail to give us a proof of his true poetic power which becomes manifest in the word-pictures that he has painted for us, e.g., the tragic tale of Harṣa’s isolation and misery. The use of dialogues lends variety and dramatic power to the poem. On the other hand, he becomes obscure at certain places because he uses the words in a technical sense, without giving any explanation, e.g., dvāra, ‘high frontier watch station’, pādāgra, ‘high revenue office’. Another difficulty is created by his use of varying forms of the same name, e.g., Loṣṭhaka, Loṭhaka and Loṭhana.

He is very fond of using similes at every turn; the mountain,
the river, the sun and the moon are quite common. His other characteristics are abundance of paronomasias, antitheses and occasional play on words. The simplicity of the sloka metre is happily varied by interposing more ornate stanzas. Even when his language becomes intricate, it possesses a charm of its own, e.g., he says of king’s flatterers:

ye kecinnau sāthya maugdhyanidhayāste bhūmrāṁ raṅjakāh.¹

A picturesque description of the goddess Bhramaravāsini is given:

bhāsvad bimbādhara kṛṣṇakeśī sitakarānanā
harimadhīś śivākārā sarvadevamayīvā sā.²

82. Minor Works.

1. Kumārapālacaritam or Dvyāśrayakāvya. It was written about A.D. 1163 by the Jaina monk Hemacandra (A.D. 1088-1172). It gives an account of the Cālukya King Kumārapāla and his immediate predecessors. It contains twenty-eight cantos (twenty in Sanskrit plus eight in Prakrit). Mainly it is intended to afford illustrations of the rules of Sanskrit and Prakrit grammar taught in his own work. He was a jealous propagandist of Jainism and his remarks are prejudiced. In Cantos XVI to XX Kumārapāla is represented as pursuing a pro-Jaina policy,

2. Prthvirāja-vijaya gives an account of the victories of Prthvirāja Chāhamāna. The poem is of considerable historical interest but only one fragmentary and defective manuscript is available. The poet’s name is unknown. The style is similar to that of Bilhana. He is mentioned by Jayaratha in Alaṅkāra-vimarśinī (A.D. 1200) and is commented upon by Jonaraja of Kashmir (A.D. 1448). Probably the author belonged to Kashmir.

3. Rāmapālacaritam of Sandhyākara Nandin describes the feats of Rāmapāla of Bengal (A.D. 1084-1130).

4. Somapālavilāsa of Jalhana of Kashmir gives an account

---

¹ Whosoever are the embodiments of wickedness and folly, they are the flatterers of princes.

² Her lower lip was lustrous (possessed of sun) like the Bimba, her hair was black (consisted of Kṛṣṇa), her face was moon-like (consisted of Soma), her waist was like lion (possessed of Viṣṇu) and her countenance was auspicious (consisted of Śiva). Thus, she was made, as it were, of all the gods.
of the king Somapālavilāsa conquered by Sussala. The poet is mentioned by Maṅkha as a member of the Sabhā of King Alaṅkāra of Kashmir.

5. Rājendrakarṇapūra of Śambhu is a panegyric of Harṣadeva of Kashmir.

6—9. The works like Kīrtikaumudī and Surathotsava, both of Someśvaradatta (A.D. 1179—1262), Sukṛtaśaṅkīrtana of Arisimha (13th century) and Jagaducaritam of Sarvānanda (13th century) are more or less panegyrics which deserve no detailed reference here.

10. Mention may finally be made of the writers of Kashmir who continued the Rājataraṅgīnī. Jonaraja (d. in 1459), his pupil Srīvara and the latter’s pupil Śuka have carried the story down to the annexation of Kashmir by Akbar; but the work is devoid both of originality and poetic merit.
THE PROSE ROMANCE AND THE CAMPU

83. The Origin of Prose Romance. The origin of prose romance like that of epic is shrouded in mystery. We are confronted with the mature works of illustrious writers like Daṇḍin, Subandhu and Bāṇa. Nothing is known of the earlier specimens. In his introduction to Harṣacarita, Bāṇa of course refers to Bhāṭṭāra Haricandra, as the writer of a prose work of high repute but nothing further is known about this famous author. It is not even certain, although it is probable, that he was earlier than Daṇḍin.

The prose romance may be distinguished from the folk-tale. While the essence of the latter is swift and easy narrative, that of the former is elaborate description. Thus we find that the prose romance is couched in the elegant Kāvyā style. For its origin in style therefore we have to go back not to the simple narrative but to the inscriptions of Rudradāmana and Hariśeṇa’s panegyric of Samudragupta. This influence of the poetic Kāvyā on the gradual development of the prose romance must have lasted for centuries.

It was suggested by Peterson that the Indian romance was indebted to the Greek romance. There exist many parallels between the two, e.g., the manner of describing feminine beauty, and the portraying of love-parallels in animals and plants, etc. It is argued that the Indian astrology has been strongly influenced by the Greek astrology and that a similar influence could have been possible in the domain of romance. M. Lacôte showed some resemblances between the Greek romance and Guṇāḍhyā’s Bṛhatkathā, e.g., the occurrence of a race of aerial beings, the persecution of the hero and the heroine and their ultimate triumph, the separation and the re-union of the two lovers and their heroic adventures.¹

¹ Some other parallels of incident between the Greek romance and the Vāsavadattā are: falling in love from a dream, svayāṁvara, exchange of
etc.—and concluded that the Brhaikathā was indebted to the Greek romance. Later on he changed his opinion and arrived at an opposite conclusion that the Greek romance was indebted to the Indian literature. All these conclusions are based on insufficient data. The divergences between the Indian romance and the Greek romance are even more important than the obvious parallels that exist. "The romances of the two peoples are totally different both in plan and in spirit, even as a cursory reading will show." In Sanskrit romance, emphasis is laid upon elaborate description; but in Greek romance all attention is given to the story. To conclude we may say that the Indian and the Greek romances grew independently of each other, fostering on their respective civilisations and literary traditions.

84. Dandin. His Works. Traditionally Dandin is said to have written three works. Daśakumāracaritam (prose romance) and the Kavyādarśa (a treatise on rhetorics) are certainly his, although in the former he has violated the rules laid down by himself in the second, evidently because precept is easier than practice. There are vague conjectures about his third work. From the occurrence of a common verse in the Mrçchakaṭikā and the Kavyādarśa, Pischel concluded that his third work might be the Mrçchakaṭikā, but the discovery of Bhāsa’s works has shown that the same verse occurs in the Cārudatta also which is therefore the source of Dandin. It is said that the third work might be Chandovici, which is referred to by him in the Kavyādarśa, but it is doubtful if the reference here is to any particular work or the general science of rhetorics. Similarly there is a reference to the Kalāpari-

letters between lovers, raining, long-winded lamentations and threatening suicide. The following parallels of literary device are also noteworthy—stories within stories and episodes, descriptions of nature, detailed personal descriptions, learned allusions and citations of precedents, and alliteration, etc. (cf., Gray’s edition of Vāsavadatta, pp. 35-6. He concludes, "Yet all these parallels, and many more which might be cited, seem to me to prove nothing.")

2. cf., Gray’s Vāsavadatta, p. 37.
3. cf., the following verse of Rājaśekhara:
   trayo’gnayastrayo vedāstrayo devastra gurāh
   trayo danḍi prabandhāca tṛisu lokeṣu viśrutāh..
ccheda in the Kāvyādarśa, which if it were a work of Daṇḍin, might have been a later chapter of the Kāvyādarśa rather than a separate work. He was certainly not the author of the Avantisundarīkathā which in its elaborate style vies with the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa.

Personal Life. Nothing is known in particular about the personal life of Daṇḍin. From the introductory stanza of the Daśakumāracaritam it has been suggested that he was probably a worshipper of Viṣṇu, but it has been ignored that the Pūrvaṃṭhikā (as the introductory portion of the work is styled), in which this stanza occurs is admittedly not the work of Daṇḍin. That he was a southerner and a possible native of Vidarbha is quite probable; he eulogises the Vaidarbhit style, speaks highly of the Mahārāṣṭrī language, refers to the Kaliṅgas, Andhras, Colas and the rivers of the south and is intimately conversant with the manners and customs of central India, cf., his description of the goddess Vindhyavāsini in the narrative of Viṣṇuta.

Date. The date of Daṇḍin has been a matter of great controversy. In the last narrative, which is related by Viṣṇuta, there is a reference to the dynasty of Bhoja. Relying on this internal evidence, Wilson concluded that Daṇḍin must have lived in the reign of an immediate successor of king Bhoja and placed him in the 11th century A.D. in spite of the fact that the other considerations suggested a much earlier date.

Peterson placed him in the 8th century A.D. on the grounds, (i) that there appears to be a reference to the rhetorician Vāmana (8th century) in the Kāvyādarśa, II. 258-9; and (ii) that the verse II. 197 of Kāvyādarśa bears close resemblance with a similar description in the Kādambarī. The late Vishnu Krishna Chiplunkar pointed out some close resemblance between the narrative of Mantragupta in the Daśakumāracaritam and the fifth act of Bhavabhūti’s Mālatī-

---

2. cf., Daṇḍin’s

aratanālokasamāñharyamavāryam sūryaśrāmbhīḥ
dṛṣṭirodhakaram yūnāṁ yauvanaprabhavam tamaḥ

and Bāṇa’s

—kevala ca nisargata evābhūnabhedyamaratnālokocchedyamapradipaprabhāpaneyamatigahanam tamo yauvanaprabhavāṁ.
mādhavanī and concluded that he must have lived about the time of Bhavabhūti. That Bāṇa has not referred to Daṇḍin in his introduction to the Harṣacaritam cannot lead us to any conclusion because he has not mentioned even great poets like Bhāravi.

The evidence of style shows us that the Daśakumāra-caritam bears more affinity to the Pañcatantra or the Kathāsaritsāgara than to the prose romances of Subandhu or Bāṇa. Although Daṇḍin says in the Kāvyādāra, (ojaḥ samāsabhūyastvametad gadyasya jīvitaṁ : Vigour and the profuse use of compounds constitute the life of prose) the Daśakumārarcaritam is simplicity itself as compared with the Vāsavadatta and Kādambarī; he is neither so difficult nor so artificial as Subandhu or Bāṇa. According to Indian opinion Daṇḍin is deservedly known for his padalālitya which is equivalent to elegance and refinement of style based on happy choice of words which is both attractive and impressive. Besides, Daṇḍin is not unmindful of the story and is not so elaborate in description as Subandhu and Bāṇa. This points to a date about A.D. 600 which is corroborated by the geographical conditions obtaining in the Daśakumārarcaritam.

The theory of 6th century A.D. can quite fit in with the internal evidence of his having flourished in the region of an immediate successor of King Bhoja; Tod in his Annals of Rājasthan has on the strength of a Jaina chronomagmatic catalogue mentioned three kings, bearing the name Bhoja, ruling in Mālava in A.D. 575, 665 and 1042. We may therefore conclude with some certainty that Daṇḍin flourished towards the close of the 6th century A.D. 

1. cf., note 2 on p. 96.

2. cf., The Geographical Data of the Raghuvamśa and Daśakumāra-caritam, p. 46, Collins (1907).

3. Vijjikā, a poetess of Deccan, has referred to Daṇḍin, cf., vṛthaiv Daṇḍinā praktaṁ sarvaśuklā sarasvatī. If she be identical with Vijaya-bhaṭṭariṅkā, Queen of Candraditya, the eldest son of Pulikeśin II, she lived about A.D. 660. The identification would again place Daṇḍin about A.D. 600.

The relative date of Daṇḍin with reference to Bhāmaha is hotly contested but there are reasons to believe that Daṇḍin is earlier of the two: (i) Rudraṭa's Kavyālāṅkāra says: nanu Daṇḍimēdhāvirudrabhāmāhādi kṛtāṁ santyevālāṅkāra śāstrāṇi. Namisādhv also speaks in the
85. The Dasakumaracaritam. The title of the work suggests that it contains the narratives of ten princes. The main work begins abruptly with the story of the hero, prince Rājavāhana, and contains eight chapters (called ucchvāsas). The introductory portion called the Pūrvapiṭhikā contains five chapters and gives us the frame-work of the story and the narrative of two princes—thus making the number ten. The supplement called the Uttarapiṭhikā completes the narrative of the last prince Viśrutha. The considerations of style apart, the Pūrvapiṭhikā is essentially different from the main work of Daṇḍin even in plan and spirit. There are even inconsistencies of details, e.g., in the Pūrvapiṭhikā, Arthapāla is Tārāvali’s son and Pramati is the son of another minister Sumati, but in the main work Arthapāla and Pramati are both the sons of Kāmapāla, by Kāntimati and Tārāvali. Both the Pūrvapiṭhikā and the Uttarapiṭhikā are extant in varied forms, which clearly shows that they are certainly not the work of Daṇḍin. The fifth chapter of the Pūrvapiṭhikā is superior in style to the remaining chapters and shows the hands of two even in the Pūrvapiṭhikā.

The hero of the work is Rājavāhana, the son of Rājahamśa, who was the king of Magadha, but defeated by the lord of Mālava he was spending his days in refuge. His nine associates are the sons of ex-ministers and nobles who are brought there in the forest one by one. They all grow up together and march out on an expedition to build their fortunes. The prince Rājavāhana goes on an errand to the nether region and the other nine go out in quest of him. Rājavāhana returns after some time and not finding his companions goes out in the same strain. Evidently these names are arranged chronologically as we find reference to Medhāvirudra in Bhāmaha’s work also; (ii) Daṇḍin’s treatment is crude and unscientific as compared with that of Bhāmaha who certainly excels him in precision, logical acumen and clearness of perception; (iii) Bhāmaha on some occasions refers to the opinion of others (apare, anye, etc.) which are found in Daṇḍin’s work.

That Daṇḍin’s Kavyādarśa is later than the Bhāṭṭikāvya is almost certain. Bhāṭṭi illustrates almost the same figures as are defined by Daṇḍin but differs a good deal in their order and other details which could not be the case if he had followed Bhāṭṭi. This, however, does not help us in arriving at the exact date of Daṇḍin because the dates of Bhāṭṭi and Bhāmaha are also indefinite.
search of them. Gradually they all meet and narrate to one another the events of their adventurous careers. The exploits are strange, heroic and varied. The width of their range depicts the great imaginative power of the author. It would be wrong to believe that the work depicts in any way the Hindu society of those days; the real aim of the author is to provide pleasure and not depict social conditions. In spirit, these stories bear resemblance to some of those found in the Brhat-kathā of Guṇāḍhya; thus magic, witchcraft, superstition and miracle are the order of the day. We are told of men falling from the air into the arms of a passer-by without any injury to either party. Rājavāhana, the hero, is enchained by a silver chain which changes into a divine nymph, named Suratamaṇḍāji; she was reduced to that form by the curse of sage Mārkaṇḍeya. People are expert in the art of gambling, thieving, breaking houses and other allied activities. The love-pictures are painted in such detail that they are repugnant to a modern reader, and some of the passages have to be expunged in order to render them as suitable text-books.

Style. We have already referred to the padalālitya of Daṇḍin traditionally ascribed to him, and said that he is far from being elaborate like Subandhu or Bāṇa.

Daṇḍin is known for his remarkable power of characterisation. Not only are the princes, but even the minor characters are very vividly drawn. They have got their own individuality and are painted with the poet’s usual vigour, insight and liveliness.

As a poet of nature and description, Daṇḍin can neither rival Kālidāsa, nor Bhāravi nor Māgha, yet his descriptions of spring, the sunset, the meeting of Rājavāhana with Avantisundari, Pramati’s account of the unknown princess and Kandukavati’s play at the ball are specimens of fine composition worthy of a great writer.

His perfect command over the language is admirable. He

1. See § 84 above.
2. Daṇḍin is known as a poet of great repute. His Kāvyādarśa is all in poetry and even his Daśakumāraracaritam is poetic in spirit (cf., rasātmakāṁ vākyamāṁ kāvyamāṁ). An old admirer of Daṇḍin has said:
   jāte jagat, vālmīkau kaviṁtāt bhavat
   kavi iti tato vyāse kavayastayi Daṇḍini.
could write the whole of Chapter VII without the use of labials; Mantragupta was severely bitten in the lips by his beloved and he very cleverly resorted to this device of avoiding the labials and placing his hand on the mouth when he narrated his story. Being a follower of the Vaidarbhī school, Daṇḍin aims at easy intelligibility, exactness of expression, sweetness of form and elegance of diction and strictly avoids hardness of sounds and bombast. Even in prose he avoids long compounds difficult to comprehend. He is a skilled grammarian and in strict observance of the rule parokṣe liṅ he avoids the use of past perfect in the narration of accounts by the princes. His use of the aorist is on the other hand quite frequent.

Daṇḍin can excite laughter too. The wild ventures of the princes and their queer methods of achieving their end, amply bespeak of the author’s power of wit and humour. Queen Vasundharā invites the nobility of the town to a close meeting and spreads a false rumour under the pledge of solemn secrecy—indeed a fine way of doing it.

The opening paragraph of the Pūrvapīṭhikā is in the elaborate style of Bāṇa. We find in it lengthy sentences containing long and difficult compounds. The writer of the Pūrvapīṭhikā has also overdone in the excessive use of yamakas, e.g., kumārā mārābhīrāmā rāmdyapauruṣā ruṣā bhasmikārtarayorayopahasitasamīraṇā raṇābhīyānena yānenabhuyadayāśaṁsaṁ rājānamakārṣuḥ.1

86. Subandhu is known to us as the famous writer of the Vāsavadattā, the earliest reference to which appears in the 11th stanza of Bāṇa’s introduction to Harṣacaritāṁ:
kavināmagalad darpo nūnam vāsavadattayaṁ saktyevasaṁ pūṇḍuputrānāṁ gatayaṁ karṇagocaram.

In the 20th stanza of his introduction to the Kādambarī, Bāṇa has referred to his work as iyam ati dvayī kathā and the

1. The princes who looked as charming as Cupid, who possessed the manliness of Rāma and others, who had in anger reduced to ashes their enemies, and who laughed to scorn the wind in speed made the king hopeful of prosperity by their onward march of an expedition.

2. Surely, the pride of the poets melted away through the Vāsavadattā, having reached their ears, just as the pride of Pāṇḍu’s sons vanished through Indra-given spear reaching Karṇa.
commentator tells us that the *dvārī* here refers to the *Bṛhatkathā* and *Vāsavadattā*.

There are, of course, some later references to him in literature. Vākpatrikāja has mentioned him along with Bhāsa and the author of the *Raghuvarṇa* in his *Gaudavaha*; according to Kavirāja’s *Rāghava-pāṇḍavīyaṁ*, Subandhu, Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Kavirāja (himself) are unsurpassed in *vakroktī* (equivocation); and Maṅkha has eulogised him along with Menṭha and Bhāravi. There are several other references to him in the anthologies. The *Bhojaprabandha* of Ballāla (16th century) has enumerated him as one of the thirteen luminaries at the court of Bhoja of Dhāra. A Kannada inscription of A.D. 1168 has recorded his name as eminent in Kāvyā. This shows that his fame had travelled far into the south by the 12th century A.D.¹

The date of Subandhu is still indefinite. Although his work contains numerous allusions to the epics and the Purāṇas, the Upaniṣads and the Mīmāṁsā and Nyāya philosophies; the *Bṛhatkathā* and the *Kāmasūtra*, and hostile references to the Buddhists and the Jainas, they shed little light upon his date. There are two² references to Chandovicitī, and if Chandovicitī is the work of Daṇḍin which is more doubtful than probable, he existed later than Daṇḍin. There are evidences to suggest that he wrote his work in the reign of an immediate successor to king Vikramāditya: (a) the tenth introductory stanza of the *Vāsavadattā* contains the words gantavati bhūvi vikramāditye, (b) Narasimha Vaidya, one of the glossers of the *Vāsavadattā* says, kavirayaṁ vikramāditya saḥyaḥ; tasmin rājī lokāntaram prāpte etannibhandhāṁ kṛtavān (The poet was a courtier of Vikramāditya. He wrote

---

¹ The *Daśakumārācaritaṁ* of Daṇḍin contains the following reference to *Vāsavadattā*: anurūpabharrtaṃ gāminīnāṁ ca vāsavadattādināṁ varṇanena grāhayaḥ nusayaṁ, ‘and make her repent by an account of ladies like Vāsavadattā who obtained worthy husbands’. It more probably refers to the heroine of Bhāsa’s *Swapnavāsavadattām* than to the work of Subandhu. The reference *Vāsavadattāmadhikṛtya kṛto granthaḥ* contained in the vārttiṣa (about 3rd century B.C.) on Pāṇini (IV. iii. 87) pertains clearly to Bhāsa’s work.

² Chandovicitīra mālinīsanātha and Chandovicitīrṇ bhrājamānatanamadhyāṁ [ed. Hall, 119, 235].
this work when the king had passed away.), (e) Hall's manuscript of the Vāsavadattā describes Subandhu as Vararuci's sister's son (Śrīvararuci bhāgineyāḥ) who is alleged to be the court-gem of Vikramādiya; but nothing can be decided definitely on the basis of this evidence alone.

The fact that Subandhu has alluded to Uddyotkara and the Baudhāhasāṅgatyaśāntikāra of Dharmakīrti in the phrase, nyāyasthitimivoddyotkarasvarūpām bauddhasāṅgatimivālaṅkāra-bhūṣitām, is significant. Both Uddyotkara and Dharmakīrti flourished in the latter half of the sixth century A.D. Subandhu may therefore be placed towards the close of the 6th century A.D. That he wrote earlier than the Harṣacaritām of Bāṇa is certain.

Plot. The hero of the romance is the virtuous Kandarpaketu, son of Cintāmaṇi. Once, towards dawn, he saw in dream an extraordinarily charming, eighteen year old girl, and set out in quest of her with his friend Makaranda. After long, they came to the Vindhya mountains where the prince, one night, overheard the male-bird explaining his late hours to his suspicious wife and through it got the clue of his lady-at-heart. She was Vāsavadattā, the only daughter of Śrīgāraśekhara, the king of Kusumapura. She too had dreamt of a youth like Kandarpaketu and had sent out her maid Tamālikā in search of him. The meeting is arranged at Kusumapura. The marriage of Vāsavadattā was ready to be performed the very next day with Puśpaketu, a Vidyādharā prince. Kandarpaketu and Vāsavadattā, therefore flew immediately on a magic steed and reached the Vindhyas. In the morning Kandarpaketu found her absent and, mad with love, was determined to commit suicide when a heavenly voice checked him from doing so by promising his reunion with his beloved. After several months he found his beloved in stone and brought her to life by his touch. From her he learnt that while two armies fought with each other to win her for their leaders, she had unknowingly stepped into that bower forbidden to women and was transformed by the sage's curse until he found her. Thereafter they returned to Kandarpaketu's capital and ever lived in happiness.

As distinguished from ākhyāyikā, the Vāsavadattā is to be classed as kathā; its subject-matter is more akin to the
Kādambarī than to the Harṣacaritam and we find in it kathā elements, e.g., beliefs in dreams, talking of birds, magic steeds, transformations of forms and effect of curses, etc.

Style. The aim of the author is to give us a work which contains pun in every syllable. The achievement is admirable and the poet’s boast is significant, but judged from modern standards, the work is not entirely free from defects. The framework of the story is slender and the gorgeous description in its manifold elaboration is everything. The maiden’s beauty, the hero’s heroism and the charming description of the spring, the forest and the mountain are very vividly painted. The interest of the story is almost lost in the artificiality of the style which often becomes wearisome and puzzling to the reader. It is written in perfect Gauḍī style; thus it contains long compounds, strained constructions and bombast; it aims at creating effect by sound rather than by sense, and abounds in alliteration and other sabdālaṅkāras. The figure next in frequency to śleṣa (paranomasia) is virodhābhāsa (antithesis), which consists in the meaning being apparently self-contradictory but in reality consistent and more intensified, e.g., it is said of king Cintāmāni,

vidyādharo’pi sumanāh, dhṛtarāṣṭropi guṇapriyāh, kṣamānu-gato’pi sudharmāśritah......“Though a demi-god he was a god (he possessed knowledge and noble mind), though Dhṛtarāṣṭra he was a friend of Bhīma (he possessed a kingdom and was fond of virtues), though he had come to earth he took refuge in heaven (he was filled with patience and took refuge in good government).”

The figure māladipaka which consists of a conjoined series of words, each of which refers to the one preceding, may be illustrated by the following:

nāyakena kīrttih, kīrttyā saptasāgarāh, sāgaraiḥ kr̥tayugādi rājācarita smaraṇaṁ......“The fame (was attained) by the hero, the seven oceans by fame and the remembrance of the lives of the kings of golden age by the oceans......”

2. Figures of speech pertaining to word, as distinguished from those pertaining to meaning.
The *Vāsāvadatta* exhibits a remarkable absence of the sense of proportion which is in a way the real foundation of style. No topic is let go till the author has carried it to the farthest extreme, e.g., in the description of some incident every possible minor detail is given; and as if that is insufficient it is followed by a series of similes and fire-work of puns. If some exhortation is intended to be given, the same idea is intensified over and over again in a variety of ways. This defect springs from the ready wit and rich resourcefulness of weaving a story within a story.

87. Bana's Kadambari. The *Kādambarī* of Bāna is of interest to us in more ways than one.

(i) It is one of the few works in Sanskrit literature whose date is definitely known to us. It can therefore serve a landmark in the history of Indian literature and Indian thought.

(ii) It furnishes us with a standard example of classical prose.

(iii) It is a popular romance that contributed to the folklore of India.

Like the other work of Bāna, the *Kādambarī* is also left incomplete by the author but it is fortunately brought to a finish by his son Bhūșana Bhaṭṭa. The story is rather a complex one; it possesses the characteristic of emboxing narrative within narrative. The major part of the story is put in the mouth of a parrot which ultimately turns out to be sage Puṇḍarīka, the secondary hero of the novel. The name of Kādambarī, the heroine, appears only after we have gone through half the work. King Śūdraka to whom the story is related appears to be a figurehead whose name could have been easily dispensed with but ultimately he turns out to be the principal hero. Candrāpiṭa in another life under the influence of curse. Thus the interest of the story is very ingeniously maintained up to the last. In brief the story runs as follows:

There is a king named Śūdraka to whose court a parrot is brought by a Caṇḍāla girl. Being induced, the parrot relates its woeful tale to the king. Its mother died at the time of its birth, and the father was soon after caught by the hunters. Some disciple of sage Jābāli found it lying helpless in the desolate forest and taking compassion brought it to the sage's.
The hermitage. The sage once began to relate the following story to his disciples which the parrot faithfully recounts.

In Ujjayinī, there reigned a king of excellent virtues, named Tārāpiḍā. His wife Viḍāsavatī was the most accomplished of all ladies. He had a very wise minister Śukanāsa. Through Śiva's favour, the king got, after long, a son named Čandrapiḍā. The minister's son, of the same age, was named Vaiśampāyana. Both grew up together; the one could not stay without the other for a moment. A great educational institution was constructed for them and they became accomplished in all the arts by their sixteenth year. The famous discourse of Śukanāsa is then delivered to Čandrapiḍā. The prince is made Yuvarāja; he is given a wonderful horse Indrāyuḍha and a faithful companion Patralekhā. The prince then sets out on an expedition of digvijaya and for three years leads a victorious campaign. Once in pursuit of two Kinnaras he went far into the forest and came to a beautiful lake where he found a charming lady Mahāśvetā practising penance. She told him that she had liked a certain youth Puṇḍarīka and was in turn liked by him, but before they could express their feelings to each other, the youth perished. She wanted to become sati on the funeral pyre of her beloved but his body was taken away by a divine figure, promising her reunion. She also told him of her friend Kādambarī, of exquisite beauty.

Čandrapiḍā then met Kādambarī. They took fancy to each other but before the shy couple could express their love the prince received an urgent call from his father and had to leave the place to the utter disappointment of both. Kādambarī's sorrow knows no bounds. She is checked from committing suicide by Patralekhā who comes to Čandrapiḍā and describes faithfully the love-stricken condition of Kādambarī.

Čandrapiḍā prepares to seek his beloved. A misfortune then befalls. Vaiśampāyana had insisted to stay on the bank of the lake where Mahāśvetā practised penance; he had now disappeared. Čandrapiḍā goes out in quest of his companion Vaiśampāyana. Meeting Mahāśvetā, he learns from her that a

---

1. Bāṇa's work ends here. The narrative is continued by his son Bhūṣāṇa Bhaṭṭa.
certain Brahmin youth had sought her love which she naturally refused (being faithful to Puṇḍarīka), but when he insisted further she became indignant and cursed him to be a parrot. Hearing this Candrāpiḍa fell dead. Kādambarī reaches there and is even more sorrowful than Mahāśvetā. A divine voice bids them preserve the body of Candrāpiḍa which had lost the soul through curse and assures them of reunion with their lovers. Indrāyudha enters the lake and in his place there springs up Kapiṇjala, the friend of Puṇḍarīka from whom they learn that Candrāpiḍa is the incarnation of moon, that Vaiśampāyana is Puṇḍarīka and Indrāyudha Kapiṇjala.

Hearing this story from the sage, the parrot recognised its own identity as Puṇḍarīka-Vaiśampāyana and set out in quest of Candrāpiḍa but unfortunately it was caught on the way by the Caṇḍāla girl who had brought it there. The continuation of the story shows us that the Caṇḍāla girl was none other than the mother of Puṇḍarīka who had kept the parrot under her strict control so that it may not come to any other trouble. Śūdraka contained the soul of Candrāpiḍa. The effect of curse was now at an end. Śūdraka died instantaneously. Candrāpiḍa revived in the arms of Kādambarī, as if he had arisen after long slumber. Puṇḍarīka also joined them soon after. The wedding ceremonies of both the couples are performed and complete happiness prevails everywhere. After that the couples were never separated from each other even for a moment.

Literary Merit. In literary merit, the Kādambarī which is in all essentials a kathā excels the author's other work, the Harṣacaritam, an ākhyāyikā. The double story of the loves of Kādambarī and Mahāśvetā is very skilfully interlaced; in fact there are few parallels to it in any literature of the world, practically none in Sanskrit. Although the work is in prose, it has been styled as Kavya by the Indian rhetoricians because it is full of sentiments and is embellished with various alankāras. The principal sentiment is that of śṛṅgāra (Love), which is very skilfully developed through all the ten stages including that of death—a result not achieved by any other poet before or after him. The subordinate sentiments are those of Wonder and

1. cf., rasātmakaḥ vākyam kāvyam.
2. e.g., the successive lives of the moon and Puṇḍarīka.
Pathos, examples of which are scattered all over the work. Among the various alaṅkāras, the ornament of śleṣa (paranomasia) is the most prevailing: the next to it is the alliteration of initial consonants as well as in its subtler forms. The rasanopamā (girdle of series) is exemplified, ‘As youth to beauty, love to youth, spring to love’—so was Kapiṇjala to Puṇḍarika. Other alaṅkāras are too numerous to mention here. In fact, Bāṇa has been regarded as one of the finest writers in Sanskrit literature. Pandita Govardhanacarya said of him:

\[ jātā śikhaṇḍini prāk yathā śikhaṇḍi tathāvagacchami \]
\[ prāgalbhya madhikamaṃptum vāṃ vāno babhūveti. \]

Another critic Dharmadāsa describes his literary skill in this fashion:

\[ rucirasvaravarṇapadā rasabhāvavatī jagānanmanoharati \]
\[ tat kiṃ taruṇī nahi nahi vāṃ bāṇasya madhurasilasya. \]

Jayadeva went still further and said hṛdayavasatiḥ paṁcaba-ṇastu Bāṇaḥ, ‘Bāṇa is Cupid with his abode in the heart (of the damsel of poetry).’ Other critics too have extolled his literary merits in their own way.

Bāṇa possesses wonderful power of description, keen observation of human tendencies and natural objects and strong poetic imagination. Not only the principal characters but even the minor ones are very vividly drawn. The strong passion and the virgin shame of the heroines as well as the corresponding feelings of the lovers and their mutual fidelity are very nobly drawn—a true lover perishes rather than swerve from the object of the heart. The picturesque description of the beautiful scenery on the Himālaya mountain, the lake Acchoda and other natural objects shows true literary merit. The quiet life of the sages is very ably contrasted with the magnificent pomp of the court life.

The scope of his descriptive power is vast indeed and it is:

1. e.g., the condition of Kādambari and Mahāsvetā, on the death of their lovers and that of Candrāpiḍa, on hearing the death of Vaiśampāyanas.
2. Just as Śikhaṇḍini became Śikhaṇḍi once, so I think Bāṇi (the art of poetry) became Bāṇa for further development.
3. Possessed of charming sound, complexion (letter) and feet, and full of affection (sentiment) and feelings (emotions) she attracts the mind of the world. Is she a young damsel? No, no. The poetry of the sweet-natured Bāṇa.
said of him, Bānccchiṣṭaṁ jagat sarvaṁ (The whole world is touched by Bāṇa.)

Another characteristic of Bāṇa, which is particularly noticeable from the Kādambarī, is his scholarly command of the language which made him use rare and difficult words. The love for puns added to it, made his work difficult to comprehend without the aid of a learned commentary. Judged from modern standards, this defect of Bāṇa has been severely criticised by western scholars. As mentioned before, his prose has been compared to “an Indian wood where all progress is rendered impossible by the undergrowth until the traveller cuts out a path for himself and where, even then, he has to reckon with malicious wild beasts in the shape of unknown words that affright him.”

The work lacks sense of proportion; no topic is let go till it is almost impossible for the author to say anything more about it, e.g., a simple statement like ‘There is a city named Ujjayini’ would be padded with epithets, and epithets to these epithets extending over two pages; sometimes the epithets consist of compounds extending over one line. To take another instance, the advice of Śukanāsa to Candrāpiḍa extends over seven pages. The advice does not end till it has thoroughly impressed the young prince’s mind in all possible ways. The main characteristic of Bāṇa’s style, however, is, that it varies with the sense to be expressed and in many of his speeches he is perfectly simple and direct.

The Source of the Kādambarī. The plot of the Kādambarī bears in broad outlines a close resemblance to the story of King Sumanas found in Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara (11th century A.D.). As the latter is an abridgement in Sanskrit of Guṇāḍhya’s Brhatkathā which, although now lost, existed at the time of Bāṇa, it may be concluded that Bāṇa borrowed his plot from the Brhatkathā but changed it in details to heighten the artistic effect of the story.

Bāṇa’s Influence upon the Later Romances. It was no easy job to reach the high standard of Bāṇa’s romance. The later romances are of little merit but they clearly show the over-

1. Weber’s remark as quoted by Peterson in the introduction to his edition of the Kādambarī.
powering influence of Bāṇa on them. One of them is the Tilakamañjārī of Dhanapāla¹ (10th century A.D.) who lived under the patronage of the court of Dhārā. It gives an account of the love of Tilakmañjārī, the heroine, and Samaraketu, the hero. Not only in spirit but also in style, the work is an imitation of the Kādambarī which the author readily admits.

The other work indebted to Bāṇa is the Gadyacintāmaṇi of the Jaina author Odāyadeva, alias Vādibhasimha. It deals with the legend of Jīvandhara which also forms the topic of the Jīvandharacakampū. Its date is uncertain.

88. The Campū. The Campū is the technical name given to that form of literary composition which is partly in prose and partly in verse, the subject-matter being that of romance.² This form of composition is recognised in the Sāhityadarpana, as legitimate in a Kathā (romance), and the earliest specimens of the Campūs belong to the 10th century A.D.

The earliest writer of the Campūs known to us is Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa who is also the author of the Nausari inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Indra III, dated A.D. 915. His two works are the Nalacampū (also known as the Damayanti-kathā) and the Madālasa-campū, the former being incomplete. Both are in the perfect gaudī style; thus they abound in long compounds, numerous puns, endless epithets, strained constructions and too much alliteration always sacrificing sense to sound. Some of his stanzas, however, are quite pretty, e.g., a verse of his given in the anthologies runs as:

\[ \text{Apragalbhapadanyāsā jananirāgahetavāḥ} \\
\text{santyeke bahulālāpāḥ kavayo bālakā iva.}³ \]

1. His other works are Paiyalacchi (a Prakrit lexicon, written in A.D. 972-3 and Rṣabhapañcāśikā (fifty Prakrit stanzas) in honour of the Jaina saint.

2. There are other forms of literature also where the verses are mingled with prose, but there the verses are either gnomic in character or are introduced as headlines to stories that follow (e.g., the Pañcatantra) or are used to heighten the effect or emphasise any particular idea. Here the verses are narrative in character and describe the incidents side by side with the prose.

3. There are some poets like children; their diction is immature (their feet are tottering), they cause displeasure to the people (cause delight to their mothers), and speak much (have many endearments).
Another romance of the 10th century is the *Yaśastilaka* of Somadeva, the Jaina writer, who wrote it in A.D. 959. This work is, in literary merit, far superior to the two Campūs mentioned above. The story is on the whole interesting. The object of the author appears to be the propagation of the principles of Jainism in a popular form; thus Māridatta, the king, who is the hero of the romance and who wants to sacrifice a pair of all living things including a boy and a girl to the family goddess Caṇḍamāri-devatā, does ultimately become a convert to Jainism along with his people. Some of his stanzas are quite interesting, e.g.,

\[ \text{avaktā'pi svayaṁ lokaḥ kāmaṁ kāvyaparikṣakaḥ} \\
\text{rasapākānabhijño'pi bhoktā vetti na kiṁ rasaṁ.} \]

Another Jaina romance, probably of the same century, is the *Jivandharacampū* of Haricandra. It is based upon the *Uttarapurāṇa* of Guṇabhadra. The story is far from interesting.

There are several other Campūs, the *Rāmāyaṇacampū* (ascribed to Bhoja), the *Bhāratacampū* by Ananta and the *Udayasundarīkathā* of Soḍḍhala (A.D. 1000) etc., but they are all minor works and do not deserve any notice here.

---

1. Even if a person is not able to express himself, he might be a good judge of poetry. Does not a person who takes food know the flavour (rasa), even if he be ignorant in the art of cooking?

2. That he is an author of the Jáicā work, the *Dharmaśārmābhyyudaya* (in 2 cantos) is uncertain.
89. Gunadhyā’s Brhatkathā. The earliest work on popular tale\(^1\) referred to in Indian Literature is the Brhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya. The original work which is in Paiśācī is unfortunately lost; still it is possible to form some idea of the work and its author from its different versions which claim to be translations or more or less free abridgments. Kṣemendra’s Brhatkathāmaṇjarī and Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara are the two important versions from Kashmir, and Buddhavāmin’s Brhatkathāslokāsamgraha from Nepal.

(a) Guṇāḍhya’s Life. According to the Kashmirian versions, Guṇāḍhya was born at Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī. He was a great favourite of King Sātavāhana who knew little Sanskrit. The king was once asked by his queen during the water-play modakaiḥ (=ma+udakai: not with waters), which owing to his ignorance of the rules of sandhi, he misunderstood as ‘with modakas’ (i.e., laḍḍus). Thus dejected, the king expressed his longing to learn Sanskrit. Guṇāḍhya offered to teach him in six years, at which Šarvarman (the author of Kātantra) laughed and said he could do it in six months. Regarding the task as impossible, Guṇāḍhya laid a rash wager that he would neither use Sanskrit nor Prakrit nor any other known language if he (Šarvarman) succeeded in the object. Needless to say, Guṇāḍhya lost the wager and had to retire to the Vindhya, where he undertook the voluminous task in Paiśācī, the language of the goblins. The disciples of Guṇāḍhya took this work of seven lakh verses to king Sātavāhana who rejected it unceremoniously. Guṇāḍhya felt dejected; he read the verses aloud to the wild birds and beasts around him and went on burning them as the reading was finished. The

\(^{1}\) Such tales are current more among the masses than among the higher classes of society. Even nowadays there is the custom of children gathering together in the evening around an old matron of the family who narrates to them interesting folk-tales in Indian homes.
fame of the work then reached the king who could save one-seventh of the work (i.e., one lakh verses) which formed the Brhatkathā.

According to the Nepalese version, Guṇāḍhya was born at Mathurā and was a protégé of King Madana of Ujjainī. There are other minor differences in detail. A close study of the two versions suggests that the Kashmirian one is certainly more reliable than the Nepalese. The author of the latter was probably actuated by the desire of bringing Guṇāḍhya as near Nepal as possible.

(b) References in Literature. Daṇḍin is so far the earliest writer to refer to Guṇāḍhya’s Brhatkathā in his Kāvyādārsā. Subandhu has mentioned Guṇāḍhya’s name in his Vāsavadattā, and Bāṇa has celebrated the fame of the Brhatkathā in the introduction to the Harṣacaritaṃ as well as in the Kādambarī. Later references in literature abound. It is mentioned in the campūs of Trivikrama and Somadeva. It is also referred to in the Saptaśati of Govardhana and a Cambodian inscription of A.D. 875 records the name of Guṇāḍhya.

(c) Plan of Work. It has been suggested that the plan of his work was based on the scheme of the Rāmāyaṇa. Just as Rāma in the Rāmāyaṇa proceeds with Sītā and Lakṣmana, is separated from Sītā and wins her back with the aid of Lakṣmana and takes the throne of Ayodhyā, similarly in the Brhatkathā, the hero Naravāhanadatta, proceeds with Vegavati and Gomukha, is separated from Vegavati and after many adventures wins Madanamañjūkā (the heroine) with the aid of Gomukha and obtains the kingdom of the Vidyādharas. Just as Sītā’s honour remained unsullied in the hands of Rāvanā, similarly Madanamañjūkā maintained her purity in the house of her ravisher Mānasavega. That Guṇāḍhya knew the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and Buddhist legends cannot be doubted. The apparent resemblance is in the bare outline; in essentials the contents of the Brhatkathā present a marked contrast. The adventures of Naravāhanadatta and Gomukha are mainly based upon the popular tales of his time and the stories that he may have learnt from the travellers. These stories are of particular interest to the labourer, the sailor, the tradesman and the wayfarer. The object of the author is to write in Paisācī some light literature intended for
the masses and not to write in Sanskrit some biography of a historical or a mythical king or a code of morality to educate the higher classes of society. Guṇāḍhyā possessed great power of originality. In fact, his is the first work of its type.

The characters of Guṇāḍhyā are very effectively drawn; not only the major characters but even the minor ones have an individuality of their own. Naravāhanadatta is the son of Udayana whom he excels. He is born with thirty-two auspicious marks and is destined to be a Buddha or an imperial sovereign. He appears as justice incarnate. Gomukha is a politician, wise and tactful. He may be rightly compared to the famous minister Yaugandharāyana. Madanamañjūkā, the heroine, has a close resemblance to Vasantasena, the heroine of the Mṛcchakaṭṭīkaṃ.

(d) Form of Composition. No conclusive answer is possible to the question, ‘Did Guṇāḍhyā write in prose or verse?’ All the three versions are in verse and seem to suggest that the original must have been in verse. The story of the origin of the Brhatkathā as recorded in the Kashmirian versions shows that Guṇāḍhyā wrote seven lakh verses out of which one-seventh was preserved by King Sattavāhana. As opposed to this, we have the view of Daṇḍin who says that a Kathā is in prose and cites the Brhatkathā as an instance. His view cannot be brushed aside lightly, for Daṇḍin is old enough and possibly knew the Brhatkathā himself in some form or the other. The fact that Hemacandra has cited a prose passage from the Brhatkathā lends support to Daṇḍin’s view, although Hemacandra’s evidence, being late, cannot be much relied upon.

(e) Home of Paśācī. Guṇāḍhyā is known to have written his work in Paśācī. According to the Kashmirian versions, he was born at Pratiṣṭhāna on Godāvari and wrote his work in the Vindhya mountains. This leads us to believe that Paśācī was a Vindhyan dialect. Sir George Grierson, on the other hand, has classified a group of Piśāca languages in the northwest of India. According to him these languages bear a direct

1. apādāḥ padasantāno gadyāmākhyāyikā kathā, iti tasya prabhādau dvau (Kavyādārśa, I. 23).
   bhūtabhāṣāmayīṁ prāhurad bhutārthāṁ brhatkathāṁ (Kavyādārśa, I. 38).
relation to the ancient Paisācī dialect and are at present spoken in the territories of Kafiristan, Chitral, Gilgit and Swat valley. In these Piśāca languages of the north-west, $d$ is hardened into $t$ and the other soft letters are hardened into corresponding soft letters. But this tendency is noticed in the Vindhyān dialects also. Lacôte has suggested that Guṇāḍhya might have picked up the Paisācī dialect from some travellers from the north-west. The theory does not appear to be convincing in itself. Besides, there are other difficulties. In Paisācī there is only one sibilant; but the Piśāca languages of the north-west have observed the distinctions in sibilants ever since the time of Aśoka. There is not the slightest evidence to suggest that Guṇāḍhya ever lived in the north-west. Besides, we have the evidence of Rājaśekhara that Paisācī was used in a vast territory including the Vindhyān range. We may therefore conclude that evidence is mainly in favour of Paisācī being classified as a Vindhyān dialect.

(f) Date. The Brhatkathā is certainly earlier than the 6th-century A.D. because the work is referred to by Daṅdin in his Kāvyādarśa as written in the speech of the Bhūtas, and later by Subandhu and Bāṇa in their respective works. Possibly the author of the Mrčchakaṭikām knew the work and drew the character of Vasantasena from Madanamañjūkā of the Brhat-kathā, but unfortunately the date of Mrčchakaṭikām is also not definite. Lacôte has placed the author in the first century A.D. on account of his having lived in the reign of Śātavāhana. As opposed to this, it is pointed out that Śātavāhana is a mere dynastic name and cannot lead us to any definite conclusion. His association with Śarvavarman, the author of Kātantra grammar, also suggests a date later than 1st century A.D.

(g) Importance of the Work. (i) The Brhatkathā is a work of great importance not only because it is the earliest work on popular tale, but also because it is a great store-house of Indian literary art.

(ii) The influence that it has exercised upon later Sanskrit literature is next only to that of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata. It has proved to be an unending source of subjects and types upon which the later writers have freely drawn.

(iii) The tales of the Brhatkathā refer to an otherwise obscure period of Indian history. Used with scrutiny they can
shed much light on the history of Indian thought and manners of those times.

(iv) The *Brhatkatha* marks an important stage in the evolution of Indian literature.

90. Buddhavamin*’s Slokasangraha* (8th or 9th century). The full name of Buddhavamin’s work is the *Brhatkatha-*śloka-saṅgraha. Thus it purports to be an abridgment in ślokas (or a collection of the ślokas) of the *Brhatkatha*. Only a fragment of the work is available and it is doubtful if the author ever completed the whole. The manuscripts of the work have been discovered in Nepal; the work has therefore been classified as the Nepalese version even though there is no other evidence to connect the author or the work with Nepal. It is ascribed to the 8th or the 9th century A.D.

The fragmentary portion of the work that has survived contains 28 cantos comprising 4,539 stanzas. The author appears to have had direct knowledge of the original *Brhatkatha* in some form or other. He presumes the reader’s knowledge of the story of Udayana and begins to relate the love-adventures of Naravāhanadatta, one after the other. A comparison with the Kashmirian versions shows that there are enormous differences in details. Not only do they differ in the arrangement of matter but also in the spirit in which the subject-matter is dealt with. Besides, there is much extraneous matter in the Kashmirian versions, e.g., they include some stories of a version of the *Pañcatantra* and the whole of *Vaitālapañcaviṃśatikā*. Formerly it was held that the Kashmirian versions are more or less based on the original *Brhatkatha*, but the discovery of Buddhavamin’s work has altogether changed our views. A comparison of the parallel passages in the three works would suggest that Kṣemendra and Somadeva possibly knew Buddhavamin’s work and abridged the same. At least, it is right to remark that many episodes contained in the Kashmirian versions appear irrelevant and remain obscure unless they are explained by reference to the *Śloka-saṅgraha*.

As regards the extraneous matter contained in the Kashmirian versions, a two-fold explanation is possible. Either the *Brhatkatha* that reached Kashmir was an amplified copy of the original and much extraneous matter including a version of the *Pañcatantra* and the whole of *Vaitālapañcaviṃśatikā* was...
interpolated into it; or that the abridgers did not understand their job properly and did not, therefore, carefully observe the limitations set upon themselves.

Style. The style of the Śloka-saṅgraha is simple, clear and elegant. It would not be popular literature if the style were not simple. His characters are clearly and vividly drawn. There is a realistic tinge in all that he writes. It appears that the author had personally seen the places mentioned by him. The moral tone of the original is greatly elevated in this work. His language is characterised by the introduction of numerous Prākritisms. He is an expert in Sanskrit grammar and is fond of using many aorist forms.

91. Ksemendra's Brhatkatha-manjari (A.D. 1063-6). The Brhatkathā-maṇjarī, as the name suggests, purports to be a summary of the Brhatkatha. From a perusal of the other Maṇjarī (Rōmāyaṇamaṇjarī and Bhāratamaṇjarī which also he wrote) we find that he is a faithful summary-writer. His Brhatkathā-maṇjarī contains only 7,500 stanzas against 21,388 of the Kathāsaritsāgara. More often than not, the art of summarizing is carried to an extreme; thus his Maṇjarī is dry and lifeless, devoid of all grace, often obscure and even unintelligible unless made clear by reference to the Kathāsaritsāgara. Possibly his Maṇjarīs were intended to be exercises in the art of versifying.1 If so, the Brhatkathā-maṇjarī would naturally be a production of his youth. Kṣemendra is not a mere condenser. When there is an opportunity, he takes pleasure in exhibiting his descriptive power and narrates the incidents in a truly charming and elevated style. The work was written in A.D. 1063-6.

In contents, the Brhatkathā-maṇjarī bears a close resemblance to the Kathāsaritsāgara; both belong to the same period, were written in the same locality and had a common source to draw upon. The work is divided into eighteen books called lāmbhakas (possibly meaning Adventure or Conquest). Book I styled Kathāpiṭha gives the tale of the origin of Guṇāḍhya's Brhatkathā. Books II and III give the history of Udayana and his winning of Padmāvatī. Book IV relates the birth of Naravāhanadatta and the remaining books describe his nume-

1. In fact, the poet believed that a would-be poet should undertake the practice of such like exercises.
rous love-adventures, his ultimate union with Madanamanjūkā, the heroine, and his acquisition of the sovereignty over the Vidyādaaras. The thread of the original story is often lost in the net-work of episodes that abound the work. Some of the legends are really fascinating and charming. Book VI contains the legend of Sūryaprabha wherein the author exhibits his skill of blending together Brahmanic mythology with Buddhist legends and popular beliefs. In Book XV we have apparently a parallel to a legend of the Mahābhārata; the hero proceeds to conquer a White Island (the svetadvipa of the Mahābhārata) where a fervent prayer is addressed to Nārāyaṇa in the elaborate Kāvya style.

92. Somadeva’s Kathasaritsagāra (A.D. 1081-88). The name Kathāsaritsāgara means ‘An Ocean of Streams of Stories.’ The work was written by Somadeva, a Brahmin of Kashmir, in 1063-81, probably a few years later than Kṣemendra and is thrice that work in volume, and nearly twice as much as the Iliad and Odyssey put together. This work was written by the author to divert the mind of the unhappy Sūryamati, the queen of Ananta of Kashmir. The king committed suicide in A. D. 1801 and the queen committed satī on his funeral pyre.

Somadeva’s work has been divided into 18 books called lambhakas (like that of Kṣemendra’s work) and 125 subdivisions called taraṅgas (waves), an innovation of his own later adopted by Kalhaṇa. The plan of the work up to Book V is the same as that of the Bṛhatkathā-maṇjarī but is later changed in the arrangement of its contents so as to preserve the reader’s interest and make the translation from one book to another appear natural. The stories of Somadeva are certainly more charming and attractive, they possess liveliness and freshness, and are varied in character. Besides they are presented to us in a simple, clear and elegant style. Only 761 stanzas out of a total of 21,388 are in other than the sloka.

1. The sub-divisions of the Bṛhatkathā-maṇjarī are called guccas (clusters).

2. The following verse would serve as a typical illustration of his style.

parārtho phalajanmāno, na syurmārgadrumā iva
 tapachido mahāntaścejīrṇāraṇyaḥ jagad bhaver.

“The world would be a desolate forest if there were not the great,
metre. He strictly avoids long compounds, difficult constructions and the use of alaṅkāras. His main object is to maintain the rapid flow of the simple narrative in which he admirably succeeds.

His stories are of living interest. Many of them are from a version of the Pañcatantra and go back to the early 5th century A.D.¹ We have the amusing stories of fools, knaves and cheats. Intriguing stories of women are given. Some of these stories are really edifying. The faithful Devasmitā is in vain instructed by the deceitful hermit-lady:

bhūtendriyānābhidroho dharmo hi paramo mataḥ²

She proves too clever for her would-be lovers, makes them drink wine mixed with poison, imprints their foreheads with the iron paw of a dog, and throws them into a ditch of filth. Later she proclaims them as her run-away servants and puts them to eternal shame—a treatment thoroughly befitting their wicked plans. Some stories have a Buddhistic tinge, e.g., we are told of a prince who took out his eye because the women felt enamoured of him for his beauty. There are tales of wonders on sea and land. We learn of shipwrecks and camphor-land and what not. The depiction of natural scenery is not ignored.

93. Vetalapancavimsatika is a set of twenty-five tales related by a Vetāla (ghoul) to king Trivikramasena (or Vikramāditya, as the later versions have it). It may originally have existed in some independent form but it has come down to us as included in the Bhaktakathā-mañjarī and in the Kathāsaritsāgara. Many later recensions are known. The one attributed to Śivadāsa³ (dated 12th century or even later) is in prose and verse. Another prose recension of an unknown author appears to be mainly based upon the version of Kṣemendra. The recensions of Jambhaladatta and

the removers of distress, who are born to do good to others, like the trees on roads which remove heat and do good to others by their fruits."

¹ These stories are found in a work by Ārya Saṅghasena which was later translated into Chinese by his pupil Gunavṛddhi in A.D. 492.

² Satisfaction of physical senses is regarded as the highest dharma.

³ Śivadāsa is also known to us as the author of two other story books, namely the Sālivāhana-kathā and the Kathārṇava. The former contains 18 cantos in verse and prose and is based upon the Bhaktakathā-mañjarī and the Kathāsaritsāgara. The Kathārṇava contains thirty-five stories of fools, gamblers, rogues, cheats, etc. They amuse us and teach morals.
of Vallabhadāsa are even later. The popularity of the work can be well imagined from the fact that it has been translated into almost every modern language of India.

The outline of the work is simple. The king is under obligation to a certain ascetic, who bids him to fetch a certain corpse hanging on a tree in the cemetery. The king readily agrees, but the corpse is possessed by a Vetāla who expresses his willingness to proceed if the king would remain silent.

On the way, the Vetāla narrates a story involving a knotty problem and demands solution from the king who gives proof of his ready wit and lo! off goes the Vetāla so that the whole task has to be done over again. In this manner twenty-five stories are narrated, each of a different type and each demanding a puzzling solution, e.g., we are told of a girl who was seized by a demon but was later rescued by the united efforts of three lovers; one of them points out by his skill the place of her confinement, the other arranges for a vimāna by his miraculous power and the third subdues the demon by his valour. Naturally the question arises, ’Who should get the girl?’ and the king readily replies, ‘He who possesses valour.’ When the twenty-fifth problem is put to the king, he remains silent. The Vetāla then informs the king how the ascetic had planned to murder him and instructs him how he could get rid of him.

The style of Śivadāsa’s work is simple, clear and attractive; language is easy and graceful. Word-plays are rare. The following is an illustration of yamaka (alliteration):

\[sa dhūrjaṭjaṭājūto jāyatām vijayāya vah\]
\[yatraitkapitalbhṛāntin karotyadyāpi jāhnavi\]

94. Śukasaptati. The Śukasaptati is a collection of seventy tales narrated by a parrot to its erring mistress. Madanasena, a merchant’s son, goes out to a foreign country, leaving his wife in charge of a crow and a parrot who were the embodiments of the Gandharvas. The mistress is prepared to leave the path of virtue. The direct advice of the crow is abhorred; it is:

1. May the matted locks of Śiva where even to-day Gaṅgā causes an illusion of white hair, be for your victory.

2. There is nothing surprising in this phenomenon. The theory of ‘Transmigration of Soul’ makes the birds and beasts as real as human beings. We have already seen how Bānā’s Kādambarī is put in the mouth of a parrot.
threatened with death if it dared to interfere again like that. The clever parrot approves of the conduct of its mistress and enquires if she knows how to get out of the difficulties as did so and so. The mistress appreciates the suggestion and is prepared to spend a night to listen to the story when she finds that the story ends with another difficulty out of which so and so escaped in such and such a manner. The stories are artistically inter-woven and every night the parrot is ready with a fresh story. Seventy stories are related when the master returns and the object of the parrot is achieved. Mostly the stories relate the clever tricks of the unfaithful wives.

The work is on the whole interesting. It is written in simple prose, mixed with occasional gnomic and narrative verses. Some verses are in Prakrit, and it has been suggested that the original might have been in Prakrit but no other evidence is available to prove it. The work has come down to us in two recensions, known as Ornator and Simplicior of Schmidt. The former is attributed to a Brahmin Cintāmani Bhaṭṭa and the latter to an unknown Śvetāmbara Jain. The work is popular and has exerted some influence on later literature in modern languages. Its date is not known. Possibly it was known to the Jain Hemacandra (A.D. 1088-1172) in some form or other.

95. Simhasana-dvattrimsika is a set of thirty-two tales narrated by the images of maidens on the throne of Vikramāditya. It is said king Vikramāditya got this throne from Indra but after his death it was buried in the earth. Later it was discovered by Bhoja of Dhārā (11th century). When he wanted to 'seat himself on the throne, the images related these stories to him. The popularity of the work may be imagined from the fact that the work has come down to us in varied versions, (some in prose interspersed with narrative verse and others in verse mingled with gnomic verse, or in verse alone) and has been translated into modern languages. The exploits of Vikramāditya has remained quite a popular subject with Sanskrit authors; the interest of this work therefore remained unabated. The language is simple. Neither the name of the author nor the date of the work is definitely known. All that we can say with some amount of certainty is that the work is fairly later than the Vetalapañcaviṃśatikā.
96. Buddhist Literature. So far we have been dealing with only the Brahmanic literature of popular tale. In this and the following sections we shall consider the Buddhist and the Jaina literature which abounds in this branch of secular literature. The Buddhistic tales have got the definite object of propagating their religious doctrines. They deal with the fruits of men's actions. Devotion to the Buddha brings bliss in the next world; the reverse of it leads one to hell. The earliest works that deserve mention here are the Avadānas—legends of valorous acts or glorious achievements.

A. Avadānaśatakan. Of all Avadāna texts it is the oldest known so far. The Avadānaśatakan was translated into Chinese in the first half of the third century A.D. It may therefore be dated 1st or 2nd century A.D. It cannot be much earlier than that because the term dīnāra occurs in it. It is based mainly on the Vinayapiṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins. The work is divided into ten daśakas (decades). The stories are important more from the point of view of the morals they inculcate than from that of literary merit. In form the work is partly in prose and partly in verse of the simple Kāvyā type. Some legends are historical in character, e.g., we are told of Śrīmati, the queen of Bimbisāra, who refused to abide by the prohibitory injunction of Ajātaśatru to pay homage to the relics of the Buddha and went straight to heaven when killed by his order for disobedience.

B. Divyāvadāna. It is a collection of legends borrowed from the various Buddhistic sources, mainly the Vinayapiṭaka of the Sarvāstivādins. One section of the work illustrates the doctrines of the Mahāyāna school; the remaining deals with principles of the Hinayāna school. The author certainly knew the Buddhacaritam and the Saundarānanda of Āsvaghōsa. His literary attainments were not high. The description of Nanda's beauty [atiśya mārtthān anupetva devān1 (Saundarānanda IV.)] is poorly expressed by him as atikrānto mānuṣavarnamāsamprāptaśca divyavarṇām while describing the beauty of Gupta's son.

The Divyāvadāna lacks the uniformity of style which is probably due to the variety of its sources. Sometimes we come

1. Having excelled the mortals but not reaching the gods.
across simple prose mixed with narrative verse; on other occasions we find elaborate prose intermingled with verse of the Kāvya type.

The work may approximately be dated in the 2nd century A.D. It is later than the Avadānaśatakam described above, and is pretty earlier than A.D. 265 when an important legend, the Śārdūla Karnaṇadāna, of this work was translated into Chinese. The stories are interesting and excite different sentiments. Really pathetic is the story of Kunāla, the son of Aśoka. His step-mother successfully poisoned the mind of her husband against him with the result that Kunāla's eyes were brutally taken out.

C. Jātakamālā (the Garland of Birth-stories) of Āryaśūra is a collection of tales relating the glorious deeds of the Bodhisattva, i.e., it describes the noble actions performed in the previous births of the would-be Buddha who is supposed to remember whatever happened to him in the past lives. The Jātakamālā of Āryaśūra is based mainly on the Pāli Jātaka book and the Pāli Cariyā-piṭaka in content and on the epics of Aśvaghoṣa in style. The work has been identified with Bodhisattvāvadānamālā. These Jātaka stories do not pretend to contain any ancient history. They are rather like the Christian parables and are looked upon as homilies intended to propagate the recognised doctrines of Buddhism. The declared object of the work is to rouse or invigorate saddhārma (true faith) in the minds of the reader.

The stories are written partly in elegant prose and partly in narrative verse of the Kāvya style. Each story is introduced by a simple prose passage and has got a definite moral to teach. To illustrate the supreme merit of charity we are given the tale of the Bodhisattva when he once became the king of Śibis. He gave so much in charity that the mendicants had nothing more to ask for. He gave away even his both eyes to an old blind Brahmin (in fact, it was Indra who had come disguised to test his great resolve of charity) who asked for only one.

1. Bodhisattva is one who is on the way to the attainment of perfect knowledge and has only a certain number of births to undergo before attaining the state of the Supreme Buddha.

2. This identity of the two names was first pointed out by Rajendra Lal Mitra.
In vain do the ministers beseech him to give some other gift to the blind Brahmin. Quite significant is the king’s reply:

\[ yadeva \ yācyeta \ tadeva \ dadyānāṃśitaṁ \ prīṇayatiḥa \ dattaṁ \ kimuhṣamānasya \ jalena \ toyairāśyāmyataḥ \ prārthitamarthānammasmai. \]

When the ministers plead further, the king effectively remarks:

\[ nāyaṁ \ yatnāḥ \ sārvabhaumatvamāraptu, \ naivasvargaṁ \ nāpavargam \ na kīrttim \ trātuṁ \ lokāntyayam \ tvādaro \ me \ yāncākleso \ mā \ ca \ bhūdasya \ moghaḥ. \]

Generally we find that there is no proportion in the object sacrificed and the cause for which the sacrifice is made. Thus in another tale we are told of the Bodhisattva sacrificing his life to feed a hungry tigress.

Āryaśūra was a great scholar and a gifted writer. His language is chaste and diction pure. His style is similar to the inscriptions of the 2nd and 3rd century A.D. Besides he is skilled in the use of metre which he can adapt to the sentiment to be expressed. Some of the metres are rare and would do credit to any artistic poem. He employs the various alaṅkāras in his verses, e.g., we find simple but beautiful alliteration in the following lines,

\[ tataścakampe \ sadhāradharā \ dharā \ vyatīya \ valāṁ \ prasasāra \ sāgarāḥ—(Śibijataka, 38). \]

In prose he often employs long compounds, but is seldom obscure. The following will serve as a typical illustration of his dignified prose.

\[ atha \ Bodhisattvo \ vismayapūrṇamamānōbhī mandāṁmeṣapra-vikasitanayanaramātyairanuyātāḥ \ puraṁścābhivikṣyamāno \ jayāśir-vacanapurahsāraśca \ brāhmaṇarabhinandayamānah \ puravaramucch-ritadvajavicitrapatāka \ pravitanyamānābhhyudayaśobhamabhigamyā \]

1. One should give a thing asked for. An undesired thing, if given, does not please him. Of what use are the waters to a person carried by water. I shall therefore give to him the thing for which a request has been made.

2. This effort of mine is to obtain neither sovereignty, nor paradise, nor salvation, nor fame. My regard is to protect the people. May not his exertion of begging remain fruitless.

3. Then the earth shook along with the mountains and the Ocean flowed forth having transgressed the shore.
parsadi niṣaṇṇah sabhājanārthamabhigatasyāmātyapramukhasya brāhmaṇārthavṛddhapaurajānapadasyaivaṃātmopanāyikam dharmāṃ desayāmāśa

As his work is based on Pāli sources and is Buddhist in character, it is not surprising to find traces of Pali-isms here and there.

Date. The identity of Āryaśūra with Aśvaghoṣa has been pointed out by Tārānātha, but without much reason. He has also added some more names by which Aśvaghoṣa was known but that cannot lead us to any definite conclusion. The epics of Aśvaghoṣa and the Jātakamālā of Āryaśūra differ so much in style that we cannot treat the suggestion with any seriousness.

The Jātakamālā was rendered into Chinese in about A.D. 1000 and the author Āryaśūra was known to the Tibetan tradition as a famous teacher and anthologist of stories. The work was known to the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing in the 7th century A.D. A Sūtra on the Fruits of Karma, attributed to Āryaśūra, was translated into Chinese in A.D. 434. The author may, therefore, be approximately placed in the fourth or even in the third century A.D.

97. Jaina Literature. Like the Buddhist stories, the Jaina tales are also didactic in character. Their object is not to amuse the reader but to teach the doctrines of Jainism.

A. The Upamitibhava-prapañca-kathā of Siddharṣi (A.D.906) is an allegory of human life (ātman) in the form of a popular tale, and is an important work because it is the first¹ of its kind in Śanskrit literature. It was written by Siddharṣi in A.D. 906. It is not difficult to follow the allegory because the author has himself explained it at the end of the introduction. The work is written in prose interspersed with occasional verses, and the language is so simple that even children would follow it easily—at least such is the aim of the author. The style is pleasing but the work is not interesting because of its being allegorical in character and didactic in nature.

B. The Pariśiṣṭaparvan of Hemacandra (A.D. 1088-1172) relates the stories of Jaina saints of ancient times. His stories are both simple and popular. His mind is so much obsessed

---

¹ Another allegorical work is the Prabodha-condrodaya, of a later date.
with the idea of religious propaganda that even the historical king Candragupta is made to die as a pious devotee of Jainism. It is strange that Vincent Smith believed this story. The work is a supplement to the author's own work, *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusacaritam*.
THE DIDACTIC FABLE

98. Characteristics of the Didactic Fable. The Indian rhetoricians do not make any distinction between the class of literature represented by the Bhātkathā on the one hand and the Pañcatantra on the other. A comparative study of the two, however, conclusively shows that they do not entirely belong to the same category. They differ in spirit, in form and in subject-matter. The ultimate object of the former is to amuse the reader, that of the latter is to teach nīti, good conduct of life and polity. The former is written in simple prose or narrative verse or a mixture of both but the latter is written in elegant prose interspersed with gnomic verse. Even the titles of the stories in the latter are given in verse. In the popular tale we find superstitious beliefs, popular myths, stories of love and adventure, dreams and counter-dreams, but in the Pañcatantra we find mostly stories of birds and beasts which appear to possess human feelings and emotions and appear in the rôle of wise politicians and skilled exponents of nīti. To distinguish it from the popular tale, the Pañcatantra has therefore been classed as the didactic fable.

99. Origin of the Didactic Fable. It would be idle to find the didactic fable in the Vedic literature, much less in the Rgveda. The main characteristics of the Pañcatantra, as we have noted above, are the beast-element and the instruction in nīti. A solitary hymn in the Rgveda (VII.103) seems to compare the recital of the Brahmins at the sacrifice to the croaking of frogs at the commencement of the rainy season. Later we find some reference in the Chāndogya-upaniṣad, e.g., we learn how Satyakāma first receives his instruction from a bull, then from a flamingo and then from another bird. In the Mahābhārata, we find fable in its elementary form. We are told of the pious cat which inspired confidence in the mice and then ate them all. Vidura advised Dhṛtarāṣṭra to stop the harassment of Yudhiṣṭhira and his brothers lest he might lose
the bird that laid golden eggs. On another occasion we are told of a clever jackal who got rich booty with the help of his friends like tiger, wolf and others but deprived them of any share in it by his roguery. This, it is suggested, illustrates the manner in which the Pāṇḍavas should be treated.

The advent of Buddhism gave an impetus to the development of the fable. Great stress was laid upon the doctrine of transmigration of soul according to which the soul migrated from human bodies to beasts or vice versa according to the sinful or meritorious actions that were performed. As we have seen before, both the Buddhists and the Jainas adopted the tale as a definite means of propagating their religious views. In the Buddhist Jātakas we find beast stories illustrating the earlier lives of the Bodhisattva and other saints. The monumental evidence of the Buddhist Jātakas at Bharhut conclusively shows that the beast fable was quite popular in the 2nd century B.C. It is also corroborated by certain allusions to proverbs occurring in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali.

As regards the second element, viz., instruction in nīti, the author is certainly indebted to the Nitiśāstra and the Arthashaśāstra. The avowed object of the author is to teach nīti—Politics, practical wisdom and the science of morality—to the ignorant Kṣatriya sons of a king in a manner that they may learn with pleasure. That the author knew Čāṇakya’s work as well as several other treatises on Politics may be regarded as certain. A skilful blending of the principles of the Nitiśāstra with the beast fable gave rise to the didactic fable as we find it in the Pañcatantra which has no parallel in the history of Sanskrit literature. It forms an independent species by itself.

1. cf. the following verse in the Hitopadeśa (a version of the Pañcatantra):

    kathamahalena bālānāṁ nītistadiḥa kathyate (Introductory verse 8).

    Nīti is described here (in this book) for (young) boys in the garb of stories.

    The Pañcatantra itself is described as Nitiśāstra in the introduction and was written after going through sakalārthāśāstrasāra in the world.

2. In the introduction, the author pays homage to the different writers on nayāśāstra:

    manave vācaspataye śukrāya parāśarāya sasūtāya
cāṇakyāya ca viduṣe namo ’stu nayaśāstrakartrubhyāḥ.
100. The Original Pañcatantra. (1) Name of the Original Work. The name of the original work must certainly have been Pañcatantra. The title Pañcatantra occurs in the southern Pañcatantra, the Nepalese Pañcatantra, the Hitopadesa and in fact all versions that give any name, e.g., in the Hitopadesa we have the confession of the author:

pañcatantrātattāḥ 'nyasmād granthādākṛṣyā likhyate.¹

[Introd. V. 9]

The introduction to the Pañcatantra records:

etat Pañcatantrakam nāma nītiśāstram bālavabodhanārtham bhūtale pravruttām.

The word tantra in the title means ‘A chapter or section of of a work’. The internal evidence supports this view:

tantraīḥ pañcabhīretteaccakāra sumanoharam śāstram,

That a book is so named, we also see from the titles of works like the Aśṭādhyāyī [a book of eight chapters, name of Pāṇini’s grammar]. Perhaps it is implied that the word tantra means a section ‘dealing with Politics and practical wisdom. Hertel has interpreted it as ‘trick’, but that is not convincing.

(2) The Popularity of the Work. The popularity of the work may well be estimated from the fact that it has come down to us in over two hundred versions existing in more than fifty languages, about three-fourths of which are extra-Indian. In a.d. 1100 it was rendered into Hebrew and by a.d. 1570 it was translated into Greek, Spanish, Latin, Italian, German, old Slavonic, Czech and English. At present its range extends from Java to Iceland.

In India, the work has been even more popular. It has been translated² into mediaeval and modern languages and re-translated into Sanskrit; it has been transformed into verse and re-transformed into prose, expanded and contracted. Not only that, most of these stories passed current as folk-tales and were gathered again in the modern collections of oral tales. It would not be an exaggeration to remark that such great

¹ It is written having extracted (the contents) from the Pañcatantra and another work.

² The books on popular tale (e.g., Pañcavimśatikā of Śivādāsa, Śukasaptati and Sīhāsana-dvārakīṃśatikā) have made a free use of the Pañcatantra, and translations exist in Braj Bhāṣā, in Hindi, in old and modern Gujarati, in old and modern Marathi, and in Kannada, Tamil, etc.
popularity has not been enjoyed by any other secular book of the world.

(3) Recensions of the Pañcatantra. The original Pañcatantra is unfortunately lost. It is, however, possible to reconstruct the original to some extent with the help of its different versions that have come down to us. A comparative study of these versions shows conclusively:

(i) that they are all derived from a single literary archetype (otherwise it would not be possible to account for the numerous verbal identities in verse as well as in prose); and

(ii) that the flaws that have crept in these versions do not go back to the original.

The following versions would be of help to us in the reconstruction of the original:

I. 1. The Tantrākhyāyikā;
   2. The text composed by a Jaina (about A.D. 1100) known as textus simplicior;
   3. The text composed by Pūrṇabhadra (about A.D. 1199).

II. 1. The Southern Pañcatantra;
   2. The Nepalese Pañcatantra;
   3. The Hitopadesa.

III. The Brhatkathā version in Kṣemendra and Somadeva.

IV. The Pahalavi version which became the basis of all western versions.

According to Edgerton, who has worked laboriously on his work, there are four independent streams of Pañcatantra tradition (as given above). According to Hertel, there are only two independent streams. The differences between the two would be better understood from the tables given below:

HERTEL'S CLASSIFICATION

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Tantrākhyāyikā} \\
\text{N.W.} \\
Pahalavi Southern Textus Pūrṇa \\
\text{Pañcatantra Simplicior Bhadra} \\
\text{Hitopadesa} \\
\text{Brhat-} \\
\text{kathā} \\
\text{versions:}
\end{array}
\]

* Indicates hypothetical versions in both tables.
Edgerton's Classification. See table below.

These differences are of value because the re-construction of the original would largely depend upon them.

1. Hertel assumes that all existing versions go back to a corrupt archetype (called ‘t’.) This according to Edgerton is pure imagination.
2. Hertel assumes an intermediate archetype ‘k’ to which all versions except the Tantrākhyāyikā go back. This also is a myth according to Edgerton. According to Hertel’s view a verse or a prose passage could be original only if it occurred in the Tantrākhyāyikā and at least one of the ‘k’ descendants; but according to Edgerton it would be original if it occurred in versions of any two independent streams and even if it did not occur in the Tantrākhyāyikā.

3. Hertel assumes another intermediate archetype N.W. to which the southern Pañcatantra, Pahalavi and Simplicior go back. This also is unproved.

The results of Hertel are not convincing. According to him the Pahalavi, the Southern Pañcatantra and the Textus Simplicior are all derived from an intermediate archetype N.W., but a closer study of these texts shows that there are marked differences between them and that they belong to three independent streams of Pañcatantra tradition. According to Hertel there should be more resemblance between the Pahalavi and the Simplicior than between the latter and the Tantrākhyāyikā or even between Simplicior and Pūrṇabhadra, but the case is quite reverse. Similarly, according to him, there should be more resemblance between Hitopadeśa and Pūrṇabhadra than between Hitopadeśa and Southern Pañcatantra, but that is not a fact.

4. Author. In the introduction we are told that the three sons of king Amaraśakti of Mihilāropya were entrusted to the care of Viṣṇuśarma who undertook to teach them polity in six months. That Viṣṇuśarma is undoubtedly the author of this work is clearly stated in verse 3 of the introduction. There are no reasons to assume that the name might be a fictitious one. Nothing else is known about the personality of the author. From his homage to several gods in the introductory stanza\(^1\) we may presume that he was a cosmopolitan Brahmin and not a Buddhist or a Jaina.

---

1. It runs as follows:

Brahmā Rudraḥ Kubera Hari-Varuṇa-Yamā Vahnrindraḥ Kuberaś-
Candraśīyau Sarasvatyudadhī ṇ ganagā Vāyuruvī Bhujangāḥ
Siddhā nadyośvinau Śrīrdītiśritisutā mātaraścanḍikādyūḥ
Vedastīrthāni yajñā ganaśasumunayaḥ pāṇtu nityāṃ grahāśca
5. **Place of Origin.** Nothing definite is known about the home of the original *Pañcatantra*. Hertel suggests that it might have been composed in Kashmir because of the non-occurrence of the tiger and the elephant in the original work, while the camel is fairly known, but the argument is inconclusive. The name of certain pilgrimages are mentioned but that cannot lead us to any conclusion because such names were known throughout the length and breadth of India. If king Amaraśakti of Mihiläropya be a reality, the author might belong to the Deccan. The mountain Rṣyamūka mentioned in the text is situated in Western Deccan and accords well with this view.

6. **Date.** Dīnāra is a Roman coin *denarius* which travelled through Greece to the east. Reference to it is made in a certain verse believed to be occurring in the original. The work cannot therefore be anything but post-Christian. It must be much earlier than A.D. 550, the date about which it was rendered into Pahalavi by Barzoē. The Pahalavi version although now lost was rendered into old Syriac in A.D. 570 by Bud. The original *Pañcatantra* therefore might go back to the third or even the second century A.D.

7. **Language.** The scholars are generally agreed that the original was certainly composed in Sanskrit. On no other account can we explain the identical Sanskrit language of the different versions that have come down to us. Besides we do definitely know that the work was intended for the Kṣatriya princes and was composed by an orthodox Brahmin. It would be difficult to understand how such a work could have been ever written in the Prakrit.

101. **The Contents of the Pancatantra.** The *Pañcatantra* contains five books, each dealing with a separate topic. Book I contains the introduction and the account of ‘Separation of Friends.’ By means of several stories, one enboxed within another in the manner of a Chinese nest, we are told how two happy friends, the lion Pīṅgalaka and the bull Saṅjīvaka, are brought to inimical terms by the skilful tricks of two clever

---

1. Dr. Hertel does not seem to attach any importance to this verse. He believes that the original work was composed in about 200 B.C. In fact, even at this early date, some of the original stories were already ancient.
jackals Karaṭaka and Damanaka. Piṅgalaka laments the loss of Sañjīvaka, but the clever Damanaka consoles him and becomes his premier.

Book II is styled Mitrasamprāpti (Acquisition of Friends). The frame-work of the story tells us how Citragrīva (the dove-king), Hiraṇyaka (the mouse), Laghupatanaka (the crow), Citrāṅga (the deer) and Manthara (the tortoise) make friends with each other, one after the other and by rendering mutual assistance escape numerous hardships and miseries, (not excepting even death). This book is perhaps more charming than Book I and emphasises upon the maxim yāni kāni va kartavyāni mitrāṇi satānyapi (One should make as many friends as one possibly can).

Book III deals with the tactics of war and peace, by illustrating hostilities between the owls and the crows. The leader of the crows objects to the election of the owl-king as hideous and points out by the tale of the Cat and the Hare the dangers of a mean king. The owl-king resolves to take vengeance on the crows. The clever minister of the crows pretends that he has been expelled by the haughty crow-king and secures an easy admittance into the fold of the foolish owls. A tale describes the advantages of ‘split in the enemy’s camp.’ Ultimately an opportunity occurs and the stronghold of the owls is set fire to.

Book IV deals with the loss of one’s gettings. A monkey and a crocodile are fast friends. The latter’s wife feels jealous of it, pretends to be sick and demands the heart of the monkey as the only remedy for her cure. The crocodile unwillingly gives assent and invites him to his place. While the crocodile is carrying his friend to his watery home, the monkey comes to know of his intentions and says, ‘Why did you not tell me before, I have left my heart on the fig-tree?’ The foolish crocodile readily believes it and returns to the bank to enable his friend to bring his heart. The monkey escapes. In vain does the crocodile make further attempts to extend friendship and invite him to his place. The monkey tells him that he is not the ass who would return. Thus the tale of the ass is related and so on.

Book V deals with the harm done by inconsiderate action. The story relates how a Brahmin kills his favourite mongoose.
whom he left in charge of the little babe. Finding his mouth blood-stained, he thought he had killed his son. In fact, the mongoose had killed the serpent and saved the life of that boy. His wife also felt repentant and relates the tale of a barber who lost his own life by hasty action. The last two books are strikingly brief. In some of the ancient recensions they are reduced in bulk to the verge of extinction. Thus they appear to be like appendices to the three longer books.¹

102. Style of the Pandatantra. (i) It will be seen from the foregoing that the Pañcatantra is essentially a book of didactic fables whose avowed object is to impart instruction in niti—politics and practical wisdom—in a charming and attractive manner. It contains wise and witty stories in most of which the characters are animals. The fable and the political purpose are so skilfully blended that a fable which is good in itself as a fable serves also as a befitting illustration of some moral or political maxim. For example, the first tale of Book I narrates how a monkey who pulled out a wedge was caught in it, thus illustrating that one should not poke one’s nose in others’ affairs. Tale 21 of Book I illustrates the famous maxim of the Mahābhārata, śaṭaṁ prati śātyamācaret.² A merchant turns dishonest and says that the balance of iron deposited with him by his friend while going out on a journey was eaten away by the mice. The clever friend stole his son and said that the boy had been carried away by a hawk.

¹ The following table gives the reader some idea of the comparative length of the different books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. of pages</th>
<th>No. of ślokas</th>
<th>No. of tales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book I</td>
<td>Mitrabhedaḥ</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book II</td>
<td>Mitrasampaṛpti</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book III</td>
<td>Pākolākyāṁ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book IV</td>
<td>Labdhapraṇāsāṁ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book V</td>
<td>Aparikṣitaśūkram</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The references given here are in accordance with the Nīrṇayaśāgara edition, published in 1902.

² The object of these stories is to teach practical politics and not necessarily morality. Thus some of these stories retain their Machiavellian character. Even the frame-work of Book I illustrates how by their cunning two clever jackals succeeded in causing estrangement between two intimate friends, the lion and the bull.
siddhi prārthayatā janena viduṣā tejo nīgrhya svakāṇīn
tattvotsāhavatāpi daivavidhiṃṣu sthairyaṃ prakāryaṃ kramāt
devendra draviṣevarāntaka samairāpyanvito bhṛtṛbhiḥ
kiṃ kliṣṭaḥ suciṃam tridāṇḍamavahacchhrīmānna dharmaṃmajaḥ¹

(III. 223):

But even these verses are simplicity itself when compared with the Kāvyā style of the later writers. The following verse describing the relation between the king and the prime-minister occurs also in the Mudrārāksasa:

atyucchrite mantriṇi pārthive ca
viṣṭabhya pādavupatiṣṭhate śriḥ
sā strīsvabhbhāvādasahā bharasya
tayordvayorekataram jahāti.²

As regards prose, it is admittedly not the least as difficult as that of Daṇḍin or Bāṇa; in fact, it is simpler than even the prose of the Jātakamāla and the Campūs. It abounds in the use of participial formations. The past tense is generally denoted by past participles or historic present. The passive construction is more frequently used than the active. The gerunds and the adjectival participles are abundantly used, and the nominal verbal forms instead of finite forms.

103. The Tantrakhyāyika is a version of the Pañcatantra of which the only manuscript known comes from Kashmir and is written in the Śāradā script. It was discovered by Hertel in the beginning of the present century. It has come down to us in two sub-recensions, called by Hertel α and β. According to Hertel, α is more original and according to Edgerton β.

Hertel overemphasised the importance of the Tantrākhyāyikā.³ Still it cannot be denied that the Tantrakhyāyikā

¹. In actions of fate, a wise person wishing success; even though possessing energy and courage, should gradually observe firmness, having suppressed his own lustre. Did not the distressed Yudhiṣṭhira (lit., son of Dharma), although possessed glory, and accompanied by brothers like Indra (lord of gods), Kubera (god of wealth) and Yama (god of death) bear for long the tridāṇḍa (the Sannyāsin’s rod)?

². Having placed her feet on highly elevated minister and king, Fortune tries to serve (both), but on account of her feminine nature she is not capable of bearing the burden, and forsakes one of these two.

³. According to him, the Tantrakhyāyikā is the only version which contains the unabbreviated and not intentionally altered language of the
has preserved more of the original text than any other version. The differences with the original consist mainly of additions and expansions rather than omissions and alterations. Some of these added stories are, the Blue Jackal (I. 8), the Clever Jackal (I. 13), Somilaka, the Weaver (II. 4), the Wicked Procress (III. 5), King Śibi (III. 7), the Old Goose (III. 11), the Onion-thief (IV. 1), and the Sham Warrior (IV. 3). In some of these stories we find an abundant use of the aorist—a clear sign of their spurious character. It is not possible to assign any definite date to this work.

104. The Textus Simplicior. The text of this version is fairly altered in plan as well as in substance. All the five books are made approximately equal. Some stories from Books III are placed in Book IV and fresh matter is added to all the books. The frame-work of Books III, IV and V is changed, e.g., in Book V, the tale of the barber forms the main story and the tale of the ichneumon is inserted therein. Some of these new tales are quite interesting, e.g., in tale (I.5) we find how a certain weaver pretends to be Viṣṇu but gets exposed through the folly of a certain king who boasts of divine connection. While the latter wages war against the neighbouring kings and is about to be defeated, Viṣṇu has to come down to his succour to save his own reputation.

The text of this version is more akin to the Tantrākhyāyikā. It retains about one-third of the ślokas of the orginal Pañcatantra. That this text was composed by a Jaina may be concluded from the fact that it contains references to Jaina monks instead of Brahmin sages, and freely uses technical terms like digambara, nagnaka, ksapaṇaka and dharmia deśanā, etc. On the whole, the author is a master of good style.

The Textus Simplicior quotes verses from Māgha and Rudrabhatṭa and is definitely before Pūrṇabhadra (A.D. 1199). It may therefore be roughly dated about A.D. 1100.

105. Pūrṇabhadra’s Text (Pañcākhyānakā). The text of Pūrṇabhadra is generally known by the title of the Pancākhyānaka. It is based partly on the Tantrākhyāyikā and partly on author, but there are other versions also which contain the unabbreviated and not intentionally altered language of the author.

1. This name is also applied sometimes to the Textus Simplicior mentioned above.
a prototype of the Textus Simplicior. Some of his matter seems to have been borrowed from an unknown version. It contains at least twenty-one new stories, some of them being quite interesting, e.g., one tale (I. 9) brings about a contrast between the gratitude of animals and the ingratitude of man. The author seems to have made extensive studies in the Nitiśāstra. His style is simple, clear and elegant. The text was composed in A.D. 1199 to please a minister Soma.

106. The Southern Pancatantra. The text that became prevalent in Southern India has come down to us in five recensions. It is mainly based on the same original as the Nepalese version and the Hitopadesa. Undoubtedly it retains more of the original matter than the two Jaina versions described above. According to Edgerton, it preserves two-thirds of the ślokas and three-fourths of the prose of the original. Except one version which is greatly expanded and contains ninety-six tales, all other versions are more or less abbreviated and omit a good deal of the unimportant matter of the original. Like the Nepalese version, it quotes a verse from Kālidāsa and is therefore certainly post-Kālidāsa.

Of the unoriginal tales, the tale of the cowherdess (I. 12) may be cited as an example.

107. The Nepalese Version. Many manuscripts of the Nepalese version are available. One manuscript contains only the verse portion, but other manuscripts contain the prose portion also along with, either in Sanskrit or in Newari. Books I and II are transposed in this version; evidently the author must have made use of the original upon which the Hitopadesa was based. No definite date can be assigned to this version. All that we can safely say is that it must be post-Kālidāsa.

108. The Hitopadesa is a version of the Pañcatantra connected especially with Bengal. In fact, it has supplanted all other versions there. This text was composed by Nārāyaṇa, a protégé of Dhaivalacandra. That the author was a Śaivite may

---

1. It contains one prose piece also by oversight.
2. cf., yāvat svarnācālayāṁ davadahanasamo yasyaṁ sphulīgarḥ stāvamārāyaṇena pracaratū racitāḥ sagrahoya kathānāṁ (IV. 138).
3. cf., śrimān dhaivalacandrośau jīyāṁ māṇḍalikō ripūn yēndyāṁ sangraho yatnalekhayitvā pracāritaḥ (IV. 139).
be inferred from his homage to god Dhūrjaṭi in the introductory verse of Book I as well as to god Candrárdha Cūḍāmanī (II. 172) and Candramouli (IV. 138). As we learn from verse 2 and 8 of the Introduction, the object of the author is to impart instruction in Sanskrit, cleverness in speech and skill in politics, all through the medium of such simple stories as the children might understand. The author says:

\begin{quote}
śruta hitopadeśo’yaṁ pāṭavaṁ Saṁskṛtoktoṣu
vācāṁ sarvatra vaicitryaṁ nītīvidyāṁ dadāti ca (verse 2);
yannave bhājane lagnaḥ saṁskāro nānyathā bhavet
kathāchalena bālānāṁ nītistadiha kathaye.
\end{quote}

As the author himself says in verse 9 of the Introduction, the Hitopadeśa is based upon the Pañcatantra and some other work. What that other work might be is not possible to determine in the present state of our knowledge. Evidently it must be some book of fables for the author gives us at least seventeen new tales. That the aim of the author was not necessarily to teach morals and that he closely followed the original scheme of the Pañcatantra is quite clear from the fact that out of the seventeen additional tales only two are edifying; of the remaining fifteen, seven are fables, five are of intrigue and three Märchen. For the tale of the mouse that was transformed into a cat, a dog and a tiger successively but had to be re-transformed to its own shape when it wanted to kill the sage, the author is probably indebted to the Mahābhārata. The tale of the clever woman (II. 6) occurs in the Śukasaptati and that of Vīrāvāra in the Vetāla-paṅcaviṃśatikā. Of the works on nīti, he borrowed most from the Kāmandaṅkīya Nītisāra.

**Date.** (i) The Nepal manuscript of the Hitopadeśa is dated 1373; so it must be placed before that date.

(ii) The author is certainly later than Māgha and Kāmandaki from whom he borrows a good deal.

(iii) His use of the term Bhaṭṭāraka-vāra suggests a date later than A.D. 900.

(iv) His indebtedness to the Śukasaptati and the Vetāla-paṅcaviṃśatikā cannot help us much in assigning any definite date to this work.

**Plan.** The Hitopadeśa is divided into four books, called Mitralābha (Acquisition of Friends), Suhṛdbheda (Splitting of Friends), Vīgraha (War) and Sandhi (Peace). Books I and II
of the original are transposed in this work. Books III and V of the original have been remodelled into two books, **Vigraha** and **Sandhi**. Book IV of the original has been dropped. A new frame-story has been given to **Sandhi** (Book IV), and several stories from Book I and Book III are incorporated into it. Thus re-fashioned the **Hitopadeśa** retains nearly one-third of the verses and two-fifths of the prose of the original **Pañcatantra**.

**Style.** The author purports to teach Sanskrit and nīti to children. In consonance with this object, his language is simple, clear and interesting. He avoids long compounds and difficult constructions except in some of the quoted verses. The author closely follows the style of the original **Pañcatantra** and uses participial forms in lieu of the finite forms and prefers the passive to the active construction. Several ślokas appear to be the author’s own composition. They bear evidence to his great poetic skill. The work has been popular not only in Bengal but throughout the length and breadth of India with the result that it has been translated into almost all modern Indian languages. The following will illustrate the simplicity of his verses:

\[
\text{mātā śatrūḥ pitā vairī bālo yena na pāṭhitah} \\
\text{na śobhate sabhāmadhye hamsamadhye bako yathā} \\
\text{(Introduction, 25);} \\
\text{yathā hyekena cakreṇa na rathasya gatirbhavet} \\
\text{evam puruṣakāreṇa vinā daivam na sidhyati} \text{(Introduction, 20).}
\]

The following will serve as a typical specimen of his prose:

*Tad bhavatāṁ vinodāya kākakūrmāṭināṁ vieitrāṁ kathāṁ kathayāṁ. Rājaputariruktāṁ, Kathyatāṁ. Viṣnusārmovāca. Śrutyatāṁ sampratī mitralābhaḥ. Yasyāyamādyāḥ ślokāḥ*

109. **The Brhat-Katha** or the North-western version. The version of the **Pañcatantra** which came to be reproduced in the **Brhatkathā-maṇjarī** and the **Kathāsaritsāgara** could not possibly have been contained in the original **Brhatkathā** but developed much later in Kashmir. It differed from other versions in the omission of the Introduction and Book I, tale 3. All the five books appear to have been separated in it by extraneous matter placed in between. It is not possible to determine the text of this version. Kṣemendra is too brief and Somadeva omits even the original tales.
110. The Pahlavi Version and Migration of the Fable to the West

The Pahlavi version of the \textit{Pañcatantra} came into existence in the reign of Chosrau Anosharwān (A.D. 531-79) through the efforts of the physician Barzē. It appeared under the title of Karatāka and Dāmanaka (the names of two clever jackals in Book I). This version must have borne a close resemblance to the \textit{Tantrākhyāyikā}. Unfortunately the Pahlavi version was lost. It was, however, translated into old Syriac by one Bud by A.D. 570, and into Arabic by Abdallah ibn-al-Moqaffā' about A.D. 750. Only one incomplete manuscript of the Syriac version is available. The Arabic version appeared under the title of Kālīlah wa Dimnah (the variants of Karatāka and Dāmanaka). This Arabic version is important because it became the basis of all western renderings. In about the 10th or 11th century A.D. it was rendered into later Syriac, and in A.D. 1251 into old Spanish. These translations were not fertile enough. In about A.D. 1080 the Arabic version was rendered into Greek. The Greek version then became the basis of the Italian version (translated in 1583 by Giulio Nuti), one German and two Latin versions, as well as many Slav reproductions. The translation of the Arabic version into Hebrew about A.D. 1100 by Rabbi Joel is even more important because it was further rendered into Latin by John of Capua between A.D. 1263 and 1278. This work appeared under the title of \textit{Directorium vitae humanae} and was printed twice in A.D. 1480. This was further reduced into German in 1483 by Anthonius Von Pforr under the title \textit{Das buch der byspel der alten wysen} [The Book of Gospels of Old Sages (Wise Men)]. Since then it has been printed several times. This translation is important because it greatly influenced the German literature and became the basis of renderings into Danish, Icelandic, Dutch and Spanish (1493). The Spanish version was then translated into Italian in 1546, the latter being translated into French in 1556.

The direct translation of the Latin version into Italian by A. F. Doni appeared in two parts in Venice in 1552. The first part of this work was rendered into English by Sir Thomas North in 1570 under the title \textit{The Morale Philosophie of Doni}.

The Arabic version was also translated by Abu’l-Maāli
TABLE ILLUSTRATING HOW THE INDIAN FABLE MIGRATED TO THE WEST
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French

Eastern

Turkish

German

Dutch

Hungarian

Malay
Naṣrallāh in the first half of the 12th century A.D. This translation further became the basis of Anwārī Suhailī by Husain in about 1494. It was further translated into Turkish by Ali in the first quarter of the 16th century. The Turkish translation was further translated into French, which was then translated into Dutch, Hungarian, German and even Malay.

The most important use made of these fables is that of La Fontaine. In his second edition of the fables (1678) he clearly acknowledges that for a greater part of his new matter (VII-XI) he is indebted to the Indian sage Pilpay (the corrupt form of Vidyāpati). The table on the preceding page will enable the students to grasp easily how the Indian fable migrated to the west.
THE DRAMA

111. The Origin of Drama. The origin of drama is shrouded in mystery. The earliest specimens of drama that survive in literature are the mature works of Kālidāsa and his predecessors which flash upon our eyes like lightning. Various theories have been propounded to explain the mystic origin of the Sanskrit Drama; some are connected with the religious origin, others with the secular origin.

A. The Traditional Theory. According to the traditional theory, the science of dramaturgy is of divine origin. With the advent of the silver age, the gods and mortals approached Brahmā with a request to give them something for entertainment. He meditated and produced the Nāṭyaveda after having extracted the quintessence from all the four Vedas—dance from Rgveda, song from Sāmaveda, mimicry from Yajurveda and sentiment from Atharvaveda. Śiva contributed the Tāṇḍava dance, Pārvati the Lāśya dance, and Viṣṇu the four dramatic styles. Viśvakarman, the celestial architect, made the theatre. The earliest plays staged were the Tripurādāha and the Samudra-manthana on the occasion of the Indradhvaja festival. Bharata was appointed to bring this art down to the mortal region. The legend is important because it brings out the following noteworthy points:

(i) that all the four Vedas contributed to the making of the Nāṭyaaveda;

(ii) that the earliest dramas were religious in character and that they were performed on religious occasions;

(iii) that both men and women took part in it; and

(iv) that the actual drama was non-existent in the Vedic period. It was on this account that the gods had to request Brahmā to create a new type of literature for them.

B. Religious Origin of the Drama (i) Ridgeway suggested that the drama in India and in fact all over the world is the outcome of reverence shown to the spirits of the dead, which again
is the source of all religion—a revival of the doctrine of animism in one of its connotations. This theory assumes that the dramas were performed to gratify the spirits of the dead, for which there is no evidence at all. The theory may have its value for general ethnology, but fails in the case of India.

(ii) The Festival Theory. The clue is taken from the staging of the plays on the Indradhvaja festival. This theory suggests that the Indradhvaja festival is just a parallel to the May-pole festival and that the drama might have its origin in the festivities connected with the spring when almost all civilised nations have one or the other festival after the dreary winter. The theory is ingenious indeed. Yet, unhappily for this theory, the Indradhvaja festival comes at the end of the rains, and indicates Indra’s victory over the cloud-demons.

(iii) The Kṛṣṇa-cult Theory. This theory connects the origin and growth of the Indian drama with the rise and spread of the Kṛṣṇa-cult. There are important elements indeed associated with the Kṛṣṇa-cult, e.g., processions, songs, music, dance and even Lila (a kind of primitive drama)—which contributed to the making of the Sanskrit drama. The drama developed in the country of Śūrasena—the very home of Kṛṣṇa-worship—and the predominance of Śauraseni Prakrit in the drama clearly indicates its having originated there. The recent revival of Brajabhāṣā owing to the popularity of the Kṛṣṇa-cult also shows that it must have exerted great influence on the growth of the Indian drama. Yet the theory is not without weak points: firstly, there is no evidence to show that the Kṛṣṇa-dramas were the earliest ones; and secondly it ignores the equally important share contributed to the drama by Rāma, Śaiva and other well-known cults.

C. The Secular Origin of the Drama.

(i) Popular-mime theory. Hillebrandt and Sten Konow believe that there existed popular mimes before the origin of the Indian drama and that this in conjunction with the recitation of epics, gave rise to the origin of the drama.

Keith has challenged the probability of this theory. There is no adequate evidence to show the existence of popular mimes before the drama. All references to mimes by Konow refer to the period of the Mahābhāṣya or even later, which in no way prove his position. In fact, according to Keith, our know-
knowledge about the primitive mime is all hypothetical. The arguments of Hillebrandt are more weighty. He has pointed out (i) the use of Prakrits side by side with Sanskrit, indicating the popular element in drama; (ii) the mixture of prose and verse; (iii) the simplicity of Indian stage, and (iv) the popular character of Vidūṣaka. Better explanation is, however, possible for all these points: (i) The Kṛṣṇa-cult theory explains the popular element in the drama which accounts for the use of the different Prakrits; (ii) the mixture of prose and verse, and (iii) the simplicity of Indian stage are quite in accord with the religious origin of drama; (iv) the popular character of Vidūṣaka can be traced back to the character of the Śūdra in the Mahāvratā rite which is essentially a religious rite. On the other hand, there is no evidence to connect it with the secular origin.

(ii) The Puppet-play Theory. Pischel suggested that the drama had its origin in the puppet-plays which are frequently referred to in the Mahābhārata, the Kathasaritsāgara and the Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājāsekhara as puttalika, putrikā, darumayi, etc. The term sthāpaka (lit., one who places something in proper position) seems to be better explained by this theory, but the chief drawback of this theory, as pointed out by Hillebrandt, is that the puppet-show presupposes the existence of drama, on which it must essentially be based.

(iii) Shadow-play Theory. Lüders holds that the shadow-play is an essential element in the growth of Sanskrit drama. It is noteworthy that the term rūpaka is best explained by this theory. But, as Keith rightly remarks, this theory is based on the mis-interpretation of a certain passage in the Mahābhāṣya. Like the previous theory, this also presupposes the existence of drama. It also fails to account for the mixture of prose and verse, and of Sanskrit and Prakrit in the drama.

(iv) The Dialogue-hymns Theory. There are more than fifteen dialogue hymns in the Rgveda, whose character is pronouncedly secular. Max Müller suggested in 1869 and Lévi supported him later that these hymns represent dramatic spectacles of religious character. Schroeder elaborated this theory further and tried to prove that these hymns represented the mystery-plays, an inheritance in germ from Indo-European times. Hertel went a step further in asserting that the growth
of the Vedic drama could be traced in the *Suparnādhyāya*, an attempt which is obviously unsuccessful. Other scholars have suggested different interpretations. Whatever be the interpretation, this much is certain that there are some dialogue-hymns in the *Rgveda*, and that a few of them (e.g., Saramā and Panis) can be satisfactorily explained by the dramatic spectacle theory.

How then did the drama come into existence? Where are we to find the earliest signs?

A. The Evidence of the Vedic Ritual. There exists adequate evidence to show that almost all the dramatic elements can be discovered in the Vedic ritual.

(a) The essential elements of the drama are dance, song, and dialogue. References to dance exist in the *Rgveda*, e.g., in the wedding-hymn, the matrons dance to secure the longevity of the new pair. Song is admittedly known to the *Sāmaveda* and the dialogue-hymns in the *Rgveda* have been referred to above.

(b) The Vedic ritual involved a complex round of ceremonies in some of which was present the element of dramatic representation. Of course, it fell short of the real drama, because the representation was not the aim. The actors sought a direct religious result.

(c) The *Mahāvrata* rite was certainly dramatic in some respects. At this rite the maidens danced round the fire. The struggle of the Śūdra and the Vaiśya for light is certainly dramatic.

(d) The *Harivanśa* evidences the fact that in the intervals of sacrificial sessions the dialogue-hymns were recited to amuse the patrons and priests assembled there.

(e) If we further accept the view that the dialogue in prose was added from the ritual element seen at *Mahāvrata*, then we may discern almost all the elements of the drama present in the Vedic ritual.

All these elements were, however, working in their isolated character. Their essential synthesis as well as the development of the plot which constitute real drama were reserved for the later period; and recitation (an element more important than song so far as Sanskrit drama is concerned) was contributed by the epics later on.
As regards the Greek connection, we might say there is little possibility of the Greek drama contributing to the origin of the Sanskrit drama.

In conclusion, we might say that the Indian drama is a growth of centuries: it was an organism that was continually evolved, assimilating into itself each new factor that came its way, and yet preserving its own peculiar individuality unabated. As Belvalkar says, "No one theory can be adequate to explain all its complex factors. The war of wits that ranges now over one and now over the other of its manifold features and aspects makes the problem more intricate than ever. And this is what we must expect; for the drama purports to be *lokāṅukṛtih* and, it is no wonder, if, like life itself, it baffles all analysis".

112. The Greek Origin of Drama. Some scholars believe that the Sanskrit drama might have originated from the Greek drama. They presume that the Greek drama flourished much earlier than the Indian drama, that after the invasion of Alexander the Great certain Greek colonies thrived at the seacoast where the Greeks must have kept a native stage in order to beguile themselves in their leisure hours and that this contact must have greatly influenced the growth and development of Sanskrit drama as it undoubtedly did some other branches of Sanskrit literature, viz., astronomy, astrology and mathematics. Weber and Windisch tried to elaborate this argument by pointing out resemblances between the two. Much stress was laid upon the use of the words *yavāni* and *yavanikā*. The Yavānis (Greek maidens) are represented in Sanskrit drama as among the body-guard of the king, but for this the Greek drama offers no parallel. The term Yavanikā suggests that the curtain of the Indian drama was made of foreign material, possibly Persian tapestry as pointed out by Lévi. The absence of curtain in the Greek drama too is suicidal to the argument of the Greek borrowing. On the other hand, there are important reasons to believe that the Sanskrit drama could not have borrowed from Greece, for Greek and Sanskrit plays are diametrically opposed in spirit, in arrangement and in principle.

(f) The Greek drama recognises, whereas the Sanskrit drama ignores, the unities of place and time. Even in the *Abhijnāna-Sākuntalam* of Kālidāsa we find that one act is located in the forest while the other in the palace, or to go further, one act is
located on the earth while the other in heaven. There may be a change of place even in the same act as we find in the last act of the *Abhijñāna-Śākuntalam*. As regards time, several years elapse between the last two acts of the *Abhijñāna-Śākuntalam* and between the first two acts of the *Uttararāmacaritam*.

*(iii)* In Sanskrit drama we find the happy blending of tragic and comic incidents which is altogether against the rules of the Athenian stage. In this respect it can be better compared to the Spanish and English\(^1\) plays to which, as Schlegel observes, "the terms tragedy and comedy are wholly inapplicable, in the sense in which they were employed by the ancients." The Sanskrit plays are invariably of a mingled web, and blend "seriousness and sorrow with levity and laughter."\(^2\) Although they try to arouse all the emotions of the human mind, terror, grief and pity included, they never offer a calamitous conclusion, which, as Johnson remarks, was enough to constitute a tragedy in the days of Shakespeare.

*(iii)* The key-note of Greek poetry was joy and pride of life, but the Sanskrit playwrights had a serene and complacent attitude towards life. Thus neither Indian tragedy could be depicted in its deeper sense, nor Indian comedy in its higher forms.

*(iv)* The Greek chorus is entirely unknown to the Sanskrit drama.

*(v)* In extent also the Sanskrit plays differ from the Greek ones. The *Mṛcchakaṭikaṃ* is at least thrice as large as any of the plays of Æschylus. On the other hand, while the Greeks staged even three tragedies and a farce at one sitting, the

---

1. Other points of resemblance with the plays of Shakespeare are, *(i)* the character of Vīḍūṣaka which is a close parallel to the fool in Shakespeare, *(ii)* the admixture of prose and verse, *(iii)* the portraying of individual persons rather than types of characters, *(iv)* the introduction of romantic and fabulous elements, *(v)* the introduction of puns and comic distortions of words, and *(vi)* common devices to further the action of the drama, e.g., the writing of letters, the restoration of the dead to life and the introduction of a play within a play. Macdonell says, "Such a series of coincidences, in a case where influence or borrowing is absolutely out of question, is an instructive instance of how similar developments can arise independently."

2. *e.g.*, The jester plays a prominent rôle, while the hero and the heroine are plunged in deep sorrow.
Indians staged only one play, if it was a long one.

(vi) As opposed to classical, the Sanskrit drama is essentially romantic in character.

The Sanskrit drama is a highly complex affair. The Sāhityadāraṇyā divides the Sanskrit drama into two main classes, the rūpaka and the upa-rūpaka. The former has been further subdivided into ten varieties and the latter into eighteen. The Sanskrit drama has got its own characteristic features. On these various grounds we may conclude that the Sanskrit drama is certainly indigenous in character and not a foreign graft. Horrweitz says, "Do we say that the German theatre is a Chinese loan because play-houses existed in Peking ever so much earlier than in Leipzig and Weimar? Why then in the case of India? If dramatic literature originated independently in China and in Greece, well, the same could have happened in India."

113. The Characteristics of the Sanskrit Drama. Some characteristics of the Sanskrit drama such as the entire absence of tragedy, the non-adherence to unities of time and place, the happy blending of tragic and comic incidents, the comparative length of the Sanskrit plays and their romantic character have been noticed above. Some other characteristic features of the Sanskrit drama are given below:

(i) The Admixture of Descriptive Prose and Lyrical Verse. The action of the drama is generally furthered by descriptive prose which is often very commonplace, but the effect is invariably heightened by the introduction of lyrical verses that suit the occasion. In truth, it is these verses that add real charm and beauty to the play. Without them it would appear as a dry piece of conversation. The Abhijñāna Śākuntalam alone contains about two hundred such verses. Usually these verses form about half the volume of the drama. They are couched

---

1. The Sanskrit drama avoids the representation of death and insists on a happy conclusion as a rule which is strictly adhered to; so much so that Bhavabhūti and others had to bring about the re-union of Sītā and Rāma in the end. Although here is no tragedy at the end, yet there is enough of it in the beginning and in the middle even in the great dramatists in the form of pathos and the portrayal of separated love. In the Mrchakaṭikām and the Abhijñāna Śākuntalam we find it in the middle, and in the Uttararāmacaritām we find it throughout; especially so in the beginning.
in varied metres and serve to show the great skill of the poet. The Admixture of Sanskrit and Different Prakrits. Different characters speak different languages according to their social status. The heroes, the kings, the men of high rank and the ascetic ladies speak Sanskrit as a rule. Vidūṣaka, although a Brāhmaṇa, speaks Prakrit. The high-class women, children and the better class of servants usually speak Śauraseni in prose and Mahārāṣṭrī in verse. The other attendants in the royal palace may employ Māgadhi. The other varieties of Prakrit—Ābhāri, Paisācī and Avanti, etc.—are used by cowherds, robbers, swindlers, gamblers and the like. The Apabhramśa is used by the most despised people and the barbarians.

(iii) The chief aim of the Sanskrit dramatist is to arouse a particular sentiment in the minds of the audience. The sentiment may be śṛṅgāra (erotic), vīra (heroic), karunā (pathos) or any other. The plot, the characterisation, and everything else are subordinated to this end. As no emphasis has been laid upon action in the Sanskrit plays, most of them, judged by modern standards, have come to be regarded as dramatic poems, rather than as plays proper.

(iv) Only well-known vikhyāta themes are chosen for the drama so that the audience can fully enjoy it. The plot is generally taken from history or epic legend. With a few exceptions the main interest of the plot centres in a love-story and the amatory sentiment occupies a predominant position. The hero and the heroine fall in love with each other at first sight, but get separated and have to pass through various stages of longing, despondency, doubts, obstacles and hope etc., till they finally get reunited for life. The comic element is occasionally introduced by the court-jester and the heroine’s confidantes.

(v) The Sanskrit drama commences with a benedictory stanza called nāndi and then follows the prologue wherein the Sūtradhāra (stage-manager) accompanied with his wife or

1. In practice, we find that the erotic sentiment predominates. The heroic comes next. Bhavabhūti develops the pathetic sentiment in his Uttarāmaracarita. The remaining sentiments are only suggested, as occasion requires, but seldom developed in full.

2. The noble exceptions are the Mudrārūkṣasa of Viśākhadatta, the Veṣaṃhāra of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa and the Nāgananda of Sṛiharṣa.
assistant informs the audience of the play to be staged and leaves the stage by introducing the next actor to the audience. The number of acts in a play varies from one to ten, according to species (e.g., the nāṭikā has four acts and the prahasaṇa only one). In between the two acts there is introduced an interlude called praveśaka or viśkambhaka to inform the audience of such events as have taken place behind the stage and the information of which is necessary for the audience to understand further happenings. There is no limit to the number of characters, who may be human, semi-divine or divine, in a play. The whole piece concludes with the Bharatavākya (a national prayer) recited by one of the principal characters, generally the hero himself.

(vi) As regards the theatre-hall, the Nāṭyaśāstra lays down that it may be of a square, rectangular or triangular shape. The occasions for dramatic representation are laid down. They are the lunar holidays, a royal coronation, public fairs and religious festivals, marriages, birth of a son, meeting of friends and taking possession of a house or a town for the first time. These performances were generally held in music-halls. A curtain called yavaniṅka separated the stage from the retiring-room (nepathyā). When the actors had to enter hurriedly, they did so ‘with a toss of the curtain.’ The stage-scenery and decorations were very commonplace. Most things were explained to the audience by descriptive verses, mimetic action: an elaborate system of gestures (nātyena), which the audience well understood.

(vii) The Sanskrit dramatists seemed to think that the real object of dramatic representation was lokaraṇjana (propitiating the audience and adding to their happiness), and not necessarily the depiction of life as they found it. If a play were to have a calamitous end, the audience would leave the theatre-hall grim and morose, with the result that the very object of dramatic representation would be frustrated. Besides, since the Indians believe in the transmigration of soul death would not be as tragic an event to them as to the western world. Instances of exceptions to the general rule have been pointed out, e.g., the Uṛuḥpaṇga has a calamitous end. But, even in such cases, we have to remember that the spectators have no sympathy for characters like Duḥṣāsana; rather they
feel happy on their tragic fall. According to the theorists, real tragedy does not lie in the fact of death which presents a revolting and terrible sight, but in the production of the sentiment or pathos that precedes or follows it. Death is, therefore, never visually represented.

(viii) Not only that, nothing considered indecorous whether of a comic or a serious nature was represented on the stage. Thus the pronouncement of a curse, banishment or national disaster, biting or kissing and eating or sleeping, etc. were strictly avoided on the stage.

114. Some Important Plays. The number of Sanskrit plays which have been printed or still exist in manuscript exceeds six hundred, but the important ones among them which deserve any notice here are just a handful. The dramatic works of Bhaṣa, Kālidāsa and Asvaghosa have been dealt with in earlier chapters. Other important plays are:

(i) The Mṛchakaṭikā of Śūdraka,
(ii) The Ratnāvalī, the Priyadārśikā and the Nāgānanda ascribed to Śrīharṣa,
(iii) The Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta,
(iv) The Venīsaṁhāra of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa,
(v) The Mālātiṁādhavaṁ, the Mahāvīra-caritaṁ and the Uttararāma-caritaṁ of Bhavabhūti,
(vi) The Bālabhārata, etc. of Rājaśekhara,
(vii) The Kundamālā of Diṁnāga,
(viii) The Anargharāghavaṁ of Murāri, and
(ix) The Prabodha-candrodaya of Kṛṣṇamiśra.

115. Śūdraka. King Śūdraka has enjoyed great popularity in Sanskrit literature. His name has been alluded to by the author of the Veta-la-pańcaviṁśatikā, by Daṁchin in his Daśakumārascaritaṁ, by Bāna in both Harṣacaritaṁ and Kādambarī, and by Somadeva in Kathāsaritsāgara. Kalhaṇa describes him as a predecessor to King Vikramāditya. Several works¹

1. The notable among them are
   (i) Śūdraka-carita alluded to by Vādighaṅghāla in his commentary on the Kavyādarśa;
   (ii) Śūdraka-katha of Rāmila and Saumila alluded to by Rājaśekhara;
   (iii) Śūdraka-kathā, a Prakrit poem of Pańcaśikha mentioned by Bhoja; and
   (iv) Vikrānta-Śūdraka, a play mentioned by Bhoja and Abhinavagupta.
were written to describe his life. The prologue to the *Mṛcchakātukā* also gives some particulars of his life. He was a great scholar of the Vedas, knew Mathematics, loved arts and possessed heroic qualities. By ardent devotion, he was able to secure boons from Śiva. His numerous conquests and adventures are variously described in the legendary accounts.

Contents. The *Mṛcchakātukā* (the Clay-cart) is a *prakaraṇa* in ten acts. It deals with the loves of Cārudatta, a typical *nāgaraka*, as described by Vātsyāyana in his *Kāmasūtra*, and Vasantasenā, a rich courtesan. The virtuous Brāhmaṇa, Cārudatta, has been reduced to extreme poverty by his princely liberality; yet he did not forsake his piety. Vasantasenā, who was born as a courtesan and was highly accomplished in the arts of dance and music, loved him immensely for his qualities. Cārudatta possessed self-control and a keen sense of self-respect. Thus we notice that advances in love are generally made by Vasantasenā. She does not reciprocate the love of Śakāra, the brother-in-law of the ruling king and incurs his wrath. Her love for Cārudatta is pure and unselfish; even the Viṭa has to admit, “Though a courtesan, her love is very unlike that of a courtesan.” When Śakāra taunts her as an “inamorata of a beggarly Brāhmaṇa,” she takes pride in it. Cruel and cowardly that Śakāra is, he inflicts severe injury on her and she becomes unconscious. Thinking that she is dead, he accuses Cārudatta of having murdered her. What a pity? To be accused of having murdered one whom he loved so much! When he is questioned in the open court about his relation with Vasantasenā, his social status and true honour persuade him to evade the question for a moment, but when pressed by Śakāra, he readily replies, “Am I to say that she is a friend of mine? What if it were so? Let youth be accused and not character.” In the words of Browning, he might as well say,

How sad and bad and mad it was
But then, how it was sweet!

Cārudatta is sentenced to death. In the meantime, Vasantasenā recovers, presents herself on the scene of execution and saves Cārudatta. At this very time, a revolution takes place in the capital. Āryaka whom Cārudatta helped out of the prison successfully deposes the reigning king Pālaka and
himself becomes the king of Ujjayini. In appreciation of his previous services, Āryaka appoints Cārudatta as one of the superior officers in the State.

Criticism. The Mṛcchakaṭīkā presents a remarkable contrast to the masterpieces of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. In it, neither the hero is a mere paragon of virtue, nor the counterhero an embodiment of sin. The hero Cārudatta possesses several excellent virtues, but he does not adopt the self-righteous attitude of Duṣyanta. He is a man of the world, does not disdain gambling, loves dance and music and is fond of attending concerts. Vasantasenā too has neither the sweet girlish charm of Kālidāsa’s Śakuntalā, nor the mature womanly dignity of Bhavabhūti’s Sitā. Even in the midst of tempting surrounding, her heart is pure and her love for Cārudatta noble. When Śakāra, overpowered with brutal lust, threatens to kill her and throttles her, she is constant in her affections and the last words in her mouth were Namo Cārudattassā.

The characters in the Mṛcchakaṭīkā are drawn from all levels of society. They present us with a grim reality which is the chief characteristic of this play. There is enough of action in this play; it is therefore a real drama in every sense of the term. Another special feature of this play is that each of the twenty-seven minor characters possesses an individuality. The characters include courtiers, police constables, robbers, thieves, politicians as well as holy mendicants. In Act III, we come across an interesting account of a burglary in which stealing is treated as a regular art. The name mṛt+śakatīkā is based on an episode in the sixth act. Vasantasenā fills the little clay-cart of Cārudatta’s child with gold jewels. This serves as a circumstantial evidence in the trial and makes the plot more complicated. The interlinking of a political revolution with the private affairs of the two lovers adds new charm to the play.

Date. Unfortunately the date of Śūdraka cannot be determined with certainty. He is certainly earlier than Daṇḍin, Bāṇa and the author of Vētāla-paṭcaviṁśatīkā whose works make varied allusions to him. According to Kalhaṇa, he is a predecessor of Vikramāditya, but the latter’s identification with the founder of the Vikrama era cannot be claimed with certainty. He is certainly later than Bhāsa, the author of the play
Cārudatta, an amplified version of which the Mrchakaṭikā is. An attempt has been made to arrive at the date of Śudraka on the basis of his contemporaneity with Svāti mentioned in the Avantisundari-kathā. According to one calculation, Śivavati lived about A.D. 81, while according to another calculation based on the chronology of the Purāṇas he ruled in the 4th or the 5th century B.C.

116. Three Plays ascribed to Harsa. (a) The Author.
(i) The prologues to the three plays, Priyadarśikā, Ratnāvalī and Nāgānanda give the name of the author as King Harsa. At least four kings bearing the name of Harsa are known to history:

(i) Harṣa, the king of Kashmir;
(ii) Harṣa, the grandfather of King Bhoja of Dharā;
(iii) Harṣa-Vikramāditya of Ujjayini, the patron of Matṛgupta;

and (iv) Harṣavardhana, the king of Kānyakubja.

H. H. Wilson ascribed the Ratnāvalī to Śrīharṣa, the king of Kashmir (A.D. 1113-1125), but this view is not tenable because it has been quoted five times by Kśemendra (middle of the 11th century) in the Aucityālankāra and at least once by Damodaragupta, the minister of king Jāyapīḍa (last quarter of the 8th century) in the Kuṭṭināmata. The author of the Ratnāvalī must be much earlier than the 8th century A.D. That Harṣavardhana (A.D. 606-648), the king of Kānyakubja, might be the author of these plays, is corroborated by the evidence of I-tsing who records that king Śilāditya (another name of Harṣavardhana) versified the story of Bodhisatva Jīmūtavahana and had it performed by a band accompanied by dancing and acting and thus popularised it in his time. We are further informed by Bāṇa that Harṣavardhana possessed poetic genius.

(ii) Dhāvaka or Bāṇa (?). While pointing out ‘wealth’ as

---

1. For a detailed note on this point see Chapter IV ante.
2. Kalhana says, in the Rājatarangini (para. 568):
   tatrāhāsyyajayībhā śrīmān Harsāparābhidhāta,
   ekacchātraśacakravatī Vikramāditya ityabhūta.
3. Ratnāvalī: I. 8, II. 2, II. 3, II. 4, and II. 12.
4. ibid., I. 24.
5. A Record of the Buddhist Religion in India and the Malay Archipelago (Tr. by Takakusu, p.163).
one of the objects of poetry, Mammaṭa in his Kāvyaprapkāṣa, illustrated it by saying, Śrihariṣāderdhāvākā (Bāṇa)¹ dīnāṁyā dhanam. Possibly, Dhāvaka wrote some good poetry at the court of Harṣavardhana and got handsome reward for the same from his patron. That Bāṇa got immense wealth from his patron for writing the Harṣacaritam cannot be denied. That Bāṇa could not have been the author of these plays should be quite clear from the utter disparity in their style when compared with the Harṣacaritam. Besides, the Harṣacaritam of Bāṇa is decidedly superior in literary merit and Bāṇa could have got more wealth by the sale of his romance than by the alleged sale of these plays. The above line of Mammaṭa was, however, differently interpreted even in the 9th century A.D. and Rājaśekhara then wrote that Dhāvaka wrote these three plays and got wealth from Śriharṣa on that account.² It is difficult to say how much reliance can be placed upon this interpretation of Rājaśekhara because we have nothing else of Dhāvaka. On the other hand, some beautiful verses³ ascribed to Harṣavardhana occur in the anthologies.

(iii) Common Authorship. The Nāgānanda has a Buddhist colouring. God Buddha is invoked in the nāndi; Jimūtavāhana, the hero, is the Bodhisattva and the principle of ahiṁsā paramo dharmāḥ is emphasised upon. Macdonell was of the opinion that the Nāgānanda might belong to a different author but the following reasons do not warrant us to arrive at such a conclusion. These three plays are not only ascribed to the same author in their prologues but also contain common verses. One verse is common to the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā and two others are common to the Priydarśikā and the Nāgānānda. Besides, these three plays are so similar in style and tone that they do not leave the reader in any doubt regarding their common authorship.

(b) Plot. (i) The Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā are both

---

1. This is the reading according to the Kashmir manuscript.
2. See p. 49 above.
3. A commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra by Harṣa is also known. Although the Ratnāvalī serves well to illustrate the technical rules of dramaturgy, we cannot definitely assert that it has common authorship. The commentary is quoted by Abhinavagupta, Śrādātanaya and Bahurūpa-miśra.
nāṭikās in four acts and are closely connected in subject-matter as well as in form. Their common hero is Udayana and the chief queen in both cases is Vāsavadattā. It describes the ultimate union of Sāgarikā (i.e., Ratnāvalī, the princess of Ceylon) and Udayana, as planned by the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa. Owing to a ship-wreck Rātnavalī had reached the court of Udayana in a helpless condition. For some time she served the chief queen as maid-servant but ultimately her identity was revealed. Like a true Hindu wife, always prepared to sacrifice her own comforts in the interests of her husband, Vāsavadattā at last gave her consent to the celebration of Udayana's marriage with Ratnāvalī. The plot is based on a historical or epic tradition and is given in a varied form in the Kathāsaritsāgara. The Rātnavalī forms a close parallel to the Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa on the one hand, and Karpūra- maṇjarī of Rājaśekhara on the other.

The Priyadarśikā describes the ultimate union of Āraṇyikā (i.e., Priyadarśikā) with Udayana. She was the daughter of Drḍhavarman, king of the Aṅgas, and was betrothed to king Udayana. Before the marriage could be celebrated, Drḍhavarman was captured by the Kāliṅgā king and Priyadarśikā was admitted to the harem of Udayana, under the name of Āraṇyikā. After many vicissitudes, her identity is revealed and the marriage is celebrated.¹

The Nāgānanda describes in five acts the extraordinary self-sacrifice of Jīmūtavāhana² in offering himself in lieu of the snake to be devoured by Garuḍa. Goddess Gaurī is pleased with this generous act of Jīmūtavāhana and revives him to the joy of his mourning parents and loving wife. The dead serpents are also revived and Garuḍa takes a vow not to feast upon snakes again. The play is a happy admixture of Buddhist and Hindu elements and does very much reflect the times in which it was written.

(c) Style. Harṣa is an able representative of the Vaidarbhī school of poetry. Although he lacks the keen observation and

¹. It has a play within it arranged by the confidante (Sāmkṛtyāṇi) in which the king (i.e., feigned Manoramā) shows ardent love for Āraṇyikā (playing the part of Vāsavadattā).

². A similar story of Jīmūtavāhana is given in the XXII Taravīga of the Kathāsaritsāgara.
high-flown imagination of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa, he possesses the
great merit of simplicity and clarity. His Sanskrit is classical and
precise, and the use of figures of speech restricted and refined.
We find in him little originality, enough descriptive power and
happy smoothness prevailing throughout. The following
verses will serve as models of his style. Udayana tells
Vāsavadattā:

aruhyā śailāśikharāṁ tvad vadanāpahṛtankāntisarvasvah
pratikartumivordhvakarah sthitah purastānniśā nāthah.

On another occasion he remarks:

virama virama vahne muñca dhūmānubandham
prakaṭayasi kimuccairacisāṁ cakravālam
virahahutahujahā yo na dūgadā priyāyāh
pralayadahanabhāsā tasya kiṁ tvaṁ karosi.

The following remark of Jīmitavāhana is noteworthy:

svaśārīramapi parāthe yath khalu dadhyāmayācitaḥ kṛpayā
rājyasya kṛte sa katham prāṇivadhakrauryamanu manye.

(d) Language and Metres. Besides classical Sanskrit,
Śriharṣa has used different Prakrits. Sauraseni predominates,
Mahārāṣṭri is used in verses and Māgadhī is used by a servant
in the Nāgānanda. His most favourite metre is Śardulavikrīḍita
which occurs 73 times in his plays. The next to it is Sragdhara,

117. The Mudrarakṣasa of Viśākhadatta is one of the great
Sanskrit plays which describes in seven acts a political event
of the Maurya period. The various Machiavellian devices of
Cāṇakya to win over Rākṣasa, the wise and faithful minister of
the last Nanda king, and the skilful plans of the latter to over-
throw the new Maurya king by combining with Malayaketu, the
Mleccha king, are effectively described. Cāṇakya succeeds in
creating Malayaketu's mistrust in Rākṣasa who is obliged to
leave his (Malayaketu's) service in disgrace. Candanadāsa, the
friend of Rākṣasa, is in danger because he gave shelter to the
family of Rākṣasa. Rākṣasa surrenders himself to Cāṇakya
in order to save his friend's life. Cāṇakya offers him the prime-
ministership of Candragupta Maurya which he must accept, if
Candanadāsa's life is to be saved. Rākṣasa consents unwillingly
and the play ends in all happiness.

The Mudrārākṣasa is historical in character and is full of
state intrigues. The sentiments of love and pathos have absolu-
tely no place in this play. The only female character, the wife of Candanadāsa, is introduced in the last act, not to represent any scene of affection and tenderness but that of stern duty and sacrifice. The permanent feeling (sthāyībhāva) that pervades the drama is that of resoluteness (utsāha) and the prevailing sentiment is the heroic sentiment (vīra), although it does not attain to that high pitch which it does in the Mahāvīracaritaṁ of Bhavabhūti. No other play in the whole range of Sanskrit literature can surpass the Mudrārākṣasa in the remarkable unity of action, which it possesses. From the highest to the lowest, all characters have but one object in view; all schemes have but one end, namely the conciliation of Rākṣasa. Notions of right and wrong are subordinated to the achievement of political ends. Friendships are formed and broken according to political needs. End justifies the means. Even a noble soul like Candanadāsa is threatened with death, so that Rākṣasa may yield. The different characters have been vividly represented. A peculiar feature of this play is that the author has arranged these characters in groups of two each. Cāṇakya and Rākṣasa are astute politicians and great schemers. Candragupta and Malayaketu are the two opposing kings, greatly differing in their merits and attainments. Bhāgurāyaṇa and Siddhārthaka, etc. form lesser pairs, and their personal qualities are well-contrasted. Language is forceful and dignified; melody and charm of the verses are well-preserved. Some western critics have called it the only real drama in Sanskrit.

The Author. The prologue to the play tells us that the author Viṣākhadatta belonged to a high Datta family that occupied a conspicuous position in the administration of the province. He was the grandson of a Sāmanta and the son of a Mahārāja. He was well versed in grammar, dramaturgy, politics, astronomy and logic. He was himself a Śaivite, had some regard for Buddhism but bore dislike to Jainism. Some stray verses of his appear in the anthologies.

Date. There are different views regarding the date of this famous play:

(i) The two important variants of the name of the ruling king that occur in the Bharatavākya are Avantivarman and Candragupta. Of the two Avantivarmans known to Indologists, one belongs to Kashmir (A.D. 855-883), and the other is the
Maukharī king of Kanauj, the cousin of Prabhākaravaradhana, (second half of the 6th century A.D.). Some scholars have placed the poet in the reign of Avantivarman of Kashmir. Jacobi has further identified the eclipse referred to in the text as that of Dec. 2, A.D. 860. But there is nothing to support this view. On the other hand, we are definitely told in the Bharatavākyya that this ruling king protected the earth which was being molested by the Mlechchas (mlechhairudvejyamānā). As Avantivarman of Kashmir is not known to have conquered or subdued any foreign king, we turn to the second Avantivarman of Kanauj who rendered substantial help to Prabhākaravaradhana in the extirpation of the Hūṇas. Sten Konow prefers the second reading ‘Candragupta,’ and identifies him with Candragupta II (A.D. 375-413) but that does not explain the conquest of the Hūṇas because they had not overpowered that territory till then. Viśākhadatta must have lived earlier than Bhartṛhari who quotes the following verse of the Mudrārākṣasa in his śataka:

prārabhyate na khalu vighnabhayena nīcaih
prārabhya vighna vihātā viramanti madhyāḥ
vighnaiḥ punaḥ purarapi pratihanyamānāḥ
prārabdhavattamagunāḥstvamivodvahanti.

The words tvamiva clearly show that the verse originally belonged to the play.

118. The Venisamhara. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa’s Venisamhāra is another play of heroic sentiment (vīra rasa). In six acts it attempts to dramatise a well-known episode from the Mahābhārata. Draupadī has vowed not to braid her hair until the insult done to her by Duḥṣāsana is avenged. Bhīma becomes indignant and says that he would break with Yudhiṣṭhira if he made peace with Duryodhana. Kṛṣṇa is unsuccessful in his mission of peace. The Great Battle takes place. All the Kauravas are killed and Bhīma braids the hair of Draupadī with his own hands, wet with Duḥṣāsana’s blood.

Style. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa’s delineation of characters is admirable. They have their individuality like those of the

1. So also A.B. Keith who says that there is nothing that prevents a date in the 9th century, though the work may be earlier. It appears to be later than Mṛcchakaṭīkā, Raghuvamśa and Śiśupālavadhā [JRAS 1909, 145]
Mrçchakaṭṭikā, but the play suffers from lack of action because there is enough of narrative and vast abundance of epic detail. The depiction of love is ineffective, perhaps because the author slavishly followed the rules of dramaturgy. Like the author of the Mudrārākṣasa, he has in him both fire and energy. Like Bhavabhūti, he is fond of using long compounds in Sanskrit or Prakrit prose at places, and creating effect by the adaptation of sound to sense wherever possible. The play is not devoid of humour and pathos. The last act is well-known for its dignity of thought and ease of expression. His description of night is very fine and he has come to be called as Niśā-Nārāyaṇa.

Date. (i) Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa has been quoted by Vāmana, Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta; he is, therefore, certainly earlier than the 8th century A.D.

(ii) Traditionally he is said to have immigrated from Kanauj to Bengal at the invitation of Ādisūra, king of Bengal (first half of the 7th century).

(iii) A manuscript of the Nīvī, a commentary on Dharmakīrti’s Rūpāvatāra, states that at the request of Bāna, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa became the pupil of a Buddhist monk, and that the work Rūpāvatāra is the joint product of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and Dharmakīrti.

Thus Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, may be treated as a contemporary of Bāna.

119. Bhavabhūti. (i) Bhavabhūti is one of the great dramatists of Sanskrit. His real name was Śrīkaṇṭha. Several stanzas, not found in the extant plays, are ascribed to him in the anthologies which show that he must have written much more. He was a native of Vidarbha, was born in a renowned family of the Vedic scholars and was himself a great scholar.¹ His first attempt was severely criticised, but conscious of his art and full of optimism he continued his work undaunted and undeterred. He feels as if the goddess of speech attended on him like a submissive handmaid² and that people

¹. In the earlier two plays he uses several passages which are reminiscent, not only of the Vedic literature (the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras) but also the Kāmaśāstra, the Arthaśāstra, the epics and the works of Kālidāsa, etc.
². yah Brahmāṇamīya devi vāgvaśyevānuvartate (Uttara., I. 2).
are as apt to entertain doubts about the excellence of compositions as about the purity of women. He further administered a direct rebuke to his critics and said that his work was not intended for them. Some kindred soul will surely be born; time is endless and earth is broad.

(ii) His Works. (a) Mahāvīrācaritam is possibly the earliest work of Bhavabhūti. It records a full account of his ancestors, is crude in form and shows the hand of a novice. The plot is taken from the Rāmāyaṇa, but it is very different from its source. The whole story is treated as the feud of Rāvana and his plots to ruin Rāma (Mahāvira, the great hero). It lacks the novelty of the Mālatīmādhavaṁ but has more of unity of plot. Certain scenes are, however, undramatic; the progress of action is hampered by numerous details and long speeches. The characterisation is feeble. Even Mālyavanta and Rāvana do not impress the reader as outstanding personalities.

(b) Mālatīmādhavaṁ is a prakāraṇa in ten acts. The plot is based upon certain isolated stories of the Kathāsaritsāgara which the author worked up and combined into an effective whole, thus producing a novel thing altogether. The inspiration for writing this prakāraṇa was probably drawn from the Mrccha-kāṭikā, but it lacks the humour of that play, so much so that even Vidūṣaka finds no place in the whole of the Mālatīmādhavaṁ. On the other hand, he had great love for what was terrible, horrible and supernatural in nature.

The Mālatīmādhavaṁ describes the ultimate union of Mālatī, the daughter of a minister, and Mādhava, a young scholar. The king of that country is determined to marry Mālatī with a favourite of his whom she hates. The king’s plan is frustrated by Makaranda, a friend of Mādhava, who disguises himself as Mālatī and goes through the wedding ceremony with him.

1. yathā strīṇāṁ tathā vācāṁ sādhutve durjano janoḥ.
2. ye nāma kecidiha naḥ prathayantyayavajñāṁ
   jānanti te kimapi tān prati naiṣa yatnāḥ
   utpaya te sti mama ko'pi samānādharmā
   kālo hyaṁ nikhadirvipulā ca pythvi (Mālatī, I. 6).
3. According to an Indian tradition, Bhavabhūti wrote only up to V. 46 of this play. The rest is said to have been completed by Subrahmanya Kavi. The exact cause of this incompletion cannot be determined.
Although Bhavabhūti is all serious, yet much of the love and grief of the characters seems to be unconvincing. The plot is mainly based upon an accident. Mālatī is twice saved from sure death by mere chance. Act IX bears an influence of Kālidāsa’s Meghadūta and Act IV of the Vikramorvasīyam. Mādhava wants to send a cloud-message to his lost love. Although Bhavabhūti does not possess the grace and charm of Kālidāsa, he excels him in the quality of tragic pathos in this act.

(c) Uttararāmacaritāṁ is decidedly the best work of the poet. It was the product of his mature intellect. The author himself says:

śabdabrahma vidaḥ kaveḥ pariṇata praṇītasya vānīnimīmāḥ

(Uttara,.VII. 20).

The plot is based upon the well-known episode of the abandonment of Sītā as a consequence of a false rumour, narrated in the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, but the author does not follow it slavishly. He improves upon it in many respects to suit his dramatic needs. Some of his innovations are, (i) the picture-gallery scene, (ii) the invisible Sītā, overhearing the conversation of Rāma and Vāsanti, (iii) Rāma’s confession of love for Sītā before Vāsanti, (iv) the fight between Lava and Candraketu, (v) the visit of Vasiṣṭha and party to Vālmīki’s hermitage and (vi) the enactment of a play on the later deeds of Rāma in his presence.

In this play, of seven acts, Bhavabhūti’s depiction of the sentiment of pathos reaches its climax; in fact, in this quality of his he remains unsurpassed. Even stony hearts would melt and weep with Bhavabhūti. Evidently the poet is conscious of this quality of his when he says eko rasah karuṇa eva nimitrabhedāt, etc. In this respect, Bhavabhūti bears a strong contrast with Kālidāsa. The latter, like Shakespeare, suggests; Bhavabhūti, like Milton, expresses. When heart is overpowered with grief, words are few. Not one of those who gather round the body of Cordelia utters a word of sorrow in Shakespeare. Similarly, when Kālidāsa’s Rāma hears about the false rumour about Sītā, his heart, caught in a great conflict between love:

1. api grāvā roditi api dalati vajrasya hṛdayaṁ
   or karuṇasya mūrtirathavā śarīrinti virahavyatheva.
and duty, is shattered into pieces, but he does neither faint nor shed tears. Like a resolute king he bids Laksmana to take Sitā to the forest and abandon her there. It is only after listening to the parting message of Sitā through Laksmana that the king in Rāma gives way to the man in him. His eyes become dim with unshed tears, he says a few words but does neither weep nor declaim. On the other hand, Bhavabhūti follows the writers on romance and would not let go the topic until his characters faint or shed a flood of tears and the spectators actually begin to weep with him.

The Uttararāmacaritāṁ is undoubtedly a greater success than his other plays. Characterisation is, in some respects, excellent. However, the play suffers from lack of action and judged from modern standards, it has been often styled as a dramatic poem rather than drama proper. Another feature of this play is that it contains a play within it in the last act. In this act Bhavabhūti surpasses even Kālidāsa. The reunion of Sitā and Rāma is full of charm and depth of sentiment which we miss in the wood-land love of Śakuntalā and Duśyanta.

(iii) Style. (a) Bhavabhūti is a poet of emotion; thus he has been rightly compared to Milton as contrasted with Kālidāsa’s comparison to Shakespeare. If he lacks the sweetness, grace and quality of suggestiveness of Kālidāsa, he excels in the quality of depicting appropriately a situation or emotion in a few words, e.g., the old chamberlain addresses Rāma in the usual way as ‘Rāmabhādra,’ but then soon falls back on ‘Your Majesty.’

(b) What is awe-inspiring, grand and supernatural in nature has an attraction for Bhavabhūti more than for any other poet. His description of lofty mountains, dense forests, cataracts and valleys are simply picturesque. He is, however, not indifferent to the gentler and romantic aspects of nature, cf.,

---
1. Verses like the following occur in the anthologies in praise of Bhavabhūti:

bhavyāṁ yadi vibhūṭāṁ tvam tāta kāmayase tadā
Bhavabhūtipade cīttaṃvīlambān nīveśaya. 1.
sukavi dvitayāṁ manye nikhile'pi mahītale
Bhavabhūteḥ śuṣaścāyāṁ Vālmīkiṣu-śriyakah. 2.
Bhavabhūteḥ sambandhād bhūdharaḥbhūreva Bhārati bhāti
etāt kṛtakārūṇye kimanyathā roditī grāvā. 3.
description of the midnight at the end of Act VII in the Mālatīmādhavam.

(c) Bhavabhūti is skilled in the profound representation of a variety of sentiments in his plays (bhūmāṁ rasāṁ gahanāḥ prayogāḥ, etc.); thus the predominant sentiments in the Mahāvīrācaritaṁ, the Mālatīmādhavam and the Uttarārāmacaritaṁ are vīra, śṛṅgāra and karuṇa respectively. Even in the same play we find a variety of sentiments represented, e.g., in the Mālatīmādhavam we come across the vīrārasa in Acts III and VII, raudra in Act III, bībhaṁ, and bhayānaka in Act V, karuṇa in Act IX, and adbhuta in Act IX and X.

(d) The Mahāvīrācaritaṁ and the Mālatīmādhavam show an unevenness of style and the gradually making up of a great poet. Occasionally his verses are characterised with remarkable clearness and perspicuity and the rhythm is well suited to the emotion or sentiment. The Uttarārāmacaritaṁ is written in a noble and elevated style, full of vigour, elegance and grace and can be described in the poet’s own words: dhīroddhatā namayatīva gatirāharirīṁ.

(e) Another chief feature of his style is his mastery power of expression which is displayed equally well in all the three plays.

(f) As contrasted with Kālidāsa he is an able representative of the Gauḍā style which, in accordance with the dictum ojah samāsabhūyastvametad gadyasya jīvitaṁ, aims at long compounds in prose. More often than not, he uses deliberately difficult words and complex constructions, caring more for words than ideas.

(g) He has just claims for luxuriance and elevation of expression (praudhatvamudāratā ca vačasāṁ).

(h) He is most impressive when he is simple and natural, cf., the words of Mālatī overheard by Mādhava, which have also the deliberate rhyming effect:

\[\text{mlānasya jīvakusumasasya vikāsanāni}\\ \text{santarpanāni sakalendriyamohanāni}\\ \text{ānandanāni hṛdayaikarasāyanāni}\\ \text{diśtyā mayāpyadhigatāni vacomṛtāni.}\]

The heart-rending rebuke of Vāsantī is administered in the same strain:

\[\text{tvam jīvitaṁ tvamasi me hṛdayaṁ dvitīyaṁ...}\]

(i) He is very fond of using rare grammatical forms and
has extensive vocabulary.

(j) His characters, especially of the Uttarāmacaritam, have a reality of their own; cf., the woeful sorrows of Rāma. and Sītā:

kimapi kimapi mandam mandamāsattiyyogāt.

(k) His conception of love is of a higher type and certainly far nobler than the normal in Sanskrit literature, cf., advaitam: sukhaduḥkhayo...

(l) As an illustration of his self-consciousness and egotism, we might cite from the Mālatīmādhavaṁ:

ahora sarasaramanīyatā saṁvidhānasya (VI. 16. 2) and
asti vā kutascidevambhūtaṁ vicitra ramaṁ yojvalam mahāpra-karaṇāṁ (X. 23. 18).

(m) His strength lies in the Śikharī metre. Other metres of great occurrence are Śārdūlavikriḍitāṁ and Vasantaśilakā.

(iv) Date. Fortunately the date of Bhavabhūti is fairly certain. Bāna does not make any mention of him in the introduction to the Harṣacaritam but Vāmana (8th century) quotes him and Rājaśekhara¹ (about A.D. 900) calls himself an incarnation of Bhavabhūti. Kalhaṇa² mentions that Bhavabhūti and Vākpatirāja were the protégés of Yaśovarman of Kanauj. Yaśovarman was conquered by Lalitāditya of Kashmir and the latter is known to have sent an embassy to China about A.D. 736. Vākpatirāja eulogises Bhavabhūti in his work and his words ajjavi³, ‘even to-day’, show that Bhavabhūti was earlier and had attained fame by his time. Bhavabhūti may, thus be placed about A.D. 700.

120. Rajasekharā was born in a family⁴ of poets and was married to Avantisundarī, an accomplished Rajput princess, proficient in poetics. In all probability, he was a native of:

1. cf., babhūva valmīkabhavah purā kavistataḥ prapedobhuvī bhartṛ- menṛhatāṁ
    sthitāṁ punaryo bhavabhūtrekhayā sa vartate samprati Rājaśekharāṁ
    (Bālarāmāyaṇa, I. 16).

2. kavirvākpatirāja Śrī Bhavabhūtyādi sevitaḥ
    jito yayau yaśovarmā tad guṇastuti banditāṁ (IV. 144).

3. bhavabhūjalahi niggayakavvāmayarasakaṇā iva phuranti
    jassa vīsesā ajjavi viyadesu kahāṇivesesu (Gaud., 799).

4. He was the son of a high priest and the great-grandson of Akālajalada, a great poet.
Vidharbha and Kuntala.

(i) Rājaśekhara, the king? It is stated in the Saṅkaravijaya of Mādhavācārya that Rājaśekhara was the king of Kerala and that he presented three plays of his own composition to Saṅkarācārya. An inscription of king Rājaśekhara is also available which is assigned to the 9th or the 10th century A.D. on paleographical grounds.¹ There are, however, no reasons to identify the poet Rājaśekhara with king Rājaśekhara. The fact that the poet Rājaśekhara was the son of a high priest is sufficient to show that he could not possibly have been the king himself. In all probability, the poet Rājaśekhara came after king Rājaśekhara.

(ii) His Works. In the prologue to the Bālarāmāyaṇa, Rājaśekhara himself tells us that he wrote six works. Besides the four plays mentioned below, he possibly wrote the Ratnamāñjarī, a nāṭika and an Aṣṭapratradala-kamala (as evidenced by Bhoja).

(a) Bālarāmāyaṇa. It is a mahānāṭaka in ten acts. The prologue records some non-existent merits of the poet. The chief characteristic of the play is that the poet has made the love of Rāvana the dominating feature. Rāvana has been, from the beginning, depicted as a rival of Rāma to win Sītā.

(b) Bālabhārata or Pracānda-pāṇḍava. It is incomplete. Only two acts are available. It describes the marriage of Draupadī and the gambling scene and goes up to the departure of the Pāṇḍavas to the forest.

(c) Viddhasāla-bhaṇḍikā. It is a regular nāṭika in four acts. The hero of this play is King Candravarman of Lāṭa. The plot is neither interesting nor important.

(d) Karpūra-māñjarī. It is also a nāṭikā in four acts. It describes the vicissitudes of the love and the final union of King Candrapāla and the princess of Kuntala. It was written at the request of his wife and is wholly in Prakrit. The poet boasts that Prakrit, the language of women, can be used as a medium of literary expression by one who is well-versed in it.

(iii) Dramatic Art.² The chief characteristic of Rāja-

---

² The following verse of praise occurs in the anthologies:
šekhara’s works is that he is elaborate in description. He does not bother about the originality of plot or the skilful characterisation. His whole attention is concentrated upon effective expression and copious use of harmonious sounds. Keith is of the opinion that if poetry consisted merely of harmonious sounds, he would be ranked as one of the highest poets. He is greatly skilled in the use of Sanskrit as well as Prakrit metres. He has used at least seventeen varieties in the Prakrit metres alone. His language is simple and interesting and his metres elegant and attractive. Words from vernaculars, especially Mahārāṣṭrī, have been freely introduced. Another characteristic of his style is the occasional use of rhyme, as we find in the Gitagovinda and the Mohamudgara.

(iv) Date. Fortunately it is possible to determine the date of Rājašekhara with certainty. He calls himself an avatāra of Bhavabhūti. He quotes the rhetoricians Udbhāta (8th century) and Ānandavardhana (9th century) and has been himself referred to by Somaveda, the author of Yaśastilakacampū (completed in A.D. 960) and Dhanañjaya, protégé of King Muñja of Dhārā (A.D. 974-993). In all his four plays, Rājašekhara has described himself as the spiritual teacher of King Mahendrapāla of Kanauj. The inscriptions of this king are dated A.D. 903 and 907. We can therefore safely place Rājašekhara in about A.D. 900.

121. The Kundamala of Dinagā. (i) This play in six acts was published for the first time in 1923 in the Dakshina Bharati Granthamala from four manuscripts discovered in the South. Soon after it attracted the due attention of Sanskrit scholars and many commentaries and translations of the work have appeared.

The name of the author is variously given as Diñnāga or Dhiranāga. The prologue, which is available in the Mysore transcripts only, mentions that the play Kundamāla was

\[\text{pūrṇa śrotarasāyanāḥ racayitum vācaḥ satāṁ saṁmatāṁ vyuttaptaṁ paramānavāptumavadhitāṁ labdhum vinrasrotasaḥ, bhoktaṁ svādu phalaṁ ca jīvitātaryadyasti te kautukāṁ tad bhṛataḥ śrutaṁ Rājaśekhara kaveḥ sūktāṁ sudhāsyandiniḥ}\]

1. cf., Note on Bhavabhūti’s date.
written by the poet Diṅnāga, resident of Arārālapura.¹ On the other hand, the scribe says at the end of the Tanjore manuscripts that it is the work of Dhīranāga of Anūparādha. The name Diṅnāga is certainly more familiar to Sanskrit scholars than Dhīranāga. There are reasons to believe that we should put more reliance on the author's own words in the prologue than the scribe's words at the end of the play. Consequently there is a tendency among the scholars to prefer the reading as Diṅnāga.

(ii) The plot of the Kundamālā is borrowed from the Uttarākandā of the Rāmāyāna and deals with the story of the banishment of Sītā, her discovery and re-union, as in the Uttararāmacaritām of Bhavabhūti. The drama is styled Kundamālā because a garland of Kunda flowers floating in the lake (and seen by Rāma) leads to Sītā's discovery at the hermitage of Vālmīki.

(iii) Dramatic Art and Style. In poetic power Diṅnāga is inferior to Bhavabhūti but as a dramatist he is more successful. There is life and action in the play, and characterisation is more vivid and picturesque. He has avoided certain defects of Bhavabhūti, e.g., he does not indulge in long speeches and elaborate descriptions (which are more suited to a poem than a play), nor does he use long compounds and difficult words. The sentiment of pathos (karuṇa) predominates throughout; there is no admixture of other sentiments, as, for instance, of the vīra-rasa (heroic sentiment) in the Uttararāmacaritām. Language is simple and attractive; dialogues exquisite and dramatic. While the Uttararāmacaritām is called a dramatic poem, the Kundamālā is a real drama, fit for stage. The characters of Diṅnāga are not ideal or ethereal like those of Kālidāsa, but are even more realistic than those of Bhavabhūti. He is fond of anuprāsa (alliteration) and yamaka (paronomasia), but he never uses those alaṅkāras at the cost of lucidity. Another characteristic of his play is the occasional use of rhythmical prose.

(iv) Date. The theme of the Kundamālā is exactly the same as that of the Uttararāmacaritām. A closer study of the
two reveals the fact that the author of the Kumārakūṭa had the Uttararāmacaritām before him at the time of writing his own play. In some respects the Kumārakūṭa is, more or less, an amplification of the Uttararāmacaritām. In Bhavabhūti’s play, Rāma recognises Sītā by touch alone, but in this one, Rāma recognises her by embrace plus five more objects, viz., breeze, garland of Kunda flowers, her image in water, footprints and shawl. In Uttararāmacaritām Rāma and Sītā come into contact with each other only once, but in the Kumārakūṭa they do so twice. These instances can be multiplied. Besides there are certain things in the Kumārakūṭa which remain inexplicable except with reference to the Uttararāmacaritām, e.g., Sītā feels proud to know that Rāma is incompassionate towards her, cf., nīranukroṣa iti abhimānaḥ (Act III before sloka No. 12). There is absolutely no occasion for her abhimāna in the Kumārakūṭa. The text becomes clear when we read in the Uttararāmacaritām Rāma saying:

snehanā dayāṁ ca saukhyāṁ ca yadi vā jānakīmaṇi
 ārādhanaṁ lokasya muñcato nāsti me vyathā

(Uttara., I. 12).

Besides, we find that Rājaśekhara is silent about this work. The earliest writer to quote from this play is Bhojadeva (about A.D. 1018-1060). Quotations from or references to this work also occur in the Mahānātaka (11th to 13th century), the Bhāvatprakāśa of Śāradātānaya (about 12th century) and the Sāhitya-dīrpaṇa (14th century). We may, therefore, place the Kumārakūṭa approximately in the 10th century A.D.

122. Murari. (i) The Anargharāghavān of Murāri is an elaborate play in seven acts dealing with the story of the Rāmāyaṇa. In plot it mainly agrees with the Mahāvīrācaritām of Bhavabhūti.

(ii) Dramatic Art and Style. Murāri is one of the great poets of Sanskrit literature. He is occasionally styled as Mahākavi and Bāla-Vālmiki. He is highly praised for his gāmbhirāya, cf.,

devīṁ vācamapūsate hi bahavaḥ sāraṁ tu sārasvatam
jānīte nitarāmasau gurukula kliśto Murāriḥ kaviḥ
abhīrāṅghita eva vānarabhājaṁ kintvasya gamburghīrata
māpattāla nimagnapīvaratanurjānāti manthācalaḥ

His power of expression is remarkable and his command
of language and grammar admirable. There is a great deal of hyperbole in his work, e.g., the moon cannot compare favourably with the face of a beautiful lady and stars must shine at night to make up this deficiency of the moon.¹ His diction is chaste but learned. Very often he makes a display of his scholarship and it is not possible to follow him without commentary. There is some originality in his similes and lyrical harmony in his verses. Some of his stanzas are really graceful and charming. On the whole, his style might be described as magnificent. It is a pity that some western scholars have miserably failed to appreciate the true worth of his work. According to Wilson, the Hindu *pandaītas* have shown Murāri an unjust preference, for "the Hindus of these days are little able to estimate purity of conception, delicacy of feeling, or brilliancy of fancy." But one who has thoroughly studied the *Anargharāgahavanī* will find that Murāri is rightly praised for these qualities.

(iii) Date. (a) Murāri has cited two verses from Bhavabhūti and is therefore decidedly later than him.

(b) Ratnākara, the protégé of King Avantivarman of Kashmir (A.D. 855-884) has made a punning reference to Murāri in the following verse of the *Haravijaya*:

*āṅkoṭthanaṁ tvaṁ ikvottamanāyakasya
nāsaṁ kavirvadyahatta yasya murārīrittham* (XXXVII. 167).

(c) From Maṅkha’s *Śrīkanṭha-caritam* (A.D. 1135) it appears that he regarded the author as earlier than Rāṣṭekhara. Murāri may, therefore, be approximately placed in the first half of the 9th century A.D.

123. Kṛśnamisra. The *Prabodha-candrodaya* of Kṛśnamisra is an important allegorical play which was written by the author to teach the principles of Advaita philosophy to one of his dull students. The superiority of the Advaita Vedānta is brought out in this drama in a very clear and lucid manner. The characters are the personifications of abstract qualities.

The evil king Error is introduced as ruler of Benares. He is accompanied with his loyal associates, the Faults and Vices. Their adversaries are Righteousness and the noble King Reason,

---

1. *anena rambhoru bhavanmukhena tuṣārabhānōstulaya dhṛtasya
ūnasya nīnam pratipaśaṁaya tārāṁ svhuṃrti pratimānakaṁdaṁ*
assisted by all virtues. The latter have been forcibly turned out from their home, but there is a prophecy that Reason will some day be reverted into Revelation and that the acquisition of true knowledge will destroy the reign of Error. The play ends with a glorious success of the noble party and an utter discomfiture of the wicked party.

Date. The prologue to the drama records incidentally the defeat of King Karna-deva at the hands of King Kirtivarman. King Kirtivarman is said to have ruled from A.D. 1049 to 1100 and made the above conquest in about A.D. 1065. Krsnamiśra may, therefore, be definitely placed in the second half of the 11th century A.D.

124. The Decadence of Drama. Soon after Murāri and Rājaśekhara, the drama began to decline. Even in other departments of Sanskrit literature there was a definite set-back—the period of activity of classical Sanskrit ends with about A.D. 1100, but in the field of drama this literary inactivity was more pronounced. The gulf between Sanskrit and the spoken languages had become even wider. Even the Prakrits of the dramas became fossilised and their place was regularly taken first by the Apabhraṃśas and then by the vernaculars. Words from vernaculars, especially Mahārāṣṭrī, were freely introduced by Rājaśekhara. The occasional use of rhyme in the later writers is also due to the influence of the vernaculars. Gradually the vernaculars themselves came to assume the literary form and the demand for drama written in Sanskrit or literary Prakrits decreased. The poets who wanted to write for fame (yaśa) took to writing of Kāvyā or other forms of composition, because it was idle to seek fame by the composition of Sanskrit drama, for which there was no popular audience but only a limited appeal. As a hobby, however, plays continued to be written in Sanskrit up to the present century.
Appendix I

THE VEDIC PERIOD

General Outline. The term ‘veda’ is a very comprehensive one. It is the fountain-head of all true knowledge. It is generally derived from the root ‘vid’, to know, but it is also possible to derive it from the root ‘vid’, to exist, ‘vid’, to obtain, and ‘vid’, to reflect, cf.,

\[ \text{vidanti jānanti, vidyante bhavanti vindanti athavā vindante,} \]
\[ \text{labhante, vindanti vicārayanti, sarve manusyāḥ satyavidyāṁ} \]
\[ \text{yairyeṣu vā, tathā vidvāṁsasca bhavanti te vedāḥ.} \]

The vedic literature is admittedly far older than the literature of any other branch of Indo-European family and is distinguished by refinement and beauty of thought, as well as by skill in the handling of language and metre. It is mainly religious in character. According to Bloomfield, it is the most ancient literary monument of India, the most ancient literary document of the Indo-European peoples—the foundation, for all time, of India’s religious thought.

The Vedic literature includes the four vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads and the Śūtras. The earlier names\(^2\) for the respective vedas were also ṛcāḥ, yajūṃśi, sāmāni and atharvāṅgirasah; they refer rather to the different styles of composition than to canonical collections.

In the vedic period three well-defined literary strata are to be distinguished.

(1) THE FOUR VEDAS

An outcome of creative and poetic age, they are called Śaṅhitās (collections) and are of varying age and significance.

\[ \text{1. Svami Dayananda Sarasvati in Ṛgvedādibhāṣya-bhūmikā.} \]
\[ \text{2. cf., ṛcāḥ sāmāni chandāṃsi purāṇam yajuṣā saha} \]
\[ \text{ucchistājajjīfare sarve divī devā diviśritāḥ} \quad (\text{Athrava, 11.7.24).} \]
\[ \text{evaṁ vāre’sya mahato bhūtasya niḥsvasitametad yad ṛgvedo} \]
\[ \text{yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo’tharvāṅgirasah} \quad (\text{Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upan., 2.4.11).} \]
This may be styled as the Mantra period. There is a great passage of time between the *Rgveda* and the other Vedas. Hence, some scholars like Max Müller have sub-divided this period, into two: viz., 1. The Chandas period, and 2. the Mantra period; the first being the age of composition and the second being that of compilation of the hymns.

(a) *Rgveda* is the oldest and therefore the most important. It consists entirely of lyrics in praise of different gods.

(b) *Sāmaveda* consists mainly of stanzas (except 75) from the *Rgveda*. It may be called the book of chants.

(c) *Yajurveda*. Besides stanzas from the *Rgveda* it contains original prose formulas. It is a book of sacrificial prayers and has been handed down in two forms called *Krśna-Yajurveda* and *Śukla-Yajurveda*.

(d) *Atharvaveda*. It is much later than the *Rgveda*. In form, it is similar to *Rgveda*, the matter being mostly taken from the tenth *māṇḍala* of it. In spirit, it represents a much more primitive stage of thought. It deals with spells and incantations appealing to the demon world, witchcraft current among the lower classes of the population and derived from an immemorial antiquity. It is also known as *Brahmaveda* or the veda of the Brahman priest. To quote Whitney, "The most prominent characteristic feature of the *Atharvāṇa* is the multitude of incantations which it contains; these are pronounced either by the person who is himself to be benefited, or more often by the sorcerer for him."

These Vedas are of inestimable value to those who care to study the evolution of religious beliefs. As literature, the enduring interest lies in the ancient seers’ vision of the beauty, the majesty and the power of divine manifestations and in the myths and legends related to them. According to Bloomfield, the paramount importance of the *Rgveda* is as philosophy. Its mythology represents a clearer, even if not always chronologically earlier, stage of thought and religious development than is to be found in any parallel literature.

(2) THE BRAHMANAS

In this period, the priests transferred their creative energies to the elaboration of sacrificial ceremonial. The result was a ritual system far surpassing in complexity of detail and picturesque grandeur, anything the world has elsewhere known. These
theological treatises were styled the Brāhmaṇas because they deal with brahman (devotion or prayer). They lay much stress upon the application of Vedic hymns and formulas to the innumerable details of the sacrifice.

They are entirely in prose, some of them being accented like the Vedas themselves. They represent the oldest prose-writing of the Indo-European family. From the western standard of criticism, their style is cumbersome, rambling and disjointed. Since the Brāhmaṇas furnish the oldest prescriptions for the ritual and explanation of the language, as well as the oldest traditions and philosophical speculations, they are not without value for the history of language and civilization, but according to Kaegi, 'the gold is largely hidden under a mass of dross.'

According to Macdonell, the lower limit of this period cannot be placed below 500 B.C., since its latest doctrines are presupposed by Buddhism, and the year of the Buddha’s death has been calculated with a high degree of probability to be about 480 B.C. The earliest stratum may be assumed roughly to extend from 1500 to 1000 B.C.

3. The Sutras

These are compendious treatises composed in an extremely concise style of prose, dealing with Vedic ritual on the one hand, and with customary law on the other.

The main object of the Sūtras is to supply a short survey of the sum of the scattered details. They are not concerned with the interpretation of ceremonial or custom, but aim at giving a plain and methodical account of the whole course of the rites or practices with which they deal. They are marked for utmost brevity. The very name Sūtra (thread) from śīv (to sew) suggests that purpose. The language is so compressed that the wording of the most laconic telegram would appear diffuse as compared with it. The saving of a single syllable gave more pleasure to a seer than the birth of a son to a householder, naturally because it meant so much saving of energy of all concerned, for all ages. They are algebraic in form and serve as good aids to memory. Naturally they are quite unintelligible without commentaries.

THE RGVEDA

I. General Description. The Rgveda represents the most ancient poetry of the Indo-European family that has come down
to us in the form of a collection of hymns. The cause of the collection of these hymns is not practical like that of *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda*, but purely scientific and historical. The only recension which has come down to us, of Śākala school, contains 1017 hymns; and if we include the eleven Vālakhīlya hymns in the middle of the 8th book, 1028. According to the great sage Śaunaka, there are in all 10,580 mantras, 1,53,826 words and 4,32,000 syllables. These mantras have been composed in 14 different metres.

II. Arrangement. These hymns are grouped into ten books called maṇḍalas, each maṇḍala being divided into hymns (sūktas), and each hymn being further sub-divided into mantras (stanzas). The number of hymns in the first and the last book is the same, i.e., 191. The general character of the ten books is not identical.

(i) Books II-VII (called family books) form one group, because (i) each one of them is attributed in its entirety to the same family of seers and (ii) the hymns in these books are arranged on a uniform plan differing from that of the rest.

(ii) The first, eighth and tenth are the productions of different sages and their groups are arranged on the identity of authorship.

(iii) The ninth book contains hymns all of which are addressed to the single deity Soma, and its groups depend on identity of metre.

A. The Family Books (II-VII). The number of sūktas in each succeeding book is greater than the one preceding it except in two cases. These books are uniform in general character and internal arrangement. According to western scholars, they, therefore, form the nucleus of the *Ṛgveda* to which the later books were successively added.

B. In the eighth book the Kaṇva family predominates; but the prevalence in it of the strophic form of composition impresses upon it a character of its own. Moreover, its hymns are less than in the seventh. The first part (1-50) of the first book bears a close affinity to it. There also the Kaṇva family and the favourite strophic metre of the eighth book predominate. There are, moreover, parallel and also identical passages in the two collections. Their addition to the nucleus marks the second stage.
C. The ninth book was added when the first eight were complete for the simple reason that it is a collection of the hymns addressed to Soma-Pavamāna, that have been extracted from all the first eight books. These Soma-Pavamāna hymns are composed by the same families which produced Books II to VII.

D. The hymns of the tenth book undoubtedly came into being at a time when the first nine books existed, for the following reasons:

1. The author of one of its groups (20-26) begins with the opening words (Agnimile) of the first stanza which indicates that Book I existed at that time even as a combined collection.

2. It is after the Soma book.

3. The number of its hymns is equal to that of the first.

4. It is the book of recent groups and recent individual hymns. The character of its possessing individual hymns corroborates the conclusion that it is an aggregate of supplementary hymns.

5. As regards mythology, we find that the earlier deities begin to lose their hold. While the first nine books have anthropomorphic deities, the abstract notion of deities dominates in the tenth book and the deities like manas, manyu, satya, vāk and jñāna appear for the first time.

The comprehensive notion of the deities as Viśvedevāḥ increased in prominence. Other deities like Rājayakṣmaghnāṁ, Alakṣmīghnāṁ and Sapatnīghnāṁ also appear.

6. A number of hymns deal with matter quite foreign to earlier books, e.g., cosmogony, philosophical speculation¹, wedding and burial rites, spells and incantations, dialogues and the vedānta² hymns, etc.

7. Form or Linguistic Basis. (a) Vowel contractions occur much more frequently while the hiatus has grown rarer.

(b) The use of the letter l instead of r is strikingly on the increase.

(c) The declension of the nominative plural in āsas is on the decline.

1. na saddāśīt nāsat……, etc.
2. sahasrākṣā……(X. 90)
(d) Old words go out of use and others become commoner, e.g., sīm occurs only once in the tenth book, while fifty times in the rest of the Rgveda.

(e) A number of words common in the later language is only to be met with in this book, e.g., labh, kāla, Lakṣmī, evaṁ, etc.

Linguistically, therefore, the tenth maṇḍala forms a transition to the other Vedas.

III. Chronological Strata in Rgveda. Many centuries must have been required for all the hymns of the Rgveda to come into being. The poets of the older part of the Rgveda themselves mention predecessors, in whose wise they sing, whose songs they desire to renew, and speak of ancestral hymns produced in days of yore. The linguistic evidence does not help us much, but it is quite possible to distinguish differences of thought, style and poetic ability.

We have no manuscripts of the Rgveda. But the other Vedas contain the readings of the Rgveda which are considerably older than the testimony of Yāska and of the Prātiṣākhyaśas. The other Vedas are, in fact, for the criticism of the Rgveda, what manuscripts are for other literary monuments.

IV. Text Uninterpolated. There is ample evidence to show that the text of the Rgveda has not been interpolated with. The textual criticism of the Rgveda is concerned with two periods. The first represents the older period when it was handed down by oral tradition but did not yet appear in the form of Saṁhitā. It is just possible that rare changes of oral tradition may have taken place in this period. The second period is represented by the stage when it was put into Saṁhitā-form with numerous modifications of euphonic combination, e.g., the Saṁhitā-form reads tvamḥ hyagne instead of the original tvamḥ hi agne. Fortunately for us the hymns are composed in metre, and the original readings can be restored even where the rules of later Sandhi have modified them.

Except for these very few changes which do not affect the real text, we may say that the present text represents the original text of the Rgveda. Each syllable of the Rgveda bears one of the three accents—udātta, anudātta and circumflex—and it is remarkable that even in such minute details the text of the Rgveda has been preserved with the greatest care. The following
evidence will show that the text has been preserved from the remote antiquity with marvellous accuracy.

(a) *The Evidence of the Other Vedas.* The Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda and the Atharvaveda have borrowed a good deal from the Ṛgveda. In this respect, they serve as the manuscripts, and their comparison with the Ṛgveda reveals the fact that the text of the Ṛgveda is invariably the same.

(b) *The Oral Tradition.* Even before this, the text of the Ṛgveda had continued to be handed down by oral tradition. The continuity of the oral tradition was regarded as a sacred duty, and not a single syllable of the text could be tampered with. Down to the present day, we have Veda-pāṭhins, known as the Śrotarīyas, who are in a way the living manuscripts. They are authorities as far as the text of the Ṛgveda is concerned even in its minutest details. (To mention incidentally, they are authorities on pronunciation and guided by the evidence of the Prātiśākhyas we can assume that the Ṛgveda was recited in the hoary past exactly in the same way.)

(c) *The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* bears testimony to the fact that there was possibility of varying the mantras in the other Vedas, but that in the case of the Ṛgveda, the very idea had to be rejected, even when proposed by certain teachers.

(d) *The Brāhmaṇas and the Śūtras.* There occur numerous passages in the Brāhmaṇas as well as in the Śūtras (notably in the Śāṅkhāyana) mentioning the number of mantras in particular śūktas or in a particular group of śūktas. These statements agree with the extant text of the Ṛgveda.

(e) It is to be noted that while quoting the Ṛgveda, the Brāhmaṇas and the Śūtras have made certain alterations which were due exclusively to ritual technicalities. They do not in any way show the inaccuracy of the present text.

(f) *The Safeguards—Pada-pāṭha.* Numerous safeguards were taken to preserve the text in all accuracy. Considerably before Yāska and Śākalya, the author of the Aitareya Āranyaka, the pada-pāṭha was composed, analysing each word and giving it in its independent form. The importance of the pada-pāṭha becomes clear to us when we see that six mantras have not been analysed into pada-pāṭha but given over again in the Samhitā-form; and that the eleven Vālakhilya hymns are not
treated at all. On internal evidence we find that these hymns do not form the genuine part of the Ṛgveda.

(g) Krama-pāṭha. Next comes in order the krama-pāṭha which gives every word of the pada-pāṭha twice over, once in combination with the previous word, e.g., the words a, b, c, d are written as ab, bc, cd, etc.

(h) Jaṭā-pāṭha. This makes the system complex by giving it in the form ab, ba, ab, bc, cb, bc, etc.

(i) Ghana-pāṭha. Still more complex is the ghana-pāṭha which is ab, ba, abc, cba, abc; bc, cb, bcd, etc.

(j) The Prātisākhyaś are next in order. Their purpose was to point out rules for the change of the pada-pāṭha into Saṃhitā.

(k) Further, the Anukramaṇīs or the appendices saved the text from any change or error by recording the number of mantras in each sūkta, the number of sūktas, the total number of words and other numerous details, the comparison of which shows that the Rgvedic text has not been the least interpolated with. Similarly the Brhad-devatās, containing the names of the seers, etc. of the various mantras, corroborate this fact.

(l) The Vedas, since the time of their very origin, have always been held as the sacred books of the Hindus. As such, all possible precautions were taken to preserve their accuracy at all costs.

(m) The famous commentaries of Skandāsvāmin (10th century) and Sāyaṇa (14th century) are also in accord with the present text.

V. Importance of the Rgveda. The Rgveda is the most ancient literature of the Indo-European family. Its historical importance as well as the assistance rendered by it in the sphere of comparative philology cannot be overrated. Without it we would have learnt nothing definite of the primitive man and would have formed many conjectures and hypotheses without basis. The domain of comparative philology would have lacked a good deal without this book—the common heritage of the East and the West. The Sanskrit language is admittedly older than either Greek or Latin; and on examination of the Rgveda we find that its language differs from the classical Sanskrit more than the Greek of Homer does from the Attic or the English of Chaucer from modern English.

1. Poetry. Although we do not find in the Rgveda the
smooth and melodious verses of Kālidāsa, nor the deep and heart-rending emotions of Bhavabhūti, nor the polished and jingling music of Daṇḍin, nor the elaborate and highly finished art of Māgha, nor the deep significance of Bhāravi, nor the bewilderingly complex phrases of Bāṇa, yet the Rgveda possesses hymns, about some of which even the goddess of poetry can be well proud of. The freshness and beautiful imagery of the hymns addressed to the Dawn and the peculiar homeliness of the hymns addressed to Agni cannot fail to strike the heart of the sympathetic and appreciating reader.

2. Philosophy. Although there is no particular system of philosophy, nor any clear-cut solution to the problems of life like 'Who am I?' to be found in the Rgveda, yet it cannot be denied that the philosophy of the Rgveda proper, if philosophy it can be called, is much more practical and appealing. 'Give and take' is the keynote of the philosophy of the Rgveda.

3. Antiquarians' Interest. As already hinted above, the Rgveda is the oldest record of the Aryans and is, therefore, the sole means of knowing the history of the mind—culture, civilisation, social life and religion—of the primitive man living in an age of which no records, no monuments and nothing else are available except the Rgveda which fortunately, thanks to the oral tradition of the Aryans, is correct to a syllable.

4. Present Interest. The study of the Rgveda is absolutely necessary for a right understanding of India and her history even today. Our civilisation from times of old down to the present day is one homogeneous whole. Our religion, philosophy, morals, literature and social habits are all more or less based on the Rgveda. The Indian mind is even today the same as it was in the Vedic age in many respects. The influence of the Veda on our conduct has been widely recognised everywhere and at all times.

5. Rgveda and the History of the World. The contribution of Rgveda to the history of the world has been immense. To quote Max Müller, “In the history of the world, the Rgveda fills

1. cf., Bhagavadgītā, III, 11: devān bhāvayatānena te devā bhāvayantu vah parasparah bhāvayantah śreyah paramavāpsyatha.
a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill."

6. Comparative Philology. The study of the Rgveda is most important from the point of view of comparative philology. Formerly each nation thought its own dialect to be the oldest one with which to start and compare other dialects. The Rgveda has furnished a right starting point and has led to the establishment of the Indo-European family of languages. "No single circumstance," says Whitney, "more powerfully aided the onward movement than the introduction to western scholars of the Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India." Being older than Greek and Latin, Sanskrit has thrown a welcome and new light on the etymologies of words, laws of research in particular and comparative philology in general. Such being the importance of Sanskrit, still more becomes the importance of the Veda, for it is with Vedic idiom alone that we can begin the study of the Rgveda.

7. Comparative Mythology. It may be added that the study of the Rgveda is highly important for the science of comparative mythology and comparative religion, e.g., Jupiter, Zeus, Dyauhpitar.

8. Again, it is highly useful to study the growth of Sanskrit language and how words have changed their meaning in its development, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\sqrt{kup} & = \text{to move} & \text{Sanskrit} & = \text{to be angry} \\
\sqrt{ram} & = \text{to stop} & & \text{to enjoy} \\
\sqrt{sam} & = \text{to toil hard} & & \text{to rest, to be tranquil}
\end{align*}
\]

To conclude, "The chief importance of the Rgveda lies in the very extraordinary fulness of disclosures which this unique book gives to the student of philology and the history of civilization. In this no other literature is to be compared with it...... Its historical importance and its value for the history of mankind cannot be easily overrated."

VI. Age of the Rgveda. Various theories with more or less cogent arguments are held on this point. Max Müller's view is that the age of the Samhitā is about 1200 B.C. The date of the Buddha's nirvāṇa is definitely fixed as 483 B.C. He presupposes the Upaniṣads which may therefore be placed from

1. Kaegi.
800 B.C. to 600 B.C. The mantra period which precedes it may be allowed 200 years before it and the chandas period another 200 years still before. Thus we reach the probable date of 1200 B.C. Max Müller foresees the objection that 200 years is too small a period for the growth of such a wide literature. To this he answers that this has been done "under the supposition that during the early period of history, the growth of the human mind was more luxuriant than in later times, and that the layers of thought were framed less slowly in the primary than in the tertiary ages of the world." Afterwards, however, he agreed that this estimate was too low and suggested the period from 1500-1200 B.C. as the period of composition of the Vedic hymns.

An inscription from the Asia Minor, attributed to 1400 B.C., makes mention of a treaty in which gods like Indra, Mitra, Aśvinau and Varuṇa occur. These names are found in the same phonetic form. This has been cited as a proof that the Vedas would have been composed long before this. But Max Müller does not agree with this. He argues that the inscription belongs to a period when the Aryans were in the Asia Minor and had not entered India. The Vedas were composed mainly in the Punjab valley and allowing the period of 200 years for their migration the probable date for the composition of the Vedic hymns would be 1200 B.C.

Whitney and Kaegi call the period from 2000-1500 B.C. as that of the composition of the Vedic hymns. Kaegi says, "The older Indian chronology presents great difficulties. The determination of the Vedic period must be deduced from the histories of the various literatures which lie between the hymns and the fixed dates of Buddhism, from the difference in language and in the religious and social views between the former and the latter, and can therefore approximate the true period only by centuries."

2400-1400 B.C. is considered by Haug as the period of the production of the Vedic hymns.

These theories are mainly based on linguistic data. Jacobi reaches the probable date of 4000 B.C. on the strength of astronomical data. An allusion is found in the Vedic literature regarding the beginning of seasons. Noticing the change and calculating the time that should have been required for this
change he reaches the date mentioned above.

Sankar Balakrishna Dikshit has hit upon a passage in the \textit{Satapatha Brāhmaṇa} where the position of the \textit{Nakṣatras} and \textit{Kṛttikās} is alluded to. By comparing that position to the present one he concludes that \textit{Satapatha Brāhmaṇa} could not have been later than 3000 B.C. and that the \textit{Ṛgveda-saṁhitā} is older still.

Lokamanya Balagangadhar Tilak in his \textit{Orion} has suggested even a greater antiquity of the Vedic hymns. He has hit upon a \textit{mantra} where the day and the night of six months each are alluded to. He says that this could happen in the Arctic regions only in at least 6000 B.C. According to him, therefore, the age of the \textit{Ṛgveda} cannot be later than 6000 B.C.

Last but not the least is the orthodox theory which holds that the \textit{Ṛgveda} was revealed with the beginning of this universe. Traditionally this view has been held in India through the ages and is not without importance. Lord \textit{Kṛṣṇa}'s following message to Arjuna is even today a gospel truth to the Indian mind:

\begin{quote}
sahasrayugaparyantamaharyad brahmaṇo vidūḥ rātrīṁ yugasahasrāntāṁ te'horaṭravido janāḥ avyaktadvyaktayah sarvāḥ prabhavantyaharāgame rātryāgame pralīyante tatraivāvyakta saṁjñāke bhūtagrāmaḥ sa evāyaṁ bhūtvā bhūtvā pralīyate rātryāgame'vaśaḥ pārtha prabhavityaharāgame.\textsuperscript{1}
\end{quote}

According to this view, the supreme power \textit{Brahma} first of all created \textit{Brahmā}, the creator. While the former is \textit{aṅkṣara}, 'imperishable' and \textit{kālātīta}, 'beyond calculation of time', the latter is limited in time, his age being 108 years of 360 days each.\textsuperscript{2} His each day is equal to one thousand cycles of the four yugas (\textit{Satyayuga}, \textit{Tretāyuga}, \textit{Dvāparayuga} and \textit{Kaliyuga} each being equal to 4,32,000, 8,64,000, 12,96,000 and 17,28,000 respectively, to make a total of 43,20,000 years) ; similarly his each night is equal to a thousand yugas. Those who know the Reality have realised this well within their hearts. When Brahmā's day dawns, all manifestations spring from the \textit{sūkṣma} (the non-manifest) and when the night comes they vanish into

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1] \textit{Bhagavadgītā}, VIII, 17-19.
\item[2] cf., \textit{Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa}, Brahma Khaṇḍa, Adhyāya V.
\end{footnotes}
that sūkṣma (the non-manifest) again. The same multitude of beings (sa eva bhūtagrāmaḥ) is born again and again (bhūtvā bhūtvā) with the dawn and vanishes with the dusk. Accordingly when the creation started with the Brahmare’s day, the god-realised souls which had become non-manifest during the Brahmare’s night, became manifest again; they awoke, as if from slumber; and while, in meditation, they visualised and perceived directly the supreme Brahma within themselves and burst out in prayerful ecstasy. These formed the various mantras of the veda. All of them were not composed at the same time. As and when the different seers meditated, some truth revealed itself in their heart of hearts and took the form of the mantra.1 The various mantras were not ‘composed’ by them, but they were ‘seen’ by them, cf. ṭṣayāḥ mantradraṣṭāraḥ; ṭṣīḥ darśanāt; sāksīt kṛta dharmāna ṭṣayo babhūvah, etc.

For ages, these mantras passed from one lineage to another by oral tradition and were hence known as śruti. All Indian faiths are agreed that the vedic mantras are the supreme authority to govern the conduct of mankind.2 The ṛcāḥ, yajūniṣi, sāmāni and atharvāni continued side by side, till at long last, according to the needs of time, they were arranged into the four samhitās called the Rgveda-samhitā, Yajurveda-samhitā, Sāmaveda-samhitā and Atharvaveda-samhitā, by the mighty seer Vyāsa.

The above calculations of time may appear as fantastic to a modern mind because the same is not gifted with the develop-

1. Brahmareśvara samudbhavaḥ.
2. cf., purāṇam mānavo dharmaḥ sāṅgo vedacikitatarām ājñā sidhāṇi catvāri na hantavyāni hetubhiḥ
   kiṃca
   śrutistu vedo vijñeyo dharmaśāstraṁ tu vai smṛtiḥ
te sarvārtheṣvamāṁsyate tābhyām dharma hi nirbāhau
yo’vamanyeta te tuhe hetuśastraśrayo dvijāḥ
sa sādhubhirbahiṣkāryo nāstiko vedanindakaḥ
vedaḥ smṛtiḥ sadācāraḥ svasya ca priyamātmanaḥ
etaccaturvidhaṁ prāhuḥ sākṣād dharmasya lakṣaṇaṁ
apitum
   yaṁ kaścit kasya ciddharmo manunā samprakīrtitaṁ
sa sarvobhihi hito vede sarvajñatamayo hi saḥ
sarvantu samavekṣyanāṁ nikhilam jñānaacaksuṣā
   śruti prāmāṇyātō vīdvān svadharme niviṣeta vai
ment of sūkṣma talents, but to a spiritual mind it is all crystal-clear as day-light. Theories of learned scholars and human observation may vary from time to time, from country to country and from nation to nation, but the revelations embodied in these mantras are eternal. No definite date can be assigned to them for the simple reason that they are pre-historic. As regards the age of the Śamhitā text, it may be further added that the Śamhitā text did not come into existence till after the completion of Brāhmaṇas, because

(1) the Brāhmaṇas contain a number of direct statements regarding the number of syllables in a word or a group of words, which are at variance with the Śamhitā text owing to the vowel contractions made in the latter;
(2) the older part of the Brāhmaṇas shows hardly any speculations of phonetic questions connected with the Vedic text;
(3) the older explanatory Brāhmaṇas do not show any acquaintance with such a Śamhitā, whereas the later do, as do also the early philosophical Upaniṣads.

VII. Interpretation of Rgveda. According to Śāṅkhyaśāstra creation is threefold:—adhyātmaḥdibhūtāmahidevaṃca; soul, destructible world and gods.1 Accordingly, the vedic mantras carry threefold interpretation in accordance with the attitude of the reader. More stress has, however, been generally laid on the physical interpretation. In other words, we may say that the abhidhā-śakti has been given prominence and the lakṣaṇā-śakti and vyañjanā-śakti of the mantras generally ignored. The following are the essential qualifications of a Vedic scholar in order to arrive at a correct interpretation of the mantras:—

(1) A deep study of the Brāhmaṇas which serve as dictionaries and commentaries of the Vedas.
(2) An adequate knowledge of the six vedāṅgas.2
(3) A thorough realisation of the underlying principles of Indian philosophy.
(4) A thorough grasp of the natural environments and Indian way of life.

1. Śūtras, 3-4.
2. cf., śikṣā vyākaranāṁ chando niruktāṁ jyotiṣaṁ tathā
ekalpaśceti saṅgaṁi vedasyāhurmaniśitaṁ
The following are the desirable qualifications.

(1) A study of the commentaries of the different scholars, e.g., Sāyāṇa, Svami Dayananda, etc.

(2) A study of the relevant portions of the Purāṇas, Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā and Dharmaśāstras. They are based upon the Vedas and have, by large, carried the underlying spirit and the tradition of the Vedas further. All of them regard the Vedas as the supreme authority.

(3) An insight into comparative mythology.

(4) A study of comparative philology.

It will be readily admitted that while the western scholars had a good advantage in some of the desirable qualifications, they generally lacked in the essential qualifications. Accordingly they arrived at fanciful and incorrect notions about the religion and philosophy of the Vedas, e.g., in spite of abundant internal evidence to the contrary, it has been generally held by them that the Aryans worshipped not one, but numerous Gods. It is just like saying that Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyaṇa had many wives, namely Sītā, Jānakī, Vaidehi and Maithili, etc. No real scholar of the Vedas would ever entertain such fanciful notions with veneration.

After Yāska there were several commentators of the Rgveda who have carried the tradition from century to century, e.g., Skandavāmī (A.D. 600), Mādhavabhaṭṭa (9th century. A.D.), Venkata-mādhava (11th century A.D.), Ānanda-tīrtha, Jayatīrtha, Śrīnīvāsa-tīrtha, Mādhava or Mādhavārya (author of Rgarthadipikā), Sāyāṇa (author of Vedārthaprakāśa about A.D. 1350), Uḍgītā-cārya, Devarāja Yajvan, Bhaṭṭa Bhāṣkara, Govindavāmin, and Śaḍguru Śīṣya. Last but not the least Dayananda’s etymological method is a useful contribution to Vedic interpretation. All have held that the Aryans believed in ‘One Reality’ known

1. Wilson was of the view that the voluminous commentary of Sāyāṇa (14th century) which referred to the various scholars of yore and which explains or paraphrases every word should be regarded as authority for the interpretation of the Rgveda.

2. purāṇanyāya mīmāṁsā dharmaśāstraṇgamiśrītōḥ 
vedāḥ sthānāni vidyānāṁ dharmaśya ca caturdāsa
(Yājñavalkya-smṛti, I.3).

3. cf, ekaṁ sad viprā bahudhā vadyantyagnīṁ yamantī mātariśvānamāhūḥ
(Rgveda, I.164).
as Brahma. The various so-called gods, Agni, Indra, Varuṇa, Yama and Rudra, etc., are its different manifestations which the great seers realised in meditation and through whom they worshipped the one and the same ultimate reality.

VIII. Religion and Philosophy of the Rgveda. The Vedic seers believed in the Karma theory and the transmigration of soul. Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa (Righteous duty, prosperity, position and finally salvation, i.e., emancipation from the bondage of re-birth and re-death) are the fourfold supreme goals of human existence. As you sow, so shall you reap; consequently good actions result in happiness, bad actions in misery and mixed ones partly in pleasure and partly in sorrow. No one can live without action. Just as some seeds fructify in a few days, while others in some years, some actions yield results immediately while others in the next birth. But just as roasted seeds do not fructify, desireless selfless actions do not bear any fruit. The goal of salvation is the most supreme one. It is not impossible but most difficult to attain. One in a million may rightly comprehend the ‘Ultimate Reality’, by resorting to constant spiritual practice (abhyāsa) and extreme dispassion (vairāgya) in many lives; but the spiritual practice of others also, who pursue this El dorado, does not go in vain. They attain higher and higher lives, more sublime than the previous ones. Such were the god-realised seers to whom the Vedas were revealed. They had not attained salvation but were certainly on the way to it. They then were gifted with the spiritual attainments of their previous births, and in moments of their supreme meditation the significance of the True Reality dawned upon them. They realised that the only way to

1. cf., manuṣyāṇāṁ sahasreṣu kaścidyatati siddhaye
   yañatāmapi siddhānāṁ kaścinmāṁ vetti tattvataḥ.
   bhūnāṁ Janmanāmante jñānāvānāmāṁ propadyate.—Bhagavadgītā,
   VII. 3 & 19.

   abhyāsena tu kaunteya vairāgyeṇa ca grhyate.—ibid., VI. 35.
   abhyāsa vairāgyābyāṁ tannirodhaḥ.—Pāṭahjala-yogaśūtra, I. 13.

2. cf., pṛṣṭya puṣya kṛtaṁ lokānuṣitvā śāśvatiḥ samāṁ
   sūcīnāṁ śramitaṁ gehe yogabhrāṣṭo' bhijāyate
   athavā yogināmeva kule bhavati dhīmatāṁ
   etadādi durlabhataṁ loke Janma yadīrṣaṁ.—Bhagavadgītā,
   VI.41-2.

3. tatra tāṁ buddhiṣāṁyogam labhate paurva-dehikaṁ.—ibid., VI. 43.
salvation was the performance of desireless unselfish actions, which they call by the name of yajña. All other actions bear fruit and entangle a person into the cycle of re-birth. As the actions are innumerable, so the yajñas too are of various types, e.g., daiva-yajña, brahma-yajña, sāmyama-yajña, indriya-yajña, ātmassānyama-yoga-yajña, dravya-yajña, tapo-yajña, yoga-yajña, svādhīyāya-yajña, jñāna-yajña, apāna-yajña, prāna-yajña, kumbhaka-yajña, japa-yajña and prāṇāgni-hotra-yajña. Manusmṛti has enjoined upon every householder the daily performance of the following five Mahāyajñas, viz., brahma-yajña, pītṛ-yajña, daiva-yajña, bhūta-yajña and nṛ-yajña. Similarly various types of yajñas are mentioned in the Veda, e.g., āsvamedha, ajamedha, gomedha, vājapeya, puruṣamedha and sarvamedha, etc. Many scholars have felt that this refers to the killing of the various types of animals in the sacrifices performed by the Aryans. Some have doubted whether killing of human beings actually existed in the Vedic times. This view is certainly against the evidence of the epics and the Dharmaśāstras, cf.,

surā matsyā madhu māṁsamāsavaṁ kṛṣa raudanaṁ
dhūrtaṁ pravartitam hyetannaitad vedeṣu kalpitam
mānāṁ mohāccha lobhacca laulyametat prakalpitam
vṛṣṇum evābhiṣānanti sarva yajñeshu brāhmaṇāḥ
pāyasaṁ āśām obhiscam tasyāpi yajanaṁ sūrtaṁ
yajñīyaścaiva ye vṛksa vedeṣu parikalpitūḥ

These malpractices were certainly not enjoined by the Vedas. They may have been started by the greedy and the selfish people out of delusion or avarice. According to Dharmaśāstras the Brāhmaṇas worship the deity with milk-preparations and flowers and the fuel of trees enjoined in the Vedas. Further it is clearly laid down:

"īṣṭayajñēṣu yaṣṭavyamitī vā vaidikī śrutih
ajasaṁjñāni bijāni cchāgam no hantumahatha
naiṣa dharmah satāṁ devā yatra vadhjeta vai paśuḥ."
According to Vedic tradition, sacrifices have to be performed with seeds only. *Aja* refers to a kind of seeds. Goat should not be killed. Killing of animals is not the sacred duty of the good.

In the Upaniṣads we come across references like *kāmaḥ paśuḥ; manyuh paśuḥ*. They are verily the deadly enemies of an aspirant after truth. Lord Krṣṇa asked Arjuna to kill this animal in man which is the destroyer of all higher knowledge. In short, the entire life of an Ārya should be *yajñamaya*. The performance of sacrificial rites was its one form which was given more emphasis in the Veda. To impart dignity and picturesqueness to the whole performance it was made more and more elaborate. While offering oblations to the fire, it was clearly said by the Yajvan, *idamagnaye na mama, idaṁ varuṇāya na mama, idamindrāya na mama*, etc. (This is for Agni, nothing of me. Thir is for Varuṇa, nothing of me. This is for Indra, nothing of me; etc.).

Sacrifice is known as *iṣṭakāmadhuk*. Performed with faith (*śraddhā*), it fulfils desires cherished by the Yajvan. Accordingly it became more and more popular with all sorts of persons, whether they wanted salvation or heaven or worldly pleasures.

Simplicity and sincerity are the dominating characteristics of the Vedic hymns. Heart speaks to heart in them and there is no place for the cold formalism and artificial elaborateness.

Such melancholy ideas as ‘this life is a dream, and the worldly existence is unsubstantial; death is nature, life is an accident’ are conspicuous by their absence in the *Ṛgveda*. The Vedic religion is all optimistic.

According to many scholars, the chief trait of the Vedic religion is what is called Henotheism or Kathenotheism. It consists in the tendency to raise the particular god to the most exalted and unsurpassed position, to whom all other gods are subordinate for the moment. This is explained by the fact that the seers believed in one ‘Ultimate Reality’. Whatever the

---

1. *kāma eṣa krodha eṣa rajoguṇasamudbhavaḥ mahāśano mahāpāpmā viddheyanamīha vairiṇaṁ.—Bhagavadgīta*, III. 37

2. *pāṃpaṇaṁ prajahi hyenaṁ jñānaviṣṇananāṣanaṁ.—ibid., III. 41*

3. Sacrifice connotes *tyāga* and not murder, e.g., self-sacrifice means the *tyāga* of self and not self-suicide.
manifestation, they praised it to the highest because it was one and the same supreme power.

IX. Subject-matter of the Rgveda. In addition to the prayer-hymns, there are about twelve dialogue-hymns which indicate the course of the action and refer to past events. According to western scholars, these hymns foreshadow the dramatic and epic poetry of later times.

Magical Hymns. There are also about twelve magical hymns, which consist of spells directed against disease, vermin, enemies or other injurious agencies.

Secular Hymns. About 20 poems in the Rgveda have a more or less secular character. They deal with social customs; the liberality of patrons, ethical questions, riddles and cosmogonic speculations. One of the most noteworthy is the long wedding hymn (X. 85).

Funeral Hymns. From the five hymns concerned with funeral rites, it appears that though burial was occasionally practised in Vedic times, cremation was the usual manner of disposing of the dead. The later Vedic ritual practically recognised this method alone. In accordance with a custom of remotest antiquity still surviving in India, the dead person was provided with ornaments and clothing for use in the future life. Though not recognised by the Rgveda, widow-burning, says Macdonell, survived among military chiefs from Indo-European times.

The Gambler’s Lament. A beautiful poem on the gambler’s lament goes to prove the antiquity of gambling.

Three of the secular poems are of a didactic character, and may be regarded as forerunners of the sententious poetry which flourished so luxuriantly in classical Sanskrit literature.

Cosmogonic Hymns. Six or seven hymns deal with the problem of the origin of the world. These early speculations are very interesting as the sources of divergent streams of later thoughts. The Puruṣa-sūkta (X. 90) describes everything as evolving out of the Puruṣa. ‘Puruṣa is all this world; what has been and what shall be.’ This hymn thus represents the oldest product of the pantheistic literature of India. Puruṣa hymn is one of the very latest poems of the Rgveda; it presupposes a knowledge of the three oldest Vedas, to all of which it refers by name, besides mentioning the four castes for the
first and only time in the *Rgveda*.

Two other cosmogonic hymns advance the theory that the waters produced the first germ of things. The other two explain the origin of the world philosophically as the evolution of the existent *sat* from the non-existent *asat*.

*The Song of Creation* (X. 29), a poem of great literary merit is noteworthy as the starting point of the natural philosophy which in later times assumed the form of the evolutionary Sāṁkhya system. This hymn advances the theory that after the non-existent had developed into the existent, first came water, whence intelligence was evolved by heat. The Brāhmaṇas agree with this theory.

The cosmogonic hymns of the *Rgveda* are the precursors not only of Indian philosophy, but also of the Purāṇas, one of the main objects of which is to describe the origin of the world.

**XI. Recensions of Rgveda.** The *Carana-vyūha*, a supplementary work of the Sūtra period mentions five, the Śākalas, the Vāśkalas, the Āśvalāyanas, the Śāṅkhāyanas and the Māṇḍūkyas. The third and the fourth of these schools almost resemble the first, a slight difference being in the arrangement of the Vālakhiliya hymns. The last school, if ever it possessed an independent character, lost all its traces at an early period and no information of any kind about it is preserved. The Vāśkalas differed from the Śākalas in admitting eight additional hymns and assigning a different position to a group in the first book. In this respect it compares unfavourably with the extant text. Thus it is evident that the Śākalas not only possessed the best tradition of the text of the *Rgveda*, but handed down the only recension, in the true sense, which as far as we can tell, ever existed.
left unmarked). This is one of the four systems of accentuation.

XII. Vedic Metre. There are about 15 different metres. Only seven of them are frequent and three among them are commonest, claiming together four-fifths of the total number of stanzas in the Rgveda.

The Vedic metrical unit is called pāda (foot) which means a line. Each pāda consists of 8, 11, or 12 syllables, and each stanza contains three or four pādas.

1. Gāyatrī metre consists of three lines of eight syllables each, the last four of each being iambically arranged. Nearly one-fourth (2,450) of the total number of mantras is in this metre, e.g.,

\[ \text{agnimīle purohitām} \\
\text{yajñasyā devamṛtviyām} \\
\text{hotāram ratnadhātaman.} \]

2. Anuṣṭubh consists of four lines of eight syllables each. It is used in mantras amounting to one-third of those of the Gāyatrī metre. In the post-Vedic period Gāyatrī tends to disappear and Anuṣṭubh becomes prominent.

3. Jagati is four lines of 12 syllables each.

4. Triṣṭubh is of four lines of 11 syllables each. Two-fifths of the Rgveda is in this metre.

5. Pragāthā is a strophic type in which one group consists of the mantras of mixed metre. It is mostly found in Book VIII.

Prof. Arnold has arrived at four periods in the gradual historical development of Rgveda on the basis of its metres.

(1) The Bardic Period or the period of originality, to which belong hymns of Books VI and VII and some others.

(2) The Normal Period in which perfection rather than originality of form is the aim, to which belong hymns of Books III, IV and IX where Triṣṭubh and Gāyatrī are exclusively employed.

(3) The Cretic Period where almost Triṣṭubh and Jagati metres are employed, and the Cretic rhythm is favoured, to which belong many of the hymns of Book I and a few of Book X. This is a period of transition.

(4) The Popular Period to which belong a large number of

---

1. A few older hymns with verses of eight syllables show a trochaic cadence (Kaegi).
hymns of Book X, and of which the contamination of a Triṣṭubh hymn by Jagatī is the characteristic.

THE LATER VEDAS: SAMAVEDA

I. Relation with other Vedas. It resembles most closely the Rgveda. All its mantras except 75 have been taken from Book VIII and IX of the Rgveda. The order, however, is modified on the model of the Yajurveda, the reason being that the hymns are intended for chanting. Their utility consists in their ritual application.

II. Form. In form these mantras appear in the text of the Sāmaveda as if they were to be spoken or recited, differing from those of the Rgveda only in the way of marking the accent. The Sāmaveda therefore is only the book of words employed by the special class of Udgātṛ priests at the soma sacrifice. Its mantras assume their proper character of musical sāmans or chants only in the various song-books called gānas. They are four in number, two belonging to each division of the Veda. Each mantra can be chanted in innumerable ways.

III. Division and Scope. The Sāmaveda is divided into two-books called ārcikas. The first, i.e., the Pūrvārcika also known as Chandaṃ, Chandaśī or Chandasikā is divided into six and the second into nine Prapāṭhakas (lessons). Each Prapāṭhaka of the first consists of ten decades of mantras except the 6th which has nine. The mantras are addressed to Agni (12 decades), Indra (36 decades) and Soma (11 decades) respectively.

Each decade of Book II is divided into sometimes two and generally three sections. The peculiarity of the Uttarārcika (also called ūha and rahasya) is that generally three verses are grouped together and form one ṛk, and the first of them occurs in the Pūrvārcika (also known as Prakṛti). The second book refers to the following seven topics in order, Daśarātra, Sāṁvatsara, Ekāha, Ahīna, Satra, Prāyaścitta and Kṣudra. The total number of mantras is 1549. There are two prominent modes of chanting. One has to do with only three notes but the other has to do with as many as seven notes.

IV. Internal Date. The second book (Uttarārcika) is both later in date and secondary in character, because:

(1) It repeats mantras from the first book.
(2) It deviates very little from the text of the *Ṛgveda*.
(3) The verses of the first book which recur in the second agree more closely with the readings of the *Ṛgveda* than the other verses by which they are surrounded.

V. Comparative Date. (i) Some statements of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* show that the first book of the *Sāmaveda* existed at least as early as the second part of that Brāhmaṇa;

(ii) As a collection, *Sāmaveda* is earlier than the Taittirīya and Vājasaneyī recensions of the *Yajurveda*. The latter contain verses used also as Śāma chants, in a form which shows the variations of the *Sāmaveda* in contrast with the *Ṛgveda*.

It may be noted that the various readings of the *Sāmaveda* are due partly to inferior traditions and partly to the adopted readings for the sake of singing. Prof. Weber's theory that they contain archaic forms as compared with the *Ṛgveda* and that they were therefore borrowed at a time before the existing redaction of the *Ṛgveda* took place has been shown to be untenable.

VI. Commentaries. Among the famous commentators of the *Sāmaveda* may be enumerated Śāyaṇa, Mādhava (the author of *Vivaraṇa*) and Mahāsvāmin and Bharatāsvāmin.

VII. Recensions. Among the thousand recensions only three are now available, viz., Rāṇāyanīya, Kauthuma and Jaiminīya (also called Talavakāra).

(1) Rāṇāyanīya (Hyderabad).\(^1\) It contains text along with translation and glossary. Later it was published along with Śāyaṇa's commentary. It was the first Veda edited in its entirety. A critical edition of the same has now been brought out by the famous Vedic scholar Satyavrata Śāmaśrami.

(2) Kauthuma (Gujarat). Nothing has been preserved except the 7th *prapāthaka* (ed. 1868) and two indices of the deities and composers of the *Sāmaveda*. According to Naigeya school, it supplies us with an indirect information about the text of the *Ṛgveda*.

(3) Jaiminīya. This recension was prevalent in Karnataκa. There is nothing particularly noteworthy about it.

---

THE YAJURVEDA

Chief Characteristics.—(i) *Yajurveda* introduces us to a new geographical area and a new epoch of religious and social life in India as different from the *Rgveda*. According to western scholars, the centre of activity appears to have changed from Panjab proper to Kurukṣetra (the holy-land, Brahmāvarta venerated even in the *Manusmṛti*, and the centre of Brahmanism), and the Paścāla country, the Yamunā-Gaṅgā-Doab, and Mathurā, the capital of the Matsyas.

(ii) It comprises the hymns taken from the *Rgveda* and explanatory prose-passages of the same from the ritualistic aspect. Hence this Veda is partly in verse and partly in prose. From a linguistic point of view, this serves as the oldest specimen of the Vedic prose.

(iii) This Veda has two main divisions, namely Šukla-*Yajurveda* and Kṛṣṇa-*Yajurveda*. Šukla-*Yajurveda* is not intermingled with explanatory prose-passages and is known for its well-arranged plan of the hymns. The name is significant because of its having been revealed by the sun. On the other hand, Kṛṣṇa-*Yajurveda* is intermingled with explanatory prose-passages about the performance of the sacrificial rites and its contents are not properly arranged.

Šukla-*Yajurveda* (Vajasaneyi Samhita). This Veda was taught by Vājasaneyya (otherwise known as Yājñavalkya) to his fifteen pupils. He was the son of Vājasani (Vāja=food, sani=offering, i.e., he who had the offering of food¹). Hence this Samhitā came to be known as *Vājasaneyi-samhitā*.² Kaṇva and Mādhyandina were his two prominent pupils and through them arose the two important recensions of this Veda, known as Kaṇva-śākha and Mādhyandina-śākha. These two recensions are almost identical in subject-matter and in arrangement. Small divergences exist in prose part. These small discrepancies are due to geographical changes, since each has its own peculiarities of spelling. It has forty chapters (adhyāyas), each of which is further sub-divided into kaṇḍikās

¹. It is a ample proof of the fact that the killing of animals was never intended to be resorted to, in the sacrifices ordained in this Veda.

². The followers of the Vajasaneyī school occupy at present a wide area, embracing north-east and central India.
which number 1975 in all.

A. Contents. (a) 1-25 adhyāyas contain the formulas for the general sacrificial ceremonial as under:
   1-2—new and full moon sacrifices.
   3—morning and evening fire sacrifices.
   4-8—Soma-yajña.
   9-10—Two modifications of the same.
   11-18—Construction of altars for the sacred fires.
   19-21—for the Sautrāmaṇī, to expiate the evil effects of too much indulgence in soma-drink.
   22-25—Aśvamedha.
   (b) 26-40—khila or supplement (Uvaṭa and Mahidhara also point out as such).
   26-29—Sacrificial formulas repeated.
   30-39—New sacrifices such as Puruṣa-medha, Sarva-medha, Pūrmedha and Pravargya appear.
   40—Īśāvāsyopaniṣad.

Prof. Max Müller says: “In this stifling atmosphere of perpetual sacrifice and ritual the truly religious spirit of the Rgveda could not possibly survive. Adoration of the powers, and beneficence ‘of the gods, as well as the consciousness of guilt is entirely lacking.”

B. Original Text. The original text consists of the first 18 adhyāyas only.

1. External Evidence. (a) This is the only portion containing verses and prose-formulas which almost recur in the Taittiriya-saṁhitā.

   (b) The contents of the last 22 Chapters are found again only in the Brāhmaṇa and the Āranyaka belonging to the Taittiriya-saṁhitā.

   (c) It is only this portion which is quoted and explained word for word in the first nine books of its own Brāhmaṇa. Only a few mantras from the 17 Chapters are mentioned in that work.

   (d) According to the ancient index of the Śukla-Yajurveda attributed to Kātyāyana, the ten chapters (26-35) form a supplement (khila). Uvaṭa and Mahidhara also point out the same.

2. Internal Evidence. (a) Chapters 26-29 are of a supple-
mentary character, because they contain *mantras* relating to sacrifices dealt with in the previous chapters.

(b) Chapters 30-39 deal with altogether new sacrifices, e.g., *Puruṣamedha, Sarvamedha*, etc.

c) Chapter 40 is a late addition because it bears the character of an Upaniṣad.

d) Chapter 39 makes mention of two additional qualities of *Rudra*, viz., *Īśāna* and *Mahādeva*, absent in a similar passage in Chapter 16.

e) Chapter 30 specifies most of the Indian mixed castes while the 16th Chapter mentions only a few of them.

Accordingly we arrive at the following chronological strata in this *Saṁhitā*:

- **Stage I.** Chap. 1-18 original
- **Stage II.** Chap. 19-25 dealing with the old (26-29) or new (30-39) ceremonies.
- **Stage III.** Chap. 26-39
- **Stage IV.** Chap. 40 *Īśavasyopanisad*.

It will be observed that even the original portion of the *Sukla-Yajurveda* must have assumed shape somewhat later than any of the recensions of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*, as appears from its more systematic separation and distribution of the matter.

C. Commentators. Among its famous commentators may be enumerated Harîsvamī (7th century A.D.), Udaya (850 A.D.), Uvaṭa (11th century A.D.), Mahîdhara (also known as Mahîdâsa) and Sîyâna.

**Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda.** The *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda* has come down to us in the following four important recensions:

1. *Kāthaka-saṁhitā*.
2. *Kapiśhala-Kaṭha-saṁhitā*—It is available in fragments only.
3. *Maitrāyaṇi-saṁhitā* (also known as *Kālāpa-saṁhitā*).
4. *Taittirīya-saṁhitā*.

All these recensions agree in arranging their matter according to a common principle different from that of the *Vājasaneyi-saṁhitā*. In its fundamental portions, even the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda* does not intermingle the *Yajumśī* with their explanation, e.g., the

---

1. cf., *yajati yajate va amena iti yaj + usī = yajuḥ*, i.e., the *mantra* which prescribes the mode of worship.
first four lessons of Book I, and the Book IV of the Taittirīya-
saṃhitā and the lessons 1-13 of the Maitrāyaṇī-saṃhitā 
(excluding 4-6) furnish a parallel recension of the correspond-
ing parts of the Vājasaneyī-saṃhitā.

The first three recensions mentioned above are known by 
the comprehensive term Caraka. These are closely related in 
language, having many forms in common, which are not found 
elsewhere. They were widely known before the beginning of 
the Christian era. Patañjali speaks of the Kāthakas and the 
Kālāpas as the universally-known schools of the Yajurveda. The 
Rāmāyana mentions that these schools were highly honoured 
in Ayodhyā. Gradually they were ousted by the followers of the 
Taittirīya and Vājasaneyī recensions. The Kāthaka-saṃhitā is 
now prevalent in Kashmir and the Maitrāyaṇī in the country 
near the Narmada from Nasik to Baroda, more particularly at 
Ahmedabad.

*The Maitrāyaṇī-saṃhitā has four kāṇḍas, sub-divided into 
54 prapāṭhakas. It was first edited by L. V. Schroeder 
(1881-86).

The Taittirīya-saṃhitā is now the most important of these 
Saṃhitās. It has come down to us in two schools, namely 
Āpastambha (in the territory round the Godāvari) and 
Hiranyakñēśin (further south). It contains seven books (aṣṭakas 
or kāṇḍas) containing from five to eight lectures (adhyāya, 
praśna or prapāṭhakas) each, total being 44. It was first edited 
by A. Weber in 1871-72. Each lecture is sub-divided into 
anuvākas. The first anuvāka corresponds with the first kāṇḍikā 
of the Vājasaneyī (Śukla-Yajurveda) but all the rest differ and so 
does the arrangement of the subjects. Many of the topics are 
indeed alike in both the Saṃhitās, but they are differently placed and differently treated. Consecrated fire is the subject 
of Books IV and V. Book VII treats of the Jyotiśṭoma including 
the forms of preparing and drinking the soma juice.

Commentaries. Among the famous commentators of the 
Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda may be enumerated Sāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara 
Kapardīsvamī, Bhavasvamī (A.D. 1300) and Guhadeva.

Date. As Bloomfield observes, “the Yajurveda is a later 
collection in the main, though it contains much substance that 
is old, old enough indeed, to be prehistoric. But like all 
other Vedic collections, its redaction, at any rate, presupposes
the Rgveda. The yajûṃṣi or formulas in prose which form the characteristic element of this Veda are unquestionably the oldest prose on record in the literature of the Indo-European peoples."

THE ATHARVAVEDA

As a source of the history of civilisation, the Atharvaveda is quite as important and interesting as the Rgveda itself.

(a) According to western scholars, the Atharvaveda represents the backward notions of the masses, as opposed to the advanced religious views of the Rgveda.

(b) Its witchcraft is more primitive than that of the Rgveda, some of its spells being doubtless of prehistoric antiquity.

(c) In amount of theosophic matter, it exceeds all the other Samhitās.

Traditional View about its Origin. The Atharvaveda is variously known as Atharvaṅgiras, Bhrgvaṅgiras and Brahmadeva. According to a legend of the Gopatha-brāhmaṇa1 which is a Brāhmaṇa of the Atharvaveda, Brahmā the Creator, performed a severe penance, as a consequence of which two lustrous sages were produced namely, Atharvan and Āṅgiras. The sage Atharvan was also known as Bhrugu. Hence the mantras which were revealed to them or their descendants came to be known as Atharvaveda, Bhrgvaṅgiras and Atharvaṅgiras. It came to be known as Brahmadeva also, because (1) the mantras in this Veda are called Brāhmaṇi, (2) there is enough matter which deals with the realisation of Brahma and attainment of the mokṣa.

Scope and Subject-matter. The Atharvaveda is divided into twenty kāṇḍas, which are further sub-divided into 48 prapāṭhakas containing 764 sūktas and 6,000 mantras. According to some scholars, the holy magic mantras which were used to overcome disease and for defensive purposes referred to Atharvan and the magic mantras which were applied for offensive and destructive purposes (technically known as māraṇa and uccāṭana) referred to Āṅgiras. The word Atharvan occurs in the Rgveda also. During the Brāhmaṇa period, the sages who worshipped fire were known as Atharvans and during the

Sūtra period, all priests came to be known as Atharvans.

Recensions. There were nine recensions of this veda, namely Śaunakīya, Paippalāda, Jāmala, Tottāyana, Dāmoda, Carṇāvidyā, Devadarśi, Brahmapālāsa and Kunaravā, out of which the first two only have been preserved. The Śaunakīya recension is well-known. It was commented upon by Śāyaṇa (A.D. 1400) and has been lately edited by S. P. Pandit. (A.D. 1890), Roth, Whitney and Bloomfield. The Paippalāda recension has been preserved in a single manuscript.

Prominent Sages. The prominent sages of the Atharvaveda are Kaṇva, Bāderāyaṇa, Kaśyapa, Kakṣivān, Viśvāmitra, Agastya, Jamadagni, Purunidha and Vāmadeva.

THE BRAHMĀNAS

The creative period of the Vedas came at length to an end. The Vedas had laid great stress upon the performance of yajñas. To impart dignity and grandeur to the whole show, it was necessary to chalk out minute details. Hence arose the need for the Brāhmaṇas which record a ritual system far surpassing in complexity of detail anything the world has elsewhere known.

The Brāhmaṇas [the books dealing with devotion or prayer (brahman)] are theological treatises laying much stress upon the application of Vedic hymns and formulas to the innumerable details of the sacrifice. They also serve as commentaries on the difficult portions of the Vedas. They are entirely in prose. The Taittirīya- and Sañ̄apatha-brāhmaṇas are accented like the Vedas. They represent the oldest prose-writing of the Indo-European family. Their main purpose is to explain the mutual relations of the sacred text and the ceremonial, as well as their symbolical meaning with reference to each other.

Their Contents and Importance. They interweave exegetical, linguistic and etymological observations, and introduce myths and philosophical speculations in confirmation of their cosmogonic and theosophic theories. They contain pedantic discussions full of sacerdotal and even exaggerated conceits. They are the oldest treatises on ritual practices extant in any literature, and hence are of great interest to the student of the history of the religion in general, and of Indian antiquity in particular. They also contain some important legends and many striking.
thoughts.¹ "Since the Brāhmaṇas furnish the oldest prescriptions for the ritual and explanation of the language, as well as the oldest traditions and philosophical speculations, they are not without value for the history of language and civilization; but the gold is largely hidden under a mass of dross."²

Contrast between the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas. 1. The Vedas are poetical in matter and form; the Brāhmaṇas are prosaic and written in prose.

2. The thought of the Vedas is on the whole natural and concrete; that of the Brāhmaṇas artificial and abstract.

3. The chief significance of the Vedas lies in their mythology; that of the Brāhmaṇas in their ritual.

Subject-matter. The Brāhmaṇas are attached to the various Vedas and their subject-matter varies accordingly. The Brāhmaṇas of the Rgveda limit themselves to the explanation of the duties of the hotra of the rks. They follow more or less the order of the ritual irrespective of the succession of the hymns in the Veda itself. The Brāhmaṇas of the Sāmaveda are concerned with the duties of the udgātr of the sāmans, and those of the Yajurveda explain the duties of the adhvarya, the sacrificer. These Brāhmaṇas follow the order of their respective Vedas, which are already arranged in the ritual sequence. The Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda rarely explains any individual verses, while that of the Yajurveda practically forms a running commentary on all the verses of the text.

General Growth. In course of time, the Brāhmaṇas came to be regarded as śruti (revelation). The sphere of revelation also included Āranyakas, ‘forest books’ (meant to be studied in the solitude of forest). The latter form the later portions of the Brāhmaṇas. The final part of these, again, are philosophical books named Upaniṣads. The pantheistic ground-work of their doctrine was later developed into the Vedānta system.

Brāhmaṇas of the Rgveda. The Aitareya-brāhmaṇa and the Kaushitaki-brāhmaṇa (also called Sānikhyāyana-brāhmaṇa) belong to the Rgveda. The former contains 40 chapters and

---

¹ The poetic value of these stories and legends may be judged from the fact that they remain stock-themes for the Sanskrit poets of later times, e.g., Pururavas-Urvasī legend.
² Kaegi.
the latter 30 chapters.

**Brāhmaṇaś of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurvedā.** All the three Saṃhitās of *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda* contain prose-portions which form the most important Brāhmaṇaś:

(1) Of the *Taittirīya-saṃhitā*, the prose-portions form the oldest Brāhmaṇa. Besides, there is one independent *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* supplemented by *Taittirīya-āranyaka*, the last four sections of which Āranyaka constitute the two Upaniṣads, the *Taittirīya* and the *Mahānārāyaṇa* (also known as *Yājñikī*). In matter, the *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* is analogous to its Saṃhitā and is rather a continuation of the same in three books.

(2) Of the *Kāṭhaka-saṃhitā*, there is no independent Brāhmaṇa extant. From the internal evidence of the *Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa* it appears, however, that the last three sections of Book III and the first two sections of the *Taittirīya-āranyaka* belonged to this school. In these sections is told the story of a boy Naciketas which forms the basis of the *Kāṭhaka-upaniṣad*. Moreover, in these sections *y* and *v* are not changed into *iy* and *uv* as in the rest of the Brāhmaṇa.

(3) Of the *Maitrāyani-saṃhitā* also, there is no independent Brāhmaṇa. Its fourth book, however, consists of explanations and supplements to the first three books and has the character of a special Brāhmaṇa. There is, however, one *Maitrāyani-upaniṣad* belonging to this Saṃhitā.

**Brāhmaṇaś of the Śukla-Yajurveda.** To the *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā* belongs the *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* which has come down to us in two recensions of the Mādhyanandinās and the Kāṇva. As its name indicates, it contains 100 *adhyāyas*. The Mādhyanandina recension contains 14 books and the other 17 books. It has its own Āranyaka, the latter portion of which is known as the *Bṛhadārānyaka-upaniṣad*.

In importance, this Brāhmaṇa is next only to the *Ṛgveda*. It is a mine of important geographical data and noteworthy narratives. The narrative of Pururavas and Urvaśī is related at length as compared with its mention in the *Ṛgveda*. The narrative of Śakuntalā is also referred to. According to the western scholars, the onward progress of the Aryans in three stages is hinted in another legend. The story of Manu and the Deluge is quite interesting.

**Date.** The language and the style of this Brāhmaṇa indi-
cate that it belongs to the later stage of the Brähmanic period. On theosophic side also, there is a clear development in the idea of the universe. The treatment is throughout detailed and systematic. There are indications in the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa that it was composed before the rise of Buddhism.

Author. The great sage Yājñavalkya is mentioned as the author of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa.

Brāhmaṇas of the Śāmaveda. There is no Brāhmaṇa extant of the Kauthuma-śākhā, but the Brāhmaṇas of Tāṇḍin and Talavakāra schools are available. The Pañcaviṃśa-brāhmaṇa (also called Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa and Praudha-brāhmaṇa, and the Śaḍviṃśa-brāhmaṇa belong to the Tāṇḍya recension and the Talavakāra-brāhmaṇa belongs to the Talavakāra-Śākhā. The last six chapters in the Śaḍviṃśa-brāhmaṇa are called the Adbhuta-brāhmaṇa. It deals with rituals to ward off evil effects on special occasions. The Chāndogya-brāhmaṇa also belongs to the Tāṇḍya recension, but it has very little character of a Brāhmaṇa. Except for the beginning, it is the same as Chāndogya-upaniṣad. The Tulavakāra-brāhmaṇa has five books. Its fourth book is called Upaniṣad-brāhmaṇa and contains two lists of the teachers of the Śāmaveda tradition and the Kenopaniṣad. Its fifth book is called Ārṣeya-brāhmaṇa and contains a list of the rṣis of the Śāmaveda. There are three other Brāhmaṇas also which belong to this school, but they are Brāhmaṇas in name only. The Vaiṣṇa-brāhmaṇa contains a list of the teachers, the Śāmavidhāna-brāhmaṇa deals with the chanting of the hymns, and the third Devatādhya-yā-brāhmaṇa deals with the deities invoked in the Śāmaveda.

Brāhmaṇas of the Atharvaveda. To Atharvaveda belongs the Gopatha-brāhmaṇa which is divided into two kāṇḍas containing eleven prapāṭhakas, the first kāṇḍa containing five and the second six. Some portions of it have been extracted from the Śatapatha- and the Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa.

THE ARANYAKAS

The Āranyakas are the concluding portions of the Brāhmaṇas. arānye bhavam iti Āranyakam (arānya+viññ). They were composed in the forests and were meant to be studied there. According to Indian tradition, the Veda, the Brāhmaṇa and the Āranyaka taken together represent the Karma-kāṇḍa. It
corresponds to mantra, vidhi and arthavāda; the first contains the hymns to be recited at the sacrifice, the second deals with the mode of performing that sacrifice and the third explains the directions given in the second and offers justifications for the same. While the Brāhmaṇas deal with the details to be recognised by the householders (grhasthins), the Āraṇyakas deal with the directions to be observed by the Vānaprasthins. They contain a harmonious blending of Karmayoga and the Jñānayoga, and laid foundation for the Upaniṣads which teach Brahmavidyā of the highest order.

Āraṇyakas of the Ṛgveda. To Ṛgveda belong the Aitareyāraṇyaka and the Kauṣītakāraṇyaka. The first contains 18 chapters and is attributed to Āśvalāyana. The second contains fifteen chapters only. Both have been commented upon by Śaṅkara and Sāyana.

Āraṇyakas of the Yajurveda. The Taittirīya-āraṇyaka1, which is in continuation of the Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa, belongs to the Taittirīya Śākhā of the Krṣṇa-Yajurveda. It is accented. The first one-third portion of the 14th section of the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa forms the Āraṇyaka of the Śukla-Yajurveda.

Āraṇyakas of the Sāmaveda. The Chāndogyāraṇyaka which is the first portion of the Chāndogyopaniṣad is the Āraṇyaka of the Tāṇḍya Śākhā of the Sāmaveda. The Upaniṣad-brāhmaṇa which is attached to the Talavakāra Śākhā of the Sāmaveda is, in fact, an Āraṇyaka of that Śākhā. The name Upaniṣad-brāhmaṇa, in fact, suggests a form of literature in the transitional stage between the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads, which is the true character of the Āraṇyakas.

There is no Āraṇyaka of the Atharvaveda.

THE UPANISADS

The Upaniṣads are, on the whole, the continuations of the Brāhmaṇa and the Āraṇyaka portions of the Vedas. While the Veda and the Brāhmaṇa lay emphasis on Karma-kāṇḍa the Upaniṣads lay emphasis on the Jñāna-kāṇḍa which corresponds well to the fourth stage of human life called sannyāsa. This secret lore was taught in confidence by the gurus to their

1. It has been commented upon by Sāyana, Bhāskarāmiśra and Varadarāja.
-deserving pupils who waited on them for years on end. That is why this branch of knowledge came to be known as upaniṣad [upa (near) + ni (in confidence) + sad (to sit)].

They are the texts of the Veda’s highest religion and philosophy. There is no important thought in Hindu philosophy, heterodox Buddhism included, which is not rooted in the Upaniṣads. Next to the Rgveda, the Upaniṣads are the most important literary document of early India.

Like the Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas, the Upaniṣads are attached to one Veda or the other. Ten belong to the Rgveda, nineteen to the Śukla-Yajurveda, thirty-two to the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda, sixteen to the Sāmaveda and thirty-one to the Atharvaveda. As regards the subject-matter, these 108 Upaniṣads can be classified into the following six groups:—

(1) dealing with Vedānta, 24; (2) Sāṁkhya or Sannyāsa, 17; (3) Yoga, 20; (4) Vaiṣṇava, 14; (5) Śaiva, 15; (6) Śākta and others 18. Out of these 108 Upaniṣads only the following fourteen are noteworthy:—


Nos. 1 and 2, Aitareya and Kauśitakī, belong to the Rgveda. No. 3 Brhadāraṇyaka belongs to Śukla-Yajurveda. It contains interesting dialogues between Yajñavalkya, Janaka and others on the realisation of the soul. No. 4, Taittiriya, belongs to the Taittiriya Śākhā of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda. It contains an interesting dialogue between Varuṇa and his son Bhṛgu on the true nature of Brahma. Nos. 5, 6 and 7 are also attached to the Taittiriya Śākhā. Kaṭhapaniṣad contains two books of three chapters each. It contains the important legend of Yama and Naciketas on ‘How to overcome death?’

The Śvetāśvatara contains the discourse of the sage Śvetāśvatara delivered to his pupils on the samanvaya of Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Vedānta. No. 8, Maitrāyaṇiya, belongs to the Maitrāyaṇiya-samhitā of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda. No. 9, Iśa, forms the 40th chapter of the Vaiṣṇasanyāsa-samhitā of the Śukla-Yajurveda. It opens with the word Iśa. It lays emphasis on the fact that the ultimate reality is one which pervades the entire universe. That reality called Brahma or Iśa is never
changing, while this universe is ever-changing. To achieve the highest goal of self-realisation, one should act selflessly and desirelessly and lead a life of dedication. No 10, Chāndogya, belongs to the Tāṇḍya Śākhā of the Sāmaveda. It contains interesting dialogues between the sage Uddālaka and his son Śvetaketu. No. 11, Kena, belongs to the Talavakāra Śākhā of the Sāmaveda. It begins with the word kena. Herein the Brahma is described as entirely different from things known and unknown. He is the primary source of all forces in the world—animate as well as inanimate. The remaining three Upaniṣads belong to the Atharvaveda. The Muṇḍaka describes knowledge as two-fold, higher and lower. The former deals with the realisation of Brahma and the latter with the teachings of the Vedas. The Praśna is in the form of questions and answers. Herein sage Pippalāda answers his six disciples on the various aspects of spiritualism including the origin of matter; the three states of existence, waking, dream and sleep; and meditation on ‘Om’. The Māṇḍūkyya also deals with Brahma as endless and beginningless infinite power. Although the Upaniṣads are attached to the different Vedas, their subject-matter is common. They believe in the theory of Karma and transmigration of soul. The main purpose of all the Upaniṣads is the realisation of the true nature of Brahma and emancipation from the cycle of re-birth and re-death. Prof. Deussen says that the thought of the Upaniṣads has not its equal in India nor perhaps anywhere else in the world. What entitles them to enduring respect is that they show us the human mind engaged in the most plucky and earnest search after truth.

Form. Nos. 5, 6, 7, 9 and 12 (viz., Mahānārāyaṇa, Katha, Śvetāsvatara, Iṣa and Muṇḍaka are in verse.

Nos. 11 and 13 (viz., Kena and Praśna) are partly in verse and partly in prose. The remaining seven are in prose.

Nos. 4 and 5 (viz., Taiṭṭiriya and Mahānārāyaṇa) are accented.

On the basis of linguistic evidence and subject-matter, it is concluded that Nos. 1-4 and 10, 11; viz., Aitareya, Kauśitaki, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Taiṭṭiriya, Chāndogya and Kena represent the earliest stage of development and that the Praśna, Maitrāyaṇiṇya and Māṇḍūkyya are of later origin.

Migration to the West. Dara Shikoh got many Upaniṣads
translated into Persian. The Persian pronunciation of the word Upaniṣad is ‘Oupnekhat.’ The Frenchman Anquetil Du Perron (A.D. 1775) made a Latin translation of Dara Shikoh’s version which proved eventful in the west. It was through this double disguise that Schopenhauer became acquainted with the Upaniṣadic thought. He praised this translation in these words: ‘It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death.’ Because they contained the ‘Doctrine of Unity’, the Upaniṣads were in his eyes the fruit of the profoundest insight the world has ever seen.

THE SUTRAS

The Sūtras are compendious treatises composed in an extremely concise style of prose dealing with Vedic ritual on the one hand and with customary law on the other.

The main object of the Sūtras is to supply a short survey of the sum of the scattered details. They are not concerned with the interpretation of ceremonial or custom, but aim at giving a plain and methodical account of the whole course of the rites or practices with which they deal. They are marked for their utmost brevity. If the Brāhmaṇas erred on the side of verbosity and repetition, these did so on the side of brevity. From a literary point of view they represent a style which is characteristic of their own. They are quite unintelligible without commentaries by experts. The very name sūtra (thread) from sīv (to sew) suggests its marked brevity. The language is so compressed that the wording of the most laconic telegram would appear as diffuse when compared with it. The saving of a single syllable gave more pleasure to the sages than the birth of a son to a householder. They are so algebraic in form and so compressed.

Date. Research has hitherto failed to arrive at any definite result as to the date of their composition. Linguistic investigations, however, tend to show that the Sūtras are closely connected in time with the grammarian Pāṇini, some of them appearing to be considerably anterior to him. Macdonell has suggested the probable chronological limits as 500 and 200 B.C. The more concise and precise a composition is, the later it is to be placed in time, for the evolution of the style is obviously in the direction of increased succinctness.
The Six Vedāṅgas. In this Sūtra literature, there stand out most prominently the six Vedāṅgas—which do not imply the existence of six separate treatises, but only the admission of six subjects as a necessary study for the right understanding of the Veda.

śīkṣā vyākaranam chando niruktanm jyotisam tathā kalpaśceti śaṅgāni vedasyāhurmanīṣīnaḥ.

1. Śikṣā. It gives instruction in the correct pronunciation and accentuation of the Saṁhitās. It is dealt with in the works called Prātiśākhya. They contain a number of minute observations about the phonetic changes undergone by Vedic words when combined in a sentence, cf.,
gurutvaṁ laghutā sāmyaṁ hrasva dirgha plutāni ca
lopaṅgama vikārāśca prakṛtirvikṛtih kramāḥ
svarīdattācatvamānī svāso nādastathobhayām
etat sarvāṅca vijñeyam chando bhāṣāmadhikyatā.

Thus they are of great aid to Vedic philology. They are in this respect next to Taittirīya-āranyaka. They also tell us that the accent was musical. As the name Prātiśākhya suggests, each Veda has its own Prātiśākhya.

Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya of Śaunaka is attached to the Ṛgveda (Śākala recension). Vājasaneyi-prātiśākhya-sūtra of Katyāyana belongs to Śukla-Yajurveda of Mādhyandina Śākhā. Taittirīya prātiśākhya-sūtra belongs to Krṣṇa-Yajurveda (Taittirīya-Śākhā). Śaṁa-prātiśākhya, Puṣpasūtra and Paṁcavidha-sūtra belong to Śāmaveda. Ṛtharvaveda-prātiśākhya-sūtra (also called Caturadhīyikā) belongs to the Atharvaveda.

Later on there appeared works like Pāṇini-śīkṣā, Nārada-śīkṣā, Vyāsa-śīkṣā and other similar ones attributed to the sages Bhāradvāja, Yājñavalkya and Vasiṣṭha, etc.

2. Grammatical Sutras. Great skill was achieved by the Indians in this subject. According to Macdonell, “The Sanskrit Grammarians of India were the first to analyse word-forms, to recognise the difference between the root and the suffix, to determine the function of suffixes, and on the whole to elaborate a grammatical system so accurate and complete as to be unparalleled in any other country.”

The earliest extant work on Grammar is the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. He has mentioned numerous predecessors like Śākaṭāyana, Senaka and Śākalya but nothing has been preserved
of them because they have been superseded by Pāṇini. It deals mainly with classical Sanskrit and is therefore not the oldest Vedāṅga. Uṇādi- and Phīt-sūtra are anterior to him.

3. Chanda (Metre). It explains the rules applicable to the metres in which the Vedic mantras were composed. Piṅgala’s work, an important chandas work of antiquity, cannot be the oldest, for it treats of the Vedic as well as classical metres looking upon both as equally important. The Nidāna-sūtra explains the nature and names of Vedic metres and also contains an index to the metres of the Vedic mantras. It contains ten sections.

4. Nirukta (Etymology). The earliest extant work on this subject is the Nirukta of Yāska (before 800 B.C.). He has mentioned seventeen predecessors before him, including Śākapuṇi. His work is divided into three sections, namely (1) Naighanṭuka-kāṇḍa containing synonyms; (2) Naigamakāṇḍa (also called Aikapadika) dealing with difficult and ambiguous words; and (3) Daivata-kāṇḍa dealing with the various deities of earth, heaven and sky. Like other Vedāṅgas, its study is very essential for the interpretation of Vedic hymns.

5. Jyotisa (Astronomy). Sacrifices must be performed at the auspicious time in auspicious nakṣatra on auspicious lunar date in an auspicious month. Hence arose the need for a thorough study of Jyotiṣa (the science dealing with the movements of various luminaries). Lunar calculations were given more importance than the solar ones. Jyotiṣa-vedāṅga, a work of unknown authorship, contains 36 verses attached to the Rgveda and 43 verses attached to the Yajurveda.

6. Kalpasūtras (Ritual). The Kalpasūtras are important in the history of Vedic literature, because they not only mark a new period of literature, but also contribute to the gradual extinction of the numerous Brāhmaṇas. Their origin is to be traced to the Brāhmaṇa portion of the Vedas. They are called Kalpasūtras because they determine the performance of the sacrifices, cf., kalpyate samarthyate ṣaṅkaprayogātra iti vyut- pattaḥ (Sāyaṇa). They have the advantage of being clear, short and complete. They may be classified as follows:—

(a) Śrautasūtras. They are based on Śruti. They deal with the ritual of the greater sacrifices (e.g., Darśapūrṇamāsa and
Soma, etc.) for the performance of which three sacred fires (Dakṣiṇa, Āhavanīya and Gārhapatya) and the ministrations of the various priests (Hotṛ, Adhvaryu, Udgātr and Brahmaṇ) are necessary. Each Veda has its own sūtras.

Ṛgveda—Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana Kalpasūtras intended for the Hotṛ priest.

Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda—Baudhāyana, Āpastambha, Hiranyakeśi, Mānava, Bhāradvāja Kalpasūtras, intended for the Adhvaryu priest.

Śukla-Yajurveda—Kātyāyana Kalpasūtras, intended for the Adhvaryu priest.

Śāmaveda—Māsaka, Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana Kalpasūtras, intended for the Udgātr priest.

Atharvaveda—Kauśika and Vaitāna Kalpasūtras, intended for the Brahmaṇ priest.

(b) Gṛhyasūtras. They are based on Smṛti. They deal with the household ceremonies, the sixteen saṁskāras¹ (from the time of conception in the mother’s womb till after death) or the rites to be performed with the domestic fire in daily life. They are recited by the householder himself. They presuppose the knowledge of Śrautasūtras. Though thus connected, the two do not form a unity. The Gṛhyasūtras disclose the deep-rooted tendency in the heart of man to bring the chief events of his life in connection with a higher power, and to give to his joys and sufferings a deeper significance and a religious sanctification. They are attached to each Veda as follows:

Ṛgveda—Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtras.

Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda—Āpastambha and Mānava Gṛhyasūtras.

Śukla-Yajurveda

Mādhyandina Śākhā

Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra.

Śāmaveda—Gaubbhila Gṛhyasūtra.

Atharvaveda—Kauśika Gṛhyasūtra.

(c) Dharmasūtras. They are in general the oldest sources of Indian law, and also deal with the duties of castes and of the orders in life. Their point of view is essentially religious as the very term Dharma, “religion and morality”, implies. They are based on the Vedas whose authority they quote. Some of the earlier Dharmasūtras are Āpastambha, Gautama, Vāsiṣṭha

¹ e.g., Caula Karma, Upanayana, Samāvartana, Vivāha, etc.
Baudhāyana and Viṣṇu. The latter are Manu, Yājñavalkya and Nārada. They are generally designated as Smṛti.

(d) Śulvasūtras. The Śulvasūtras deal with the rules for measuring and building the sacred altar. They represent the beginning of Indian Geometry.

The relative importance of the six Vedāṅgas for the interpretation of the Vedas may be gauged from the following ślokas:

\[ \text{chandah pādau tu vedasya hastau kalpo'tha paṭhyate} \\
\text{yotiśāmayaṇaṁ cākṣuṁniruktāṁ śrotararucyate} \\
\text{śīkṣā ghrāṇantu vedasya mukharin vyākaraṇaṁ smṛtam} \\
\text{tasmāt sāṅgamadhītyaiva brahma loke mahīyate.}^{1} \]

THE ANUKRAMANIS

The Anukramaṇis are indices to the Vedas. They have played an important part in preserving the text of the Vedas from loss or change. They quote the first word of each hymn, its deity, its metre, the number of mantras, and the total number of syllables, etc. From their perusal it transpires that the Rgveda contains 1,017 sūktas, 10,580½ mantras, 1,53,826 words and 4,32,000 syllables. Each Veda has its own Anukramaṇi.

(a) Rgveda-ārśānukramaṇi (list of seers), Chandonukramaṇi (list of metres), Devatānukramaṇi (list of deities), Sūktānukramaṇi (list of the hymns), Padānukramaṇi (list of words), Anuvākānukramaṇi (list of chapters), Bṛhaddevatā (list of the gods together with the allusions connected with them) and Rgvidhāna (dealing with the magic effects obtained by the recitation of particular ākṣas)—all these eight are attributed to the sage Śaunaka. Sarvānukramaṇi contains all the above indices of the Rgveda composed by Kātyāyana, a pupil of Śaunaka.

(b) Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda (Taittiriya-saṁhitā)—Ātreya-sīkṣā and Cārāyanyya (also called Mantra Rahasyādhīya).

(c) Śukla-Yajurveda (Vājasaneyi-saṁhitā—Mādhyaandina Śākhā)—Yajurvedānukramaṇi of Kātyāyana.

(d) Sāmaveda—Ārṣeya-brāhmaṇa. In spite of its being designated as a Brāhmaṇa, it is only an Anukramaṇi.

(e) Atharvaveda—Bṛhat-sarvānukramaṇi.

---

THE PARISISTAS

Pariśiṣṭas (Appendices) like Caraṇārayuḥa ascribed to Śaunaka are in style less concise than that of the sūtras. The simple Anuṣṭubh śloka preponderates. They are about twenty in number and all of them belong to Ṣāmaveda.
Appendix II

HOW SANSKRIT CAME TO BE KNOWN TO THE WEST

(i) Although tales of the Pañcatantra and stories about the wisdom of the Aryans had reached Europe in the Middle Ages, yet it knew nothing about their language or the vast literature in Sanskrit. Some European missionaries acquired familiarity with Sanskrit and a Dutch translation of Bharṭṛhari was produced by Abraham Roger in 1651, but the Europeans remained as ignorant of Sanskrit as ever. A forged copy of the Yajurveda was prepared by a Jesuit missionary in the 17th century. Voltaire took it as real and greatly welcomed it in the middle of the 18th century. The forgery being discovered, the European scholars began to feel that not only Sanskrit literature, but also the Sanskrit language, was a forgery made by the Brahmins on the model of Greek after Alexander’s invasion. This view was ably defended by a professor at Dublin even in the fourth decade of the 19th century.

(ii) Warren Hastings was the first Englishman to realise the importance of Sanskrit literature and the desirability of governing the Indians according to their own customs and manners. Thus, through his efforts, a digest in English was prepared of the legal works in Sanskrit in 1776 through the medium of a Persian translation.

(iii) Charles Wilkins who learnt Sanskrit at the instigation of Warren Hastings brought out a translation of the Bhagavadgītā in 1785, and the Hitopadeśa in 1787.

(iv) The next orientalist who took keen interest in the study of Sanskrit learning was Sir William Jones (1746-94). He founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784, brought out a translation of the Sākuntalam in 1789 and a translation of the Manusmṛti soon after. He also published the Sanskrit text of the Rūtusamhāra in 1792.

(v) Next we come to the great scholar, Henry Thomas Colebrook (1765-1837). He was the first man to employ
scientific method in the study of Sanskrit language and literature. He published texts and translations of some important works and also wrote essays dealing with different branches of Sanskrit literature. This material proved very helpful to the later scholars.

(vi) The introduction of Sanskrit on the continent of Europe took place under queer circumstances. Alexander Hamilton (1765-1824) studied Sanskrit in India. While he was passing through France on his way home in 1802, fresh hostilities between England and France broke out, and he was taken prisoner there. During his stay in Paris, he taught Sanskrit to some French scholars and also to the renowned German poet, Friedrich Schlegel. This proved eventful. In 1808, Schlegel published his important work, *On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians*, and brought about a revolution in the study of Oriental learning. This also led to the introduction of the comparative method in the science of language. Inspired by his work, the German scholars began to take great interest in the study of Sanskrit language and literature. It will not be an exaggeration to remark that much of the work done in this field in the west is due to German scholarship.

(vii) In 1816, F. Bopp published his work on the conjugational system of Sanskrit, as compared with Greek, Latin, German and Persian, and thus laid the foundation of the Science of Comparative Philology.

(viii) The studies of Europeans were so far confined to classical Sanskrit. Colebrook’s essay ‘On the Vedas’ had appeared in 1805. Now the German scholars devoted themselves more closely to the study of the Vedic texts. A large number of Vedic texts was available at the East India House and F. Rosen began to work upon them in about A.D. 1830. His edition of the first Aṣṭaka of the *Rgveda* appeared in A.D. 1838, shortly after his premature death.

(ix) The publication of R. Roth’s work *On the Literature and History of the Veda* in 1846 gave a further impetus to the study of the Vedic literature in the West. R. Roth (1821-95) himself was the founder of Vedic philology and his example became a source of inspiration to many others. Prof. Bühler of Vienna, assisted by about thirty scholars of different nationalities undertook to prepare a comprehensive encyclo-
paedia dealing with the whole Vedic and Sanskrit literature. On his death in 1898, Prof. Kielhorn of Göttingen undertook to complete this gigantic work.

(x) A. Kuhn and Max Müller prosecuted their studies in the religion of the Veda with great zeal. Their researches led to the foundation of the Science of Comparative Mythology.

(xi) By the beginning of the present century almost all the important Vedic and Sanskrit texts were edited and some of the more important texts translated by European scholarship. The field for further research was now ready. Since then a host of western scholars have laboriously worked in the domain of Indo-Aryan antiquity. References to the contributions of these notable writers—Macdonell, Hopkins, Horrwitz, Winternitz, Pargiter, Oldenberg, Peterson, Hertel, Edgerton, Ridgeway, Keith and several others—have been made in the course of the book at proper places. In the course of a century and a half the whole range of Vedic and Sanskrit literature which in quantity exceeds that of Greek and Latin put together has been thoroughly explored. In spite of all that has been done, there is yet a vast field for research. There are thousands of manuscripts of less important works lying in the Indian and European libraries and a good deal of original work is quite possible on them.
THE ORIGIN OF THE INDIAN ALPHABET

Several European scholars hold that the Aryans at first did not know the art of writing, and that they acquired it from the foreigners. In the early stages of oriental studies this belief, as Bühler tells us, was based "probably not so much on special studies in Indian palæography which as well as epigraphy were mostly neglected owing to the force of unfavourable circumstances as on the general impression that certain Indian characters strongly resemble semitic letters and on the conviction supported in several cases by clearest evidence that the Indo-Aryan civilisation includes many and various elements borrowed from western nations—Semitic, Persian and Greek." Many theories\(^1\) have been proposed to explain the process by which the borrowing took place. Among these the most widely known is that of Bühler.

Buhler's Theory. According to Bühler's view, the Indian alphabet originated from the north semitic, i.e., Phoenician alphabet and was derived from one of the later types of the North-eastern semitic type. His conclusion is based upon the following assumptions:

1. Some of these theories are stated below:—

(i) According to Prof. Weber, it is derived directly from the oldest Phoenician alphabet.

(ii) According to Dr. Deecke, it is descended from the Assyrian cuneiform characters through an ancient Southern Semitic alphabet which was also the parent of the Himyaritic.

(iii) According to Dr. Isaac Taylor, it comes from an alphabet of Southern Arabia, the parent of Himyaritic.

(iv) According to M. J. Halevy it is of a composite character, some letters from Aramaic alphabet of the 4th century B.C., some from Kharoṣṭhi, some from Greek; and this hotchpotch is alleged to have been concocted about 325 B.C.

Sir A. Cunningham, on the other hand, believed that the Indian (also called Pāli or Brāhmi) alphabet was an Indian invention and was based on a system of indigenous hieroglyphics.
(1) That an alphabet is originated from the hieroglyphics of Egypt; and

(2) That the original direction of writing of the Brāhmī alphabet was from right to left, as substantiated by the Eraṇ coin.

With these assumptions he proceeds on to show on the evidences of (i) the writing (lekha etc.) referred to in the Jātakas and Mahāvagga, etc., (ii) the palaeographic facts contained in Aśoka's edicts, (iii) the Indian letters on the Persian sigloi, (iv) the legend of the Eraṇ coin, and (v) the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscriptions, that the origin of writing commenced earlier than the 4th century B.C. (as previously assumed by Max Müller) more probably in the 6th century B.C., and that the alphabet referred to is the Brāhmī alphabet.

That the Phoenician alphabet existed before 850 B.C. is quite evident from the Sinjirli inscription and the characters engraved on the Assyrian weights. He further compares the two alphabets—the Phoenician and the Brāhmī and finds that the latter may be derived from the former by principles laid down by him, viz., turning the letters upside down, from right to left, avoiding top-heaviness of the letters, etc.

Probable as the theory appeared, it greatly attracted the attention of the scholars, but soon after it became untenable in the light of further discoveries.

Objections against Buhler's Theory. I. (a) The very assumptions upon which he worked are now challenged. Flinders Petrie in his The Formation of Alphabet has now shown that the origin of alphabet is to be sought in the symbols and not in hieroglyphics. The primitive man cannot be assumed to be skilful enough in conveying his ideas by drawing pictures and paintings (that is only possible in a developed state of the society). He can only be expected to draw lines—horizontal, vertical, straight or curved—and to express his thoughts by these symbols.

(b) As regards the second assumption, the discovery of one

1. He does not try to prove that the Brāhmī alphabet is necessarily foreign in character, or that its indigenous origin is impossible. Accepting the foreign origin as probable, he only explains what the process of borrowing might have been.
coin is neither sufficient nor conclusive to prove that the original direction was from right to left. The discovery\(^1\) of the Holkar inscription of the 19th century and that of the later Andhra inscription clearly shows that the inscriptions running from right to left are really the stamps to engrave the inscriptions, with their letters being consequently reversed.

(c) It is also noteworthy that the Bhaṭṭiprolu inscriptions, although anterior to the Eraṇ coin are written from left to right.

II. The principles\(^2\) of his derivation are quite elastic.

---

1. The words \textit{ek pāy ānā Indore} are inscribed reversed on an Indore coin dated v. s. 1943. The syllables \textit{Sṝ} and \textit{pa} are inscribed reversed on an ancient seal bearing the inscription \textit{Sṝ ssapakula}. Similarly some other coins also bear the inscriptions reversed.

2. He compares the letters of the oldest Indian script found in Bhaṭṭiprolu casket, Eraṇ coin and Aśoka's edicts with the actually occurring signs in the oldest Semitic inscriptions and the Assyrian weights. He tries to show that 44 letters of early Brāhmī alphabet are traceable in the Semitic signs and that it contains representatives and derivatives from all the 22 Semitic characters. Owing to a certain 'pedantic formalism' of the borrowers, a desire to have signs well suited to the formation of regular lines and a strong aversion against all top-heavy letters, a number of Semitic signs had to be turned upside down or to be laid on their sides, while triangles or double angles at the top had to be removed. The original direction was from right to left as he tries to prove from an Eraṇ coin; with the change of direction the characters were also turned from right to left. Equipped with these rules of derivation, he takes each Semitic letter and comparing it with the corresponding Brāhmī letters tries to show how the original was borrowed and developed. To take a few illustrations:

\(i\) The Semitic Tsade was turned upside down and the small bar towards the right was turned towards the vertical line. This was later turned to the left with the change of direction and became ख, the Bhaṭṭiprolu form of \textit{খ}.

\(ii\) The Semitic nun was turned upside down. Later a single bar protruding on either side of the foot of the vertical line (\(\text{।} \)) was substituted as a cursive development. Thus \(\text{।} (=\text{Brāhmī ऋ}) \) was the result.

Thus Bühler traces 22 Brāhmī representatives of all the 22 Semitic signs. He further shows the development of derivatives by transposition or mutilation of the borrowed signs or by adding straight lines, curves or hooks to them. Thus he connects all the 44 Brāhmī signs with the Semitic prototypes.

According to the date of the Semitic inscriptions, Messa's stone and Assyrian weights, the period of introduction must fall somewhere between
They indicate no close resemblance of, or mutual identity of the two alphabets. He does not stick to the principles laid down by himself in all cases. As a learned writer in the Encyclopaedia Britannica has remarked, according to his principles it is possible to derive any alphabet from any other alphabet. Again his derivations do not explain many points, some of which are the following:

1. The top-heaviness of ga ‘ṅ’, ja ‘ḷ’ and ka ‘ṭ’.
2. The identification of Brāhmī ‘ṭ’ ka with Semitic Taw ‘ṭ’.

Why was the Taw ‘ṭ’ modified into Brāhmī ‘ṇ’ if the similar letter was acceptable to the Indians as ka? Why was not Brāhmī ‘ṭ’ allowed to remain as a substitute for Semitic Taw ‘ṭ’ and another letter like ‘ṇ’ chosen for ‘ka’?, etc., etc.¹

3. This theory does not explain as to why the direction of writing was changed subsequently. It is an inherent characteristic of an alphabet that it continues to be written in the same direction in which it was invented. To effect any change in direction is no less an arduous task than inventing a new alphabet. For instance, the decimal system was invented in India and it was written from left to right. It continued to be written in the same direction even when it was adopted by the Semitic countries. Similarly, the direction of Kharoṣṭhī has also not changed. It continues to be written from right to left.

4. Evidently, Bühler started with doubtful hypothesis. He

890 B.C. and 750 B.C., probably “more towards the lower date.” He further tries to prove the early existence of trade voyages of Indian merchants to Persian Gulf on the Indian Ocean, and thinks that the Semitic alphabet may have come to India through Messopotamia. The important characters remained in the hands of the traders with none or very slight modification. Next they were transferred to the Brahmins who evolved a complete system of Brāhmī alphabet. The evolution could not have been accomplished quickly. Bhaṭṭiprolu evidence shows that more than one attempt was made in many cases. The whole process must have been gradual and we must allow a prolonged period between importation and complete elaboration which itself was complete before 500 B.C.

1. Some other arguments against the Semitic origin are:

(i) Non-analogy of letters representing the same sounds.
(ii) The difference of sounds representing different letters, e.g., Brāhmī g but Semitic gimel.
(iii) There are no signs for medial vowels in Semitic; nor is there any distinction of short or long.
assumed that the Greek alphabet was derived from the Phoenician alphabet which in itself is a matter of doubt.

5. In order that a nation or a community may derive its alphabet from another nation or community, it is essential that there should be a close contact and mutual intercourse between the two, prior to that. But no such evidence has been found so far. If ever such a contact existed, it could be between the peoples living on the coasts. Accordingly, if Indian alphabet was a borrowed one, it should have been derived from the South Semitic people, but Dr. Bühler has refuted this himself.

6. The excavations of the pre-historic mounds near Hyderabad (Deccan) have provided ample evidence to conclude that the origin of the Indian alphabet was pre-historic. It originated during the life-time of the primitive man, although it might have developed later. The following points are noteworthy:

(a) The shape of the earthen pottery discovered indicates that it belongs to a period not later than 1500 B.C.
(b) Some earthen pots placed in the Madras Museum belong to the later stone age, not later than 3000 B.C.
(c) There are at least five signs on them of the uninitial vowels which resemble those of the ancient Brāhmī alphabet, e.g., there are signs for mātrās (e) and f (i). Verily these signs of the pre-historic pottery are the precursors of the letters in the Brāhmī alphabet.

7. There are on these pots initial letters, one each, of the names of their makers. Such practice existed in Egypt and Europe and was not unknown in India. This also indicates that the origin of the Brāhmī alphabet took place in India in the pre-historic period.

8. There are two stone-pieces preserved in the collection of the pre-historic antiquities in the Indian Museum which belong definitely to the Later Stone Age. Not one, but many letters are engraved on them. On one there are three letters m, ā, t written together. On the other two, there are four letters. All these letters resemble the letters of the Brāhmī alphabet.

9. The above is further corroborated by historical evidence:

(a) Mention of ikāra and ukāra is found in the Chāndogya-upaniṣad, e.g., agnirikāraḥ.
(b) The application of internal *sandhi* is given in the *Aitareya-āraṇyaka*.

(c) Mention is made in the *Satapatha-brāhmaṇa* of the total number of words in the different Vedas as well as of the minute divisions of time (corresponding to one-seventieth of a second). Such calculations could not be possible without adequate knowledge of the art of writing.

(d) Mention is made in the *Rgveda* of an *aṣṭakarnī* cow, a cow on whose ear there is to be found the numeral eight.

(e) R. Roth has rightly said that the preparation of the Prātiṣākhyanas could not have been possible without the written manuscript of the Vedas.

(f) Exceedingly high numbers were used in Vedic period. The science of grammar had reached a highly-developed stage in very ancient times. Mention is also made of the numerals engraved on the dice as well as on the bodies of the animals. All this clearly indicates that the Indians were conversant with the art of writing in very ancient times.

The prevalence of oral tradition in ancient India does not refute the above, because it was indispensable for the correct pronunciation of the Vedic mantras.
Appendix IV

Resolutions of the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad

I. Somnath Session, May 1951.

Moved by—Sri K.M. Munshi.
Seconded by—Hon’ble Justice Sri N.H. Bhagwati.

I. “We the delegates of the Akhil Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad now assembled at Prabhas, declare in all solemnity and faith:—

(a) That Sanskrit is the language of India’s culture and inspiration; that it is the world’s classical language and the key to a true understanding of India’s cultural and spiritual greatness; and that through Sanskrit and its allied languages, particularly Pali and Prakrit, the world can realise the life of the spirit enshrined in them;

(b) That India’s immediate and paramount need is to promote the study of Sanskrit so that this treasure-house of her past and the source and inspiration of her modern languages should become an intimate part of the life of the people; that research in Indology and other allied subjects keep pace with the advance of knowledge and thus the varied and manifold wealth of our heritage be made more readily available to the entire world;

(c) That to achieve these purposes, a Sanskrit Vishva Parishad be established which would work in association with Somnath Trust and all other agencies throughout the world that have similar aims and work in the same field.

“We further declare that it will be our steadfast resolve and endeavour to realise these aims.

“In token of our consent to the above we have this day set our signatures hereunder.”

II. To accomplish the ends enumerated above, it was “Resolved that the delegates of the Akhil Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, now assembled at Prabhas, do hereby constitute the Somnath Sanskrit Vishva Parishad.”
“FURTHER RESOLVED that the said Council be and is hereby empowered to co-opt maximum 20 additional members over and above the President, the Acharyas, Vice-Presidents and Secretaries.

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council be and is hereby authorised to exercise the powers necessary and incidental to the implementation of the above resolutions to place the Vishva Parishad on a proper and effective footing by framing the Constitution; to co-opt other members and to generally conduct its activities.

“FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of the Reception Committee of the Akhil Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad and the delegates to the said Akhil Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad be and are hereby enrolled as the Founder-Members of the Somnath Sanskrit Vishva Parishad.”

III. Sri H.V. Divatia then moved the following Resolution:

“RESOLVED that Hon’ble Sri K.M. Munshi be and is hereby elected Chairman of the said Council of Somnath Sanskrit Vishva Parishad.”

This was seconded by Sri K. Balasubramanya Aiyar and on being put to vote was carried unanimously.

IV. The following Resolution moved from the Chair was adopted unanimously:

“RESOLVED that for the time being the office of the Vishva Parishad be located in the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Chowpatty Road, Bombay 7.”

III. Banaras Session, November 1952.

Moved by—Dr Panjabrao Deshmukh.
Seconded by—Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, Justice Sri C.B. Agarwala.

(1) “Recognising the necessity of promoting the study and love of Sanskrit, the most important of all Indian languages, as also its allied languages, particularly Pali and Ardhamagadhi, of establishing a closer bond of association between all students
and lovers of the aesthetic, moral, cultural and spiritual heritage—embodied in Sanskrit and the said allied languages in different parts of the world;

Being of the opinion that the Basic Resolution adopted when the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad was founded at Somnath, on May 11, 1951, requires to be early implemented,

I. THIS CONFERENCE

(a) RECOMMENDS to the Council that an exchange of professors and lecturers should be arranged between different parts of the world where Sanskrit and the said allied languages are studied, wherever necessary, with the aid of the Government and Universities;

(b) REGRETS

(i) that the study of Sanskrit, on which depends the cultural unity of India, the future development of Indian languages and literature and the maintenance of the cultural, moral and spiritual outlook of our people, is coming to be considered of secondary importance in our Universities and educational institutions,

(ii) that, in several Universities, even highest degrees in Sanskrit and Ancient Indian Culture are obtainable without much textual knowledge and capacity to speak or write Sanskrit, and

(iii) that even in Pathashalas, Sanskrit has come to be imparted in the regional languages;

(c) CONSIDERS IT ESSENTIAL

(i) that all Universities in India should have a Department of Sanskrit for research, teaching and extension lectures,

(ii) that Sanskrit should be made compulsory at the secondary education stage and in higher education in arts,

(iii) that at all stages of education, prominence should be given to the history and culture of the people of India, bringing out the continuity and inspiration which Sanskrit has provided to the people of India in all ages and the influence which it has had in different parts of the world, and

(iv) that Vishva Parishad Professorships should be instituted, enabling recognised scholars and competent lovers of Sanskrit to deliver lectures on Sanskrit and the said allied languages and the heritage above-named in different parts of India and other...
parts of the world where Sanskrit or the said allied languages are being studied;

(d) Views with alarm the progressive extinction of the Pathashalas in the country, due partly to loss of patronage and partly to the inability of its products to earn their living;

(e) Urges upon the Governments and Universities in India that, if the love of Sanskrit and its place in India as a living language is not maintained, it will adversely affect the character, moral and cultural, of its people and that, therefore, urgent measures should be taken

(i) to give support to the Pathashalas now largely denied to them by the elimination of the ruling princes and jagirdars, and by the diversion of trust funds, reserved for Sanskrit learning by the terms of settlement; and endow Chairs for scholars who have attained high scholarship according to Shastric methods of study and organise some form of recognition for scholars who have attained distinction,

(ii) help the Parishad to increase the usefulness of Pathashalas,

(iii) by the co-ordination of the standard of education in the Pathashalas all over the country,

(iv) by the introduction of certain modern subjects in Shastric studies to make the holders of Shastric titles eligible for employment in Government and private service on the same salary and other terms as graduates of the Universities,

(v) by establishment of uniform recognition of Shastric titles acquired throughout India;

(f) Further urges upon the Government and Universities and constituent members

(i) to place at the disposal of the Parishad one or more of their specialists who may organise steps to achieve this purpose, and

(ii) to provide funds for Vishva Parishad Professorships;

(g) Further urges upon all educational authorities to recognise the study of Sanskrit at all stages by modifying the courses of studies, so that, except in special higher courses, they may provide an attractive literary background and to see that Sanskrit teaching, as far as possible, is conducted by the direct method through the medium of Sanskrit;
(h) Recognises that, in order to fulfil the objects of the Parishad, it is necessary to have an All-India Sanskrit University in order to co-ordinate and stimulate Sanskrit studies throughout the country;

(i) and urges upon Governments, Universities and Institutions that steps may be taken to organise such a University where Sanskritic studies may be pursued on ancient as well as modern lines in addition to modern studies and which may help to standardise and co-ordinate Sanskrit studies in all Universities and Institutions, with Sanskrit as the medium;

(j) and congratulates the Government of Uttar Pradesh on having already taken some steps which are calculated to lead to the fulfilment of this purpose;

(k) recommends that all Indian languages should adopt Devanagari as their script.

II. THIS CONFERENCE RESOLVES:

(a) That the Council constituted at Somnath do continue to function with the addition of not more than 20 members as may be elected by the conference;

(b) That the Council so constituted, in addition to the powers conferred at Somnath, frame and adopt a constitution for the Vishva Parishad which will be in force till the next Session of the Parishad where it will be submitted for approval;

(c) That, in the constitution so framed, Governments, Universities, founder Institutions and associated Institutions and the branches of the Parishad, should have a right of direct representation, a certain percentage of seats being reserved to be filled by election by individual members."

III. Nagpur Session, April 1954.

Moved by—Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar.
Seconded by—Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh and Sri Brijlal Biyani.

THIS CONFERENCE

Expresses its sense of gratitude to those State Governments, institutions and philanthropists who have helped in establishing Vishva Parishad Professorships and requests them to continue
this help in future also and invites them and others to render
further help;

REGRETS that some of the Universities in India have still
not established departments and chairs of Sanskritic studies and
 Ancient Indian Culture and requests them to do so at an early
date;

RESOLVES that in order that Sanskrit may continue to play
an effective rôle in the development of the languages and life-
of India, it is necessary that the useful features of the tradi-
tional method may be preserved;

(i) And therefore requests the Universities to institute
appropriate degrees or make suitable arrangements to ensure
the award of existing degrees for such students who qualify
themselves in the study of Sanskrit according to traditional
methods, supplemented by such studies as would impart know-
ledge in the critical and historical appreciation as might be
found absolutely necessary for bringing the degrees to an
appropriate level,

(ii) to make appropriate provision to affiliate Pathashalas
within their jurisdiction so that the students preparing for
such degrees could avail themselves of such institutions for
studying Sanskrit according to traditional methods, and

(iii) to make provision in the Universities on the lines of
the Madras, Lucknow, Nagpur, Bihar and other universities to
enable students to qualify themselves in Sanskrit studies accord-
ing to traditional methods;

REQUESTS the Union and State Governments that students
who have passed the Shastric examination of the Government
College, Banaras, or an examination of similar standard and
those who have passed the Acharya Examination of the Govern-
ment College, Banaras, or an examination of similar standard
may be recognised respectively as equal to those who have
passed B.A. or M.A. examination of Universities for purposes
of Government Service and for franchise;

REQUESTS the local authorities all over India such as
municipalities, local boards and school-boards as also religious
bodies and temples to take up the responsibility of maintaining
and keeping alive the existing Sanskrit Pathashalas, schools and
colleges and calls upon the branches of the Parishad either to
see that the responsibility is taken over by such bodies or
themselves to maintain those Sanskrit Pathashalas and Colleges;

Requests the Union and State Governments to encourage
original works in Sanskrit as in other regional languages;

Requests the Union and State Governments to set up
agencies by which all the unpublished manuscripts in India or
in other countries may be brought together in one centre in
India, either in the original or in photostat copies, so that the
vast store of knowledge may be brought together and preserved
and as and when convenient, published.”

IV. Tirupati Session, November 1955.

“THIS CONFERENCE

I. (a) Welcomes the recognition by several nations of the
principle of Panchashila, which represents in international
affairs the supremacy of those moral and spiritual values for
which India stands and of which Sanskrit is the storehouse and
medium;

(b) Draws the attention of the Universities of the world to
the necessity of taking steps to further the study of Sanskrit in
order that the moral and spiritual values for which it stands
become the effective heritage of all the nations.

II. Urges upon the State Governments and Universities to
prescribe, at the High School and early University stages, the
compulsory study of Sanskrit, so that a proper appreciation
of the heritage of India might inspire the younger generation to
reinforce our national solidarity; to join in developing the
culture of India on the lines suited to her genius but so as to meet
the demands of modern conditions; to help by upholding the
moral and spiritual values for which India stands, so that the
conflicts and tensions of the present day might be replaced by
an emotional awareness of human unity based on peace and
faith which those values involve.

III. Urges upon the Government of India to appoint an
All-India Board of Sanskrit Studies for co-ordinating, standar-
dising and promoting Sanskrit Studies all over India.
IV. Urges upon the Central and State Governments
(a) to establish Sanskrit Universities at several centres to which Pathashalas could in their respective regions be affiliated;

(b) to make in the Second Five-Year Plan provision for such Universities; for Departments of Sanskrit in the Universities within their jurisdiction; for grants-in-aid to Pathashalas; for a fund to help institutions to collect and publish unpublished manuscripts; and for a fund to publish critical editions of Sanskrit works;

AND APPOINTS a Committee of the following to approach the appropriate authorities in consultation with the Chairman:

Sri M. Patanjali Sastri, Chairman
Sri N. Chandrashekhara Iyer
Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar
Sri Bakshi Tek Chand
Sardar K. M. Panikkar
Sri J. H. Dave.

V. RESOLVES to appoint a Committee of the following members:

Sri K. M. Munshi, Chairman
Sri M. Patanjali Sastri
Justice Sri P. Satyanarayana Rao
Dr Sampurnanand
Dr B. Gopala Reddi
Justice Sri P. V. Rajamannar
Sri Govinda Menon
Sri B. Ramakrishna Rao
Sri C. Subramaniam
Acharya Badrinath Verma
Sri Jagat Narain
Sri Pannalal Bose
Sri B. A. Mandloi
Sri H. V. Divatia
Sri R. N. Dandekar
Sri J. H. Dave
Sri K. Chandramouli, Convener
Sri R. P. Naik, Secretary.

(a) to enquire and report on the reorganisation of the
traditional courses in Sanskrit so as to fit them into the scheme of modern education and create possibilities of career;
(b) to enquire and report on the methods of teaching Sanskrit at all stages, with special reference to the new method of teaching which is being tried by the Kuppuswami Shastri Research Institute, Pandit Anant Shastri Phadke and others;
(c) to enquire into such other matters as may be germane to the above.

VI. PLACES ON RECORD its appreciation
(i) of the Central Government in convening a conference of University Professors of Sanskrit for discussing Sanskrit education and research in all stages, and of the All India Radio in giving a place to Sanskrit in their programmes at all stations;
(ii) of the Andhra Government for having introduced Sanskrit as a main subject of study in the B.A. course and for having given triple increments to Telugu Pandits who have passed the prescribed examination in Sanskrit;
(iii) of the Madhya Pradesh Government for having established the Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya at Raipur affiliated to the Saugar University;
(iv) of the Punjab Government (a) for having announced their intention to establish a Sanskrit University at Kurukshetra, (b) for having upgraded the status of Shastris (Pandits), (c) for having started a Training College for them, (d) for having made Graduation in Sanskrit compulsory for Lecturers in Hindi and Punjabi, and (e) for having provided grant-in-aid to Sanskrit Pathashallas;
(v) of the Uttar Pradesh Government for having announced their intention to introduce the Banaras Sanskrit University Bill in the current session of the U.P. Legislative Assembly;
(vi) of the University of Lucknow for having made general Sanskrit a compulsory subject of study for all graduates in Arts; and
(vii) of the Travancore Devasthanam Board for providing free Hostel facilities and special scholarships of a large value for Sanskrit students.

VII. EXPRESSES its concern that several Universities in India have not so far established departments or chairs of
Sanskrit Studies nor made provisions for enabling Shastris and Acharyas to qualify for their degree examinations; and

FURTHER REQUESTS all the Universities to organise extension lectures in Sanskrit language and literature and have the culture influenced and shaped by them.

VIII. Views with concern the removal of Sanskrit teachers from High Schools in several parts of the country on the plea of decreasing strength of students and draws the attention of the appropriate authorities to provide teaching in Sanskrit in all schools by suitable provisions for grants and scholarships as a matter of national concern.

IX. AUTHORISES the Committee consisting of the following to submit a reply to the questionnaire of the Official Languages Commission with particular reference to the encouragement of the study of Sanskrit and its bearing on Hindi:

Sri M. Patanjali Sastri
Prof. K. A. S. Iyer
Dr V. Raghavan
Sri J. H. Dave.

X. THIS PARISHAD calls upon all the branches and Kendras as also all lovers of Sanskrit to organise a Pathashala Fund for helping the pathashalas within their respective areas and to hold branch conferences.

XI. RESOLVES to celebrate as a National Festival, the days associated with Vyasa, Valmiki and Kalidasa, the Masters of Sanskrit literature, viz., Vyasa Purnima (Asadha Shukla 15), Rama Navami (Chaitra Shukla 9) and Vijaya Dasami (Asvin Shukla 10) respectively.

XII. RESOLVES to institute the Vishva Parishad Examinations for elementary courses in Sanskrit and authorises the Chairman to appoint a committee to prepare a suitable syllabus and the Council to conduct the examinations.

V. Kurukshetra Session, January 1957.

Moved by—Sri K.A.S. Aiyar.

"THIS SESSION OF THE SANSKRIT VISHVA PARISHAD

I. PLACES ON RECORD

(i) its deep sense of loss on the death of Sri Ravi Shankar
Shukla who was associated with it from its very foundation as its Vice-President, and who, as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Nagpur Session, rendered it valuable services;

(ii) its deep appreciation of his services to the cause of Sanskrit in various ways, among other things in helping to found the Raipur Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya and the Indology Department of the Nagpur University.

II. PLACES ON RECORD its sense of loss on the death of Sri Justice B. K. Mukerjea, Chief Justice of India, who as its Vice-President, and the President of the Bengal Sanskrit Association, rendered valuable services to the cause of Sanskrit.

III. PLACES ON RECORD its appreciation of the action

(i) of the Government of India

(a) in appointing a Sanskrit Commission to consider the question of the present state of Sanskrit education in India in all its aspects, and

(b) including Sanskrit Programmes from time to time in the All India Radio broadcasts;

(ii) of the Government of the Punjab in establishing a Sanskrit University at Kurukshetra;

(iii) of the Government of Uttar Pradesh in

(a) taking steps to further the establishment of the Varanasi Sanskrit University,

(b) increasing the grant to the Pathashalas and setting up model Pathashalas in the State,

(c) having begun the practice of awarding cash prizes to writers of original works in Sanskrit, and

(d) in placing the Shastris and Acharyas on the same footing as Graduates for entry into service, for emoluments and franchise;

(iv) of the Governments of Andhra, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Bombay, Bihar, Assam and Rajasthan for taking steps to recognise the traditional system of Sanskrit education in their States in order to make it suitable to the present-day needs.

IV. EXPRESSES its acknowledgment to the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan for organising, in pursuance of the Resolution of the Tirupati Session of the Parishad, examinations in elementary courses in Sanskrit with a suitable syllabus; notes with pleasure:
that in the first examinations held in September, 1956, 2,824 students appeared in over 80 centres; and CALLS UPON all Branches, Mandals, Kendras as also organisations to open centres for these examinations wherever possible.

V. CONGRATULATES the several State Governments on the active interest they have been taking in the promotion of Sanskritic studies and URGES UPON THEM

(a) to establish Sanskrit Universities at suitable centres to which the Pathashalas in their respective regions could be affiliated, and

(b) to make provision for Departments of Sanskrit in the Universities within their jurisdiction; for grants-in-aid to Pathashalas; for a fund to help institutions to collect and publish unpublished manuscripts; and for a fund to publish critical editions of Sanskrit works.

VI. In confirmation of the Resolution passed at the Tirupati Session, URGES UPON the State Government and Universities

(i) to prescribe, at the High School and early University stages, the compulsory study of Sanskrit to enable the younger generation to appreciate the heritage of India; to reinforce national solidarity; to develop Indian Culture, of which Sanskrit has been the principal storehouse and instrument, on the lines suited to her genius; to uphold moral and spiritual values in order that the conflicts and tensions of the present day might be resolved by an emotional awareness of human unity based on peace and faith;

(ii) to reorganise the institutions for Sanskritic studies, where traditional methods are followed, on the lines suggested in the previous resolutions of the Sanskrit Vishva Parishad so as to provide career possibilities for the products of these institutions; and

(iii) to place them in respect of emoluments and franchise on the same footing as University graduates.

VII. IS OF THE OPINION that now that India is free and her cultural contacts with other nations, which had been disrupted in the recent past, have been resumed it is essential that steps should be taken to maintain the permanent influence of Sanskrit in the life of the country as also to activise the old contact
with those countries;

AND THEREFORE URGES upon the Government of India to establish a Central Institute

(i) TO PROMOTE higher study and research in Sanskrit, Pali and Ardhamagadhi by combining the traditional methods which might in co-operation with the existing Universities

(a) secure all available manuscripts in India and abroad,

(b) secure photostat and microfilm copies of manuscripts which have found their way into foreign museums and private collections,

(c) provide an exchange for all the work that is being done in India and outside in the field of Sanskritic studies,

(d) help to edit or re-edit, as the case may be, Sanskrit works of importance;

(ii) TO PROVIDE a world centre for studies in Sanskrit and allied languages and in Indian Philosophy, Religion and Culture, with a provision to depute qualified professors to different countries, particularly in the East and South-East Asia, so that the study and the spread of Indian Cultural contacts may be carried on as before.

VIII. URGES UPON all authorities of Temples, Maths and Religious Charities in the country to spend their surplus funds on the promotion of Vedic, Shastric and Sanskritic studies, which have always been authoritatively considered as an essential part of Ishta or religious charity.

IX. DRAWS attention to Resolution XI of the Tirupati Session of the Parishad and urges upon the country to celebrate as a National Festival the days associated with Vyasa, Valmiki and Kalidasa, viz., Vyasa Purnima (Ashadha Shukla 15), Rama Navami (Chaitra Shukla 9), and Vijaya Dasami (Asvin Shukla 10) respectively."

VI. Puri Session, April 1959.

"THIS SESSION OF THE SANSKRIT VISHVA PARISHAD GATHERED AT PURI

I. OFFERS its felicitations to

(1) the Government of Uttar Pradesh for establishing the Varanasi Sanskrit University;"
(2) the Government of Bihar for sponsoring a Bill to establish a Sanskrit University at Darbhanga and the Maharaja of Darbhanga for providing munificent help for it;

(3) the Sanskrit Commission for a comprehensive report on the importance of Sanskrit in the life of India and on the ways and means to promote its importance;

(4) the Governments of Assam, Orissa and Rajasthan for the steps they are taking to create conditions in which Sanskrit Universities may be established.

II. Having considered the working of some Universities which have been established with the avowed object of promoting Sanskrit,

URGES upon them to take more effective steps to fulfil that object.

III. WELCOMES

(1) the establishment of the Central Council of Sanskrit Education, Hyderabad, and hopes that in course of time it may develop into a Sanskrit University;

(2) the formation of an Association at Madras to organise a Sanskrit University for Tamilnad;

(3) the action of the Punjab University in starting Sanskrit Title Examinations in its Oriental Faculty;

(4) the activities of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan to popularise Sanskrit in the country through its Saral and Shastriya Examinations.

IV. REQUESTS the Central Government to implement the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission regarding the establishment of the Central Board of Sanskrit Education with powers and functions similar to the University Grants Commission and place at its disposal adequate funds for the promotion of Sanskrit.

V. (A) STRONGLY DISAPPROVES the view of the Secondary Education Commission that Sanskrit should not be given a place among the compulsory languages to be studied at the Secondary stage and that it should only be an optional language;

(B) VOICES the general opinion in the country that without a compulsory study of Sanskrit an Indian cannot

(1) acquire necessary mental discipline as well as cultural
and moral background,

(2) avail himself of its great resources for the development of regional languages,

(3) develop a sense of unity and continuity to our national life,

(4) appreciate the higher values flowing from our heritage, which alone gives India a unique place among the nations;

(C) Is of the view that making Sanskrit an optional language will be tantamount to eliminating it from studies, denying to regional languages the primary source of their enrichment, endangering the basic unity of our people, and undermining their cultural, moral and spiritual foundations;

(D) and therefore urges very strongly upon the Central and State Governments and educational authorities to provide for compulsory study of Sanskrit at the secondary stage and alter the three-language formula of the Central Government in the light of the recommendations of the Sanskrit Commission.

VI. Regrets that a large number of Universities in India have not yet established any chair of Sanskrit and urges upon them to take early steps to remedy this deficiency.

VII. Urges upon Governments, Universities, Institutions and Organisations to accelerate the pace of

(1) securing for Pathashalas a well-recognised place in the educational system of the country,

(2) providing financial support for them, at the same time helping them to reorganise the courses of study by introducing essential modern studies without detriment to the standard of Pathashala system,

(3) helping the movement for founding Sanskrit Universities and starting Oriental Faculties in ordinary Universities to which the Pathashalas should be affiliated

(4) placing the Shastris and Acharyas on the same footing as B.A.s and M.A.s of the University respectively for entering Government employment,

(5) popularising Saral and Shastriya Examinations in all parts of the country.

VIII. Views with concern the diversion and wastage of Trust funds and surplus revenues of Maths and Mandirs earmarked for or appropriately expendable for studying Sanskrit, and
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URGES upon the Central and State Governments to take appropriate action to see that such funds are not applied for purposes other than promoting Sanskrit;

CALLS upon all the institutions and organisations interested in Sanskrit to take steps to prevent such wastage or diversion and to have the funds utilised for Sanskrit studies, and

AUTHORIZES the Executive Committee to set up Regional Committees, where necessary, to take such steps.

REQUESTS the Government of India to provide for sufficient number of scholarships and stipends to students and scholars of Bali who would come to India for the study of Sanskrit and to avail themselves of the research facilities in India.

VII. Bombay Session, December 1961.

Moved by Sri Balasubramanya Iyer, M.L.C., Madras.
Seconded by Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, Speaker, Lok Sabha, New Delhi.

"THIS SEVENTH SESSION OF THE SANSKRIT VISHVA PARISHAD ASSEMBLED AT BOMBAY

I. Expresses its sense of relief that, by the grace of God and prayers of his countrymen, our beloved President, Dr Rajendra Prasad, also the President of the Parishad, has been restored to health after his recent illness, and

PRAYS to the Almighty to vouchsafe to him many more years of undiminished strength and vitality.

II. PLACES ON RECORD

(i) its deep sense of loss at the sad demise of Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant, a distinguished son of India and one of the founder Vice-Presidents of the Parishad, who, besides giving his full support to the Parishad from its inception, rendered great service to the cause of Sanskrit by sponsoring the Varanasi Sanskrit University;

(ii) its sense of deep sorrow at the demise of Dr. A. S. Altekar and Prof. Indra Vachaspati, both Sanskrit scholars of eminence.

III. Having considered the activities of the Central and
several State Governments, Universities and non-official organisations in the country for the promotion of Sanskrit,

(i) EXPRESSES its gratitude

(a) to the Central Government for its proposal to establish a Central Sanskrit Vidyapith at Tirupati, and

URGES that adequate funds be provided to enable it to function in an effective manner;

(b) to the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, for the services that it has been rendering for the propagation of Indian Culture and Sanskrit learning;

(c) to the Sanskrit Education Society, Madras, for establishing Research Professorships in Vyakarana and in Shaiva Agamas as a step towards founding a Sanskrit University;

(ii) PLACES ON RECORD its appreciation of the University of Bombay in making the study of Sanskrit compulsory up to the Inter-Arts course, and

URGES upon other Universities in the country to adopt a similar course;

(iii) URGES upon the Kurukshetra and Sri Venkateswara Universities, which were originally conceived as Universities for the promotion of Sanskrit, at any rate to effectively organize higher studies in Sanskrit, and

(iv) URGES on other Universities in the country which have not so far established departments of Sanskrit and allied subjects to do so at an early date;

(v) FURTHER RECORDS its appreciation of the Sanskrit programmes of the All India Radio, and

REQUESTS that Radio lessons in Sanskrit may be arranged by every station as is done for Hindi, and that news may be broadcast in Sanskrit.

IV. While welcoming the appointment by the Government of India of the Central Sanskrit Board,

URGES upon the Central Government to give the Central Sanskrit Board the same statutory status and powers as regards Sanskrit education as those enjoyed by the University Grants Commission as recommended by the Sanskrit Commission in respect of University education and to place at its disposal adequate funds to promote Sanskrit studies effectively in the country;
URGES upon the Central and State Governments the necessity of implementing the scheme for re-organizing Sanskrit teaching on traditional lines formulated by the Central Sanskrit Board and to give Sanskrit titles, where obtained after qualifying in some modern subjects, equivalence with University degrees for the purpose of service etc., but without imposing certain kinds of restrictions as is being done at present;

URGES that suitable employment opportunities should be provided to Sanskrit title-holders from recognised institutions all over the country.

V. Draws attention to the undisputed fact that Sanskrit has been the main unifying force in the country from the earliest times directly and indirectly through the modern Indian languages, and

STRONGLY URGES that every step should be taken by the Governments and the people to strengthen and consolidate its influence through education at different levels;

REITERATES its view that this aim could only be achieved by making effective provision for compulsory study of Sanskrit as a separate subject at least at the stage of secondary education;

VIEWS with concern the omission by the Central Advisory Board of Education to recommend Sanskrit as a compulsory subject of study in the Lower and the Higher Secondary Schools in the country, and

URGES upon the State Governments, Universities and Secondary Education Boards to make effective provision for compulsory study of Sanskrit at the secondary stage of education;

FURTHER CALLS upon the State Governments, Universities and Secondary Education Boards to implement as an interim measure the request of the Central Government recently made to the State Governments in the following terms:

'On the suggestion of the Central Sanskrit Board and taking into consideration the cultural and unifying values of Sanskrit, the Government of India have requested the State Governments and the Secondary Education Boards (i) to encourage the composite course of a classical language with the mother-tongue or the regional language, (ii) to make the
passing in the classical language part of the composite course compulsory and (iii) to assign a reasonable percentage, say 30 to 40 per cent of marks to the classical language.

VI. Being of the opinion that intensive study of Sanskrit must be combined with the study of modern subjects and viewing with deep concern the dwindling number of students in Sanskrit Pathashalas and colleges on account of the lack of opportunities of gainful employment,

COMMENDS to the State Governments the adoption of the scheme of ‘Oriental Schools’ organized by the Madras and Andhra Governments on a par with other Secondary Schools.

VII. Recognizing the value of traditional learning in Sanskrit and allied subjects,

RECOMMENDS to the Central and State Governments that adequate grants, subsidies and scholarships should be awarded to scholars of repute to carry on their work in their own traditional way in their special fields.

VIII. Being deeply concerned at the Hindu Trust funds and surplus revenues of religious institutions like Maths, Mandirs and Temples, earmarked for and/or utilisable for the study of Sanskrit, being diverted and wasted,

URGES upon the Governments

(a) that on no account should such funds be diverted to purposes other than those relating to Sanskrit learning and related objects;

(b) that provision for Sanskrit studies be made a priority charge on such funds,

URGES that an All-India Fund for promoting Sanskrit studies should be established and steps be taken by legislation or otherwise to augment the same by transferring surplus funds and revenues of religious trusts and endowments;

FURTHER URGES upon the Hindu Religious Endowments Commission the necessity of taking a firm stand in favour of the building up of such a Fund; and

HEREBY APPOINTS a Sub-Committee to represent the point of view of the Parishad before the said Commission.

IX. Being of the view that Members of the Indian Administrative and Foreign Services should be fully conversant with the cultural heritage of India so as to be able to appreciate the
genius of our country and to present it to the world in a proper manner and that this will not be possible without an adequate knowledge of Sanskrit,

REQUESTS the Government of India that greater importance should be given to Sanskrit by increased weightage in marks for Sanskrit in the competitive examinations for the Indian Administrative and allied services.

X. Being of the opinion that Sanskrit should continue to remain a living force in India, and that it is necessary that it should also become a vehicle of modern thought and expression in a simple and easily understandable style,

RECOMMENDS that text-books in Sanskrit should provide, among other things

(a) lessons conveying modern knowledge, such lessons being in short and simple sentences with a minimum of Samāsas and Sandhis;

(b) topics of daily use in a conversational style;

(c) exercises in essay writing; and

(d) a graded scheme of vocabulary equipment;

FURTHER RECOMMENDS that in any scheme of Sanskrit studies emphasis should be laid on speaking simple and easily understandable prose.

XI. This Session

RECOMMENDS that ways and means of making Sanskrit simpler and more easy to learn without violating the traditional rules of grammar and idiom be explored so as to overcome the complaint that it is a difficult language to master.
Appendix V

Test Questions.

1. Name some of the scholars who were pioneers of Sanskrit study in the west.
2. What are the two periods of Sanskrit learning? Wherein lies the importance of our Sanskrit?
3. Trace the origin of Indian alphabet? What are its varieties? Give an account of Sanskrit before and after the Christian era? (C. U.)
4. What is the difference between classical and Vedic Sanskrit? (C. U.)
5. Trace the origin of modern dialects of India? What is the relation of Sanskrit to Prakrit?
6. How far Sanskrit is a spoken language and when? (C. U.)
7. Give an account of the place of epic in the classical or post-vedic period.
8. What are the two classes of epics—characterise? Give an instance of each class. (C. U.)
9. What are the different recensions or editions of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata?
11. What is the date of the Mahābhārata? Describe its stages of development?
12. What are the main episodes of the Mahābhārata?
13. What is the relation of the Purāṇas with the Mahābhārata? (C. U.)
14. What is your opinion on the age of the Purāṇas? What are its various classes? Name some of the Purāṇas which describe the majesty of Viṣṇu or Brahmā or Śiva? (C. U.)
15. What is the main theme of the Rāmāyaṇa? Which is earlier: Rāmāyaṇa or Mahābhārata? “Rāmāyaṇa is the

1. C.U. stands for Calcutta University.
forerunner of our Kāvyas"—examine the statement. (C.U.)

16. What is the source of the Rāmāyaṇa and where was it composed?

17. What is your opinion on the date of the Rāmāyaṇa?
(C. U.)

18. What are the stages of development in the Rāmāyaṇa?
(C. U.)

19. What influence has Rāmāyaṇa on the public?

20. Give the date of Sanskrit Kāvya or epic literature.

(C. U.)

(C. U.)

22. Determine the different theories on the date of Kālidāsa.
(C. U.)

23. Name some of the chief Kāvya works. What are the characteristic features of our Kāvyas?
(C. U.)

24. What are the principal prose compositions? Can you suggest an approximate date of these?
(C. U.)

25. Give an account of Sanskrit lyrics. Mention some of them.
(C. U.)

26. What do you know of Gitagovinda? Determine its place in the lyrics? What is its date?
(C. U.)

27. Trace the origin and development of Sanskrit Drama. What are its characteristics and structure?
(C. U.)

28. Name and compare in broad points the dramas of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti? Name some of the dramas of Rājaśekhara? What is his date?

29. Give an account with date of Sanskrit Fable and its ethical literature? What is the relation of Pañcatantra with Aesop's Fables?
(C. U.)

30. Write notes on the following authors or works as the case may be (based on C. U. papers):—Vyāsa, Harivaṃśa, Aśvaghosa, Samudragupta, Buddhacarita, Vatsabhaṭṭi, Dinnāga, Haravijaya, Rāghava-pāṇḍaviya, Padmagupta, Setubandha, Vāsavadattā, Harsacarita, Bāna, Ṛtsamāhāra, Caurapaṇcāśikā, Bilhaṇa, Amaruśataka, Gitagovinda, Ghaṭakarpāra, Mṛcchakaṭiṅkā, Nāgānanda, Veniśamāhāra, Bālabhairava, Karpūramaṇjarī, Kṛṣṇamīśra, Prabodhacandrodaya, Pañcatantra, Kathāsaritsāgara, Bṛhatkathāmaṇjarī, Guṇāḍhya, Maṅkha, Gaudavaho (of Vākpatirāja), Vēṭalapaṇcavimsati, Vidhāśālabhaṇḍīkā, Viśākha-
datta, Hāla, Vairāgyaśatakā, Śāṅgadharā, Subhāṣitāvalī, Kalhaṇa, Rājatarangini, Jimūtavāhāna, Halāyudha, Mahābhārata, Daṇḍin, Navasāhasāṅkacarīta, Jayadeva, Somadeva, Bhāravi, Bhartṛhari, Amaruśatāka.

31. State with example the principal characteristics of Indian Drama. (C. U.)

32. Give a survey of Indian ethical or lyrical poetry.

33. What distribution of dialects is usually adopted for actors of various ranks in Sanskrit dramas?

(C. U. 1914, 28, etc.)

34. Give a brief account of two of Sanskrit historical Kāvyas and mention their authors. (C. U. 1929)

35. What do you know of the migration of Indian fables in the west? (1922)

36. State in brief what you know of Brhatkathā and other later recasts of it.

QUESTIONS OF THE PUNJAB UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

1962 (April)

(a) Attempt any two of the following:—

(i) What do you know of Aśvaghoṣa as (1) a poet and (2) as a dramatist? Briefly describe his works.

(ii) Bring out the historical and literary value of the Daśakumāracarīta.

(iii) Give a brief account of the origin and development of popular tales in Sanskrit. 14

(b) Write brief notes on any two of the following:—

Raghuvaṃśa; Saundarananda; Hitopadeśaḥ. 6

1961

(a) Attempt any two of the following:—

(i) Assess the merit of Bhāsa as a dramatist.

(ii) In which age of Indian history would you place Kālidāsa and why?
(iii) Discuss the origin and development of the popular tales in Sanskrit literature.  

(b) Attempt either of the following:—

(i) Describe the society depicted in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki.

(ii) Write brief notes on any two of the following:—

Pratimā-nātakam; Somadeva; Harṣacaritām.

1960 (September)

(a) Attempt any two of the following:—

(i) Discuss the age of the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki.

(ii) To what period of Indian history would you assign Kālidāsa and why?

(iii) Write a critical note on Bhāravi as a poet.

14.

(b) Attempt either of the following:—

(i) Trace briefly the growth of didactic fables in Sanskrit literature.

(ii) Write brief notes on any two of the following:—

Śvapnavāsavadattā; Kumārasambhava; Kādambari; Kathāsaritsāgara.

1960 (April)

(a) Attempt any two of the following:—

(i) Give a literary appreciation of the Rāmāyaṇa. Why is Vālmīki called ‘the first poet’?

(ii) Discuss the age of Bhāsa.

(iii) Evaluate the writings of Aśvaghoṣa.

14.

(b) Attempt either of the following:—

(i) Trace briefly the growth of popular tales in Sanskrit literature.

(ii) Write brief notes on any two of the following:—

Meghadūta; Śīṣupālavadhā; Daśakumāracarita; Hitopadesa

1959 (September)

Attempt any four:—

(a) Discuss the importance of Rāmāyaṇa as the first epic of Sanskrit literature.
(b) Review briefly the contents of *Raghuvarṇa* of Kālidāsa and its place in Sanskrit epic literature.

(c) Make a critical survey of the style of Daṇḍin and its importance in Sanskrit prose literature.

(d) Enumerate in broad outline the influence of *Pañcatantra* on the fable literature of the world.

(e) Write short notes on any two of the following:

*Bṛhatkathāmaṇjarī*; *Svapnavāsavadattā*; *Vikramorvaśīyaṃ*; *Kādambarī*.

1959 (April)

Answer any four:

(a) Make a critical survey of *Kādambarī* as a prose romance.

(b) Discuss the problem regarding the age of the plays ascribed to Bhāsa.

(c) Review briefly the importance of popular tales and didactic fables in Sanskrit literature.

(d) Enumerate in broad outline the influence of Bhāravi on Māgha, with special reference to their epics.

(e) Give brief notes on any two of the following:

*Sāriputraprakaraṇa*; *Rūtasaṃhāra*; *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha*; *Daśakumārācarita*.

1958 (September)

(a) Write short notes on any two of the following:

*Saundarananda*; *Svapnavāsavadatta*; *Śīṣupāḷavadhā*, *Bṛhatkathāmaṇjarī*.

(b) Give a critical appreciation of Daṇḍin as a prose-writer.

(c) How is Māgha indebted to Bhāravi?

(d) Name the authors of the following:

*Buddhacarita*; *Cārudatta*; *Pañcatantra*; *Mālavikāgnimitra*; *Priyadarśikā*; *Mahāvīrācarita*; *Kirātārjunīya*; *Kathāsarit-sāgara*.

1958 (April)

(a) Write short notes on any two of the following:

*Pañcatantra*; *Ratnāvalī*; Bhāravi; Māgha.
(b) Give a brief account of the origin and development of prose literature in Sanskrit.  
(c) Who is earlier: Aśvaghoṣa or Kālidāsa? Discuss their dates.  
(d) Examine critically Bhavabhūti as a playwright.  

1957 (September)  

(a) Write short notes on any two:—  
Raghuvamśa; Pañcatantra; Daśakumāracarita; Gītagovinda.  
(b) Adjudge Kālidāsa as a poet and as a dramatist.  
(c) What do you know about Brhatkathā and its Sanskrit versions?  
(d) Enumerate the works of Bhavabhūti, Harṣa and Bhāravi.  

1957  

(a) Write short notes on any two:—  
Buddhacarita; Uttararāmacarita; Kathāsaritsāgara; Nāgānanda.  
(b) Write a critical appreciation of Bāṇa as a prose writer.  
(c) What do you know about Bhāsa and the dramas attributed to him?  
(d) Enumerate the works of Kālidāsa and discuss briefly the authenticity of Rūtamāhāra.  

1956 (September)  

(a) Write notes on any two:—  
Aśvaghoṣa, Daṇḍin, Kṣemendra, Jayadeva.  
(b) Give a brief account of Kathā literature in Sanskrit.  
(c) Write a critical note on Bhāsa, giving the names of dramas attributed to him.  
(d) What do you know of Kālidāsa and his works.  

1956  

(a) Write notes on any two:—  
Saundarāṇānanda, Pratimā, Śākuntala, Ratnāvalī.
(b) Adjudge Bhavabhūti as a dramatist.
(c) Illustrate how Māgha is indebted to Bhāravi.
(d) Give an account of Pañcatantra’s translation into Pahlavi and other foreign languages.

1955 (September)

(a) Write short notes on any two:—
   Saundarananda; Vikramorvaśiyam; Ratnāvalī; Hito-padeśa.
   8
(b) Write a critical note on either Bhāravi or Bhavabhūti.
   4
(c) What do you know of the works of Bhāsa.
   
   Or
   Give a brief account of lyrics in Sanskrit literature.
   8

1955

(a) Write short notes on any two:—
   Pañcarātra, Kumārasambhava, Nītiśataka, Gītagovinda.
   8
(b) Write a critical note on either Māgha or Somadeva.
   4
(c) Give a brief account of pre-Kālidāsan Kāvya in classical Sanskrit.
   
   Or
   Give some account of Sanskrit Prose Romance.
   8

1954 (September)

(a) Write short notes on any two:—
   (1) What is Ādi Kāvya? State the importance and effect produced by this Kāvya.
   (2) Write a critical note on the style of Bhāsa.
   (3) What do you know of the date and works of Bhavabhūti?
   (4) Discuss the date of Kālidāsa.
   12
(b) Write in brief what you know of the following:—
   (1) Either Bhāravi or Rājaśekhara.
   (2) Either Kumārasambhava or Rājataraṅgiṇī.
   8

1954

Answer any two:—
(i) What reasons are there for holding that the Mahābhārata
in its present form is an amplification of an older and simpler poem?

(ii) Estimate Kālidāsa as a dramatist.

(iii) Give an account of didactic fables in Sanskrit literature explaining their importance and popularity.

1953 (September)

Answer any four:

(1) Give a brief account of classical Sanskrit prose literature.

(2) Name and characterise the principal Sanskrit lyrics.

(3) What do you know of Pañcatantra, its recensions and translations?

(4) State in brief the contents of the Mahābhārata.

(5) Write a note on one of the following authors:—
Bhāsa; Bhāravi; Somadeva.

(6) Write a note on one of the following works:—
Vikramorvaśiyam; Nitisataka; Rājutaraṅgini.

1953

Answer any four:

(1) Give a brief survey of the classical Kāvya literature.

(2) Point out the characteristic excellences of Kālidāsa.

(3) What do you know of the authorship of the Rāmāyaṇa?

(4) Estimate Bhāsa as a dramatist.

(5) Give some account of the popular tales in Sanskrit.

(6) Write notes on the following:
   (i) Either Aśvaghoṣa or Bhavabhūti.
   (ii) Either Śāntiparva or Hitopadeśa.

1952 (September)

Answer any four:

(1) Describe the development of the epic poetry.

(2) Discuss the date of Kālidāsa.

(3) Write a note on the style of Daṇḍin.

(4) What is the importance of Kādambarī as a piece of literary art?

(5) Mention and briefly describe three foremost Mahākāvyas.

(6) What do you know about:—
(a) Somadeva, (b) Bhāravi, (c) Āryaśūra, 
(d) Navasāhasāṅkacarita and (e) Hitopadeśa. 5, 5, 5, 5

1952

Answer any four:—
(1) Trace the origin of the epic poetry.
(2) Mention and substantiate the date of Daṇḍin.
(3) Describe and explain the importance of Pañcatantra.
(4) Write a note on the social life as described in the Kāvyā literature.
(5) Mention and briefly describe the two foremost works of Kālidāsa.
(6) What do you know about:—
Vātsyāyana; Guṇādhya; Subandhu; Saundarānanda; Yaśastilaka. 5, 5, 5, 5
Appendix VI

QUOTATIONS IN THE NAGARI SCRIPT

p. 18 व्राच्छ्यु: कवयः केवितु सम्रात्याचकलस्यप्रे।
व्राच्छ्युविन्ति तथैवाये प्रतिहासिन्म भटि। (महाभारत)

p. 26 मन्वादि भारतं केनिदिका स्त्रि तथापरे।
तथा परिचरायाचे विप्राः सम्यक्यते। (महाभारत)
व्रतिमानस्तु मानुष्ये लोके वैश्वानाय उक्तवान्।
एकं वातसहस्रं तु मयोक्तते वै निबोधत।
जयो नामेतिहासिन्यम्
नारायणं नमस्कृत्य नरं चैव नरोत्तमम।
देवीं सरस्वतीं चैव तत्तो जयमुदीर्येदु। (महाभारत)

p. 27 महत्वादु भारत्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्।

p. 34 यस्मिन् यथा वहिते यो मनुष्यः
तस्मिन् तथा वतलयस स धर्मः।
मायाचारे मायया वातितमः
साध्वाचारे: साधुनां प्रत्युपेयः।

p. 35 प्रति चाय एकम पुरा गीतः श्लोको वाल्मीकिना भूषि।

p. 36 सेना भिन्ना नौरिव सापरे।
सेना भिन्ना नौरिवागाबे।

p. 38 सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गेश्च बंधो मन्त्वतराशिणे च।
बंशानुसरितं चैव पुराणं पंचलक्षशतम्।

p. 41 इत्यं मे गये यथुत्ति वजुर्दि स्तोत्रम सचत्यम प्रसिद्धम।
प्रसिद्धाय महाभूते वितस्त्वायाँकीये श्रुयु ह्वासुष्योभय।
p. 43 अनुग्रहं प्रयाण च साकेतं मगधास्तयः।
एतान् जनपदान् सर्वान् भोक्तन्ते गुप्तवंशाजः। ॥

p. 45 भासो रामिलसोमिली वरसिचि: श्रीसाहसःकः कवि
मेण्यो भारविक-कालिदास-तरला: सकलं: सुवर्णवच यः।
दण्डी वासुदिवकरी गरेपितः: कान्तिश्च रतिकरः
सिद्धा यथं सरस्वती भगवती के तत्त्व सर्वेऽपि ते। ॥ (राजशेखर)

यस्याश्चकोरिष्कुरिन्करः कर्णपूरो मद्यरो
भासो हरसः कविकुलहुः: कालिदासो विलासः।
हरयो हरयो हुदयवसितः: पंचबाणास्तु बारा:
केषा नैं कथय कविता-कामिनी कौन्तकाय। ॥ (प्रसन्नराघव)

बाला सा विविधनं चतुर्वंशम्
तन्त्री च सा स्वतं भत्रोपिनितः गविष्टः।

...............
हा कापि सा किमिवं कि कथयामि तथ्यः।
दुःखातो मयि दुःखिता भवित या दुःखे प्रहुत्ता तथा
दीने दैन्यमृपैतिः रोषपथे प्रथं: वघो भापते।
कालं वेदित कथः करोति निनुभा मलसंत्वे रज्यति
भार्या मन्निवरः: सका परिजनः: सैका बहुतवं गता। ॥

p. 46 नान्यन्ते ततः: प्रविशाति सूत्रधारः;

p. 47 किर वक्षयतीति हृदयं परिशिष्टं मे
शंक्वचरः: प्रलयसागर घोषृतुलयः। (कर्त्यमारम्)
सत्य स्वतं प्रलयसागर घोषृतुलयम्। ॥ (हृदवारयम्)

p. 48 शापामि सत्येन मयं न जाने। (मद्यमथ्योगम)
किमेतदं मो मयं नाम भवतोऽयं मया शुचिन्। ॥ (बालबरतम्)
श्रवं सर्वमलंकरो भवित सुरूपाराम्।
भ्रो श्रकुल्यां खु इस्तरां
इमामिन महं त्र्स्नां राजस्हिं: प्रशास्तु नः।
किमिवं हि मधुरार्गेण मधवं नाक्तिनाम्।
p. 49 सूत्रचार कृतांत्रभेनायकः हुमुमिमकः।
सपतककैः लेमे भासो देववृंदलरिव।
स्वप्नवासवदवस्य दाह्मोऽभून पावकः।
कारणं तृतिवस्य न सम्पन्न कुलीनता।
धावकोपिः हि यदृ भासं कविनामप्रिस्मोऽभवत्।
आदि भासेन रचिता नाटिका प्रियदशिका।
तत्स रत्नलीले नूनं रत्नमालेव राजते।
................................
नागान्वं समालोच्य यस्य श्रीहर्षचिक्रमः॥

p. 50 पादाक्तान्तिनु मुप्यायणः सोःम भेदं शिलासनम्॥
नूनं काविवचित्रसीना मां हृद्व वा सहसा गता॥
चिरसुचुः कामो मे वीणंया प्रतितोऽविह।
तानु तृ देवीं न पुष्यामि यस्या घोषवती प्रिया॥

p. 51 इति यज्ञानककम् समापत्तम् विक्रमकार समवत् १७२७ श्राविनः
क्रम्यपदो द्वितीयामम् भौमवास्ये लिक्षितम् स्वामी युधानन्तीव।
इति यज्ञकलम् संपूर्णम् विक्रमीय संवतस्त्र १५५६ मासानामुल्लमे
पीढ मासे सिते पके पूर्णमाम्याम गुज्वासरे लिक्षितम् देवप्रसाद
शर्ममा हस्तिनापुर निवासी।
रक्षतु वसाः धर्मं स्वं प्रजा स्वरगुप्षुः॥
त्वम् राजसितं गृथ्वी सागरान्तः प्रशाधि च॥

p. 52 श्लेषः प्रसादः समता माधुर्य सुकुमारता।
प्रयथ्यकित्वाद्रत्ममोः कान्तिसमाधवः॥ (काव्याद्वर्ती 1. 41)
श्लोके पर्यं गुह जोंथं स्वर्वं लघु पंचमम्॥
हितथुः पांडयोऽहसं सततं दीर्घमण्योः॥
नवं शरायं सलिलस्यपूर्णं सुप्रसङ्क्तं दर्मादुत्तरी यम।
तत्तस्य मां भूनारकं च गत्वेऽवो महतोऽपिस्य क्रुद्ते न युध्येत॥
चूर्तं हि नाम पुस्तस्या सिद्धासनं राज्यम्॥

p. 53 प्रसादुप्रसेव
यथान्वयकारादिव दीपदर्शनम् (चाद्वत)
यथान्वयकारादिव दीपदर्शनम् (चाऋति)
यो याति दशां वरिष्ठताम् (चाआत)
*** नरो *** (चाभृत)
किलन खर्जूर पाण्ड (चाहृ)
कामिनी गण्ड पाण्ड (चाभृत)

p. 54 वेदाकरसमवायप्रविष्टे भारतो वंशः । (प्रतिज्ञायोगधरावरणः)

p. 55 इत्यां सागरसर्वन्तः हिमबद्धविस्त्र्यकुण्डलाम्)
महीमकातपत्तां राजसिंहः प्रशस्तः नः ॥

p. 56 येन शास्त्रे च शास्त्रे च नन्दराजगतां च भूः ।
अधम्पुष्टात्मारुषैः तेन शास्त्रमिदं कुतम् ॥
स्वयंमेव विभगुपतशक्तिकार सूत्रं च भावं च ।
कोटिकिये न कता शास्त्रे विमुक्तं प्रयविस्तरम् ॥
कोटिकिये न नरेन्द्रां शासनस्विधिकुतः ।

p. 57 इत्यद्वादनीः श्राचार्यं विभगुपतेन मौर्यायोः पद्मि : शोकसहस्रः ॥
संक्षर्ता । (वष्णवः)
कोटिकिया कामन्दकीयायिदै नीतिपत्तिकौशलां ॥
नववं तानुः नन्दानूः कोटिकिये श्राहेदः समुद्रिणयिति ॥
******कोटिकियाः एव चन्द्रगुप्त राज्येभिषेकयिति ॥
नवनन्दानूः द्विः कविचुः अपनानुवर्धिणयिति ॥
स एव चन्द्रगुप्तं वे द्विः राज्येभिषेकयिति ॥

p. 58 वात्यायनोऽमलनागः कुटिलस्वरकास्वः ।
प्रमलितः पक्षिलस्वमी विभगुप्तोऽक्षुः लक्ष्म सः ॥
प्रथम्या लाभे पालने च गयननित्र प्रायंशास्त्राइष्टौ पूर्वाचार्यः : प्रस्थापितामि
प्रायंशास्त्रायं सन्धित्व एकमिब्ययङ्स्रस्त्रं कुतम् । (प्रायंशास्त्रः)

p. 61 इत्यद्वादनीः श्राचार्यं विभगुपतेन मौर्यायोः पद्मि : शोकसहस्रः ॥
संक्षर्ता । (वण्डवः)
स्वयंमेव विभगुपतशक्तिकार सूत्रं च भावं च ।
p. 71 अश्मर्यन्त-संगमवेन साधुमायस्थ्यमिल्लेव्यवलम्बतेवेऽऽः (कुमारसंभव)

p. 73 आदानं हि विसमेय सतां बारिमुचाभिव (रघुवंशम् IV)

p. 74 क्रोधं प्रभो संहर संहरेति
यावदु गिरः खे महतं चरित्ति (कुमारसंभवम्)

p. 78 प्रवत्तामप्रकृतितितियास्थिरवः, सरस्वती श्रुतिमहतं महीयताम्।

p. 80 चतुर्पल्लकान्तवला-सनातन्यत्वार-कुललाभित्यकोत्तरानि।
तदन्तयाबिचि-सिताब्रह्म, वुहेयोपमानि स्वहारिणय यत।
कृत्याश्बुंध-शिखरप्रसिद्धानि चालन्यायाभावानि दीर्घवल्लभीनि सवेदिकानि।
गाण्याचवशवदमुखराणि निविटितितिरक्षामाणि लोकदवलव शोभितानि।

बिंद्तुवनं ललितविरितं: सेन्त्रांचं सचिवं:
संगीताय प्रहतमुरजः: सिस्यघम्भीरपरोपम।

p. 81 श्रीमद्भज्यस्तविश्वानः योवने विषयेशियाम्।
वार्षके मुनियुगीनान् योगेनाणे तनुल्यजाम्। (रघुवंशम्)

p. 82 तवासेस्म पदः: क्रीतस्तिपभिः (कुमारसंभवम्)

p. 83 निर्गतास्य न वा कस्य कालिवदस्य सूक्तितु।
प्रीतिमंधुर सदाविन मंजरीविच जायते। (हृद्यविरितम्)
पुरा कविवां मुनिन्याप्रती कस्तिकाचितिष्ठत्कालिदासाः।
काव्यापि ततुल्य-कवीरभावावादनामम्का साध्यबति बमृव।

काव्यसास्त्रम व्यविति।
गुढ़ीग्री सचिव: सवेब मिथः: प्रियशिष्या ललिते कलाविध।
कस्या विशुद्धेन पृथ्विनां, हरता त्वां वद किने मे हृदम्।
भायां मन्त्रवरं: सवेन परिजन: सौका वहृत्तं गताः। (भास)
प. 84 मलिनं हिंभौशोलस्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति।(व्रणिन्)
उपमा कालिदासस्य भार्वरयौरयरवम्।
द्रिणन: पदलालित्यं माथे सन्ति श्रोणुया:।

प. 91 दीर्घं यथा निर्मृतम्युपेतो नैवावति भान्तिन्ति नान्तरिक्षम्।
दिशं न कांविरं विदिन्दं न कांविरं स्वेद्यस्यात् केवलमेति शान्तिम्।
तथा कत्वा निर्मृतत्वम्युपेतो नैवावति भान्तिन्ति नान्तरिक्षम्।
दिशं न कांविरं विदिन्दं न कांविरं क्लेशक्षायात् केवलमेति शान्तिम्।
(सौन्दर्यम् XVI. 28-29)
मार्गाचलव्यतिकराकूलितेव निर्मृः, शैवाधिराजनर्या न ययो न तस्यो
(शृद्धारसमवम् V.85)
सोनिनिष्ठयानापि ययो न तस्यो तरंगारण्येश्वर राजहंसः।।
(सौन्दर्यम् IV.42)
व्युद्वरयस्तो वृषत्कन्धः: शालप्रांशुमहामुजः। (रुद्रपारम् I.13)
दीर्घामहाहवक्षा: सिंहसो वृषभेश्वरः। (सौर II.58)

प. 92 तां सुन्दरी चैना लमेत नन्दः, सा वा निषेधेति न तं नत्रूः।
हद्नसं प्रवृत्तं कर्तव्यं न ज्ञेतायोऽयूवै नान्तरिक्ष्री।।
(सौर IV.7)
स्वेनेव रूपेना विषूषिता हि विवृणानामपि भूषणं सा।।
(सौर IV.12)
प्रस्तवसामाविवक्तस्य गामू।
उद्वारसंश्ये: सतृवैरसंश्ये।।
कालादसनिर्जायते मथ्मानादू, भूमिस्तों कार्यमिना देवति।
सोविसाहृतान्त नायस्यायां नरायण, मायारथ: सर्वयलो: समन्ति।।(मास)

प. 93 काश्च हि मथ्यन्त् लभते हुतासनं, भूमिक खननं विन्दिति चाँपि तोयम्।।
निबन्धिनं: किंचिन्नास्त्यसाध्वं, न्यायेन युक्तं च क्रृतं च सर्वं।।
(ब्रह्मगौर)
रामायणेषुद्वृत्तं महात्ममुक्तपायनु, यज्ञायतोद्वियमणान् भानुः।
समन्तायोगीत् वारि वेषं पश्चात् समुद्रभिसमुखं प्रस्थये।।(ब्रह्म०)
निजाशुनिर्देशमदंगभस्मभिमुखा विशुच्छितलंछलनोमृजाम्।
तिदास्यतां यास्यति तात्वतापि, कि वद्यवनेत्र गुनः कलकितः॥ (नैषपीय)

p. 94 कविमर: कविरचं: कविरितमल्वश्च कलिदासश्च।
श्रेणे कवयः कपगश्चापलमात्रं परं दशंति॥

p. 95 प्रकाशं सर्वतो दिव्यं विद्वन्नाना सतं मुदे॥
प्रवोधनपरा हुशा भा रवेरिवे भारवे:॥

p. 96 कतिपयसहकार पुष्परस्य सनुज्यित्वनिलिनिद्वचारः।
सुरभिमुखार्थागमान्तंश्चे, समुपयो शिशिरः स्मरैकन्यः॥
हिंदु मनोहारि च हुलमं वचः।
न हि प्रियं प्रकुलुमन्यूर्तित मृषा हितिषिघः॥
उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेर्ष्योगोरवम्।
दण्डन: पदलालिस्य माचे सन्ति त्रयो गुणः॥

p. 97 न नीण्कूणोनुदेवै नाना नानाना नद्॥
नुलृक्षुनो नुदुदेवै नानेनायुगुनुदुदु॥

p. 98 व्यास्या गक्षंमिर्द काव्यं उल्लवं: सुधियामलम्॥
हुता दुमेवस्त्राहस्मम् विहव भ्रायता मया॥
रामांशि परावर्षयोनि तपस्तो, ववं हुतेन्द्रुभितात्मवै॥
तपेन तपस्य यथायसो नः, सन्वि: परेणास्तु विमुच सीताम्॥
(बलसमद्विति)
तावद् भा भारवमातीयायवन्मायस्य नीदये:॥
उदिते तु पुनर् माचे भारवभार रवेरिव॥
उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेर्ष्योगोरवम्।
दण्डन: पदलालिस्य माचे सति त्रयो गुणः:॥
माचै माचे इवाशेषं कश: कम्पतंतु जगतु।
श्लेषामोदरर चापि सम्माधब्यत्तु महीरजः:॥

p. 99 श्रविचाय तदा तदार्थं विशुच्छितलांछलनोमृजाम्॥
भवतोभिमान: समीहते सत्यः कर्तुमुपेत्य माननम्॥ (माघ)
p. 100 नालम्बे दैश्वर्तां न निषिद्धति पीखिपे।
शब्दांतः सत्त्वविविलयं ह्यं विद्यानवल्ले॥ (माघ)
श्रुतां गिरं गदसीति ज्ञाति पद्मोविषुष्याने।
निन्द्रामयं श्रीरमचर्यंतस्तव कर्मयोगं विकसत्यस्तप्ता॥ (माघ)
प्रसन्नशृवच्छयो गुम्तीविवृत्यान्यं कुर्युगपद्ययासा लोक इव व्यक्तरेपि
(हस्यचरित्म्)।

p. 103 द्वितीयपक्षपौरोक्षदः (बस्मभृत्ति)।

p. 104 स्वामि सम्मंदफला हि मण्डनम् (कुमारवास)
प्रियेषु सीमामयफला हि चाषता (कालिवास)
पस्यनु हतो मतमवापणातोः। शक्तीविपश्चतु न मिमोहल वच्चः।
उहू विधाता हि कृतो कथा ताविल्यसि तस्यां सुम्भोवितः॥
(कुमारवास)
न स राम इह कथ या तंत्रयुक्तो वन्तितदिनमः॥ निजहस्तपता पुत्रतानोऽविद्येस्तो निनिलीनिलीनमः॥ (कुमारि)

p. 105 जनकी हरणं करतुः रघुवंशी स्थितेश्वरि।
कवि: कुमारदासाच रावणाच यदि शमः॥ (राजशेखर)
नुपेशे कन्यां जनकेन दिसितात्। प्रयोगिनां लभ्यितुं स्यंवंते॥
द्विजखपयेसं स चर्मनन्दः। सहनुशस्तं सुख्मायणीयत॥ (कविराज)

p. 111 इथं व्यासपुत्रं बाला भूस्या: कागुपायते।
कदालाश्च शरायनं मनो मे हरिसायते॥ (श्रुंगारतिक)
इन्द्रवेशों नयं मुखमुखणेन। कुंदेन दल्मघरं नवपलवेन।
प्रज्ञानि जम्पकदले: स विधाय वेषाः। कान्ते कथं घटितवापुलेन
वेत्॥ (श्रुंगारि)

p. 114 विपद स्थतमंथामुदयमेव कशंः। सदृशसि वायस्तुता युथि विक्रमः।
वच्चितिः चारभिवच्चित्वस्तं शुश्र, प्रकृतिरसिद्धिमेव हि महत्मनमं॥
(मदभरि)
श्रावकान्तं सर्वेणं जनं जरसा यातायुम योवं
सन्तोषो चन्दलिप्स्या शमसुखः प्रौढ़ास्त्रणा विनंमाः।
लोकांमध्ये निर्मुख वनबुधो व्यालै दुर्जने
रसौधेव विद्वृत्योऽयुयपहः प्रसंगं न किं केतन वा ॥ (सत्तुहरि)
कामिनीकायकान्तारे कुचपूर्वतुर्गमे ॥
मा संचर मनः पान्य तत्त्वाते समर्तस्करः ॥ (सत्तुहरि)

प. 115 बाले, नाथ, विमुच्छ मानिनि रूपं, रोशांमया किं कृतम्,
खेदो असमातु, न मेंपरायणैं मथुरा स्वेषस्पष्टाः मयैः
तत् किं रोदिष्ट गदृढ़देव बचसा, कस्याण्त्व रूढ़ते,
नन्वेतनम्, का तवारिन, दयिता, नास्मील्योऽस्थते ॥ (ग्रम्मशास्त्रः)

प. 117 प्रथापि तां प्रभृतियोऽनु मृगाधवकाशीं, पीयृष वर्णकुच कुम्भयुग् वहन्तीं।
पश्याम्यं यदि पुनःदिवसावसाने, स्वरुपजवनवराय्यसु ल्याजामी ।
(विलहार)

प. 118 हृरिरसनरादि बहुति मधुपवने
किमपरमसदिकसुख संख्यभवने (जयदेव)

प. 119 कथितसमयेण परहृति न यये वनम्।
मम विफलमिदममलसपमपि योवनम्।
यामिं हे कन्हिः शरदां सहस्रजनवचनवचिता
मम मर्यादेशं वदिम्य वित्तक्षेषेताः।
किमिति विष्द्वाय विद्यानमऽचेतताः। यामिं हे……ः (जयो)
मामियं चलितव विलोक्य वृत्तं व्यवनिचयनेन
सापराधत्या मयापि न वारितांजितभयेन।
हृरि हृरि हृतादरत्वा गता सा कुमितेवः
किं करित्यति किं वनित्यति सा चिरं विरेते ः।
किं चनेन जनेन किं मम जीवितं गृहे ॥ हृरि हृरि……ः (जयो)
हृति तव तभी सुवा स चन्द्रः श्यामास्तमोमितिदितः।
सदेशसर्वस्य एव विनिमं संकेतकावासकः।।
भृणो भृणो इसे वसन्तममत्स्वेतो नयन्यं यथा
गच्छ क्षेतं सामाग्री निपुणं यहनु ते देवता: ॥ (शीतामक्तरिका)

प. 121 सङ्कुञ्जत्वति राजाः: सङ्कुञ्जत्वति पण्डिता:।
सङ्कुञ्जकत्वं प्रदीप्यते श्रीप्रेतानि सकृतं सकृत् ॥ (चारक नैतिकाण्डः)
p. 123 श्रो: समासभूमस्त्वमेलदु गद्यव जीवितम्
जातिरेका संजा इवायित्ता (विज्ञकं)

p. 125 जानामि करिकाांतच्छल हताधिवितं
मम नात्यत विभावसः पार्थीजीवितेष्वरात्
उलस्कुः तुझ्मन्द्रव्यास्तदेष निवचित्तया
वाण्यवायुः निरांकलुः देहभरविभवनाम् II (विज्ञकं)

p. 129 वे केचिन्नु शाठथ-मौध्यजीवितस्ते शूण्यता रश्रकाः II (कल्हण)
भास्वदू बिभावसरा कुण्यकेशी तितकरानना ||
हरिमध्या शिवाकार सर्वदेवमध्यीय ताता || (कल्हण)

p. 132 वयोजनयथो क्षेत्रयथो क्षेत्रयथो गुणाः
तयो दण्ड-प्रबन्धाच्छ त्रिषु लोकेषु विद्वृता: II (राजशेखर)

p. 133 ब्रह्मान्तार्कसंहारमवार्य सूवर्दिनमिः
हृद्धिरेववर यूनां योवनप्लभवं तम: || (बिज्ञकं)
—केवल च निषिद्ध्वा एवाभासुःवर्त्तार्कसंहारमवार्य
स्वतं तमो योवनप्लभवम् || (बाला)

p. 134 श्रो: समासभूमस्त्वमेलदु गद्यव जीवितम्
उपेलि दण्डिता श्रोक्तं सर्वयुक्ता सरस्वती (विज्ञकं)
ननु दण्डीमहाबिच्छद्मधारां दुःखतति सन्तवेलांकराश्चास्तातिः
(रूप)

p. 136 रसालकं वाक्यं काव्यं
जाते जगति वाल्मीको कविरिच्चित्यभास्वतु
कवी इति ततो भ्यासे कथयस्त्वम्पद दण्डिनं

p. 137 कुमारा माराभिरामा रामाक्ष्यंक्ष भस्मीकृतार्यो स्योपहसित-
समीरणा एकाभियाणेन यात्रामुद्यासां राजामनकारोः II (विज्ञकं)
कहीतानबलदु दयान्त्व तुनां वास्तवद्यताय
शक्तेये पाण्डुआर्जय गतय एण्गोचरम् || (बाला)
p. 138 गतवति शुचि विक्रमादित्यें (बासवबत्ता)
कविरंग विक्रमादित्यसम्य:। तस्मिन् राज्य लोकान्तरं प्राप्ते एतं निबंधं
कृतवान् । (राजसहबद्ध)
श्रृणुभूषणैः गामिनीनां च वासवदत्तादीनां वर्णेने प्राह्याणुशायम् ।
(द्रष्टिनरू)

वासवदत्तामधिकृतय कृतो प्रन्यः । (बालिक)
छन्दोविचित्रितर भालिकसनाथा
छन्दोविचित्रि भाराजमानतमुन्म्याम्
इत्यमतिद्वयी कथा

p. 139 न्यायस्वतितिमिवोद्योतकस्वरूपां, बीहसंगतितिमिवालंकारभूषिताम्। (सुबन्ध)

p. 140 विवाहरोपिपुष्मनः: धृतराष्ट्रोपिगुणप्रियः; कश्मारुकान्तोपि सुधमाणितः
(बासवबत्ता)
नायकेन कीति:, कीत्या सप्तसागरः, सागरः: कुलुमागवाराजचरित
सम्माम्...(बासवबत्ता)
प्रायश्चरस्थितय प्रायवर्णविन्यासमृद्धम्यनिधि: । (सुबन्ध)

p. 143 रसतमकं वाक्यं काव्यम्

p. 144 जाता शिल्पिणिः प्राक्: यथा शिखण्डः तथा गच्छन्मा:।
प्रागल्लभिधिमात्रं वायो वारो भूषेवति । (पण्डित गोवर्धननाचार्य)
शिवरस्वरवर्षपदः रसस्वस्तवती जग्नभूतो हरति ।
तद्भि कि तत्रेयः नहिः नहः वायो द्राक्ष स्वस्तवत्सलि । (चर्मचार)
हृदयसत: पञ्चवार्तस्तु बायो: (जयदेव)

p. 145 बाणोचिथां जगतु सर्वेम्

p. 146 प्रमुखभयद्याता जननिरागहेतुः
सन्त्येके बहुलाप्पा: कवयो बालका ह्यः । (त्रिविक्रम भट्ट)

p. 147 प्रवक्तांपि स्वयं लोकः कामं काव्यपरीक्षकः
रसपराकामस्थिषौ भोक्ता वेदित न कि रसम् । (सोमवेव)
p. 150 अपादः पदसन्तानो गदामाल्यायिका कथा, इति तत्त्व प्रस्तुती द्वौ \n
(विष्णु)

भूतभाषामयी प्रामृत्तपुतारी बुद्धक्षयाम्। (बिष्णु)

p. 154 परार्थ फलजन्मानो न स्मृतमेकुम्मा इति।
तपच्छिद्रो महान्तस्तब्ज्यो जेड्यारित्यं जगद्यु भवेत्।। (सोमदेव)

p. 155 भूतेन्द्रियानभिन्नों गमों हि परमो मतः।। (क्यासरिसागर)

p. 156 स धूर्जटिटाज्जुटो जायता विजयाय वं।
यशौपलितभान्ति करोत्यवधापि जानवनी।। (शिबदास)

p. 158 प्राचीन मस्तयूह प्रणुस्य देवान्।। (सोमनारायण IV)
प्रतिकान्तो मानुषार्वागमस्मप्रपातवच दिव्यवाणूम्।। (विश्वाबदान)

p. 160 यदेव यात्स्ये तदेव ददाननादीविद्य स्नेहायतीह दत्तम्।
किमुहयमानस्य जलेन तोप्तेदायाम्यतः प्राचितमयेस्मे।।

(जातकमाला)

नायेव यलं। सार्वभीमतमाध्यु, नैव स्वर्ग नापवायां न कीतितयो।।
शारु लोकान्तियं लवादरो में, जान्यावलेशो मा च भुदस्य मिशं।।

(जातक 38)

तत्त्वाको सादागर दगा

(शिबजातक)

p. 164 काव्यालेन बालानं नीतित्वदिह कथ्यते। (हिलोबेद्य)

भवेन वाच्यस्तन्द्रे गुरुयाय प्ररापराय समुत्ताय।।
चारुक्षाय च विदुध्यर नमोत्सतु नयशाख्यन्तुभंश्य।। (पञ्चबन्त्र)

(फलन्त्र)
p. 165 पत्रवतन्त्रात्यायस्माद् प्रवायादायण्य लिख्यते। (क्षेत्रोपवेश)
एतत् पद्धतिवक मात्र नीतिवास्त्र बलायविधानां यूतले प्रकृतम्।
(पठ्वतत्त्व)
तत्त्वे: पत्रविभिन्नचक्रकार सुमनोहरं शास्त्रम्। (पठ्व)

p. 168 श्रद्धा खर: कुसारो हृरवस्यवया विहिरिन्त: कुबेरः
स्त्रज्ञावस्यी सरस्वत्युदविषुवया बायुहेयाः बुजुर्गाः।
विद्या तयोद्भिन्नी श्रीदित्यदितिषुवता मातुरविषुवकाया
बेदासीयायिन यजया गणवसुमनय्: पालु नित्य ग्रहास्य।
(पठ्व)

p. 170 यानि कानि च कल्त्यायिनि मिनायिशि शतायिषि (पठ्व)

p. 171 शतं प्रति शाठथचांचरूण्य (महाभारत)

p. 172 न गोप्रदानं न महिप्रदानं
न चान्नदानं हि तथा प्रथातम्।
यथा वदत्तीह बुध: प्रदानं
सर्वेण् प्रदानेऽवभायप्रदानम्। (पठ्वतत्त्व)

p. 173 यस्य बुजुर्गत: तस्य निन्दुः देस्तु कूलो बलम्।
वने शिलहो मदोस्य: शाखकेन निपातितः। (पठ्व)
श्रवस्योपाणवं कुलवा नैव भोग समशुद्धं।
श्रवणं महादानच सुहः: सोमिलको यया। (पठ्व)
वातवृत्तिविवृत्तिस्य श्रुतियुक्तिस्य धातवं।
पृष्ठतोस्तुमृत्युमिव कदा तत्रेम भविष्यति। (पठ्व)
श्रायकले तु संप्रार्ते बल्मिक्तं मित्रभेव तत्।
बुजुर्गकले तु संप्रार्ते कुर्जेऽकोपि सुहुः भवेत्। (पठ्व II. 118)
उदमेन हि सिद्धपर्यतो कार्यादि न मनोरथ:।
न हि शिलयस्य सुप्रत्य स्विवचित्तेऽयते मुखः। (पठ्व III. 38)
कि तथा कियते चेन्य या न सूते न दुर्शाद।
कोश्यं: पुत्रेण जातेन यो न विद्यान भक्तिमान्। (पठ्व कवामुख)
p. 174 सिद्ध प्रार्थयता जनेन विनशा तेजो विद्वृष्ट स्वर्यः ।
सत्तीद्रस्तुकृतापि देवविद्विषु स्वर्यः प्रेक्षायं क्रमात् ।
वेदवर्गः विनिरप्रवधरौ सर्वतोमयीस्मात् गर्भायां धम्मातमः ॥ (पश्चिमII. 223) ।

p. 176 यावतु स्वर्गानन्द्वलोकं दयाभनसमो यस्य स्पृशित ग।
सतानन्दायांस्त्रं प्रजंतु रचित: सम्महृथ्यं कथानाम् ॥
(हिलोपदेश IV. 138) ।

p. 177 सूतो हिलोपदेशों र अत दार्योतिबिताय ।
बालसं वैषयन नीतिविद्वां दशातिच च ॥ (हिलो) ।
यनवे भाजने लगन: संस्कारो नायन्या भवेत् ।
कष्टालेलेन बालाण्या नीति स्तविधि कथ्येते ॥ (हिलो) ।

p. 178 माता शामः पिता बैली बालो देव न पाठवतः ।
न शोभे समाम्बे हुसम्बे बबो यथा ॥ (हिलो) ।
यथाहेकन चक्रेण न रस्य गतिसंबेद्वेत् ।
एवं पुष्यकारेण विना देवं न मित्यस्यति ॥ (हिलो) ।
तदु भवता विनोदाय काक्रूमीदीनां विचित्रां कथा कथ्यायम् ।
राजपुष्य-स्वतं । कथ्यायम् । विद्युष्मार्गवाच ।
शुभं संप्रति विनलाभः ।
(हिलो) ।

p. 186 वादयनित तथा शास्त्रिः लास्तवापि चापरे ।
नाटकान्यपरे माधुर्यायामि विविधानि च ॥ (रामायण II. 69. 4.)
रसशृङ्ख्लार कामसङ्गीतरौ भयानकः ।
श्रीरामभीर श्रेष्ठुः कामसंगीतरौ भयानकाम् ॥ (रामायण I.4.9.)
श्रीकृष्ण तथा स्वर्णीपिनिः । (रामायण I. 83.15)
इत्यबबितः सूक्ष्मात्स्फूर्तः पौराणिकस्तथा । (महाभारत I. 51. 15)
QUOTATIONS IN THE NAGARI SCRIPT

196. तत्ततेषु िशुविष्यां श्रीमान्, ह्योपराभिवः।
एकच्छवश्रकवर्त्ती विक्रमासिद्ध इत्यभूतोऽऽ (कल्ह्)

197. श्री ह्योपराभिवाक वारणां दीनामिभ चनम् (भमाट)

199. प्रास्स्त्र शौचिंशिनं, श्वर वदनापहृत्नकान्तिसमिभवः।
प्रतिकर्त्तामिवोध्रव्यकः सिद्धः पुरस्तानर्वानाशः। (हर्ष)
विरम विरम वह ते मुखः धूमानुवन्धम्
प्रकटवर्त्ति किमुखशर्विषां चक्रवालम्।
विरहुतमुखाः यो न दयः प्रियायाः।
प्रलयदहनमासा तस्यं करेऽर्वत् (हर्ष)
स्व शरीरस्य परास्यं यः लघु ददामायानिच तृप्यः।
राज्यस्य कुते श कर्य प्रार्र्वधर्मीयमुख्यम् (हर्ष)

201. प्रास्स्त्रेत् न लघु विधचन्चने नीचेः।
प्रार्हन्य विध्व-विहता विरमिति मध्यः। (हर्ष)
विच्छैः पुनः पुनर्पि प्रतिह्यमानाः।
प्रार्हन्यमुत्तममुपास्त्र्विमोद्रहिंति। (भुवराक्षस)

202. यं ब्राह्मायमिनयें देवी वामवेवनुस्तंते। (उत्तररामचरितम्)

203. यथा स्त्रीगां तथा वाचां साधुः पुज्यो जनः।
ये नाम केवलिहि नः प्रश्नयत्ववानाः।
जानन्ति ते किमिहि तान् प्रति नैष यतः। (सारात्मकाब)

204. शब्दव्रह्मविवः कवे: परिषोजमास्य वानीमिमाम्। (उत्तरम VII. 26)
एको रसः कल्हा एव निमिति नैदात्।
श्रष्ट्रा रोदिति श्रष्टव दलिति वचस्य इत्ययम्।
कल्हा शरीरस्य मूलितरथवा शरीरिकं विरह्यम्।
p. 205. भव्यां यदि बिश्रृंगि त्वं तात कामवते तदा।
भवभूतियदेस चितमनिलमं निवेशय।।
सूक्ति द्वितयं मन्ये निभिलेश्य पहीतते।।
भवभूति: शुष्कछायं वाल्मीकिसुतु तौत्तीयकः।।
भवभूति: संवव्यादू भूवहर्षुदेव भारती भारत।।
एततु कलकारायेन किमन्यथा रोदिति ग्रावा॥

p. 206 भूमां रसानो गहना: ययोगा:।
शीरोढ़ता नमयलीवत गतिर्गिर्गिर्मू (भवभूति)
श्रीज: समासभूसत्वमेदव गदस्य श्रीवितमू।
श्रीकुटस्वादारता च वचसामू।
म्लानस्य जीवकुमस्य विकासानाति, संतप्यसानि सकलेदिगुहासानाति।
अन्नदनानि हृद्वस्वकरसायानाति, विष्ठया मयायथिगितानि वचोमुखानि॥
(मालतीमाधव)
त्वं जीवतं त्वममि ते हृदयं हितीयं......

p. 207 किमपि किमपि मद्यं मन्दमातिस्तियोपायादू (उत्तररामचरितम्)
श्रीदैतु सुखुदड़वयो:......
श्रीहो सरसरण्यीयता विद्वानस्य (मालतीमाधव VI. 16. 2).
श्रस्ति वा कुटस्वरेवमू श्रीवितरमायी योज्यवं महाप्रकरसायमू
(मालतीमाधव X. 23.18)
बूमू वलम्मकवम्: पुरा कविस्त: प्रपेदोपुरुषि भृत्तू भेज्जतामू।
स्थित: पुनयों भवभूतिरेखवा स बर्तंते सम्बजित राजशेखरः॥
(बालरामायण 1. 16)
कविवाक्षपरितवर श्री भवभूत्यादि सेवित:।
जिती यथो यशोवर्मां तदु गुएस्वतित बनिःसतामू॥
(राजतरंगिणिो IV. 144)
भवभूम्भूजलमि निगमयक्षमत्वसयक्षा इव फुरितम्।
जास्स विस्तया ब्रजज्वो वियदेयुह कहाल्लांवेसु॥
(गोविंद 799)

p. 209 यतातृ श्रीवर्णयानं रचिदितुं वाच: सतां संमतां
ब्लाभावं परमभवाप्तमे श्री लघुं रसेश्चोस:।
श्रीकुटू स्वादू फांवं जीवितरोंखिति ते कौतुकं
तदृ भ्रात: श्रृणु राजशेखर कवे: सुक्ति: सुधास्यन्दिनी:॥
p. 210 तत्र भवतो 5 राराल्पुर बास्तवाय्यः कवेदेश्नागस्य कृततः कुन्दमाला

p. 211 स्त्रेः दयां च सौभयं च यदि वा जानकीमपि ।
श्रावणाय लोकस्य मुँहतो नासिति मे व्यथा ॥

(उत्तररामचरित I. 12)

देवीं वाचमुपाते हि बहवः सारन्तू सारस्वतं
जानीते नितरामसौ सुस्कूल बिलष्टो मुरारि कूिः
श्रवितवैविद्यं देव वानरभारे किंतवस्य गम्भीरता
सापाताल निममगण्ये रत्नाकरं नामवाचः

p. 212 श्रृंगोत्यानान्तक इवार्तमानायकस्य
नायं कविवर्ष्टत वस्य मुरारिरितवमू ॥ (रत्नाकर)
श्रमने रंभोगं भवन्युऽवन गुपाराभासौतुलया भुतस्य
उनस्य नूऽन्त प्रतिपूरणाय तारा: स्फुरक्षण प्रतिमानश्चाण्डः ॥ (मुरारि)

p. 214 विदिति जानिति, विद्वाने भवति, विद्वन्ति ब्रह्मावव विद्वन्ति, लभन्ते,
तिद्विद्वन्ति विद्वार्यन्ति, सर्वं मनुष्याः सत्यविष्यं वैः सत्या
विद्वासंस्कर भवति ते वेदा: ॥ (वयायनस्य सरस्वती)
श्रंच: सामान छन्दसि सुराः यजुर्वा सह ।
उद्धृत्यात्जीवने सर्वं दिवं देवां दिविशिष्टाः ॥ (ब्रह्मवेद 11.7.24)
एवं वारेष्य सहतो भूतस्य निश्चिन्तितमेतदु यदृ श्रृंगे युज्येवं
सामीवेदो अविभवज्ञस्... (बूहदार्यकोषस्यादु 2.4.11)

p. 218 न सदासीतव नासवः
सहस्वाशः... (अष्टेव X. 90)

p. 222 देवानृ भावस्तानेन ते देवा भावस्ततु वः ।
परस्परं भावस्ततं: श्रेयं: परमवाच्यः ॥ (मगवजीता III. 11)

p. 225 सहस्तुस्य पर्यात्महव्रेण ब्रह्माणो विभुः ।
राज्यं रोहस्यस्तानं वेश्वरः वार्तविविदो जना: ॥
श्रव्यक्ताव्यक्तः सर्वं: प्रभवन्त्वह्रागमे ।
राज्याग्रामें प्रलीयन्ते तत्बाव्यक्तसंज्ञके ॥
शून्यांग्राम: स एवायं भूतवा भूतवा प्रलीयते ।
राज्याग्रामें ज्ञास: पार्थ प्रभवन्त्वह्रागमे ॥ (मीता VIII. 17-19)
पृ. 226 \[\text{ब्रह्माकार \ समुद्रचमः}\\
\text{पुराणा मानवो धर्मः सांगो बेदविकण्ठतमः}\\
\text{श्रावासिधानि चलारिः न हुतव्यानि हेदुभि:}\\
\text{किच,}\\
\text{शुक्लस्तु वेदो विज्ञेयो धर्मशास्त्रं तु वै स्मृति:}\\
\text{ते सर्वविधमांसेः तास्यां धर्मो विन्यमी विषमान्}\\
\text{योजमयेत ते दूषरे हेदुसास्त्राध्ययो द्विजः}\\
\text{स साधुभिरविकायो नासितो वेदनिश्वः}\\
\text{वेदः स्मृति: सदाचारः स्वस्य च सिद्धमात्रम:}\\
\text{एतत्तुलिकं प्राहः साक्षाद धर्मस्य लक्षायम्}\\
\text{प्रथितु,}\\
\text{यः कार्तिकेत्य कस्य चिद्वर्मो मनुना सम्प्रक्षित:}\\
\text{स सर्वोपासितो वेदेः सर्वात्मरात्रो हि स:}\\
\text{सब्र तु समवेश्येदं विधितं ज्ञातचलुपया}\\
\text{व्रतिः प्रामाण्यात्तिविद्या वत्तश्च स्वभमि निविषेऽति वै}\\
\]

पृ. 227 \[\text{शिष्या ध्याकरणां छन्दो निस्कतं ज्योतिषं तथा}\\
\text{कल्याणेति षड्गौतिः बेदस्याहुर्मण्नीपिः}\\
\]

पृ. 228 \[\text{पुराणयाय भीमानस्मार्मास्त्रां सम्प्रक्षित:}\\
\text{बेदः स्वानाति विधानां धर्मस्य च नादुर्दश:}\\
\text{(पाणिबोध्यः मृतिः I.3)}\\
\text{एकं सदृ बिन्दा बृहुया वदन्यानि यम मातिरिस्वानानाः:}\\
\text{अर्ह्वेद I.164)\\
\]

पृ. 229 \[\text{मनुयायां तहस्वेणु कार्तिकेश्वरमनि सिद्धे:}\\
\text{ललामपि सिद्धां गोविन्दः मां बेदित तत्त्वत्:}\\
\text{वृहं जन्ममानात ज्ञातानू मां प्रवचते}\\
\text{अर्थ्यस्य तु कौलेये वैराग्ये च श्रुत्त्वं}\\
\text{भौप्ता VI. 35)}\\
\text{अर्थ्यार्थ वैराग्यात्मकं तत्त्वरोध:}\\
\text{(पातंजलियोगसूत्र I.13)}\\
\text{प्राप्य पृष्ठकां सलीकान्तियशास्त्री: समा:}\\
\text{शुचीनां श्रीमातां गृहः योगाप्रकृतोभिज्ञाते}\\
\text{श्रवण्या योगिनामेव हुले भवति धीमताम्}\\
\text{एतदिः कुलेश्वरलं लोकं जनयद्विशाम्}\\
\text{(सब्रध्वीगा VI. 41-2)}\\
\text{तम तं बुद्धिसंयोगं लभते पीविषेहिक्तम्}\\
\text{(सब्रध्वीगा VI. 43)}\\
\]
p. 230 सुरा मल्या मध्य मांसमासवं कृष्ण रीढ़म् ।
धूर्तं: प्रविष्टिं ह्यो तन्मैतदु वेदेनु कल्पितम् ॥
मानामोहाः लोमाळ्छ लौक्यमेक्तू प्रकाशितम् ॥
बिध्युमेवाभिजानिन्त सर्व यज्ञेण ब्रह्माण्यां: ॥
पायसं: सुप्रभोमिस्त तस्यापि यज्ञं स्मृतम् ॥
वस्त्याश्रयं वे वृक्षा वेदेनु परिकल्पिता: ॥

(महाभारत, शांतिपर्व 10-12)

वीजैयंजेपु वष्ट्वयमिति वा वैदिकी जूतिः ।
श्रेष्ठापिनी बीजानि च्यागं नो हनुमथे ॥
ैैष धर्मः: सतां देवा यज्ञ वच्चेते वै पञ्चु: ॥ (भारती, शांतिपर्व 337)
यज्ञार्थं कर्मसूचिनयन्त लोकोऽर्थं कर्मवतन्त: ॥ (ब्रह्मण III. 9)
श्रवणात ऋषियोऽः तस्यस्तु तत्त्वराम।
हृदो देवो बलिनम्भो वृत्तियोऽत्रविन्यासम् ॥ (मनुसूत्रतिः III. 70)

p. 231 काम एव क्रोध एव रजोगुणा समुदभवः ।
महाशास्ने महापापम्या ब्रह्मेवेनमिह वैरियम् ॥ (मीतान्त III. 37)
पाप्यान्त प्रजहि हृदं ज्ञानविज्ञान नाशानम् ॥ (मीतान्त III. 41)

p. 234 श्रवन्तिमिच्छे पुरोहितम्
यज्ञस्य: देवृत्तिविनम्
होतारं रत्नघातानम् ॥

p. 250 शिश्न व्याकरणं छन्दो निश्चयं ज्योतिषं तथा ।
कल्पश्रेष्ठतः श्रमेव वेदान्तमांदमणीं ॥
गुल्लं लघुता साम्यं हस्तवतीर्थ्युतानि च ।
लोपागम विकारार्थः प्रकृतिविविधत: क्रमः ॥
स्वर्तिदततनीचत्वं: श्वासो नादस्तथोभयं ।
एततु सर्वं च दिक्षतं छन्दोभाषामधरीयं ॥

p. 253 छन्द: पादी तु वेदस्य हस्तो कल्पोज्य प्रवेशते ।
ज्योतिषायामनं च चिन्निनंशं श्रोतमुख्यते ॥
शिश्न भार्या तु वेदस्य गुल्ला व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।
तत्स्माद संगमगीयिव ब्रह्मांलोके महूःते ॥
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<td>Aṣṭādhyāyī, 58, 165</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Aṣṭapadipradala-kamala, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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**Ādi Granth, 119**

Ādi-purāṇa, See Brahma-purāṇa.

Ādisūra, King, 202

Ānandavardhana, 72, 84, 116, 202, 209

Āpastamba-sūtra, 42, 62

Āranyakas, the, 13, 238, 243, 245-6

Āryabhaṭṭa, 80

Ārya Saṅghasena, 155

Āryasūra, 159-61

Āryāśaptaśati, 112

Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi, 46

Āśvalāyana-sūtras, 42

Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra, 33

Indradhvaja festival, 182-3

Ujjayinī, 14, 15, 195

Uttarapurāṇa, 147

Uttarārāmacariyam, 47, 187, 189-91, 193, 204-7, 210-11

Udaya, 239

Udayasundarikathā, 147

Uddyotakara, 139

Udbhāta, 209

Upaniṣads, the, 4, 5, 14, 88, 110, 120, 138, 214, 223, 231, 238-9, 244, 246-9

Upamitiḥbhaprapaṇcakathā, 161

Uvaṭa, 238-9

Urubhaṅgaṁ, 46, 47, 192

Ṛgveda, 8, 9, 14, 17, 36, 120, 163, 182, 184-5, 215-38, 241, 243, 251, 256, 263

Ṛtusaṁhāra, 64, 68, 73, 74, 80, 103, 110, 255

Ṛsabhapaṇcāsikā, 146
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Aitareya Āranyaka, 220, 263
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 120

- Odayadeva, 146

Aucityālaṅkāra, 196

Kaṭaka, 20
Kathārṇava, 155
Kathāsaritsāgara, 134, 145, 148, 153-155, 154, 178, 184, 193, 198, 203
Kapardīśvāmi, 240
Kapphanābhuyudaya, 106
Kabir, 58
Kaṁsavadha, 186
Karṇabhārāṇ, 46, 47
Karṇasundarī, 124
Karṇadeva, 213
Karpūrāmāri, 198, 208
Karma, Theory of, 6
Kalāpariccheda, 12
Kalāvilāsa, 121
Kalhaṇa, 6, 106, 126, 122, 126-9, 154, 193, 195-6, 207
Kavīndravacana-samuccaya, 120
Kaviputra, 65
Kavirāja, 105, 123, 138
Kavirahasya, 105
Kāṭayavema, 75
Kāṭhaka Samhitā, 33
Kātyāyana, 8, 9, 12
Kātantra Grammar, 148, 151
Kādambarī, 14, 106, 123, 124, 133, 137, 140-6, 149, 156, 193
—kathāsāra, 106
Kāmamkṣa, 57, 58
Kāmamkṣaṣṭāma Nītisāra, 177
Kāmasāstra, 64, 72, 101, 118
Kāmasūtra, 59, 99, 138 194
Kālidāsa, 5, 6, 18, 30, 45, 48, 49, 51, 54, 55, 61, 63-85, 88-9, 91-2, 94-103, 104, 106, 108-9, 110-12, 123, 136, 176, 182, 188, 193, 195, 198-9, 204-205, 210, 222
Kāvyādarśa, 52, 94, 123, 132-4, 136, 149, 150-1
Kāvyaprakāśa, 197
Kāvyālaṅkāra, 134
Kaśikāvṛtti, 95, 100, 105
Kirātārjunīyāṁ, 94, 95, 99
Kīrtikaumudi, 130
Kirtivarman, 213
Kundamāla, 87, 193, 209-11
Kubera, 15, 38
Kumāradāsa, 99, 103, 105
Kumārapālacakarita, 109
Kumārasambhava, 64, 70, 73, 75, 79, 82, 85, 89, 91, 104
Kumārila, 31
Kūrma-purāṇa, 39
Kṛṣṇamīra, 87, 193, 212
Kṛṣṇa Ṛṣa, 63, 78, 79
Kauṭilya, 42, 52, 55, 56-62, 128
Kṣemendra, 21, 31, 101, 106, 121, 126, 148, 152-4, 155, 166, 178, 196
Khaṇḍana Khaṇḍakhādyā, 101
Gadgacintāmaṇi, 146
Gaṅgā, 15, 36
Gaṅgavaha, 105, 122, 138
Gaṇḍīstotragāthā, 90
Garuda-purāṇa, 18, 39
Gitagovinda, 44, 117, 209
Gunāḍhyāya, 131, 136, 145, 148-151
Gunabhadra, 147
Gunavṛddhi, 155
Guhadeva, 240
Grhyasūtras, 35
Gopatha-brāhmaṇa, 241, 245
Govardhana, 112, 149
—Ācārya, 144
Ghaṭakarpara, poet, 111, 121
—poem, 111
Candra Bardai, 9
Candraśekhara, 76
Caraka, 240-1
Caraṇa-vyūha, 233
Cāṇakya, 57-61, 121, 164. See Kauṭilya
—Nitiśāstra, 121. See also Arihaśāstra.
—Rājanīti. See Cāṇakya Niti-
śāstra.
Cārucaryā, 121
Cārudattam, 45-8, 52-4, 87
Cidambara, 106
Cintāmai nibhāṭṭa, 157
Caurapañcāśikā, 116, 124
Chandoviciti, 132, 138
Chavillākara, 127
Chāndogya-upaṇiṣad, 43, 163, 262
Janamejaya, 26, 35
Jambhala đatta 155
Jaya, 26
Jayađeva, 44, 75, 117-9, 144
Jayaratha, 129
Jayāditya, 100
Jalhaṇa, 120, 129
Jātakamāḷā, 159, 161, 173
Jānakiharayām, 103-5
Jinasena, 70
Jīvandharacampū, 146, 147
Jonarāja, 120, 129, 130
Jyeṣṭha kalaśa, 125
Tantrākhyāyikā, 113, 166-168
174-5, 179
Tantra-vārtttikā, 31
Tārānatātha, 161
Tipīṭaka, 23
Tilaka Commentary, 20
—mañjari, 146
Tulsi Das, 58
Tripruddāha, 182
Trivikramabhāṭṭa, 146, 149
—sena, 155
Trīṣaṭšālākāpuruṣa-caritām, 107, 162
Dakṣiṇāvarthanātha, 70
Daṇḍin, 16, 52, 57, 61, 84, 96, 98, 103, 108, 123, 131-138
149, 150-1, 174, 193, 195, 222
Daśakumāraračaritam, 15, 57,
132-8, 193
Daśaśvatararačaritam, 106
Das Rāmāyaṇa, 23
Dayananda, 228
Diṅnāga, 80, 87, 193, 209-11
Dīvyāvadāna, 158
Duḥśāsana, 192
Dūta-ghaṭotkacān, 46
Dūtavākya, 46, 47
Dvyāśrayakāvya, See Kumāra-
pālaračaritām.
Dhanapāla, 146
Dhananājaya, 209
Dharmakirti, 139, 202
Dharmadāsa, 144
Dharmashastra, 128
Dharma-piṭaka-nidāna, 86
Dharmaśarmābhyudaya, 107,
147
Dhāvaka, 49, 50, 196-7
Dhīranāga, 209-11
Dhoyika, 70
Namisādhu, 134
Narasimhavaidya, 138
Nalacampū, 146
Navasāhasānkararita, 7, 124-
Nāgānanda, 49, 50, 100, 106,
191, 193, 196-9
Nātyadarpana, 50
Nātyaśāstra, 87, 106, 192
Nātyaveda, 182
Nānak, 58
Nārāyaṇa, 176
Nicula, 80
Nirūkta, 58
Nītipradīpa, 121
—ratna, 121
—śāstra, 88, 121, 164, 176,
197
—sāra, 57, 61, 121
—śataka, 113-4, 120
—vākyāṃśa, 57
Nilamata-purāṇa, 127
Nilakaṇṭha, 26, 28
nepathya, 192
Naṣṭadhiya, 7, 93, 101
Naṣadhapurāṇa, 39, 42
Padmamihira, 127
Paṣya-Kādambarī, 107
Patañjali, 8, 9, 12, 13, 24, 58, 63, 120, 164, 186-7, 240
Paṇcākhyaṇaka, 175
Paṇcatantra, 57, 120, 134, 146, 152, 155, 163-179
Paṇcarātra, 46, 47, 55
Parāśara, 164
Parimala. See Navasāhasānkaracaritaṁ
Pariṇāṣṭaparvan, 161
Pavanadūta, 70
Pāṇini, 5, 8, 9, 12, 15, 25, 33, 48, 52, 55, 77, 97, 138, 165, 186, 249, 250-1
—'s Grammar, See Aṣṭādhyāyī.
Pārśva, 86
Pāli Caritya-piṭaka, 159
Pāśupata Helarāja, 127
Purāṇas, the, 5, 13, 17, 18, 37-44, 63, 72, 77, 89, 122, 138, 225, 233
Puspāpurī, 15
Purāṇa-saṁhitā, 37
Pūrṇabhadra, 166-168, 175
Pūrṇayaśaḥ, 46-48, 52, 54, 62
Prthvirāja-vijaya, 129
Prthivi Raj Rasau, 9
Paśucalici, 146
Pracandra-पांडava, 208
Pratijñāyagandharayanaṁ, 46-48, 52, 54, 62
Pratimā-nājakaṁ, 46, 47
Prabodha-cundrodaya, 87, 161, 1V3, 212
Prasannarāghavam, 75
Pravarasena, 123
praveśaka, 192
Priyadarśikā, 47, 50, 193, 196-8
Balibandha, 186
Ballāla, 138
Bahurūpamīśra, 197
Bāna, 14, 31, 42, 49, 76, 82, 95, 100, 103, 105-6, 112, 116, 123, 124-5, 126-7, 131, 133-5, 136-7, 139-46, 149, 151, 156, 174, 193, 195-7, 202, 207
Bāṇabhaṭṭa, 138
Bālabhārata, 193, 208
Bālarāmāyaṇa, 75, 184, 208
Bālacaritaṁ, 46-8
Bilhana, 116, 124-5, 127, 129
—kāvyā. See Caurapaṇcāśikā.
Bihāri, 113
Buddhacaritaṁ, 78, 8690, 158
Buddhasvāmin, 148, 152-3
Brhatkathā, 123, 131-136, 138, 146, 148-54, 163, 166, 178
—mañjarī, 148, 153-5, 178
Brhat-samhitā, 126
Bodhisattvāvadānamālā, 159
Buddhasaṅgatyaśalaṅkāra, 139
Baudhāyana Dharmasūtras, 33, 62
Brahmāṇḍa-puṇaṇa 18, 37, 39, 57
Brahmaṇas, the, 5, 8, 9, 14, 37, 40-42, 214-6, 220, 227, 233, 238, 242-5, 251
Brahma-puṇaṇa, 39, 41
Brahmavaivarta-puṇaṇa, 39
Bhagavadgītā, 14, 88, 255
Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, 87, 191, 193, 201-2
Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, 240
Bhaṭṭāra Haricandra, 123, 131
Bhaṭṭi, 97-101, 114, 135
—kāvyā, 97, 114, 135
Bhandarkar, 8
Bharata, 52, 106, 182, 187
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Yāśka, 9, 12, 58, 220, 228

Raghuvamśa, 18, 64, 72, 74-5, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 88, 91, 103, 134, 138, 201

Ratnākara, 101, 212

Ratnānarjī, 708

Ratnāvalī, 49, 50, 193, 196 8

Raṅganātha, 75

Ravikandra, 115

Rasikaraṇījana, 107

Rākasakāvya, 111

Rāgḥava-nāṣadhiyaṁ, 105

—pāṅḍaviyaṁ, 105, 138

—yādaviyaṁ, 106

Rāgavahāṭṭa, 76

Rājatarangaṁ, 120, 126, 127, 128, 196

Rājānaka, See Ratnākara.

Rājaniti-samuccaya, See Cōṇa-kīya-nītiśatakaṁ.

Rājendra-karṇapaṇa, 130

Rajendra Lal Mitra, 159

Rājasēkhara, 45, 49, 50, 75-6, 105, 106, 132, 151, 184, 193, 198, 207-209, 212

Rāmacandra, 107

Rāmapālacaritam, 129

Rāmacandra Gunacandra, 50

Rāmāyaṇa, 5, 8, 13, 17-25, 30, 46, 69, 72, 88, 89, 105-107, 110, 149-51, 186-7, 203-4, 210-11, 240

—campā, 21, 147

—maṅjarī, 21, 107, 153

Rāmila, 45, 193

Rāvanarjunīyaṁ, 106

Rāvanavadha, See Bhaṭṭikāvya.

Rudradāmanā inscription, 54, 63, 131

Rudrata, 134

Rudrabhaṭṭa, 175

Rāpāvatāra, 202

Romakasiddhānta, 81

Lalitāditya, 207

Līṅga-purāṇa, 39

Lokanātha, Commentary, 20

Vajrasūci, 32, 90

Vatsabhaṭṭa, 70, 74, 80, 98, 103

Vararuci, 45, 121, 139

Varāha-purāṇa, 39

Varāhamihira, 73, 126

Varuṇa, 15, 36

Vallabhādāsa, 156

Vallabhadeva, 73, 74, 83, 120

Vasubandhu, 80

Vākpati, 105

—rāja, 121, 124, 138, 207

Vākyapadiya, 113

Vāgīśvara, See Ratnākara.

Vācaspati, 164

Vātsyāyana, 194

Vādībashīṃha, 146

Vādīrāja, 107

Vāmana, 52, 84, 105, 116, 133, 202, 207

Vāmana-purāṇa, 39

Vāyu, 15

Vāyu-purāṇa, 35, 37, 39, 42, 43, 44, 57

Vārttikā, 138

Vālmīki, 18, 22, 26, 34, 35, 51, 69, 87, 96, 106, 210

Vāsavadattā, 123, 131, 137-41, 149

Vikrama Era, 63, 77, 79, 108, 195

Vikramāditya, 7, 77, 78-9, 108, 109, 111, 114, 128-9, 155, 157, 197, 195

Vikramāṅkadevacaritam, 116, 124

Vikramorvaśīyaṁ, 49, 64, 65, 75, 77, 98, 204

Vijjikā, 134

Vidhāsāla-bhaṭṭikā, 208

Vinayapitaka, 158

Vimalasūri, 18

Viṣkambhaka, 192

Viṣṇu-purāṇa, 18, 37, 39, 43, 44, 57

Viṣṇugupta, 56

Viṣṇuśarma, 168, 178

Viṣṇuśahasranāma, 33
Viśākhadatta, 52, 191, 193, 199-201
Vīresvara, 113
Vṛddha Cāṅkya, See Cāṅkya-nītiśāstraḥ
Vēṭalapaṇiclevīṃśatikā, 152, 155, 157, 177, 193, 195
Vēṭalabhāṭṭa, 121
Vedas, 5, 14, 37, 39, 40, 42, 61, 182, 214-55
Venīsāṃhāra, 87, 191, 193, 201
Vemabhūpāla, 115
Vairāgyasatakam, 113, 114
Vaiśampāyana, 26, 28
Vyasā, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 37, 42, 61, 226
Śaktibhadra, 46
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 42, 220, 225, 236, 244-5, 263
Śaṅkara, 76, 115, 246
—vijaya, 208
Śambhu, 113, 130
Śarvavarmā, 141, 151
Śākuntala, 5, 48, 65, 113, 244, 255
Śāntideva, 24
Śānti-satakā, 116
Śarāgadhāra, 120
—padhāti, 45, 120
Śaradātanaya, 50, 117, 211
Śariputra-prakarana, 86
Śārdūla Karmāvādāna, 159
Śālivāhana-kathā, 155
Śiṣṭā-samuccaya, 24
Śibiśatāka, 160
Śiromāṇi, Commentary, 21
Śilāhāra, 116
Śīsupālavadhā, 98, 99
Śivadāsa, 155-6, 165
Śiṃa-purāṇa, 39
Śivasvāti, 196
Śivasvāmin, 106
Śīsupālavadhā, See Māghakāvyā
Śilābhāṭṭārikā, 119
Śuka, 130
Śukasaptati, 156, 165, 177
Śukra, 164
Śūdra, 53, 193
Śrīgāra-satakā, 113
Śrīgāratilaka, 111
Śrīgāraprakāśa, 50
Śaunaka, 217
Śrīkāṇṭha, 202
—caritām, 107, 212
Śrīdhāradāsa, 120
Śrībhoojadeva, 50
Śrīvora, 120, 130
Śrīharṣa, 7, 101, 191, 193
Ślokasaṅgraha, 148, 152, 153
Śvetāmbara Jaina, 157
Sat-sai, 78, 112-3
Saddharma Smṛtyupasthāṇa, 24
Sadukti-karṇāṁrtha, 45, 120
Sandhya-kara Nandin, 129
Saptasāti, 149
Samasyāpūrayāna, 70
Samayamāṭṭkā, 121
Samudra-manthana, 182
Śamyukta-ratna-piṭaka, 86
Śarvajña Nārāyaṇa, 28
Śarvāstivādins, 158
Śātavaḥana, 112, 123, 148, 150-1
Śāmaveda, 182, 185, 217, 220, 235-6, 243
Śāyaṇa, 60, 221, 228, 236, 239, 240, 242, 246
Śāhityadarpana, 75, 146, 190, 211
Siddapur inscription, 54
Siddharṣi, 161
Śiṃhāsana-dvātrimśikā, 157, 165
Sukṛtasaṅkīrtana, 130
Subandhu, 31, 76, 101, 105, 106, 123, 131, 133-9, 149, 151
Subrahmanya, 203
Subhāṣītāvalī, 45, 83, 120
Subhāṣītamuktāvalī, 120
Surathotsava, 130
Sūktimuktāvalī, 45
Sūktikarṇāṁrtha, See Sadukti-karṇāṁrtha.
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Sūtras, 13, 120, 214, 216, 220, 249-53
Sūtrālaṅkāra, 86, 90
Sūri, See Kavirāja.
Sūrya-sataka, 116
Setubandha, 103
Soḍḍhala, 147
Somadeva, 57, 145, 147, 148, 149, 152, 166, 178, 193, 209
Somapālavilāsa, 129
Somila, 45, 193
Someśvaradatta, 130
Sauti, 26, 29, 31
Saundarānanda, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 158
Saumilla, 65
Skanda-purāṇa, 39
Skandāsvāmin, 221, 228
Svapnavāsavadattamī, 46-8, 51, 138
Hayagrīvavadha, 106
Haradatta Sūri, 105
Haraprasada Sastri, 90
Haravijaya, 101-2, 212
Haricandra, 107, 123, 147
Harivaṃśa, 21, 28, 29-31, 33, 185-6
Hariśeṇa, 108, 131
Harisvāmī, 239
Harṣa, 76, 101, 106, 128, 196-8
—caritān, 42, 49, 76, 82, 95, 100, 112, 123, 126, 130, 134, 137, 139, 140, 143, 149, 193, 197, 207
Halāyudha, 106
Hastipaka, 106
Hāla, 78, 112-3
Hitopadeśa, 128, 164-68, 176-8, 255
Hemacandra, 107, 128, 150, 157, 161